

TECHNO-SECULARISM: COMMENTS AND REFLECTIONS

by Varadaraja V. Raman

Abstract. I comment on some of the points made in John Caiazza's thesis on techno-secularism and offer some of my own further reflections on the subject. Tertullian's rhetorical question about Athens and Jerusalem has universal relevance, not just for Western culture, and, notwithstanding the many positive contributions of science and technology to human culture and civilization, they may not take the place of religion of one kind or another in the foreseeable future. What is needed is to transform religions in ways that meet the challenges of a world drastically transformed by science and technology.

Keywords: *aparâ*; Gnosticism; magic; NOMA; *parâ*, *pratyaksha*, *proksha*; techno-secularism; Vedic framework.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON CAIAZZA'S ESSAY

There are a number of interesting ideas in John Caiazza's essay (2005), but many of them can also be considered from different perspectives.

1. "Western civilization attains its vitality and uniqueness because in it two major sources of knowledge and inspiration contend, the secular and the revealed" (2005, 10). This (paraphrased) thesis of Leo Strauss is valid only in the West's modern and ancient Greek phase. Western civilization is more than two and a half millennia old. Secular knowledge challenging revealed knowledge was a phenomenon in the ancient Greek world when astronomy was forbidden in the Athens of Pericles because it tended to shake people's belief in religious mythology. The condemnation of Anaxagoras to death was an ancient instance of science versus religion. Ironically, at that time it was Athens that stood for religion (Smith 1952, 145). Also, in the fifth century B.C.E. the rest of Europe was not yet part

Varadaraja V. Raman is Emeritus Professor of Physics and Humanities at the Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY 14623; e-mail vvrps@ritvax.isc.rit.edu.

[*Zygon*, vol. 40, no. 4 (December 2005).]

© 2005 by the Joint Publication Board of *Zygon*. ISSN 0591-2385

of Western civilization. Thus, Caiazza's statement that "with the rise of modern science, what was previously a controversy about secular and revealed knowledge between theological academics has become a steel-cage death match" (p. 12) overlooks the fact that similar death matches had occurred in ancient Greece—long before the rise of modern science.

After the rise of Christendom, there was not much of a secular force to contend with for at least thirteen centuries. Then again, quite a few historians now reject that there ever was a serious science-versus-religion conflict in the West. For example, it has been pointed out that "One of the most remarkable developments of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries has been the relentless advance of the perception that there exists a permanent, essential conflict between the natural sciences and religion" (McGrath 2004, 79). Even ignoring this, the oft-quoted confrontations between the church and science, such as the Galilean episode and the one between Bishop Samuel Wilberforce and Thomas Henry Huxley, are of relatively recent vintage compared to the longevity of Western civilization.

2. "[Stephen J.] Gould's NOMA proposal . . . is not new" (p. 11). This is quite true. And although Gould was diplomatic in his efforts to avoid confrontations between creationism and science, it is important to remember that while creationists have been well heard in the United States, and are even feared by the scientifically enlightened for their potential for turning the clock back, this is certainly not an all-inclusive aspect of Western civilization which includes Europe, Canada, Australia, and South and Central America as well. In fact, "In America, the defender of liberal religious values has the burden of differentiating his own position from that growing body of creationists whose attacks on the theory of evolution constitute a threat not merely to the orientation of research but to the cognitive content of academic science" (Brooke 1991, 343). Moreover, the NOMA (non-overlapping magisteria) principle was not only proposed by some scholastics, as Caiazza points out, but has been practiced in the Hindu world with great success for at least a century now.¹

3. "Science has its own implied metaphysics . . . while discounting colors, motion, and other evidence of our senses as merely secondary qualities" (pp. 12–13). It is true that Galileo referred to *qualia* as not subject to quantitative objective study, but it is not entirely accurate to say that science *discounts* these as "merely" secondary qualities. What science has successfully managed to do during the centuries after Galileo is to correlate many of the *qualia* with its own fundamental entities, such as electric charges and chemical reactions that are part of neurons. One need not grant "putative superiority" to the methodology of modern science (p. 13), but one is obliged to admit that this methodology happens to be more effective and fruitful when it comes to explaining natural phenomena in rational and coherent ways.

4. “The triumph of science over religion . . . comes at a peculiar time, namely, when science itself faces challenges to its cultural hegemony . . .” (p. 13). Caiazza’s comments on postmodernist attacks on science are on target. It is quite true that the attack on science, whether left-wing or right, “constitutes an intellectual challenge that has not yet been successfully met by defenders of scientific objectivity” (p. 13). One reason for this is that, like Diogenes Laertius of ancient times, most scientists, unlike philosophers, think that by walking they can defeat the logic that makes one believe that walking is impossible. Many also find it a waste of time to be engaging in debates with “philosophers, *litterateurs*, historicists, sociologists, feminists, and multiculturalists” (p. 13). Practicing scientists generally think that these scholars write interesting papers and books and speak in conferences but don’t contribute much to further human knowledge about the phenomenal world and often display a lack of understanding of what science is all about. Most serious scientists believe that they are better off working in their laboratories and observatories, doing calculations and other such things that advance science and thereby help solve humanity’s more pressing material problems. Their benign indifference is what gives the impression that the “intellectual challenge . . . has not yet been successfully met by defenders of scientific objectivity.”

5. “The triumph of science also has been obstructed by developments from within science itself, since some of its basic theories, especially in physics, have developed beyond the simple-minded materialism characteristic of nineteenth-century thinking” (p. 13). I doubt if many physicists would describe relativity and quantum mechanics as obstructions to science. The improvement, expansion, and/or occasional replacement of successful explanatory paradigms are all intrinsic to the scientific enterprise. This is what gives the scientific enterprise its strength and intellectual credibility and makes it contextually more acceptable than systems of thought that are unaware of or indifferent to newly acquired knowledge, information, and insight. Bereft of advances and periodic changes, there would be no live science.

6. Physics “can no longer give us visually precise pictures of . . . the atom, with its myriad attendant particles. . . .” This is not a failing of physics but its accomplishment in unraveling the ultimate nature of the material reality that surrounds us. However, even in the classical era, few if any physicists engaged in “triumphant put-downs” (p. 14). But the Laplacian quip to Napoleon still holds: One *does not need* the God hypothesis to explain celestial mechanics (p. 14), which is very different from saying that God is altogether irrelevant in speaking about cosmic origin and matters of human significance. As to the Stephen Weinberg–John Polkinghorne debate (p. 14), one may be sure that it was not the last of its kind in human history. Diehard physicist that he is, Weinberg is understandably annoyed by religious doctrines that blatantly contradict basic

scientific results. But when he exclaims that religion is “an insult to human dignity” (quoted on p. 14), it reveals more about his own understanding of religion or lack thereof than anything about religion itself. There also are people who say, on the basis of nuclear weapons and global warming, that science is a threat to the human species. We cannot expect profound comments about either science or religion from those who have no direct experience of what they are talking about.

7. “. . . the science-religion controversy can no longer be settled decisively in intellectual terms” (p. 14). This may be true. But it does not follow from this that in the pure intellectual sense “science and religion have gained some form of parity” (p. 14). What may be said is that one is gradually beginning to realize that science and religion belong to very different domains of human existence: one to the discursive and the other to the experiential plane. Science expands our mind, and religion touches our soul. From this perspective, assessing their relative ontological merits becomes a non-problem.

8. Techno-secularism. Caiazza’s reflections on techno-secularism are interesting. His reference to William James (pp. 15ff.) is apropos. James’s conclusion (in Caiazza’s words) that “the variety of religious experience was best explained by seeing reality not as a duality of mind and matter, that is, as a competition between religion and secularism, but as a monism that combines both elements of mind and matter and could in effect support either religion or secularism” (p. 16) deserves reemphasis in our times.

9. “[A]ny sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic” (p. 17). Though the term is clarified later in the essay, this quote from Arthur C. Clarke is based on a popular use of the word *magic*: as an occurrence whose explanation in familiar terms is well-nigh impossible, though one knows that there is nothing supernatural about it. Insofar as the roots of present-day technology are occult and beyond our grasp, known only to the initiated few, and in that technology performs what could strike one as miracles, it does compete with religion.

Caiazza correctly recognizes the facile identification of science with ubiquitous technology in the minds of many people and the related phenomenon in which, just as palpable nature is regarded as a manifestation of the inscrutable Divine in traditional religions, in the modern framework the wonder of technology is seen as a manifestation of inscrutable science. This insightful observation uncovers the framework that goads people of our age to unwittingly replace the Nature and the God of our ancestors with technology and scientists.

10. “The displacement of religion from civic life is more the effect of technological ubiquity and power than the result of direct cultural and intellectual causes” (pp. 18–19). This statement gives only one side of the picture, because it is no less true that the ubiquity of radio and television has also enabled preachers and evangelists to go into homes and keep audi-

ences spellbound by their inspired oratory, something they could not do before. This is as true in the United States as in other countries where preaching via the TV screen occurs every day. In other words, affiliation with cults and sects as well as attraction to religious thoughts have also resulted from modern technology. If, as reported by Bill Moyers recently, a third of all Americans believe in the literal interpretation of the Bible, at least part of the credit or discredit for this must go to some of the powerful fundamentalist TV broadcasts.

11. "Avoiding the inevitability of death, techno-secularism refuses to deal with the issue of what comes after . . ." (p. 20). And rightly so, because it is not within the scope or competence of science or technology to speculate about postmortem states. This is not to say that the issue is irrelevant or unimportant. Though quite aware of the inevitability of death, techno-secularism holds the view that consideration of what comes after death offers little in the way of achieving its own goal of providing a wholesome and healthy life to human beings in their premortem phase.

12. "Techno-secularism has a fear of religion's ability to motivate people and social events effectively . . ." (p. 20). Caiazza seems to imply that there is some kind of a techno-secular force scheming to fulfill its own goals to keep them "in line with the bureaucratic state." It is not clear that there exists any such conspiratorial force in the intentionality of those who create, manipulate, and propagate technology, even if they sometimes do this mindlessly.

13. Athens-Jerusalem metaphor beyond the West. The significance of Tertullian's question "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?" lies in its relevance not just to Western civilization but to all civilizations. It is a rhetorical formulation of the NOMA principle, for it suggests that philosophy (science) and religion are distinct enterprises. Analytical, discursive thinking has little to do with the experience of spirituality. However, to say on the basis of the locations that this is a Western phenomenon ignores similar situations in cultures beyond Judeo-Christianity.

Thus, in the context of the controversies provoked by the writings of Al-Farabi and Ibn Sina, al-Ghazali could well have asked, "What has Baghdad to do with Maccah?" It is now recognized by most scholars that, as was to happen in the West later, even in the midst of such tension science continued to flourish in the Islamic world. Howard Turner has pointed out, contrary to the frequently stated view that within a "theocratic versus secular framework" Islamic civilization took "a long and steady downward course," "between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries alone, important work in astronomy and mathematics was completed" (Turner 1995, 204).

The Vedic thinkers of India distinguished between what we come to know through our senses (*pratyaksha*) and the knowledge that is remote from the senses (*proksha*).² In the Vedic framework, the latter type of knowledge is acquired through divine testimony. This developed into the view

that there are two kinds of knowledge—knowledge of matters of everyday interest, called *aparâ*, and knowledge about that which never perishes, *parâ*. The first is what philosophers are interested in; the second is what spiritual aspirants seek. The “higher knowledge is described as that whereby what has not been heard of becomes heard of, what has not been thought of becomes thought of, and what has not been understood becomes understood” (Mahadevan 1980, 31).

Parâ knowledge corresponds to Gnosticism in the Western tradition, for it also is based on mysticism and esoteric practices and on the conviction that by these means the human soul can pierce through the intervening opaque worlds between us and the realm of the Divine. Like all revealed knowledge, it is to be accepted without proof or demand for proof. *Parâ*, like Gnosticism, is also about ways of finding our way back to where we came from and about the ultimate dissolution of the world.

Thus, *parâ* is about an unfathomable mystic undercurrent of higher knowledge and indescribable transcendence. We read in the Mundaka Upanishad, “That which is ungraspable, without family, without caste, without sight or hearing, without hands or feet, eternal, all-pervading, omnipresent, exceedingly subtle, that is the undecaying which the wise perceive as the source of all things” (Radhakrishnan 1992, 672–73).

ON TECHNOLOGY AND RELIGION

1. Jacques Ellul. In the context of discussing the impact of technology, we may recall Ellul, one of the keenest thinkers in this area. In his influential book on the subject Ellul stated, “Nothing belongs any longer to the realm of the gods or the supernatural. The individual who lives in the technical milieu knows very well that there is nothing spiritual anywhere. But man cannot live without the sacred. He therefore transfers his sense of the sacred to the very thing which has destroyed its former object: to technique [technology] itself” (Ellul 1964, 143). He also pointed out that whatever desacralizes a given reality itself becomes a new sacred reality. This is one of the points Caiazza is making.

2. Technology and the ethical framework. There also is danger in technology when it is divorced from its scientific and moral roots, as seems to be happening today. Notwithstanding the claims of the Enlightenment thinkers and the hopes of humanists, the devaluation of religion in technologically advanced societies has not had altogether benign effects. Technology as the sole ethical force tolerates promiscuity, facilitates corruption, and encourages selfish behavior, given that there are no moral codes that threaten long-range adverse consequences. Technology furnishes weapons to hurt and kill enemies, religious as well as political, real as well as imaginary, to religious systems that encourage or condone hate for the other, bigotry about one’s own, and doctrinal narrowness. Every destructive creation of technology has come within reach of persons whose moral frame-

work often justifies indiscriminate killing. Individuals who contribute little to the advancement of scientific knowledge have acquired all the technology they need not only to help themselves, which is good, but also to destroy others, which is terrible. Nor is technology useful in comforting the afflicted or consoling the bereaved. Given this, it is unlikely that technology or science can truly replace religion in human culture.

3. Technology and spiritual ecstasy. Then again, technology does not provide ecstatic experiences of the spiritual kind that deep religions do through prayer, hymns, and meditation. If one were to see the roots of spirituality in particular kinds of neuron firings resulting from modes of cerebral chemistry, the time might not be too far off when we would have techniques for stimulating the brain to produce mystical feelings, as one already does to a degree through psychedelic drugs.

3. Impact on beliefs and values. It is no secret that modern science and technology have seriously affected traditional beliefs and values. No matter what theologians say and religious institutions declare, most scientifically awakened people are convinced that science rather than sacred books are more reliable when it comes to explaining the phenomenal world. When a child gets sick, most parents take him to a doctor or hospital rather than to a priest or minister. Sinner or saint, all get cured by the same medications. This casts doubt on the notion that we suffer because of our moral transgressions and evil thoughts. As a result, the behavioral constraints of earlier times, which depended largely on implicit belief in an unhappy aftermath for proscribed indulgences, have been reduced if not removed.

Then again, science and technology have not only diminished effort and ailment but also increased possibilities for pleasure and excitement. An important characteristic of physical pleasures, as ancient wisdom tells us, is that one not only tires of them soon but often craves more, and at heightened levels. This leads to more searching and greater restlessness.

4. Need for deeper satisfaction beyond the physical and the intellectual. Knowledge and comfort (science and technology) are not enough to lead a sane life. Hence the inadequacy of science and technology to satisfy all human needs. Just as art, literature, and music respond to our aesthetic longings, religion comes to our aid on the spiritual, psychological, and emotional planes irrespective of how these longings arose in the human heart. For seeing meaning and purpose in life, and to answer profound and often difficult questions regarding life, death, and relationships, most of us need religion of one kind or another.

The raw intellectual strength of science and the ease-giving power of technology tend to dismantle the supports on which religious faith rests. This leads many to a spiritual void that is as serious as economic distress and more so than a lack of understanding of the structure of matter or of stellar configurations.

One may recognize logical flaws in the world picture of religions, may grant that science has the right explanation for atoms and galaxies, and may cultivate technology for providing us with all the creature comforts we desire. But even science has admitted that it does not know everything, and technology has the potential to bring our species to extinction. In such a context, many wonder, what is so wrong with embracing old-time religion, which was good enough for our ancestors?

Psychologists and sociologists have pointed out that some aspects of modern technological societies are especially conducive to the propagation of the kinds of cults we see today. For one thing, a drastic consequence of life in our megalopolises is a sense of loneliness. In the stress and turmoil of mechanical existence, routinely performing chores to get a periodic paycheck, one is often lost in faceless crowds. Intense personal contacts are rare, friendships tend to be thin, and the sense of belonging to a community is seldom fully satisfied. Conflict in values between parents and children arises at an early stage, and one feels rejected and ready to explore new things. Age-old existential questions pop up at every disappointment or frustration, and there comes a point when one is prepared to accept any answer as long as it is consoling.

5. Anti-science moves and other modes. One road that some have chosen to combat the intellectual onslaughts of modern science is to reject logic and reason as the sole paths to knowledge and to claim literal validity for the holy books of their tradition. Others have embraced cults that have sprung up during the past few decades. Religious cults are nothing new in history; any insightful person endowed with qualities of leadership can attract a throng of confused people and reveal to them his or her version of ultimate truth. As long as there are enough bewildered people in the world whose trust in the religion of their parents has been shaken, there will be new cults and religions, for these provide alternative paths, even if they are not any more convincing (from an objective point of view) than what are already available and unsatisfactory.

Some have felt that the present confusions of the spirit are caused not only by science and technology but equally by the religious institutions of Western traditions where modern science arose in the first place. Therefore, it has been argued, one must search elsewhere for true wisdom, peace, tranquility, and revelation. Hence the appeal of exotic and New Age modes for spiritual fulfillment.

At the same time, recognizing in the spirit of productive capitalism that religion may be channeled into another lucrative enterprise, some creative entrepreneurs have founded religious institutions with corporate efficiency, investing in real estate and fisheries the vast amounts they siphon from the simpleminded. And so we have witnessed the interesting phenomenon of religious leaders driving expensive automobiles and residing in palatial mansions. Through radio, television, and word-processed form letters they

reach not only the hearts and homes and souls but also the savings of millions. Their hold on the gullible is the envy of investment firms and movie stars.

Then there are the more sophisticated spiritual innovators whose forte lies in their free use of terms from current psychology and physics: “auto suggestion,” “biofeedback,” “quantum leap,” and “alpha rhythm” are all part of their vocabulary. They blend yogic insights with results from modern physics, meditation with modern physiology, abnormal psychology with karma, computers with astrology. These science-equipped religionists are more successful among the half-educated who are made to feel that they still respect scientific worldviews and are not chained to primitive magic. Whatever one may say about frail reason and cold science, it uplifts the ego to imagine that our beliefs and practices don’t contradict them.

ROOTS OF SUICIDAL TECHNOLOGY

Technology is often benign, but it also can be malignant. Its negative impacts have provoked antitechnology movements. Yet, unlike an epidemic, a volcanic eruption, or a hurricane, technology is the work of humans. And humans are supposed to be intelligent. How did we permit technology to perpetrate horrors hurting our own species?

There are at least four major sources for the negative impacts of technology.

1. Inability to foresee long-range consequences. The power of science arises from its ability to predict, but the capacity for prediction is limited to simple systems. There are many complex systems in the world. Our planet is a huge system made up of simpler systems connected in intricate and inseparable ways. Modifying one part affects other parts of the whole. In particular, living organisms are interconnected with the larger ecological system. It is difficult, indeed impossible, to foresee all the consequences of changes, slow or fast, that could intrude into the whole system.

2. Economic greed. Another source of technological evil is the economic passion of human beings. Technology is meant to serve us. One pays for that service. This is how economic factors come in. Those responsible for spreading technology—industrialists and business people—create jobs. This generates products for consumers, income for producers, and profits for investors.

Industrialists would like to make and sell as good a product as can be made, but only as long as profits keep pouring in. When conflicts arise between the concerns of the consumer (quality, durability, product safety) and those of the producer (cost of production, possibility of fewer sales if price is too high), the instinct is to make self-serving decisions. From unsafe cars and unnecessary drugs to inexpensive but dangerous toys for children, we have numerous instances of irresponsible selling. The motive

in most such instances is not to cause deliberate harm but to enhance the level of profit taking.

References to the neurotic penchant for gold may be found in ancient mythologies. Long before the present age, avarice and greed stimulated human passions in various cultures. Lewis Mumford drew an analogy between the unquenchable thirst for money and the stimuli that excite the brain's pleasure center, pointing out that "in order to 'turn on' this insensate pleasure center, 'technological man' now threatens to 'turn off' his life." Mumford suggested that money is "the most dangerous of modern man's hallucinogens" (Mumford 1970, 169).

Abundant satisfaction of the pecuniary craving often results from the blatant misuse or overuse of technology. In the fast-changing, thrill-seeking framework of technological society, short-range gains are more appealing than long-range stability. If the profits for this year will be considerable, the hardships society may have to face a decade from now do not seem to be worth considering.

3. Weapons and warfare. Technology has had its most serious effects on our potential to destroy the world many times over. War is provoked by two factors, one publicized and the other not. The public reason is invariably a moral stance: adherence to a principle, ideal, or ideology. Wars generally are waged to right the wrong, punish the wicked, free the down-trodden, or save heathen souls. The silent causes of war are generally economic: to acquire more territory or power, exploit a weaker nation, gain trade monopolies, stimulate a nation's sagging productivity and trade. These reasons are intimately tied to economic growth and development. Not only does highly developed technology promote the cause of war through its arms and ammunitions, but technology itself can benefit considerably under conditions of war: the waste and destruction encourages search for greater efficiency in production, while the constrained conditions call for innovations to lessen hardships.

It is legitimate to ask, If war can have beneficial effects, why should we be against it? If we can stimulate a nation's weak economy, why should we not provoke a war? The questions cannot be answered without an ethical framework, for it is destruction of life and property that makes war unacceptable. The declaration of high ideals and the spirit of sacrifice for a principle arise only in an enlightened framework.

4. A fourth root of technological evils is scientific knowledge. As Francis Bacon noted, "human knowledge and human power meet in one" (1947, 78). Power, like the sharp-edged knife, can be used for a variety of purposes. Fruits and vegetables may be sliced more easily with a knife, and so can the throat of an unarmed human being. Without that knife, neither can be accomplished with such ease.

The Renaissance philosopher Cornelius Agrippa, writing against the occult sciences (which he had once practiced), made a rather insightful, though

impractical, comment on the business of intellectual exploration: “the pursuit of the sciences is so dangerous and unpredictable that it is far safer to be ignorant than to know” (Agrippa 1969, 70).

Some four centuries later, as if to confirm Agrippa’s warning, Jonathan Schell, in his lamentation on *The Fate of the Earth*, noted that “the fundamental origin of the peril of human extinction by nuclear arms lies not in any particular social or political circumstances of our time, but in the attainment by mankind as a whole, after millennia of scientific progress, of a certain level of knowledge of the physical universe” (Schell 1982, 100).

There is great partial truth in this statement. It is our knowledge of the fundamental constituents of matter and of the forces governing them that has made nuclear weapons a reality in the same way that it was our knowledge of gunpowder that made other kinds of warfare possible. However, these are the physical or material, rather than the fundamental or only, origins of the peril. It is true that nuclear war, unlike any other, has the potential to wipe our species off the face of the globe. Yet social and political circumstances, rather than scientific knowledge, are what will trigger the war that will spell the final fate of humanity. Even the possibility of computer errors initiating a nuclear attack arises only because the missiles are directed against particular nations; this again is the result of political mistrusts and ideological conflicts. Scientific knowledge, like coal or fossil fuel, is available for exploitation. But even tons of these will remain inert forever on the moon or on a planet where there is no oxygen. Political and social conditions provide that oxygen for igniting the fuel. In other words, it is only humanity’s ethical framework that can, perhaps will, save the species in the context of scientific knowledge. Technology and science can never replace religion in the broadest sense of the term.

Our knowledge of the physical world, which makes the ill effects of technology possible, is also required for the eradication of diseases, the cultivation of more food for the world’s population, and heating our homes.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Given all this, what are scientists and religionists to do? To begin with, scientists need to recognize that the longing to connect with the cosmos, preferably through a tradition that has a respectable history, is genuine and normal, not a consequence of a lack of a college course in physics or biology. To reject or decry such a need does disservice to science by alienating many from it, besides belittling an important factor in human culture. What the world needs is not eradication of religions but their reformulation in more meaningful ways. Enlightened leaders of all faith traditions need to educate their flocks on the richness and grandeur inherent in the scientifically revealed picture of the cosmos. The scientist is like an art connoisseur, as it were, who helps us understand the magnificent works of

creation, revealing its many hidden charms and unrecognized aspects. From such perspectives the religions of the future will strive to experience what lies beneath ordinarily perceived reality: something that is aesthetically satisfying, contextually meaningful, and spiritually uplifting. The ethics of religions will stress caring and compassion more than refraining from enjoyments, and faith loyalties will not call for disrespecting, disparaging, or assaulting people of other faith systems.

Technology will be playing an important role in all of this. Techno-secularism would be dangerous without techno-ethics, by which I mean an ethical framework that would use technological means to actualize its goals.³

NOTES

1. Until recently, in the Hindu world scientists seldom talked about Vedic versions of genesis or cosmology, and most theologians were not really concerned about Big Bang or evolution.
2. For more on this, see Prasad 1958, 20ff.
3. Examples of this: Use of the mass media for spreading the messages of love, caring, compassion, and the like; transportation of aid and assistance to distant regions; using the computer for distance learning.

REFERENCES

- Agrippa von Nettesheim, Henricus Cornelius. 1969. *On the Uncertainty of Human Knowledge*. In *Renaissance Philosophy*, Vol. II. New York: The Modern Library.
- Bacon, Francis. 1947. *Novum Organum*. In *Man and the Universe: Philosophers of Science*. New York: Random House.
- Brooke, John Hedley. 1991. *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Caiazza, John C. 2005. "Athens, Jerusalem, and the Arrival of Techno-Secularism." *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science* 40 (March): 9–21.
- Ellul, Jacques. 1964. *The Technological Society*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Mahadevan, T. M. P. 1980. *Invitation to Indian Philosophy*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann.
- McGrath, Alister. 2004. *The Twilight of Atheism*. New York: Doubleday.
- Mumford, Lewis. 1970. *The Myth of the Machine: The Pentagon of Power*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Prasad, Jwaka. 1958. *History of Indian Epistemology*. Delhi: Munshi Ram Manohar Lal.
- Radhakrishnan, S. 1992. *The Principal Upanishads*. Delhi: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Schell, Jonathan. 1982. *The Fate of the Earth*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Smith, Homer W. 1952. *Man and His Gods*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Turner, Howard. 1995. *Science in Medieval Islam*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.