

УДК 171

## TECHNIQUE IN THE MODERN WORLD: ETHICAL ASPECT

### ДЕЯКІ МІРКУВАННЯ ЩО ДО МОРАЛЬНИХ ТА ЕТИЧНИХ ПРОБЛЕМ РОЗВИТКУ ТЕХНІКИ

**Aliieva O. N.,**

Candidate of Philosophy, Assistant Professor of the Philosophical, Socio–Political and Legal Sciences Department, Donbass State Pedagogical University (Slavyansk, Ukraine), e–mail: Alievaol@mail.ru

**Belousova K.,**

master, Philological department, speciality: philosophy, Donbass State Pedagogical University (Slavyansk, Ukraine)

**Алієва О. Г.,**

кандидат філософських наук, доцент кафедри філософії, соціально–політичних і правових наук, Донбаський державний педагогічний університет (Слов'янськ, Україна), e–mail: Alievaol@mail.ru

**Білоусова К.,**

магістр, Філологічне відділення, спеціальність: філософія, Донбаський державний педагогічний університет (Слов'янськ, Україна)

*In this article the author attempts to analyze such a rather complicated phenomenon as the development of technology in the modern world and the influence of this process on the life of the XXI century. The article deals with the moral and value interpretations of such outstanding scholars as M. Heidegger, H. Ortega–i–Gasset, A. Toffler, and others. Summarizing their scientific achievements, the author tries to develop some kind of «panacea» for preserving a person's own nature, freeing her consciousness from excessive «technocratic» in modern society.*

**Keywords:** philosophy of technology, technocratization, Gestelle, industrial society, post–industrial society, information society, homo technicus.

*Автор ставить перед собою завдання проаналізувати достатньо складне явище як розвиток техніки в сучасному світі та вплив цього процесу на життя людини XXI сторіччя. Метою даної статті є аналіз змін, що відбулися у ставленні сучасної людини до буття, зумовлені становленням соціокультурної парадигми Нового часу, які і дотепер актуальні.*

*В статті розглядаються моральні та ціннісні інтерпретації що до феномену техніки таких видатних вчених як М. Гайдеггер, Ортега–і–Гассет, Е. Тоффлер та ін. Узагальнюючи їх науковий доробок автор намагається розробити «паначею» для збереження людиною власної природи, звільнення її свідомості від надмірної «технократизації» у сучасному суспільстві.*

*Протягом останнього періоду поняття «техногенне», «індустріальне» переосмислюються. Це викликано тим величезним впливом, який техніка разом з наукою має на матеріальне життя людей в практично кожному куточку земної кулі. Але найголовнішою причиною, на нашу думку, є той факт, що саме на сучасному рівні розвитку техніки, набагато прозорішими стали фундаментальні її характеристики. Сучасна техніка часто зумовлює шляхи вирішення багатьох економічних, наукових та навіть політичних питань.*

*В сучасній антропології техніки навіть з'явився спеціальний термін, що визначає людину XXI ст. – homotechnicus (людина технічна). Homotechnicus властиві такі ознаки: раціональність, схильність до стандартизації, увага до деталей, методичність.*

*Людство охопила ідея будь–якою ціною здобути необмежену владу над природою, зробити її джерелом ресурсів. Відверта технократизація набуває все більш загрозуючий рис, перетворюється на справжню загрозу духовному життю людства та його психологічному, і навіть психічному здоров'ю. Технічний прогрес, що вишив з–під контролю людини та підпорядкував її життя собі, стає причиною самовідчуження індивіду, в наслідок чого втрачається зв'язок людини не лише з навколишнім світом природи, але й навіть зі своїм внутрішнім «Я». Тенденція до підміни справжніх цінностей штучними ідеалами постійного невгамовного споживання, утилітарно–прагматичне ставлення до життя не може не лякати. Найбільш дієвим, на нашу думку, засобом*

*самозбереження людської особистості в сучасних умовах є обмежено розумне використання техніки, коли людина залишається її володарем, а не залежним рабом.*

**Ключові слова:** філософія техніки, технократизація, Gestelle, індустріальне суспільство, постіндустріальне суспільство, інформаційне суспільство, homotechnicus.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

### Problem statement and the state of its study.

Moral aspect of the incessant technical progress hardly become the main philosophical problem nowadays. Technological development has led to the incredible breakthrough in human history, all aftereffects of which cannot be foreseen and predicted even by the most painful imagination, although we are direct participants of the mechanization and technicalization ourselves.

At the present stage of development in Ukraine historically coincided processes of active filling of living space with various forms of technology, as well as changes in priorities of social development, therefore, the relevance of this work is obvious. In addition, our country must solve a number of problems associated with the development of the latest forms of technology. Socio–philosophical aspect of the relationship «man – technology» in all their diversity and dynamics also needs to be understood.

At the beginning of the 20th century all attempts of philosophical reflection about the technology often reduced to optimistic prospects. But the real interest in this problem begins with the World Philosophical Congresses in Vienna (1968), Varna (1973) and Dusseldorf (1978) where appeared a critical attitude to technical progress. Professional philosophers' attention focused on negative aspects of technological progress. The philosophy of technology was considered by such thinkers as E. Durkheim, A. Bergson, M. Berdyaev, M. Heidegger, H. Ortega–i–Gasset, G. Marcuse, K. Iaspers.

Modern philosophy of technology is a sufficiently disciplined system of conceptual representations that has its own subject, methodology, set of own research methods.

But ontological, ethical, cultural, anthropological aspects of technological progress require further study not only as a purely scientific problem, but also as having a huge «applied» meaning.

Attention of modern scientists researching technology is concentrated, first of all, on the moral and value component of technical rationality, general technical policy. Leading researchers in the philosophical aspect of technology development are: G. Jonas, H. Lenk, E. Toffler, L. Mumford, J. Eully, V. N. Rosin, V. S. Gorokhov, V. M. Knyazev, B. V. Novikov and others.

**The purpose of this article** is to analyze some changes that have taken place in the attitude of the modern person to entity, conditioned by the emergence of the socio–cultural paradigm of the New Time, which is still relevant. From the New Age the entity has become subjective and dependent of the subject. For a more complete disclosure of this problem, it is necessary to analyze the main methodological

approaches to the understanding of technology developed in the 20th century.

**The main material.** The world of machines and mechanisms now accompanies the person at every turn. Man, society are becoming more dependent on modern, complex machinery – mechanisms, machines that now manage various vital systems. Civilization of the 21st century can be defined by a number of signs as an industrial civilization of anthropogenic type.

In general, the model of the historical movement in philosophical literature is interpreted as follows: traditional – industrial – postindustrial, informational and ecological society. However, such a schematic model does not reveal all the wealth of history. However, such model is essential for the identification of the essence of science and technology.

During the last period, concepts «technogenic», «industrial» are redefined. This is due to the tremendous influence that technology, together with science, has on the material life of people in virtually every corner of the globe. But the main reason, in our opinion, is the fact that at the current level of technological development their fundamental characteristics became much more transparent. Modern technology often leads to solving many economic, scientific and even political issues.

Science and technology as directions of human activity have a long story. However, if in previous centuries the problems of these areas were interesting only for a narrow circle of intellectuals involved, and the attitude to technology was purely applied, our time put these two phenomena at the center of public attention. Understanding their significance for history and each person was a task of philosophical thought. Now the philosophy of technology and the philosophy of science have developed as relatively independent areas of theoretical search.

It should be mentioned that if science is an ancient object of philosophical reflection, technology has become the subject of professional philosophical analysis relatively recently. Of course, the thinkers of Ancient Greece, the Renaissance, and the New Age turned to the consideration of theoretical and philosophical problems of technology, however, the first rudiments of the philosophy of technology arose in the 19th century in Germany, France. The middle of the 20th century gave rise to a powerful surge of attention to this problem.

E. Kapp's research «Fundamentals of Technology Philosophy» is the first fundamental understanding of technology. Also interested in this problem A. Espinas [8, p. 17], F. Dessauer [8, p. 19] and E. Durkheim [8, p. 21]. But in the second half of the 20th century, technology and its social phenomenon became the subject of systematic philosophical research. The ontological status and the genesis of technology, its essence and prospects for the future development of the industrial forces of society are considered. According to M. Haydegger, the technique is the first principle, the sources of the human self, a means of self-realization of mankind [2, p. 93].

At the beginning of the 20th century, the vast majority of thinkers determined the tendency to

acceleration of social and historical time, a significant change in its tempo and rhythm, and the increasing and greater «compression» of events within a unit of time – separate generation or individual's life. Every year, this tendency gained all the clearer distinctive features. As a result, all the theories and concepts of socio-historical economic, ideological orientation appear within scientific schools. They tried to find out the essential principles and origins of a new reality, make an attempt to predict (with objective data and scientific methodological approaches) the near future.

A. Toffler in his work «The Third Wave» said about such futurological projects: «When I say that something «will», I hope the reader will make an appropriate correction, which will take into account the uncertainty factor. ... In addition, social forecasts are never completely impartial and scientific, even if they use a large amount of computerized data.

«The Third Wave» is a biased prediction, and it does not pretend to be scientifically grounded. By saying this, we, however, do not mean that the ideas outlined in this book are fantastic or unsystematic. ... Work ... can be defined as a semi-systematic model of civilization and other relationships with it» [9, p. 23].

Global changes in public life cannot reflect on the characterization of the modern person: his behavior, motivation, the system of values and meaning of life. Therefore, the 21st century philosopher who tries to capture the reality of his present day inevitably becomes a «professional» anthropologist-philosopher: society affectson man, but it, in turn, undergoes radical changes as a result of the influence of man and the changes that take place with her.

The problem we are facing requires the identification of the main features of the new historical reality. The following are generally accepted: the planetary scale of any not only an international event, the informatization of society, the technologizingnot only production, but also of society as a whole, the dehumanization of society and man, the threat of environmental catastrophes and nuclear war, etc. At the beginning of the 21st century, such categorical definitions as «post modernity», «globalization», «industrial», «postindustrial», «informational» society appear. There are also such definitions as «revolution of hope», «humanization of technology», «human renewal», etc.

Entity for a person means just a certain opportunity, necessary for the accomplishment of some tasks, a man is doomed to the formation of his beingto realize a certain program,–noted H. Ortega-i-Gasset, spanish philosopher and sociologist of the 20th century. Life is something that a person has to create for himself personally. Man is the creator of himself. Liveis first of all, to make the maximum effort to arise something that is not yet, that the person himself arise, he will also persistently strive for this purpose, using everything that exists [5, p. 192].

H. Ortega-i-Gasset argued that life is a technically deterministic production. Therefore, the person himself «starts» with the development of technology.

Man, coupled with the technique, begins to determine both the possibility and the goals of

«finding» reality. According to M. Heidegger, a person, while always on the verge of opportunity, sees before himself only one goal – to choose one thing – to find a way to answer the demands of entity. Any person in our time between these opportunities is in danger: he simply cannot see the hidden, that is, does not understand all the dumbbells of reality.

M. Heidegger considered such a direct danger. Where the detected appears for a person, not even as an «object», but as a widespread object's present situation, within which the person himself is only an element, there is a person on the most cliff from which it can collapse. It was at that time that he considered herself the ruler of the land. There is an illusion that everything that happens on its path is simply an addition to its power. The person seems to be dealing with himself. But precisely at this moment, according to M. Heidegger, she does not go to meet herself, does not find its essence [2, p. 233].

Wherever «Gestell» reigns as a form of «answer to the demands of entity», any other possibility of entity disappears. The technical world dictates necessity only for its existence, by refraining from other means of entity. Heidegger's theory of technique [3] emphasized the danger of the continuous development of technology for the modern civilization and, at the same time, the inability to overcome the technical handling of human speech, is an integral part of his critique of modern civilization.

M. Heidegger devoted the role of art a possible alternative to the technique of joining humanity to the simplest, inviolable truths of entity in the world. The art of the 21st century is systematic attempts to rid the meaning, to reconstruct what became an inexorable logic of industrialization century, to subordinate creative imagination, to destroy and to made up new elements of the form. This refusal to understand the technique as a fatal deterministic phenomenon, is the desire to imagine it in the form of a certain phantasmagoria and «technicalism».

Exactly art, branche of human life, in which attracts an alogy, implicitly rational sense of entity capable, according to M. Heidegger, can give an opportunity an individual to exist, without distorting the ontological foundations of his entity. Withdrawal from a purely technical way of representing the world is a way that allows a person to save his world [2, p. 235]. The threat is not in the technology itself, but in its power over man. The threat is not in the technology itself, but in its power over man. Such an interpretation of the phenomenon of technology is common to the entire Western philosophy, which determines that the only way of implementing the development of technical civilization prepares for a moment when a person will have to turn to himself if he does not want his total progress led to a disaster. M. Heidegger depicts his «Gestell» as an unnatural phenomenon that has become very threatening [2, p. 233].

The thinker tried to consolidate some philosophical preconditions for the liberation from technological determinism [2, p. 119]. M. Heidegger had some pessimistic views on the future development of technical civilization: it had to develop only in the

direction of further dehumanization. The only recipe for this should have been the return to man himself, the construction of a new spiritual atmosphere [2, p. 97]. In it, a person would be able to take a fresh look at himself, as well as the meaning and meaning of technology.

Otherwise, the rapid development of technology can lead a person to a disaster. Therefore, it is necessary to get rid of the technician's interpretation of thinking and to supplement illogic rationalism with the intuition of the artist, to combine wisdom and poetry, to realize the only ontological basis of technology [2, p. 109].

Changes in the nature of work put a complex ideological and moral problem: whoever serves – technology to man or man to technology. M. Berdyayev in the work «Man and Machine» argued that the technique is dual, like everything in the world. Technical civilization is dangerous first of all for the human soul. Therefore, he believed the philosopher, cannot allow the full autonomy of technology and give it full freedom of action.

All diseases of modern civilization are generated by mechanical reality. Modern civilization does not want to know a person and therefore, a person is very easy to hold on to this civilization. Personality is the opposite of the machine, and the technical civilization makes the person become its instrument.

In modern anthropology of technology, even appeared a special term for a person of the 21st century – homo technicus (human technical) [7, p. 263]. G. Marcuse, for example, the main component of «human technical» calls it functional–production aspect. Man does not appear as a self-sufficient individual, but as an element of a huge mechanism of production. From there follows rating of each person according to his usefulness, contribution to the global efficiency. Homo technicus is characterized by the following features: rationality, propensity to standardize, attention to detail, methodic.

One, in any case, is obvious: technology is just a means, it is not good and not stupid bad. It depends on what the person will do with it, what it serves, in what conditions he puts it. The whole question is what kind of person will conquer it, which it will reveal itself with its help.

Could it happen that technology, breaking away from the content of human life, will turn into a mean of the crazy madness of the inhumane people, or that the whole globe, together with all people, will become a giant factory, an ant, which, in making and destroying, remains in this eternal cycle in an empty cycle, devoid of all content and content of events? The mind can construct such an opportunity; however, the consciousness of our human nature will repeat: it is impossible.

The structure of technology includes subjectivity as a human ability that has a source in human nature. Engaging in technology through education is essential in the creation of technology. This is the first stage of the application of technical authority over nature, which cannot be realized by one person, and because of this it has a great social significance. The technique shows up itself as an active ability and power inherent

not only to the individual, but also to man as a social creature and, ultimately, to humanity as a whole.

The ability of the subject to convert at the same time means the ability of the object to be transformed. With the advancement of technology, nature, its forces and substances become more and more accessible to the use of their human. Consequently, the ontological space of technology is not only the subject and the object, not only human consciousness and nature. The essence of technology cannot be localized either in the subject or in the object. It reveals itself as the relation between subject and object. The essence of technology is realized to the extent that the subject actually mastered the object and the object is really mastered by the subject.

**Conclusions.** So, the unceasing development of science and technology, which began in the early period of an industrial society and is gaining momentum in the 21st century, have led to the technocratization of human world outlook, the emergence of a genuine «cult of technology». Humanity has embraced the idea of gaining unlimited power over nature at any cost, making it a source of resources. Outward technocratization becomes more and more endangered by rice, becoming a real threat to the spiritual life of mankind and its psychological, as well as mental health.

The technical progress that came out of control of man and subjugated his life to himself, becomes the cause of self-immolation of the individual, resulting in a loss of human connection not only with the surrounding world of nature, but even with his inner self. The tendency to substitute true values for the artificial ideals of constant irrepressible consumption, utilitarian and pragmatic attitude to life cannot but be frightened. In our opinion, the most effective means of self-preservation in modern conditions, is the limited use of technology, when a person remains its owner, and not an addicted slave.

#### References

1. Adorno, TV., 1989. 'On technology and humanism', *Philosophy of technology in the FRG*, Moscow: Progress, p.364–371.
2. Haydegger, M. 2003. 'Time and Being', Kharkiv: Folio, 503 p.
3. Haydegger, M., 1989. 'Basic concepts of metaphysics', *Questions of Philosophy*, No.9.
4. Memford, L., 1986. 'Technique and nature of man', *New technocratic wave in the West*, Moscow: Progress, p.225–239.
5. Ortega-i-Gasset, H., 2000. 'Reflections on technology', *Ortega-i-Gasset H. Selected Works*, Moscow: The whole world, p.164–232.
6. Rubenis, AA., 1992. 'Technique and morality', *Ethical Thought: Scientific Publicist Readings, 1991*, Moscow: Republic, p.38–53.
7. Sidorina, TYu., 1996. 'Anthropology of technology', *Philosophy: Textbook*, Ed. V. D. Gubina, T. Yu. Sidorina, V. P. Filatova, Moscow: Russian word, p.263–265.
8. Stepin, VC., Gorokhov, VG, Rozov, MA., 1995. 'Philosophy of science and technology', Moscow: Contact – Alpha, 372 p.
9. Toffler, A., 1982. 'Third Wave', *USA: Economics, Politics, Ideology*, Moscow, No.7, p.99.

\* \* \*