

## THE FORMATION OF A NEW DISCOURSE OF TECHNIQUE IN THE CONDITIONS OF TRANSITION FROM TECHNOGENIC CIVILIZATION TO ANTHROPOGENIC ONE

Olga Dolskaya

*National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute"*

### Annotations:

**Дольская Ольга. Формирование нового дискурса техники в условиях перехода от техногенной цивилизации к антропогенной**

Анализируются попытки выйти на существенную характеристику техники в разных цивилизациях. В условиях перехода к антропогенной цивилизации техника рассматривается как творчество, как воплощение знаний не одного человека, а коллектива, как результат изобретения и носитель информации, а не утилитарный объект. Фиксируя факторы, свидетельствующие об изменении дискурса смыслового понимания техники, автор приходит к выводу, что нас ожидает реализация того феномена заботы о себе, который активизирует диалог с техникой, поэтому необходимо отказаться от машинного понимания техники и формировать новый дискурс о ней. Свою индивидуальность человек реализует, только приобщаясь к практике трансиндивидуального.

**Дольська Ольга. Формування нового дискурсу техніки в умовах переходу від техногенної цивілізації до антропогенної**

Аналізуються спроби вийти на сутнісну характеристику техніки в різних цивілізаціях. В умовах переходу до антропогенної цивілізації техніка розглядається як творчість, як втілення знань не однієї людини, а колективу, як результат винаходу і носій інформації, а не утилітарний об'єкт. Фіксуючи фактори, що свідчать про зміну дискурсу смислового розуміння техніки, автор приходиться до висновку, що нас очікує реалізація того феномена піклування про себе, який активізує діалог з технікою, тому необхідно відмовитися від машинного розуміння техніки та формувати новий дискурс про неї. Свою індивідуальність людина реалізує тільки залучаючись до практики трансіндивідуального.

**Dolskaya Olga. The formation of a new discourse of technique in the conditions of transition from technogenic civilization to anthropogenic one.**

Analysis of attempts to get the essential characteristic of technique in various civilizations is given. In conditions of transition to anthropogenic civilization technique is considered as creativity, as the embodiment of knowledge of not a single person but of a team, as the result of the invention and the media, and not as a utilitarian object. While recording the factors that indicate a change in the discourse of semantic understanding of technique, the author comes to the conclusion that the implementation of the phenomenon of self-care, which will intensify the dialogue with the technique is waiting for us, so it is necessary to abandon machine understanding of technique and form a new discourse about it. The individuality of a person is realized only by an introduction to the practice of trans individuality.

### Key words:

техника, трансіндивідуальність, сутність техніки, забота, цивілізація, технічний об'єкт, технореволюціонер, машина.

техніка, трансіндивідуальність, сутність техніки, турбування, цивілізація, технічний об'єкт, технореволюціонер, машина.

technique, trans individuality, essence of technique, anxiety, civilization, technical object, techno revolutionary, machine.

Technology is becoming increasingly important not only in the life of society as a whole, but also in the life of every person. That is why the problem of techniques in the context of each civilization is becoming more urgent. Humanity is familiar with cosmogenic and technogenic anthropogenic civilizations. Today a new round of the development of human civilization is being founded – anthropogenic civilization is being formed.

Technique has recently become the subject of philosophical analysis. Philosophy of technique was formed in the XIX century in Germany and France, and in the beginning of XX century in Russia. But already the mid-twentieth century witnessed great interest in the search for its ontological entity (Martin Heidegger, Karl Jaspers, Thomas Veblen, Alvin Toffler and others).

The purpose of this study is to state the factors, indicating a change in the discourse of semantic understanding of technique.

Every civilization has its own discourse of technique. Every civilization formulates the meaning of this term. Nevertheless the search of the ontological meaning of technique is a very complex task. Arguments of P. Florensky and M. Heidegger may serve as examples [1]. P. Florensky proposed

to search its essential basis in a person's ability to organize space. The only mechanism of this process is the meaning attached to certain objects or phenomena by people. The technique was both a means of achieving an aim and one of the elements of the space created. Technique acts as a special way of finding life.

M. Heidegger suggested that we are kept by instrumental meaning of technique, and its contemporary discourse is issued due to this instrumental understanding. In order to be free from the power of such a definition of technique, one must understand what the term "instrument" means. The instrumental definition of technique can be considered veritable, but verity must be reasonable. M. Heidegger tries to understand what the ancient Greeks meant by the term "instrument". For them instrument is an action undertaken for a specific purpose. This action gets the name "active cause" - αιτιον. This reason is not related to the Latin term "causa". For the Greek consciousness, the cause is not something that is done with something. The Greek term is translated as instruction in the meaning of "creation". But every creature, says M. Heidegger, in Greek sounds like ποιησις (creativity). And thanks to the creativity the Nature (Φυσις) is revealed, but

it is revealed as the highest value: "Creation leads something secret to that of no secret. Creation is at the same time Ent-bergen, that is what the Greeks called ἀληθεία, and we call "truth". Therefore, the technique is not simply "the means" in the instrumental meaning; the technique is a way of revealing the truth. So ancient ἀληθεία was focused on understanding and acted as a way of discovering the truth, but not the production of something for the sake of some goal" [2, p. 74].

Today we discuss the technique and feel it in a new way. Completely new understanding of the technique was formed in the period of Renaissance: it was not associated with the art of creativity any more. A striking example of this transformation is the work of Leonardo da Vinci. He is perceived as an artist, and his engineering is dissolved in the art. But since then, the technique is no longer perceived as art, it was divided into two different spheres: real technique and artistic. The former relied on the accuracy of perception of the world, and the latter "pulled" man of empiricism and "shifted" in an imaginary reality.

At the end of XVI–XVII centuries technical products become widespread: the technique is being actively implemented in all areas of life, the world of man is impossible without it. It determines not only the level of economic, social and political development, but is one of the major criteria in determining the status of a state in predictive nature, etc. Descartes described the mechanical world, and he was sensually indistinguishable from our ability to perceive the macrocosm. The discourse of a new perception and understanding of the technique through the metaphor of hours, the moving mechanism of the machine was formed. The metaphor of the machine was so clear and perceived literally that the technique began to be openly associated with the machine. This image has become quite convenient for classical paradigm of scientific rationality: it adequately described the macrocosm, the life world of the man and the machine metaphor was just a godsend for clarity of the description. Apparently, in the system of education through training the technique of thinking formed by the classical scientific rationality is reproduced.

Together with "machine" understanding of the technique understanding of nature has also changed. In the world around us, thanks to technology, everything is transformed in something assigned to supply something for something. Modern technique reveals itself in power demand to nature, namely to supply energy. This is a new type of hiddenness, behind which an essence of the technique is hidden. The peculiarity of modern technology is that its visual state is not something external to the person. The existing condition is a way of making not only technology, but also the man himself. M. Heidegger notes that this is the requirement of being. This is so-

called Set. In this world everything is set: nature, natural resources, space, and man. Set is the way to attain both technology, and the man himself. That is why the Set is imperceptible to humans.

Presenting himself as a Lord and Master, almost a God, man does not see himself, because he is located entirely within the boundaries of the Set. Here I would like remind you the myth, so that you could understand another facet of the relation of man and deity. In the myth we find the proof of the fact that technical work is akin to the divine one. It was believed to be the imitation of the action of the gods. In the tradition of the Olympic Pantheon people were regarded as followers of Hephaestus. It was quite a strange God, even from the perspective of the storyline, which is present in the myths about him. The unwanted son of Zeus was dropped from Olympus and lived in the valley and was rarely invited to Zeus's Palace. At the same time he was married to the most beautiful goddess, Aphrodite, and the God of war Ares was not able to "compete" with him by force, when Hephaestus was angry. Often the gods avoided him, not because the communication with him was unpleasant, but rather for fear of incurring his wrath, or simply to attract attention. The character is, at least, paradoxical. The people, who create technical products, call themselves followers of Hephaestus. Their products are equal to the divine in the beauty and singularity of their application, and symbolic power, creating special conditions for life to the one who owns this product.

Industrial development and scientific and technical development contributed to the formation of a new discourse of technique. In contemporary studies the level of its development is considered to be fundamental. We would like to focus our attention on one significant fact of the technogenic civilization. It was time when the first Academies of Sciences appeared and the first higher technical institutions were opened. The first higher technical school was opened in the XVIII century in France; its name is School of Bridges and Roads. In 1885 Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute was opened, and in the period from 1898 to 1902, six new technical higher educational institutions were established in Russia. At the same time Nicholas II issued an edict on the establishment of the Kiev Polytechnic Institute. A little later, Kiev, Warsaw and St. Petersburg Polytechnic institutions receive Imperial status.

But at the same time the alienation of man from technology is hold. To introduce the machine into the life of people is not only to improve their life, to make it comfortable: the technique is not only present around a person; it is already his integral part. Another attempt has been made to consider the technique in the context of labour. It is associated with the name of Gilbert of Simondon, who believes that the study of production and management does

not allow understanding the technique in the context of the problems characteristic of a new civilizational breakthrough. He believes that the technique was deprived of the human part, turning into a purely functional mechanism. Simondon draws attention to the fact that the technique holds such a thick layer of "human", which previously remained unnoticed and raises technical object on the pedestal of science: "therefore, the technical object introduces a category broader than labour: this is operator function. The latter implies that the basis of the technical object, a condition of its possibility is the act of invention. However, the invention is not work, it does not involve psychosomatic mediation between the nature and the human. The invention is not only adaptive and protective behavior, it is a mental operation, mental functioning, belonging to the same sphere as scientific knowledge" [3].

Simondon forms the concept of loss of individuation in the context of the alienation of man: in the XIXth century the worker, who is subordinate to the mechanical tools, has lost its know-how and, therefore, his whole personality. He found himself reduced to the status of the proletariat. For comparison, today in this role proved to be the consumer whose behavior is standardized, thanks to the artificial production of his desires. Here he loses his lifestyle (*savoir-vivre*), that is the ability to live. "High samples" are replaced with the most recent fashion brands. A similar situation has occurred with the proletariat, who were in opposition not only to the machine but also to themselves, and to science and technology.

Simondon believes that a new discourse will help to overcome the alienation of man on the basis of transindividual groups: "the way to reduce alienation is not through social sphere (including labour community and class) and not through the sphere of interindividual relations, usually considered by psychology, but through transindividual team. Technical object appeared in the world in which social structures and mental content were generated by labor, which means that the technical object was introduced into the world of labor instead of creating a world of technique with new structures. The machine is known and used through work, not through technical knowledge; the relation of the worker to the machine is inadequate, because interacting with the machine, he does not extend his work of inventive activity" [3]. In the words of Simondon we can feel the call to creative development: not only to use what is already invented, but to be engaged in the process of development of transindividual collective achievements. It is interesting to note that N. Luhmann, thinking in the late XXth century about the status of the mind of the XXI century, concludes his transversality. He considers the idea of the mind in terms of transindividual structures, which

are expressed in specific historical language depending of specific era and representing a particular type of rationality [4].

The formation of a new discourse requires new terms, allowing one to join ontological essence of man and technology into a whole. Today the term "care" is increasingly used in philosophy, and philosophy of technique is no exception. This is Heidegger's and Foucault's "taking care of oneself", Ricoeur's "care of oneself", Simondon's "care of technique". In our view, the semantic contents of these terms are crossed. Let's see how Ricoeur's arguments about the gift go on ontological and ethical component of transindividual. Ricoeur tried to find answers, related to issues of identity, problems of its formation. He proposed a new philosophy of man, and it was based on the theme "good teacher", because his philosophy is a practical philosophy directed against the exaltation of the Cartesian "I" in favor of dialogical relations.

Care is a fundamental human characteristic. Not care, which is identical to duties, but care, which is equal to the gift. P. Ricoeur draws a parallel between the concepts of "forgiveness" and "the gift". "The gift is opposed to market exchange in which the gift is seen as an opportunity to get something in return... It means to give, not expecting an answer. Perhaps it's too ascetic perception of the gift. But you must see its mystical sense, to know that in this way the exchange takes place at a deep level" [5, p. 334]. Such a "deep level" is associated with the situation of the event. A. Whitehead, explaining events, insists that the principles of the formation of objective reality are impossible without the reformed subjectivist principle – "principle of identity" [6, p. 685], thereby explaining the process of formation as the formation of subjective unity, absorbing the objective reality. This reality "is pulled together in the unity of experience." The problem of givenness was considered by E. Husserl, who claimed equivalence of entity and phenomenon; M. Heidegger, who tied it with Genesis; and then J.-L. Marion, who based his conclusions on the ideas of J. Derrida on the phenomenon of the gift [7].

J.-L. Marion comes to the conclusion that a givenness, that is the ability to be, is a deep property of all phenomena [8]. With its help, "it is possible to describe phenomenologically not only the objects, as did Kant and partly Husserl, and not only Genesis, as was the case of Heidegger, but also such phenomena discovered by late phenomenologists – Levinas, Ricoeur, Gadamer, Derrida – as the ethics of the other, a historical event, narrative, difference, etc., about which it is difficult to say that they are objects, as well as to say that they "are" in general" [7, p. 57]. Therefore, in the gift as in givenness ethical and ontological characteristics are implemented and the category of "care" has a special rhythm of existence, because it might be considered as an ontological

and ethical range of categories. Therefore, in the dialogue, the principle of individuality is reformed: the vertical rhythm of ontological nature is implemented in relations between people. The basis for the ontological nature of the relationship is the gift of man, combining ontological and ethical dimension.

In the context of this understanding of the care becomes clear what Simondon means when he proposes to release the machine from its machine understanding. The call to take care of oneself leads us to the idea of forming a completely new man. This new man will probably appear only under condition of the radical revision of the expression traditional for industrial society: "Machine is out of control, and people can do nothing to control it"/ Only the practice of collective trans-individual will allow change the nature of such discourse about the technique and fully realize oneself as an individual.

It is in the context of such trans-individuality a new man of O. Toffler is formed. But Toffler gives him the status of the techno-revolutionary [9], who is now found as a carrier of the "new discourse" in the existing technological civilization. "The techno-revolutionary raise questions as follows: we will control the technology, or it will control us; "we" simply can no longer be the usual tiny stratum of the elite of scientists, engineers, politicians and businessmen. Time requires the democratization of the process of the adoption of technological solutions. Anti-nuclear campaign, which took place in West Germany, France, Sweden, Japan and the United States, the fight against the "Concord" or for the control of genetic research – all this is clear evidence of present day requirements [9, p. 120].

A popular saying by A. and B. Strugatskiyes "Thinking is not an entertainment, but an obligation" would be strengthened by the words: "...and the responsibility and care". The techno-revolutionaries are guided by this principle. As for us, citizens of the XXI century, we cannot use the car without studying the device, we can't make online payments and purchase without being able to use in practice the basic knowledge of information technology. The technique "forces" us constantly learn in new and new modes. We are confronted a realization of the phenomenon of self-care, which will intensify our dialogue with the technique. Why dialogue? Technique today is more result of the invention and the media, rather than a utilitarian object. Each new stage of development in the field of technology led to the need for a new round of specialized knowledge and, as a consequence, efforts are needed for their creative assimilation by man of the new civilization.

#### References

1. Pavlenko, A. N. (2003). Technical possibilities. O. Pavel Florensky and Martin Heidegger. *Human*, 3, 67-67. [in Russian]

2. Heidegger, M. (1993). *European nihilism*. In: Time and being: Articles and introductions. Moscow: Republic. [in Russian]
3. Simondon, Zh. (2011). About the way of existence of technical objects. *Anthology 'Translit'*, 9, 94-105. [in Russian]
4. Luhmann, N. (2002). *Das Erziehungssystem der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt on Main: Suhrkamp.
5. Ryker, P. (1997). Forgiveness and gift. *Spirit and Letter*, 1-2, 333-336.
6. Whitehead, A. N. (1990). *Selected phylosophycal works*. (Y. T. Kasavyn, Trans.). Moscow, Progres.
7. *On the Gift: A Discussion between Jacques Derrida Jean-Luk Marion*. (1999). In: God, gift and postmodernism. (John D. Caputo & Michael J. Scanlon, Eds.). Indiana : Indiana University Press.
8. Marion, J.-L. (1999). *Sketch of Phenomenological Concept of Gift*. In: Post Modern Philosophy and Christian Thought. (M. Westphal, Ed.). Indiana: Indiana University Press.
9. Toffler, E. (2004). *The third wave*. Moscow: AST.

#### Information about the author:

**Dolska Olga Olexiyivna**  
National Technical University  
«Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute»,  
21 Frunze Street, Kharkiv,  
61002, Ukraine  
doi:10.7905/vers.v0i2.578

Received at the editors' office: 15.03.2013.

Accepted for publishing: 17.03.2013

Translation: Tetiana Riabukha

