## 1

#### As a Chinese female, I recognize my privilege and the opportunities America has given me. However, I also recognize how the state and the institution has oppressed minorities.

#### Mathematics – Mos Def

Yo, it's one universal law but two sides to every story

Three strikes and you be in for life, manditory

Four MC's murdered in the last four years

I ain't tryin to be the fifth one, the millenium is here

Yo it's 6 Million Ways to Die, from the seven deadly thrills

Eight-year olds gettin found with 9 mill's

It's 10 P.M., where your seeds at? What's the deal

He on the hill puffin krill to keep they belly filled

Light in the ass with heavy steel, sights on the pretty shit in life

Young soldiers tryin to earn they next stripe

When the average minimum wage is $5.15

You best believe you gotta find a new ground to get cream

The white unemployment rate, is nearly more than triple for black

so frontliners got they gun in your back

Bubblin crack, jewel theft and robbery to combat poverty

and end up in the global jail economy

Stiffer stipulations attached to each sentence

Budget cutbacks but increased police presence

And even if you get out of prison still livin

join the other five million under state supervision

This is business, no faces just lines and statistics

from your phone, your zip code, to S-S-I digits

#### White supremacy is built on the practice and promotion of racism on a global level

Rabaka, 7

(Reiland Rabaka, 4 August 2007, The Souls of White Folks, W.E.B. Du Bois’s Critique of White Supremacy and Contributions to Critical White Studies,Department of Ethnic Studies Center for Studies of Ethnicity and Race in America (CSERA),University of Colorado-Boulder, Ketchum)

In his critique of the global aspects of white supremacy, Du Bois engaged its origins and evolution, locating its genesis, uniqueness and ubiquitousness in European imperial global expansion, domination, and colonization. What distinguished white supremacy from local, national and regional racisms, such as those that exist between certain non-white groups, is its international imperial nature and modern world-historic influence and effects. At the heart of the history of white supremacy, as quiet as it is kept, is a prolonged practice and promotion of an extremely acute form of cultural racism and cultural theft. For Du Bois, whites were “super-men” and “world-mastering demi-gods” with “feet of clay” (1995a, p. 456). By which he meant, whites, with all their claims of superiority and “superhumanity,” were or appeared super-strong because they built their empire(s) on the inventions and innovations, and on the cultures and contributions of the people of color they colonized (p. 457). But, as the “super-men” with “feet of clay” comment reveals, the colored and colonized were well aware of whites’ weakness(es), of their Achilles’ heel(s): Their imperial push for global domination, that is, their centuries spanning project(s) of setting up systems of oppression unwittingly and ironically created intra-imperial cultural tensions, racist sibling rivalries amongst themselves, and also created the context and laid the foundation for the very anti-imperial colored/colonized hammer that would smash the imperial white “super-men’s” “feet of clay.”

#### Whiteness is performed. Within debate space it is not simply enough to be ‘antiracist,’ but rather changing the way we perform ourselves in the debate space is the only way to combat whiteness.

Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley et al, 13

(Dr. Shanara R. Reid-Brinkley, PhD, Assistant Professor of Public Address and Advocacy, Director of Debate, William Pitt Debating Union, Amber Kelsie, M.A., Nicholas Brady, 2013, http://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/, Accessed 1/25/14, NC)

There is no racism without bodies coded and trained through practice. There are subjectivities that are raced which means that there are bodies that “look white” that are implicated in whiteness. White privilege in this frame can be recognized as an unearned benefit while offering a position of redemption when privilege is used toward anti-racist efforts. Yet, one can simultaneously be engaged in good anti-racist work as a white person, while engaging in political and social actions that reproduce privilege. And yet, we already recognize that whiteness is not just about skin color, though we cannot deny the existence of white-skin privilege. Whiteness is normative—it produces behavioral and performative patterns that sustain the significance of whiteness as a signifier. Bankey critiques what he calls “Reid-Brinkley’s model for resistance in the flesh” as a failed political project with dangerous implications for contemporary debate practice.

#### Hip Hop Lives – KRS-One

Hip means to know, it's a form of intelligence

To be hip is to be update and relevant

Hop is a form of movement

You can't just observe a hop, you gotta hop up and do it

Hip and hop is more than music

Hip is the knowledge, hop is the movement

Hip and Hop is intelligent movement

Or relevant movement we sellin the music

So write this down on your black books and journals

Hip hop culture is eternal

Run and tell all your friends

An ancient civilization has bee born again, it's a fact

#### Hip Hop is an intelligent movement that functions to break down the normative culture of debate and creates a potential for radical communal change.

Dr. Reid-Brinkley, 8

("THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE")

For these debaters, **the use of hip hop functions to create an aesthetic community within the often hostile space of the debate community.** In essence, **the use of this music overwhelms a space that would normally be uncomfortable.** **I remember walking down the hallway at a** national college **tournament and being drawn to the deep sounds of a hip hop base beat emanating from the walls**. I stood outside and peeped through the small plastic window and it was a young Louisville team. **The use of hip hop invaded the quiet and stillness of the tournament hallway** as debate rounds are in session. **The normal sounds of someone’s rapid fire of words and** cacophony of **gasps** (debaters must take quick and deep breaths periodically to maintain the speed) **or muted notes of the timer beeping, papers shuffling, and the screech of chairs sliding against the cold floors were ripped away in an instant. Only the beat remained**

#### We must engage in an organic Hip Hop countermovement, which creates multiple diverse forms of resistance from below to colonial globalization.

Hibbard, 3

(A senior at the University of Puget Sound majoring in international political economy) (Noah, “”Popilar Public Resistance”, http://upress.kent.edu/nieman/popular\_public\_resistance.htm)

The opening quote exemplifies four critical characteristics of hip-hop culture, they are: (1) its transcendental cultural space, “nation”; (2) its inherent contradictions, “paradox perpetrators”; (3) its representation of the marginalized, “black youth”; and (4) its resistance to mainstream, “industry” representations of the culture. Each of these characteristics is a derivative of the neoliberal hegemonic function. **Free-market capitalism has “commodified”2 and “co-opted”3 hip-hop culture** (although not completely as we shall see later) **and this creates fragmentation of thought and contradiction in action. However, in dialectical reaction there are organic countermovements that are resistant and “antithetical” to the hegemonies that oppress them**.**4 The process of globalization has stretched and deepened hip-hop’s predominance, allowing its cultural influence to transcend the boundaries of race, class, gender, religion, and region. In doing so, voice is often given to the voiceless**. **Therefore, hip-hop culture could serve as a conduit for electric and eclectic resistance from below, a key factor in challenging globalization from above**.¶ To fully explore all the nuances of hip-hop as resistance, this paper will first discuss three theories of resistance: countermovements, counterhegemony, and infrapolitics.5 **Countermovements explain why and what people resist (with some how, as well) and counterhegemony and infrapolitics explain how people resist**. These three theories account for the ideal type outputs of the resistance matrix, whose inputs are: undeclared or declared, singular or collective, unorganized or organized, and reformist or revolutionary**. The various outputs of the resistance matrix are resisting neoliberal ideological domination because it produces a system of norms, values, meanings, and identities that promote non-egalitarian economic, political, and social interests. Hip-hop culture, because of its historic and organic antithetical nature, indirect critiques of neoliberal globalization, supranational coherence, diverse body of agents, and deep and wide range of engaged resistance strategies, is a critical contributor to resistance from below to top-heavy neoliberal globalization**.¶ By photographing hip-hop culture through the theoretical lenses of the Polanyi-Gramsci-Scott triad and contrasting their negatives to the ideological pictures of neoliberal globalization, hip-hop’s counterhegemonic image is brought to the forefront**. Hip-hop culture performs an instrumental role in challenging the hegemony of neoliberal ideology, and thus globalization, through a variety of forms of resistance that carve dissident cultural enclaves**. These hidden enclaves of resistance are a viable forum for the formulation, elaboration, and dissemination of a counterhegemonic consciousness and culture**, which is a prerequisite for any solidified and sustained form of resistance (countermovements, wars of position, and wars of movement**).

#### This Alternative form of knowledge production leads to a double conscious. The inclusion of personal narratives allows us to reflect on out own social location, while alternate forms of knowledge allow us to understand the oppression of others. By teaching code switching we allow intra-communal discussion.

Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley et al, 13

(Dr. Shanara R. Reid-Brinkley, PhD, Assistant Professor of Public Address and Advocacy, Director of Debate, William Pitt Debating Union, Amber Kelsie, M.A., Nicholas Brady, 2013, http://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/, Accessed 1/25/14, NC)

Bankey’s positioning of himself at the borderland while excluding (multiply situated) black people in debate from that same space makes little sense to those familiar with the history of race in America. Black people have never not had to be in close relation to whiteness. This is Dubois’ theory of double consciousness (which, though especially emblematic of black experience, is a way of understanding the world that can be learned by non-blacks). Black people have always existed in an in-between space of blackness and whiteness with anti-blackness serving as the context for this relationship. Black folks in America are always already in an interracial relationship with whiteness; this is especially true in the context of debate. The tone of Bankey’s criticism assumes black people exclude white people from their space, but MPJ and other debate practices demonstrate the direct manner in which white people exclude black people from interracial dialogue in the debate space. An even more recent example of how structural racism functions is the exclusion of Elijah Smith, the reigning NDT champ, from the Kentucky Round Robin, and the attempt to change the rules pertaining to transfer students. We are disappointed by this addition to the consistent complaint made by whites that black people must be constantly accessible to whites even while white people disavow the structure of policed segregation in supposedly common spaces. In fact, it seems quite likely that this thesis will inspire debate arguments that produce exclusions of black students rather than an inclusive space of participation. We find it highly unlikely that it will produce an authentic communication or disalienation. There are countless examples of the manner in which black people attempt to meet the communicative and bodily expectations of dominant culture and dominant debate. Code-switching is part and parcel of our interracial romance with debate, an example of our commitment to compromise. Black people often code-switch into “white-people speak” when dealing with white people while using black language and tonal intonations (regionally specific) when in majority black spaces (in fact, it seems that it is when we “speak authentically” in the presence of whites—share ourselves with whites—that we are charged with the crime of being “intentionally” unintelligible). Within debates, (vis-à-vis framework for example) there is a denial or a disavowal of even the possibility of an engagement across rhetorical difference, which is the move Bankey makes. He refuses to code switch in the thesis by not attempting to understand the kinship networks in debate for black people or to engage in rhetorical practices to demonstrate a commitment to engaging difference at the level of method and performance.[9] How often do we encounter white people who can code-switch (and no we don’t mean the latest hip hop slang) into the communicative and socio-political practices of black culture? The black is always already at the borderland. But double consciousness is something that for most people—especially non-blacks—must be learned and practiced. We believe that these kinds of practices and attempts on the part of black people to meet whites more than half-way are evident for those who choose to see. But also we must point out that in communication studies code-switching, the vernacular, counter-publics, and many other concepts evoke the double-sidedness of rhetorical practice in ways that complicate the very notion that there could ever be a pure communication. We therefore invite Bankey to read the Communication Studies section of the library as well as the Black Studies section.

## Case

#### Warming’s root cause is consumption patterns that stem from the post-industrial revolution era of Western imperial domination. Any other proposed solution to warming is a pretentious red herring presented by whiteness.

**Wynter, 7**

(Sylvia, Professor Emeritus in Spanish and Romance Languages at Stanford University, “The Human being as noun? Or being human as praxis? Towards the Autopoietic turn/overturn: A Manifesto,” otl2.wikispaces.com/file/view/The+Autopoetic+Turn.pdf)

For if, as Time magazine reported in January 2007 (Epigraph 2), a U.N. Intergovernmental panel of Natural Scientists, were soon to release "**a smoking-gun report which confirms that human activities are to blame for global warming**" (and thereby for climate change), and had therefore predicted "catastrophic disruptions by 2100," by April, the issued Report not only **confirmed** the above, but also repeated **the major contradiction** which the Time account had re-echoed. **This contradiction, however, has nothing to do in any way with the rigor, and precision of their natural scientific findings**, but rather with the contradiction referred to by Derrida's question in Epigraph 3—i.e., But who, we? That is, their **attribution of the non-natural factors driving global warming and climate change to, generic human activities, and/or to "anthropocentric forcings"; with what is, in effect, this mis-attribution then determining the nature of their policy recommendations to deal with the already ongoing reality of global warming and climate change, to be ones couched largely in economic terms**. That is, in the terms of our present mode of knowledge production, and its "perceptual categorization system" as elaborated by the disciplines of the Humanities and Social Sciences (or "human sciences") and which are reciprocally enacting of our present sociogenic genre of being human, as that of the West's Man in its second Liberal or bio-humanist reinvented form, as homo oeconomicus; as optimally "virtuous Breadwinner, taxpayer, consumer, and as systemically over-represented as if it, and its behavioral activities were isomorphic with the being of being human, and thereby with activities that would be definable as the human-as-a-species ones. Consequently, **the Report's authors because logically taking such an over-representation as an empirical fact**, given that, as highly trained natural scientists whose domains of inquiry are the physical and (purely) biological levels of reality, although their own natural-scientific order of cognition with respect to their appropriate non-human domains of inquiry, is an imperatively self-correcting and therefore, necessarily, a cognitively open/open-ended one, nevertheless, **because in order to be natural scientists, they are therefore necessarily, at the same time, middle class Western or westernized subjects, initiated** 15 as such, **by means of our present overall education system and its mode of knowledge production t**o be the optimal symbolically encoded embodiment of the West's Man, it its second reinvented bio-humanist homo oeconomicus, and therefore bourgeois self-conception, over-represented as if it were isomorphic with the being of being human, they also fall into the trap identified by Derrida in the case of his fellow French philosophers. The trap, that is, of conflating their own existentially experienced **(Western-bourgeois or ethno-class) referent "**we," with the "we" of "the horizon of humanity." **This then leading them to attribute the reality of behavioral activities that are genre-specific to the West's Man** in its second reinvented concept/self-conception as homo oeconomicus, ones that are therefore as such, as a historically originated ensemble of behavioral activitiesas being ostensibly human activities-in-general. **This, in spite of the fact that they do historicize the origin of the processes that were to lead to their recent natural scientific findings with respect to the reality of the non-naturally caused ongoing acceleration of global warming and climate change, identifying this process as having begun with the (West's) Industrial Revolution** from about 1750 onwards. That is, therefore, as a process that can be seen to have been correlatedly concomitant in Great Britain, both with the growing expansion of the largely bourgeois enterprise of factory manufacturing, as well with the first stages of the political and intellectual struggles the British bourgeoisie who were to spearhead the Industrial Revolution, to displace the then ruling group hegemony of the landed aristocracy cum gentry, and to do so, by inter alia, the autopoetic reinvention of the earlier homo politicus/virtuous citizen civic humanist concept of Man, which had served to legitimate the latter's traditionally landed, political, social and economic dominance, in new terms. This beginning with Adam Smith and the Scottish School of the Enlightenment in the generation before the American, French, and Haitian (slave) revolutions, as a reinvention tat was to be effected in now specifically bourgeois terms as homo oeconomicus/and virtuous Breadwinner. 116 That is as the now purely secular genre of being human, which although not to be fully (i.e., politically, intellectually, and economically) institutionalized until the mid-nineteenth century, onwards, when its optimal incarnation came to be actualized in the British and Western bourgeoisie as **the new ruling class, was, from then on, to generate its prototype specific ensemble of new behavioral activities, that were to impel both the Industrial Revolution, as well as the West's second wave of imperial expansion, this based on the colonized incorporation of a large majority of the world's peoples, all coercively homogenized to serve its own redemptive material telos, the telos initiating of global warming and climate change**. Consequently, if the Report's authors note that about 1950, a steady process of increasing acceleration of the processes of global warming and climate change, had begun to take place, this was not only to be due to the Soviet Revolution's (from 1917 onwards) forced march towards industrialization (if in its still homo oeconomicus conception, since a march spearheaded by the 116 See the already cited essay by J.G.A. Pocock "symbolic capital," education credentials owning and technically skilled Eastern European bourgeoisie)—as a state-directed form of capitalism, nor indeed by that of Mao's then China, but was to be also due to the fact that in the wake of the range of successful anti-colonial struggles for political independence, which had accelerated in the wake of the Second World War, because the new entrepreneurial and academic elites had already been initiated by the Western educational system in Western terms as homo oeconomicus, they too would see political independence as calling for industrialized development on the "collective bovarysme "117 model of the Western bourgeoisie. Therefore, with the acceleration of global warming **and climate change gaining even more momentum** as all began to industrialize on the model of homo oeconomicus, with the result that by the time of the Panel's issued April 2007 Report the process was now being driven by a now planetarily homogenized**/standardized transnational "**system of material provisioning or mode of techno-industrial economic production based on the accumulation of capital; as the means of production of ever-increasing economic growth, **defined as "development**"; with this calling for a single model of normative behavioral activities, all driven by the now globally (post-colonially and post-the-1989-collapse-of-the-Soviet Union), homogenized desire of "all men (and women) to," realize themselves/ourselves, in the terms of homo oeconomicus. **In the terms, therefore, of "its single (Western-bourgeois or ethno-class) understanding" of "man's humanity," over-represented as that of the human; with the well-being and common good of its referent "we"—that, not only of the transnational middle classes but even more optimally, of the corporate multinational business industries and their financial networks**, **both indispensable to the securing of the Western-bourgeois conception of the common good**, **within** the overall terms of the behavior-regulatory redemptive **material telos of ever-increasing economic growth**, put forward as the Girardot-type "cure" for the projected Malthusian-Ricardo transumed postulate of a "significant ill" as that, now, ostensibly, of mankind's threatened subordination to (the trope) of Natural Scarcity, this in the reoccupied place of Christianity of its postulate of that "ill" as that of enslavement to Original Sin."' With the result that the very ensemble of behavioral activities indispensable, on the one hand, to the continued hegemony of the bourgeoisie as a Western and westernized transnational ruling class, is the same ensemble of behaviors that is directly causal of global worming and climate change, as they are, on the other, to the continued dynamic enactment and stable replication of the West's second reinvented concept of Man; this latter in response to the latter's existential imperative of guarding against the entropic disintegration of its genre of being human and fictive nation-state mode of kind. Thereby against the possible bringing to an end, therefore, of the societal order, and autopoetic living Western and westernized macro world system in it bourgeois configuration, which is reciprocally the former's (i.e., its genre of being human, and fictive modes of kind's condition of realization, at a now global level. This, therefore, is the cognitive dilemma, one arising directly from the West's hitherto unresolvable aporia of the secular, that has been precisely captured by Sven Lutticken in a recent essay. Despite, he writes, "the consensus that global warming cannot be ascribed to normal fluctuations in the earth's temperature... **(the) social and political components of this process have been minimized; man-made nature is re-naturalized, the new (un)natural history presented as fate." And with this continuing to be so because** (within the terms, I shall add, of our present "single understanding of man's humanity" and the unresolvable aporia which it continues to enact), **"(t)he truly terrifying notion is not that (global warming and climate change) is irreversible, but that it actually might be reversible—at the cost of radically changing the economic and social order...**"119 **The changing, thereby, of the now globally hegemonic biologically absolute answer that we at present give to the question to who we are,** **and of whose** biohumanist homo oeconomicus **symbolic life/death** (i.e., naturally selected/dysselected) code's intentionality of dynamic enactment and stable replication, **our present "economic and social order" is itself the empirical actualization.**

#### Engaging the state fails to provoke change and instead creates a world of error replication and results in more of the same

**Martinot** and **Sexton,** Director, critical race theorist at *San Francisco State* University and African American Studies School of Humanities UCI, 20**03** (Steve and Jared, "The Avant-Garde of White Supremacy", Social Identities, Volume 9, Number 2, 2003 Accessed 8-3-12, MR)  
  
There are oppositional political movements of course; some are progressive, fewer are radical. But each encounters a certain internal limitation. For instance, there are movements seeking to make the police more accountable to legal and communal standards of conduct; but their role then becomes one of making the state work better and more efficiently. They work, perhaps unwittingly, at reconstructing and not dismantling the white state. What they fail to understand or accept is that the police are already accountable, but to something out of reach of the principles of justice or democracy. There is a (largely symbolic) multiracial or mixed race movement that understands itself to be the very transcendence of race but, in mixing and matching races supposed to really exist, it subsumes the products of racism in ways that recall many dimensions of white supremacist thinking. The ethic of retribution that legitimates the expanding prison-industrial complex in the US and beyond is one of these products. Even political opposition to that ethic outside the prison wall falls prey to a certain acceptance of criminal law; in other words, it assumes that the prison is essential to social order. This acceptance is unacceptable from the point of view of the violence and violation engendered by the prison regime. Political (or politicised) prisoners demand an epistemology of a different order, one that challenges the internal limits of opposition in a radical way — the dream of prison abolition

#### The promise of economic growth for all and democracy to come is the most pernicious lie of whiteness—the affirmative defuses revolutionary energy into an always unrequited hope, justifying violence, warfare and racism through the dream of inclusion.

Hoescht, 8

(Heidi, PhD in Literature from UCSD, “Refusable Pasts: Speculative Democracy, Spectator Citizens, and the Dislocation of Freedom in the United States,” Proquest Dissertations)

This dissertation examines the intimate connections between emancipatory democracy and speculative economics. It studies cultural texts that reflect and express national ideals of U.S. democracy that emereged in three periods of heightened captialist speculation the Jacksonian period of the 1830s, the 1930s Popular Front period, and the rise of liberal multiculturalism between 1980 to the present. The project engages two kinds of cultural texts. The project derives its proximate objects of the study--folklore, literature, literary criticism, stage performances, community festivals and public parks—from a range of critical and cultural texts produced by Constance Rourke, F.O. Matthiessen, Nathaniel Hawthorne, George Catlin, Frederick Law Olmsted, and the neighborhood of Powderhorn Park. Yet, the disseration also explores a second text that connects these seemingly disparate objects and authors. The social text that binds the chapters of this dissertaion is a broader text of U.S. culture and social practice that is conditioned and inflated by the logic of speculation. This second text reveals culture as a central link in the economic project of U.S. nationalism. Culture in this text, is a key technology by which U.S. inequality is reproduced, reiterated, and translated across contexts. I argue that the cultural logic of specualiton disables possibilities for participatory democracy and racial, gendered, and class justice and equality. This logic aligns the emancipatory aspirations of aggreived groups to the market and property interests of elites. I show that culture has been instrumental for expanding social inequality through the promises of U.S. nationalism. The speculative logic of U.S. democracy relies on the category of "not yet freedom" to hide economic and racial inequalities. It preserves the idea of democracy only by deferring actual justice to a perpetually pushed back future. The pursuit of democracy in the United States has been haunted by histories of refusal and deferral. When aggrieved groups ask for emancipation, elites often respond with promises of freedom without doing the hard work of creating justice. Refusable Pasts explores how the national culture of the United States portrays the deferral of freedom to some unspecified "not yet" time in the future as evidence of real democratic inclusion in the present. Promises of future freedom evidence the power and pervasiveness of popular aspirations for democracy. Yet because national culture offers aggrieved groups democratic promises rather than democratic practices, it also demonstrates the power of elites to suppress popular democracy and preserve their own privileges. Speculative logic and market subjectivity permeate U.S. national culture. Speculative practices originate in economic relations, but their logic structures national culture as well. Speculative logics promising future growth have connected the expressive cultures of U.S nationalism to the economic life of the nation's elites. Just as investors anticipate that economic returns in the future will reward their work in the present, citizens are encouraged to defer their desires for empowerment, autonomy, dignity and community to some perpetually promised but never quite realized time of "not yet" freedom in the future. Hope functions as a fundamental mechanism for deferring freedom to the future and refusing radical change in the present. Under these conditions, culture serves as a cover story promoting economic expansion and empire, slavery and racial subordination, plunder and perpetual warfare. The national culture of the nation works to instantiate, legitimate, and perpetuate economic inequality and social stratification. It is also one forum that elites use to manage the emancipatory aspirations of popular struggles. Culture counts because stories centered on the logic of speculation promise symbolic reconciliations as the salve to the wounds caused by the perpetuation of inequalities in society. The speculative logics that inform national culture portray inexcusable injustices in the present as mere preludes to a promised prosperity and freedom in the future. Thus, the democratic promises inscribed inside national culture actually function as powerful mechanisms for the perpetuation of decidedly undemocratic practices and policies.

#### Science leads to assumptions of domination over nature and others, this ontology of domination turns case

**Weinberger '92** [Jerry Weinberger, Professor of Political Science at Michigan State University, “Politics and the Problem of Technology: An Essay on Heidegger and the Tradition of Political Philosophy”, The American Political Science Review, Vol. 86, No. 1 (Mar. 1992), pp. 112-127, JSTOR)KR/JRC]

For Heidegger, **modern science and technology are rooted conjointly in the metaphysical worldview.** According to this view, the world is conceived of as a spatial whole made up of three parts. These three parts are the demonstrably knowable and eternal ground (objective laws of matter) of every particular entity; all the particular entities; and the human subject who discovers the objective ground and lives among the various entities. **In discovering the ground, human beings become able completely to manipulate and transform the various things in nature. In doing so they endow the things with values. Science tells us that only humans, not other entities, have value, and that humans give the world its meaning or value as their knowing discloses the world's manipulability. Science is** thus **humanistic** to its core. **In its light every particular entity stands neutrally (not as nature) between the necessity of its objective ground** (matter in motion, extension, etc.) **and the freedom of subjective human art, between fact and value. When understood as the indubitable vantage point for universal, scientific** (mathematical) **knowledge, subjectivity is the certain and fixed beginning point for discovering the objective ground of manipulable things. But when experienced as the animus of the individual soul, subjectivity is merely arbitrary. Thus, facts are taken to be objective, and values are taken to be merely subjective, thus revealing the essential kin- ship of subjectivity and manipulable entities**, both of which have no fixed character or nature. We cannot hope for salvation from Kant, says Heidegger, because Kant's account of subjectivity-as transcendental unity of apperception and as the free legislation of the absolute moral law-itself assumes dogmatically a metaphysical conception of the subject. Thus, free subjectivity and the manipulability of entities turn out to be the same in comparison to the necessity of objective ground. In fact, **for modern science there are no essential differences between subjectivity, objectivity, freedom, and manipulability. These aspects of "reality" are actually united in a technological understanding of being:** subjectivity is the Archimedean point for uncovering objectivity (Descartes); the doctrine of moral freedom dogmatically presumes that very subjectivity (Kant); and the identification of being with the knowable and changeless entity (objectivity) grew out of the problem of fixing stable grounds for the arbitrary manipulations of human art (Plato and Aristotle). **Even for pure natural science "to be" is "to be the ground of the manipulable." Science is humanistic and humanism is technological.** (See Heidegger [1927] 1972, 89-101, 202-208, 317-21; 1962, 122- 34, 246-52, 364-68; 1982, 112-17; SchUrmann 1987, 75; Zimmerman 1990, 157-63, 196, 222- 23.)

#### Science is intrinsically tied to technological thought

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

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