

Heidegger Shell and 2NC Stuff

Produced By Ryan Schubert for Ceren/Leong

INC Shell	1-2
2NC Overview	3
2NC "Nuke War" Link	4
Alternative Solves Yo' Case	5
Alternative = Meditation = Solves the K	6
A2- Perm	7-9

Heidegger 1NC

A.

The essence of technology is the use of instrumental reason to uphold human ends. Technology enabled the production of the atomic bomb and the widespread destruction of the environment. The affirmatives overly focused critique of marine exploitation fails to address the broader structures of technological violence that threaten our annihilation, and actively replicates technological rationality. Turning case.

Hubert Dreyfus, professor of philosophy at Berkley, explains in 1995.

Cambridge Companion to Heidegger, p. 304

Heidegger comes to the surprising and provocative conclusion that focusing on loss and destruction is still technological. All attempts to reckon existing reality in terms of decline and loss in terms of fate, catastrophe, and destruction are merely technological behaviors. Seeing our situation as posing a problem that must be solved by appropriate action is technological too: “The instrumental conception of technology conditions every attempt to bring man into the right relation the more urgent the more technology.... The will to mastery becomes all the more urgent the more technology threatens to slip from human control.” Heidegger is clear this approach will not work. “No group of men, no commission of prominent statesman, scientist, and technicians, no conference leaders of commerce and industry, can brake or direct the progress of history in the atomic age.” Heidegger’s view is both darker and more hopeful. He thinks there is a more dangerous situation facing modern man than the technological destruction of nature and civilization yet this is a situation about which something can be done – at least indirectly. Heidegger’s concern is the human distress caused by the technological understanding of being, rather than the destruction caused by specific technologies. He distinguished the current problems caused by technology – ecological destruction, nuclear danger, and so on – from the devastation that would result should technology solve all our problems. What threatens man in his very nature is...that man by the peaceful release, transformation, storage, and channeling of the energies of physical nature, could render the human condition...tolerable for everybody and happy in all respects. The “greatest danger” is that the approaching tide of technological revolution could so captivate and beguile man that calculative thinking may someday come to be accepted and practiced as the only way of thinking. The danger, then, is not the destruction of nature or culture but certain totalizing kinds of practices – leveling of our understanding of being. This threat is not a problem for which we must find a solution but an ontological condition that requires a transformation of our understanding of Being.

Heidegger 1NC

B. Implications

1. Solvency is indeterminate

Approaching environmental exploitation as a problem to be solved replicates the very technological behaviors that raise the threat of extinction in the first place, turns case.

2. Case Turn

Replicating technology ushers in a new era that witnesses the planetary triumph of technological problem solving that reduces humanity to ontological damnation. That outweighs the 1AC harms and swamps solvency.

Michael Zimmerman, professor of philosophy at Tulane, explains in 1994 – Contesting Earth's future, DCIS.

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 one's relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur an ontological clearing through which such life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity's one-dimensional disclosure of entities virtually denies them any "being" at all, the loss of humanity's openness for being is already occurring. Modernity's background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material "happiness" for everyone by reducing nature to pure energy. The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity's slow-motion destruction of nature; unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided nuclear war only to survive as contended clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading in 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.



Exploitation is not an isolated technology – it's a symptom of a broader system of dehumanizing violence that is enabled by technological instrumental reason. We're nailing them on the link debate

1. Extend Dreyfus 95 from the 1NC – the evidence is phenomenal. Isolating exploitation as a danger to be solved only goes skin deep – the card says explicitly that the plan won't work. Conceded implication.
2. The 1AC is itself a technological behavior; they're part and parcel of the system that produced the degradation of the environment in the first place, turns case.
3. Extend Dreyfus and Zimmerman -- The 'protection' of natural resources ushers in a new world order that seeks technology's planetary triumph. Zimmerman proves that swamps case because it destroys all that makes life worth living; and it outweighs case. That's also conceded.

Finally remember,

Exploitation of resources is only one symptom of the larger disease that is technology. Even if they win a short-term link turn, technology will always rise up again in new forms to rear its ugly head. Swamps Solvency

The way the affirmative talks about total nuclear war establishes their harms scenarios as an absolute referent for justifying the nihilistic triumph of humanist technology. Cements the link.

-Michael Roth, "Poetics of Resistance" 1999 p. 197-198.

The technological age is the age of the apocalypse, of the nuclear holocaust. But this nuclear holocaust is always and essentially a "not-yet." It is a war, a technological war, that has not yet happened, and this is its essence. For the 'reality' of the nuclear age and the fable of the nuclear war are perhaps distinct, but they are not two separate things" ("NANN," 23). Since the nuclear war is a holocaust, an apocalypse, it will have always already not-yet occurred. And this for good reason; it is as the apocalypse—the limit of all that can occur, it is the death of all possibility.²⁰ In talking about nuclear war

(*) There is nothing but distant opinion [belief]. One can no longer oppose belief and science, duxi and epideme, once one has reached the decisive place of the nuclear age, in other words, once one has arrived at the critical place of the nuclear age. In this critical place, there is no more room for a distinction between belief and science, thus no more space for a "nuclear criticism" strictly speaking. Nor even for a truth in that sense. No truth, no apocalypse. (As you know, Apocalyptic means

Revelation, of Truth, Unveiling.) No, nuclear war is not only fabulous because one can only talk about it, but because the extraordinary sophistication of its technologies—which are also the technologies of delivery, sending, dispatching, of the missile in general, of mission, of missile, emission, and transmission, like all *techné*—the extraordinary sophistication of these technologies coexists, cooperates in an essential way with sophistry, psychorhetoric, and the most cursory, the most archaic, the most crudely opinionated psychology, the most vulgar psychology. ("NANN," 24)

The missile that is a crucial component of technology for apocalyptic nuclear war is the missive or mission of the delivery mechanism. The sending of a dispatch that Heidegger described, through the use of the *Geschick/schicken*, orders the mode of Being of modern technology. Technology is therefore essentially the technology of Being. The economic structure of technology most closely approximates that of the economy of *differance*, but it does so with a difference. The critical discussion of this age is the discourse of crisis; this is the age of the crisis. And the crisis is a sort of division in the foundation, a crack in the foundation, in the spread of technology, the nuclear apocalypse has laid away for all the world and not just the nuclear powers. A technological textuality is disseminated throughout the earth and occupies the earth like a foreign power's threat to the earth's life.

The nuclear age is not an epoch, it is the absolute *epoché*; it is not absolute knowledge and the end of history, it is the *epoché* of absolute knowledge ("NANN," 27). As such, it is the suspension of judgment, it puts the last judgment out of play. In this way, the nuclear apocalypse organizes all that occurs within the age. It acts as the absolute referent of the age, to which the economy of the technological text is geared and to which it is disposed (*Besland*). All that is in the age of technology is standing in reserve for this final occurrence, gathered together in anticipation for this future event. The context of the whole of modern life is focused around the singularity of this not-yet occurring event. This event is without a name since it cannot be named, it cannot be evoked insofar as it is the essential not-yet of naming. This nameless event of the apocalypse that so closely resembles the textuality of the text in the economy of *differance* is the quintessential transcendental signified that organizes all economy that occurs, in its nameless name, around it.

The exploitation of the planet is contingent upon a technological problem-solution mode that reduces the world to an exploitable reserve. Only our critique can break the circle and avert annihilation.

-Martin Heidegger 1959 Discourse on Thinking p. 56

~~>What great danger then might move upon us? Then there might go hand in hand with the greatest ingenuity in calculative planning and inventing indifference toward meditative thinking /total thoughtlessness. And then? Then man would have denied and thrown away his own special nature - that he is a meditative being. Therefore, the issue is the saving of man's essential nature. Therefore, the issue is keeping meditative thinking alive.~~

~~Yet, releasements toward things and openness to the mystery never happen of themselves. They do not befall us accidentally. Both flourish only through persistent courageous thinking.~~

~~Perhaps today's memorial celebration will prompt us toward this. If we respond to the prompting, we think of Conradin Kreutzer by thinking of the origin of his work, the life-giving powers of his Heuberg homeland. And it is we who think if we know ourselves here and now, as the men who must find and prepare the way into the atomic age, through it and out of it. > 5c~~

The affirmative's exclusive calculative focus on the harms misses the point. Removing the harms forces humanity into the clutches of technological nihilism. Don't let the imperative to solve annihilate the ontological value to human life. Endorsing the INC's meditation on technology can solve this impact.

-Martin Heidegger 1959 Discourse on Thinking p. 55-56

But for the time being— we do not know for how long— man finds himself in a perilous situation. Why? Just because a third world war might break out unexpectedly and bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the

destruction of the earth? No. In this dawning atomic age, a far greater danger threatens. Precisely when the danger of a third world war has been removed! A strange assertion!

Strange indeed, but only as long as we do not meditate. In what sense is the statement just made valid? This assertion is valid in the sense that the approaching tide of technological revolution in the atomic age could so captivate, bewitch, dazzle, and beguile man that calculative thinking may someday come to be accepted and practiced as the only way of thinking.

What great danger then might move upon us? Then there might go hand in hand with the greatest ingenuity in calculative planning and inventing indifference toward meditative thinking, total thoughtlessness. And then, then man would have denied and thrown away his own special nature—that he is a meditative being. Therefore, the issue is the saving of man's essential nature. Therefore, the issue is keeping meditative thinking alive.

Let release from toward things and openness to the mystery never happen of themselves. They do not befall us accidentally. Both flourish only through persistent, courageous thinking. 755-56

1. Only a Negative ballot solves - Environmental destruction is the Symptom – Not the Disease. Protecting marine natural resources always has a terminal solvency deficit – it completes humanity's technological triumph over the planet and subverts all the makes Human Life Worth living. Only pitting the critique decisively AGAINST the plan can salvage human life. Reject the permutation.

-Martin Heidegger 1959 Discourse on Thinking p. 49-53

We grow still more thoughtful and ask: If this is so, can man, can man's work in the future still be expected to thrive in the fertile ground of a homeland and mount into the ether, into the far reaches of heavens and the spirit? Or will everything now fall into the clutches of planning and calculation, of organization and automation?

If we reflect upon what our celebration today suggests, then we must observe the loss of man's autochthony with which our age is threatened. And we ask: What really is happening in our age? By what is it characterized?

The age that is now beginning has been called of late the atomic age. Its most conspicuous symbol is the atom bomb. But this symbolizes only the obvious; for it was recognized at once that atomic energy can be used also for peaceful purposes. Nuclear physicist everywhere are busy with vast plans to implement the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The great industrial corporations of the leading countries, first of all England, have figured out already that atomic energy can develop into a gigantic business. Through this atomic business a new era of happiness is envisioned. Nuclear science too, does not stand idly by. It publicly proclaims this era of happiness. Thus in July of this year at Lake Constance, eighteen Nobel Prize winners stated in a proclamation: "Science [and that is modern natural science] is a road to a happier human life."

What is the sense of this statement? Does it spring from reflection? Does it ever Ponder on the meaning of the atomic age? No! For if we rest content with this statement of science, we remain as far as possible from a reflective insight into our age. Why? Because we forgot to ponder. Because we forgot to ask: What is the ground that enabled modern technology to discover and set free new energies in nature.

This is due to a revolution in leading concepts which has been going on for the past several centuries, and by which man is placed in different world. This radical revolution in outlook has come about in modern philosophy. From this arises a completely new relation of man to the world and his place in it. The world now appears as a object open to the attacks of calculative thought, attacks that nothing is believed able any longer to resist. Nature becomes a gigantic gasoline station, an energy store for modern technology and industry. This relation of man to the world as such, in principle a technical one, developed in the seventeenth century first and only in Europe. It long remained unknown in other continents, and it was altogether alien to former ages and histories.

The power concealed in modern technology determines the relation of man to that which exists. It rules the whole earth. Indeed, already man is beginning to advance beyond the earth into outer space. In not quite twenty years, such gigantic sources of power have become known through the discovery of atomic energy that in the foreseeable future the world's demands for energy of any kind will be ensured forever. Soon the procurement of the new energies will no longer be tied to certain countries and continents, as is the occurrence of coal, oil, and timber. In the foreseeable future it will be possible to build atomic power stations anywhere on earth.

Thus the decisive question of science and technology today is no longer: Where do we find sufficient quantities of fuel? The decisive question now runs: In what way can we tame and direct the unimaginably vast amounts of atomic energies, and so secure mankind against the

danger that these gigantic energies suddenly—even without military actions—break out somewhere, “run away” and destroy everything?

If the taming of atomic energy is successful, and it will be successful, then a totally new era of technical development will begin. What we know now as the technology of film and television, of transportation and especially air transportation, of news reporting, and as medical and nutritional technology, is presumably only a crude start. No one can foresee the radical changes to come. But technological advance will move faster and faster and can never be stopped. In all areas of his existence, man will be encircled ever more tightly by the forces of technology. These forces, which everywhere and every minute claim, enchain, drag along, press and impose upon man under the form of some technical contrivance or other—these forces, since man has not made them, have moved long since beyond his will and have outgrown his capacity for decision.

But this too is characteristic of the new world of technology, that its accomplishments come most speedily to be known and publicly admired. Thus today everyone will be known and publicly admired. Thus today everyone will be able to read what this talk says about technology in and competently managed picture magazine or hear it on the radio. But—it is one thing to have heard and read something, that is, merely to take notice; it is another thing to understand what we have heard and read, that is, to ponder.

The international meeting of Nobel Prize winners took place again in the summer of this year of 1955 in Lindau. There the American chemist, Stanley, had this to say: “The hour is near when life will be placed in the hands of the chemist who will be able to synthesize, split and change living substance at will.” We take notice of such a statement. We even marvel at the daring of scientific research, without thinking about it. We do not stop to consider that an attack with technological means is being prepared upon the life and nature of man compared with which the explosion of the hydrogen bomb means little. For precisely if the hydrogen bombs do not explode and human life on earth is preserved, an uncanny change in the world moves upon us.

Yet it is not only the world is becoming entirely technical which is really uncanny. Far more uncanny is our being unprepared for the transformation, our inability to confront meditatively what is really dawning in this age.

No single man, no group of men, no commission of prominent statesmen, scientist, and technicians, no conference of leaders of commerce and industry, can brake or direct the progress of history in the atomic age. No merely human organization is capable of gaining dominion over it.

Is man, then, a defenseless and perplexed victim at the mercy of the irresistible superior power of technology? He would be if man today abandons any intention to pit meditative thinking decisively against merely calculative thinking. But once meditative thinking awakens, it must be at work unceasingly and on every last occasion—hence, also here and now at this commemoration. For here we are considering what is threatened especially in the atomic age: the autochthony of the works of man.

Thus we ask now: even if the old rootedness is being lost in this age, may not a new ground and foundation be lost in this age, may not a new ground and foundation be granted again to man, a foundation and ground out of which man's nature and all his works can flourish in a new way even in the atomic age?

What could the ground and foundation be for the new autochthony? Perhaps the answer we are looking for lies at hand; so near that we all too easily overlook it. For the way to what is near is always the longest and thus the hardest for us humans. This way is the way of meditative thinking. Meditative thinking demands of us not to cling one-sidedly to a single idea, nor to run down a one-track course of ideas. Meditative thinking demands of us that we engage ourselves with what at first sight does not go together at all.

2. Still Links – The INC Dreyfus evidence specifically indict the technological framing done in the IAC. Any attempt to understand the Earth in technological terms is violent and poses the greatest danger to humanity.

3. No Net Benefit – The perm doesn't magically fix their rhetorical framework—there is still no impact to the case. The INC proves that you can't sever from the reduction of the Earth to a standing reserve.

4. Severance – The only way the perm could be net beneficial would be if it severed the rhetorical spotlighting of only certain technologies in the IAC. Severance is bad for debate because it allows the aff to be a moving target that the negative could never pin down. Voter for fairness