



Philosophische Winterakademie
13. bis 16. Februar 2018
Wettbewerb Philosophischer Essay



Turning the case around: Does science need philosophy? Why? Did science not come up with computers without a philosophical comment on it? Did science not fly to the moon without asking Kant for permission? Scientists build houses, cars, ... – well, and the atom bomb. Oppenheimer himself commented on this case with a philosophical text. “If the radiance of a thousand suns / may at burst at once into the sky / that would be like the splendour of the mighty one” is an excerpt from the Bhagavad Gita, a holy scripture of Hinduism and the basic text of Yoga – the original philosophical system as part of the six darshanas, not the modern sport. Taking Oppenheimer into account: Physics were able to build this weapon without philosophy, however, physicists are not able to discuss the effects of their work – ethically – without philosophers or own education on this field. “And I am become death, the shatterer of worlds” the text continues. And the United States had no problem becoming death and using their shatterer on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Science does not need philosophy for its work, but for the evaluation of it, for the justification of it.

Let us shortly swap the roles in our translation of the quote. Translation now: Philosophy without science is meaningless, science without philosophy is dangerous. Well, it fits maybe even better. As mentioned before, philosophy for getting information is outdated, therefore it starts to become meaningless if you try to use philosophy as primary source of knowledge. But philosophy might prevent science from becoming dangerous by valuating and warning – a philosophical voice in the military decision of using a technological product based on scientific knowledge could have led to the prevention of the usage of such a weapon, therefore science without philosophy might be indeed dangerous.

Referring a second time to Hawking, he explained this by focusing on science as successor of philosophical concepts. However, after the analysis of the relationship of science and philosophy in an extreme case, philosophy cannot be compared to science on the same level. Science (from Latin *scientia*, knowledge) and philosophy (from Greek *sophia*, wisdom) must be considered to appear on two different levels. In order to set up a terminology (Confucius would be proud of us, he himself taught that “At first, the terms must be clear”, also according to the Lunyu in the German translation by Richard Wilhelm), science and philosophy must be understood as tools, science for getting knowledge, philosophy for acquiring wisdom. And whereas knowledge is a first step, just receiving information, wisdom is a second, higher, sophisticated step, interpreting knowledge and using it wisely. Therefore trying to let science and philosophy outcompete each other is like a match of a football team against a basketball team – and this most probably with quidditch balls. In a comparison of both it is basically not possible to deny the importance of one of them. Although they might have a relationship full of tensions, they cannot live without each other; they resemble an old couple, but also the grandfather and his grandson mentioned above. The youngster needs his grandfather for advice, he profits from experience and developed points of view, his wisdom. The grandson, in turn, brings fresh wind in the life of his grandfather, he teaches him how to use smartphone, computer and internet. Grandpa would be lost without the help of younger persons in this context and his grandson without education and advice. Our quote was used in two different ways now and both were reasonable to a certain extent, the first one as word-by-word understanding (“science to be the learning, ...”) and the second one with its ability to describe the case (science as possible source of suffering and philosophy for prevention of it), which has two major reasons. Firstly, Confucius never talked about the relationship of science and philosophy, because he basically did not know anything about modern science and would have never drawn a comparison of it to his personal philosophy. His quote emerged from a similar, but not this context. Secondly, exactly this interference of possible interpretations implicates a relationship of both terms, science and philosophy, a relationship that cannot be dissolved.