

*Session VI*

## Understanding the Philosophical Foundations of the Family : Hegel and Unification Thought

Dietrich Seidel

Ph. D. Christian Theology,  
Assistant Professor of UTS, USA

### Introduction

In our time, when the institution of the family is confronted with an ongoing process of relativizing traditional moral and ethical values, there emerges the need to understand family issues not only within the confines of immediate human relations, but also with regard to questions related to the ultimate nature and destiny of the family. The pastoral task of finding safeguards against the violation of basic family norms can only be effectively fulfilled if people are aware of the ontological roots of such moral norms. Thus, it seems that philosophical and theological reflections on the family become a necessary step for being successful in our common task of healing and improving family relationships.

It is the aim of this study to explore and evaluate two theistic philosophical approaches for discussing fundamental principles that define the institution of the family. We start our analysis by focusing on G. W.F. Hegel's dialectical philosophy of the family.<sup>1</sup> Our treatment of Hegel will be limited to two of his writings, the *Phenomenology of Spirit*<sup>2</sup> and the *Philosophy of Right*.<sup>3</sup> The *Phenomenology* was written in 1806 and became Hegel's first published book, while the *Philosophy of Right* dates back to 1821 when he had built the reputation to be the outstanding philosopher of his generation. Thus, both works cover a time span of about fifteen years of development of Hegel's thought and seem to represent sufficiently his philosophical understanding of the family.

The second theistic philosophical approach deals with an exploration of the Unification Thought position on the family. Unification thought can be seen as the developing philosophical explication of Unification theology, a system of doctrine which is based on a comprehensive revelation received by Rev. Sun Myung Moon. For our study, we will mainly use two sources published by the Unification Thought Institute, namely, *Explaining Unification Thought*<sup>4</sup> and *Fundamentals of Unification Thought*.<sup>5</sup> It seems that both works treat adequately the philosophical implications of the Unification view of the family.

Given the complexity of the Hegelian philosophical system and the novelty of philosophical concepts in Unification Thought, it becomes necessary to assign the first chapter of this paper to the discussion of philosophical foundations and basic methodological considerations. After having adumbrated both philosophical approaches, we will proceed to the analysis of the definition of the family according to Hegel and Unification thought. Our concluding comparative analysis attempts to show how Hegel's view on the family offers, on the one hand, several important points of agreement with the Unification position, while, on the other hand, there appear essential disagreements which can be seen as important innovations on the part of Unification Thought within the contemporary discussion of the philosophical foundations of the family.

## Chapter One

### Basic Concepts and Philosophical Method

Before examining the definition of the family in Hegel and Unification Thought, we shall analyze relevant philosophical concepts and the specific method employed in our two approaches. Three issues shall be addressed. First, we will discuss presuppositions for Hegel's perception of the ethicaessence as it is presented in the *Phenomenology* and the *Philosophy of Right*. Second, we will outline essential presuppositions for Unification Ethics by referring primarily to *Explaining Unification Thought*. Finally, we present a brief evaluation of our two philosophical approaches in terms of their continuities and discontinuities.

#### 1. Presuppositions for Hegel's Perception of the Ethical Realm

##### a. The Development of Spirit

For the uninformed reader, it may be difficult to grasp Hegel's view on the family as set forth in the *Phenomenology* without first studying basic concepts such as actuality and truth, in order to comprehend the Hegelian notion of the manifestation of Spirit as ethical essence.

In the *Phenomenology*, Hegel describes the development of Spirit by analyzing characteristic moments of this process such as consciousness, selfconsciousness, and reason. In showing the manifestation of Reason in Spirit, Hegel holds that two categories are of principal importance: actuality and truth. Hegel says:

When this Reason which Spirit has is intuited by Spirit as Reason that exists, or as reason that is actual in Spirit and is its world, then Spirit exists in its truth; it is spirit, the ethical essence that has an actual existence.<sup>6</sup>

...The living ethical world is Spirit in its truth.<sup>7</sup>

According to this text, Hegel understands Spirit as encompassing its most developed abstraction, that is, Reason or Logos, together with

its function in an actual world. That Reason has to be acted upon is one ontological presupposition for Spirit to exist. Moreover, Hegel perceives this existence of Spirit as corresponding to an originally designed order and, thus, fulfilling the criterion of truth. Spirit, says Hegel, is marked by action, not any kind of action, but one qualified by truth, or an action which carries the ethical essence. For Hegel, the ethical order, and with it the treatment of the family, becomes then the manifestation of True or Absolute Spirit.

Before attempting to define the family, Hegel gives an account of two further manifestations of the Spirit, namely, the community and the nation. Hegel's explanations of community and nation hinge on his assertion that Spirit itself embraces and unites the ontological categories of individuality and universality. Hegel states:

... the ethical substance is *actual* substance, Absolute Spirit (universal essence) realized in the plurality of existent consciousnesses; this Spirit is the community... (community) is implicitly Spirit or substance, in that it preserves (the individuals) within itself. As *actual substance* it is a nation, as *actual consciousness* it is the citizen of that nation.<sup>8</sup>

These quotations from the *Phenomenology* illustrate two issues which need further explanation. First, Hegel understands the term substance "as the universal essence and End" which is viewed in opposition to "individualized reality."<sup>9</sup> To Hegel, the earlier mentioned ethical action within Spirit is responsible for the splitting up of Spirit into the two moments of substance as universal essence and individualized reality. In Hegel's thinking, Spirit not only contains the element of division into moments or abstractions, but, more importantly, Spirit implies an active mediation between opposite categories. In other words, the unique quality of Spirit consists of its ability to keep opposite moments balanced within an overarching, integrated whole. Hegel understands the unifying agent between the universal essence and its individualized expression to be self-consciousness. That is to say, self-consciousness initiates ethical action by raising individuality to the point of unity with absolute Spirit or the universal essence.

Thus, the ethical action as an action which is qualified by truth is defined for Hegel by the individual's participation in Absolute Spirit.

The second issue concerns the movement of absolute Spirit towards the individual. Hegel states that as long as there is no ethical action, the universal essence and End has an existence only in thought.<sup>10</sup> However, because the mediation of self-consciousness is the bearer of the ethical essence, there occurs the ontological event where substance as universal essence moves into actual existence. In other words, the category of actuality for Hegel implies not just the reality of self-consciousness involved in ethical action, but it also constitutes the realization of the End, that is Absolute Spirit actualized in a community or nation as a multitude of individuals. Thus, Hegel's concepts of community and nation are based on his notion of actual substance, whereby both actuality and substantiality imply a teleological fulfillment of the Absolute Spirit.

We have seen that Hegel assigns primacy to the understanding of Absolute Spirit as Reason or Logos, which in its actualization as truthful action becomes the ethical essence. This means Absolute Spirit is uniting thought and reality, thus appearing as both rational and real. However, to determine truth, we must discover the actual relationship of each entity with the Absolute.<sup>11</sup> For Hegel, that process of determining truth can only be advanced by applying the dialectical method.

#### b. The Dialectical Method

In order to understand Hegel's philosophical system, and in particular his view on the family, it seems indispensable to recall the basic tenets of his dialectical method. For our purpose of analyzing family relationships, it is suitable to discuss Hegel's dialectic according to the *Philosophy of Right*.

In describing the development of Spirit, Hegel employs the term existence, or the act of being, in a threefold way following the pattern of his dialectical method: as existence-in-itself, existence-for-itself, and existence-in-and-for-itself. Existence-in-itself stands for the initial stage of development where all properties are implicit, latent, or undeveloped. It is a stage of potentiality, also referred to as simple

being (einfaches Dasein), where vital relationships with its surroundings are not yet established. Existence-for-itself, however, connotes the subsequent or antithetical stage of development in which the original core of simple being becomes explicit and actual. At this level indeterminations are overcome and the first movement from potentiality to actuality is accomplished. Finally, the terms existence-in-and-for-itself describes the unifying stage of development where the previous two stages are synthesized to a superior, integrated whole. In the words of Macbride Sterrett, it is at this stage where "latent universality has been completely specified" or where "individuality has become fully universalized."<sup>12</sup>

Hegel's dialectical method presents itself in the above mentioned three modes of existence. With reference to the *Philosophy of Right*, existence-in-itself can be replaced by subjective Spirit or individual self-consciousness, which has the potential to be influenced and shaped by an objective surrounding. According to the Hegel scholar Howard Kainz, this objective surrounding, perceived as existence-for-itself, is further identified with universal, objective norms, or 'oughts' to which man must submit.<sup>13</sup> In other words, these objective norms, which Hegel describes under the subheading 'morality', stand in an antithetical position to the most distinct quality of subjective Spirit, namely, the exercise of freedom. According to Hegel, this basic tension between subjective freedom and the laws of morality constitutes the dialectical ground for further development. The resulting stage, understood as existence-in-and-for-itself, reconciles the previous antithetical modes of existence. Finally, it is Hegel's aim to show in the *Philosophy of Right* that existence-in-and-for-itself constitutes successive levels of society such as family, community and the state.

In the above reflection on Hegel's dialectic the often used stereotype terminology of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis was avoided. As Walter Kaufmann points out in his book, *Hegel: A Reinterpretation*, it was Kant and Fichte who introduced the terminology of thesis, antithesis and synthesis.<sup>14</sup> Later on, Schelling continued to use these terms, but Hegel did not. On the contrary, Hegel expressly rejects the mechanical formalism of a three step

dialectic with which he is often charged. At one point, Hegel reproaches Kant for having "everywhere posited thesis, antithesis, synthesis."<sup>15</sup> Rather, according to Kaufmann, Hegel's dialectic is more adequately understood in terms of a consistent pursuit of unsettled views and attitudes so that if this approach is taken seriously and pushed to its limit a change into other views and attitudes will occur.<sup>16</sup> In other words, Hegel's dialectic has to be seen as an explanatory device which emphasizes development through conflict. As Kaufmann puts it, the driving powers of this development are "human passions which produce wholly unintended results and the irony of sudden reversal."<sup>17</sup>

We have discussed Hegel's dialectical method as it is presented in the *Philosophy of Right*. In applying his dialectics to the ethical sphere, Hegel recognizes that man's moral struggle is based on the dialectical confrontation between man's inherent disposition for exercising freedom and the laws of morality. Before analyzing the further application of Hegel's dialectic to the family, we will outline basic presuppositions for Unification ethics in order to prepare the ground for a meaningful evaluation of teachings on the family as set forth by Hegel and Unification Thought.

## 2. Presuppositions for Unification Ethics

We are now in the position to use our findings for Hegel's understanding of the ethical realm for presenting relevant philosophical issues in Unification Thought. This is to say, our study of basic concepts in Hegel's philosophy provides the opportunity to highlight the uniqueness of several philosophical positions as presented in Unification Thought. In particular, there are two issues which seem to be essential for Unification ethics. First, we will explore the significance of a purpose-centered philosophical approach in Unification Thought. The second issue refers to the concept of development which includes primarily methodological topics dealing with the question of identity and change. Here, we will present a brief analysis of the Unification concept of development by discussing three metaphysical principles. Moreover, the application of these principles can be found in the explanation of the notion of the Logos,

which will illustrate the Unification understanding of reason.

a. The Centrality of Purpose

Unification Thought emphasizes that the very purpose of created reality is based on the central character of God, namely, God's heart. 18 The affirmation that creation originated from the desire of God's heart assigns then to the created order the specific purpose to fulfill that original motivation. According to Unification Thought, heart is defined as the "emotional impulse to be joyful through love". Thus, God's motivation for creating is rooted in the desire to realize joy through love.

Apparently, Unification thought freely applies concepts like heart, emotion, love, and joy to the divine life. The philosophical justification for ascribing concepts of human experience to God is based on the assumption to permit analogical anthropomorphisms when speaking about God. In other words, once we accept that man is created in God's image (Gen. 1:27), we are able to speak about God in imageries drawn from man's idealized experience. However, only analogical anthropomorphisms with a conceptual content, such as heart, love or compassion, qualify for contributing to our knowledge of God.<sup>19</sup>

Presupposing the use of analogical anthropomorphisms, Unification Thought describes the attributes of God with the concept of the Original Image. In short, the theory of the Original Image refers to God via conceptual ideal types derived from human experience. With that philosophical approach for developing the Original Image, we are now able to discuss further the centrality of purpose as it is expressed through God's heart, love, and joy.

According to our human experience we affirm love and joy as emotional forces which need for their existence the interaction between the polar positions of subject and object. That is to say, emotions of love and joy are generated if there is give and take action between people who relate to one another from positions of subject and object centered on the purpose of heart. In particular, Unification Thought explains how in the Original Image heart becomes the ultimate ground for the emergence of love.

Heart is the emotional force to connect the subject and the object. With the impulse of heart as motivation an emotional force flows toward the object from the subject (and vice versa). This emotional force is love. Therefore, heart is the source of love and its starting point.<sup>20</sup>

Two issues are addressed in this text. First, the heart of God exists as an emotional force based on the give and take action within the fundamental polarity of subject and object in the Original Image. In Unification Thought, this polarity is described as God's dual characteristics of Sung Sang, or internal character, and Hyung Sang, or external form.<sup>21</sup> These dual essentialities of character and form are supremely manifested through the mind and body of man, and they relate to each other from positions which are identifiable as subject and object.<sup>22</sup> In particular, within the Original Image, heart occupies the core of Sung Sang, thus defining the innermost essence of God's character. Moreover, according to Unification Thought, the Sung Sang and Hyung sang aspects of the Original Image always manifest themselves in the created order through another polar set of Yang and Yin characteristics.<sup>23</sup> These dual qualities of Yang and Yin can be understood as distinct attributes of all created beings which reach from their basic distinction of plus and minus in physics to their most developed forms of masculinity and femininity in the biological sphere. The actuality of the Original Image, or its realization in creation, then implies the manifestation of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang in the created world with distinct Yang and Yin characteristics. This means for human beings that their spirit and body can only exist as concrete expressions of masculinity and femininity. Thus, the highest realization of Sung Sang, Hyung Sang and Yang, Yin characteristics of the Original Image is found in the creation of man and woman.

The second issue in the above quotation refers to the understanding that heart provides the motivation or driving force for the realization of love. Heart as the motivational force becomes then the source of love, with the affirmation that heart and love exist

on the foundation of the same metaphysical principle, which is defined as give and take action between subject and object. Here, love can be seen as an extension or self-communication of heart, based on the motivating force of seeking joy.<sup>24</sup> This means that Unification Thought assigns utmost importance to the purpose or direction love is supposed to fulfill. Hence, the ethical realm is determined by loving actions which are centered on heart. Thus, it is not sufficient to study love as a phenomenon, but only by making the true purpose of love the foundation of ethical conduct, will we be able to solve problems that originate from the misuse of love.

We have seen that Unification Thought ascribes the centrality of purpose, as defined through the heart of God, to all of created reality. In particular, God's heart provides the motivation to realize joy through love. Therefore, all created beings find the reason for their existence in their inherent purpose to serve the realization of love as it is determined by God's heart. In short, Unification Thought affirms the Heart Motivation Theory<sup>25</sup> as the basic philosophical principle which serves to explain the purpose of development for created beings and which defines ethical conduct in terms of being in agreement with God's original design for the ideal of creation.

#### b. The Concept of Development

##### (1) Three Metaphysical Principles

The question remains how Unification Thought explains the actualization of God's love through the created order. Why do human beings and in particular the human family, manifest God's love more completely than any other created being? Here, we need to explore the concept of development.

As we have seen from our discussion of the heart of God, all created beings are the result of the emotional impulse to realize joy through love. This means that God's motivational force of heart becomes the starting point for the process of communicating the love of God through created reality. According to Richardson, Unification Thought affirms three metaphysical principles which describe that process of an unfolding of God's love through the created order.<sup>26</sup> These three metaphysical ultimates describe the structure of the

Original Image and are identified as: the principle of give and take action; the concept of the quadruple base; and the principle of Chung-Boon-Hap action, or the action of origin, division, and union. These three principles are absolutely universal and fundamental since they apply for all existing beings without exception.

As above mentioned, within the Original Image there is give and take action between Sung Sang and Hyung Sang centered on heart or purpose. The nature of God's heart guarantees an absolutely harmonious give and take action in the Original Image, thus forming a harmonized body or union. This confirms the general principle that give and take action based on heart or purpose leads to a definite result in terms of advancing the fulfillment of the original purpose.<sup>27</sup>

In order to define the interaction of God's attributes, Unification Thought introduces the spatial analogy of the quadruple base and the temporal analogy of Chung-Boon-Hap action. That is to say, one can distinguish four spacial divisions or positions within the Original Image as defined by heart, Sung Sang, Hyung Sang, and the harmonized body.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, we are able to determine three temporal divisions, that is, first, heart as Chung, or origin, then Sung Sang and Hyung Sang as Boon, or division, and finally, the harmonized body as Hap, or union.<sup>29</sup>

For our analysis of the developmental aspect of the created order it is important to point out that Unification Thought applies the quadruple base and the Chung-Boon-Hap action to two distinct modes of existence, that is the modes of identity and development. First of all, let us consider these modes of existence for the Original Image. On the one hand, if heart takes the central position in the give and take action between Sung Sang and Hyung Sang the result will be the harmonized body or union between Sung Sang, thus forming the identity maintaining quadruple base. In this way, the identity of the Original Image is defined as the absoluteness and unchangeability of heart. On the other hand, if purpose as rooted in the motivation of heart takes the central position in the aforementioned give and take action of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang, the result will be a new product, that is, a multiplied body.<sup>30</sup> The developmental aspect of the Original Image, as reflected in Logos, or the actual process of creation,

is then expressed through a developing quadruple base which is defined with the four positions of purpose, Sung Sang, Hyung Sang, and multiplied body.

However, in the case of created beings, it is always purpose that determines their identity and development.<sup>31</sup> In other words, by virtue of their createdness, created beings without exception have an inherent purpose that serves the fulfillment of the desire of God's heart. Created beings then form the identity maintaining and developing quadruple base for realizing their intrinsic purpose. Moreover, it seems important to notice that Unification Thought considers both concepts, the identity maintaining quadruple base and the developing quadruple base, as expressions of a formative process based on the give and take action between distinct positions of subject (Sung Sang) and object (Hyung Sang).

How then do these structural metaphysical ultimates apply for the activities of the Original Image and in particular for the development of human beings and the family in terms of becoming the qualified object of God's love? To answer this question, we will discuss the notion of the Logos, which appears as the first necessary step within the process of creation.

## (2) The Notion of the Logos

For Unification Thought, Logos defines the thinking of God, or the conceptual formation of a comprehensive plan within the Original Image for the purpose of bringing creation into existence.<sup>32</sup> Since thinking or mental activities are internal and causal, it is located in the Sung Sang (internal character) of the Original Image. However, as mentioned above, for any formative action to take place, the three metaphysical principles need to be applied. That is to say, within the Sung Sang of the Original Image, a quadruple base has to appear that would allow the formation of the Logos. According to Unification Thought, this inner quadruple base with its formative action in the Sung Sang of the Original Image is defined as the give and take action between Inner Sung Sang and Inner Hyung Sang centered on the purpose of creation.<sup>33</sup> More precisely, in agreement with our previous definitions, Logos is explained as an inner

developing quadruple base, since on account of its purpose centered formulation, Logos can be identified as a resulting new product (the multiplied body), that is understood as God's conception and blueprint for creation. How then is Logos defined in relation to the concepts of Inner Sung Sang, the functional elements, and Inner Hyung Sang, the elements of form? Unification Thought explains Inner Sung Sang with the spiritual or functional faculties of intellect, emotion, and will and assigns to Logos the faculty of the intellect with reason as its particular manifestation.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, Inner Hyung Sang is perceived as a variety of mental forms such as idea, concept, principle or law. In defining Logos by way of its Inner Hyung Sang aspect, Unification Thought associates Logos with law. Thus, the notion of Logos is understood in terms of the mutual interaction of reason and law, centered on purpose. As Logos marks the first developmental stage for the realization of creation, there is a second stage, in which God accomplishes the transformation of that original conceptual blueprint into the substantial creation.<sup>35</sup> Evidently, that second stage describes a further developmental activity which permits its definition as an outer developing quadruple base. That is to say, Logos as the inner developing quadruple base in the position of the Sung Sang of the Original Image performs a purpose centered give and take action with Hyung Sang, or the external form of the Original Image, which is identified as pre-energy.<sup>36</sup> In short, the creative process enters its final stage by forming an outer quadruple base that is composed of purpose, Logos, pre-energy, and multiplied body. The ideal of creation, as represented conceptually by the Logos, is then actualized by bringing a substantial object for God's love into existence. As previously mentioned, that qualified objects for God's love are human beings, and in particular the human family.

So far we have analyzed the concept of development in Unification Thought by focusing on the discussion of three metaphysical principles and the notion of the Logos. It has become clear that the conceptual apparatus for explaining development is consistently related to the original purpose of creation. It seems that such a purpose-centered approach allows then the use of developmental categories for describing the unchanging aspect of

reality. That is to say, the three metaphysical principles affirm their universal validity not only for explaining phenomena of change or development, but also in providing answers for the understanding of the nature of identity. The uniqueness of these philosophical foundations in Unification Thought can be further illustrated through a brief comparison with Hegel's position.

### 3. Summary

Our study of the philosophical foundations of the family can be summarized by way of a comparative analysis between Hegel and Unification Thought. For our purpose of preparing the discussion of the family in both systems of thought, it will suffice to focus on three general issues. Within the presented philosophical foundations, we are able to discern the (1) principal presupposition or starting point of the philosophical system, (2) its basic philosophical method and (3) the goal or actualization of the original presupposition.

(1) We have seen that Hegel postulates the development of Spirit through distinct moments such as consciousness, self-consciousness, and reason. As Spirit appears in these distinct moments or abstractions, it also has the quality of providing an active mediation between opposites, such as individuality and universality. To illustrate these basic assumptions, Hegel speaks of the emergence of self-consciousness when the opposite moments of universal essence and individualized expression are balanced by the integrating function of the Spirit. Self-consciousness in the individual is then the manifestation of Subjective Spirit, while the further development of self-consciousness in the community is represented through Objective Spirit. Finally, the actualization of reason or universal essence in a multitude of individuals becomes the rational state which represents the teleological fulfillment of Absolute Spirit.

In all these foundational presuppositions, Hegel refers to the primacy of Reason or Logos, an assumption which differs from the Unification concept of the Heart Motivation Theory. That is to say, the Original Image in Unification Thought, which is comparable with Hegel's notion of Absolute Spirit, refers to the heart of God as the

starting point for further philosophical inquiry, thus emphasizing the personal and relational nature of God. Hegel contrasts the Unification position when he speaks of Absolute Spirit in terms of the actualization of reason, thus affirming an impersonal and essence oriented understanding of God. While Hegel sees self-consciousness as the leading category for the realization of reason, it seems that the Unification concept of the Heart Motivation Theory implies the centrality of object-consciousness,<sup>27</sup> since all of created reality is understood to exist in an object position towards God, who occupies the position of the ultimate subject.

(2) In comparing Hegel's dialectical method with the three metaphysical principles in Unification Thought, we can affirm some sequential correspondence of the concepts of Hegel's existence-in-itself, existence-for-itself, and existence-in-and-for-itself with the Chung-Boon-Hap (origin-division-union) action in Unification Thought. However, there emerges a major difference between the two thought systems.

On the one hand, Hegel sees existence-in-itself as the latent potential stage which stands in an antithetical relationship with its surrounding which is identified as existence-for-itself. In other words, these first two stages in Hegel's dialectic interact from mutually opposing positions, thus advancing their development through conflict, cancellation, or negation. It is only in the third or unifying stage of existence-in-and-for-itself in which the inherent contradiction of the dialectical process is resolved. The previous two stages then merge into a superior integrated whole.

Unification thought, on the other hand, perceives the process of development as being entirely penetrated by Chung, the antecedent origin or purpose. This means, the activity of the subsequent stage of Boon, or the division between Sung Sang and Hyung Sang, is understood as give and take action between subject and object or correlative elements which are free from any contradictory tension. That is to say, the concepts of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang, and by the same token the notions of Yang and Yin, relate to one another in a complementary and harmonious way. The final stage, Hap, or union, then contains the new creation or multiplied body which can be compared with Hegel's existence-in-and-for-itself. Obviously the



omission of an overarching purpose in Hegel's dialectic can be held responsible for affirming forces of contradiction and negation within the process of dialectical development.

(3) From our past discussion we can identify the goal of the developmental process as the establishment of the ethical realm. It seems that Hegel locates the ethical realm in the notion of individuality, when he makes the actuality of self-consciousness dependent on its involvement in ethical action. Here ethical action is defined by the movement of Absolute Spirit towards the individual. That is to say, Absolute Spirit as universal essence finds its individualized expression in an actual self-consciousness which engages in action qualified by truth. Thus, for Hegel the actuality of self-consciousness marks the reality of subjective Spirit which then becomes the bearer of the ethical essence.

Unification Thought would agree with Hegel to define the ethical realm through actions which are based on truth. However, Hegel explains truth as reason that is actual in Spirit, thus reducing the connection with Absolute Spirit to the actuality of Reason. For Unification Thought, it is crucial to understand truth in terms of Logos which is based on the original purpose of love, as it is defined by the heart of God. Therefore, the ethical realm is perceived as the manifestation of God's heart in loving actions. Hegel differs from Unification Thought not only with reference to the notion of truth, but also with regard to the understanding of freedom and ethical conduct. Since Hegel considers the ethical essence to be determined by actualized Reason, he seems to imply an emphasis on subjective freedom within ethical conduct. Once actualized Reason as subjective Spirit or existence-in-itself acts upon its inherent freedom, it is confronted with its objective surrounding or existence-for-itself. For Hegel, subjective freedom then encounters the dialectical conflict with objective norms which are identified as the laws of morality. Thus, Hegel admits an implicit struggle when subjective freedom is exercised within the ethical realm. Unification Thought, on the other hand, explains the notion of Logos with the inner developing quadruple base including purpose, reason, and law. In short, Logos contains in itself the harmonious interaction between reason and law,

or freedom and ethical norm, centered on the common purpose of actualizing the desire of God's heart. Thus, according to Unification Thought, the exercise of subjective freedom within the ethical realm is free from any inherent contradiction and serves the realization of God's ideal for human beings.

## Chapter Two The Definition of the Family

After having examined basic concepts and methodological considerations, we now proceed to analyze the definition of the family within the two philosophical approaches of Hegel and Unification Thought. We will focus on issues which will describe the unique characteristics of each approach, so that our comparative study can be beneficial for better understanding both systems of thought.

### 1. Hegel's View of the Family

In analyzing major characteristics of the family, Hegel seems to focus on two basic issues. First, he discusses the function of love in the formation of a unique family consciousness. Such a new consciousness among members of the family seems to develop from the dialectical grounding of family relationships. Second, Hegel defines the family in relation to the ethical sphere. Here, the family appears as a distinct moment in the development of Spirit and receives its identity in opposition to the state. In this section we will present Hegel's understanding of the family as determined by the transforming power of love, and then discuss his definition of the family with reference to the ethical sphere. Finally we will summarize our findings in preparation for our comparison with the Unification view of the family.

#### a. The Family as Determined by Love

##### (1) Family Relations and Hegel's Dialectic

In the *Philosophy of Right*, Hegel presents a succinct definition of the family which we shall analyze in more depth. First of all, it

is evident that Hegel's definition of the family contains the whole dynamic of his dialectical method. Seeing the individual within the family as existence-in-itself, Hegel moves on by postulating love as the further determination of Spirit. Ultimately, Hegel defines the family as existence-in-and-for-itself when individual Spirit, being reconciled with love, acquires a higher level of development, thus becoming substantial Spirit. Hegel says:

The family has, as the immediate substantiality of Spirit, its self-experienced unity, that is love, as its determination. In this way, its disposition (or inwardness) consists of the self-consciousness of its individuality within this unity and as such its essentiality exists-in-and-for-itself. Thus, (the Spirit manifested in) the family exists (within this disposition) not as a person for itself but rather as a member.<sup>33</sup>

To further analyze this text we shall focus on three issues. First, Hegel speaks of the disposition or inwardness (Gesinnung) of the Spirit which is manifested in the family. To arrive at this disposition Hegel has to unfold the dialectical process in terms of its different moments. The starting point or existence-in-itself is the self-consciousness of individuality. That is to say, first of all, the individual is aware of its own ego or independence. However, self-consciousness carries the potentiality of development, which becomes actualized in confrontation with other individuals in the family. This preoccupation of the individual with other family members is expressed by an actual relationship of love. In Hegel's view, the individual is now in the position to leave behind its ego, or the awareness of its independence. Thus, love itself becomes the determining category and as such it represents the family surrounding for the individual. Moreover, for the dialectical development of Spirit, this family surrounding can be seen as existence-for-itself. Within the unity of love the individual, after having given up its ego, regains its self-consciousness of individuality in an advanced manner, that is on the level of the family. In Hegel's understanding a new self-consciousness of individuality emerges because of an ontological

presence of love. Finally, this new self-consciousness, being the essentiality of the family, exists-in-and-for-itself as the result of the dialectical process.

The second point in the quoted text concerns the consequence or outcome of the familial disposition (Gesinnung). That is to say, Hegel refers to the immediate result for the self-consciousness of Spirit. Self-consciousness does no longer exist-for-itself, that is as a person being only aware of other persons, but rather it exists-in-and-for-itself, by going beyond its reflective stage and intergrating its former identity. In Hegel's words, self-consciousness experiences a new identity as a member of the family.

The third issue in the above definition of the family deals with the continuation of the dialectical development of Spirit. The term "substantiality" connotes for Hegel "givenness", or "given into existence" (ein Gegebensein). The family constitutes a unique quality of Spirit, and with it a new existence or kind of its own is called into being, that is it is made substantial. Moreover, the family in this new substantiality is also immediate substantiality. That is, it presents itself on the rudimentary level as existence-in-itself. For Hegel, the manifestation of Spirit in the family as a new genre constitutes the first unreflective appearance of objective Spirit. Hegel understands the full dimension of objective Spirit in "the movement through the form of its moments"<sup>34</sup> as (A) the immediate, or natural, ethical Spirit-the family, (B) the civil society, and (c) the state. When Hegel treats the family in relation to the ethical sphere, he sees the family in an antithetical position vis-a-vis the civil society and the state, as will be further explained later in this paper.

## (2) The Irrational Aspect of Love

Hegel has shown that love plays the crucial role in bringing about the developmental breakthrough for individual Spirit to become objective spirit in its immediate manifestation as family. Thus, it comes as no surprise that Hegel offers a more explicit statement about love in a supplementary note which follows his above-quoted definition of the family in the *Philosophy of Right*. We shall now analyze Hegel's statement on love.

As explained earlier, Hegel understands the initial demonstration of love as the surrender of the individual ego, or the denial of personal independence, that is one's being-in-itself, thus realizing existence-for-itself (*Fürsichsein*) as related to the development of individual consciousness. In other words, love allows an individual to give up any preoccupation with independence within the consciousness of unity with the other. Hegel says:

The first moment of love is that I wish not to be an independent person for myself, and that, if I am, I feel myself defective and incomplete. The second moment is that I win myself in another person, that I am recognized in him as he is in me. Hence, love is the most enormous contradiction to the understanding, which it cannot solve. Nothing harder is found than this punctiliousness of self-consciousness which is denied, and which I am still said to have affirmed. But love is at once the source and the solution of the contradiction; as solution it is ethical concord.<sup>40</sup>

What appears to be the core issue in this text is the description of love in terms of an unresolved inner dialectic. That is to say, Hegel points at two ontological moments of love, both of which seem to stand in an irreconcilable opposition. First, love causes my self-consciousness to deny the main characteristic of personhood, that is my ego and independence or being-in-itself. Moreover, my self-denial is based on an actual, internal experience of incompleteness. This means, my self-consciousness becomes increasingly aware of the fact that there is no further growth or development solely by existing-in-itself. Hegel sees this awareness of a developmental impasse and the subsequent self-denial as the presuppositions for the turn to the other person. By giving myself to the other, the second ontological moment of love occurs, namely, that I again find my personhood, but on a more advanced or mature level, through establishing meaning for myself in the other person, just as the other person became meaningful for me. This second moment of love, as Hegel sees it, describes merely the result of a loving relationship between two

persons but it does not explain the development of the actual transformation of self-consciousness. In other words, Hegel admits that one cannot speak of a dialectic interaction between the two moments of love, in terms of an understandable and determined formalism. rather, Hegel concedes implicitly that a qualitative leap in the development of self-consciousness has to be recognized. Thus, in Hegel's view, love remains inaccessible to man's understanding because of two reasons. First, due to the qualitative leap, a new kind of self-consciousness emerges from the experience of love, whereby the notion of an evolutionary, that is, scientifically comprehensible, development has to be abandoned. Secondly, the resulting ontological moment of love presents the new quality of self-consciousness as being completely contradictory to the initial moment of love. In Hegel's understanding, this paradox between the necessity of negating self-consciousness in order to gain its affirmation, assigns an irrational dimension to the essence of love.<sup>41</sup>

#### a. The Family and the Ethical Sphere

What is unique for Hegel's approach of defining the family is his deductive method from the general to the particular phenomenon.

That is to say, Hegel speaks first about the community and the state and then defines the family as standing in an antithetical relationship to community or state. To underline this contract, Hegel points to a distinctive split of the ethical substance when he speaks of the *human law* as represented by the community and the state and the *divine law* as referring to the family. On the one hand, Hegel states that the community and the state constitute realities that are conscious of themselves and are expressed in human laws and customs. On the other hand, the family embodies the actual universality or the *divine law* in a position which is opposed to the self-conscious ethical action of the community or state. It can be shown that this antithetical split between *human* and *divine law* has its roots in Greek thought.<sup>42</sup>

As the defender of the *divine law*, the family is mentioned implicitly by Hegel in terms of "the simple and immediate essence of the ethical sphere,"<sup>43</sup> and he further explains this rudimentary

concept of the family in the following text :

This moment (i.e., the inner notion or general possibility of the ethical sphere in general containing within it the moment of self-consciousness) which expresses the ethical sphere in this element of immediacy or (simple) being, or which is an immediate consciousness of itself, both as essence and as this particular self, in an 'other,' i.e. as a natural ethical community—this is the Family.<sup>44</sup>

What stands out in this definition of Hegel's concept of the family is the category of immediacy. The family, as the immediate manifestation of the ethical order, is not mediated by any other reflective stage within the ethical realm; it is simply the rudimentary unreflective or natural institution in itself. This concept of immediacy for Hegel implies that the family remains within the ethical order on the level of an unconscious or inner notion. Moreover, this notion of the family as related to an unconscious existence has to be understood in opposition to the actual, or self-conscious existence as represented by the community or the state. In other words, Spirit as manifested in the family, finds itself in an unreflective stage, preoccupied with individual concerns and its own existence. However, Spirit carries also the potential of reflecting on its own level of existence. When it actually engages in this self-reflection, Spirit, according to Hegel, sublimates (aufheben) its so far 'unconscious' existence on the family level and moves on to the self-conscious level of the community. Thus, the element of opposition between family and community has to be understood in terms of a transition from the 'unconscious' to the 'self-conscious' stage of existence. As Hegel phrases it "the Penates (household gods) stand opposed to the universal Spirit."<sup>45</sup>

What seems to be another integral part of defining the family in the *Phenomenology* is Hegel's understanding of the ethical character of the family. Here it is interesting to note that Hegel bypasses the function of love in defining the ethical dimension of the family. Rather, what defines the family as ethical for Hegel is

the connection of the individual with the universal or divine aspect of the family. In Hegel's view this is the duty of the individual to honor the deceased members of the family. Hegel states :

... because the ethical principle is intrinsically universal, the ethical connection between the members of the Family is not that of feeling or the relationship of love... the ethical principle must be placed in the relation of the individual member of the Family to the whole Family as the substance... the content of the ethical action must be substantial or whole and universal; ... (this) deed (or action) concerns no longer the living but the dead."<sup>46</sup>

This text of the *Phenomenology* points to a shift of relationships. What Hegel defines as the ethical dimension of family life is no longer the loving relationship between the individual members of the family, but the relationship of the individual to the family as a whole, as it is expressed in the duty to bury the deceased. Thus, the family is in its essence only connected with Absolute Spirit by observing the burial rites, an act which in itself exhibits to Hegel the perfect *divine law*. This peculiar emphasis on burial rites in defining the ethical principle within the family calls for a separate investigation of Hegel's influence by Greek thought.<sup>47</sup>

### C. Summary

In discussing Hegel's view of the family we have seen that due recognition is given to the function of love within the dialectical development of family consciousness. Hegel points out that on account of its irrational aspect, love becomes the solution of its own contradictory nature, thus being the agent of ethical unity within the family. According to Hegel, this ethical unity shows itself in three subsequent stages, namely (1) the growth or transformation of self-consciousness through loving relationships with other family members, (2) the emergence of our inner familial disposition which defines a unique family identity in terms of the new self-consciousness

of being a member of the family, and (3) the affirmation of the family as the immediate or unreflective substantiality of Spirit which constitutes the first dialectical moment or existence in itself of objective Spirit.

We have found that Hegel attempts to offer a rational analysis of the above stages in the developments of the family within the systematic framework of his dialectical approach. However, being aware of the incomprehensible aspect of the nature of love, Hegel seems to admit implicitly that his dialectical method cannot be universally applied while claiming to be fully scientific or rational.

Our discussion of the family in relation to the ethical sphere has shown that Hegel argues for a dialectical split of the ethical substance as it is expressed through an inherent opposition between the community and the family. By accepting the community or state as the locus for the actual ethical substance, Hegel concludes that the family has to be derived from the community. In fact, we have discussed Hegel's definition of the family as the immediate, natural, ethical community. In order to summarize the content of this definition, we shall focus on three issues. First, there is the notion of immediacy as referring to the initial unreflective level of objective Spirit which is synonymous with the natural manifestation of objective Spirit. Second, as mentioned above, Hegel defines the family not on its own ground, but with respect to the community and the state. The family then appears as the unconscious, inner Notion in opposition to the actual self-conscious existence of the community. Lastly, Hegel defines the ethical dimension of family life by stressing the family duty to honor the dead, while the relationship of love among the members of the family appears to be insignificant for identifying the ethical aspect of the family.

So far we have analyzed Hegel's understanding of the family by focusing on the function of love in family relationships and on the significance of the family for the ethical sphere. We will see that our findings on Hegel's treatment of the family provide an effective background for discussing the Unification view of the family.

## 2. The Family in Unification Thought

According to Unification Thought the discussion of the family is of central importance for understanding the original purpose of human beings and their present condition. That is to say, the family is not only seen as a phenomenon within the existing world order, but it is above all perceived as the original manifestation of God's ideal of creation. As earlier mentioned, Unification Thought is based on *Divine Principle*, a comprehensive revelation received by Reverend Moon. The teachings of the *Divine Principle* explain man's present situation in terms of a process of restoration, in which the fallen state of human beings will be overcome through man's cooperation with God's providence of salvation.<sup>48</sup> This means that contemporary man finds himself confronted with two contrasting inner dispositions. On the one hand, man experiences his alienation from God and the reality of evil which, according to the *Divine Principle*, is explained through the Fall of Man.<sup>49</sup> On the other hand, man is somehow aware that despite his separation from God, there exists a remnant of goodness within himself, since under any circumstances, man remains God's creation. The *Divine Principle* speaks of the original mind of man when affirming man's awareness of an existing bond with his Creator.<sup>50</sup> Because human beings have an original mind, they are able to understand God's will for their purpose and destiny.

Unification Thought attempts to offer a philosophical foundation for the theological explanation of man's condition as set forth in the *Divine Principle*. In particular, Unification Thought takes up the task to further clarify those laws and principles which describe the original God-given order, while at the same time recognizing the need for offering a solution for man's fallen state. In other words, by deepening the understanding of man's original purpose and ideal vis-a-vis God, Unification Thought offers a substantial contribution for solving the human predicament. Thus, with reference to our analysis of the family in Unification Thought, we will direct our explanations to the ideal of the family as it was originally intended by God.

Two issues will be central for our discussion of the family. First, we explore the notion of the family as the qualified object for God's love by focusing on the concept of the three Blessings. Moreover, we need to examine the relational aspect of love for grasping the

ideal of the family as presented in Unification Thought. Second, we will relate our findings to the ethical implications of the family ideal, thus addressing implicitly the question of how the fallen state of the human race can be overcome. Finally, in preparation for our comparative analysis with Hegel's view of the family, we will present a summary of our discussion of the family in Unification Thought.

#### a. The Family as God's Object

For Unification Thought, it is essential to affirm that the supreme manifestation of God's love is accomplished through the human family. In order to fulfill God's purpose of creation, man as an individual is supposed to develop his potential for building a God-centered family. Unification Thought in its chapter on ethics states:

God created man as the object of love and God's love appears more completely through the family rather than through a human individual. Therefore, the ideal in God's creation is that God's love be realized through the human family.<sup>51</sup>

This text presents two major issues for further explaining the family. First, the family is defined within the larger concept of a qualified object for God's love. What seems to be crucial is the developmental aspect of that qualified object, which is expressed in the Unification concept of the three Blessings. The second issue refers to the question why, in fact, does the family manifest God's love in a more profound way than the individual human being. The answer to this question can be found in the discussion of the relational aspect of love. We will see that our earlier presentation of basic philosophical concepts in Unification Thought provides an adequate foundation for discussing the Unification view of the family.

#### (1) The Three Blessings

Human development is effectively described through the Unification concept of the three Blessings which has its Biblical foundation in Gen. 1:28. "(1) Be fruitful, and (2) multiply, and fill the earth and (3) subdue it."<sup>52</sup> These three Blessings mark three

stages in the process of accomplishing God's ideal of creation.<sup>(1)</sup> First, human beings should attain maturity on the individual level by developing the ideal of a unique personality centered on God's heart. How does Unification Thought explain that process of maturation? As earlier stated any process of development involves the three metaphysical principles. To focus on the principle of give and take action and the quadruple base will be sufficient for our analysis, since the principle of Chung-Boon-Hap (origin-division-union) action can be considered as the temporal version of the quadruple base.<sup>53</sup>

Unification Thought holds that growth occurs for human beings when a developing quadruple base is formed. That is to say, when the Sung Sang and Hyung Sang aspects of man, that is his mind and body, have harmonious give and take action centered on purpose, then a multiplied body is formed, namely, the maturing individual. However, the human body, from the viewpoint of its biological functions, grows autonomously in accordance with the laws of nature.

The uniqueness of human growth in terms of character formation then lies in the human mind. The Unification Theory of Original Human Nature discusses the human mind as follows:

The human mind, in which spirit mind is subject and physical mind is object, is the original mind. That the physical mind obeys spirit mind means to put the life of values (spiritual values) first and the material life second.<sup>54</sup>

This passage affirms that maturation is based on the harmonious interaction of the spirit mind and the physical mind. The spirit mind determines the Sung Sang aspect of the human mind and is responsible for the pursuit of spiritual values such as truth, goodness, and beauty based on the purpose of the whole that is to realize the ideal of God's love. However, in order to accomplish its purpose, the spirit mind needs to be connected with the physical body, which, according to *Divine Principle*, provides the necessary vitality elements for spiritual growth.<sup>55</sup> Therefore, the human mind includes as its Hyung Sang aspect the physical mind, which represents needs and

desires related to the purpose of individual survival and maintenance, such as food, shelter, and procreation. In short, the human mind grows, in terms of character formation for the sake of realizing God's love, when spirit mind and physical mind interact from their respective positions of subject and object. Unification Thought indicates the uniqueness of that growth process by affirming man's personal creative involvement in maintaining the subject-object relationship between spirit mind and physical mind. That personal involvement can be identified as the fulfillment of man's responsibility for achieving the ideal of his maturation. Although we have analyzed human growth from the perspective of the individual, we need to keep in mind that according to the Unification view of the ideal of creation, any personal character formation occurs within the family setting. Thus, individual motivation in its final analysis depends on a harmonious family life.

(2) The central significance of the family for the original ideal of creation is expressed in the Unification view of the second Blessing. After attaining personal maturity, man is called "to multiply" (Genesis 1:28) through building loving relationships within the context of family life. Individual maturity can be described as an expression of God's vertical love, which is based on a distinct partnership between God and the individual person, whereas the second Blessing extends that vertical partnership by means of a horizontal partnership among spouses in marriage. As above mentioned, Unification Thought explains the Original Image not only in terms of essentialities of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang as supremely manifested through the human mind and body, but it also affirms the secondary attributes of Yang (masculinity) and Yin (femininity), which find their complete expression in the ideal partnership of husband and wife. The first and second Blessings imply that personal growth is followed by marital growth. As the individual forms for his or her development an internal quadruple base composed of purpose, spirit mind, and physical mind, likewise the spouses form for their marital growth an outer quadruple base which, in fact, becomes the family quadruple base including the positions of purpose, husband, wife, and children. In order to understand the family ideal,

we need to recall the original purpose, which occupies the central position in the family quadruple base. As earlier stated, purpose is defined in terms of the desire of God's heart to realize joy through love. For that purpose to be fulfilled, it is necessary that man, as the object of God's love, also experiences joy through love. According to Unification Thought, men and women become qualified objects to God once they attain personal maturity and are blessed in marriage, thus experiencing God's love as husband and wife. That is to say, the marriage partners develop their horizontal loving relationship by extending their vertical love for God to each other. The resulting marital partnership can be described as a horizontal two-in-oneness which, in fact, exists as a three-in-oneness with God at its center. Such a God-centered marital love then becomes the foundation for the new creation as it is manifested through children.<sup>65</sup> Unification Thought understands the ideal of the family not only with regard to fulfilling man's happiness in accordance with the second Blessing, but it also sees the family as the central paradigm for explaining man's relationship with created reality.

(3) We have seen that individual maturation served as the foundation for establishing the family ideal. Likewise the realization of harmonious family relationships appears as man's qualification for exercising dominion over the created order in accordance with the third Blessing. This means that man can only govern creation with God's love once he has realized the different aspects of God's love through an ideal family life. Unification Thought describes the developmental aspect within the third Blessing by means of an outer developing quadruple base. Here, purpose is the desire of God's heart to realize the ideal world as it is expressed with the Biblical concept of the Kingdom of Heaven. Moreover, the Sung Sang position is occupied by man who has realized the family ideal, and all created things are assigned to the Hyung Sang position. The substantial fulfillment of the second Blessing then takes the Sung Sang position within the quadruple base of the third Blessing, while the give and take action with the Hyung Sang position realizes the purpose of all created things, namely, to be governed by man. Thus, human development in its final stage can be described through the second

and third Blessing if one considers man's activities in the created order as an extension of an ideal family relationships. That is to say, man qualifies as lord of creation by actively relating his experience of God's love from his family life to all things. The fulfillment of man's lordship over creation will then result in the ideal word as it was originally intended by God.

So far we have analyzed the developmental aspect of the family as God's object of love according to Unification Thought. The significance of the family ideal is, however, not limited to questions of human development, but it also illustrates the Unification understanding of the concept of love.

## (2) The Relational Aspect of Love

We have earlier raised the question why God's love is manifested in a more profound way through the family and not through individual human beings. The answer lies in the Unification understanding of the nature of love. We have seen that for Unification Thought, the starting point for love is God's heart, and that the intrinsic quality of love is its orientation towards the realization of joy. However, joy is only fully realized if there exists a substantial object which reflects completely the essence of the subject. Unification Thought states :

joy arises when one (subject) loves an object and when the object resembles the subject,(then) the subject feels joy.<sup>67</sup>

This passage refers in particular to the exchange of love between God as the subject, and man in the position of object. Here, joy is defined as the presence of love based on the law of resemblance, a law which can be understood as an essential correspondence between the position of subject and object.<sup>68</sup> This means, the more the object reflects the character and form of the subject, the more joy is felt by the subject. Hence, the subject feels an increasing awareness of its own character and form by being stimulated by the resemblance of the object. Thus, joy starts with an increased self-awareness of the subject which is reciprocated by the object through give and

take action. That is to say, also the object reaches a higher degree of self-awareness within the mutual experience of joy. However, it has to be pointed out that the concept of an increased self-awareness is here understood not as an isolated experience in self-consciousness, but rather it signifies a complete inner orientation towards the other, within an emerging partnership of subject and object. This partnership implies that the impulse of love from the subject towards the object is reciprocated to the subject by virtue of the resemblance of the object. That resemblance in its fulfillment then includes the increased self-awareness of the object within the emotional state of joy. In the Unification view, the ability of the object to reciprocate love to the subject is defined as the emotional force of beauty.<sup>69</sup> In particular, the affirmation that God is emotionally affected by man's beauty becomes the ontological foundation for the relational understanding of love in Unification Thought. In other words, love is not limited to its essential nature as an active emotional force within the subject, but through its inherent object-directedness it receives fulfillment by the response of the object depending on the quality of the object's beauty.

Now, we can better understand in what way man is supposed to be a qualified object for God's love. Let us discuss two major points. First, it has to be pointed out that the object of God's love which fully expresses the heart of God, is an object that includes love itself in order to achieve supreme resemblance for the realization of Joy. This means that God communicates His love by creating human beings in such a way that humans themselves substantiate God's love in their own being. Such human resemblance towards God on an individual level has been already explained through the first Blessing.<sup>69</sup>

Second, as earlier mentioned, the dual essentialities of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang in the Original Image find their substantial expression in the human mind and body or the spirit mind and physical mind. These dual essentialities then provide the foundation for the ability of human beings to be loving as individuals and to respond to God's love vertically. However, Unification Thought also affirms in the Original Image the secondary attributes of Yang



(masculinity) and Yin (femininity) with which the Sung Sang and Hyung Sang elements of all created beings are endowed. In particular, the creation of man and woman fully resembles the Original Image not only in their Sung Sang and Hyung Sang aspects, but also with respect to the Yang, Yin attributes. As earlier indicated, the supreme beauty of human beings in their position as objects of God's love is attained through the second Blessing.<sup>61</sup> In other words, the realization of God's vertical and horizontal love through the family ideal then manifests the fullest expression of the relational aspect of love.

We have seen that the Unification perception of the nature of love can be explained through the family when seen from the viewpoint of its originally given purpose. Since the family explains human life in such a comprehensive manner, we can also expect to derive profound ethical implications from the family. In our final section, we will discuss the Unification Thought position on the significance of the family for the ethical realm.

#### b. The Family as Ethical Paradigm

For Unification Thought, ethics is primarily concerned with the practice of love.<sup>62</sup> As our previous discussion has shown, the Unification concept of love always includes the two dimensions of vertical love for God in the eternal order and horizontal love among human beings in the temporal order. Moreover, the supreme realization of that vertical and horizontal love has been explained through the family quadruple base. In fact, the practice of love within the family is described through the mutual relationship of each position with three objects. For example, the position of God, which also signifies God's heart and purpose, encounters three object positions, namely, husband, wife, and children, while the husband relates to the three object positions of God, wife, and children. Subsequently, this pattern applies for all four positions and it explains the fulfillment of the three objects purpose. That is to say, God's love finds in the family its qualified object through the loving relationships between each position and its corresponding three objects. Here, the realization of God's love in the family shows itself

in three kinds of love, also defined as the divisional loves of parental love, conjugal love, and children's love. This implies that divisional love is love with direction, which means that parental love is vertical love from the parents to the children, while children's love is vertical love from the children to the parents and conjugal love defines the horizontal love between husband and wife.<sup>63</sup> For Unification Thought, the goal of ethics consists of the realization of these divisional loves, which amounts to the perfection of the family quadruple base. Moreover, Unification ethics emphasizes that each position in the family quadruple base is directed towards fulfilling the purpose for the whole and the purpose for the individual by way of accomplishing the three objects purpose.<sup>64</sup> In other words, the concept of purpose as derived from God's heart includes, on the one hand, the advancement of God-centered loving relationships in society and state with the goal of attaining the ideal world and, on the other hand, it guarantees the fulfillment of individual desires within the scope of maintaining the family ideal.

That intrinsic connection between the universal end and individual formation is also expressed in the Unification understanding of ethics in relation to morality. As earlier explained, the foundation for building an ideal family is the fulfillment of the first Blessing. We have seen that individual maturity involves the development of the human mind through the inner quadruple base (purpose, spirit mind, and physical mind), while the formation of family relationships is based on the outer quadruple base (purpose and family members). As the attainment of the first Blessing is the presupposition for fulfilling the second Blessing, likewise the norm of individual human behavior, understood as morality, then becomes the foundation for the norm of human behavior in the family which is identified as ethics. Unification Thought also speaks of morality as the subjective norm which includes virtues of individual maturation, while ethics is defined as objective norm which involves virtues formed in family life.<sup>65</sup> In short, ethics implies a distinct interaction between morally responsible individuals according to an original design which is defined through the family quadruple base.

One outstanding feature of Unification ethics consists of the

application of family ethics to social ethics. In fact, such an extension of family ethics to society seems to be consistent with the previous affirmation to regard morality as the presupposition for ethics. In other words, as much as the norm of individual human behavior functions as the foundation for the norm of family relationships, likewise ethics as the norm of human behavior in the family becomes the paradigm for social ethics. We can also say, as the attainment of the first Blessing serves the realization of the second blessing, in like manner the fulfillment of the second Blessing becomes the presupposition for achieving the third Blessing. However, the important point in these conceptual considerations seems to be the Unification assertion that family relationships provide the basic pattern for fulfilling the purpose for the individual as initiated by the first Blessing and the purpose for the whole in terms of achieving the third Blessing. Since the family is identified as the qualified object of God's love, both objectives of individual maturation and building the ideal world seem to be based on an intrinsic orientation towards perfecting the family. Thus, Unification Thought implies the paradigmatic function of family ethics for the ongoing formation of individuality within the family and for all levels of social interaction such as society and state.

### c. Summary

Our treatment of the family in Unification Thought can be outlined by highlighting four major issues. (1) First, Unification Thought attempts to explain the foundations and philosophical implications of the family from the viewpoint of the originally created order. While being fully aware of the state of confusion which surrounds contemporary family life, Unification Thought affirms the need for analyzing the family ideal as it was intended by God. Thus, it seeks to provide the theoretical framework for guiding the necessary change in human interactions, not only with regard to overcoming the present decline in man-woman relations and family life, but also with respect to offering a workable blueprint for a harmonious world.

(2) Second, we have found that, according to Unification Thought,

the family is defined as the qualified object for God's love. Here, the centrality of a transcendent purpose functions as an ordering principle for the deviation of the present state of the family from the intended ideal. The developmental aspect of that family ideal is explained through the three Blessings. Personal growth is followed by marital and parental growth, with the goal to qualify for lordship over creation. We have seen that the process of growth involves the developing quadruple base, thus ensuring a progress which is centered on purpose. Moreover, the question of how to maintain a distinct identity, as a unique individual or as a harmonious family, is also answered in a dynamic manner through the give and take action within the identity maintaining quadruple base.

(3) Third, we have seen that the meaning of the transcendent purpose of the family becomes clear when we study the Unification notion of the relational aspect of love. For Unification Thought, the overall purpose of realizing joy is accomplished through the presence of love, based on the resemblance between subject and object. It has been the emphasis on the law of resemblance which requires a distinct quality on the part of the object in order for joy to be realized. That necessary quality of the object leads to the definition of beauty as the emotional force which reciprocates the received love. Subsequently, the family appears as the qualified object for God's love when it attains the quality of supreme beauty before God. Such beauty is realized if God's vertical and horizontal loves are expressed within the family ideal. The relational aspect of love is then manifested in a perpetual exchange between love and beauty which, in fact, confirms the relational mode of existence as set forth by the Unification concepts of give and take action and the quadruple base.

(4) Our final point concerns the definition of the ethical sphere through the family. Since Unification ethics emphasizes the practice of love, it is indispensable to clarify further the major kinds of love that determine human relationships. Here, the family emerges as the paradigm for expressing God's love as parent's love, children's love, and mutual love. The uniqueness of Unification ethics becomes visible when the paradigm of family ethics is applied to the purpose for

the whole and the purpose for the individual. In particular, the application of family ethics to social ethics sheds new light on the role of the family in society and state.

## CONCLUSION

Our analysis of the philosophical foundations of the family in Hegel and Unification Thought has reached the point of serving its original intention, that is, to show unique characteristics of both systems of thought. We will proceed with an assessment of important features in the understanding of the family for Hegel and Unification Thought by following the pattern of comparison offered in the preceding chapter. That is to say, we will address three central issues, namely (1) the basic perception of the formation of the family, (2) the understanding of love, and (3) the significance of the family for the ethical sphere. Since each of these issues offer a considerable number of possible points that can be used for a comparative analysis, we need to limit our discussion for the sake of brevity, to a few important topics.

(1) The first issue deals with the basic perception or unique feature in the formation of the family. Both Hegel and Unification Thought see love as the determining factor in the formation of family life. Hegel speaks of love as the determination of Spirit, or the self-experienced unity and determination of the family. Following his dialectical approach, Hegel describes the development of the family by confronting individual self-consciousness (existence-in-itself) with the consciousness of other family members (existence-for-itself).<sup>88</sup> The power of love transforms the original self-consciousness into the new self-consciousness of being a member of the family, thus realizing the goal of the dialectical process (existence-in-and-for-itself). Hegel points out that the new self-consciousness no longer exists for itself, but through the experience of being loving, it has left behind its reflective stage by integrating its former identity of ego and independence into the new family-member consciousness. We can argue that Hegel perceives the formation of the family primarily as the emergence of a new self-consciousness, or the transformation of

individuality in terms of attaining membership in the family.

Unification Thought explains the formation of the family quite differently. While Hegel deals with the family as a phenomenon that is rationally analyzed by focusing on self-consciousness as the immediate instrument of reason, Unification Thought contrasts Hegel's approach in emphasizing the need for understanding the family ideal.<sup>87</sup> That is to say, in the Unification view, it is not sufficient to know the family intellectually in its present state, but rather it is more important to comprehend the emotional grounding of the family as it is defined through its purpose in accordance with the originally intended created order. Thus, for Unification Thought, the family is defined as the qualified object for God's love, and its purpose of actualizing God's love penetrates the stages of formation as described by the three Blessings.<sup>89</sup> Here, the realization of joy through love becomes the final goal for the development of the family. It is not Hegel's notion of the formation of a new self-consciousness as a family member for which love provides its transforming power, but, as Unification Thought affirms, it is the actualization of love through the family quadruple base which employs various stages of self-consciousness. Love is not supposed to exist for the sake of developing self-consciousness, but the formation of self-consciousness exists for the sake of love. The purpose centered Unification approach contrasts here the rational Hegelian system.

(2) The discrepancy between Hegel and Unification Thought is further illustrated when we examine the understanding of love in the twophilosophical approaches. Hegel attempts to explain love by distinguishing two ontological moments which are supposed to interact dialectically.<sup>90</sup> The initial moment of love consists of denying one's main characteristics of personhood, that is ego and independence. In Hegelian terms, existence-in-itself surrenders its individuality, thus attaining existence-for-itself, or the consciousness of unity with the other. This initial step of self-denial originates in an awareness of incompleteness, which for Hegel amounts to the awareness in self-consciousness that there is no growth by remaining in the stage of existence-in-itself.

The second moment of love marks the turn to the other person

by establishing meaning for oneself in that other person, and vice-versa, the other person becomes meaningful for oneself. However, Hegel admits that the two moments of love do not show any defined dialectical interaction. Reason merely encounters a dialectically unexplainable qualitative leap in the development of self-consciousness. Unification Thought would agree with Hegel that love starts with complete self-giving, which amounts to a certain denial of the self. We can argue that the primacy of giving in the principle of give and take action supports this point. Moreover, Hegel's admission of an incompleteness in self-consciousness as shown through the inability to develop one's personality in isolation from others, points to the Unification view that man is created for the sake of God and other people. However, Hegel does not further analyze that internal experience of incompleteness, whereas Unification Thought seems to begin the development of the notion of love with that acknowledgment of the insufficiency of the self and its essential inner directedness to love for the sake of others. That is to say, Unification Thought holds that in its essence love is relational, it can be described as the emotional force directed from the subject to the object, while the response of the object through beauty is defined as the emotional force directed from the object towards the subject.<sup>70</sup> In the Unification view, love originates from the heart of God and is directed towards the realization of joy. Thus love is always endowed with purpose and direction. As mentioned above, Hegel concedes that love remains inaccessible to human reason. By contrast, Unification Thought implies that reason has its ontological grounding in love. Moreover, Hegel's concept of a unitive experience of love in individual self-consciousness is superseded by the Unification notion of the relational essence of love as expressed in an actual partnership between God and man and among human beings which is confirmed by the mutual interaction of love and beauty between subject and object.

One final point concerns the relational mode of existence for all of created reality which has its foundation in the Unification understanding of the heart of God and the subsequent relational definition of love and joy. In other words, Unification Thought

develops the unique concept of the developing and identity maintaining quadruple bases which provide a relational definition not only for the phenomena of growth and change, but also for the unchanging aspect of reality. It seems that Hegel's dialectical understanding of stages of self-consciousness as rational manifestations of Absolute Spirit does not account for any further development at the end of the dialectical process. This means once Absolute Spirit is fully realized through the rational state, the resulting rational perception of identity then seems to exclude any further development in the stage of fulfillment. Unification Thought, on the other hand, affirms both identity and development for the ideal of creation as the stage of fulfillment. In short, Unification Thought replaces Hegel's rational perception of reality with a thoroughly relational mode of existence for the created order.

(3) The third issue deals with the understanding of the family in relation to the ethical sphere. We have seen that Hegel defines the family as the unreflective or natural institution on the level of an unconscious or inner notion.<sup>71</sup> At the same time, the family is the immediate essence of the ethical sphere. For Hegel, the notions of immediacy and of the unreflective or unconscious level of existence are derived from his dialectical definition of the family. That is to say, when the new self-consciousness emerges it exists in-and-for-itself on a new reflective stage as the consciousness of membership in the family. Moreover, Hegel affirms that this new family self-consciousness also forms a unique quality of Spirit as the first unreflective appearance of objective Spirit, that is as existence-in-itself of its own kind. For Hegel, objective Spirit manifests itself through the form of its dialectical moments as family, civil society and state. Subsequently, Hegel contrasts the level of the family defined as the unconscious or inner notion, with the self-conscious level of the community or state. Following this line of thought, Hegel affirms a split of the ethical substance between human law, representing the state, and divine law, as defining the ethical sphere of the family.

Hegel's understanding of the family with reference to the ethical sphere is contrasted by Unification Thought in several points. Above all, the Unification theory of ethics offers a consistent objective norm

for human conduct based on the ideal of the family. Here, ethics is defined as the practice of love, and the various kinds of love are derived from the relationships within the family quadruple base.<sup>22</sup> Since purpose, as the expression of the heart of God, is the center of the family quadruple base, the three kinds of divisional loves are always understood as love with direction. Moreover, purpose includes the purpose for the whole and for the individual, thus providing continuity for applying family ethics to society and state. This means, according to Unification Thought, society is the direct expansion of the family, which allows family ethics to become the foundation for other kinds of ethics, in particular, the ethics for the state.

We have seen that for Hegel, the family is perceived as standing in dialectical opposition to the state. Unification Thought, on the other hand, understands the family as the comprehensive ethical paradigm which includes also the state. Moreover, Unification ethics rejects Hegel's inherent opposition between rationality and love as it has been expressed by the competing orders of human and divine law. Rather, the Unification view implies an essential harmony between human and divine law by confirming God's love as the foundation for human reason.

In our final analysis, we can say that the rational understanding of the family as presented by Hegel is insufficient since it fails to explain the essence of love due to the subordination of love to reason. Unification Thought seems to offer a valid alternative through its purpose centered approach for explaining the family ideal. The family then becomes not only the standard for human development towards individual maturation, but it also serves as the ethical paradigm for all levels of human society.

#### Endnotes

- 1 Rudolf J. Siebert, *Hegel's Concept of Marriage and Family, The Origin of Subjective Freedom* (Washington D.C.: University Press of America, 1979) p. III.
- 2 G.W.F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, transl. by A.V. Miller

- (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977). Henceforth cited as *Phenomenology*.
- 3 G.W.F. Hegel, *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*, in *Samtliche Werke: Jubiläumsausgabe in 20 Bänden*, Hermann Glockner, Ed. (Stuttgart: Frommann, 1964), Vol. 7. Henceforth cited as *Philosophy of Right*.
  - 4 *Explaining Unification Thought* (New York: Unification Thought Institute, 1981). Henceforth cited as *EUT*.
  - 5 *Fundamentals of Unification Thought* (Unpublished manuscript, Unification Thought Institute, 1989). Henceforth cited as *FUT*.
  - 6 *Phenomenology*, # 440, p.265.
  - 7 *Ibid.*, # 442, p.265.
  - 8 *Ibid.*, # 447, p.267.
  - 9 *Ibid.*, # 444, p.266. Note how Hegel's use of the term "substance" goes beyond the Aristotelian category of substance as "that which exists independently from anything else", or as "essence existing in itself independently."
  - 10 *Ibid.*
  - 11 William S. Sahakian, *History of Philosophy* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1968), p.190.
  - 12 Macbride Sterrett, *The Ethics of Hegel* (Boston: Ginn, 1893), p. 58.
  - 13 Howard P. Kainz, *Hegel's Philosophy of Right with Marx's Commentary: a Handbook for Students* (The Hague: Nijoff, 1974), p.8.
  - 14 Walter Kaufmann, *Hegel: a Reinterpretation* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965), p.154.
  - 15 For this quote I am indebted to Kaufmann who lists as reference: G.W.F. Hegel; *Samtliche Werke: Jubiläumsausgabe in 20 Bänden*, ed. Hermann Glockner (Stuttgart: Frommann, 1927-30. Vol. 19), p.610.
  - 16 Kaufmann, p.156.
  - 17 *Ibid.*, p.161.
  - 18 *FUT*, chapter 1, p.35.
  - 19 By contrast, the metaphorical use of anthropomorphisms applies to expressions which imply a distinct physical imagery such as

"to hear the sound of the Lord God walking in the garden" (Gen. 3:8). This metaphorical use is quite limited and does not advance our understanding of God in terms of discussing God's attributes. See the yet unpublished article by the author: "The Love of God in Unificationism" (Barrytown, N.Y.: Unification Theological Seminary, 1989), p.3. Henceforth cited as *LGU*.

20 *FUT*, chapter 1, p.39.

21 The Korean terms "Sung Sang" and "Hyung Sang" do not have satisfactory English equivalents. "Sung Sang" means generally the invisible, internal, functional aspect of beings such as mind or instinct, while "Hyung Sang" refers to the visible, external, material aspect such as body, shape, and structure. See *Divine Principle*, pp.20ff.

22 Unification Thought stresses the importance of the notion that the Original Image, with respect to the Divine Image, contains the united or harmonious body of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang. This notion tells us that we receive an accurate picture of God once we have penetrated the meaning of the mutual relation of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang. The difficulty lies in the task of affirming the mutual relation of Sung Sang and Hyung Sang as a completely united body. Western experience of reality is generally burdened with the conceptual split between the spiritual, abstract realm and bodily, actual existence. However, Unification Thought insists that content and form, or mental and material aspects as represented by Sung Sang and Hyung Sang have to be in their essence of the same quality when seen from the perspective of their common ultimate cause. There is only a relative difference between Sung Sang and Hyung Sang as it is expressed through their positions of subject and object. See *FUT*, pp. 6-16 and *FUT*, chapter 1, pp. 17-28.

23 *FUT*, chapter 1, pp.28-31.

24 *LGU*, p.6.

25 *FUT*, chapter 1, p.40.

26 M. Darrol Bryant and Herbert W. Richardson, Eds., *A Time for Consideration* (New York: Edwin Mellen, 1978), p.302.

27 *FUT*, chapter 1, p.47.

28 *Ibid.*, p.48.

29 *Ibid.*, pp. 53-54.

30 *Ibid.*, p.50.

31 *Ibid.*, p.52.

32 *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

33 *Ibid.*, See also pp.49,51.

34 *Ibid.*, p.42.

35 Unification Thought speaks of the "Two-stage Structure of Creation." See *FUT*, chapter 1, pp.51-52.

36 God's Hyung Sang is responsible for the material aspect of all created beings. That material aspect includes energy, since according to the laws of physics energy can be regarded as the essence of matter. God's Hyung Sang signifies the unlimited potential for creating physical energy; thus it can be called "pre-energy," or "pre-matter." See *FUT*, chapter 1, pp.21-24.

37 *FUT*, chapter 3, pp.20-21.

38 *Philosophie des Rechts*, # 158, p.237. The German text runs as follows: "Die Familie hat als die unmittelbare Substantialität des Geistes, seine sich empfindende Einheit, die Liebe, zu ihrer Bestimmung, so dass die Gesinnung ist, das Selbstbewusstsein seiner Individualität in dieser Einheit als an und für sich seiender Wesentlichkeit zu haben, um in ihr nicht als eine Person für sich sondern als Mitglied zu sein."

39 *Ibid.*, # 157, pp.236-237.

40 *Ibid.*, # 158, pp.237, 238. The translation follows largely Macbride Sterrett's version. See Strett, p.138.

41 That, for Hegel, love goes beyond the faculty of understanding and includes a mystical dimension can be better seen from the original German text where Hegel says: "Die Liebe ist daher der ungeheuerste Widerspruch den der Verstand nicht lösen kann ..."

42 It can be argued that Hegel was influenced by Sophocles' drama *Antigone* when he affirmed an antithetical relation between the state and the family or between human and divine law.

43 *Phenomenology*, # 449, p.268.

44 *Ibid.*, # 450.

- 45 *Ibid.*
- 46 *Ibid.*, # 451, p.269-270. 47 See note 41. By locating Antigone's heroic deed in the performance of burial rites for her brother, Sophocles seems to have chosen an action where the ethical and religious dimension of family life virtually coincide. Divine law becomes then the law of the family.
- 48 *Divine Principle*, p.170.
- 49 *Ibid.*, p.65ff.
- 50 *Ibid.*, p.64.
- 51 *FUT*, chapter 6, p.2.
- 52 *Divine Principle*, p.41.
- 53 *FUT*, chapter 1, p.53.
- 54 *FUT*, chapter 3, p.7.
- 55 *Divine Principle*, p.60.
- 56 *LGU*, pp.26, 27.
- 57 *FUT*, chapter 1, p.35.
- 58 This section is largely in agreement with the author's essay "The Love of God in Unificationism." See *LGU*, pp.8,9.
- 59 *FUT*, chapter 7, p.4. See also *Divine Principle*, p.48.
- 60 See chapter II, subsection 2., a.,(1), of this paper.
- 61 *Ibid.*
- 62 *FUT*, chapter 6, p.1.
- 63 *Ibid.*, pp.2, 3.
- 64 *Ibid.*, p.3.
- 65 Unification Thought identifies virtues of morality as purity, honesty, courage, and self-control. Virtues in ethics are defined as benevolence or clemency and filial piety or loyalty. See *FUT*, chapter 6, p.6.
- 66 See chapter II, subsection 1, a, (1).
- 67 See chapter II, subsection 2, a,
- 68 See chapter II, subsection 2, a, (1).
- 69 See chapter II, subsection 1, a, (2).
- 70 See chapter II, subsection 2, a, (2).
- 71 See chapter II, subsection 1, b.
- 72 See chapter II, subsection 2, b.

## Bibliography

## I. Primary Sources :

## 1. Hegel

Hegel, Gustaf Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phanomenologie des Geistes*. Vol. 2 of *Samtliche Werke* in 20 Vols. Ed. by Hermann Glockner. Stuttgart : Frommanns, 1958-64.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans. by A.V. Miller, Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*. Vol. 7 of *Samtliche Werke* in 20 Vols. Ed. by Hermann Glockner. Stuttgart : Frommanns, 1958-64.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Philosophy of Right*. Trans. by S.W. Dyde. London : Bell, 1896.

## 2. Unification Thought

*Explaining Unification Thought*. New York : Unification Thought Institute, 1981.

*Foundamentals of Unification Thought*. Unpublished manuscript, Unification Thought Institute, 1989

## II. Secondary Sources

## 1. Hegel

Fackenheim, Emil. *The Religious Dimension in Hegel's Thought*. Indiana : Indiana University Press, 1964.

Glockner, Hermann, *Hegel Lexikon*. Stuttgart : Frommanns Verlag, 1957.

Kainz, Howard P. *Hegel's Philosophy of Right with Marx's Commentary*. The Hague : Nijhoff, 1974.

Kaufmann, Walter Arnold. *Hegel, a Reinterpretation*. Notre Dame : University of Notre Dame Press, 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. *An Introduction to Hegel's Metaphysics*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Reyburn, Hugh A. *The Ethical Theory of Hegel, A Study of the Philosophy of Right*. Oxford : Clarendon, 1967.

Siebert, Rudolf J. *Hegel's Concept of Marriage and Family. The Origin of Subjective Freedom*. Washington D.C. : University Press of America, 1979.

Stace, W.T. *The Philosophy of Hegel. A Systematic Exposition*. New York : Dover, 1955.

Sterrett, Macbride. *The Ethics of Hegel- Translated Selections from his "Rechtsphilosophie"*. New York : Ginn, 1893.

## 2. Unification Thought

Brunner, Emil. *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption*. Trans. by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia : the Westminster Press, 1952.

Bryant Dorrol and Richardson, Herbert. Eds. *A Time for Consideration*, New York ; Edwin Mellen, 1978.

Guerra, Antony J. *Unification Theology in Comparative Perspectives*. Barrytown NY : Unification Theological Seminary, 1988.

Kim, Young Oon. *Unification Theology*. Revised Edition. New York : HSA-UWC, 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. *An Introduction to Theology*. New York : HSA-UWC, 1983.

Lee, Hang Nyong, Ed. *Research on the Unification Principle*.

Seoul : Song Hwa, 1981.

Matczak, Sebastian A. *Unificationism, A New Philosophy and Worldview*. New York : Learned Publications INC., 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. *God in Contemporary thought*. New York ; Learned Publications Inc., 1977.

## III. Reference Sources :

*Divine Principle*. New York : The Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity (HSA-UWC).

Edwards, Paul, Ed. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. New York : Macmillan, 1972.

Moon, Sun Myung. *God's Will and the World*. New York ; HSA-UWC, 1985. *Outline of the Principle, Level 4*. New York : HSA-UWC, 1980.

Richardson, Alan and Bowden, John, Eds. *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Theology*. Philadelphia : Westminster, 1983.

Sahakian, William S. *History of Philosophy*. New York : Barnes & Noble, 1968.