## Vorlesung "Anwendungssysteme" - 1 -

Einführung

Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Informatik, Arbeitsgruppe Software Engineering Prof. Dr. L. Prechelt, S. Salinger, J. Schenk, Ute Neise, Alexander Pepper, Sebastian Ziller Übungsblatt 1 WS 2009/2010 zum 23.2.2010

**Vorbemerkung:** Mehr noch als in anderen Veranstaltungen kommt es in den Übungen zur Vorlesung "Anwendungssysteme" darauf an, dass Sie sich jederzeit an der Diskussion über die Inhalte der Vorlesung sowie die Lösungen der Übungsaufgaben beteiligen können. Bereiten Sie sich dementsprechend auf die Übungen vor - machen Sie sich also ausreichend Notizen bzw. arbeiten Sie die Lösungen schriftlich aus.

## Aufgabe 1-1: (Textanalyse)

Lernziele: Begriffe "Technikfolgenabschätzung" (bzw. "Technikfolgenbehauptung") und "Technikfolgenbewertung" verstehen; bei einer Diskussion darüber nicht abschweifen.

- Sehen Sie sich noch einmal die Definitionen/Beschreibungen der Begriffe Verfügungswissen, Orientierungswissen, Technikfolgenabschätzung und Technikfolgenbewertung in den Vorlesungsfolien an und bereiten Sie sich darauf vor, diese in der Übung zu erläutern und gegeneinander abzugrenzen.
- 2. Unten folgt ein Text von Wendell Berry aus dem Jahr 1987. Lesen und verstehen Sie diesen Text.
- 3. Welche Aussagen macht Berry über die Wirkungen von Computern (im Sinne von Technikfolgenabschätzung, nicht von -bewertung)? Fertigen Sie darüber eine Liste mit genauen Zeilennummern an.
- 4. Welche der Aussagen aus Teilaufgabe 3 halten Sie für plausibel, zwiespältig oder unrealistisch? Begründen Sie Ihre Antwort.
- 5. Betrachten Sie die Liste von Forderungen an neue Technologie am Ende des Textes. Diese stellt eine Technikfolgenbewertung dar, denn Berry geht davon aus, dass der Computer keine dieser Forderungen erfüllt. Welche der Forderungen teilen Sie (im Bezug auf neue Technologien allgemein) persönlich vollständig, teilweise oder gar nicht? Anders gesagt: Welche halten Sie für sinnvoll, überzogen oder untragbar? Warum? Bereiten Sie Ihre Antworten so vor, dass Sie diese in der Übung nachvollziehbar darstellen und begründen können!

## Wendell Berry: Why I am NOT going to buy a computer

Like almost everybody else, I am hooked to the energy corporations, which I do not admire. I hope to become less hooked to them. In my work, I try to be as little hooked to them as possible. As a farmer, I do almost all of my work with horses. As a writer, I work with a pencil or a pen and a piece of paper.

My wife types my work on a Royal standard typewriter bought new in 1956 and as good now as it was then. As she types, she sees things that are wrong and marks them with small checks in the margins. She is my best critic because she is the one most familiar with my habitual errors and weaknesses. She also understands, sometimes better than I do, what ought to be said. We have, I think, a literary cottage industry that works well and pleasantly. I do not see anything wrong with it.

A number of people, by now, have told me that I could greatly improve things by buying a computer. My answer is that I am not going to do it. I have several reasons, and they are good ones.

The first is the one I mentioned at the beginning. I would hate to think that my work as a writer could not be done without a direct dependence on strip-mined coal. How could I write conscientiously against the rape of nature if I were, in the act of writing, implicated

> 6 7 8

9

5

111213

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

10

in the rape? For the same reason, it matters to me that my writing is done in the daytime, without electric light.

I do not admire the computer manufacturers a great deal more than I admire the energy industries. I have seen their advertisements, attempting to seduce struggling or failing farmers into the belief that they can solve their problems by buying yet another piece of expensive equipment. I am familiar with their propaganda campaigns that have put computers into public schools in need of books. That computers are expected to become as common as TV sets in "the future" does not impress me or matter to me. I do not own a TV set. I do not see that computers are bringing us one step nearer to anything that does matter to me: peace, economic justice, ecological health, political honesty, family and community stability, good work.

What would a computer cost me? More money, for one thing, than I can afford, and more than I wish to pay to people whom I do not admire. But the cost would not be just monetary. It is well understood that technological innovation always requires the discarding of the "old model" — the "old model" in this case being not just our old Royal standard, but my wife, my critic, closest reader, my fellow worker. Thus (and I think this is typical of present-day technological innovation), what would be superseded would be not only something, but somebody. In order to be technologically up-to-date as a writer, I would have to sacrifice an association that I am dependent upon and that I treasure.

My final and perhaps my best reason for not owning a computer is that I do not wish to fool myself. I disbelieve, and therefore strongly resent, the assertion that I or anybody else could write better or more easily with a computer than with a pencil. I do not see why I should not be as scientific about this as the next fellow: when somebody has used a computer to write work that is demonstrably better than Dante's, and when this better is demonstrably attributable to the use of a computer, then I will speak of computer with a more respectful tone of voice, though I still will not buy one.

To make myself as plain as I can, I should give my standards for technological innovation in my own work. They are as follows:

- 1. The new tool should be cheaper than the one it replaces.
- 2. It should be at least as small in scale as the one it replaces.
- 56 3. It should do work that is clearly and demonstrably better than the one it replaces.
- 4. It should use less energy than the one it replaces.
- 58 5. If possible, it should use some form of solar energy, such as that of the body.
- 6. It should be repairable by a person of ordinary intelligence, provided that he or she has the necessary tools.
- 7. It should be purchasable and repairable as near to home as possible.
- 8. It should come from a small, privately owned shop or store that will take it back for maintenance and repair.
- 9. It should not replace or disrupt anything good that already exists, and this includes family and community relationships.