**C) Domination Impulse—reframing the fundamental question from “what ought we do?” to “how ought we think” allows us to escape from the current drive to dominate the planet.**
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Both normative and technocratic futurism are in the service of power empowering itself to the possibility of ‘unconditional dominance’. The one (normative futurism) thinks in terms of ‘values’, the other (technocratic futurism) in terms of the technological as ‘utilitarian intelligence’. Both are under the sway of the ‘framework’, *Ge-Stell*, the essence of technology as will to power. What is posited as value finds itself in the service of the framework, just as much as does what is preferred as technological ‘fix’. The call to world order that finds expression in the work of social scientists is the ‘gathering agent’ of *Ge-Stell* “that challenges mankind to put everything that discloses itself into the position of stock, resource, material for technological processing.” It is in this specific sense—being in the service of the unconditional dominance of the will to power as the essence of technology—that the movement for world order, as the globalism of normative and technocratic futurism, is the extreme possibility of ‘completed’ political philosophy. By now we must have learned that properly to approach the problem of world order is not to do so as if it were chiefly or solely an epistemological question, i.e., “approaching a problem as if it were to be solved by the acquisition of knowledge.” Rather, it must first and foremost be understood as a metaphysical or ontological question; i.e., it can be solved primarily by understanding it as one that requires the penetration of Being as a response to the call of Being. This means that world order thinking must think more deeply the essence of its quest and task, that it must see the problem of world order in terms of the abiding epochal dispensation of the essence of technology, of Being as the will to power, and then in terms of Being’s potential ‘turning’. World order thinking that thinks in terms of values—peace, justice, economic well-being, ecological balance—or by way of instrumental reason must, if it is to attain to the possibility of an alternative criterion for mankind’s world sojourn, come to understand how its movement is steeped in the fundamental features of the modern age. Only in this way can it understand the immediately relevant question of whether the world-order-future is to be the genuine *ordo* of human *being*, of Being, or the production of its semblance, the representation of that *ordo*, rather than its most proper presentation. Only in this way can it come to see the need for asking the fundamental question, “How must we *think*?,” rather than the ambiguously urgent question, “What ought we to *do*?” (which is not really a ‘rather than’ but the recognition of thinking itself as action, as the authentic doing).