

Heidegger:

“The essence of technology is by no means anything technical”



“Thus we shall never experience our relationship to the essence of technology so long as we merely conceive and push forward the technological”

For Heidegger technology is ontological because:

1. It *manifests* a world
2. It *articulates* a world
3. It *reconfigures* a world

“Technology is a way of revealing”

What does it reveal?

Our being-in-the-world

What is a world?

Our sum total of meaningful practices, beliefs, pasts, possible futures... *as a significant whole*

“Ontology” is not about things or entities (ontic knowledge) and their properties (“substance ontology”) as self-sufficient entities, even if that is easy to program (ie computational inadequacy)

It is about being-in-the-world

A question of being

Oliver Sacks example of Dr. P.

Gloves can be, but not as entities with properties

Gloves in an equipmental totality

Last problem: CP Snow: natural science descriptions adequate for human world? We are not substances with equipment!

How *do* we have our being? “Essence is existence.”

What will the National Map say about the various worlds?

Ethnosphere: from 6,000 languages to 3,000

“Ethnocide”? Losing these worlds

