

What is the destiny of science? - Science Conference Pursues Absolute Values

Louise Strait
January 1975



"What is the destiny of science?"

Until now, scientific research has not embraced the internal world of cause, but only the external world of result; not the world of essence, but only the world of phenomena. Today science is entering a higher dimension; it is no longer concerned exclusively with the external world of result of phenomena, but has begun to examine the internal world of cause and essence as well.

Those who have taken the path of science are concluding that, without the truth that relates to the spiritual world of cause, that is, the internal truth, man cannot attain the ultimate purpose of science; that is, the discovery of the external truth, which pertains to the external world of result."

This explanation of the destiny of science, from the Divine Principle, explains in part why Reverend Moon founded the International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences. This third such conference convened in London, England, November 21-24, 1974. Approximately 120 scientists from all over the world participated.

The theme of the science conference was "Science and Absolute Value." Reverend Moon welcomed the conferee, and gave the opening address. Excerpts of his talk follow: "Although the progress in science has provided us with a tremendous amount of information, we still suffer from our inability to internalize this information and our inability to fully comprehend its deeper implications. This inability has led to much anxiety, confusion, and uncertainty, which results from a loss of a firm basis and standard of reflection. As a result, we feel that we are in a state of imbalance between ourselves and the suddenly expanded reality caused by scientific progress..."

"In the past we have recognized the contribution of science and technology to the enrichment of human life without deep reflection. Now we begin to wonder. Some disquieting questions come to mind. Are we happier? Are we ethically more sound? Are we becoming more humane with love and concern for one another? The answers to these questions are not found simply by analyzing statistical results because the human being has many aspects which are not discretely quantifiable. In any discussion of the quality of life, these non-quantifiable factors play a major role. As illustrations, let me cite love, the ideal, the joy of creating, belief in God, and numerous other value systems.

The question of the preservation and development of these human aspects of life remains the greatest theme of our research. In light of this theme, the question of interpretation and proper use of the vast amount of information created through scientific research and discovery becomes a profound and serious one..."

"When we reflect on the history of the human race, we see that there have been new frontiers in every era, some culminating in the development of literature and others in the blossoming of medicine or other sciences. Yet in the past, development of science and technology has been aimed mainly at the conquest and exploitation of nature.

"Today this very science compels us to set up a new ethical standard. The new ethic should concern itself with the problems of love for nature and a reexamination of human values and the need for cooperation among human beings. It should attempt to set a new view of value and a new ethical norm which can bring about an ideal world of a harmonious co-existence among all creatures on the earth.

"The development of science and technology has certainly raised issues that invite us to seriously reflect on what is essential for us to remain human and to preserve humanity in our lives. I strongly believe that

all this can be made possible only when every field of science and technology is mobilized for the benefit of mankind and when a cooperative spirit of human activity is available on the part of the men who handle the scientific technology.

"I ardently desire and expect the answers to come from you. This will surely be realized with the result of your respective researches with your opinion and wisdom. From the very bottom of my heart I beg you to play the role of the bridge that will connect and lead the present world to the world of higher dimension and absolute value."

Who were listening to these remarks? There were 24 Nobel Prize-winners. And in looking over a list of participants I found a number that I had heard of myself.

One was Lord Adrian, the honorary chairman of the conference a chancellor of Cambridge University. Another person was Piet Hein. When I live in Denmark in 1966 I heard of him as a very famous poet. An architect and scientist as well, he started his own corporation, and *Life Magazine* published a quite extensive story on him.

Sydney Hook, who is a professor at Columbia University and author of a number of philosophy books, was not one of the main participants. He was only on the panel of one of the smaller sessions.

Also, I noted that Jurgen Moltmann, a contemporary theologian who is known for what is called the "theology of hope," was also present. A number of people sent in papers to the conference but were unable to attend.

Among them was Willy Brandt, past chancellor of West Germany and a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize.

I was really astounded in looking through the findings of the conference. I found that only one or two people questioned whether science should be serving the higher dimension. Every other scientist scholar accepted this assumption and were wondering, "What are the higher values that we should be pursuing, and how should we go about doing this?" I was really amazed at such a departure from the past. I think that maybe ten years ago there wouldn't have been such a conference. People probably weren't interested.

Now, everyone there was really searching for value. Reading the papers prepared before the conference, I was able to look into their thoughts and see what they were concerned about. I would like to share a few portions of these papers with you, so that you can feel that these men were pursuing the questions, "What is truth?" "How can we create a beautiful universe?" "How can we really create a good world?" These men were actively pursuing value.

I found that there were roughly three categories: Some emphatically said that the world with higher values does exist; then there were those who emphasized the desperate need to find and to serve higher values; others were asking, "How can we do it?"

A world of higher values exists

Russell L. Ackoff of the University of Pennsylvania said, "My principal witnesses are the philosophers of ancient Greece who never forgot the fourth voice. They divided the pursuits of man into four categories: (1) the scientific -- the pursuit of truth; (2) the political -- economic-the pursuit of plenty; (3) the ethical moral -- the pursuit of goodness; and (4) the aesthetic-the pursuit of beauty. These categories were refined out of the philosophical thought of centuries. They were not a product of a deliberate effort to divide man's activities into exclusive and exhaustive categories.

Obviously, they were not mutually exclusive, since man clearly can conduct two or more of them simultaneously. Nevertheless, I believe that it is valuable to regard these categories as exhaustive."

Dr. Kenneth Cragg of the University of Sussex said, "Let Man Be Man as the theme of his self-liability is also the obligation of his institutions. The powers, policies, systems, laws, technologies, sciences, cultures, of his fashioning are only right when they are right by him. Science is for man, not man for science. The contemporary menace is that, in their insistent thrust, all these orders and institutions claim an autonomy which threatens the human through and beyond them. Even sociology, as the study of society as it is, demands to be 'value-free,' despite there being no 'society' in the absence of value."

Another surgeon, Ronald Raven, wrote, "At this time of social change, an effort is required to up-grade the quality of family life; attitudes and opinions of young people are referred to. The scientists can make important contributions in leadership and ideas where social conditions must be changed. The quality of life depends on many factors, medical, social, and spiritual, and all who shape society hold responsibility. It is evident that the trans-disciplinary expansion and application of many sciences is essential to achieve our objective of a life worth living."

M. W. Thring of the University of London was very nonmaterialistic in his viewpoint: "If, and only if, enough people can learn to judge their success in life by creative achievement and not by possessions then it is possible to achieve a decent world society in the XXI century -- this can be called the Creative Society, since everyone will have the opportunity to maximize their quality of life by creative achievement."

Longing for higher values

There were others who were really hungering for a higher value to science and to all of life. One theologian, E. L. Mascall, was very much against genetical experimentation. He wrote, "Finally the question is raised whether under the impact of genetic science it will be possible to defend and to preserve any permanent dignity and status for man in the absence of any metaphysical or theological belief about him."

Another doctor, Werner Th. O. Forssman, was very much opposed to any kind of euthanasia, which is mercy killing-either active or passive. One of his points as a doctor was that even though people look like they are suffering very much when they are dying; it usually isn't the case. The person has usually accepted the fact of his death long before the people around him do. Also, he said that it would threaten mankind very much if killing of human beings is legalized and that "a license to kill may under difficult political circumstances be brutally and barbarically used to regulate future overpopulation."

Dietrich Bonhoeffer in Hitler's Germany was very much conscious of this too. Apparently some of the genocide that Hitler undertook was due to some sort of ideal of euthanasia, or killing all people who are suffering or unfit to live. Another applied sciences professor, J. Basile from the University of Louvain (Belgium), said, "In conclusion, a new scale of values for a new changing world appears necessary to favor unity and continuous progress of mankind."

It includes: inner freedom by strength of will and character, esthetic sensibility, creative attitude, respect of psychosomatic effects, and the religious sense of the sacred." A scientist said this. Enrice Cantore, director of the Institute for Scientific Humanism in New York, said, "Science is inadequate to found value-hence its inspiration must be integrated into an overall ethical theory of philosophical type."

The ethical insufficiency of science consists in its practical inefficacy, inspirational one-sidedness, and theoretical incompetence. As a conclusion, science proves to be a particularly urgent challenge of contemporary man to humanize himself. The seriousness of the challenge is due to the dangers with which sciences threaten to overwhelm man. But the challenge points also to new positive perspectives which should spur man to a new effort toward authenticity."

I would like to quote at length from the paper of a man named A. Szent-Gyorgyi of the Institute of Muscle Research at MIT and a winner of the Nobel Prize in medicine. "We have only three absolute values, which are absolute because all other values depend on them. The first of these is life, because without life there is no value, and life is in jeopardy because armaments are out of control and have heaped up enough explosive power to wipe mankind off his little globe in one blow."

"Our second absolute value is our DNA, nucleic acid, developed and guarded by nature through three billion years. We are what our DNA is. For the first time in history man found a means, in high-energy radiation, with which he can damage his DNA and if an atomic holocaust will leave any survivors, it will be survivors with a badly damaged DNA."

"Our third absolute value is our children. They too are an absolute value because the future of our race depends on how these children will be. At present half of the world's children go to bed hungry, not having had enough protein to build a sound brain and are destined to go through life as half-humans."

"It was science which has shaped the past, and science can help man a great deal to build his new world. Unfortunately, scientists are practically excluded from government which is mostly in the hands of lawyers, acquainted with all the tricks of their trade, hut unacquainted with the basic laws of existence and unable to grasp the terrifying force of atomic power."

"I am unable to close without mentioning a fourth absolute value: our globe. To keep it inhabitable we must stop our uncontrolled breeding. We have upset balances by introducing death control without birth control. The balance must and will be restored. If left to nature, the correction will be utterly painful."

"I hope that this conference will contribute to building the new scale of values in which beauty and knowledge takes the place of power and possession, globalism the place of parochial nationalism making out of life an attractive adventure."

How to create such a world

The scientists had a few interesting ideas on how to work towards creating a new world of values. One of them, Ervin Laszlo, who participated in the first Unified Science Conference in New York in November of 1972, said that science can have three functions in creating value. One is a monitoring function, which is to warn us of an impending crisis. The current food shortage could be one example.

Another is goals research, which is to offer realistic and worthy goals for policy decisions. This could mean science cooperating with policies and economy. The third is feasibility studies, which is to test the anticipated effects of decisions before they are carried out.

Another scientist had a really fascinating idea. Valerius Geist, from the Faculty of Environmental Design

at the University of Calgary in Canada, said that there is a particular kind of environment which we should study in order to learn about a more ideal world. He said, "The 'natural environment' which should be the standard for comparison is that from which man evolved and developed his typical human attributes, such as the large brain, the great intellectual and physical skills, the largely culturally-based behavior, the great ability to cooperate and be altruistic but also destructive and cruel beyond compare. These attributes were apparently evolved in the periglacial ecosystems of the Wurm glaciations. Here man reached exceptional physical development, and developed the first cultures; from here he dispersed to ultimately colonize all major terrestrial biomes.

In order to achieve optimum phenotypic development of individuals and thereby reduce significantly congenital deformities, stunted growth and development, poor intellectual performance, the frequency of physical, mental and social breakdown, and to maximize the age of retirement, we should create ontogenic environments similar to those of the periglacial families. This means, at a minimum, supporting the stable, extended family and enhancing the probability of high quality nutrition being made available to growing individuals. The creation of optimum ontogenic environments should take precedence over economic and political dictates, since otherwise we shall be faced with ever-increasing social costs. A dismissal of human evolution and biology from the decision-making process is likely to be expensive. It is shown how predictions derived from the periglacial family compare with empirical evidence, and thus demonstrated that the method proposed is at least promising."

What he seems to do is to go back to the Garden of Eden to find out what it was like there and to create a family based on it. This periglacial environment for the family seems to be the original world before the fall.

Lastly, I would like to read from the theologian Jurgen Moltmann. He says that happiness is no longer the right kind of value for us to seek. He says that we too much equate happiness with materialism, and he wants us to search for more true values. In so doing he outlines how science and values should inter-cooperate, which I think is another important theme of the conference. The conference wasn't asking the scientists to quit being scientists, rather to continue being scientists but also find a way to make their efforts contribute to human value.

Moltmann says, "All processes which change our natural environment have their source in economic and social processes. These in turn are determined by human demands and values. A change in societal behavior toward the natural environment will therefore have to begin with a change in man's economic and social behavior. The desire for happiness by the fulfillment of all demands will be subordinated to the hunger for justice and community.

This is the way from the pursuit of happiness and symbiosis, from the struggle for existence to peace in existence, and from will co power to solidarity. Only symbiosis between rival organisms have a chance of survival. Our chance of survival lies in the symbiosis of men among themselves and of men with nature."

This conference highlights the efforts of scientists to find value, their endeavor to find beauty, their endeavor to create a better world. Our value is in being facilitators to those who are pursuing value. We can help organize the science conference, print literature, raise the funds, serve the scientists, and give them a creative opportunity which they never would have had elsewhere.

Not only is the search for values important, but these very values of truth, beauty, and goodness are what will make up the new world. The problems the scientists are considering -- how to deal with the food crisis or the population crisis to make a more humane life -- are what will create a restored world. So we have a tremendous opportunity ahead of us.

Our great opportunity is not only to pursue these values for ourselves, but also to serve those people who are trying to pursue these values and sacrifice ourselves for them. We are not only sacrificing ourselves for our nation or for the World, but for the greatest good of all, that is, the coming of the new age.

The fourth conference will convene in New York this fall, and will include 360 participants and 250 or more observers. Future plans in this field including forming a world-wide scientific organization and a year-round research system to carry out the objectives of the conference. Seven specialized committees will in the future prepare position papers on their subjects and publish their findings in an academic monthly.

"The scientific fields of today are so specialized," Reverend Moon reflected, "dealing with very minor parts of the entire field of science. So sometimes they lose vision. So the Unification Church is bringing these scientists together to harmonize and unify scientists towards some unified purpose. Bringing together scientists in all fields is a great and beautiful opportunity for them to understand each other."