

# Science and the Rise of Science Supremacists

by Bhakti Madhava Puri, Ph.D.  
Princeton Bhakti Vedanta Institute  
Princeton, NJ 08542

May 14, 2018

We have zero tolerance for supremacists of any type and the hate speech that they generate.

We remind and request all to follow the one rule of humility, tolerance and respect when addressing one another, even in the case of complete disagreements. It is what makes it possible for us all to consider a wide diversity of viewpoints urbanely without the dialog becoming acrimonious. We do not think this rule is beyond the ability of intelligent ladies and gentlemen to observe.

One may make the case that the major problem in the world today, certainly in the USA, is extremism and its consequent polarization of society. What lies at the root of that type of mentality and how did it develop? The question is often asked: why are we suffering? An answer may come from the Greek tragic play of Sophocles' *Antigone*, which may be paraphrased – “We suffer because we have erred.”

Today's scientists, mathematicians and other professionals might not be expected to recognize where that line comes from and the great significance it has maintained in human culture for millennia. Historians tell us it was composed by Sophocles almost 500 years before the historical appearance of Christ. Why has it endured and been so highly respected by scholars, the learned and other members of society for so long?

It is not hard to imagine that when Sophocles wrote that play, it was in the midst of a social crisis much like the one we are facing in our own modern or post-modern culture. The central figure of the play is Antigone, who was the daughter of the deceased Oedipus Rex, or King Oedipus who Freud made famous in the 20th century. Her brothers eventually become enemies and were killed in an ensuing battle. The then ruling king, Creon, declared that the brother who had joined the enemy ranks (named Polynices) should be dishonored like all the other enemy soldiers who had been killed, and left on the battlefield as carrion rather than afforded a burial.

Antigone could not bear to allow her brother such a fate, which in Greek tradition was considered a very serious matter since the soul of one who did not receive a proper burial would be condemned. So she felt she had a moral and divine spiritual duty to him. To fulfill such a duty, however, she would have to disobey the King's order, which was punishable by death to the offender.

Since Antigone was also engaged to Creon's son, it made the situation for the King even more difficult when Antigone finally decided to disobey the king and perform the burial

rites for her brother. In the end the King decided not to kill Antigone for the sake of his son but to bury her alive in a cave. While in the cave Antigone took her own life by hanging. When the King's son found out about this he also took his own life. Then when the King's wife found out about her son she also committed suicide. In this way the tragedy unfolded.

King Creon was advised by his priest that he should not try to challenge the divine law which Antigone felt obligated to follow, that was higher than any man-made law or decree by the king. Although the king was just trying to preserve the dignity of the community over which he ruled for their benefit, it was also alloyed with his personal motives for preserving his own authority and attendant power and prestige. The people in general also respected Antigone's dutiful moral attitude toward her brother as higher than any man-made decree. Yet the result was agonizing suffering all around.

So what was the moral Sophocles was trying to teach his countrymen here? It comes in the line "We suffer because we have erred." What was the error? It must have been on both sides since they all suffered in the end.

Everyone is genuinely driven by the desire to do what they believe is right. Even an evil person may think that destroying human culture and civilization is somehow right. The supremacists think that they are right and all their peers just don't realize it, and even the whole of civilization before them were all idiots or insane, and that their own idea of truth will still be right for all future time to come. The important point to recognize here is that each one believes their own idea of truth is based on what they think is right. The problem is that, even if each person is genuinely acting upon and certain that what they are doing is right and for the good of all, it can produce very serious conflict.

What Sophocles is trying to point out is that we have to recognize this inherent moral rectitude within ourselves and others and try to understand first where it comes from. We are not to imagine some extraneous causation such as the natural struggle for existence, or selfish genes, or the discharges of neural patterns. As soon as we subject moral certitude to judgement we place ourselves above morality, thereby relativizing it, i.e. justifying immorality. When this happens suffering will certainly ensue because suffering is just the product of a conflict between our constitutional, divine or moral rectitude and what we believe or do that is opposed to that.

Antigone was conflicted between her divine and social duties, of which the divine held more importance. Creon was likewise conflicted with the same duality of which the social held more significance. The error comes from being unable to harmonize the two and instead becoming absorbed in extremes resulting in the social and internal polarization that ensues.

Trying to understand one's self comes with the ability to understand others, as much as trying to understand others brings a better understanding of oneself. We need to be reasonable. *Isaiah* 1.18 states: "Come now, and let us reason together, said the Lord." Books like the Bible or other scriptures do not retain a place for such long periods of time in human civilization because they are filled with superficial superstitions. Some profoundly

sound, useful and essential wisdom is found in such literature that benefits mankind. Certainly we find some outmoded ideas as well, particular idiosyncrasies that may have had some significance for a particular time, or may have contingently entered those works. But we don't reject the brilliance of the Moon because it has pock marks on it; we don't reject the usefulness of fire because it also produces smoke.

Kindly think about and consider the idea that it is not only the particular conception of truth of which you may be certain and want to convey to others that is most important, but rather the underlying qualities within us that contribute to forming and holding such truths. We have to start the healing process somewhere and we are trying to point out the direction that may take.

---

If we can have even a hint of how the spiritual self-determination of humility, tolerance, respect, and love influences our intelligence, we would recognize how much our conceptions of truth derive their form and genesis from within that milieu.

Self-determination, self-realization, or self-actualization requires a focus upon the internal realm that constitutes our spiritual nature. The saints and sages who cultivate those noble qualities within themselves had an intelligence and rational ability that could comprehend ideas that would be far beyond the scope of imagination for those who do not have or even know how to access or cultivate those qualities. How could this even be explained to the later in a way they might understand?

So we have to rely on the good qualities that may lie dormant within our hearts and pray or hope that these spiritual principles may be kindled and brought back to consciousness so that they may be cultivated and bear fruit. Even the rationality within the idea of creation, which seems so foreign and contrary to the materialism of modern scientific thought, can be seen to have perfect justification when we know enough about the philosophical relation of identity that exists between thought and being, that modern science and philosophy based on Cartesian dualism has totally forgotten about or misconceived.

The fact that finite thinking is different from that which it thinks, is the very quality that makes it finite. That is why we cannot create or bring anything into being merely by thinking it. We can only think *about* things that already *are* and manipulate them in different and ever newer ways. But if one can understand that there must consequently be a God Whose thinking and being are identical and therefore infinite, then the mere Will ("Let there be light") is enough to establish its being or manifestation. It doesn't even require the clicking of God's fingers, which would be an activity for a far lesser being.

An intelligent and educated discussion about the relation of good qualities and their influence on the kind of intelligence that is a consequence thereof is always important to consider. In other words, it is not only the truth of which one is convinced that is significant, but the attitude that underlies its formation as much as the rationality or, in most cases, rationalization (which is quite a different thing) by which it is established and

held to be true. It is only when we become clearly conscious of this that a completely revolutionary concept of knowledge can be introduced that will make what we think of as knowledge today be seen for what it is, and has nothing to do with real knowledge. But that can only be explained at the appropriate time, as they say when the time is right and all these preliminary grounds are understood.