

## HARDT'S AND NEGRI'S NOTION OF TECHNOLOGY

### ABSTRACT

The Greek word *techne*, out of which our contemporary notion of technology is derived, is usually understood and directed around (current) production (*poiesis*). However, *techne* is much more; *techne* also means knowledge. For example, I do not know how to build a chair, but I know how to use one. In this sense, *techne* does not need any thematization or further knowledge on causes of how a particular thing is made. In other words, *techne* represents Heidegger's readiness-to-hand, *Zuhandenheit*. Thus first and mostly, this knowledge is nominal and teleological oriented, for the sake of something. There is no "neutral" point of view of technology; it is always for the sake of something. From Max Weber's notion of rationalization of politics in the form of giant bureaucracy, Marcuse's "one-dimensional" man and consumption, Foucault's production of the truth to Heidegger's *Gestell*, *techne* is always in the service for the sake of something. Hence, from the position of contemporary society, the passage happens from the transcendence of disciplinary society to an immanent society of control. In short, the passage to society of control includes the production of subjectivities, the technology of production, which is not fixed in identity-politics but hybrid and modulating. The know-how of *techne* of the society of control is widely and "democratically" dispersed. Know-how is not anymore interested in disciplinarian production but is now creative and depended upon cooperation within the multitude. Furthermore, insofar *techne* had always imitated nature or *physis*, the present conditions of technology can not only imitate nature but also in some manner even "replace" it. We only have to think about the possibility of cloning people to imagine that someday birth and death will not be biological facts but technical. It seems that boundaries between nature and man have been breached. The analogy between them presented in Aristotle's *Physics* became obsolete. The issue is not that a man is creative as nature but that he becomes creative as much as nature. The potential threats stemming from this led some thinker like Heidegger and Arendt to analyze these perplexities with great insight, but also it led them to ignore what could have been possible solutions in social-economical realities. Hence, for Heidegger and Arendt, this becomes the ontological nightmare. However, Hardt and Negri fully embraced this ontological nightmare. In truly Spinoza's fashion, they see possibilities based on the fact that a man is no different in their capabilities than nature, animal, or machine. They reject any transcendence and representation imposed on the natural man. In this vein, the man is indeed seen as a labourer because labour signifies a natural aspect of a man. Man cannot be separated from nature because, as much as nature, a man is a creative force. That being said, the paper will explore their understanding of technology and the role that it plays in the multitude of creative forces.

Keywords: Negri, Hardt, technology, labour, multitude, biopolitics.