### Cap 1NC

#### 1. Heidegger’s focus on ontology reinforces capitalism - it obscures the material connections necessary for a true revolutionary position

DeFazio 12 (Kimberly, English Professor at University of Wisconsin Lacrosse, Winter/Spring 12, Machine-Thinking and the Romance of Posthumanism, http://redcritique.org/WinterSpring2012/machinethinkingandtheromanceofposthumanism.htm)

In the most basic terms, of course, both Heidegger and Marx agree that, as Marx puts it, "at the present day general consciousness is an abstraction from real life and as such antagonistically confronts it" (Economic Manuscripts 105)—that is, that consciousness is alienated from reality. But Heidegger's hostility to the "general consciousness" is deeply tied to his romantic treatment of technology and technological thinking. "In utilizing public means of transport and in making use of information services such as the newspaper," Heidegger argues, "every Other is like the next. This Being-with-one-another dissolves one's own Dasein completely into the kind of Being of 'the Others' in such a way, indeed, that the Others, as distinguishable and explicit, vanish more and more. In this inconspicuousness and unascertainability, the real dictatorship of the 'they' is unfolded' (Being and Time 154). Elaborating his machine-thinking, Heidegger here perhaps makes most manifest his rejection of the working class "mass," within whom (it is assumed) all individuality is lost and one sinks into "averageness" and "mediocrity." Deeply aware of the growing international power of the organized working class, not only in the Soviet Union, but throughout Europe and even in the US after the first world war, what Heidegger "sees" in the strengthening urban proletariat is an indistinguishable mob threatening unique authenticity (individuality), which is a code for private property. As a result, it is not the property relations which strip workers of the means of production, forcing them to work for someone else that Heidegger sees as the root problem of the working class. It is instead the machines that cause the working class to lose their individual freedom and individuality, not workers' class relation to machinery but the machinery itself (along with its instrumental thinking). Thus the homogenization (abstraction) of labor by capital gets translated as "leveling down" and "averageness" which themselves are then equated with "publicness." The "city" (the space in which technology is most concentrated) then is rejected because it "controls every way in which the world and Dasein get interpreted" (165). Nature in turn becomes the romantic space in which "every difference of level and of genuineness" and the "heart" of matters are experienced outside of social interpretation—as the "ineffable." This of course leads Heidegger, in his later writings, to become more and more concerned with the consequences of technology's "enframing" logic for nature. As he puts it in "The Question Concerning Technology," in a technological age "even the cultivation of the field has comes under the grip of another kind of setting-in-order, which sets upon nature. It sets upon it in the sense of challenging it. Agriculture is now the mechanized food industry, air is now set upon to yield nitrogen, the earth to yield ore, ore to yield uranium, for example" (320).¶ For Heidegger, the conflict between "consciousness and real life" (Marx) is ultimately a mode of thinking that has not been attentive to Being, and can be remedied with a new mode of thinking. For Marx, by contrast, this results from the social relations in which the products of human's labor are alienated from them. Only a society in which a few own the means of production can others be in a position that they not only must sell their labor to survive but under conditions in which they have no control over or property in their product of labor. "How would the worker come to face the product of his activity as a stranger," Marx asks, "were it not that in the very act of production he was estranging himself from himself? The product is after all but the summary of the activity, of production... In the estrangement of the object of labor is merely summarized the estrangement, the alienation, in the activity of labor itself" (73-4). For this reason, there can be no moving beyond the situation in which people are alienated from their productive activity ("hammering") unless the social relations of production are transformed. But Heidegger bypasses change of material relations by suggesting that hiding behind (or "alongside") the materiality of the everyday world of tools is a deeper, more elusive being—one which renders the relation of subject and object far more "ambiguous" (subjective) and which can be accessed only through intuition. For Heidegger, the more authentic approach to Being can only take place through the "qualitative experience" constitutive of being-in-the-world as against the "abstract" (concept) or theory.¶ It is, however, only abstraction that allows one to grasp the abstract material relations underlying experience. To repeat, the hammer is material not because of the qualities of its "thingness" (the argument of mechanical materialism and matterism) but because of the abstract social relations which both produce it and which determine its applications and its "meanings." In the guise of putting forward a new notion of the (immaterial) "material," Heidegger's argument is a means of dismantling the concepts needed for materialist explanation of the world. Without concepts which make connections between apparently fundamentally different entities and phenomena, there is no way to understand the labor relations which position people in structurally similar ways much less the economic laws which compel capital to exploit labor. Heidegger forgets, in other words, that "pre-reflective" or "primordial" experience is the space of ideology. Focusing only on the excessive "experience" of labor thus directs attention away from the material world which shapes experiences and onto the subjective ways of thinking about experience as an isolated "in itself": precisely the ideological ways of thinking capital fosters so as to inhibit working people from identifying common (class) interests and collectively fighting for them.¶ Ultimately, then, as Lukács put it, Heidegger represents "the philosophical 'third way': the claim to be above the antithesis of idealism and materialism (which he terms realism)" (Destruction of Reason493). That is to say, "He claimed to be arguing an objective doctrine of Being, an ontology, but he then defined the ontological essence of the category most central to his world on a purely subjectivistic basis, with pseudo-objectivistic expressions" (496). The real value of Heidegger's writings has thus been their ideological function for capital. Confronting catastrophic contradictions, Heidegger sought to understand the nature of human being not in the social relations of production, but in "primordial" ways. He launched a major offensive against instrumental thinking—what was for him a metaphysical will to presence that impeded humans' ability to grasp their true relation to Being—and developed new ways of comprehending the embeddedness of the subject in its environment, so as to blur the boundary between subject and object that had been a cornerstone of Cartesian and Newtonian thinking. But in so doing, he separated instrumentality from the relations in which instruments come to dominate human life and human thinking. His ontology, which in the light of its broader historical context functioned to establish a philosophical basis for the recovery of a defeated nation, has operated since then, in diverse ways, to absorb the contradictions of the imperialist era of capitalism into the realm of a more ephemeral and fluid conceptualization of existence. Thus, while posthumanism ostensibly critiques Heidegger's "essentializing" of the human, as I will address later on, his idealist treatment of being and machine-thinking informs the entire structure of posthumanist thinking and is a testament to its ultimately conservative role in the 21st century.

#### 2. The logic of capitalism results in extinction through the creation of ecological catastrophe and violent imperialist wars that will turn nuclear

Foster 5 [John Bellamy, Monthly Review, September, Vol. 57, Issue 4, “Naked Imperialism”, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm>]

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: “[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal.” The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue. The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China,that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the “nuclear club.” Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism. The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society. The classic name for such a society is “socialism.” Such a renewed struggle for a world of substantive human equality must begin by addressing the system’s weakest link and at the same time the world’s most pressing needs—by organizing a global resistance movement against the new naked imperialism.

#### 3. Class divisions are the root of all other oppressions

Kovel 2 (Alger Hiss Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, awarded Fellowship at the John Guggenheim Foundation, Joel, The Enemy of Nature, pages 123-124)

If, however, we ask the question of efficacy, that is, which split sets the others into motion, then priority would have to be given to class, for the plain reason that class relations entail the state as an instrument of enforce­ment and control, and it is the state that shapes and organizes the splits that appear in human ecosystems. Thus class is both logically and historically distinct from other forms of exclusion (hence we should not talk of 'classism' to go along with 'sexism' and 'racism,' and `species-ism'). This is, first of all, because class is an essentially man-made category, without root in even a mystified biology. We cannot imagine a human world without gender dis­tinctions – although we can imagine a world without domination by gender. But a world without class is eminently imaginable – indeed, such was the human world for the great majority of our species' time on earth, during all of which considerable fuss was made over gender. Historically, the difference arises because 'class' signifies one side of a larger figure that includes a state apparatus whose conquests and regulations create races and shape gender relations. Thus there will be no true resolution of racism so long as class society stands, inasmuch as a racially oppressed society implies the activities of a class-defending state.'° Nor can gender inequality be enacted away so long as class society, with its state, demands the super-exploitation of woman's labour. Class society continually generates gender, racial, ethnic oppressions and the like, which take on a life of their own, as well as profoundly affecting the concrete relations of class itself. It follows that class politics must be fought out in terms of all the active forms of social splitting. It is the management of these divisions that keeps state society functional. Thus though each person in a class society is reduced from what s/he can become, the varied reductions can be combined into the great stratified regimes of history — this one becoming a fierce warrior, that one a routine-loving clerk, another a submissive seamstress, and so on, until we reach today's personi­fications of capital and captains of industry. Yet no matter how functional a class society, the profundity of its ecological violence ensures a basic antagonism which drives history onward. History is the history of class society — because no matter how modified, so powerful a schism is bound to work itself through to the surface, provoke resistance (`class struggle'), and lead to the succession of powers. The relation of class can be mystified without end — only consider the extent to which religion exists for just this purpose, or watch a show glorifying the police on television — yet so long as we have any respect for human nature, we must recognize that so funda­mental an antagonism as would steal the vital force of one person for the enrichment of another cannot be conjured away.

#### 4. Vote negative to adopt the historical material criticism of the 1NC - historical analysis of the material conditions of capital is the only way to break free from is contradictions and social inequalities it causes

Tumino 1 (Steven, teaches at the City University of New York, Spring, What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before)

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

#### 5. Historical materialism must come first - it predetermines consciousness and the very possibilities of reflective thinking

**Marx 1859** (Karl, a pretty important dude. “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy: Preface” http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm) JM

>edited for gendered language<

In the social production of their existence, [people] inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of [people] that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms – with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic – in short, ideological forms in which [people] become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society.

### CP

#### Michelle and I affirm that the 50 states should remove all restrictions on energy production from non-conventional windmills.

#### States solve wind

NREL 11 (National Renewable Energy Laboratory, April 25, 2011, “State Policies Key to Clean Energy Development, Report Says,” http://www.nrel.gov/news/press/2011/973.html)

States’ policies are important to solar and wind energy development and in reducing energy use says a new report from the U.S. Department of Energy’s (DOE) National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). The findings are in report, State of the States 2010: The Role of Policy in Clean Energy Market Transformation.¶ “This report shows the importance of the state and local policy in encouraging clean energy market development,” said Mike Pacheco, NREL vice president of Deployment & Market Transformation. “Specifically, state policymakers may be more effective at driving clean energy investment using a suite of policies and keeping the policies in place longer.”¶ Building on an emerging body of literature identifying connections between state policy and renewable energy, the State of States 2010 report quantifies the connection between state clean energy policies, renewable energy development and actual reductions in energy use. Renewable energy use increased 3 percent across the United States in 2010, the report says.¶ It is the first time energy efficiency has been considered in this type of analysis, and the report shows significant connections between reduced energy use and building codes, electricity prices and, in some cases, energy efficiency resource standards. Even though state policies might apply to a wide variety of renewable energy resources, the analysis shows that most often there’s a relationship between policy and solar and wind development. So, if states tailor policy to other resources, it might help increase development of renewable energy sources in addition to solar and wind.¶ “State policy efforts can help sustain the good work started by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act in creating economic development opportunities through clean energy,” said LeAnn M. Oliver, DOE Weatherization & Intergovernmental Program Manager. “State of the States 2010 offers practical information to policymakers on how to further promote those policies.”

### Framework

#### A. Our interpretation is that the affirmative should have to instrumentally defend the institutional implementation of a topical plan.

#### B. Violation – the aff doesn’t defend a plan.

#### C. Best for fairness.

#### 1. Plan focus is the only predictable way of affirming the resolution. Philosophical and theoretical concerns certainly play into the ways that policies are made, but the resolution only calls for us to defend and/or question political-institutional implementations of these kinds of concerns.

#### 2. Plan focus is the only way to ensure a fair division of ground. The affirmative has the advantage of trying to solve the most heinous problems of the status quo—without plan focus, debates devolve into whether or not things like racism, sexism, classism, or homophobia are good or bad. While problems are often less contestable, solutions to these problems are—we can debate about whether or not a particular proposal will fix or worsen these problems and proffer our own solutions.

#### D. Best for education:

#### No solvency for their critique without institutional focus. We must try to change policy in order to change the world—the concentration of power in the hands of political elites is inevitable, so we must work within that system to check oppression and violence.

Themba-Nixon 2k [Makani, Executive Director of the Praxis Project, *Colorlines* 3.2, pg. 12]

The flourish and passion with which she made the distinction said everything. Policy is for wonks, sell-out politicians, and ivory-tower eggheads. Organizing is what real, grassroots people do. Common as it may be, this distinction doesn't bear out in the real world. Policy is more than law. It is any written agreement (formal or informal) that specifies how an institution, governing body, or community will address shared problems or attain shared goals. It spells out the terms and the consequences of these agreements and is the codification of the body's values-as represented by those present in the policymaking process. Given who's usually present, most policies reflect the political agenda of powerful elites. Yet, policy can be a force for change-especially when we bring our base and community organizing into the process. In essence, policies are the codification of power relationships and resource allocation. Policies are the rules of the world we live in. Changing the world means changing the rules. So, if organizing is about changing the rules and building power, how can organizing be separated from policies? Can we really speak truth to power, fight the right, stop corporate abuses, or win racial justice without contesting the rules and the rulers, the policies and the policymakers? The answer is no-and double no for people of color. Today, racism subtly dominates nearly every aspect of policymaking. From ballot propositions to city funding priorities, policy is increasingly about the control, de-funding, and disfranchisement of communities of color. What Do We Stand For? Take the public conversation about welfare reform, for example. Most of us know it isn't really about putting people to work. The right's message was framed around racial stereotypes of lazy, cheating "welfare queens" whose poverty was "cultural." But the new welfare policy was about moving billions of dollars in individual cash payments and direct services from welfare recipients to other, more powerful, social actors. Many of us were too busy to tune into the welfare policy drama in Washington, only to find it washed up right on our doorsteps. Our members are suffering from workfare policies, new regulations, and cutoffs. Families who were barely getting by under the old rules are being pushed over the edge by the new policies. Policy doesn't get more relevant than this. And so we got involved in policy-as defense. Yet we have to do more than block their punches. We have to start the fight with initiatives of our own. Those who do are finding offense a bit more fun than defense alone. Living wage ordinances, youth development initiatives, even gun control and alcohol and tobacco policies are finding their way onto the public agenda, thanks to focused community organizing that leverages power for community-driven initiatives. - Over 600 local policies have been passed to regulate the tobacco industry. Local coalitions have taken the lead by writing ordinances that address local problems and organizing broad support for them. - Nearly 100 gun control and violence prevention policies have been enacted since 1991. - Milwaukee, Boston, and Oakland are among the cities that have passed living wage ordinances: local laws that guarantee higher than minimum wages for workers, usually set as the minimum needed to keep a family of four above poverty. These are just a few of the examples that demonstrate how organizing for local policy advocacy has made inroads in areas where positive national policy had been stalled by conservatives. Increasingly, the local policy arena is where the action is and where activists are finding success. Of course, corporate interests-which are usually the target of these policies-are gearing up in defense. Tactics include front groups, economic pressure, stand for takes place in the shaping of demands. By getting into the policy arena in a proactive manner, we can take our demands to the next level. Our demands can become law, with real consequences if the agreement is broken. After all the organizing, press work, and effort, a group should leave a decisionmaker with more than a handshake and his or her word. Of course, this work requires a certain amount of interaction with "the suits," as well as struggles with the bureaucracy, the technical language, and the all-too-common resistance by decisionmakers. Still, if it's worth demanding, it's worth having in writing-whether as law, regulation, or internal policy. From ballot initiatives on rent control to laws requiring worker protections, organizers are leveraging their power into written policies that are making a real difference in their communities. Of course, policy work is just one tool in our organizing arsenal, but it is a tool we simply can't afford to ignore. Making policy work an integral part of organizing will require a certain amount of retrofitting. We will need to develop the capacity to translate our information, data, and experience into stories that are designed to affect the public conversation. Perhaps most important, we will need to move beyond fighting problems and on to framing solutions that bring us closer to our vision of how things should be. And then we must be committed to making it so.

### Disad

#### 1. Obama winning – swing state polls and voters like his policies so far

Bowen 9/20 (Robert Bowen¶ Economic Policy writer for the Examiner¶ Currently a businessman, Robert Bowen served in the Colorado legislature in the 1980s as a moderate Democrat. He was also appointed by three different governors to serve on various boards and commissions, “New Fox News poll released Thursday shows Obama winning 3 key swing states” 2012, http://www.examiner.com/article/new-fox-news-poll-released-thursday-shows-obama-winning-3-key-swing-states)

Despite two re-set buttons, Mitt Romney’s campaign continues to back slide. The latest bad news comes from the Fox News poll for the crucial states of Ohio, Florida, and Virginia. The poll was released Thursday, and it is not good news for Romney. The results were confirmed by 3 other polls this week.¶ According to Fox News, Obama tops Romney by seven percentage points among likely voters in both Ohio (49-42 percent) and Virginia (50-43 percent). In Florida, the president holds a five-point edge (49-44 percent). Obama’s lead is just outside the poll’s margin of sampling error in Ohio and Virginia, and within the margin of sampling error in Florida.¶ .¶ The poll shows that majorities of voters are unhappy with how things are going in the country, yet in all three states more say they trust Obama than Romney to improve the economy. It was not asked in this poll, but in others, more voters still blame Bush and Republicans for the bad economy than Obama.¶ Likewise, in each state more voters believe the Obama administration’s policies have helped rather than hurt the economy although the margins are small. They favor Obama by two points in Florida, three points in Ohio, and five points in Virginia.

#### PTC extension unpopular

Styles 12 (August 2, 2012 Geoffrey Styles Managing Director of GSW Strategy Group, LLC, an energy and environmental strategy consulting firm “Last Hurrah for the Wind Power Tax Credit?” http://theenergycollective.com/node/99336)

As the Reuters article makes clear, there will be other opportunities for the PTC to be reinserted in the extenders bill or other legislation. However, by persistently arguing for extending the existing credit without modification, the wind industry and its supporters may be misreading the public's appetite for such generous subsidies in a period of protracted economic weakness, notwithstanding the recent Iowa poll. Despite its rapid recent growth wind still contributes less than 4% of the nation's electricity and just 1% of our total energy consumption, and the green jobs angle is wearing thin. Last year's expiration of the ethanol blenders credit set a precedent for ending another large, generous subsidy before its beneficiaries agreed they were done with it. If congressional Republicans line up behind their party's standard beareron this issue, the wind industry will have missed its opportunity for a graduated, multi-year phaseout of the PTC, instead of stepping off a cliff in 2013.

#### 3. Approval ratings are key to the election

Cook 11 (The National Journal Political Analyst, Charlie, October 27, “Underwater,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-obama-underwater-20111027>, d/a 7-20-12, ads)

The best barometer of how a president is going to fare is his approval rating, which starts taking on predictive value about a year out. As each month goes by, the rating becomes a better indicator of the eventual results. Presidents with approval numbers above 48 to 50 percent in the Gallup Poll win reelection. Those with approval ratings below that level usually lose. If voters don’t approve of the job you are doing after four years in office, they usually don’t vote for you. Of course, a candidate can win the popular vote and still lose the [Electoral College](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-obama-underwater-20111027). It happened to Samuel Tilden in 1876, Grover Cleveland in 1888, and Al Gore in 2000. But the popular votes and the Electoral College numbers usually come down on the same side.

#### 4. Romney will repeal the ACA

Friedman 12 Jun 28, 2012 EMILY FRIEDMAN ABC producer and digital reporter covering Gov. Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign “Romney Calls for Obamacare Repeal as ‘Bad Law’”

http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/06/romney-calls-for-obamacare-repeal-as-bad-law/

Mitt Romney today renewed his vow to repeal the health care law that the United States Supreme Court today upheld, referring to the plan as “bad law” and “bad policy.”¶ “As you might imagine I disagree with the Supreme Court’s decision and I agree with the dissent,” said Romney, with the Capitol building as his backdrop. “What the Court did not do on its last day in session I will do on my first day if elected President of the United States and that is I will act to repeal Obamacare.”

#### 5. The ACA is key to women’s rights and ending gender discrimination in health care

Arons and Panza 12 (Jessica, Director of the Women’s Health and Rights Program and a member of the Faith and Progressive Policy Initiative at American Progress, honors graduate of Brown University and William and Mary School of Law., Lucy, Policy Analyst with the Women's Health and Rights Program at American Progress, May 22nd, Top 10 Obamacare Benefits at Stake for Women, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/healthcare/news/2012/05/22/11552/top-10-obamacare-benefits-at-stake-for-women/)

The Supreme Court is currently reviewing the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act, more commonly known as “Obamacare.” This landmark piece of legislation signed into law by President Barack Obama drastically reforms the way health insurance works in our country. Below we outline 10 reasons why, as stated in the Center for American Progress report “Women and Obamacare,” women in America have so much riding on the Supreme Court’s decision.¶ 1. Obamacare guarantees coverage of preventive services with no cost sharing. Preventive care promotes health and saves money. Yet many preventive care services are out of women’s reach due to high co-pays, deductibles, and co-insurance. More than 50 percent of women have delayed seeking medical care due to cost, and one-third of women report forgoing basic necessities to pay for health care. But under the health reform law, insurers are now required to cover recommended preventive services such as mammograms, Pap smears, and well-baby care without cost sharing. More than 45 million women have already taken advantage of these services. And starting this August more services, including contraception, gestational diabetes screening, and breastfeeding supports, will be added to the list of preventive care that must be covered at no additional cost.¶ 2. Maternity care will be required in new insurance plans. Coverage for maternity care—health care that only women need—is routinely excluded in the individual insurance market. Only 12 percent of plans sold in the individual market even offer maternity coverage, which is frequently inadequate because of waiting periods or deductibles that can be as high as the cost of the birth itself. But once Obamacare is fully implemented in 2014, about 8.7 million women will have guaranteed access to maternity care in all new individual and small group plans.¶ 3. Women will no longer be denied insurance coverage for gender-related reasons. In today’s insurance market, it is common for insurers to refuse to cover women because of gender-based “pre-existing conditions,” such as having had a Cesarean section or being the victim of domestic violence or sexual assault. Thankfully, this practice will be outlawed under Obamacare in 2014. In the meantime, adults with pre-existing conditions who have been uninsured for at least six months can purchase affordable coverage through temporary Pre-existing Condition Insurance Plans.¶ 4. Women will no longer be charged more for their insurance coverage just for being women. Under a practice known as “gender rating,” insurers currently charge women higher premiums than men for identical health benefits. As a result, women now pay $1 billion more than men each year for the same health plans in the individual market. As of 2014, however, under the Affordable Care Act, gender rating will become illegal in all new individual and small group plans.¶ 5. Women have more control over their health care. Already, women no longer need a referral to see their obstetrician-gynecologist thanks to Obamacare. And they get to choose their primary care physician and their child’s pediatrician from their plan’s list of participating providers.¶ 6. Women will gain better access to affordable health insurance. Starting in 2014 women and their families, as well as small businesses, will receive tax credits on an income-based sliding scale to help purchase insurance coverage. This will help individuals who earn up to $43,000 per year and up to $92,200 for families of four. Also in 2014 up to 10.3 million women will gain insurance coverage when Medicaid expands its income eligibility to include people with incomes below 138 percent of the federal poverty level—less than $15,000 for individuals and about $31,809 for a family of four in 2011. The health law also eliminates Medicaid’s categorical requirements, so that low-income women who meet the income requirements can be enrolled even if they have no children and are not pregnant.¶ 7. Insurance companies can no longer place limits on the amount of money they’ll spend on covered medical expenses. Women are more likely than men to suffer from a chronic condition, and an unforeseen medical emergency or a chronic illness can cause an insured person to rapidly reach a coverage cap in their insurance plan, leaving enrollees to fend for themselves, sometimes with thousands of dollars in unpaid medical bills. But under Obamacare lifetime coverage caps have been eliminated and annual limits are being phased out. Approximately 39.5 million women have already benefited from the ban on lifetime caps.¶ 8. Women and their families benefit from critical consumer protections in Obamacare. Because women use health care services at higher rates on behalf of themselves and their families, ensuring just insurance practices is of critical importance. The Affordable Care Act has already eliminated the practice of “rescission,” when an insurance policy ends the moment a beneficiary gets sick. The health law also requires insurers to spend at least 80 percent of premiums on actually providing health care, as opposed to administrative costs, or pay enrollees a rebate. Policyholders and employers will receive approximately $1.3 billion in premium rebates this year alone.¶ 9. Women in marginalized communities are seeing reforms that respond to their needs. Women of color, lesbian and bisexual women, and transgender people are disproportionately uninsured and subject to higher rates of health disparities. Obamacare is making critical strides in providing vulnerable women with quality health care through increased access to insurance coverage, increased funding for community health centers, promoting health literacy and cultural competency, prohibiting discrimination in the health insurance market, and improving data collection. For instance, already an estimated 5.5 million African Americans, 6.1 million Latinos, 2.7 million Asians, and 0.3 million Native Americans, many of them women, have received preventive service coverage with no cost sharing under the health reform law.

#### 6. We must reject gender oppression at every turn – any compromise is a sellout

Gordon and Gordon 95 senior lecturer in the Department of Education at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev and Gordon, general director of the Foundation for Education, 1995

[Haim and Rivca, Sartre and Evil: Guidelines for a Struggle, p. 130)

**Consider the widespread oppression of women. Every compromise with this oppression, any reconciliation with the male oppressors is a sellout**. Moreover, there is no Santa Claus who will bring women in the world justice, equality, and freedom. **What members of the women's movement and the men who support them face is a long, difficult day-to-day struggle against the basic Evil of gender oppression and exploitation of women**. Therefore, women or men who believe in a Santa Claus who will bring women justice, freedom, and equality are fools. **And those who** do not believe in Santa Claus, who **continue to struggle for freedom and equality for all women, must not flee from hating those men and those institutions that continue to oppress, exploit, debase, and degrade women.**

### Case

#### Wind power fails – unreliable in providing electricity to the grid in peak hours, which means coal, natural gas and nuclear plants can’t be replaced

Institute for Energy Research 12 (August 13th, a not-for-profit organization that conducts intensive research and analysis on the functions, operations, and government regulation of global energy markets, California’s Flex Alert: A Case Study in Intermittent Energy, http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/48788)

California has long been a leader in promoting wind and other renewables to power the electricity grid. Recently, California has gone even further and in 2011, Gov. Jerry Brown signed a law to force an increase in the amount of renewables utilities must use to 33 percent of the state’s electricity by 2020.¶ Currently, the state is experiencing a stressed electricity grid because of high demand and because some nuclear and natural gas plants are offline. Mandated renewable energy is proving itself incapable of filling the void. This situation show how little actual value wind, solar and other politically correct renewables have in the real world work of supplying people with electricity when they need and want it.¶ California is currently experiencing a “flex alert” which strongly urges Californians to use less electricity. According to the California ISO, the operator of the region’s power grid, it is “critical” to conserve electricity today to make sure there aren’t blackouts. Here’s the graphic representing the alert:¶ Because California is rushing headlong toward more and more renewables in the electricity grid it is important to look at how renewables are contributing to keeping the electricity grid stable. For example, California has 4.297 gigawatts of installed wind capacity which could really help California balance the grid if the wind blew at the right times (spoiler alert—the wind doesn’t blow at the right times).¶ The first chart below shows the supply and demand for August 9, 2012 in the California ISO electrical grid. The actual demand is in blue and the available generation is in orange. The second chart shows the renewable generation in California at that time.¶ There are some very important things to note with respect to the renewable generation. Wind’s production peaked just before 1 am, when electricity demand was dropping as people went to bed and nighttime temperatures reduced the need for air conditioning. At the time, wind was producing 6 percent of California’s electricity, but after 1 am, wind began to falter and wind production fell by 90 percent by 11 am. At that time, wind was producing less than 100 megawatts of electricity—a mere 0.2 percent of the electricity in California.¶ This shows how wind fails to produce electricity when needed most. At 11 am, as electricity demand was rapidly increasing and electricity producing was needed most, wind was at a low ebb. Fortuitously, wind production increased in the afternoon, but by 5:30 pm, wind was only producing a little more than 1 percent of California’s total electricity.¶ Solar helped meet demand more than wind, because solar has the advantage of producing electricity when the sun is shining and households are using more power. But even solar failed to produce much electricity during the period of highest demand, producing just 2 percent of the state’s electricity at its peak. Solar production peaked at nearly 1 gigawatt at 11 am and continued to produce about 1 gigawatt until 3 pm. The problem is that the state’s highest period of demand occurred at about 5 pm, when solar’s production had fallen by over 50 percent from its peak.¶ This data shows how little value wind and solar have in producing electricity when people really need it, and should be a wake-up call to California—one of the many states with mandates—as well as the Obama administration and other promoters of wind and solar. Even though wind and solar production might be growing in California, it isn’t helping to balance the grid and keep the lights on. Electricity production has to balance electricity demand and wind and solar aren’t doing a good job contributing. Moreover, it does not matter how many wind and solar installations are built because natural gas and other reliable power plants will be required to be built to meet peak electricity demand.

#### Wind can’t provide stable power

Boone 10 (Jon, PhD, Environmentalist, and Formal Intervenor in Wind Installation Hearings, “OVERBLOWN: Windpower on the Firing Line (Part I)”, <http://www.masterresource.org/2010/09/windpower-overblown-part-1>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

Consequently, wind generation is relentlessly fluctuating, according to the whimsy of its power source, between zero production, which occurs 10-15 % of the time, and its maximum possible performance, its rated capacity, which is achieved very rarely. Over the course of a year, a wind project, if sited in good wind territory, produces an average yield of about 25-30% of its rated capacity. About 60% of the time, it produces less.¶ Whatever it does produce is constantly changing, moment-to-moment; no one can predict what it will produce at any future time. Wind’s performance history also shows that wind plants generally produce most at the times of least demand—and least at the times of peak demand.[2]¶ Here’s an example of routine wind flux, culled at random from a BPA posting for a brief period on January 1, 2009. BPA had 1,600 MW of installed wind. At this time, the actual wind generation was 443 MW in the first minute. Five minutes later it was 454; then it was 476; then 489; then 505, etc. Three hours later it had fallen below 200 MW–and continued downward.[3]¶ Occasionally, wind production involves very wide swings across nearly the whole range of its rated capacity, dropping or rising precipitously in less than an hour.[4] Consider the impact of this flux if the installed wind capacity were 5,000 MW.

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

Santoni 85 (Ronald E. Phil. Prof @ Denison, Nuclear War, ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-7 )

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

#### Their infatuation with ontology is politically debilitating – focusing on ontology divests politics of its emancipatory potential and devolves into a self-justifying cycle of never-ending critique.

Yar 2k (Ph.D in the Department of Sociology at Lancaster University, Majid, “Arendt's Heideggerianism: Contours of a `Postmetaphysical' Political Theory?,” Cultural Values, Volume 4, Issue 1, January, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Academic Search Complete)

Similarly, we must consider the consequences that this 'ontological substitution' for the essence of the political has for politics, in terms of what is practically excluded by this rethinking. If the presently available menu of political engagements and projects (be they market or social liberalism, social democracy, communitarianism, Marxism, etc.) are only so many moments of the techno-social completion of an underlying metaphysics, then the fear of 'metaphysical contamination' inhibits any return to recognisable political practices and sincere engagement with the political exigencies of the day. This is what Nancy Fraser has called the problem of 'dirty hands', the suspension of engagement with the existing content of political agendas because of their identification as being in thrall to the violence of metaphysics. Unable to engage in politics as it is, one either [a] sublimates the desire for politics by retreating to an interrogation of the political with respect to its essence (Fraser, 1984, p. 144), or [b] on this basis, seeks 'to breach the inscription of a wholly other politics'. The former suspends politics indefinitely, while the latter implies a new politics, which, on the basis of its reconceived understanding of the political, apparently excludes much of what recognizably belongs to politics today. This latter difficulty is well known from Arendt's case, whose barring of issues of social and economic justice and welfare from the political domain are well known. To offer two examples: [1] in her commentary on the U.S. civil rights movement in the 1950s, she argued that the politically salient factor which needed challenging was only racial legislation and the formal exclusion of African-Americans from the political sphere, not discrimination, social deprivation and disadvantage, etc.(Arendt, 1959, pp. 45-56); [2] Arendt's pronounceraent at a conference in 1972 (put under question by Albrecht Wellmer regarding her distinction of the 'political' and the 'social'), that housing and homelessness were not political issues, that they were external to the political as the sphere of the actualisation of freedom as disclosure; the political is about human self-disclosure in speech and deed, not about the distribution of goods, which belongs to the social realm as an extension of the oikos.[20] The point here is not that Arendt and others are in any sense unconcerned or indifferent about such sufferings, deprivations and inequalities. Rather, it is that such disputes and agendas are identified as belonging to the socio-technical sphere of administration, calculation, instrumentality, the logic of means and ends, subject-object manipulation by a will which turns the world to its purposes, the conceptual rendering of beings in terms of abstract and levelling categories and classes, and so on; they are thereby part and parcel of the metaphysical-technological understanding of Being, which effaces the unique and singular appearance and disclosure of beings, and thereby illegitimate candidates for consideration under the renewed, ontological-existential formulation of the political. To reconceive the political in terms of a departure from its former incarnation as metaphysical politics, means that the revised terms of a properly political discourse cannot accommodate the prosaic yet urgent questions we might typically identify under the rubric of 'policy'. Questions of social and economic justice are made homeless, exiled from the political sphere of disputation and demand in which they were formerly voiced. Indeed, it might be observed that the postmetaphysical formulation of the political is devoid of any content other than the freedom which defines it; it is freedom to appear, to disclose, but not the freedom to do something in particular, in that utilising freedom for achieving some end or other implies a collapse back into will, instrumentality, teleocracy, poeisis, etc. By defining freedom qua disclosedness as the essence of freedom and the sole end of the political, this position skirts dangerously close to advocating politique pour la politique, divesting politics of any other practical and normative ends in the process.[21]

#### Heidegger’s privileging of ontology is complicit in atrocities

Committee on Public Safety 96 (The writers subsume their individual names within the denomination of "Committee" in deference to the indivisibility of the work presented Levinasian Scholars "My Place in the Sun" Reflections On The Thought Of Emmanuel Levinas Diacritics 26.1 (1996) 3-10 Project Muse) TBC 7/7/10

At the heart of Levinas's critique of Heidegger is the reproof that the question of man has become submerged in the question of being, and thus that the recovery of the meaning of being entails the forgetting of the meaning of the human. Heidegger's Letter on Humanism (Brief über den Humanismus), published in 1947, in which he claims that "what is essential is not humanity, but being" [Brief 24] is offset by the title of Levinas's work, published in the same year, in which he shows how the anonymity of existence, or being, is redeemed only by the existent, or be-ing; hence, De l'existence à l'existant, from existence to the existent--denoting a sense of direction, lost needlessly in Lingis's translation of the title as Existence and Existents. Levinas depicts the anonymity of being through the il y a, in which the impersonality of the verb mirrors the subjectless horror of existence. The anonymity of the il y a is "saved" ultimately only through the face of the other for whom one is always inescapably responsible. It is not that Levinas retreats from the ontological (the domain of Sein or being) to the ontic (the domain of the Seienden or be-ings), or that he rejects being in favor of some pre-Heideggerian idealist notion of the subject. Rather, his emphasis on the passage from the bare meaning of être or existence to l'étant or existent gropes toward what finally comes to signify the ethical, whereby the anonymity of the infinitive is overcome by the priority of the participial being-for-another-existent and the subject deposed rather than posed [EI 50]. "I am wary of that debased word 'love,'" he remarks again to Nemo, "but the responsibility for the other, being-for-the-other, seemed to me, even at that time [1947], to put an end to the anonymous and senseless rumbling of being" [EI 51]. Only in the most practical and mundane of obligations to the other is ontology rendered ethical and humane. This horror invoked by the anonymous il y a is not to be confused with Heideggerian anguish before death, or care for being. Levinas describes how the original De l'existence appeared in a cover on which were inscribed the words "where it is not a question of anxiety" [EI 47]. One could scarcely ask for a more explicit derangement of fundamental ontology, in the light of a horror of the il y a which had become historically incarnated for him: "None of the generosity which the German counterpart of the 'there is,' the 'es gibt,' is said to contain was displayed between 1933 and 1945," he writes later [DL 375]. There is no mistaking his imputation of ideological implications of complicity between Heideggerian Sein and modern genocide. They are related, not by happenstance but as the fundamental possibility of each other. Invoking the Platonic concept of the good beyond being (epekeina ts ousias), Levinas contests the notion that nothingness is a privation of being and that evil is a privation of the good, insisting that evil itself is a positive mode of being. Being can be more primally terrible than simply not-being. In brief, the distance between Heideggerian ontology and Levinasian ethics can be measured by the difference between an inquiry into being qua being (ti to on) and an inquiry into humanity itself (ti bioteon)--a distance which, as Heidegger himself observes in his Letter [Brief 22], is paradoxically both farther away than any individual be-ing and yet nearer than any be-ing could ever be.

#### Focus on ontology is bad - preventing widespread death takes precedence.

Davidson 89 (Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Chicago, Arnold, coeditor of Critical Inquiry, Critical Inquiry, Winter 1989. p.426)

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

#### We must engage in calculative thinking and meditative thinking.

Kockelmans 85 **(Joseph, Penn State philosopher, HEIDEGGER AND SCIENCE , p.254.)**

This ambivalent attitude In regard to modem science and technology, which says at the same time yes and no, corresponds to the two modes of thinking we have referred to earlier**. Calculative thinking will help us to use our resources effectively; meditative thinking will help us in making certain that technicity will not overpower us. Meditative thinking will thus make it possible for us to come to a freedom in regard to things that lets beings be** ( Gelassenheit), **by maintaining an openness to the mystery that is hidden in modem technicity.**

#### Being is a useless philosophical narrative and its pursuit condemns actual people to death

Caputo 93 (John D. – prof Phil. Villanova) Against Ethics p. 30

That would mean you cannot have an obligation to Being or Spirit or the People, nor can Being or Spirit oblige anything. Being, Spirit, History, Man: the playthings of Greco-German mythophilosophizing, which is my somewhat free translation of *die Sache* *des Denkens* (which I claim, as a translation, is *wahr* if not *richtig*). Nothing happens in or to Being and Spirit. What happens happens to beings that bear up or bend under what is happening. Being cannot suffer a disaster, or suffer oblivion, because it does not suffer at all. Being and Spirit are mythico-super-Subjects, the upshot of totalizing attempts to describe what is happening, leaving those of us with proper names to face the worst. History and Being, History and Spirit, the History of Being, the History of Spirit: so many tall tales and meta-narratives, gigantic, stories that forsake the minima moralia of damaged live, the minute scraps and remands Being leaves behind. A disaster is a damaged life, damaged beyond repair. ¶ Being shows no interest in damaged lives; they are none of Being’s business (Sache). Indeed, many bleeding bodies may well be a sign that Being or Spirit is on the mend, or on the march, healing itself and making itself Whole or Holy, getting ready for the Other Beginning, while the dead are left to bury the dead. Forget Being. There is nothing to remember. Replace it with a mnemo-technique for remembering proper names.

#### Phenomenology fails – we can’t transcend purely empirical ideas

Bartok 84 (Philip J. Dept of Phil U of Notre Dame FOUCAULT’S ANALYTIC OF FINITUDE AND THE “DEATH” OF PHENOMENOLOGY) TBC 7/8/10

Foucault’s line of argument here is most plausibly understood as an internal objection to Husserl’s approach: Transcendental phenomenology fails to achieve the (transcendental) aims set out for it by Husserl himself. The transcendental reduction fails insofar as it merely effects something like a shift of vision, attempting to assign transcendental significance to what are, by Husserl’s own admission, merely empirical contents. If Foucault’s archaeological analysis of the character of the modern episteme is adequate, this failure was inevitable given the fact that Husserl’s project was configured by an episteme characterized by the analytic of finitude. Given the problematic dual status of “man” under this episteme, Husserlian phenomenology cannot help but devolve into an anthropology.

#### Discourse on being is so abstract that it renders us silent—it is nihilistic paralysis.

Rosen 69 - Borden Parker Bowne Professor of Philosophy at Boston University – 1969 (Stanley Rosen, Nihilism: A Philosophical Essay, P. 45-46)

I have been arguing that ontological speech, in the sense attributed to it by those who follow Heidegger’s distinction between the ontological and ontic, is in fact silence. Ontologists of this type wish to talk about Being as distinct from beings, and speech will simply not permit this. If this is a defect of speech, and the significance of speech is in the deepest and final sense relative to silence, then there is no reason for what we say or for whether we speak at all, other than the mere fact, although there is equally no reason to keep silent. The result is absurdism or nihilism.

#### The aff results in paralyzing passivity.

Wolin, 90 - Distinguished Professor of History at the City University of New York Graduate Center- 1990 (Richard Wolin, *The Politics of Being*, P. 147)

As we suggested earlier, the essential thinking of the later Heidegger promotes an "eclipse of practical reason." For his post-Kehre reformulation of the relation between Being and Dasein rebels so fervently against the voluntarist dimension of his own earlier thinking that the very concept of "meaningful human action" is seemingly rendered null and void. If the early Heidegger attempted to rally Dasein to "decisiveness" (Entschlossenheit), the thought of the later Heidegger appears at times to be a summary justification of human passivity and inaction (Gelassenheit)-so prejudicially is the balance between Sein and Mensch struck in favor of the former term. Thus, in the later Heidegger, the campaign against practical reason develops along a two-fold front: not only is the concept of Being grossly inflated, but the powers of human reason and will are correspondingly devalued. In the later writings, Being assumes the character of an omnipotent primal force, a "first unmoved mover," whose "presencing" proves to be the determinative, ultimate instance for events in the lowly world of human affairs. In its other-worldly supremacy, this force both withdraws from the tribunal of human reason and defies the meager capacities of human description: "A Being that not only surpasses all beings-and thus all men-but which like an unknown God rests and 'essences' in its own truth, in that it is sometimes present and sometimes absent, can never be explained like a being in existence; instead, it can only be 'evoked.' "

#### Aff doesn’t solve – intention does not affect action the way they assume

Searle 5 (John, Prof Berkeley The Phenomenological Illusion SCHRIFTENREIHE- WITTGENSTEIN GESELLSCHAFT, VOL 34, pages 17-38 http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~jsearle/PhenomenologicalIllusion.pdf) TBC 7/9/10

Another example of the phenomenological illusion comes out in Merleau- Ponty’s discussion of skillful coping, which he calls “motor intentionality”. (Merleau-Ponty 1962) The idea is that because there are all kinds of routine actions, such as walking or driving a car, that do not have the concentrated focused consciousness of intentionality, of the kind you get for example when you are giving a lecture, that therefore they have a different kind of intentionality altogether. If it feels different then it must be different. But if you look at the actual conditions of satisfaction there is no difference in the logical structure. To see this, contrast doing a type of action as skillful coping and doing it as concentrated deliberate action. For example, normally when I get up and walk to the door I do it without special concentration or deliberation. Skillful coping. But suppose I do it and concentrate my attention on doing it. Deliberate action. The cases as described, though they feel different, are logically similar. In both cases I am acting intentionally and in both there are causally self referential conditions of satisfaction. I succeeded in what I was trying to do only if my intentions in action caused the bodily movements. It is a clear case of the phenomenological illusion to suppose that different phenomenology implies a different kind of intentionality with a different logical structure.