

**François Laruelle,**

The Concept of 'First Technology':  
A 'Unified Theory' of Technics and Technology.

*Sur Simondon: Une Pensée de L'Individuation et de La Technique,*  
ed. Gilles Châtelet, Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 1994, 206-19,  
trans. Nandita Biswas Mellamphy.

In order to define the object of which we are speaking, which affixes its limits upon our discourse, and also in order to define a certain relation to the work of Simondon or Heidegger—the two greatest philosophers of technics—we will make two distinctions, the relevance or irrelevance of which will be demonstrated by their capacity or incapacity to 'ground' a new discipline called 'first technology'. These distinctions are expressed in this way: a *science* rather than a philosophy or a 'human science' of techniques [*des techniques*], but a science of the *essence* of technics [*la technique*], not of properties or technical facts. So, this is our object—which the works of Simondon and Heidegger will contribute to setting up according to a relation to be determined—the formulation of which bears witness to a paradoxical nature: a real science, not a philosophy; but a new kind of science of transcendental essence, not a science of 'ontic' or 'positive' facts. Essence is the traditional object of philosophy, and that by which philosophy claims to distinguish itself from science; how could science, as science, take essence as its object?

The most general antinomy, that of science and of philosophy.—We think that the means to resolve it exists outside of philosophy, either as epistemology or as positivism (=philosophy of science), and that it must be sought apart from the invariable means of ontology, but not outside of a dimension of thinking and experience that philosophy itself has always postulated without ever recognizing it, while denying it to science. *It consists of the dimension, no longer of Being, but of the One insofar as it rejects all interchange with Being and which, for the reason that renders it inalienable within Being, must be said to be 'One-of-the-last-instance'.* We will come back to this. What meaning could this have for that other antinomy, partially derived from the previous one, of *technics* and of *technology*? Can we establish principles of a unified, not *unitary*, theory (=philosophical, hence hierarchical) of technics and technology? This new discipline 'grounded' in the non philosophical experience of the One would require a double contribution: the contribution of technology, that is of the philosophical type of knowledge about technics, of logos as techno-logos, thus the dimension of *essence*; it would also require the contribution of science, which is the gauge of an objective and rigorous analytic (not interpretive) treatment of the objects and properties called 'techniques' and which we will call 'technical' effects (but solely within the purview of this treatment, thus distinguishing this use of the word 'technical' from its philosophical and technological use). The object of this unified theory—if the latter is possible: to know it,

it would be necessary to restart from the One—we can thus define it no longer as the banal and philosophical *essence of technics* which presupposes given or supposedly given objects as technical, as well as their intentional aim within the philosophical horizon of essence as *eidos*; but as technical *Essence*, writing destined to indicate an indivisible bloc, a strict identity of technics and of essence which is no longer philosophical or hierarchical. This ‘strict’ identity obviously remains to be thought and known both with the help of the One and of technological discourses; but we can always posit it as our *object*.

A ‘unified theory’, without being an ‘ontic science’, is also not an ‘ontological science’ in the sense in which philosophy or metaphysics is. It represents the emergence of a new theoretical genre, *neither philosophy nor science, but using the essence and scientific object of both* within relations that have become unintelligible to the most reflexive epistemology, as well as to the most positivist. That it is a unified theory, without being a science in a classical or ordinary sense, is explained by the nature of its cause: the One; a unified theory in this form represents a *transcendental use* of the sciences. It is a non-philosophical usage because here the transcendental is no longer interchangeable with metaphysics and *does not claim to add to or take from the sciences or to intervene in their practice*. It is an *immanent use of the sciences which leaves them as is*; a new discipline which includes the concept of science but without philosophically dominating or legislating over it any more.

We start from a currently held thesis in order to pose our problem which is, in effect, the problem of the usage, not the validity, of this thesis:

1. The knowledges of the ‘technician’ belong to a vaster sphere, that of projective knowledges with intentional or sense content; it goes from certain biological phenomena to phenomena of ‘understanding’, from the ‘project’ and in general from technology, to the knowledges that make up the ‘technological’.
2. This type of knowledge does not give rise to sciences in the strong or classical sense of the term, explanatory sciences rather than projective ones, determining rather than reflective, in a word mathematized. We are not challenging this thesis, but we pose the following problem: is it possible to elaborate an egalitarian *unified theory* of these two types of knowledge? This theory can, as such, be neither an analytic or reductive science of projective knowledges nor conversely, a philosophical synthesis which would once again return to project a synthesis and to philosophically dominate the sciences. We must search for a principle of unification outside of this double reductionism which is neither scientific nor philosophical—a third instance of experience and thinking—, or at least orient ourselves towards it and its necessity.

To this end, we propose a certain use of the Theory of Demonstration and, in particular, of the works of Gödel as a new *paradigm* of thinking which we will extract from metamathematical problems in order to generalize and transpose it to more ‘conceptual’ problems of philosophy and of technics. Rather than a philosophy or epistemology of knowledges or of the science of the technical—which remain a philosophical enterprise and consequently a simple

specular commentary on these knowledges—we reinscribe technics and technology within the theoretical interval of science and metascience, of language-object and metalanguage. The Gödelian idea—beyond even the works of Gödel—consists, on the one hand, in postulating an interiority or practical immanence of science that legitimizes itself without needing to have recourse to a philosophical legitimation; and, on the other hand, in judging the grounding claims of metalanguage in order to refute them from their most philosophical or ‘auto-foundational’ forms.

How can this problematic be ‘applied’ here?

1. We imagine that ordinary knowledges that have technics as object, being of a projective type, are globally of the nature of a *meta*-language that describes technics in a certain way. These technical knowledges—‘technology’ in our sense—do not spontaneously come from ‘the’ science, nor from technics as science would apprehend it, but a metalanguage that decides upon the being of technics.
2. What holds the role of the language-object vis-à-vis this metalanguage which is technology? Not the sciences which are invested in techniques (scientistic reductionism) but the *identity*, to be determined, of technics grasped by science and technology, the identity of the technician and of the technologue: the ‘technical Essence’.
3. It is possible, through a regulated process and operations to be determined, to project or internalize the metalanguage that is technology within the theoretical space defined by this strict identity of the (explanatory) sciences and (projective) knowledges, of technics-under-science and technics-under-philosophy.
4. If this *identity* or this *equality* excludes double reductionism (scientific, and techno-logical and/or philosophical), it is still, for the moment, unthought as such. We cannot, in reality, posit it except under the banner of a simple *hypothesis* to be progressively determined with *data* furnished by forms of technological thinking.
5. What is only a hypothesis enables explaining the illusions that engender this double reductionism: illusions of technical-philosophies on the one hand, and on the other hand, illusions produced by technological knowledges when left to their own devices. In both cases, they are of a philosophical or quasi philosophical type; technology too, and not only science, secretes its ‘spontaneous philosophy’.

This identity is not a new figure taken by ‘western metaphysics’, it is derived neither from the philosopher nor from the technician, nor from the scientist. It is a new theoretical type that is not completed by existing knowledges but that represents the chance or future of a new *usage* of what previously had no use, pure theory; or a new *theory* of what previously had no theory, technics. A *scientific utopia*, perhaps ...

A unified theory here is not the simple positivist symmetry of a philosophy. Without doubt it consists as much in refusing the authority of the ‘philosophy of technics’, and what would be the more or less vicious circle of a technique of technics, as in refusing a ‘human science’ of technics or the technical, with the philosophical and/or technological

self-positioning which is at the heart of these doctrines. This refusal, however, is not taken in by a theoreticism or a complementary scientific idealism and still less by a positivism (a science of technics). Apart from a philosophy of technics and its modes—history etc.—one could imagine a ‘hard’ science of technics. But a unified theory, if it is to be a science, cannot be a reductive, ‘physicalist’ science of technics. Its object is the *technical Essence (of technics)* and this latter does not claim to be a substitute for objects, machines and maneuvers, and still less for their conditions be they physical, economic etc. Science here is, more precisely, the only rigorous knowledge of the Essence (*of*) technics. It is the guardian par excellence of the immanence of the technical situation, the guarantor of a purely phenomenal description, an immanence, moreover that is no longer only that of knowledge in general but one that will have to have a form adapted to technics. There is here no theoretical reduction, and only philosophy can believe—for a moment—in technical phenomena ‘in themselves’, having no other ‘in itself’ than Essence, which is not itself technological.

### ***Technical Essence/Essence (of) Technics and Techno-logy***

In order to enter into our object more precisely, let us set off again from the distinctions suggested at the outset and tease out some consequences.

1. The first distinction is that of *technical* and *technological*. These will no longer be two types of entities or objects, of ‘phenomena’ that are both supposed to be ‘technical’ or be *in themselves* of a ‘technical’ order and distinguished simply by material economic, social or historical traits, and by their different relations to science. Rather, technics here is the object to which we offer science (thus including contemporary ‘technologies’), whereas technology is of the order of discourse, of knowledge, knowledge of human sciences regarding this object and more generally knowledge of a philosophical type of knowledge, *techno-logos* or *techno-logical difference* which still basks in the human sciences—though from afar. Our principal object is thus technics rather than techno-logy in this sense.
2. This distinction is continued and specified by another distinction that bears on the content of the single word ‘technics’. This latter here designates the essence of technics, but more exactly what we are calling the technical Essence (*of*) technics: *from all initial conjecture* (to be rectified), the ensemble of actions, operations, and causalities that make up the technical *phenomenon*, grasped within its elements and its ultimate requisites. It can also designate more traditionally *so-called or supposedly ‘technical’ effects and objects*. Here again, however, we make a choice, apparently at least; our real object, the one we propose to know or determine is the [technical] Essence (*of*) technics, not technical objects.

We will ask: what is really ‘technical’ and where does it lie, this so-called ‘essence’ or these so-called ‘technical’ objects so minutely described by Simondon who knows what he was talking about? This question has no relevance from our viewpoint and is decomposed in the following way:

◊ If there are technical objects, they are indeed those that Simondon describes, but we question here that, whether as 'becoming' or 'concretisation', they exist with scientific objectivity and define the technical Essence (of) technics. By contrast, what we are calling the technical Essence (of) technics is not itself 'technical', that is to say not a technical object and not understood from Simondon's philosophy, from its reading or its re-interpretation. Moreover, since the notion of *object* is here a philosophical notion par excellence, linked to that of objectification and to logos and to all Greco-Simondonian ontology—if we can permit this shortcut—we will say rigorously, to correct Heidegger's formula: *the technical Essence (of) technics is nothing technological and cannot be understood by the notion of 'technical object', whether in a state of genesis or not, that is to say by technology in the highest sense of techno-logos, which is that of Simondon.*

However, it is not enough to say that the essence of technics is nothing technological if it is for the purpose of leaving it undetermined and hanging. Heidegger still postulates too much about the validity of ontology and of technology to do anything other than its deconstruction and so as not to leave undetermined the Essence (of) technics thus experienced in a way that is still too negative. It must be determined further and in a more positive way, but not positivist. How to proceed then since by all evidence we cannot ignore Simondon or Heidegger and his phenomenology of instrumentality, whose authority and relevance we have nevertheless suspended? To remove all contradiction, it suffices to return to these technological philosophies under the condition of this suspension and, consequently, to treat them and the entire sphere called 'techno-logy' as a simple material and no longer as a point of view; as an ensemble of properties or phenomena without relevance for determining the Essence (of) technics *by themselves, by their self-interpretation or their self-position*, but with the help of a new theory which could nevertheless determine this latter.

In other words: on the one hand, Heidegger's and Simondon's descriptions both belong to the genre of onto-techno-logical difference (either, like Simondon, to put it into play as process of concretization and functional overdetermination; or like Heidegger, to draw it, if we can say, behind itself and articulate it upon the ontological difference, and even on the 'withdrawal' that permits thinking this latter, a withdrawal that nevertheless continues to consider it as pertinent). From our point of view, these descriptions are about combinations of technical effects and philosophical decisions. The well-known 'technical object' of the former and the equally well-known 'instrumental circuit' of the latter do not exist 'in themselves' but are simply alleged technics raised to the status of essence; they are amphibological formations, but inevitable if one is a philosopher; that is, more or less Greek or phenomenological decisions that isolate material, physical, and social phenomena produced by technical causality, and that raise these [decisions], perhaps not without good reasons, to the status of fact or technical factum, indeed sometimes [to the status] of technical essence. But they remain for us *techno-logical universals*.

Conversely, for us, if these universals in themselves can no longer define or think the essence of technics, they remain, in any case, 'well founded' within their logic [*ordre*] which is that of an objective fetishism, and are necessary under the heading of objective data for a discipline that would propose to define this essence in a positive and non-circular manner, this time by way of a scientific rather than philosophical usage of these universal—although in a 'unified theoretical' sense to be determined. It is a matter of making *technics* theoretically intelligible without deducting or projecting them from so-called 'technical' phenomena in a vague or intuitive manner; without making this essence the result of a more or less worked out or altered self-positing of surface technical effects.

It is on this condition that essence will cease to be an indeterminate generality. Under the name of the technical Essence (of) technics, we no longer search for a trait common to a spoke, an engine and a computer; common either by abstraction or even by self-positing of properties presumed already to be common; traits that would run through technical objects. Initially we are not given technical objects by arbitrarily supposing that they are 'technical'. No, this essence is itself a new type of object without originary or specular continuity with 'technical objects'. This technical essence is still before us: we do not have to philosophize it as already having taken place, but instead to know it, to produce knowledge relevant to it. For this, we make use of these descriptions of the spoke, engine and computer, under certain suspensive conditions, descriptions about which we can say this: no longer to interpret Simondon once again, to stop reinterpreting the essence of technics; but to make use of Simondon and techno-logical reinterpretations to know the Essence (of) technics and, with this goal in mind, to transform or rectify these interpretations; to explain them finally within the techno-logical guise under which they produce this essence.

Now if we pick up again from the techno-logical given in its spontaneous self-representation and its self-sufficiency, which operations are necessary to arrive at the preceding distinctions? The human sciences and philosophy establish a system in order to constitute the sphere of techno-logical discourse. It is for this system that 'technical objects' exist, that is, an amphibology of the Essence (of) technics and of the object as onto-techno-logical form. It is not enough to say, in the hope of destroying technics as 'background-world' [*arrière-monde*], there are no technical phenomena but [only] a technical interpretation of phenomena because this would reconstitute a generalized technology as the general form of every background-world, at once philosophical machine and engineering philosophy. It is to reconstitute the philosophical myth of a supposed 'technical' object the nature of which one knows nothing; confusion between a phenomenon gratuitously called 'technical' and an essence that is wholly philosophical.

It is necessary to have at least two reductions or two suspensions in order to reach technical Essence and free it from its intuition and consummation, from its philosophical contemplation: a technological reduction of appearances or of technical transcendental suppositions for the benefit of techno-logical difference. It is the bracketing of regional or ontic appearances of technics upon which the human sciences live; the suspension of the perspectives of the engineer, the manufacturer, the sociologist, the anthropologist, the economist, the psychologist, the ‘technologue’ etc., for the benefit of the perspective of the philosopher as ‘techno-logue’, and of its correlate: *the relation or onto-techno-logical difference* to which are dedicated the descriptions of Simondon and Heidegger who thus bring out an invariant techno-logical schema synthesizing these perspectives within a superior perspective. Technological efficacy—the onto-techno-logical difference—is, in effect, irreducible to the four causes metaphysic’s isolates: it contains the four [causes], but as their ‘superior form’. At once it generalizes their division or heterogeneity, and their unity; it makes coextensive these two properties while at the same time suspending or annulling their more massive or regional forms, the most representative ones, the ones most susceptible to being opposed in a transcendent manner.

But a second nullification is necessary from our perspective, that of philosophy itself, of techno-logical causality still external to the Essence (of) technics. But [with regards to] this suspension of techno-logical philosophy, only a new discipline—a unified theory of science and philosophy—can implement it, and thus to free an Essence (of) technics based on obviously non-philosophical processes and to return to the immanence of the ‘technical situation’ without just reflecting upon it under the form of generalities, technological effects and schemas.

We would thus cease to imagine technical causality on the physical model of propulsion; or on the technico-philosophical model of production; or on narrow models of the spoke, the engine, the computer, which are transcendent ensembles from which we can only have *opinions* about this generality that would be ‘technics’ or ‘technologies’, but no more. No supposedly technical object can serve as example of the Essence (of) technics. This latter is not made, but rather comes out or makes itself known within a science to be practiced here and now. This is why we will describe this essence by the ‘formal’ terms of ‘technesis’ and ‘technema’, for example, rather than by projections that come out of tools such as mechanics or informatics which are here mere materials and models of interpretation for the science of this essence. It is to challenge the ‘history of technics’ as much as their ‘philosophies’, at least as ultimate point of view, as well as the circular and unstable generalities that they produce. The theory of the Essence (of) technics is an inaugural rupture with the technicist construction of machines, their economic management, and their philosophical ‘meditation’. It does not extend into a techno-logical essence of constructed and supposedly given machines. It halts the chain of confusion that goes from

given and inert machine-objects to their working or techno-logical schema, and from this latter to their essence. But if [the theory of technical Essence] ceases to be inscribed within the production of techno-logical universals, it is in order to take these as regional properties that it must explain.

The goal of these reductions, as such, is to dissolve the amphibology in which philosophies and the human sciences dwell; the confusion between the Essence (of) technics with its regional, material or economic etc. conditions, and its philosophical conditions; the idea that there would be an original continuity between a supposedly technical experience and this essence. This dissolution, however, is but one of the least positive aspects of the venture which is to determine the immanent technical phenomenon, to determine it more positively than Heidegger did, but without reflecting the ‘technical object’ within this essence as did Simondon, for example.

Our approach must be understood in terms of its ambitions but also in terms of its limits. We cease treating ‘objects’ or technical ‘causality’ as metaphysical entities—‘mythological’ ones as a philosopher might say—that we would design freely according to such a decision or line of demarcation, manipulating scientific knowledge and reified, factualized and fetishized technical effects, and in this way believing that we might describe the real and soon modify it in its essence. The invariant of ‘philosophies of technics’ is that they more or less circularly arrange effects or processes, properties that are supposed to define this order of phenomena and philosophical decisions, this mixing that is supposed to equivalent to [*valoir comme*] essence. But this discourse rests on an oversight or repression of something = x that precisely a science would propose rather than take it as its object: the *essence* or the *identity* (of) technics, the *identity or the immanent phenomenon that prevents from sinking into and dissolving within philosophy and the sciences*, that [avoids] being dogmatically reduced to philosophy, indeed a techno-philosophical mix like for example ‘conceptual’ or ‘desiring machines’, or reduced to applications of science that are supposedly ‘fundamental’. A science of the essence of technics is the best means of protecting [the essence or identity (of) technics] from its double ontological and scientistic reduction. Philosophies of technics do not see that they do not see the problem of identity or essence—that is, of the *reality*—of technics, and it is the object of a special science only to reestablish the correct and ‘complete’ formulation—‘a *science* of the *essence* (of) technics’—and to make the real critique of the philosophical repression of this essence. Thus it is a matter of putting a term within foundational techno-logical discourses of technics, of expressing their theoretical impossibility, yet without denying their use of data within a science.

### **The Hypothesis of ‘First Technology’**



How to characterize this special science from the perspective of its theoretical sense, [this science] adapted to essences, and which uses philosophical, e.g. onto-techno-logical, formations that follow meta-technical discourses as well as their regional properties, in order to know the Essence (of) technics? Here are its main features:

1. We are given a body of phenomena or properties: thus no longer so-called properties in themselves of supposed technical objects, but techno-logical discourses themselves. Not phenomena as posited by, for example, Simondon, which we would claim to be reinterpreting, but rather the descriptions that he gives them and which are, as such, *our* 'objects'. Important clarification: we treat techno-logical discourses as meta-technical discourses which target the Essence (of) technics but in an illusory way and through a repression. All onto-techno-logy (Heidegger included because he did not invalidate it right off the bat) can be treated like a vast program of philosophical foundations of technics, like a meta-technics. It is this form [of meta-technics] that constitutes our region of phenomena. Obviously it is a matter of explaining and limiting within a science these foundational programs that are philosophies of technics.

2. We give ourselves a space, a posture rather or a scientific but transcendental interiority (which adds nothing to the concept of science) in which we will project these meta-technical discourses. A posture, that is to say here the minimal conditions for having a science, a *reality* of this latter. *Why then is there science instead of only philosophy?* This problem is very limited. It does not eliminate the question regarding the empirical conditions of the existence of such a science—for example, condition of objects (since the science that we are applying operationalizes the region of technological phenomena)—but the philosophical or epistemological reduction of the essence of science to its empirical conditions, for example to its methods or procedures, to its work, etc., and its reduction to its ontological conditions. What is the *reality* of science rather than its effectiveness and its conditions of possibility? In order to have a reality and thus an autonomous essence of science rather than its simple possibility, it is not necessary to have Being, in the sense in which tradition and Heidegger can still understand it as presence or representation, as ontological project; but if this is not to suffice, there must be first a One—not *of* the One, but 'One itself' and thus a non-metaphysical but purely transcendental usage of science. And then there must be the Multiple, that is Being if you will, but in a new, precisely non-philosophical, sense, although one not entirely estranged from this philosophical sense.

'The One itself': no longer that which philosophy places within the neighbourhood of Being and that with which it considers itself to be interchangeable; no longer the arithmetico-philosophical mix of number 1 internalized and held up within the metaphysical One; but that which others have already called 'radical immanence' devoid of scission, nothingness, transcendence, alienation. We call it the One-of-last-instance: in order to mark its inalienable but determining character—this apparent contradiction being the content of the concept of

‘determination-in-the-last-instance’—determining of essences, of the essence (of) science and that (of) technics. This One is certainly not science not technics, that is to say their essence, it is only the immanent cause of these essences.

Yet such a cause, given its purely transcendental but real status—and not additionally metaphysical and ontological—is no longer a metaphysical entity composed and self-composed within a philosophical discourse. Its theoretical status is that of a *hypothesis* or an *axiom* (neither logico-formal, nor logico-real— $Me=Me$ —, but purely real or immanent in-the-last-instance). *First Technology* is thus not an *a priori* or speculative construction—despite certain appearances—it is also a science proceeding by way of hypothesis, but now within a transcendental or real in-the-last-instance usage of the latter.

As for the ‘Multiple’ which is the content of Being, that is to say, no longer of the cause but of the element of representation or scientific ‘presentation’ strictly speaking, it is deduced from the One under certain conditions upon which we pass here (those of a science of the Essence (of) science which uses philosophy as material). From this perspective, Being has three or four characteristics:

- ◊ It is the void as devoid (of) a One, [the] un-real as empty (of) [the] real (non-One); also, and by definition, evidently empty of all philosophical form, of all philosophical and/or technological consistency;
- ◊ This void is identically a pure Multiple, unrepresentable just as the One itself is unrepresentable, thus devoid of all philosophical form of closure or unity, but also of all form of scientific regional, arithmetic-type consistency for example, and even more so of arithmetic-philosophical mixed forms;
- ◊ However, this Multiple receives a consistency of the One itself, but consistency-in-the-last-instance and nevertheless absolutely internal: it is neither ontic (arithmetic) nor ontological (‘presence’);
- ◊ This Multiple finishes being determined when it is specified according to philosophy and its structures or properties—we will not here describe this specification.

Here are the minimal conditions which explain the non-philosophical *reality* of science, or which gives it [this reality] (to know whether it is real *by itself* is not our problem). Not the sufficient reason of science, but the cause that can determine in-the-last-instance, that is to say, *to use it without modifying it as science. It is there that we have a paradigm of intelligibility that is neither philosophical nor scientific or positivistic; it is grounded on a new type of intersection, neither epistemological nor of philosophy or science, where the latter acquires the means of treating the former as its object without reducing it in a positivistic way.*

3. It suffices to now be given this scientific position and to project into it or scale it down to technological discourses in order to be able to elaborate a rigorous, non-illusory discourse on the Essence (of) technics. Whereas philosophies of technics practice the headlong rush into

metatechnics, into techno-logical one-upmanship, we here inhibit this process, we reverse as it were, instituting a discipline of scientific essence that has as phenomena the meta-sciences or meta-technics, and as real object essences and only essences, to be determined rigorously and realistically upon a non-philosophical mode.

It is not ‘technoscience’ that is a problem, it is *techno-philosophy*, of which ‘techno-science’ is an avatar and an artifact.

We thus call *Essence (of) technics* the ensemble of residues abandoned by technological or meta-technical statements, allowing this to be kept under the heading of knowledge when we pose it as explanatory—that is to say theoretical and critical—hypothesis, this scientific position itself, at least its real essential ingredients. The Essence (of) technics is thus known and on the other hand explains the illusory forms under which this essence is given within technological discourses. What we call scientific position corresponds to the Essence (of) science such that can be known without epistemologically interpreting it, and it functions here like a no longer philosophical type of hypothesis and relative *to* what is to be interpreted, but like a scientific type, heterogeneous to phenomena and solely capable of giving rise to a true explanation rather than a more or less circular interpretation.

The onto-techno-logical scheme is a *given* with respect to the really basic given that is the One. And it is only when it is treated as material that it appears afterwards like a double that took the place not so much of essence itself as of the elaboration of its knowledge. Science does not *return* from the imaginary double to the real veiled by it; it does not dispel the double, it uses it to know the real and as a result gives it its status as double; and the double is what becomes the techno-logical when, ceasing to be a point of view, it is treated as simple material.

This position of the problem has important consequences for the status of techno-logy. We use the techno-logical schema as simple index and as material. A science does not trace its real object from its phenomena which are but partially external and repressed constructions of the Essence (of) technics.

Saving the immanent phenomenon of technics from its philosophical flight-path and from its objectification, this is the goal. Thus it is by no means a matter of a new stronger technics, a new type of ‘instrument’ or a new conception (philosophical and ‘mythological’) of technics grounded *upon* the foundation of a science or by the techno-logical interchangeability of or investment in the latter. [It is a matter of] obtaining a rigorous, non-interpretive knowledge of technics. And this is the knowledge that is new, not ‘technics’. What we call ‘first technology’ is, as such, neither an effective technology—it is not within our power to invent it—nor a philosophical generality or a ‘concept’ of techniques; it is knowledge, primary or anterior by right to all philosophy, of its essence—of an essence that leaves it as is without claiming to appropriate it.