



TO WHAT DOES EDUCATION LEAD--TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES?

by

Carol J. Voisin
Director of Special Studies
Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, California, USA

The Nineteenth International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences
Seoul, Korea August 19-26, 1992

© 1992, International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences

ABSTRACT

TO WHAT DOES EDUCATION LEAD - TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES?

CAROL J. VOISIN

THE DISCUSSION IN THIS PAPER IS IN THREE PARTS. FIRST, THERE IS AN ANALYSIS OF THE "THEORY OF EDUCATION" PRESENTED IN THE FUNDAMENTALS OF UNIFICATION THOUGHT BY DR. SANG HUN LEE. HERE WE HAVE A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE PRESUPPOSITIONS THAT UNDERGIRD THE THEORY. THE SECOND PART IS A LOOK AT THE PRACTICE OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN THE UNIFICATION CHURCH SHOWING THE RELATION OF THE PROBLEMS OF THE THEORY WITH THE PRACTICE. FINALLY, THE CONCLUSION INCLUDES SUGGESTIONS FOR STRENGTHENING THE THEORY AND THE PRACTICE.

TO WHAT DOES EDUCATION LEAD - TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES?

At even a first blush we can not answer this question without a context in which to place it. When placed within the context of the Unification Church and when based upon the "Theory of Education" found in the Fundamentals of Unification Thought written by Dr. Sang Hun Lee, we have a framework from which to begin an exploration of this question within this particular context.

When identifying the context of the Unification Church, we are looking at the church as it is found in the United States and we are thinking primarily of its adult membership when reference is made to a population in the discussion to follow. The education of the children of these adults is not in the perview of this discussion. Our focus is primarily upon the theological education of adults as presented in the "Theory of Education" developed by Dr. Lee.

The discussion to follow has three parts. The first part is an analysis of the "Theory of Education" presented in the Fundamentals of Unification Thought. Here we will look at the presuppositions that undergird the theory and critique them. The second part of the discussion is to look at the practice of theological education in the Unification Church showing the relation of the problems of the theory with the practice. The third part will conclude with some suggestions for strengthening the theory and hence the practice.

PART ONE

The "Theory of Education" found in the Fundamentals of Unification Thought is indeed a complex and sometimes baffling presentation of reflections and ideas. To be sure, it is a genuine effort to bring light on the subject of education within the Unification Church. A limitation of our discussion however is that this is written from the perspective of a non-believer of the Unification mythology. Evenso we are attempting to understand and to critique what is a viable and important attempt to bring to fruition a vision of education in a religious context.

Before beginning, it should be noted that some attention needs to be given to the origin and purpose of Dr. Lee's book within the church. Hopefully such a discussion can occur within this group or perhaps around the edges of it. The point is it needs to happen some time, somewhere in order for these presentations to have any value whatsoever.

Now with preliminaries out of the way, let us move into the text. The five part structure of the chapter presents an interesting skeletal formation. Each section obviously builds upon the other and the Divine Principle is the foundation for this theory of education. From it evolves three forms of education which give rise to the image of the ideal educated person, and upon this traditional Western theories of education are shown to be lacking from the standpoint of Unification Thought. Let us look more closely at the flesh that is found on this skeletal formation.

The most important foundation for education is based on the

biblical text Genesis 1:27. The paraphrase of the text by Dr. Lee reads like this "God created man and woman as His objects, which are meant to resemble Him".¹ This paraphrase becomes more interesting when compared to the New English Bible translation which reads as follows "So God created man in his own image; in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them." (Genesis 1:27). The old Revised Standard Version translation is "So God created man in his own image in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them." (Genesis 1:27). There is virtually no difference between two authoritative translations of the text. Evenso, Dr. Lee's paraphrase tries to capture the spirit of the text but instead seriously distorts it.

Let us look more closely at the paraphrase. Dr. Lee is saying that God created man and woman as His objects. It is not clear what is meant by "objects", unfortunately in the preceding and proceeding sentences and paragraphs that word and its relation to the original biblical text is not explained. The reason that we are asking for further explanation is that the biblical text neither uses the word "objects" nor the words "man and woman" though the latter can be implied from the use of "male and female" found in the biblical text. Perhaps Dr. Lee was using "objects" to replace the use of "image" in the original text. If so there is an obvious distortion of the original text in this paraphrase, because image refers to a representation, imitation, or likeness while an object is a person or thing to which action, thought or feeling is directed. The distortion lies in the fact that the original text

states that man or in the Hebrew "ha-'adam" is created in the "image" of God or in the likeness of God. Nowhere does the text say or imply that "ha-'adam" was created as an object to which action is directed as if "ha-'adam" is only "acted upon by God".² Rather "ha-'adam" was created in the image of God which carries far more theological meaning than does the notion of "ha-'adam" being " a mere object".

To be sure there is more to be considered in this paraphrase because Dr. Lee goes on to say that these objects, man and woman, are meant to resemble Him (God) (pg.196-197). To be sure it can be argued that "resemble" is referring to image or to created. To whichever the reference is made it creates an ambiguous, if not confusing mental picture of man and woman who as objects are being acted upon just by the definition of being an object. The real confusion lies, however, in the notion of resemblance, because if they do indeed resemble God then does this mean that God likewise is an object and therefore acted upon as an object? What Dr. Lee means here is not clear. Perhaps it is not made clear in the Divine Principle and perhaps something is missing in the translations of the Korean to the English. Whichever it may be, the word that most obviously exposes the paraphrase as a distortion of the original text is the use of the word "meant"- "God created man and woman as His objects, which are meant to resemble Him".(pg.196) With "meant" Dr. Lee interjects the idea that man and woman were "meant" to resemble God which implies they do not. It really is not clear as to what he was getting at here other than

to interject the notion of humanity's brokenness and failure to adequately resemble God. But failure to resemble God is not even mentioned or implied in the original text of Genesis 1:27 "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them". Where is there any inference that this image or resemblance was simply "meant" to be instead of being an actuality? To be sure the biblical text goes on to describe the "fall" but that is not what Dr. Lee was paraphrasing. Therefore this leads us to conjecture that there is some agenda being introduced that is not truly or literally "biblical". The foundation for education may well be grounded in Dr. Lee's paraphrase, but it is not grounded in Genesis 1:27.

Be this as it may or may not be, let us pursue with Dr. Lee his development of the three great blessings which are basic to his theory of education. Based on the paraphrase discussed above education according to Dr. Lee "can be described as the process of raising children to attain resemblance of God...it (education) is an effort to guide children to resemble God...To resemble God is to resemble the Divine Image and Divine Character".(pg.197) Even though the foundation of education refers to "man and woman" and not to children one can infer that Dr. Lee is thinking of children, when grown will be men and women resembling God; or that adults are really like children in their faith until they are indoctrinated into a religious system or set of values. It is the latter that we are assuming he means in this particular sentence. In a similar way the foundational paraphrase makes no mention of a "Divine Image" or

a "Divine Character", therefore we can only assume that this development of his theory and its foundation comes from something other than the biblical text. It is obvious that he is drawing upon the Divine Principle, but it is difficult to know what is paraphrase and what is his own creative imagination. This difficulty leaves us wondering just from where these notions of "divine image" and "divine character" are derived. Is this just a creation of his imagination? If not and this is "revelation", then how does he know that what he is describing is indeed "divine character" and not simply a projection of his own character or that of someone else's? Moreover if it is neither of the above and simply a reflection or even a paraphrase of the Divine Principle, why is he not asking such basic questions as a part of his reflection? Even a believer can question and inquire more deeply into what is being proposed to be truth than can the original authority. In fact should not a theory of education have such a critical component?

Having digressed a bit, let us continue with Dr. Lee's description of what shape "resemblance to God" takes in his theory of education. "...to resemble God ...(is) to resemble the Divine Image and also to inherit the Divine Character, namely Heart, ...and so on of God.", (pg. 197) what does this mean? When taken within the framework of the Unification mythology the references are probably these: "to resemble God" the referent for God is the source, creator, sustainer of the universe, or Yahweh for the Hebrew people and "abba" for Jesus; "to resemble the Divine

Image" the referent is Reverend Moon; and "to inherit the Divine Character, namely heart" the referent is Reverend Moon's character and heart. Assuming these referents are correct, Dr. Lee's theory or the agenda behind and within his theory is that education is to resemble Reverend Moon and to inherit his character or heart. To be sure, any relation that this theory may have to the Hebrew scriptures can be dismissed and rightly so, because there is no logical, metaphorical, or textual relation of the theory to Genesis 1:27. This means that we are being presented a theory of education that is not based upon Hebrew scriptures but is based upon the life and thought of Reverend Moon.

The three blessings like the theory of education are derived from Hebrew scripture. Since we have just discovered that the theory of education is not related to Hebrew scripture but is based upon Reverend Moon, let us look afresh at the three blessings and their place in the theory of education. God gave man and woman blessings or commandments when God said "Be fruitful, multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it: and have dominion over every living thing that moves upon the earth" (Gen.1:28). (pg.197) This verse is a direct quote according to the punctuation of Dr. Lee's text which gives no reference to a particular version of the Bible that he may have used. Let us compare this verse to that found in The New English Bible: "God blessed them and said to them, 'Be fruitful and increase, fill the earth and subdue it, rule over the fish in the sea, the birds of heaven, and every living thing that moves upon the earth.'" (Gen.1:28). The old Revised Standard Version reads

this way "And God blessed them, and God said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.'" (Gen;1:28) If we take the biblical text as authoritative then Dr. Lee has seriously misread the text. If we do not take the biblical text as the basis for his thought in developing his theory then we are left asking what is the basis of his theory. Given the spirit of his reflection, let us assume that the biblical text is authoritative in this part of his thinking. Of course to be thorough we would need to return to the Divine Principle, but since there is no reference to it we must proceed according to the letter of the text.

The biblical text in both versions quoted above reads this way, "God blessed them and said...". It is important to note that it was God who blessed THEM not what God was directing them to do. Therefore there seems to be a misreading of the text to say that "He (God) gave them the three blessings...". In the biblical text there is no mention of blessings just that woman and man, female and male, were blessed by God. The significance of this difference in texts is either that the text was misread or Dr. Lee wants the text to say something that it does not say. Assuming the latter given the analysis of the "paraphrase", then Dr. Lee is presenting an agenda separate from that of the biblical text. Then we must wonder why he wants to use Hebrew scripture at all, when his agenda

is not to take the spirit or the letter of the text but rather to introduce something very different and not logically related to the text. Then, upon what is his theory built or from where are the blessings derived?

Given that the text Gen. 1:28 is not formally the foundation of Dr. Lee's development of the three blessings and by implication neither the foundation for them in the Divine Principle, let us look at just what are the three blessings which are also referred to as commandments "these three Great Blessings (or three great commandments)". First, the designation of "blessings" or "commandments" seems problematic. Are these commandments that carry with them a demand as well as consequences should they not be kept or are they "blessings", a wish or sanction for happiness which is holy and carries no strings attached to it for right action or commitment? Dr. Lee needs to come clean here as does the Divine Principle. Commandments and blessings are not synonymous by definition, if they are within the context of Unification mythology, then certainly in a text that is interpreting or reflecting upon this mythology there needs to be some explanation as to how these terms can be used synonymously.

Second, the meaning given to each item is interesting: " 'be fruitful', means to grow; 'multiply, and fill the earth' means to give birth to children; and finally 'subdue it (the earth)' means to have dominion over all things." (pg.197) Again the ideas being defined - be fruitful, multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it

- are words taken directly from the biblical text, but which have no logical or substantive relation to the development of Dr. Lee's thought. The meaning given to fruitful which is "to grow" seems odd. Fruitful is an adjective meaning bearing more fruit or producing much, while "to grow" is a different form of speech, a verb, and means to raise, to cultivate, or to develop. To be sure the problem could be in the translation from Korean to English, evenso, there seems to be a difference in the meaning of the two words. One word refers to bearing more or producing much of what has already been created or born while the other is an action word that does or causes the creating or bearing. So what is the intent of Dr. Lee in giving this particular definition to this blessing? The next blessing likewise has an ambiguous meaning when "multiply, and fill the earth " is given the meaning of giving birth to children. Is the referent to male and female giving birth to children or is the referent to multiply and fill the earth with what it already has in it and on it which would include plant and animal life as well as human life? As the second blessing is defined it is ambiguous and unduly exclusive of what is to multiply and fill the earth. Without the multiplication of animal and plant life, human life can not survive. Finally, the third blessing or commandment "to subdue it (the earth) means to have dominion over all things" needs careful qualification. Given the ecological crisis that the world is in today that particular phrase "to have dominion" is the idealogical root of the destruction of our rain forests and of land strip mining and of the dumping of toxic waste.

Moreover, the qualification of this blessing needs to include the fact that "to have dominion" DOES NOT MEAN dominion over any human being especially of man over woman. Dr. Lee's presentation of the blessings or commandments remains at best ambiguous. Moreover to build an entire theory of education on ambiguity does not seem to be the prudent thing to do.

Nevertheless, let us proceed to Dr. Lee's next thought. These blessings or commandments are to be realized by man and woman. With this realization man and woman come to inherit God's Heart, reason-law, and Creativity and to resemble God's natures of perfection, multiplication, and dominion. (pg.197) It goes without saying that several questions emerge from this construction which is directly related to the Divine Principle in principle. The most obvious questions are these: from where are these ideas derived that is God's Heart, reason-law, and Creativity and how is it that God has three natures very unlike any notion of the Christian Trinity if one were just to refer to the number three alone and not to the technical meaning of any theological language? We acknowledge that definitions are given in detail on the following pages but our inquiry is located before the definition at the point of derivation. When reading this section it would be quite plausible to not ask questions of the text nor to notice inconsistencies in it and to infer that these anthropomorphic features of God are derived from Genesis 1:27-28. However as we know our questions raise serious doubts about a substantial or formal relation between Hebrew scripture and the foundation of Dr.

Lee's theory of education. Therefore without hesitation and with complete openness we must ask from where these features of God are derived.

The most obvious answer is that this construction of God's features is a matter of revelation and faith. Given such an answer our questions can now deepen the level of our discussion. Revelation is related to something or someone who is familiar and known, otherwise the revelation or what is unknown to us could not be received as such, because something is needed to which to relate the new knowledge or understanding. Therefore the revelation of God's features that are an integral part of Dr. Lee's theory of education, that originate in the Divine Principle, are revelation received by Reverend Moon and communicated by him through his life and teaching. Then how can we assess such a personal and profound revelation? Faith as we know is not blind because at least four sources are available to us that deepens our faith that seeks understanding and that can in the process expose our idolatry. These sources are together known as the quadrilateral - experience, reason, tradition, scripture. Used by theologians for centuries and most self-consciously by Charles Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church, we can assume the quadrilateral to be an acceptable source for screening what we accept as new understandings or new knowledge. Let us use the quadrilateral to analyze one of the features of God that is given in revelation through the Divine Principle and in Dr. Lee's theory of education.

The state of perfection is one of those features. It is also related to the New Testament scripture passage Matthew 5:48. In a brief yet cogent manner, let us utilize the quadrilateral to analyze this feature especially because of its place in Dr. Lee's theory of education.

The section dealing with perfection refers only once to scripture but its place is at the center of the definition - "Jesus said, 'You must...be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect' (Matthew 5:48). This is a call for people to resemble the perfection of God." (pg.197) Let us again compare versions of this verse from the old Revised Standard Version - "You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." and from The New English Bible - "There must be no limit to your goodness, as your heavenly Father's goodness knows no bounds." (Matthew 5:48) First, the difference between Dr. Lee's quote and the RSV version of the text is interesting. Why was the "therefore" not included in the quote of the verse? Second the NEB version of the text is somewhat different from the RSV. Because "goodness" is used in the NEB version instead of "perfection" could Dr. Lee use the term "goodness" in place of "perfection"?

Let us try to answer these two questions. Why was the "therefore" left out of Dr. Lee's rendition of the verse, Matthew 5:48? The "therefore" refers to what was said prior to this summarizing verse. This means what came before this verse could be understood to be descriptive or inferential content for the meaning

of "perfect". What does come before is probably one of the most profound and challenging statements put forth by Matthew:

You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven; for he makes the sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust. For if you love those who love you, what reward have you? Do not even the tax collectors do the same? And if you salute only your brethren, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

(Matthew 5:43-48)RSV

"To love your enemies and to pray for those who persecute you..." to do this is to become sons of the Father who lets the sun rise and the rain to fall on evil and on good. A surface reading of the text seems to say that to become sons of the Father is to be perfect as the heavenly Father is perfect and to become sons is to love your enemies and to pray for those who persecute you. To be sure this is a call to do more than others, your brethren and tax collectors. The "therefore" in verse 48 seems to be used in such a way as to mean "as a result of this" or "consequently". Therefore the verses prior to verse 48 carry a considerable amount

of the content for the verse such that we can say "perfect" is defined by the previous verses. Again it is important to consider that "perfect" is an adjective that is descriptive or that modifies a noun. Dr. Lee converts "perfect" from an adjective into a "noun" in his interpretation of the text "This is a call for people to resemble the perfection of God." (pg.197) In the New Testament text God or Father remains the subject while in Dr.Lee's conversion of meaning God becomes the possessive of perfection. This observation leads us to again conclude that the description to follow is not grounded in the biblical text and that an agenda is being presented other than that of an interpretation of Matthew 5:48. Through a comparison of scripture we can say that the feature of God that is perfection is not scriptural nor based on the Christian spirit of the scripture.

Dr. Lee's description of perfection follows his reference to Matthew 5:48. The definition takes the form of a "state of perfection". The state of perfection is the mutual relationship of sungsang and hyungsang that are a subject and object, in a give and receive action that is centered on Heart. (pg.197) Dr. Lee goes on to say "for people to resemble God's perfection means that their sungsang and hyungsang are united in oneness, centering on Heart." (pg.197) This is an interesting definition of the state of perfection that is also identified as a feature of God. The most obvious question to ask is from where does this notion of God's perfection arise? Since it is not from Christian scripture, is it derived from an Eastern religious tradition? If so then that

tradition should be quoted instead of Christian scripture. However it seems the answer to these questions is likewise obvious, that is a new revelation is being set forth that has no carefully defined relation to any particular religious tradition, ancient or modern, or it is a synthesis of several with no way of directly relating it with any one or several traditions which makes it difficult for the observer or the believer to "test" the revelation in and through scripture and tradition.

Evenso we must be able to explore the feature of God's perfection in some depth some way. We can say, given the New Testament and reason, that this new revelation of God's perfection has very little if anything to do with Matthew 5:48. Then let us move on to see what it does have to do with experience, the actual living through an event or events and/or personally understanding or observing something in general as they occur? We are told that there are four kinds of sunqsang and hyunqsang and the one that is connected with God's perfection is the physical mind and spirit mind. (pg.198) Because the spirit mind is the subject, it has dominion over the physical mind. (pg.198) Why this is so is not explained and should be, because it proposes a hierarchy of values and a dualism which if necessary needs to be explained. The attributing of values to spirit mind such as trueness, goodness and beauty and attributing basic human needs to physical mind such as the pursuit of food, clothing, shelter and sex (pg.198) seems somewhat arbitrary without some definition of mind, spirit, and physical, that is related to the history of ideas or to some

tradition. Otherwise any or no meaning can be given to these ideas that are so pivotal to Dr. Lee's theory of education. Moving away from these cerebral matters let us look at what is definitively stated to be God's perfection and how it relates to human experience.

Dr. Lee says "In summary, a life of food, clothing and shelter must be led centering on the life of trueness, goodness, and beauty, based on love. This is what is meant by resembling God's perfection." (pg.198) He goes on to say that a person is a dual being of the spirit person and the physical person and that human growth involves both, but primarily the growth of the spirit person which is the involvement of a person's spiritual level. (pg.199) There are several ways in which we could unpack these statements, but let us focus on what is germane to human experience. Of course food, clothing and shelter are basic human needs. It is interesting that in this restatement that Dr. Lee leaves out sex. This may be an oversight but it seems he wants to keep sex in the blessing dealing with multiplicity and not with the values of trueness, goodness and beauty. Be that as it may, human beings do experience basic human needs and according to Dr. Lee these needs must be related to trueness, goodness, and beauty in order for a person to resemble the perfection of God. Then how in our experience of basic human needs are these needs related to trueness, goodness and beauty and are there persons in whom this integration has taken place, in whom there is the resemblance of the perfection of God?

Dr. Lee's answers to these questions would obviously be related to the life, work and thought of Reverend Moon. Even if Reverend Moon does successfully mediate this unity of spirit mind and physical mind, how in our own experience do we find these basic values and needs influencing the way we live our lives? Let us use the example of clothing and beauty. We all wear clothes. How is beauty which is dominate related to the selection and the wearing of clothing? The selection of clothing seems to be primarily related to one's economic well being and to one's place in work and in society in general before it is related to beauty, trueness or goodness. For instance the way in which Barbara Bush and a San Francisco prostitute would go about selecting clothing would be very different because of their places in life. Nevertheless is there something in the process of the selection and wearing of clothing that is common to both and that illustrates the relation of beauty to clothing? To try to answer this question in this paper would take us too far from our stated goals. Nevertheless, these are the kinds of questions and the directness of inquiry that is needed in order to make sense out of how human beings are to resemble the perfection of God.

Experience seems to be the only part of the quadrilateral that is available to Dr. Lee for clarifying and providing something besides words which have no stated relation to any tradition or scripture and that at points make no sense.

Therefore, from our brief analysis of Dr. Lee's theory of education and particularly the foundation of that theory, we can

say that his theory has some serious problems. Those problems are that there is not a direct nor an inferred relation of his theory to Hebrew scriptures or to the New Testament, that there is an agenda or a new revelation that has no relation to the history of ideas nor to a religious tradition(s), that there is a confusion of images and language which at best conveys ambiguity, and finally that at points the theory makes no sense. If there are these problems with the foundation of a theory, then what is happening in the practice of the theory?

PART TWO

Let us look at the theological education of certain members of the Unification Church to see how their education corresponds to Dr. Lee's theory of education. In the eighties Unification Church leaders in the United States selected forty-fifty of its brightest and most committed young members to send to the best graduate schools in the United States for philosophical and theological education. These women and men while in graduate school were also involved in intensive seminars on unification thought and were expected to be the expositors and the apologists of unification thought at NEW ERA and ICUS meetings held around the world. This appeared to be a kind of intense indoctrination in the life, work, and thought of Reverend Moon and of what was being said and written about him. Even though they were engaged in some critical thinking around their graduate studies, a few of those who taught them in these programs and who would say that they even learned from them

about the Unification Church, wondered about their unwillingness or inability to think critically about unification thought. For instance, the graduate students would raise no question nor ask that sense be made out of the non-sense that the three blessings are derived from Hebrew scripture, while their theological training would demand that the author of such a claim come clean with the source of the three blessings or commandments and clarification of language and categories that ensue from these blessings.

Why would critical thinking be applied to their academic studies and not to the material into which they were being indoctrinated? Critical thinking is used here as a kind of norm for education, because it is that form of thinking that analyzes presuppositions or self-evident truths in order to make explicit what is implicit. Given that critical thinking is a necessary part of adult, graduate education, we can try to answer the above question.

First, one could surmise that the notion or practice of critical thinking is not evident in Dr. Lee's theory of education. It certainly is not evident in the survey of traditional theories of education where a paragraph is given to describe various representations. (pgs.220-231) This indicates that the intellectual leaders of the church are not engaged in a careful, critical look at their own presuppositions nor those of whom they present as not measuring up to unification theory. Therefore how could those for whom they are mentors hope to do much more?

Second, with the promise of a top flight education, an

arranged marriage, children, and a position of leadership and prestige within the church, why criticize the thought of the powers that are providing all this? There is no motivation or reward for critical thinking, in fact it is just the opposite, through accepting uncritically unification thought, these members were given everything they could possibly want. And the price tag is their life. It would be interesting to know what these graduate students would have done with their lives without the unification church. Even though critical thinking was rewarded in the academic setting it was not (is not) rewarded within the church.

Third, we need to consider the fact that given unification thought to be a matter of faith and a new revelation, its members are not finding any way to think critically, because this revelation in their collective mind has made all that is implicit, explicit. Therefore, all there is to know, learn, or believe is contained in unification thought. There is nothing left to make explicit. It is the norm that is beyond any questioning. It is the authority for meaning and understanding in life. Or is it? What does "it" stand for? Is the authority of or for the revelation Reverend Moon, the Divine Principle, Fundamentals of Unification Thought, the oral tradition of the church? Then it needs to be asked which Reverend Moon is the authority and which edition is the authoritative one and how and who is to verify oral tradition and transform it into the tradition of the church? The question of authority may be the point at which members or believers can begin to think critically without being influenced by

outsiders, because this is a pivotal question for the membership of any vital religion or religious movement. This is a pivotal question because the answer to it is the basis upon which a religion or movement survives the erosion of its collective memory and the lure of other religions or movements.

The above suggestions for an answer to the question as to why in the unification education of the graduate students there was not an engagement of critical thinking within their own faith system are just suggestions that may or may not lead to some kind of conclusive answer. Leaving this, let us move on to some suggestions for strengthening the theory and hence the practice of Dr. Lee's theory of education.

PART THREE

In Part One above we learned that the foundation for Dr. Lee's theory of education is problematic at best and is ambiguous as well. Suggestions for strengthening the theory are these: develop a new foundation because basing it upon Hebrew scripture and the New Testament is not satisfactory; in order to develop a new foundation a location for authority needs to be identified perhaps it could be something like a quadrilateral - experience, reason, tradition, scripture; purge the content of the theory of revelational content and replace it with ideas about learning, knowing, understanding, listening, thinking etc., save the revelational content; finally, begin the theory from observing what

has happened with the graduate students who have completed their degrees, draw upon their experience of being educated and of being indoctrinated. These suggestions might begin to lessen the ambiguity and the problems in Dr. Lee's theory of education. Moreover somewhere in here there is a very interesting theory for theological education that could be revelotinary.

Theory and practice are not polarities but rather are mutually dependent, an integrating pair of ideas not unlike concept and percept. This means the theory is never complete or absolute but is always in a state of being molded and shaped by practice and likewise practice is analyzed and rethought by theory in an evolutionary or developmental process so that neither remains static. Given the analysis we offered above of the theory and its practice, it would be interesting to take an additional step in the theological education of the graduate students who with their earned doctorates could engage in a public debate wherein they offered a critique of unification thought and "outsiders" tried to defend it. By switching the role from expositor to critic, a new clarity of the revelational content might emerge as well as setting forth a different quality in the role models and leaders of the church. This could also prove to be a very interesting model or data for discussing theological education which in the United States needs some direction for reform.

There are many other suggestions for enhancing the relationship between theory and practice in education but the limited length for this paper prevents me from elaborating any

11
further. Be that as it may Dr. Lee's theory of education does indeed provoke critical thinking and discussion that needs to go far beyond the words of this paper and certainly it will and probably does in the everyday life of members of the Unification Church.

1.Sang Hun Lee, Fundamentals of Unification Thought, (Tokyo: Unification Thought Institute, 1991). From hereafter indicated by page number after quotation.

2.Phyllis Tribble, God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978) p.17.