

## Application of Unification Thought to Moral and Ethical Education

Prof. Andrew Wilson

Unification Theological Seminary Barrytown NY / USA

### I. Introduction

For the past eighteen months I have been working with the International Educational Foundation, under the direction of Dr. Joon Ho Seuk, whose primary mission is to develop educational materials for use in China and the nations of the former Soviet Union. Since 1992, over 30,000 teachers and administrators have participated in IEF programs in the former Soviet Union. More than 5,000 schools have moral and ethical education courses using the textbooks developed by IEF for high school and middle school children. In the three years since it began working in the People's Republic of China in October 1994, IEF has conducted almost 40 conferences in more than 20 cities throughout China.

IEF is presently the only foreign organization allowed by the Chinese government to teach philosophical or ethical material in that country. Educators, scholars and ministry officials comment favorably, saying that IEF's presentations are infused with authentic Chinese values. One condition for IEF to operate in China is that it develop a program that is appropriate for a secular audience, with no mention of God or theology. Instead IEF has adopted a profound universal values approach. The American branch of IEF, which is responsible for the work in China, has been continuously upgrading its lecture materials, looking to eliminate any remaining religious terminology and to meet the strictest standard of material suitable for secular school use. The latest edition of its lecture manual, tentatively titled *Cultivating Heart & Character*, is due to be

published this summer.

The universal values orientation of IEF's lectures designed for secular audiences also make them suitable to many Western nations. The public schools in the United States are prohibited by law from teaching religion, but many are adopting programs of moral education framed in secular terms. These programs go broadly under the title "Character Education." The ground on which character education can be accepted in American public schools is that they are based on moral and ethical principles that are universally regarded by all cultures, religions and philosophies. IEF is engaged with many American educators in this work. This paper will review some of the issues and decisions made in constructing a secular application of Unification Thought for a program in moral and ethical education. Over several years of lecture presentations, traditional Divine Principle and Unification Thought lectures have gradually been contextualized for audiences of professional educators, fitting to their background, philosophical outlook, and professional needs. In developing this adaptation, we have had to face several issues.

First, the theory had to be stripped of all religious language and content. Given the centrality of God in Unification Thought, this cannot hope to be a 100% accurate translation. How much of the essence of Unification Thought remains if God is left out? That may depend in large measure on how the adaptation is made. It is not necessarily wise simply to strip away references to God without making some adjustments to elements of the theory whose meaning would be altered within a secular ontology.

Second, the theory can be simplified. Unification Thought makes many profound philosophical statements. However, in dealing with a specific social application in this case, moral and ethical education must pare away those aspects of Unification Thought that are only of marginal application.

Third, the theory must confront well-accepted educational theories and critique them. Contemporary educational theory has an individualistic and relativistic perspective that is as wrong-headed as communism. Like communist theory, we must critique it and advance our view as a counterproposal. Other aspects of educational theory are of great utility to educators; these cannot so easily be disposed of. Rather, we must explore points of contact between these ideas and Unification Thought.

Fourth, the theory will be cognizant of the inner development of Unification Thought. The foundational work pioneered by the late Dr. Sang Hun Lee is being supplemented by diverse teachings on

individual morality, marriage and family, and social ethics contained in the newly expanded canon of Rev. Moon's works, including Blessing and Ideal Family, God's Will and the World, and the Family Pledge. Many of these teachings are applicable to education and to moral and ethical theory.

## II. IEF's Lecture Program

IEF's current program includes ten lectures. Four are specific applications dealing with educational methods, sex education and drug education. The six theoretical lectures can be described briefly:

- 1) The keynote address by Dr. Seuk.
- 2) "The Need for Character Education" critiques the non-directive and value-free ideal prevalent in Western education and proposes as an alternative the "balanced education" of Unification Thought's theory of education.
- 3) "Foundations of Universal Values" gives a philosophical foundation for moral and ethical values grounded in the theory of the three Basic Life Goals (secular terminology for the Three Great Blessings): ① mature character, ② loving relationships and family, and ③ contribution to society. This lecture includes many essential foundational teachings, including duality (dual characteristics), interaction (give and receive action), the principle of human responsibility, heart, conscience, true love, the four spheres of love (four great realms of heart), horizontal and vertical order, dual purposes, the work ethic (ethic of dominion), the ethic of contributing to society (filial piety, patriotism, etc.) and the ethic of legitimate authority (true parent, true teacher and true leader).
- 4) "A Character-Based Approach to Sex and Love" explains the reasons why young people should keep sexually pure. It discusses the meaning of true love, the damaging effects of premarital sex on love, and how to protect one's love until marriage.
- 5) "Family, Marriage and the Role of Sexuality" discusses the significance of the family as the school of love, the value of marriage and the ethic of Absolute Sex in sustaining a happy and healthy marriage.
- 6) "Causes and Resolution of Conflict" delves into the causes of conflict and the way of restoration through indemnity. The causes of conflict are described as selfishness and misdirected love. "Restorational Conflict Resolution" consists of three steps Reflection and Reorientation,

Reversal and Restitution, and Reconciliation and Renewal secular terminology for repentance, indemnity and forgiveness. It also discusses ways of dealing with marital conflict and methods of teaching conflict resolution in the classroom.

All of these lectures are illustrated by quotations from philosophers and teachers from all cultures (Aristotle, Mencius, Toynbee, Martin Luther King), statements by modern educators, as well as stories and examples from life. The following remarks are reflection particularly on the work I have been doing to develop the central theoretical lecture, "Foundations of Universal Values." They reflect an engagement with the four issues, mentioned above, which arise in any secular application of Unification Thought. Perhaps this exposition can be an instructive example for others who are faced with a similar task.

## III. Value and Values

An issue that complicated our work at the outset was the meaning of the word "value." In philosophy and ethics, the term "value" has many different meanings. Classically, following Plato, people have regarded values like Goodness, Truth and Beauty as objective realities; thus Max Scheler, a phenomenologist, regarded values as objective essences that are known intuitively by the heart. Personalists like sorely likewise emphasized the givenness of values which transcend persons, although they are always carried by persons, "God created a universe that is friendly to values and works out its purposes in light of them." On the other hand, a few philosophers reject the essential reality of values and locate them either in the subject or in the object. Samuel Alexander defined value as the quality in the object; thus all truth, beauty and goodness are cognized in contemplating external reality. On the other hand, Brightman taught that values exist in the subject, in persons, who impute values to objects. Nevertheless, he draws a distinction between values and norms; norms are the standard of values, and these are objective, existing in the mind of God.

*Essentials of Unification Thought [EUT]* defines value as "a quality of an object which satisfies a desire of the subject." The desire to seek beauty means to seek what is beautiful in another, while the realize beauty means the desire to become beautiful, for the sake of one's partner. The discussion in *Exposition of the Divine Principle*,

with its example of a flower, follows this line of thought. Thus ethical values, which fall in the category of values to be realized, are the rooted in the desire to become a valuable object to a higher subject.

But without positing a priori the existence of God as the absolute Subject, this definition is inadequate. Framed in a secular theory, it leaves no grounds for positing absolute, universal values. Consider the problem of determining values in ethics, which concern the behavior of "I," the subject. One could reason that "I" can be valued by a higher subject, and my value determined by that subject's desire. That is the idea behind Rawls' theory of the ideal observer. But what is the standard of value of the ideal observer? How do we know what that subject values in his object "I"? How do we know whether the ideal observer values more the humble Christian or the Nietzschean *bermensch*? The problem of determining values is not solved by this maneuver. Students who do not have the entire Unification metaphysics as a foundation for understanding this expression are likely to misunderstand it. We can recognize in light of these difficulties why so many philosophers have regarded Truth, Beauty and Goodness as objective realities. Yet *EUT*'s definition apparently denies any essential metaphysical reality to values apart from their concrete manifestation; they only exist as qualities of people and things.

*EUT* declares that the absolute God is the only sure foundation for determining absolute values. How, then, can we introduce an absolute standard of values in a secular teaching? Illumination comes when we go further on with *EUT* in its philosophical analysis of value. What is it that lies within the subject, which recognizes that a quality in an object is a value? To answer this question, *EUT* gives an analysis of human desire, which is rooted in the Purpose of Creation given by God, namely the Three Great Blessings. "Desire is an impulse of the human mind to attain a certain purpose. The desire to attain the purpose of the whole is called the desire to realize value, and the desire to attain the purpose of the individual is called the desire to seek value." "Then, for what purpose do human desires exist? They exist for realizing the Purpose of Creation, the completion of the Three Great Blessings." On this basis, we can formulate a clearer understanding of moral and ethical value, as a quality of an entity which promotes the attainment of the purpose of creation. When these are well-established qualities embodied in the subject, they may be called "virtues."

This analysis gives us a point of departure for a secular foundation for universal values. Philosophical grounding of values must begin

with an analysis of human purpose. If we can establish philosophically the grounds for accepting the Three Great Blessings as the fundamental purposes of human life, then we have a sound foundation for universal values. This is indeed the approach we are taking in IEF. The lecture posits three Basic Life Goals as the universal purposes of human life: mature character, loving relationships and family, and contribution to society. These three Basic Life Goals are almost self-evident. They can easily be supported by principles of natural law. From them, we can determine all moral and ethical values. We can establish the proper standard for values. Even though values have no substantial reality in themselves (in Plato's sense), they are grounded in the purpose of life, whose essence is absolute.

#### IV. The Philosophical Ground for Moral and Ethical Theory

*EUT* posits three grounds for absolute values: theological, philosophical, and historical. However, in applying Unification Thought to secular philosophy, only one ground is available and secure—natural philosophy. (I will not here go into questions raised by *EUT*'s historical argument.) Since the theological ground ends with an argument for the Three Great Blessings, we have bracketed the question of God and have simply made the Three Great Blessings our starting-point. This leaves open the question of how to ground the Three Great Blessings in natural philosophy. The IEF perspective is a practical one, designed for educators. It is self-evident that among the goals of education is enabling students to attain these basic life goals. The three Basic Life Goals provides a clear and simple framework for human life. Nevertheless, further work in laying a philosophical foundation for these life goals should be undertaken.

*EUT* teaches that to establish philosophical ground of absolute values, "it is necessary for us also to observe nature and the universe, discuss the fundamental laws at work there, and thereby derive a new view of value." In the classical understanding of "the investigation of things" as carried out by Chu Hsi, as well as in the Western concept of natural philosophy, the principles of nature are not limited to observation of the non-human world, but also include an inquiry into human nature as well. If one were to limit them to the non-human world, it would be impossible to explain about responsibility, heart, or true love. Yet these are easily shown to be aspects of natural

law.

*EUT* discusses seven "Laws of the Universe" which are foundational to the existence of individuals, families and societies. These constitute the laws of nature governing all existence. Our lecture employs a similar list of foundational principles, or laws of nature, which differs only slightly from the laws in *EUT*.

1) Growth to completion — the "identity maintaining and developmental nature" of all existence lacks any concept of stages of growth towards a predetermined goal of completion. Although *EUT* discusses this aspect of growth in the Theory of Education, it seems that its ontology needs to be adjusted. The foundation for discussing human maturity depends upon a clear elucidation of this principle of nature.

2) Duality and interaction — these encompass *EUT*'s principles of correlativity, purposefulness and centrality, and harmony in the give-and-receive action between subject and object partners.

3) Order and position — the elaboration of vertical and horizontal order in nature is foundational for discussing family ethics.

4) Interdependent hierarchy — the connected body includes a discussion of the dual purposes of all beings that link them into many-leveled systems.

The last law, circular motion, is used in place of the Four Position Foundation to diagrammatically depict the individual truth body.

## V. Diagramming the Basic Life Goals

Typically in *Expositions of the Divine Principle and Unification Thought*, the Three Great Blessings are depicted by the model of the Four Position Foundation. However, in the context of a non-religious ethical theory, this diagram and its underlying concepts pose certain problems. In IEF's presentation, it was decided to depict the three Basic Life Goals by an atomic model in which two or more spheres rotate around a central sphere. The central sphere is labeled "true love."

The diagram and concept of the Four Position Foundation is complex, requiring considerable explanation to the uninitiated. The complexity of this model is due in large part to the fact that it is diagramming two different concepts at once. In general, greater clarity and simplicity can be obtained by a diagram that tries to explain one concept, not two. First, there is the interaction between

the right and left spheres centered on the top sphere, which can as well be depicted by a simple atomic model. Second is a temporal development called Origin-Division-Union. However, there is no foundation in the non-religious teaching of IEF to discuss the concept of a temporal Origin. The explanations of this moral and ethical philosophy describe phenomena entirely on the horizontal, earth plane.

The simplification of leaving out Origin-Division-Union yields something like an atomic model. In this simplification, the bottom position of the Four Position Foundation is simply the atomic model as a whole. The atomic model may be regarded as viewing the Four Position Foundation from the bottom sphere. A second issue in diagramming the Basic Life Goals is what to place at its center. In the exposition of the Three Great Blessings in *EUT*, the center is usually called "Heart," sometimes "purpose," and sometimes "love." In the foundational theory of the Original Image, the center of the Four-Position Base is called Heart or purpose. However, in IEF's presentations, we have chosen to call the center of relationships "true love." In the Family Pledge, all human purposes are to be fulfilled centering on true love.

*EUT*'s use of the term "purpose" is problematic for diagramming the center of the three life goals, for two reasons. First, if "purpose" refers primarily to God's purpose of creation, it cannot stand in a non-religious moral philosophy. Second, from the standpoint of human beings, the three Basic Life Goals are themselves descriptive of human purpose. Therefore, to place purpose at the center of a diagram describing purpose would create a logical impossibility, an infinite regress. Eliminating this option, the choice is whether to depict the central position as heart or true love.

## VI. Heart

Heart in Unification Thought has a strong vertical dimension, since the starting-point of Heart is God's Heart. In translating Unification Thought into secular ethical theory, however, whatever one posits as the central pole of relationships and the foundation for establishing an absolute standard of value must be something within nature, within the world of relative human existence. What aspect of the human essence is unchangeable and absolute? We posit Heart, yet, Heart in Unification Thought is first of all God's Heart, and only

secondly is it mirrored in the human person. A horizontal understanding of heart — where the word loses its capitalization is not so clear.

In our non-religious application, we use the term heart to mean the center of character and the inner source of the desire for relatedness. It lies at the very core of the human person. The human heart is inherently true and good, as Mencius taught. However, in many people it is covered over by deviant and selfish desires. For that reason, the true meaning of heart is not immediately accessible to many people.

Here one needs to be careful of definitions. Defining heart as “the impulse to find joy through love” can easily be misunderstood as referring to horizontal, even fallen, relationships. Heart in common parlance simply means the center of human desire, but desires, as we know, can be either good or evil. Thus, we commonly say, “he has a selfish heart,” or “his heart was drawn to his beautiful secretary.” However, heart in any teaching adapted from Unification Thought must refer to an unchanging essence that is rooted in the original nature. It must be deeper than desire, and contain the innate direction towards goodness. It must have the compass-like nature of the conscience, which points towards true values.

Therefore, in the process of adapting Unification Thought's concept of Heart to a non-theistic philosophy, one should consider adding an explicit moral and ethical component to the definition. It may be true that “Heart is the core of the human personality,” but it is not self-evident, and will require much explanation. It is simpler to say that heart is the center of good character. We must clarify the moral and ethical orientation of heart, stating that it motivates ethical relationships. We can explicitly make the link between heart and conscience, stating that heart is the root of conscience.

But does not this beg the question? How do we know that the human heart indeed pursues these things? We must wrestle with the fact that Heart in its original sense in Unification Thought is fundamentally rooted in the teaching of the *imago dei*. The absolute value-orientation of Heart is due firstly to its transcendent Source. Rev. Moon teaches that the human heart resonates with God's Heart and links the human being with God. The concepts of Heart — conscience, too — are like the poles of value within an otherwise unstable human nature. They bear their weight as the foundation for values because of their link to the Absolute God. It is an open question whether they can bear the weight when cut loose from that secure mooring.

## VII. True Love

In the words of the Family Pledge, people are to establish good families and peaceful nations by living “centered on true love.” Might it make more sense to place true love, rather than heart, at the center of human life and human relationships? Is there any justification for placing “true love” at the center of the model diagramming the three Basic Life Goals? Theologically speaking, Heart is the center of the divine character, while true love is the manifestation of God's heart in the process of creation. God's true love means His total investment and total giving in creating the universe and human beings. Yet all of this love was for the purpose of Heart, namely, to receive joy through loving a good object partner. Hence in the divine realm, Heart may be regarded as prior to love.

However, from the standpoint of human beings, who are created out of God's true love, it can be argued that (human) true love is prior to (human) heart. God's true love existed before humans were created and was the cause of human existence. As the result of God's investment of true love, human beings were created with a heart. Heart is the essence of a created, living existence, but love was the agent that created the living existence. Furthermore, since true love is relational, the human experience of true love began from the point when God began to give His true love in creating humans. From before their existence, humans have known and felt God's true love. Heart, on the other hand, provides the basic orientation for existence. Rev. Moon teaches that love is prior to life. Therefore, from the human standpoint, true love is prior to heart.

Translated into non-theological terms, parental love is the closest approximation of true love. Children are conceived and raised by parents who love them unconditionally and would do anything for their welfare. The experience of true love is something accessible to all people who have parents. In their sermons, Rev. and Mrs. Moon often describe God's true love through the analogy to parental love.

When God created Adam and Eve, His first son and daughter, God wanted them to be better than Himself. Traditional thinking would say that this is absurd. But please take a moment to think about this. When we as parents look into the faces of our children, we wish upon them an infinite amount of love and hope. We want them to grow and achieve things we ourselves only dreamed of. True love is experienced in the human world primarily as parental love. Parental

love is unconditional, unchanging, and entirely for the sake of the child. The family centered on true love is centered on the parents' love for each other and for their children — these are inseparable. Rev. Moon teaches,

*The Four Position foundation is completed only when, according to the original order of heaven, love is substantially transmitted to the children through the family as an intermediary, forming a lineage. Therefore, parents must teach their children how to love. As a wife, one should become exemplary in loving one's husband and thus teach the children to love. As a husband, one should teach the children about God's love, and through loving one's wife and educating the children, teach them to love.*

For children, true love is a profound experience and the core of what will nurture their heart. Children who are filled with true love from their parents respond with beauty, expressed as gratitude and obedience. Induced by parental love, children imitate their parents' moral standard; thus true love is the center of moral striving and self-discipline leading to mind/body unity.

True love is the center of human life through all its stages. As children, people can experience true love and internalize that experience as the measure of the love they always want. As adolescents who are seeking a marriage partner, people can be careful and discerning about love because they have their parents' love as a standard reference point. They want nothing less than a faithful spouse because their parents were faithful to them. As parents, people can realize the fullness of true love in giving and sacrificing for their children. As productive citizens, people can extend their true love to the realms of work and society.

Here we see that the notion of true love is relational to the core. Even in a non-religious formulation, true love connects people to a reality transcendent of self. It provides secular human life with a vertical dimension — the rootedness in parents. It was discussed above that when the notion of heart is considered apart from God, it loses its absoluteness. As merely an internal, individual essence, the heart can easily be submerged by the welter of deviant desires. True love, on the other hand, being inherently relational and vertical, is the strong and enduring pillar for determining moral and ethical values within a secular application of Unification Thought.

True love is the center of individual character in several senses. First, as mentioned, experiences of true love, especially parental love,

are what nurture the heart, and hence cultivate the moral feeling which is at the root of good character. Second, the experience of receiving true parental love and responding with filial obedience and imitation naturally orients the relationship of mind and body in proper harmony. Third, good character established in this way — with mind and body in proper order — is a necessary condition for giving true love to others, particularly to one's spouse and children. Fourth, true love is an ethical ideal. Since all people want the highest true love, it is the standard against which all relative love is measured. The pursuit of true love provides the motivation for moral and ethical behavior, which is necessary to attain true love.

In moral terms, true love can be defined as having several aspects. First, its orientation is for the sake of the other. Second, its quality is unconditional and unchanging. The word "unconditional" needs some explanation. It can mean the unconditional support and comfort that a mother gives to her child, even if the child makes a misstep or becomes a delinquent. But unconditional love also includes a father's withholding of praise and giving punishment to a child who does not measure up to his high expectations. That sort of "conditional" love of a father is at its core unconditional, since the father's efforts at education are entirely for the child's benefit. What is unconditional in true love is the commitment to the welfare of the other.

Third, true love is sincere and profound, coming from the heart. Heart is linked to true love as its emotional center and root within the self. Thus one could construe heart as the personal and psychological center of true love. However, heart and true love are not the same. Heart is an inner faculty of the soul, while true love is essentially relational. As discussed above, it is necessary to posit true love, not heart, as the center of character, of relationships, and of all ethical action, in order to avoid lapsing into individualism and relativism. Heart cannot encompass all the dimensions of true love.

Fourth, true love is ethical. That means that true love includes the principles of order and position that lie at the heart of ethics. Here we can discuss the definition of the word "true" as meaning proper, correct, in accord with the proper order and with the laws of nature. The word "true" has a background in Eastern ethical philosophy, particularly the Confucian concept of *cheng ming*, the Rectification of Names. When Confucius said, "Let a king be a king, let a minister be a minister, and let a father be a father," he was referring to the fallen human tendency to misuse one's position, and thus act in ways inappropriate to that position. "A king who oppresses the people to build up his own wealth is not a king, but a thief," said Mencius. A

father who does not treat his son with humaneness is not a father. In Confucianism, the essential condition for establishing a good society was for people to act correctly according to their position. Thus, "true" love is love proper to one's position. The same can be said of the word "true" in the concepts "true parent," "true teacher" and "true leader."

Fifth, true love is the fruit of good character and productive of people with good character. The operation of true love in the family is a virtuous cycle. Children nurtured in the true love of parents will develop good character, cultivated through the realms of children's love and sibling's heart. When they enter the realm of conjugal love, their good character becomes the foundation for a happy and enduring marriage. Then as parents, their good marriage is the foundation for giving true parental love to the next generation. On the other hand, unstable families, whose parents lack good character, lead to a vicious cycle of poorly adjusted children who are likely to fall into a life of promiscuity and crime.

It is a serious misconception of Western culture to identify true love with the passion of conjugal love. This misidentification leads to disappointment, as the passion of young love never lasts, even in the best of marriages. True love is that quality of love that gives a couple the strength and devotion to weather the storms and challenges of a lifetime together.

Yet, an even deeper misconception of Western culture is to identify true love primarily with conjugal love. The source and measure of true love is the vertical relationship of parent and child. Parental love is a constant in this fallen world. Even evil parents do not intentionally teach their children wrong things, for they want their children to be successful in life. Parental love endures even in the midst of an ugly divorce, for "after a bride and bridegroom divorce, they can forget each other, but they miss their children more and more as time goes by. Anyone who has children can understand this feeling." Thus Rev. Moon declares, "The parent and child relationship is more important than the husband and wife relationship." It is particularly necessary to assert this vertical pole of true love when Unification Thought is applied to a non-religious context, where there can be no appeal to God's love as the vertical source of true love.

## VIII. The Moral Faculties

In ethical theory, the faculties of character which correspond to the three mental faculties of emotion, intellect and will are called moral feeling, moral knowing, and moral action. Moral feeling describes moral emotional sensibility, including empathy and compassion for others and the zeal for justice and right. Moral knowing includes wisdom, prudence, and knowing right from wrong. Moral action describes the will to act in the face of adversity; it is established through the virtues of courage and self-control.

At the same time, Unification Thought and Rev. Moon's teachings describe two core aspects of character, namely heart and conscience. Heart we have already discussed. The conscience is the inner teacher, knowing a persons' deepest self and also knowing the right way to go. It is compared to the compass of a ship. The role of the conscience is specifically linked with achieving mind-body unity. Furthermore, Unification Thought describes human person as having three qualities — a being of heart, a being of logos, and a being of creativity. A being of logos is a person whose reason is totally united with the norms of human life and the laws of nature. A being of creativity is a person who is capable of planning and implementing his or her purpose.

How do these various moral faculties relate to one another? It is obvious that the heart is somehow related to moral feeling and the conscience to moral knowing. Similarly, the notion of "a being of logos" is connected to the conscience and moral knowing and "a being of creativity" is linked to moral action. However, the formulation of Unification Thought resists any attempt to systematize them all into three faculties corresponding to intellect, emotion and will. In IEF's model of the human person, these are distinguished from one another because they lie at different levels.

Heart lies at the core of character. The impulse to proper relatedness and true love is foundational to the development of character and to all human conduct. Next comes the conscience, which encompasses all the dimensions of the original mind as it seeks to establish its subjective role in relation to the body. Mind-body unity is essential to the proper expression of character. At the outer level are the three faculties of moral feeling, moral knowing, and moral action. These are not just faculties of the mind, but faculties of the unified person, whose feelings, thoughts and actions are one. Therefore, moral

feeling, moral knowing and moral action are established on the foundation of mind-body unity.

## IX. Moral Development and the Four Realms of Heart

Sometimes dealing with other theoretical approaches requires Unification Thought-based theoreticians to clarify certain points that are not clear. One such case has to do with Unification Thought's theory of moral development through the Four Realms of Heart. This developmental model does not come into the world on a tabula rasa. There is already an existing theory of moral development among educators, propounded by Lawrence Kohlberg and based upon the work of the developmental psychologist Jean Piaget.

Kohlberg's model is well-founded upon a large volume of research studies on children's moral reasoning. Moreover, it is of considerable practical utility, especially for early childhood education. Educators need to know how children reason about moral issues, and how their method of reasoning changes as they grow older. For this reason, IEF's theory of moral and ethical education must acknowledge the explanatory power and proven efficacy Kohlberg's model, and enter into constructive dialogue with it. Let us examine it briefly. Kohlberg defines five stages of development, with other theorists attempting to fill in additional stages either prior to or following his five. Young children go through stages of closely identifying with their parents alternating with stages in which they need to assert their individuality. Thus, the "terrible twos" is a time when the child begins to assert his individuality. He wants to feel his power, and constantly challenges the limits set by parents. By preschooler or kindergarten age, the child enters Stage 1, a time of unquestioning obedience. The child seems to be much more pliable. He accepts his parents' word as law and obeys without ever questioning that the parents are right. The adult is the sole source of authority, and punishment.

Then in Stage 2, which begins around age seven, the child develops a self-interested notion of fairness that is fair for "me." He will enforce that fairness in play with peers, and try to insist on it from his parents as well. If a schoolmate doesn't share or doesn't give him a turn, he protests, "it's not fair." If he feels mistreated by a parent, he might reject their authority and claim his own "rights." If his schoolmate causes him harm, he will insist on a like punishment. "An eye for an eye" justice applies at this stage.

In Stage 3, which may begin around age ten or eleven, the child's idea of right and wrong is dominated by what others think of him or her. This is the stage of interpersonal conformity. The child obeys her parents because she wants his parents to think well of her, and that in turn makes her feel good about herself. In relations with schoolmates, the child becomes strongly influenced by peer pressure. She wants to be well-liked by her friends. A child may remain at this stage until age fifteen or older, when he or she makes the transition to Stage 4.

Stage 4 is the stage of respect for laws, for the system, for the welfare of society in which one finds one's proper place. One's moral reasoning is no longer dominated by what others think. Instead, self-worth comes from carrying out one's responsibilities to the society, to the law, etc. This is the stage to develop the ethic of citizenship. Postulated stages above Stage 4 are much disputed in the educational literature.

Stage 5, according to Kohlberg, is when a person acts by a principled conscience, transcending social convention. But some object that this view of "post-conventional morality" may reflect Western cultural or male gender bias. Apparently, a more complete analysis of the stage(s) of moral maturity is needed. Unification Thought will probably have much to say on this topic.

The centrality of the family in moral development is a hallmark of Unification Thought's moral and ethical theory. In contrast, Kohlberg's theory describes stages of individual moral development independent of family relations. In an important article comparing Kohlberg's theory with the view of moral development posited by Unification Thought, Tanabe reviews recent psychological research that demonstrates the importance of social factors, especially the family, and their influence on individual cognitive development. For example, the parents' emotional support, or lack of it, is more closely correlated with adolescents' moral development than what would be predicted by Kohlberg's model.

From the standpoint of Unification Thought, Kohlberg's theory suffers from several weaknesses. It does not explain the powerful influence of family interaction in moral development. It does not explain the dramatic character changes which begin at the onset of adolescence. It does not deal with evident gender differences in the character development. It does not address the powerful impact of early sexual experience on character. Nor does it explain the profound ethical reorientation that occurs when people become parents.

Nevertheless, Kohlberg's model also challenges us to clarify the formulation of moral development in Unification Thought. It clearly



shows that the moral reasoning of children develops both in relation to parents and peers, and for much of childhood these two arenas of moral interaction overlap. Thus, Kohlberg's Stage 2, beginning at age 7, and Stage 3, beginning at age 11 and ending well into adolescence, describe ways of moral reasoning which the child applies both in relating to parents and to other children. The question therefore arises for Unification Thought: where is the boundary between the child's realm of heart and the sibling's realm of heart? If the sibling's realm of heart encompasses all interactions with brothers, sisters, classmates and peers, then it begins quite early in the child's life, even in the preschool years. Tanabe seems to allow this possibility:

Relating this model to Kohlberg's stages, the pre-conventional level stages 1 and 2 clearly correspond to the young child first relating vertically to parents (stage 1) and then horizontally to siblings and peers (stage 2). The conventional level stages 3 and 4 correspond to the older child, adolescent, and finally single adult, in vertical relationship to family, and horizontal relationship to the larger group.

If so, then the child enters the sibling's realm of heart begins quite early, around age seven. That seems too young. Granted, the higher realms of heart encompass and support growth in the lower realms. Nevertheless, at age seven, the parents are still the most important moral influence on the child. Moreover, how can a child at that age be judged to have completed the child's realm of heart?

An alternative is to see the child's realm of heart and the sibling's realm of heart not as true stages, coming in an ordered sequence, but rather simultaneous spheres of social interaction. In that case, the child is relating to his parents within the child's realm of heart and simultaneously relating to his peers as part of a growing sibling's realm of heart. However, that would be inconsistent with the claim that the conjugal realm of heart and the parents' realm of heart are true stages. Does one have to complete a prior stage before entering the next stage? This is an essential point, for it is the basis of the moral claim that one should not engage in premarital sex with a friend, thereby confusing the sibling's and conjugal realms of heart.

A more likely view places the age of graduating from the child's realm of heart to the sibling's realm of heart at puberty and the onset of adolescence. The horizontal development of friendships and the like before puberty are preparation for the age when peer relationships become dominant. Dr. Lee himself takes this position:

*As we develop, children's love extends horizontally into brother's*

*and sister's love, which reflects parental love. That is because a child grows to understand that parents love his or her siblings just as they love him or her. When they reach puberty, a man and woman awaken to that realm of love.*

The determining factor is what is the central or primary relationship. Even though elementary school children are developing horizontal friendships and developing the foundations of sibling's love at home, they are still under the primary care of parents and teachers, never leaving their supervision. In the teenage years, young people have more independence to be among peers in the absence of parents or teachers. Peer relationships then naturally begin to eclipse the parental bond as a central concern of life.

Kohlberg's model has Stage 3 continuing from pre-adolescence well into mid-adolescence. His model does not account for the dramatic character changes which occur at puberty, which falls in the middle of that stage. Children who at age ten were obedient to parents at age thirteen become rebellious and distant from them. Children who seemed harmonious and well adjusted become moody and changeable. If Kohlberg's model is correct that the moral reasoning aspect of development continues unchanged through these momentous years, then there must be a considerable difference between the development of the heartistic and cognitive aspects of character.

Finally, establishing puberty as the boundary between the children's realm of heart and the sibling's realm of heart places the times for graduating from one realm to the next at the natural transitions of human life: birth, puberty, marriage, parenthood. This discussion illustrates the way that the expression of Unification Thought is clarified and developed through the encounter with a competing theory. Most discussions of the Four Realms of Heart do not clearly identify the boundary between the children's and sibling's realms. The question was easily sidestepped. However, the engagement with Kohlberg's theory of stages of moral development forces Unification theorists to deal squarely with this issue. The benefits of this new clarity point to the value of applications like this one, which bring the insights of Unification Thought into the mainstream discussion of educational, social and psychological theory.