

follows.

Firstly, Unification Epistemology is removed from the theological category to maintain scientific precision. The "existence of God (both the transcendent and the immanent God)" and the "creation of God" is treated as a *hypothetical basis for scientific research*. It is neither established nor self-evident fact. It is a methodological position that can be accepted not only by religious believers, but also by all men. Unification thought has inherent in its logical structure an ability to prove this hypothesis as fact. As a matter of fact, in the paper written by Dr. Tanabe such a bud is being brought up. I believe that Unification Epistemology will be universally persuasive in proving hypotheses. That is because Unification Epistemology can be a proof of the existence of God by refining the methodology. Here religion and science get united.

Conclusion

As Dr. Tanabe mentioned in her paper, Unification Epistemology has made possible the understanding of human beings in terms of serving the purpose of God's creation. In the process of human development, not only biological, physical and mathematical elements, but also spiritual elements play a very important role. Dr. Tanabe has aroused a controversy in the academic world by daringly emphasizing spiritual elements (God's purpose of creation), which have been ignored in scientific research. In the future research the establishment of more broadly based general and interdisciplinary research centers is required by introducing the science of religion and theology, which are lacking in Piaget's interdisciplinary research. I expect that such a research center will be established, and that Dr. Tanabe's research will be more deeply developed for human understanding by getting people who will cooperate with her.

(Note 1) Richard I. Evans, *Dialog with Jean Piaget*

(translated into Japanese by Tamotsu Utsugi)

(Senshinshobou Publishing Co. Ltd. 1975), p161

(Note 2) ditto. pp.164 - 5.

Session VII

Linguistic Evidence for the Validity of Unification Thought

Paul J. Perry

Ph. D. Candidate in Linguistics, Executive Director of
Unification Thought Institute of America, USA

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to seek evidence for the validity of Unification Thought by applying Unification Thought concepts to the field of linguistics. The method of the paper is to present an analysis of a specific linguistic problem, to discuss traditional solutions to that problem, and then to contrast those solutions with Unification Thought. The Unification thought concepts that have some bearing upon the views I will propose will be taken from Theory of the Original Image, Ontology, Epistemology, and Theory of Original Human Nature.

Throughout the ages, humankind has groped for an explanation of the phenomenon of human languages. Unification Thought has a

particular way of understanding language that can clarify linguistic questions, such as the hypothesis of the "language faculty," the question of the relationship between "form" and "substance" in Saussurean linguistics, and the matter of the possibility of a "universal language." The particular contribution of Unification Thought consists in its specification of the relationship between language and thinking and between language and culture, which will be dealt with below.

I. Noam Chomsky's Concept of "Language Faculty"

The term 'language' will be used in three different meanings: (1) the abstract system underlying the collective totality of the speech/writing behavior of a community (e.g., English, French, Japanese); (2) the faculty that enables individuals to learn their language (e.g., language faculty); and (3) the universal properties of all speech/writing systems (e.g., human language). Though important, the distinction in meaning is not crucial for the argumentation in this paper.

A. The "Language Faculty"

Noam Chomsky, Professor of Modern Languages and Linguistics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, revolutionized the field of linguistics with the publication of *Syntactic Structures* in 1957.¹ His goal was to describe the properties of language with mathematical precision and to guard against the then-current tendency to explain language from a behavioristic perspective.² For that purpose, he developed the generative approach to grammar, which theorizes that language is the most important means for the investigation of the human mind.³

Over the years, Chomsky has developed his views through a series of models of the human mind's ability to produce and understand a language. A key concept in Chomsky's system is that of the "language faculty," which is an "innate predisposition" to acquire a language. Here Chomsky is not referring simply to the potential to learn a language, but rather to specific knowledge of formal principles of language. In his view, the knowledge of such principles

is innate to humans.

The "language faculty" hypothesis raises many issues. One of them is related to the epistemological dispute between rationalists and empiricists. For rationalists, truth is derived from reason without the necessity of referring to experience. For empiricists, all knowledge is derived from experience. Based on empiricism, the linguist Leonard Bloomfield developed a theory of language that was dominant in linguistic theory during 3 decades prior to Chomsky and served as the background for Chomsky's theories. A brief account of Bloomfield's views follows.

Bloomfield's views are based on behavioristic principles for the study of meaning. One of such principles is that all linguistic data which are not directly observable or physically measurable must be rejected as unscientific. The basic assumption is that the way to obtain a scientific account of language is to look at linguistic phenomena from the perspective of *stimulus and response*. Hence, the linguist should seek the structural relations among the elements of spoken language, or the "surface structure" of linguistic performance. The specific patterns of linguistic realization within a speech community are totally arbitrary, or purely conventional. At the time of Bloomfield, these views were quite popular, but they are now largely discredited by research both in linguistics and in brain physiology.⁴

In contrast, Chomsky started from the premise that linguistic patterns are not arbitrary, whereby he rejected Bloomfield's behaviorist account of language acquisition. Chomsky's arguments were mostly based on "creativity" in language. He noted that the behaviorist theory does not jibe with observable facts of language acquisition and development. He observed that children of five or six years of age do not merely repeat word for word what they hear, but are able to produce an indefinitely large number of sentences they have never heard before. In other words, they can create entirely original sentences. Chomsky argued that the behaviorist theory of language acquisition in terms of stimulus and response would account for children repeating what they have heard before, but it fails to account for the type of creativity in language whereby children can

say entirely new things.

In proposing the theory of the "language faculty," Chomsky broke away from the empiricist method of linguistic analysis and placed himself within the rationalist camp. Keeping in sight his aim to develop a theory that could bring mathematical precision to linguistics, Chomsky claimed that humans are endowed with specific "mental faculties" enabling them to acquire knowledge, including the knowledge of language.⁵ For critics, however, Chomsky is a "mentalist" who has fallen in the pitfall his predecessors had attempted to avoid. In other words, in rejecting empiricism,⁶ Chomsky was not able to incorporate the positive elements of that thought system.⁷

The label of "mentalism" can be attributed to Chomsky's lack of an adequate philosophical foundation for his theory of the language faculty. For example, he noted that the language faculty exists in humans but not in animals; but when he attempted to explain why this is so, he failed to give a philosophically satisfying solution. He states,

It is a reasonable surmise, I think, that ... the capacity for free, appropriate, and creative use of language as an expression of thought, with the means provided by the *language faculty*, is also a *distinctive feature of the human species*, having no significant analogue elsewhere. The neural basis for language is pretty much of a mystery, but there can be little doubt that specific neural structures and even gross organization not found in other primates (e.g., lateralization) play a fundamental role. (Chomsky 1975, 41) (emphasis added)

Chomsky seems to be grasping at a straw here. In a nutshell, his explanation is based primarily on the differences in the human body when compared with the body of the animals. I do not dispute that specific neural structures and even phenomena such as lateralization play an important role in explaining the existence of the capacity for creative use of language in the human species.⁸ From the Unification Thought point of view, however, this explanation is

incomplete and philosophically insufficient. In order to expound the Unification Thought view, two Korean expressions will be introduced, namely *Sung Sang* and *Hyung Sang*. These terms basically mean "internal character" and "external form," and they represent key concepts in Unification Thought. *Sung Sang* refers to an internal reality (e.g., mind) and *Hyung Sang* refers to an external reality (e.g., body). These terms will be further explained below, in the context of the relationship between thinking and language.⁹

Chomsky's explanation of the language faculty is incomplete because it considers only the *hyung sang* (external) aspect of human nature, namely, the physical body. Humans also have a *Sung Sang* (internal) aspect, namely, the spirit self.¹⁰ The "language faculty," as expressive of human languages, exists in humans and not in animals because humans have a spirit self and animals do not.¹¹

B. *The Relationship between Thinking and Language*

Unification Thought considers that thinking and language exist in the relationship of *Sung Sang* (internal aspect) and *Hyung Sang* (external aspect). As mentioned earlier, these Korean terms are usually translated as 'internal character' and 'external form', but the translated terms do not very well convey the richness of the Korean terms. Therefore, Unification Thought makes use of the Korean terms.¹²

Applying these concepts to human nature, Unification Thought states that humans are a united body of *sung sang* and *hyung sang*. Humans possess a dual mind, namely, spirit-mind and physical mind. This is because a human being is a dual man, namely, spirit-man and physical man (EUT, 99). Since humans are endowed with a spirit mind, they have reason; therefore, humans can think—and this distinguishes them from animals (see Fig 7, "Stepped Structure of *Sung Sang* and *Hyung Sang* in Existing Beings," EUT, 47).¹³

Thinking is an internal reality that can be manifested externally through human language. Language can be regarded as the *Hyung Sang* (external aspect, body, or "clothing") of thinking, or the vehicle for the expression of thought. Thinking, therefore, can be regarded as the *Sung Sang* (internal) aspect of language.

At this point, it may be useful to discuss the Unification Thought view of the activity of thinking in humans. According to Unification Thought, human thinking resembles Logos in God; the activity of thinking in the human mind corresponds to the activity of creating Logos in the mind of God. A brief explanation of God's Logos follows:

Logos is the Multiplied Body formed by give-and-take action between Inner *Sung Sang* and Inner *Hyung Sang*, centering on purpose. Inner *Hyung Sang* refers to idea, concept, original law, and mathematical principle; Inner *Sung Sang*, on the other hand, refers to intellect (sensitivity, understanding, and reason), emotion, and will. Reason, in the Inner *Sung Sang*, and law, in the Inner *Hyung Sang*, play the most important role in the formation of the Logos. Accordingly, we call Logos 'Reason-Law'. (EUT, 24)

A similar description can be given in regards to the activity of thinking in the human mind. Humans have a spirit self, which contains a spirit mind. The spirit mind has intellect, emotion, and will (Inner *Sung Sang*) as well as ideas, concepts, laws, and mathematical principles (Inner *Hyung Sang*).¹⁴ Once thinking is formulated, it can be expressed through the medium of language. The statement that thinking and language exist in the relationship of *Sung Sang* and *Hyung Sang* implies that the language faculty cannot be explained by physiological and physical processes alone. It must be explained by the give-and-take action between physiological processes (physical mind) and spiritual processes (spirit-mind).

Chomsky, therefore, was not able to give a good philosophical explanation for the existence of the language faculty in humans. As a consequence of that deficiency, he finds it very hard to deal with the phenomenon of rudimentary types of language in animals. A more satisfying explanation can be found in Unification Thought, as discussed above.

C. The Notion of "Form" and "Substance" in Saussure

The Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) is credited with laying the foundation for linguistic science in the 20th century. In his book *Cours de Linguistique General* (1916), Saussure established the distinction between 'form' and 'substance' in language. To explain his view, he compared language utterances with performances of a symphony: Just as two performances of a symphony will differ in some respects while remaining basically identical to the same musical piece, two utterances of a linguistic form will differ in a variety of details and yet will be recognized as identical to the same linguistic form. For instance, the sentence "Today is Tuesday," when uttered by two different people (or by the same person in two different occasions) will sound slightly different in each case—but of course, the utterances are identical in their abstract "form," or meaning. In other words, there is an essential nature of language that is not dependent upon its actual manifestation in specific languages.

1. Saussure's Emphasis on 'Form'

The two musical performances of the same piece have the same 'form'; likewise, the two linguistic utterances of the same sentence have the same 'form.' The performances and the utterances are the 'substance'; the corresponding underlying structures are the 'forms'. The form is independent of the substance, upon which it is imposed. According to Saussure, the primary object of linguistics is to study abstract forms rather than substances. The linguist must analyze the underlying structure of utterances rather than the specific details of the utterances themselves.¹⁵

In Unification Thought terminology, Saussure's 'form' is related to 'content,' and Saussure's 'substance' is related to what Unification Thought calls 'form.' In this section, however, I will continue to use these terms as defined by Saussure's terms; in other words, 'form' refers to the internal reality, and 'substance' to the external reality.¹⁶

The major criticism against Saussurean structuralism, especially against American structuralism, is that it became "mentalistic" and cannot be classified as scientific.¹⁷ The reaction against that kind

of "mentalistic" analysis appeared as the behavioristic approach to linguistics by Leonard Bloomfield, as mentioned earlier.

From the Unification Thought outlook, Saussure's distinction between 'form' and 'substance' is similar to the distinction between thinking (the *Sung Sang* of language) and language itself (the *Hyung Sang* of thinking), as discussed earlier.

Saussure, however, was not clear in establishing the relationship between the inner 'form' and the outer 'substance.' This lacuna led his followers to disregard the importance of the outer substance of language and to concentrate in the inner form—and that led to their being characterized as 'mentalists.' This resulted in the reaction by behaviorists, who took the opposite point of view, claiming that "the only useful generalizations about language are inductive generalizations" (Bloomfield 1933, 20).

2. Unification Thought's Reinterpretation of Saussure's Views

A balanced view between both extremes can be obtained through Unification Thought. As mentioned before, Unification Thought regards language as the body of thinking in the sense that language is the *Hyung Sang* aspect of thinking. This means that language has the potential to receive the characteristics of thinking and to become the embodiment of thinking. For example, clear thinking results in clear language; muddled thinking results in muddled language. By the same token, it often happens that one's thinking becomes clearer as one works out the linguistic expression of it, developing the thought as one goes along, so to speak.¹⁶

The ideal, therefore, is a harmonious relationship between *Sung Sang* and *Hyung Sang*. Thus, it would be incorrect to disregard either one or the other of these aspects. Disregarding the "substance" (external aspect), as some Saussurean linguists have done, is erroneous, just as it is erroneous to disregard the "form" (internal aspect), as behaviorists have done.

Further clarification on this matter can be obtained from the Unification Thought concept of the "Purpose of Creation," which is the purpose for which God created humankind and the universe. The purpose of creation is the realization of the God's impulse of

Heart (see EUT, p. 21). In God, the purpose of creation becomes fully realized only through the outer quadruple base—that is, through the creation of substantial reality. In the case of human beings, also, creativity is fully realized only through the substantialization of whatever has been planned or thought about. That is why Unification Logic states that the purpose of thinking is for practice.¹⁷

The activity of expressing thought in language is a form of practice. For instance, someone who "thinks" about a great book but never expresses it in actual language cannot be considered a great author.

In a sense, then, the internal aspect of language yearns for expression in actual linguistic utterances. It is not correct, therefore, to disregard the external aspect of language. By looking at this matter from the Unification Thought point of view, we can have a balanced relationship between Saussure's "form" (internal) and "substance" (external). Saussurean linguistics, therefore, must be supplemented by Unification Thought in order to avoid the shortcomings of mentalism.

Nevertheless, what is remarkable about Saussure's emphasis on the 'form' of language rather than its substance is that he has pointed the way toward the universalization of language. If language, per se, does not depend on its external "clothing," so to speak, then there must exist an internal reality of language that is common to all languages. This is very much in accord with Chomsky theory of "universal grammar," and it leads right into the question of the possibility of a "universal language."

II. The Quest for a Universal Language

First I will look at this matter from a linguistic point of view; next, I will look at it from the perspective of the relationship between language and thought and between language and culture.

A. Linguistic Evidence for the Possibility of a Universal Language

The term "universal" is widely used in Chomsky's generative theory of grammar, in which "universal" refers to those properties

of language that are common to all languages. Chomsky noted that different languages make use of the same formal operations in the construction of grammatical sentences. Upon such observations, he based his rationalist philosophy of language.

Chomsky proposed the view that human beings possess an innate, a priori knowledge of a *universal grammar*, which constitutes the common basis for all languages, regardless of how different they may look in the surface structure. The aim of linguistics, briefly stated is

to construct a deductive theory of the structure of human language that is at once sufficiently general to apply to all languages ... and not so general that it would also be applicable to other systems of communication or anything else that we should not wish to call language. In other words, linguistics should determine the universal and essential properties of human language. (Lyons 1970, 110-11)

Chomsky distinguishes three components in language, namely, a *syntactic component*, a *semantic component*, and a *phonological component*. The surface structure of language contains the phonological component. Hence, differences among languages can be found in phonology, whereas the semantic component is invariant among languages and the syntactic component simply pairs the phonological and semantic components.²⁰

For Chomsky, then, the human mind has an "initial condition," or an "innate condition," which enables it to learn a language by exposure to data from the environment. Chomsky does not believe that humans start out like a *tabula rasa*; rather, children start out with innate principles of linguistics, which they naturally know. These principles are not really learned from experience but only activated from exposure to linguistic data. Chomsky says,

I think it is reasonable to postulate that the principles of general linguistics regarding the nature of rules, their organization, the principles by which they function, the kinds

of representations to which they apply and which they form, all constitute part of the innate condition that "puts a limit on admissible hypotheses." If this suggestion is correct, then there is no more point in asking how these principles are learned than there is in asking how a child learns to breathe, or, for that matter, to have two arms. (Chomsky 1968, 171) (emphasis added)

The principles of the "innate condition" constitute what Chomsky has called the "language faculty." For Chomsky, the "universal and essential properties of human language" constitute part of the "innate condition." This is the essential core of Chomsky's "Innateness Hypothesis" of the language faculty and his theory of the *universal grammar*.

The theory of universal grammar provides a linguistic background for the question whether it is possible for humankind to have a single, universal language.

There is no doubt that a common means of communication among all peoples of the world is among the deepest and most cherished of human aspirations. Our inability to communicate with a fellow human being, simply because he/she was born in another part of the earthly globe, does violence to our sense of universal brotherhood and human solidarity.²¹ From the Unification Thought perspective, however, since language is the external aspect of thought, the quest for a universal language must be preceded by the quest for a universal thought system, or for the unification of thoughts.

B. The Quest for the Unification of Thoughts

In the Unification Thought view (EUT, 45ff), *Sung Sang* and *Hyung Sang* exist in a subject-object relationship. Since *Sung Sang* is in the subject position (the initiating position), any change must be initiated in the *Sung Sang* and then be extended to the *Hyung Sang*, because it is the nature of the object to follow and unite with the subject.²² Since thought is in a subject position to language, the questions regarding the possibility of a universal language lead directly to questions regarding the unification of thoughts. To what

extent, and by what means, can human thinking be unified? In order to find the answer to that question, we must first inquire into the reason why thoughts are in a state of confusion in the first place. According to Unification Thought, the cause of confusion in thinking lies in the fact that humans have not been able to discover God's absolute truth:

Many philosophers and theologians have appeared from ancient times to the present day, expressing many different thoughts. They have dealt with a wide range of truths concerning the universe, life, history, cognition, art, and so on. However, the truths which they expressed remain relative truths, not having been absolute truth. We have witnessed that soon after one particular thought has emerged, another thought, dissatisfied with or opposed to the preceding thought, has always emerged. This is because the truths inherent in the thoughts up to this time have not been eternal or *universal*, that is, they have not been absolute. The conflicts between these thoughts brought about the division of values and eventually have given rise to a world of great confusion as we see today. (emphasis added)²⁸

Vast commonalities exist in human nature and thinking. Undoubtedly, there are differences in human thinking, but those differences are quite small when compared with the commonalities. The following are a few the commonalities: the quest for freedom, peace, prosperity, truth, goodness, beauty, happiness, and ideals. Furthermore, all human beings seek values. Though values may be perceived differently as we go from one nation to another, the differences are not as important as the commonalities. People who travel from one culture to another soon realize that behind apparent differences there is the fundamental reality of human nature, which people all over the world share. The commonalities represent the universal aspect of the human heart and mind, and they can be the foundation for the unification of human thinking.

With regard to the relationship between language and thinking,

the term 'thinking' refers not only to the logical laws of thought, but also to the contents of thought—that is, one's perspective on values, world view, religious beliefs, and so forth. In other words, language is connected with culture. This raises the question of the relationship between language and culture in the context of the quest for a universal language.

The most obvious aspect of the relationship between language and culture is that people learn the language of the culture in which they are born. In the United States, for instance, children of immigrant parents are quick to learn the language of their new home country, and only with a great deal of effort, if at all, will learn the language of the "old country."

When people learn a foreign language, they have a reason to make that kind of effort. They hope to improve themselves, to find financial opportunity, or to obtain some other benefit. For the most part, it seems that what motivates people most to learn another language is the benefit they can reap from the culture with which that language is associated. In order to learn a language well, learners must absorb some aspects of the culture of that language. If in their hearts they are reluctant to embrace the culture, they will find it much harder to learn the language. On the other hand, when people have a positive attitude toward the values of another culture, they will naturally tend to learn the language of that culture. Therefore, if there were a single culture that everyone could value, then people would generally have a positive attitude toward learning the language of that culture; eventually, that language could, in effect, become a "universal language." From this perspective, the quest for a universal language must be preceded by the quest for a culture that can be valued by everyone and can be the basis for the unification of cultures.

C. Toward the Unification of Cultures

At different times in history, there has occurred the phenomenon of a temporary unification of cultures in a great empire (e.g., Hellenistic culture, Roman culture), but eventually such unified empires invariably have fallen apart. Usually it was the culture of

a particular nation that became dominant in a large area of the world. But why have such unified cultures repeatedly failed? This question will be addressed next.

1. Culture and Civilization

The English anthropologist E.B. Tylor has defined culture as the "complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" (from *Primitive Culture*, 1871). According to Unification Thought, culture and civilization are related as *sung sang* and *hyung sang*: Culture is the totality of the achievements of human activities when viewed from the spiritual standpoint of religion, art, philosophy, etc. Civilization is the totality of the achievement of human activities when viewed from the material viewpoint of science and technology.²⁴

The thought systems of a people—that is, the ideas about politics, economy, society, education, science, art, philosophy, religion, publication, speech, and so forth—are all covered by the concept of culture; they constitute the core of civilization. Religion is the most essential aspect of culture, according to Unification Thought.

2. True Culture

According to Unification Thought, the core of culture can be centered either on reason or on Heart; the ideal culture, however, is the culture centered on Heart (love) rather than reason. There is nothing intrinsically bad about reason, but reason without love has easily been overwhelmed by self-centeredness. The importance of Heart for "true culture" can be seen from an analysis of the Unification Thought concept of *Heart*. A description of the relationship between culture and Heart follows.

"Heart" (*Shimjong* in Korean) is a key concept in Unification Thought. This term does not refer to the physical heart; rather, it refers to the "emotional impulse to joy, through love."²⁵ Heart is the most essential aspect of the mind. From heart comes the force that drives the intellectual, emotional and volitional faculties of the mind. In other words, ideally speaking, Heart should be the motivation

for all human activities. True culture, therefore, is the totality of the achievements of human activities when the motivating power for such activities is Heart and love. In true culture, all the aspects of religion, art, philosophy, etc., are carried out on the basis of Heart and love.

In fallen history (See *Divine Principle*, Part II), culture has been carried out on the basis of reason rather than Heart; therefore, cultures have often become self-centered and destructive. The Unification Movement has been initiated for the purpose of solving the human fall and establishing a culture based on Heart and love. In other words, the goal of the Unification Movement is to establish "true culture."

3. Relationship between Language and Culture

A person's mother tongue is intimately connected with the totality of life in the community. One learns a language within a community and, for the most part, one learns about the way of life in that community by being taught through spoken or written words.

Cultural norms exert a great deal of influence on how people behave in society. For instance, the fact that someone eats one kind of food and not another, or that eats in a certain way and not in another—these facts are largely determined by culture. For example, Oriental people eat with chopsticks and Western people use a fork—because that is the way it is done in their culture; children from Oriental parents living in the West, however, quickly adopt Western habits.

When seen in its relationship to society, culture can be described as the totality of the aspects of human life insofar as they are determined by membership in a society. The acquisition of a mother-tongue takes place insofar as an individual is a member of a society. Hence, language is an aspect of culture.

Language identifies membership within a group or society. Consider, for instance, the children of immigrant in the United States, mentioned earlier. Generally speaking, these children are anxious to learn English and to adopt the speech habits of Americans as an effort to identify themselves with their communities. English, for

them, becomes their entitlement to full membership in their new homeland. The same occurs when a novice enters a new profession: The novice tries to learn the locutions, specific words and phrases of that profession as a mark of full membership of the group. This shows the influence of culture over language change. Therefore, cultural assimilation brings about linguistic assimilation.

In the past, vast distances and geographical barriers made it difficult for groups to become integrated into a single culture. Their languages tended to become increasingly different as time went on. The situation in the world today, however, is quite different. The world is becoming a "global village." We can travel around the world more quickly than our forefathers traveled around the country one century ago. Air travel has become a common means of transportation. Mobility and accessibility have made isolationism a thing of the past. Nations are becoming increasingly dependent on world markets.

The barrier that has been blocking the unification of the world as one global village is political rather than geographical, namely, the barrier separating the democratic bloc from the Communist bloc. But that barrier is now quickly disintegrating, and an era of unprecedented cooperation is now beginning. Therefore, the last barrier for the unification of the world is disappearing. The vision of a world of universal culture and universal language no longer appears to be an impossible dream. In the next section, the process for bringing about the unification of cultures, and its implication to universal language, will be considered.

III. Toward a Unified Culture and Universal Language

A universal, or international, language is a language that serves as a means of communication among linguistically diverse groups. The problem of communication among peoples of differing native languages is an ancient problem in human history. At different times, partial solutions to that problem have been found. The Roman Empire imposed Latin in its western part and Greek in its eastern part. In China, northern Mandarin (*kuo yu*) has been adopted as a lingua

franca among the literate younger generations. Hindustani, prior to 1947, was a lingua franca for the linguistically diversified nation of India. Arabic, the language of the Qur'an, is spoken in the Arabian Peninsula, parts of the Middle East, and North Africa. In these cases, the *first language* of large numbers of people became unified, if not permanently, at least temporarily.

Another solution has been the adoption of a universal *second language*, which can be either a natural language or an artificially constructed language. The language of powerful nations are sometimes adopted for that purpose. For instance, French, English and Spanish have played the role of an international language, to a certain degree. What caused those languages to achieve prominence in the world was the fact that their country of origin was very powerful and controlled large parts of the world through politics, economy, religion, thought, art, and so forth. As a powerful nation imposes its culture on peripheral nations, the language associated with it is imposed as well.

A corollary of this principle, suggested earlier, is that, if it is possible to unify the cultures of the world centering on a certain culture, then it is possible that the language of that culture will naturally be accepted as a universal language.

Artificially constructed languages have also been presented as candidates for an international language. Esperanto is the best known and most successful of such languages. Invented by the Polish-Russian doctor L.L. Zamenhof in the 19th century, Esperanto is built up from parts of the vocabulary and grammatical structures of existing languages, especially Western European languages. It has over 100,000 users in more than 80 countries of the world; and yet, Esperanto has so far failed to achieve official recognition either in the United Nations or in a particular country.

Actually, the world is still teeming with linguistic diversity and confusion. Therefore, both the languages of great empires and the artificially constructed languages have failed to unify the world linguistically. The reason, according to Unification Thought, is that no country has been able to bring about a true unification of cultures in the world.²⁸ The prerequisites for such unification will now be

examined.

A. Prerequisites for the Unification of Cultures

Prior to solving matters pertaining to the unification of languages, we must first solve matters pertaining to the unification of cultures. The reason for the failure of historical attempts at unifying cultures, especially by great empires, is that those cultures did not have the proper qualifications to become the central culture. For example, Alexander the Great (356-323 B.C.) established a great cultural unity centering on Hellenism in a vast area of the world, involving most of Europe, the Mediterranean, the Near and Middle East, Africa, Persia, and parts of India. Great movements of unification were also achieved by Egypt, the Roman Empire, the British Empire, and so forth.

But history shows that dominating cultures reach a zenith and then decline. For example, the Hellenistic cultural sphere was finally dominated by the advent of Muslim imperialism in the 7th century A.D.—which, likewise, eventually collapsed. Other great empires followed the same fate, giving origin to the “rise and fall of civilizations.”

Historians hardly agree as to the cause of the rise and fall of civilizations. Arnold Toynbee maintains that the origin of a new civilization begins with an environmental challenge that provokes a creative and unprecedented response by the people. When the people make an unprecedented effort in response to that challenge, they give rise to a new civilization. Stagnation and decline come about when the people of that society begins to use force and coercion, rather than creativity and acceptance, as the means to unite the nation.

Unification Thought looks at the phenomenon of the decline of cultures from the point of view of the *law of indemnity* (See EUT, 307). The rise of a certain nation's culture comes about when that nation contributes to the benefit of the peripheral nations. Their relationship is justified by allegations of mutual advantage. In the end, however, the dominating nation comes to damage and exploit the peripheral nations. When that happens, the dominating nation comes under the law of indemnity, namely, the law which states that

an evil cause brings about an evil result. The evil dominating nation inevitably falls, and its culture perishes. Once a culture fails, it can no longer become the unifying cultural center of the world.

What prerequisites, then, must a culture fulfill in order to qualify to become the center for the unification of cultures? Unification Thought suggests that only a culture of Heart and love can truly become the center for the unification of cultures. There are three main prerequisites, as described below.

1. *The unification of cultures is to be accomplished by a nation with a history of no invasion of other countries.*

The future culture of the ideal world intended by God is a culture of true love. Hence, it is a culture based on freely accepted values. We have seen that the use of force and coercion to unify cultures eventually will end up in failure. True unification comes on the basis of Heart and love. Therefore, only a nation with a history of no invasion of other countries will be able to succeed as the nation which will unify all cultures.

2. *The nation that will unify all cultures must have an excellent religious culture.*

Centering on this excellent religious culture, the unity of religions must be established. The culture of Heart and love is deeply related to God. It is the culture in which the ideal of God's creation is realized. Since this culture is based on God's love, it can become a unifying culture, because love is the power to unite. All religions seek God's love, but since their doctrines differ, the direction of love in different religions has not coincided. Hence, unity of religions must be accomplished as a prerequisite for the unification of cultures.

3. *The nation that is to unify all cultures must have a culture of righteousness.*

War is the oldest of human institutions, and it seems that every dominating culture sooner or later makes use of war to attain its goals. According to Unification Thought, however, war came about due to the human fall, and therefore, it can be eradicated through

the resolution of the history of sin and history of restoration.²⁷ One of the goals of true culture is the establishment of a life style centering on God's Heart and love. Righteousness must be the foundation for such a life style.

One of the problems leading countries to unrighteous behavior is the theory of national self-interest, or nationalism. The love of one's country is a great virtue, but if that love transforms itself into blind nationalism, it may become unrighteous and self-centered. Selfish nationalism can become to communities what egoism is to individuals. Therefore, the country that is to unify all cultures must have a culture of righteousness. This type of culture will display the following characteristics:

- a. *Co-existence*: The use of nonviolent methods to settle disputes;
- b. *Co-prosperity*: The establishment of an equitable system of distribution of goods whereby one can secure minimal conditions of economic well-being.
- c. *Co-righteousness*: The safeguard of peace by the enforcement of righteous laws through legal and peaceful solutions whereby violence can be averted.

Looking back on human history, there are very few nations that do not have a history of invasion and have an excellent religious culture, an excellent traditional culture, and a culture of righteousness. From the analysis proposed here, however, it seems undeniable that only a culture with such qualifications will be able to unify the world cultures. Now we are ready to extend our discussion to the question of universal language.

B. The Hope for a Universal Language

The hope for a universal language is based on the hope for the unification of cultures, which must take place on the basis of on God's Heart and love, as discussed earlier. History shows us—as pointed out before—that the application of power has failed as a means to bring about the unification of cultures and the establishment of a universal language. Artificial languages, including Esperanto, have not succeeded in gaining worldwide acceptance. The analysis offered in this paper suggests that only the language of a nation which qualifies

to unify all cultures centering on Heart and love, as explained above, has the potential to become a universal language in the true sense. If such a language is freely accepted based on Heart and love rather than imposed through force and coercion, then the hope for a universal language can be fulfilled.

CONCLUSION

Chomsky's concepts of "universal grammar" based on his theory of "language faculty" can provide an argument for the possibility of a universal language. Likewise, Saussure's concepts of "form" and "substance" in language indicate that underneath the external appearances of languages there is a deeper aspect of language that is common to the human species. These two perspectives raise the possibility that what distinguishes one language from another results more from historical accident than from any ontological reality of human nature. In the past, geographical distances and political separation was largely responsible for the diversification of languages. Today, as the world approaches a greater and greater level of integration and mutual dependency, it is to be expected that the phenomenon of diversification will begin to reverse itself toward integration, raising the question of the possibility of the world ever attaining a "universal language."

I have argued, however, that the attainment of a truly universal language presumes the unification of thought and the unification of culture. My argument was based on the Unification Thought view that thought and language are in the relationship of *Sung Sang* and *Hyung Sang*, hence, in the position of subject and object. Therefore, languages cannot be truly unified unless thoughts, also, are truly unified.

The question of the unification of thoughts raises another question, namely, the unification of cultures. I pointed out that the world has seen many instances of efforts to unify cultures, but those efforts have largely been a failure when the nations spearheading the unification process eventually declined. This phenomenon is connected with the rise and fall of civilizations, which Unification Thought

interprets from the point of view of the "Law of Indemnity." I have also suggested three of the prerequisites for a certain nation to qualify as the central nation for the unification of cultures. These prerequisites are as follows: (1) The central nation must have a history of no invasion of other countries; (2) The central nation must have an excellent religious culture; (3) The central nation must have a culture of righteousness.

The connection between the unification of cultures and the unification of languages is based on the intimate relationship between language and culture. It is also based on the argument that if large numbers of people in the world are willing to embrace a certain culture, it is possible that they will also be willing to learn the language associated with that culture, since that language will be the best vehicle for conveying that culture.

My paper, then, suggests that the effort to attain a universal language is connected with a larger effort involving the unification of thoughts, the unification of culture, and eventually the unification of languages. Even though thoughts are more internal (Sung Sang) than both language and culture, there is not strict implication of temporal order in the relationship of these three tasks. In other words, the efforts to unify these three areas can take place simultaneously.

One might wonder whether one is not being overly optimistic or overly "prophetic" in attempting to describe matters pertaining to a universal language in view of the extreme variety of languages in the world today. On one hand, it may appear to be so. It may appear that a prudent person would leave for a far-distant future the issues of a universal language. On the other hand, the recent events in the world have shown that people *can* be taken by surprise; matters that appeared to be for a distant future sometimes come to pass very quickly. That was the case with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the rapid democratization of Eastern Europe in 1989.

There are three reasons that lead me to believe that a universal language is imminent in the world. First, we are now living in an era of unprecedented international reorganization toward unification; this is specially evident in Europe, but it is happening in other parts

of the world as well. Second, breakthroughs in communication and transportation are going to make every part of the globe very accessible to every other part of the globe. And third, I believe we are now entering an era in which God is establishing the ideal of a One World Family on earth—and part of God's plan, I believe, is the establishment of a universal language that can bring together all humankind as brothers and sisters under the love of God.

ENDNOTES

1. Not only is Chomsky a superb scholar and prolific writer, but also he puts his ideas across extremely well in speeches, debates, and writings.
2. Behaviorists quickly found themselves hemmed in by their own theory as the complexity of linguistic data demanded more and more intricate explanations based on stimulus and response.
3. Those who have adopted the Chomskyan theory of linguistics have largely pulled ahead of scholars who still hold on to older theories, both in terms of scholarly prestige and faculty positions.
4. Sir John Eccles, for instance, in his work on mind and brain interaction, has found that the avidity with which babies learn words and practice language skills far surpass anything that could be explained through stimulus and response. He says,

As well all know, even in the first months of life a baby is continually practicing its vocal organs and so is beginning to learn this most complex of all motor coordinations. Movements of larynx, palate, tongue and lips have to be coordinated and blended with respiratory movements. It is another variety of motor learning, but now the feedback is from hearing and is at first imitative of sounds heard. This leads on to the simplest types of words like "dada," "papa," and "mama" that are produced at about one year. It is important to realize that speech is dependent on feedback from hearing the spoken words. The deaf are mute. In linguistic

development, recognition outstrips expression. The child has a veritable word hunger, asking for names and practicing incessantly even when alone. It dares to make mistakes evolving from its own rules, as for example with the irregular plural of nouns. Language does not come about by simple imitation. The child abstracts regularities and relations from what it hears and applies these principles in building up its linguistic expressions. (Sir John Eccles, ed., *Mind & Brain-The Many-Faceted Problems*, Washington, D.C.: Paragon House, 1982, p. 84.

5. As an attempt to keep in step with developments in science and to apply scientific rigor to linguistics, Chomsky rejected the then-current linguistic theories on the grounds that those theories, while adhering strictly to a positivistic approach to research (allowing only propositions that are based on direct inference from sensory data), gave rise to linguistic theories that were largely descriptive and taxonomic, with little explanatory power.
6. Chomsky has attempted to put linguistic research in touch with the intuitive perception of language as an inner, subjective phenomenon, which had been lost in empiricist theories.
7. In his initial theoretical framework, Chomsky made a clearer distinction between "deep structures" and "surface structures," which he now seems to underplay. His early views could be seen as a linguistic counterpart of Claude Levi-Strauss' "structuralist ethnology," which maintains that only universal, deep-structure aspects of the mind can give any acceptable explanations to the events of human life. The ambivalence of Chomsky's theory is that he seems to want to benefit from the overall research framework of this view without necessarily committing himself to the underlying philosophical assumptions that such a view entails.
8. Diane McGinness points out "four primary differences between humans and the apes, all of which combine to produce the elements and artifacts of human culture." These are language,

a vast superior memory, self-awareness, and superiority in sequencing fine-motor behavior. In part, these characteristics can be explained by brain differences, but McGinness points out that "the major dilemma in the attempt to understand man's origins is related to why and how the brain began to change in size so dramatically" (McGinness' emphasis). While human beings' nearest genetic relative, the chimpanzee, has a ratio of body weight to brain size of 1kg to 8.75cm³, human beings have a ratio of 1kg to 22cm³. (Diane McGinness, "Was Darwin Conscious of His Mother?" in *Mind & Brain-The Many-Faceted Problems*, edited by Sir John Eccles, Washington, D.C.: Paragon House, 1982, p.30.

9. See *Explaining Unification Thought*, chapters one, two and three, for a more thorough explanation of the meaning of the terms *Sung Sang* and *Hyung Sang*.
10. Of course, Chomsky admits the existence of the mind, but it is not clear from his writings whether the mind is a reality in its own right or a product of the supremely complex structures of the human brain. This philosophical ambivalence is reflected in the ambivalence of Chomsky's theory.
11. It should be noted, however, that the dual characteristics of *Sung Sang* and *Hyung Sang* are pervasive in all of reality, according to Unification Thought. Therefore, even animals possess their own *Sung Sang*. Hence, it is not surprising to find a type of primitive language in animals. According to Unification Thought, even a cell has a form of primitive consciousness (See W.H. Thorpe, "Science and Man's Need for Meaning," *Mind & Brain*, 1982, edited by Sir John Eccles, Washington, D.C.: Paragon House.)
12. For a more extensive explanation of these terms, see Unification Thought Institute, *The New Cultural Revolution and Unification Thought*, p. 37..
13. See note no. 12 above.
14. Inner *Sung Sang* and Inner *Hyung Sang* are part of *Sung Sang*. For further explanations, see *Explaining Unification Thought*, ch. 1.

15. This may be regarded as the linguistic counterpart fo Sigmund Freud's analytical psychology, according to which human behavior is governed not by "surface-structure" events of life but rather by "deep structures" of the subconscious mind.
16. Saussure's concept of "form" and "substance" is analogous to Aristotle's distinction of "form" ('eidos') and "matter" ('hyle').
17. Sturucturalism distinguishes between surface structures, which are accessible to observation, and *deep structures*, which are inaccessible to direct observation. Any attempt to understand language, or human beings in general, must be based on the search for deep structures.
18. Writers often find that this is true—in other words, a writer may begin a piece with a rather vague idea of what he/she wants to say and then clarigy the ideas in the process of expressing them. Phenomena such as this raise the issue of the relationship between language and thought from a psychological point of view, such as whether thinking can exist without any linguisitic expression. The Unification Thought concept of *Sung Sang* and *Hyung Sang* can be quite helpful in this regard. The two elements are in mutual relationship; therefore, it is quite possible that one influences the other and vice versa. *Sung Sang*, however, is in the subject position.
19. Another example would be someone who thinks praising thoughts but never expresses them or thinks loving thoughts but never utters loving words or thinks encouraging thoughts but never utters encouraging words, and so forth. In such cases, one might say that those thoughts were wasted, because they did not become expressed in practical reality. Hence, language is a form of practice.
20. It should be noted that Chomsky has been less than successful in clarifying the inner workings of the semantic component, which he supposes to be universal. As Newmeyer points out, this area has given rise to disputes between Chomsky and some of his disciples, and the issues are far from being fully resolved. (See Frederick J. Newmeyer, 1986, *Linguistic Theory in America*,

- Second Edition, New York : Academic Press.)
21. On the other hand, there is a certain sense in which on wishes to value the existence of particular languages, with their culture, customs, and particular characteristics. In other words, there is a certain desirable aspect to the diversity of languages. For instance, the Japanese language is most adaptable to convey the Japanese soul, and it would seem that any attempt to create a universal language would lead to the loss of those characteristics that are typical to Japanese, or any other language. From the Unification Thought point of view, however, the existence of a universal language should guarantee the preservation of the uniqueness and characteristics of existing languages.
 22. The two positions, however, affect each other mutually. In some case, changes initiated in the *Hyung Sang* will have an effect in the *Sung Sang*. For instance, a person whose body becomes ill may find that the spirit, also, will be affected, to one extent or another, by the body's situation. It is interesting to note, however, that the modern trend in medicine is to look for a psychosomatic explanation of illnesses—and there are branches of medicine that pay particular attention to the spiritual or mental aspects of well-being or illness.
 23. UTI, *Unification Thought and the New Cultural Revolution*, pp. 92-93.
 24. UTI, *Unification THought and the New Cultural Revolution*, p. 79.
 25. UTI, *Unification Thought and the New Cultural Revolution*, p. 78.
 26. The attempts at unification carried out by the great empires of history cannot be considered truly successful, because the culture imposed on the peeripheral countries did not have the proper requisites to become the center for the unification of cultures, as discussed below.
 27. See *Explaining Unification Thought*, chapter 10, for a full explanation of the appearance of struggle in history as a means to turn history from the direction of evil to the direction of

good.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bloomfield, L. 1928. "A Set of Postulates for the Science of Language," *Language* 2. Reprinted by M. Joos (ed), *Readings in Linguistics*. Washington: American Council of Learned Sciences, 1957.

_____. 1933 *Language*. New York: Hold.

Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

_____. 1968. *Language and Mind*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

_____. 1974. *Reflections on Language*. New York: Pantheon Books.

_____. 1981. *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. New York: Praeger.

Divine Principle. 1973. 2nd Ed. New York: HSA-UWC.

Eccles, Sir John, ed. (1982). *Mind & Brain-The Many-Faceted Problems*. Washington, D.C.: Paragon House.

Kripke, S. 1982. *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lyons, John. 1970. *Noam Chomsky*. New York: The Viking Press.

Outline of the Principle, Level 4. 1980. New York: HSA-UWC.

UTI, 1981 (abbreviated as "EUT"). *Explaining Unification Thought*. New York: Unification Thought Institute.

UTI, 1987. *The New Cultural Revolution and Unification Thought*. Tokyo: Unification Thought Institute.

Russell, B. 1948. *Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Session XII : Comment

Hisayoshi Watanabe

Professor of English
Literature, Kyoto University, Japan

I must, first of all, appreciate having been given the opportunity to comment on such an excellent paper. I am not a specialist in linguistics, but this essay has been in several senses most richly suggestive to me. I recently have more and more papers to read for examination, but I must confess that on my special field (English literature) I seldom come upon articles as satisfyingly delightful as this essay of Mr. Perry's. The sureness of sense of problem, that is, the eye quick to detect where the problem lies, the far-reachingness of problem construction and its development, the perspicuity of argument—these are indisputably the prominent traits of this essay. And these, to my regret, are the very qualities deplorably missing in the essays I recently read.

Why so? It would be unjust to ascribe it only to the exceptional brightness of Mr. Perry. For brightness is equally distributed among my fellow scholars. It would come to the question, I should suppose, of how Unification Thought makes one clear-headed and leads one unerringly to find the whereabouts of problems. To understand a thing is to understand its relative position among others, among other spheres of knowledge, and ultimately among the ultimate human issues permeating all. And I am sure, even from my insufficient