

## Lecture 9 - Society in Motion

James Rising

MIT OpenCourseWare

**What did you think of the reading?**

Future Shock is a classic, from 1970. And yet, it still feels incredibly relevant today (mmm, sounds like an exponential- or perceptually exponential- trend...). How it gotten worse since 1970, or have we reigned in the changing or the shock? Will things get better or worse?

**Do the themes of transience, disassociation, and replacibility capture the gestalt of our time?**

We're only starting to realize that everything in our lives is now transient. There are no more careers for most of us. The home you may remember no longer existed, and couldn't any more. We have to always move on, and that involves a shift in how we conceive of ourselves.

**Future Shock Levels**

There's a taxonomy of extremity of future shock, and our acceptance of them:

- SL0: The current norm; a traditional culture in an urban setting.
- SL1: The technophile, or forward-thinking educated person.
- SL2: The sci-fi fan, obsessed with "futuristic" technology.
- SL3: The transhumanist, focused on becoming the futuristic tech.
- SL4: Singularity advocates, where the world becomes futuristic tech.

**Is there currently Future Shock?**

Do people suffer from this, like a disease? How does it related to "stress", as defined by modern society? What are the expectations on people for knowledge, adaptation, and response to new technology?

What happens when there are even greater rates of change?

**What are the consequences of more transient relations?**

Are voluntary organizations doomed to decay? Or will they be strengthened by being freed from institutionalization?

**How do social networks affect relationships?**

They appear to make it easier to have more, but weaker relationships. They allow us to stay connected over space, by being disconnected to where we are.

**If humans can't handle a certain level of change and transience, will we eventually revolt?**

We can reject our technology. Perhaps we have to- we don't have a choice, if it denies a part of our human nature that cannot change.

**Can we embrace transience?**

What would it mean to only live in the moment? In part, it promises personal freedom and individual fulfillment, but it's a very disconnected freedom.

Can we choose a level of transience we're comfortable at, and maintain it in an ever-more transient world?

**Will the trend toward transient relationship with things continue?**

The throw-away society now threatens our world. Is it a natural consequence of the rate of change of the world, and therefore cannot be stopped, or can we have one without the other?

MIT OpenCourseWare  
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

ES.256 The Coming Years  
Spring 2008

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.