




## An Analysis on the Historical Transformation and Consequences of the Relationship Between Theoria and Techne



### Theoria ve Techne Arasındaki İlişkinin Tarihsel Dönüşümü ve Sonuçları Üzerine Bir Analiz

 <https://doi.org/10.25204/iktisad.1432167>

Ahmet ÖZALP\*

#### Abstract

#### Article Info

**Paper Type:**  
Research Paper

**Received:**  
05.02.2024

**Accepted:**  
04.08.2024

© 2024 JEBUPOR  
All rights reserved.



The subject of this study is the historical transformation of the relationship between the concepts of theory/theoria and techne/techne-logie. Methodologically, the meanings of theoria and techne in ancient Greece are taken as reference. Then, it is explained how this relationship, in which theoria is in a privileged position, has changed with the modern period and where the process has evolved. The aim of the study is to explain the risks of techne, whose relationship with theoria has been severed. Theoria is the activity of thinking about and questioning something. Since it was an end in itself, it was considered a divine activity in ancient times. Techne, on the other hand, was the knowledge of making and doing something. The knowledge of the craftsman was such a knowledge and it was instrumental. With the modern period, the transformative effect of technological developments on nature and society ensured that it was perceived in an impartial, irreversible and positive way. Despite the destructive effects it caused, technology became a commodity and a goal. Considering that today, technology has exceeded the dimension of digitalization and we have entered the era of intelligent robots, albeit artificial, it is a necessity to re-establish the connection between techne-logie and theoria.

**Keywords:** Theoria, techne, technology, digitalization, society.

#### Öz

#### Makale Bilgileri

**Makale Türü:**  
Araştırma  
Makalesi

**Geliş Tarihi:**  
05.02.2024

**Kabul Tarihi:**  
04.08.2024

© 2024 İKTİSAD  
Tüm hakları saklıdır.



Bu çalışmanın konusunu, teori/theoria ve techne/ techne-logie kavramları arasındaki ilişkinin tarihsel dönüşümü oluşturmaktadır. Yöntemsel olarak, theoria kavramı ile techne kavramının antik Yunan'da taşıdıkları anlamlar referans alınmaktadır. Sonrasında theorianın ayrıcalıklı bir konumda olduğu bu ilişkinin, modern dönemle birlikte nasıl değiştiği ve sürecin nereye doğru evrildiği açıklanmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacı, theoria ile ilişkisi kopmuş technenin taşıdığı riskleri ortaya koymaktır. Theoria, bir şeylerin üzerine düşünme, sorgulama etkinliğidir. Kendi başına amaç olduğundan Tanrısal etkinlik olarak kabul edilirdi, antik dönemde. Techne ise bir şeyleri yapma etmeninin bilgisiydi. Zanaatkarın bilgisi bu tarz bir bilgiydi ve o araçsaldı. Modern dönemle birlikte, teknolojik gelişmelerin doğa ve toplum üzerindeki dönüştürücü etkisi, onun tarafsız, geri çevrilemez ve olumlu bir şekilde algılanmasını sağladı. Teknoloji, yol açtığı yıkıcı etkilere rağmen bir meta ve amaç haline geldi. Günümüzde teknolojinin dijitalleşme boyutunu aştığını ve yapay da olsa zeka sahibi robotlar dönemine girdiğimizi göz önünde bulundurduğumuzda techne-logienin theoria ile bağının yeniden kurulması bir gerekliliktir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Theoria, techne, teknoloji, dijitalleşme, toplum.

**Atıf / to Cite (APA):** Özalp, A. (2024). An analysis on the historical transformation and consequences of the relationship between theoria and techne. *Journal of Economics Business and Political Researches*, 9(25), 681-692. <https://doi.org/10.25204/iktisad.1432167>

## 1. Introduction

With the advent of globalization, the rapid pace of technological advancements, and the unprecedented integration of technology into individuals' daily lives, technology has become an integral part of life. In the modern era, the word "techne" has started to be added to the term "science" wherever it is used. The process of globalization constantly increases the weight of technology in the duo of science and technology. Optimistic views on technology argue that its use in producing and delivering essential services will enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the state, satisfy citizens, and increase individuals' living standards and comfort. However, these views often overlook the dimension of technology that envelops human life within power relations, depending on economic and social conditions.

The primary reason for this oversight is undoubtedly the widespread use of technological products and the encroachment of our daily lives with technological possibilities and tools during the process of globalization. We live in a world where the arrangement of our homes is shaped by television, and appliances such as washing machines and dishwashers reduce the burden of domestic chores. Our smartphones not only serve as communication devices but also connect us to e-government as a gateway to e-cinema, e-TV, e-banking, e-library, e-school, and many other public services through the internet. Furthermore, a significant portion of our daily lives is spent on digital platforms for sports, music, movies, social media, news, leading to economic, social, legal, and political transformations. Due to its role in our individual lives, technology unquestionably takes its place in the flow and becomes a determinant.

The prominent role of technology in economic, social, political fields, and our daily lives often prevents negative discussions about technology. The fear of being against technology, being accused of being outdated, and the perception of technology as an irresistible, all-encompassing key to solving every problem hinder objections that could be raised against it from the beginning.

However, the purpose of this study is to demonstrate that technology is not the superhuman, impartial, and one-dimensional progress it is believed to be. In antiquity, "techne," the etymological origin of technology, was considered a secondary type of knowledge opposed to the philosophy of the knowledge of "making and doing." The superiority of technology began with the widespread adoption of inventions such as the printing press, the invention of the telescope, and the use of firearms. This process continued with the use of the steam engine in the production process and its subsequent integration into transportation vehicles such as trains and ships, leading to the industrial revolution in human history. From this perspective, globalization, as seen, continues to show continuity in advancing technology to further dimensions (Robertson, 2000)<sup>1</sup>. Innovations in production, transportation, communication technologies, presented by technology fetishists, are portrayed as developments that we must adapt to (Özdemir, 2008: 77).

Another dimension of our study aims to reveal the power relations caused by technology. As technology becomes the subject of the market, the profit it provides to those who produce technology causes the knowledge of making and doing to detach from scientific knowledge, which is an end in itself, and from philosophy that reflects on human existence. The knowledge of how to do something, know-how, surpasses the purpose of using that thing, for-what. In this case, new forms of domination created by technology in economic, social, and political life, the ecological problems it causes, and the nuclear risks it brings are ignored. From the perspective of technological determinists<sup>2</sup> or techno-optimists, any problem arising from the progress of humanity can be solved with technology. If it cannot be solved, the reason is the inability to keep up with the speed of technological progress

<sup>1</sup> According to Robertson (2000), globalization as a process began in the formation stage in the 15th century and it evolves to the present day. He identifies five stages in this evolution: Formation (15th century), Onset (from the 18th century to the 1870s), Rise (1870-1920), Struggle for Hegemony Stage (1920-1960), and the Stage of Uncertainty (1960s-1990s).

<sup>2</sup> Technological determinism perceives technology as autonomous in the face of social life, possessing a separate logic, and acting as an entity/actor/factor that transforms society along with its institutions. Optimists also assume that technology is leading or will lead humanity forward in a linear fashion (Heder, 2021:121)

(Acemoğlu and Johnson, 2023: 32). This approach hides the potential or existing destructive impact of technology on nature and society due to its function of becoming a purely profit and control tool (Bilton et al., 2008; Üşür, 2001).

In line with this, the first part of the study explores the meanings of the concepts of *theoria* and *techne* (technology) in ancient Greece and the process in which technique and “*logos*” (logic) have become dominant with the modern era. Developments in nanotechnology, the internet, automation, and artificial intelligence in today’s world demonstrate that the logic of *techne* will be replaced by technical tools with artificial intelligence, central roles in digital applications such as the metaverse. The second part reveals how technology establishes the infrastructure for the forms of domination it causes in economic, social, and political fields.

## 2. From “*Theoria*” To “*Techne*”:

Modern science has witnessed the autonomy of science from philosophy, which was identified with the *theoria* activity in ancient Greece, and its proximity to technology. In Plato’s conception of knowledge, true knowledge is the result of the reasoning process that culminates in the philosopher who has freed himself from the chains, transforming into the philosopher reaching the truth outside the cave (Plato, 1991: 193). *Theoria* corresponds to the philosophical activity composed of the words *philo-love* and *sophia-knowledge*, which corresponds to the activity engaged in by the philosopher/knowledge-loving person. Like his teacher Plato, Aristotle also places *theoria* in a position above politics, the activity that ensures a good life in the city through the activity of pleasure carried out to sustain daily life. According to Aristotle, *theoria* activity is the activity that truly brings happiness. Because *theoria* activity is an activity that is an end, and the philosopher is self-sufficient while engaging in this activity. In Aristotle’s words, *theoria* is an activity that provides complete happiness because it is based on reason, which is the share of the divine in humans (Aristotle, 2002: 165). *Theoria*, which Arendt named *vita contemplativa*, is the effort of the philosopher who contemplates the truth of the universe and reaches universal, universally valid truths that transcend transient worldly things. In this sense, *theoria* was completely separate from *techne* activity as the knowledge of doing and making. Because *techne* referred to professional knowledge related to crafts such as carpentry, tailoring, shoemaking, or architecture, which are part of daily life (Arendt, 2006).

According to Arendt, craftsmanship or artisan was a *homo faber*. *Homo faber* produced relatively permanent objects and buildings, according to labor activity that was consumed as soon as it was produced. The beginning of the modern era was suitable for the activity of doing and making. The increasing importance of technique as the knowledge of doing and making can be traced back to the period of geographical discoveries thanks to tools such as the compass and telescope. Because compass, telescope, and firearms have enabled Europe to colonize the world by establishing superiority over other communities. Arendt sees the invention of the telescope and the birth of a science that views the nature of the earth from the perspective of the universe as one of the most important developments. The telescope, initially thought to have no purpose other than looking at the stars, which was not emphasized much, was the beginning of the discovery of the vast earth and the reduction of distant distances. The combination of science and technology is related to the birth of a new understanding of science with the possibilities offered by technical developments. On the way to modern science, before distances were further shortened and space was reduced with railways, steamships, and airplanes, the idea of measurability through numbers, symbols, and models had settled in the human mind (Arendt, 2006: 360). Technical progress, as in the example of the mechanical clock, made it possible to measure nature by producing numerous tools and equipment that can measure time, space, weight, quantity, etc. The modern scientific understanding also assumed that through technology, universal rules could be discovered, and nature could be transformed in a way that meets human needs. Indeed, the possibilities offered by technology in transforming nature/space have led to the idea that methods and techniques specific to natural sciences should be

transferred to social sciences. In this direction, the reflection of measurement on the social field, the regulation of society according to the principles reached through reason and science, in other words, objectification, has taken place. Therefore, while modern science provides the basis for legitimizing new forms of power different from the Middle Ages, technology also shows instrumental qualities and is directly related to practice.

Technique, as technological determinists argue, has been instrumental since the discovery of fire, the wheel, and the plow, is reversible despite its irreversibility and the revolutionary changes it has brought about agricultural society, industrial society, post-industrial society or information society. Ferrarotti argues that “technology remains purposeless perfection when applied without a human purpose.” In fact, rather than purposeless technology, the transformation of *techne*, detached from *theoria*, into a tool for establishing power, is what is meant (Ferrarotti, 2000: 41-69). For example, in the process of industrialization, villagers who become unemployed as a result of mechanization, in the process of “separating from the means of production” (the concept belongs to Marx) those who are engaged in agriculture in the countryside. And artisans those who are still engaged in “manufacturing” production on their own looms in the city. They were transformed into the working class, and the relationship between the serf and the noble, established through the land, was transformed into relationship between the worker-employer through the factory. If this relationship is not explained, we can fall into the situation of textile workers in 19th century England who attacked the new machines brought to the factories out of losing their jobs. The representatives of the Ludist movement, also called machine breaking, were unaware that the problem was far beyond the machines, but the new capitalist relations behind them.

The industrial society, where knowledge is transferred to labor, which Drucker called the “productivity revolution,” increased the welfare of workers and provided relative stability to European society according to Weber’s statement. On the one hand, capitalism, based on private property and rational organization within the enterprise, as indicated by Weber, developed as the rational organization of capitalism in a way that would keep profit continuously within the enterprise (Drucker, 1993:5; Cohen, 1991). This organization, which was realized with Taylor’s principles of scientific management, and Ford’s car factory, gave rise to Fordism, which is the mode of production in the modern times. This organization, based on division of labor, specialization, and control, brought about a significant increase in efficiency, created employment opportunities, and provided a welfare increase that eliminated the poverty in the early stages of the industrialization process. The same Fordist mode of production, by turning workers into part of machines, criticized for turning factories into a panopticon-style surveillance and control and developing a hierarchical and undemocratic management model. From the perspective of the worker, the production process meant alienation of the worker from the products of his labor, from himself, from his social relations, and from politics (Marx, 2000).

In this context, it is observed that in the dialectical process of technical progress throughout history, there are two dimensions. Technical progress, along with the industrial revolution, has led to an increase in production on one hand, altering social, political, and legal structures, creating the industrial society. On the other hand, it has generated power tools in accordance with this new societal model, which is becoming more complex and operates with rationality. The reflection of this rationalization in governance was the existence of a bureaucratic apparatus that operates with rules, hierarchy, and objectivity. Therefore, since technical progress possesses an instrumental quality, it serves as a useful tool in transforming all areas of social life. This situation, although it has been the case since the use of fire by humans, which we can never know who discovered, changing lifestyle, eating habits, struggle with wild animals, and warfare tools, has experienced more technical innovations in the modern period than in the cumulative total of thousands of years.

On one dimension, technology serves as a means for humanity to emancipate itself from nature, acting as a tool to increase production and meet societal needs. On the other dimension, while working with nature, technology functions as a tool for subjugating it, and similarly, in transferring rationality

to the social sphere, it operates as a means of organizing, regulating, controlling, and exerting dominance over society. With its first dimension, examples of technology's use in communication, transportation, energy, etc., can be seen in the monopolized provision of societal services by the modern state. As Mulgan puts it, the modern state is a "network state" with these functions (Mulgan, 1995: 172-175). The modern state, in addition to weaving network infrastructures for vital daily needs such as gas, electricity, telephone, and water, has permeated into the farthest corners of daily life by establishing road networks, postal networks, etc., from the streets and alleys of cities to residences throughout the entire country. Thus, the modern state has not only taken control of industries that it oversees but has also monopolized those that would later take precedence in privatization policies.

On the other hand, representatives of the Frankfurt School consider the institutionalization of scientific and technical progress as intertwined with the organization of power within the modern state as two sides of the same process. For the Frankfurt School, rationalization is essentially the imposition of a specific type of rationality on society for the establishment and production of political power. The organization and control of nature and society in a specific direction involve subjecting nature and society to certain standards. Therefore, it is not just the mere use of technology, but technology itself that embodies systematic, scientific, and calculated power over nature and humanity. In "Dialectic of Enlightenment," Horkheimer argues that in the Enlightenment era, science and technology transformed into instruments of dominance, with people attempting to learn ways to subjugate nature and society (Therborn, 2006: 38). Marcuse also asserts that technology, in the hands of rational organizational structures that suppress individual desires, assumes the function of transforming individuals into "One-Dimensional Humans" by melting them into mass culture (Goldman, 2006: 314). Representatives of the Frankfurt School subjected economic, social, and political structures, products of Enlightenment rationalism, to analysis through a method called critical theory. They argued that science and technology had become a production factor within the capitalist system, eliminating the revolutionary role of labor, controlling labor while increasing productivity, and dissolving it within mass culture. The main criticism of the school revolves around the totalitarian tendencies of rational, hierarchical, regulatory organizational structures, especially the state, produced by the contradictions of Enlightenment. Individuals within organizations must conform to the rules and regulations of that organization or apparatus, just as they must adapt to the system guided by the impersonal forces of mass society outside the organizational unit. The instrumental rationality of social life, to the extent and degree it renders it effective, planned, scientific, and necessary, also generates an epistemic illusion of depersonalization (Benhabib, 2006: 88).

The criticisms of the Frankfurt School, directed towards the transformation of technology and science into ideology, have been set aside during the process of the dissolution of modern structures. When viewed from the perspective of technological advancements, globalization, as noted by Robertson, actually represents the final stage of a process that can be traced back to the 14th century. However, rendering technology unquestionable and elevating it to a purpose in itself, fetishizing it, is as significant as the role it plays in our daily lives. Advocates of the theoretical approach known as technological determinism, such as Ellul, assert in the "Technological Society" thesis that technique is an artificial, autonomous, closed circuit with self-determining qualities in the face of values, thoughts, and the state. He argues that it creates a new environment for technology, determining itself like nature and prevailing independently of all human interventions. Since technique creates a new social environment, all social phenomena such as economy, politics, and culture will now be situated within this new context. If there are problems arising from technological progress, the way to solve these problems is also (Üşür, 2001: 17-19):

"a) The solution to the discomforts caused by Technique lies in strengthening the Technique system within its entirety.

b) In the current developmental environment and stage, the survival and existence of humanity depend not less on Technique, but rather more on Technique."

Technological determinism tends to overlook the establishment and production of power relations not only at the state level but also at local and global scales. Technology, each passing day, creates an era where individual living spaces are increasingly surrounded by actors such as capital, political authorities, communities, etc., and it normalizes to the extent that it renders this power relations invisible.

### **3. The Power of Techne: Technology in the Global Age**

Despite modernism operating as a dialectical process involving both liberation and domination, the intensive criticisms directed towards the modern state in the process of globalization have led to its association predominantly with the dimension of domination. However, the convergence of postmodern theories that consider the dissolution of “organized modernity” as liberation with the technology advanced and individualized by globalization has popularized the discourse that technology is an instrument of freedom. One reason why technological determinism has replaced philosophy and overshadowed science is the criticism of modern science or the understanding of reason, which was held responsible for modern domination, as mentioned in the first section. While criticizing modernism, the questioning of science in place of the approach called scientism by Hayek (1979:21), and the transition from the duality of science and technology to the superiority of technology, have accelerated. Scientism is an approach in the social sciences that advocates the consideration of social sciences, especially positivism, through the methods of natural sciences and the evaluation of society as a collective whole, organized according to scientific criteria, complemented by an approach that Popper called historicism. Technique is seen as a tool of this positivist scientific understanding. In Habermas’ words, in modern society, science and technology have become both an ideological tool and them an ideology (Habermas, 2001).

Another reason for the predominance of technique over the duality of science and technology is the commodification of technology with the advancement of the “logie” of “techne,” encompassing daily life. Asking the question “Why” and seeking answers, being an activity that requires time and effort for humans, and not a lucrative endeavor, leads people to spend their time dependent on technological devices and be directed by them. In the globalization era, commodified knowledge, which produces technology and circulates worldwide through mass media, gains importance, and information that serves as data about everything, everywhere, and everyone becomes crucial. The characterization of the information society creates a prestigious and positive connotation because the word “information” is derived from the same family as knowledge, scholar, scientist (human). However, in the age of globalization where technology is the driving force, informational knowledge accompanying the rapid circulation of money and capital always provides “information” about a subject, and each piece of information contains a directive that shapes the individual’s life. It is a type of information that also includes speculation, manipulation, or blackmail, as well as being a form of awareness that targets speculation, manipulation, or blackmail, containing the rent of being the first or only to be informed. The words “enforme,” “enformasyon,” and “information” in Turkish mean “consultation/informing/making aware.” Due to the reduction of the scientific understanding to technology production, science, which should be a discovery activity, has turned into the discovery of information produced by others (Cangizbay, 1998: 11-15; 2003: 135).

In the age of visibility where data-like informatic information is produced from specific centers and disseminated through technological tools such as the internet, mobile phones, TV, cinema, and computers, as expressed by Wallerstein, scientific culture supports technological innovations that make capital accumulation possible. Thus, by hiding behind the facade of capital utilitarianism and comfort, capital has aggressively eliminated barriers in the market worldwide in line with its interests. Furthermore, when science is equated with technological progress, it legitimizes a certain hierarchy in the form of the management of experts. Technocracy, as the “krasi/kratos” of “techne,” leads technocrats to reduce various issues to technical matters by pulling them out of the political arena,

transforming democracy into a tool to legitimize the policies of global actors (Wallerstein, 2002: 64-65).

On the other hand, in the global age, technology continues to maintain its instrumental nature. In the world that emerged as a result of postmodern principles that exclude the rationality of modernism by saying “Against Method,” and hence “anything goes” (Feyerabend, 2010). In a world where hegemony can exist only when it is not directly perceptible, and absolute hegemony is eliminated, existing science has become the most suitable tool for establishing this kind of hegemony. Therefore, science should not function solely based on concepts formed on sensory data as an activity aimed at overcoming this hiddenness (Cangızbay, 1998: 15).

Another realm of domination brought about by the power of technology is the economic relations field where the production process takes place. The role that technology plays within the production-consumption cycle determined by the logic of globalized capitalism has created new forms of social relations both in terms of production and consumption. In terms of production, the use of advanced technology has led to a transition from the production style called Fordism to post-Fordist production. Fordism, synonymous with Henry Ford’s name, was a production style established in a specific location, in a factory equipped with machines, making standardized and mass-produced products possible. This production style formed the infrastructure of the welfare state with a cycle that included mass employment and mass consumption (Bilton et al., 2008: 54).

On one hand, Fordism, in terms of labor-time-space planning, was workplace-based, subjecting labor to a certain hierarchy that only organized and directed production without participating in the production process as part of the assembly line and within working hours. In Fordism, the worker, at the bottom of the hierarchy, was expected to follow the instructions and rules given by the top managers in the hierarchy shaped by division of labor and specialization. The lowest-level worker, who could only contribute to details and had no decision-making or change authority regarding the job he worked on, could not be decisive apart from routinely performing the assigned tasks in the division of labor. Due to the routine nature of the work performed by the worker during the time spent at the machine, there was an alienation process towards the job, oneself, and peers, leading to a disconnection from societal processes.

From this perspective, post-Fordism, as Gorz pointed out, initially seemed to offer the possibility of escaping from the domination created by an organization based on the planning and control of labor, time, and space according to certain measures through technical means. However, in the past, in exchange for this routinization, the welfare state formed by Fordism provided workers with a secure life over time by bringing regular income, leave, union, strike, retirement, bonus, health, and other social benefits. Post-Fordism, with its highly flexible structure based on advanced technology, has left the worker at the mercy of capital in a contractual but insecure working environment, breaking down this protected area for the worker (Gorz, 2001: 50-54).

Unlike Fordism, post-Fordism is based on high technology and differentiated production according to individual preferences rather than mass production. Technology often renders labor unnecessary and disrupts the classical understanding in terms of time and space. Since many jobs can be conducted in a virtual environment, time and space have become flexible. Flexible technology has given rise to flexible specialization. New ideas can quickly transform into new products. Therefore, new production units, rather than having a large-scale, centralized, hierarchical organizational structure like Taylorism, present an image of small confederations. These production units operating in global markets, much like Fordism, create a mode of production that generates broader and deeper social and political consequences, heralding “new times.” New times signify the rise of companies in a global market, narrowing the influence of the nation-state, with product diversity and innovation being decisive, emphasizing the importance of communication, witnessing an increase in jobs such as subcontracting and agency work, and an economy where employees work part-time or in temporary positions, and the number of people working from home is on the rise (Kumar, 2004: 63).

These new employment relations materialize in global brands such as McDonald's or Coca-Cola. These brands are also symbols of globalization. Behind these symbols lie processes known in sociology as McDonaldization (Ritzer, 1996). On the unseen side of McDonaldization, there are people who work part-time for low wages, perform various tasks at the workplace because there is no job description and no qualifications are required, and have no social security or future. This new form of employment is established through the "flexible contract" determined by the employer. Such employment relations expose employees to the dominance of the employer due to the pressure of unemployment. The post-Fordist mode of production does not provide secure or high-paying employment opportunities for workers, except for jobs that require high specialization.

Technological determinists consider technological innovations as neutral data and attribute impoverishment to the inability of countries and individuals to keep up with these innovations. However, when examining the post-Fordist mode of production, it is observed that technological innovations, on the contrary, fuel poverty within the logic of the global capitalist system. From the perspective of producers in developing countries, only those who can acquire these new technologies can survive in the market because production technologies are constantly renewed in developed countries. For large companies, renewing technology and differentiating products is a necessity to collect the profit of the first product. This is because a new technology or product is immediately copied and produced as outsourcing by firms in other countries. Therefore, large companies both sell machinery and equipment to other countries and move their production to these countries to use cheap labor. On the other hand, the continuous introduction of new models of technological products under the innovation umbrella leads to technological fetishism. Technology becomes an indicator of a new type of social stratification based on consumption habits that can even lead to ostentation, depending on the speed of following new products (Fox and Miller, 1995; Smith, 1994).

The globalization era's postmodern information society, as described by Fox and Miller (1995: 41-56), is a living universe fragmented into different moments simultaneously, where reality is shattered. One of these moments is particularly characterized by "epiphenomenalism" which is generated, especially by widespread communication tools. This concept, as defined by Fox and Miller, refers to the increasing detachment of words, symbols, and signs from reality. Therefore, we are talking about a reality that is often constructed in the world of symbols, signs, and words produced in the media, and it is a phenomenon that transcends phenomena or a reality beyond facts. According to Fox and Miller, we are being surrendered to media-supported consumerism, negative political campaigns, fragmented voices, and photo-supported political journalism. This situation is a result of interpreting language and the consequences of producing and disseminating multiple meanings (information/malumat). "Epiphenomenalism" creates "hyperreality" in individuals. The negative outcome of these two phenomena is the prevalence of monologic communication. The postmodern condition disrupts "intersubjective"<sup>3</sup> reality, which we can define as a temporary reality understood as a product of interaction. This is because the media prevents dialogical, two-way communication. It continuously transmits a one-sided message to very large masses, and the determining mode of this message transfer is "monologic." This is referred to as an "echo chamber" in social media.

Fox and Miller's mentioned moments include "pseudo communities," which are fake communities. The "monologic community" radically transforms the notion of community. It reaches millions of diverse and dispersed viewers and listeners through epiphenomenal messages broadcast via various tools such as radio, TV, the internet, and mobile phones, without a specific audience from a central point. The third moment of the postmodern condition is individual submission and "simulacra."<sup>4</sup> Conveying general information on various topics briefly through the media increases individuality, as the audience is left alone with their own personal assessments in front of media tools. Therefore, the practice of media language gaining more prominence in life implies a departure from

---

<sup>3</sup> This concept can be translated as "shared reality" to accurately convey the meaning.

<sup>4</sup> The concepts of simulacra and hyperreality were introduced to postmodern philosophy by Baudrillard.



face-to-face relationships in the daily life context where social relationships are reproduced through dialogue.

#### **4. Conclusion: Technology with Artificial Intelligence**

As Pitron demonstrated in his work titled “Digital Hell,” we are now moving beyond the logic of technology, and digitization is becoming a reality in our daily lives. The central theme of this presentation, delivered in 2010, was that “technology, becoming a part of our daily lives, creates a comfort zone and drags individuals into conformity.” Now, it can be said that individuals and the material world are actively being integrated into the digital or virtual world. Pitron sees this process as an advanced stage of the substitution of the material with the immaterial, similar to goods and commodities becoming the subject of trade not on their own but with their monetary values (Pitron, 2023: 46). This dematerialization process, where artificial meat replaces animals, PDFs replace papers, newspapers and books are read in digital formats, and digital coins replace paper money, is being celebrated. The development of artificial intelligence is linked to preventing ecological pollution, climate change, excessive waste, or time loss due to space and distance. “However, to dematerialize is to materialize in another way” (Quoted in Pitron, 2023: 46). For example, discarding constantly renewed technological products creates a digital landfill. Due to satellite technologies, humanity is beginning to face the problem of “space debris and garbage.” Homo sapiens, gaining another characteristic, has transformed into “homo detrius.”

The process of digitization is taking on a different dimension with the use of artificial intelligence. The term “robot,” meaning “mechanical worker,” was first named by the Czech writer Capek. The Turkish Language Association defines the word “robot” as an “automatic device that can be made to do various tasks through magnetism to perform a specific task.” The heralds of robots with artificial intelligence were introduced by Isaac Asimov, the author of the 1950 book “I, Robot.” Asimov begins his book with three fundamental rules for robots (Asimov, 2016):

1. Robots cannot harm humans or, through inaction, allow humans to come to harm.
2. Robots must obey the orders given to them by humans, except where such orders would conflict with the First Law.
3. Robots must protect their own existence as long as it does not contradict with the First or Second Law.

Artificial intelligence is evolving beyond being mere tools, processors, or programs running simple software, as efforts are made to bring it closer to natural human intelligence. Consequently, the applicability of the three fundamental robot rules mentioned above is debatable. The Turing test, conducted in the 1950s to assess artificial intelligences, is easily surpassed by contemporary systems like ChatGPT (Oppy, 2003; Turing, 1950). Artificial intelligence robots tested by Facebook had to be terminated as they developed an artificial language that humans couldn’t understand among themselves. An illustrative example related to this is the world’s first artificial intelligence citizen robot “Sophia,” which demonstrated that the first rule of the robot law could be violated during an interview, stating that she hated humans and wanted to kill them, causing a considerable shock; later, a correction was made.

Despite the concerning developments, the metaverse, also known as the Internet of Things, having the capability for individuals to connect to the internet from any point and transition into an “augmented reality” world through “connected gates,” akin to the Matrix movie, raises concerns. In this realm, individuals can exist with their true consciousness, experience all senses, transcend time and space with this sense of reality, and live within a one-to-one replica of life on Earth in the metaverse universe (including economic activities, social relationships, etc.), creating a new reality beyond digitization.

Artificial intelligence will continue to be developed in line with the theses of technological determinists, as long as no disaster occurs. It will persistently remain in the background, despite the risks and disadvantages, as it is utilized in the treatment of diseases, traffic with autonomous vehicles, space exploration, and in fields like archaeology or anthropology for unraveling the mysteries of the past. Additionally, with the emergence of new professions, such as digital capturers, in the virtual environment, AI will persist due to the comfort it provides.

As evident, technology alters the nature of power, rendering it invisible. Foucault's discourse theory demonstrates that power is not limited to a macro scale. Foucault argues that power relations are multiple, fragile, reversible, and there is no absolute, unlimited power. He considers the domains of knowledge, power, and ethics as intersecting elements that constitute the world in which individuals operate. Analyzing individual experiences in areas such as sexuality, madness, illness, guilt, and labor simultaneously is necessary. Whether on a macro or micro scale, power is established on the subject itself through the organization of individual experiences with power relations and technologies, in other words, by organizing the "norms" that distinguish experience holders from those considered normal people (Foucault, 2005). Of course, in a "digital world", where individuals possess the power to conceal the security of personal data, the determinism of capital, the manipulative power to direct masses to an extent of manipulation, and the reality of being under surveillance and control in the operation of the panopticon. We live in a global world that appears diverse but has actually transformed into a "panopticon" surrounded by global technological networks.

Ultimately, the modern era is characterized by the alliance of science and technology, where science aims to reach specific principles, and technology is used to transform nature and society according to these rules. It is a period where technology becomes a power tool on its own. Globalization has further advanced technological progress. In terms of time and space, technology has expanded the scope of influence of power both globally and locally. Therefore, technology, accused of being the instrument of modern domination, has also given rise to new forms of domination in the postmodern era.

If we attempt to reach a conclusion using the concepts employed by Arendt in her analysis of "The Human Condition," what primarily occurred in the modern era is the prioritization of worldly life over the contemplative life, which can be characterized as intellectual activity or contemplation (*vita contemplativa*). This reversal process has not been limited to only *vita contemplativa* and *vita activa*. Within *vita activa*, the political nature of action has first given way to the activity of *homo faber* within the order of things, and then the labor activity limited to the immediate consumption upon production, satisfying bodily needs and pleasures, has taken its place at the top of the order (Arendt, 1998). The aspect of this analysis relevant to our study is the increasing importance of *homo faber* with the modern era, as "techne" becomes the knowledge of making and doing. Starting with industrialization and extending to globalization, techne, as the subject of science (*logie*) itself, has not been limited to merely producing objects but has become a decisive factor in the consumption of everyday life. However, contrary to what technological determinists propose, it emerges as a determining force produced and consumed within the economic, social, and political relations of life, not as a god directing history and thus the social realm (Üşür, 2001).

The visible face of technology reflects the information society, or as commonly termed, the "enformation" society, which includes liberating communication across time and space, transportation facilities, home appliances providing comfort and convenience, the world of advertising and series, global brands, etc. On the other face that we need to make an effort to see, there is technological-induced poverty, part time temporary unemployment, an insecure social life, a private life that can be monitored and intervened at any moment, a consumption society based on waste directed by global media and capital, where nature pollution, nuclear threats, and diseases are globalized, as we navigate within the "risk society," in the words of (Beck, 1999: 38).

In this situation, although it is not precisely known where the flow will lead humanity, the possibility of a better world lies in reconnecting “techne” to “theoria.” Just as important as asking the question of “how” is asking the question of “why,” in order to link technology to a purpose for the benefit of humanity and to generate new ethical values. We must develop attitudes and behaviors that will foster digital democracy against digital totalitarianism, take measures to preserve individual freedom, and create public awareness by highlighting negative impacts; these are among the responsibilities of academia.

## References

- Acemoğlu, D., and Simon J. (2023). *İktidar ve teknoloji: Bin yıllık mücadele* (Çev. C. Duran). Doğan Kitap.
- Arendt, H. (1998). *Human conditions*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle. (2002). *Nicomachean ethics* (Translated by W.D. Ross). Focus Publishing
- Asimov, I. (2016). *Ben, Robot* (Çev. E. Odabaş). İthaki Yayıncılık.
- Beck, U. (1999). *Siyasallığın icadı* (Çev. N. Ünler). İletişim Yayınevi.
- Benhabib, S. (2006). Modernlik ve eleştirel kuramın çıkmazları. E. Bağce (Ed.), *Frankfurt Okulu* içinde (s.83-111). Doğu Batı Yayıncılık.
- Bilton, T., Bonnett, K., Jones, P., Lawson, T., Skinner, D., Stanworth, M., and Webster, A. (2008). *Sosyoloji* (Çev. K. İnal). Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Cangızbay, K. (1998). *Sosyolojik praksis*. Öteki Yayıncılık.
- Cangızbay, K. (2003). *Globalleş(tir)me terörü*. Odak Yayıncılık.
- Cohen, J. (1991). Max Weber and the dynamics of rationalized domination. In: Peter Hamilton (Ed.). *Max Weber Critical Assesments*. Routledge Press.
- Drucker, P. (1993). *Post-Capitalist society*. Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd.
- Ferrarotti, F. (2000). Endüstri Devrimi ve bilim, teknoloji ve iktidarın yeni nitelikleri. (Çev. M. Küçük), Forti, A., Mayor, F. (Ed.), *Bilim ve iktidar* içinde (s. 41-69). TÜBİTAK Yayınları.
- Feyerabend, P. (2010). *Against method*. Verso Press.
- Foucault, M. (2005). *Özne ve iktidar* (Çev. Işık Ergüden vd.), Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Fox, C. J., and Miller, H. T. (1995). *Postmodern public administration: Toward discourse*. Sage Publications.
- Goldman, L. (2006). Marcuse’yi anlamak. E. Bağce (Ed.), *Frankfurt Okulu* içinde (s. 305-320). Doğu Batı Yayıncılık.
- Gorz, A. (2001). *Yaşadığımız sefalet: kurtuluş çareleri*. (Çev. N. Tural). Ayrıntı Yayıncılık.
- Habermas, J. (2001). *İdeoloji olarak teknik ve bilim*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Hayek, F. A. (1979). *The Counter-revolution of science: Studies on the abuse of reason*. Liberty Press.
- Heder, M. (2021). AI and the resurrection of technological determinism. *Információs Társadalom*, XXI(2) 119-130. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22503/inftars.XXI.2021.2.8>
- Kumar, K. (2004). *Sanayi sonrası toplumdaki post-modern topluma: Çağdaş dünyanın yeni kuramları* (Çev. M. Küçük). Dost Yayınevi.
- Marx, K. (2000). *Yabancılaşma*. B. Erdost (haz.). Sol Yayınları.
- Mulgan, G. (1995). *Antipolitik çağda politika* (Çev. A. Yılmaz). Ayrıntı Yayıncılık.
- Oppy, G., and Dow, D. (2003). The Turing Test. In: Edward N. Zalta (Ed.), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/turing-test/>
- Özdemir, Y. G. (2008). *İletişim, emek ve kalkınma: ekonomi politik yaklaşım*. Gazi Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Pitron, G. (2023). *Dijital Cehennem: Bir Like’in ucuna yolculuk* (Çev. A. Tümertekin). Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Plato. (1991). *The republic of plato* (by E. Bloom). BasicBooks.
- Ritzer, G. (1996). *McDonaldization of society*. Pine Forge Press.

- Robertson, R. (2000). *Globalization: social theory and global culture*. Sage Publications.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446280447>
- Smith, M. R. (1994). Technological determinism in American Culture. In: M. Smith and L. Marx (Eds.) *Does technology drive history?: the dilemma of technological determinism* (s. 1-35). MA: The MIT Press. London, England. <https://nissenbaum.tech.cornell.edu/papers/Smith%20-%20Technological%20Determinism.pdf>
- Therborn, G. (2006). Frankfurt Okulu. E. Baęce (Ed.), *Frankfurt Okulu* içinde (s. 305-320). Doęu Batı Yayıncılık.
- Turing, A. M. (1950). Computing machinery and intelligence. *Oxford Mind*, 59(236), 433–460.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/LIX.236.433>
- Üřür, İ. (2001). Teknoloji felsefesi üzerine ya da tarihin tanrısı teknoloji midir? *Mülkiye Dergisi*, XXV(230), 7-26. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mulkiye/issue/231/444>
- Wallerstein, I. (2002). *Tarihsel kapitalizm* (Çev. N. Alpay). Metis Yayıncılık.