

“Techno-Structure”

A brief reply to the presentation of Professor Adriano Fabris, of the University of Pisa, “La radice umana della crisi ecologica” (“The Human Root of the Ecological Crisis”), which was offered within a series of seminars devoted to the papal encyclical *Laudato Sí* at the Pontifical Gregorian University (December 17th, 2015).

Sodann: wenn sich um eine Doktrin amoralischer Technizität Zirkel bilden, werden sich ihnen dank ihrer Bösartigkeit autochthone Kräfte zugesellen, um mit deren Hilfe die alte Macht wieder zu verwirklichen, nach der die Sehnsucht ja immer auf dem Grunde ihres Herzens lebt.

Ernst Jünger, *Gärten und Strassen* (1939)

Much has been talked and written about this new, so-called *technocratic* era. Much has been said, through “literalized metaphors” (T. Szasz) —for that is all we seem capable of doing— of this human being “at the center of,” or better, “imprisoned” by a hyper-technicized, centralizing apparatus; of this human being who, thus entrapped for over two centuries, ends up not knowing neither what he is doing, nor why he acts the

* Then, when a number of lodges will have formed around a doctrine of amoral technicity, autochthonous forces will be drawn to their malignancy in order to reawaken with their help the *ancient power*, the longing for which is always throbbing at the bottom of their heart (Ernst Jünger, *Werke*, Bd. 2. [“Gardens and Streets”]. Stuttgart: Klein-Cotta, 1960-65 [1942], 28-29, emphasis added).

way he does, nor what he himself has (humanly) become after such a prolonged habituation to the dictates of an *alien* presence —of an inhuman presence, like that of the “machine,” which appears to have gained the upper hand over everything. This is the story, the tale, the myth of the monster, of the mechanized Golem, which, cosmically, insinuates itself in the psycho-social fabric of our recent experience in order to take possession of the world and its inhabitants. From this mythologeme, as we know, Hollywood has derived a notorious blockbuster: *The Matrix* (1999). In this story, as in the many discursive speculations, aired in the past century, on so-called “technological power,” the curious aspect resides in the suggestion that the political executive (in- and out-of-sight), with its elites, its “clubs,” has *disappeared*; apparently, we may no longer see, or catch sight of the (more or less violently autocratic) “conductor,” who, in the narrative, is thereby (suitably) replaced by a “routine” of a “crazed” computer, which, one day, nests itself deviously at the helm, ensnaring us and/or eventually attempting to annihilate us all (as in A. Clarke’s novel, which S. Kubrick brought to the big screen with his 1968 classic *2001: A Space Odyssey*), or which, like the “matrix” itself, “vampirizes” us after having systematically thrown us into a state, generally irreversible, of psychic coma. The machine “masks” the coma, spoon-feeding us, throughout our lives, a scripted hallucination, which we grab hold of, mistaking it for the daily consecution of our wakeful state.

Some of the many philosophers that have treated this esteemed theme have stressed how the “discipline of