Committee VI
Unification Thought and the Global
Transformation of Consciousness

DRAFT--6/15/91
For Conference Distribution Only

DISCUSSANT RESPONSE

by

David A. Carlson
Department of World Religions
Unification Theological Seminary
Barrytown, New York, USA

to **Gene James'**

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

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

Committee VI
Unification Thought and the Global
Transformation of Consciousness
Response to: "Axiology: A Critical Examination of Dr. Sang Hun Lee's Unification Axiology" by Gene James
By: David A Carlson

Professor James gives us a very thoughtful essay on the Axiology section of Unification Thought. His purpose, as stated, 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." His essay has five parts: a) God and the Purpose of Creation, b) Created Beings, c) Axiology, d) Applications of the Axiology, and e) Suggestions and Criticisms.

Professor James begins with a summary of the Theory of the Original Image, since, per Dr. Lee's contention, in order "to develop an adequate axiology and apply it correctly, we must begin with theology." He looks, at some length, at the concepts of Sung Sang, Hyung Sang, Inner Sung Sang, Inner Hyung Sang, Logos, purpose, positivity, negativity, give-and-take action, heart, Inner Quadruple Base, and Outer Quadruple Base and then turns to "Created Beings," noting that "all things also mirror divine nature in forming a double quadruple base" and are called "individual truth bodies." Human beings are in the direct image of God, whereas all things are in the indirect image of God.

Next under consideration is "Axiology." Professor James notes that "human beings differ from the rest of creation in having the

60

abilities to seek truth, goodness, and beauty, and to give and receive love," but that "God's purpose in creating the universe cannot be realized unless human beings actualize these values in their conduct." Our "actions have no value unless they fulfill the responsibilities assigned to" us and "give joy to God." He summarizes the theory of value: value is a quality arising from a relationship, and actual value is distinguished from latent value.

When considering the "Application of the Axiology," Professor James notes that our "first duty must be to strive to understand God's nature and His plan in creating" us. "Only then will we be able to discover the principles which should guide our lives." The problem, however, is that because we are "fallen and estranged from God" we no longer "seek to discover and apply" in our lives "the principles God established for the proper functioning of the universe." One such principle, the most fundamental one, is "give-and-take action according to which all things were created to establish subject-object relations and enter into harmonious interaction with one another." Because "order within the created world is a reflection of the order within the Original Image," we can gain some understanding of God through nature. This reflection involves inner and outer, and horizontal and vertical subject-object relationships. Thus, "each individual has a proper place in the social-political order." Mention is also made of the three blessings (perfection

60

of character, family, and dominion) and the ways in which they involve inner and outer quadruple bases. The family itself is the model for larger social institutions such as a school. Appropriate values must be sought after in all these different relationships. "Establishing an order of relationships that mirrors God's nature and the natural order, and maintaining one's position within it" Professor James sees as being "the heart" of the Unification position on ethics. The "order to be established is an hierarchical one in which some people initiate actions and others receive them," that is, some people are subjects, and others are objects in any given relationship. To know which subject-object relations should be established in society we again "look to nature and the family as our model." He calls attention to certain implications for men and women.

In offering "Suggestions and Criticisms" Professor James wishes to point out "certain considerations which show Dr. Lee has made certain assumptions that need additional defense." He asks, for example, "is it legitimate to infer rules of human behavior from a concept of God understood in formal and spatial terms?" Suggesting the possibility of "metaphor," he holds that if the Unification concept of God is a "correct" one, "in what sense is it correct?" How far ranging might "metaphor" be applicable? Is the "resemblance" between "spatial" and "moral" relationships "metaphorical?" He raises questions concerning "positivity" and "negativity," and the phenomenon of "repulsion" in terms of

68

"authority" in the family situation of husband and wife. Professor James raises the question of "the paternalistic thesis that all other institutions ought to be modeled on the family" wherein the father is the authority figure, pointing out that paternalistic theories have in the past been rejected in both the political and economic spheres. He finally calls to task the distinction between "equality of rights" and "equality of love," holding that "there is no inherent conflict between pursuing both." He ends by raising the intriguing possibility that "the axiology Dr. Lee develops is only one of those that may be developed within Unification thought."

I appreciate Professor James' essay on Axiology. It is both thoughtful and challenging. It is apparent that he has taken the material very seriously. My first comment has to do with the organization of his essay. Since Theory of the Original Image, and Ontology, are other sections in Unification Thought, and will be addressed separately in our deliberations, granting that there is some overlap, I would like to have seen less space devoted to a review of their content and more attention given to Axiology. Ten pages are taken to review concepts which will most likely be dealt with in other essays. I appreciate the fact that in Unification Thought "theology" is the basis for developing an axiology. But only three pages are devoted to Axiology and the remainder of the essay is given to its application and Professor James' very helpful suggestions. Of eighty-one endnotes, there

60

are only six taken from the actual pages of the text of the section on Axiology. This comment, of course, is not at all meant to detract from the quality of the discussion in the essay. Let me move on to some questions of accuracy. In his review of God and the Purpose of Creation, a small error is made on page three. He states: "Since Inner Sung Sang, which contains Inner Hyung Sang..." Inner Sung Sang and Inner Hyung Sang are related to each other as subject and object, and the latter is not usually thought of as being contained in the former. He has, on page eight, correctly identified one of the most troublesome ideas in the chapter on Ontology (his reference is to the idea as laid out in the chapter on the Original Image), an idea which needs some refinement in its expression. This is, of course, the idea of the positivity and negativity of the human mind. Another error occurs on page ten where he states: "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." This is only half correct. The Inner Quadruple Base is/can be both Identity-Maintaining and Developing, and the same holds true for the Outer Quadruple Base.

When Professor James turns his attention to Axiology on page eleven, he lifts up some central ideas. Human beings are different from the rest of creation in that they are concerned with truth ("trueness" would be better), beauty, goodness, and love, and value is a quality that arises from the relationship

61

between subject and object, wherein the object produces joy for the subject. He also notes the distinction between latent and actual value, and the fact that human beings must actualize values in their conduct. These points are all very relevant but I would like to have been given some reflection on the concepts of "essence of value," "subjective action" and the "standard of value," significant concepts which would have something to contribute in response to the questions he raises in later parts of his essay.

In his discussion of the application of Axiology, Professor James raises some very important questions. He asks how we can know what the principles were which God intended us to live by. He realizes that Unification Thought argues for a divine-human-natural "reflection" but he asks how this reflection is to be understood. In discussing the "three blessings" ("promises") he makes a comment on page sixteen which can easily be misunderstood. He states: "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..." In fact, developing one's character has to do with the Inner Quadruple Base. When one speaks of the family, one is concerned with the Outer Quadruple Base. He asks on page seventeen what values should govern family life. Again, he notes Dr. Lee's premise about the reflection between the divine, the human, and the natural worlds, and again

60

questions how this is to be understood. It has to do with the subject and object relationship. Actually, Professor James at this point is encroaching upon the Ethics section and, again, this will be dealt with in another paper. But his excellent comments do deserve a response. The thrust of his questions is concerned with how we are to know what subject/object relations should be established in society. The subject-object relationship is critical in Unification Thought and exists universally, in all spheres. The purpose of subject/object relationships, in the human sphere, is to realize the love of God between two people. When a relationship is established between husband and wife, one is necessarily subject and the other object. These positions can change at times as when, for example, a man is sick in bed, or when a woman is a business executive. In any case, however, there should be true love realized between them. And the practical content of such love will vary depending on the specific context.

One of the more important questions Professor James raises, and one which concerns the questions raised so far, has to do with the sense in which statements in Unification Thought are to be taken, whether literally or as metaphor. He asks: "is it legitimate to infer rules of human behavior from a concept of God understood in formal and spatial terms?" Unification Thought speaks of God in terms of "attributes and structures," which are taken metaphorically, and yet are considered to be a "correct

understanding." Then, is talk about give-and-take action not "equally metaphorical?" Also, is it legitimate to compare a "spatial" relationship and a "moral" relationship? Is this moral relationship not metaphorical also? Of course, the Reality which we call "God" is beyond all categories of human thought. Nevertheless, Unification Thought believes that God must be made relevant to our human experience and the whole thrust of Unification philosophy is to offer practical ways in which to address and solve actual problems. The view of God in Unification Thought is, therefore, presented as a "correct understanding" in the sense that it provides a model or pattern for order and position (which are found throughout the universe) in human society, through which we can correctly guide our relationships. This model, or pattern, is purposely expressed in terms relevant to our concrete world of time and space. As for the issue of metaphor, I refer Professor James to Ontology where it is explained that give-and-take action is basically "circular movement," the "existing mode of existing beings" (p. 84) and that "there are numerous kinds of motion that are not literally circular." In order to fulfill his/her specific purpose of creation, the "literal" circular movement of a human being was transformed "to mental action centering on heart and value, due to the peculiar feature of the duality of flesh and spirit." (p. 98, Unification Thought, 1973) This transformation is not metaphorical; it is "modified circular motion." It is a literal (real) transformation, but at the same time I would hesitate

before trying to show a specific literal instance of "mental action centering on heart and value." This is for the intuition. On another point, Professor James states that he is not informed "in any way about the particular actions it would or would not be legitimate for the parent to undertake in exercising" authority over a child. Human beings are not robots, but beings of free will, and especially heart. In any given situation, it is the heart and sense of true love which alone can dictate the appropriate "particular action" which is contextually "correct," keeping in mind the importance of the parent having a mature heart and a sincere and pure desire to nurture the child in such a way that his/her true divine nature might be manifested. Sometimes soft love, but sometimes spanking is appropriate. The parent is subject to the child (object) and this does not change (thus, the child must respect and obey the parent, while the parent must love, care for, guide the child. In this way the proper order and position can be maintained and love actualized, but the particular actions, etc. may vary according to context. Professor James also sees a problem concerning the husband and wife in the "doctrine" of positivity and negativity. In response, the position of Unification Thought is that once a husband and wife are united in true love, the distinction between subject and object (which is a means to the end of unity, as seen in the four position foundation, or quadruple base) becomes secondary and the unity of heart they manifest becomes the primary reality. Therefore, a wife who is

60

more intelligent and a better leader can humbly and sincerely (lovingly) complement her husband with advice, etc. while supporting her husband whereas the husband can humbly listen to his wife's counsel in his activity, and thus together they can be a wonderful and inspiring couple, a true example of leadership. We are not complete in ourselves. I agree with Professor James that decisions should be made jointly. The "repulsion" action which he notes has its context in the chapter on history where the real "repulsion" is that between good and evil in historical development, and has to do with the separation of good and evil. Unification Thought does not usually think of repulsion action as being of importance in a family context (exceptions would be related to "restoration through indemnity," but this is only a "temporary" phenomenon).

Unification Thought does not promote the "paternalistic" thesis. In fact, in the Theory of Education, the parental model (husband and wife) is explicitly pointed out as being the ideal pattern. A husband-wife team should be the center. This is why the Unification Movement emphasizes the concept of True Parents. If there was a husband and wife team of true love at the center of the economic and political spheres, it may very well be that we would not see the corruption, bureacracy, bribery, scandal, graft, etc. that we presently sometimes see.

Finally, Professor James sees "no inherent conflict" between an equality of rights and an equality of love. I feel there is some

misunderstanding here about the meaning of "rights." The point in Unification Thought is that true equality is an equality of love (far more important than a mere equality of rights), wherein everyone feels fully satisfied internally, although what they feel they have a "right" to may be very different among different individuals. Furthermore, love can only be realized through order, that is, through the proper subject/object relationship. Because they are in different positions (one is subject, one is object) they will not necessarily feel, internally, the "right" to exactly the same thing/s (= "equality of rights"), but what is important is that whatever it is that they feel they need or have a right to, they can truly feel equal only when every need is fully satisfied. The question may be raised as to what needs there are, and which ones are of primary and secondary importance, etc. At this point the concept of the "absolute standard of value" in axiology would be very helpful. However, this essay has focused more on "ethics" than on "axiology." His closing remark that "the axiology Dr. Lee develops is only one of those" that might be possible in Unification Thought is intriguing. It is not inconceivable that another axiology could be developed, but at this point I find the present perspective very attractive, although it could still use some refinement. Although the bulk of his discussion has concerned ethics more than axiology the ethical questions he raises are very important. Again, I want to thank him for a very thoughtful essay and apologize for not offering a better response in return.