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#### Transportation technology’s fixation with speed manipulates nature draining it of value

Nadis, History professor at California State University, 2006 (Fred, “*The Enchantments of Technology (review)”,* Technology and Culture, Project Muse)

¶ In this intriguing synthesis, Lee Worth Bailey proposes that the apparent "disenchantment" of the world that accompanied the scientific and industrial revolutions would better be described as a transfer of "enchantments" from the natural to the technological order. With a nod to Bruno Latour, Bailey asserts that despite the technological underpinnings of modern society, "We have never been modern." The modern world is laden with hidden "enchantments," including the unstated desires, fantasies, and myths that guide technological development, research, and commerce.¶ ¶ Bailey insists that a variety of invisible enchantments guard the gateways to the rational-technological order. His argument is strongest when he examines the philosophical underpinnings of scientific detachment and objectivity. He notes that the technological project's aim, from Francis Bacon on, has been to "subject" nature—to cleanse it of spirit and posit it as nothing but brute matter. The scientific worldview required a new "disenchanted" metaphysic and Descartes eventually offered one, when he insisted on the sharp distinction between "subject" and "object" that became enshrined as a ruling cognitive assumption of modernity. Enlightenment epistemology reframed "Being" as neutral matter, meaningless beyond its use value. As an adjunct to this conquest of nature and its mysteries, Enlightenment epistemology likewise conquered the "self," isolating a reasoning subjective consciousness from earlier modes of "being-in-the-world." This modernist worldview, which encouraged what Bailey calls the "brain in a vat" model of selfhood, inevitably heightened alienation and encouraged, in compensation, a nihilistic will to power often channeled through technology.¶ ¶ Bailey strengthens this argument with his discussion of the rise of the camera obscura and magic lanterns as modernizing technologies. The camera obscura provided an analogue for a disembodied sensibility, one that gained sense impressions from a distinct material realm. The phantasms of the magic lantern, ironically, strengthened this epistemology: "The magic lantern exhibits the philosophical notion that a purely internal psyche pro-jects subjective feeling outward onto a soulless world of objects" (p. 78). In this way, new technological developments strengthened the construction of a cleansed world in which isolated "subjects" confronted "objects."¶ ¶ Throughout this work, Bailey, a professor of religious studies and philosophy, is admonitory, insisting that our worldview with its hidden enchantments and enshrinement of reason is pathological. He develops his argument with chapters that look at key enchantments that have guided technological development: speed, the Titanic, flight, and "Robogod." These chapters graft social critique to the history of technology. For example, the lust for speed, or the "rush," has guided transportation technology, as isolated [End Page 816] consumers seek a "sublime" state behind the steering wheel. The chapter on the Titanic uses this tragedy as an example of the hidden hubris of technologists. In his chapter on flight, Bailey insists that the history of aviation and aeronautics has a barely hidden spiritual subtext. A chapter on robotics, or "the Pinocchio Project," points to the millennialism dreams rampant in the artificial intelligence and robotics community.¶ ¶ Throughout, Bailey is prescriptive. He bases his position on phenomenologists such as Husserl and Heidegger who rejected the simple subject– object dualism and proposed a return to the notion of Being. He also cites Gregory Bateson, Morris Berman, and other thinkers influenced by environmentalism. Bailey's effort to define "deep technology" overlaps with countercultural and environmentalist critiques of materialism. He strains to avoid pop jargon—rarely, for example, resorting to the word "holistic"— yet urges much the same program. Although he makes vague mention of international organizations and self-imposed ethical codes growing from within the technological communities, his prescription falls into the realm of the therapeutic as he argues that it is up to individuals to see and experience the world in its greater complexity, without the blinders of guiding enchantments.¶ ¶ The Enchantments of Technology is a useful synthesis of philosophy, religious studies, and history. Undergraduate engineering and science students, who might indeed have their eyes opened to the realm of hidden enchantments that Bailey unveils, would be ideal readers.¶

#### **This technological framing poses the world as standing reserve and removes the essence of humanity**

Idhe, Professor of Philosophy and the Director of the Technoscience Research Group at Stony Brook, 2010 (Don, *Heidegger’s Technologies*, Project Muse, Pg 54-55

Now the concept of technology that pervades the lecture clearly combines¶ elements from both sides of the earlier contrasting modes of relation.¶ It remains the case that only through concern with the world, through¶ what remains the praxical, is humanity effected in its essence. And it is¶ only because it is effected in its essence that technology can be considered¶ dangerous. ‘‘The threat to man does not come in the first instance from¶ the potentially lethal machines and apparatus of technology. The actual¶ threat has already afflicted man in his essence’’ (QT 309). But what is¶ now taken into the very way in which world is perceived are the previously¶ negatively characterized ‘‘reductions’’ whereby the world becomes mere¶ standing-reserve.¶ I have indicated that latently the ‘‘nature’’ of the ready-to-hand already¶ anticipates the notion of standing-reserve. Taking account of nature in¶ such a way that the ‘‘wood is a forest of timber’’ is already to be open to¶ a world taken as standing-reserve, but this is a necessary and not sufficient¶ condition. What makes it sufficient is the addition of thematically and¶ systematically taking ‘‘nature’’ into a calculative and universal view of¶ nature as standing-reserve. But this is the metaphysics of what may be¶ characterized as a scientific or theoretically organized technology and not¶ that of any simple handiwork technology. Thus in some sense, the illuminating¶ distinctions of the ready-to-hand and the present-at-hand of Being¶ and Time collapse in the later work and become unified.¶ One result of this collapse is the elimination of any purely contemplative¶ science. There can be no ‘‘just looking’’ in what should more correctly¶ now be called a technological science. The Greek ideal is what is lost—¶ and if Heidegger is correct, then those who think they are remaining true¶ to this ideal are merely naı¨ve and open to being used by technological¶ culture. As with the non-neutrality of technology, there can now be no¶ neutrality to science.¶ Ironically, a compatible way of interpreting this collapse of readinessto-¶ hand and presence-at-hand in the later Heidegger is to see that the¶ science latent within presence-at-hand, in contemporary technological science,¶ has become an existentialized science. That is why it can be thought¶ of as effecting humanity in its essence. I shall not speculate concerning¶ how this might literally be the case in contemporary genetic engineering,¶ however tempting such an excursus might be, but it is in such examples¶ that one might see how humanity itself becomes standing-reserve in the¶ Heideggerian sense.¶ Technology, then, becomes the combined powers of what was earlier¶ both readiness-to-hand and presence-at-hand. Humanity is effected essentially¶ because science itself is technological in its contemporary sense and operates in the praxical dimension. But in these transpositions the earlier¶ positive tone given to the praxical also disappears and is replaced with the¶ characterizations of technological culture as ‘‘dangerous,’’ ‘‘ambiguous,’’¶ ‘‘mysterious,’’ and as harboring even a certain ‘‘monstrousness.’’ It is from¶ such characterizations that Heidegger’s critical attitude toward technology¶ provides material for an interpretation that sees him as dominantly pessimistic¶ regarding humanity’s future.

#### That outweighs extinction – it’s better to die than to live as slaves to technological thought

Rojcewicz, Professor of Philosophy at Point Park University, 06 (Executive Director of the Simon Silverman Phenomenology Center at Duquesne University, cotranslator of Heidegger’s work. Richard, The Gods and Technology: A Reading of Heidegger, page 140-141)

Heidegger now launches an extended discussion of the danger inherent in modern technology. It needs to be underlined that for Heidegger the threat is not simply to human existence. The prime danger is not that high-tech devices might get out of hand and wreck havoc on their creators by way of a radioactive spill or an all-encompassing nuclear holocaust. The danger is not that by disposing of so many disposables we will defile the planet and make it uninhabitable. For Heidegger the danger**—**the prime danger—does not lie in technological things but in the essence of technology. Technological things are indeed dangerous; the rampant exploitation of natural resources is deplorable; the contamination of the environment is tragic. We need to conserve and to keep hightech things from disposing of us. Yet, for Heidegger, conservation, by itself, is not the answer. Conservation alone is not radical enough. Conservation is aimed at things, technological things and natural things, but it does not touch the outlook or basic attitude that is the essence of modern technology, and it is there that the danger lies. It may well be that conservation will succeed and that technology will solve its own problems by producing things that are safe and nonpolluting; nevertheless, the prime danger, which lies deeper down, will remain. For the danger is not primarily to the existence of humans but to their essence: "The threat to man does not come in the first instance from the potentially lethal effects of the machines and devices of technology. The genuine threat has already affected humans—in their essence" (FT, 29/28). In a sense, the threat inherent in modern technology has already been made good. Though we have thus far averted a nuclear disaster, that does not mean the genuine threat has been obviated. Humans still exist; they are not yet on the endangered species list. It would of course be tragic if humans made that list. Yet, for Heidegger, there could be something more tragic, namely for humans to go on living but to lose their human dignity, which stems from their essence. Here lies the prime danger, the one posed not by technological things but by the disclosive looking that constitutes the essence of modern technology. The prime danger is that humans could become (and in fact are already becoming) enslaved to this way of disclosive looking. Thus what is primarily in danger is human 3 danger in modern technology is that humans may fail to see themselves as free followers, fail to see the challenges directed at their freedom by the current guise of Being, and fail to see the genuine possibilities open to them to work out their destiny. Then, not seeing their freedom, humans will not protect it. They will let it slip away and will become mere followers, passively imposed on by modern technology, i.e., slaves to it, mere cogs in the machine. For Heidegger, there is an essential connection between seeing and freedom. The way out of slavery begins with seeing, insight. But it is the right thing that must be seen, namely, one's own condition. The danger is that humans may perfect their powers of scientific seeing and yet be blind to that wherein their dignity and freedom lie, namely the entire domain of disclosedness and their role in it. Humans would then pose as "masters of the earth," and yet their self-blindness would make them slaves.

Our alternative is to suspend technological thought.

#### **Questioning is a pre-requisite to effective action and is the only way to restore Being**

Babich, Professor of Philosophy Fordham University, 2012 (Babette, “Heidegger’s Philosophy of Sicence and the Critique of Calculation: Reflective Questioning, Gelassenheit, and Life”, *Heidegger on Science* edited by Trish Glazebrook, Project Muse, Pg 165-166

What Heidegger means by questioning remains more elusive than even¶ his more attentive readers tend to think. More is at stake in any question¶ than is supposed at first glance and still more is involved in what, in his¶ 1934 course on Logic as the Question After the Essence of Language, he names¶ “authentic and genuine questioning” [eigentliches und echtes Fragen] (GA 38,¶ 18), understanding such questioning as an invitation to reflection, that is,¶ to the kind of thinking that holds faith with—and such we see again will be¶ the meaning of piety, dedication, or devotion to—its own task. Delineating¶ the formal structure of questioning in section two at the start of Being¶ and Time, Heidegger begins by turning the question upon itself. From this¶ reflexive perspective, he writes:¶ Every questioning is a seeking. Every seeking is guided in advance¶ by what is sought. Questioning is a cognizant [erkennende] seeking¶ for an entity both with regard to the fact that it is and with regard¶ to its being as it is. This cognizant seeking can take the form of¶ an “investigating,” in which one lays bare that which the question¶ is about and ascertains its character. . . . Questioning itself is the¶ behaviour of a questioner, and therefore of an entity, and as such¶ has the character of Being.23¶ Thus, as Heidegger attempts to pose the question of Being as a question that¶ has been forgotten, it is characteristic of his thinking that he will first find¶ it necessary to reflect upon the Being of questioning (as such) and indeed¶ as the Being of a seeking that is always guided in advance, in order to be¶ a question at all, by that which is sought. In this way, every questioning¶ includes: das Gefragte—that which, and to begin with, is asked about; das¶ Befragte—that which is interrogated in the inquiry itself; das Erfragte—the¶ aim of the inquiry: that which is to be discovered. A question thus spells¶ out the range, object, or frame of what might be considered as a reply or¶ answer but Heidegger will carefully distinguish between answer-bound or¶ -determined questioning—the kind of question that seeks only a pregiven¶ answer—from the kind of question that genuinely asks after what might¶ come forth as an answering reply.¶ For Heidegger, philosophical thinking is an active questioning. Hence,¶ “authentic” questioning is about the asking as such rather than the answer.¶ With Heidegger, we are not only to reflect on the nature of questioning,¶ but on the meaning of thinking, of thought itself, language, and indeed the¶ embodied mortality of the inquirer. In opposition to calculative thinking,¶ Heidegger opposed sense-directed reflection [Besinnung] for embodied, mortal¶ beings such as ourselves. It is this sensitively, incarnate reflection that¶ Heidegger contrasts as properly philosophical or indeed poetical thought to¶ the rational, calculative (and effectively unquestioning because solutioninformed¶ and answer-driven) project of Western technologically articulated¶ and advancing science. Such a poetically attuned task of reflective thinking¶ would open its own way, just as “questioning always builds a way,”24 by its questioning advance (ground, object, and aim). Thus questioning “is¶ the unique habitat and locus of thinking” (WD, 113/185). However, and¶ as opposed to the transparent and calculative inquiry that seeks solutions,¶ authentic questioning ultimately turns out to be so rare that it is not clear¶ that we can ever be otherwise than underway to questioning. One has,¶ reflecting in this fashion, to take up a position in questioning, a disposition¶ toward thought, an inclination. “To venture after sense or meaning [Sinn] is¶ the essence of reflecting [Besinnen]. This means more than a mere making¶ conscious of something. We do not have reflection [this is, as we shall see,¶ also the meaning of what Heidegger names Gelassenheit] when we have only¶ consciousness. Reflection is more. It is calm, self-possessed surrender to that¶ which is worthy of questioning” (VA, 64/180; cf. WD, 116/189). What matters¶ in questioning then will be thoughtful reflection (cf. VA, 64/180). But¶ this brings us to a precipitously superficial insight—and Heidegger learned¶ this best from Nietzsche—an insight reduced by trivializing convention.¶ No sooner does one broach such a set of reflections, Heidegger warns, but¶ “just as quickly, indeed, the next day, it is transmitted as the cliché: everything¶ turns upon question-worthiness [alles kommt auf die Fragwürdigkeit an]”¶ (WD, 113/185). Although, “with such an invocation one seems to belong¶ amongst those who question” (WD, 113/185), such questioning is almost¶ always other than authentic or genuine. We need then to be careful as we¶ follow Heidegger in his reflections on thinking (and questioning) to avoid¶ the lure of reductive convention.¶ As Heidegger distinguishes science (even as philosophy) and what¶ he calls thinking (even as philosophy), when he says that “science does¶ not think” [die Wissenschaft denkt nicht] (WD, 4/8; cf. WD, 57/33, 154/134,¶ 155/135), he also observes that thinking per se does not figure in the calculative¶ project of professional and university mathematicians and scientists.¶ But, reciprocally, knowing as such turns out not to be the excellence of¶ thinking (“thinking knows essentially less than the sciences” [WD 57/33])¶ and thinking is from its inception, distant from conceptualization as such:¶ “the totality of the great thinking of Greek thought, Aristotle included,¶ thinks non-conceptually [begrifflos].”25 Heidegger’s most critical claim here¶ is that thinking is effectively impotent, inherently inefficient: “a doing that¶ effects nothing” [ein Tun, das nichts bewirkt].26 Such “impotent,” “ineffective” reflection remains, however, “more provisional,¶ more forbearing, and poorer in relation to things” (VA, 65-6/181)¶ and for this reason, thoughtful reflection is not to be reduced to analytic¶ “problem solving.”27 In the attempt to learn such reflective or sense-attuned¶ thought (as opposed to the technical culture of problem solving, manufactured¶ knowledge, or even practicable wisdom, etc.), “we must [instead] allow¶ ourselves to become involved in questions that seek what no inventiveness can find” (WD, 5/8). Heidegger specifies the calculative inquiry characteristic¶ of modern technoscience (and the current environmental crisis, indeed, the¶ current economic crisis, shows that little has changed), by contrast, as a¶ solution-obsessed project: the “inquiry that aims straight for an answer. It¶ rightly looks for the singular answer, and sees to it that the answer is found.¶ The answer disposes of the question. By the answer, we rid ourselves of the¶ question” (WD, 160/158). The circumstances of the current array of crises¶ exemplify the limitations of such an approach while indeed underscoring¶ its incorrigibility at the same time. Having “disposed” of the question, we¶ are hard pressed to consider alternative solutions.

## **\*\*\*Links\*\*\***

## **Tech**

#### Technology enframes the world and makes everything standing reserve

Idhe, Professor of Philosophy and the Director of the Technoscience Research Group at Stony Brook, 2010 (Don, *Heidegger’s Technologies*, Project Muse, Pg. 108-109

The second implication, however, is more abstract—it is only by turning¶ Technology (capitalized) into a ‘‘metaphysics’’ that it becomes possible¶ for Heidegger to claim that science itself is subsumed into Technology:¶ ‘‘Technology is therefore no mere means. Technology is a way of¶ revealing. . . . Technology is a mode of revealing. Technology comes to¶ presence in the realm where revealing and unconcealment take place,¶ where aletheia, truth, happens.’’44 But this end of metaphysics is simultaneously¶ the transcendentalizing of Technology and its characterization as¶ ‘‘Enframing,’’ ‘‘Standing-Reserve,’’ and the reduction of the whole of¶ nature under its ‘‘challenge.’’ Technology as hidden within modernity, is¶ again contrasted with the ‘‘Greek’’: ‘‘And yet the revealing that holds sway¶ throughout modern technology does not unfold into a bringing-forth in¶ the sense of poie´sis. The revealing that rules in modern technology is a¶ challenging which puts nature to the unreasonable demand that it supply¶ energy that can be extracted and stored as such.’’45¶ From this streams the cascade of contrasts between Heidegger’s romantic¶ and nostalgic premodern preferences and the negatively cast consequences¶ of modernity, technoscience. Under the former, the ‘‘Question’’¶ includes the old windmill, the old wooden bridge, the Rhine, and old¶ handwork technology; and under the latter, a hydroelectric plant, jets,¶ radar, agriculture as mechanized food industry, mining—both uranium¶ and coal, and power stations.¶ The revealing of Technology that challenges the earth itself ‘‘sees’’ the¶ earth as standing-reserve, for mining, for mineral deposits, for yielding¶ ore, nitrogen for agriculture, uranium for nuclear uses—all this is Technological¶ ‘‘revealing,’’ and it now sucks up and includes modern science¶ itself under its sway:¶ Because the essence of modern technology lies in Enframing, modern¶ technology must employ exact physical science. Through its so¶ doing, the deceptive illusion arises that modern technology is¶ applied physical science. This illusion can maintain itself only so¶ long as neither the essential origin of modern science nor indeed¶ the essence of modern technology is adequately found out through¶ questioning.46¶ The more intimate relations between science and its technologies, the¶ inversion that sees science as more than merely technologically embodied,¶ are prescient—but also deeply flawed.¶ Heidegger’s thin understanding of the history of technology shows¶ through even in this essay: mining, and whatever mode of revealing it¶ belongs to, goes back to prehistoric times; by Roman times the lead levels¶ had risen almost to modern heights; and while the old windmill may not¶ take the wind for granted as power source, the old sawmill that dams the¶ stream does. But there is a worse result from elevating Technology into a¶ metaphysics as well: It dooms Heidegger’s analyses of technology to being¶ the same for every technology. Taking nature, the earth, as enframed¶ standing-reserve leads—one can say logically—to his later claims in the¶ interviews that the Holocaust and modern agriculture are equivalent¶ (both treat their resources as standing-reserve). In short, the elevation to¶ technology with a capital ‘‘T’’ emasculates Heidegger’s philosophy of¶ technology from making any nuanced conclusions about particular technologies¶ (without capitals) because everything stands under the revealing¶ power of enframed standing-reserve. If such a move is philosophically disastrous, a second move that while¶ belonging closely to this late insight, but that was not fully followed out,¶ shows more promise. Heidegger begins to get a glimpse—but a glimpse¶ only—that late modern science may, in fact, be different from early modern¶ science. I have previously noted this in his belated recognition that¶ quantum physics totally resituates the early modern subject-object distinction.¶ In the ‘‘Question’’ he finally realizes that standing-reserve ‘‘designates¶ nothing less than the way in which everything presences that is¶ wrought upon by the challenging revealing. Whatever stands by in the¶ sense of standing-reserve no longer stands over against us as object.’’47¶ This ‘dissolution’ into pure relationality [noted earlier] implies something¶ approaching a ‘systems’ approach to technology’ . . . an airliner that stands¶ on a runway is surely an object. . . .We can represent the machine so. But¶ then it conceals itself as to what and how it is. Revealed, it stands on the¶ taxi strip only as standing-reserve, inasmuch as it is ordered to ensure the¶ possibility of transportation. For this it must be in its whole structure and¶ in every one of its constituent parts, on call for duty . . . ready for takeoff.’’¶ 48 Much later, Bruno Latour was to say, ‘‘airplanes do not fly, Air France flies.’’ But the implication, undeveloped, is that late modern science¶ may harbor a very nonmodern epistemology, no longer bound to¶ the Cartesian subject-object, and representationalist context. Rephrasing,¶ ‘‘physics, in all its retreating from the representation turned only toward¶ objects . . . will never be able to renounce . . . that nature reports itself in¶ some way or other that is identifiable through calculation . . . and remains¶ orderable as a system of information.’’49 This, however, hints at something¶ very different from early modern physics and early modern epistemology.¶ Heidegger never followed through on this insight.¶ I shall now leave Heidegger, ambiguously caught in his late recognition¶ that within science itself, an epoche had emerged that no longer was commensurate¶ with the early modern science that Heidegger deeply contested.¶ And, although there were moments of prescience—which I have identified—¶ in relation to late-twentieth- and early-twenty-first-century thinking¶ about science, he still is left in the main as now as much ‘‘history’’ as¶ were his contemporaries: Carnap, Feigl, Reichenbach, and others. Crippled¶ by a paucity of systematic thinking about science, a shallowness of¶ awareness of the histories of both science and technology, Heidegger now¶ takes his own place as ‘‘history.’’

#### The usage of tools such as roads, bridges, and waterways is not a blind action- it entails a greater system of manipulation of the natural environment and a destruction of being

Idhe, Professor of Philosophy and the Director of the Technoscience Research Group at Stony Brook, 2010 (Don, *Heidegger’s Technologies*, Project Muse, Pg 46-48)

What emerges from this analysis is a description of equipmentally¶ intentional structures, which Heidegger calls the ready-to-hand. It is the¶ equipmental (noematic) context that is the condition for the manifestation¶ of a ‘‘tool’’ as ready-to-hand.¶ The kind of Being which equipment possesses—in which it manifests¶ itself in its own right—we call ‘‘readiness-to-hand.’’ Only¶ because equipment has this ‘‘Being-in-itself ’’ and does not merely¶ occur, is it manipulable in the broadest sense and at our disposal.¶ (BT 98)¶ What is more, it is from this structure that Heidegger contends one can¶ detect a kind of praxical knowledge that is distinct from what we ordinarily¶ think of as theoretical knowledge. A simply predicative knowledge of¶ things described by properties misses this stratum, ‘‘no matter how¶ sharply we just look at the ‘outward appearance’ of Things in whatever¶ form this takes, we cannot discover anything ready-to-hand’’ (BT 98).¶ Contrarily, it is only in use that the distinctive characteristics of the¶ ready-to-hand emerge. ‘‘When we deal with them by using them and¶ manipulating them, this activity is not a blind one; it has its own kind of¶ sight, by which our manipulation is guided and from which it acquires its¶ specific Thingly character’’ (BT 98). Here the turn is made to the noetic¶ correlate. The sight that emerges in active use, noetically, is also a field¶ characteristic of human engagement, circumspection. ‘‘The sight with¶ which they thus accommodate themselves in circumspection . . . action has¶ its own kind of sight’’ (BT 98–99).¶ Heidegger sets off in strongest terms the difference between this praxical¶ sight and a theoretical observation. The latter would focus its gaze¶ upon the ‘‘tool’’ and thus make of it an object having such and such properties—¶ but this precisely hides the distinctive character of the entity in¶ use. It is the peculiar manifestation of the tool in use that is the secret to¶ praxical sight. The tool in use appears not as an object to be seen, but¶ recedes or withdraws.¶ The peculiarity of what is proximally ready-to-hand is that, in its¶ readiness-to-hand, it must, as it were, withdraw in order to be readyto-¶ hand quite authentically. That with which our everyday dealings¶ proximally dwell is not the tools themselves. On the contrary, that¶ with which we concern ourselves primarily is the work. (BT 99)¶ Here is an essential insight concerning the ready-to-hand. The entity in¶ praxical use ‘‘withdraws’’ or is taken into a manifestation that is partially¶ ‘‘transparent.’’ This is one reason why the ready-to-hand may be so easily¶ overlooked and also a reason for the inappropriateness of a predicate analysis.¶ It is a phenomenologically positive feature of the appearance. It is,¶ moreover, thoroughly in keeping with the intentionality analysis being¶ presupposed by Heidegger. The human user refers through the tool-equipment¶ toward one in which the work or result appears. A Thing in the¶ mode of ready-to-hand is radically different from a Thing in the mode of¶ being ‘‘just there’’ or present-at-hand.¶ Although a full characterization of the mode of the present-at-hand is¶ not called for in this essay, its relationship with the mode of the ready-tohand¶ is. It might be thought that the two modes could merely be variants¶ upon concern with the world, but this is not the use to which Heidegger¶ puts his distinction. Rather, he argues that one is the condition for the other, that readiness-to-hand precedes presence-at-hand, and it is this argument¶ that is both the inversion of Husserlian phenomenology and the¶ source of what later becomes the primacy of technology in relation to¶ science. The themes that arise in this argument are precisely those that arise¶ concerning technology in the later lecture. First, readiness-to-hand is a¶ mode of disclosure. It is through the ready-to-hand that the environment¶ appears as a ‘‘world.’’ Praxis discovers Nature through the ready-to-hand.¶ Heidegger’s analysis traces this discovery not merely from a subject, but¶ also intersubjectively and on through wider and wider reaches until¶ Nature is seen in a certain way:¶ Any work with which one concerns oneself is ready-to-hand not¶ only in the domestic world of the workshop but also in the public¶ world. Along with the public world, the environing Nature is discovered¶ and is accessible to everyone. In roads, streets, bridges,¶ buildings, our concern discovers Nature as having some definite¶ direction. A covered railway platform takes account of bad¶ weather; an installation for public lighting takes account of the¶ darkness. . . . In a clock account is taken of some definite constellation¶ in the world-system. . . . When we make use of the clockequipment,¶ which is proximally and inconspicuously ready-tohand,¶ the environing Nature is ready-to-hand along with it. (BT¶ 100–101)¶ Here one sees the anticipation in Being and Time of the way in which¶ the founding totality is seen through a mode of disclosure. The readyto-¶ hand discovers the world, but only implicitly, because the world lies¶ ‘‘behind’’ the partial withdrawal of the equipment in its use.¶ Our concernful absorption in whatever work-world lies closest to¶ us, has a function of discovering; and it is essential to this function¶ that, depending upon the way in which we are absorbed, those entities¶ within-the-world which are brought along in the work and with¶ it . . . remain discoverable in varying degrees of explicitness and with¶ a varying circumspective penetration. (BT 101)¶ Second, what is ultimately revealed is the world as a whole. ‘‘The context¶ of equipment is lit up, not as something never seen before, but as a¶ totality constantly sighted beforehand in circumspection. With this totality,¶ however, the world announces itself ’’ (BT 105).¶ Third, once disclosed, world is seen to be that in which Dasein already¶ was, that in which Dasein has its relation of being-in: The world is therefore something ‘‘wherein’’ Dasein as an entity¶ already was, and if in any manner it explicitly comes away from anything,¶ it can never do more than come back to the world. Being-inthe-¶ world, according to our interpretation hitherto, amounts to a¶ non-thematic circumspection absorption in references or assignments¶ constitutive for the readiness-to-hand of a totality of equipment.¶ (BT 106–107)

## Maintenance

#### Maintenance is the utmost example of standing reserve. We replace things that are no longer useful to us making the entire world potentially disposable

Idhe, Professor of Philosophy and the Director of the Technoscience Research Group at Stony Brook, 2010 (Don, *Heidegger’s Technologies*, Project Muse, Pg 48-50)

What is peculiar about the mode of the ready-to-hand is precisely the¶ way in which the entities, the equipment, manifest themselves by paradoxically¶ withdrawing in use. This partial transparency in use functions¶ to conceal the very context in which the equipment occurs. In noting this,¶ Heidegger is considerably subtle in his phenomenological tactics, but,¶ simultaneously, he begins to employ what I call the negative turn to isolate¶ the structural characteristic he is interested in displaying.¶ Equipment in use appears as partially transparent, as hidden from¶ direct observation. To show this, Heidegger inverts the situation and contends¶ that the equipmental context (which is the first index for world)¶ appears through negativity when the equipment somehow fails to¶ function.¶ There are two reasons for this negative turn. The first is tactical with¶ respect to presence-at-hand. Heidegger argues that the mode of relationship,¶ which is theoretical, the present-at-hand, cannot discover either¶ equipment or an equipmental context. One does not uncover the praxical¶ at all by adding predicates to an object. A ‘‘tool’’ is not a bare physical¶ entity to which one may add ‘‘values’’; neither is its serviceability or¶ usability seen by a bare perceptual cognition. Thus, the negative turn¶ functions, in part, to short-circuit the temptation to give an account of¶ the ready-to-hand in terms of a theoretical metaphysics. Regarding equipment,¶ ‘‘we discover its unusability, however, not by looking at it and¶ establishing its properties, but rather by the circumspection of the dealings¶ in which we use it’’ (BT 102).¶ The second reason functions as a positive phenomenological tactic by¶ making what must be described as the partial transparency of equipment¶ in use appear indirectly. Thus, by this variation—no different in function from a Husserlian fantasy variation—Heidegger displays this feature of¶ the ready-to-hand by noting that piece of equipment which malfunctions,¶ is unusable or even missing serves to indirectly light up its genuine function.¶ But in the process, the negative appearance must be characterized in¶ partial thinglike terms: conspicuousness, obtrusiveness, obstinacy. ‘‘When¶ its unusability is thus discovered, equipment becomes conspicuous. This¶ conspicuousness presents the ready-to-hand equipment as in a certain unreadiness-¶ to-hand. . . . When we notice what is un-ready-to-hand, that¶ which is ready-to-hand enters the mode of obtrusiveness’’ (BT 102–103).¶ This is to say that a malfunctioning piece of equipment emerges from¶ its functional transparency and becomes a ‘‘thing’’ that just lies there.¶ Indeed, it is from this negative characterization that Heidegger derives the¶ origin of the present-at-hand!¶ Anything which is un-ready-to-hand in this way is disturbing to us,¶ and enables us to see the obstinacy of that with which we must concern¶ ourselves in the first instance before we do anything else. With¶ this obstinacy, the presence-at-hand of the ready-to-hand makes¶ itself known in a way as the Being of that which still lies before us¶ and calls for our attending to it. (BT 103–104)¶ isPresence-at-hand is, in this way, dependent upon the primacy of the¶ ready-to-hand. ‘‘The modes of conspicuousness, obtrusiveness, and obstinacy¶ all have the function of bringing to the fore the charactertic of presence-¶ at-hand in what is ready-to-hand’’ (BT 104).¶ Now, once emergent from the ready-to-hand, the mode of presence-athand¶ can attain its own relative autonomy. It becomes possible to attend¶ to things predicatively, theoretically. But at the same time, presence-athand¶ has been derived from its praxical base. This derivative character of¶ the present at-hand carries with it, at first, the interpretation that casts it¶ negatively as a deficient mode of concern. ‘‘It [equipment] reveals itself as¶ something just present-at-hand and no more, which cannot be budged¶ without the thing that is missing. The helpless way in which we stand¶ before it is a deficient mode of concern, and as such it uncovers the Beingjust-¶ present-at-hand-and-no-more of something ready-to-hand’’ (BT¶ 103).¶ I take it that this inversion is strongly indicative of both the primacy¶ of technology and of praxis in Heidegger’s later phenomenology, but it is¶ also penultimate with respect to the ultimate strategic use to which the¶ negative turn is put. The purpose of the analysis is to get at the world that¶ belongs to the ready-to-hand, and the inversion is but one step along the¶ way. What equipmental negativity ultimately reveals is the latent context¶ to which it belongs, the ‘‘world’’ inhabited by concern.¶ When an assignment has been disturbed—when something is unusable¶ for some purpose—then the assignment becomes explicit. . . .¶ When an assignment to some particular ‘‘towards this’’ has been¶ thus circumspectly aroused, we catch sight of the ‘‘towards this’’¶ itself, and along with it everything connected with the work—the¶ whole workshop—as that wherein concern always dwells. (BT 105)¶ It may now be seen that the basic strategic and functional elements¶ that characterize the philosophy of technology found in ‘‘The Question¶ Concerning Technology’’ were present in the much earlier opus Being and¶ Time, although they are not specifically identified with technology as such¶ there. Nevertheless, praxis in Being and Time functions as the basic existential¶ stratum through which the world is revealed and as the basic realm¶ of action from which sciences may arise (as processes of theoretically developing¶ present-at-hand).¶ The emphasis upon praxis as existentially basic is what characterizes¶ the Heideggerian inversion of Husserlian phenomenology. Thus it may¶ be said with more than a touch of -parallelism that Heidegger is to¶ Husserl what Marx was to Hegel.

## **Environment**

#### The use of calculative thought ensures the failure of environmental movements, only questioning can solve

Kevin Michael DeLuca, Associate Professor of Speech Communication and adjunct in the Institute of Ecology at the University of Georgia, author of Image Politics: The New Rhetoric of Environmental Activism and numerous articles exploring humanity-nature relations and technology, 2005, “Thinking with Heidegger Rethinking Environmental Theory and Practice”, in Ethics & the Environment 10.1 p. 67-87,

In addition to meditating on media and public relations practices, a careful reading of Heidegger would compel environmentalism to meditate on its relations to technology and to images. To address the issue of technology first, environmental groups often rely on modern technology while writing off such use as a necessary cost of 'doing business' in a modern, mass media public sphere. That may be true, but Heidegger's writings caution us against gliding over the writing off. What are the costs of using modern technology? Besides relying on the technological infrastructure of the communication industry (computers, telephones, video camcorders, etc....) to appear on TV, issue press releases, maintain web sites, lobby politicians, and raise money, environmentalists in the course of working and living rely on cars, planes, air conditioning, highways, microwaves, electricity, and a plethora of plastic products. In short, environmentalists are implicated and imbricated in the technosphere.¶ Now Heidegger's meditation on the essence of technology and the essence of humanity's relation to technology serves to displace the conventional questions concerning technology. Heidegger refuses the question of whether technology is good or bad or neutral. As he puts it, "Everywhere we remain unfree and chained to technology, whether we passionately affirm or deny it. But we are delivered over to it in the worst possible way when we regard it as something neutral; for this conception of it, to which today we particularly like to do homage, makes us utterly blind to the essence of technology" (1993, 311–12). Instead, Heidegger is asking after the essence of technology, which, he famously declares, "is by no means anything technological" (1993, 311). Rejecting the understanding of technology as a "mere means" that humans can master, what he terms the merely correct but not true "instrumental and anthropological definition of technology" (1993, 312), Heidegger proposes technology as "a way of revealing" (1993, 318).¶ Avoiding the romanticism of a return to the Pleistocene or the utopianism of embracing a Star Trek futurism, from a Heideggerian perspective the question becomes, "What sort of revealing does a particular regime of technology make possible?" More prosaically, what sort of relationships [End Page 78] to the earth and world does a technology enable? To this question, Heidegger provides a stinging critique of modern technology [albeit, admittedly, tempered by an ontological hope (see 1993, 333–41)]. The way of revealing of modern technology is Gestell or enframing: "The revealing that rules throughout modern technology has the character of a setting-upon, in the sense of a challenging-forth. . . . a challenging, which puts to nature the unreasonable demand that it supply energy which can be extracted and stored as such" (1993, 321, 320). Nature, then, is reduced to a "standing-reserve... a calculable coherence of forces" (1993, 322, 326),6 so that "nature reports itself in some way or other that is identifiable through calculation and that it remains orderable as a system of information" (1993, 328).7 Heidegger gives examples from the fields of agriculture and energy that ring even more true today (see 1993, 320–21).¶ Of farming, Heidegger writes:¶ The work of the peasant does not challenge the soil of the field. In sowing grain it places seed in the keeping of the forces of growth and watches over its increase. But meanwhile even the cultivation of the field has come under the grip of another kind of setting-in-order, which sets upon nature. It sets upon it in the sense of challenging it. Agriculture is now the mechanized food industry. ¶ (1993, 320)¶ Of course, the all-too-immediate reaction to such an example is to charge Heidegger with a dangerous romanticism. With the benefit of a few decades experience around the world with the products of the mechanized food industry, from tasteless food, soil erosion, and ubiquitous pesticides to emptied communities, alienated consumers, and green imperialism, in retrospect Heidegger's critique seems understated. More significantly, though, the question is not a moral one of good or bad but an exploration of what possible ways of relating to nature are opened and foreclosed with different practices of revealing. Heidegger himself dismisses the possibility of romanticism in response to the giganticism and the progress of science, "whose onset can neither be hindered nor even held up in any way, by any romantic remembering of what was earlier and different" (1999, 108). Indeed, Heidegger's fundamental critique of modern technology is not directed at the world it reveals but the world it erases:¶ Where this ordering holds sway, it drives out every other possibility of revealing. Above all, enframing conceals that revealing which, in the [End Page 79] sense of poiesis, lets what presences come forth into appearance. As compared with that other revealing, the setting-upon that challenges forth thrusts man into a relation to whatever is that is at once antithetical and rigorously ordered. Where enframing holds sway, regulating and securing of the standing-reserve mark all revealing.

## **State/AT- Cede the poltical**

#### The affirmatives appeal to leaders enables war once everything becomes standing reserve

Mitchell, Assistant Professor of Philosophy Emory, 2005 (Andrew, “Heidegger and Terrorism”, http://docserver.ingentaconnect.com/deliver/connect/brill/00855553/v35n1/s10.pdf?expires=1343617879&id=69865278&titleid=1404&accname=Dartmouth+College&checksum=D191F47ADD05EA353BF3771CFA59803A)

For this reason—and the following is something often overlooked in¶ considering Heidegger’s political position between the wars—Heidegger¶ is critical of the very notion of a Führer, or leader, who would direct¶ the circulation of the standing-reserve according to his own personal¶ will. The leaders of today are merely the necessary accompaniment of¶ a standing-reserve that, in its abstraction, is susceptible to planning.¶ The leaders’ seeming position of “subjectivity,” that they are the ones¶ who decide, is again another working of “objectification,” where neither¶ of these terms quite fits, given that beings are no longer objective.¶ The willfulness of the leaders is not due to a personal will:¶ One believes that the leaders had presumed everything of their own¶ accord in the blind rage of a selfish egotism and arranged everything in¶ accordance with their own will [Eigensinn]. In truth, however, leaders are¶ the necessary consequence of the fact that beings have gone over to a¶ way of errancy, in which an emptiness expands that requires a single¶ ordering and securing of beings. (GA 7: 89/EP, 105; tm)¶ The leaders do not stand above or control the proceedings, the proceedings¶ in question affect beings as a whole, including the leaders.¶ Leaders are simply points of convergence or conduits for the channels¶ of circulation; they are needed for circulation, but are nowhere outside¶ of it. No leader is the sole authority; instead, there are numerous¶ “sectors” to which each leader is assigned. The demands of these¶ sectors will be similar of course, organized around efficiency and productivity¶ in distribution and circulation. In short, leaders serve the¶ standing-reserve.¶ Any goal beyond the will itself, any political goal, for example, will¶ not be able to voice itself over the will’s own monologue. Insofar as¶ modern warfare was a use of force for political goals, modern warfare¶ is surpassed. The will surrenders its relation to the object in order to¶ will itself all the more forcefully. It reaches a point where no political,¶ which is to say “external,” goal can reach it. There can be no¶ opposition when the will recognizes nothing but itself, and the more¶ the will succeeds in this, the more impersonal it becomes. Politics’¶ effectiveness withers away in this transformation, since the goals of politics¶ remain always conditional. The unconditional will is apolitical,¶ and this transforms the relation between war and politics as expressed¶ in Clausewitz’s famed dictum.¶ War is not, as Clausewitz still thinks, the continuation of politics by other¶ means. If “war” means the “total war,” i.e. the war that arises from the¶ machination of beings here let loose, then it becomes a transformation of “politics”¶ and a revelation of the fact that “politics” and every plan-directed¶ course of life were themselves only ever the uncontrolled execution of¶ metaphysical decisions that they do not master. (GA 69: 209) The transformation of war into terrorism, since this is what we are¶ talking about when we talk about the machination of beings, is equally¶ a transformation of politics. The metaphysical decisions beyond our¶ control are those having to do with being as replaceable value. Political¶ decisions are not made by leaders who would be in control of the¶ matters decided. These decisions are nothing that we could willfully¶ decide. Politics becomes in this a means of directing life according to¶ a plan. We will return to this idea of planning when considering its¶ role for our general “security.” For now it is enough to note that with¶ this transformation in the nature of politics, it can no longer be said¶ to precede its “continuation” in war. The transformation of war in¶ total war (or terrorism) is equally a transformation of politics:¶ Such a war does not continue something already present, but rather compels¶ this into the execution of essential decisions, of with it itself is not¶ master. For this reason, such a war no longer admits of “conquerors and¶ conquered”; all become slaves of the history of being. (GA 69: 209; em)¶ Conquered and conqueror are both political designations and are each¶ outmoded today. The leaders are slaves.

## **Nuclear War/Terrorism**

#### The insecurity in the face of nuclear war forces us to confront being, securing ourselves from the threat of war kills questioning

Mitchell, Assistant Professor of Philosophy Emory, 2005 (Andrew, “Heidegger and Terrorism”, http://docserver.ingentaconnect.com/deliver/connect/brill/00855553/v35n1/s10.pdf?expires=1343617879&id=69865278&titleid=1404&accname=Dartmouth+College&checksum=D191F47ADD05EA353BF3771CFA59803A)

Like the atomic bomb, terrorism operates at the level of threat.¶ Insofar as it calls into question all beings, terrorism is itself a metaphysical¶ determination of being. Terrorism makes everything a possible object¶ of terrorist attack, and this is the very terror of it. Everything is a possible¶ target, and this now means that all beings exist as possible targets,¶ as possibly destroyed. But this should not be taken to mean that¶ there are discrete beings, fully present, now threatened with destruction.¶ The ineradicable threat of destruction transforms the nature of¶ the being itself. The being can no longer exist as indifferent to its¶ destruction; this destruction does not reside outside of the being. Instead,¶ destruction inhabits the being and does so, not as something superadded¶ to the being, but as the essence of the being itself. Beings are¶ henceforth as though destroyed. Terror brings about an alteration in¶ the very mode of being of reality, the real is now the terrorized. Reality¶ is already terrorized; the change has already taken place, and this¶ regardless of whether an attack comes or not. Beings exist as endangered,¶ as terrorized, and this means as no longer purely self-present.¶ It means that, in terms of pure presence, beings exist as already destroyed.¶ Destruction is not something that comes at a later date, nor is it something¶ that may or may not already have taken place. Destruction exists¶ now as threat. The effectiveness of terror lies in the threat, not the¶ attack.¶ Like the threat of nuclear war, the threat of terrorism targets everything,¶ with no chance of distinguishing potential from nonpotential targets.¶ This means that there is nothing we can do to avoid it. Since¶ there are no marks that would betray a place, person, or thing as possible¶ location or victim of terrorist assault, there is no way that we¶ can be prepared for it. This means that terrorism is able to threaten¶ us where we are most unsuspecting. Terrorism attacks precisely where¶ we would not expect an attack because it targets the basis for our¶ sense of security, the commonness of the everyday. Terrorism is a¶ threat to the ordinary and the common. It comes from within our¶ safest regions, from no outside source. An outside terrorist power would¶ either annihilate beings or not annihilate beings. In the first case, the¶ beings would be nothing; in the second, they would remain extant.¶ This manner of thinking, in terms of presences and absences, of something¶ and nothing, actually has nothing terrifying about it. The point is almost Epicurean; annihilation is nothing to us. The terror of terrorism¶ is not located in the fear of an external power, but in the terror¶ that the enemy is already here with us, “inside” our walls, threatening¶ the homogeneity of the home. This terrorism is nothing that blows up¶ beings into nothingness, but rather one that places them in danger¶ and only threatens to destroy them. But this threat is stronger than¶ any terrorist attack ever could be.¶ Heidegger provides us with a further way of conceptualizing the¶ threat of terrorism, a way that is likewise attentive to the conjunction¶ of interiority and terror. His remarks are found in a posthumously¶ published dialogue between an older man and a younger man, dated¶ 8 May 1945, the day of Germany’s capitulation in World War II, and¶ entitled “Evening Conversation in a Prisoner of War Camp in Russia¶ between a Younger and an Older Man.”18 What threatens here is not¶ the world war, as Heidegger makes painfully clear in the dialogue’s¶ dated postlude: “On a day that the world celebrates its victory / and¶ does not yet realize that / for centuries already, it is the victim / of¶ its own upsurgence” (GA 77: 240). The world wars, as we have seen,¶ are only the result of more “global” changes, of transmogrifications of¶ ontology, if even that name still holds. The threat in the camp is that¶ the devastation of the earth will continue without end and that there¶ will be an annihilation of the human essence in the process. For the¶ older man, this is the epitome of evil, “the devastation of the earth¶ and the annihilation of the human essence that goes along with it are¶ somehow evil itself [das Böse selbst]” (GA 77: 207). The consideration¶ of evil that follows will slowly unfold the logic behind the terrorist¶ threat and reveal the error in the older man’s concern with annihilation.¶ The younger man cautions that evil here cannot be understood as¶ a moral bad but, somewhat paradoxically, as what he calls “the malevolent”¶ (das Bösartige; GA 77: 207). The German term Bösartige designates¶ what it names as a kind or a sort, Art, of evil, Böse; in a sense¶ it is a generic term. The older man objects to this designation as senseless—¶ it would be like claiming that space is really the spatial—and the¶ younger man tells him that his objection results from his still thinking¶ of evil as the morally reprehensible, where such a moral thinking, we¶ are to understand, views everything in black and white terms. When¶ we think evil otherwise, the statement “evil is the malevolent” gains¶ in significance. Evil is to be thought from out of the malevolent (bösartig).¶ “The malevolent is the rebelliousness [Aufrührerische] which is based¶ in fury [Grimmigen], so much so that this fury in a certain manner con-ceals its inward wrath [Ingrimm], but thereby constantly threatens at¶ the same time” (GA 77: 207–8). Malevolence is a “stirring up” or an¶ “upheaval” of rebelliousness that arises from fury. Not that fury maintains¶ a simple identity, to be sure. Fury would now seem to lie at the¶ root of evil, but fury itself bears an inner fury, an inner wrath, though¶ this inward wrath does not show itself directly. Malevolence is thus¶ the uprising of fury out of a concealed inner fury; it is a transposition¶ or movement across a boundary, a tale told by the prefixes under consideration¶ here: from the In of inward wrath to the Auf of the upheaval¶ of fury. This is malevolence, and it is the essence of evil, as the parties¶ soon come to agree, “The essence of evil is the inward wrath of¶ a rebellion which never entirely breaks out, and which, when it does¶ break out, still disguises itself and which, in its hidden threat, is often¶ as though it were nothing” (GA 77: 208). Two points are to be drawn¶ from this.

## **Science**

#### Science assumes to know the answer to the ontological question destroying being

Idhe, Professor of Philosophy and the Director of the Technoscience Research Group at Stony Brook, 2010 (Don, *Heidegger’s Technologies*, Project Muse, Pg 35-36

Here, once again as in Being and Time, there begins to emerge the primacy¶ of praxis that characterizes Heidegger’s version of phenomenology.¶ And it is here that I shall begin to make the most specific connection¶ with Heidegger’s famous ‘‘tool analysis,’’ which serves as the model for¶ his philosophy of technology. The common view of technology, related¶ to what Heidegger calls the instrumental and anthropological view, holds¶ that modern technology is a child of modern science. Technology is a¶ mere tool of science or, at best, an applied science. Heidegger inverts this¶ view and claims that modern science is essentially the child of technology.¶ The strategy by which he seeks to show this is a reflection of the same¶ functional inversion employed in Being and Time. This inversion of science¶ and technology calls for careful examination.¶ There are two correlated ideas that appear at the beginning of the strategy¶ which bear initial note. First, Heidegger grants that the contemporary¶ dominant view of technology seeks to strongly differentiate between scientific¶ technology and the older handwork technology. Heidegger does¶ not deny that there are differences, but he plays these down. For instance,¶ in granting correctness (not truth) to the instrumental view of technology,¶ he notes that this view can bring both handwork and scientific technology¶ under the same rubric as ‘‘means’’ or as instrumental toward ends. Here¶ the difference between technologies is merely a matter of relative complexity¶ (QT 288–289). Second, the constant emphasis upon technology¶ as poie´sis and as techne´, a making in the ancient broad sense, tends to play¶ down a difference between ancient and modern technology. But third,¶ and most profoundly, the difference is played down strategically because¶ the essence of technology is not itself technological but is existential.¶ What Heidegger does grant is that modern technology allows the secret¶ grounds of technology as enframing to emerge more clearly, allows what¶ was long latent and originary to be made more explicit.¶ Correlated with this downplay of an essential difference between¶ ancient and modern technology is the necessary admission that modern¶ technology is chronologically later than modern science.¶ Chronologically speaking, modern physical science begins in the¶ seventeenth century. In contrast, machine-power technology develops¶ only in the second half of the eighteenth century. But modern technology, which for chronological reckoning is the later, is, from¶ the point of view of the essence holding sway within it, historically¶ earlier. (QT 304)

#### Science is intrinsically tied to technological thought

Idhe, Professor of Philosophy and the Director of the Technoscience Research Group at Stony Brook, 2010 (Don, *Heidegger’s Technologies*, Project Muse, Pg 36-37

It is said that modern technology is something incomparably different¶ from all earlier technologies because it is based on modern physics¶ as an exact science. Meanwhile we have come to understand¶ more clearly that the reverse holds true as well: modern physics, as¶ experimental, is dependent upon technical apparatus and upon progress¶ in the building of apparatus. (QT 295–296; italics mine)¶ This is to say that modern science is embodied technologically. One¶ might very well say that one basic difference between modern science and¶ its ancient counterpart is precisely its increasingly technological embodiment¶ in instruments.¶ But if science is embodied in instruments as a necessary condition for¶ its investigation, this is not yet to say that technology is its origin. Yet that¶ is the claim Heidegger ultimately makes. The form the argument takes is¶ essentially that it is first necessary to view nature as a storehouse or standing-¶ reserve toward which man’s ordering behavior can be directed. This¶ provides the condition of the possibility for a calculative modern science.¶ Modern science’s way of representing pursues and entraps nature as¶ a calculable coherence of forces. Modern physics is not experimental¶ physics because it applies apparatus to the questioning of nature.¶ The reverse is true. Because physics, indeed already as pure theory,¶ sets nature up to exhibit itself as a coherence of forces calculable in¶ advance, it orders its experiments precisely for the purpose of asking¶ whether and how nature reports itself when set up in this way. (QT¶ 303)¶ Thus, hidden behind modern physics is the spirit of technology, technology¶ in its ontological sense as world-taken-as-standing-reserve. Its firstness, however, only gradually becomes clear. Such conditions are not¶ necessarily first known, they only gradually come clear. Historiologically,¶ then, modern science does play a role. It begins to announce what lies¶ behind science as technology comes to presence.¶ The modern physical theory of nature prepares the way not simply¶ for technology but for the essence of modern technology. For such¶ gathering-together, which challenges man to reveal by way of ordering,¶ already holds sway in physics. But in it that gathering does not¶ yet come expressly to the fore. Modern physics is the herald of¶ enframing, a herald whose origin is still unknown. (QT 303)¶ But the origin does gradually become clear, the origin that is technology¶ as ontologically interpreted. ‘‘All coming to presence, not only modern¶ technology, keeps itself everywhere concealed until the last.¶ Nevertheless, it remains with respect to its holding sway, that which precedes¶ all: the earliest’’ (QT 303).¶ Technology as enframing, Ge-stell, as originary, is the condition of the¶ possibility of modern science. In Heidegger’s terms this is the primacy of¶ technology.¶ Because the essence of modern technology lies in enframing, modern¶ technology must employ exact physical science. Through its so¶ doing the deceptive illusion arises that modern technology is applied¶ physical science. This illusion can maintain itself only so long as¶ neither the essential origin of modern science nor indeed the essence¶ of modern technology is adequately found out through questioning.¶ (QT 304)¶ Here the inversion is complete; technology is the source of science,¶ technology as enframing is the origin of the scientific view of the world as¶ standing-reserve.

## **Security**

#### Security prevents us from questioning, only a world of insecurity forces us to question our relation to world

Mitchell, Assistant Professor of Philosophy Emory, 2005 (Andrew, “Heidegger and Terrorism”, http://docserver.ingentaconnect.com/deliver/connect/brill/00855553/v35n1/s10.pdf?expires=1343617879&id=69865278&titleid=1404&accname=Dartmouth+College&checksum=D191F47ADD05EA353BF3771CFA59803A)

There can be no security. If being is what threatens then security as¶ the absence of terror would be the absence of being. But the absence¶ of being is precisely the threat. Obviously, security is just as little to¶ be found in the absence of danger as it is in the consummation of¶ the danger, total annihilation. Instead, security is to be found within¶ the danger and threat of being. But how? Heidegger likewise provides¶ us endangered ones with a way of thinking security and preservation.¶ This is his fourth contribution to a thinking of terrorism.¶ Security and assurance, both equally apt translations of the German¶ Sicherung, are indissociable from certainty (Gewißheit) for Heidegger. In¶ the course of the 1968 seminar in Le Thor, Heidegger provides a brief¶ history of this relation between security and certainty: “the quest for¶ certainty appears first in the domain of faith, as the search for the¶ certainty of salvation (Luther), then in the domain of physics as the¶ search for the mathematical certainty of nature (Galileo)” (VS, 30/13).¶ Heidegger unites these two concerns for certainty within a single concept:¶ assurance (Sicherung), “In the quest for mathematical certainty,¶ what is sought is the assurance of man in nature, in the sensible; in¶ the quest for the certainty of salvation, what is sought is the assurance¶ of man in the supra-sensible world” (VS, 30/14).22 Certainty is in the¶ service of assurance or security and is only the epistemological aspect¶ of a greater ontological condition of security. Security is freedom from¶ uncertainty in all of its forms, sensible, super-sensible, and ontological.¶ Salvation and the mathematical certainty of nature are themselves to¶ be understood as instances of an ontological assurance against uncertainty.¶ Ontological uncertainty would be found in conceptions of singularity,¶ where the uniqueness of a thing renders it irreplaceable and¶ thus opens us to the possibility of loss, or in conceptions of alterity,where the other is not anticipated and confined in advance to the¶ strictures of categorical thought. Uncertainty in this broader sense is¶ eliminated in security. One is securely insulated against these differences¶ of the world. For modern thought, the securing of representations for¶ representational thinking provided the backdrop for the arrival of certainty¶ (see GA 7: 82; EP, 98). Modern metaphysics itself, according to¶ Heidegger, “means the securing of the human being by itself and for¶ itself ” (GA 67: 167). Such a policy must be abandoned as the human¶ becomes more and more a piece of the standing-reserve like everything¶ else. This postmodern security is accomplished through bestowal¶ and appraisal of value, “Securement, as the obtaining of security, is a¶ grounding in valuation” (GA 5: 262/195; tm).¶ What is valued can be replaced by something of equal value, and¶ this fact lies at the center of our conception of security today. Securement,¶ as a giving of value, assures us against loss by making the world replaceable.¶ In this respect, security is nothing other than total availability,¶ imagined as a world of utter transparency where all resources, human¶ and otherwise, are constantly surveilled and traced through their paths¶ of circulation. The transformation in being coincident with the end of¶ modern warfare likewise puts an end to modern politics and establishes¶ in its place an impersonal commitment to the furthering of¶ planned replacement. Security is only possible when everything works¶ according to these plans, and this requires “leaders,” whose true function¶ now becomes evident. For the plan, “the necessity of ‘leadership’,¶ that is, the planned calculation of the securing of the whole of beings,¶ is required” (GA 7: 89–90/EP, 105; tm). The demand for security is¶ always a call for such Führers.

#### Security justifies the extermination of all that is different

Mitchell, Assistant Professor of Philosophy Emory, 2005 (Andrew, “Heidegger and Terrorism”, http://docserver.ingentaconnect.com/deliver/connect/brill/00855553/v35n1/s10.pdf?expires=1343617879&id=69865278&titleid=1404&accname=Dartmouth+College&checksum=D191F47ADD05EA353BF3771CFA59803A)

¶ Homeland security is thus an oxymoron, since one of the most¶ prominent effects of planning is the elimination of national differences¶ and “homelands.” Security itself is precisely the planned elimination¶ of differences, and as for “homeland,” it is ever more difficult to conceive¶ of a homeland that would be nationally distinct from another.¶ This is not to be understood as a complaint against internationalism¶ either, for “Just as the distinction between war and peace has become¶ untenable, the distinction between ‘national’ and ‘international’ has¶ also collapsed” (GA 7: 92; EP, 107). We have already seen that Heidegger¶ attributes a will to the annihilation of homeland to Americanism; what¶ needs to be added to this view is that there is not one form of government¶ any different; each is run by leaders:¶ 210 The uniformity of beings arising from the emptiness of the abandonment¶ of Being, in which it is only a matter of the calculable security of its¶ order, an order which it subjugates to the will to will, this uniformity¶ also conditions everywhere in advance of all national differences the uniformity¶ of leadership [Führerschaft], for which all forms of government are¶ only one instrument of leadership among others. (GA 7: 93; EP, 108; tm)¶ Government and politics are simply further means of directing ways¶ of life according to plan; and no one, neither terrorist nor politician,¶ should be able to alter these carefully constructed ways of life. Ways¶ of life are themselves effects of the plan, and the predominant way of¶ life today is that of an all-consuming Americanism. National differences¶ fall to the wayside. The homeland, when not completely outmoded,¶ can only appear as commodified quaintness. All governments participate¶ in the eradication of national differences. Insofar as Americanism¶ represents the attempt to annihilate the “homeland,” then under the¶ aegis of the abandonment of being, all governments and forms of leadership¶ become Americanism.¶ The loss of national differences is accordant with the advent of terrorism,¶ since terrorism knows no national bounds but, rather, threatens¶ difference and boundaries as such. Terrorism is everywhere, where¶ “everywhere” no longer refers to a collection of distinct places and¶ locations but instead to a “here” that is the same as there, as every¶ “there.” The threat of terrorism is not international, but antinational¶ or, to strain a Heideggerian formulation, unnational. Homeland security,¶ insofar as it destroys the very thing that it claims to protect, is¶ nothing opposed to terrorism, but rather the consummation of its threat.¶ Our leaders, in their attempt to secure the world against terrorism,¶ only serve to further drive the world towards its homogenized state.¶ The elimination of difference in the standing-reserve along with the¶ elimination of national differences serve to identify the threat of terrorism¶ with the quest for security. The absence of this threat would¶ be the absence of being, and its consummation would be the absence¶ of being as well. Security is only needed where there is a threat. If a¶ threat is not perceived, if one believes oneself invulnerable, then there¶ is no need for security. Security is for those who know they can be¶ injured, for those who can be damaged. Does America know that it¶ can be damaged? If security requires a recognition of one’s own vulnerability,¶ then security can only be found in the acknowledgment of¶ one’s threatened condition, and this means that it can only be found¶ in a recognition of being as threat. To be secure, there must be the threat. For this reason, all of the planned securities that attempt to¶ abolish the threat can never achieve the security they seek. Security¶ requires that we preserve the threat, and this means that we must act¶ in the office of preservers.

## **Agriculture/Locks**

#### The agricultural system perpetuates calculative thought- we use food prices to wage war against the 3rd world

Houseman and Flynn, professors of philosophy Emory, 2011 (Benjamin and Thomas, “Cooling Down Global Warming: Revisiting Sartre and Heidegger on this Modern Day Challenge”)

This notion (i.e. the distancelessness of our world and failure to consider the thing¶ as thing) sets the stage for Heidegger’s next lecture, “Positionality”. Now that Heidegger¶ has established this distancelessness in relation to the thing, he proceeds to expand the¶ scope of this thought beyond one particular thing (e.g. the jug in his lecture “The Thing”)¶ but instead in relation to everything—in our entire way of relating to the world. He says,¶ “[This distanceless] stands insofar as everything that presences is standing reserve…The¶ standing reserve persists. It persists insofar as it is imposed upon for a requisitioning.¶ Directed into requisitioning, it is placed into application” (1951, 2-3; my italics). This¶ notion of relating to the world as standing reserve is at the core of Heidegger’s thought.¶ It refers to a way of perceiving the world that does not consider the thing as thing;¶ instead, it considers the thing for our application and thereby encourages us to¶ ‘requisition’, order, call upon, and marshal our surroundings for the benefit of our use.¶ This notion of application is exemplified not only in the use of a particular technological¶ device (e.g. using a computer for a specific, results-oriented purpose), but more broadly¶ speaking in how we approach the world. We approach the world in terms of how things¶ can be applied, largely for the sake of generating desired results. We then order the¶ 29¶ world, as standing reserve, in such a way that those results can be realized and achieved,¶ while all along forgetting about the thing as thing and failing to concernfully approach¶ that which presences.¶ Heidegger speaks of the agricultural industry and the Rhine River to underscore¶ how things are now standing as standing-reserve to be marshaled and positioned. He¶ says, “Agriculture is now a motorized food industry, in essence the same as the¶ production of corpses in the gas chambers and extermination camps, the same as the¶ blockading and starving of countries, the same as the production of hydrogen bombs”¶ (1951, 2-6). Regarding the Rhine River, he says, “The hydroelectric plant is placed in the¶ river. It imposes upon it for water pressure, which sets the turbines turning, the turning¶ of which drives the machines, the gearing of which imposes upon the electrical current¶ through which the long distance power centers and their electrical grid are positioned for¶ the conducting of electricity” (1951, 2-6). While equating the motorized food industry to¶ the production of corpses in gas chambers may be interpreted as a distasteful and¶ offensive comparison, Heidegger’s intentional bluntness and lack of reservation¶ emphasizes the gravity and ubiquity of this positioning. No longer do we relate to the¶ Rhine as thing—as the beautiful River that we are connected to, that we dwell around, as¶ part of Being. On the contrary, it is approached for the sake of its consequences, for the¶ sake of producing electricity, which in turn powers our televisions, which in turn defines¶ how we plan our days, etc. etc. Indeed, Heidegger defines this “self-gathered collection¶ of positioning” (1951, 2-11) as positionality [das Ge-Stell], and, according to Heidegger,¶ it is in this positionality wherein the essence of technology lies.¶ 30¶ So why does it matter that we now live in a positioned world exemplified by our¶ new relationship to the Rhine as standing reserve? Positionality removes us from our¶ natural environment—the environment that provides the materials that we then convert¶ into energy and use to power our devices. When we turn on our computers, lights, cars,¶ etc. rarely do we reflect on the process and resources that allow for us to operate our¶ machines. For example, when we turn the lights on in a room, hardly ever do we say to¶ ourselves: “I am glad we have that hydroelectric plant in the Rhine, which converted that¶ water energy into electricity using a turbine, which was then shot through power lines¶ into my home, producing the effect I am now witnessing with this lit light bulb.”¶ Positionality, as exemplified here in the power grid, causes us to take for granted our¶ natural environment. This unappreciative attitude that defines the technological culture¶ we live in today does not encourage people to concernfully approach things and our¶ world—instead it distances us from the very environment that is such a part of our¶ essence as beings in this world. Herein lies the problem: because we are so immersed in¶ this positioned world that induces us to take nature for granted, we do not realize that¶ turning on that light bulb actually has real consequences for our environment, such as¶ producing global warming. In addition, the technological, positioned world also removes¶ us from caring for and guarding our environment, and Heidegger proceeds in his lecture¶ by stressing the danger of positionality.

## **Industry/Military**

#### Economic growth is tied to a process of securitization that prevents effective questioning

Mitchell, Assistant Professor of Philosophy Emory, 2005 (Andrew, “Heidegger and Terrorism”, http://docserver.ingentaconnect.com/deliver/connect/brill/00855553/v35n1/s10.pdf?expires=1343617879&id=69865278&titleid=1404&accname=Dartmouth+College&checksum=D191F47ADD05EA353BF3771CFA59803A)

America is the place where the identification of peace and war is fully¶ realized in the collusion of industry and the military. Industry increasingly¶ determines the options available for the everyday life of the populace.¶ That same industry now has at its disposal the military power¶ of society. Where free trade is hindered, where natural resources are¶ not completely available to the market for “political” reasons, military¶ intervention is called for. Democracy is another name for free trade,¶ it is solely an economic term, and democracy must be spread across¶ the globe, not due to any respect for “human rights,” but in order to¶ allow industry to exceed its own expectations and expand its trade¶ routes. Resistance to free trade is met with “liberating” martial force.¶ Conversely, military spending is a driving force in the economy. Due¶ to sheer size alone, economic effects attend the military as employer¶ and as contributor to local economies. The military provides access to¶ higher education for many who would otherwise have to make do¶ without it. It likewise allows citizens to learn employable skills for work¶ in society. The presence of the military in a community is valued as¶ a sign of prosperity. We might also add that military vehicles (the¶ Hummer) and military clothing (“camouflage”) have penetrated mainstream¶ American fashion. Nowhere is the abolishment of the distinction¶ between war and peace more evident than in today’s America.¶ But if we attend closer to Heidegger’s words, it may be possible to¶ hear in them a hope for America in the thinking of being. Those who¶ are interested in the question of being do not see the reality of their¶ country. Without this situated awareness of one’s “homeland,” the¶ question of being cannot be posed. The question remains an abstract¶ and academic matter, something for quotation marks, the “question¶ of being.” Would a proper understanding of American reality make¶ possible an asking of this question, or is the question simply impossible¶ for America? Is America, as the epitome of all Americanism, still¶ a homeland or has technology completely ravished the country of all¶ specificity and uniqueness? These are the questions that the age of¶ technological machination raises for America. Heidegger names the¶ fundamental attunement of this age “terror” (Erschrecken).

## **Terrorism**

#### Terrorism forces us to confront our worst fears resulting in a direct confrontation with being

Mitchell, Assistant Professor of Philosophy Emory, 2005 (Andrew, “Heidegger and Terrorism”, http://docserver.ingentaconnect.com/deliver/connect/brill/00855553/v35n1/s10.pdf?expires=1343617879&id=69865278&titleid=1404&accname=Dartmouth+College&checksum=D191F47ADD05EA353BF3771CFA59803A)

It is in the face of this technological wasteland of the Americanistic¶ unworld that terror can occur as a salvation. Terror is the attunement¶ proper to the unworld and the age of machination, and to feel terror¶ is to be given the opportunity to respond to it. Terror is experienced¶ “at the abandonment of being” (GA 65: 46/32; tm), which is to say¶ that it is felt “in the face of what is closest and most obtrusive, namely¶ that beings are” (GA 45: 2/4). Terror is experienced as a trembling,¶ a fact which finds some etymological support.16 A movement of terror¶ is disclosed here as well, a flight from the terrible, a withdrawal. The¶ trembling withdrawal of terror is not something that is simply a subjective¶ experience (Erlebnis); rather, it is a trembling on the part of¶ beyng to which terror is attuned. In the Contributions to Philosophy ( from¶ Enowning), trembling (Erzitterung) names the way in which the event of¶ the clearing of being takes place. Trembling is “the spreading out of¶ the time-play-space, in which trembling itself, as the hesitation of its¶ clearing (the there), takes place [sich ereignet]” (GA 65: 244/173; tm).¶ The opening of the “there,” the clearing of being, cannot occur in¶ full presence. Opening and concealment are not so oppositionally¶ disposed. “Hesitation” is the surest index of this fact. Terror as a¶ fundamental mood is an attunement to this hesitating, wavering,¶ self-withholding of beyng. In a strange image from the Contributions,¶ Heidegger states that the effects of this hesitation are “sprayed” forth,¶ from no single, self-present origin, and that this spraying is attunement¶ (Stimmung): “Attunement is the spraying forth of the trembling of beyng¶ as enowning in Da-sein” (GA 65: 21/16; tm). The intimacy (Innigkeit)¶ that Heidegger stresses here and elsewhere between trembling and¶ enowning should not be lost on us. Beyng trembles.17 The withdrawal¶ of beyng sets up a resonance that lacks any substantial stability—a resonance¶ between beings and the withdrawn beyng.¶ But terror would not be at all attuned to this if beyng and its abandoned¶ beings were to retain a separate and distinct identity. The resonance¶ that Heidegger describes is such that there are no resonating¶ poles to support it. This is another way in which modern or Clausewitzian¶ opposition is overcome for Heidegger. Because the presence of withdrawal¶ in beings can only be experienced as a trembling, terror is the¶ fundamental mood of the age. Terror is the feeling of a bond with¶ being, one that persists in the face of a withdrawn being and participates¶ in that same withdrawal. Terror, in a sense, would be a memory¶ of being, not of something that ever took place, but of taking-place¶ as such. This remarking of being is terror, and for Heidegger it provides¶ a retreat from the onrush of the standing-reserve: “Terror lets¶ the human retreat before this, that the being is, while at first the being¶ was just a being to him: that the being is and that this—beyng—has¶ abandoned and withdrawn from all ‘beings’ and what appears as such”¶ (GA 65: 15/11; tm). Seizing upon terror in this manner, one sees that¶ there is no being behind beings and that what befalls beings befalls¶ being as well, due to their strong intimacy. Terror puts being into¶ beings, in some sense, and this alerts it to the responsibility of guarding¶ and preserving this withdrawal of being. To preserve it is to insist¶ upon a moment of concealment in technological circulation, a blind¶ spot before its infinite eye. The terrified one accords with being and¶ this means that, for the American, the “reality of that country” may¶ be seen and the “question of being” finally posed as the question of¶ being. This bond of terror is at the same time the bond of the citizenry,¶ the bond of the citizens of the homeland America. What is terrifying¶ is that America withstands the onslaught of Americanism; terror¶ can teach us this. Terrorism is always “Erschreckenismus.”In the 1941/42 lecture course devoted to Hölderlin’s hymn to memory¶ and commemoration, “Andenken,” Heidegger returns to terror in a¶ context that stresses its non-operative or extra-economic character.¶ Here the concern is with the festival and the holiday as an interruption¶ of the everyday, the latter understood as the reign of utility and useful¶ work. But Heidegger will not find the essence of the holiday to¶ depend upon the presence of the workday; holidays are not “days off”¶ for him. Rather, the festival begins through a measured reserve and¶ keeping to oneself (Heidegger’s terms are Innehalten and Ansichhalten).¶ This “coming-to-oneself ” is a freeing of one’s essence which brings¶ one before the appearance of the uncommon (cf. GA 52: 74–75). Just¶ as wonder distinguished itself from amazement, admiration, etc. by the¶ fact that it experienced beings as uncommon without recourse to a¶ previously understood horizon of conventional commonality, so too¶ does terror need no recourse to the common. Terror is a transformation¶ of the everyday that nevertheless exceeds the everyday. It bears¶ witness to an ever more thickly veiled withdrawal. At the moment¶ where one collects oneself for the holiday, “Wonder begins, or else¶ even terror” (GA 52: 75). In either case there is a belonging to the¶ uncommon. And what is it that is uncommon? “The uncommon concentrates¶ itself in this: that beings exist at all, and not, far rather, nothing”¶ (GA 52: 75). For wonder, the being of beings was uncommon,¶ for terror, the uncommon is the veiling of being. This veiling institutes¶ a situation of terror and trembling, wherein uncommon being¶ wears the robes of commonality. The uncommon can only be found¶ in the common, and to find it there is to retreat from the all too common¶ theatrics of presence. Terror is an interruption of the play of¶ presence.

#### The modern world requires the fear of terrorism to force it to think about ontological questions

Mitchell, Assistant Professor of Philosophy Emory, 2005 (Andrew, “Heidegger and Terrorism”, http://docserver.ingentaconnect.com/deliver/connect/brill/00855553/v35n1/s10.pdf?expires=1343617879&id=69865278&titleid=1404&accname=Dartmouth+College&checksum=D191F47ADD05EA353BF3771CFA59803A)

Insofar as it is Americanism that is identified with technological¶ domination and the spread of the unworld, then it is no wonder that¶ America is the place where the question of terrorism can and must¶ be posed. Instead of turning from terror, we are called to respond to¶ it. Not by sealing ourselves off from it in a single-minded deafness,¶ but by preserving the trace of being in its withdrawal. America is distinct¶ in this because America most faces the challenge of Americanism.¶ America is today fighting the shadow of itself, it yearns to leap over¶ its shadow and into a state of pure visibility and security. America is¶ not faced with an outside aggressor, but with its own photographic¶ negative in Americanism/terrorism. America’s challenge is to not recognize¶ itself in Americanism and to preserve its difference from this ogre.¶ For America to believe that it is the driving force behind Americanism¶ is for America to believe that it is in control of being. Americanism¶ is a movement of being; it is nothing “American.” America’s other is¶ neither Greece nor Rome, but Americanism. America must distinguish¶ itself from Americanism in order to confront Americanism as its ownmost¶ other. Terror can teach us this and lead us to preserve what is¶ our own.¶ Is this to say that we should remain forever terrorized? exist forever¶ in a state of terror? Is this supposed to provide a solution to the¶ problem of terrorism? Surely that would be an outrageous demand¶ (arge Zumutung) to place upon thinking. The older man says the same¶ thing about malevolence as a basic trait of being; it places an outrageous¶ demand upon thinking. A first step away from the imposed convenience¶ of Americanism might be heard in the words of the younger¶ man, “That this should be easy, namely to think the essential, is also¶ a demand which only arises from the spirit of devastation” (GA 77:¶ 215). If we are to think the essential, to think what withdraws in concealment¶ before the total availability of the unworld around us, then¶ our thinking itself will have to change. Thinking the essential, this is¶ a thinking that we can never be done with, a thinking that is never¶ to be accomplished, a thinking that concerns what can never be thought¶ through. Rather than think from out of the spirit of devastation, we are called¶ to let it into thought; not to think devastation, but to devastatedly think.¶ Thinking itself must be devastated and terrorized if we are to think¶ today. Such a thinking would attend to the uncommon nature of our¶ present situation before the terrorist threat. If America is terrorized,¶ then it is terrorized by Americanism. But Americanism is nothing more¶ than an epoch of being; it is the withholding of being in its withdrawal¶ from us. In the face of this withdrawal we are called to think. Perhaps¶ this is possible nowhere other than America; perhaps this thinking itself¶ will mark another beginning for America, an American thinking that¶ would not be enslaved to a pragmatic and utilitarian metaphysics. To¶ think in this other American manner would be to entertain a new¶ relation to technology, what Heidegger calls in the Spiegel interview of¶ 1966 an “explicit relationship” to technology and “to what is happening¶ today and what has been underway for three centuries.”24 Is¶ such a thinking possible? Could it ever arise in America? Heidegger¶ answers the question directly:¶ : This explicit relationship, do the Americans have it today?¶ : They do not have it either. They are still entangled in a¶ thinking, pragmatism, that fosters technological operating and manipulating¶ but simultaneously blocks the path toward a contemplation of what¶ is characteristic of modern technology. In the meantime, attempts to break¶ away from pragmatic-positivistic thinking are being made here and there in the USA.25

## **\*\*\*Impacts\*\*\***

## **War**

#### Standing reserve justifies endless wars because everything is considered disposable and replaceable

Mitchell, Assistant Professor of Philosophy Emory, 2005 (Andrew, “Heidegger and Terrorism”, http://docserver.ingentaconnect.com/deliver/connect/brill/00855553/v35n1/s10.pdf?expires=1343617879&id=69865278&titleid=1404&accname=Dartmouth+College&checksum=D191F47ADD05EA353BF3771CFA59803A)

With everything available as standing-reserve, troops included, the¶ exhaustion of resources is no longer possible. Resources are precisely¶ in themselves replaceable, to the extent that, in being given over to¶ replacement, even the idea of an “in itself ” is already drained of reality¶ ahead of time. There are no longer any “losses” that cannot be¶ replaced. In other words, there is no longer any friction. All uncertainty¶ is lost, since it is not recognized in the first place. Everything¶ is monitored and controlled. The whole “battle” is given over to a¶ planning that is able to incorporate everything it encounters, since it¶ only ever encounters what is already planable in essence, the standing reserve.¶ Strategy’s demise is the ascendancy of planning. What this¶ means is that war can now go on interminably, subject to no other¶ logic or obligation than its own. Nothing can resist it. But without¶ resistance, war must end. Peace can now go on interminably as well,¶ subject to no other logic or obligation than its own. The logic in question¶ for both war and peace is the logic of replacement, the obligation¶ for each is the obligation to consume. There is no law that would¶ ¶ supervene or subtend consumption; there is no order outside of it that¶ could contain it. Clausewitz’s ideal is realized in a manner that collapses¶ the very distinctions that gave it birth. “War” is no longer a¶ duel; it recognizes no authority outside of itself. The name for this¶ new amalgam of war and peace is terrorism. Terrorism is Clausewitz’s¶ absolute war in the mirror of technology.¶ War and peace come to complete agreement and lose their oppositional¶ identity in the age of value and the ersatz. Without concern for¶ resources, consumption continues untroubled, since war is a kind of¶ “consumption of beings” no different from peace: “War no longer battles¶ against a state of peace, rather it newly establishes the essence of¶ peace” (*GA* 69: 180). The essence of peace so established is a peace¶ that defines itself in regards to war, which binds itself inseparably to¶ war, and which functions equivalently to war. In either case, it is¶ simply a matter of resource consumption and replenishment. In¶ Clausewitzian terms, there is perhaps too much continuity or “continuation”¶ between war and peace, “War has become a distortion of¶ the consumption of beings which is continued in peace” (*GA* 7: 89/*EP*,¶ 104). The peace that technology brings is nothing restful; instead it is¶ the peace of unhindered circulation. We cannot even ask when there¶ will be peace or when the war will end. Such a question, Heidegger¶ specifies, cannot be answered, “not because the length of the war cannot¶ be foreseen, but because the question itself asks for something¶ which no longer is, since already there is no longer a war that would¶ be able to come to a peace” (*GA* 7: 89/*EP*, 104; tm). The basic oppositions¶ of Clausewitzian warfare are undone at this point, an undoing¶ that includes the distinction between ideal and real.

#### The affirmatives engagement in calculative thought reaffirms the destructive potentialities of atomic weaponry

Housman and Flynn, professors of philosophy Emory, 2011 (Benjamin and Thomas, “Cooling Down Global Warming: Revisiting Sartre and Heidegger on this Modern Day Challenge”)

In his lecture “The Thing”, Heidegger considers the concept of nearness and¶ shows that the shortening of distances pervading

society does not make us any nearer to¶ considering the thing as thing. Heidegger says, “Up to now, the human has considered¶ the thing as a thing just as little as he has considered nearness” (1951, 1-5).14 We have¶ failed to consider the ‘thinghood’ of the thing—we merely produce, use, and consume¶ things without them being near to us, without thinking about the ways in which the thing¶ represents itself and presences. This is no new occurrence, though. Heidegger says,¶ “[T]he compelling knowledge of science has already annihilated the thing as thing, long¶ before the atomic bomb exploded. The explosion of the atomic bomb is only the crudest¶ of all crude confirmations of an annihilation of things that occurred long ago” (1949, 1-8). These new technological devices, like the atomic bomb or television, do not define¶ technology and do not explain why we have lost our sense of nearness to things; rather, a¶ larger metaphysical, calculative, scientific, and thoughtless culture extending back before¶ the Industrial Revolution, but intensified after that epoch, has persistently restricted us¶ from being near to things. As such, what presences fails to be ‘concernfully approached’,¶ fails to be near to us, but instead presences as distanceless objects void of meaning,¶ thought, or consideration.

## **Environment**

#### Standing reserve justifies the destruction of the environment in order to maintain consumption

Housman and Flynn, professors of philosophy Emory, 2011 (Benjamin and Thomas, “Cooling Down Global Warming: Revisiting Sartre and Heidegger on this Modern Day Challenge”)

Heidegger echoes many of his earlier thoughts on technology from his Bremen lectures in¶ his seminar in Le Thor two decades later, and supplements his earlier ideas with notions¶ of consumption and replacability. He first speaks of the orderability of forests—how¶ they are no longer integrated into our being but are viewed in terms of utility. A forest is¶ now a systematically planned area designated as a “greenspace”, exploited by¶ businessmen and technologists. We perceive this greenspace in terms of supply, in terms¶ of standing reserve. Heidegger believes this way of relating to our surrounding, this way¶ of being, lends itself to seeing objects as replaceable and for our consumption. He says,¶ “Today being is being-replaceable…It is essential for every being of consumption that it¶ be already consumed and thus call for its replacement” (2003 [1977], 62). This way of¶ being, this predominance of replacement and consumption, is but another dimension of¶ this overarching culture of positionality and technology. We think in terms of utility,¶ application, and efficiency rather than in terms of guarding the thing itself. We dispose¶ of objects without care; we use an object and then discard it, for its purpose has been¶ served. Consider a water cooler. Every part of that water cooler—the plastic jug¶ containing the water, the metal inside the cooler itself, the plastic cups for drinking the¶ water—is discarded once it no longer performs its function or because we believe it has¶ become contaminated and must be destroyed. Heidegger recognizes that this wasteful¶ 36¶ culture has serious consequences for our being, and the consequences are now¶ manifesting themselves quite markedly in global warming. Does this mean that¶ Heidegger was implicitly encouraging an ethic of sustainability and recycling? Possibly,¶ however Heidegger’s thought was more concerned with being, ensuring that we do not¶ lose our essence, and that we do not become “slave[s] to the forgetfulness of being”¶ (2003, 63). While his philosophy surely lends itself to an environmental ethic and sheds¶ light on our activity fueling global warming, it was not explicitly directed at preserving¶ our environment. Nevertheless, this abundance of replacement and consumption that¶ Heidegger speaks of is simply unsustainable, for we do not have infinite resources and¶ cannot continue to produce and consume at such high levels.¶ Heidegger’s philosophy of technology, described in his Bremen lectures and¶ discussed further at his seminar in Le Thor, in many ways paints a dark picture of our¶ current mode of living in this world. We have become dependent on technology and now¶ only relate to the world for the sake of how it can be applied. We see our surroundings as¶ orderable, as standing reserve not yet utilized but soon to be positioned for our use and¶ consumption, and fail to appreciate the environment as part of our being. This danger,¶ and lack of distress about it, threatens our human essence as thought-worthy beings, as¶ beings near to the thing as thing and guarding it. Yet, even after describing such an¶ unsettling world, Heidegger remains hopeful that we can regain our essence and learn to¶ incorporate our thought-worthy being into a technological world—say yes and at the¶ same time no to technical devices—while still preserving our essential space. First,¶ though, we must find our way back to this essential space and experience thinking in its¶ original form, through its original correspondence. According to Heidegger, then, once¶ 37¶ we revive our essence we can live with technology rather than as slaves to it and can find¶ a way to prevent the damage of our earth due to global warming. Thinking is the path to¶ letting being be, to allowing the world to world, and to guarding being, and it is here that¶ we must now turn our attention.

## **Standing Reserve**

#### Technological thought makes the world standing reserve

Idhe, Professor of Philosophy and the Director of the Technoscience Research Group at Stony Brook, 2010 (Don, *Heidegger’s Technologies*, Project Muse, Pg 34-35

The world in its technological shape is the set of conditions that Heidegger¶ defines as world taken as standing-reserve (Bestand). This is to say¶ that the world, revealed technologically, is taken in a certain way, as a¶ field of energy or power that can be captured and stored. ‘‘The revealing¶ that rules in modern technology is a challenging, which puts to nature the¶ unreasonable demand that it supply energy which can be extracted and¶ stored as such’’ (QT 296). This makes world a field as standing-reserve.¶ This view has certain consequences, for example, ‘‘The earth now¶ reveals itself as a coal mining district, the soil as a mineral deposit’’ (QT¶ 296), which is to say that nature appears as a certain potential for human¶ use. This is a variant upon how nature may be viewed. It stands in contrast¶ to those civilizational variants that, for instance, regard the earth as¶ mother and to which one does not even put a plow. Thus one may say¶ equivalently that the technologically viewed world is a variant upon civilizational¶ possibilities or that it is a historical transformation upon how¶ nature is taken.¶ Heidegger argues that such an understanding of the world is a condition¶ of the possibility for our taking up the kinds of technologies that we¶ actually develop now. He emphasizes the transformational features of this¶ enterprise. Thus not only is it the case that the earth may be viewed as a¶ resource, but what was previously taken as the dominance of nature over¶ man becomes inverted so that man dominates nature through technology.¶ ‘‘In the context of the interlocking processes pertaining to the orderly disposition¶ of electrical energy, even the Rhine appears to be something at¶ our command. . . . The river is dammed up into the power plant. What¶ the river is now, namely, a waterpower supplier, derives from the essence¶ of the power station’’ (QT 297). Technology, in this sense, is both the¶ condition of the possibility of the shape of world in the contemporary¶ sense, and the transformation of nature itself as it is taken into¶ technology. Phenomenologically, for every variant noematic condition there is a¶ corresponding noetic condition. Thus, if the world is viewed as standingreserve,¶ the basic way in which the world is perceived, there must also¶ be a correlated human response. That, too, takes particular shape in a¶ technological epoch. The activities of humans in response to world as standing-reserve are those of revealing that world’s possibilities, characterized¶ by Heidegger as ‘‘unlocking, transforming, storing, distributing, and¶ switching about’’ (QT 298). Man is taken into the process of ordering:¶ ‘‘Precisely because man is challenged more originally than are the energies¶ of nature, i.e., into the process of ordering, he never is transformed into¶ mere standing-reserve. Since man drives technology forward, he takes part¶ in ordering as a way of revealing’’ (QT 299–300).

## **\*\*\*Alternative\*\*\***

## Environment

#### Only stepping back and questioning can solve for environmental problems

Housman and Flynn, professors of philosophy Emory, 2011 (Benjamin and Thomas, “Cooling Down Global Warming: Revisiting Sartre and Heidegger on this Modern Day Challenge”)

Heidegger directly speaks to this notion of a ‘step back’ in many of his works, but¶ particularly in his 1957 essay entitled “The Onto-Theo-Logical Constitution of¶ Metaphysics”. He says, “The step back points to the realm which until now has been¶ skipped over, and from which the essence of truth becomes first of all worthy of thought”¶ (1969 [1957], 49). Stepping back out of positionality, out of solely calculative thinking,¶ out of the plans and schedules of our daily lives, provides an entirely new perspective on¶ how we relate to the world, on how we live in this world, that will enable us to see certain¶ aspects of our world in an altogether new dimension. This step back allows us to pull out¶ of the systematically rigid, planned, and positioned world that consumes us. Through this¶ step back and meditative thinking, we can begin to live resonantly through releasement,¶ escaping the shackles of technology that currently overpower and define our being.¶ Even if we learn to have this comportment towards things engendered through¶ releasement and become capable of living with technology rather than as slaves to it, will¶ this be sufficient; will global warming cease being a danger? Many people would argue¶ that technology must be reformed and transformed altogether, for even if we learn to live¶ with technology, the levels of greenhouse gases emitted by the technological devices we¶ use on a daily basis is simply unsustainable. As mentioned earlier, though, Heidegger¶ 42¶ accepts the technological direction of history and realizes that we cannot simply eliminate¶ technological devices from our daily lives; we cannot instantaneously revert to a pre-¶ Industrial, agrarian society. However, failure to revive our meditative thinking means¶ that calculative thinking would continue to dominate the way we think, thereby only¶ exacerbating the levels of consumption, utility, application, and positionality that define¶ the modern technological world. Failure to ‘step back’ and a persistence of calculative¶ thinking would only keep us on the same path; global warming would only increase and¶ we would stand little hope of preserving our environment.¶ Releasement, while it represents a non-willing, does not mean that the will ceases¶ to exist altogether. While one can be open to the mystery of the world, one can also live¶ his or her life but take that which presences and ascribe meaning to it through a¶ meditative thinking. This means that in letting being be, the true essence of being¶ breathes freely and reveals itself. In the context of the modern technological world, we¶ release ourselves to the world by letting the technical devices and phenomena—cell¶ phones, automobiles, power plants, the motorized food industry etc.—enter our lives so¶ that we can understand exactly how they fit into our world. Through such an¶ understanding, we may begin to see those technical devices and phenomena from a new¶ perspective, one that may inspire us to modify them in such a way that we can more¶ essentially guard being. Indeed, global warming fundamentally threatens being; if our¶ roles as shepherds of being means protecting being from that which threatens it, then we¶ must address this culture of modernity overrun by calculative thinking and rooted in¶ global warming. Releasement towards things enables us to live with technology because¶ 43¶ it enlightens us on the very dangers inherent in modern technology but separate from its¶ essence.¶ Heidegger does not intend to suggest that we can provide a quick and easy¶ solution to global warming merely through changing the way we think. He recognizes¶ the scope and force of technology, and feels this danger in all its power. However,¶ adjusting the way we live our lives represents a necessary step towards preventing global¶ warming from destroying our earth. We cannot solve this problem through continually¶ applying metaphysical methods involving calculations, statistics, and numbers to the¶ objectified and alienated environment around us. Such thinking still resides in the¶ calculative and positioned culture of modernity that prevents us from coexisting¶ meditatively with nature.

## **Standing Reserve**

#### Identifying essence allows us to remove ourselves from the standing reserve

Idhe, Professor of Philosophy and the Director of the Technoscience Research Group at Stony Brook, 2010 (Don, *Heidegger’s Technologies*, Project Muse, Pg 39-40

It is at this juncture that Heidegger makes a strategic phenomenological¶ move. To recognize and identify the essence of technology, to comprehend¶ it, is to have located it or to take note of it as bounded, as having a¶ horizon. Thus by the same move that grasps technology in its essence, the¶ possibility of becoming free occurs.¶ But when we consider the essence of technology we experience¶ enframing as a destining of revealing. In this way we are already¶ sojourning within the open space of destining, a destining that in¶ no way confines us to a stultifying compulsion to push on blindly¶ with technology, or, what comes to the same, to rebel helplessly¶ against it and curse it as a work of the devil. Quite to the contrary,¶ when we once open ourselves expressly to the essence of technology,¶ we find ourselves unexpectedly taken into a freeing claim. (QT 307)¶ What this amounts to, in the Heideggerian program, is to have recognized¶ that the relationship to technology is not technological, but is an¶ existential relationship and hence circumscribed by all the features that¶ characterize existentiality. And to characterize the human response to¶ technology, now located and limited, is to recognize that technology is,¶ first, not neutral: ‘‘We are delivered over to it in the worst possible way¶ when we regard it as something neutral; for this conception of it, to which¶ today we are particularly likely to do homage, makes us utterly blind to¶ the essence of technology,’’ (QT 288); is, second, ambiguous: ‘‘the¶ essence of technology is in a lofty sense ambiguous’’ (QT 314); and is,¶ third, mysterious: ‘‘technology is not demonic, but its essence is mysterious’’¶ (QT 309). But all of these are characterizations of existential intentionality¶ with respect to the truth structure of concealing-revealing.¶ I have indicated that Heidegger’s theory of truth is a complex field theory.¶ It is complex because the structure of revealing is inextricably bound¶ to concealing—indeed, bounded by concealing which is its horizon. ‘‘All¶ revealing belongs within a harboring and a concealing. But that which¶ frees—the mystery—is concealed and always concealing itself. . . . Freedom¶ is that which conceals in a way that opens to light. . . . Freedom is¶ the realm of the destining that at any given time starts a revealing on its¶ way’’ (QT 306). I shall not here go into the complexity of the ratio of¶ concealing to revealing that marks Heidegger’s theory of truth, but it is¶ important to note its result for a human relationship to the essence of¶ technology.¶ Heidegger characterizes a range of possible responses to technology.¶ These range from blind obedience to equally blind rebellion. But he also¶ allows for a free (authentic?) relationship that faces technology in its¶ essence. But because there is such a range, there is also danger: ‘‘Placed¶ between these possibilities, man is endangered by destining. The destining¶ of revealing is as such, in every one of its modes, and therefore necessarily,¶ danger’’ (QT 307).

#### Questioning rolls-back the current process that is causing the loss of worldhood

Richter, professor at the Philosophy Department at the University of Hamburg , 2012 ( Ewald,“Heidegger’s Theses Concerning the Question of the¶ Foundations of the Sciences” translated by Trish Glazebrook and Christina Behme, Heidegger on Science edited by Trish Glazebrook, Pg 72-74

In Being and Time, Heidegger interprets “Dasein” as “being-in-theworld.”¶ Insofar as in modern thinking the origin has been lost from view,¶ a gradual “loss of worldhood” can be discussed in the sense of Heidegger’s¶ concept of world (world as “entire context of significance”). Thus, it is necessary,¶ especially in the current age, to recognize that by grasping things in¶ terms of their sensibly perceived properties (e.g., taking a wooden chair as¶ an object of a certain hardness, weight, and color etc., this chair is already¶ no longer perceived as “a thing in the environment”). Even though the¶ qualities mentioned need not yet be perceived as quantities of a certain¶ value, they are already, as determinations, properties that are attributed¶ or denied to the being as thing-descriptions that are used in subsequent¶ assertions. Heidegger says in connection with a chair described in this way:¶ “what we have just said of the perceived can be said of any piece of wood¶ whatsoever” (GA 20, 49/38). Something is said about the chair, “not qua¶ chair-thing, but rather as a thing of nature, as natural thing” (GA 20, 49/38)¶ A difference must be acknowledged when a being is determined as a¶ thing of nature. When, in his famous second meditation, Descartes describes¶ a piece of wax by its sensibly perceived properties (as colored, of a certain¶ form, size, hardness and coldness), this is according to Heidegger already¶ an apprehension of the thing as “nature-thing.” It already constitutes a¶ “theoretical apprehension” (GA 20, 247/182) that is no longer guided exclusively¶ by a primordial understanding of significance. Descartes then takes a¶ well-known further step. He considers the identity of the wax throughout¶ its changing qualities, and forces the reader to admit that henceforth determinations¶ by the intellect are relevant (the thing is thereby determined as¶ “extended, flexible, and changeable”). A direct route follows from these¶ intellectual determinations of a thing of nature to the Kantian determination¶ of the “object of cognition.” For Kant, it is assumed a priori that the¶ “object of cognition” is always located in a well-defined space and time, and¶ that other properties of the thing can be described in well-defined “degrees¶ of intensity.” This is the kind of “projection” that natural science seeks using¶ mathematical relations between measurements. Insofar as natural science¶ cannot abandon the thought of “a nature,” it strives to overcome several¶ essentially different descriptions of nature in favor of one determination.¶ So a being is experienced in the sciences in a new way of what-being¶ and how-being. A change has taken place that is grounded in the “projection”¶ of science. What the object of science can be is thereby determined¶ from the outset. Heidegger says about this change in the way of seeing: “a different being is not related to and discovered, but rather the being of the¶ already evident being is from the beginning seen, taken and determined differently”¶ (GA 27, 186). The projection of science “drags the being clearly¶ into the light, without changing it into anything else.” Such knowledge can¶ be understood as a “letting-be” [Seinlassen] of a being qua object that must¶ “make use of the openness of the being” (GA 27, 180). The being, removed¶ from its original context, reveals itself “as lying-before [als vorliegendes], as¶ positum.” In this sense, scientific knowledge is “positive knowledge” (GA¶ 27, 197). Heidegger carefully considered such relations of lying-before [vorliegenden].¶ On one hand, science gives itself its object area, and therewith¶ also the relevant ground of its experience; but on the other hand, its ground¶ is already given in the primordial lifeworld. We see in more detail how¶ this latter ground is already given, although science as science can have¶ no insight into it.¶ There is, however, another difficulty that first must be overcome: the¶ realm of natural things [Naturdinge] evidently extends further than the realm¶ of things of use [Gebrauchsdinge]. The latter are things of nature, but conversely,¶ we make a wealth of statements about natural things to which we¶ have no access—especially in modern natural sciences. The “systems” set up¶ in these sciences are markedly similar on a general level, despite substantial¶ individual differences. Concerning “what” the objects are, one can always¶ reply they are physical “systems,” and the “how-being” of these systems is¶ determined by physical values that have a universal applicability. If the¶ values and laws (e.g., the relations between lawlike values of place, velocity,¶ and mass in physics) are examined more closely, then it becomes clear¶ that science applies to more than objects of use in a novel but legitimate¶ extension. Through a totally changed constitution of the being [Seinsverfassung]¶ of beings, it becomes possible to say something about objects that¶ are in no way “affected by that constitution” [Verhaltung] (as ready-to-hand¶ objects of use), to which we “do not need to reach with our methods, and¶ upon which we do not need to touch” (GA 27, 182). The entire field is¶ “outlined in advance” by the projection.¶ Heidegger’s subsequent insight is also significant for scientific theory.¶ The “active” approach of the scientist toward nature, which expresses itself¶ in experimental arrangements, is seen by him in the right light. I have¶ already hinted that according to Heidegger science can prompt a being to¶ reveal what was previously not known, that it can “get the latter out” of¶ the being. It is important here to understand properly how the activity of¶ the scientific approach does not lead to a subjective falsification of objects.¶ This activity (so reads his analysis) has the character, when properly seen,¶ of “withdrawing before the being” (GA 27, 183). What experiment reveals¶ about an object is revealed by the way in which the experiment is arranged. These arrangements are tailored right from the start towards the object under¶ investigation in such a way that it is prompted to produce a particular kind¶ of answer about its how-being. The entire process is carried out through¶ measurement of what is meaningfully questionable and answerable by physics¶ according to its projection (at a derivative level). The primordially perceptual¶ object is, however, he reminds us, “the specific environmental thing,¶ even if it remains hidden.”

## **Error Replication**

#### Technology can never solve the problems that it creates- turns case

McWhorter, Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Northeast Missouri State University. , 92 (Ladelle, Heidegger and the Earth, ed. by Ladelle McWhorter)

Thinking today must concern itself with the earth. Wherever we turn on newsstands, on the airwaves, and in even the most casual of conversations everywhere - we are inundated by predictions of ecological catastrophe and omnicidal doom. And many of these predictions bear themselves out in our own experience. We now live with the ugly, painful, and impoverishing consequences of decades of technological innovation and expansion without restraint, of at least a century of disastrous "natural resource management" policies, and of more than two centuries of virtually unchecked industrial pollution - consequences that include the fact that millions of us on any given day are suffering, many of us dying of diseases and malnutrition that are the results of humanly produced ecological devastation; the fact that thousands of species now in existence will no longer exist on this planet by the turn of the century; the fact that our planet's climate has been altered, probably irreversibly, by the carbon dioxide and chlorofluorocarbons we have heedlessly poured into our atmosphere; and the mind-boggling fact that it may now be within humanity's power to destroy all life on this globe. Our usual response to such prophecies of doom is to ignore them or, when we cannot do that, to scramble to find some way to manage our problems, some quick solution, some technological fix. But over and over again new resource management techniques, new solutions, new technologies disrupt delicate systems even further, doing still more damage to a planet already dangerously out of ecological balance. Our ceaseless interventions seem only to make things worse, to perpetuate a cycle of human activity followed by ecological disaster followed by human intervention followed by a new disaster of another kind. In fact, it would appear that our trying to do things, change things, fix things cannot be the solution, because it is part of the problem itself.

## **Ontology First**

#### Ontology is a pre-requiste to effective action- only when we know how we relate to the world can we effectively work within it

Gelven, research professor at Washington University, 89 (Michael Gelven, “Commentary on Being in Time” p. 30-33)

Both science itself and the philosophy of science are ways of Being, in which Dasein directs its attention toward these various kinds of activity. But the ability of Dasein to do this is itself prior to these particular activities, and in fact greatly determines them. Hence ontologically, an analysis of what it means to be is prior to and affects our ultimate understanding of all other inquiries concerning particular things that are. Suppose, for example, I don't ask, What is science? but rather, What does it mean to be scientific? In the former question I may well be asking for categories and the a priori conditions that may be necessary if certain functions are to proceed. But in the latter question I am asking what it means for the self to direct its attention to such categories, and hence this disposition of the self to make use of these categories is primary. The categories may be open to question but the disposition of the self to attend to what is formally verifiable in an organized body of knowledge is not. In this sense, what it means to be scientific is prior to the question of what science is. This priority of the question of Being is not merely in terms of the sciences. All inquiries, even those dealing with such "unscientific" questions as ethics and value, are likewise grounded in the primordial or fundamental discipline. Whether I ask the question in terms of how it is possible to be a scientist or to be moral, the fundamental question is always what it means to be at all. It must be clearly understood that Heidegger is in no way suggesting a psychology. When I ask the question, What does it mean to be scientific or moral? I am not asking for an account of my psychological states, or for motives, or for determinant factors in my environment; such considerations are ontic considerations, and themselves presuppose the kind of analysis done by the fundamental ontologist. The question is, What are the modes of Being that I regard as moral? There is no major argumentation given by Heidegger that the question of Being is the fundamental question aside from the fact that the question of Being does seem to be a valid kind of question in every possible form of inquiry. But the real proof of this must wait the completion of the analysis. Although it is perfectly relevant and significant to show, as Heidegger has done, that the question of Being can occur as a kind of presupposition behind every inquiry, whether this question provides the basis for such inquiries can obviously be argued only in terms of each and every individual case. In the actual analyses to follow, Heidegger accomplishes this kind of argumentation for some of the major areas of human concern. That he does not carry this out individually for each science is hardly to be expected; but he does provide us with sufficient analysis to lend serious credence to the claim that the question of Being is the fundamental question of all philosophy.

#### Philosophical questioning is a pre-requisite to effective evaluation of science

Babich, Professor of Philosophy Fordham University, 2012 (Babette, “Heidegger’s Philosophy of Sicence and the Critique of Calculation: Reflective Questioning, Gelassenheit, and Life”, *Heidegger on Science* edited by Trish Glazebrook, Project Muse, Pg 159-161)

By saying that “all scientific thought is merely a derived form of philosophical¶ thinking” (EM, 20/26). Heidegger’s claim is that, in consequence,¶ philosophy “is prior in rank.”3 Heidegger thus opposes the creatively foundational¶ activity of philosophic reflection to the then popular articulations¶ of epistemological investigations into the sciences of his era as the kind of¶ “logic” (Heidegger sets this off in quotes) following after science, “ ‘limping¶ along in its wake,’ investigating the status of [any given] science as it chances¶ to find it in order to discover its ‘method’ ” (SZ, 10/30). By contrast, the¶ “productive logic” (SZ, 10/30, emphasis added) of philosophy is ultimately¶ capable of illuminating breakthroughs and even within science itself (but¶ only to the extent that it is “philosophical” as Heidegger emphasizes). And¶ more than one scholar writing on Heidegger has noted an anticipatory parallel¶ with Kuhn as Heidegger continues to write in Being and Time, this¶ creative logic leaps ahead “into some area of Being, discloses it for the first¶ time, in the constitution of its Being, and, after thus arriving at the structures¶ within it, makes these available to the positive sciences as transparent¶ assignments for their inquiry.”4¶ For Heidegger, writing in Husserl’s critical foundational spirit with¶ respect to the development of mathematical physics, “What is decisive” is¶ the creativity of “the mathematical project of nature itself” inasmuch as the¶ project “discovers in advance something constantly objectively present (matter)¶ and opens the horizon for the scientific perspective on its quantitatively¶ definable moments (motion, force, location, and time)” (SZ, 362/413–14).¶ The “founding” of “factual science” is “possible only because the researcher¶ understood that there are in principle no ‘bare facts’ ” (SZ, 362/414), that,¶ in other words, the material project of nature must be given in advance, a¶ priori. Only then is it possible for a science to be “capable of a crisis in its¶ basic concepts” (SZ, 9/29).¶ Heidegger, who remained committed to phenomenology throughout¶ his life, emphasizes that beyond any superficially obvious call “to the things¶ themselves,”5 phenomenology “presupposed life.”6 To understand this presupposes¶ a specific and hermeneutic attention, in the methodic sense Thomas¶ Seebohm has underlined, like Heidegger indeed with reference to Dilthey.7¶ In methodic focus for Heidegger himself and in addition to history and the¶ philosophical question of time, was the transformation of the biological¶ sciences that was well underway at the time and in addition to the more¶ well-known transformations of physics as a mathematical science, and to a¶ lesser degree, of chemistry8 in the same vein.¶ Including and exceeding Claude Bernard’s milieu intérieur, as the evolution¶ beyond Cartesian mechanism, Heidegger’s own reference would be¶ critically ecological in Ernst Haeckel’s original sense (assuming we might be¶ able to translate as Pierre Duhem long ago suggested that we could not¶ do, between the sensibilities of “German” and “French” science),9 radically¶ environmental, in today’s rather specifically “English” (and not American¶ or Canadian or Australian, etc.)10 terminology: “Life is that kind of reality¶ which is in the world and indeed in such a way that it has a world. Every¶ living creature has its environing world not as something extant next to it but as something that is there [da ist] for it as disclosed, uncovered.”11 And¶ in 1925, Heidegger emphasized that “for a primitive animal, the world can¶ be very simple,” explaining that we run the risk of missing “the essential¶ thing here if we don’t see that the animal has a world.”12 Heidegger’s original¶ continuum of complexity–simplicity must accordingly be added to contemporary¶ readings of Heidegger’s subsequent discussions of the world-poverty¶ of the animal in terms of indigence.

#### You cannot assess the impacts of the affirmative- questioning is a pre-requisite to determining morals

Richter, professor at the Philosophy Department at the University of Hamburg , 2012 ( Ewald,“Heidegger’s Theses Concerning the Question of the¶ Foundations of the Sciences” translated by Trish Glazebrook and Christina Behme, Heidegger on Science edited by Trish Glazebrook, Pg 83-84

Starting now with the next question, “Who am I?,” Heidegger writes¶ that the utmost distress (of lack of distress) expresses itself where “everything¶ is held to be calculable and, above all, where it is decided, without a preceding¶ question, who we are and what we are to do” (GA 65, 125/87). Dasein,¶ so runs one of the most famous phrases of Being and Time, is “always mine.”¶ At first glance, this will appear to some as self-evident. One might say that,¶ whether human or not, every object is always this and not some other¶ object. In the case of human being, one can of course reflect on oneself,¶ and then voice the trivial sentence: “I am this and not some other being.”¶ Whoever talks so obviously suffers no distress with the question, “who am¶ I?,” yet fails especially to see that Heidegger is not talking about a secondary¶ reflection on one’s own “consciousness,” or an “objective system.” Rather,¶ he is talking about something that for all reflection comes “too late.” I¶ “know” “always already” in a certain sense (and entirely without reflection)¶ that Dasein is “always mine,” and at the same time I do not “know”¶ it. In order better to understand “mine-ness,” we need to pay attention to¶ the second of Heidegger’s remarks (“to what are we called?”), which is also¶ easy to misunderstand. This second point does not (at least not primarily)¶ ask, “what we should we do as moral agents?” The primary concern here¶ is not obligation in the modern moralistic sense. Rather, it is the fact that¶ Dasein is called to itself. That the “itself” is at the same time not, is implied¶ here when being “called” and thus also the call are mentioned. That is, a¶ decisiveness is necessary in order that we really are—in order to be the¶ “there [Da]” of Da-sein.¶ What has just been said remains unintelligible to one who takes the¶ “I” as something present-at-hand among many present-at-hand entities.¶ Each I that is present-at-hand in this way perishes after a certain time, as¶ experience shows is the case with human bodies (including their so-called¶ “consciousness”). For Heidegger, it is essential to consider things entirely¶ differently. He is concerned with respect to Dasein about the being carried¶ away [Entrückheit] of human being into the “truth of the being.” He then¶ asks, what is the “other of this carrying away?” His concern is not the¶ presence or absence of something previously present-at-hand, but rather¶ “the totally other of the t/here [Da], totally concealed from us, but in this¶ shelteredness-concealedness [Verborgenheit] belonging essentially to the t/¶ here and needing to be sustained along-with the inabiding of Da-sein” (GA¶ 65, 324/228). The shelteredness-concealedness of the t/here mentioned here¶ can be open for Dasein. There is for Dasein the possibility of bringing the¶ shelteredness-concealedness into a relation to truth; that is, there is a possibility¶ of attaining its own self and therewith at the same time of arriving¶ at the “sustaining” of what is utmost for Dasein, the “traversal of the widest¶ removals-unto” [Entrückungen] (GA 65, 324/227).¶ According to Heidegger, the possibility of being in an actual sense¶ “oneself” is therefore given to human being along with the openness of being—the openness of the shelteredness-concealedness of the there [Da].¶ This selfhood, according to the later Heidegger, is grounded in mastery of¶ “owning in enowning” [Eignung im Ereignis] (GA 65, 320/224). Simultaneously,¶ owning-to [Zu-eignung] and owning-over-to [Über-eignung] belong here.¶ Said differently, Da-sein can come to “itself” in owning-to only if this owning¶ to “itself” happens through being and is an “owning-over-to in enowning.”¶ The entire weight of this question, which includes the “secret,” shifts¶ itself for each “self” (actually for us “mortals” together) to the essence of¶ the truth of being. This question is not to be treated as a theme of modern¶ science, since a “secret” of this kind is different from anything that can be¶ thematized in any such science. The question belongs rather to that which¶ can be threatened by the sciences, that is, by an illegitimately generalized¶ concept of reality.

## Discourse first

#### Language has a direct tie to being- the discourse of the 1ac should be rejected if it enables the loss of being

Hatab, professor at Old Dominion University, 2012 (Lawrence, “From Animal to Dasein: Heidegger and Evolutionary Biology”, Heidegger on Science edited by Trish Glazebrook, Project Muse Pg 109-110

I close with a brief consideration of perhaps the most important topic of¶ all in this matter, the question of language, which unfortunately I cannot¶ address adequately within the limits of this chapter. It is common to see¶ language as the distinguishing mark of the human species. In fact, without¶ language there would be no human culture at all. This is the spirit of¶ Heidegger’s remark that language is the “house of being” and that humans¶ dwell in this house (GA 9, 313). Language is the environment in which¶ the world opens up for human beings, and it too exhibits a circularity¶ that eludes explication. Any attempt to “explain” language or connect it with prelinguistic elements must employ language to do so. Even “nonverbal”¶ comprehensions or experiences bank on having been oriented into a¶ language-laden environment from the first moments of life.¶ I would like to suggest ways in which language can be implicated in¶ the openness that Heidegger insists marks the human world. To begin, as¶ suggested above, language is the very shaping of the human world from the¶ start. And in everyday linguistic practices and exchanges, we take language¶ to be spontaneously disclosive of things. In direct conversations I simply¶ understand immediately the disclosive effects of speech without marking a¶ difference between the speech and its reference. Or if someone is verbally¶ helping me learn a practical task, guiding my actions and pointing out¶ aspects of the practice as we go along, I am immersed in this disclosive¶ field without noticing “words” as distinct from “referents” (or puzzling as to¶ how words relate to their referents). In this respect there is a “fit” between¶ language and the world. And yet, there is a difference between verbal utterances¶ per se and the subject of utterances, and it is this differentiated relation¶ that makes possible the openness of language, particularly in terms¶ of temporality. Words give a presence to things that can be retained in¶ the absence of things. It is this presencing of absence that makes possible¶ the stretches of temporal understanding that far exceed any primitive time¶ sense that animals might possess. With words I can retain the past and¶ project the future in vivid detail, and I can be released from the actual by¶ envisioning the possible, I can scan temporal dimensions to compare present¶ experience with past experience and uncover alternative futures based¶ on the comparison. All of this is made possible by the differential fitness of¶ language. Without fitness, speech about the past or future would not register.¶ Without difference, speech would be trapped in actuality.¶ Differential space is what opens up language (and the world) and¶ makes possible the dynamic openness of human language that does not¶ seem evident in animal calls and their functions. In addition to temporal¶ extension, consider examples of openness such as metaphor, comparisons,¶ distinctions, negations, new or extended uses, misuses, deceit, asking questions,¶ and meaningful silences.23 All this indicates that the human linguistic¶ environment is animated by traversals of otherness exceeding immediate¶ states, which strictly empirical descriptions cannot convey. Interestingly,¶ linguistic research shows that one of the few universals across different¶ human languages is the capacity for negation, and that expressing negation is¶ essential to language.24 Negative dimensions, of course, are the core of Heidegger’s¶ phenomenology, which articulates how nonbeing is not the opposite¶ of being, since absence is intrinsic to the rich scope of world-disclosure (cf.¶ GA 24, 443/311–12; GA 9, 113–20). In light of the phenomenological¶ negativity¶ of language, from an evolutionary standpoint it is difficult to conceive¶ how animal sounds and calls approximated or inched their way toward this surpassing dimension of language. It may be that the differential fitness¶ of language itself opened up the dimensions of Dasein’s radical finitude, as¶ Heidegger understands it. But it is a puzzle to envision how mere sounds¶ “evolved” to the point where language as fitting and as different emerged¶ in some contiguous sense. The puzzle can be aggravated by noticing that¶ my posing this question as a problem presupposes my already having been¶ outfitted by language as a differential dynamic. And what about the as as¶ such? What “is” the “as”? Can we take the “as” as, well, what? At this¶ point one appreciates the aptness of Wittgenstein’s appeal for silence, or¶ more positively, Heidegger’s talk of the self-showing marvel of being that is¶ simply bounded by concealment and thereby not susceptible to explication.¶ However human life has emerged from the earth, the very powers that let¶ us explore this question cannot themselves be tracked in the earth.

## **\*\*\*Answers\*\*\***

## **Permutation**

The permutation devolves back into technological thought- technologies makes us believe we have already found the answer to the ontological question

McWhorter, Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Northeast Missouri State University, 92 (Ladelle, Heidegger and the Earth, ed. by Ladelle McWhorter)

 Heidegger often refers in his writings to the dramatic changes to which he was witness - the loss of rootedness to place that came with the Invention of the automobile, then the airplane, and now our various vehicles t-or travel in interplanetary space; the conquering of distances that has accompanied the development of communications technologies such as radio, television, and film, and of course, the changes in our thinking of and with the natural world that have come as we have become seemingly more and more independent of the earth's forces, more and more capable "of outwitting them and even of harnessing them and forcing them to conform to our wills. These changes - but more especially human beings' unreflective incorporation of these changes into our daily lives - struck Heidegger as strange and very dangerous. It may well be that there is nothing really wrong with using a tractor to plow one's land or with using a computer to write one's book, but there is something ominous, Heidegger believed, about our not giving any thought to what is happening to ourselves and to the world when we do those things, or our not noticing or at least not caring about the disruptions these changes bring about in the fabric of things. Heidegger calls us to give thought to - or give ourselves over to the thought of - the strangeness of our technological being within the world. His works resound with calls for human beings to grow more thoughtful, take heed, to notice and reflect upon where we are and what we are doing, lest human possibility and the most beautiful of possibilities for thought be lost irretrievably in forces we do not understand and only pretend we can control. - Heidegger's admonitions are sometimes somewhat harsh. "Let us not :"01 ourselves," he wrote in 1955. "All of us, including those who think professionally, as it were, are often enough thought-poor; we all are far too easily thought-less. Thoughtlessness is an uncanny visitor who comes and goes everywhere in today's world. For nowadays we take in everything in the quickest and cheapest way, only to forget it just as quickly, instantly."! Some might find this unnecessarily harsh. We academicians may wish to contest the accusation. Surely, in the universities of all places, thinking is going on. But Heidegger had no respect for that or any other kind of complacency. The thinking he saw as essential is no more likely, perhaps unfortunately, to be found in universities or among philosophers than anywhere else. For the thinking he saw as essential is not the simple amassing and digesting of facts or even the mastering of complex relationships or the producing of ever more powerful and inclusive theories. The thinking Heidegger saw as essential, the thinking his works call us to, is not a thinking that seeks to master anything, not a thinking that results from a drive to grasp and know and shape the world; it is a thinking that disciplines itself to allow the world - the earth, things - to show themselves on their own terms. Heidegger called this kind of thinking 'reflection'. In 1936 he wrote, "Reflection is the courage to make the truth of our own presuppositions and the realm of our own goals into the things that most deserve to be called in question. Reflection is thinking that never rests complacently in the conclusions reached yesterday; it is thinking that continues to think, that never stops with a satisfied smile and announces: We can cease; we have the right answer now. On the contrary, it is thinking that loves its own life, its own occurring, that does not quickly put a stop to itself, as thinking intent on a quick solution always tries to do."

#### Meditative and Calculative thought are mutually exclusive- calculative thought crowds out the possibility of questioning

Idhe, Professor of Philosophy and the Director of the Technoscience Research Group at Stony Brook, 2010 (Don, *Heidegger’s Technologies*, Project Muse, Pg 40-41

But what is the danger? The answer is essentially the same as the previously¶ noted danger of taking correctness as truth, the danger of taking a¶ part for the whole. ‘‘In whatever way the destining of revealing may hold¶ sway, the unconcealment in which everything that is shows itself at any¶ given time harbors the danger that man may misconstrue the unconcealed¶ and misinterpret it.’’ (QT 307; italics mine).¶ A misinterpretation, for Heidegger, contains elements that reflect the¶ errors possible in taking correctness for truth. They revolve around his¶ version of mistaking the part for the founding whole. Thus, unless it is¶ recognized that technological revealing is also a concealing (and it is from¶ concealing that the origin of freedom arises), it can be mistaken for the¶ totality. Technology, by its very status as a mode of revealing, may harbor¶ this temptation.¶ The coming to presence of technology threatens revealing, threatens¶ it with the possibility that all revealing will be consumed in ordering¶ and that everything will present itself only in the unconcealedness of¶ standing-reserve. (QT 315, italics mine)¶ Noematically, this is the implicit claim of ultimate truth, world must¶ appear totally or ultimately as standing-reserve. Noetically, the same index¶ for danger can occur. By reflexively taking account of their place within¶ world, humans face the danger that they can also be taken as standingreserve.¶ When destining reigns in the mode of enframing, it is the supreme¶ danger. This danger attests itself to us in two ways. As soon as what¶ is unconcealed no longer concerns man even as object, but exclusively¶ as standing-reserve, then he comes to the very brink of a precipitous¶ fall, that is, he comes to the point where he himself will¶ have to be taken as standing-reserve. (QT 308)¶ If the world becomes totally perceived as standing-reserve, then reflexively,¶ humanity itself may come to perceive itself as the same.¶ In one respect, this is to note that the technological mode of truth is¶ ‘‘reductionistic.’’ But it is reductionistic in a special Heideggerian sense¶ because it is not that something can be ‘‘added to’’ this mode of revealing¶ that will correct it—although it appears that Heidegger himself opts for¶ something like this alternative as a solution. Rather, one mode of revealing¶ can be changed only by, in effect, being replaced. Its ‘‘reductionism’’¶ is a reductionism of disregarding the concealed, the horizon of all unconcealedness¶ or revealing.¶ I am not particularly concerned here with Heidegger’s response to the¶ danger of technology, but rather concerned with its explanatory scope.¶ Even so, it is perhaps well to note that his response was never well formed.¶ In the technology essay, the response was, in fact, a form of remedy for¶ ‘‘reductionism.’’ It contained two primary steps. The first remains continuous¶ with what may be called ‘‘phenomenological therapy.’’ This therapy¶ is to address the critical question to technology, as to any truth claim, and¶ to seek to limit its hubris toward totality. Critical questioning, in Heidegger’s¶ sense, calls us back to noting the structure of the invariant concealing unconcealing¶ that limits every totality. This is the perennial philosophical¶ task:¶ Because the essence of technology is nothing technological, essential¶ reflection upon technology and decisive confrontation with it must¶ happen in a realm that is, on the one hand, akin to the essence of¶ technology, and, on the other, fundamentally different from it . . .¶ For questioning is the piety of thought. (QT 317)

#### Technology perpetuates a tie to the military industrial complex- independent disad to the permutation

Idhe, Professor of Philosophy and the Director of the Technoscience Research Group at Stony Brook, 2010 (Don, *Heidegger’s Technologies*, Project Muse, Pg 89-90

This engineering science is as wedded to the ‘‘military-industrial complex’’¶ as any Eisenhower ever dreamed of ! (We have already noted that¶ Galileo, yet another century later, followed the same path.)¶ In the twentieth century, the same thing happened. Very shortly after¶ the discovery of fission, Werner Heisenberg, seeking to recoup his reputation,¶ wrote secret letters to the War Ministry of the Third Reich and later¶ organized a conference, the proceedings of which were titled Probleme der¶ Kernphysik, in which he proposed nuclear-powered submarines, battleships,¶ and a super-explosive that was to launch the Nazi attempt to build¶ an atomic bomb. The difference with da Vinci lay mainly in the now¶ corporate and multiauthored structure of twentieth century science and¶ technology.2¶ The birth of Renaissance science is a birth within technological garb¶ and institutionally wed to the same sources of finance as today’s Big Science.¶ It is only the nineteenth-century successful myth that has convinced¶ us that it was ever otherwise. Here, too, is the doubled relation to technology¶ that occurs at the birth of modern science. It is embodied in instrumental¶ technologies, but embedded in a matrix of engineering and linked¶ to the largest-scale patronage available.¶ In a last look outside at the lights of the valley in which Florence lies,¶ the contemporary man of the tale reflects upon his worries: There remains¶ part of the haze over the valley, which can be seen in some degree every¶ day. The plague is gone, replaced by a much slower process in atmospheric¶ pollution. The Germans to the north have begun to realize that¶ their two intense loves—for forests and for automobiles—have now¶ reached contradictory straits. They have initiated actions concerning pollution¶ controls and unleaded gasolines, even against the delicacies of¶ Common Market politics. Farther north still, the Swedes have decided¶ that one cannot always have both the whale and the reactor and have chosen¶ to phase out their reactors (although, until recently, their westerly¶ neighbor, Norway, was one of the countries still killing whales).¶ Famine is unheard of in these parts now, and Italy has surpassed¶ England in production and gross national product. But the man knows¶ that in the South, in the former colony of Italy—Ethiopia—there is still¶ famine, abetted by the very indigenous government that replaced the colonizers,¶ by desertifying farming practices, and by the lack of sufficient aid¶ due to world political tensions.¶ The moral of the tale is clear enough: Although nostalgias and romanticisms¶ may—in small doses—soften our harshest views, they can also¶ obscure and sometimes dangerously obscure issues. What is more strongly¶ needed than either of these medications is a deeper sense of the ambiguity¶ of technological civilization in both its negative and positive vectors, that¶ is, its heightened sense of contingency.¶ This sense of heightened contingency is itself a legacy of our current¶ immersion in technological texture. It is part of our inheritance of the¶ earth, a dimension of the non-neutral way in which we have received and¶ taken up that inheritance. So the harder question is how we will care for¶ and handle that inheritance. It could be squandered; it could be conserved;¶ and it might even be increased.

## **AT- Tech inevitable**

#### Meditative thought allows us to cope with a world of technology

Housman and Flynn, professors of philosophy Emory, 2011 (Benjamin and Thomas, “Cooling Down Global Warming: Revisiting Sartre and Heidegger on this Modern Day Challenge”)

Heidegger contrasts this notion of meditative thinking with calculative thinking.¶ He believes calculative thinking pervades society today and has been largely privileged¶ over meditative thinking—meditative thinking has lost its place due to an emphasis on¶ calculative thinking. This calculative thinking should remind us of what Heidegger said¶ earlier on positionality, for they both point to a certain way of ordering, computing, and¶ planning without reflection and appreciation for the meaning surrounding us. In a sense,¶ then, meditative thinking is defined by what it is not—namely, calculative thinking—but¶ 39¶ also by what it is: a reflective, contemplative, engaged, and open form of thinking that is¶ man’s essential being.¶ Reviving meditative thinking will not only return us to our essential space, but it¶ will also enable us to both affirm and deny technology—to dwell in a world with¶ technology rather than as slaves to it—because it allows us to experience the world in a¶ way that Heidegger calls “releasement towards things” [Die Gelassenheit zu den Dingen].¶ Heidegger believes that by assuming this comportment towards technology we will be¶ able to arrive at its hidden meaning, which remains mysterious and concealed to us. He¶ says, “Releasement towards things and openness to the mystery…grant us the possibility¶ of dwelling in the world in a totally different way. They promise us a new ground and¶ foundation upon which we can stand and endure in the world of technology without being¶ imperiled by it” (1966, 55). Releasement towards things, then, refers to a certain mode of¶ dwelling that has been overlooked in our modern age due to the primacy of calculative¶ thinking. But what exactly is this mode of dwelling and what does Heidegger really¶ mean by the phrase ‘releasement toward things’?¶ Heidegger admits that the meaning behind ‘releasement’ conceals and hides itself;¶ yet, through the conversation between the scientist, scholar, and teacher, an¶ understanding of releasement becomes more near to us. The scientist, scholar, and¶ teacher first recognize that releasement must be a certain ‘non-willing’, a “renouncing of¶ the will” (1966, 59) that is open to what surrounds us, to our exteriority, in its¶ approaching us. This non-willing closely ties in to a certain waiting—a waiting that does¶ not wait for a specific object, but rather waits in openness to whatever presences. While¶ this description of what Heidegger means by releasement may seem wholly passive, the¶ 40¶ scientist observes that releasement lies “beyond the distinction between activity and¶ passivity” because, as the scholar notes, “releasement does not belong to the domain of¶ the will” (1966, 61). So, according to Heidegger, because releasement refers to a nonwilling,¶ it cannot be labeled passive; it must be considered in an entirely new light that¶ shines outside of the metaphysical dualism between passivity and activity. In many¶ ways, Heidegger’s description of non-doing parallels the notion of Wu Wei in Taoism.¶ Wu Wei, translated as ‘creative quietude’, ‘creative non-doing’, or ‘the art of letting-be’,¶ is exhibited in the movement of the planets around the sun, in that the planets do not will¶ themselves around the sun—it simply happens. This creative non-doing, or embracement¶ of the natural movement that presences around us, can facilitate an understanding of what¶ Heidegger may be envisioning in his conception of releasement, insofar as it lies beyond¶ the will.

## **AT- our ont is good**

#### Science is a lie- we can never determine what is real

Babich, Professor of Philosophy Fordham University, 2012 (Babette, “Heidegger’s Philosophy of Sicence and the Critique of Calculation: Reflective Questioning, Gelassenheit, and Life”, *Heidegger on Science* edited by Trish Glazebrook, Project Muse, Pg 169-170

Heidegger’s deliberately gnomic suggestion that the sciences “lie” in¶ this same very “inconspicuous state of affairs as a river lies in its source”¶ (VA, 63/179) is drawn out of his extended hermeneutic reflection on what¶ had been a formerly unremarkable or seemingly obvious (i.e., as we now¶ see: inconspicuous) claim that “science is the theory of the real” (VA, 42/157).¶ Saying that modern science “is the theory of the real” distinguishes it from¶ its ancient and medieval counterparts. The distinction is not a matter of¶ development or progress and hence it is more than a merely historical distinction.¶ 34 A perfectly paradigmatic shift characterizes the exactly incommensurable¶ differences between modern, medieval, and ancient Greek¶ science and this shift has inspired several scholars who read Heidegger¶ together with Kuhn on the nature of research science.35 Heidegger’s own¶ account here is more historical than sociological in tenor.36¶ An observation that aims at empirical reports, or what counts as the¶ same in the tradition of the medieval schoolman (we may think of Roger¶ Bacon just as Heidegger also invokes him in this context), experience,“remains essentially different from the observation that belongs to science¶ as research” (H, 81/121). For the experiment, as opposed to the contingent,¶ empirical domain of experience, requires a pre-established rule, a stipulated¶ law, and hence the very institutional and empirical framework of modern¶ experimental science constitutes as such the very base-line of calculability¶ and calculation: “to set up an experiment means to represent or conceive¶ [vorstellen] the conditions under which a specific series of motions can be¶ made susceptible of being followed in its necessary progression, i.e., of being¶ controlled in advance by calculation” (H, 81/121). Because such an experiment¶ is the expression of a projected law, one has both a criterion for and¶ a limitation on possible results. This is, of course, the very possibility of¶ measurement.37 Heidegger will emphasize that experimental measurement¶ is essentially not a matter of experience per se. The scientific observation¶ made through experiment is not a matter of experience, be it personal or¶ common. For Heidegger, it is “only because modern physics is a physics¶ that is essentially mathematical that it can be experimental” (H, 80/121,¶ emphasis added).

# **Aff**

## **Perm**

The alternative fails it prevents action- the permutation can effectively solve for the world’s problems

Houseman and Flynn, professors of philosophy Emory, 2011 (Benjamin and Thomas, “Cooling Down Global Warming: Revisiting Sartre and Heidegger on this Modern Day Challenge”)

Having said that, though, Heidegger never explicitly states how this mode of¶ dwelling described as a releasement toward things will allow us to say both yes and no to¶ technology—how it will guide us towards finding the hidden meaning in technology.¶ Furthermore, while the scientist, scholar, and teacher come to identify that releasement¶ lies beyond the distinction between activity and passivity, the challenge still persists in¶ identifying what such a non-willing would practically look like in society. Since we are¶ neither passive nor active, does this mean we are simply living aimlessly, without any¶ purpose, solely in the moment but reflective nonetheless in that moment, waiting for a¶ “turning” of being to occur in society? Heidegger’s message does not to encourage us to¶ become dormant, lazy individuals who simply meditate upon everything in such a way¶ that we lose any sense of action in our own lives. Heidegger says calculative thinking is¶ 41¶ needed along with meditative thinking in its own right. Practically, then, releasement¶ signals a thoughtful way of living in the world that steps back from the ‘ontic’, everyday¶ hustle-bustle and finds meaning in what presences around us through careful¶ consideration and a non-doing that lets being be.

#### Technology is not inherently evil- we have to combine the definitions to determine the essence of technology

Idhe, Professor of Philosophy and the Director of the Technoscience Research Group at Stony Brook, 2010 (Don, *Heidegger’s Technologies*, Project Muse, Pg. 29-31

To uncover the phenomenon, it must be free from its layers of less¶ adequate interpretation which, again in typical fashion, Heidegger attributes¶ to a ‘‘subjective’’ understanding, here called the instrumental and¶ anthropological definitions of technology.¶ One says: Technology is a means to an end. The other says: Technology¶ is a human activity. The two definitions of technology belong¶ together. For to posit ends and procure and utilize the means to¶ them is a human activity. The manufacture and utilization of equipment,¶ tools, and machines, the manufactured and used things themselves,¶ and the needs and ends that they serve, all belong to what¶ technology is. The whole complex of these contrivances is technology.¶ Technology itself is a contrivance—in Latin, an instrumentum.¶ The current conception of technology, according to which it is a¶ means and a human activity, can therefore be called the instrumental¶ and anthropological definition of technology. (QT 288)¶ Such a definition implies that technology is merely an invention of a¶ ‘‘subject’’ and functions as a mere neutral instrument. The definition,¶ Heidegger characterizes, is correct. But then, in a move directly reflective¶ of his earlier analysis of logical or propositional truth in relation to truth¶ as disclosure, he notes that what is correct is not yet true.¶ Correctness turns out to be ‘‘true’’ in a very limited sense, true with¶ respect to some aspect or part of a larger whole. The whole, however, is¶ more than that which contains parts; it is ultimately the set of conditions¶ of possibility that found the parts.¶ The correct always fixes upon something pertinent in whatever is¶ under consideration. However, in order to be correct, this fixing by¶ no means needs to uncover the thing in question in its essence. Only¶ at the point where such an uncovering happens does the true come to¶ pass. For that reason the merely correct is not yet the true. (QT 289)¶ The phenomenological form of the argument here is that correctness¶ is not in itself untrue but is limited or inadequate, and it may be characterized¶ as a partial truth, in which case it now covers over the larger or¶ more basic truth that founds it. It then becomes functionally untrue by¶ concealing its origin. Moreover, it is only by comprehending the whole¶ that founds correctness that it can be seen as partial. Thus what is¶ involved in taking correctness for truth is like a fallacy of taking a part for¶ the whole. But it is also more than that in that comprehension of the¶ whole is a necessary condition for recognizing what is a part.¶ Heidegger’s strategy becomes clearer if it is seen that his overall theory¶ of truth is, in effect, a complex field theory. Truth is aletheia, translated as¶ ‘‘unconcealedness,’’ brought to presence within some opening that itself¶ has a structure. Beings or entities thus appear only against, from, and¶ within a background or opening, a framework. But the opening or clearing¶ within which they take the shapes they assume, is itself structured.¶ Overall this structure has as an invariant feature, a concealing-revealing¶ ratio. Thus one may say that it always has some selectivity factor as an¶ essential feature. Understood in this way, it becomes clear that beings as such are never¶ simply given: they appear or come to presence in some definite way that¶ is dependent upon the total field of revealing in which they are situated.¶ Preliminarily, it is important to note that the field or opening in which¶ things are ‘‘gathered’’ is, in a sense, given. It is given historically as an¶ epoch of Being. This is to say that the Heideggerian notion of truth has¶ something like a ‘‘civilizational given’’ as a variable. It is what is taken for¶ granted by the humans who inhabit such a ‘‘world.’’ Variables given in¶ this sense are particular shapes of the invariant revealing-concealing structure¶ of truth.

## No Link

#### There is no inherent evil in science- it enables a self-reflective process that solves the impact

Richardson, professor emeritus of philosophy at Boston College. , 2012 (Williams, “Heidegger’s Critique of Science”, *Heidegger on Science* edited by Trish Glazebrook, Project Muse, Pg 33-34)

The scientific method implies that the scientist conceives of himself as a¶ subject and of the beings with which he deals in research as objects that¶ are posed before him to be investigated. This seems innocuous enough.¶ But recall that this relationship between subject (the scientist) and object¶ (the research material) is made possible only by antecedent projection of a¶ blueprint of the being under investigation, and it is only to the extent that¶ the being conforms to this projected blueprint that it becomes an object¶ at all. In other words, the antecedent project filters out every element in¶ a being that makes it what it is, except that aspect by which it becomes¶ an object for the scientific gaze. It is only when the phenomenon that is¶ being interrogated has been reduced to its mere object-character (let’s call¶ it “objectness”) that the researcher can proceed top the task of measurement,¶ that is, verification of the project (whether by experimentation or¶ examination of sources). Because the object-ness of the phenomenon under¶ investigation is the only aspect of it that is relevant for the scientist in¶ terms of the rigor of his method, the risk is that the phenomenon is for him¶ only to the extent that it is an object to be measured in research, and the¶ scientist risks the assumption that Max Planck made explicit: “The actual¶ is whatever can be measured” (VA, 54/169).¶ In any case, the constriction of the scientific enterprise to the scope of¶ the subject–object relationship remains as significant today for the examination¶ of microphysical particles as for classical mechanics. What has changed¶ with the advent of subatomic physics is the manner in which the object-ness¶ of objects is experienced, but not the subject–object polarity as such (VA,¶ 57/172–3). Heisenberg’s principle of indeterminacy, for example, many very¶ well render obsolete certain theories of the objectifying process such as the¶ Kantian one, but what it makes clearer than ever is the correlative character¶ of the subject–object conjunction, so that without presupposing the¶ subject–object polarity as such, the “principle of indeterminacy” is unthinkable¶ (GA 9, 402/304). The method of modern science presupposes, then,¶ a metaphysical stance that sees the beings encountered in the world to be¶ no more than objects for a subject.¶ Metaphysical Foundation¶ This metaphysical stance according to which every being (i.e., everything¶ that is) is conceived as either a subject or an object (i.e., an object for a¶ subject) Heidegger calls “subject-ism” because it arose at that moment in¶ the history of the West when man first experienced himself as subject. This¶ took place with the arrival on stage of René Descartes. It was with Descartes¶ that the epoch of history that we call “modern times” began. It was¶ in Descartes’ experience of beings and the “world” that the foundations of¶ the worldview of modern time slay. The modern scientific attitude as such¶ is no more than an epiphenomenon of Cartesian subject-ism.¶ Why is the Cartesian experience so characteristic of modern times?¶ What, for that matter, was the experience? What characterizes modern man¶ most profoundly as Heidegger sees it is the vindication of his own liberty.¶ This took place with the declaration of independence from the ties of¶ faith that bound his medieval forefathers. The universe becomes for him by¶ and large an anthropocentric rather than theocentric one, or, as Heidegger¶ expresses it, “. . . he frees himself unto himself . . .” (H, 81/127). This has¶ momentous implications for Descartes, especially for his conception of truth.¶ For medieval man, we are told, received his certitudes (whether the¶ teachings of dogma or the assurance of eternal life) from his faith. Medieval¶ scholars might want to qualify this, of course, but that’s another matter—this¶ is the way Heidegger sees it, and that is our only concern for the moment.¶ Once modern man chose independence in the name of liberty, how was he¶ to replace his vanished certitudes? It could only be in and through himself.¶ “. . . This is possible only to the extent that self-liberating man guarantees¶ for himself the certitude of the knowable . . .” (H, 99/148). This was the¶ context, then, in which Descartes set for himself the task of discovering a¶ new foundation for truth that would be unshakable (fundamentum inconcussum¶ veritatis)—foundation because it would be the ground upon which all¶ truths would ultimately rest, unshakable because man himself would be the¶ final arbiter of it.¶ We know well enough how Descartes proceeded. The “unshakable¶ foundation of truth” was for him the cogito ergo sum: “I—in thinking—am.”¶ The statement itself was, after all, true, for it corresponded to the situation¶ of fact. Moreover, the statement was not only true but certain, for in¶ making it the thinker not only knew the situation of fact but knew that¶ he knew it and was stating it accurately, for even to doubt it was itself a¶ type of thinking that implied the existence of the one who thought. This¶ radical truth, then, was unshakable. And not only was it unshakable but it¶ was the foundation of all other truths, for any other truth was formulated¶ by a type of thinking which rested on the basic truth which consisted in¶ the thinker’s certainty of his own existence.