

Index

Index	1-2
LINKS -	
Link – technology	3
Link – technology	4
Link – corporate	5
Link – corporate	6
Link – social management (renewables)	7
Link – management of the environment	8
Link – economic policy (renewables)& plan fails	9
Link magnifier – renewables require innovation	10
ANSWERS TO -	
AT: permutations	11
AT: permutation	12
AT: permutation	13
AT: permutation	14
AT: we solve	15
AT: do nothing fails (alternative solves)	16
AT: movement fails	17
AT: case outweighs	18
AT: case outweighs	19
IMPACT -	
Impact – outweighs nuclear war	20
Impact – managerialism	21
Impact – environmental destruction	22
Alternative	23
Aff – K fails	24

AT: perms - 32 - 36

Link – technology

Modern renewables are used to capture nature for subjective human desires – stealing its intrinsic values and devaluing nature as standing reserve.

Tad Beckman [professor emeritus of philosophy, humanities, and social sciences at Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, CA 91711 "MARTIN HEIDEGGER AND ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS"; <http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/HEIDART.HTML>] 2000

Heidegger clearly saw the development of "energy resources" as symbolic of this evolutionary path; while the transformation into modern technology undoubtedly began early, the first definitive signs of its new character began with the harnessing of energy resources, as we would say. (7) As a representative of the old technology, the windmill took energy from the wind but converted it immediately into other manifestations such as the grinding of grain; the windmill did not unlock energy from the wind in order to store it for later arbitrary distribution. Modern wind-generators, on the other hand, convert the energy of wind into electrical power which can be stored in batteries or otherwise. The significance of storage is that it places the energy at our disposal; and because of this storage the powers of nature can be turned back upon itself. The storing of energy is, in this sense, the symbol of our over-coming of nature as a potent object. "...a tract of land is challenged into the putting out of coal and ore. The earth now reveals itself as a coal mining district, the soil as a mineral deposit." {[7], p. 14} This and other examples that Heidegger used throughout this essay illustrate the difference between a technology that diverts the natural course cooperatively and modern technology that achieves the unnatural by force. Not only is this achieved by force but it is achieved by placing nature in our subjective context, setting aside natural processes entirely, and conceiving of all revealing as being relevant only to human subjective needs. 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.

Link – technology

[] A major technological increase is the only way to achieve a switch to renewables.

Leigh **Glover** [Assistant Professor, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy and Policy Fellow, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, Ph.D., University of Delaware, author of “from Love-ins to Logos: the Demise of Renewable Energy as a Social Movement” in “Transforming power” edited by Byme, Toly, and Glover pages 256] **2006**

The current technology problem for renewable energy is one that focuses on the middle-class. What is that problem? Making renewable energy technology a substitute for the conventional energy system without disrupting the middle-class penchant for consumption. Optimists and promoters for renewable energy will immediately cite the rapid growth of wind energy, and describe how effectively large-scale wind turbines are being plugged in to meet the needs of baseload supply for regional electricity grids. A contrary view holds that what is being revealed more than opportunities for the technology are its limits; there are actually relatively few places with the kinds of wind characteristics suitable for large-scale units. Wind energy, the dashing prince of renewable technologies, turns out to realize an economy of scale in only a few places (often those of great scenic beauty both on- and off-shore), and has a disinclination to work everyday. Moreover, wind's arrival tends to upset some middle- (and upper-) class neighborhoods if it is thought to be obtrusive (see a special issue of the Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review, 2004, for a review of opposition to the Cape Wind project).

For PV, the problems have been about designing systems that are indistinguishable from grid-derived electricity. Accordingly, the challenges have become not how to rig up an array of PV cells, but how to arrange the metering so the system is integrated into the existing grid and how to work out systems of accounting to capture its benefits. In this way, the applications for PV are supplemental to a grid connected user.⁹ Ingenious as these solutions have been, they are essentially adaptations to make PV technologies perform in ways to meet the criteria set by grid-based electricity planners.

Scaling up renewable energy technologies to meet the demands of a conventional energy system has not been very successful for most sources. Renewable energy has its place in the conventional energy system, such as wind farms and building-integrated PV, but technologically it is a long way from meeting the primary energy needs of the developed world. When basic calculations are completed for the number of wind turbines or PV arrays needed to replace the world's coal-fired power stations, the resulting scenarios verge on nothing less than the bizarre.¹⁰ Meeting current energy needs will necessitate the maturation of technologies, such as tidal power and various large-scale forms of solar concentrators, and the development of other technologies that are currently far from viable. And yet the renewables-based economy continues to be premised on the assumption that we have the available technology to meet global energy demands (see, e.g., Scheer, 2002). **256**

Link - corporate

[] The environmental movement has gone corporate – even “green” policies are technological and micro-managed.

Leigh Glover [Assistant Professor, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy and Policy Fellow, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, Ph.D., University of Delaware, author of “from Love-ins to Logos: the Demise of Renewable Energy as a Social Movement” in “Transforming power” edited by Byme, Toly, and Glover pages 247] 2006

Having been a part of the general environmental movement that saw renewable energy as the promise of a new future and now seeing that future being owned by British Petroleum, General Electric, Royal Dutch Shell, and other corporate giants responsible for the devastation wrought by their promotion of fossil fuel and nuclear energy use, it is difficult to regard the emerging sustainable energy era with unbridled enthusiasm. It appears that these corporations can buy renewable energy businesses more easily than homeowners can purchase the equipment. At a time when global energy use is at its highest levels ever and forecast to continue rising (IEA, 2004; UNDP et al., 2000), environmentalists and staid international institutions alike are eagerly anticipating the solar economy (Flavin and Lenssen, 1994; Scheer, 2002; Brown, 2003; World Bank, 2004). Somewhere along the line, renewable energy went from the domain of counter culture to corporate mainstay, from communes to communication strategies, from naturalism to natural capitalism, and from love-ins to logos.

Renewable energy once offered an alternative social future, characterized as the “soft energy path.” Amory Lovins’ 1979 landmark text set the bar for energy sustainability and despite the furnace-load of works on renewable energy since that time, in many respects Lovins’ basic case has not been surpassed.^{1,2} *Soft Energy Paths* provided a clear, thorough, and explicit account of the social values and implications associated with a renewable energy future. Compared to the conventional energy-society order, the alternative promised to be more democratic, less militarized, less hazardous, more flexible, more efficient in its uses of energy and capital, and more open to options and choices in the social sphere. As befits a work of this reputation and influence, many scholars depict *Soft Energy Paths* as the starting point of the renewable energy movement. But this work also marks the onset of the demise of renewable energy as a social movement, conveniently establishing the division between the “counter culture” movement and the arrival of the “corporate culture” project. Since then, there are precious few considerations of renewable energy as a social initiative. Today, discussion of an energy counter culture is almost completely moribund. Modestly, we seek to give the original idea of soft energy paths its due. 247 - 8

Link – corporate

[] the concept of renewables is one of nature, the reality is one of corporate domination– it has become centralized and easy to manipulate and control.

Leigh Glover [Assistant Professor, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy and Policy Fellow, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, Ph.D., University of Delaware, author of “from Love-ins to Logos: the Demise of Renewable Energy as a Social Movement” in “Transforming power” edited by Byme, Toly, and Glover pages 263-4] 2006

In contrast, the renewable energy proposal seems essentially premised on consumer sovereignty when the dominant consumer preference is for mass consumption. Advocacy of a soft energy future embedded in current society seems to take the economic rationality of the individual consumer as the motive force for change, when attention should have been directed at collective scales of transformation.

So what is the current prospect for renewable energy on the broad scale for industrialized economies?

- Renewable energy systems will likely be owned by oligopolies (state and private) that control the world's fossil fuel, electric, and nuclear energy systems.
- Renewable energy, in its logo-friendly format, will be made compatible with the corporatist, neo-liberal ideology of the developed world and will become part of the process of economic globalization.
- Renewable energy will become part of the centralized system of energy production and distribution in which energy users' choices will be those dictated by consumer sovereignty; i.e., they will be completely dependent on the corporate-organized and -defined market for 'green energy' and the like.
- Renewable energy technologies will aspire to technological sophistication and will soon be understood and serviceable only by experts and managed by professionals.

Today, I cannot readily buy or order renewable energy systems suitable for my home. They are not offered for sale in the building supply superstores and my local builder doesn't know anything about them. After thirty years of advocacy, renewable energy is still a niche product. Yet what will be the transforming effect if, in the not too distant future, such systems are easily ordered (perhaps from the Internet)? Is anything more to be expected from the corporate vision of soft energy? 263-4

Link – social management (renewables)

[] an increasing web of renewables – strengthens social control due to security concerns and human dependence

Leigh Glover [Assistant Professor, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy and Policy Fellow, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, Ph.D., University of Delaware, author of “from Love-ins to Logos: the Demise of Renewable Energy as a Social Movement” in “Transforming power” edited by Byme, Toly, and Glover pages 261] 2006

In that collection of generalizations about renewable energy as a social solution were concerns about: an increasing interdependency in society, its growing complexity and the need for greater social management, its vulnerability to failures, the need for increased security of centralized systems, rising social and economic risks of these big systems, the alienation of people from decisions that shape their lives, and the inefficiency and precariousness of large systems. Oddly, while the smaller and easier environmental concerns have tended to be swept up in state-sponsored ecological modernization, the social concerns of these nascent energy system critics withered. A possible exception to this generalization is the decline of nuclear energy in the developed world; despite an enormous effort by state powers to arrest decline, the industry barely made it out of the 1970s. This decline, however, was hardly motivated by the wider social implications of the industry; rather, the technology proved to be too dangerous and its energy outputs too expensive despite the staggering levels of public sector subsidy and vigorous efforts to convince the public of the industry's safety.¹⁶ 261

Link – management of the environment

[] The concept of management is derived from an idea that we can “fix” nature – in reality attempts to “mend” the environment teach us how to exploit nature in the future.

Ladelle McWhorter [Prof. of women's studies at U. of Richmond; “Heidegger and the Earth “Guilt as Management Technology”: A Call to Heideggerian Reflection” 4] 1992

What is most illustrative is often also what is most common. Today, on all sides of ecological debate we hear, with greater and greater frequency, the word *management*. On the one hand, business people want to manage natural resources so as to keep up profits. On the other hand, conservationists want to manage natural resources so that there will be plenty of coal and oil and recreational facilities for future generations. These groups and factions within them debate vociferously over which management policies are the best, that is, the most efficient and manageable. Radical environmentalists damn both groups and claim it is human population growth and rising expectations that are in need of management. But wherever we look, wherever we listen, we see and hear the term *management*.

Link – economic policy (renewables) & plan fails

[] renewables doom the plan to failure – create a structure of social and economic management that only further damages the earth.

Leigh Glover [Assistant Professor, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy and Policy Fellow, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, Ph.D., University of Delaware, author of “from Love-ins to Logos: the Demise of Renewable Energy as a Social Movement” in “Transforming power” edited by Byme, Toly, and Glover pages 263] 2006

Here, then, is where renewable energy as a social solution has been doomed; renewable energy can be a productive technology that provides a service, but who in corporate-managed society wants independence in production? Almost no one in the developed world, it appears. To consider that there is a place for independent production of energy is completely counter to the mass consumption impulse of modernity. Provision of services by third parties, usually corporations and contractors, is the efficient (and profitable) preference of the contemporary order. Are we seriously considering that families who have service contracts for their water heaters and appliances, who have garages to service their cars, who use thermostats to control household temperatures, who use televisions and VCRs for entertainment, who operate computers and telephones in order to communicate with people and read items of interest, want to operate their own energy systems?

Crossing the divide of fossil fuel energy requires using the bridge of energy conservation and reduced consumption to reach a genuinely renewable energy-based society on the other side. Such a transition means tackling contemporary society's preference for abundance over sufficiency, for waste over frugality, for replacement over repair, and for frivolity over utility. Because a transformative renewable energy future cannot be premised on normal economic activity, the viability of the strategy rests on converting some of the core attributes of society. To date, the advocates of renewable energy have tended to look past this sociological condition and argue their case entirely on technological, economic, and ecological virtues. 263

Link magnifier - renewables require innovation

[] renewables are uniquely worse than other forms of technology – they will be constantly updated to deal with an ever increasing human demand.

Leigh Glover [Assistant Professor, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy and Policy Fellow, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, Ph.D., University of Delaware, author of “from Love-ins to Logos: the Demise of Renewable Energy as a Social Movement” in “Transforming power” edited by Byme, Toly, and Glover pages 258-9] 2006

Fourthly, there is the issue of energy efficiency. Renewable energy can be highly efficient when applied directly to the energy service task as there are no distribution and transmission losses, less conversion losses from energy to task, and few reserve capacity requirements as energy is only used when needed. But when used as a fuel source in a centralized energy supply and distribution system, renewable energy is made as relatively inefficient as fossil fuels. Most of the advantages of renewable energy are lost when it fuels the conventional energy system and is built with excess capacity, transmitted with high losses, and so on. Several implications arise from this: for a start, renewable energy is hardly cheap when used inefficiently.

Renewable energy is currently in the process of being overhauled as a technology. Much of what was developed at the small scale is of no commercial use for large energy supply companies. A new generation of technologies is now being developed to serve quite different ends. Associated with the introduction of this technology is a new set of social issues. What renewable energy advocates seem to have overlooked is that the social and environmental benefits of the old technology are not necessarily characteristic of this new generation. These new technological developments have effectively closed off meaningful advances in the old technology in the developed world, so that designing technologies that people could buy and operate for their homes, farms, small factories, and commercial centers is no longer being pursued. Renewable energy technology is held in a cycle of perpetual disadvantage, whereby every successive advance to make it fit better into the conventional energy system creates a further set of obstacles that erode its original advantages over fossil fuels. 258-9

AT: permutations

[] the permutation is stuck in a frame of catastrophe – evaluating calculations and nature together inevitably fails -- the alternative is critical to take a step back and reevaluate our relationship and tame our impulse to intervene.

Ladelle McWhorter [Prof. of women's studies at U. of Richmond; "Heidegger and the Earth "Guilt as Management Technology": A Call to Heideggerian Reflection" vii-viii] 1992

When we attempt to think ecologically and within Heidegger's discourse (or perhaps better: when we attempt to think Heideggerly within ecological concerns), the paradoxical unfolds at the site of the question of human action. Thinking ecologically – that is, thinking the earth in our time – means thinking death; it means thinking catastrophe; it means thinking the possibility of utter annihilation not just for human being but for all that lives on this planet and for the living planet itself. Thinking the earth in our time means thinking what presents itself as that which must not be allowed to go on, as that which must be controlled, as that which must be stopped. Such thinking seems to call for immediate action. There is no time to lose. We must work for change, seek solutions, curb appetites, reduce expectations, find cures now, before the problems become greater than anyone's ability to solve them – if they have not already done so. However, in the midst of this urgency, thinking ecologically, thinking Heideggerly, means rethinking the very notion of human action. It means placing in question our typical Western managerial approach to problems, our propensity for technological intervention, our belief in human cognitive power, our commitment to a metaphysics that places active human being over against passive nature. For it is the thoughtless deployment of these approaches and notions that has brought us to the point of ecological catastrophe in the first place. Thinking with Heidegger, thinking Heideggerly and ecologically, means, paradoxically, acting to place in question the acting subject, willing a displacing of our will to action; it means calling ourselves as selves to rethink our very selves, insofar as selfhood in the West is constituted as agent, as actor, as controlling ego, as knowing consciousness. Heidegger's work calls us not to rush in with quick solutions, not to act decisively to put an end to deliberation, but rather to think, to tarry with thinking unfolding itself, to release ourselves to thinking without provision or predetermined aim.]

vii - viii

AT: permutation

[] The Calculations of the lac trap the affirmative in a world of action – that fails to address a moral and ethical dilemmas that are imbedded in a technological control of managerial thought.

Ladelle McWhorter [Prof. of women's studies at U. of Richmond; "Heidegger and the Earth "Guilt as Management Technology": A Call to Heideggerian Reflection" viii] 1992

¶ The first essay, "Guilt as Management Technology: A Call to Heideggerian Reflection," gives an overview of Heidegger's thinking on technology and discusses Heidegger's call for reflection as opposed to instrumental or calculative thinking about the earth. It carefully distinguishes reflection, in Heidegger's sense, from moral stock-taking or ethical judgment. In fact, it suggests that moral discourse and practice are themselves forms of technology, sets of techniques for maintaining control over self and other. As such, morality shows itself as a danger, as part of the technological, calculative, managerial thinking that currently endangers the earth itself. The essay closes with a kind of warning. If it is the case that morality is part of technological discourse and practice rather than a separable discourse whose purpose is critique, then moral condemnation and moral guilt are reinstatements of the calculative. Thus, our tendency to feel guilty about our treatment of the earth is not a change of heart but is rather a perpetuation of human domination. VIII

AT: permutation

[] allowing for forms of management corrupt the genuine nature of the alternative – the perm is no better than the affirmative itself.

Hanspeter Padrutt [Psychiatrist at daseinalyistisches institute in Zurich author of "Heidegger and Ecology" in "Heidegger and the Earth "Guilt as Management Technology": A Call to Heideggerian Reflection" pages 22] 1992

It is obvious that the shift from the objectifying subject to the Da has various consequences for ecology. At issue for ecology, too, is the descent of humans from their anthropocentric throne and the surrender of their autocratic, tyrannical position which makes everything around into their object. Of course there are snares on this descent that can be more easily detected if we pay heed to this shift in the way that Heidegger thinks it. (I will come back to this later.)

The three steps that articulate my attempt to show how Heidegger's thinking is meaningful for ecology are also steps of varying degrees of difficulty – ledges, as it were, that make the descent more difficult. The significance of coming-forth holding-in-reserve is usually easily accepted. The meaning of the shifting is also often immediately clear. However, there is the danger that, when superficially assimilated, both of these quickly get classified in a customary way of thinking, e.g., such that they get mixed in with a little atomic physics and some Eastern thinking – also superficially incorporated – and become a digestible New Age Cocktail. Instead of being a New Age Cocktail, it is a Molotov Cocktail, explosives for hardened and rigid structures and fronts. This will be clearer as we venture into the third and most difficult step in the descent. ✓ 22

AT: permutation

[] It is impossible to combine the radical sense of the alternative with the rational and logical affirmative.

Ladelle McWhorter [Prof. of women's studies at U. of Richmond; "Heidegger and the Earth "Guilt as Management Technology": A Call to Heideggerian Reflection" top of page 2] 1992

[Some might find this unnecessarily harsh. We academicians may wish to contest the accusation. Surely, in the universities of all places, thinking is going on. But Heidegger had no respect for that or any other kind of complacency. The thinking he saw as essential is no more likely, perhaps unfortunately, to be found in universities or among philosophers than anywhere else. For the thinking he saw as essential is not the simple amassing and digesting of facts or even the mastering of complex relationships or the producing of ever more powerful and inclusive theories. The thinking Heidegger saw as essential, the thinking his works call us to, is not a thinking that seeks to master anything, not a thinking that results from a drive to grasp and know and shape the world; it is a thinking that disciplines itself to allow the world – the earth, *things* – to show themselves on their own terms. Heidegger called this kind of thinking 'reflection'. In 1936 he wrote, "Reflection is the courage to make the truth of our own presuppositions and the realm of our own goals into the things that most deserve to be called in question."² Reflection is thinking that never rests complacently in the conclusions reached yesterday; it is thinking that continues to think, that never stops with a satisfied smile and announces: We can cease; we have the right answer now. On the contrary, it is thinking that loves its own life, its own occurring, that does not quickly put a stop to itself, as thinking intent on a quick solution always tries to do.] pg 2

AT: we solve

[] the notion of solvency is what we are kritiking – the idea that there is one over arching solution that can capture all the affirmative has deemed as “harms” is ridiculous – we must move away in constant criticism of that very notion to avoid recreating their impacts.

[] the only way to “solve” would be a massive increase in technology – thus increasing social control and domination.

Leigh Glover [Assistant Professor, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy and Policy Fellow, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, Ph.D., University of Delaware, author of “from Love-ins to Logos: the Demise of Renewable Energy as a Social Movement” in “Transforming power” edited by Byme, Toly, and Glover pages 258] 2006

Thirdly, there are environmental protection requirements. For the counter culture's conception of renewable energy, this simply is not a major problem as none of the technologies are likely to be of great scale or involve especially toxic materials or processes. In order to meet the demands as a fuel source for the conventional system, however, renewable technologies must be large (as per the dictates of economy of scale), and must at the same time comply with environmental regulations. For example, large-scale hydro-power isn't environmentally acceptable, even though it is the largest renewable energy source within the conventional energy system (McCully, 2001). In another case, one might examine the issue of the coastal locations of large wind turbines. By displacing conventional power plants and possibly nuclear facilities, wind turbines are an environmentally more desirable technology. Yet, socially and ecologically there can be objections to sources of our energy which redefine the landscape. When we make renewable energy match the needs of the conventional energy system, whatever social or ecological issues that need to be resolved for these technologies increase in scale along with the size of the units involved. That there could be environmental problems arising from the original generation of renewable energy technologies is contrary to their design imperatives, but entirely consistent with the consequences of large centralized renewables-based systems in service to modern society. 258

AT: do nothing fails (alternative solves)

[] alternative is not hopeless – we must move away from current environmental regulations – that force management and accounting that reduces nature to economic value.

Ladelle McWhorter [Prof. of women's studies at U. of Richmond; "Heidegger and the Earth "Guilt as Management Technology": A Call to Heideggerian Reflection" 27] 1992

A few years after the Americans landed on the moon, the Club of Rome published those famous computer predictions, entitled "The Limits of Growth," which showed that, if things continue the way they have gone on "spaceship earth," soon it could not go on. Better founded and more oppressing still was the study commissioned by President Jimmy Carter, which appeared in 1980 with the title *Global 2000 Study*. Both studies are honest appraisals and cautious predictions, which can shake up humankind. However, since they take for granted the basis of "world-models" or "spaceship earth," they can also solidify the opinion that the world is a machine. Spaceship earth and the world model correspond to a worldview of objectifying subjectivism and are snares along the way of descent from the throne of master and owner of nature. Actually the question emerges whether the objectifying reductionism of natural science – which can be detected in many notions of the ecological movement – should not also become questionable for this movement. As sensible and correct as the demand to save energy is, still the concept of energy remains reductionist and ambiguous, because it reduces the light and warmth of the sun, the waterfall in the mountain stream, the roaring of the wind, the burning of wood, and the power of the horse, reduces this whole world to kilowatt hours. Is it not noteworthy that the concept of energy comes from the way language got used in the eighteenth century and, in the historical unfolding of being in this language, is connected with Aristotelian *energeia*, the work-character of beings? Just as problematic as natural science's reduction of all beings in the concept of energy is, so too is the economic reduction of all beings to a monetary value problematic. Certainly the proposals for economic decentralization and for the development of a softer technology made by the British economist E. F. Schumacher (author of *Small is Beautiful*) are as relevant today as ever. Certainly the provocative theses of an Ivan Illich are in many ways very pertinent. And probably an ecological economy will develop presumably in the direction of James Robertson's "alternatives worth living." But one cannot overlook the fact that an ecological accounting still reduces things to a monetary value and that many concepts of these authors are characterized by the economy of objectifying subjectivism, by a worldview of the retailers – as, for example, the concept of a "qualitative growth."

27

AT: movement fails

[] The alternative does not need to create a movement --- the idea of a need for public backing fuels the link – we content with doing nothing – attempting to spur revolution is certainly co-opted in managerial thought.

[] Calculations and preventative measures are rooted in human domination – this stratifies society and flips the affirmative attempts at “solvency”

Hanspeter Padrutt [Psychiatrist at daseinalystisches institute in Zurich author of “Heidegger and Ecology” in “Heidegger and the Earth “Guilt as Management Technology”: A Call to Heideggerian Reflection” pages 19-20] 1992

[The place of consciousness is the place of the objectifying Cartesian subject. This subject, the “thinking substance” of the “I think therefore I am,” tyrannically brings objects before itself. It stands in the *center*, surveys, and examines on all sides – sees in perspective – from its own point of view. It is no accident that construction from a *central perspective* was discovered by two architects in the early Renaissance and soon took its place victoriously in painting. This perspectival relationship of the primary (human) subject to the perspectively observed world (a relationship that emerged in the Renaissance) – this perspectival “worldview” – is inextricably linked with the emergence of the method of natural science grounded in mathematics. The self-certain domination of the subject and the objectifying method that yields certainty belong together; together they form what I would call ‘objectifying subjectivism’. 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.²²]

19-20

AT: case outweighs

[] The hyped up world of the impacts of the lac rely on the idea that humans can separate from humanity – ignoring our essence and calculate and quantify harms – this fuels the seemingly endless drive to act.

Ladelle McWhorter [Prof. of women's studies at U. of Richmond; "Heidegger and the Earth "Guilt as Management Technology": A Call to Heideggerian Reflection" 7-9] 1992

T Some men feel guilty about sexism; many white people feel guilty about racism; most of us feel guilty about all sorts of habits and idiosyncrasies that we tell ourselves we firmly believe should be changed. For many of us guilt is a constant constraint upon our lives, a seemingly permanent state. As a result, guilt is familiar, and, though somewhat uncomfortable at times, it comes to feel almost safe. It is no surprise, then, that whenever caring people think hard about how to live with/in/on the earth, we find ourselves growing anxious and, usually, feeling guilty about the way we conduct ourselves in relation to the natural world. Guilt is a standard defense against the call for change as it takes root within us. But, if we are to think with Heidegger, if we are to heed his call to reflect, we must not respond to it simply by deplored our decadent life-styles and indulging ourselves in a fit 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, 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.)

It is probably quite true that in many different cultures, times, and places human beings have asked the question: How shall I best live my life? But in the West, and in relatively modern times, we have reformulated that question so as to ask: How shall I conduct myself? How shall I behave? How shall I manage my actions, my relationships, my desires? And how shall I make sure my neighbors do the same? Alongside technologies of the earth have grown up technologies of the soul, theories of human behavioral control of which current ethical theories are a significant subset. Ethics in the modern world at least very frequently functions as just another field of scientific study yielding just another set of engineering goals.

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 in 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

[Continued no text deleted]

AT: Case outweighs

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 human 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 warns.

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. | 7-9

AT: case outweighs

[] permutation proves the link to the K – the affirmative can't constrain the urge to act – this is a result of Managerial control and domination.

Ladelle McWhorter [Prof. of women's studies at U. of Richmond; "Heidegger and the Earth "Guilt as Management Technology": A Call to Heideggerian Reflection" 6] 1992

The danger of a managerial approach to the world lies not, then, in what it knows – not in its penetration into the secrets of galactic emergence or nuclear fission – but in what it forgets, what it itself conceals. It forgets that any other truths are possible, and it forgets that the belonging together of revealing with concealing is forever beyond the power of human management. We can never have, or know, it all; we can never manage everything.

What is now especially dangerous about this sense of our own managerial power, born of forgetfulness, is that it results in our viewing the world as mere resources to be stored or consumed. Managerial or technological thinkers, Heidegger says, view the earth, the world, all things as mere *Bestand*, standing-reserve.

All is here simply for human use. No plant, no animal, no ecosystem has a life of its own, has any significance, apart from human desire and need. Nothing, we say, other than human beings, has any intrinsic value. All things are instruments for the working out of human will. Whether we believe that God gave Man dominion or simply that human might (sometimes called intelligence or rationality) in the face of ecological fragility makes us always right, we managerial, technological thinkers tend to believe that the earth is only a stockpile or a set of commodities to be managed, bought, and sold. The forest is timber; the river, a power source. Even people have become resources, human resources, personnel to be managed, or populations to be controlled. (6)

import
card 12x

Impact – outweighs nuclear war

[] Human domination over nature is worse than a nuclear conflict – reduces our relationship with the environment to pure meaningless total annihilation.

Michael Zimmerman [professor of philosophy @ U of Tulane; contesting the Earth's future, Radical ecology and Postmodernity pages 119-20] 1993

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 Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one's soul by losing ones 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 in an ontological clearing through which life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity's one dimensional disclosure to entities virtually denies that 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 into pure energy. The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in a nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity's slow destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided a nuclear war only to survive as contended clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise. Deep ecologists might agree that a world of material human comfort purchased at the price of everything wild would not be a world worth living in, for in killing wild nature, people would be as good as dead. But most of them could not agree that the loss of humanity's relation to being would be worse than nuclear omnicide, for it is wrong to suppose that the lives of millions of extinct and unknown species are somehow lessened because they were never "disclosed" by humanity.

Impact – managerialism

[] In attempting to “correct” the issues we’ve caused with the environment – the affirmative is stuck in the cyclical structure of the last century.

Ladelle McWhorter [Prof. of women’s studies at U. of Richmond; “Heidegger and the Earth “Guilt as Management Technology”: A Call to Heideggerian Reflection” bottom of page 2] 1992

Thinking today must concern itself with the earth. Wherever we turn – on newsstands, on the airwaves, and in even the most casual of conversations everywhere – we are inundated by predictions of ecological catastrophe and omnicidal doom. And many of these predictions bear themselves out in our own experience. We now live with the ugly, painful, and impoverishing consequences of decades of technological innovation and expansion without restraint, of at least a century of disastrous “natural resource management” policies, and of more than two centuries of virtually unchecked industrial pollution – consequences that include the fact that millions of us on any given day are suffering, many of us dying of diseases and malnutrition that are the results of humanly produced ecological devastation; the fact that thousands of species now in existence will no longer exist on this planet by the turn of the century; the fact that our planet’s climate has been altered, probably irreversibly, by the carbon dioxide and chlorofluorocarbons we have heedlessly poured into our atmosphere; and the mind-boggling fact that it may now be within humanity’s power to destroy all life on this globe. pg 2

Impact – environmental destruction

[] The affirmative is simply a small guilt driven action – acting on guilt entrenches managerialism we act on impulse once we see benefit for ourselves.

Ladelle McWhorter [Prof. of women's studies at U. of Richmond; "Heidegger and the Earth "Guilt as Management Technology": A Call to Heideggerian Reflection" 8-9] 1992

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 in 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 human 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 warns.

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.

Thinking along Heidegger's paths means resisting the power of guilt, resisting the desire to close ourselves off from the possibility of being with our own finitude. It means finding "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." It means holding ourselves resolutely open for the shattering power of the event of thinking, even if what is shattered eventually is ourselves.] 8 - 9

Alternative

[] The alternative is to frankly reflect of the status quo approach to environmental destruction – intervention fuels domination—we must strive to open space for alternative possibilities to our relation with earth.

Ladelle McWhorter [Prof. of women's studies at U. of Richmond; "Heidegger and the Earth "Guilt as Management Technology": A Call to Heideggerian Reflection" 3] 1992

Our usual response to such prophecies of doom is to ignore them or, when we cannot do that, to scramble to find some way to manage our problems, some quick solution, some technological fix. But over and over again new resource management techniques, new solutions, new technologies disrupt delicate systems even further, doing still more damage to a planet already dangerously out of ecological balance. Our ceaseless interventions seem only to make things worse, to perpetuate a cycle of human activity followed by ecological disaster followed by human intervention followed by a new disaster of another kind. In fact, it would appear that our trying to do things, change things, fix things cannot be the solution, because it is part of the problem itself. But, if we cannot act to solve our problems, what should we do?

Heidegger's work is a call to reflect, to think in some way other than calculatively, technologically, pragmatically. Once we begin to move with and into Heidegger's call and begin to see our trying to seize control and solve problems as itself a problematic approach, if we still believe that thinking's only real purpose is to function as a prelude to action, we who attempt to think will twist within the agonizing grip of paradox, feeling nothing but frustration, unable to conceive of ourselves as anything but paralyzed. However, as so many peoples before us have known, paradox is not only a trap; it is also a scattering point and passageway. Paradox invites examination of its own constitution (hence of the patterns of thinking within which it occurs) and thereby breaks a way of thinking open, revealing the configurations of power that propel it and hold it on track. And thus it makes possible the dissipation of that power and the deflection of thinking into new paths and new possibilities.

Heidegger frustrates us. At a time when the stakes are so very high and decisive action is so loudly and urgently called for, Heidegger apparently calls us to do – nothing. If we get beyond the revulsion and anger that such a call initially inspires and actually examine the feasibility of response, we begin to undergo the frustration attendant upon paradox; how is it possible, we ask, to choose, to will, to do nothing? The call itself places in question the bimodal logic of activity and passivity; it points up the paradoxical nature of our passion for action, of our passion for maintaining control. The call itself suggests that our drive for acting decisively and forcefully is part of what must be thought through, that the narrow option of will versus surrender is one of the power configurations of current thinking that must be allowed to dissipate.

Aff – K fails

[] Their own author concedes that we don't truly know what we are critiquing – we don't understand Heidegger's goals and can't escape technology.

Tad Beckman [professor emeritus of philosophy, humanities, and social sciences at Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, CA 91711 "MARTIN HEIDEGGER AND ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS"; <http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/HEIDART.HTML>] 2000

The major difficulty with the present discussion of technology is the fact that we focus attention on what we call technology in its everyday sense and we ignore technology in its essence. In this situation, it matters little whether we embrace technology or condemn it, for we are all equally enslaved by our misunderstanding of what technology actually is. According to Heidegger, "technology [in its everyday sense] is not equivalent to the essence of technology." {[7], p. 4} To be free of misunderstandings, to relate to technology intelligently, we must find its central meaning and that can be done only by discovering its essence. (2) 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? In summary, the problem with our critique of technology lies at two levels. First, while we argue and take sides on the issue of technology, none of us is really free to deal with it constructively because none of us really understands it in its essence, i.e., in its entirety and in its central sense. Second, our limited understanding of technology is so misguided that little of value can be salvaged from it. This is because all discussions are prefaced on the view that technology is an object which we manipulate as a means to our own ends. In fact, the essence of technology reveals it as a vast system of organization which encompasses us rather than standing objectively and passively ready for our direction and control.

AT: permutation

[] The permutation will inevitably be co-opted by the managerial notions imbedded in civilization - genuine reconsideration is crucial to move away from "what society says"

Ladelle McWhorter [Prof. of women's studies at U. of Richmond; "Heidegger and the Earth "Guilt as Management Technology": A Call to Heideggerian Reflection" 6-7] 1992

This managerial, technological mode of revealing, Heidegger says, is embedded in and constitutive of Western culture and has been gathering strength for centuries. Now it is well on its way to extinguishing all other modes of revealing, all other ways of being human and being earth. It will take tremendous effort to think through this danger, to think past it and beyond, tremendous courage and resolve to allow thought of the mystery to come forth; thought of the inevitability, along with revealing, of concealment, of loss, of ignorance; thought of the occurring of things and their passage as events not ultimately under human control. And of course even the call to allow this thinking - couched as it so often must be in a grammatical imperative appealing to an agent - is itself a paradox, the first that must be faced and allowed to speak to us and to shatter us as it scatters thinking in new directions, directions of which we have not yet dreamed, directions of which we may never dream.

And shattered we may be, for our self-understanding is at stake; in fact, our very selves - selves engineered by the technologies of power that shaped, that are, modernity - are at stake. Any thinking that threatens the notion of human being as modernity has posited it - as rationally self-interested individual, as self-possessed bearer of rights and obligations, as active mental and moral agent - is thinking that threatens our very being, the configurations of subjective existence in our age. /4-4/ 6-王

AT: perms

[] Current renewables market combines – state and corporate actions to create one cohesive management team – this modernization of renewables is at the heart of managerial thought.

Leigh Glover [Assistant Professor, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy and Policy Fellow, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, Ph.D., University of Delaware, author of “from Love-ins to Logos: the Demise of Renewable Energy as a Social Movement” in “Transforming power” edited by Byme, Toly, and Glover pages 254-5] 2006

More than the actual scale of corporate investment, at stake is what to make of a renewable energy future steered by corporate strategy and state policy. It is offered here that this development represents the “ecological modernization” of renewable energy.⁸ While the state has dabbled in renewable technologies for quite some time, these efforts have been highly publicized and generally of little significance. Almost no national energy system in the developed world has managed to get beyond a couple of percent of its energy supplies or meet any significant portion of its major energy service needs from renewable sources. Yet, with the entry of large energy corporations into the field, the responsibility of the state is changed and its provider role for the interests of “capital-in-general” is evoked. Now the state will work more assiduously to provide the regulatory, policy, and political settings that will assist the development of the renewables-based economy. Doubtless the state’s task of easing the way for renewable energy is made politically gentler if the conventional energy corporations also own the renewable energy enterprises.

One hallmark of ecological modernization is the cooperation between states, corporations, and arguably, NGO advocates. Some environmentalists and progressive corporations have taken to proclaiming the benefits of cooperation, and governments can often be found applauding the maturity of these decisions. Certainly, in renewable energy there has been plenty of “working together.” A marriage of interests has always been likely between elements of the corporate sector and those environmentalists seeking national policy changes, because many environmental groups concentrating on national politics have mostly abandoned any prospect of widespread change through “bottom-up” civil society actions (Gottlieb, 2005). Reform of the energy sector has meant “solving the economic problem,” and the solution has been to pursue economies of scale in production of renewable energy units, invest in technological improvements, and hack away at subsidies given to conventional energy or to acquire access to high subsidies for renewables. These strategies can be pursued simultaneously with civil society mobilization, but this nevertheless requires bringing the interests of the state and corporations to bear on the problem. 254-5

AT: perms

[] they are still tied to the notion of solvency – this dooms all attempts to failure – quick fix schemes are simply card tricks with no magic the alternative is critical to navigate away from the cycle of destruction that is current managerial systems.

[] If we are to break the current cycle we must leave the earth alone.

Hanspeter Padrutt [Psychiatrist at daseinalytisches institute in Zurich author of "Heidegger and Ecology" in "Heidegger and the Earth "Guilt as Management Technology": A Call to Heideggerian Reflection" pages 17-18] 1992

Coming-Forth Holding-in-Reserve in Phenomenology and Its Connection to Ecology.
In the short text "Markings" from 1969, Heidegger wrote that the astonishing thing about the Greeks of the classical age is that they caught sight of the sayable from out of a "coming-forth holding-in-reserve" (*aus einer zuvor-kommenden Zurückhaltung her*).¹² And in the lecture on "Language" in 1950, he said that 'coming-forth holding-in-reserve' is the way in which mortals are to dwell in language.¹³ I found this phrase "coming-forth holding-in-reserve" only in these two places in Heidegger's texts; still, this phrase seems to me a very suitable designation for the basic comportment of that phenomenology which – according to *Being and Time* – lets that which shows itself from out of itself, self-showing, be seen and thus pays heed to what makes up the initially and mostly hidden root unfolding of what self-shows.¹⁴ Holding-in-reserve 'holds back' from the naive prejudice and rash theory, from the chatter and bustle of the public eye, and from the historically conditioned covering over and displacement. On the other hand *coming-forth* is not to be confused with superficial 'apparencty', but rather fits in with the unpretentious root-character, the unsaid and unthought, the unexpected – the 'originary' in future and in history. *Coming-forth* also fits in with what is called 'fore-running' into the possibility of death in *Being and Time*, which – when called by the call of conscience – insures the "disclosedness" in any given "situation" and is not to be misconstrued with a rash, breakneck leap. The notion of coming-forth holding-in-reserve is broad enough also to help elucidate a bit the preserving fourfold, which I mentioned at the beginning.¹⁵ Mortals rescue the earth by not exploiting it and by letting the earth be earth. Letting-be means not only letting the earth be at rest, but also letting its *being* come forth, to intimate its root unfolding, to let earth emerge, including emerge into flora and fauna. Mortals receive the sky by not conquering it and by letting it be, coming forth and drawn to day and night, the seasons of the year, the weather patterns – also foregoing that technical dialectics which makes night into day and winter into summer. Mortals await the gods by avoiding dogma and worship of idols and by paying heed to the withdrawal of the unfamiliar, the fullness, and the brilliance in the absence of the gods. And mortals accompany one another and themselves by pulling back from that falleness in which – according to *Being and Time* – an opposition is at play "under the mask of being-with"¹⁶ or in which fellow human beings are handled like countable numbers and sickness and death are handled like breakdowns in the machine. Mortals accompany one another and themselves by anticipating one another in genuine concern-for, fore-running into the possibility of death¹⁷ – all of this in coming-forth holding-in-reserve. 17 - 18

AT: perm - do that alt (theory)

1. This perm is a reason permutations are bad- allowing the aff to capture the entire neg. strategy steals any possible ground. Skews my time and education because I'm forced to argue against MY alternative. This perm flats a win, which is unfair. Our interprat is that perms are fair and educational in a world where it is combination that includes the plan and alt, because we are able to generate offense against it.
2. There is no net-benefit to this perm- another reason why this perm should be rejected.
3. They can't do the alt- 1AC speech act indicates that they don't understand their assumptions of the way things operate, in a world of technological management
4. They are responsible for the arguments they made, hold them responsible for the damage they have already done.
5. The perm severs the entire 1AC. This is bad an a voting issue.
 - a. Education- severance makes the aff a moving target, making it impossible to generate links or clash. That means it's impossible to get education, because they just shift advocacies after every speech.
 - b. Ground - Severing out of different parts of the plan makes it impossible for the negative to garner offense against the aff.
6. Winning on this perm is impossible- even if they win framework they can't weigh any impacts because they give up the case.

Alternative - explanation

** This all depends on the affirmative you should adjust it based on the level of inclusivity you are seeking

The basic premise of the Alternative is – that total resolution is a flawed notion looking for the next technological answer to our problem inevitably fails. We must reflect on the approach we choose when the stakes are so high blindly following the urge to act dooms us to failure.