

The Principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness and the Utopia Thought by Thomas More

Dr. Hang-Je Kim
Sun Moon University / KOREA

I. Preface

The principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness is the thought for the ideal society or the ideal world which 'the Unification Principle' advocates. Also, it is an idea for a perfect society explained as the kingdom of heaven on earth. According to Unification Principle, the society of the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness was describes as follows. "Movements to further the Principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness arose on God's side, while communism was born on Satan's side, in order to demolish economic systems which concentrated a society's wealth in the hands of a privileged few. Each of these movements has sought to establish a system which would distribute wealth more equally among people."¹⁾ The Principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness would be realized after Communism perishes.

Therefore, the original mind of human beings that yearn for and search after God's ideal world of creation will go so far as realizing the ideal world which has completed God's purpose of creation and thus will finally fulfill the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness. Thus, based on the Unification view of history that accords with development of history, the Unification Principle is optimistic about the advent of a society of the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness.

Thomas More(1478-1535) is a person who represents the Utopia thought which appeared from Western tradition. His *Utopia*(1515,

1516) not only takes the original position of all the utopian thoughts up until now, but also is the object of continuous dispute. However, Thomas More's Utopia thought was a dream and reality on the ideal world or a perfect world which the humanity has aimed at. Also, his Utopia thought has something in common with all religions' vision toward ideal society, in particular with the thought of the Principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness of the Unification Principle.²⁾ Here, I would like to compare the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness of Unification Thought with 'utopia' thought of Thomas More and retrace a historic position toward the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness.

I. The Principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness

1. Human Beings and Society

In the Unification Principle, a view of man refers to human beings as the object of God's heart(*Shimjung*) and love. Unlike the creature other than human beings, God, the subject of creation created human beings as the direct object of His heart and love. For this reason, God endowed human beings with His creativity and autonomic responsibility at the same time.

Therefore, humanity is a responsible being who can autonomically control the desire of goodness and evil. In spite of sinfulness because of the fall, human beings have the ability to go by themselves toward the goodness and God's country under God's grace. Humanity has the traces of original mind enough to realize God's providence heartistically beyond his indolence. Accordingly, human beings feel the great happiness when they make ceaseless efforts to fulfill God's country toward goodness following God's guidance. Human beings are, in essence, a being who lives for the sake of others.

Beings with original nature constitute a basic unit of society by establishing a true family based on true love of God. The true family is a basic community of true love which has overcome family selfishness. Further, the society, the community of true families is a society of co-living, co-prosperity and co-righteousness upon the foundation of true love.

Still, the community of true family does automatically not become a society of co-living, co-prosperity and co-righteousness. Just as humanity has autonomic responsibility family has a responsibility as

a family. The responsibility to make all families of a society become true family centering on God is a responsibility as a connected body. A society is maintained through give-and-receive relationship, which gives precedence to the value of social common goodness, but still does not disregard the value of true family; that is, through the responsibility as a connected body in which independence and relationship between values are engaged in developmental interaction. Therefore, the social environment of co-righteousness that can realize a true family is also very important.

2. The Principle of Co-Living

The Principle of Co-living is an economic thought "The Principle of Co-living is a thought of co-ownership based on God's true love." In other words, "Co-living is a thought of co-ownership based on true love of God."³⁾ Here, joint ownership does not simply mean a material possession. In terms of ownership, capitalistic economy recognizes private ownership, and socialism or communism premises social ownership. The view on ownership in the principle of Co-living starts with spiritual possession called 'love' at its center, overcoming the limit of both capitalism and communism which talk only about material possession. Therefore, ownership in the principle of Co-living signifies "first, co-ownership between God and me."⁴⁾ This being the case, the idea of ownership in the principle of Co-living may be called 'public ownership'

In 'public ownership' like this, both human beings and nature possess in common what belongs to God. Accordingly, it can not only break from the selfish individualism which the fallen humanity has, but also escape from totalitarian view of ownership which ignores the individual ownership by human beings who, as individual truth body, resemble God.

According to the Unification Principle, the world of creation belongs to God, the Creator. "It is because, originally, the world of creation is under the dominion of God and love."⁵⁾ God is of public character since He is the owner of everything including human beings. Therefore, seen from the relationship of God and human beings, it is the relationship of parents and children centered on true love. The unit by which parents and children live together is the family, and the family based on true love means the family where things that belong to the family belong to parents and children as well, thus a joint ownership.

Therefore, the joint ownership under the principle of Co-living can

be formalized as the idea of co-ownership between God and me, the whole and me, and the neighborhood and me based on God's true love. Then, what would be the extent of the joint ownership? According to Unification Thought, "that is the extent that accords with one's means, that is, reasonable ownership."⁶⁾ Also, that reasonable ownership is entrusted to one's own conscience. It is possible because the conscience is the original mind which the original humanity has. Since humanity knows that psychological desire has a greater value than material desire, the reasonable ownership according to one's own conscience can be attainable.

Further, whereas common property reasonable ownership can be attainable it is not identical in quantity and quality. It is because although an individual exists as a connected body, each individual has an individual image as an individual truth body as well. Accordingly, it is not an equal distribution, but a reasonable distribution, and induces a distribution which aims at the possession by the whole. Besides, joint ownership makes fair the distribution process of lack goods. It is because since that possession is based on unselfish love, one can control the quantity and quality of one's reasonable ownership as much as one likes.

Besides, the principle of Co-living does not regard an economic activity simply as a distribution process of material goods. The economic activity under the principle of Co-living is defined as a unified process in which Heart, love, appreciation and harmony flow together. It is because "goods themselves are also an physical and spiritual body in which sincere heart and love put together. The distribution process itself is also a physical and spiritual process in which sincere heart and love of the subjects in an economic activity flow together."⁷⁾

3. The Principle of Co-prosperity

"The principle of Co-prosperity is a political thought of about a political aspect of an ideal society."⁸⁾ According to Unification Thought the principle of Co-prosperity is especially regarded as an alternative to the political ideology in capitalistic democracy.⁹⁾ Due to its structural contradiction, democracy based on capitalism has the problem of rich and poor coming from the disproportionate distribution. Soon, the disparity of wealth (or maldistribution of wealth) caused economic inequality and charged people with lack of freedom. Further, it is common knowledge that such a point has brought about political inequality and lack of freedom. In other

words, democracy based on capitalism is full of flaws to the extent that it is challenged by communists. Besides, in the capitalistic democracy, selfish individualism came to stand unrivaled and all sorts of irregularities, corruption and crime came to overflow.

The principle of Co-prosperity that was suggested, more than others, as an alternative to democracy based on capitalism may, in short, be called a thought on common politics. Common politics signifies a political system and operation under common participation. Common participation means a participation through an election of representatives that accords with the idea of democracy in its true sense. The important point in electing representatives is to elect those who offered themselves as "brother and sisters in a family based on God's true love and attends the Messiah in the place of God as True Parents of humanity."¹⁰

Also, it means a common participation where people running as representative are recommended thoroughly by their neighbors and are elected through a lottery form accompanied by solemn prayer and ceremony and accept its result as the will of God. Therefore, a common politics in the principle of Co-prosperity can take rank with "a politics for brothers, by brothers and of brothers centered on true parents of human beings."¹¹ This being the case, the principle of Co-prosperity can be regarded as a politics of common participation centered on Godism rather than as a democratic politics.

This is different from cosmopolitanism. although it can be viewed as a cosmopolitanism in its real meaning because it is an idea of brotherhood in which the entire human beings, after the world is united as one country, attend one center as parents and have a brother and sister relationship as children of that parents. Since the unification of the world was not realized and true parents of humanity have not appeared, how even cosmopolitanism hasn't witnessed its realization in spite of the existence of its idea.

The ultimate system of government which the principle of Co-prosperity aims at is a Messianic kingdom. The a Messianic kingdom establishes a society of extended family of true love centered on the Messiah, who is the true parent of human beings, and does a common politics by common participation. Here, it is clear that the Messianic kingdom does not signify an idea of a local country or a traditional monarchy system. Therefore, we can say that although the advent of the Messiah is realized in a chosen land, which is one of local nations, the realization of the Messianic kingdom is possible only after the world is unified.

The allotment of power in the political system based on the

principle of Co-prosperity, which the Unification Principle explains clearly, accords with the idea of division of the three powers. This is not a division of powers aimed at restraining abuse of power as Montesquieu asserted, but rather it is in the sense of sharing power in order to harmonize the three powers. "Power in the principle of Co-prosperity talks about authority of true love and represents a heartistic power which makes an object feel appreciation for a subject's true love from the bottom of his heart and thus voluntarily obey the subject's idea."¹²

Therefore, we can say that the allotment of powers in the principle of Co-prosperity is just like "each of many organs of a body taking a share of many kinds of physiological functions and organically cooperating with each other for the common purpose of maintaining the human body."¹³ This is based on the fact that, when God created the world, He shaped His ideas on the ideal form of the kingdom of Heaven on earth after the model of human body. Accordingly, the structure of a nation in the ideal world resembles a human bodily structure. For example, as if the functions of internal organs in human body including lungs, heart, stomach and bowels are eternal and immortal, the three departments of administration, legislature, and judicature and their functions are eternal and unchanging in the ideal world.

4. The Principle of Co-righteousness

The principle of Co-righteousness is a thought of common ethics. Therefore, the principle of Co-righteousness is "a thought that all people should establish a sound moral society, that is, a society of common ethics by observing and practicing morality and ethics both publicly and personally."¹⁴ Also, the principle of Co-righteousness is the ethics of an ideal society, that is, the value of a society of common ethics whereby entire people, irrespective of rank, live keeping a view on ethics in common.

Therefore, the principle of Co-righteousness is a vision of a future society where even religion has disappeared. A society of the principle of Co-righteousness is one where people lead a life of true love, that is, a life of heaven in the realities of life along with the Messiah who is True Parents. Since everybody in such a society lives on with the identical view on value, religious doctrines centered on faith up until that time come to change to life ethics centered around practice. We refer to this kind of ideal society as a society of common ethics, that is the society of the principle of Co-righteousness.

Characteristics of this society of the principle of Co-righteousness is that it is "first supported by the true love movement the Three Great Subject Thought in accordance with in society."¹⁵ According to the *Three Great Subject Thought*, the three great centers, that is parents who are the center of a family, teachers who are the center of a school and managers who are the center of supervision, give God's true love infinitely to their own objects, that is children, students and employees, thus advancing love among each other and finally making the entire society a society of love and ethics. Any gap that may exist can be extinguished by this kind of true love. For example, "poverty will soon disappear by true love of those who have even a little bit more, the alienated people will soon be consoled by true love of those in charge of management and those who feel drain of knowledge will soon have the drain satisfied by true love of knowledgeable people."¹⁶ It is because true love is initiated by heart and love of God who can't help taking care of people in need.

Secondly, common ethics of the principle of Co-righteousness is an expanded form of true family ethics. This is because the family foundation established by true parents and true children centered on true love is the basis of a society of common ethics. When this family ethics is expanded, the whole society comes to be filled with true love of God. This is common ethics of the principle of Co-righteousness.

5. The Principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness

Whereas the principle of Co-living, the principle of Co-prosperity and the principle of Co-righteousness which we have examined so far have individual concepts and contents, they are not divided thoughts. A concept as the whole united with the principle of Co-living, the principle of Co-prosperity and the principle of Co-righteousness takes precedence. It is because the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness form a theory of an ideal society as the whole.

In spite of that, looking into the relationship among Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness is the basis of understanding the concept as the whole. The foundation of the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness is the principle of Co-righteousness. Here, Co-righteousness goes beyond the concept of justice that is generally talked about. According to *J. Rawls*, justice has fairness as its attribute. We can say that the nature of fairness is a primitive social contract as in natural state.¹⁷ One of the principles of this justice is that each individual equally shares freedom that can be

harmonized with other people's freedom and the other is to solve social inequality by mediating social inequality reasonably to everybody's interest.

By emphasizing that justice rests on true love, however, common ethics of the principle of Co-righteousness makes it clear that fair distribution can be controlled through true love for the sake of others. Therefore, the principle of Co-righteousness has a feature of being a view on value which manages an economic and political system of a future society, that is, an ideal society. Further, with the principle of Co-living, the principle of Co-prosperity and the principle of Co-righteousness united centered on God, the world of the ideal of creation which God has envisioned can be fulfilled.

III. Utopia Thought of Thomas More

1. Utopia and The Background of Utopia

Thomas More's 'Utopia' means a place that does not exist in the world(outopia) or a good place in the world(eutopia). In Korean, it may correspond to 'an ideal land'. Unlike what our 'ideal land' has means, however, his utopia covers a more specific phase of social life.

Europe at the time More wrote 'Utopia' was suffering from a serious confusion in political system caused by religious reform. Owing to its political ambition, each religious denomination then was concealing serious economic problems, which modern economic system of that time was developing, and their significance. More brought up this very problem and severely criticized from the position of humanism the negative aspects of possession or acquired economy which the modern economy aimed at.

Further, the problems dealt with in 'Utopia' are not restricted simply to one era, either. The problems of poverty and wealth, education, health, food, clothing and shelter are universal and constant. Thomas More deals with these problems with the spirit of Renaissance humanism. Accordingly, while he fundamentally tries to make an effort for understanding and improving to poor and unfortunate people, he lets loose his anger on so-called leisure class who is well off with unearned income.

Thomas More's critical spirit like this is embroidered with Renaissance humanism, that is, the hope that one can shape oneself and form a society according to what human beings choose. We may say that because of this point Thomas More could conceive 'Utopia' as the best society on earth. Because of these factors, 'Utopia' draws our

attention while it is seen as something far from us as well. Therefore, although it is an art work made from ideals that do not exist in reality, it produce a critical spirit to the current world at the same time.

'Utopia' has as its background the era corresponding to the peak of Renaissance, from 1492 to 1520. This era is characterized as the rise of absolute monarchy, weakening of Catholic church, victory of humanism and the emphasis of Greek classics on Scholasticism. Accordingly, it is not a coincidence at all that 'Utopia' concurred with the time when Machiavelli's 'The Prince' or Erasmus' 'Praise of Folly' were written. When we look at the other side of Thomas More's criticism, we need to note that it becomes the basis of a new political science which Machiavelli proposed in 'The Prince.' In other words, the reason that Thomas More is an idealist and Machiavelli become a realist is a product of the era with the same foundation. Originality of 'Utopia' can be found first in its form. Thomas More explains a perfected ideal world as if it actually exists.

Secondly, originality more important than form is hedonism and the communism shown in 'Utopia.' Pleasure is the national purpose of utopia. He asserts that Utopia is the best society because it guarantees welfare and happiness of everyone who lives in it, and that the acme of the welfare and happiness lies in pleasure. Since the pleasure glorifies life on earth, people in Utopia are typical Renaissance human beings. Pleasure is, of course, a word whose meaning ranges quite extensively, but in the sense that Thomas More saw good behavior and moral act constitute the source of pleasure, he made Epicureanism transform.

Understanding of pleasure directly develops into Utopia's understanding of Communism. Communism in 'Utopia' is not an aim, but a means. It is a means by which all citizens, either as a group or as an individual, can enjoy pleasure. As its evidence, Thomas More mobilizes the primeval Christianity and Plato. Whereas in Plato's 'The Republic' Communism of ruling class alone is stressed, in 'Utopia' the whole society is Communistic. Thomas More emphasizes the solidarity of family and advocates democracy of noble cause in contrast to aristocratism. In other words, he is primarily talking about common ownership system including food, clothing and shelter. Besides, he is designing a society where everyone lives with one thinking and mind, and he emphasizes that material communism can be made perfect by mental unification.

Thomas More's Utopia leaves a room for making things totalitarian by restraining change in excess of putting too much emphasis on

harmony. In countries that emphasize social harmony or totality, there is not a single exception in the role of secret police being powerful in modern society. So, the part where Thomas More inquires into the authenticity of religion makes us doubtful of whether it is indeed for happiness or pleasure. It is because spiritual communism or the uniformity system is more appalling than material one. Humanists of that time, however, welcomed Thomas More's communism. It was because his communism was a lower concept of Christianity.

Thomas More's original importance may be said to lie in his critical nature rather than in his ideal. Since his ideal is for progress and social control, it needs a new criticism on real society. In particular, we need to pay attention to Thomas More's Utopia in relation to today's 'Distopia.' It is because the utmost ideal always accompanies the worst despair.

2. 'Utopia' Thought

1) Human Beings and Society

Thomas More's Utopia where altruism and peace exist in selfishness and war, voluntary cooperation and agreement exist in despotism and tyranny, fair distribution exists in the maldistribution of wealth, and religious freedom and tolerance exist in religious persecution and oppression designs a world totally different from then European society. We may say that Utopia is what More thinks is the utmost society and Utopians are those who he thinks are the best people. Utopians could accomplish prosperity and happiness because they were supported by social environment, which, among evil and goodness that exist in human nature, restrained evil and made the impulse of goodness manifest itself. Also, what made Utopians be virtuous is their social system and environment. Accordingly, Thomas More saw that it is not so much a product of human nature as a product in society that brings forth good quality and virtue. Still, More does not say that the source of all goodness and evil exists in a social system alone. It is because he believed from the position of an orthodox Christian that human nature is susceptible to falling into evil. Still, he was not indulged in the viewpoint that human beings are completely fallen. He believed in good nature and potential that are immanent in human self. He asserted that, based on this double-sided characteristics of human nature, one can reach an ideal society by establishing a society that can inhibit factors of human evil, that is, negative factors, and actively expand positive aspects of a human

being, that is, factors of goodness.

Also, More did not see that all evils in human society originate from social system alone, and, thus, did not think that all sins and the source of sins would be eradicated through social regulation or economic improvement alone. He saw that the root of evil is stuck very deeply in human minds. More's negative and critical viewpoint on human nature as is shown above is the reflection of his Christian view on human beings. More's Utopia appeared as the form of a society with a binding power in order to restrain human beings it results from pessimistic and negative viewpoint on human beings.

2) A Society with Co-ownership System

Then, what would be a society be like that will become the foundation of the ideal society More thought of? The society is co-ownership, which abolished private ownership or monetary economy. He asserted that, for social justice and social prosperity, the abolition of the system of private ownership of all things would be a fundamental solution. "Where private property exists and everything is judged by money, justice and prosperity cannot be realized. Where the worst persons possess the best thing, there can not be justice. Where an extremely few persons share everything, there cannot be prosperity."¹⁸⁾ The way to reach the welfare of the entire community lies in maintaining equality in all aspects. Would such equality be indeed possible in a place where an individual's belonging are recognized as private property? So long as goods are not infinite at all, if anyone should claim absolute property rights to all the property one has, a few would certainly come to possess the goods and the rest would become poor. It is absolutely necessary that even the poor should be able to live, as other affluent people should do. The reason is that the rich, who are avaricious and shameless, are useless people and attributes less to the society than people who are good, and maintain living by working everyday. Therefore, as long as private property is not abolished, fair and equal distribution of wealth and happiness in human world can not exist. Thus there is no way for the good people who occupy the greatest portion of humanity to find their way out of the chain of poverty and misery."¹⁹⁾ More's abolishing private property and having the co-ownership system as the basis of the ideal society had its aim at realizing social justice. He defined that the society where illegality is committed and abuse and misuse of the law is ordinary is anti-utopian.

More insists that, when it becomes a society of co-ownership system, not only does the disparity in wealthy disappear through the

fair distribution, but also an individual's selfishness becomes extinct and the individual comes to work for the sake of the welfare of the public, not for himself. When such a society is realized, all people come not to worry about one's own life, family or the future of one's descendant. Also, even when one gets too old to work, he can get the same treatment as people of other ages. Accordingly, they can always live pleasantly and merrily. In other words, More' Utopia is not a society in exclusive support of abundance that satisfies people's desire to the maximum through maximizing production and wealth. It is safe to say that his Utopia is a self-supporting and self-sustaining cooperative society to have people get self-satisfaction by restraining their desire. Therefore, whereas the perfect equality toward work and enjoyment exists there, control throughout entire human life and restriction on freedom exists.²⁰⁾

As was explained so far, the social system in Utopia was a necessary way and a condition to eradicate social evil and its root. He sees that the abolition of private ownership system and monetary system is a way to get rid of human selfishness and greed, it means that fundamentally the root of evil inheres deeply in human nature rather than in a social system. Still, More does not think that a social system is irrelevant to evil. What he means is that, even though the evils in Europe in 16th century were rampant upon the social soil, it originated from a factor more fundamental than social environment, that is, human true nature. Seen in this way, there is something in More that is different from modern socialists. Modern socialists insist that the source of social evil lies in social system, in private ownership, in particular. They think that the private ownership system caused the confrontation between bourgeois and proletariat and between the exploiters and the exploited, which in turn resulted in social conflicts. Therefore, they insist that, only when the private ownership system is abolished, social evils cease to exist completely and a classless equal society can be realized.

3) Welfare Society

As More insisted that 'the only way to get to the welfare of the whole is an equality in all aspects,' justice and equality are ultimately concluded as the ideas for welfare and happiness. The relationship between justice and welfare and happiness is like two sides of a coin. Both sides are the basic conditions for the realization of ideal society and its aim at the same time. We can say that it is the two most reliable axes that help maintain a society. Social justice can not be fulfilled without meeting material demand and economic prosperity.

Also, no matter how much a society eulogizes its material prosperity, the society can not be maintained for a long time so far as true justice does not exist there. Therefore, justice and welfare are the ultimate goal of all societies and become the standard that judges whether or not the social system is appropriate. For More, The utmost system based on justice and equality may be regarded as the very optimum way for the realization of welfare.

More's principle of distribution justice rests on fairness, that is, equality. What More explains in *Utopia* is a perfect and overall equality. According to the natural law, Utopians are all equal in the natural law. There can be neither an oppressor nor the oppressed in *Utopia*. Public officials are, for the most part, chosen by election and their term of office is fixed to one year. Since all goods are shared in common, they are all affluent while actually they have nothing at all. People all work equally six hours everyday, and the rest time is employed well on leisure depending on a certain standard. Since the division of labor is not practised, city-dwelling people and farmers are shifted with each other every two years and living quarters are also exchanged every ten years by lottery. Equal education is given to anyone and everybody eats on a common table and wears almost common clothes. In this aspect, More's aim could be said to be not only the fair distribution of goods but also a perfect equality that treats all people equally throughout the whole human life. He thought that the equality is indeed an indispensable condition to establish a rightful social order.

More's thinking on justice is closely related with the concept on 'equality.' Equality is a judgement defined according to conscience, reason and justice inherent in the natural law and nature. Therefore, justice becomes a major means that makes the legal concept of equality more perfect by revising and complementing the positive law. So, justice can be said to be a concept expressed on the premise that law can be imperfect or insufficient, that the execution of law can be a violation of justice and, further, and that there can be conflict arising between justice of the positive law and that of the natural law.

Equality is a judgement that depends on the spirit of innate law which transcends the formal provisions of law. It is a right and claim that should be duly recognized even though it is not elucidated in the positive law. More was looking straight at social law system contrary to equality and absurdity of its operation. However, what enraged More more than anything else was that the so-called rich people were legitimizing and justifying their exploitation of the poor by

making use of public laws. It was because the rich, having enacted laws in order to accumulate property by all sorts of unfair means, were declaring it with the justification that they were for the sake of public good. While claiming the goods which they acquired by all kinds of dishonest ways as their private property, the rich enacted laws in order to protect the goods. Contrary to this, in *Utopia* society where private property does not exist, there is no conspiracy or injustice of the rich and, thus, many laws are not necessary, either. Justice and equality are maintained and distribution is done evenly just by some number of simple and lucid laws. It is because the law in *Utopia* society is based upon nature and reason.²¹⁾

4) Pleasure and Hedonism

More divides genuine pleasure into physical pleasure and spiritual pleasure.²²⁾ Bodily pleasure is again divided into sensual pleasure and health. Spiritual pleasure includes intellectual activity, joy coming from meditation on truth, recollection on sincere life of the past or a firm expectation of happiness to come. However, the best of the spiritual pleasure lies in a good life putting virtue into practice. Therefore, the pursuit of the truth and intellectual activity should be aimed at cultivating and practicing virtue.

Also, there is their own order in the values of pleasure. The top of physical pleasure is health and the first of spiritual pleasure is the practice of virtue. There is a greater value in the spiritual pleasure than in the physical pleasure. Then, what are the norms humanity should observe practically and concretely in order to seek after genuine pleasure? First, one should not let the pursuit of a smaller pleasure hinder or lose a bigger pleasure. Next, one should not let the pursuit of pleasure cause suffering or sadness afterward. Finally, one's pleasure should not trouble or do harm to others. So long as pleasure does not conflict the above three norms, it may be called a good and real pleasure.

More did not believe that humanity's happiness lies in pleasure at all. He also says that all pleasures cannot be estimated equally. The reason why he believes that happiness exists only in certain sorts of pleasure depends on his religious and moral viewpoint. According to More, pleasure can be protected when it is based on what can be regarded as three sources of religion; the immortality of soul, God's Providence for the happiness of humankind and the judgment and compensation on the doomsday. It is because, in case people deny these religious sources, they will stick at nothing to seek after their pleasure alone and such pursuit of pleasure will cause pain in the

end and all efforts to accumulate goodness in the present world has no meaning at all. Therefore, the pursuit of real happiness is insufficient with reason alone that neglects the religious sources, and is possible when the reason accepts the bases. Accordingly, we can see that reason and faith are placed together in More's thought.

Next, More says that in pleasure there is one that originates from good desire and motivation and the other from false and mean desire. It means that More divides pleasure into real pleasure and false one. True pleasure is often good and fair, and the false pleasure is wrongly recognized as pleasure even though there is nothing pleasant in itself. Therefore, when one pursues pleasure, a norm that one must observe is demanded.²³⁾

The concept that deserves attention in More's theory of pleasure is reason.²⁴⁾ As More indicated, to conform to nature is to obey directions of reason. This thinking means that the principles of reason and nature are the same. Therefore, reason is the source of virtue along with nature and always seeks after a pleasant thing in its true character. Reason, however, does not order human beings to seek after their own pleasure only. Rather, it leads human beings to love God who created them and endowed them with the possibility of happiness. Besides, reason asks people to love their neighbors. In other words, reason orders people to cooperate not only for their own happiness and welfare, but also for other's happiness and welfare. Seen in this way, More's principle on pleasure can be thought to be close to religious altruism that allows reasonable thinking.

IV. The Principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness and Utopianism by Thomas More

1. Human Beings and Society

Whereas, in a broad sense, the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness understands human beings as a family being, More's utopianism shows a difference in understanding them as a social being. There is, of course, essential and realistic distinction that unlike the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness, which sees that human true nature aims at goodness, More's Utopianism thinks that human nature has the dual characters of good and evil. Accordingly, whereas the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness views human beings optimistically and positively, More's Utopianism has a pessimistic and negative view on them.

The principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness see that human virtue can be acquired and trained through family. However, More's Utopianism fills the gap between an individual and society with social environment by insisting that human virtue can be realized through social environment. By placing family in the middle between an individual and society, the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness has a passage structure, which claims that an individual is perfected by family and a complete society starts from a perfected family.

Contrast like this should not go to an extreme. It is because More's Utopianism did not make positive element in human trueness come to nothing. Besides, he did not think that the origin of all evils would be destroyed by way of social system alone. In spite of that, the point by which More's Utopianism is different from the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness on human beings and society is that socialist attribute is very emphasized in More's Utopianism because of historic reality at that time.

2. The Principle of Co-living and The Society of Co-ownership System

The view on possession in the principle of Co-living is, in short, common private ownership. Common possession stands for a possession within one's means, that is, fair possession. Public possession means co-ownership between God and me on the premise of spiritual possession called 'love.' Co-ownership, namely, public possession, possible is because of the conscience that everyone comes to have once everyone is restored as an original human being.

Still, common private ownership is not indiscriminately equal. It is because common possession is a fair distribution when it is seen from the aspect of distribution. Since it also is a common distribution based on unselfish love, it can fairly distribute quantity and quality of a fair possession as much as it wants. Compared to this, More's society of co-ownership system tries to abolish private ownership system and monetary economy that upholds the system. It is because nothing but social justice and equality is absolutely requested in order to reform a society of injustice and inequality resulting from private ownership system.

Equal possession, however, cannot make humanity's possession desire stop forever. It is because, according to the principle of Co-living, a human being is an individual truth incarnation and a connected body at the same time. God created human beings so that they are

harmonized with the whole while respecting each other's individuality. A human being, who has recovered his lost original mind and has experienced God's love through his heart not only controls his selfishness fully, but also does not take the whole as a means.

Also, even though a society of co-ownership system is capable of realizing a fundamental equality by abolishing and disciplining the private ownership system and unearned income bracket on the level of social justice, it is not as righteous as reasonable possession. It is because a system that can make a human's greed stop cannot exist and because it can rather give birth to another bracket of possession.

3. The Principle of Co-prosperity and A Welfare Society

More's Utopianism, that is, the realization of an ideal society, is to fulfill a happy welfare society. More's Utopianism makes it clear that a happy welfare society is not realized simply by material prosperity. More's Utopianism puts the ideological basis of the realization of a welfare society on social justice and equality.

In a welfare society, justice of distribution should be made and people are equal in front of natural law. A welfare society leads all people to a genuine pleasure through an equal happiness and More's Utopianism seeks after a society of welfare and prosperity that satisfies spiritual happiness and material happiness at the same time. Like this, a welfare society is in a close relationship with a society of co-ownership system because common possession and a fair distribution of goods are a very important part in happiness and pleasure of human beings.

Compared to More's welfare society, the principle of Co-prosperity advocates co-politics. It is because a political ideology that can solve the contradiction of democracy based on capitalism, that is, the problem of economic inequality is the principle of Co-prosperity through co-politics. In this way, the principle of Co-prosperity also criticizes superficiality of capitalism as More's Utopianism did and suggests a political ideology as its alternative.

Having already advocated a reasonable possession in the principle of Co-living, however, the principle of Co-prosperity talks about a political body that establishes a society of large family of true love centered on the Messiah and operates co-politics by co-participation as a political ideology which can guarantee and maintain the reasonable possession. Therefore, the principle of Co-prosperity aims at a society that co-prospers on the basis of Heart and love centered

on God. The principle of Co-prosperity refers to a power love as the authority of true.

Therefore, whereas More's welfare society intends to accomplish spiritual happiness and pleasure by systemizing social justice and equality where material happiness and pleasure are dealt with first, the principle of Co-prosperity points out that it is impossible with social systems such as justice and equality. It makes it clear that politics of common participation based on God's true love can solve such problems.

4. The Principle of Co-righteousness and Hedonism

Being a thought of common ethics, the principle of Co-righteousness puts love at its center. The ethical foundation of More's Utopianism rests on pleasure. However, the principle of Co-righteousness and hedonism are the same in that they are all aimed at happiness. As a way to reach happiness, the principle of Co-righteousness refers to love and More's Utopianism mentions pleasure. The Principle of Co-righteousness says that the way to accomplish love which leads to happiness is to follow desire. Still, it does not talk about the whole of desire. One should follow the original good desire. It is the same as More's Utopianism, which does not say that all pleasures are the way to reach happiness.

The difference between the principle of Co-righteousness and hedonism lies in the structure to realize love and pleasure. In other words, while the principle of Co-righteousness thinks that the basic structure to realize love lies in the family, hedonism sees that the structure to lead to pleasure can be originated in a social system. It is clear that family and society are the structures that transcend an individual. However, we can find that a more buffering structure is needed if it is true that the socialization process that leads to justice and equality has failed historically.

The principle of Co-righteousness putting up the family as a buffering structure has a very reasonable aspect since More's Utopianism, as is said in hedonism, relied too much on the reason of an individual in realizing social justice and equality, thus only remaining ideal. The families in the principle of Co-righteousness is a structure in which one experiences ethics of love. The principle says that, When such ethics expands socially, we can achieve a society of common ethics.

Of course, the principle of Co-righteousness also pays attention to the problem of how to get away from family selfishness, which we may say to be almost inborn. Therefore, common ethics of love through family is the ethics by which one achieves a true family by

realizing true love after learning and realizing God's heart. God's heart, being sad and painful resulting from the human fall, is definitely deeper than hedonism which aims at pleasure. It is because God's heart like this demands human beings to keep ethics of living for the sake of others.

V. Conclusion

The novum of the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness lies in the ultimate accomplishment of historic Utopianism, which arose from the natural manifestation of the original nature of human beings who aspire after the ideal of creation. As an ideology that ultimately completes the reality which not only capitalism but also socialism and Communism have tried to achieve and, further, establishes a new reality, the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness is a vision that realizes a perfect society, namely the ultimate ideal of human history. It is because the unwavering foundation of true love alone can realize eutopia, not outopia.

Notes

- 1) The Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity, *The Divine Principle*, (Seoul: Sung-Hwa Publishing Company, 1995), pp.473-474.
- 2) *In the Unification Principle*, "Thomas More's Utopia, written in sixteenth-century England, expressed a vision of the socialist ideal. Their inclination toward socialism originated from the natural impulse of the original mind as it pursues the ideal of creation." (op.cit., *Divine Principle*, p.472) Thus, the Principle makes it clear that Thomas More's Utopia thought for the ideal society which the humanity aims at appeared through the desire of the original nature of creation ahead of the society of the principles of Co-living, Co-prosperity and Co-righteousness.
- 3) Unification Thought Institute, *Outline of the Unification Thought* (Head-wing Thought), (Seoul: Sung-Hwa Publishing Company, 1993), p.758.
- 4) *Ibid.*, p.758.
- 5) *Ibid.*, p.758.

- 6) *Ibid.*, pp.762-763.
- 7) *Ibid.*, p.764.
- 8) *Ibid.*, p.765.
- 9) *Ibid.*, p.765.
- 10) *Ibid.*, p.772.
- 11) *Ibid.*, p.773.
- 12) *Ibid.*, p.775.
- 13) *Ibid.*, p.775.
- 14) *Ibid.*, p.776.
- 15) *Ibid.*, p.778.
- 16) *Ibid.*, p.778.
- 17) Rawls, John., *A Theory of Justice*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), pp.60-61.
- 18) T. More, G. M. Logan(ed.), *Utopia*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p.38.
- 19) *Ibid.*, p.39.
- 20) There are critics who say that, even though More's Utopia aims at perfect justice and equality, a close examination of his social structure and form shows many contradictions and inconsistency. The slavery or a lifetime monarchism, or the labor exemption for special classes such as people in public positions, churchmen or scholars definitely goes against the principle of a perfect equality, even though it has its own reservations within itself. Also, we can say that to acknowledge a family system while abolishing a private ownership system in order to get rid of attachment and selfishness toward private ownership at the same time goes against the basic spirit of perfect co-ownership system. In this respect, we doubt the fundamental intention that is shown in More's Utopia. We criticize that his co-ownership system is not a practicable social plan or formulation of a policy, but is nothing more a visionary fiction and intellectual play of a humanist. Refer to *Utopia*, pp.xxii-xxiv.
- 21) See *Utopia*, pp.21-25, 32-34, 38-39, 87, 107-109.
- 22) Refer to *Ibid.*, p.65.
- 23) Refer to *Ibid.*, p.74.
- 24) *Ibid.*, p.71.

References

- 1) The Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity, *The Divine Principle*, (Seoul: Sung-Hwa Publishing Company, 1995.)
- 2) Kim, Young Han, *Ideal Society and Utopia*, Citizen Lecture of Korean History Vol. 10. (Seoul: Il-Jo-Gak, 1992.)
- 3) Unification Thought Institute, *Outline of the Unification Thought(Head-wing Thought)*, (Seoul: Sung-Hwa Publishing Company, 1993).
- 4) Rawls, John., *A Theory of Justice*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971).
- 5) T. More, G. M. Logan(ed.), *Utopia*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

SESSION III

A New View of God and A New Theory of Creation

Chairman : Antonio L. Betancourt L.

Presentation:

- A Proposal of a New Creation Theory
Akifumi Otani
- Keeping The Family:
Coping with the Challenges of the 21st Century
Atty. Celso C. Talaba