

A Reflection on Dr. Theodore T. Shimmyo's Paper
Individuality and Relationship--A Unificationist View

Paper Discussant: Avtar Singh

Reverend Sun Myung Moon is the contemporary Philosopher and Spiritual Being who has shared his knowledge of the Reality with the seekers and lovers of truth on earth. His intuitive knowledge has also been analysed and articulated as a philosophical system. We have been presented with a profound aspect of his thought by Dr. Theodore T. Shimmyo. Dr. Shimmyo has explicated the most central aspect of any Idealist thought, namely, "Individuality and Relationship" according to the philosophy of Unificationism. One is, of course, always conscious of the concept of inherent "internal" relationship in any philosophical idea centering around 'unification' as the attempted and expressed ideal. But Dr. Shimmyo has, very meticulously, analysed and argued the cogency of the Unification view of the individuals' relationship, although such a notion can also be very adequately and convincingly conveyed as a revealed intuition. Dr. Shimmyo seeks to employ the rational methodology to establish that Unificationism "Sees no real tension between the individuality of a particular existent and its relations to other particular existents." According to this exposition, Unificationism holds that "The genuine individuality of a particular existent would enhance its harmonious relationship with other particular existents."

Dr. Sang Hun Lee has also confirmed that "in Unification Thought, the first problem is that of 'existence' and the second concerns how all existing beings interrelate, i.e., the problem of 'relationship.' (P.1.)

Reverend Sun Myung Moon, in the 'Founder's Address,' for the Fifteenth ICUS Conference on November 28, 1986, has very clearly emphasised the importance of an unmistakable understanding of the nature of relationship between the individuals. On page 3 of this Address, he says, "Since love comes from the other, 'live for the sake of others' is the highest philosophical principle." Reverend Sun Myung Moon has carried the point further and suggested the need to understand the relationship even within the individual. Again on page 3 of the same address, he clarifies that "the Unification, as I mentioned before, means the unity between the mind and body in love." He has even presented this as an important goal for the present Conference when he concluded his Address with the remarks, "It is, therefore, my fervent wish that all the professors gathered here will also strive for the unity of mind and body."

I have brought in Reverend Moon's Conference Address in my present comments with a view to citing the source for the present paper, and also for showing the centrality of problems of individual and relationship in the philosophy of Unificationism.

According to Shimmyo, "Unificationism affirms the 'internal relations' between the particular existents by blurring the traditional sharp distinction between 'Universals' and 'particulars.'" (P. 2.). It thus overcomes the difficulties of the thinkers such as Aristotle, Descartes and Locke. The scheme for overcoming this is "by saying the following two things: (1) that Universals are particular in the sense that they do not really exist except as exemplified in particular existents; and (2) that particular existents are Universal in the sense that they can, by reason of their exemplifications of Universals, enter into the description of each other." (Pp. 2-3.) The author of the paper reminds us that there are two possible meanings of his statement; that Universals are particular and that these do not exist except as exemplified

in particular existents. The Universals, according to him, may refer to the "Universal image," in which sense it may be taken to refer to God's dual characteristics, namely the positivity and negativity, which appear "Universally in every created being." The Korean words, Sung Sang and Hyung Sang, are used for this positivity and negativity. These are, respectively, mental and physical in character. (P. 4.)

We are told that it is God that individualizes the "individual image." God creates particular individuals by individualizing the universal image first. The reason why he creates the world this way is that his "Heart" seeks joy by loving his individually unique objects. A student of Indian Philosophy may easily see the doctrine of krida or lila which partly explains the same process with somewhat similar view. Here krida or lila refers to the playfulness or joyous expression as creation. Dr. Sang Hun Lee has also explained this very clearly as quoted on page 8 of the present paper.

The last section of the paper deals with the Unification assertion that Universals are particular in the sense that they do not truly exist as individualized in particular existents. These particular existents are called "individual truth bodies" in Unificationism. We learn here that individual truth bodies enter into the description of each other. The answer to the question as to how it is possible, is given (1) by appealing to the "Universal image" as the fundamental source of relationality, and (2) by developing a "theory of collation." The first is seen as somewhat similar to the Christian doctrine of vestigiar trinitatis in creation. The creation has a vestige of the Trinitarian relation of God. Dr. Sang Hun Lee elaborated this further in "Explaining Unification Thought". He points out that "every individual truth body has subject and object elements within itself, and is, at the same time, connected with other individual truth bodies in subject-object relationship

(p. 57). This thought is developed further to point out the logical possibility in this regard. The second way in Unificationism is to see collation between the 'Universal Image' "exemplified in one individual truth body and the same image exemplified in another. This theory of collational relationship is established through ten fundamental categories or forms of existence from the Universal image. You find an enumeration of these categories on page 11 of the paper. All of these are derived from the 'give-and-take' action, and the quadruple base, which the Universal image has. These categories are, however, regarded as subordinate and a second group of categories, in addition to the above ten, are proposed. Only three of these are identified in the paper. The still more subordinate categories are not spoken as categories but are referred to as 'concepts.' This includes even the subordinate category of man as concept (p. 12). We are told that particular existents are "collated" with each other in terms of these immanent categories and concepts. This seems to me a very profound insight but, personally speaking, I have experienced difficulty in understanding 'collation' or 'collated' as relation at this point. My difficulty is entirely due to my inadequate knowledge of the Unification Theology. The writer seems to presume a certain level of our familiarity with the doctrine and, therefore, feels free to use words a little unconventionally. Many other philosophers also do that. I am, however, not entirely put off by this abridged-argument. In fact, it appears to me to be an invitation for all of us to study more the Unification Thought so as to overcome this difficulty in the presentation of a thought which is abstracted from the experiential premise. The two ways of demonstrating the internal nature of relations in Unificationism is a great gift from the East and a more vigorous understanding of it promises to be more fruitful. I hope that the exponents of the contemporary philosophy school of Unificationism will come

up with more material which may be used for communicating with other philosophical positions. The insights of the Indian philosophy can also be cited to see as well as demonstrate how they have explained the problems of individuality and relationship. I quite see that in a brief paper like this, Dr. Shimmyo could perhaps refer to only some of Western thinkers. He has, however, done well. On the whole the coherence and the cogency of the Unification philosophy is quite impressive and inviting for further study and research.

Sikhism, the religious tradition founded by Guru Nanak in India in 1469 A.D., and to which tradition I belong, has also emphasised the integrating characteristic of the internal relationship. It is my honest conviction that there can be great application of this philosophical doctrine of relationship in one's theoretical epistemological understanding as well as in social cooperation for manifesting the real characteristic of this relationship.

One of creative application of this knowledge of internal relationship may be in removing, what Dr. Sang Hun Lee, President, Unification Thought Institute, Seoul, has called a "present-day confusion" in his paper outlining the Reverend Moon's concept of new cultural revolution. It is in this sense that we can correctly understand the old dictum "knowledge is virtue." The individuals, as embodiment of Heart, are then seen not as alienated and hostile individuals but as internally related partners who intuitively and spontaneously see the truth of the 'culture of love as the culture of heart.' The unity of knowledge will then be the realization of the unity of being. The science and the culture will appear as fused in the unity of the Absolute. The doctrine of the internal relations will then be seen as revelation which not only informs but also inspires. And there will be boundless bliss ensuing from this knowledge and culture which is the theme of the present conference.