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## Tech Thought Good

### Tech Thought Good – Growth

#### Technological thought and the process of spreading technological ideals, is key to growth.

Michael Zey, professor at the School of Business Administration at Montclair University and executive director of the Expansionary Institute and internationally recognized expert on the economy, society and management, as well as author. Seizing the Future, 1998 p38-39

One of the clearest examples of the third corollary of the Imperative of Growth is the employment of advanced biotechnology to eliminate toxic waste. Advanced technology has led to the development of what is referred to as bioremediation to combat wastes and impurities that poison water supplies. Bioremediation utilizes living organisms to clean up waste, even entire contaminated sites—such microorganisms liter­ally eat hazardous materials. Companies now use such bacteria to “eat” oil spills, and other con­taminants in the air, in the sea, or on land. In the United States, demand for bioremediation products and services will increase 16 per­cent each year, reaching $230 million in 1995. In the near future, biotechnology and genetic splicing will produce a “superbug” with a ravenous appetite for the most hazardous and poisonous chemicals that pollute our air, soil, and water. According to the American Academy of Microbiology, the types and classes of synthetic chemicals that can be neutralized by bioremedia­tion will increase dramatically. For instance, until recently, hydro­chlorofluorocarbons, or HCFCs, one of the chemical classes that supposedly destroy the ozone layer, were considered to be nonbiode­gradable. However, scientists at Envirogen, a New Jersey-based biotechnology firm, have discovered microbes that render HCFCs harmless. Therefore, such organisms can be used to treat HCFC waste and by-products before they are released into the atmosphere. The human imagination knows no bounds when it applies itself to the problems of pollution and industrial waste. In fact, a whole new field, geoengineering, has evolved to tackle these environmental co­nundrums. On the drawing board sit imaginative plans such as that of Melvin Prueitt, a researcher at Los Alamos National Laboratory. His scheme involves cleaning the air of Los Angeles with ninety-five towers that utilize a complex technology to suck in L.A.’s impure air, “scrub­bing” it, and releasing clean air back into the city’s atmosphere. He claims that this method alone could clean and recycle half of L.A. ‘s air daily. Princeton University professor Thomas H. Stix possesses an even bolder plan. He suggests that laser beams strung across mountain passes could “process” the Earth’s atmosphere: The beams would break up chlorofluorocarbons before they reach the stratosphere. Other propos­als suggest “injecting” 50,000 tons of propane into the stratosphere to reduce ozone loss. These examples demonstrate that even if growth does initially cause society some environmental problems, the solution must be more, not less, growth. Technology and research, both elements of progress, be­come the solutions to the negative byproducts of progress. As some environmentalists and biologists stated in a recent Harper’s magazine article, “humanity is the only savior of the environment.” The fourth corollary states that each unit or actor either contributes or has the potential to contribute to the system more than it consumes. This actually leads to an exponential contribution of each member of the system. This property differentiates human systems from other group structures. In human society, the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Each individual with a productive idea can communicate his or her ideas not just to one other person, but to millions at a time. With the growth of modern electronics, including computer networking, each individual’s power to contribute beyond his or her immediate environ­ment grows. It is a historical truism that the denser the population, the greater the exchanges of ideas, goods, and services; hence the importance of cities and large universities in the development of civilization.

#### Without growth, disease, famine, proliferation and ethnic and religious conflict will engulf the globe.

Leonard Silk, Professor of Economics at Pace University. “Dangers of slow growth,” Foreign Affairs, Wntr 1993 v72 n1 p167(16).

In the absence of such shifts of human and capital resources to expanding civilian industries, there are strong economic pressures on arms-producing nations to maintain high levels of military production and to sell weapons, both conventional and dual-use nuclear technology, wherever buyers can be found. Without a revival of national economies and the global economy, the production and proliferation of weapons will continue, creating more Iraqs, Yugoslavias, Somalias and Cambodias - or worse. Like the Great Depression, the current economic slump has fanned the fires of nationalist, ethnic and religious hatred around the world. Economic hardship is not the only cause of these social and political pathologies, but it aggravates all of them, and in turn they feed back on economic development. They also undermine efforts to deal with such global problems as environmental pollution, the production and trafficking of drugs, crime, sickness, famine, AIDS and other plagues. Growth will not solve all those problems by itself But economic growth - and growth alone - creates the additional resources that make it possible to achieve such fundamental goals as higher living standards, national and collective security, a healthier environment, and more liberal and open economies and societies.

### Tech Thought Good – Environment

#### Critiquing technological advances are regressive and doom the environment to catastrophe – it’s impossible to solve environmental problems without applying tech and instrumental rationality

Stephen Eric Bronner, Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, 2004, Reclaiming the Enlightenment: Toward a Politics of Radical Engagement, p. 160

Critics of the Enlightenment may have correctly emphasized the price of progress, the costs of alienation and reification, and the dangers posed by technology and scientific expertise for nature and a democratic society. Even so, this does not justify romantic attempts to roll back technology. They conflate far too easily with ideological justifications for rolling back the in­terventionist state and progressive legislation for cleaning up the environ­ment. Such a stance also pits the Enlightenment against environmentalism: technology, instrumental rationality, and progress are often seen as inimical to preserving the planet. Nevertheless, this is to misconstrue the problem. Technology is crucial for dealing with the ecological devastation brought about by modernity. A redirection of technology will undoubtedly have to take place: but seeking to confront the decay of the environment without it is like using an umbrella to defend against a hurricane. Institutional action informed by instrumental rationality and guided by scientific specialists is unavoidable. Investigations are necessary into the ways government can in­fluence ecologically sound production, provide subsidies or tax-benefits for particular industries, fund particular forms of knowledge creation, and make “risks” a matter of public debate. It is completely correct to note that: “neither controversial social issues nor cultural concerns can be settled sim­ply by scientific fiat, particularly in a world where experts usually disagree and where science can be compromised by institutional sponsors. No labo­ratory can dictate what industrial practices are tolerable or what degree of industrialization is permissible. These questions transcend the crude cate­gories of technical criteria and slide-rule measurements.”7

### Tech Thought Good – Freedom

#### Critical theory that rejects science is a tool of domination - the scientific method rejects claims to absolute knowledge and can be a basis for liberation, but only by engaging it via the affirmative

Stephen Eric Bronner, Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, 2004, Reclaiming the Enlightenment: Toward a Politics of Radical Engagement, p. 163-64

Critical theory in the future must, once again, become more modest: it needs to specify the practices to which its categories apply. The difference between history and nature, wrote Vico in The New Science, is that human­ity has created one and not the other. His famous statement, which looked back to Kant and forward to Lukacs and the beginnings of critical theory, has serious implications. Science cannot be expected to meet either meta­physical or politically correct expectations: such concerns bring to mind the communist believers who in the 1920s attacked Einstein for promoting rela­tivism. The point is not to get entangled in the immanent workings of sci­ence, which most critical theorists do not even remotely understand, but in­stead illuminate the institutional complexes with their particular balance of forces wherein “science” receives its direction and its aims. The Enlightenment notion of science, in the main, mirrored the more general philosophical rejection of closure and absolute knowledge. Bacon and Boyle, with their concern for methodological flexibility and provisional truth, already projected less the obsession with positive certainty than the emphasis upon “falsifiability” advocated by Sir Karl Popper. But it was sure­ly Lessing who best expressed this general trend within Enlightenment thinking when he wrote the famous words: “if God held the truth in his right hand and in his clenched left fist the quest for it, along with all my future er­rors, and then told me to choose, I should point to the left and humbly say: ‘Father give! The pure truth belongs to You alone!’ “14

#### Science is the opposite of domination – scientific knowledge liberates people from arbitrary power and aims to improve every individual’s life

Stephen Eric Bronner, Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, 2004, Reclaiming the Enlightenment: Toward a Politics of Radical Engagement, p. 21-23

Even in scientific terms, progress retained a crit­ical dimension insofar as it implied the need to question established certain­ties. In this vein, it is misleading simply to equate scientific reason with the domination of man and nature.15 All the great figures of the scientific revo­lution —Bacon, Boyle, Newton—were concerned with liberating humanity from what seemed the power of seemingly intractable forces. Swamps were everywhere; roads were few; forests remained to be cleared; illness was ram­pant; food was scarce; most people would never leave their village. What it implied not to understand the existence of bacteria or the nature of electric­ity, just to use very simple examples, is today simply inconceivable. Enlightenment figures like Benjamin Franklin, “the complete philosophe,”’6 became famous for a reason: they not only freed people from some of their fears but through inventions like the stove and the lightning rod they also raised new possibilities for making people’s lives more livable. Critical theorists and postmodernists miss the point when they view Enlightenment intellectuals in general and scientists in particular as sim­ple apostles of reification. They actually constituted its most consistent en­emy. The philosophes may not have grasped the commodity form, but they empowered people by challenging superstitions and dogmas that left them mute and helpless against the whims of nature and the injunctions of tradition. Enlightenment thinkers were justified in understanding knowl­edge as inherently improving humanity. Infused with a sense of furthering the public good, liberating the individual from the clutches of the invisible and inexplicable, the Enlightenment idea of progress required what the young Marx later termed “the ruthless critique of everything existing.” This regulative notion of progress was never inimical to subjectivity. Quite the contrary: progress became meaningful only with reference to real liv­ing individuals.

### Tech Thought Good – Life

#### We have moved beyond the relation with technology that Heidegger envisioned. Embracing technological thought is crucial to life.

Michael Peters, Research Professor of Education at the University of Glasgow. AND Ruth Irwin, Bright Futures and Ryoichi Sasakawa Scholar. The Trumpeter, 2002. “Earthsongs: Ecopoetics, Heidegger and Dwelling”

<http://trumpeter.athabascau.ca/content/v18.1/peters_irwin.html>

Associated with his epistemic turn in the 1930s, Heidegger began to think that technology was both the danger in terms of human obliviousness to Being and also the saving power. The destiny of Being has metamorphosed into an epoch inescapably enframed by technology. The spark of life that is humanity is beginning to envisage itself more positively than as the polluter of the Earth. In Kim Stanley Robinson’s Mars trilogy, terraforming other planets was both the possibility and the result of the political and ecological mess produced by consumer capitalism and technology. In Sam Neil’s televised series on astronomy, terra-forming is imagined because the solar system will age and gradually heat up, making Earth unearthly. Technological creativity makes it possible to take all life elsewhere in a fast forward version of evolution. The spark of life, Neil states, quite possibly only exists on this planet, in the billions of stars and solar systems of the universe. Safe-guarding, nurturing, and regenerating it is the potential and responsibility of technology and humanity.

### AT: Empirics Bad

#### **We don’t need to win our epistemology is perfect – but it’s better to try and understand the world through flawed empiricism than just give up on all meaning – it’s key to persuading audiences**

Rudra Sil, assistant professor of Political Science at University of Pennsylvania. “Against Epistemological Absolutism: Toward a “Pragmatic” Center,” in *Beyond Boundaries* ed Sil and Eileen M. Doherty 2000 p160-161

An even stronger case is made by Paul Feyerabend who attacks the very idea that a paradigm might provide some conceptual coherence to a body of theoretical literature; rather, the problem of incommensurable meanings in each and every theory, in each and every case, makes it impos­sible to generate shared paradigms. Thus, Feyerabend’s relativistic epistemology provides no criteria whatsoever for the acceptance or refutation of theories, leaving social scientists with a growing body of inconsistent and incommensurable theories.~~ Feyerabend’s position is implicitly accepted by many interpretive theorists as well as postmodernists. For relativists, it is not simply the “methodological immaturity” of the social sciences that pro­duces debates over the relative merits of theories; the very nature of social inquiry makes it impossible to achieve a uniform set of methods or criteria for the evaluation of theory.56 Posrmodernists even make a virtue out of this criterionless social science where “anything goes.” Some of the less skepti­cal posrmodernists proceed to emphasize intuition and empathy as substi­tutes for positivist method, but the most extreme relativists can do no more than “deconstruct” texts to reveal hidden biases and challenge hidden assumptions. In both cases, there is no basis for determining when an insightful narrative or an act of deconstruction yields anything of signifi­cance to anyone other than author. Is there a position between Feyera bend’s relativism, on the one hand, and Popperian conventionalism or Lakatos’s sophisticated falsificationism on the other? To most social scientists in their everyday work, the latter seems unfeasible and the former unthinkable. Instead, some have responded to the challenge of absolute relativism by calling for the use of compelling arguments and empirical findings not to test or falsify theories but to modestly engage in the “rational persuasion” of a given audience; thus, they posit a bounded notion of “rationality,” stripped of its absolute universalism and consistent with socially constructed intersubjective realities.57 Others suggest that theories may initially be incommensurable, but that they can be “translated” so as to enable at least a tentative compari­son and evaluation on the basis of the same kind of empirical tests.s8 In these approaches, the result will not be definitive and theories will never become laws, but instead of crirerionless narratives, scholars can at least make an effort to persuade audiences by appealing to their own common-sense version of “reason” by relating theories to compelling empirical observations.In the end, there may be no alternative to relying on the judgment of other human beings, and this judgment is difficult to form in the absence of empirical findings. However, instead of clinging to the elusive idea of a uniform standard for the empirical validation of theories, it is possible to simply present a set of observational statements—whether we call it “data” or “narrative”—for the modest purpose of rendering an explanation or interpretation more plausible than the audience would allow at the outset. In practice, this is precisely what the most committed positivists and inter­prerivists have been doing anyway; the presentation of “logically consis­tent” hypotheses “supported by data” and the ordering of facts in a “thick” narrative are both ultimately designed to convince scholars that a particular proposition should be taken more seriously than others. Social analysis is not about final truths or objective realities, but nor does it have to be a meaningless world of incommensurable theories where anything goes. Instead, it can be an ongoing collective endeavor to develop, evaluate, and refine general inferences—be they in the form of models, par­tial explanations, descriptive inferences, or interpretations—in order to render them more “sensible” or “plausible” to a particular audience. In the absence of a consensus on the possibility and desirability of a full-blown explanatory science of international and social life, it is important to keep as many doors open as possible. This does not require us to accept each and every claim without some sort of validation, but perhaps the community of scholars can be more tolerant about the kinds of empirical referents and logical propositions that are employed in validating propositions by schol­ars embracing all but the most extreme epistemological positions.

#### **Rejecting the aff forecloses an epistemic middle ground that allows designing effective political responses – they undermine the possibility of interdisciplinary knowledge**

Rudra Sil, assistant professor of Political Science at University of Pennsylvania. “Against Epistemological Absolutism: Toward a “Pragmatic” Center,” in *Beyond Boundaries* ed Sil and Eileen M. Doherty 2000 p164-166

These categories along the “epistemological spectrum” do not repre­sent distinct points along a unidimensional axis, and the boundary sepa­rating each adjacent pair of categories is in each case quite fuzzy. This fuzziness simply suggests that the various epistemological positions com­pared in this chapter, though idealized as categories, in reality, shade into each other. Hence, the deliberate choice of the term “spectrum” to capture the wide range of nuanced distinctions that become evident when one grad­ually moves away from either the positivist or relativist extremes. And it is precisely these nuanced alternatives that mark the point of departure for the argument against epistemological absolutism. If various kinds of “pos­itivists” and “relativists” cannot agree among themselves on a set of foun­dational propositions, perhaps it is best to shift our attention away from the debates between positivists and relativists and toward a reasonable epistemological “middle ground” that at least engenders or sustains communication among scholars studying similar kinds of substantive problems. The first three categories are all variants of “positivism.” While Comte’s version of “logical positivism” may be uncommon in twentieth-century scholarship, the Kantian and empiricist traditions are very much alive and well, and indeed the contemporary debates over specific method­ologies in social science are being framed by those who at least implicitly adhere to one of these two versions of positivism. The sixth category prob­ably represents a more well-established and less stark version of relativism that can be traced to turn-of-the-century German phenomenologists and hermeneuricians who viewed the study of historical sequences or cultural interpretations as context-bound and thus rejected the idea of developing anything resembling general explanatory models. The last two categories include different kinds of “posrmodernists” who have built on the skepti­cism of earlier relativists, but have gone further by adopting an “anti-rep­resentational” position.59 The epistemological “middle ground” I have been referring to is cap­tured in the assumptions found in the fourth and fifth categories. These assumptions are either explicit or implicit in the works of many familiar scholars in postwar social theory who appear to converge on a Weberian “middle ground” despite differences in their substantive research interests and intellectual heritage. While not all are equally concerned with episte­mological problems, they all recognize the social construction of reality, but nonetheless find an “intersubjective” realm based on common under­standings and practices from which tentative inferences can be drawn through context-sensitive studies that are replicable at least in principle if not in fact. On the basis of the foundational premises offered by scholars I place in these fourth and fifth categories, it is possible to identify an epis­temological center consisting of the following unprovable but entirely “rea­sonable” and “pragmatic” philosophical propositions. (1) Social reality is intersubjective and involves both complexity and regularity, leaving open the possibility of modest partial explanations and deep interpretations. (2) There is no reason to assume either the positivist position on the fact-value distinction or the skeptics’ position that all claims to knowledge are equally fraught by normative bias; rather, while facts and values may be difficult to separate, it is possible to recognize that they are in principle separable for the self-conscious investigator. (3) While research may not be intended to serve a particular ideological perspective, it is important to recognize that the questions to be investigated and the claims they generate have implications in the realms of policy-formation and ideology-critique. (4) Moreover, empirical reality-tests, while an insuf­ficient basis for refuting or verifying a theory, are nonetheless one impor­tant aspect in the process of rendering an argument—whether a hypothesis or a narrative—more compelling to an audience. In the final analysis, it may be best to regard the entire process of social research as an ongoing collective search for meanings by a community of scholars. This search may not result in any definitive answers to theoretical or practical questions given the diverse foundations informing the puzzles, texts, and models that preoccupy members of this community. Nevertheless, thanks to the mediating role played by those subscribing to a pragmatic epistemological middle-ground, the process can still yield valuable insights, partial explanations, and even modest “lessons” and that can be judged as more or less convincing in the eyes of one’s audience whether this audience consists of academic peers, the lay public at large, or the pol­icy-making community. In an era of increasingly divided disciplines, scholars adopting a more pragmatic epistemological “middle ground,” by virtue of their agnosticism, are likely to make the most critical contributions to whatever cumulation of knowledge is possible in the social sciences. These scholars are in a bet­ter position than those at the extreme ends for the purpose of generating and sustaining greater dialogue across different disciplines, theoretical approaches and intellectual movements precisely because their assumptions prevent them from hastily dismissing a study on grounds that are only meaningful to a subgroup within the wider community of scholars. In the absence of meaningful dialogue across different intellectual communities— whether delimited by disciplines, paradigms or methodological schools— the social sciences risk becoming permanently “balkanized,” with scholars passing up opportunities to glean valuable insights from intellectual prod­ucts developed on the basis of different foundational assumptions

## Alt Fails

### Alt Bad – Nazi

#### Heidegger was definitely a Nazi and is an independent reason to reject the kritik

Alex Steiner, world socialist web site, the case of martin Heidegger philosopher and nazi, 2000, http://wsws.org/articles/2000/apr2000/heid-a03.shtml

Documentary evidence exists that Heidegger expressed sympathy for the Nazis as early as 1932. Given his previous history, this should not come as a shock. Immediately following Hitler's seizure of power, Heidegger joined the Nazis. Heidegger was a dues-paying member of the NSDAP (the Nazi party) from 1933 to 1945. He became the rector of Freiburg University in April of 1933, three months after Hitler came to power. His infamous inaugural address was delivered on May 27, 1933. Heidegger apologists have claimed that this address represented an attempt to assert the autonomy of the university against the Nazis' effort to subordinate the sciences to their reactionary doctrines. In fact, the address was a call to arms for the student body and the faculty to serve the new Nazi regime. It celebrates the Nazi ascendancy as “the march our people has begun into its future history.” Heidegger identifies the German nation with the Nazi state in prose that speaks of “the historical mission of the German Volk, a Volk that knows itself in its state.” There is even a reference to the fascist ideology of zoological determinism when Heidegger invokes “the power to preserve, in the deepest way, the strengths [of the *Volk*] which are rooted in soil and blood.”

#### Heidegger’s philosophy leads to a totalitarian state and violence

Alex Steiner, world socialist web site, the case of martin Heidegger philosopher and nazi, 2000, http://wsws.org/articles/2000/apr2000/heid-a03.shtml

On June 30, 1933 Heidegger gave a speech to the Heidelberg Student Association in which he gave his views on the role of the university in the new Nazi order. The following excerpt speaks for itself. It provides a glimpse of Heidegger's commitment to the Nazi ideals of blood, race and absolute subservience to the Führer. “It [the university] must be integrated into the Volksgemeinschaft and be joined together with the state ... “Up to now, research and teaching have been carried on at the universities as they were carried out for decades.... Research got out of hand and concealed its uncertainty behind the idea of international scientific and scholarly progress. Teaching that had become aimless hid behind examination requirements. “A fierce battle must be fought against this situation in the National Socialist spirit, and this spirit cannot be allowed to be suffocated by humanizing, Christian ideas that suppress its unconditionality ... “Danger comes not from work for the State. It comes only from indifference and resistance. For that reason, only true strength should have access to the right path, but not halfheartedness ... “University study must again become a risk, not a refuge for the cowardly. Whoever does not survive the battle, lies where he falls. The new courage must accustom itself to steadfastness, for the battle for the institutions where our leaders are educated will continue for a long time. It will be fought out of the strengths of the new Reich that Chancellor Hitler will bring to reality. A hard race with no thought of self must fight this battle, a race that lives from constant testing and that remains directed toward the goal to which it has committed itself. It is a battle to determine who shall be the teachers and leaders at the university.”[4]

#### Heideggerian strategies result in Nazist expression to avoid the radicalization of subjectivity

Slavoj Zizek, professor of philosophy at the university of Ljubljana, The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology, 1999, pg. 21

The standard story about Heidegger is that he accomplished his *Kehre* (turn) after becoming aware of how the original project of *Being and Time* leads hack to transcendental subjectivism: owing to the unreflected remainder of subjectivism (decisionism, etc.), Heidegger let himself be seduced into his Nazi engagement; when, however, he became aware of how he had burnt his fingers’ with **it,** he cleared up the remainders of subjectivism and developed the idea of the historical-epochal character of Being itself. . . One is tempted to invert this standard story: there is a kind of ~vanishing mediator’ between Heidegger I and Heidegger II, a position of radicalized subjectivity coinciding with its opposite that is, reduced to an empty gesture, the impossible intersection between the ‘decisionism’ of Heidegger I and his late ‘fatalism’ (the event of Being ‘takes place’ in man, who serves as its shepherd . . .). Far from being the ‘practical consequence’ of this radicalized subjectivity, Heidegger’s Nazi engagement was a desperate attempt to avoid it.. . . In other words, what Heidegger later dismissed as the remainder of the subjectivist transcen­dental approach in *Being and Time* is what he should have stuck to. Heidegger’s ultimate failure is not that he remained stuck in the horizon of transcendental subjectivity, but that he abandoned this horizon all too quickly, before thinking out all its inherent possibilities. Nazism was not a political expression of the ‘nihilist, demoniac potential of modern subjec­tivity’ but, rather, its exact opposite: a desperate attempt to avoid this potential.

### Ontology Focus Bad – Genocide

#### Heidegger predetermines the result of ontological interrogation ensuring that ontology precludes ethical considerations from occurring. This inevitably recreates orders of violence.

Emmanuel Levinas, professor of philosophy, Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority, 1969, pg. 45-46

The primacy of ontology for Heidegger does not rest on the truism: “to know an existent it is necessary to have comprehended the Being of existents.” To affirm the priority of Being over existents is to already decide the essence of philosophy; it is to subordinate the relation with someone*,* who is an existent, (the ethical relation) to a relation with the *Being of existents,* which, impersonal, permits the apprehension, the domination of existents (a relationship of knowing), subordinates justice to freedom. If freedom denotes the mode of remaining the same in the midst of the other, knowledge, where an existent is given by interposition of impersonal Being, contains the ultimate sense of freedom. It would be opposed to justice, which involves obligations with regard to an existent that refuses to give itself, the Other, who in this sense would be an existent par excellence. In subordinating every relation with existents to the relation with Being the Heideggerian ontology affirms the primacy of freedom over ethics. To be sure, the freedom involved in the essence of truth is not for Heidegger a principle of free will. Free­dom comes from an obedience to Being: it is not man who possesses freedom; it is freedom that possesses man. But the dialectic which thus reconciles freedom and obedience in the concept of truth presupposes the primacy of the same, which marks the direction of and defines the whole of Western philosophy. The relation with Being that is enacted as ontology consists in neutral me existent in order to comprehend or grasp it. It is hence not a relation with the other as such but the reduction of the other to the same. Such is the definition of freedom: to maintain oneself against the other, despite every relation with the other to ensure the autarchy of an I. Thematization and conceptualization, which moreover are inseparable, are not peace with the other but suppression or possession of the other. For possession affirms the other, but within a negation of its independ­ence. “I think” comes down to “I can”—to an appropriation of what is, to an exploitation of reality. Ontology as first philosophy is a philosophy of power. It issues in the State and in the non-violence of the totality, without securing itself against the violence from which this non-violence lives, and which appears in the tyranny of the State. Truth, which should reconcile persons, here exists anonymously. Universality presents itself as impersonal; and this is another inhumanity.

#### The aim of their critique is pointless science is key to stop violence

Stephen Eric Bronner, Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, 2004, Reclaiming the Enlightenment: Toward a Politics of Radical Engagement, p. 162-63

Reclaiming the Enlightenment calls for clarifying the aims of an educated sensibility in a disenchanted world. But this requires science. The assault upon its “instrumental” character or its “method” by self-styled radicals trained only in the humanities or social sciences is a self-defeating enterprise. Criticizing “bourgeois” science” is meaningful only with criteria for verification or falsifi­cation that are rigorous, demonstrable, and open to public scrutiny. Without such criteria, the critical enterprise turns into a caricature of itself: creationism becomes as “scientific” as evolution, astrology as instructive as astronomy, prayer as legitimate a way of dealing with disease as medicine, and the prom­ise of Krishna to help the righteous a way of justifying the explosion of a nu­clear device by India.10 Striking is how the emphasis on “local knowledge”—a stance in which all science is seen as ethno-science with standards rooted in a particular culture’1 —withdraws objectivity, turns the abdication of judgment into a principle of judgment, and recalls what was once a right-wing preoccu­pation with “Jewish physics,” “Italian mathematics,” and the like. Forgotten is that those who do physics or biology or mathematics all do it the same way or, better, allow for open scrutiny of their own way of doing it. The validity of science does not rest on its ability to secure an “absolute” philo­sophical grounding, but rather on its universality and its salience in dealing with practical problems. There is a difference between the immanent method of science and the external context in which it was forged. The sociology of sci­ence is a completely legitimate endeavor. It only makes sense to consider, for example, how an emerging capitalist production process with imperialistic as­pirations provided the external context in which modern science arose. But it is illegitimate to reduce science to that context or judge its immanent work­ings from the standpoint of what externally inspired its development.12 Too much time has already been wasted on “deconstructing” the scientific method for what Foucault termed its “dogmatic approach” and its supposed­ly hermetic character. That is the case not simply because the “scientific revo­lution” was directed against a scholastic view of nature that constrained the possibilities of inquiry or because the Enlightenment spirit influenced many nontraditional notions of science like homeopathy. It is primarily because, in political terms, the issue is not the “method” of science but the type of scien­tific research that demands funding and, ultimately, the ends to which science is put. Again defined by what they oppose, ironically, those principally con­cerned with the scientific method reflect the establishmentarian tendency to isolate science from politics. Whatever the connection between this method and metaphysics, or the status of its original commitment to benefit humani­ty, there is no reason to believe that science in the age of globalization has lost its ability to question previous claims or established authority: neither from the standpoint of science nor ethics is it legitimate to maintain that “the en­lightenment has lost any trace of its own self-consciousness. “13

#### The only discovery we make in this nothingness is the truth in scientific rationality. This ensures an eternity of concentration camps.

Vaclav Havel, Former President of Czechoslovakia and Playwright. 1984. “Politics and conscience” Living in Truth. Pg. 142

The fault is not one of science as such but of the arrogance of man in the age of science. Man simply is not God, and playing God has cruel consequences. [Humankind] has abolished the absolute horizon of his relations, denied [its]

personal ‘pre­objective’ experience of the lived world, while relegating personal conscience and consciousness to the bathroom, as something so private that it is no one’s business. Man rejected his responsibility as a ‘subjective illusion’ — and in place of it installed what is now proving to be the most dangerous illusion of all: the fiction of objectivity stripped of all that is concretely human, of a rational understanding of the cosmos, and of an abstract schema of a putative ‘historical necessity’. As the apex of it all, man [humankind] has constructed a vision of a purely scientifically calculable and technologically achiev­able ‘universal welfare’, demanding no more than that experimental institutes invent it while industrial and bureaucratic factories turn it into reality. That millions of people will be sacrificed to this illusion in scientifically direct­ed concentration camps is not something that concerns our ‘modern [subject] man’ unless by chance [they them self] he himself lands behind barbed wire and is thrown drastically back upon his natural world. The phenomenon of empathy, after all, belongs with that abolished realm of personal prejudice which had to yield to science, objectivity, historical necessity, technology, sys­tem and the ‘apparat’ — and those, being impersonal, cannot worry. They are abstract and anonymous, ever utilitarian and thus also ever a priori innocent. And as for the future? Who, personally, would care about it or even personally worry about it when the perspective of eternity is one of the things locked away in the bathroom, if not expelled outright into the realm of fairy tales? If a contemporary scientist thinks at all of what will be in two hundred years, he does so solely as a personally disinterested observer who, basically, could not care less whether he is doing research on the metabolism of the flea, on the radio signals of pulsars or on the global reserves of natural gas.

### Ontology Focus Bad – Paralysis

#### Heidegger’s approach prevents discrimination between impacts and results in a paralysis. There is absolutely no way to weigh competing impacts in this world.

Andrew Feenberg, Chair of Philosophy and Technology at SFU. 1996. “From Essentialism to Constructivism: Philosophy of Technology at the Crossroads” http://www.agora.qc.ca/textes/feenberg.html

Unfortunately, Heidegger's argument is developed at such a high level of abstraction he literally cannot discriminate between electricity and atom bombs, agricultural techniques and the Holocaust. All are merely different expressions of the identical enframing, which we are called to transcend through the recovery of a deeper relation to being. And since he rejects technical regression while leaving no room for a modern alternative, it is difficult to see in what that relation would consist beyond a mere change of attitude. Surely these ambiguities indicate problems in his approach (3).

### Ontology Focus Bad – Extinction

#### **Ontological questioning must stop in the face of mass death**

Arnold Davidson, co-editor of Critical Inquiry, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Member of the Committees on General Studies in the Humanities and on the Conceptual Foundations of Science at the University of Chicago, Critical Inquiry, Winter, 1989

I understand Levinas’ work to suggest another path to the recovery of the human, one that leads through or toward other human beings: The dimension of the divine opens forth from the human face….Hence metaphysics is enacted where the social relation is enacted—in our relations with men….The Other is not the incarnation of God, but precisely by his face, in which he is disincarnate, is the manifestation of the height in which God is revealed. It is our relations with men…that give to theological concepts the sole signification they admit of. Levinas places ethics before ontology by beginning with our experience of the human face: and, in a clear reference to Heidegger’s idolatry of the village life of peasants, he associates himself with Socrates, who preferred the city where he encountered men to the country with its trees. In his discussions of skepticism and the problem of others, Cavell also aligns himself with this path of thought, with the recovery of the finite human self through the acknowledgment of others: As long as God exists, I am not alone. And couldn’t the other suffer the fate of God?…I wish to understand how the other now bears the weight of God, shows me that I am not alone in the universe. This requires understanding the philosophical problem of the other as the trace or scar of the departure of God. [CR, p. 470] The suppression of the other, the human, in Heidegger’s thought accounts, I believe, for the absence, in his writing after the war, of the experience of horror. Horror is always disconnected toward the human: every object of horror bears the imprint of the human will. So Levinas can see in Heidegger’s silence about the gas chambers and death camps “a kind of consent to the horror.” And Cavell can characterize Nazis as “those who have lost the capacity for being horrified by what they do.” Where was Heidegger’s horror? How could he have failed to know what he had consented to? Hannah Arendt associates Heidegger with Paul Valery’s aphorism, “’Les evenements ne sont que l’ecume des choses’ (‘Events are but the foam of things’).” I think one

### Ontology Focus Bad – Cedes the Political

#### Their alternative dooms us to extinction – only pragmatic political action can solve and allow the space for metaphysical investigation. This also answers their argument that ontology outweighs nuclear war

Ronald E. Santoni, Phil. Prof @ Denison, 1985, Nuclear War, ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-7

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to omnicide. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often. stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we Simultaneously act to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the ams race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about out disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”? Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is *not* to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be too permissive in this regard. In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be an early accomplice to the most horrendous crim against life imaginable – its annihilation. The Nuremburg tradition calls not only for a new way of thinking, a “new internationalism” in which we all become co-nurturers of the whole planet, but for resolute actions that will sever our complicity with nuclear criminality and the genocidal arms race, and work to achieve a future which we can no longer assume. We must not only “come face to face with the unthinkable in image and thought” (Fox) but must act now - with a “new consciousness” and conscience - to prevent the unthinkable, by cleansing the earth of nuclear weaponry. Only when that is achieved wll ultimate violence be removed as the final arbiter of our planet’s fate.

## Perm Solvency

### Permutation Solvency

#### The ambivalent nature of technology must be embraced in some forms to achieve the multitude of potentialities that form a progressive approach to being and the world

Andrew Feenberg, Chair of Philosophy and Technology at SFU. 1996. “From Essentialism to Constructivism: Philosophy of Technology at the Crossroads” http://www.agora.qc.ca/textes/feenberg.html

The idea of a "concrete technology," which includes human beings and nature in its very structure, contradicts the commonplace notion that technique "conquers" its objects. In Simondon's theory the most advanced forms of progress consist in the creation of complex synergies of technical and natural forces through advances that incorporate the wider contexts of human and environmental needs into the structure of technical systems. While there is no strictly technological imperative dictating such an approach, strategies of concretization could embrace these contexts as they do others in the course of technical development. Where these contexts include environmental considerations, the technology emerges as reintegrated or adapted to nature; where they include the capacities of the human operators, the technology progresses beyond deskilling to become the basis for vocational self-development and participatory management. Demands for environmentally sound technology, and humane, democratic and safe work, are thus not extrinsic to the logic of technology, but respond to the reflexive tendency of technical development to construct synergistic totalities of natural, human, and technical elements. These considerations allow us to identify a type of directional development that is both technically and normatively progressive. The normative standards of that development are immanently derived from the resistances evoked by the technical process itself. That connection is clear where technical advance suppresses contextual features of nature and social life that the individuals mobilize to defend or to incorporate into improved designs through secondary instrumentalizations. The theory of concretization offers a better account of the bias of technology than that proposed by substantivism. This bias is not determined once and for all by the essentialized primary instrumentalization as in Heidegger and Habermas, but also has a complex social dimension. To be sure, technology may enframe and colonize; but it may also liberate repressed potentialities of the lifeworld that would otherwise have remained submerged. It is thus essentially ambivalent, available for very different types of development (21). The evidence of this is all around us. It has taken a certain theoretical obstinacy to ignore that evidence and to abstract from the emancipatory implications of technology in construing its essence. That obstinacy nevertheless had its justification as a reaction against the dystopian politics of technology of the postwar period. As technological issues are increasingly contested today, the dystopian risk fades. It is no longer sufficient to challenge the "one-dimensionality" of "technological thinking;" what is needed is an account of technology's ambivalence as a locus of social change.

### Permutation Solvency – Grossberg

#### We must use the institutions that exercise power to change them

Lawrence Grossburg, University of Illinois, We Gotta Get Outta This Place, 1992, p. 391-393

The Left needs institutions which can operate within the systems of governance, understanding that such institutions are the mediating structures by which power is actively realized. It is often by directing opposition against specific institutions that power can be challenged. The Left has assumed from some time now that, since it has so little access to the apparatuses of agency, its only alternative is to seek a public voice in the media through tactical protests. The Left does in fact need more visibility, but it also needs greater access to the entire range of apparatuses of decision making and power. Otherwise, the Left has nothing but its own self-righteousness. It is not individuals who have produced starvation and the other social disgraces of our world, although it is individuals who must take responsibility for eliminating them. But to do so, they must act within organizations, and within the system of organizations which in fact have the capacity (as well as the moral responsibility) to fight them. Without such organizations, the only models of political commit­ment are self-interest and charity. Charity suggests that we act on behalf of others who cannot act on their own behalf. But we are all precariously caught in the circuits of global capitalism, and every­one’s position is increasingly precarious and uncertain. It will not take much to change the position of any individual in the United States, as the experience of many of the homeless, the elderly and the “fallen” middle class demonstrates. Nor are there any guarantees about the future of any single nation. We can imagine ourselves involved in a politics where acting for another is always acting for oneself as well, a politics in which everyone struggles with the resources they have to make their lives (and the world) better, since the two are so intimately tied together! For example, we need to think of affirmation action as in everyone’s best interests, because of the possibilities it opens. We need to think with what Axelos has described as a “planetary thought” which “would be a coherent thought—but not a rationalizing and ‘rationalist’ inflection; it would be a fragmentary thought of the open totality—for what we can grasp are fragments unveiled on the horizon of the totality. Such a politics will not begin by distinguishing between the local and the global (and certainly not by valorizing one over the other) for the ways in which the former are incorporated into the latter preclude the luxury of such choices. Resistance is always a local struggle, even when (as in parts of the ecology movement) it is imagined to connect into its global structures of articulation: Think globally, act locally. Opposition is predicated precisely on locating the points of articulation between them, the points at which the global becomes local, and the local opens up onto the global. Since the meaning of these terms has to be understood in the context of any particular struggle, one is always acting both globally and locally: Think globally, act appropriately! Fight locally because that is the scene of action, but aim for the global because that is the scene of agency. “Local struggles directly target national and international axioms, at the precise point of their insertion into the field of imma­nence. This requires the imagination and construction of forms of unity, commonality and social agency which do not deny differences. Without such commonality, politics is too easily reduced to a ques­tion of individual rights (i.e., in the terms of classical utility theory); difference ends up “trumping” politics, bringing it to an end. The struggle against the disciplined mobilization of everyday life can only be built on affective commonalities, a shared “responsible yearning: a yearning out towards something more and something better than this and this place now.” The Left, after all, is defined by its common commitment to principles of justice, equality and democ­racy (although these might conflict) in economic, political and cultural life. It is based on the hope, perhaps even the illusion, that such things are possible. The construction of an affective commonal­ity attempts to mobilize people in a common struggle, despite the fact that they have no common identity or character, recognizing that they are the only force capable of providing a new historical and oppositional agency. It strives to organize minorities into a new majority.