

## **The Destiny of Technique, The Destiny of Capital**

**Gianni Vattimo**

A hasty reading of Heidegger's thought frequently provides the opportunity to refer to "Technique" (*die Technik, in German*) as if it were an abstract entity full of consequence in our lives. For this reason some philosophers treat it as predestination. And if the term is written in block letters, it becomes ideological mystification to the highest degree.

What is postulated is that Technique possesses an inner and essential tendency to take up gradually increasing spaces in life, rendering Man a mere cog in the great production mechanism, as shown in "Modern Times" by Chaplin through images that have become archetypes of modernity's criticisms.

Well then, Technique is not driven by an inner logic that pushes it as if the "technologization" of everything were pre-destined.

And besides, Chaplin's movie was about capitalist production, not Technique.

Even the engineer Frederick Taylor, whose book written about "The principles of scientific management" at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century became a source of inspiration for what was to be called "*Fordism*", thought of himself as a philanthropist: he believed that his book would contribute to making work less tiring and more productive.

Capital is what makes the idea of Technique as pre-determined unacceptable: Capital that pushes development at all costs; it is not "undetermined" development, but rather specifically directed towards the most immediate profit.

To return to Lenin's ideal: electrification (i.e. technique) + soviet (that is development's popular direction).