
Contents

| | |
|--|------|
| Acknowledgments | ix |
| Foreword | xi |
| Bernard REBER | |
| Introduction | xvii |
| Chapter 1. Care and Technology: An Anthropological Question | 1 |
| 1.1. From mastery to care | 1 |
| 1.1.1. Making good use of technology, anticipating its potential risks: two possible examples of care in technology? | 1 |
| 1.1.2. Do we need to learn to master our technological mastery? | 11 |
| 1.1.3. The limits of the externalist approach to technological regulation | 22 |
| 1.2. In what sense can technologies be “inherently” caregiving? | 27 |
| 1.2.1. Can there be an intrinsic morality of technology? | 27 |
| 1.2.2. Technology and care: a difficult articulation | 35 |
| 1.3. Taking care of living beings | 49 |
| 1.3.1. Care and technology: from ethics to anthropology | 49 |
| 1.3.2. Caring about valuating living beings | 56 |
| 1.3.3. The difficulty of thinking technology from life | 72 |
| 1.4. Transition | 87 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter 2. Technology and Life: Analysis of a Divorce | 89 |
| 2.1. Body, gestures, technology, production | 89 |
| 2.1.1. Work without skill | 89 |
| 2.1.2. Control and discipline of technology | 99 |
| 2.1.3. A rupture in the conception of technology: the divorce of technology and life | 106 |
| 2.2. The intellectualist conception of technology: the Kantian turning point | 123 |
| 2.2.1. Difficulty in thinking of the artisan’s activity | 123 |
| 2.2.2. Technology excluded from the field of aesthetics | 130 |
| 2.2.3. Technology, a synthetic activity without representation and without rule. | 134 |
| 2.3. Transition | 150 |
| | |
| Chapter 3. The Conditions of Care in Technology | 151 |
| 3.1. Vitalist approaches to technology. | 151 |
| 3.1.1. The concept of technological evolution: contributions and limits with regard to care. | 151 |
| 3.1.2. Technology as an “organ projection”: contributions and limits with regard to care. | 156 |
| 3.1.3. The utopia of Erewhon: analysis of an aporia. First condition of care in technology | 159 |
| 3.2. Philosophical anthropology, a promising way to articulate care and technology? | 175 |
| 3.2.1. Plessner’s biological anthropology: redefining the concepts of organ and organism | 175 |
| 3.2.2. Industrialization, work, and life. Critique of modernity in Gehlen. | 183 |
| 3.3. The organ-instrument. Second condition of care in technology | 188 |
| 3.3.1. From the organ as part of the organism to the organ as an instrument with use-value | 188 |
| 3.3.2. Putting the individual point of view first in the ethical evaluation of technology | 193 |
| 3.4. From anthropology to aesthetics | 213 |
| 3.4.1. Is it enough to recognize that humans “belong to nature” to orient technology towards care for nature? | 213 |
| 3.4.2. Creating a new perception. Fourth condition of care in technology | 220 |
| 3.5. Transition | 224 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter 4. Design, Technology and Life | 227 |
| 4.1. At the sources of design for life | 227 |
| 4.1.1. The premises of design | 227 |
| 4.1.2. Overcoming the conflict of arts and industry: the rational aesthetics of Paul Souriau | 235 |
| 4.1.3. Industry and the fragmentation of experience: anthropology and instrumentality in Dewey's work | 241 |
| 4.1.4. Life as judge of technology. Lewis Mumford | 246 |
| 4.1.5. Towards a design for life: László Moholy-Nagy | 257 |
| 4.1.6. Opening | 262 |
| 4.2. Towards responsible and caring innovation | 264 |
| 4.2.1. Technical activities and care: practical lessons from ancient China and Greece. | 264 |
| 4.2.2. The square of care in technological design | 272 |
| | |
| Conclusion | 287 |
| | |
| References | 293 |
| | |
| Index | 311 |