

Terms for Reading the Alienating Interventions of Modern Technology in Personal and Collective Life according to Jean-François Lyotard

Christos Ath. Terezis*

Introduction

The facilitation and effective management of the daily life affairs have always been a critical demand related to specific –and most often pressing– necessities and a fascinating expectation since the emergence of the human species, and above all since its integration in the collective forms of a particular institutional organization. This perspective has always been subject to two main conditions: on the one hand, through the incisive and penetrating “reading” of the natural environment, and on the other hand, through the invention and construction of material –and by their evolution, technical– means, with the main aim of most effectively using the products of this reading in the long term. This dual objective was gradually incorporated into the perspective of the strict horizons –and indeed normative ones– of reason; thus, science, as the theoretical explanation and classification of natural nuclei and phenomena, and technology, as the way of applying the expansion of mental products into quantitative results, have consequently been adapted to the circumstances, especially to the unforeseen ones. Of

* Christos Ath. Terezis is a former Professor of Ancient Greek and Byzantine Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy and former Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Patras, as well as former Director of the Postgraduate Program “Studies in Orthodox Theology” at the Hellenic Open University.

course, up to the Renaissance, science clearly outperformed technology; yet, from the Enlightenment onwards, we could argue that the two fields have been on an equal footing and have been firmly cooperating, while their mutual reinforcement has increasingly contributed to their evolution¹. However, with the explosive development of the capitalist mentality, which has been mainly applied on –and connected with– the economic expansion, both were integrated into a special perspective, that of quantitative gigantism, which brought about a reckless, in terms of the results obtained, interference with the natural environment. Instead of nature being a challenge to man for developing a fruitful dialectic –and an artistic one– with it, it is being turned into a space of exploitation, and unsustainable. This exploitation arises from various private and decadent state systems, which devise strategies for its expansion, based mainly on the aforementioned transformation of science and technology (from now on we will choose the term technology). We will approach one aspect of this question by elaborating certain positions of Jean-François Lyotard, one of the most emblematic critical thinkers of the 20th century, which we will also attempt to view from the standpoint of certain implications in areas that this thinker does not systematically touch upon in his seminal study, but which may deductively emerge through certain combinations.

1. On the evolution of science and the terms that underpin it from the Early Modern period to the beginning of the 20th century, see Ch. C. Gillispie, *Στήν κόψη τῆς ἀλήθειας* (=The Edge of Objectivity: An Essay in the History of Scientific Ideas), Greek transl. D. Kourtovik, National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation, Athens 1986, from which we read: “With the Enlightenment, technology first began to feel the rational touch of science that in more recent times has transformed the world [...]. Diderot made an extremely skilful move: he made technology the bearer of ideology. It was natural that the latter should monopolize the attention of intellectual historians, because it is the ideology of progress and liberalism” (pp. 162-163). These can scarcely be found in modern times. Technology has obviously assumed the characteristics of an ideology, but what matters is how the terms of progress and liberalism are understood, which, as it is generally agreed, are linked to the way in which they are approached by the powers which buy and exchange rational thinking.

A. General Remarks on the Technology's assimilative processes

Jean-François Lyotard in his famous treatise *La Condition Postmoderne*² attempts to highlight –and, in our view, succeeds in doing so with the appropriate refined justifications in a critically oriented authorial project– the problems that have come to the fore in the form of a storm or at least a pathogenesis during the second half of the 20th century, due to the growing presence of technology in all areas of human activity, communication and choice, including certain spiritual ones, no longer perceived or explained in traditional but in post-traditional terms. We should note here that he does not talk about the use of technology, which is undoubtedly inevitable and justifiable, but to its inexhaustible intrusive penetration to every possible aspect of the human endeavor, which constitutes Modernity's supreme model of worship. Indeed, he emphasizes that this penetration is carried out in such a way that it is invested with qualitative-value determinants, which legitimize, almost automatically and without proper checking based on authentic and refined evaluative criteria, any presence or any priority given to it or any invocation of it even regarding to the most important aspects of life. Thus, a holism is constituted, which has is totally unrelated and not corresponding with the fields of its circulation but mainly with the way in which it transforms and inscribes them in its familiar directions, transforming their semantic authenticity into pragmatic adaptations of doubtful or subversive correspondence to what is anthropologically appropriate. It is thus permanently present not in terms of the emergence and the conscious qualitative utilization of the reasons of things, but in terms of the stated operationalist purposes, that are totally irrelevant to the value-based normative and aesthetic reading of the living beings, i.e. from spirituality³. Indeed, Jean-François Lyotard projects his positions

2. Greek edition: Jean-François Lyotard, *Η μεταμοντέρνα κατάσταση*, Greek transl. K. Papagiorgis, Gnos Publications, Athens 1988.

3. “With the dominance of information technology, a certain logic is imposed, and consequently a set of options referring to the judgements accepted as ‘knowledge’” (*Η μεταμοντέρνα κατάσταση*, p. 32). “The state, and especially the corporation, abandon

and evaluations in such a way that we can characterize him as a prophetic empiricist reader and thinker, since during the last fifty years his reasoning and argumentation have been increasingly validated: man is gradually being replaced by his own technological constructs, which subverts both causal and evaluative hierarchies. The contemporary man does not find in his creations his personal achievements; on the contrary, he is absorbed by their instrumentality, transforming himself into a tool. He has reached to the point to even attribute metaphysical characteristics in their content and their mission, so that he does not exhaust their significance in their applications. In other words, it approaches its products as its providential sponsors, as the almost absolute premises of its expectations and ambitions.

By fully taking into advantage of his findings from the socio-economic-political atmosphere of his time, the French thinker proceeds to reasoning processes of such precision that they become arguments –or, at least, occasions– for critically and reconstructively penetrating and renewed reflections, having as his constant point of departure the anthropological schemes of personal and collective liberalism and of conscious democratic institutions, which are referring into the whole horizon of interests. His central remarks are related with the identification of the substitution of roles between the *cause* (as creator) and the *effects* (as creations), which subverts, almost radically, their constitutional responsibilities by definition and clearly leads to irreversible forms of alienation, which are not very far from ending to massification, i.e. to a society without the basic sceptic and oppositional reflexes for better reduction and self-management⁴. Apparently, modern man, in terms of the principles he

the narrative of idealistic or humanitarian legitimacy to justify the new hypothesis: in the discourse of the contemporary capital donors, the only credible hypothesis is power. One does not buy experts, technicians and devices to know the truth, but to increase power" (*idem.*, p. 115). Clearly, the person who is perceived in modern times as an expert has nothing to do with the model of Socrates, who saw him as an experiential assimilator of knowledge and as a transformer of its content in the perspective of morally and politically benevolent presence.

4. See *H μεταμοντέρνα κατάσταση*, *op.cit.*, pp. 31-32: "The knowledge cannot pass through the new channels and become effective unless it can be translated into quantities of information. Consequently, on the basis of the above, we can predict that everything that cannot be translated into structured knowledge will be abandoned, and that the

now adopts and multifariously supports, is stripping himself of his natural qualities and is self-mutilated in terms of his possibilities to create fascinating readings of the reality, which have historically constituted crucial transformations, with artistic achievements being inexhaustible in invention and renewing aesthetic taste, which is in every respect demanding and refuses to conform to conventions and compromises, while at the same time is constantly seeking the new.

B. Technology and Education

Of central importance to J.-Fr. Lyotard's whole argumentative process are the descriptions of education, especially university one. As far its didactic structure and its collective objectives are concerned, he highlights the issue of the substitution of education for training, mainly vocational one, based on the rules of the market and social influence, which is largely defined by economic and property criteria, linked to normative-psychological situations –in other words, those that serve the individual or group-sectional interests on the basis of clearly quantitative terms and marginalize dialectical references or deconstruct their values. Actually, it is a criterion which –imperceptibly at first– is deified, or at least becomes the univocal condensation of existential meanings and perspectives, targeting at the increased reproduction of a model, which exclusively serves them and which itself seeks the agreements that will magnify it. With his penetrating and critical approach, Lyotard traces the trends that have prevailed in the contemporary world, and to a large extent in the so-called Western one, and makes incisive anthropological interpretations; as the starting point of his remarks and arguments, he chooses those agents that have historically been shown to establish consciously valuable paradigms, both in *thought* and *action*.

orientation of new research will be subject to the condition of being able to translate the potential results into the language of the machine" (p. 32). It should be added here that during the last thirty years the use of computers by pre-adolescents and adolescents has been growing at a dizzying rate, with the result that a new type of human being is developing "out of thin air". All their knowledge is contained in micro-devices, so that the model of education is not based on search and is not a sporting achievement.

His substantiated readings are also drawn from his findings regarding the prevalence of the psychology or the mentality of efficiency and productivity –the exclusively quantitative goals or the ever-expanding capitalist mode of existence–, which turns out to be insatiable, thus becoming increasingly assertive, with the final consequence of turning the new generation into a toolbox. The overhauling of ideals constitutes the dominant environment permeating all social strata, engendering uniformity that will inevitably result in massification⁵.

In addition, J.-Fr. Lyotard identifies the generalized prevalence of technology as the underlying cause of the reason's instrumental use, i.e. the radical overthrow of its very existence and the normative conditions of its functioning, as well as the cancellation of the models formed by the authentic Enlightenment, which insisted on the safeguarding of personal individuality as the bearer of this supreme resource [the reason], but at the same time on its creative inscription in renewed collective consultations, which would be transformed into institutional safeguards in the process towards the whole. Under any perspective, the enlightenment model does not act discriminately against the whole but inscribes it on a collective scale of presenting – in other words, in the conscious development of democratic liberalism –which moves in the opposite direction to an elitist model– on a wide range of choices and activities, enriched, and even culturally transformed, in the course of time. Thus, under the implications of this more general observation, he points out the almost radical reversal: the broader implications of the attempted mechanization of young people, by mainly insisting that the Higher Education produces exclusively executives, whose training will increasingly feed the statutory positions and expectations developed by the dominant political-economic system and those social control groups

5. *Η μεταμοντέρνα κατάσταση*, op.cit., p. 36: “Instead of being disseminated thanks to their ‘educational’ value or their political importance, we can imagine that knowledge can be circulated in networks analogous to that of currency [...], knowledge exchanged in the context of everyday life for knowledge credits with the aim of maximizing the effects of a program”. The fact that the exchange value of knowledge is brought to the fore erases from its content the manic love, who is impulsively and inexorably drawn to its reception. Fascination falls into management.

that feed it or collaborate with it the prospect of the entrapment or even the mutilation of the rights of collective entities. In other words, Universities do not prepare students for in-depth erudition and in the perspective of the latter's stimulating application in the search for truth, which, in its extensions on a deep historical scale, is linked to the new generation's radical or, at least, rejuvenating politicization. Thus, truth is trapped in one-dimensional modes of individual and collective (or more precisely, group) behavior and, by extension, citizens who are sensitive enough to authenticity are prevented from seeking and capturing the deepest reason of things, since it is precisely their inner nature that is profoundly deconstructed. Consequently, Education, instead of being a creative institution, and in terms of its reception on the part of the people attending its various levels, it assumes the mission of the medium or the tool, a choice and a situation which impregnate the new generation. This results to the denial of value being appreciated as value –a subversion that could lead to barbarism–, since knowledge is inscribed into a competitive environment. Let us add that, despite the fact that in every scientific field knowledge shows impressive developments, the concerns are raised from here on in the following way: Which forces are exploiting it and for what ulterior motives? Does utilization turn into exploitation?

J.-Fr. Lyotard brings to the fore an additional crucial parameter; he points out that the ever-expanding intervention of technology has resulted to the restriction of the decisive educational and pedagogical role of teachers as agents of the qualitative functioning of knowledge, as well as of the promotion of its fruitful and innovative social implications. Nowadays, by an inevitable and perhaps irreversible necessity, teachers are simply perceived as competent administrators and implementers of that extreme programming defined by a superior design system that is being imposed by its quantitative and psychologically attractive force, which is transformed, without any effort on the part of those who teach the acquired knowledge and research for the discovery of the new, into power, often precipitating it into conflicting perspectives. It is a power exploited only by the aforementioned forces, and with a permanent prospect of expansion, seeking in every possible way to weaken the

dialectical method in the teaching process⁶. Thus, knowledge is transformed from a coordinating and transformative value of existential quests into a factor of predominance and only financial success. And here we must point out the following, which expands on a previous observation: Without doubt, much of the new knowledge produced is socially beneficial, but it must be considered whether it brings economic benefits and who exploits or reaps the benefits. From being a coordinating and transformative value of existential quests knowledge is thus transformed into a factor of domination and exclusively financial success. Here we should point out the following, which expands on a previous observation: Without doubt, much of the new knowledge is socially beneficial; still, it should be considered whether it generates economic surpluses and who exploits or reaps its benefits.

The philosopher is therefore led by his reasoning to a further conclusion: Modern society, having lost its authentic relationship with truthfulness, is governed by an extreme and ever-expanding alienation, by the abolition of the value of the human person, of the value of the human person, understood in traditional terms and as a self-meaningful political entity, as well as the undermining of the principles which have shaped fertile –and under conditions of the status quo or stereotype’s conscious subversion– cultural patterns. It thus ascertains the creation of an atmosphere far removed from these cultural objectives which lead to the evolution of the individual into a person with genuine intentional-referential-affective and at the same time coordinatively institutional projections, which will correspond to a *cultural teleology*, which is not

6. See *H μεταμοντέρονα κατάσταση*, *op.cit.*, p. 120: “The universities and higher education institutions are now called upon to develop competences and no longer ideals. The transmission of knowledge no longer appears to be aimed at forming an elite capable of leading the nation to emancipation; it offers the system the players capable of playing their appropriate role within the factual positions that the institutions need”. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 124: “The principle of efficiency results in the subordination of higher educational institutions to the authorities [...]. The transmission of knowledge escapes the exclusive responsibility of scholars or students. The idea of the ‘university freedom’ belongs to another era”. The question that comes to the fore is not the idealistic perspective –the knowledge for the sake of knowledge–, but whether it has the capacity to repeatedly introduce into collective and world events the rhythms that are appropriate to its statutory position.

realized except through renewed transitions towards the ongoing and continuous emergence of virtuous examples – those not subject to the atmosphere in which the economic markets claim to impose their managerial domination. We would point out that these are the paradigms that resist any external attempt for them to be integrated as subsystems of a wider financial system⁷.

C. The Reduction to the Narrative Discourse

The proposals formulated by J.-Fr. Lyotard could be characterized, in the broad sense of the term, as archaeological; they are not reactionary in terms of becoming but are grounded in terms of how it should work. Thus, they refer first of all to a rethinking of the technology's statutory role – a healthy, necessary and exciting human conquest and as an expression of the creative reflexes of scientists, functioning both as research subjects and as healthily intervened subjects in the society. However, since the whole issue has taken on broader anthropological dimensions, it is clear that this philosopher will consider that the above goal will be achievable if modern people will first attempt to reverse their inner world, whose mechanistic and self-serving automatisms must be confronted with an ever-renewing skepticism, which assigns priorities not to the object of reference but to themselves as the referent subject. It brings to the forefront the undertaking of radical and now

7. See *Η μεταμοντέρονα κατάσταση*, *op.cit.*, p. 105: "The emancipation project has nothing to do with science; we have been immersed in the positivism of this or that particular knowledge, the wise have become scientists, research tasks have become departmental tasks that no one controls; and for its part, theoretical or humanistic philosophy has only to fail in its legitimizing functions; this explains the crisis it is going through where it still claims to exercise them or its degradation to a study of logic or the history of ideas where it has realistically given up those functions". It is no coincidence that in modern times the relationship between professional researchers of philosophy and public opinion has taken on the characteristics of a fission. However, philosophical texts that project an open and fruitful anarchism penetrate diverse social strata and initially activate reflexes of creative marginalization. This is where archaeology comes into the fore: the suffering consciousnesses are constantly reduced to the necessity of the presence of the thinker, whether in the guise of Plato's philosopher-king or the Stoic sage.

heroic transitions, which will re-emphasize the authentic, according to the traditional schemes, importance of knowledge as a good and not as a tool for the promotion and realization of acquiring more and more of the available assets, not only without criteria but also without evidence of qualitative justification. Apart from that, by making references to ancient Greek authors, such as Homer and Plato, he argues that the narrative discourse should be reintroduced as expression, as consciousness and as experience, in order to confine the dominant, unambiguously scientific image of the modern era within its true limits, or even to transform it, but only under the precondition that this discourse should not be absolutized by not methodologically and purposefully appropriating what he denies⁸. This clarification seems to be necessary, since the narrative discourse is called upon to reflect, in any environment of announcements or semantics, the balance between *being* and *knowing*, not in order to ensure a modest conformity but to capture the authentic qualitative relations between the parties involved and at the same time to exclude linguistic absolutism, which reflects or leads to a broader one. This broader one is none other than the one who attempts to impose its supposedly justified purposes as “soteriological” or “messianic”. We should emphasize here that it is crucial that words do not refer to images but to the conditions that shaped them and will function in terms of struggle and achievement – i.e., they must not be inscribed in the formal relation of signifier-signified; rather, they must reveal participation in what exists and happens, and obviously under the conditions of collective processes. If such a correspondence

8. *Ibid.*, p. 82: “In the form itself, the one that Plato has given to his dialogues, the attempt to legitimize knowledge surrenders the weapons to the narrative; for each of these dialogues is always taking the narrative form of a scientific discussion. It makes no difference here if the story of the conflict is more shown than told, more staged than narrated, and therefore is more akin to the tragedy than the epic. The fact is that the Platonic discourse, which inaugurates science, is not scientific, and that to the extent that it intends to legitimize it. Scientific knowledge cannot know and make known the true knowledge without resorting to the other knowledge, the narrative, which for it is non-knowledge”. Of course, the fact that Plato was a poet, since he was also an excellent mathematician, cannot be used as a reason for the above, while also in his dialogue *Timeus* he brings to the fore his achievements in Physics and Astronomy. With his poetic flair he makes scientific discourse expressively flexible, so that the latter be able to fascinate and constantly pave the way towards new researches.

does not occur, language will become an enforcement agent and will cancel out any attempted penetration into the historicity of concepts⁹.

According to J.-Fr. Lyotard, the ultimate anthropological goal is the reducing of the linguistic stereotypes that have developed among the people of the modern age, and their replacement with another, one that has an emotional, and inevitably experiential, tone. From this point onwards, we believe that the procedures for returning to the archaeological can be put in place: Communication with the natural environment, which will be seen as a material with rational characteristics, capable of contributing its familiar messages, will be raised to an ecstatic-erotic level, an approach that is highly different from a stereotypical positivism, or, even more, from any particular utilitarian goal. Thus, nature will not be perceived as a field in which relentless interventions will be made having productivity as their sole criterion, an attitude which will lead to an unbridgeable distance between the subject and those objects inscribed in its exploitative vision, which has caused severe ecological degradation, at least during the last decades. And the dialectics could be highlighted in the following way: The application of reason to the various fields of human activity is naturally acceptable. It clarifies and leads to deductions, and not only in terms of purpose. But under what conditions and in what direction?

9. Theodoros Georgiou, in his prolegomena to the Greek translation of *La Condition Postmoderne*, summarizes the issue as follows: “As a result of the representational way in which the relation between man and the world is organized, anything that is not depictable is rejected, the heterogeneous elements of the thing are condemned to obscurity and non-existence, and finally the place of the object is occupied not by the thing itself as a factuality, but by the thing as an intellectual construct” (p. 15). J.-Fr. Lyotard, referring to what he calls the factual condition, concludes with the following remarks: “[...] to formulate our own rules and ask the receiver to accept them. By obeying to this condition, we define an axiom, which includes the definition of the symbols to be used in the proposed language, the form that the expressions of this language must respect in order to be accepted (well-formed expressions) and the acts that will be allowed on these expressions and that define the axioms themselves” (*Η μεταμοντέρνα κατάσταση*, *op.cit.*, pp. 107-108). The manipulation of public opinion, which will result from the above tactics, is the inevitable corollary, which will be applied in many sectors, such as interference in the natural environment. Propaganda-like expressions will therefore be used to increase production and the prevalence of the productivity mentality, and specific ways of cultivating the land will be defined, which will be followed without the imposition of certain criteria, or there will be widespread indifference to its qualitative and temporal endurance.

Does it seek to act by participating into the reason of things? Under such adjustments, there will therefore be proposals for mutations on the scene, which will reconstitute the political atmosphere in its original institutional mission – in the qualitative determinations of collective activities and topical redefinitions¹⁰.

Based on this perspective, the French thinker suggests, mainly through counter-examples, a flexible way of viewing objectives and evaluating the criteria by which personal and collective needs and perspectives will be perceived and dealt with, under a permanently communicative intentionality. This is an atmosphere that will obviously put, on the one hand, people on the axis of claiming freedom, not only for themselves but also for all the agents –personal or natural– with whom they communicate, and, on the other hand, in a deliberative mode, democracy, as a renewal or restoration of institutional imprints under the prism of virtuous anthropological legacies and quests. Lyotard does not speak about a conservative retrogression but the activation of that critical faculty which will detect and neutralize illusions and operate aesthetically, i.e. not only by seeking beauty but also one anything or anyone far removed from expediency, power and overpowering interventionism. This is the field in which aesthetics is bringing to the fore, and indeed without compromise, the ethical readings which see the profession, whether theoretical or practical, as a vocation, as the expression of a personal “well-being” and “well-acting”, which are gradually transformed into a collective *good*¹¹. From this point onwards we can discuss about the

10. In his prologue to the Greek translation of *La Condition Postmoderne*, Theodoros Georgiou notes the following: “The modern world, as a mechanism of endless manipulation of nature, as a process of controlling objects according to the notions of universality, generality and objectivity, has turned out not to be the ‘kingdom of freedom’, but the world of reified rationality; it is the world that has constructed its own destruction by its own means” (p. 10). By analogy, we would argue that the above is not particularly different from the Christian anthropological theory of the Fall and “original sin”.

11. J.-Fr. Lyotard approaches the above question in many ways, even by putting forward certain positions of German idealism on education. By way of illustration, we quote the following remark: “A scientific assertion is knowledge if, and only if, it is placed in itself within a universal process of generation [...] – and indeed it can. It only needs to presuppose that this process exists (the Life of the Spirit) and that it is itself its expression. This presupposition is even necessary in the game of theoretical language”

origins of teleology, the anticipations of a eudaimonic mode of existence, which can only recall Plato's¹² and Aristotle's¹³ relevant positions.

Epilogue – Towards a New Christian Theological Reading

What we have already elaborated –and which represent only a fraction of J.-Fr. Lyotard's reflections–, we could argue that they are inscribed, with the necessary adaptations of course, in the Christian critical discourse, which is permanently oriented towards the value-forms of freedom, of personhood as particularity and as a collective offering, of creativity as an innovative consciousness, and of respect for the natural environment, which is understood as theophany. Many relevant studies have been written by leading Christian thinkers, who have drawn on the patristic tradition to decipher and address current problems. We indicatively refer to Philip Sherrard's book *Human Image: World Image: The Death and Resurrection of Sacred Cosmology*, from which we quote the following: “Man is an integral part of the natural world. His place in it is indeed fundamental, since he is in every respect the center of the universe. He is not only a genuine microcosm, representing in himself the unity of all things in the microcosm, but he also performs an essential intermediate and mediatorial role between God and the world which He has created. It is thus a vital link in the process of transformation by which things ascend to the scale of being in order to ultimately rest in God”¹⁴. The above treatise also examines issues concerning the status of science and scientists in the modern era, with discussions mainly concerning the natural sciences and mathematics from the perspective of their encounter with a generalized Christian anthropology, constituted on the basis of creative responses to the divine

(*H μεταμοντέρνα κατάσταση*, *op.cit.*, p. 101). We are faced with a presupposition which we might characterize as transcendental.

12. See indicatively his dialogues *Lysis*, *Phaedrus*, *Republic*, and the *Laws*.

13. See indicatively *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1097a-1103a.

14. Ph. Sherrard, *Θάνατος καὶ Ἀνάσταση τῆς ἱερῆς κοσμολογίας*, transl. P. Soultanis, En Plo Publications, Athens 2008, p. 108.

providence's projections¹⁵. These responses are both mental, psychic and physical, with St. Maximus the Confessor's *Mystagogy* crystallizing the miracle of transgressions and specifying the theory of the Last Days. In Sherrard's book, the anthropological constructions and attitudes are inextricably interwoven with Trinitarianism and Ecclesiology, and indeed with an allegorical discourse that is fascinating for its inventions and for its challenges to a dynamic renewal of the believer's conscience.

15. Of course, it would be an unforgivable omission if we did not mention Ol. Clément, *Ἡ Θεολογία μετὰ τόν «θάνατο τοῦ Θεοῦ»* (= *Theology after “God’s death”*), Chr. Yannaras (ed.), Athena Publications, Athens 1973, with the last chapter of the book entitled “Technique and Resurrection” (pp. 193-229), from which we quote the following assessment: Without realizing it, technological eschatology is gradually giving birth to a new type of humanity. The hypertrophy of computational thinking, which is purely cerebral, and the sensual denial of thought during entertainment, weaken the heart’s unifying forces. A whole subtle sensibility, open to the mystery of things, disappears in the metallic environment of the Technopolis” (p. 213).