

I'd like to sketch out some attitudes toward technology which I personally prefer. These aren't the only attitudes possible. Nor are they the only ones I'm likely, eventually, to prefer myself. They're just attitudes.

Some will find these attitudes naive, arguing that the development of technology has its own logic to which we must adapt. Others will find these attitudes dangerous, arguing that technology is, definitionally, bad for man, nature and society and that it must therefore be destroyed. Some will recognize that these attitudes are an initial attempt to see technology as our servant and the servant of the environment.

The first attitude toward technology is that it is the creature of man. Man makes technology. Therefore, it makes sense to say that man can control it. The truth of the Frankenstein myth—the myth of technology taking matters into its own hands and eliminating human control—is that the people who created the monster allowed (or intended) it to get beyond their control.

The second attitude toward technology is that man can do with it whatever he wants. Technology is the same as magic. This means that the only significant question regarding technology is, *what should be done*. Showing that something *can* be done is, definitionally, an irrelevant activity.

Like the Sabbath, technology is made for man; man is not made for technology.

The third attitude toward technology is that it should function invisibly. What is important about a machine is *what* it does. *That* it does something is irrelevant. Our tendency to place technology in places where it can be highly visible derives from the attitude that one should prove that one *can* do something. This attitude involves a lack of self-confidence.

An analogy with the human body is useful here. We tend to flaunt our achievements by exposing them to view: phone lines. Imagine if the brain wanted to flaunt its abilities by stringing brain cells around the outside of our skulls.

Technology should be invisible, recessed. This reality is signaled by the phrase, technological infrastructure.

The fourth attitude toward technology is that it should develop in the direction of "doing more with less". Thus unless other considerations should take precedence, technology should develop in the directions of:

miniaturization
speed
low heat production
low energy consumption
zero waste production
multi-channel control capabilities
multi-environmental compatibility
zone organization (i.e. systems which organize progressively large hunks of reality; this goal is only possible through miniaturization.)

The fifth attitude toward technology is that both the form and the function of technology must be "beautiful" in every respect. Not sanitized like an IBM office, but beautiful and warm. The machine itself and the thing it does must be optimally esthetically pleasing to those who are associated with it. A technology which degrades people and the environment is, definitionally, bad. The idea that we can use an unattractive and degrading technology (e.g. a factory or an office building) to manufacture a pleasing product is nonsense. A beautiful environment is the minimum requirement, not the idealized goal.

The sixth attitude toward technology is that it can be changed and improved. If a piece of technology is not doing what people want it to do, they must find a way to change it or build another piece which does what they want. It is unreasonable to say that any piece of technology is "as good as we can get it". Technology is fully and fundamentally mutable. The development of technology is an infinite pro/regress.

The seventh attitude toward technology is that technology is necessary. The relevant questions regarding technology are whether, what, when, should and will.

The eighth attitude toward technology is that, like magic, it is a quick-sand. In fact, there is no fundamental difference between using technology for "beneficial purposes" and using it for "other" purposes. We need not to do away with technology but to get beyond it. Beyond technology we do not get into hassles like "good" and "bad" technology. In a sense, we get beyond much of what has been said in the previous three pages.

The most fundamental attitude toward technology, therefore, is that it *IS* magic.

The metaconcept behind that statement is that thinking is technology. It is the idea in one's mind which is real and the hardware is merely a realization or manifestation of sets of ideas.

DEFINITION: *technology is thinking is technology is magic*

