




6-2



AXIOLOGY:

**A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF DR. SANG HUN LEE'S
UNIFICATION AXIOLOGY**

by

Gene James
Professor of Philosophy
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee, USA

The Eighteenth International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences
Seoul, Korea August 23-26, 1991

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF DR. SANG HUN LEE'S
UNIFICATION AXIOLOGY

Gene James

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to present an exposition and criticism of some of the ideas put forward by Dr. Sang Hun Lee in the book Explaining Unification Thought. Dr. Lee states in the Preface that although the system of thought he develops takes its departure from revelation, his intention is to show the relevance of Unification thought to philosophical issues by developing a comprehensive, systematic body of thought that is applicable to all recognized areas of philosophy. His goal is thus similar to the one pursued by Thomas Aquinas who developed a philosophical system based on Christian revelation. Since the goal is to work out a systematic body of thought, the emphasis is on appeal to reason rather than dogma. As Dr. Lee states, "dogmatic certainties have no place in philosophical discussion."¹ Consequently, my evaluation of Dr. Lee's work will focus on the extent to which it successfully resolves certain philosophical problems, rather than on the revelation from which it takes its departure. Since it would be impossible to discuss the full range of Dr. Lee's thought in a single paper, I have focused on his axiology or theory of value. However, this limitation is not as restrictive as it might first seem because his axiology is both intertwined with other areas of his thought, especially his theology, and because the system of thought he develops was intentionally undertaken, not as an end in itself, but as a means of providing principles for guiding human conduct. Thus he states at the beginning of the first chapter: "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."² Similar statements occur throughout the book.

The fact that Dr. Lee believes that the goal of thinking should be practical does not mean that he thinks we can avoid theoretical issues. To the contrary, he insists that unless practice is grounded in correct theory, it will be impossible for us to find solutions to the problems confronting human beings. More specifically, he argues that although people today often try to solve problems without any reference to God, "we will not...be able to find a basic solution to our problems, unless we deal with God correctly."³ In other words, to develop an adequate axiology and apply it correctly, we must begin with theology -- with the nature of God and His purpose in creating the universe. In conformity with this doctrine, my discussion of Dr. Lee's axiology will begin with his conception of God. I shall then discuss the axiology he develops on the basis of his theology, some of the practical principles he deduces from his axiology, and conclude with a brief evaluation of some of the ideas that have been presented.

GOD AND THE PURPOSE OF CREATION

Dr. Lee's discussion of God and His purpose in creating the universe is divided into two sections: the nature of God and the nature of created beings. Although he does not believe that we can have direct knowledge of God's nature, he says that nevertheless we can develop a theory of what we think God is like based on reason and revelation. However, he cautions us

to "remember that in discussing ontology we do not, and cannot, deal with God Himself, but only with the attributes of God. Consequently, our ontology is called "Theory of the Original Image," and not "Theory of the Original Being."⁴

According to Dr. Lee the Original Image can be thought of as composed of two basic components Sung Sang and Hyung Sang. The first time the terms Sung Sang and Hyung Sang are introduced they are at least partially equated with the terms 'spirit' and 'matter'.

Unification Thought says that the Original Image is the united body (Neutral, or Harmonious Body) of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang....Philosophers, thus far, have explained the cause of the universe as either spirit (Sung Sang), or matter(Hyung Sang), but never as the united body (Harmonized Body).⁵

However, Dr. Lee immediately warns us that the conception of God as the union of spirit and matter does not by itself give us an adequate picture of God. One reason for this, is that Sung Sang and Hyung Sang must be further divided into Inner Sung Sang and Inner Hyung Sang, both of which are attributes of God's mind. To make matters even more complicated Inner Hyung Sang is a part or aspect of Inner Sung Sang. Since Inner Sung Sang, which contains Inner Hyung Sang as a part, is an attribute of the mind of God who created everything else, Dr. Lee also refers to it as Original Sung Sang.

The Sung Sang of God (Original Sung Sang) is the mind of God, or the attribute of God that constitutes the fundamental cause of the invisible, functional aspects of all existing beings (i.e., their mind, instinct, life, etc.). The Sung Sang of God consists of Inner Sung Sang and Inner Hyung Sang. The Inner Sung Sang is the functional part of the mind (Sung Sang), and has the three functions of

intellect, emotion, and will. Here, intellect refers to the function of cognition; emotion to the function of feeling; and will, to the function of decision....The Inner Hyung Sang is the objective part of the mind (Sung Sang); it refers to ideas, concepts, original law, and mathematical principles.⁶

This quotation makes it clear that since Inner Hyung Sang is part of the mind of God, it cannot be identified with matter, especially not matter as it was conceived in the West prior to the nineteenth century, i.e., as passive, inert, and standing in opposition to mind conceived of as active and transformative. If, however, we think of matter as containing a life force, and thus as active rather than passive, we come closer to what Dr. Lee seems to have in mind. If, at the same time, we retain the idea that all activity comes from God, then matter may be said to be informed by God. This seems to be what Dr. Lee has in mind when he says:

The Hyung Sang of God (Original Hyung Sang) is the attribute of God that constitutes the fundamental cause of the material aspect of all existing beings (i.e., their mass, shape, structure, and so on). The essence of the Hyung Sang of God may be considered a kind of energy latent in God. This latent energy is considered as manifested in the matter of the created world and in its physical force.⁷

Inner Hyung Sang, then, may be said to be the creative energy or force which is part of God's mind (Sang Sung), and which in creation is transferred to the physical world. Since this energy or force is transferred to the physical world, the physical world may be said to contain Sung Sang.

The Sung Sang of God...is manifested to varying degrees in the Sung Sangs of all the different entities that make up the creation.

Minerals, molecules, and atoms...might seem to lack any manifestation of the Original Sung Sang (God's mind); yet, in an atom, that which directs the force causing the electrons to orbit the nucleus is the Sung Sang of the atom, manifesting some part of the Original Sung Sang. In plants, life and growth are an additional manifestation of Sung Sang. In animals, instinct is a higher manifestation of Sung Sang. Finally, in the mind of man...almost all the Original Sung Sang functions of God are manifested.⁸

The dynamic relationships which hold between Sung Sang and Hyung Sang, within the divine nature can perhaps be best understood by examining what is meant in saying that Sung Sang plays a subject role, and Hyung Sang an object role, in the Original Image. Unificationists do not restrict the term 'subject' to mean 'self' or 'consciousness'⁹, but use it in a broader way:

[W]hen...dual beings, or dual elements, give and take something to each other, forming a reciprocal relationship, the being (or element) that is chiefly dominating, active, or central is called subject; and the being (or element) that is chiefly dominated, passive, or dependent is called object.¹⁰

According to Dr. Lee the primary relation which holds between Sung Sang and Hyung Sang within the Original Image, then, is that "Sung Sang, which is subject, actively controls and works on Hyung Sang, which takes an objective, passive position."¹¹ When these two elements enter into this type of reciprocal, give-and-take relationship, the result is a creative overflow that produces the universe. Or, in more traditional language, the result is Logos which finds its expression in the creation of the world.

Logos is formed through the give-and-take action between Inner Sung Sang and Inner Hyung Sang, centering on purpose. In the formation of

Logos, both the Inner Sung Sang and the Inner Hyung Sang are expressed through the attributes of positivity and negativity.¹²

To understand this statement we need to examine what is meant by the terms centering on purpose, positivity, and negativity. In saying that Sung Sang and Hyung Sang enter into give-and-take actions centered on purpose, Dr. Lee intends to emphasize that aspect of God's nature which Unificationists call heart.

That which lies deeper than intellect, emotion, and will is Heart, which... means the emotional impulse to seek joy through love. This impulse wells up from the bottom of the mind; it is irrepressible, even for God himself. In order to obtain joy, there must be an object of love....God, therefore, having Heart, seeks objects, in order to fulfill His impulse for joy. This explains why God created man and all other creatures.¹³

The interactions between Sung Sang and Hyung Sang which result in the creation of the world may thus be said to be directed or purposive. They come about because of God's Heart which motivates Him to create and love subordinate beings. "Purpose is grounded in, and established by, Heart....Heart is the...reason for the establishment of the Purpose of Creation."¹⁴

Since Sung Sang and Hyung Sang are part of a purposive process, the interactions which take place between them are not antagonistic or competitive, but one of cooperation to achieve a common goal. Thus, Dr. Lee repudiates the Marxist-Leninist view that all development is the result of a struggle of opposites. Also because Sung Sang and Hyung Sang are related to one another by a pre-established harmony, it would be an error to

describe Dr. Lee's view as dualistic. Sung Sang and Hyung Sang are merely two of the elements involved in the creation and development of things, not independently existing units.¹⁵

Since Heart is a deeper part of the divine nature than intellect, Logos or reasoning is subordinate to Heart and love in the creation of the universe:

Heart, or Purpose, occupies the central or highest position; Sung Sang, which contains reason, is in the second position; Hyung Sang...is in the third position; and the United Body, or the Multiplied Body, is in the fourth position. Reason...is not the motive, but the means to accomplish the Purpose of Creation.¹⁶

This fourfold analysis is labeled by Unificationists the Inner Quadruple Base of God. It is matched by a corresponding Outer Quadruple Base which will be discussed below. Before examining the latter, however, two other features of the Original Image need to be discussed. The first is the set of characteristics referred to as positivity and negativity.

In addition to Sung Sang and Hyung Sang, the Unification Principle ascribes another set of dual characteristics to God, namely positivity and negativity. These dual characteristics relate between themselves as subject and object.¹⁷

This does not mean, Dr. Lee goes on to explain, that God has two primary sets of dual characteristics because:

Positivity and negativity are not direct attributes of God, but attributes of god's Sung Sang and Hyung Sang. We may describe them as attributes of attributes. Both Sung Sang and Hyung Sang contain positive and negative attributes.¹⁸

Unfortunately Dr. Lee's explanation of positivity and negativity as indirect attributes of God's mind is very brief. About the only help we are given in understanding their exact nature is a comment made immediately after the above introduction of the doctrine which describes the positive and negative aspects of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang insofar as they are features of the human mind: "The positive aspects of man's Sung Sang (mind) include perspicacity, good memory, cheerfulness, activeness, and so on. The negative aspects include obtuseness, poor memory, melancholy, passiveness, and so on."¹⁹ Since it is unlikely that Dr. Lee intends to attribute the latter attributes to God, the comment raises more questions than it solves.

One final element that composes God's mind according to Dr. Lee is the set of individual images He has of all things in the universe.²⁰ Although these existed in God's mind prior to the creation of the corresponding objects, unlike Platonic ideas which are abstract and general, individual images are specific and "concrete." They provided the models God used in creating the various objects that make up the universe.²¹ Human creativity is conceived by Dr. Lee in a parallel way.²²

The following two passages may be taken as summing up Dr. Lee's discussions of the Original Image and process of creation.

Sung Sang and Hyung Sang, positivity and negativity, and Individual Images are called Divine Image. Heart, Logos, and Creativity are called Divine Character. The Divine Image and the Divine Character constitute the ORIGINAL IMAGE.²³

In the Original Image, Sung Sang and Hyung Sang form a United Body, or Harmonious Body, through give-and-take action centered on Heart. The structure of the Original Image is the Quadruple Base (Four-Position

Foundation), which is made up of four components: Heart, Sung Sang, Hyung Sang, and United Body (Harmonious Body). Heart, actually, lies deep within the Sung Sang, but we put it in the central position, since it is the motive or starting point, for the give-and take action....Centering on Heart, Sung Sang is in the subject position, while Hyung Sang is in the object position. The relationship between subject and object is as that between active and passive, controlling and obeying, central and dependent, creating and conserving, initiating and responding, dynamic and static.²⁴

CREATED BEINGS

According to Dr. Lee not only were human beings made in the image of God, but nature was made in the image of human beings.²⁵ Even though God is described in Genesis as creating human beings on the last day of creation, "it is the Unification Thought point of view...that...God conceived the image of man first. Then He conceived the images of animals, plants, and finally minerals."²⁶ God conceived humans first because they are the most complicated being, and then conceived others beings by progressively leaving out more and more features. Dr. Lee refers to this as the downward theory of creation.²⁷

Everything that was created may be said to have been created in the image of God because, like God, all things may be described as a composite of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang, having both positive and negative features, and forming a United or Harmonious Body through give-and-take action centered on purpose. As a result of these interacting features, all things also mirror divine nature in forming a double quadruple base.

The Quadruple Base that is formed by the give-and-take action between Inner Sung Sang and Inner Hyung Sang is called the Inner Quadruple

Base....The Quadruple Base that is formed by the give-and-take action between this Sung Sang and the Hyung Sang is called the Outer Quadruple Base.²⁸

The Inner Quadruple Base that characterizes divine nature may be thought of as the process by which God maintains Himself, the Outer Quadruple Base as the creative process through which He develops and maintains the world. Thus, Dr. Lee also speaks of God's Inner Quadruple Base as his Identity-Maintaining Quadruple Base and his Outer Quadruple Base as his Developing Quadruple Base.²⁹

The Inner or Identity-Maintaining Quadruple Base of God differs from the Inner Quadruple Base of Created objects because the former is part of God's unchanging, eternal nature.³⁰ God's Developing-Quadruple Base, on the other hand, should be seen as dynamic in nature since it represents His activity in creating and maintaining the world. Created things mirror God by having both relatively unchanging and changing attributes.³¹ People, for example, Dr. Lee comments, grow and develop without losing their identity.³² To emphasize that all things reflect God by having both an inner and an outer quadruple base, Dr. Lee refers to created objects as individual truth bodies.³³

The primary or most important difference between human beings and other individual truth bodies is that "man is the direct image of God's Divine Image and Divine Character, but the rest of creation is the indirect image of God, reflecting only His Divine Image."³⁴ Human beings may be said to have been created in the direct image of God because: (1) They alone share

with God the attribute of Logos. This means that like God they are capable of forming ideas and acting upon them. (2) It means also that, unlike the rest of Creation where give-and-take action takes place automatically, "man's harmonious give-and-take action requires his own creative effort and responsibility."³⁵ That is to say, unlike the rest of Creation, human beings have free will and are, therefore, responsible for their actions. (3) Human beings also differ from animals because they not only have Hyung Sang desires for food, shelter, sex, etc., but have Sung Sang desires to seek truth, goodness, and beauty.³⁶ Finally, human beings are like God because He gave them Heart, the capacity to love and respond to love.

God's purpose in creating the universe and especially human beings was

to receive joy from them, by seeing them express the values of trueness, goodness, and beauty and by seeing them love one another....Accordingly, God gave man the desires to realize and to seek value. These are the original desires of man....The purpose of other created beings, on the other hand, is to please man."³⁷

AXIOLOGY

Since human beings differ from the rest of creation in having the abilities to seek truth, goodness and beauty, and to give and receive love, Dr. Lee states, in a section of the book titled The Theoretical Foundation of Axiology, that: " A discussion of value, according to Unification Thought must begin with...man; for man is the center of the universe, and all problems have their starting point in him."³⁸

Although human beings were created with the abilities to seek truth,

goodness and beauty, God's purpose in creating the universe cannot be realized unless human beings actualize these values in their conduct. This is true, according to Dr. Lee, because even though something may have been created to fulfill a particular purpose, it will not have actual value unless it in fact fulfills that purpose. "Actual value is determined by the judgement of the subject in the process of the give-and-take action that takes place between the subject and the object."³⁹ In the case of human beings this means that their actions have no value unless they fulfill the responsibilities assigned to them, and, therefore, give joy to God their Creator. Similarly, other things have value only to the extent that they produce emotional responses in human beings. "When a person's emotions are positively stimulated by an object, that object can be said to have value for him. An object that does not significantly stimulate a person's emotions has no value for him."⁴⁰

Dr. Lee's theory of value may therefore be summarized as follows: Value is a quality that arises from a process of give-and-take between a subject and an object, in which the object produces happiness or joy for the subject. Objects lack actual value unless they in fact produce this result. However, to the extent that objects have the capacity to do this, they may be said to have potential or latent value. Human actions have actual value only if they fulfill God's purpose in creating the universe thereby giving Him joy. Other things have value only to the extent that they are capable of, and in fact succeed, in bringing joy to human beings who are the center of the universe, the reason it was created.

APPLICATION OF THE AXIOLOGY

Since the purpose of human beings is to give joy to God, their first duty must be to strive to understand God's nature and His plan in creating them. Only then will we be able to discover the principles which should guide our lives. This is the reason Dr. Lee says that his theories of "dual characteristics and the...Quadruple Bases in the Original Image have been proposed, not for the sake of theorizing, but in order to be practiced in daily life."⁴¹

According to Dr. Lee, and Unificationists in general, the most fundamental problem that confronts us in discovering the principles that ought to guide our lives is that human beings are fallen and estranged from God. "In the fallen world, man is ignorant of the Purpose of Creation of everything, including himself. As a result, he no longer has the original desire with which he was endowed at the creation."⁴² Thus, although humans were created with an innate desire and propensity toward creativity, and were intended by God to dominate or rule by love the rest of creation, fallen human beings are no longer aware that true joy can be achieved only through the fulfillment of the responsibilities God has given them.⁴³

Consequently, they do not seek to discover and apply in their lives the principles God established for the proper functioning of the universe.

The most fundamental of these principles is the principle of give-and-take action according to which all things were created to establish subject-object relations and enter into harmonious interaction with one another. Thus, human beings should follow this principle and exhibit love and

harmony in their interactions with another, but because they are fallen, they disregard it and act in selfish ways that create disharmony and strife.

[N]ational and societal problems have been caused by "non-principled"... fallen man, for societies and nations are formed of such people. Natural phenomena, operating in accordance with cosmic principles, do not reflect those problems. Clearly, man has become a non-principled being....[T]he solution to the problems...is to change non-principled man into principled man.⁴⁴

We can repair a broken watch, Dr Lee maintains, only if we know how it is supposed to function. "Similarly, we can guide an immoral man into a life of righteousness only if we know what man's original or principled state is supposed to be."⁴⁵

But how can we know what principles God intended us to obey in doing this? Notice that in the foregoing quotation, Dr. Lee maintains that although most human beings do not govern their lives by the principles God intended, nature nevertheless conforms to the principles God created to regulate it. Elsewhere in speaking of the disorder that characterizes human affairs he says: "No such disorder is found in the natural world."⁴⁶ Dr. Lee believes, in fact, that even though human beings were created in the direct image of God, and the rest of nature created only in His indirect image, because "man is fallen...it is often easier for him to gain some understanding of God through nature"⁴⁷, than through the study of his own nature. To state the central idea here more rigorously, Dr Lee maintains that: "Order within the created world is a reflection of the order within the Original Image."⁴⁸

In what ways does the order of the created world reflect that of the Original Image? According to Dr Lee:

Every individual truth body contains the correlative aspects of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang, positivity and negativity....[T]he elements of each of these correlative aspects relate between themselves as subject and object....[T]he relationship between subject and object is as that between dominating and dominated. In other words, it is as the relationship between active and passive, central and dependent, creating and conservative, initiating and responding, controlling and obeying, dynamic and static, extrovert and introvert, etc.⁴⁹

Give-and-take relationships of the types described not only hold within individual truth bodies, but between them as well, because every individual truth body "is, at the same time, connected with other individual truth bodies in subject-object relationships."⁵⁰ Furthermore, these relationships are not only horizontal but vertical. That is to say, individual truth bodies are organized in hierarchial fashion so that "from elementary particles to the great macrocosm, there are numerous levels of individual truth bodies."⁵¹ Every individual truth body may, therefore, be said to be a subject for those below it, and an object for those above it.

On the basis of the foregoing Dr. Lee argues that just as each element has its proper place in the harmonious functioning of the physical universe, each individual has a proper place in the social-political order. "Every being has a specific position from which to engage in give-and-take action, and cannot perform principled give-and-take action apart from its position."⁵² If people do not fulfill the duties correlated with their

proper places, the result is disorder and confusion. If, on the other hand, they fulfill the duties and roles God intended, the result will be social harmony.

In applying the rules learned from reflection on the Original Image and the natural world to human life, Dr Lee argues that we must also keep in mind what he call the law of completion through three stages, viz., that for anything to be perfected it must pass through three stages of development: formation, growth, and completion.⁵³ Just as a flower does not bloom immediately after being planted: "Realizing the Purpose of Creation means completing God's three great blessings: the perfection of character, the perfection of the family, and the perfection of dominion."⁵⁴

The three blessings referred to here are in fact promises. Human beings have to grow and perfect themselves and society in order to obtain them.⁵⁵ The statement that "man has been made to resemble God," also, "does not mean that he does so completely at the moment of birth; he must first grow up to be an adult."⁵⁶

The first step in fulfilling one's duties and realizing these promises, is to perfect one's character, a task that requires one to emulate God by creating correct Inner and Outer Quadruple Bases through give-and-take actions. A correct Inner Quadruple Base is obtained when one's spirit-mind dominates one's physical-mind. The spirit-mind is that part of the human psyche that seeks truth, beauty and goodness, and desires to do God's will. The physical-mind is that part of the psyche which seeks physical

satisfactions. Unless one's physical-mind is subordinate to one's spiritual-mind, the result will be inner disharmony and chaos. This doesn't mean that physical satisfactions are evil, or ought to be neglected. It implies rather that physical satisfaction should be pursued for the sake of spiritual fulfillment; not the other way round. However, fallen human beings do just the opposite. As a consequence they fail to achieve inner peace and harmony, and instead live lives of turmoil and desperation.

To achieve the inner peace and harmony which result from perfecting one's character is, however, to obtain only the first of God's three promises or blessings to us. The second blessing is the perfection of family life. The key considerations here are: (1) Just as one cannot achieve perfection of character without establishing a correct Inner Quadruple Base, one cannot achieve perfection of family life without establishing a correct Outer Quadruple Base, resulting in harmonious give-and-take action with others. (2) If one is unable to achieve this kind of relationship within the family, one will also be unable to achieve it with others. Thus, Unificationists believe that perfecting the family is a necessary condition for achieving proper relationships in other areas of life.

What values should govern family life? In conformity with his premises that one can derive norms for human action from reflecting on the nature of God and the laws at work in the universe, Dr Lee argues that:

[T]he relationships among heavenly bodies...were patterned after the image of a family. Accordingly, the order of the cosmos and the order of the family are similar, and we can derive the view of value, or the standard of conduct, of man by observing the

cosmos....In the cosmos there is vertical order; in the family, likewise, there is vertical order and vertical love: parental love (downward) and children's love (upward).⁵⁷

Since relationships in nature reflect the Original Image, and relationships in a perfect family reflect those in nature, it follows that relationships in a perfect family reflect the Original Image or God. Thus Dr. Lee states: "In their relationship, the ideal husband resembles one essential aspect of God (positivity), and the ideal wife resembles another essential aspect of God (negativity). Neither is complete or fulfilled without the other. Only when united do they substantially resemble the harmonious positivity-negativity relationship in God."⁵⁸

Just as the establishment of a correct Inner-Quadruple Base requires that one's spiritual-mind dominate one's physical-mind, establishment of a correct Outer-Quadruple Base requires recognition of the hierarchy that ought to hold in the social world, and of one's proper place within it.

There is no harmonious give-and-take action if the participants do not occupy their correct positions -- if, for example, students in a school oppose their teachers and go on strike; or the teachers do not care about the well-being of their students. Harmonious give-and-take is based on love and on the observance of position.⁵⁹

Here again the family is the model:

Love is directional: the love of parents for their children is vertical (downward); the love between husband and wife is horizontal; and the love of children for their parents is vertical (upward). Unless each family member is in his or her proper position, true love cannot be realized.⁶⁰

Establishing an order of relationships that mirrors God's nature and the

natural order, and maintaining one's position within it, is essential to Unification ethics as Dr Lee understands it. Indeed, this may be said to be the heart of his position.

Without position and order, there is no direction, and love cannot be expressed. Ethical standards, therefore, deal with the order of love. Accordingly, ethics can be briefly defined as the establishment of order." ⁶¹

Since the order to be established is an hierarchial one in which some people initiate actions and others receive them, it is also essential that the relationships be thought of as establishing subjects and objects. This is true because: "In order for give-and-take action to be established, there must be correlative elements of subject and object."⁶² Morality as Dr. Lee conceives it, therefore, requires that some people follow the orders of others. He states, for example: "The object-position is necessary in order for us to establish order, morality, and norms in our society; only through respecting and following a true person in the subject-position can order and morality be reestablished."⁶³

Since positivity and negativity are also basic features of God and nature, these characteristics must be taken into consideration as well in establishing an ethical order. "Give-and-take action is always carried out between subject (+) and object (-), not between subject (+) and subject (+). The action between subject and subject is repulsive -- that is, they refuse to unite and, actually, repel each other."⁶⁴ Given this view struggle is a manifestation of repulsion between subjects.⁶⁵ Or, alternatively stated, it is a result of people failing to accept their

proper place in the scheme of things, refusing to accept object positions and insisting instead on subject positions.

But how are we to know what subject-object relations should be established in society? Here again, according to Dr Lee, we should look to nature and the family as our model. For example, observation of nature informs us that "man has more positive characteristics than woman, and woman has more negative characteristics than man."⁶⁶ Or to state the same idea somewhat differently: "Man is born as the united being of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang characteristically positive (masculine), while woman is born as the united being of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang characteristically negative (feminine)."⁶⁷ Now we know from the earlier discussion of the Original Image that the positive element in God is that which is responsible for His activity and constitutes Him as a subject. We know also that to be a subject is to take an active, dominating position; whereas to be an object is to take a passive dependent role. Since the human male has more positive characteristics than any other created thing, it follows that men ought to dominate all other things including women.

Man is the subject and dominator of all creation...He is in the subject-position not only with regard to creation, but also with regard to his wife, his subordinates, his children, those younger than him, and so forth.⁶⁸

Women may on occasion assume subject positions, but only if a husband-wife relationship is not involved:

When their relationship is not of husband and wife, woman can at times have the subject-position, and man, the object position. For example:

the relationships between mother and son, elder sister and younger brother, female senior officer and male junior officer, and female teacher and male student.⁶⁹

Notice how age as well as sex is a fundamental consideration. It would apparently be improper for a younger sister to assume a permanent subject position toward an older brother, even if she were better informed and wiser.

It is crucially important that at this point a possible misunderstanding be avoided. In saying that men should dominate women and the rest of creation, Dr. Lee is not claiming that men should treat other people any way they wish. To the contrary, he insists that:

While in the subject-position, man must be guided by the original subject-consciousness -- that is, by love. Subject-consciousness is often misconstrued as one's tendency to...dominate others by putting oneself first. The true, or original subject-consciousness, however, is love; in other words, to be a subject means to love those in the object position."⁷⁰

Similarly, he maintains that: "At the base of ethical conduct...there must be the practice of love, for without love norms are nothing but rules and regulations that one can easily ignore."⁷¹ Thus, to dominate others, as Dr. Lee uses the term, is not to act toward them in selfish ways, but to govern them with love. To conceive of domination as necessarily selfish is to equate it with the domination characteristic of fallen man.

Another fundamental assumption of Dr. Lee's axiology is that: "A school, a commercial company, a social organization, and a nation are extended forms of a family....Accordingly, they should display the same kind of order."⁷²

It follows that the same ethical standards or principles that apply to marriage and the family should be applied to them. The only difference is that: "When these ethical standards are applied to business, they become business ethics; when applied to a nation, they become national ethics."⁷³

Dr. Lee offers the following example of how these principles constitute a business ethics:

The numerous labor problems in capitalist society...can be solved, if family ethics are applied to the economic world. The relationship between the president of a firm, for instance, and his employees should be like that between a parent and his children; the relationships among workers, like those among brothers and sisters. The idea that the president of a business organization should reap most of the profit is wrong. In order to create a family-like atmosphere, the president must have the heart of a parent. Parents exist for the whole family and want their children to earn money as well. The president should think of his employees as his own children or his own brothers and sisters, taking responsibility for them as if they were members of his family. His attitude should be that he is earning money, not primarily for himself, but for them. There will be no need, then, for employees to strike in order to take money away from the president.⁷⁴

SUGGESTIONS AND CRITICISMS

Because the remaining space is limited, the following suggestions and criticism are very brief. They consist primarily in pointing out certain considerations which show that Dr. Lee has made certain assumptions that need additional defense.

It should not come as a surprise that Dr Lee's theories of the Original Image and created beings terminates in social and political conclusions, because we are told a number of times that this is the primary purpose for which they were developed. But is it legitimate to infer rules of human

behavior from a concept of God understood in formal and spatial terms? Let us recall Dr Lee's remark quoted above that "in discussing ontology we do not, and cannot, deal with God Himself, but only with the attributes of God. Consequently, our ontology is called "Theory of the Original Image," and not "Theory of the Original Being."⁷⁵ And after presenting the first part of his theory that God is composed of the dual elements of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang, he states: "Actually, God is absolute, and thus cannot be separated into elements. He is not a composite being as finite beings are. The theory of dual characteristics objectifies God into the world of time and space, for the purpose of obtaining a convenient and correct understanding of God."⁷⁶ Slightly later he states: "[T]here is neither time nor space in God. Thus, our explanations about attributes and structure in God are figurative and metaphorical."⁷⁷

There is a prima facie problem with these remarks. Notice that, on the one hand, it is claimed that because God is not composite, one cannot speak of Him as literally separated into elements; but, on the other hand, it is maintained that a concept of God derived in this manner is nevertheless a "correct understanding of God." The question, therefore, arises if the account that has been given is not a literal account, then in what sense is it correct? Furthermore, if statements about attributes and structures of the divine nature are only metaphorical, then talk about dynamic relations between such attributes, e.g., give-and-take action, would seem to be equally metaphorical.

Another related problem is that because the relationships being described

are spatial, any resemblance between them and moral relationships must also be metaphorical. This poses problems for the account that is given of the proper relations between human beings. For example, consider again the passage:

[T]he relationships among heavenly bodies...were patterned after the image of a family. Accordingly, the order of the cosmos and the order of the family are similar, and we can derive the view of value, or the standard of conduct, of man by observing the cosmos....In the cosmos there is vertical order; in the family, likewise, there is vertical order and vertical love: parental love (downward) and children's love (upward).⁷⁸

If this is meant to refer to the physical universe which we experience through our senses, the vertical order that is being mentioned must be spatial. That is, upward and downward here mean only that one thing is located above or below another thing in space. One can if one wishes take the concept of a parent having moral authority over a child as analogous to the spatial relationship of one thing being above another spatially, but an argument must be presented to show how, if at all, this helps us understand the nature of such authority. Even if we add the statement that the parent should exercise his or her moral authority over the child with love, this doesn't inform us in any way about the particular actions it would or would not be legitimate for the parent to undertake in exercising the authority. One cannot even deduce from such a spatial analogy that the child ought to obey the parent, because from the fact that some things in the universe are above others, it follows just as much that the parent should obey the child, as that the child should obey the parent. In fact neither inference follows, and the only way it could be shown that the latter follows would be to demonstrate that: (1) certain types of things are always above other

types of things, (2) parents are more like the type of thing that is always above the other type of thing, (3) children are more like the type of thing that is always below the other type, and (4) when a certain class of human beings are more like a type of thing that is always above some other type of thing, and other human beings are more like the type of thing that is always below the former type of thing, then the latter human beings should always obey the former. However, I cannot imagine what type of argument could possibly establish such a thesis.

Similar problems arise regarding the doctrine of positivity and negativity. Consider the statements: (1) "Give-and-take action is always carried out between subject (+) and object (-), not between subject (+) and subject (+). The action between subject and subject is repulsive -- that is, they refuse to unite and, actually, repel each other."⁷⁹ "Struggles, therefore, are a manifestation of the repulsion between subject and subject -- not between subject and object."⁸⁰ These statements are used by Dr. Lee in an attempt to show that the husband should always have authority in the family. The suggestion is that there can be but one leader in the family, and God and nature have decreed that it must be the male. The husband must be the only leader or subject in the family or otherwise struggle and chaos would result. Consequently the wife must take the object role. This ignores the fact that the wife might be more intelligent and a better leader than the husband. Even if that is not the case, human beings are capable of entering into equal partnerships in other areas such as business. Why cannot decisions within the family also be made jointly? If to be a subject means to relate to other people with love, there should be no reason this

66-7-5

could not be the case. Indeed, it is the case in many families in the West. No doubt positive and negative electrical charges repel one another, but that in no way proves that one model of the family is, therefore, superior to another, or that God intended one to be adopted to the exclusion of the other. It does not seem that the analogy will support the conclusion.

The paternalistic thesis that all other institutions ought to be modeled on the family with the father understood as having primacy of authority also needs defense. This theory as applied to government has been rejected in the West since the time of John Locke because of the abuses to which it led. Instead of conceiving government officials as the parents of the people, Locke and subsequent democratic thinkers view them as agents of the people, delegated to perform certain tasks but not others, and legitimately removed from office if they do not carry out their assigned responsibilities properly or exceed their authority.

Paternalistic theories have also been rejected in the economic sphere in the West. Unlike Dr. Lee who argues that the president of a company should be seen as a parent, and employees as their children, Western theorists see both the president and employees as paid agents of the stockholders who own the business, and to whom they are therefore responsible. Needless to say one if one starts from this premise one will arrive at a different business ethics from the one Dr. Lee sets forth. (The obligations of employees to stockholders are of course not the only ones they have.)

Dr. Lee says that it is impossible to have genuinely ethical rules without

love. I agree totally with this statement. However, I do not believe that God had decreed that paternalistic institutions are a better way of expressing love than alternative institutions. For as John Stuart Mill pointed out, even when decisions that are made on our behalf are arrived at with love and are in our best interest, we are nevertheless deprived of a great good, of exercising the autonomy and assuming the dignity God intended us to have. Equality dignity before God therefore seems to imply equal rights in decision making.

However, Dr. Lee contrasts equality of rights and equality of love as though it were impossible to obtain both, and says that democratic societies should pursue the latter rather than the former. "Today's democratic societies are going in the wrong direction in their search for equal rights. Democracy should pursue the equality of love."⁸¹ However, if love includes respect for the rights of others, then there is no inherent conflict between pursuing both. Furthermore, this view does not seem to me to be inconsistent with Unificationism. For example, both the development of democratic institutions and the doctrine of equal rights are cited in Part II, Chapter IV, Section VII, (6) of Divine Principle as helping usher in the age of restoration. This suggests that although give-and-take and the desire to achieve harmony is fundamental to the development of the self, the family, and democratic government, they need not take the same form at each stage, that e.g., respect for the rights of others makes no sense when one is talking about the attempt to perfect one's character but is essential for bringing about social harmony and democratic government. It would, therefore, appear that the conclusions which Dr. Lee draws from

his discussion of such principles as those of give-and-take and the principle of growth through three stages, are not the only conclusions one may reach starting from Unification revelation, and that just as Thomism is only one of the philosophies that have been developed within Christian thought, the axiology Dr. Lee develops is only one of those that may be developed within Unification thought.

1. Sang Hun Lee, Explaining Unification Thought, Unification Thought Institute, 481 8th Avenue, New York, N.Y., 1981, xvii. All subsequent quotations in this article are from this book. Although Dr. Lee is in the process of revising this work and I was sent a copy of the preliminary revision of the chapter on axiology, I have not quoted from it because without an opportunity to examine the entire revised book I might misinterpret the contents of a single chapter and the final revised version may differ from the preliminary version.

2. p. 3.

3. p. xxiv.

4. p. 6.

5. p.6.

6. pp. 6-7.

7. p. 10.

8. p.8.

9. p. 58.

10. p.60.

11. p. 29.

12. p. 54

13. p. 21.

14. p. 26.

15. p. 13.

16. p. 36.
17. p. 17.
18. p. 17.
19. p. 17.
20. p. 73.
21. p. 31.
22. pp. 35, 263-72.
23. p. 28.
24. pp. 28-29.
25. p. 3.
26. p. 69.
27. p. 69.
28. p. 30.
29. p. 31.
30. p. 31.
31. p. 31.
32. p. 75.
33. p. 76.
34. p. 76.
35. p. 83.
36. p. 203.
37. p. 209.
38. p. 201.
39. p. 207.
40. p. 201.
41. p. 38.

- 42. p. 210.
- 43. pp. 26-27.
- 44. p. xxiv.
- 45. p. xxiv.
- 46. p. 42.
- 47. p. 6.
- 48. p. 83.
- 49. p. 57.
- 50. p. 57.
- 51. p. 58.
- 52. p. 91.
- 53. p. 302.
- 54. p. 124.
- 55. p. 217.
- 56. p. 217.
- 57. p. 93.
- 58. p. 101.
- 59. p. 37.
- 60. p. 132.
- 61. p. 236-37.
- 62. p. 91.
- 63. p. 109.
- 64. p. 316.
- 65. p. 317.
- 66. p. 52.
- 67. pp. 101-02.

- 68. p. 109.
- 69. p. 53.
- 70. p. 109.
- 71. p. 225.
- 72. p. 93.
- 73. p. 233.
- 74. p. 236.
- 75. p. 6.
- 76. p. 15.
- 77. p. 39
- 78. p. 93.
- 79. p. 316.
- 80. p. 317.
- 81. p. 240.