

Comments on Papers  
from the Viewpoint of Unificatin Thought

by Sang Hun Lee

I would like to express my deep gratitude to the organizing Chairman, Dr. Durwood Foster, and also to the Speakers, Discussants, and all other participants for making this committee a great success. I enjoyed reading the papers, and I learned a great deal from each one of them.

Now, I would like to share with you a few comments about the points that impressed me most in the papers. My comments are intended not to criticize the papers but rather to point out what is common or similar between the contents presented in the papers and the position of Unification Thought.

Our basic approach in Unification Thought when commenting on a thought, except in the case of Communism, is usually to show the points of similarity and difference from the viewpoint of Unification Thought. The reason is that Unification Thought, which is Rev. Moon's thought, is based on love and aims at "reviving traditional thoughts in our time to make them valuable for the accomplishment of God's Will.

I have found that each paper contains common points and similarities with Unification Thought. This has strengthened my belief that it is possible to unite thoughts and to unite religions.

Today, however, in the interest of time, I will limit my comments only to similarities, and my comments will be very brief. Also, please understand that I do not mean to say that I have grasped all the points in the papers correctly and completely. Now, let me begin my comments on the papers one by one.

First, with respect to Dr. R. Balasubramanian's paper, entitled "The Tradition of Advaita Vedanta," I think that his position that the solution of existing problems is to be found through getting closer to the One Being (Self-Existing Being) is identical with that of Unification Thought. Unification Thought also seeks to solve existing problems by clarifying the attributes of the One Being (God).

Next, with regards to Dr. Ki-Young Rhi's paper, "Hua-yen Philosophy and Bodhisattva Ethics," I think that Ui-Sang's ontology is very similar to that of Unification Thought. In other words, his theory that "the one and the whole," "big and small," "moment and eternity," "far and near," "visible and invisible" are identical is similar to that of Unification Thought. So I found it very interesting. Also, the theory that the ultimate cause of the universe (the One Mind) is endowed with the attributes of mercy and love is also similar to the Unification Thought view of the ultimate cause.

Next, with regard to Dr. Huston Smith's paper on "Philosophy, Theology and the Primordial Claim," I was impressed by and interested in his assertion that the present-day decline of philosophy and theology is derived from man's reliance on powerless reason and that it is possible to encounter the Absolute Being through either "intellect" or "tacit knowing," which is a kind of intuition similar to the tropism of plants. These points are similar to the Unification Thought concept of spiritual sensitivity.

Next, as for Dr. David W. Chappell's paper, "T'ien-T'ai Buddhism and the Unity of Knowledge," I was deeply impressed to learn that Chih-i, founder of T'ien-T'ai Buddhism, vowed to "save mankind" through the unification of religions and made a great deal of effort to unite religions. His attempt to unite the divided denominations of Buddhism, by discovering the absolute truth that is common to all denominations, is similar to that of Unification Thought.

Next, with regard to the paper by Dr. David Kalupahana, "The Fusion of Fact and Value in Jamesean Pragmatism, "James' concept of the "stream of consciousness" seems to correspond to the Unification Thought concept of the continual formation of the inner developing quadruple base. So, I found it very interesting.

Next, with regard to Dr. Cromwell Crowford's paper, "The Liberation Philosophy of Ram Mohan Roy," I was impressed to learn that a movement for the unity of religions was promoted by Ram Mohan Roy in the early 19th-century India. His belief in the possibility of the unity of religions, through the commonality of religions, is identical to beliefs expressed in Unification Thought. So, I think that his position should be highly valued.

Next, Dr. Gene G. James' paper, "John Dewey's Philosophy of Creative Intelligence," criticizes Dewey's theory that, as science develops, faith in a transcendent God disappears, on the ground that his prediction did not come true. From the viewpoint of Unification Thought, which recognizes God, Dr. James' criticism of Dewey is well founded. On the other hand, Dewey maintained that human beings grow by continually reorganizing and re<sup>re</sup>constructing their experiences and habits in a mutual relationship with the environment. I was interested in this point, because it is similar to the Unification Thought position that human beings, the subject, acquire knowledge and joy through give-and-take action with all things, the object.

Next, as for Dr. Linda Hansen's paper, "Simone de Beauvoir: A Philosopher in Dialogue," it seems that Dr. Hansen supports the position of de Beauvoir, who, while inheriting Sartre's viewpoint of "mutual conflict among human beings," still recognizes the "relationship of mutual dependency among human beings." In this context, dialogue becomes possible only on the foundation of the relationship of mutual dependency. This view is similar to the Unification Thought position that created beings exist in the relationship of give-and-take action between subject and object.

Next, as for Dr. Lonnie Kliever's paper, "H. Richard Niebuhr's radical Monotheism as a 'World Theology,'" I found it also very interesting. Niebuhr's theory that "faith cannot help but develop in a pattern: polytheism-->henotheism-->radical monotheism" is similar to the theory of the "struggle between good and evil"--or between the good God and the evil god--proposed by the Unification view of history.

Next, with regard to the paper by Dr. Nona Bolin's paper, "Jacques Derrida: The Dominion of Unity," I found it quite complex and was not able to grasp all of its contents. Nevertheless, I did perceive that Dr. Bolin is very concerned with the relationship between man and woman. Unification Thought shares this concern and deals with the original and principled relationship between man and woman as a most important matter.

Finally, as for Dr. Shimmyo's paper, it introduced some aspects of Unification Thought itself. The way he compares some of the concepts of Unification Thought with those of other philosophies is highly commendable.

This concludes my comments on the papers of Committee 3. Thank you very much for your hard work and earnest participation. Particularly, I would like to thank the Organizing Chairman, Dr. Durwood Foster, for his great contribution toward the success of this committee. I am looking forward to seeing all of you again soon.