

THE QUADRUPLE BASE MODEL OF GOD

by

Frank R. Harrison, III
Sandy Beaver Professor of Philosophy
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia USA

DISCUSSION PAPER

on

Kerry C. Pobanz's

**UNIFICATION THOUGHT AS A FOUR-POSITION CONCEPTUALITY
FOR HARMONIZATION**

The Fourteenth International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences
Houston, Texas November 28-December 1, 1985

In examining the paper of Kerry Pobanz at least one thing seems realitively important, namely that it is necessary to become clear in views concerning ourselves, our relationships to others like us, our relationships to non-human -- but finite -- things, and our relationship to God. [1] All of this is necessary, though perchance not sufficient, if we are to have correct actions and, thereby, live in harmony, peace and prosperity. If this is the central issue being addressed in both the essay of Pobanz and Explaining Unification Thought by Sang Hun Lee, then the relationship holding between praxis and theoria is of central importance for Unification Thought. And in general the relation is that praxis is the guiding raison d'etre for theoria. [2]

Certainly there are all sorts of problematic areas in the daily rounds of any particular human being. There are all manner of circumstances in which demands for decisions are encountered. Many of these demands are moral in nature, that is to say they concern the interrelations of various humans in certain areas of action. [3] On the other hand, many of these concerns are socio-political in nature, that is to say they concern the interrelationships of a particular human with a larger group -- a society -- of other humans. It is within such very practical considerations, then, that ancient problems begin to refocus themselves for Pobanz and Lee: The individual versus society, permanence versus change, the one versus the many, and, coupled

with all of these, the problem of faith versus reason.

There is nothing new about these problems, as problems, in either the annals of theology or philosophy. In more contemporary anglo-american philosophy they are viewed by many as boring, however, if not out-and-out pseudo problems. Nonetheless, there are always those for whom the one versus the many, permanence versus change, and so on, remain deeply fundamental and exciting. Such people work hard and conscientiously in attempting to find answers, or resolutions, to such issues. Generally attempted answers have led either to some form of pluralism or monism. In their approaches, however, both Ponanz and Lee reject that possibly successful answers are exhausted by the pluralism-monism dicotomy. Rather a tertium quid, "unionism," is introduced as being the correct stance. [4] Other attempts are not only incorrect from the viewpoint of theoria but are dangerous as well from the viewpoint of praxis. Positions other than that of unionism are dangerous precisely because they either hinder or completely stop proper praxis. Indeed Ponanz speaks of the "bankruptcy of Western Philosophy" while quoting both Rabbi Martin Heir and Professor S. A. Matczak in support of his bankruptcy view. [5]

In this paper I do not have space to construct any lengthy analysis of how unionism attempts to amalgamate the various polarities suggested above into one harmonious God-centered theoria that will both permit and guide proper praxis. Nonetheless, it is important to make a few comments concerning Unificationist Thought before introducing what I conceive of as some problems

with this position. Perhaps the best place to commence is with the concept God.

Actually there are two concepts of God in unionism -- the absolute God and the relative God. [6] The absolute God -- that God which is beyond space and time and of which we can directly say nothing -- can, and does, reveal Himself to human kind through the relative God. [7] It is this manifestation of the absolute God that is call the "Original Image" of God and which is viewed as having a specific structure of attributes that can be known by human kind. Indeed it is this structure that was first revealed to the Reverand Sun Myung Moon who, then, revealed it to others. [8] In the theoria of the Original Image, God is seen as having a particular structure composed of four different attributes actively interrelating with one another to produce a harmonious whole. These four attributes are called "Heart," "Sung Sang," "Hyung Sang," and "United Body." Taken together in their proper relationships, these four attributes make up the "Quadruple Base" that is the structure of the Original Image. Reading in both Pobanz and Lee, one comes to discover quickly that the Quadruple Base appears everywhere. Every individual thing reflects the Quadruple Base of the Original Image. From the relative God to quarks -- and beyond -- there is the Quadruple Base reduplicated. Thus every individual is isomorphic with the God of the Original Image. [9]

With an eye to praxis, this fundamental structure of the Original Image answers important questions that leave other

theologies mute. [10] "Why," for instance, "does God create anything?" The response of unionism is because of the Heart of God, that is because of His irrepressible emotional impulse to seek joy through love. In order for love to become complete, there must be an object, or objects, of that love which can also return the love of the lover. So God creates in order that He may have objects to fulfill His impulse for joy. Very well, but "How does God create anything?". [11] First, the Divine Plan, or Logos, is brought into being by a give-and-take action between the Inner Sung Sang and the Inner Hyung Sang of the revealed God, centering on the purpose of fulfilling Heart. As Pobanz says, following Lee,

The Logos is formed in the mind of God as a kind of blueprint. For instance, before God substantially created a bird, He thought of an exact plan or concrete blueprint of the bird. [12]

This concrete blueprint of a particular bird -- including its particular feathers, etc. -- then becomes the purpose around which the Outer Sung Sang and the Outer Hyung Sang of the Original Image -- the revealed God -- interact to produce the concrete spacio-temporal bird now singing in my garden.

The theoria of the Quadruple Base is not, however, only the explanatory model for creation of the spacio-temporal universe by God, it is also the foundation of all right moral and socio-political intercourse between various individuals.

Thus, the Logos establishes not only standards by which things in themselves were created, but also the norms governing correct relationships amongst all

things. [13]

Indeed Ponanz approvingly cites a passage from Lee, " --- ethics cannot be established without a religion." [14] Behind this remark is the view that in order to have an ethics, there must be values. However these values cannot be merely socio-politically determined. Rather they must be absolute. This absolute nature of value must be grounded; must be explained. Such an explanation must eventually come to a terminus in the very nature of God.

An answer to the question, "Why be moral?", is also offered within the Quadruple Base theoria. Because the individual human being is most especially created within the image of God, he too has Heart. [15] The individual human also, like God, seeks fulfillment of joy through love in a give-and-take relationship with some object, or objects, of love. The human being, however, is in a fallen state and, as such, is no longer directly aware of the correct means by which to channel his Sung Sang and Hyung Sang give-and-take to fulfill himself in those objects proper to his Heart. Nonetheless, the human still longs for fulfillment, and, thus, should be moral in order that this longing might be satisfied. [16] So morality demands not only correct desire, but also correct action that this desire might be fulfilled. Yet desire and action, in order to be correct, must be guided by correct theoria. Thus praxis is the overall reason for seeking theoria.

Admittedly my expository comments are extremely sketchy, and in their brevity unjust to the richness of creative thought

presented by Pobanz and Lee. Nonetheless these comments do represent, minimally, my grasp of the Unificationist view of the Original Image, the Quadruple Base and the relationship of that view to creation and morality. It is upon this understanding that the following critical issues are raised.

While the Unificationist view speaks in terms of both the absolute, or transcendent, God and the relative God, nonetheless these two concepts of God are quite distinct. Indeed we can say nothing directly of the absolute God given His transcendent nature, on the one hand, and our very limited spatio-temporal language on the other. [17] What, then, is demanded is a model, or paradigm, of the absolute God -- the real God -- in order to understand Him. And, so goes the claim, the absolute God does reveal Himself to us through the Reverend Moon in the form of the relative God of the Original Image.

In general since the function of a model is to give some insight concerning that which is modeled, there must be something similar about the model and that which is modeled. Perhaps they both have similar functions in an overall system of some sort. Perhaps they both have the same structure. Perhaps they are both made of the same materials. Further there must also be some means by which one can move from the model to that which is modeled -- rules of translation, as it were. The model airplane, as an example, may have the same structure as that airplane of which it is a model. Nonetheless the model airplane is much smaller. However there is a rule of translation which states

that "one inch" in the model is to be understood as "six feet" in term of that which is modeled. If there were no similarity in terms of either function, structure or material, nor if there were no rules of translation, then we would be very baffled concerning both the utility of the model and its meaning.

This, I submit, is precisely the position in which we find ourselves concerning the two concepts of God -- the absolute and the relative -- in Unification Thought. There the revealed doctrine of the Original Image supposedly serves as a theoria -- a model -- of the absolute God. Understanding the model should aid us in grasping that which is modeled. [18] Within the theoria of the relative God concept is introduced the notion of the Quadruple Base. This concept is explicated by introducing further concepts such as Heart, Sung Sang, Hyung Sang, and United Body. However Lee and Pobanz both state and imply that the model is actually not -- structurally, materially, spacially, or temporally -- similar to that which is purported to be modeled. [19] Thus I am unable to grasp the utility of the theoria of the Original Image in explaining, or helping to come to understand, the absolute God.

Furthermore I am unable in principle to grasp the meaning of various utterances within the theoria itself. As Lee suggests, the theoria must be expressed " --- within the limitations of our words, which have been developed in space and time --- ." [20] Indeed Lee claims that " --- our explanations about attributes and structure in God are figurative and metaphorical." [21]

I presume when Lee and Pobanz employ spatial terms such as "deeper than," "contained in," "inner," "outer," "verticle," "horizontal," and the like, they are using them metaphorically. Yet neither supplies any key to the interpretation of such spatial metaphors. I know what it is to say that I dig one hole in my gardner deeper than another, or that my inner office is past the outer office of the secretary. I even know what it is to claim that a particular individual is contained in a given set as a member of that set. But in principle I do not know how such strings of words are to be understood in connection with the concept of God as employed by Lee and Pobanz. I simply do not know what to make of, for example, such strings of words as "The Heart of God is deeper than His Sung Sang."

Further, for the sake of argument, let us assume a metaphysical principle stating that nothing can exist corresponding to a contradiction. Of course someone might not wish to assume this principle, and may attempt to reject it. [22] Nonetheless assuming it, I know without any hesitation that there is no particular object -- nor could there be -- corresponding to the phrase "x is a round square." I also know without any hesitation that there is nothing -- nor could there be -- corresponding to the phrase "that example of the null set which has three members." But, then, what of some purported individual named "God" of whom such phrases as "Chaneability and unchangeability are united in God" are said? [23] Given the metaphysical assumption, there can be no such thing corresponding to such phrases.

Thus my first criticism of the theoria of the Original Image presented by Lee and Pobanz in terms of the Quadruple Base may be summed up by saying that it is useless, meaningless and non-assertive. If these charges could be overcome, there are, however, others to be met. Of these I shall mention two.

First, one is often tempted -- and in many cases rightly so -- to raise the question "Is it true?" when assessing a particular view taken of a particular subject-matter. Suppose we were to ask of the Unificationist concerning the theoria of Quadruple Base structure of the Original Image of God, "Is it true?". What response might we expect? First, it may be suggested that the general Quadruple Base view, entailing the nature of God, the created order, and the relationships of these one to another are doctrines based on personal revelations of Reverend Moon. Thus, as revealed to an individual who in turn reveals them to other individuals, these doctrines are either accepted or rejected. If accepted, they become the criteria for correct ascription of such phrases as "x is true" and "x is false". Strictly speaking, however, the revelations themselves are neither true or false. They are, for whatever reasons, accepted or rejected.

Yet we cannot but be mindful of "false prophets." There are many who have claimed, do claim and no doubt will claim, to have had various revelations directly from God. And while many such claimants have been, are and will be nothing more than charlatans out to make financial gain, nonetheless there

are others who are quite sincerely convinced that they have had direct revelations from God, and that any other claimed revealed positions that do not correspond with their own must be rejected. Thus why ought one -- not impugning the personal sincerity of the Reverend Moon -- accept his revelation as correct, or true? Or, more generally, by what litmus test are we to tell false prophets from true ones? I hold that this is, indeed, a central question for Unification Thought.

Pobanz presents at least what may be a germ of a response when he suggests that

Unificationism contends that a much more solid theory is based on the observed harmony, correspondence, cooperation and complementarity among all existing things. Therefore, it emphasizes the law of give-and-take which explains this harmony. [24]

We accept the revelations of the Reverend Moon because they "fit with" our observations of the perceptible spatio-temporal world around us. But this is not an overly satisfactory reply. Of course we observe order in the spatio-temporal world around us. In that anything exists it must display some order. But we also observe a great deal of disorder, and not only in the moral, social and political realms. Granted the order that is observed, is the Unificationist theoria the only way to explain this order? Is it the only satisfactory model or paradigm?

Second, at least within what may be broadly conceived of as the Christian tradition, there is a tremendous intellectual strain between the assertion of the complete distinctness of

God from His creation -- His utter Transcendancy -- and His complete intimacy in and with His creation. This is more especially seen to be the case with regard to the individual human being made in the image of God. That God is held to be utterly distinct and at the same instant intimately close has caused no small amount of consternation to the Christian theologian attempting to make rational sense out of his faith. I suspect that some of this same consternation is experienced by the Unificationist. I further suspect that an attempted resolution of this difficulty is an acceptance by the Unificationist of a type of emanation of all creation out of the very Quadruple Base of the Original Image. Unlike the generally accepted Christian view in which God creates the matter for all things out of nothing, both the "form" -- the Sung Sang, and the "matter" -- the Hyung Sang are actual attributes of God in the view of the Unificationist. Thus all of creation, as it were, "flows out of" the very nature of God.

But not only does all of creation "flow out of" the very nature of God, it does so in order that God might be fulfilled -- might complete Himself in a give-and-take love relation with His creation. Thus unlike the more-or-less orthodox Christian view, God is not accepted as perfect, as complete in Himself. He essentially stands in need of something other than His basic Self in order to complete Himself. But, if I am correct that the created order is but an extension of the Quadruple Base of God, then some sense may be made out of the notion that God

completes Himself by extending Himself. However one may then raise questions concerning the incomplete nature of God before the creation of any spatio-temporal individual. Or one may wish to suggest that God never did create in the sense that there was the first moment of time in which the first thing moved, but rather that the spatio-temporal order is, as a necessary extension of God, co-eternal with Him.

In either case the relative God, now assumed for the sake of argument, of the theoria that does model the absolute God, essentially needs His creation in order to find and sustain His joy, that is to say in order to perfect Himself. This being the case, the human being has as his task and obligation the returning of the love of God in aiding Him to achieve His joy, and thus to complete Himself. Hence the human is made in the image of God -- that is in the same Quadruple Base form -- in order that he may serve God.

Is this human being himself a unique creature in his own right, independent of his Original Maker and in Whose Image he is made, or is he merely a part of the "overflow" of the very nature of God Himself? Furthermore if part of the "overflow" then what is to count as the principle, or principles, of "individuation" of the human from God? One might say that there is a difference between the concrete plan in God's mind of a particular person and the spatio-temporal person. But if the plan of God is a perfect plan, and we take the word "perfect" seriously, then what could possibly be the differences between the perfect

plan God has of John and John himself? [25] In any event a problem for the Unificationist is one of maintaining the distinct otherness of God while also not indulging in some sort of anthropomorphism.

The above remarks are but several general comments concerning the essay of Pobanz and the background material of Lee. None of my remarks are meant to bring into question the seriousness and the good intentions with which the Reverend Moon declares his revelation. Nor are they meant to suggest that that revelation is in principle barred from any meaningful, consistent and useful interpretation. And most assuredly I do not wish to demean the good intentions of any of the Unificationists -- most especially Lee and Pobanz. Yet it does appear that neither of these gentlemen have supplied a meaningful and consistent interpretation of the revelation of the Reverend Moon which could possibly lead to correct praxis. In any event I hope that my remarks will serve to stimulate further discussion.

FOOTNOTES

- [1] In my paper I shall be appealing not only to "Unification Thought as a Four-Position Conceptuality for Harmonization" by Kerry C. Pobanz, Research Assistant, Unification Thought Institute. I shall also make a good deal of use of especially the first forty-one pages of Explaining Unification Thought

(Unification Thought Institute; New York, 1981) by Professor Sang Hun Lee. There appears to be nothing in the paper of Pobanz suggesting that he is in any disagreement with Lee, while there is a great deal to indicate the reverse. In the following footnotes I shall simply use "Lee" and/or "Pobanz" followed by a number in order to indicate reference and page when referring to either one of these works.

[2] As Lee says in one of many passages

True knowledge, directly or indirectly, results in action; it is not an end in itself. Unification Thought is written, not to satisfy man's appetite for knowledge, but to reform our lives, society, and the world, in accordance with the Providence of God. [Lee, 3.]

See also: Pobanz, 4.

[3] The concept morality is not to be confused with either that of prudence or etiquette.

[4] Pobanz, 24.

[5] Pobanz, 2.

The phrase "bankruptcy of Western Philosophy" is no doubt overly strong and misleading here. Perchance Pobanz is thinking of some sort of mechanistic-materialisms culminating in Positivism. But one could hardly identify this with Western Philosophy in any scholarly manner. Nor, while the atrocities of World War II were horrendous, should

we forget the heros and saints who were also "products" of Western Weltanschauung.

[6] Lee, 8.

[7] Lee, 6, 39, 41; Pobanz 10, 15.

[8] Lee, xxii, 13.

[9] Lee, 8, 11, 12, 18, 22, 31, 40; Pobanz, 8, 12, 17.

[10] Lee, 22, 23.

[11] Lee, 19, 21; Pobanz, 11, 16.

[12] Pobanz, 11.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Pobanz, 30.

Where "religion" would, I suppose, among other things, also indicate a correct view of the nature of God.

[15] In this paper I am using masculine pronouns in strictly a grammatical manner.

[16] Lee, 21, 27; Pobanz, 25, 26.

[17] Lee, 28; Pobanz, 15.

[18] Lee, 41.

[19] Lee, 15, 28, 39; Pobanz, 15.

In a model-modeled situation, both the model and the modeled are "real." They differ primarily in terms of the various functions they each serve within a particular area of interest. Furthermore we have in such particular areas of interest very clear notions of what it is for the modeled "to fit" the model, and vice versa. In the case of the model airplane-airplane for instance, both are equally visible and both are equally measurable by the same measuring device. It would be difficult to press any of these sorts of considerations in speaking of the Original Image as a model, or paradigm, of the absolute God.

[20] Lee, 28.

[21] Lee, 39.

[22] It is difficult logically to conceive what either the term "accept" or "reject" could mean in this context. A discussion of this point, however, would take us very far afield from

the more modest and immediate ends of this commentary.

[23] Lee, 31; Pobanz, 13.

[24] Pobanz, 20.

[25] One may do well to remember some of the more salient comments Philo addresses to Cleanthes in The Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion by David Hume.