Technopoly: a tool-using worship

At a time when innovative technologies and environmental awareness are simultaneously emerging, this dossier examines man's relationship with technology.

Although a [2023 *Guardian* article entitled "US Scientists Turn Old Plastic into Soap after Fireside Inspiration", written by A. Murray published] (document 1) points out a scientific plastic-free breakthrough that backs up the [2014 survey's results conducted by the *Pew Research Center* and entitled "Technological change and future"] (document 5); both a [2020 academic paper from *Nature*, written by D. McLaren a Markusson] (document 2) and a [2019 book review entitled "The Deification of technology" written by John-Pierre Maeli] (document 3) unequivocally warn readers as to how technology can lure mankind into believing it is the silver bullet to climate change; such an illusion is mocked in a [2010 Mike Keefe's political cartoon published in *the Denver Post* entitled "Greenish Technology"] (document 4). To what extent are man-made environmental challenges rooted in mankind's blind trust in technology?

While technology lures mankind with advancement (I), it allows them to transfer responsibility onto science (II). Such tech-using worship should be questioned (III).

Technology lures mankind with advancement, by serving its needs. Indeed, as debunked in document 4, the technological innovation of the car serves human purpose. It can do even more: if electric vehicles raise concerns, a scientist suggests a power plant to remedy the situation. Similarly, if plastic pollution is addressed, a scientist comes up with a process to turn plastic into soap (Document 1). Document 3 logically asserts that the omnipresence of technology is a god-like savior, protecting mankind from the man-made hazards. Inevitably, this results in a growing level of confidence in technology's promises, which ranges from 51% to 67% across all population profiles (Document 5).

The development of technology allows society the possibility of transferring responsibility onto technology. The survey's very wording demonstrates that people don't necessarily *feel* they play an active role in implementing change, technological optimists outnumbering pessimists by two-to-one. Illustrated by document 4, this technological god-like-savior lure is embodied by the scientist placed between the power plant and the driver as if to absolve the latter of his lifestyle's consequences. And yet, the breakthrough scientist in document 1 makes it clear that her discovery does not obviate the need for a global change, as people need to reduce their pollution impact. (99)

In this regard, such worship should be questioned. Like all systems, someone must be in control as criticized in document 2. Political decision-makers though, whose agendas don't match the climate emergency, are in the best position to spark this shift. Instead, they use technological progress to justify eco-destructive but economy-friendly decisions that benefit OECD as document 1 exposed. This catch-22 disclosed by document 5 points out a correlation between individuals' wealth and confidence in life-saving technologies. Technology must therefore be deemed as a tool subject to the biases and wills of its creator, capable of sustaining their deleterious lifestyle (document 3). Consequently, mankind's very perception of technology needs to be reconsidered.

Eventually, the value of technology is determined by society itself which can trigger ecological backlash. Technology should be an instrument of social change but should not be worshipped.

440 words

⇨ **[1 word]**