Author Lee Kwang-Suk

Source *NJP Reader #10 Living in the Postdigital, Reliving the Museum*

Publisher Nam June Paik Art Center, Yongin

A Techno-Ecological Sense and Future Museums

Colophon

Editor Kim Yoonseo

Co-Editor Yun Jahyong

Translation Kwak Jae Eun

Designer Kim Kyuho

Published on April 19, 2021

?-?=∞
NAM JUNE PAIK ART CENTER
백남준아트센터

© 2021 Nam June Paik Art Center and Author. All rights reserved. No part of this article may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means without written permission of Nam June Paik Art Center and Author.

Lee Kwang-Suk has conducted studies and written extensively as a critic on the interface of technology, society, and arts & culture. Lee is associate professor in the Graduate School of Public Policy and Information Technology at Seoul National University of Science and Technology. Lee earned his Ph.D. in Radio-TV-Film at the University of Texas at Austin. He is working as an editorial board member of *Internet Histories: Digital Technology, Culture & Society*, and also as a co-editor-in-chief of *Culture/Science*. His research areas include critical studies of technology, platform labor culture in East Asia, techno-subculture, the commons, the Anthropocene, and critical making. He is the author of several books, *Against Techno-Fetishism* (2020), *Data Aesthetics in Society* (2017), *Rethinking the Datafied Society* (2017), *Aesthetic Notes from the Edge: Art Activism Responding to a Social Crisis* (2016), *New Art Activism: The Cultural Politics in the Era of Post-media* (2015), *IT development in Korea: A Broadband Nirvana?* (2012), *The Art & Cultural Politics of Cyber Avant-gardes* (2010).

The COVID-19 pandemic is changing almost everything about daily life. It forces us to accept wearing face masks and "social (physical) distancing" as necessary measures to prevent the virus infection spread. Thereby, not physical face-to-face contact, "non-contact" relationship is accepted as the new normal of the disaster society. Our society risks the fate of the country on the so-called "Korean New Deal," sympathizing with the framework of disaster capitalism and is accelerating efforts to create a society based on platform capitalism and AI automation. The pandemic-caused crisis also had an impact on museums. It has been quite a long since national and public museums, having served as a medium between creators/producers and the audience, closed their doors for public safety reasons. Accordingly, people are shedding new lights on non-contact digital creation and virtual exhibition and viewing, to which was relatively paid less attention.

The disappearance of social contact and relationship caused by physical distancing in daily life, non-contact activities, precarious delivery work through platforms of production and distribution but out of sight of consumers, enhanced enforcement for data algorithm-based close infection control, individuals confined to the grids built on the tricks of algorithm-based media aesthetics, such as Netflix. Are all these indeed the kind of technology we have wanted so much? Are non-contact platform technology, "social" technology, and remote communication technology in this chaotic world the form of future technology that will enable us to maintain the qualitative relationship in human society? What is to become of the fundamental alienation between man and natural ecology, entailed by our deepening fetishization of technology? How would Nam June Paik see this situation in which almost all human activities are accelerating the advent of a smooth post-digital society marked by non-contact, automation, and AI algorithm? How should museums in this era respond to contemporary technology, and what topic should they address about it? Is their movement to the virtual world from the buildings with firmly closed doors really the answer we are looking for?

This article raises fundamental questions about technology in the age of disaster. First, it will examine the status of contemporary technology, particularly the technology-dominating conditions of virus-disaster capitalism. On the other hand, it will propose the cultivation of what I call "techno-ecological sense" as a practical solution, through which it will continue to discuss the status and role of future museums. I wish that the following declarative statements would be read as a survival guide for our long journey to overcome disaster capitalism.

First, Oversaturation of Technology: Technology has become the crucial driving force and its part of human civilization and served as the absolute principle for constructing the material world on the earth. On the one hand, technology has brought about the prosperity of human life and consciousness but, on the other, turned into a boomerang of anti-life and anti-human rights, threatening our survival itself. Faith in technology has now become an emerging religion and a blind belief. The capitalist technofetishism on the plea of "anthropocentrism" has crept into our lives and minds, regulating and controlling almost all arrangements in everyday life. It surpasses the intensity of the commodity fetishism combined with the traditional desires of consumer capitalism. We find ourselves in the situation of oversaturation, overflowing with excessive technology in the most delicate details in daily realities and discourses of technological innovation to exaggerate it. French philosopher of technology Gilbert Simondon used the term "hypertelia(hypertélie)" to describe this extreme overdevelopment of a technology or its parts beyond the limit of usefulness. The social oversaturation or overevolution of technology, or "techno-glut," which exceeds the operation within the project of human reason and rationality, is the present state of modern society and our near future. In that today's "capitalist realism," in cultural theorist Mark Fisher's terms, is being reorganized as a high-level new order mixed with the oversaturation of technology, it presupposes the phase of late capitalism which is more complicated and tricky for planning a life different from the previous one. Particularly, Korea is at the height of the conflicts of capitalism represented by technology oversaturation.

Second, Phygital World: The boundary between the material and the immaterial began to be blurred with the dawn of the commercial use of the internet in the 1990s and almost disappeared under the smart culture's influence since the 2010s. The long-established regulatory power of the material over the immaterial has turned upside down. The capitalist reality is increasingly floundering as much for the extension of technological logic into society as for the social construction of technology. We could say that the digital dominance over the real, material world indicates the arrival of the "phygital" world. Although the formation of the phygital fostered the expansion of human senses and affects and resonance among them, it also split human beings into data "dividuals" to be cultivated in platform machines and used them as kindling in the data melting pot of AI algorithm analysis. Italian philosopher Maurizio Lazzarato describes the latter, or, the human condition in which the accumulation of dividuals of their biological data, emotions, and affects is processed and managed through the integral algorithm in databank(center) as "mechanic enslavement." Platform technology is a threat to living organisms because it is the most powerful big machine to hold substantial sway over the phygital logic. The appearance of the big platform machine could be regarded as a sort of a tragic occasion to drive the phygital logic into darkness. Almost all activities in late capitalism have already been absorbed by platform machines or are transferring to dot-com machines

Third, Platform Order: The platform machine is a complex of high-tech devices of big data, algorithms, internet of things(IoT), AI, cloud computing, data center, and others. It is evolving to a high-level intelligent machine that stretches out its numerous AI data-collecting tentacles to suck in all human creative activities and biological rhythm through the data mechanism and then captures, processes, and releases them. The platform forces almost all living things, including humans, and objects to follow its mechanical arrangement and rhythm. At the heart of the platform "mechanical enslavement," there lies the power of (big) data processing of the de-personified automatic intelligence. The platform order jeopardizes the wage-labor relationship by disturbing employment contracts and rearranges most human beings in the position of ghost (machine's errand) workers and shadow (care and reproductive) workers. The platform machine complex

operates quite differently from the capital transplantation or movement in previous days due to its easy cross-border reproduction of the entire frame of its internal technological organization in the electronic space, like genetic "memes." Furthermore, the platform enjoys excessive capture and predation so much that it soaks up and monopolizes even the last drop of the values and tradition of the reciprocal "commons" familiar to us. The capitalist machine of "sharing platform," which came to us like a mirage of "innovation" and "sharing," now captures the non-capitalist culture of friendship and symbiosis(vacant room sharing, carpool, reciprocal exchanging labor, sharing meals, and the likes) through the mechanism of capitalist commercial products. Today, the platform's biggest problem lies in disturbing the socio-natural ecosystem and absorbing human common sense or relationship into capitalism's commercial relations and orders under the pretext of the efficiency and convenience of arranging tangible and intangible resources. The issues of platform labor are the contradictory reality reflecting these problems. Moreover, while working in the field of representation and discourse, the platform machine has brought about another effect of the question of "post-truth." The current operation of platform algorithm in gear with the right-populist logic, be it intentionally or not, now serves as a mental coding device for the new political grammar of contemporary capitalist power which relegates all self-evident orders of historic, progressive, and social values to an incomplete and nondeterministic status.

The Variable of the Coronavirus Pandemic

Fourth, "Anthropocenic" Convulsion: The oversaturation of human-natural ecological pollution now makes even the all-enduring earth respond very instantly and nervously. The issues regarded as local environmental problems have been extended to the question of maintaining or abolishing the planet. The disaster of coronavirus infectious disease, following wildfires in one's neighborhood, desertification, floods, heatwaves, ultra-fine dust, and the likes, has become a pervasive way for the earth to express its anger immediately. The "Anthropocene," has pushed back the Holocene as the official geological designation to call the current epoch, refers to a unit of geologic time of extreme ecological crisis in which human civilization controls the planet. It is still giving us a painful global-scale warning of zoonosis. It urges humanity to wake up to the natural-ecological condition of technology, which has been neglected. As Dipesh Chakrabarty emphasizes, the Anthropocene requires recognizing the "suffering of the planet" and the "suffering of other species," from the sense of the global community of common destiny and urgent climate actions to end them. We may be grateful to this microbial life, the coronavirus, which toned down the madness of the reckless capitalist machine for a moment, at least, for the COVID-19 disastrous situation sounds like a burning warning to herald the beginning of full-scale global calamity. This microbial being temporarily stopped the capitalist locomotive endowed with the instinct of rushing, making us pay attention to the socially disadvantaged people we have forgotten and restoring vitality to various non-human life and objects, one by one. When viewed differently, the virus, though terribly fatal to human life, may work as a catalyst to remind us of the reality that we may have neglected or not noticed. It is only a kind of a fit of convulsion or a feeble symptom of the Anthropocene. Since the climate crisis is the precursor of the Anthropocenic catastrophe, the Anthropocenic crisis needs to be taken seriously from the ontological aspect of all (non)life. Nevertheless, the present lesson given by the Anthropocene does not lie in the fear effect caused by the apocalyptic doomsday prophecy. Instead, the lesson calls for radical actions against the climate crisis right now. Without seeking and taking some immediate climate actions, the infectious disease disaster and the more significant calamities will visit us again and again as an uninvited guest.

Fifth, Anti-ecological Tendency of Technology: In the climate crisis and the Anthropocenic crisis, dot-com companies are regarded as quite an eco-friendly business, unlike "chimney" industrial factories that are socially condemned as the largest carbon emission source. High-tech semiconductor production, extensive use of AI, data center construction, green renewable energy business, and others are glossed over as if they were a "clean," crystal-clear technology. Digital technology, in particular, conceals its anti-environmental destructiveness. One should face the fact that the Korean national growth strategy of "digital New Deal" could be lethal to "Green New Deal." It has already been long since "electronic waste," a new pollutant discharged from the high-end dot-com environment, became the primary source of ecological pollution. Electronic waste most rapidly joined in aggravating the earth crisis as a scourge to destroy the natural ecology along with plastic contamination. The same goes for the life-threatening situation caused by technological disasters. The process of coping with the Fukushima nuclear accident and radiation exposure demanded the sacrifice of non-regular workers and the powerless local residents. The disadvantaged people sacrificed on the altar of anti-ecological technology have become the biggest problem in our society. For example, look at those who are alienated from the mainstream technological system, those who have lost part of their bodily functions due to radioactivity and toxic chemical machines, those who are excluded from the permission to view crucial technology designs, those who are deprived of the human right to data protection, those whose mind and body are exhausted from the computational logic of automated machines, those who are at risk of death from overworking for unstable platform labor, and those who lost their job and livelihood due to unattended automation. To defend the anti-ecological nature of technology, the Korean "Green New Deal" also needs to take the anti-life and anti-ecological boomerang, which could be created by the high-end digital condition, into account. We should be wary of our old practice to functionally divide the realms of natural and social ecology and read the entire inter-connected circulative cycle of nature and human society, which is mediated through technology.

Sixth, Overevolution of Disinfection Control Technology: The coronavirus pandemic situation is changing almost all everyday senses in Korean society. Wearing face masks and "social (physical) distancing" has become the necessary measure to prevent the spread of the infection. Now people are forced to accept "non-contact" relationships as a new everyday life or a new normal. COVID-19 has brought the invisible contradictions and weak links latent within the society to the surface one after another. Swayed by the government's hastiness for "K-disinfection," the Koreans are rigid in coping with this infectious disease and compliant with the technology against human rights. They obey the given vector of technology overevolution without any substantial suspicion. Now bio-governance, hand in hand with populism, is in the limelight, and to use the analogy of new materialist Levi R. Bryant's different types of machines, a series of "rigid" and "lifeless" new non-contact machines and body tracking devices followed one after another. It aggravates the overevolution and oversaturation of path tracking and surveillance technology. In this virus-infected world, many countries refer to, borrow, and adopt the precedents of others' disinfection technology in the fight against the pandemic. For them, these disaster-type anti-virus technologies are highly likely to remain, being embedded within the urban design, even after the disaster and returning to everyday life. Smart city technologies in urban design and planning with digital control systems are now being applied in investigating the coronavirus patient's trajectory, which is also likely to undergo a process of reverse revolution from disinfection city design to smart city design when we return to ordinary life. To secure a smooth and comfortable daily life that is virus-free, safe, and clean, we would continuously desire a convenient non-contact market based on the platform and automated machines. The disinfection control technology would set itself up as our companion, along with the non-contact market, in post-disaster everyday life. Fear of infection would increase technology acceleration more and more, and no one dares to easily resist the acceleration direction of the technology, which takes public health hostage.

Seventh, Non-contact Virus-Free Automated Society: "The Korean New Deal," which followed the Committee on the Fourth Industrial Revolution and the Artificial Intelligence(AI) National Strategy, is a command by the contemporary planned economy of the Korean-style technology acceleration. The government risks the fate of the country on the "Korean (particularly, Digital) New Deal" in sympathy with the reality of disaster capitalism, which extracts data from algorithmic subjects and throws it into the platform melting pot of newly-rising dot-com conglomerates. The desire for the infection-free and safe "non-contact" market is linked to the social "omnipresence" of platform machines and AI automation. At this very point, all of the technological maximalists, the Silicon Valley technology elite, and Western leftist intellectuals offer the prospect for "Fully Automated Luxury Communism" with one voice, which is a vision of the utopian future society of automation and post-work. However, widespread artificial intelligence and automatic robots, though intended for disinfection and maximum machine automation efficiency, would not work without the sacrifice of human "living labor", which assists artificial intelligence, stepping behind it, like shadows or ghosts. To the extent, these "shadow" or "ghost" workers remain in the harsh, polarized labor market condition in which they had to perform physical manual labor, such as parcel and food delivery, care, express delivery, and logistics, connected to platform algorithm devices, their death from overwork or accident will never be eliminated. For the non-contact AI market, precarious workers are pushed out of the visible area and out of social care. Relatively stable wage labor will be replaced with AI machines more and more rapidly. Highly possibly, this replacement will bring about an explosion of precarious workers or shadow/ghost workers who assist AI machines. Unpaid work like care and reproduction will be absorbed into the driving force of capitalism, enslaved to technology, and thereby expedite changes in ways of exploiting the surplus value of labor. There is a strong probability that contemporary capitalism will not end up with the ultimate end or disappearance of labor due to "technological unemployment" caused by AI and others. Instead, it may advance "AI capitalism." This form of capitalism replaces humans' wage labor with AI machines and produces the colossal-scale lower class of humans who are subordinate to the machine and work as machine attendants or at sundry low-paying jobs. Without any transition plan for these suppressed and alienated individuals to have an opportunity for a different life, the dream of "luxury communism" in the automation society is utterly in vain.

The Eco-Politics of Technology

Eighth, "Post"-Anthropocenic Strategy: The Anthropocenic convulsion may have resulted from the desire of brakeless speeding of the capitalist society in which "all that is solid melts into air." Thus, if the earth cannot stand the desire anymore, we should take this convulsion as a transitional opportunity to imagine a life different from the previous ones. If there is no awareness of how necessary it is to cultivate ecological common sense and break away from "anthropocentrism," the time may come when each individual's survival will be threatened. The "post"-Anthropocenic strategy is to build alternative ecological logic for mutual coexistence between (non-)human species on the earth. It is also to understand the post-human relational materiality, or the interlocking and interrelationship between all things that look localized, unrelated, and far distant from each other. The post-Anthropocene is indeed a matter of developing "trans-corporeality" in Stacy Alaimo's expression. However, the Anthropocenic convulsion also includes the traces of the time-old nasty evils and contradictions of capitalism, such as the development and plundering of "cheap nature," conglomerates' industrial management of the bio-natural environment, destruction of land and common urban infrastructures, the devastation of human labor, and high-level automatic technological

power. In this sense, if we do not criticize the "capitalocene" of the earth ecology and attempt at ecological transition, the destiny community discussion that we are all to blame for the present Anthropocenic crisis or complete blindness to scientific technology is either naïve or void. To prevent the "Green New Deal" as an effective and urgent strategy for the post-Anthropocene from becoming a market variety of "environment business" or "climate Keynesianism," it should be accompanied by emergency measures to save the "burning earth" and long-term ecological actions. To put it another way, while using the "Green New Deal" as an opportunity to deliver the earth, we should also undertake to map out another radical Plan to build a global ecological society, ultimately.

Ninth, Reams of Techno-Ecological Politics: We will be surrounded more and more closely by technological subordination, as manifested in the devastation of technology-mediated "living" labor, the politics of the "post-truth" of suspicion and distrust, the extension of extreme right-wing popular politics, big data science for controlling the human body and mind by dividing them into "dividuals," and the intensity of life subsumption based on algorithmic automation. By shaking off the extreme "cult of growth" mediated through high-end technology and eliminating the primary factors to cause cracks in the virtuous cycle of metabolism between man and nature, we should set the eco-purposive direction of technological civilization. We should weed out the innovation logic without respect for life and outline the eco- and symbiosis-oriented technological system. If we divide our "ecologies" mainly into three spheres of nature, humanity, and technology, each of them sometimes self-evolves, and other times, overlap or cross each other. As far as global nature is concerned, the direction of technology needs to move from the exploitation of "cheap" resources, growth addiction, and the developmental paradigm to the outlook of "ecological technology." On the other hand, as for the future of coexistence and solidarity between the human and the non-human in consideration of their species differences, the prospect of "convivial technology" covering all sorts of (non-)living others should be developed. It is impossible to complete the future technological prospect, or "eco/symbiosis technology," without the project of designing an alternative non-capitalist life. In other words, what is required is the topography and ecological politics of interrelation between what Felix Guattari called "*mécanosphère*" and nature and human(social) ecology.

Tenth, Formation of Techno-Ecological Politics: Although techno-ecological politics may be categorized as a sub-strategy of the larger umbrella of the post-Anthropocenic strategy, it is still both an ecological politics and practice of technology because it signifies the future sustainable ecological prospect of human technology. By nature, technology builds its ecosystem while entangling itself with natural and human ecologies like a net. In particular, the capitalist technology more actively regulates the patterns and arrangements of this complicatedly interwoven network between those three ecosystems. It requires the virtuous cycle of natural-technological-social ecologies and new methodologies for technological resistance and practice to prevent ecological rifts. In this sense, it becomes significant to mobilize humanity's theoretical and practical experiences and legacies to stop the speeding and rush of capitalist technology and plan a different life. Ultimately, techno-ecological politics is to construct a new techno-ecological vision that centers on the socially and ecologically disadvantaged people endangered by the future scenario of the earth. The scenario, however, is required to deal with more than anthropocentric earth-saving actions. It should include convivial solidarity, which could save not only human beings otherized in the capitalist reality but also animals, mechanic species, mutants, and natural objects. Nevertheless, even in this relationship of "flat ontology," it is not advisable to neglect or miss technological scenery and the range of its change. Humankind's big data algorithm and political-economic power of bio-information or genetic engineering have increased the possibility that the flat relationship between man and newborn objects would be rapidly damaged, and the dominance of capital becomes more intimate. Although the density of the connection between (non-)human species, the actual arrangement of powers will not be quite equalitarian and mostly subsumed under the shadow of the

privatized values and reification of late capitalism. Even when embracing the extension of new thought about flat ontological and transversal ties between man and all kinds of living and non-living things, we need to prepare a radical ecological politics by diagnosing the ecological rifts and injuries made by capitalist value production and the constellation of ecological class politics.

The Status of Future Museums

Eleventh, Techno-Ecological Aesthetics: Watching the *2020 Ars Electronica Festival*, new media theorist Lev Manovich left a controversial essay titled "My Anti-Digital Art Manifesto" on Facebook. His harsh criticism about the tendency of digital art focused on its aesthetics isolated from reality, as shown in the techno-artistic works produced so far. For example, he thinks that digital art has only repeated the same unrealistic techno-aesthetic monolog as that of the 1940s, like a parrot or with no one hearing it, only with different media. Manovich argues that the algorithmic world of Netflix reflects the real everyday life of our age more realistically. However, his approach that views the Netflix quantum theory, the most commercial trick in algorithmic film aesthetics, as the highlight of technological aesthetics is substantially problematic. Nevertheless, considering the status of digital art, which has maintained the technologist sublime beauty passing from the post-media in the 1990s to the post-digital(online), his manifesto is worth contemplating. The pandemic situation more deepens this technologist sublime. For example, the spatial function of national or public museums disappears, and the ones in the virtual space emerge both as mainstream and a future model. People are shedding new lights on non-contact digital creation and virtual exhibition and viewing, to which was relatively paid less attention. Almost all things are accelerating the advent of a smooth post-digital society marked by non-contact, automation, and AI algorithms. If Paik is living with us now, how would he respond to this situation? Paik was an interpreter of medium technology, who was more prominent than anyone else but, on the other hand, also tried to go beyond the social usage and rigid limitations of mainstream media machine and always attempted at "change of use" and subversion from early in his career. If he is living again with us now, he would not merely comply with the instrumental overevolution of technology or any given direction of technology caused by the fear of the virus. Using new media, he may have tried to extend a new aesthetic imagination to connect technology and human through technological aesthetic subversion and revolution.

Twelfth, Ecological Commons of the Technologically Disadvantaged and Zombie Machines: Viewed from the purpose of preventing the outbreak of virus diseases even after the COVID-19 or securing the earth's sustainable resilience, the attitude of passively adjusting to the non-contact new-normal logic toward a disaster-induced technological society is merely a stop-gap measure before the catastrophe of the ecology in the earth. Instead, it is more techno-ecologically meaningful to actively prepare new mutual solidarity and relationships between (non-)humans. We need to start techno-practical discussions that have been excluded from techno-ecological debates: those about resurrection and restoration of countless "zombie media" which are scrapped due to "planned obsolescence" despite their residual value, coexistence between humans and new post-human machines, human bodies' subordination to automated machines and technological unemployment, and alternative zenofeminist technological models against the male-technological ruling order. The reason for paying attention to the "share of those without share" is that the distortions of our life disturbed us from recognizing them, led us to neglect them, and urged us to dash madly for something high-end and new. We need to notice those that are technologically alienated, such as delay, retardation, black-and-white, low-definition, noise, material relationships and contacts, bugs, mutants, and zombie media, which are technologically compared with the transparent world of

the sophisticated algorithm of non-contact automation. All of them are neither clumsy past nor immature errors that should be overcome. On the contrary, they need to be conceived as an important sign to reveal the naked face of the alienation of objects and techno-ecology in late capitalism. In this capitalist society in which overevolution and obsolescence of technology are co-occurring, the power to move human emotion lies in the reinstatement of these excluded and discarded post-human machines as they are and even their status of creating an ensemble with all things under the sun, rather than in Netflix's sophisticated algorithmic film aesthetics. If we seek the association of autonomous solidarity between human-technological disadvantaged, that is, the prospect of "commons," it would be completed only with the ecological politics which embraces non-human, alienated objects and machines.

Thirteenth, Future Museums and Cultivation of Techno-Ecological Sense: Considering what has been happened, technology in our realities has become a harmful product of civilization to increasingly disturb the solidarity and reciprocity with others, rather than to encourage and mediate it. If anything, technology has been deified as the absolutely sublime. It seems to be necessary to seriously reflect upon whether contemporary museums have aided, agreed with, or acted as a broker for that tendency. The capitalist technological order becomes to occupy even the position to manipulate and distort our socio-psychological relationship and its density. The "distancing"-type technology improvised by the immature slogans and disinfection order of the virus-disaster technological society has aggravated the so-called "Zoom fatigue" day by day. What is and ought to be the museum of everywhere to be remembered as the "Gift of Nam June Paik" in 2020? I think that the first mission of the museum, at least, is to stop the present dominant stream of techno-art and prepare an opportunity for new thought or introspection with technology or aesthetic imagination. It ought to be a place seething with inventions of technologies that are involved with disadvantaged living beings and others and cultivate common social sense, not the cult of government-led non-contact disinfection technology. It ought to attempt at social communication and conversation with those without share who are excluded and left out from safety, pursue solidarity with them, and tries to find solutions, rather than being confined to the function and form of extending non-contact communication mediated through artificial technology in the infectious disease disaster society. Future museums, which aim to emphasize the aesthetic practices in the field and their social sympathy more than any other, must attach importance to cultivating the social "*sensus communis*" about the situation which is being increasingly polarized and demolishing the common foundation. Here, the term *sensus communis* refers to the emotional sense of being with others. In our society, there appear abnormal signals in this sense. The crisis of the present society is caused by the loss of *sensus communis*. As biologist and feminist theorist Donna Haraway said, all "being do not preexist their relatings ··· Subjects, objects, kinds, races, species, genres, and genders are the products of their relating." We construct both ourselves and each other in interrelationship with others. The *sensus communis* that we are with each other would not mean the mutual relationship between only humans. It presupposes the reciprocal relation not only with other human beings but also with all kinds of organisms and technological artifacts that are with us. Furthermore, it must focus on developing thoughts and introspective sensibility about the relational ecological circuit of nature-technology-society to examine the Anthropoceninc crisis today fundamentally. By taking issue with contemporary technological problems or treating them as aesthetic materials, at least, future museums need to disclose the abnormal signals of overevolution overshadowing the technological development in our human society, creating new techno-aesthetic senses, and think about how to graft them onto the reciprocal sensitivity and shared emotional structure. More basically, there is a problem of securing "technological introspection" or "technological power" of citizens. Future museums need to willingly present themselves as a laboratory to anatomize the emerging emotions and textures of high-end media and technology lying across the human body and then cultivate the techno-aesthetic introspective sense. They need to be a socially shared place to raise and enhance citizens'

"critical literacy" about techno-ecology. They ought to be an outpost in which people can acquire "*savoir technique*" in the language of the citizen, to use technology philosopher Yuk Hui's term, and sharpen their introspective sense of technology. In some sense, it is also about turning museums into the channel for social solidarity with objects and those without share and a laboratory of pathos to develop the eco-political introspective sense.