

4. "Our survival depends more on the saints who set humane goals than on the technicians who provide ingenious means." ...Modify Darwin with Nietzsche/Shaw/Teilhard/Jantsch/mystics.

The 7th "way of being religious" (Streng et al) is "The New Life Through Technocracy." The computer is the closest thing it has to a god, and the public's present love/hate relationship with the computer is truly, worrisomely, religious....This thinksheet grows out of my distress over the 18th-c. mechanistic ideology of two TV series (Carl Sagan's "Cosmos" and Rich. Attenborough's "Life on Earth"), over my participation (necessarily half-hearted) in the present Luddite (antitech) "peace" movement, and over the ominous truths in Theo.Roszak's "Where Is Human Evolution Headed?" (48-51, THE DIAL:From WGBH Boston, Mar/82).

"Infinite power at our fingertips" (4NW8Mar82 letter) "makes us electronically egotistical." And the producer of a \$10,000 gold designer pistol says (85) "The pistol is so pretty you forget it's a gun." Japan's samurai macho has yielded to techno-macho, just as America's religiopolitical macho yielded to techno-macho (e.g., IBM's THE ADVENTURE OF TOMORROW, 1979). The bloated Pentagon budget, and the current Luddite "peace" movement, are both machine-centered; they are the YES and NO of nuclear weaponry. It is true that to be prepared to maintain our way of life, we need to be prepared to destroy others--but should we maintain our way of life? It is true that nations should be "deterred" from attacking each other, but "deterrence" has become theological (in the pop-sense of "muddy and irrelevant"). Current paleobiologies say that some species overdeveloped (hypertrophied) themselves out of existence: have we, nuclearly, evolved to the point of self-destruct? And if so, is it politically practicable to prevent human extinction? These may be insanely self-canceling: Reagan, Reganomics, Washington, the USA & USSR, humanity. Is any or all of this something I should work myself up about? And should I feel guilt and shame if I can't (which is the situation)?

1. MIRROR-EFFECT. Voltaire's "If God made us in his image, it didn't take us long to return the compliment" applies to today's technopsyche: we see ourselves as machine (since Newton), as computer (since 1956, the invention of the diode). Listen to Sagan & Attenborough with a critical ear: What is the image of humanity? Atheism and inhumanism disguised behind a screen of "science"! An adopted paradigm is a self-imposed limitation of vision, and they are idiot savants within an early-modern scientific understanding of the world. What's especially serious here is that both series are being made available to public schools: that enchanting, seductive packaging of an antibiblical religion! No religion in the public schools, indeed.

2. Godless "dynamism without direction," Roszak calls it: evolution as "a ceaseless, shapeless, and mindless process that follows standard Darwinian theory." "Just as classical (Adam Smith) economics was used to chase government from the marketplace, so Darwinism was used to drive God from the state of nature. The universe ran by itself; no central planning agency was needed." Every spokesman for God should become prepared to speak against this pseudoscientific atheism.

3. This "biological laissez-faire" has been attacked from the start--first, by Alfred Russel Wallace, cofounder of natural selection, who saw, in addition to adaptation, a transcendent factor, "a more daring movement boosting evolution toward higher levels of complexity and consciousness." "At the cutting edge of this vertical thrust" is "the most unaccountable development of all, that of the human brain, an organ that vastly transcends the competitive advantage we may once have needed to outsmart our primate rivals." And mind is (contra Sagan) more than made in the image of the analytic intelligentia; it is also spiritual.