

Human Being and its Possibility

—Man and Technology—

Fragmental draft

Tomonobu IMAMICHI

1. Terminology

Under the word technology I understand all sorts of knowledge of technical cohesion.

Under the word technocracy I understand manipulation which is done in the technical cohesion.

Under technical cohesion I understand the unity of many machinery units which are the units of instrument.

2. Technical cohesion as circumstance

The circumstance of mankind is different from that of animals in general in the following three points:

a) The nature in general is not the circumstance of animal, whose circumstance is nothing but one part of nature, namely, the locally limited topos. On the contrary, the whole nature is the circumstance for mankind through its technology because technology has surpassed the limited locality. In this sense technology is situated between mankind and the whole nature as the medium of both beings.

b) The animal may have instrument or may produce an instrument through our interpretation; e.g. the beaver uses wood in order to build a dam. But it cannot make a technical cohesion like mankind. With the whole nature the technical cohesion becomes one of the circumstances of mankind.

c) The historical accumulation of cultural products which shows itself as one part of circumstance in mankind cannot be found in the world of animals.

Through the facts of a, b, c we can recognize the following two important matters:

I) The human kind makes its circumstance through its civilization and culture.

II) The circumstance of human kind consists of a triple structure, namely, the whole nature

the technical cohesion
the historical culture.

The circumstance is therefore circumstance not because it surrounds us, but because it surrounds us and stands against us, namely, the circumstance is therefore circumstance because it and we are thrown in the co-relative tension. The human kind and its circumstance stand therefore in mutual operation. We can easily recognize the operation from our side to the objective technological cohesion. We have produced it, improved it and we have enlarged it in order to improve our condition. But it is not enough for us to enumerate our objective operation which has changed the technological cohesion, if we wish to discuss the technological cohesion as circumstance. Why? Because we must think of the operation of the circumstance to us in the reciprocal tension.

The question must now be formulated as following:

What has the technical cohesion as circumstance done to the human kind? Or better formulated, how we have changed ourselves in the technical cohesion. In this way the problem (man and technology) on the level of retention to the past shows itself as reflection about the subjective change in the technology.

3. Subjective change of human kind in the technical cohesion

The reversion of logical structure of act.

The human kind is a being with reason which thinks according to logical order. When we act we must think how we act, so we have logical structure also in practice. What is the logical structure of practice? Aristoteles shows us the classical model of practical logic:

The major premise, the purpose A is desired.

The minor premise, means p, q, r, s will realise this desired A.

Conclusion: With a certain reason I choose p as my means to the purpose A.

This classical form of the practical syllogism is still valid even today, but this form is actually for the choice of one means to an undoubted purpose. Is there any undoubted being in the present world? In this technical cohesion there are at least some undoubted beings with us. What are they? They are effective power, electricity, atomic energy, capital as economic force. They exist in front of us as strong powers which make possible many purposes as the object of choice. So in the modern model of practical syllogism we must formulate as follows:

Major premise, a means P exists as our property.

Minor premise, this means P will realize the following purposes a, b, c, d.

Conclusion: With a certain reason we choose a as our purpose as one of the possibilities of our means.

The primacy of the means to the purpose is here as clear as daylight. We

can realize only the purposes which an undoubted power as means contains in itself. Now, our undoubted being as means is nothing else but the physical or economical power. It suggests only the physical purpose and it cuts off the metaphysical transcendence. In this problem of reversion of logical structure in practical syllogism we can recognize at once the three following *perils*:

- I) Technology founded the kingdom of means. We must choose one purpose among some limited purposes which undoubted physical means make possible. So we have lost contact with the transcendence in the case of act. *This is the peril of morality.*
- II) The classical form of practical syllogism concerns "I", the singular subject. On the contrary, the modern model of practical syllogism concerns "we", the plural subject whose representative type is the committee. That means, such a situation makes us forget the personal responsibility and lifts up the function of a personal collectivism. *This is the peril of individuality.*
- III) The effective action without morality and without individuality is not of human kind. This is the circulation of machine. The inequality of human kind with machine is the unconscious result of life in the technical cohesion.
- IV) The technical cohesion gives us an entirely new form of abstraction. Until today the abstraction is a logical term. But the modern technology creates a form of abstraction unknown until now. What is it? It abstracts the result and throws away the process to the result, e.g., we can compare the contrast of alpinism and rope-way. The latter, the technological invention has diminished the toil of the process and reserves the effect of alpinism, namely, the view from the top of the mountain. The technology diminishes therefore the time and toil, two sides of the process. Now, the human existence is not of space but of time. If the technology diminishes the time, it is the menace to the human existence. So, the technology is the moment of human alienation to the thing.

The toilsome process is indeed the chance for exercise of intellectual device. The toilsomeless diminished duration is therefore of anti-intellectual reaction. *This is the peril of human thinking.* Really in the signal cohesion of technocracy we must take a rapid reaction. Here meditation is synonymous with hesitation. We have reckoned many negative sides of technological influence on human being in the technological circumstance. Are they all for us to say about the theme? No, there are many positive sides.

- V) On the technological circulation the correct and rapid reaction according to the universal signal is required. Almost without interiority one must react precisely. Correctness, rapidity, precision, three mechanical-

automatic reactions and the responsibility to signal. Responsibility as a new virtue has been placed in front of the problems. This word "responsibility", as the last volume shows, is of recent origin. On this new virtue we must think seriously. In the technical cohesion, which has gigantic vital force, one button pushed by one person has the power to destroy the lives of many people whom the one person in question cannot see. This situation is the end of the morality of "face to face". The love for the neighbour before the modern technology was originated from the sentiment of having personal contact in the limited locality. But in the vast technical cohesion all mankind in synchronical relation is actually the neighbour. In the physical sense we cannot see our neighbour. So the objective person of our act is now the unseen person. Therefore the fundamental of morality is not the emotion seen on the face of the near neighbour, but the reasonable reflection to the unseen being. Here one can trace a new possibility to the world of belief and to the unseen transcendence. It is almost a theological horizon in the future.

In the technical cohesion as we say, the correctness of reaction to the signal is more importantly required than the sincerity of act to the word. There is the horizon where the sincere unability is morally inferior to the unsincere ability. At the first glance it seems to be the victory of efficiency. Can Mephistopheles smile at this scene? No.

The sense of this scene is that the human morality of the immanent consciousness which has presided the past is now in danger on the horizon which it composed. The technology shows us clearly, there exists a superior virtue to the individual sincerity. This limit of immanent morality suggests the religious area.

- VI) The technology has enlarged the human existence through the optic machine, e.g. we can experience visually the movement of bacterias which we can feel; through the aeroplane we can experience the view of the birds from above. It means our experience in the technical cohesion is not only human experience but also pan-vital experience, so the human world is really topos of all sorts of experience in all sorts of lives.
- VII)
 - a) As conclusion we may say, the morality of personal act is now limited within the private sphere. It has new function for the social life.
 - b) The morality of the labour in which the responsibility and the correctness are the prime virtue is now required for the social life. The sincerity is inferior to the ability.
 - c) This does not suggest the victory of efficiency but the limit of old morality of "face to face".
 - d) The new religious horizon in which the transcendent must be sought

after is open. The place of human kind in the whole cosmos is enormously lifted up through the gaining of pan-vital experiences. It is not the alienation but the spiritual embracement.

In the new circumstance the human being has founded a new virtue like responsibility. Our actual circumstance, in which the morality of "face to face" is in danger, stimulates us to build up the new horizon of the religion. Against the nihilisation of time, and so the nihilisation of human consciousness, the modern people run to the art, whose essence is not effect but the process of its experience. The human being has its possibility in its future, if it does not give up its meditative faculty, namely philosophy.

University of Tokyo