

From Free Sex to Pure Love

Dr. Hisayoshi Watanabe
Setunan University / JAPAN

I

The Spanish philosopher Ortega Y. Gasset once remarked in his *Revolt of the Masses* (1930) that there are two kinds of people, one those who live day-to-day lives dominated by their desires without any objective in the future, and the other those who excel others in the power of self-control, living with strict self-discipline, with some definite aims to achieve. He asserts that in any time and place the latter should be the selected few who take on the leading role over the undisciplined many. But, Ortega says, in reality a mass-ridden, vulgar democracy has dominated the modern world as if it were the best way to guide our community.

Ortega's early discernment about the modern world has proved to be true; indeed, it seems to be more than true at this turn of the century. A cheap idea of democracy has penetrated almost all phases of our social life. Democracy is all right if it is properly understood and properly applied, but when it comes to mean the supremacy of undisciplined, dissolute masses of people, as it does in many parts of the world, without exaggeration it almost amounts to a suicidal principle to the community that has adopted it. The problem is that this fool-centered, fool-fostering democracy is not led and advocated by arrant fools but by a group of intelligent people, particularly by the mass media which are doubtlessly a powerful guiding factor of our time.

This low form of democracy understands equality as the leveling of all members of the community down to lower human standards; it

takes liberty for licence to do anything without being responsible. The situation is most tragic when the principle is introduced into the public education of the young, as it has been in Japan by the notorious *Nikkyoso*, the communist-led Japan Teachers Union. They take advantage of the absolutized notion of democracy to instil into the young the notion of unconditional equality, unrestrained freedom, and unreserved individualism.

They often go to the extreme of denying the the principle of competition, in the name of equality, either in learning or in athletics, with the result naturally of lowering the level of the whole classes. They also try to put into children an exaggerated picture of the traditional social discriminations now almost out of mind of the younger generation. They teach children virtually to hate those who may be responsible, their forefathers who made such a deplorable country, and ultimately their own country. All these have the motive, however unspoken and even unconscious, of enfeebling the established order of society and leading the whole nation toward their goal.

The danger comes to the utmost when sex education is conducted along such a leftist principle. Though only recently there have appeared some criticisms, leftist sex education has almost enjoyed monopoly in Japan. The wonder is that nobody has dared to oppose it at least openly, until the Unificationist publications and movements began a campaign against it.

It is a matter for extreme regret that in Japan the most widely used sex education textbooks have been those written by Mr. Naohide Yamamoto, a person who holds the radical idea that the emancipation of mankind cannot be completed until we have gained a complete sexual freedom. His idea is most clearly known through his teaching that one's sexual organ is a hundred percent one's own, so that one is not to be hindered from using it by any authority or any ethical consideration — making sharp contrast with Reverend Moon's teaching that one's sexual organ wholly belongs to one's spouse. Mr. Yamamoto also urges young people to have courage to tolerate the divorce of their parents because they are looking for 'true love'. He asserts that our aim is to establish a perfect '*Eros Commune*', that is to say, a deconstruction of the family.

This is astounding found in a book for school use, but all the more astounding is the fact that it has been accepted uncritically among middle and primary schools of Japan, even granting there have been no rival books. One reason for it is perhaps the theory's logical consistency that all communistic theories have, against which for lack of rival theories the Japanese have been unable to defend

themselves.

I think this is more or less true of all developed countries after World War II. For the last fifty years or so people of the world have tended to value free sex as if it could conduce to the progress of mankind. At least they have been unable to say "no" definitely to such a trend. Only recently people, especially Americans, seem to have come to realize, little by little, that sexual licence can only bring unhappiness with it, and that the destruction of the family finally may lead to the destruction of the country.

Significantly, there are statistical researches, such as those of Mr. Patrick Fagan, that clearly show there is a close parallelism between the breakdown of conjugal relationship and the juvenile delinquency of the same community. More significant is the statistical fact that the rate of juvenile delinquency is very low among church-going families in America. In Japan there is at the moment a serious phenomenon called *Gakkyu-hokai*, namely the breakdown of school education. Often, teachers of lower grade classes are unable to begin teaching, because children simply refuse to obey their teachers, running about, talking and playing in the classroom. Notably, they are the offspring of the post-war generations who were educated to value freedom and individualism above anything else and heard little or nothing of morals or responsibilities, much less of good and evil. Ironically, the total educational effect took some time to appear, and has now appeared in its perfectness in those children to our annoyance. There are also an unusually great number of children who refuse to go to school. In either case the grown-ups usually do not know what to do to cope with it.

Another phenomenon closely related with *Gakkyu-hokai* and still more deplorable is *Enjo-kosai* — literally, aided companionship, but actually, high-school or middle-school girl's prostitution. What is different of it from what we know as prostitution is that the girls have no guilty sense at all, characteristically saying to others and to themselves that they are not doing any harm to anybody. This apparently is the result of the education both they and their parents received — education warped by ideological prejudices, given on the principle that personal freedom must be absolute. Here again, even in the face of prostitution, parents and teachers cannot effectively argue against it, because they themselves have received the same education, that makes them diffident and reluctant to say anything in regard to such a matter. It is no exaggeration to say that the younger parents are trained to feel guilty for interfering in their children's 'freedom'. As freedom is taken to be licence, so discipline is

taken to be suppression.

I

This is apparently a symptom of the disruption to come sooner or later of the whole community, and ultimately of the nation. Having awakened to the seriousness of the matter, the Ministry of Education recently made an investigation of the 'school breakdown' and found that in an unusual percentage and degree our primary schools are suffering from unruliness of children. The Ministry also revises from time to time the teaching manual for sex education to cope with the more and more degenerating moral awareness and behavior of the young. Although the extremist sex educationist Mr. Yamamoto is now excluded from the council list, the Ministry of Education seems to be wondering to what extent teachers should be strict and to what extent liberal. After all the bureaucrats are no exception to those who were exposed to the *Nikkyoso* education (In this I am indebted to Ms. Ryo Yomo's report published in *En-ichi*, August & September, 1999).

As things stand now, the Japanese public as a whole are at a loss what measure to take against the sexual misdemeanor of the young, who are getting lower and lower in age. Just to show how flurried but helpless the elders are: the former Governor of Tokyo Metropolis is reported to have said that the only way to prevent school girls' prostitution is to instil into them the dreadfulness of contagious diseases. Such a measure may be effective, but it dodges the point of the matter just as the advice to use condoms. The ex-Governor was not particularly timid or stupid: all Japanese after the war have been taught to regard personal freedom as absolute and traditional morals as something dubious, and as a result we were made shy of referring to morals even when it is necessary. We are afraid to be thought old-fashioned and narrow-minded. Actually we are not sure of ourselves.

To give another example of our ambiguous measure. Near my house there is a public middle school, and beside its main gate there has long been fixed a placard, saying "Live your life cherishingly (with great care) as you live it only once. (*Taisetsuni ikiyou, ichidokagirino kono jinsei*)." I do not doubt the seriousness and sincerity of the schoolmaster, but I doubt whether it will have effect on the wild adolescents. Under the present Japanese circumstances, however, this is the utmost that can be said for admonition.

It means that what happens only once to you must be dear to you

and it must be treated with care and deep thought. This borders on religious thinking, but whether the schoolmaster is conscious or not, he forbids himself to be religious because it will put him in a dangerous position as a teacher. It seems to me this placard motto is most characteristic of the present Japanese educational situation. Teachers and parents and Education Ministry as well, if they are really concerned at all, are all looking for some solid moral foundation on which to build their teaching, but as soon as they become aware that morality and ethics really presuppose religion, they make all haste to turn their back on that dangerous area, for nothing is more dangerous in the present-day Japan than to refer to religion or anything connected with religion with educational intention. I mean religion, not particular denominations. If they are to survive, they have to pretend to be indifferent or be really indifferent to what should be the most fundamental human concern, whether we call it religion or by some other name.

Here is exemplified one of the utmost human folly. No one can deny the truth — the well-expressed truth — of the saying "One's life must be treated with great care because it is lived only once." But for this motto to be effective, there must be a religious feeling supposed behind it — a feeling that our life is given us by some great being that transcends us. Whoever has thought of it, however, is quite forgetful of the fact that he cannot count on such a feeling on the part of the young, except in the rare cases where they are from religious families. But young ones brought up by religious parents are not only rare but they are seldom trouble-makers. What is incongruous is that, while at least in public schools religious education is scrupulously avoided as if it were something dangerous, teachers have to appeal to the pupils' religious feeling.

Most certainly education in post-war Japan has been materialist education, where anti-religious feelings are naturally fostered. That has been the aim of the communist-led *Nikkkyoso* teachers, too. People have been taught virtually to despise religion or religious feelings, and that makes the overall atmosphere prevailing in Japanese society.

Only recently we have come to suspect that something is wrong with our education, that our community as a whole is getting morally enervated. But nobody as yet has spoken out about the necessity of religious education, except Unification Thought groups, as far as I know. For one thing, the concept 'religion' is basically misunderstood or intentionally perverted in Japan. To a greater part of the Japanese it suggests something mentally imbalanced, mentally deficient. They

are alert, or think they should be alert, not to be deceived by such a thing. Religion is not such a thing, of course. It is something that answers our fundamental need of knowing what we are or what we live for, something that gives us meaning of life. If we deny rightful existence of such questions, then we only confess our mental deficiency. Because it can also be defined as a totally revolutionalized view of the world, in that respect despising religion simply means cowardliness.

The placard motto "Live your life cherishingly as you live it only once" may be rephrased as "Respect your own self." Indeed, the most sorely needed thing to the young easily giving themselves to violence, crime or prostitution is a feeling of self-respect. But to appeal to self-respect presupposes right interpretation of the 'self'. And right interpretation of the 'self' presupposes religion. If 'self' is understood simply in terms of materialism, as it is by most Japanese, and the divinity of its origin or the divinity of its orientation is flatly denied, self-respect is simply nonsense: my lower self respecting my lower self.

Those young who give themselves to prostitution, free sex, or drugs seem to be unanimous in saying they are not doing harm or giving pain to anyone. So please leave them alone. But they are under a grievous delusion to think that their self or their life is something self-contained and isolated from others', just as one block of wood is from another. The point to be made is that their normal classmates, too, tend to the same opinion, according to statistics. This is evidently the result of their education — education based on materialism and putting a too high value on individualism. They cannot think of themselves and all other human beings except materialistically: they are taught life is simply an exceptional kind of matter. Besides, they are taught individual freedom should not in any case be suppressed. So the truth is that, before we deplore their behavior, we ourselves have to reconsider our philosophy of education, our own philosophy. There lies the real difficulty of the problem.

But even apart from our philosophy, we can right their prejudices by telling them that, far from never doing others any harm, they are, by making their future married life difficult, going to do great harm to their household which is the smallest unit of society. If they say they despise marriage, that will as well be a cause of social trouble because either no child or extra-marital child is a grave social problem. Anyway, human beings cannot live alone: to live is to involve others.

Self-respect is the word that should be stressed before anything

else. Self-respect can lead to respect for others, for social life and social responsibility, and respect for life itself, which is by no means a special kind of matter, as vulgar science would tell us. Thus self-respect is impossible without a religious feeling, and for religious feeling we need religious education in the sense of coming to right interpretation of the human being. I say right because there exist wrong interpretations as if there could be free choice in such a matter. But this is a problem that must be discussed independently.

III

Mr. Patrick Fagan's researches (See his paper "How to Reconstruct Education and Family — A Proposal from the U.S." read at the Tokyo and Osaka symposium, April 1999) indicate that when the rate of abnormal families in a community reaches 30 percent, the whole community begins to collapse and the children of the community are brought under a circumstance seriously detrimental to their mental and physical growth, and the rate of their criminal acts suddenly begins to rise. This well shows that our private affairs are no longer private but of material significance to the public. Now we have come to reap the fruits of free sex we once thought not bad. (Patrick Fagan's researches are about American society, but they can be considered to apply to Japan and all other developed countries.)

Before the last World War and up until very recently things used to be a bit different. It seems to me that the idea of 'privacy' has changed from what it was in my youth and is still changing. Some decades ago there used to be a clear-cut division between the private and the public. Our private affairs (sexual behaviors above all) were not questioned very much so long as we divided them from our public affairs. This was because our main concern was war, or after the war, economic reconstruction and growth. Our privacy was invisible, as it were, behind our greater national concerns. But now we have outgrown those stages of our development: we live in a more spiritual age — or at least in a less materialistic age.

We certainly are living at a turning point of history where our values are beginning to change. We are more and more conscious that our private life directly affects our public life, our country, the world we live in. The distinction between the private and the public is getting blurred. The computer, the Internet, is certainly one great factor in it. It is making the world smaller and close personal contact easier.

This change may be likened to that of our idea of environmental pollution. Half a century ago nobody could have understood what environmental pollution was. The oceans were so vast, the skies were so vast, we could not imagine the small amount of wastes our private life produces could be of any significance. But now we, at least people of developed countries, have come to think our private wastes can immediately pollute our world.

Likewise, it seems to me, we have come to be vaguely aware that our private conducts can pollute the world. We feel its direct influence, if we are perceptive enough, as the spiritual enervation of people in general, and most clearly as the moral aberrations of our offspring — our direct mirror. Looking at the young in streets or schools, we feel without exaggeration a national disruption is drawing near — the end of the world, as T. S. Eliot said, "not with a bang but a whimper." We feel our world as so small and tender a thing that we personally can affect it, both physically and spiritually.

IV

At the Pure Love Alliance rallies where I have been invited several times to give encouraging speeches, I referred to Ortega Y. Gasset's remark mentioned at the beginning of this essay, and said that there are two kinds of people, one living with self-imposed disciplines and responsible both to themselves and to others, the other with no discipline at all living aimlessly to satisfy their day-to-day desires, and I assured those who gathered that they were most typically the former kind of people, that is, the real leaders of the country, the elite in the veritable sense of the word.

They may as yet be coldly received and even jeered at but, as I told them, it is becoming clearer and clearer that there is a desperate need for this kind of movement. So rapidly and visibly is our moral collapse proceeding and endangering our nation. There are no longer grounds for sneering at or ignoring them, though people and the media are slow to approve them. I reminded them that there is the Western phrase *noblesse oblige*, meaning the selected leaders have responsibilities both to themselves and to others, and told them they were just those who practice that maxim. It must be noted, in passing, that the idea or consciousness of being the selected few, which I think is important, is just the target for denouncement to those communist-led teachers, because it goes against their idea of

equality.

Statistics are making it clear that the soundness of the family is the basis of the soundness and prosperity of the community. Strengthening the family bonds thus leads to the national strength. Here again, it must be noted, the concepts of soundness and strength are a target of attack to communists, because to them soundness means simply being true to the old repressive morals, and strength simply martial strength. They attack those concepts because they interpret everything materialistically and cannot think of anything in spiritual terms. So far they have been successful in leading the masses of people to think in their own way, and to that extent successful in depriving them of their moral soundness and spiritual strength.

I have told the PLA congregations that this is the time, more than any others, when the responsible are confronted with the irresponsible, when a serious decision has to be made which party to join, when we have to choose between seeing our nation damned or seeing it saved through our own behavior.

As I told them, the strength of this movement is in the fact that it is grounded on a firm philosophical basis. It is not at all what the ignorant or sarcastic people might suppose — a mere casual movement against immorality, or a mere sentimental conservative movement. It is based on the principle that a pair of man and woman in conjugal relationship represent the universe, each pair being the center of the universe, or religiously speaking, where God can manifest Himself. Therefore, the failure of that relationship is the failure of the cosmic order, which may appear in various ills of the world. This is a holistic interpretation of the world, a view of cosmic harmony, which no one can deny today as mystic or unrealistic. We have already outgrown the mechanistic view of reality that the whole is merely the sum of parts.

Then, philosophically as well as realistically, each family is a meeting or merging point of the private and the public, the place where the cosmic order is visibly epitomized, where we are to learn how our world is formed. It is the place where we first learn how self-centered or self-sufficient way of living is out of harmony with the cosmic order or with God. Above all, it is the place where we go through unselfish parental love and where the idea of pure love or self-sacrifice is first implanted in us, however unconsciously.

Some people may object that there is no evidence of abnormal sex producing particularly low intelligence. But here it is no question of the level of intelligence produced. The question is how our intelligence

is used. We have seen examples of how morbid intelligences have warped the intellectual climate of the world. *Paul Johnson's Intellectuals* (1988) is a study of such examples in our secular age since the Enlightenment. Predilection for high IQ is another vice of the materialistic age. High IQ is important, but it must be based on the soundness of mentality, of motivation: if it serves ego-centric or resentful motivation, it can drive the world to hell. And sound mentality is only nurtured in the sound family where love and discipline and piety are the trinity that unites it.