

DISCUSSION ON COMMITTEE II

Prof. Choong Suh, Park, M.D., Ph.D.
YeungNam University Medical School
Neurology Department

Nov. 25, 1986

DISCUSSION ON COMMITTEE II

Prof. Badham concludes appropriate use of tissue and adequately regulated embryonic research directed only to ends that enhance human welfare and fulfillment must be allowed.

Prof. Kuhse and Singer concludes severely handicapped new born or infants must be sacrificed for the next child.

Prof. Davies states abortion is legalized but capital punishment is abolished in Europe but they are still controversial in the US.

Moralist thinks of justice while causalist thinks of today's welfare. In America traditional religio-regional moral thinking is stronger than in Europe.

Prof. Smith urges changes of law to accept death as natural end of earthly life, not to prolong it artificially to worsen the sufferings.

Prof. Kittree concludes whole arena of wanted life must be reassessed as it was for unwanted life. Social, moral, and jurisprudential manipulations and changes of living are necessary, to avoid social tension, compromise and create restructure of social institution and individual life.

Prof. Milinski stresses ethical use of gene manipulation high technology.

Prof. Dugherty says that American legal theory of person is not settled. It is a debate between utilitarian and right theorist, socialism and individualism.

Prof. Dungen states war against evil is justified whether it is domestic or foreign.

Summarizing all the speakers' conclusions, it became apparent that basic flow of thoughts is ethical assessment and decision of all matters including abortion, IVF, capital punish, dying right, high tech for wanted life and gene manipulation.

The ethics is for wholesome welfare and fulfillment of human being and the human being is defined as a person who is able to become an object of legislation.

Value of human being is decided by the God's value and the God's providence is prosperity of mankind. To achieve the God's will we must find out what is Good and what is Evil. Prof. Sivarska's claim of returning to Buddhism is one way.

My opinion is that man has 2 aspects of brain function, one animal function for survival and procreation which is essential for human life and controlled by old brain, the other is new brain which controls the old brain suppressively according to the God's will. Of course there are a great individual variation of percentage of the old and new brain volumes and functions. The ideal one is the saint's brain and the worst must be murderer's one. When this controlling is idealistic, then the result is Good and the opposite is Evil. Therefore what we must do is to eradicate the Evil and to promote the function of Good, that is, evolution of the new brain.

Prof. BADHAM : Christian belief and the ethics of IVF and abortion

He starts with appreciation of value of in vivo fertilization and abortion. However absolute moral value in Christianity opposes. Abortion, once allowed and supported but recently this is opposed. It says " life developing in the womb is created by God in our image and is therefore to be nurtured, supported and protected". Historically Christianity for centuries denounced surgery, anesthesia and anatomical research, which nowadays seems ridiculous. Therefore our cry and opposition against IVF and abortion today will in the future also become futile and gradually fade.

But there is one key argument, which is different from earlier medical innovations. That is "Fetus is a person from the moment of conception". To support this view there must be concrete validity. This validity should be based on Christian Scriptures, the tradition of the church through ages and the working faith.

However, the Bible says human being only when breath enters the nostril and it denies fetus as a human. Further Bible does not discuss abortion. Christian tradition stands against abortion but only for later fetus. Before Pius IX tradition did not support significantly sanctity of fetus. Roman catholic after Pius IX claim that human being starts from the time of conception, but from medical stand point it is difficult to handle fetus and mother with equal value.

Therefore the sound basis of Christian claim is "Life itself is God's providence from the moment of conception to the time of death and challenges and adversities also are God's will". Then, Prof. Badham says the heaven must be populated largely by unformed zygotes and so Christian reason can not acquiesce in so bizarre a conjunction of doctrine. But Christian can not abandon central tenets which is essential to clement theodicy and it has reason that humanity is made in the image of God.

However this reasoning^{is} not valid because human should have moral responsibility, spiritual awareness and aesthetic sensibility, which can be acquired through the individual's growth. Such quality is not present in fetus, new born or in embryo. Accordingly Christian faith also is extremely hard to justify a dogmatic stance on issue of IVF and abortion.

He concludes appropriate use of tissue and adequately regulated embryonic research directed only to ends that enhance human welfare and fulfillment must be allowed. As to abortion, although it is not good in itself, one has to choose 1 among 2 evils sometimes and in such case it should be done at the earliest possible moment.

I totally agree with Prof. Badham's statement and conclusion.

Prof. KUHSE and SINGER

ETHICAL QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE BIRTH OF HANDICAPPED INFANTS.

Prof. Kuhse and Singer starts with sanctity of life and equal value of all lives whatever it's nature might be. They raise questions of 1stly whether this is correct or not and 2ndly if this is correct does it have sound ethical basis?

Quoting baby Doe's example the fight for a principle of US that every life is individually an equally sacred is described. It is stated that futile treatment only to prolong death should be abandoned. But improved medical treatment can prolong vegetative life almost infinitely. Then what is difference between a diabetic prolonging his life with infinite insulin therapy and the vegetative life. Therefore this is not a medical judgement but ethical one. Catholic says there is ordinary therapy and extraordinary therapy, and the latter should be abandoned. However who decides this and on what basis? Catholic theologian L. Wever regrets decision making on the basis of quality of life considerations but at least he also has in doing quality of life thinking. Jesuit G. Kelly talks of extraordinarily treatment and benefit on excessive expense of the treatment, but who can decide this and on what basis? So this is also an error. Excessive burden and disproportionate treatment can be decided by the patient's medical condition. Therefore we should not reject sanctity of life view.

Human being is different from other animals or plants because humans are rational, autonomous, purposeful moral beings with hopes, ambitions, life purposes, ideals and so on. Hence the difference is based on difference in ability. This applies to handicapped newborn also. Moreover, newborn is not a person. Newborns have no such ability from the beginning but normal newborn has potential while the abnormal has not. Abnormal infant however should also be treated because of its potential though it is less than normal. But what about the infant's pain accompanying the treatment.

Infant has no mental continuity with the future child and no pain is more benefit at the moment than future expected benefit. If no therapy for crippled infant should be condemned, so should be for nonconception and abortion. There is no difference between death of newborn and death of fetus. So that the best interest of the infant is only one aspect. The interest of the parents, siblings and next child should also be considered. The severely handicapped newborn or fetus should be sacrificed for the next child. And the decision should be made by the parents. The positive (killing) and negative (letting die) therapy is morally equivalent in view of often negative therapy is more distressing than the positive one.

In my opinion, in Europe individualism has been important and sanctity of individual life is utmost value. In the Orient, however, family stands before an individual, so the value of an individual is for the family and further for the society and nation. Human being

is born as social being. If he lives totally alone, he may be not social. But in such case, there is no need of discussing abortion, handicapped infants or their treatment etc, nor need of such conferences at all. As long as man is social being, life should also be considered from this aspect. This does not necessarily refuses individualism. Rather compromise between individualism and socialism. Therefore, decision of life or death for every individual, sound or ill, should be made 1st by the individual oneself. Secondly if the individual has no ability, then one's parents, siblings or relatives in this order. Thirdly if none of these available, then the society or nation should do it.

Prof. Davies

HOW PEOPLE ARGUE ABOUT ABORTION AND CAPITAL PUNISHMENT
IN EUROPE AND AMERICA AND WHY

Prof. Davies 1st speaks of liberalization of abortion laws in Europe and US. Moralists oppose it for justice while causalists see it for today's welfare.

Against moralists' opposition, however, the law is made by causalists to prevent backstreet abortion. But Catholic Mahon says injustice is the same whether it is done in backstreet or in front street. The conservative Maude, a causalist, insists, however, the result of doing it and circumstances in which it is done is much more important. Even moralists allow abortion for cases of rape, reserving abortion for virtuous cases.

But here again some claim innocence of fetus. Thus moralists are divided in 2 parts, which became irrelevant because the law is made by causalists and recently liberal law is increasing in European countries more than in US.

Capital punishment is favored by moralists and ~~causalists~~ thought of fear of death deters another murder. Abolitionists, however, see it as follows: 1. wrong in principle, 2. harmful effect in society, 3. morbid and inflammatory effect on attitude and imagings of the ordinary citizen, 4. ineffective or even incentive to another murder (causalists), 5. often erroneous execution can occur.

But in fact horror of execution is the real reason of abolitionists. The horror was unbearable to noble English people. War criminals, however, were executed by death after 2nd WW. Nevertheless in England idealism gave way to empiricism (the full triumph of causalists' ethic).

The 1957 Act imposed death penalty for certain categories of murder.

β-J Moreover abolitionists exploited the gap between capital murder and noncapital one. There is no difference in killing whether with a knife or a revolver. It is a nuisance to say the knife is with noncapital and revolver is with capital.

Evolution of view of capital punishment in the British Parliament is illustrated in the diagram in page 33 of Prof. Davies's paper.

It shows retentionist opinion shifted to that of causalists.

American law is more moral than the British one. American Supreme Court's decision is based on women's right of privacy. It is done on the basis of pragmatic causalism, that is, the fetus had not been regarded as a person. Also discretionary capital laws had replaced mandatory ones in state after state in America. Death penalty is imposed wantonly and freakishly and discriminatory also. Lengthy extended discussions, introduced by Prof. Davies, among peoples mainly congressmen, judges, philosophers etc., whether moralist or causalist, are still unsettled in the US. Difference between Western Europe and US is that Christianity has more grass root and political strength in America than in Europe. (< 120 >)

At present in Western Europe capital punishment is abolished and abortion legalised. In the US capital punishment is still a controversial issue and so is abortion.

The reason lies in greater strength of traditional religion based on morality in America (see).

The shift away from the traditional moralism of guilt and innocence towards causalists' ethic of minimizing harm. Social problem can not be determined or administered on the basis of personal guilt or innocence.

The key question is not who is to blame but who is to pay when things go wrong. In causalist society strongest moral imperative is the avoidance of harm or sufferings at almost any cost.

In my opinion, from causalist point of view, as to capital punishment, it has deterring effect on murderers. When there is no such punishment one can commit most hideous crime, because after imprisoned he still has hope to be relieved depending on his and social circumstances.

Concerning sufferings of the murderer, what about tortures in prison. We should not neglect this. This kind of tortures are much greater than capital punishment. Judging mistakes can be minimized by many ways. It is not a problem. Unwillingness of judges to give death penalty depends on individual judge's character. This also is not a problem. Mandatory or discriminatory should be defined in the law and the decision is made by judges. The judge can not be saint and 100% perfect. But there are obvious cases from all aspects which deserve death penalty.

As to abortion I totally agree with Prof. Davies's view.

The fundamental problem is what is human life and what it is for?

Human life is for human itself in which the God dwells.

The fetus of 1st trimester, congenital irreversible hopeless vegetative existence or crippled without consciousness and horrible murderer can not be considered human beings. And the society of human being is for the human being but not for these exceptions.

3 British argument

Moralist -- The murderer is guilty of taking life and its life is forfeit. The fetus is innocent and thus sacred.

Causalist -- The murderer and its family and relatives suffer from capital punish but the fetus is not.

Catholic Mahon and Mrs. Knight -- Both wrong.

US. More moral. (American constitution is moralist document)

Causalist legislature faced moralist's opposition and legislators became hesitant to be certain on standing one side alone due to fear of losing moralists' electorate resulting in ambiguous procrastination.

Once legalized it has power to freeze the society at times but it is institutional force, not necessarily reprehensible. Politician and judges can not be philosopher-kings. They choose one which is most practical between various arguments, none of which claims less worth than the others.

The Supreme court protected a mother's privacy and her liberty by moralist assertion. However mother's right is not absolute one but limited one to be balanced against competing interests. Causalist asserts not to neglect detriment of prohibiting abortion. Like British Parliament, by pragmatic causalism, fetus is not regarded as a person.

As to capital punish discretionary capital law was discussed. Justice White said it has no meaningful basis for distinguishing capital from noncapital. Justice Douglas said death penalty applied is not merely freakish but is done in discriminatory way.

Mandatory poushment can have mistakes. Therefore discretion should be suitably directed and limited so as to minimize the risk of wholly arbitrary and capricious action.

The Supreme court did not abolish capital punishment and execution. It started again in 1977 but with the cost of extreme difficulty. As deterrent of crime its effect is complex factual issue. In the long run, effect of capital punishment will be frustrated.

Prof. N. Smith

THE RIGHT TO DIE

Prof. Smith starts with the question of "Do we have a right to die?" He states Euthanasia can be divided into active and passive, voluntary and involuntary. In England, though mitigated, suicide is still considered as a legal crime.

Individual right claims whatever we can do if we want to. Counter-vailing reasons can be the religious, the moral and the practical. But not all the people are religious and the right not to be killed means the right to choose to die except in case of social and national interest outweigh the individual's. Therefore, it is just to allow the individual his right to die except in public affairs.

However, changing law has insuperable difficulties both medically and legally. Medically physicians secretly practice euthanasia.

Lawyers are afraid of mistakes and abuses of relaxed laws and moral unacceptability.

But safeguarding law on the ground of empirical fact instead of moral fact will abolish the shortages including pseudovoluntary suicide.

Omitting (passive) and committing (active) euthanasia are at last the same, if one thinks of suffering of the former is not better than that of the latter.

Prof. Smith urges changes of law, learning to accept death as natural end to earthly life, not to prolong it artificially only to worsen the sufferings.

In my opinion, hopeless patient should die as soon as possible for himself, his family, his society, his country and for the God.

Of course the decision of hopeless should be made by medical authorities who must act upon with all his conscience.

Prof. Kittrie

HIGH TECH AND THE WANTED LIFE

Prof. Kittrie introduces his statement with determination of value. The new biological sciences which extend, secure or even initiate human life are subject of assessing moral, legal and public policy implications.

He expatiates the term "value" that it has broad meanings and implications. It can be viewed from economic, social, political, moral or religious points, which may often be contradictory each other.

Equally important is awareness of perspective value; to whom?

An assessor of human life need not be aware only of the various possible points of view and perspective but must also be ready to admit and reconcile the biases and conflicts inherent in this diversisty.

The judgemental relativism regarding the value of human life, produced by the different view points and perspectives, is further heightened by the past and ongoing debate on the commencement and termination of human life. He classifies thinkers into 2 categories; one is Prolifer who thinks life is a diverse gift endowed with divine qualities and needs to be preserved at any cost. The other is Pro-Quality-Lifer who thinks of good life. His proposed inventory for wanted life; wish to live, to lengthen life and to create life. This concerns with heroic medicine, organ transplantation, artificial insemination, and surrogate parenting. They all revolve firstly questions of cost, availability, distribution of the high tech procedures and services and 2ndly poses a host of new moral and legal concerns. For the past 3 decades the major debates in the human life arena concentrated on issues of unwanted life, which is not totally settled. But leaving this behind he proposes discussion of wanted life. 1st continuation of existing life and 2nd creation of new life. Unlike Proquality-life for unwanted life, wanted life is based on Pro-life principles, and yet moral, legal and policy issues are the same. For those wishing to live there arise the following questions 1, Is there now or should there be a public duty to help with the implication of high tech medical services for those who seek public assistance in the continuation or extension of life? 2, How should the public responsibility be discharged through governmental or voluntary agencies? 3, How much of a priority should such pro-life procedure be accorded in the outlay of public finance, compared with expenses for such other needy categories as unemployed, the blind, the disabled etc? 4, How should the potential beneficiaries be ranked? by what criteria? 5, Who should be making these critical life important decisions? He further raises questions about transplantations of various organs. When does a person cease to be oneself and becomes another? What about family relationships in such instances, and inheritance, and succession?

For those willing to procreate they raised growing number of moral and legal issues.

In conclusion, he states a human value can not be measured by market price of his component parts, for there is no accounting for the spiritual, intellectual, emotional and social value of any given human being.

One may fear debasement of man with the growth of biomedical technology and one's environment: family, tribe and town, in which human life was manifested, have been losing their vitality.

The whole arena of wanted life must therefore be reassessed, as it was for unwanted life. Social, moral, and jurisprudential manipulations and changes of living are necessary to avoid social tension, and to compromise and create restructure of social institution and individual life.

In my opinion, the basic value of all value from diverse view points, is the God's value. How you define the God is another problem.

Once such standpoint is established, the seemingly complicated issue can be solved easily. Wishing to live and willing to procreate can arouse many problems but such problems can also be solved easily when we stand firmly with mind of the God, who controls the universe including mankind equally and evenly.

We make societies and our problems are therefore social problems, which should be solved according to social value. And the social value is a part of the God's value.

Brain is the master of an individual and brain can not be transplanted in near future centuries.

Prof. Milinski

MORAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE MANIPULATION OF THE GENETIC NATURE OF MAN

Prof. Milinski says man has to break through anthropocentricity of his understanding of life and world and he has to conceive himself again as a part of nature. He must adhere in its creative work to the given natural order. He has to ethically master his power over creation. Moreover one has to consider longterm farreaching side effect together with immediate benefits of modern technology.

Jonas conclusion is 1, skill and tech should not replace accident, which is responsible for evolution of nature. 2, Man can prevent, soothe, and cure human condition for improvement but must not try to become a creator. 3, medicine should renounce the use of genetical repair possibilities.

Erecting taboos around certain realm of nature goes conviction that we do not have wisdom, value judgement or self discipline to handle them in a responsible way.

Then should we leave the evolutionary activity which from a superficial point of view is an evolutionary, genetical accident to itself and not influence it according to our understanding?

Relationship between man and nature should be appropriate, which must serve the free and purposeful development of man. Human nature is only sacred in so far as it is contingent to the equal, unprevented and useful development of all living and future human beings.

We should not leave nature as it is but we should shape it in such a way that it serves the development of human culture.

One can only support new tech if they benefit everybody concerned equally instead of being an obstacle.

With such an approach the basic, ethical question is solved which always begins with the effects of man's actions on the equal, free development of all people concerned.

Eugenic evolution is only ethically justified if it adheres to ethical criteria. Thus the transmission of hereditary diseases can not be ethically desirable.

In order to determine the possibilities of man to shape his genetic evolution, one distinguishes between three kinds of human genetically important activities of man for which he is individually and socially responsible; 1. Manipulation of nature which are not directed at any particular genetic purpose, which can however have grave side or long-term effects of genetic nature. 2. Manipulation of nature which have genetical objectives trying to influence the genes structure symptomatically. 3. Manipulation of nature which have direct genetical objectives, and try to influence the genetic structure causally.

For the first, genetically far reaching consequences are tremendous, more than our directly gene oriented activities. For the 2nd we try to prevent propagation of biologically dysgenetic consequences and to promote propagation of biologically eugenic consequences, which arouse the following questions; How far is it reconcilable with human rights on the one hand to prevent the attempt of propagation with

dysgenic consequences and on the other hand to assist the attempt of propagation of biologically probable eugenic effects?

Applied human genetics tries to lessen or exclude the dysgenic consequences of a directly gene oriented behaviour by recognizing its dysgenic consequences and limiting or rather preventing all activities that might have dysgenic effects.

After lengthy discussions Prof. Milikans says formal right of self determination of propagation is conditionally limited under certain circumstances for medicoeugenic reasons.

As to genetic counselling he says the counsellor has the right and obligation to inform about the risk and dysgenic propagation, yet because of their genetic understanding they have no right to make ethical judgement as to the decision the person seek in counselling.

He states that breeding became much simpler and more effective.

Breeding and cloning should not be done for the breeder's own interest. He fears direct manipulation artifacts of gene structure.

As to genom analysis he questions of its application, fearing its long term negative effects and misuse of its immense knowledge.

It can only be applied for protection of life. But it should only be voluntarily and the result of genomanalysis should not lead to the discrimination of the analysed persons.

He states for cloning that it violates the subject role of man. To be mere copy of being that has been realized must strife the sense of authenticity, the freedom of knowing self, of discovering oneself and ones potential.

Genetic treatment of body cells can have 2 effects; the patient is reborn or condemned to a tragical existence.

Because of 3 reasons he rejects germ flow. 1. One can not predict to what extent such interference changes the personality and causes irreparable damage. 2. Danger of measures for breeding human beings. 3. Gene therapy experiments requires human embryo. Protection of life has priority over health reasons, hence these experiments have to be rejected.

He stresses ethical use of the tech but he admits such prerequisite is rather hypothetical practically.

Finally he rejects breeding of superman, because this interferes subject role of the breded.

My opinion is that any tech per se, e.g., atomic energy, has two aspects, good and bad, which depends wholly on man's decision. When the dealers mind is good then the tech becomes good and vice versa. As a principle we should not develop tech unless our mind is good as we must not give a revolver to a child. But this does not mean that revolver itself should not be made totally. Technology must be improved only for ethical purpose. In this sense I suggest to stop arm competetion and develop scientific research about the universe and way of free travel in it.

Prof. J.P. Dougherty

THE CONCEPT OF PERSON IN AMERICAN LEGAL THEORY

Prof. Dougherty stated the concept of person has changed since 20th century from philosophical and theological to ontological and psychological one. He said 5 distinct usages of the term "person" can be identified in American legal theory.

The first is Justice, the focus of right and duties. The 2nd is Property law and the 3rd is Cooperation. The 4th is slavery and the 5th is Abortion.

It is justice that person is self determining, not confined to material order, having personal autonomy, privacy and integrity. Person never becomes a mere means of community, having certain right independent of community. Thus community and individual help, support and compensate each other.

Property is extension of self-personality.

Rooting in canon law, groups of persons and associations are called cooperation.

Human is superior to government, which makes law. As judge Burke stated person has inalienable right superior to the state.

Therefore slavery is evil and abortion is a crime. Mill claims that liberty consists in every person being left to pursue his own good in his own way. Chisholm like Boethius asserts if X is a person, X is not precluded by laws notwithstanding whether it is born or unborn.

But here skeptic argues about crippled, invalid, hopeless patient, unconscious vegetative lives values of life and their legislation. Harre defines person as social production. Blackman's view is that unborn is not a part of legislation.

Dewey says person must be a human being plus social being.

He is the same as Blackman.

Psychological definition has 2 aspects, 1 physical and the other mental.

Both are often contradictory.

American law stands on biological definition, and American constitution does not define person.

Thus, American legal theory of person is not settled. It is a debate between utilitarian and right theorist, socialism and individualism. In my opinion, "Person" can be viewed from 2 aspects, 1 is purely biological and the other social.

Biological person is a person right from the time of conception. The social one starts from the time of social being, thus becoming an object of legislation. Person can claim his inalienable right of self-determination, which however should be put behind of public and social value, because mass interest is superior to the interest of one member of the mass.

Prof. Dungen

JUSTIFIED WARFARE AND THE RELATIVE VALUE OF HUMAN LIFE

Reflexion on ethical dimension of warfare is religious in the west as well as in the east. In the west, e.g. St. Augustin, Thomas Aquinas, Grotius, Mennonites and Quakers etc.

Two kinds of thought, one is Justified War and the other Pacifism have existed. But now we face nuclear war and argue the best means to prevent it.

There has been no consistency in the west in life and death matters and such inconsistency can be found throughout history. As Leuky pointed out human nature is capricious, it has inconsistencies, benevolent and malvolent affections by nature.

Christianity asserts sanctity of human life and prohibits abortion. And yet it allows slow suicide and self torture of ascetic epidemic abridging their lives. Pacifists have slaves.

As for warfare, Thomas Upham stands against war, which he defines at best force contest between nations. Beckwith 10 years later amended this by not intervening domestic police force though he opposes war. Pacifists condemn defensive war. Their answer against foreign invader is first to obey God's command, 2nd to trust in his protection, and the 3rd to be ready to suffer martyrdom.

The opponents against Beckwith insists that Christian life is inviolable, in domestic as well as in foreign affairs. If domestic coercion is permissible, then defensive war must also be permissible.

John Lord says there is no difference between foreign and domestic robbers and murders. John Sheppard 20 years later, stated in war both sides are unjust. If one side is absolutely right, then the other side must be definitely wrong. In such case, it is not a war but a riot.

Garrison once was political anarchist, became uncertain of his theory once Civil War started.

Grimke once resistance antiwar quaker became rabid enthusiast of civil war, stating war is better than slavery, once said by Augustine. Accordingly political order must satisfy with relative peace and relative justice.

American Peace Society stated that bad peace is worse than good war. Life is an end in itself and man is an end in himself. Good and freedom which makes man must be valued above life.

Greater evil than war is enslaving man. To maintain just social order, inevitable violence can be moral.

Augustine and 9 centuries later Thomas Aquinas said the object of war is peace. Uniforms of soldiers and police justifies killing psychologically and practically.

Moreover war is often outlet of drive and emotion, provokes feeling of comrade and community, sacrificing life for higher values such as nation or supreme reality.

In addition, image of enemy becomes animal pest, drug soldiers become automatons.

In nuclear war all die, there will be no judge to prove justice, defying Bertland Russel's statement that war is better than global communist despotism. Russel and Perry had the same purpose of avoiding war but their application different. Perry said the purpose of war is to bring peace and Russel replied end of war is to stop war.

The 2nd WW was thought to be end of war, but it is not because there is no alternative justified war is found and the question of human value is not substantially solved.

Deepest emotions and ideas for good, true and holy are close to the heart of problem of war.

My opinion as to war is that in the universe there is only natural law, which applies to human society also.

The natural law existing in human society is called human law in which we human being classifies good and evil.

Human brain is consisted of new cortex and old cortex. The latter controls animal nature of man, whereas the former controls mainly holy nature by suppressing the latter. When the suppression goes well according to the God's will it is called Good, and the opposite is Evil. Origin of capricious human nature arises from this fact.

Therefore, fundamental problem is not the warfare.

Whether it is domestic or foreign is not a problem. The problem is to eradicate the evil mind throughtout the world. This is the radical problem we mankind is facing today as has been, but acutely.

Prof. SIVARASKA : The value of human life in Buddhist thought.

Professor SIVARASKA speaks of value of human life in Buddhist thought. He states man alone has potential to achieve the highest quality of life and liberation of suffering. Only man has the ability not only to lessen suffering but also eliminate the root causes of suffering altogether. It is therefore man's duty to himself and to all other beings to take the path towards overcoming all suffering and this path is shown to us by the Buddha. Buddhist attitude towards life can be characterized by the 4 signs, an old man, a sick man, a dead man and a wandering monk.

According to Buddha there are 5 facts, which every one of us should contemplate again and again; 1 decay 2 disease 3 death 4 separation 5 owner of my deeds. I am subject to the 1st three and can not escape them. There will be 4 from all the beloved and dear. And I shall become heir of my dead whether good or bad. From deep thinking of death one understands life and its meanings, hence meaningful life springs. From this we should be conditioned by righteousness (Dharma), discarding hatred, greed or delusion. We must take right path to overcome suffering. We should adjust our inner condition which should be clean and meaningful to be aware of the unjust external world, being just, neutral and selfless. This is called "walk on" in Buddhism, affirmation of wholeness of life.

In Buddhism individual perfection and social good are interdependent. Buddhist traditional society was a society in which population was highly self-reliant, economically, culturally, ethically and intellectually. Especially noteworthy was virtues and royal duties on overcoming poverty.

However since the days of colonialism, Buddhist kingdoms were replaced by imperial rule, military dictatorship or a nominal form of western democracy. Siam, though never fully colonized politically, never regained independence intellectually. Buddhist teaching became servant of colonialism, e.g. family planning is a red-herring masking the real sources of poverty and suffering in the world. Greed, hatred and violence are encouraged, lust and indulgence means affirmation of life. Ill-gotten wealth and power are admired etc. From Buddhist point of view, vital energies (sexual, resp., spiritual) should be conserved as much as possible for realization of individuals and social improvement.

How, then, the false deceptive values created by today's materialism in the name of economic development be overcome? This is only positive when we go back to essential teaching of the Buddha. Our internal condition must be clean and mindful with loving kindness and compassion to others, our enemies as much as their victims. We must stand on the side of the poor and become conscientious to prevent atomic nuclear war and towards full human development, which is real affirmation of wholeness of life.

In my opinion, Prof. Sivaraska did not touch the basic reason why we are to follow teaching of Buddhism. Not because of its virtues.

But the question is why it is virtue. Buddhism says human mind is born as clean as mirror but when one grows up the mirror becomes dirty due to deposit of dust (sin). However this is wrong, I think, because human mind is, by birth, is composed of 2 parts of the brain, one for biological survival and the other to control the former suppressively. When the latter (new cortex) controls the former (old cortex) successfully according to the God's will, then it is called Good and the opposite is Evil. Therefore human mind has from its origin two aspects and it is natural. Buddhism sees only the good aspect. Likewise the Christianity sees only the evil aspect as the original sin. But it is not sin from biological point of view, because it is essential for survival of human being. Rebirth in Christianity means biologically suppression of evil by new cortex. It is valuable virtue, of course.

Therefore what human being must do is to realize the real root of good and evil and enhance the power of new cortex so as to follow the God's providence, affirming that this path is the real path of mankind's evolution.