



ART AND HUMAN UNIVERSALITY: THE FILMS OF CHARLIE CHAPLIN
AND A UNIFICATION THEORY OF ART

by

Lloyd Eby
Assistant Senior Editor
World and I Magazine
Washington, D.C.

The Twenty-first International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences
Washington, D.C. November 24-30, 1997

© 1997, International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences

**Art and Human Universality:
The Films of Charlie Chaplin, and a Unification Theory of Art**

by Lloyd Eby

(September 1, 1997; About 6300 words.)

This essay has two parts. In the first part I present an account of a particular art, with the goal of discovering and pointing out expressions of human universality that occur in it. In the second part I sketch a particular theory of art and of human universality as expressed in art, tied to and based on an account of human origins.

Part I

The Silent Films of Charlie Chaplin

We can look to the early silent-era stage in the history of film and see it as relatively primitive, relatively untainted with those effects of modernism, post-modernism, elitism, and avant-gardism that are corrosive. Because silent films have no narration or spoken part to explain things to the viewer (except for occasional title cards), they must rely on images and scenes that are quickly grasped by everyone; they must show their point rather than say it, meaning that they must rely on actions and scenes that are more or less universal in their implications and significations. Thus we can, I think, understand silent films to be a more or less naive art form.

To be sure, no film is exactly a primitive or naive or folk art. Making films, even from the beginning of film, requires utilization of complicated and expensive technology as well as financial and other resources. It also requires achieving an intricate and productive collaboration among many skilled people: producer(s), writer(s), director, performer(s), lighting director, cameraman(men), electricians, film crew, film editor(s), musician(s), set designers and builders and painters and other crafts-persons, make-up artist(s), costume and wardrobe people, laboratory technicians, and numerous others. However, I will assume here that all this does not discredit my claim that silent film can be treated as a form of (relatively) primitive art.

Here I'll consider some of the films of Charlie Chaplin because Chaplin is, I think, relatively well known, and at least some scenes from some of his films are likely to be familiar to the widest audience of people who are not film specialists. I also think that the films of Chaplin are likely to be aesthetically and empathetically accessible to the widest audience because they exhibit a great range and intensity of

human emotions, feelings, needs and desires, as well as intellectual content.

I will give a more or less complete scenario of one of the Chaplin films, *A Dog's Life*, and then go on to give briefer accounts of highlights of some others.

A Dog's Life

The film begins with the tramp sleeping by a curb, next to a hole where cold air is getting in. He stuffs the hole with a cloth to close off the air. Next we see a dog sleeping in a washtub -- an obvious parallel with situation of the tramp.

A street sausage vendor sets his bucket down next to the tramp (a board fence intervenes between them). Reaching under the fence, the tramp steals a sausage from the bucket. A policeman observes this happening, and attempts to arrest the tramp. The tramp rolls back and forth, under the fence, dodging the cop. The tramp then takes the cop's shoe. Several cops then chase the tramp, but he eludes all of them.

The scene changes and the tramp sees a chalkboard advertisement for brewery workers. As other workmen see the ad, there is a fight to get to the window where workers are being hired -- this is an extended scene. The tramp always loses out in this scramble to someone bigger and pushier.

In the next scene there is a fight among many dogs -- this mirrors the fight among the men to get to the work window, and it especially mirrors the tramp's plight. As this scene progresses, the dogs snatch food from a sidewalk vendor, sending the vendor into a fit of frustration and rage because he is unable to cope with so many dogs. Finally, the tramp is left with one dog that becomes "his" dog and companion for the remainder of the film.

Next, the tramp and his dog attend a dance at a music hall (called a "tenderloin" in the title-card in the film), where the tramp and his dog both steal food. One man there steals money from the pocket of a second man whose girlfriend had been forcefully stolen from him. The tramp puts the dog into his pants, with the tail wagging from a hole in the back. There seems to be some confusion among spectators in the dance hall whether this may actually be the tramp's tail. In one scene this tail beats on a bass drum.

A (female) singer sings a song so sad that we see the members of the audience and even the musicians weep. One woman sheds so many tears that they fall like water from a faucet. The tramp cries too, and the tears from the weeping woman fall on him. (There's a funny scene with the tramp moving back and forth, just missing the stream of tear-water.) The scene changes with another woman singing a very lively song, and the audience laughing and dancing.

The beautiful female singer who sang the sad song comes out from the wings of the stage onto the dance floor with her former audience. She is told by the boss to smile so the patrons will buy her drinks. She flirts and then dances with the tramp (while the dog is attached to him by a leash). During this scene, the tramp steps on and sticks to gum that is on the floor. Finally, the tramp is thrown out because he cannot afford to buy the girl a drink.

In the next scene, two men (thugs) in the dance hall rob a wealthy drunk. They then go out and bury his wallet (with the money in it) in the ground. The tramp and his dog -- now outside -- lie down over the exact spot where the wallet is buried. Meanwhile, the two thugs in the dance hall (who now have money, or at least access to it in the buried wallet) follow the beautiful singer.

As the tramp and his dog attempt to sleep on the ground (over the buried wallet), the dog is attracted to what is underground, and digs up the wallet. Finding the money in it, the tramp is now rich, and he and the dog return to the dance hall.

The beautiful singer has been fired, and in addition she has been shortchanged on her pay. The tramp finds her sitting forlornly at a table. (Another dance hall girl had tried, meanwhile, to pick him up, but he didn't go with her.) The proprietor of the dance hall tries to throw the tramp out, but he shows that he now has money.

The two thugs then steal the money from the tramp. Now having no money, he's thrown out of the establishment again. Outside the hall, the beautiful singer comes to his rescue. He goes back into the hall and -- using his considerable skill and wiles in an elaborate scene that takes several minutes -- succeeds in taking the money from the two thugs. When they realize what has happened, they chase him (in a funny chase scene).

The cops get involved in chasing the tramp and shots are fired. In an elaborate chase scene, involving the tramp, cops, other bystanders, food vendors, and dogs, the tramp's dog finally gets the wallet with the money.

In the penultimate scene, the tramp, the girl, and the dog are all united, along with the money that the dog has gotten by getting (rescuing) the wallet.

Finally, in a scene introduced by the title card "When dreams come true," the tramp has become a farmer planting his crops and the girl is seen in their house. He enters the house and she puts a robe on him. The scene moves to a shot of the dog in a basket with puppies (their children!). The film ends with a smile/grimace on the tramp's face, showing his ambivalence about this new state in which he now exists.

The Pilgrim

In *The Pilgrim*, the tramp is an escaped convict with a reward of \$1000 on his head. He is masquerading as a (religious) preacher. A young man with his girlfriend sees the preacher/tramp and says "He can marry us!" The preacher/tramp runs away, with the boyfriend chasing him. Then the girl's father comes and chases the boyfriend away.

The preacher/tramp takes a train for Texas. He arrives in a Texas town just as the local congregation is awaiting their new preacher, Rev. Pine. the preacher/tramp is mistaken for Rev. Pine and is given a grand welcome. On the way to the church he steals a whiskey bottle from the chief deacon's pocket. One young woman has taken to the preacher/tramp. There's a scene in church where he's expected to preach a sermon. He tells the David and Goliath story.

Later he goes to dinner at the home of the young woman and her mother. There are extended scenes there of the boisterousness of children who do not listen to their parents. In one particularly funny scene (my children laughed a lot at it), a naughty boy-child puts a hat on a pastry the daughter is making with the preacher/tramp's help (while they are not looking) -- the hat is exactly the same shape and size as the pastry, and they proceed to put the icing and decorations on the hat. Later the guests try to eat it, in another very funny scene.

A man who was with the tramp in prison recognizes him and insinuates himself into the preacher/tramp's company with his hosts; he is identified as the preacher/tramp's fraternity brother. The woman and daughter have a large sum of money (intended for paying their mortgage) in a cabinet. The preacher/tramp and his friend (the thief) are invited to stay the night in the house, and the thief attempts to steal the money. There is another very funny scene of the preacher/tramp attempting to foil the thief and save the money for the mother and daughter, which he does.

Eventually the preacher/tramp is identified as the runaway prisoner, and the sheriff is obliged to take him back to jail. But the scene is set on the U.S. - Mexico border, and the sheriff throws him across the border into Mexico(where the sheriff has no jurisdiction) so that the tramp can escape (it takes the tramp a long while to understand this point). But, on the Mexican side of the border, the tramp is attacked by a band of robbers -- so the film ends with the tramp straddling the border.

The Kid

This film begins with an unwed mother being dismissed from a charity hospital, followed immediately with an image of Christ bearing the cross. A man (an artist) with pictures of her -- presumably the father of her child -- knocks her pictures into a fire. The mother abandons the baby into the back seat of a car; knowing that

the car owner will be wealthy, she hopes that the baby will be well cared for. But thieves steal the car. When they find that their stolen car has a baby in it, they abandon the baby on a slum doorstep.

The tramp finds the abandoned baby, and then immediately tries to get rid of it. He puts it into a baby buggy and tries to run away, but the woman who owns the buggy sees him and, thinking that the baby is his, calls a policeman on him, thereby forcing him to take the baby back. The tramp contemplates dropping the baby into a storm drain, but then decides against this. He tries to get rid of the baby again, but is repeatedly thwarted. Finally he brings the baby to his attic room, and begins taking care of it, and the baby grows into a young boy.

The adoptive father and the boy have genuine affection for one another. Meanwhile, the real mother has become a wealthy performer who gives money for support of foundling and adoptive children, and she so aids the tramp's boy. Eventually, she learns that the boy is her own child, and she, the tramp, and the boy are united into a "natural" family.

The Kid is noteworthy for the improvisational ingenuity of the tramp in caring for the child (the improvisational ingenuity here is suggestive to me of a dominant characteristic in Buster Keaton's work), and of the contempt shown for policemen by both the tramp and the boy. Conflicts here, as in most of Chaplin's films, are settled through fighting. There is also a notably strong expression of paternal and maternal affection in this film.

In his excellent new biography entitled *Charlie Chaplin and His Times* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997), Kenneth S. Lynn suggests that this film contains many autobiographical elements, representing Chaplin's own childhood.

Pay Day

Beyond the usual actions and escapades of the tramp, *Pay Day* is noteworthy for its depiction of the wife as opponent and adversary. The tramp is a worker on a construction project who is underpaid on his overtime. The foreman's daughter arrives on the scene to bring her father his lunch, and the tramp is quite attracted to her. But the tramp's wife follows him to the construction site at pay time and takes away all "his" money. When, after many mishaps and adventures, he finally arrives home at 5:00 a.m. -- wake-up time for the next day's work -- the cats have eaten his dinner and he gets only bread. Moreover, his wife chases him with a rolling pin when he finally creeps into the bedroom.

The wife as opponent and adversary may be a common theme in some literature, and certainly in comics and soap-operas. I think this theme has been suppressed nowadays because of feminist opposition, but it is still potent and certainly resonates with many husbands, even though they may not say so aloud.

The Gold Rush

Early in this film -- considered by many to be the best of Chaplin's oeuvre -- there is a scene of the tramp, as an Alaskan gold prospector, being followed by a bear. There is fear of hunger in the famous scene of the starving prospectors in the cabin; the tramp's partner is so hungry that he becomes delirious and, seeing the tramp is a chicken, attempts to kill him to eat, including shooting at him. The well-known seesawing-house-teetering-over-a-precipice scene, while being inherently funny, also arouses enormous fear in the audience because they are afraid the house will fall with the men in it.

One of the most poignant scenes occurs in the tramp's cabin. He had invited a group of the dance-hall girls, including his favorite, for New Year's Eve dinner, but they fail to come and the tramp, in a dream sequence, imagines them there. The famous scene, of breathtaking ingenuity and charm, of the tramp making two potatoes do a dance routine occurs here.

As in all of Chaplin's films, this one expresses the tramp's usual fear of authority and of being arrested, but here it is also expressed as fear of being falsely accused and of losing newly-acquired wealth and status. [In another telling scene, his partner throws away a half-smoked cigar, and the now-wealthy ex-tramp shows he is still a tramp at heart because he immediately picks up the cigar butt off the floor -- as he frequently did as a poor tramp -- and begins smoking it.] This occurs on the ship returning home when the now-wealthy ex-tramp briefly takes off his new (costly, and status-signifying) clothes and dons his earlier (tramp) clothes at the request of a newspaper photographer, who wants to show him as he was before he and his partner found the gold mine. In his tramp clothes, he falls over a railing onto the lower deck, where he meets his former girlfriend, Georgia, from the dance hall. A ship's officer is searching for a stowaway, and the girl too thinks that the tramp is that stowaway and tries to hide and protect him. But he is discovered, and the girl offers to pay his passage. When the ship's captain -- who knows his true status and wealth -- finds out what has occurred and rights things, the former tramp takes the woman as his girlfriend and the film ends with them united in his now-affluent status.

City Lights

City Lights begins with a poor blind girl selling flowers. We are shown the modest apartment where she lives with her grandmother. Next, in a night scene, we see a man by the river repeatedly try to hang himself. The tramp attempts to stop him and both fall into the river. The man is actually quite rich and takes the tramp with him to his house, where he repeatedly pours liquor down the tramp's pants.

Repeatedly in this film, the rich man loves the tramp in the evening and night when the rich man is drunk, but rejects and doesn't know him in the morning when

he is sober. The rich man's butler always tries to reject the tramp, but the rich man will not permit that when he is drunk.

Meanwhile the tramp has taken the rich man's Rolls Royce and taken the blind flower girl to her home, so she thinks he is himself rich. He kisses her hand, acting like a man of wealth and refinement, and asks to see her again.

Eventually, the tramp gets money from his rich friend and gives it to the blind girl for medical attention, and she gains her sight. She then becomes proprietor of a flower shop and gains wealth. Eventually, the tramp comes by her shop and looks in the window; she sees him but doesn't recognize who he is. She is gracious enough to invite him in, and she finally realizes he is the one who was her great benefactor. The film ends inconclusively, not answering the question whether he will get the girl or whether she will now reject him because of his low status.

This film does not say that to be blind is better -- in fact it says the opposite because the girl is clearly better off financially, culturally, and personally now that she can see. But it does raise more explicitly the question that is implicit in the previous films: whether the usual status-signifiers (clothes, cars, houses, ability to command others) are the proper ones. The tramp, after all, does not have those accoutrements, but he is a better man, in an important sense of better, than those who have them.

Selected Shorts

A bit earlier in his career Chaplin made a number of shorter films. Each has its noteworthy characteristics and moments. *The Immigrant* contains scenes of empathy, when the tramp sympathizes with the plight of other immigrants, especially the mother of the girl he is drawn to when the mother's money is stolen. It also contains fear of false accusation -- a recurring theme in Chaplin's films.

The Count contains scenes of simple pratfalls and incompetence, as well as smelly cheese. The most noteworthy theme there, in my view, is its depiction of people being impostors, assuming positions to which they are not entitled, a theme that occurs in numerous Chaplin films.

The Pawn Shop is noteworthy for its pratfalls and its business with a ladder -- the tramp repeatedly swings the ladder around and knocks people down. But it also depicts a man who says he wants to purchase diamonds from the pawnshop owner; the supposed customer is, however, really an imposter who is planning to steal the diamonds. The tramp's misadventures result in the thief being foiled. *The Adventurer* depicts an escaped prisoner on a seacoast. Much of the film consists of complex chase sequences. There is also a notable scene in which the tramp dumps ice cream down a woman's dress.

The Vagabond has more drama and less straight comedy than most of the films that preceded it -- it can be seen as foreshadowing the more complex and dramatic *The Kid*. It also is noteworthy for showing, in addition to the usual fight and chase scenes, an unsympathetic depiction of the mother as drudge or keeper.

In *Shoulder Arms* the tramp joins the "Awkward Squad" of the Army. The tramp cannot get in formation or march properly. There are many training and marching scenes with the tramp always out of it. The tramp is sent to the trenches of WWI; some scenes seem to be from actual battles of that war. In the end, after many adventures and a lot of funny "business," the tramp gets the girl (a Frenchwoman), escapes from the enemy (mostly by outwitting him), and actually captures the Kaiser.

Universal Themes and Chaplin's Tramp

As we have seen, nearly all of Chaplin's films depict certain basic and universal human needs, fears, and desires. These include hunger; fear of cold; the urges to flee and/or fight when accused or confronted; fear of wild animals; fear of authority (especially fear of policemen); fear of being accused, especially fear of being falsely accused; and sexual desire (in almost every film the tramp is drawn to a girl). All of these can be directly linked to biological survival and well-being.

Although Chaplin's movies are usually set in the America of the early twentieth century (and thus are partly time-specific), they could just as well have been set nearly anywhere -- the location itself is sufficiently non-distinctive as to be mostly irrelevant, although the machines and other technology of the time, as well as the social and economic arrangements and situations that prevailed, are frequently shown and are often principal parts of the activity.

More deeply, the themes and values of identity (Who is the tramp and why does Chaplin take up and use this character?), affinity (The tramp wants to belong, but never quite achieves this), justice (Who is guilty; will someone, especially the tramp, be unjustly accused? Will the truly guilty be apprehended?), altruism (Shown especially in the tramp's treatment of the blind flower girl in *City Lights*, but many other places too), duty (Shown, among many other places, in the tramp's taking up arms -- however ineptly -- in *Shoulder Arms*) social order (in all the films there is an implicit dialogue going on about this in the contrast between the tramp and the rest of society), and conflict resolution (the nearly endless scenes of fighting and conflict between characters in the films) occur over and over in nearly all of these films.

The central figure in all these movies -- the tramp -- exhibits certain identifiable characteristics. He is physically small. He has a distinctive walk and demeanor. Although he represents the lowest socio-economic level -- the homeless, penniless vagrant -- his behavior and his being or soul place him above his station. In fact, his manners and demeanor are frequently more elevated than those of much

more highly-situated people. He is resourceful and smart. He is afraid of certain things: hunger, cold, physical and especially metaphysical aloneness, wild animals, cops, emotional abandonment, and the scorn and putdowns of more highly-placed people. Yet he copes with all of them. He elicits the viewer's sympathy and empathy -- this depends on his being threatened and even getting beaten both by humans and by nature (as in the famous teetering-house sequence in *The Gold Rush*) because he is smaller or less well situated or less lucky than others, yet being resourceful and witty and finally succeeding against the odds.

The tramp is both cunning and sentimental, knowledgeable yet innocent, below the level of others socially and economically, yet frequently intellectually, emotionally, and culturally above them. He is in the world but not of it. He is an anarchist yet he wishes to belong, and we want him to succeed -- he brings out the covert insurgent in all of us. He is usually partly out of joint with the world around him. He often wishes to fit into that world -- he especially wants to get the girl (and finally succeeds in *Modern Times* and goes off with her at the end of the film; the end of the tramp role for Chaplin) -- yet he is never exactly one with it and frequently he deliberately breaks with it. He has a certain affinity with that world, but he is at the same time disaffiliated from it -- he often kicks it (both literally and figuratively) and has contempt for it.

Similarly with duty: The tramp understands his duty, at least sometimes, yet he is often unable to fulfill that duty in any ordinary way. But he often ends up being more effective and efficacious than those who stick by and follow their duty in the conventional way. There is an existing social order that is implicitly criticized by the being and actions of the tramp -- he challenges that particular social order as unjust, mistaken, inept, or otherwise objectionable. Yet the notion of some form of social order as a requirement for human life is everywhere asserted.

Most of all, the tramp is funny. His walk is funny, his demeanor is funny, his attitude is funny, and he does funny things with his hat, his cane, his feet, his hands, and with the people and objects he interacts with. His humor is, I think, universal in that nearly everyone, of whatever culture, is likely to find it funny. He shows us that humor is universal and universally needed and appreciated. Man cannot live by bread alone (or murder alone, as Hitchcock famously remarked) -- he has to laugh.

I suspect that these Chaplin films can or could appeal to almost everyone, of any culture, throughout the world because they appeal to and resonate with universal human desires, needs, and characteristics. Although of a particular time and place, they do not depend on those so much as they do on the tramp/clown/hero's special interactions with them, and the tramp character, while being very specific, is also, I think, universal in that he will/would appeal to almost everyone.

For one example, my own children -- daughter age 5, son age 8, and daughter age 13 -- sat and watched the Chaplin videotapes with me and laughed at the funny

scenes. These children are quite movie- and media-literate, having grown up with TV and movies, and they were initially inclined to dismiss these old, silent, black and white films as boring. But they quickly discovered otherwise. In fact, they repeatedly asked whether we had or could get any more of them to watch after we had finished looking at the Chaplin tapes I had rented for a particular evening. I take this to be evidence, however small, of the appeal of these films.

Part II

Toward a Unification Theory of Art

Although this Committee is organized around the notion of biological evolution as an account of human origins and human psychology as these are expressed in art, I will take a somewhat different tack. I am going to sketch here a different theory of the origin and place of human universals as these are expressed or found in art. I do this, first, because I find this account to be more convincing and illuminating than the Darwinist one, and that claim deserves, I think, to be tested. Second, I think this theory of art is worth looking into to see what, if anything, it offers to our investigation. The view to be outlined here, like the Darwinist one, can be understood as linking human psychology to biology, although it does it in a different way.

The view I am going to briefly characterize is the Unification view, the view developed by and out of the work of the Founder of ICUS, Sun Myung Moon. The central text for my exposition here is *Explaining Unification Thought*, by the late Sang Hun Lee (New York: Unification Thought Institute, 1981).

Unificationism (or Unification theory -- the terms I will use here for the view expounded by Sun Myung Moon and by others who based their expositions or views on his pronouncements and teachings) is a creationist theory in the sense that it is theistic and sees God's intelligent design and creative activity as necessary and central to the origin of the cosmos and the materials in it, the various species of living things, and humans. Unificationism does not answer the question however, about the mechanism by which this intelligent design and creative activity took place. It does understand this as having taken place over a long period of time (millions or billions of years), in stages, but it does not give the length of this time-period.

More important, Unification theory sees humans as created by God with certain divinely-given characteristics. Those characteristics originate from and thus resemble the characteristics of God, and are seen in biological organisms as well as in the inanimate world. According to this view, there exists what we might call a structural isomorphism among all these beings. So there is a metaphysical and ontological similarity among God, humans, and other beings. All beings have internal character (mind, in the case of humans) and external form (body, in the case of humans and animals). In addition, humans have within their bodies nearly all the

materials of the rest of the universe, and the human mind has, in undeveloped form, what the theory calls prototypes (ideas, or "seeds") of other beings. Humans are seen as a microcosm of the entire cosmos. All this provides the possibility of having a biological/scientific study of (both) the physical and the mental/psychological/spiritual aspects of the human being, including human concern with aesthetics or art.

The capacities or faculties or activities of the human mind/spirit can be said to consist, broadly speaking, of intellect, will, and emotion. To those correspond the values of truth, goodness, and beauty. Human activities involve all of these faculties - - intellect, will, and emotion -- but different faculties are more prominent in different activities. Roughly speaking, we can say that learning and science relate primarily to intellect, ethical activity relates primarily to will, and art is primarily concerned with or based on emotion.

In the *Explaining Unification Thought* text, art is defined as "the emotional activity of creating and appreciating beauty. The purpose of art is to produce joy. ...Therefore...art is 'the activity of creating joy through the creation and appreciation of beauty.'" (pp. 246-247) This definition may work for primitive or elemental or unlearned art. A more general definition might be that art is the emotional activity of creating and appreciating things that provide an emotional jolt or stimulation. That definition would take account of art that features or depends on the ugly, discordant, and disharmonious, as well as on those things that are beautiful, unified, and harmonious. It would also encompass those forms of art (e.g., Arnold Schönberg's serial compositions in music; conceptual art) which depend primarily on and derive their emotional jolt from activities that are primarily intellectual.

Unification theory sees all humans as descendants of one original human male-female pair, known as Adam and Eve -- the questions of when, where and how they appeared are not answered (except that they were created by God in some way). Thus all humans -- regardless of race, nationality, language, creed, or other differences -- are members of one (human) race. So the differences between humans are not so great as to permanently divide them, or make them not members of the same race, or make their minds and sensibilities sufficiently different that they will not respond to or create the same (or similar) universal values and aesthetic patterns. This has implications for theory of art. Among other things, it suggests that at the more basic or primitive level, human emotion, intellect, and will are likely to be similar among all people, and that major differences -- especially those of culture and history -- are learned rather than inborn. Thus primitive art and unlearned human responses to that art are likely to be similar across cultures.

Generally considered (and subject to the caveat introduced in the definition given above), art may be said to be concerned with the creation of beauty, and beauty, in the words of the *Explaining Unification Thought* text, may be defined as "the object's [i.e., the artistic object's or performance's] value felt as emotional stimulation [by the creator or appreciator of the art]." (p. 252) Thus beauty is not

latent in anything as an absolute, but comes about in the reciprocal relationship between the thing (object, performance, person, or whatever) that is being created or appreciated and the desire of the creator/appreciator in pursuing the value of that thing. So there must be *something* in the object that can give rise to the emotional feeling of beauty (or, more generally, aesthetic stimulation), but actual beauty comes about only in the reciprocal relationship between subject (i.e., the creator or appreciator) and the object (i.e., what is being created or appreciated). The judgment of beauty is thus subjective in that it requires action on the part of the subject and the inevitable addition of subjective elements to the judgment that the subject makes about the beauty of the object.

It can be said that all artistic creation and appreciation is undertaken in order to produce joy, and joy is created when a subject either creates or appreciates in such a way that a plan is substantiated (objectified, or expressed in an object) or discovered in the work (object). Such a plan, and the objectification of that plan, will have, among other things, motive, theme, and details. The artist and the appreciator need to be object-conscious, and express his or her individuality in creating and appreciating. The art object will have both content and form, or, to say it differently, both an internal character and an outward expression (in materials, action, or some other medium) of that internal content. In general, an appreciator's perception of an artwork is heightened when he/she understands or perceives the intention, motive, and theme that were given by the artwork's creator, but this need not be the case. It is possible that an appreciator may resonate deeply with a work for reasons quite different from those intended by the creator, or an appreciator may find something in the work that the creator himself put there without being aware of it.

According to Unification theory, there are certain human relationships that are primary and universal. There are three primary generations: grandparents, parents, and children, and there are types of love that arise from or correspond to each of those generations: grandparents love (for each other, for the parents, and for the grandchildren); parents love (sexual love between husband and wife, love for the grandparents, and mother's love and father's love for the children); and children's love (brother-sister, brother-brother, and sister-sister; children's love for father and children's love for mother, and children's love for grandparents), and so on. If this is so, then these primary human relationships exist as valuable and noteworthy in all cultures, and these loves, when expressed in a good or proper way, will be universally considered to be beautiful. Thus art that depicts or explores these relationships will likely be considered to be beautiful and good by all people, across cultural and other lines. Unificationism, as a theistic theory, sees all these loves as having their origin in God, and sees their proper expression as being an expression of Divine intentionality. But non-theistic usages of this theory may also be possible.

Unification theory makes possible a connection between art and ethics. That artistic creation or appreciation which tends to help people grow or progress in development of their intellect, emotion, or will in good ways can be considered to be

both aesthetically and ethically good. Art that does the opposite, although it may be very powerful aesthetically, is lesser in quality and ethically suspect. This does not mean that it may not be good aesthetically, for it may indeed give a strong aesthetic jolt. But aesthetic good -- in the sense of giving an aesthetic jolt -- and ethical good can be distinguished.

Unification theory, as written and expressed in the *Explaining Unification Thought* text, does not explore or comment on the role of humor in art, and that can be seen as a deficiency in that theory. But then, I think, the role of humor in human life and well-being has not been sufficiently explored by academics -- certainly not by philosophers, who have had almost nothing to say about it. In addition to all the other forms and facet of universality embedded in them, Chaplin's films show us how much humor as an aspect of human sensibility is universal, and how much it deserves attention by philosophers, aestheticians, psychologists, biologists, and others.

[Lloyd Eby has a Ph.D. in philosophy from Fordham University (1988). Since 1990 he has been assistant senior editor in the Currents in Modern Thought section of the monthly magazine, *The World & I* (Washington, DC). He has taught (philosophy/humanities) as a graduate assistant at Washington University (St. Louis), and as a faculty member at the State University of New York at Albany, the Unification Theological Seminary, the University of the District of Columbia, and the University of Maryland University College. Among other things, he has worked in both film and video and has written frequently on film. He is a member of the Society for the Philosophic Study of Contemporary Visual Arts (SPSCVA).]