

Techno-solutionism and Neocolonial Narratives in ICT (and other engineering) Curriculum: Extended Abstract

Srinjoy Mitra¹, Mario Pansera²

¹ School of Engineering, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

² Post-growth Innovation Lab, Universidade de Vigo, Spain

Keywords¹

ICT education, techno-solutionism, decolonisation, global justice

1. Abstract

While decolonisation is discussed and debated in various disciplines within and outside the university [1], engineers are notably absent from this introspection. Far from a neutral apolitical collection of artefacts, engineering has historically been instrumental in building and perpetuating colonial orders. All engineering disciplines, including ICT, are heavily influenced by Eurocentric knowledge and its supposed excellence [2], [3]. A reflection on the colonial history and its underpinning values that brought about development in applied sciences is rarely part of the engineering curricula [4]. On the contrary, young engineers training is dominated by concepts such as techno-optimism and techno-solutionism that uncritically frame technology as value-free, always good and the solution to any problem humanity can face [5]. At the same time, this narrow view hides to the students that most of "technological progress" is highly dependent on colonial-era exploitation of the Global South [6]. Contrary to other engineering disciplines, the ICT/electronics sector had an unprecedented growth in recent years and also has a disproportionately large influence in the modern world that dictates our everyday lives in innumerable ways [7], [8]. But this success has been also partially possible thanks to extraction of a variety of raw materials, exploitation of cheap labour and illegal dumping of e-waste in the global south [9]. This colonial legacy of the discipline has a long history, starting from some of the earliest ICT innovations e.g., long-distance telegraphic cables (that was primarily developed to establish military domination of the empire [10]) or quick adoption of photography by Western 'explorers' (that reaffirmed the 'colonial gaze'[11]) that instituted the power dynamic of the Global North. Among other important technologies, next came the wireless radio that was used to 'educate/civilise' colonial subjects and entertain the anxious settlers far from their homeland [12]. The rise of the modern mass-produced electronics industry (on which most ICT is based), itself depended on the cheap labour in colonised Hong Kong and then even cheaper resources in war-torn South Asian states (including Taiwan) [13]. That dependence is still strong as the extraction (and pollution) from Global South keep the industry running [14]. Engineering students and practicing engineers are rarely aware of the colonial legacies of their domain and how a techno-solutionist narrative helps to maintain and reproduce the colonial order. Moreover, sustainability and ideas of planetary boundaries, global/environmental justice are considered exotic topics rarely debated or even mentioned in the engineering classroom [15]. Furthermore, even when sustainability is evoked in debates about ICT, it is generally not seen with a decolonial / environmental justice lens.

B. Combemale, G. Mussbacher, S. Betz, A. Friday, I. Hadar, J. Sallou, I. Groher, H. Muccini, O. Le Meur, C. Herglotz, E. Eriksson, B. Penzenstadler, AK. Peters, C. C. Venters. Joint Proceedings of ICT4S 2023 Doctoral Symposium, Demonstrations & Posters Track and Workshops. Co-located with ICT4S 2023. Rennes, France, June 05-09, 2023

EMAIL: srinjoy.mitra@ed.ac.uk (A. 1); mario.pansera@uvigo.gal (A. 2)

ORCID: 0000-0003-1505-2316 (A. 1); 0000-0002-3806-1381 (A. 2)



© 2023 Copyright for this paper by its authors.

Use permitted under Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).

CEUR Workshop Proceedings (CEUR-WS.org)

We propose to use Information Communication and Electronic Technology (ICET) as the appropriate term that justifies this all-encompassing tech infrastructure of today. We argue that a substantial shift in the way ICET (and most other engineering subjects) is taught is needed. Although universities are primarily non-profit and exist for the public good, the teaching and research conducted by engineering educators, particularly in ICET, are conspicuously devoid of sociotechnical and political thoughts [16]. The curriculum is mostly influenced by the requirements of profit-driven industries rather than societal needs. Most of the wealthiest companies on earth (Google, Apple, Microsoft, Amazon, Facebook, Tesla etc.) are ICET-based, and most people running them are ICET engineers by training. The R&D capabilities of these top tech companies are now way past the largest government funding budgets (e.g., over \$100b recently spent by Meta alone [17] compared to EUR80b total budget of EU-H2020 over 7 years). Hence, it is not surprising that the narrative of engineering education/research is driven by these and other similar industrial players. As technology companies become increasingly powerful, surpassing even governments, it is essential to question the core of the educational system that eventually supports this industry (with trained workforce and research outcomes). The need to introspect these aspects is becoming more important in EE/CS disciplines, primarily due to the omnipresence of ICET as backbone technology in almost all industries. Yet, the negative impact of this sector (even within the so-called green-tech [18]), is rarely taught and is not easily visible to the technology researchers themselves.

2. Acknowledgements

The author would like to acknowledge Dr Agomoni Ganguli Mitra and Dr Jean-Pierre Raskin for their helpful discussion. This abstract is influenced by two other unpublished monographs on related topics, co-authored by Dr Ganguli Mitra and Dr Raskin.

3. References

- [1] G. K. Bhambra, D. Gebrial, and K. Nişancıoğlu, “Introduction: Decolonising the University?,” in *Decolonising the University*, Pluto Books, 2018.
- [2] S. J. Eichhorn, “How the West was Won: A Deconstruction of Politicised Colonial Engineering,” *The Political Quarterly*, vol. 91, no. 1, pp. 204–209, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1111/1467-923X.12773.
- [3] J. Delbourgo, “The knowing world: A new global history of science,” *History of Science*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 373–399, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0073275319831582.
- [4] B. Momo, G. D. Hoople, D. A. Chen, J. A. Mejia, and S. M. Lord, “Broadening the Engineering Canon: How Culturally Responsive Pedagogies Can Help Educate the Engineers of the Future,” *Murmurations, Emergence, Equity and Education*, vol. 2.
- [5] E. Morozov, *To Save Everything, Click Here; The Folly of Technological Solutionism*. Public Affairs, 2013.
- [6] D. Arnold, “Europe, technology, and colonialism in the 20th century,” *History and Technology*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 85–106, 2005, doi: 10.1080/07341510500037537.
- [7] UNCTAD, Ed., *Catching technological waves: innovation with equity*. in *Technology and innovation report*, no. 2021. New York Geneva: United Nations, 2021.
- [8] K. Vu, P. Hanafizadeh, and E. Bohlin, “ICT as a driver of economic growth: A survey of the literature and directions for future research,” *Telecommunications Policy*, vol. 44, no. 2, p. 101922, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.telpol.2020.101922.
- [9] J. Martinez-Alier, “Mapping ecological distribution conflicts: The EJAtlas,” *The Extractive Industries and Society*, vol. 8, no. 4, p. 100883, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.exis.2021.02.003.
- [10] S. Schaffer, “The laird of physics,” *Nature*, vol. 471, no. 7338, pp. 289–291, 2011, doi: 10.1038/471289a.
- [11] Z. Choudhary, “Photography as a Tool of Power and Subjugation: How the Camera was Used to Justify Black Racial Inferiority,” *Sacred Footsteps*. Accessed: Apr. 25, 2023. [Online]. Available:

- <https://sacredfootsteps.com/2020/06/08/photography-as-a-tool-of-power-and-subjugation-how-the-camera-was-used-to-justify-black-racial-inferiority/>
- [12] D. Clayton, "Technologies of International Radio Broadcasting," in *The Wireless World: Global Histories of International Radio Broadcasting*, S. J. Potter, D. Clayton, F. Kind-Kovacs, V. Kuitenbrouwer, N. Ribeiro, R. Scales, and A. Stanton, Eds., Oxford University Press, 2022, p. 0. doi: 10.1093/oso/9780192864987.003.0002.
 - [13] C. Miller, *Chip War: The Fight for the World's Most Critical Technology*. London: Simon & Schuster UK, 2022.
 - [14] B. K. Sovacool, A. Hook, M. Martiskainen, A. Brock, and B. Turnheim, "The decarbonisation divide: Contextualizing landscapes of low-carbon exploitation and toxicity in Africa," *Global Environmental Change*, vol. 60, p. 102028, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.102028.
 - [15] G. D. Hoople, D. A. Chen, S. M. Lord, L. A. Gelles, F. Bilow, and J. A. Mejia, "An Integrated Approach to Energy Education in Engineering," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 21, Art. no. 21, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12219145.
 - [16] E. A. Cech and H. M. Sherick, "Depoliticization and the Structure of Engineering Education," in *International Perspectives on Engineering Education*, S. H. Christensen, C. Didier, A. Jamison, M. Meganck, C. Mitcham, and B. Newberry, Eds., in *Philosophy of Engineering and Technology*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 203–216. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-16169-3_10.
 - [17] A. Hern, "Meta shares dip is proof metaverse plan never really had legs," *The Guardian*, Oct. 27, 2022. Accessed: May 09, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2022/oct/27/metaverse-shares-dip-is-proof-metaverse-plan-never-really-had-legs-facebook>
 - [18] H. Sanderson, *Volt Rush: The Winners and Losers in the Race to Go Green*. London: Oneworld Publications, 2022.