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Reading Response to *Chapter 8 + Coda*

From this week's reading, I would like to respond to Artful Design Principle 8.5 and 8.9  

*Principle 8.5: Technology is neither good nor bad, not is it neutral*  
*Principle 8.9: Technology is about what we can do. Morality is about what we ought to do*  

Principle 8.5 quotes Melvin Kranzberg to indicate that each individual’s choice with technology would inevitably alter the future of humanity. Similarly, Principle 8.9 regards technology as a tool rather than a consequence, and emphasizes the significance of using it with moral purposes.  

I agree strongly with the statement that technology is not inherently good or bad. There is a societal tendency to denounce the existence of certain technology when discovering its negative side effects. The advocates of such a stance seek to stand against technological advancement by big corporations. While questioning the morality of the use of technology is valid, the tool cannot produce harm by itself. This is because one could argue that technology would not affect any individuals if no one in society chose to use it. I believe that any topic of discussion involving technology should not deviate from identifying trends in society that necessitate its use in potentially harmful ways. Claiming that the rise of streaming services like YouTube has made children violent does not leave enough room for solutions. Instead, one could argue that the lack of education at school on the use of streaming services leads to improper uses of the technology. Such a claim identifies a specific issue from an objective perspective and includes a call to action.  

I believe that one of the ways to counter a trend of harmful uses of technology is to promote technology with moral purposes. I personally have come to the conclusion that verbally protesting against products that negatively take advantage of technology has limitations. A trend would continue even if the developers were aware of the side effects often because of commercial benefits. If one cannot stop the others from pursuing harmful output, the other option would be to increase the amount of positive usage of technology for the general public. For instance, I believe that distributing software as open-source benefits and educates those who access it while corporations continue to pursue a monopoly strategy. Similarly, I believe that technology demonstrates its capabilities exceptionally well when it is used to enhance individuals’ skills or provide aid to those with disabilities. Having discussion on the potential benefits of technology in such a way is another action to ensure that it is being designed with moral purposes.