

Creative Evolution and Individual Awakening

Dr. Hisayoshi Watanabe
Setunan University / JAPAN

I

In a symposium recently held in Kyoto among Japanese scholars of various fields, a Nobel Prize-winning scientist began his talk by projecting a picture of Charles Darwin on the screen and declaring him to be the greatest man in the history of biological studies. I was at once reminded of Professor Richard Dawkins who did just the same thing at the beginning of his book *The Selfish Gene*. It is all very well for the molecular biologist or any scientists to take the idea of natural selection just hypothetically and try to approach life as far as possible from the materialist point of view. The trouble with the Nobel Prize scientist, and with Dawkins as well, was that he turned out to be quite unable to think of life otherwise than in terms of materialism. There were some critical remarks from other panelists, but he was quite impervious to them.

This is the trouble with a considerable part of the population, especially in Japan where are generally uncritical and unimaginative, accepting materialism as somehow more high-brow and respectable. They have only to be imaginative enough to suspend their habit of thought for a moment to see how dogmatically they are thinking. An American biologist¹ who read a paper in the Washington DC symposium last November criticized the Darwinian paradigm commonly held in the community of molecular biologists as "a metaphysical a priori" of the community. Certainly, for a materialistic biologist to raise the picture of Darwin as the greatest man in history is like a Euclidean geometer raising Euclid's picture as the

greatest man in history. One must remember there are non-Euclidean geometries equally applicable to the same reality.

It all depends on the set of axioms to start with. The problem is not so much the existence of the Darwinian theory as the utter incapability to think in any other way. To give another example from my own experience: I was attending a Unification Thought lecture together with non-academic and supposedly not very religious-minded people. A man interrupted the lecture and said: "Why do you say God's plan and all that when it is evident that all things just came to be so merely by chance?" I think this is about the average response, at least in Japan, to any talk of God or creation. But is it "evident"? Is it not just his interpretation of the world? The trouble is not his opinion but his cocksureness, as was just the case with out Nobel Prize scientist.

Our task first of all, then, should be to help such people think in more flexible ways and, on that basis, to lead them to more important issues. To begin by talking of God or God's plan seems to me not very good as a strategy, because to most people, at least in Japan, such ideas are so far from their everyday thought that they more often than not will show not only contempt but hostility to them. What I propose here is to provide a shock-absorbing zone before presenting the idea of God or supernatural dimension to materialistic-minded people. What such people without a shadow of doubt hold is the notion that the universe must be a machine and nothing else. There is certain a mechanical side to the universe, but that does not mean that it is a machine. This all too evident truth must first of all be brought home to them.

To think of the universe as a machine is to believe it can be completely explained in terms of physics, which implies it should only be reduced to its component parts for us to reach into its secrets. The world of life inside it is, consequently, nothing but an exceptionally complicated part of the machine. And that ultimately implies, whether they admit it or not, that there is no such thing as life, life being mere fancy or a delusion. While few people will like such an idea, many prefer to advocate it and many more follow them uncritically. Whether it is out of spite to religious people, as is apparent with Professor Dawkins, or out of fear of being frowned upon by fellow researches, or of mere sluggishness of mind combined with a fear of being thought 'unscientific,' I do not inquire into, though I am greatly interested in the psychology of motives.

What I propose here to such people is not specially to try to be religious but just to turn the whole thing on its head, that is to say, to

reverse the whole idea and think of the universe as a life. Life would, then, be not some animate element contained in the inanimate universe, but rather the universe itself would be a life with a mechanical side to it. This, I think, is an idea not particularly hard to swallow. For it should be as reasonable to suppose life as given in the first place as it is to suppose inanimate matter as given in the first place to start with. These are opposite starting points equally sound, or equally unsound for that matter, for they are hypotheses anyway — the question of the hold on reality that we first prefer to take.

It is the question, in other words, of hypothetical priority: whether we take immaterial (invisible) life as given first, or take physical matter as given first. When we speak of conceiving of the universe as a life, we do not mean by universe any physical extended space. Still, in a way it can be said that the universe as a life has a machine (physical) side within it, and although it is not like a container, it is qualitatively, not quantitatively, larger than the physical world, just as Heidegger's term "In-der-Welt-sein" (being-in-the-world) is used to describe man's mode of being in the world, not at all meaning anything like a ball within a box.

Accordingly, once we accept that hypothesis, if you object to it and say "How can anything be life without a heart or a brain or DNA?" you are simply speaking nonsense, refuting yourself. The hypothesis that I propose may be formulated by saying "In the beginning there was life," where "in the beginning" indicates a more than temporal priority, meaning "at the deeper level of reality." This hypothetical picture of the universe will not a little recast that life had been present from the very beginning, but only as a potentiality, until the first and minimal physical conditions necessary for it to be actualized were somehow satisfied. Therefore, physical matter is only a necessary condition for living things, and not the sufficient condition as the materialist supposes.

Since this idea of the universe does not deny the material (mechanical) side of the universe, it does not at all forbid the study of life or evolution from the Darwinian or any other mechanistic point of view, but it does forbid placing Darwinism at the very center of life.

II

Those who believe in divine creation would not need any theory to prove it or to disprove the Darwinian theory of evolution. But it

seems to me that in reasoning as if to refute the Darwinian materialist, we find strong arguments to persuade our own selves into a firmer conviction of God's existence. We often hear that Darwinism still survives, not because it is a cogent argument itself but because there is no alternative to it. I should say that there would be no alternative indeed so long as we do not offer an alternative view of life. Creation is certainly an alternative concept to mechanical evolution, but what in the world is creation? That is just what Darwinians cannot bring themselves to swallow.

It is quite easy to laugh at the shallowness or meagerness of Darwinism, to point to the ideological, emotional drive behind its pretence of science, to the general pugnacity of its proponents, to its unconscious philosophy of hate. These are all traits shared with Marxism, as the late Dr. Sang Hun Lee stressed,²⁾ and just as Marxism is no longer the sanctuary-like region that it used to be, so Darwinism should no longer be a stronghold of ideology in spite of the authority of Watson and Crick, the founders of the present-day molecular biology. What is creation, then? Nothing is so unthinkable and laughable to Darwinists, because it entails the idea of a Creator and that cannot but be their (materialists') idea of a Creator. Now it should be noted that there are many philosophers and no mechanical process. One among them, the philosopher Karl Popper, who is also a mathematician and physicist, says:

Whether or not we look at the universe as a physical machine, we should face the fact that it has produced life and creative men; and it is open to their creative thoughts, and has been physically changed by them. We must not close our eyes to this fact or permit our appreciation of the successes brought by reductionist programmes to blind us to the fact that the universe that harbours life is creative in the best sense: creative in the sense in which the great poets, the great artists, the great musicians have been creative, as well as the great mathematicians, the great scientists, and the great inventors.³⁾

Also the British physicist David Bohm writes:

How, then are we to consider the evolution of life as this is generally formulated in biology? First, it has to be pointed out that the very word 'evolution' (whose literal meaning is 'unrolling') is too mechanistic in its connotation to serve properly in this context. Rather... we should say that various successive living forms unfold creatively. Later members are not completely derivable from what came earlier,

through a process in which effect arises out of cause.⁴⁾

The expression "various successive living forms unfold creatively" is remarkable, suggesting unfolding of a flower, a fit metaphor for the actualization of potentialities. Actually a similar phrase "unfolding like a flower" is used by the physicist Paul Davies in his excellent book *The Cosmic blueprint*.⁵⁾

Now, my proposal is to think of life as given first, just as the materialist thinks of matter as given first. That is to say, life is prior to matter, contrary to the belief that matter is prior to life. And by the term 'prior' I mean not only temporal priority but something a-temporal existing at the deeper levels of reality, prior to our knowledge, as it were. (I may be saying the same thing as David Bohm when he speaks of the "implicate order," but I set it aside.) What is to be emphasized is that there is no a priori priority of the physical matter over life. The fact that life appeared on the earth after some period of inanimate turmoil should not delude us, for we are just looking at the physical level of reality.

Coming back to Karl Popper, it is significant to note his expression "it [the universe] has produced life." What does the mean by "produced"? I would not like him to mean 'manufactured from raw materials'; I would prefer the word to mean as in the phrase 'produce a watch from his pocket.' This may seem fussing over a trivial matter, but what is meant by "produced" makes all the difference. For it seems to me all the difficulties over the origin of life arise from the assumption that life cannot but have been 'manufactured from raw (inorganic) materials' at a certain point of cosmic history. We can without overstretching of imagination assume life as given first and foremost as the basis of reality, and then at a certain life forms that gained a degree of viability however primitive.

This hypothesis (or paradigm) makes some mysteries of evolution less mysterious. First, it confirms that each life form or organ must emerge in its perfected form. Otherwise, cosmic life could not find a footing on which to actualize itself. That is to say, there can be no 'intermediates'-no twenty-percent amoeba, no seventy-percent fruit fly, no ten-percent eye. Second, as there is no living thing that has to purpose to effect, there must be some purpose attributable to the cosmic life as well, and that can be nothing but cosmic evolution. This universe as a whole is, on its deeper level, a drive or a force with some purpose to achieve. This hypothesis will also make the not at all falsified idea of 'vitalism' finally ineffectual, because it is an idea of something like life-ingredients added to the world of physical

mechanism, which our hypothesis completely overturns.

So we are now reduced to assuming the existence of a latent reality called life (or cosmic life) which is itself a design or blueprint that has a drive to actualize itself. If this much should be rejected as mysticism and therefore nonsense, there should be no science at all. The universe cannot 'produce' any half-made plant or half-made animal out of its pocket, contrary to Darwinian supposition. Creation must go on behind the scenes unseen by us. What, then, is that mechanism of creation or actualization?

Here the *sungsang-hyungsang* theory of Unification Thought offers us a help. It is a theory of interaction or dialectic between those two things with a shared purpose to create something—a drive to actualize itself to see its own self in a visible form. Anyone who has the experience, however scant, of composing poems or painting pictures can understand this because it is true to his own psychological-dynamic processes. The *sungsang* and *hyungsang* are something akin to the Aristotelian form and matter; but they are more powerful as postulates because they explain more of the reality of the universe.

Materialists will spurn such postulates as metaphysical, but who can see the process of Goethe's composition of a poem, even if one is watching him all the time? It all goes on within his mind. He may or may not jot down some disjointed words or phrases, but they are not intended to live anyway. Goethe must first conceive an idea of a poem (*sungsang*); then he has to lovingly struggle with the more or less intractable language called German (*hyungsang*), until some point of reconciliation (product) is reached which he himself could not exactly predict beforehand, because a new physical reality is there before him, given life, independent of him. Such is the process of literary composition, but who can see of it except the thing detached from the author as viable on its own?

Now, what is to be emphasized is that this is not a mere metaphor for the real world; it must be that this is what actually happens on the unseen level of reality. There can be no other possible explanation. Also, the parent-child relationship of creator and created emphasized in Unification Thought must be more than a metaphor.

Scientifically stated, the universe is a self-realizing, purposive system, oriented toward a state of greater wakefulness. What is usually understood as evolution—the universe's propensity to produce more and more elaborate, complicated, 'higher' living things — is just the visible side of it that makes possible this greater wakefulness. When we make a comparison between life forms and say one is lower and

another is higher, what do we really mean? We mean the degree of wakefulness, that is, how far the thing reflects and represents the whole universe internally. (This internal reflecting and representing is Leibniz's idea of 'monad,' which is referred to in Unification Thought, too.) To put it simply it is the size of mind. For instance, dinosaurs were physically far bigger than humans, but they had smaller minds, so we call them lower animals. Thus the universe, by producing mammals and lastly humans, has reached the state of greater wakefulness than in the age of all reptiles.

III

If the universe is evolving from the state of dormancy toward a state of wider wakefulness, it follows that it has a definite direction. Then it is unthinkable that it has suddenly lost that direction now that humans have emerged, nor is it reasonable to say it has no direction at this time of ours, as some nihilistic thinkers have been willing to say. Then, are we being superseded by another higher species? We can say "No," because we are the first creative species to appear in the evolutionary history. It is through us that the universe must reach a state of higher wakefulness. We are given the initiative in shaping our world; we are created to be creative. At the same time, it follows from our hypothesis that we are not quite free to make it as we like, because we are entrusted to do so, not wholly made master of it. Besides, when we say we are entrusted to create this world, we ourselves are included in it; we have to create our own selves. This is the ground of our morality and ethics.

Our hypothesis leads us naturally to admit the existence of ethics, to admit its natural and initial existence, which is to substantiate the theory that our conscience is something implanted in us when we were created, contrary to Freudian or Darwinian assumptions. What is conscience? Conscience could be termed 'cosmic-purpose-awareness'. What is ethics? Ethics might be called 'cosmic-direction-indicator'. Such definitions of conscience and ethics will enable capturing in one scheme all our activities, mental and actual, individual and collective-as motivated by a common awareness of purpose. Thus it becomes possible to integrate not only science, religion, and ethics, but also are, education, treatment of diseases, environmental, genetic and other technologies, and social, political and economical activities. None would deny that these should be activities directed toward one

aim.

Our paradigm of the universe as initially a life gives it a direction, and that direction is apparently toward greater wakefulness, toward realizing a more wide-awake, more enlightened, more lightening mind. Then what does it mean to be more wide-awake? Is it to grow more intelligent, more clever? That may be necessary but not sufficient. It seems to me the best definition of it is to grow less self-centered.

The cosmic growth could best be defined as the process of growing less self-centered. Comparing reptiles with human beings, I said they had smaller minds. A mind is small because it is self-centered. A mind that cannot get outside itself can have neither art nor science, much less religion. The growth of human mind could also be defined as a movement away from self-centeredness, this time with the implication of selfishness. Now it may be worth noting that Buddhism mentions six kinds of bonno(mental impediments or bonds) that impede man's reaching Enlightenment : greed, anger, fatuity, haughtiness, doubt, and prejudice. Notice that all these have one common denominator, and that is self-centeredness. Also notice that to be rid of these impediments is not only a religious teaching but points to the direction of human and evolutionary growth.

I think it will be agreed that religion, education, art, and treatment (especially mental treatment) have one aim in common: to lift people out of narrowness, murkiness, pettiness, lowliness of their minds. Civilization means outgrowing the self-centered stages of the human mind, not simply getting clever. Our intelligence cannot have much significance unless it implies escaping from self-confinement. We have the word 'wisdom' for such intelligence, and wisdom is another name for moral confidence.

Conclude : we have argued as if to refute Darwinian "scientific" materialists using purely scientific reasoning, and therefore without using such concepts as God or God's plan. We have found that, by proposing another hypothesis that should just as reasonably be accepted, we cannot but accept what religious people call God and God's plan. Some people may object that is a hypothesis and not truth. I admit it, but then all that we know as true are hypotheses. The question is how far one hypothesis can cover and coherently explain the whole reality as we live it, how comprehensive and powerful it is. Our hypothesis (or paradigm we may call it) is by far the better, by that or any standard. Where else can the concept of 'natural selection' find better occasion to be used?

Our morals and ethics, how we are to live, what we are to live to realize, both as individuals and as collective bodies, are not only an

integral part of our knowledge of this world; far from being unamendable to scientific knowledge, they constitute the core of it, being objectively demonstrable from our unbiased observation of the reality as it is given to us.

Notes

- 1) Jonathan Wells, "Reinterpreting the History of Life from a Design Perspective".
- 2) *From Evolution Theory to a New Creation Theory*(Unification Thought Institute, Kogensha, 1997), p.8, p.37, p.47, p.52
- 3) Karl R. Popper, *The Open Universe: An Argument for Indeterminism*(Routledge, 1995), p.174.
- 4) David Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*(Arkdkj Paperbacks 1994), p.212.
- 5) Paul Davies, *The Cosmic Blueprint*(Simon & Schuster, 1989), p. 200.

The Integration of the Socialism and Capitalism

Dr. Wei Wou

National Sun Yat-Sen University / TAIWAN

I. Integration of the Socialism and Capitalism in Taiwan

The basic philosophy of the orient world is the harmony between the Yin and Yang or the integration between the Heaven and Human nature. This is quite different with the West-Nothing to do with the book of change, i.e.I-ching. If we study the history of economic thought of the Europe, it is clear that Capitalist economic system is mainly based on the political economic philosophy of the Adam Smith (1723-1790), particularly on his *An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776). But before that, his book on the *Theory of the Moral Sentiment* (1759) was the fundamental assumptions. On the same token, Friedric Angles (1820-1895), the assumption of his publication in 1845 on English worker during his age was the basic background of Karl Marx (1818-1883) work on *Das Capital* (1876). The Capitalism and Socialism thereby divided. Instead of that, the oriental is somewhat different, i.e. there is no such distinctions.

In fact, it contains capitalism and socialism into a philosophical package, being more pragmatic way in applying whether capitalism or socialism in process of their economic development. It would depend on individual internal and external objective or subjective economic environment, then pick it up the best economic system or economic policy would appropriate for their economic Modernization. Herewith I would like to bring the Taiwan's integration of the socialism and capitalism during the period of 1949-1998 as example. The 50 years experience of the Market economy with the Chinese