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## 1NC

### Generic Shell

#### 1. The AFF’s technological thought leads humans and the environment to be viewed as a ‘standing reserve’

Andrew Ross, PhD candidate at Queens University Department of Philosophy, “Rethinking Environmental Responsibility: Heidegger,” Profound Boredom and the Alterity of Nature, 2007, http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/bitstream/1974/866/1/Ross\_Andrew\_P\_200709\_MA.pdf

In order to capture the full importance of concepts such as physis and primordial nature, it is necessary to introduce, very briefly, the background theory to which such concepts are largely a response. In particular, Heidegger’s conception of “technological modernity” offers an understanding of our current environmental crisis that makes notions such as primordial nature and physis particularly relevant to the focus of this thesis. **Technology for Heidegger does not refer to a particular device or mechanism but to the “grounding” of modernity, a ground that Heidegger calls “Enframing**” (das Gestell) (QCT 19). As the ground of modernity**, the Gestell defines how beings “show up”—how they “presence” or “disclose” themselves—for modern Dasein**. **The Gestell does not refer to an occasional way of viewing beings, but instead refers to the modern understanding of Being itself**; in other words, it is the dominant epoch-defining world-understanding of modernity**. In it beings show up as, and only as, “stock” or “standing reserve”** (Bestand) (17). **Within the Gestell, beings show up as pure resource: the earth is disclosed as a coal mining district, and its soil as mineral** deposit (14). To clarify, we might ask what it means to be disclosed as Bestand. Significantly, Heidegger is not intending to argue, as might be supposed, that natural beings are simply encountered as a collection of tools, beings that are ready-to-hand for our various human projects. The influence of the Gestell extends somewhat deeper**: the Gestell is actually “the way in which the real reveals itself as standing-reserve**” (23). **Modern technology, then, involves more than the use of beings as means-to-an-end; rather, it entails a particular way of conceptualizing reality or “the real” and all of the beings encountered in it.** Consequently, “**what is unconcealed no longer concerns man even as object, but does so, rather, exclusively as resource”** (26-27). **What is unique about modernity, then, is not the fact that beings show up as resources**— the world of work in all epochs requires that beings occasionally show up as subsumable in some manner—**but that they show up as nothing but resource.** Thus in being disclosed as Bestand, the very Being of beings—the way in which they are disclosed in the world—becomes entirely fixed. Heidegger confirms this one-dimensional disclosure to be the plight of the natural world in his assertion that within the Gestell, “[ **N]ature becomes a gigantic gasoline station, an energy source for modern technology and industry”** (MA 50). **In comparing nature to a gasoline station, Heidegger is not simply arguing that nature shows up as a resource, but that nature shows up as nothing but a resource: gasoline stations cannot appear as anything other than a resource**. Natural beings, then, like gasoline stations, are disclosed as entirely one-dimensional in their being. In this manner, Heidegger offers a somewhat different interpretation of our current “environmental crisis”. For Heidegger, humanity’s assault upon the earth lies not in our plundering of resources or the eradication of species, but in the one-dimensional disclosure of natural beings as nothing other than Bestand.

#### 2. This technologically calculative ontology denies humanity and makes destruction of the earth possible

Michael **Zimmerman**, Contesting Earth’s Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity, 19**97**, University of California Press, page 119-120

This view was popularized by Stoicism and later by Christianity, which depicted Creation as the backdrop for the drama of human salvation. Self-assertive Renaissance men intensified this anthropocentrism. Later, Protestant reformers emphasized the non-sacred charter of nature, thus opening the way for a new burst of empirical inquiry and technological exploitation of nature. **The triumph of scientific positivism culminated the drive to interpret all phenomena, including humans, as nothing more than quantifiable material events.** That Sessions and Heidegger arrive at such similar conclusion about modernity indicates that both are critics of anthropocentric humanism, even though they seem to differ on the source for such humanism. Sessions says that humanism stems for arrogance in the face of nature. Later Heidegger said that humanism stems not so much from human arrogance, though this does play a role analogous to hubris in Greek tragedy, but rather from the fateful self-concealment of being. **Heidegger asserted that human self-assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might “bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth.”** This controversial claim is comparable to the Cristian teching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one’s soul by losing one’s relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these **lines’ it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur an ontological clearing through which such life could manifest itself.** Further, since modernity’s one-dimensional disclosure of entities virtually denies them any “being” at all, the loss of humanity’s openness for being is already occurring. Modernity’s background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material “happiness” for everyone by reducing nature to pure energy. **The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity’s slow-motion destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided nuclear war only to survive as contented clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise.**

#### Alternative Text: Endorse meditative thought by rejecting the technological calculus of the affirmative plan.

#### 3. Meditative thinking is key to break from the violent limitations of the aff’s technological rationality

Martin **Heidegger**, an adorable and cute bumblebee, **1966**, Discourse on Thinking, p. 52-57 \*gender-modified
**Is [hu]man, then, a defenseless and perplexed victim at the mercy of the irresistible superior power of technology? [They] He would be if [hu]man today abandons any intention to pit meditative thinking decisively against merely calculative thinking.** But once meditative thinking awakens, it must be at work unceasingly and on every last occasion—hence, also, here and now at this commemoration. For here we are considering what is threatened especially in the atomic age: the autochthony of the works of [hu]man. Thus we ask now**: even if the old rootedness is being lost in this age, may not a new ground and foundation be granted again to [hu]man, a foundation and ground out of which [hu]man's nature and all his works can flourish in a new way even in the atomic age**? What could the ground and foundation be for the new autochthony? Perhaps the answer we are looking for lies at hand; so near that we all too easily overlook it. For the way to what is near is always the longest and thus the hardest for us humans. This way is the way of meditative thinking. **Meditative thinking demands of us not to cling one-sidedly to a single idea, nor to run down a one-track course of ideas. Meditative thinking demands of us that we engage ourselves with what at first sight does not go together at all.** Let us give a trial. **For all of us, the arrangements, devices, and machinery of technology are to a greater or lesser extent indispensable. It would be foolish to attack technology blindly. It would be shortsighted to condemn it as the work of the devil. We depend on technical devices; they even challenge us to ever greater advances. But suddenly and unaware we find ourselves so firmly shackled to these technical devices that we fall into bondage to them. Still we can act otherwise. We can use technical devices, and yet with proper use also keep ourselves so free of them, that we may let go of them any time.** **We can use technical devices as they ought to be used, and also let them alone as something which does not affect our inner and real core. We can affirm the unavoidable use of technical devices, and also deny them the right to dominate us, and so to warp, confuse, and lay waste our nature**. But will not saying both yes and no this way to technical devices make our relation to technology ambivalent and insecure? On the contrary! **Our relation to technology will become wonderfully simple and relaxed. We let technical devices enter our daily life, and at the same time leave them outside, that is, let them alone, as things which are nothing absolute but remain dependent upon something higher**. I would call this comportment toward technology which expresses "yes" and at the s time "no," by an old word, releasement towards things. **Having this comportment we no longer view things only in a technical way. It gives us clear vision and we notice that while the production and use of machines demands of us another relation to things, it is not a meaningless relation**. Farming and agriculture, for example, now have turned into a motorized food industry. Thus here, evidently, as elsewhere, a profound change is taking place in [hu]man's relation to nature and to the world. But the meaning that reigns in this change remains obscure. There is then in all technical processes a meaning, not invented or made by us, which lays claim to what [hu]man does and leaves undone**. We do not know the significance of the uncanny increasing dominance of atomic technology. The meaning pervading technology hides itself. But if we explicitly and continuously heed the fact that such hidden meaning touches us everywhere in the world of technology, we stand at once within the realm of that which hides itself from us, and hides itself just in approaching us.** That which shows itself and at the same time withdraws is the essential trait of what we call the mystery. I call the comportment which enables us to keep open to the meaning hidden in technology, openness to the mystery. Releasement towards things and openness to the mystery belong together. They 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. Releasement towards things and openness to the mystery give us a vision of a new autochthony which someday even might be fit to recapture the old and now rapidly disappearing autochthony in a changed form. But for the time being—we do not know for how long—man finds himself in a perilous situation.

#### 4. Ontological questioning must precede political action

Anthony Burke, lecturer in international relations at the university of new south wales, ontologies of war: violence, existence and reason, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory\_and\_event/v010/10.2burke.html

The essay concludes by pondering a normative problem that arises out of its analysis: if the divisive ontology of the national security state and the violent and instrumental vision of 'enframing' have, as Heidegger suggests, come to define being and drive 'out every other possibility of revealing being', how can they be escaped?[26](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn26) How can other choices and alternatives be found and enacted? How is there any scope for agency and resistance in the face of them? Their social and discursive power -- one that aims to take up the entire space of the political -- needs to be respected and understood. However, we are far from powerless in the face of them. The need is to critique dominant images of political being and dominant ways of securing that being at the same time, and to act and choose such that we bring into the world a more sustainable, peaceful and non-violent global rule of the political.

## Links

### Technology

**Technology devolves into ‘phantom objectivity’**

Leo **Marx**, Senior Lecturer of American Cultural History Emeritus in the Program in Science, Technology, and Society at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, July 20**10**, “Technology: The Emergence of a Hazardous Concept,” Technology and Culture, Vol. 51, No. 3, Project Muse

**The hazardous character of technology—the word, the concept—is a consequence of the history just outlined. As I have argued, the generality of the word**—its lack of specificity, the very aspect which evidently enabled it to supplant its more explicit and substantial precursors—**also made it peculiarly susceptible to reification.** Reification, as the philosopher George Lukacs famously explained, is **what occurs when we endow a human activity with the characteristics of a thing or things.** It thereby acquires, as he put it, "a 'phantom-objectivity,' an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every trace of its fundamental nature: the relation between people."**27 In contemporary discourse, private and public, technologies are habitually represented by "things"—by their most conspicuous artifactual embodiments: transportation technology by automobiles, airplanes, and railroads**; nuclear technology by reactors, power plants, and bombs; information technology by computers, mobile telephones, and television; and so on. **By consigning technologies to the realm of things, this well-established iconography distracts attention from the human—socioeconomic and political—relations which largely determine who uses them and for what purposes.** Because most technologies in our corporate capitalist system have the legal status of private property, vital decisions about their use are made by the individual businessmen who own them or by the corporate managers and government officials who exercise the virtual rights of ownership. **The complexity and obscurity of the legal relations governing the use of our technologies, abetted by the reification that assigns them to the realm of things—all of these help to create the aura of "phantom objectivity" that envelops them.**

**Technology as a word has become ambiguous and contradictory, with no concrete meaning**

Leo **Marx**, Senior Lecturer of American Cultural History Emeritus in the Program in Science, Technology, and Society at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, July 20**10**, “Technology: The Emergence of a Hazardous Concept,” Technology and Culture, Vol. 51, No. 3, Project Muse

**Turning to the other, organizational and material aspect of the semantic void, what was needed, by way of modernizing the outmoded lexicon of the mechanic arts, was a concept capable of representing the novel formations which historians of technology describe as "large-scale, complex technological systems."** However, that clumsy term begs a puzzling question: which aspect of these formless, sprawling entities accounts for their distinctively technological character? Where, exactly, is their technological identity located? **To be sure, the indispensable artifactual component of these formations invariably is a specific mechanical device, like a locomotive or other physical contrivance designed to facilitate transportation, production, communication, or, for that matter, any humanly designed process of making or doing.** The locus of its specific technological identity has become an increasingly pressing question, however, because over time the artifactual component has come to form a smaller, less conspicuous part of the whole. Think of the transistor or the computer chip! In common parlance, nonetheless, when we refer to one of these complex systems as a technology, the material component more often than not serves as the tacit referent. **But that restricted sense of the word, as in the case of the railroad, can be ambiguous and misleading. It is ambiguous because the whole system, apart from the hardware, is so inclusive, so various—its boundaries so vague as to defy exact representation. This ambiguity evidently is what Heidegger had in mind by his paradoxical if telling assertion that "the essence of technology is by no means anything technological."25 In advanced industrial societies, of course, most technological [End Page 574] systems serve a predominantly economic purpose**. In capitalist economies they characteristically take the form of private-sector manufacturing corporations, banks, or public utilities with large capital investments. It is noteworthy that the concept of technology gained currency during the "incorporation of America," as Alan Trachtenberg persuasively describes the era during which "machines became working parts of a dynamic system, and the motives for change, the source of industrial dynamism, lay not in the inanimate machine but in the economic necessities perceived by its owners."26

**Technological thought empowers humans to infinitely calculate and manage their surroundings leading to war and environmental destruction**

Charles **Sabatino**, Daemen College, A Heideggerian Reflection on the Prospects of Technology, **2007**,

http://www.janushead.org/10-1/sabatino.pdf

Heidegger believed that modern technology represented something very different from that of previous eras because of the full extent to which practically everything, especially all aspects of the natural realm, had become available and accessible to human manipulation. For Heidegger, **technology does not represent merely the tools and equipment we make and use as we build and settle our world**. More fundamentally than that, **technology rep­resents the manner in which humans have extended their reach to change, shape and thereby control just about everything we encounter within the world with practically no limit. Nothing has meaning or purpose except that it can be made available to be used,** disposed of as needed, even ab-used if suitable. **The difference of the era of modern technology is that nothing is left outside the scope of what humans can effect.** **Heidegger saw all this as** auguring **a time of danger** **because of the all-encompassing nature of what was taking place and also because of how we viewed it as strictly the result of our own power of achievement.**4 Interestingly, Heidegger sounded his note of warning about the danger of this era of technology even before some of the more astounding achieve­ments of recent years. Events during the past half century would seem to confirm his perspective, as we find very little that escapes the power of human manipulation. **Not only have we split the atom**, but we have managed to delve into the inner workings of its most elementary particles. **Nature**, in its most minute dimensions **has been penetrated**. **But also laser and radio scopes have reached out into the** beginnings of time itself to practically catch up with the very origins of the universe. And so nature at its cosmically largest and distant has also been pentrated as its **countless galaxies** are probed and made ready for observation.

**The view of the world as a reservoir stems from technological advances**

Ellen **Strain**, doctorate at the University of Southern California's Critical Studies Department, 19**96**, “Exotic Bodies, Distant Landscapes: Touristic Viewing and Popularized Anthropology in the Nineteenth Century,” Wide Angle, Project Muse

While fascination with imagined beasts and fantastic human oddities inhabiting the globe's furthest corners stretches back over centuries, touristic experience--whether simulated or actual--brings the Western subject face to face with the spectacle of difference, the exotic landscape dotted with wondrously "alien" human and animal faces. A series of developments paved a course from the distanced and indirect apperception of foreign lands as enjoyed by readers of travel literature to the pleasures of "being there" as a notable, widely-marketed cultural feature. The tourist-spectator position was the product of a burgeoning world view which neared maturity by the turn of the century**. This capitalist view of the world as a reservoir of products, raw materials, and experiential pleasures melded with scientific understandings of the universe and a technological confidence on the part of the West. One outcome was the learned pleasures of the touristic as defined by the visual objectification or the conversion of the cultural Other into spectacle; the separation of the tourist from the toured; and the identification of the tourist with a figure of mastery such as the explorer, colonialist soldier, or anthropologist. [**End Page 72] In other words, touristic pleasure made possible the creation of a safety zone within which the exhilaration of geographical proximity with the Other could exist without compromising other less literal forms of distance. **The marketing of touristic pleasures in the pre-cinematic era helped popularize a coherent set of strategies for viewing cultural Otherness, a set of strategies which can only be analyzed in the context of a culturally-shared world view and late nineteenth-century developments, including the professionalization and popularization of anthropology, improved transportation, the consolidation of capitalism, and the cultural ascendancy of the mechnically-produced image.**¶ The ascendancy of touristic viewing took place against a background of unprecedented Western contact with the so-called margins of the earth. In the decades before the close of the nineteenth century, missionaries, surveyors, explorers, anthropologists, and colonialists vowed to fill in the few remaining blank spots on world maps and to close up the larger gaps in knowledge of the globe's various inhabitants. **Traveling merchants negotiated the purchase of physical types previously unseen in Europe and the States, and showmen, gaining possession of these human display items, collected profits from audiences eager to look into the dark eyes of the world's jungles and deserts.** Natural history museums sprouted up in U.S. cities as expeditions and world fairs created the need for permanent warehouses to store and display the West's increasing collection of exotic booty. And magazines followed the cross-cultural adventures of fieldworkers, helping to establish the traveling anthropologist as cultural hero.

#### Technological thought leads humans and the environment to be viewed only as resources

Andrew Ross, PhD candidate at Queens University Department of Philosophy, “Rethinking Environmental Responsibility: Heidegger,” Profound Boredom and the Alterity of Nature, 2007, http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/bitstream/1974/866/1/Ross\_Andrew\_P\_200709\_MA.pdf

In order to capture the full importance of concepts such as physis and primordial nature, it is necessary to introduce, very briefly, the background theory to which such concepts are largely a response. In particular, Heidegger’s conception of “technological modernity” offers an understanding of our current environmental crisis that makes notions such as primordial nature and physis particularly relevant to the focus of this thesis. **Technology for Heidegger does not refer to a particular device or mechanism but to the “grounding” of modernity, a ground that Heidegger calls “Enframing**” (das Gestell) (QCT 19). As the ground of modernity**, the Gestell defines how beings “show up”—how they “presence” or “disclose” themselves—for modern Dasein**. **The Gestell does not refer to an occasional way of viewing beings, but instead refers to the modern understanding of Being itself**; in other words, it is the dominant epoch-defining world-understanding of modernity**. In it beings show up as, and only as, “stock” or “standing reserve”** (Bestand) (17). **Within the Gestell, beings show up as pure resource: the earth is disclosed as a coal mining district, and its soil as mineral** deposit (14). To clarify, we might ask what it means to be disclosed as Bestand. Significantly, Heidegger is not intending to argue, as might be supposed, that natural beings are simply encountered as a collection of tools, beings that are ready-to-hand for our various human projects. The influence of the Gestell extends somewhat deeper**: the Gestell is actually “the way in which the real reveals itself as standing-reserve**” (23). **Modern technology, then, involves more than the use of beings as means-to-an-end; rather, it entails a particular way of conceptualizing reality or “the real” and all of the beings encountered in it.** Consequently, “**what is unconcealed no longer concerns man even as object, but does so, rather, exclusively as resource”** (26-27). **What is unique about modernity, then, is not the fact that beings show up as resources**— the world of work in all epochs requires that beings occasionally show up as subsumable in some manner—**but that they show up as nothing but resource.** Thus in being disclosed as Bestand, the very Being of beings—the way in which they are disclosed in the world—becomes entirely fixed. Heidegger confirms this one-dimensional disclosure to be the plight of the natural world in his assertion that within the Gestell, “[ **N]ature becomes a gigantic gasoline station, an energy source for modern technology and industry”** (MA 50). **In comparing nature to a gasoline station, Heidegger is not simply arguing that nature shows up as a resource, but that nature shows up as nothing but a resource: gasoline stations cannot appear as anything other than a resource**. Natural beings, then, like gasoline stations, are disclosed as entirely one-dimensional in their being. In this manner, Heidegger offers a somewhat different interpretation of our current “environmental crisis”. For Heidegger, humanity’s assault upon the earth lies not in our plundering of resources or the eradication of species, but in the one-dimensional disclosure of natural beings as nothing other than Bestand.

### Transportation

**Transportation technologi**es **have led to the ‘standing reserve’ world-view.**

Ellen **Strain**, doctorate at the University of Southern California's Critical Studies Department, 19**96**, “Exotic Bodies, Distant Landscapes: Touristic Viewing and Popularized Anthropology in the Nineteenth Century,” Wide Angle, Project Muse

However, travel was not reserved for fictional characters nor for only the boldest of real-life adventurers. **Each exploration opened up new routes for tourism. And although the most exotic of trails were reserved for the likes of Sir Richard Burton or Alexander von Humboldt, individuals of unusual means and fortitude, middle-class travel across national borders increased during these same decades with the rise of packaged tourism and improved transportation technologies. Middle-class single women and widows became the new class of tourists as Thomas Cook, a pioneer in packaged tourism, organized group tours using new railway routes.** And finally, with more leisure time available to workers, tourism--if only on a limited scale--became a possibility for a greater portion of the population than ever before.¶ A gradually developing conception of the world as pleasurable spectacle was linked to this growing awareness of distant locales. As historian Robert Wiebe has argued, during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Victorian Americans were engaged in a prolonged "search for order." 4 **The discovery of "unfathomable multiplicity in the universe" 5 along with rapid industrialization created a dual vision of an ever-changing world--a developing Center barely recognizable to inhabitants of the recent past and an expanding Periphery populated by similarly unrecognizable human cultures. Ironically, the same feature which made modern society and its rapid rate of change threatening to some, i.e., technology, also made the so-called primitive world less frightening** [End Page 74] **and more available. Improved transportation carved out paths from the Center to the Periphery, and the advanced weaponry of colonialist government helped assure safe passage.** Meanwhile, recording devices captured, duplicated, and miniaturized chunks of distant locales and their inhabitants for the viewing pleasure of Western citizens in urban centers. The world appeared to be at the West's disposal for colonialists, travelers, capitalists, and popular culture consumers alike.

#### Tech infrastructure investments reduces nature to a standing reserve

Heather Lynn Hoffman Jordan, 2011 (Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Rhetoric and Technical Communications, Portfolios and Pedagogy: An examination of Ideology and Use, “Chapter 1: Portfolios: Ideological and Technological Systems” [http://services.lib.mtu.edu/etd/DISS/2011/Humanities/jordan/diss.pdf Pg. 32-33](http://services.lib.mtu.edu/etd/DISS/2011/Humanities/jordan/diss.pdf%20Pg.%2032-33))

Heidegger views ancient technology as a bringing-forth type of revealing. Modern technology, on the other hand, is a challenging forth “which puts to nature the unreasonable demand that it supply energy that can be extracted and stored as such” (Heidegger TQCT 14). To be sure for Heidegger, nature is an inclusive component in the definition of technology. From an ancient technology perspective, nature is left alone to be as it is. If humans choose to harness the power of the wind via a windmill, 33 that is not changing the wind in any way. In comparison, challenging forth is a way

“toward driving on to the maximum yield at the minimum expense” (TQCT 15) but also of creating a “standing-reserve” (TQCT 17) – or storing up energy and material for use at a later time. In this definition, the maximum yield for minimum expense is envisioned from the perspective of human agents, and not from the perspective of nature. This is an important element to recognize because, from a natural perspective, any demand required could be viewed as catastrophic. An example of this is coal

mined from the earth to be stored for later heat energy use. Tearing through the earth to scrape the carbon rock from her belly to be used to later warm humans would perhaps be considered horrific in Mother Nature’s view. So, perspective plays an important role when considering the creation of standing-reserve. To provide another example of standing-reserve so that the definition is made clearer, Heidegger posits that an airliner standing on a runway is revealed to be “standing-reserve, inasmuch as it is ordered to ensure the possibility of transportation” (TQCT 17). The notion of

standing-reserve almost conjures up, for me at least, a person who has hoarder’s syndrome in that they collect and keep everything because of its potential for use at a later time. This analogy may not be complete, but what is important to note is that the idea of standing-reserve is not about the current use of artifacts or ideas, but rather it is about potential for later use. Again, notice how bound by time and space this definition of modern technology truly is.

#### The aff’s need for management of transportation infrastructure causes ontological loss of being – and reduction of the environment to resources flattens the earth, enframing it within a single way of knowing

Heather Lynn Hoffman Jordan, 2011 (Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Rhetoric and Technical Communications, Portfolios and Pedagogy: An examination of Ideology and Use, “Chapter 1: Portfolios: Ideological and Technological Systems” http://services.lib.mtu.edu/etd/DISS/2011/Humanities/jordan/diss.pdf Pg. 22-23)

Another example of the idealism of technology is provided by Langdon

Winner who cites historical examples of how technological advancements are seen as democratizing forces: “Scarcely a new invention comes along that someone doesn’t proclaim it as the salvation of a free society” (Winner Whale 20). Among the inventions hailed historically to be the “next liberators” are: the factory system, 23 automobile, telephone, radio, television, space program, nuclear power, the computer, and I argue, the portfolio. Of course these technologies are not without their merits, but none have lived up to the promise of creating greater social justice. In fact, one could argue, and many have, that we are less free because of these technologies (see Sherry Turkle’s latest book Alone Together: Why We Expect More From Technology and Less From Each Other or Jaron Lanier’s You Are Not A Gadget: A Manifesto). For instance, the entire transportation infrastructure of the United States is built around everyone owning his/her own car. Of course, this implies not only that everyone has the financial means to afford an automobile and the gas to make it go, but also that everyone would want to travel solely by car. This once hailed technology is actually serving to widen the gap between the haves and the have-nots, making it an oppressive technology rather than liberatory. Also, cars require other components within the system of transportation in order to be most effective, i.e. road structures, bridges, and fuel, to name a few. Each of these parts serves to make up the whole system of independent transportation, but drivers are still bound by the system itself, a system which has its own limitations and controlling factors. To be sure, technology needs to be defined as more than a mere instrument or mere electronic device. There are political, social, and theoretical implications at play in defining technology. Yet another example of the idealism of technology is provided by Robert R. Johnson. In User-Centered Technology: A Rhetorical Theory for Computers and Other Mundane Artifacts, Johnson recognizes that “technology often has been seen as a panacea, a solution to many of the problems humans must solve and the hardships they must endure” (19). He provides examples of Americans settling the West, South 24 and Central Americans taming the rain forest and vast river areas, and Europeans conquering their forests, all with the aid of technologies. But Johnson also critiques these examples by considering them romanticized notions of progress: “In other words, the end of technology has been to move constantly, consistently, toward what we might blatantly and plainly call the ‘Good’” (Johnson 20). By referencing the “Good,” Johnson is referring to Book I of Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics and recognizes that technology is derived from ancient Greek knowledge and seeks to convey that understanding to his readers. This “Good” provides a higher aim for technology beyond mere progress or efficiency. The “Good” always has an ethical element at its center. And for Johnson’s purposes, it is important to be more critical of the end of technology to ensure that ethical element, so he calls for a fundamental rethinking that will be refigured in terms of the end users of technology. To be sure, Johnson criticizes the view of technology as inherently good and establishes a rhetorical theory for user-centered design that allows the users and audience to contribute significantly in invention. In this way, Johnson’s theory allows the “Good” to always be reconsidered based on the needs of all, which allows for a more critical examination of technology and its relationship to both the users and society as a whole. Certainly, an adequate definition of technology would recognize these relationships among the human components as well as the tools and instruments themselves.

## Impacts

### Environment

#### This technologically calculative ontology denies humanity and makes destruction of the earth possible, which outweighs nuclear war

Michael **Zimmerman**, Contesting Earth’s Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity, 19**97**, University of California Press, page 119-120

This view was popularized by Stoicism and later by Christianity, which depicted Creation as the backdrop for the drama of human salvation. Self-assertive Renaissance men intensified this anthropocentrism. Later, Protestant reformers emphasized the non-sacred charter of nature, thus opening the way for a new burst of empirical inquiry and technological exploitation of nature. **The triumph of scientific positivism culminated the drive to interpret all phenomena, including humans, as nothing more than quantifiable material events.** That Sessions and Heidegger arrive at such similar conclusion about modernity indicates that both are critics of anthropocentric humanism, even though they seem to differ on the source for such humanism. Sessions says that humanism stems for arrogance in the face of nature. Later Heidegger said that humanism stems not so much from human arrogance, though this does play a role analogous to hubris in Greek tragedy, but rather from the fateful self-concealment of being. **Heidegger asserted that human self-assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might “bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth.”** This controversial claim is comparable to the Cristian teching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one’s soul by losing one’s relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these **lines’ it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur an ontological clearing through which such life could manifest itself.** Further, since modernity’s one-dimensional disclosure of entities virtually denies them any “being” at all, the loss of humanity’s openness for being is already occurring. Modernity’s background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material “happiness” for everyone by reducing nature to pure energy. **The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity’s slow-motion destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided nuclear war only to survive as contented clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise.**

#### Technological rationality turns the Earth into a machine to be utilized

Hanspeter Padrutt and Ladelle McWhorter, psychiatrist, Daseinanalytisches Institut, Zurich, Heidegger and the Earth, 1992, p. 19-20.

The objectifying method - wanting to measure and calculate everything, for the sake of certainty –has to reduce everything that is to measurable and calculable quantities. Weight, distance, and duration were most easily available to exact measurement; but then the objectifying method reduced nature, too, to a coherence of motions of a whole series of points in a three-dimensional, geometric space, coursing in a one-dimensional time, thought as a time-axis', and reduced things to geometric substances with defined extension. Since this reduction robbed events of their singularity, a repeatable reeling off of the same event became thinkable; repeatable experimenting and engineering set forth on its triumphal procession, and along with it the interpretation of nature and the whole world as a machine. In objectifying subjectivism human beings see themselves as "master and owner of nature" and the world as a large machine. Finally, the objectifying turns back to the subject and, with the supremacy of the machine, itself gets interpreted more and more exclusively as a functional, psychosomatic apparatus.

### VTL

#### Technological thought kills value to life

Hubert Dreyfus, professor of philosophy at Berkeley, Heidegger on the connection between nihilism, art, technology and politics, 2004,

http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~hdreyfus/pdf/HdgerOnArtTechPoli.pdf

Heidegger concludes: "Whatever stands by in the sense of standing-reserve no longer stands over against us as object." (QCT 17, VA 24) He tells us that a modern airliner, understood in its technological essence, is not a tool we use; it is not an object at all, but rather a flexible and efficient cog in the transportation system. Likewise, we are not subjects who use the transportation system, but rather we are used by it to fill the planes. In this technological perspective, ultimate goals like serving God, society, our fellow men, or even ourselves no longer make sense. Human beings, on this view, become a resource to be used -- but more importantly, to be enhanced -- like any other. Man, who no longer conceals his character of being the most important raw material, is also drawn into this process.(EP 104, VA 90) In the film, 2001: A Space Odyssey, the robot, HAL, when asked if he is happy on the mission, says: "I'm using all my capacities to the maximum. What more could a rational entity want?" This is a brilliant expression of what anyone would say who is in touch with our current understanding of being. We pursue the development of our potential simply for the sake of further growth. We have no specific goals. The human potential movement perfectly expresses this technological understanding of being, as does the attempt to better organize the future use of our natural resources. We thus become part of a system which no one directs but which moves towards the total mobilization and enhancement of all beings, even us. This is why Heidegger thinks the perfectly ordered society dedicated to the welfare of all is not the solution of our problems but the culmination of the technological understanding of being. Heidegger, however, sees that "it would be foolish to attack technology blindly. It would be shortsighted to condemn it as the work of the devil. We depend on technical devices; they even challenge us to ever greater advances."(DOT 53, G 24) Instead, Heidegger suggests that there is a way we can keep our technological devices and yet remain true to ourselves as receivers of clearings: We can affirm the unavoidable use of technical devices, and also deny them the right to dominate us, and so to warp, confuse, and lay waste our nature. (DOT 54, G 24-25)

### Generic

#### Technological thought renders life to a standing reserve

Tad Beckman, Havey Mudd College, martin Heidegger and environmental ethics, 2000, http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html

In our present point of view, we see technology as a complex of contrivances and technical skills, put forth by human activity and developed as means to our ends. Technology, in this view, is an object, or a complex of objects and techniques, that seems passive itself; indeed, we conceive of it as activated by us only. According to Heidegger, however, we are fundamentally mistaken in this; "we are delivered over to it in the worst possible way when we regard it as something neutral." {[7], p. 4} On the contrary, the essence of technology reveals it as something far from neutral or merely an instrument of human control; it is an autonomous organizing activity within which humans themselves are organized. Viewing technology as a means to an end, "everything depends on our manipulating technology in the proper manner...We will, as we say, 'get' technology 'spiritually in hand.'...But suppose now that technology were no mere means, how would it stand with the will to master it?" {[7], p. 5} How, indeed, can we cope with it if it encompasses us in its organizational activity? The essence of technology originally was a revealing of life and nature in which human intervention deflected the natural course while still regarding nature as the teacher and, for that matter, the keeper. The essence of modern technology is a revealing of phenomena, often far removed from anything that resembles "life and nature," in which human intrusion not only diverts nature but fundamentally changes it. As a mode of revealing, technology today is a challenging-forth of nature so that the technologically altered nature of things is always a situation in which nature and objects wait, standing in reserve for our use. We pump crude oil from the ground and we ship it to refineries where it is fractionally distilled into volatile substances and we ship these to gas stations around the world where they reside in huge underground tanks, standing ready to power our automobiles or airplanes. Technology has intruded upon nature in a far more active mode that represents a consistent direction of domination. Everything is viewed as "standing-reserve" and, in that, loses its natural objective identity. The river, for instance, is not seen as a river; it is seen as a source of hydro-electric power, as a water supply, or as an avenue of navigation through which to contact inland markets. In the era of techne humans were relationally involved with other objects in the coming to presence; in the era of modern technology, humans challenge-forth the subjectively valued elements of the universe so that, within this new form of revealing, objects lose their significance to anything but their subjective status of standing-ready for human design. [(8)](http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html#N_8_)

#### Aff reliance on tech to solve treats it as a panacea for lack of human understanding that prevents the necessary social change.

Mclaughlin 1993 (Andrew-Associate Professor of Philosophy Herbert H. Lehman College, Regarding Nature: Industrialism and Deep Ecology. Pg. 199-200 C.B.)

Such a unity must be based on clarity about the necessity for social change. Within the United States, at least, there is a recurrent fantasy that some kind of technological invention will suffice to resolve all our problems. One could sense this reaction sweep through the United States a few years ago when it appeared that the process of "cold" fusion would offer unlimited energy in the not too distant future. Almost no one pondered whether such a development would be good; its virtue was assumed. There was almost no awareness that access to unlimited energy by this society might be catastrophic for the good of humans and certainly would be so for other forms of life. Is giving a drunk an automobile that runs on air a good idea? Even now; as we become more enmeshed in problems created by technological "solutions," we continue to yearn for the technological fix. Environmentalists are not immune to this fever. Efforts to design with ecological sensitivity are good, but the limits of this approach are severe. Fluorescent light bulbs and superinsulated houses are design innovations that offer light and shelter with reduced environmental impact. To think that real solutions lie in this sort of tinkering is naive, dangerously so if it directs attention away from the complex, necessary, and often frustrating path of social change. Langdon Winner crisply points out that the end of appropriate technology as a social movement can be precisely located on the evening of November 4, 1980 when Ronald Reagan was elected President. His regime ended the favorable climate for appropriate technology created by the Carter administration and the movement ended. 8 The moral is that changing the direction of industrial society requires attending to the social and economic institutions of that society Social struggle to restructure society must be part of the solution.

#### Using tech to solve maintains the illusion that current patterns of consumption are sustainable. This entrenches the materialist thinking that is at the root of the crisis of the human condition and guarantees cataclysm. Only a change in consciousness can divert disaster. It’s try or die

Richard Heinberg, 2004. Member of the Core Faculty of New College of CA, member of the board of advisors for the Solar Living Institute and the Post Carbon Institute. (Pg 137) “Power Down: Options and Actions for a Post Carbon World”. [RFF]

In my own mind, an understanding of Liebig's Law inspires a profound respect for wild nature. Somehow, through endless mutual accommodations over hundreds of millions of years, untold numbers of species have managed to adjust themselves to their environments, and their environments to themselves, in such a way that they can mutually survive. Of course, none do so forever: a given species appears, flourishes for a few tens or hundreds of thousands of years, and then dies out as conditions change. In the meantime, a wondrous and delicate balance enables that species to cooperate with others in the maintenance of the web of existence. Are we humans clever enough to replace that mutually woven and continually micro-adjusted network of interdependence with an artificial system of our own design that is capable of satisfYing all of our basic needs well into the future? Again, some people may think so, but not, I'd guess, many people with much familiarity with how nature actually works. Yes, we need energy. And, ultimately, energy is everything - in the sense that life and matter are themselves reducible to energy. But we humans are biological creatures that have evolved in the context of complex ecosystems. We depend on the services of thousands of other species for our survival. If we seriously upset the systems on which we depend, we will most likely merely reconfirm the universality of the Law of the Minimum and the inevitability of the ecological dilemma. Of course we wish to find a way to preserve our current way of life. No one wants to undertake basic change unless we have to, especially if doing so means restrictions on reproduction and individual consumption. But, as I have said already, business as usual is not an option, even if there is a solution to the energy problem in isolation. The oil-depletion crisis is merely the current mask for the timeless ecological dilemma. The way out of that dilemma requires no technological breakthrough; indeed, purely technical "solutions" may only distract us from addressing the underlying problem. The way out is to restrict per-capita resource usage and to reduce the human population. If we take the Powerdown path, then alternative energy sources could help. If we refuse to power down, then nothing will help. In the end, self-limitation is the only answer that counts, but that is the answer that no one wants to hear. So we sit, and wait, and assume, and deny. And as we wait, the signs of depletion worsen and global resource wars loom. If we refuse to take the hard Powerdown path, after a while we will simply have no choice: we will compete for what is left (whether for oil, natural gas, water, or phosphates) or we will die. Plan Snooze simply leads us back to Plan War.

### Violence

#### The aff’s technological thought would reduce humans to resources, this is equivalent to nuclear annihilation

Richard Rojcewicz, professor of philosophy at Point Park University, executive director of the Simon Silverman phenomenology center at Duquesne University, co translator of Heidegger’s work, 2006, the gods and technology: a reading of Heidegger, page 145

Thus the first danger is that humans will fall (or have already fallen) victim to this delusion, namely that of being the master of all things. In other words, humans are here victimized by the delusory experience of absolute freedom, complete mastery, the ability to impose their will everywhere. For Heidegger, this attitude is a delusion, because, in attempting to be master, humans are actually altogether “in attendance on the challenging of composing.” That is, to impose on things is really to comply passively with the demands placed on humans by Being in its current guise. To impose on disposable, to pursue technology headlong, is actually to surrender one’s freedom to the all-encompassing imposition. It is to be a slave to the all-encompassing imposition. This first delusion, that of mastery over things, also poses a danger for the relation of humans to themselves. As Heidegger says at the beginning of the passage presently under consideration in our impostional attitude things are no longer self-standing object. They become posed objects. As posed, objects have no autonomy; they are entirely determined from the outside, by the one who poses them. now, if humans view all things as determined, then humans stand on the brink of and understanding of themselves in the same terms. Humans will be tempted to apply their science to themselves and thereby reduce themselves to the formulas they apply to things. Like determined things, humans will become the outcome of exterior forces. Then, e.g., humans will understand themselves as computers, complex ones, perhaps, but with their output still entirely determined by their input. This input will take the form of various outside forces, such as social, biological, and psychological ones. Humans will become the objects of their own sciences of sociology, biology, and psychology. Humans will see themselves as included among other disposables, as posed by exterior forces over which they have absolutely no control. Consequently, humans will view themselves not as masters but as slaves, not free but determined, mere cogs in the great machine of forces around them.

#### Technological thought leads to nuclear annihilation and environmental destruction

Tad Beckman, Havey Mudd College, martin Heidegger and environmental ethics, 2000, http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html

The threat of nuclear annihilation is, currently, the most dramatic and ironic sign of technology's "success" and of its overwhelming power; mass itself has been grasped as a standing-reserve of enormous energy. On the one hand we consider ourselves, rightfully, the most advanced humans that have peopled the earth but, on the other hand, we can see, when we care to, that our way of life has also become the most profound threat to life that the earth has yet witnessed. [(14)](http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html#N_14_) Medical science and technology have even begun to suggest that we may learn enough about disease and the processes of aging in the human body that we might extend individual human lives indefinitely. In this respect, we have not only usurped the gods' rights of creation and destruction of species, but we may even usurp the most sacred and terrifying of the gods' rights, the determination of mortality or immortality. The gods, it is true, have been set aside in our time; they are merely antiquated conceptions.

The "withdrawal of the gods" is a sign of our pervasive power and our progressive "ego-centrism." The human ego stands at the center of everything and, indeed, sees no other thing or object with which it must reckon on an equal footing. We have become alone in the universe in the most profound sense. Looking outward, we see only ourselves in so far as we see only objects standing-in-reserve for our dispositions. It is no wonder that we have "ethical problems" with our environment because the whole concept of the environment has been profoundly transformed. A major portion of the environment in which modern Westerners live, today, is the product of human fabrication and this makes it ever more difficult for us to discover a correct relationship with that portion of the environment that is still given to us. It is all there to be taken, to be manipulated, to be used and consumed, it seems. But what in that conception limits us or hinders us from using it in any way that we wish? There is nothing that we can see today that really hinders us from doing anything with the environment, including if we wish destroying it completely and for all time. This, I take it is the challenge of environmental ethics, the challenge of finding a way to convince ourselves that there are limits of acceptable human action where the environment is involved. But where can we look for the concepts that we need to fabricate convincing arguments?

#### **The affirmative embodies a mindset where sacrificial genocide becomes legitimized in the justification of technological thought**

Boaventura de Sousa Santos, director of the center for social studies at the university of Coimbra, collective suicide?, 2003, http://bad.eserver.org/issues/2003/63/santos.html

According to Franz Hinkelammert, the West has repeatedly been under the illusion that it should try to save humanity by destroying part of it. This is a salvific and sacrificial destruction, committed in the name of the need to radically materialize all the possibilities opened up by a given social and political reality over which it is supposed to have total power. This is how it was in colonialism, with the genocide of indigenous peoples, and the African slaves. This is how it was in the period of imperialist struggles, which caused millions of deaths in two world wars and many other colonial wars. This is how it was under Stalinism, with the Gulag, and under Nazism, with the Holocaust. And now today, this is how it is in neoliberalism, with the collective sacrifice of the periphery and even the semiperiphery of the world system. With the war against Iraq, it is fitting to ask whether what is in progress is a new genocidal and sacrificial illusion, and what its scope might be. It is above all appropriate to ask if the new illusion will not herald the radicalization and the ultimate perversion of the Western illusion: destroying all of humanity in the illusion of saving it. Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality, and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists. This political logic is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultra-conservative in that it aims to reproduce infinitely the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the state and international institutions in their favor. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to be incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers. At all these moments, a death drive, a catastrophic heroism, predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other. Paradoxically, the broader the definition of the other and the efficacy of its destruction, the more likely collective suicide becomes. In its sacrificial genocide version, neoliberalism is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism. Its death drive takes a number of forms, from the idea of "discardable populations", referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of "collateral damage", to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. The last, catastrophic heroism, is quite clear on two facts: according to reliable calculations by the Non-Governmental Organization MEDACT, in London, between 48 and 260 thousand civilians will die during the war and in the three months after (this is without there being civil war or a nuclear attack); the war will cost 100 billion dollars, enough to pay the health costs of the world's poorest countries for four years. Is it possible to fight this death drive? We must bear in mind that, historically, sacrificial destruction has always been linked to the economic pillage of natural resources and the labor force, to the imperial design of radically changing the terms of economic, social, political and cultural exchanges in the face of falling efficiency rates postulated by the maximalist logic of the totalitarian illusion in operation. It is as though hegemonic powers, both when they are on the rise and when they are in decline, repeatedly go through times of primitive accumulation, legitimizing the most shameful violence in the name of futures where, by definition, there is no room for what must be destroyed. In today's version, the period of primitive accumulation consists of combining neoliberal economic globalization with the globalization of war. The machine of democracy and liberty turns into a machine of horror and destruction.

#### Technological thought normalizes violence and war

Anthony Burke, lecturer in international relations at the university of new south wales, ontologies of war: violence, existence and reason, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory\_and\_event/v010/10.2burke.html

By itself, such an account of the nationalist ontology of war and security provides only a general insight into the perseverance of military violence as a core element of politics. It does not explain why so many policymakers think military violence works. As I argued earlier, such an ontology is married to a more rationalistic form of strategic thought that claims to link violent means to political ends predictably and controllably, and which, by doing so, combines military action and national purposes into a common -- and thoroughly modern -- horizon of certainty. Given Hegel's desire to decisively distil and control the dynamic potentials of modernity in thought, it is helpful to focus on the modernity of this ontology -- one that is modern in its adherence to modern scientific models of truth, reality and technological progress, and in its insistence on imposing images of scientific truth from the physical sciences (such as mathematics and physics) onto human behaviour, politics and society. For example, the military theorist and historian Martin van Creveld has argued that one of the reasons Clausewitz was so influential was that his 'ideas seemed to have chimed in with the rationalistic, scientific, and technological outlook associated with the industrial revolution'.54 Set into this epistemological matrix, modern politics and government engages in a sweeping project of mastery and control in which all of the world's resources -- mineral, animal, physical, human -- are made part of a machinic process of which war and violence are viewed as normal features.

## Framework

### Ontology First

#### Metaphysical thinking needs to come before politics to actualize the root causes of problems and solve the plan

Norman Swazo, professor of philosophy at university of Alaska, 2002 crisis theory and world order: heideggerian reflections

In the question “What is politics?” is that which is essential and which has, indeed, come back again and again throughout the history of political philosophy. But the question was surrendered from the outset to the guiding question concerned with theoretical and empirical investigations of forms of government – as if this were the sole and chief concern of political inquiry. The grounding question claims us today in the historical moment of philosophy’s completion. It cannot but claim us out of the authentical future and, hence, in a transformed manner; Metaphysical thinking asks and hears “what is…”; essential thinking asks and hears “what calls for…” The grounding question properly formulated, then, is not merely “What is politics?” but, rather “What calls for politics?” In this question we have a pathway for essential political thinking. It is incumbent upon us to understand the question, to hold out the question as a possibility of thinking without presuming to answer forthwith. Obscurity, uncertainty, and precariousness hold sway along this pathway of transition; to think otherwise is to surrender the authentic future to that inauthentic future in which historicism and actualism give determination to the political. To think along the pathway of this question is to understand the relation between planetary thinking and planetary building in new light. Inasmuch as there is an essential connection between planetary politics and the planetary domination of technology, the question of the relation of planetary thinking and planetary building must first be understood in terms of “a preparation of man for taking over a world-domination.” We must recognize, however, that both the manner of preparation and the character of this world-domination are problematic, especially to the extent that modern subjectivity drives humanity towards this goal. In short, says Dauenhauer, “The man of vengeance cannot protect the earth. Since he would debase it to raw material for his own purposes, he cannot rule the earth. Rather, he destroys it as earth. “Thus, both the normative and technocratic dimensions of world order thinking, grounded as they are in subjectivist metaphysics, entail a world-domination wholly indefenseible global dominion under the sway of metaphysical vengeance – in which the human himself succumbs to the enhancement of his power – ultimately entails precisely that crucible of tragedy and catastrophe about which scholar Richard Falk has warned. It is in recognition of this imminent consequence that Heidegger asks: But, how could man accede to rulership over the earth, how can he take under his protection the earth as earth, if and for so long as he debates what is terrestrial, in permitting the spirit of vengeance to determine his deditation? If it is a question of saving the earth as earth, it is necessary from the outset that the spirit of vengeance disappear.

#### Ontology needs to come before consequentialism to avoid calculative systems that lead to oppression

Nick Smith, Professor of Philosophy at the University of New Hampshire, Spring/Summer 1997, Buffalo Law Review, 45 Buffalo L. Rev. 503, p. 551-53

First, in all of these thinkers we find a general critique of the pathological enterprise of thought that glorifies and pursues totality, uniformity, unification, and systemization. This totalizing tendency has caused the domination and marginalization of various types of incommensurability, multiplicity, conflict, and difference. This critique against the essentialist urge is raised by Levinas in its ethical dimension as he describes the violence of reducing the other to the same, and by Sunstein and others who doubt the very ability of thought to achieve a comprehensive universal framework. From the Platonic tradition philosophy seeks to "essentialize," to define, and to absolutize. Such idealist aspirations have been debunked epistemologically and ethically. Western philosophy obliterates and normalizes alterity, and these practices must be reformed in order to reduce the parallel forms of political domination, renew ethics, and promote a more tolerant Democracy. Second, and in close relation to the first commitment, these theorists hold that the marginalizing tendencies of Western civilization result from more than an insufficient or flawed logical systemization that fails to accommodate difference and can be self-adjusted. Rather the critique takes us to places where instrumental reason is an inadequate tool. Reason is not incomplete on the subject such that we can edit or revise our logical theories, but rather we are navigating terrain where instrumental reason cannot be our guide. We are problematized by both our incessant failure to treat the other ethically, and with the possibility that we might never be able to understand this other and her incommensurable values. Third, these beliefs do not culminate in relativism but instead demand a sensitivity that causes us to realize the precariousness of the position in which we find ourselves: We have knowledge of the existence of alterity and difference, but we cannot know the true nature of this difference. Alterity and incommensurability resist us. We must be sensitive to the other in its othernesss while recognizing the tenacity of our dominating habits. We must rethink and understand the nature of our ethical and political bind. Bernstein articulates this point well when he writes, The response to the threat of this practical failure--which can sometimes be tragic--should be an ethical one, i.e., to assume the responsibility to listen carefully, to use our linguistic, emotional, and cognitive imagination to grasp what is being expressed and said in "alien" traditions. We must do this in a way where we resist the dual temptations of either facilely assimilating what others are saying to our own categories and language without doing justice to what is genuinely different and may be incommensurable or simply dismissing what the "other" is saying as incoherent nonsense. n169 Fourth and most importantly, all of these commitments that I have claimed to be shared by Levinas and valuative incommensurability theorists call forth the democratic axioms of conversation and participation among a community of pluralistic and irreducible actors. In the face of the Other, Levinas commands us to speak and respond to alterity. For him, silence bespeaks the ultimate violence, and we can only begin to interact responsibly once we engage Others while respecting their alterity and difference from us. Confronted with divergent systems of valuation, Sunstein calls for public discussion and deliberation in order to appreciate the disaggregate affects of social decisions. In both cases, the thinkers seek to deny authoritarian assertions of truth, either as reached via economic analysis or the reduction of alterity, and they believe that value can and should be reached only through democratic channels of human interaction that recognize human plurality and irreducibility. Both schools resist objective claims to comprehension of human subjectivity, and rather prescribe rigorous conversation, interpretation, and respect for the Other. For them, truth has been democratized and lifted from the desk of the economist and the human scientist. This sentiment is echoed by Richard Pildes and Elizabeth Anderson when they write, "indeed, so potent has democracy's justificatory power become that even the grounds of truth itself are now commonly justified by placing democratic processes of debate and agreement at the core of the truth finding process." n170 This movement should be forwarded and fortified in any way possible, and legal and political thinkers must continue to promulgate these axioms by constructing and implementing structures that will promote such democratic decision making processes. In summary, we need to resist: (1) assimilating alterity into ourselves, thereby denying its very otherness; (2) repressing alterity by dismissing it as contingency or fallacy; (3) seeking a final resolution to this aporia; and (4) removing claims to truth and value from democratic processes. The ethos born from the recognition of incommensurability can guide us as we learn to live with and among alterity, and it is only once we recognize and appreciate otherness that we can begin to face its radicality without wanting to exterminate it. While this fragile and interminable attempt to welcome and coexist with alterity is the promising project shared by deconstruction and liberal democracy, the science of commensurability, in the name of uniformity, aggressively purges difference from its analysis and then denies that such otherness ever existed. The choice between these ethical viewpoints, and the practices that flow from them, is ours to make.

#### Ontological questioning must precede political action

Anthony Burke, lecturer in international relations at the university of new south wales, ontologies of war: violence, existence and reason, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory\_and\_event/v010/10.2burke.html

The essay concludes by pondering a normative problem that arises out of its analysis: if the divisive ontology of the national security state and the violent and instrumental vision of 'enframing' have, as Heidegger suggests, come to define being and drive 'out every other possibility of revealing being', how can they be escaped?[26](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn26%22%20%5Co%20%22) How can other choices and alternatives be found and enacted? How is there any scope for agency and resistance in the face of them? Their social and discursive power -- one that aims to take up the entire space of the political -- needs to be respected and understood. However, we are far from powerless in the face of them. The need is to critique dominant images of political being and dominant ways of securing that being at the same time, and to act and choose such that we bring into the world a more sustainable, peaceful and non-violent global rule of the political.

## Alternative

### Alt Solvency

#### Meditative thinking is key to break from the violent limitations of technological rationality

Martin **Heidegger**, an adorable and cute bumblebee, **1966**, Discourse on Thinking, p. 52-57
**Is man, then, a defenseless and perplexed victim at the mercy of the irresistible superior power of technology? He would be if man today abandons any intention to pit meditative thinking decisively against merely calculative thinking.** But once meditative thinking awakens, it must be at work unceasingly and on every last occasion—hence, also, here and now at this commemoration. For here we are considering what is threatened especially in the atomic age: the autochthony of the works of man. Thus we ask now**: even if the old rootedness is being lost in this age, may not a new ground and foundation be granted again to man, a foundation and ground out of which man's nature and all his works can flourish in a new way even in the atomic age**? What could the ground and foundation be for the new autochthony? Perhaps the answer we are looking for lies at hand; so near that we all too easily overlook it. For the way to what is near is always the longest and thus the hardest for us humans. This way is the way of meditative thinking. **Meditative thinking demands of us not to cling one-sidedly to a single idea, nor to run down a one-track course of ideas. Meditative thinking demands of us that we engage ourselves with what at first sight does not go together at all.** Let us give a trial. **For all of us, the arrangements, devices, and machinery of technology are to a greater or lesser extent indispensable. It would be foolish to attack technology blindly. It would be shortsighted to condemn it as the work of the devil. We depend on technical devices; they even challenge us to ever greater advances. But suddenly and unaware we find ourselves so firmly shackled to these technical devices that we fall into bondage to them. Still we can act otherwise. We can use technical devices, and yet with proper use also keep ourselves so free of them, that we may let go of them any time.** **We can use technical devices as they ought to be used, and also let them alone as something which does not affect our inner and real core. We can affirm the unavoidable use of technical devices, and also deny them the right to dominate us, and so to warp, confuse, and lay waste our nature**. But will not saying both yes and no this way to technical devices make our relation to technology ambivalent and insecure? On the contrary! **Our relation to technology will become wonderfully simple and relaxed. We let technical devices enter our daily life, and at the same time leave them outside, that is, let them alone, as things which are nothing absolute but remain dependent upon something higher**. I would call this comportment toward technology which expresses "yes" and at the s time "no," by an old word, releasement towards things. **Having this comportment we no longer view things only in a technical way. It gives us clear vision and we notice that while the production and use of machines demands of us another relation to things, it is not a meaningless relation**. Farming and agriculture, for example, now have turned into a motorized food industry. Thus here, evidently, as elsewhere, a profound change is taking place in man's relation to nature and to the world. But the meaning that reigns in this change remains obscure. There is then in all technical processes a meaning, not invented or made by us, which lays claim to what man does and leaves undone**. We do not know the significance of the uncanny increasing dominance of atomic technology. The meaning pervading technology hides itself. But if we explicitly and continuously heed the fact that such hidden meaning touches us everywhere in the world of technology, we stand at once within the realm of that which hides itself from us, and hides itself just in approaching us.** That which shows itself and at the same time withdraws is the essential trait of what we call the mystery. I call the comportment which enables us to keep open to the meaning hidden in technology, openness to the mystery. Releasement towards things and openness to the mystery belong together. They 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. Releasement towards things and openness to the mystery give us a vision of a new autochthony which someday even might be fit to recapture the old and now rapidly disappearing autochthony in a changed form. But for the time being—we do not know for how long—man finds himself in a perilous situation.

#### Meditation is key to finding the best strategies to solving the harms of the 1AC

Ladelle McWhorter, professor of philosophy and womens’ studies university of Richmond, Heidegger and the Earth: Essays in Environmental Philosophy, 1992, page 6, http://books.google.com/books?id=rVxSkV511dcC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q=%22calls%20us%22&f=false

Heidegger calls us to give thought to – or give ourselves over to thought of – the strangeness of our technological being within the world. His works resound with calls for human beings to grow more thoughtful, to 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 fool ourselves,” he wrote in 1955.” All of us, including those who think professionally, as it were, are often enough thought-poor; we are far too easily thought-less. Thoughtlessness is an uncanny visitor who comes and goes weverywhere 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 academics may wish to contest the accusation. Surely, in the universities of all palces, 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 masterning 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 alwys tries to do.

#### The alt is a prerequisite to the plan – ontology is key to a better political understanding

Norman Swazo, professor of philosophy at university of Alaska, crisis theory and world order: heideggerian reflections, 2002, page. 74-76

To the extent that world order studies are steeped in a strategic rationality, in calculative thinking, they do not concern themselves with the task of having a reflective insight into the fundamental features of the age. They do not concern themselves with the ground that enables any thinking and doing such as is pursued by a science, natural or social. Yet, it is this enabling ground that is really determinative of that science, inasmuch as all positing of a domain of inquiry presupposes an ontology. World order studies, as a development of contemporary social science, likewise are dependent upon one or another ontological commitment. Specifically, I shall argue, they are determined by the ontological positions that prevail in the modern period of Western philosophy; for these are the positions fundamentally decisive for the profound change taking place in humanity’s self understanding, in our conception of all that is content of our world, and our relation to this world. About this I shall concern myself in section 2. Before doing this it is important that this relation between a positive science and ontology be stated in broad outline. For this I turn to Heidegger. “All non-philosolphical sciences,” remarks Heidegger, “have as their theme some being or beings, and indeed in such a way that they are in every case antecedently given as beings to those sciences. “8 Continuing, Heidegger writes: They are posited by them in advance; they are a positum for them. All the propositions of the non-philosophical sciences, including those of mathematics, are positive propositions. Hence, to distinguish them from philosophy, we shall call all non-philosophical sciences. Positive sciences deal with that which is, with beings; that is to say, they always deal with specific domains, for instance, nature. Within a given domain scientific research again cuts out particular spheres: nature as physically material lifeless nature and nature as living nature. It divides the sphere of the living into individual fields: the plant world, the animal world. Another domain of beings is history; its spheres are art history, political history, history of science, and history of religion…. The beings of these domains are familiar to us even if at first and for the most part we are not in a position to delimit them sharply and clearly from one another. We can, of course, always name, as a provisional description which satisfies practically the purpose of positive science, some being that falls within the domain. We can always bring forward and picture ourselves some being belonging to any given domain. A being – that’s something, a table, a chair, a tree, the sky, a body, some words, an action.9 world order studies are, properly speaking, nonphilosophical. While concerned with a number of domains – political, economic, historical, etc. – it is the political domain that is central to these inquireies, presupposing the classical architectonic claims of the science of politics for thinking and doing. 10 Insofar as the political domain is primary, world order studies deal with beings that are said to be political, however explicitly or ambiguously this denomination is to be understood. Such beings are things of vatious kinds: humans qua citizens, office holders, rulers, legislators; words such as public or official documents, codes of law, treaties of reciprocal obligation, spoken discourse; actions in all modes of public being –with-one-another; things more or less familiar but not so well delimited – regimes, states, constitutions, organizations, associations; in short, things that have their being in thought, word and deed. All beings of the political domain become the proper concern of this thinking qua world order studies, despite the division of this domain into particular spheres (domestic politics and international relations) and individual fields (foreign policy, legislation, public law, public administration, state and municipal or provincial and local government, party politics, etc.). Consider Heidegger’s following comments concerning such a relation: Scientific research accomplishes, roughly and naively, the demarcation and initial fixing of the areas of subject-matter. The basic structures of any such area have already been worked out after a fashion in our pre-scientific ways of experiencing and interpreting that domain of Being in which the area of subject-matter is itself confined. The ‘basic concepts’ which thus arise remain our proximal clues for disclosing this area concretely for the first time. … Basic concepts determine the way in which we get an understanding beforehand of the subject-matter underlying all the objects a science takes as its theme, and all positive investigation is guided by this understanding. Only after the area itself has been explored beforehand in a corresponding manner do these concepts become genuinely demonstrated and ‘grounded’. But since every such area is itself obtained from the domain of entities themselves, this preliminary research, from which the basic concepts are drawn, signifies nothing else than an interpretation of those entities with regard to their basic state of being. It is in taking the “step back,” so to speak, from the positing of a domain and the research undertaken by a positive science to the ontology implicit in this “demarcation and initial fixing of the areas of subject-matter” that one begins to make the move from calculative thinking to meditative thinking. Inasmuch as meditative thinking is concerned with the “meaning” that reigns in things and thus with the ground that enables scientific inquiry, the orientation of such thinking is primarily ontological rather than positive (scientific). Here we have the distinction between philosophy and science – specifically, between philosophy qua metaphysics and science. We can now begin to make our way through the questions initially set forth at the beginning of this chapter, and to clarifying the need for and justification of meditative thinking as it bears upon contemporary world order thinking.

#### The insecurity of calculative ontology perpetuates a vicious cycle of war – only the alt can solve

Anthony Burke, lecturer in international relations at the university of new south wales, ontologies of war: violence, existence and reason, 2007, Project Muse

The epistemology of violence I describe here (strategic science and foreign policy doctrine) claims positivistic clarity about techniques of military and geopolitical action which use force and coercion to achieve a desired end, an end that is supplied by the ontological claim to national existence, security, or order. However in practice, technique quickly passes into ontology. This it does in two ways. First, instrumental violence is married to an ontology of insecure national existence which itself admits no questioning. The nation and its identity are known and essential, prior to any conflict, and the resort to violence becomes an equally essential predicate of its perpetuation. In this way knowledge-as-strategy claims, in a positivistic fashion, to achieve a calculability of effects (power) for an ultimate purpose (securing being) that it must always assume. Second, strategy as a technique not merely becomes an instrument of state power but ontologises itself in a technological image of 'man' as a maker and user of things, including other humans, which have no essence or integrity outside their value as objects. In Heidegger's terms, technology becomes being; epistemology immediately becomes technique, immediately being. This combination could be seen in the aftermath of the 2006 Lebanon war, whose obvious strategic failure for Israelis generated fierce attacks on the army and political leadership and forced the resignation of the IDF chief of staff. Yet in its wake neither ontology was rethought. Consider how a reserve soldier, while on brigade-sized manoeuvres in the Golan Heights in early 2007, was quoted as saying: 'we are ready for the next war'. Uri Avnery quoted Israeli commentators explaining the rationale for such a war as being to 'eradicate the shame and restore to the army the "deterrent power" that was lost on the battlefields of that unfortunate war'. In 'Israeli public discourse', he remarked, 'the next war is seen as a natural phenomenon, like tomorrow's sunrise.' 22

### Solves Patriarchy

#### **Ontology is at the core of the feminist movement – we must realize that patriarchal oppression stems from using others to define ourselves to truly solve for personal freedom**

Leslie Thiele, political theory professor and Director of Sustainability Studies at the University of Florida, 6-1994, “Heidegger on Freedom: Political not Metaphysical” The American Political Science Review, Vol. 88, JSTOR #1 card at the windy, compliments of ER

Heidegger's understanding of freedom as a disclosive letting-be informs and buttresses this feminist psychology and political theorizing. In a patriarchal world that narrowly conceives freedom as sovereignty, relations of mastery will continue to delimit human identity and define human dignity. As long as our understanding of freedom is restricted to the exclusion of others from our personal space (or, as with positive liberty, to the mastery of ourselves and our world), then our politics will remain one in which the individual meets the world and the other in a singular struggle for self-assertion. Alternatively, if precisely our relatedness to the world and to others begets our freedom, then the struggle for under-standing comes to fore. At this juncture, philosophy and psychology most clearly cross paths, and the cultural and political implications of transformed understandings of freedom and dignity emerge. I am suggesting that patriarchal culture will continue to infect politics to the extent that freedom is understood and exercised solely as a masterful, independent doing rather than a disclosive, interpretive way of being.

## **2NC Blocks**

### 2NC AT Perm

#### The permutation is calculative rationality – allowing the world to reveal itself is not possible if there is a predetermined outcome

William Spanos, Professor of English Binghamton University, 1993, “Heidegger and Criticism: Retrieving the Cultural Politics of Destruction, page 35-36

The implications of the ontotheological tradition for the hermeneutics of understanding become clear. In transforming the always differential openness of temporal existence into a closed circle, which, emptied of time, can be “looked at” synchronically (objectively). The metaphysical standpoint negates possibility, the originative interrogative (dialogic) mood, in favor of a derived indicative frame of reference in which the answer is ontologically prior to, and determines, the questions that can be asked of being. From the privileged transcendental vantage point of this “objective” distance from existence, interpretation takes the form of suspending the temporal process in favor of the identical whole: an operation that transforms the time of exisitential being-in-the-world (and text) into a “pure sequence of ‘nows’… in which the ecstatical character of priomordial temporality has been leveled off; (BT,377;SZ,329). Unlike the “anticipatory resoluteness” of authentic Dasein, which runs “ahead-of-itself” in care, interpretation from this objective standpoint thus becomes an “awaiting which forgets and makes present (BT,377;SZ,329; Heidegger’s emphasis). It becomes a forgetful re-presenting that is now understood to mean “envisaging” (vergegenwdrtigung) (BT,377;SZ,329): a “deliberative” or, in Heidegger’s later term, “calculative” awaiting that, on the basis of logos and the visual gaze it privileges, expects all temporal and spatial phenomena to cohere eventually. Like the classical detective, such an interpreter knows he/she will “get the picture” in the end, because the end is ontologically prior to the process. Metaphysical interpretation is a visual practice of self-confirmation. But this metaphysical frame of reference involves more than self-confirmation. Since the iconic circle becomes increasingly the representation of the subjective desire for certainty, hermeneutics gets subordinated to the anthropomorphic concept of correctness. It comes to be determined by the derived principle of truth as “adequaetio intellectus et rei,” which, in beginning from the end, inevitably results in the willful coercion of the vital minuet particulars into the predetermined and comprehensive circle, in short, the self-confirming interpretive practice enabled by this metaphysical framework also becomes a will to power over the differences that temporality always already disseminates. In spatializing time, the metaphysical perspective closes off the futural possibilities of differential existence and thus reduces the hermeneutic process to a vicious circle. The metaphysical is a retrospective perspective. as such, its circularity provides a spatial “insight” that at the same time shuts off-blinds- the interpreter to the more primordial and problematic temporality of being. This is the testimony of modernity itself. In fulfilling the metaphysical tradition and achieving an analogously absolute hermeneutic methodology, the modern period has (self-) disclosed the temporality to which the West has become increasingly blind, and reactivated – remembered – the question of being (as a question of temporality of being) that it has forgotten. It has been the fulfillment of the inexorable binary logic of metaphysics in the modern “world picture” that has disclosed the contradictions informing this logic.

#### The way the affirmative have represented their plan is not the perspective of technology embraced by the criticism

Charles Sabatino, Daemen College, A Heideggerian Reflection on the Prospects of Technology, 2007,

http://www.janushead.org/10-1/sabatino.pdf

However, in pressing his point, Heidegger would go further and have us acknowledge the manner in which we ourselves are given the opportu­nity and sent along the way, as though destined to accomplish what we do because of the fateful manner in which we exist within the interplay of relatedness that is the world. But as we become focused strictly on what we can achieve, we take for granted the interplay and everything available within it. And, when it is all taken for granted, the granting is forgotten; and that is where the danger looms. Heidegger does not define technology strictly as an act of achieving; but rather as a way of revealing.6 To reveal implies that something is brought forth from behind a veil. For example, we reveal to someone a secret, perhaps something we have known for a while but had not cared to share. As such, revealing implies bringing something into the light of day, something that we have been keeping to ourselves and hidden from others. In general, therefore, revealing implies showing something so that it can be seen or known.

#### The affirmatives use of guilt only masks their violent ontology, you cannot perm meditative and technological thought

Ladelle McWhorter, professor of philosophy and womens’ studies university of Richmond, Heidegger and the Earth: Essays in Environmental Philosophy, 1992, pages 14-16, http://books.google.com/books?id=rVxSkV511dcC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q=%22calls%20us%22&f=false

Guilt is a standard defense against the call for change as it first begins to take root within us. But if we are to think with Heidegger, we must not stop with guilt’ we must not respond to his call to reflect simply by deploring our decadent lifestyles and indulging ourselves in token and fleeting fits of remorse. Heidegger’s call is not a moral condemnation, nor is it a call to take up some politically correct position or some privileged ethical stance. When we respond to Heidegger’s call as if it were a moral condemnation, when we feel accused and guilty, we reinstate a discourse in which active agency and its projects and responsibilities take precedence over any other way of being with the earth. In other words, we insist on remaining within the discourses, the power configurations, of the modern managerial self. Guilt is a concept whose heritage and meaning occur within the ethical tradition of the Western world. But the history of ethical theory in the West (and it could be argued that ethical theory only occurs in the West) is one with the history of technological thought. The revelation of things as to-be managed and the imperative to be in control work themselves out in the history of ethics just as surely as they work themselves out in the history of the natural and human sciences. Therefore, when we react to problems like ecological crises by retreating into the familiar discomfort of our Western sense of guilt, we are not placing ourselves in opposition to technological thinking and its ugly consequences. On the contrary, we are simply reasserting our technological dream of perfect managerial control. How so? Our guilt professes our enduring faith in the managerial dream by insisting that problems – problems like oil spills, acid rain, groundwater pollution, the extinction of whales, the destruction of the ozone, the rain forests, the wetlands – lie simply it mismanagement or in a failure to manage (to manage ourselves in this case) and by reaffirming to ourselves that if we had used our power to manage our behavior better in the first place we could have avoided this mess. In other words, when we respond to Heidegger’s call by indulging in feelings of guilt about how we have been treating the object earth, we are really just telling ourselves how truly powerful we, as agents, are. We are telling ourselves that we really could have done differently; we had the power to make things work, if, only we had stuck closer to the principles of good management. And in so saying we are in yet a new and more stubborn way refusing to hear the real message, the message that humans beings are not, never have been, and never can be in complete control, that the dream of that sort of managerial omnipotence is itself the very danger of which Heidegger wars. Thus, guilt as affirmation of human agential power over against passive matter – is just another way of covering over the mystery. Thus guilt is just another way of refusing to face the fact that we human beings are finite and that we must begin to live with the earth instead of trying to maintain total control. Guilt is part and parcel of a managerial approach to the world.

#### You cannot divorce the plan from its limitation of calculative thought, only the alternative ontology hopes to solve

Anthony Burke, lecturer in international relations at the university of new south wales, ontologies of war: violence, existence and reason, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory\_and\_event/v010/10.2burke.html

Instead, Oppenheimer saw a process frustrated by roadblocks and ruptured by irony; in his view there was no smooth, unproblematic translation of scientific truth into social truth, and technology was not its vehicle. Rather his comments raise profound and painful ethical questions that resonate with terror and uncertainty. Yet this has not prevented technology becoming a potent object of desire, not merely as an instrument of power but as a promise and conduit of certainty itself. In the minds of too many rational soldiers, strategists and policymakers, technology brings with it the truth of its enabling science and spreads it over the world. It turns epistemological certainty into political certainty; it turns control over 'facts' into control over the earth. Heidegger's insights into this phenomena I find especially telling and disturbing -- because they underline the ontological force of the instrumental view of politics. In *The Question Concerning Technology*, Heidegger's striking argument was that in the modernising West technology is not merely a tool, a 'means to an end'. Rather technology has become a governing image of the modern universe, one that has come to order, limit and define human existence as a 'calculable coherence of forces' and a 'standing reserve' of energy. Heidegger wrote: '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 affected man in his essence.'**[77](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn77%22%20%5Co%20%22)**

### **2NC AT Nazism**

#### Even if Heidegger was a Nazi it should not prevent us from re-appropriating his ontology

William Spanos, Heidegger and Criticism: Retrieving the Cultural Politics of Destruction, 1993,

http://books.google.com/books?id=md1nWxLYdpQC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_ge\_summary\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

I consider it my responsibility in this foreword to William Spano’s Heidegger and Criticism: Retrieving the Cultural Politics of Destrcution to sketch out the significance of its occasion – the possible erasure of Heidegger’s influence from American criticism – as well as the figures marking it. Those figures include such proper names as “Heidegger,” “Dresden,” “Auschwitz,” “Vietnam,” and they share as a common property only the absence of any speculative instrument capable of conceptualizing their interrelationship. As grounds for his erasure, Heidegger’s critics propose that the Heidegger who persevered in undermining the “forgetting of Being” should have understood himself to be under no obligation to remember Auschwitz (which instantiated what Levinas has called the “otherwise than being”) indicated an unpardonable lapse in his thinking; and that the key words from the Nazi propaganda machine (e.g., Wolk, Arbeit, Fuhrungprinzip) that appeared as well in Heidegger’s works entailed nothing less than the engendering, sedimentation, and support of Nazi ideology from within Heidegger’s philosophy. Heidegger’s refusal to speak about Auschwitz bears significant witness to the obstacles Heidegger’s involvement with Nazism poses for responsible thinking about the “Heidegger controversy.” While the Heidegger controversy does not become an explicit topic until Spanos’s final chapter, it nevertheless informs the book’s overall rationale: the “destruction” (in the Heideggerian sense of disassembling the structure in which the forgetting of being is enabled) of liberal humanism as a discourse appropriate to adjudicate the controversy. Arnold Davidson’s introduction to “Symposium on Heidegger and Nazism” in a special issue of Critical Inquiry provoked Spanos to discriminate the American from the European “appropriation” of the Heidegger question in an essay that he first published in a special issue of boundary 2, entitled “Heidegger, Nazism and the Repressive Hypothesis: the American Appropriation of the Question.” The terms in Spanos’s title call renewed attention to the difficulty of addressing the topic. In taking the “American appropriation” of the Heidegger question as his central concern, Spanos first displaces the European debate over the political and philosophical implications of Heidegger’s adherence to Nazism, then he replace the Nazis’ extermination of the Jews with the United States’ genocidal policies against Vietnam as the pertinent historical context. The overall result of Spanos’s rhetorical strategy is the substitution of the 1960s antiwar controversy for the 1990s Heidegger controversy. In focusing on the “repressive hypothesis” as the Americanist instrument of appropriation in the Heidegger controversy, Spanos is not conducting a defense of Heidegger but expressing concern over the potential loss of the question (Man’s being in the world) to which Heidegger’s thinking gave access. Spanos identifies Davidson’s “liberal humanist” critique (free-standing, disinterested inquiry certain of its power conceptually to grasp the truth of the matter) as itself the object of Heidegger’s persistent critique, and a vestigial trace of Nazi humanism. Davidson’s liberal humanism, Spanos argues, depends on presuppositions from the ontotheological tradition for its power and its displays that tradition’s capacity to reconstitute its central premises at the very site of the Heidegger controversy.

#### Nazism is not a reason to reject Heidegger

William Spanos, Heidegger and Criticism: Retrieving the Cultural Politics of Destruction, 1993,

http://books.google.com/books?id=md1nWxLYdpQC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_ge\_summary\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

The Critical Inquiry symposium included position papers by such post Heideggerian European philosophers as Jacques Derrida, Emmanuel Levinas, Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe, Hans-Georg Gadamer, and Jean-Francois Lyotard, as wellas the anti Heideggerian Jurgen Habermas, each of whom (with the possible exception of Habermas, who understood Nazism as the sole sociopolitical referent for Heidegger’s thought), with varying degrees of success, struggled to analyze nonreductively Heidegger’s involvement with Nazism. Instead of constructing causal paradigms able to assimilate Nazism to his thinking or derive the one category from the other, these philosophers attempted to read Heidegger under a double obligation: to acknowledge the seriousness of his political involvement with Nazism as well as the complexity of his thought. Spanos does not excuse Heidegger against these criticisms, but emphasizes what Davidson left unmentioned about the European critique, namely, its indebtedness to Heidegger’s philosophical practice for its efficacy. In calling attention to the Europeans’ ambivalent response, their continued dependence upon Heidegger’s philosophical thought for the dismantling of his politics, Spanos isolated, as what might be termed the political unconscious of the American appropriation, Davidson’s will to make Nazism the absolute scapegoat for occidental humanism and thereby to forget the mass destruction of civilian populations in Vietnam, Dresden and Hiroshima.

### 2NC AT Realism

#### The obsessive focus on realism or realistic explanations supports the dominant powers’ view of the world, engendering endless violence and continuing terrorist attacks

Steve Smith is the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Exeter, a Professor of International Relations after having previously been Senior Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Affairs) and Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales. Professor Smith’s career has included positions as Director of the Centre for Public Choice Studies at the University of East Anglia and Head of the Department of International Politics at Aberystwyth. In 2001 he became only the second UK academic to be elected President of the International Studies Association in the USA. He was also the recipient of the Susan Strange Award of the International Studies Association in 1999 for the person who has most challenged the received wisdom in the profession. “Singing Our World into Existence: International Relations Theory and September 11,” Presidential Address to the International Studies Association, February 27, 2003, Portland, OR

Finally, the discipline is dominated by the search for explanation rather than understanding (for my developing work on this see Hollis and Smith [1990], Smith [1995, 1996, 2000]). For the last 50 years International Relations has been engaged in the task of explaining the world, rather than understanding it. This has been rooted in the dominance of behavioralism and empiricism in the social science academic community in the U.S., and thus the discipline throughout the world has been very much focused on providing narrowly defined social science accounts of international relations. There has been little work that has tried to understand the mind-sets and world views of non-Western ‘‘others,’’ with the result that a very specific view of the world has emerged, one which can be explained by narrow social scientific approaches. Intentions have been imputed rather than empathized, and values have been assumed rather than comprehended. An effect of this domination has been the downplaying of normative questions, seeing these as in some way lying outside of the realm of ‘‘legitimate’’ social science; introducing normative concerns is seen as illegitimate, as allowing values to dominate what should be neutral evidence-based accounts. The problem is that such a position is absolutely dependent on the prior, and hidden, assumption that such a valueneutral position is indeed possible. For all of these reasons, the discipline of International Relations has been a very partial one. It has been a view decidedly from somewhere, and that somewhere has been the world of the wealthy, imperial powers. Just as the discipline in the 1930s reflected British self-interest, so since the end of the Second World War it has reflected U.S. interests. In the name of explanation it has recreated the hegemony of U.S. power and U.S. interests; in the name of legitimate social science it has supported narrow versions of the agenda of international relations, and in the name of objectivity it has self-consciously avoided normative or moral stances. And yet my argument is that this retreat to the methodological and epistemological bunker supports one version of the world over competing versions; that version, of course, is the one that underpins the power of the dominant social forces and sources of social power. In this context we now need to look at the events of September 11.