

image is Good. It is therefore, my moral responsibility and obligation to maintain that Goodness in me - failure to do so, would mean a separation from Him, the Good.

Ladies and Gentlemen in my daily journey, I have never been alone. In my travel, I have a great companion, the Divine I call my God, who is loving, caring and my everything. He and I is one. He is in me and I am in Him. He is my God who has carved my name in the palm of His hand. Because of this, I completely surrender myself to Him and subordinate my will to His Divine will. Without Him, I am nothing. All that has been in me ; all that is yet to becomes from Him.

Ladies and Gentlemen, my view of God is Him, who is the great provider of mankind, the King of all Kings, the Father of all mankind, the Architect of the Universe, the God of Peace/of Harmony and Love. To all, I say MABUHAY!

Bibliography

- 1) *The Religion of Man* (Tagore)
- 2) *The World Scriptures and Religion*
- 3) *The Holy Bible* (St. Paul Publishing)
- 4) *Divine Principle* (HSA)
- 5) *Essentials of Unification Thought* (UTI)
- 6) *Towards Liberating Peace* (UNU)
- 7) *Philosophy of Man* (1995)
- 8) *Man's Place Within Nature* (1996)
- 9) *Man and the Society in Harmony with Nature* (1996)
- 10) *Cosmology of Peace* (Berry, 1984)
- 11) *Noah's Three Sons*
- 12) *Scientist in Contemporary Life* (1954)
- 13) *Concept of Man in Psychiatry* (1955)
- 14) *The Prospect of Civilization* (1984)
- 15) *Environmental Stewardship: A Vision for the 21st Century* (1993)

The Crisis of Environment and Its Over come by Unification Thought

Dr. Byung-hwan Choi
Dae-Jon University / KOREA

I. Foreword

Today, there are many problems we can not solve easily in the world. F.H.Knelman had presented 'four difficult problems' modern society have to solve. Those are the crisis of environment, the threat of nuclear, the explosion of population and inequality, and the distribution of justice. Among the four problems, I think the most difficult problems to solve is the crisis of environment. But despite of seriousness of the problem, the solution of it is very hard and will be difficult to solve in near future. For the problem is complicated. Ecosystem is the ground on which all living things including human beings exist. The human beings who had desired material abundance, have been confronted by the unexpected new challenge of disaster, before the desired ideal is achieved.

In fact, the crisis of environment is not only past, but also present problem, and the problem has been anticipated long ago. Notwithstanding, having not overcome the national grouped egoism, we human beings are making the earth and ecological system, the ground of our living into the ground of death, destroying the ecosystem without any hindrance. We have been confronted with the conflicting desire between economic development and nature preservation, and the desire have oppressed us since early time. Economic development and nature preservation are like the two hares directing toward other destination. In my opinion, it is true that the pretext of nature preservation is not to hold over economic development. Besides, it seems that we can not expect an excellent scheme to harmonize both

together for the time being. This problem is not simple. We have experienced that the temporary solution by technical development has brought about another problems, and the alternative of environmental problem only by technology can not be perfect. But also we can scarcely solve such a difficult problem through the mere ethical Ought.

Dr. Eugene P. Odum, the president of the Institute of Ecology in Georgia University, presents "the model of existence of human being," enunciates a proposition we should bind the 3E(economics, ecology, ethics) into one.¹⁾ Maybe he stress that these problems are combined closely. I think the most of problems are related to ethics. So ethics is necessary to solve the crisis of environment. But no ethics is justified without supporting of metaphysics.

I. The Position of Human Being in the Universe

The views about the position of human being in the universe are diverse. For instance, westerners are accustomed to the views that human being is the center of the universe and all things in the universe are ones for human being, accordingly it does not matter that human beings make use of them for fulfillment of human beings' desire. In other words, the nature as the total name of them is only the means to fulfill the desire of human beings. On the contrary, orientals regard nature as the object of accommodation and fear rather than dominance. But both coincide to the views which regard nature as not co-constituent with human being, but the object of human being. The reason why human beings recognized the crisis of environment put emphasis on the epoch making reformation of human consciousness for nature is dependent on this. The views which regard nature as a constituent of this community with human being is being generalized. So to speak, a human being is also a member of nature as well as another members of nature.

1. The Position of Human Being in the Christian Bible

According to Christian Bible, God created men after he had created all the creatures and gave the right to dominate over all things. The reason why men were last created is that God intended to make human beings the highest ones. In other words, previous creations have the meaning of preparation for men. Therefore, men have the right to dominate all created things, and the right is under men's

selves-will. So to speak, all created things except men are the gifts of God for human beings.

Ernst Benz interprets the christian view about men as following. A man and woman are the Image of God, and the universe is also the Image of God. And the creative Image come into view in the universe, the form of spirit existing in the consciousness of God is conceived in the universe. And all sphere of lives of creatures are nothing but the presentation of men.²⁾ That is consistent with this phrase of Bible, "for the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead: so that they are without excuse"(Rom, ch.1. ver. 20)

2. The Philosophical View Point

Above all, philosophical viewpoints are consistent with the discrimination between men and all things except men. According to those views, human beings with reason are different from all other things in value. Such a view is prominent especially in oriental thought harmonious with nature

Aristotle divides the hierarchy of beings into 4 strata, that is, inorganic nature, plant, animal, life(human being), spirit, god, and explains every character according to the main function of all strata of being. So to speak, plants have the souls having the function of nutrition intaking and growing, animals the souls having the function of sensation, sexual reproduction, instinct, and men the souls of spiritual thinking. For Aristotle, God cannot exist out of nature, nor men exist out of nature. However, he allowed the difference from other beings, asserting that immortality of soul exist only in the spiritual part of soul, in men. In addition, he asserted that in men there are mixed some property of animal and spirit, and soul is the realization of physical body. Positing men on the summit of the hierarchy of being, he viewed men as superior to other beings, but he thought men are also combined with another beings.

Hegel regards nature as many storied system, and defines it as the idea of form of other-being(die Idee in der Form des Anderseines).³⁾ For him, since nature is the external-being of spirit, it is a stage of spiritual development. It seems that such a system of nature in Hegel can provide the cornerstone which the constituent members of nature, that is, men and other creatures have not differency but liked order each other.

Today, from the serious crisis of environment, we ask a question

whether we human beings have the qualification to enjoy such a privilege in the system of nature. From early time, the theory of evolution did not recognize the privilege of human beings from nature. According to it, men are only higher evolved beings without difference from any other animals. Modern ecophilosophical discussion approaches the discussion of evolution in fact. Of course, it does mean that it does not agree with the theory of evolution on the ground of generative theory. Can men not be different from other creature on the ground of ontology? On the ground that we need it in order to overcome the crisis of environment, should we give way such a privilege? It is obvious that the world view of domination is the obstacle to overcoming the crisis of environment. Thus we should right examine the position of men in nature.

3. The Viewpoint of Unification Thought

The viewpoint is also based on the Christian Bible. According to Unification Thought, men are also the resemblances of the image of God as a creature such as other all things. But there is a difference from them. It is the difference of existing position. The world of creature is the world made by God and thus it reflects the character of God like some works reflect the character of an author. that is, the world of creature was created resembling the character of God. But men have differences from other beings. In other words, men resembled the character of God in form (*Hyungsang*) and the world of creature resembled it symbolically. The argument that men resembled the character of God means that men resembled it more concretely.

According to the Divine Principle, all the creatures including men are the substantial relative object resembling the character of God, and represent the parts of God respectively as the resemblance of God according to its own character. Such the reference means that men have the difference from other beings. But we need to pay attention to the fact that it does not mean that men can dominate other beings by the difference. And God created the world with love. Therefore, God loves not only men but also other creatures. So men should love other creatures like God

II. The Ground of the Crisis of Ecosystem

1. The Ground of the Crisis of Environment in Philosophy and Religion

According to the traditional view on the position of men in nature,

it is fact that men have taken their place in the center of the nature, and the other beings the position as their relative object. It means that only human beings have the unique reasons, and the various characteristic which only men have, support such a view. For example, only men can use a instrument, and only men can play a game and have character(symbol), seek values, have creativity, and such the properties discriminate human beings from other beings. So we can not deny the view that from the viewpoint, men can enjoy the privilege. The self consciousness of "I" as the subject of recognition of Descartes posited "I" on the place with special privilege, regarding other beings beside "I" as the relative object. And regarding nature as the relative object of us, such the view is to blame for helping for human beings to legitimate the dominance over nature

Lynn White asserts that so-called the historical origin of the crisis of our environment lies on the Judaic-Christian dogma about creation. Speaking in detail, it lies on the faith that men were made as the image of God, and spare in the transcendence over nature and whole order of nature was created for men. We can seek the root of recent crisis of environment in the cooperation of science and technology consolidated in 19th century. Before the crisis of modern science in 16-17th century, western Europe in medieval age advanced its technology prior to other's, and made use of the power of nature for the human purpose without any restriction. In Christianity, we human beings accept the dominance over nature by the discrimination from the beings.

Such a legitimation of dominance over nature was not a burden to us, so long as it is coincide with the interest of men. And the metaphor of servant, or the blessing of "dominance of all beings" in the Bible(the Gospel of Luke, ch.12, and Genesis, ch.1, ver.28) seems to legitimate the dominance of all things. We can interpret, it gave us the privilege as manager, or dominator. But the manager is not the men only with power

2. The Actual Ground of the Crisis of Ecosystem

The desire for the abundance and qualitative elevation of life is based on the use of nature. Accordingly, such a desire is obliged to be led to the destruction of ecosystem. In the early age of civilization, the use of nature by the development of scientific technology was a blessing endowed to men. But the endless desire of men was led to abuse nature, and made the entropy of matter to increase, and thus it resulted in hopelessness of the future of men. The endless desire of

men making men to destroy environment for fulfilling of the desire, threaten the ecosystem. It is obvious fact that when men seek the conflicting goals, the fulfillment of human desire and the conservation of environment, men spin themselves round in the uncertain equilibrium, and as soon as it loses the equilibrium, it is obliged to be led to the destruction of environment and pollution. For the restricted will of development of sustainable growth is not the safety zone to control the desire of men. The development of scientific technology and its application may be a desire of men in some respects. Unless the human desire of the elevation of life is restricted, the crisis of ecosystem by the development of scientific technology and by its application will be continued. The sustainable development as the recent alternative for the crisis of ecosystem is matter of giving much weight in the fulfillment of human desire rather than in the conservation of environment.

IV. Reflections of Existing Environmental Ethics

1. Biocentric Ethics

It asserts that we should consider the intrinsic and inherent values of all beings belonging to environment. If the existing ethics having non-human being as its object lays emphasis on instrumental value, new ethics should consider intrinsic value and inherent worth. Such a view represents the view which stands on the belief that all existing beings have their own intrinsic values and the values are not to be violated by anyone and anything. Schweitzer's "Reverence for life" (*Ehrfurcht vor dem Leben*) gives the important clue to biocentric ethics. Thus it became the base of biocentric ethics. P. Taylor seems to be the representative philosopher of biocentric ethics. He extended the realm of morality to natural world beside men, and lays the cornerstone of ethics on the base of moral relation between men and other living things. His focus of discussion moves from the descriptive argument that some beings have their own good on the base of biocentric perspective to the normative argument that the beings have their own inherent worth. Such a view recognizes the inherent worth of living things, and accepts the attitude of reverence for nature, and it accepts the will to carry out moral responsibility for nature.

Then, where does Taylor find out the actual ground that some beings have their own good? He maintains that, because beings with life are "teleological-center-of-a-life," they have a good. And he lays

the ground on Schweitzer's reverence for life and Aristotelian tradition of natural law. Schweitzer's 'living things as being with intrinsic value' having the will to live, or living things as being directing to some explicit goal or end like in Aristotle, have their own good on the ground of teleological beings. The core of his argument here is that the entity with intrinsic value is worth while considering morally, and all moral agents have duties to respect the entity's good. According to his view, when a thing has its good, it is that has intrinsic value. Desjardins accepting Taylor's view, recognizes that the normative argument, "living things have their own intrinsic value" can be explained and justified by the consideration of "biocentric perspective" of Taylor. But I am not sure that, how we can guarantee the validity of normative argument which it has a intrinsic value from the facts, though we agree with the proposition that all living things have their own good. As Desjardins says, the prospective of biocentrism is only "the system of belief conceptualizing the relation with other living things."⁴⁾

So P. Taylor integrates the biocentric prospective towards nature in Respect for Nature, as followings. Firstly, men are the members of global community of life as well as all other living things. Secondly, all species including men are the parts of interdependent system. Thirdly, all living things seek their own good in the process of their own life. Fourthly, we are understood that men are not superior to other living things.⁵⁾

It seems that this is the belief escaped from anthropocentrism and added the naturecentric view to the base of evolution. Such a belief involves the practice of ethical demand of respect for nature, and the practice is concrete in Taylor. It is shaped into 4 duties. They are the rules of nonmaleficence, noninterference, fidelity, and restitutive justice. Besides it, he presents the formal and procedural rules based on several traditions of liberalistic political philosophy, useful for the solution of the conflict coming out of the relations between human beings and nonhuman beings. These rules are self defense, proportionality, minimum wrong, distributive justice, and restitutive justice. These are not different from the rules between men and other men. In case the human interest is contrary to nonhuman interest, only in the case of the minimum wrong, human interest takes precedence of nonhuman interest.

Desjardis points out several problems in Taylor's biocentric ethics as followings.⁶⁾ Firstly, the rules of noninterference as the normative principle by Taylor. Desjardins asserts that this only presents at best doubtful view for nature. When we accept this, humans are outsiders

and beings different from nature. But humans are clearly the parts of nature as well as other organisms. Secondly, he doubts that Taylor put emphasis on the individual organism. Taylor values much the individual organism, maintaining that the intrinsic value resides in the individual organism and men have not direct duties for ecosystem, nonliving things, or species. From such a view, several questions arise. First question is that his ethics assumes the hostile relation between the individuals. According to such a question, this view does not present a relation of cooperation, but conflicts and hostile relation between individuals. Besides, there is a question of solution for conflict confronted with a process of performing ends. And in order that the restitutive justice displays effect, we should give up the individualism on which his ethics is dependent.

2. Deep Ecology

Deep ecology is more developed theory of environmental ethics. This ethics is interested in the solution of crisis of ecosystem and searches for the resolution by the wholistic and nonanthropocentric approach. The basic viewpoint of deep ecology tries to analyze the profound cause of environmental crisis today and resolve it by philosophical approach. Deep ecologists criticize the environmentalism which tries to substitute the exhausted sources by the development of science and technology and decrease environmental pollution, and think they can solve the environmental problems without changing the system of production and consumption in industrial society.

According to them, the "therapy" for existing crisis can be obtained only through the fundamental change of philosophical perspectives. This change involves human and cultural change. It is "reawakening of something very old,"⁷⁾ and not by new creation. So to speak, we can say that it is trying to awaken the ecological consciousness and the consciousness is wholistic and nonanthropocentric approach purposing the overcoming the ecosystemic crisis.

Especially, Naess and Sessions, the creator of this theory, developed the platforms of deep ecology as the common principle reflecting the diversity of it. By the platforms, they lay emphasis on integrating the characteristic of ecological movement and decreasing the abstraction of philosophy, providing the ground of justification of the movement. While the shallow ecology (against deep ecology) anticipated science and technology, and political consideration, deep ecology is the theory having been conscious of the fundamental human consciousness and behaviour. Ecology as science is expected that contributes

ecophilosophy through complete understanding of it and helps the new evaluation of ethics and its prescription. But here Naess does not think ecology to includes all world views. So he warns that ecology is conscious of such a world view, calls attention that it only contribute to increase our understanding about nature.

Of course, deep ecology set metaphysical questions forth as a premise. For it regards the change of our fundamental world view and our consciousness as necessity. There is included the nature of humans, the relation between human and nonhuman, and the nature of entity in these metaphysical questions. So to speak, deep ecology is related with ethical questions and metaphysical ontology. Deep ecological metaphysics has basically the proposition that individual human is not separated from nature. It accommodate metaphysical wholism in the viewpoint of ontology. Such a metaphysical viewpoint is expected the normative prescription being derived of those. The challenge of environmental crisis demands new metaphysics before new ethics is demanded. In this process of discussion, we meet with the conflict of subjective entity and objective entity and of facts and values.

In epistemology, the objective description about nature is to be measured, tested, proved, but the subjective judgement of nature is arbitrary, partial, and unverifiable. While objective description may be rational, subjective judgement may be irrational and false. We can point out obviously that subjective judgement of value(ought) cannot be derived of objective description of fact(being). But challenging the discrimination between individuals and ecosystem, deep ecologists challenge the description the subjectives and the objectives. and they expect the possibility that the evaluative judgement of nature — for example, the judgement of the value of wilderness and beauty—seems to be justified rationally like in science. But the epistemology of deep ecology involves in the study of way how we continuously stimulate to seek the fundamental change of our world view.

From the fact that deep ecology demands the fundamental change of humans' consciousness, it has two ultimate norms. This is the norm involving in nonanthropocentrism and the wholistic view. One is the norm that men recognize the fact they exist in the relations of interdependence with other beings, and the other is the norm that we should accommodate the fact that we have the equal intrinsic values, comparing with other organisms. That is self-realization, and this is the biocentric equality. Self is the self living with natural world, thus "the self-realization" is the process of self-examination

that men understand themselves to be a part of the bigger whole. And that is the process that men understand there is no ontological separation between human and nonhuman, this Self is the self described in metaphysical whole. The concept of biocentric equality is to recognize the equal value for all animals in ecosystem. The members of ecosystem have the equal right that they have their own individual forms presenting selves in the process of self-realization and all organisms and entities have the equal intrinsic value as the parts of interrelated whole.

But such a biocentric equality is not unique only in them. Already Taylor presented it, stressing reverence for nature. While Taylor's view is based on the individualism, regarding organism as the center of individual life, the view of deep ecology is rooted in metaphysical wholism and regard that organisms have the equal value as the members of community.

Deep ecologists propose that we should promote the simple lives and expect that we prefer to the community nontechnical, nonselfdependent, nonconcentrated, and political effect will be minimized, and material desire will be maintained to be the least. That is "ecotopia" they make a ideal of, that is not domination of nature, it is the community seeking harmony with nature. From the previous discussion, we can see that the ultimate norms of deep ecology are self-realization and biocentric equality. Self-realization is to be said to be a process that men know themselves to be parts of the bigger whole, and the process to recognize that there are no separation between self and others, humans and nonhumans. This stands on the tradition metaphysics. And this is a more advanced view than Taylor's individualistic biocentrism.

And the norm of biocentric equality is a view that all living things live and present themselves in the process of self-realization and have the equal rights approximating individual forms to pursue self-realization. I think deep ecology is more democratic and less hierarchical from such the view.

3. Social Ecology

Differently from deep ecology, social ecology is trying to find out the cause of the destruction of ecosystem in our society itself, instead that they think it is based on the philosophy of domination and the world view of domination. Social ecologists criticize that deep ecology is limited in the resolution of environmental problems because of relating with too general and abstract factors, and trying to approach

the ecosystemic problems from the social problem of regulation and control. Therefore, they believe that human domination and degradation arise out of social patterns of domination and hierarchy, patterns of social life in which some humans exercise control or domination over others. So the direction to the solution is converted from the problems of metaphysics and ethics to the problems related to society and political philosophy.

Bookchin, representative philosopher of social ecology, maintains that "the very notion of the domination of nature by man stems from the very real domination of human by human."⁸⁾ Social ecologists are thoroughgoing to the view that the domination of nature by human is the cause having arised the destruction of environment. The patterns of domination are such social practices and structures as not only private ownership, capitalism, bureaucracies, and even the nation-state, but also racism, sexism, class structures. Such the factors are to be said to arise social hierarchical structures practicing control and power to others. Bookchin presents the instances of hierarchical structures very widely. He analyzes it with a wide and various visual angle, including the political and economic systems, and involving the traditional, cultural, and psychological structures. One may think them to be even in the society of non-class or in the society of non-state. We can point out the domination of the young by the old, of women by men, of one ethnic group by another, of "masses" by bureaucrats, of countryside by town, and in a psychological sense, of body by mind, of spirit by a shallow instrumental rationality.⁹⁾

But social ecology is not simply limited to social philosophy and political philosophy. It is rooted in marxistic socialism, liberalistic anarchism, and diverse philosophical tradition including 'organistic tradition,' one of the tradition of western philosophy. The aspect of natural domination that social ecologists know seems to be afraid that natural environment may be misused and damaged by the society characterized by higher hierarchical structures. They believe that this provides psychological condition and material condition, and even the motive and means for the domination of nature. So human success is identified with the control and domination over nonhumans.

And the organistic tradition of social philosophy lays stress on the organistic relation between individuals and whole. But according to Bookchin's view, the motive power of humans' self activity is possible only when it is free from the control and domination of the outside, and it includes not only the compulsion of body, but social, legal, psychological, intellectual, and emotional compulsion, and thus the

society free from all forms of domination and control is true one. This is the goal of liberalistic anarchism. And philosophical anarchists assert that any authorities of compulsion cannot be justified. So he notes the role of community. According to him, a community is formed to contribute the common goal and common needs, and is free from any forms of domination over human or domination over nature, whatever they may be. Such an anarchistic community "would approximate an ecosystem and would be diversified, balanced, and harmonious."¹⁰ Under this premise, Bookchin believes that the realization of sustainable farming and proper technology are possible. In his view, sustainable farming seems to be not the form of life as the collection of solutions for special agricultural problems, but the form of life that men and creatures around men are free from the dependence on the ruling organization and ruling custom. Under such a circumstance, human beings obtain true freedom and under such a community would be harmonious.

However, Bookchin's argument has some troublesome problems. Firstly, we can ask a question, how does Bookchin establish the firm relation between social domination and the domination of nature? We believe that a causal connection between social domination and the domination of nature cannot cope with the challenge of environmental crisis unless we remove the social hierarchical structure. But the social hierarchical structure is very difficult to be removed. Besides, Bookchin casts human as "stewards" of evolution, as capable of continuously serving and directing natural evolution. But some critics argue that such a view suggests the willingness to privilege human interests over nonhuman interests, to allow humans to seize the helm of evolution and direct nature to human purposes. Bookchin seems to trust in human excessively

V. Conclusion: The Alternative Ethics by Unification Thought

The existing influential philosopher, H. Jonas proposes that since future ethics should involve image of human as well as the fate of human, and contain not only existence of body, but essence of human, the ethics practicing it should be the ethics of reverence beyond mere ethics of wisdom, and so he stress that the establishment of the ethics should approximate the realm of metaphysics.¹¹

For only the ethics on the foundation of metaphysics can be certain

to practice. Furthermore, he said that we can develop ontologically the questions about the relations between being and ought, cause and end, nature and value in order to fix the newly appeared humans' duties on the being beyond value subjectivism, and presented the duties through the concept of responsibility. We could get some references for solution of environmental problems from this view.

Klaus M. Meyer-Abich (professor of Essen Univ.) agree with this view. He stress that if we recover the responsibility of humans in the whole in natural science and in community of nature, the future relation of humans with nature will be better. And the responsibility of humans is more important in community rather than individual. And that is more important in the respect of connecting the solution of environmental problems. So he stress 'being with nature' and calls such human "conatural being." The concept of conatural being means that human has not nature, but exists with nature. In mere ethical view those are progressed one. But such the new attempts of ethics for environmental crisis is rooted in oriental philosophy.

Everyone agrees with the view that the basic ground of environmental crisis is originated from the thinking of anthropocentrism. However, we cannot but meet a crux that gives us conflicts. That is the fact that human is the being pursuing end and the very nature of human cannot but destroy nature in order to fulfill his desire. It is the very crux for us to solve. Unification Thought is regarded as nearer approximating such a problem. It seeks the ontological structure of nature system in the relation between God, human, and other creatures.

According to Hegel, nature is the appearance of absolute spirit. We could say that if we add personality to the absolute spirit, it is God. According to Unification Thought., the world of creature is the one which God of creation developed his invisible divine image as his substantial object. But the world of creature is not mere results of indiscriminate creation of all creatures including men. In the process of creation, God made a discriminancy between men and other creatures. So to speak, men is the formal creature and other creatures are symbolic ones. The formal creature resembles God directly in shape, and symbolic creatures resemble God not directly, but symbolically. I think such a view cannot adopt naturecentrism. Nevertheless, it is not anthropocentrism. In a word, it is Godcentrism. From the relation between God and the world of creature, the position and phase of human is clear. Human and all creatures are all substantial objects resembling the Image of God. They are called the individual truth body in Unification Thought., It

means that spare in the character of God, but is the substance having only his own character. In that sense, human is the formal (in Hyungsang) individual truth body, other creatures are the symbolic individual truth body.¹²⁾ A individual truth body has the element of Sungsang and Hyungsang¹³⁾ resembling God. The former is internal and the latter is external.¹⁴⁾

The internal indicates internal character, the external shape. In this description, we can say that human and other creatures are commonly the resembled bodies of God and everybody has one's own intrinsic and inherent value and worth. In 1972, an English physician, J. Lovelock presented Gaia hypothesis. According to it, the earth is the grand ecosystem (organism) which have the functions of interaction and the process of feedback loops and a living body like men. In spite this is a hypothesis, it is supported by many deep ecologists. But he did not show the concrete ontological structure of universe.

According to Unification Thought., men and other creatures have discriminancy. So to speak, existing position are discriminated. According to Unification Thought., all creatures are created being taken after the sample of proper men, so we can see the shape of original human society through the world of nature. According to Unification Thought., all beings have their own ontological strata. Namely, minerals, plants, animals, humans form the strata orderly, and human has all elements of all things synthetically. So Unification Thought. calls human the phase of synthetic substance, namely, "microcosmos."¹⁵⁾

Accordingly, it is more interesting that those beings practice "give-and-receive action"¹⁶⁾ entering into a relation of subject and object with other beings. The relation of subject and object is relative. And give-and-receive action is the activity giving and receiving with each other. From this relation, we can call all beings connected body. Namely, all beings cannot have the meaning of existence alone. According to Unification Thought., all individual body from a elementary particle to universe form connected bodies. And these connected bodies enter into a relation relatively by a purpose, and it has dual purposes, namely, a purpose for the whole and a purpose for the individual.¹⁷⁾

This is the base of consciousness of community. If human beings adopt this ontological structure in ontological world, the consciousness of community is to be natural, and human beings could maintain the harmonious relation with all things without abandoning anthropocentrism. Such the previous ontological views of U.T. would

contribute to establish a new environmental ethics epochally.

The main stream of the radical solution for the environmental crisis is the assertion that we should change our consciousness from anthropocentrism to naturecentrism. But since this is nothing but stressing the one sided duties of men, that is difficult to be harmonious with the disposition of satisfaction of human intrinsic demands. Accordingly, though a new direction of environmental ethics should be based on anthropocentrism rather than shift from anthropocentrism to naturecentrism, but it should be not domination of nature, but shift of consciousness meeting nature in the position of God. For God originally created all creatures with 'shimjung' (=heart)¹⁸⁾ and the shimjung is based on love, so God face human beings with love. So it means that men face all creatures beside men with love.

Note

- 1) E.P.Odum explains it in detail in the last chapter in *Ecology, and Our Endangered Life-Support System*, Sinauer Associates, Inc., (1993)
- 2) vgl. S.Radhakrishnan and P.T.Razu, eds., *The Concept of Man*, Allen & Unwin Ltd., (London, 1966), p.399
- 3) vgl. G.W.F.Hegel, *Enzyklop die*, p.247
- 4) R.J.Desjardins, *ibid.*
- 5) cf., P.Taylor, *Respect for Nature* (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press 1986), chap.3
- 6) cf., J.R.Desjardins, *ibid.*, pp.160-161
- 7) Bill Devall and George Sessions, *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered* (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 1985), ix
- 8) Murray Bookchin, *The Ecology of Freedom* (Palo Alto: Cheshire Books, 1982), p.1
- 9) cf., M.Bookchin, *ibid.*, p.4
- 10) M.Bookchin, "Ecology and Revolutionary Thought" (1965, published in *Post-Scarcity Anarchism* (Berkeley, CA: Romparts, 1971), p.80
- 11) vgl., H.Jonas, *Das Prinzip Verantwortung*, Suhrkamp Verlag (Frankfurt am Main 1992), p.8
- 12) *The Divine Principle*, HSA-UWC, Sung-Hwa Press (1995, 27)
- 13) According to Unification Thought the term, Sungsang means the attribute of God that constitutes the fundamental cause of the invisible, functional aspects of all existing beings (i.e., their mind,

instinct, life, etc.), and the term, *Hyungsang* means the attribute of God that constitutes the fundamental cause of the material aspect of all existing beings(i.e., their mass, shape, structure, and so on) cf. Unification Thought Institute, *Unification Thought* (N.Y 1981), pp.6~16

14) *The Essential of Unification Thought*, UTI, Sung Hwa Press(1993, pp170~175)

15) cf. *ibid.*, p.172

16) cf. Unification Thought Institute, *ibid.*, pp.29-30. But we need notice that the term, 'take' may as well be changed into the term, 'receive.'

17) cf. *ibid.*, p.185~187

18) The term, *shimjung* contains the meanings of deep intellect, deep emotion, deep love, and will. And *shimjung* means the emotional impulse to seek joy through love. cf. *The Essential of Unification Thought* p.21

References

- 1) *The Divine Principle*, HSA-UWC, Sung-Hwa Press (1988)
- 2) *The Essentials of Unification Thought*, UTI, Sung HWA Press (1993)
- 3) *The Oriental Thought and Environmental Problem*, The Environmental Institute of Korean Buddiest, Mosek Press (1996)
- 4) Desjardins, J.R., *Environmental Ethics*, Wadsworth Publishing Company(CA: 1993)
- 5) Hegel, G.W.F., *Enzyklop die Suhrkamp* (Frankfurt am Main)
- 6) Jonas, H., *Das Prinzip Verantwortung*, Suhrkamp (Frankfurt am Main 1992)
- 7) Devall, B. and Sessions, G., *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered* (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 1985)
- 8) TAYlor, P., *Respect for Nature* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1986)
- 9) Bookchin, M., *The Ecology of Freedom* (Palo Alto: Cheshire Books.1982)

SESSION V

Chairman : Kolin Turfus

Presentation:

- Creative Evolution and Individual Awakening
Hisayoshi Watanabe
- The Integration of the Socialism and Capitalism
Wei Wou
- Information and Computer Sciences Viewed From
the Principles of the Coreation
Hee-sung Chung