



**DISCUSSANT RESPONSE**

by

**Andrew Wilson**  
Editor, World Scripture  
International Religious Foundation  
New York, New York, USA

to Charles Courtney's

**EDUCATION AND THE GLOBAL TRANSFORMATION OF CONSCIOUSNESS**

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

©1991, International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences

RESPONSE TO CHARLES COURTNEY'S  
EDUCATION AND THE GLOBAL TRANSFORMATION OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Andrew Wilson

Charles Courtney has written a constructive and sympathetic reflection on Unification Thought's theory of education. It is a close reading of chapter 7 of Explaining Unification Thought [EUT], offering comments and questions on almost every paragraph. The paper evinces considerable understanding of the theory, and many of the comments are quite pertinent. A number of them have been addressed by Sang Hun Lee in his lectures at Barrytown in 1990 and, presumably, in the forthcoming volume, Foundations of Unification Thought. Therefore, I mainly wish to express my appreciation for this paper. Its constructive approach can help us to clarify concepts and further hone the theory of education in Unification Thought.

Before tackling some of the specific issues raised by the paper in the light of Lee's recent lectures, I want to point out one terminological problem which has led to some confusion. Several times in his paper, Courtney expresses disappointment that not more is said in EUT about specific pedagogical methods, materials, and techniques as they relate to educating students of various ages. This might be expected, particularly since one section of the theory is entitled "Method of Education" (EUT, 221). But now Lee is careful to distinguish between the philosophy of education, which deals with its essence and broad purposes, and the science of education, which deals with specifics of curriculum, method, and evaluation. Unification Thought offers only what is properly a philosophy of education. The section heading "Method in Education" is better rephrased "Types of Education."

We begin with an ontological question about the nature of the resemblance between created beings and God, specifically whether in ascribing temporality

to God, Unification Thought is asserting that there is development within God as there is in humans (pp. 2-3). Of course, Lee qualifies the discussion of the temporal relations among God's attributes (Chung-Boon-Hap action), stating that "there is neither time nor space in God" (EUT, p. 39). However, Courtney assents to Lee's contention that classical philosophies which regard God only from the standpoint of eternity and pure being cannot adequately deal with the relatedness of all things to one another and to their origin. Thus, in Unification Thought God is one, infinite, omnipresent, and eternally "now"; yet the attributes of God exist in temporal and spatial relations, comprising time and space, even as they comprise a unity that is beyond time and space. In God's own being, God is eternal. In relation to the creation, God acts within time. In the Original Image, there is both an Identity-maintaining Quadruple Base, which expresses the attribute of eternity, and the Developing Quadruple Base, which establishes the ground for God's activity. In the latter, we can speak of growth and development through three stages. For example, in the creation of the universe, first a purpose and plan are formed, then effort is invested in the fulfillment of the plan, and finally the purpose is realized.

Human beings likewise have both the aspects of eternity and development. The self has an identity which continues throughout life and eternally in the spirit world, and the self must grow and develop to reach maturity. Yet the meaning of resemblance is more complex, as humans only fully resemble God by fulfilling the Three Blessings. Unification Thought distinguishes degrees of resemblance: all created beings resemble God by containing the Universal Image (sung sang and hyung sang, yang and yin, quadruple base, development through three stages, etc.), but only humans have the potential, upon reaching maturity, to attain Divine Character: a character that resembles God's attributes of Heart, Logos, and Creativity. There is an additional complication, which is

brought to the fore through the theory of the Universal Image as it applies to human nature: Due to the Fall, humans, unlike other created beings, do not even manifest the Universal Image, since the relations between sung sang (spirit mind) and hyung sang (physical mind) and between yang (husband) and yin (wife) are disordered.

The next significant issue raised in the paper concerns the meaning of the First Blessing, or individual maturity. In EUT, this is defined as the maturity of the spirit self (p. 219). But Courtney rightly points out that this definition ignores the integral relationship of man's spiritual and physical natures, which should grow together. Along this line, Lee in recent lectures has fleshed out a more comprehensive definition of individual maturity based on the theory of the Original Human Nature (EUT, 99-101): it is the "unity of the spirit mind and physical mind, centering on heart." I think this revision addresses Courtney's concern. It should be clear that the perfection of the spirit self requires first the establishment of a proper subject-object relationship with the physical self, particularly since fallen people often suffer disorder in this relationship. The spirit mind seeks after spiritual values: love, truth, goodness, and beauty; it aims at a life lived for others, for the satisfaction that comes from contributing to a higher purpose. The physical mind seeks after worldly needs: food, clothing, shelter, and sex; its aim is to satisfy the physical body. Human beings have both spiritual and physical desires which should be integrated, with spiritual desires as subject. But due to the Fall, people often live centered on the physical mind, and their self-centered perspective prevents them from truly loving others or pursuing truth, goodness and beauty to the fullest extent. Love in Unification Thought is a principle of activity, of living for others; it is not mere sentiment. When the physical mind is subject, and our actions and relations with others

are oriented towards satisfying the self, there cannot be true love. True love is possible only when the physical self is disciplined and controlled so that one can devote oneself to loving and giving to others without distractions.

In education for individual maturity, children should learn self-discipline in order that the spirit mind is in the subject position over the physical mind, e.g., they should learn self-control, good manners, and proper behavior towards others while controlling self-indulgence, envy, anger, etc. They can also learn to subordinate bodily comforts for the sake of a higher goal through the discipline of athletics. Thus education of norms and physical education, which in this theory pertain to education for the Second and Third Blessings, also indirectly support education for the First Blessing.

Courtney remarks that in EUT's discussion of education of heart is excessively theoretical and doctrinal, and then charitably assuming that something more is intended, says, "it is as if the author was distracted and did not complete his thought." Courtney's own research into Unification pedagogy indicates that many psychological and social aspects are involved, not the least of which is the atmosphere of a loving family, the example given by good parents, and the efforts of teachers who practice love because they regard themselves as parents for their students. Lee also realized that he needed to develop this section of the theory, and in lectures has given a more detailed explanation of education of heart.

Before experiencing the Heart of God, the general aspects of education for individual maturity should be present: (1) a warm loving environment at home and supportive, caring teachers that children may experience the heart of love--teachers being the extensions of the parents; (2) discipline and manners in order that the children may internalize self-discipline and put the spirit mind in the subject position; and (3) learning to practice love, to appreciate

and respect others, and thus experience the satisfaction which love brings.

(4) Furthermore, teachers should themselves be people of love, who know God's heart, if they are to offer love and knowledge of God's heart to their students.

On that basis, the heart of God may be experienced, not merely understood. In EUT Lee stresses the cognitive aspect mainly because in his own experience, and in the experience of many believers, God is mainly perceived as a God of love and authority. In order to break through to a deeper level and know God as a suffering God, it took him many days of fasting and arduous prayer. But by knowing the Heart of God on an doctrinal, intellectual level, it is easier to relate with the Heart of God in one's inner life. One can make an analogy with a child's view of his or her parents: they are always strong, full of authority, full of love. Parents will not usually reveal their struggles and suffering to their own children. As the children grow and learn about the responsibility of parenting, can they begin to recognize something of what their parents have suffered on their behalf. Finally, they will recognize their parents' heart most fully when they become parents themselves. Then they will want to cry with them and comfort them for their years of toil.

Thus education begins with cognition and is fulfilled in experience and practice. To know God's heart, one begins on the intellectual level. Resources such as biographies of saints, art, literature, and the teacher's own example may be brought into play. But deeper knowledge, beyond cognition, requires a personal, spiritual experience. God's Heart is met both in prayer and in action. One may experience God's Heart in loving others, dealing with rejection and failure, taking responsibility for others, perseverance, and creating things which give joy to others.

The phrase "man of personality" (EUT, 227), which also describes individual maturity, has been defined in recent lectures as a person with "a balanced personality of intellect, emotion, and will centered on shimjung (heart)." People who know the heart of God, who have strong spirit minds so that they may act with self-control and take responsibility for their lives, will be practitioners of love. Having a balanced personality, they will have deep interest in the pursuit of truth, goodness, and beauty in all fields. Such people will want to live for the benefit of others, and may devote themselves to public service. Knowing the heart of God, they will have keen sensitivity to the emotional and spiritual condition of all beings, sympathize with their sufferings, and help them to fulfill their hopes and aspirations.

Turning to education of norm, Courtney brings out several questions. First, he points out the tension between love and obedience in education, and asks which has priority (pp. 6-7). He concludes that in Unification Thought, love indeed has priority over obedience. I think that the above discussion on education to train the individual to put the spirit mind in the subjective position and develop self-control can give a theoretical foundation for obedience as a necessary part of education. In addition, Unification Thought regards obedience in children is an expression of love for their parents; the obedient child is concerned to ease the way for his or her parents and comfort their heart. In the Garden of Eden, when Adam and Eve disobeyed God, at that moment they chose self-love and the love of Satan over the love of God. Without obedience, there was no way for Adam and Eve to realize true love. Of course, good education begins from the parents giving love, not in demanding obedience, from their children. Education should not be formalistic; obedience will occur naturally with the give-and-take of love. But regardless of the capacity of their parents, children should learn obedience as the first stage

in learning how to return love to their parents and to become responsible. Obedience, therefore, is a form of children's love, and should not be seen as in tension with love.

Second, he asks whether the education of norms in the family can easily be extended to conduct in other social roles (p. 9), as asserted by Unification Thought. I think that there is considerable social and psychological research which supports this assertion. Children from broken homes are far more likely to have discipline problems in school and to become criminals than are children who are raised by stable parents. Children of divorced parents, who fail to find in their parents role models of commitment to a relationship, have difficulty in sustaining a marriage themselves. But will a person educated in family norms be so obedient that he will never "show love by raising questions about established norms and assignments?" (p. 12). It takes more courage and more love to question unjust authority than to submit in blind obedience; hence I would guess that a person well educated in family norms will have more personal resources to challenge unjust authority than those with a weaker foundation in the home. I wonder if there are relevant sociological studies on whistle-blowers and if they back up my hunch.

Then, he questions the perfectionism in a statement from EUT (pp. 225-26) that those who receive a complete education of norm will never become unjust or corrupt, which might apply to perfect people, but not to us who live in a condition of fallenness. This observation is correct, yet it is beside the point. Even though man be fallen, the theory still applies. The education of norm will produce people of superior character who will make better citizens and better husbands, wives and parents.



Regarding the third type of education, education of dominion, Courtney recognizes that this is a broad category which covers just about every aspect of education in the conventional sense. Thus he is concerned about whether the concept dominion is broad enough to cover the whole range of human action towards the world. Specifically, does it include the aspects of receptivity, mutuality, and creativity?

. Unification Thought's theory of art sheds light on the relationship between receptivity and dominion. In Lee's recent lectures, he has discussed the unity of creation and appreciation. Creation and appreciation are both activities through which people seek joy in relation to an object, thereby creating value. In the act of creation one realizes value by adding beauty (value) to an object, while in appreciation one pursues value by finding beauty (value) in an object. Furthermore, creation is accompanied by appreciation, and appreciation is accompanied by creation. In other words, the activity of dominion requires repeated cognition of the object as it is being worked on and comes to resemble the plan in the mind of the subject; e.g., artistic creation requires repeated appreciation of the object until it comes to resemble the ideal image in the mind of the artist. Likewise, appreciation of a work of art includes an act of creation by the appreciator as she sets up a resemblance between herself and the work of art, thereby adding something of herself to the meanings evoked by the work of art. She is a subject who makes emotional judgments about the beauty of an art work which reflect to a considerable degree her personal predilections. In other words, dominion is a give-and-take relationship with an object which includes the aspects of receptivity and mutuality; and receptivity sets up a give-and-take relationship with the object which includes the activity of dominion.

Lee specifically equates dominion and creativity (EUT, 216); God's nature of dominion is his Creativity; humans likewise exercise creativity as they deal with the things in the world. Still, Courtney wonders whether education for dominion as described in EUT does not overemphasize skills, techniques, and practice while ignoring the faculties of "imagination," "perceptual delight and conversational play." Why, he asks, should education in art and music be subsumed under the category technical education? We might add, why should education in literature, which has as one object the appreciation of beauty which is a function of emotion, be classed under intellectual education? These are fair questions.

Again, the theory of art sheds some light on this issue. Creation occurs as a two stage structure (EUT, 266-68). The inner quadruple base produces a plan out of the interaction between the artist's personality (inner sung sang) and a particular style, theme, concept and idea in the artist's mind (inner hyung sang). Then the plan becomes the sung sang of the outer quadruple base for the creation of a work of art using a particular artistic medium and the requisite skills and techniques (outer hyung sang). In this two-stage structure, the outer quadruple base is developed on the foundation of technical education to develop the artist's skill; this aspect of art education is technical education. However, the education to properly form the inner quadruple base deals with the inner qualities of creativity: imagination, perceptual sensitivity, the concretization of emotion, education in a style, etc. Unification Thought's theory of education may indeed need another category besides technical education to describe this aspect of art education.

Then, is it true, Courtney asks incredulously, that every person has the God-given talent to become a genius? (p. 12) Is this not the articulation of a hope rather than a normative statement about human potential? Remember that in

Unification Thought, "genius" is applied more broadly than in ordinary usage, referring to excellence in any field, including politics, music, sports, etc., and not only in intellectual areas. The idea that every person is especially gifted in some area has circulated in educational circles for some time, and informs the pedagogical philosophy of certain private schools in Japan and the USA. It is certainly worthy of more attention.

Courtney concludes by questioning whether, in calling for unity in certain aspects of education, there will be sufficient room left for individuality. Part of the problem here is Lee's terminology, "unity in education" (EUT, 229), which in his lectures has been more properly translated "universal education." That is, education of heart and norm is universal education, applying to everyone, while education of dominion varies according to a person's talents and interests. I cannot understand how this compromises individuality. After all, the only unity ascribed to in the theory of education is that "we must turn our hearts, our thoughts, and our actions in one direction, with one goal--God" (EUT, 229). God is the origin and center of all the variety in the cosmos and in human beings. The relationship with God promoted by universal education has to do with love and moral norms, not with doctrines and creeds; hence there is no question of imposing some external doctrinal standard to which all must conform. But perhaps what is really at stake here is the traditional secular critique of religion as a threat to individual autonomy. Tillich and others have defended genuine theonomous faith against this secular critique, and I think their comments would apply here.

In conclusion, I thank Mr. Courtney for presenting a constructive and close analysis of the theory of education in Unification Thought. He has raised a number of thoughtful questions, all of which deserve further discussion.