TOPIC OF THE WEEK

IS TECHNOLOGY THE ANSWER - 2

2

Yes — **possibly. But "humanity itself" needs unpacking.**

The paradox is that technology is not an independent force that suddenly arrived from somewhere else. **Technology is human behaviour made powerful.** Our fears, desires, curiosity, competition, generosity, aggression, imagination and need for control can all become technologically amplified.

The amplification problem

Technology can magnify what is already present in us.

Fear → weapons
Greed → extraction and exploitation
Tribalism → mass propaganda and polarization
Curiosity → science and discovery
Compassion → medicine and humanitarian systems
Cooperation → global communication and infrastructure

Technology therefore doesn't necessarily make us better or worse.

It can make us **more capable of expressing either**.

And this creates a remarkable reversal

For most of human history, our technological power was relatively small compared with the forces of nature.

Now the relationship is changing.

We have become capable of altering:

- the atmosphere,
- ecosystems,

- genetic material,
- information environments,
- economies,
- warfare,
- and potentially forms of intelligence itself.

So humanity faces a new condition:

> **Our power is beginning to exceed our wisdom.**

That may be one of the defining problems of this century.

3

But what is “humanity”?

This is where the question becomes philosophical.

If we say *humanity is the problem*, we could mean:

human nature — our impulses and limitations;

human behaviour — what we actually choose to do;

human institutions — governments, corporations and social systems;

human values — what we consider desirable;

or perhaps **the separation between our technological power and our moral development**.

These aren't the same thing.

And your earlier distinction between **“I” and “my behaviour”** becomes relevant here.

Perhaps we should not say:

> *Humanity is the problem.*

Perhaps:

> **Humanity's capacity for behaviour has outgrown its capacity for self-understanding.**

That is a considerably more interesting proposition.

Because it leaves open the possibility of change.

The deepest question

Technology asks:

> **What can we do?**

Science asks:

> **How does it work?**

Politics asks:

> **Who decides?**

Ethics asks:

> **What should we do?**

Philosophy asks:

> **What does “should” mean?**

And perhaps the survival question asks something still deeper:

> **Can a species powerful enough to transform its world also become wise enough to transform itself?**

If the answer is yes, technology could become one of humanity's greatest instruments for survival.

If the answer is no, **technology may simply make our existing human contradictions more powerful.**

That is why the real 21st-century imperative may not be **technological progress**.

It may be **human maturity proportional to human power**.