

15<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Unification Thought  
Moscow, November 27-30, 2003

## **Moral Responsibility of Intellectuals: The Cosmic Good and the Liberation of the Original Conscience**

Keisuke Noda Ph.D. Unification Theological Seminary, New York  
(This paper is based upon my essay for the forthcoming *Journal of Unification Studies 2003-2004.*)

This essay explores the question of the moral responsibility of intellectuals. While scientists in social, natural, and human sciences contribute the advancement of disciplines, social progress, and community building, they can also become bearers of devastating or harmful causes. In some cases, intellectuals are simply manipulated and used by political leaders, and in other cases, they become strong advocates of harmful causes. When a society or community a scientist belongs to goes toward a wrong direction, it is hard to notice the danger. Otherwise quite conscientious individuals can lose sight and become leading advocates of the wrong causes. When one is living in a mad society, it is hard to notice the madness.

The essay focuses on the broad issue of the work of conscience. It inquires into the question of how and why the conscience is paralyzed and pursues the answer for the liberation of conscience from Unificationist perspective.

### **Introduction**

In 1933, Martin Heidegger became the first National Socialist rector of the University of Freiburg. He delivered a public speech entitled "Role of the University in the New Reich" in which he praised and celebrated the rise of the new Nazi Germany. This speech caused a political uproar after the war in philosophical community and the debate concerning his political responsibility as a leading intellectual is still lingering today. One of central questions is why such a brilliant intellectual, gifted with insights and the power of reasoning, could not see the problems of Nazi during the war. Heidegger is not just an ordinary intellectual, at least in the philosophical community. He is a monumental philosopher who initiated a new philosophical movement and his insights had a tremendous impact within and beyond the philosophical community. He sharply criticized the entire philosophical tradition of the west and the domination of technology in the 20<sup>th</sup> century civilization. How could a person who is gifted with such critical intellectual skills not see the problems of his time?

The "mistakes" of intellectuals apply not only to Heidegger but also countless other brilliant intellectuals. After the war, the majority of intellectuals including

those who publicly supported the Nazi realized their blindness during the war and felt deep sorrow for the events of Holocaust.<sup>1</sup>

What is the status of the conscience throughout an individual's life before and after a war? Was it functioning the same way or not? Does man become less conscientious at one time and more conscientious at another time? Or is man conscientious or trying to be conscientious throughout, yet fall into a pitfall one can not see?

It seems to me that these intellectuals are equally trying to be conscientious throughout their lives. At no time, they I believe did not intentionally pursue evil, yet their conscience was not working in authentic manner.

In the case of Heidegger, the issues concerning the work of the conscience are deep. Conscience is one of the key concepts in Heidegger's major work, *Being and Time* (1927).<sup>2</sup> In this work, Heidegger claims that one must listen to the voice of one's conscience in order to return to one's authentic self. In everyday life, man lives in an inauthentic manner by losing himself in the masses of society. To restore one's authentic self, one must open his heart and listen to the voice of one's own conscience. Heidegger was deeply aware of the importance of the conscience in the restoration of the original self.

What was Heidegger's "conscience" doing when he supported Nazi Germany? If it was working, what was wrong with it? What clouded his conscience? And again these questions apply to all the other intellectuals who also supported Nazi Germany. But the question of the conscience is not limited to these intellectuals but it is applicable to everyone including religious believers.

When we turn our attention to the religious community, we can see another troubling problem, that of those who are compassionate and kind to people within the same religious community can take an indifferent or even cruel attitude to those who are outside of their own faith community.

Individuals are trying to be faithful to their religious creeds and are more or less trying to live conscientiously. According to the moral standards set by its own tradition, they are making an effort to live a conscientious life.

When we step out of the boundaries of a particular faith tradition, we sometimes encounter serious conflicts among different religious communities. Take for example the conflicts among the Jewish, Islamic, and Christian traditions. There are conflicts among sects within the same faith tradition as well.

Each individual may be a conscientious believer, yet there are serious conflicts and struggles amongst different faith communities. Doesn't the conscience of each believer guide him or her to the peaceful and compassionate resolution of such conflicts? Isn't faith in God sufficient in order to cultivate the conscience? Fanatics who are engaged in terrorism usually show no remorse to

---

<sup>1</sup> Heidegger retired from the university after the war. He kept his silence and made no public comment about his wartime action to support the Nazis after the war.

<sup>2</sup> See section 55, 56, 57 of Heidegger's *Being and Time*.

anyone beyond their own communities, yet show compassion for those in the same community. Is there any difference between the supporters of Nazi Germany and these religious fanatics as far as the state of their conscience is concerned? Is our conscience extremely limited? Do the limits of conscience apply to everyone?

How much do we rely on people's conscience when we try to make a better society? In light of the diversity of beliefs and interests, if we have to rely on the conscience we must consider ways of improving or redeeming or restoring the authentic function of the conscience.<sup>3</sup> Moral teachings and education are in vain if man's conscience is severely paralyzed.

While the conscience is important especially in light of a global community with a wide range of views, ideas, and faiths, there are apparently some problems for the conscience. In the main text of the teachings of Rev. Moon, *Exposition of Divine Principle*, the conscience is defined as the faculty of mind to lead one to good. "The *conscience* is that faculty of the human mind which, by virtue its inborn nature, always directs us toward what we think is good."<sup>4</sup>

Because "what we think is good" greatly differs from individual to individual, and group to group, the pursuit of good results in the social conflicts and struggles. The Divine Principle also points out the existence of the "the original mind" as the complimentary counterpart of the conscience. While the conscience pursues what one thinks is good, the original mind pursues the original standard which God inscribed onto man. "The *original mind* is that faculty of the human mind which pursues absolute goodness."<sup>5</sup> Because of the presence of the original mind, the conscience is constantly guided and oriented to the original or authentic state.

What is then the path the conscience is to take to fulfill its original function? This essay will address the problems of the conscience in relation to the concept of good, the barriers for the proper functioning of conscience, and the perspectives of Unificationism that can contribute to the redemption of the conscience.

---

<sup>3</sup> In the speech entitled "Let's find the authentic self," Rev. Moon discussed the need of the liberation of the conscience. In this speech, he explained the importance of the conscience in restoring the genuine self and characterized the role of the conscience in guiding one's life being superior to "parents, teacher, and even God." HSA-UWC Japan. *Dansei Houkan Syurenkai Mikotobasyu*, p. 202-09.

<sup>4</sup> HSA-UWC *Exposition of the Divine Principle* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1996). P. 50.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

## 1. Universality of the Orientation to Good in the Conscience

Everyone pursues some good. Good for oneself, one's family, one's social group and so on. This tendency or orientation of the mind towards good is universal. Although there may be self-deception, distortion, and confusion in one's self awareness, one pursues some good all the time.

This orientation of the conscience towards goodness exists as a universal phenomenon. Various key philosophers explained the universality of this orientation in different vocabularies.

Plato conceived the goodness as the essential condition which exists prior to all human activities. For Plato, the good is real and it exists beyond and prior to human life. Man is already conditioned to pursue good. Even vicious criminals and evil doers have some "defense" and justification for their acts. They will give their version of a "compelling" reason why they did such and such, if you ask them why they did what they did. Why do humans care about being just? Why do we want "justify" our acts in life?

Plato will answer that there is a reign of Good beyond and prior to human existence. That is why everyone cares about being good, and therefore tries to justify his or her acts. The pursuit of justification is a universal phenomenon of life. Plato's claim of the transcendence of good coincides with the universality of the conscience's orientation towards good.

In *The Teacher*, Augustine characterized the conscience as the "inner truth" and described the leading function of conscience as the "teacher within." When a teacher appeals the conscience of the student, the student consults with the inner standard in his or her mind. It is the inner truth within the student's mind that reveals the truthfulness of the teacher's words. The student makes his or her judgment based upon the truth within the mind. A teacher who stands in front of the student is simply assisting the student so that the student can listen to the voice of the inner truth within the soul. Everyone has this ultimate guide within the soul and it is the true teacher. He calls it the "Internal light" or the "inner truth." One seems to learn by words from the teacher outside, but one can learn because of the presence of the truth within. "For he is taught not by my words, but by the realities themselves made manifest to him by God revealing them to his inner truth."<sup>6</sup>

Understanding the truth is essentially the realization of the truth within the soul. One is awakened to the truth and the external teacher is the occasion to prompt the phenomenon of discovery.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Augustine *The Teacher* in *Ancient Christian Writers no. 9, St. Augustine, The Greatness of the Soul, The Teacher* p.179.

<sup>7</sup> Socrates understood the role of philosopher as midwifery. Midwife helps a pregnant mother so that the mother can deliver her baby safely and smoothly.

In his moral philosophy, Immanuel Kant characterized the good will as “good in itself,” which is the pre-condition of moral conduct.

A good will is not good because of what it effects or accomplishes – because of its fitness for attaining some proposed end: it is good through its willing alone – that is, good in itself.<sup>8</sup>

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger succinctly describes the transcendent nature of the conscience. The conscience calls us regardless of or sometimes against our will.

Indeed the call is precisely something which *we ourselves* have neither planned nor prepared for nor voluntarily performed, nor have we even done so. ‘It’ calls, against our expectations and even against our will. On the other hand, the call undoubtedly does not come from someone else who is with me in the world. The call comes *from me* and yet *from beyond me and over me*.<sup>9</sup>

Although the interpretation of good varies from one to another, the orientation of the mind to good is universal. The faculty of mind to pursue good seems to be universal and it coincides with the claims of Plato, Augustine, Kant, and Heidegger in the capacity described above.

## **2. Multiplicity of the Interpretation of Good and the Concealment of the Original Conscience**

### **A. Conscience on Collective Level**

---

The philosopher also helps others so that they can discover the truth hidden in their soul.

<sup>8</sup> Kant *Critique of Pure Reason* p.62. Although you may notice a flavor of Kantian deontological (duty-bound) ethics in contrast to utilitarianism in this quote, you can clearly see the unconditional nature of good in Kant’s moral philosophy. The following passage also indicates the universality of the orientation to good in mind. “What we call good must be, in the judgment of every reasonable man, an object of the faculty of desire, and evil must be, in everyone’s eyes, an object of aversion.” (Kant *Critique of Practical Reason* p. 62-63.)

<sup>9</sup>Heidegger *Being and Time* p. 320. Heidegger does not explicitly identify the origin of the conscience as God.

Although the pursuit of good is universal or common to all, particular good people pursue are diverse. What is good to one particular individual is not necessarily good to others. The pursuit of good by a particular individual can be sometimes done at the expense of others' suffering and pain. The dysfunction of the conscience in individual is the most apparent and publicly noticeable phenomena. Crimes and evil acts are publicly accused, the function of the doers' conscience is questioned, and they are criticized.

The work of the conscience on collective level has a little more complicated problem. The group can be identified by racial, religious, cultural, social, political, and economical standards. Individuals identify themselves within the framework of existing groups. For example, one identifies himself or herself not only as an independent individual but also as an American, Jewish, middleclass, black, and so on. The self-identification of an individual always involves his or her involvements to the multiple collective entities at the same time.

A historical dimension adds to the identification process. With which history or with whose history do you identify yourself is the question. By taking on a particular history as your own, you internally come to carry all the history of the group. If you consider yourself black and take black history as yours, all the turmoil and pain blacks endured and went through in the past will become yours. Your identity will involve this historical past. A story of a black man taken from the African continent and sold as a slave is not someone's story but your own. The question is with which history or with whose history do you identify with. If no one identifies a given history of the collective entity, the reality of the past will disappear or lose its strong impact beyond records and research materials.

The problem lies here. Good for a particular collective entity is not necessarily good to others. There are conflicts of interest among collective entities and constituting individuals cannot easily expand their identification beyond the entities to which they directly belong. A person who is quite generous and sympathetic to others in the group he or she identifies with can be indifferent to others in a different group.

One example of this is the case of Heidegger and "conscientious" supporters of Nazi. The public-ness or collectivity of the interests of Germans looked good for its individuals. By setting aside the private good of the individual and taking the public good as individual's primary goal, the individuals must have felt that they were doing good by supporting the leaders of Germany. The public-private mechanism, that is, the prioritizing the public good and sacrificing or subjugating the private good under the public good, misguided the individuals' conscience and spared no sympathy to Jewish and other non-Germans.

Virtues are often limited within the given collective entity. Loyalty to the nation, for example, may involve a sacrifice of personal good or one's family life, yet one's dedication to the nation is limited within the boundary of the good of the nation. Religious fanatics may be in a sense loyal to the particular faith

community and can sacrifice the personal good for the sake of the group, but can be hostile or indifferent to anyone who is in different faith community.

One's conscience may tell one to be virtuous such as being loyal, honest, industrious, courageous, and generous and so on. If however these virtues are limited by the boundary of the good of the given collective entity, they may not have any effect and validity outside of the boundary.

The problem is this. The good of collective entities are not aligned with each other. There is no definitive theoretical framework in which various good are properly and harmoniously aligned. Without the alignment of collective good, the work of a person's conscience will be limited by the boundary of the group's good.

## **B. Self-deception**

Man is a master of self-deception and a genius of camouflage. The work of the conscience is clouded by the deception that one imposes upon oneself. The problem is worse since man is not necessarily aware of his own self-deception.

What does the self-deception mean? There can be a gap or discrepancy between what one thinks is consciously pursuing and one's real motive hidden in the unconscious realm of mind. Suppose one thinks that he or she is pursuing a public good. The problem is that he or she may have unconscious, hidden self-interests as the real motive under his or her awareness.

Nietzsche claimed that man's real motive for his or her activities was the desire for power in the broadest sense. Power can be intellectual, artistic, economical, social, and political. Man is pursuing power to determine his or her location in the hierarchy of values. If you have power and you are superior to others in various capacities, you are valuable. If you are powerless and inferior to others, you have less value. The power relations determine and generate your values. The stronger and more powerful you are, the more valuable you are. In the hierarchy of values, the weak holds resentment against the strong.

Nietzsche described the fundamental drive of human beings the "will to power." He claims that man covers up this hidden motive under the layers of devices such as theories, concepts, and ideals. Virtues and ideals are, according to Nietzsche, "invented" to conceal this hidden interest for power. One, however, is not aware of this concealment one imposes upon oneself. In a sense, man deceives oneself under masks of ideas and camouflage. In Nietzsche's analyses, this self-deception and self-misunderstanding is an unnoticed fact of life. He looks into things behind words, ideas, and consciousness. Nietzsche even views philosophy as a mask. So he concludes that "Every philosophy also *conceals* a philosophy; every opinion is also a hideout, every word also a mask."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. p. 229.

Karl Marx claimed that the hidden motive is the class interest based upon economic interests. No matter what ideas and ideals one advocates, one has the socio-economic interests behind one's consciousness. Virtues, moral and social good are fundamentally originated from the social-economical interests, that is, the desire for the good for the class one belongs. This "partisanship" exists deep in one's consciousness. It is so deep that one is not even aware of this concealment. For Marx, there is no neutral truth. Truth has partisanship.

These authors, who happen to be very influential in the contemporary world, looked into the discrepancy of the conscious and unconscious, and tried to reveal "hidden" motives and desires under our awareness. Although their theories have deficiencies and they were severely criticized by later theorists, the impact they had on the world is undeniable. The impacts were, I believe, due to some degree of soundness of their claims.

Are our motives crystal clear to ourselves? Do we have inherent self-misunderstanding? Are theories and ideas "invented" to cover up the hidden motives? Are we genuinely truthful to ourselves? How does Unificationism answer these questions?

Truthfulness to oneself is in fact the demand of the conscience. According to the Divine Principle, the conscience in a narrow sense is an "external form" to its counter part the "the original mind" that always pursues absolute standard of good God inscribed onto one's mind. Because man has some original standard of good inscribed by God, that is, the "the original mind," man tries to correct and guide the conscience to its original state. Conscience in a broad sense means conscience (narrow sense) guided by the original mind.

Our mind has a certain sense that can see the falseness of self, self-deception, and camouflage one imposes upon oneself. If we do not have a sense in our minds to detect falseness, one will never be able to realize these acts of deception. One of the essential functions of the conscience is to discern the truthfulness and falseness of our life. One is always guided by the original mind that sees every deed and thought, and examines one's genuine truthfulness to oneself.

Isn't it true that man constantly camouflages oneself and conceals one's original mind or conscience?

Just like the world where diverse collective entities struggle against other, there are multiple drives struggling within an individual. An individual exists as a constellation of different drives and motives. Just as there is no permanent unity or peaceful harmony in the world, there is disunity and conflicts amongst drives within an individual. Unificationism describes this chaotic state of drives in man "fallen state" or the "disunity of mind and body."

One can sometimes maintain unity amongst multiple drives and motives under the conscience. So even if one has sexual drives, desires for power, and the urge of other bodily desires, one can properly place them within the framework of one's value perspective and maintain unity within the desires. The



good one pursues are kept in an orderly fashion. But one can also lose control. One or two particular drives dominate others, and one acts according to the demands of the dominant drives against the demands of conscience that holds certain moral standards.

In other words, a particular good for a dominant desire is pursued as the primary desire, and the pursuit of other good are subjugated under the dominant good. Since bodily desires pursue their immediate satisfaction, this dominance results in the primacy of the good for the individual. Pursuit of an individual's good at the expense of others results in immoral or even criminal acts.

One often employs reason to rationalize and justify this domination. Reason can act against the original call of the conscience or the call of the original mind, and invents reasons to justify the domination. As Nietzsche claimed, theory can serve to justify the domination by the illicit motives. The genuine work of the conscience is concealed and paralyzed.

How can we liberate the original power of the conscience from self-deception and avoid the conflicts due to the pursuit of collective good?

### **3. Alignment of Good: Cosmic Good and Restoration of Conscience**

#### **A. Alignment of Good**

Unificationism institutes diverse types of good into one systematic form. The constellation of good is parallel to that of beings. Every being exists in a series of parts-whole relationships. Every being is a whole that has constitutive parts within it, and is also a part that constitutes a larger whole. For example, a family has its constitutive members as its parts, and it is a partial social unity that constitutes clan or tribe. Unificationism explains a series of part-whole relations from the individual, family, tribe, nation, world, cosmos, and God. This order of being corresponds to the order of good.

Good for the individual, family, tribe, nation, world, cosmos, and God are linked as part-whole relations. Diverse types of goodness are aligned within this cosmic system of good. What is good for the part is acceptable only when it is aligned with the good for the whole. Good for other collective entities such as race, class, social institutions, faith communities, and others must be aligned within this cosmic hierarchy of good.

The harmony among the diverse pursuits of good is possible only when partial good is aligned under the precedence of the good for the larger whole. The primacy of partial good will destroy the harmony of the whole and cause conflicts and struggle among other parts.

A typical example of the primacy of partial good is the primacy of national interests. The primacy of national interests is secured by social, political, economic, educational, and legal means. In return for their loyalty a nation protects its citizens. Individuals are also educated by the nation in such a way

that they can identify themselves as constitutive members of the nation. Even if the nation may have achieved its internal harmony, the nation can have serious struggles with other nations.

The primacy of the good of a particular collective entity results in conflicts and struggles with other collective entities. Colonization by dominant Western countries is the consequence of the idea of the primacy of national interests.

The good for the whole must take precedence over the good for the parts for the harmony of the whole. This good, however, must be extended all the way to the cosmic level. This principle is expressed as the motto such as “live for the sake of others.” Individuals live for the sake of family, the family for the nation, the nation for the world, and the world for God.

Unless the good of diverse collective entities are aligned within the hierarchy of the cosmic good, pursuit of good, which is the orientation of conscience, will result in conflicts and struggles amongst groups.

## **B. True Love and the Order of Good**

The precedence of the whole over the parts is parallel to the unificationist teaching of “true love,” to contribute and dedicate for the sake of the larger whole. This motto is applied to both individuals and other collective entities. For example, the contribution to the global good is the norm for each nation demanded by this teaching of true love. Every collective entity is asked to serve for the sake of the whole. Conflicts amongst collective entities can be resolved only when each entity acts according to the norm of true love. Harmony among races, classes, faith communities, nations, and other collective entities is possible only when each drops the primacy of sectarian interests and takes the principle of true love as the cardinal norm. The recovery of global harmony and alignment of good demands the application of this principle of love on both individual and social level.

If individuals, the smallest unity of society, have inherent problems of disunity of desires, we can never expect to build an ideal society. Any social system cannot be immune to its abuse. The precondition is that individuals observe certain common virtues. The problem is the fact that this precondition is barely maintained. As we discussed earlier, the root of the disunity in an individual is deeply rooted. It is so deep that it can easily escape from one’s attention.

How can we solve the problem of disunity in individual? First of all, we must have a rational understanding and conscious awareness of the whole architectonic of the cosmic order of good which provides the context of interpretation. Decision making requires the work of reason and reason demands understanding. Understanding the cosmic order gives the framework of interpretation within which particular decisions are made.

However, act of reason are not sufficient. Even if one has a clear awareness of what he or she should do, the problem is the lack of internal power. Even if one is clearly aware of what he or she is doing is wrong, one can be

driven to do evil acts. Reason is not often sufficient to take a control of the self. The result is the struggle within the self between the command of reason and other desires and drives that fight against it. What is missing in an individual is the central axis upon which various desires are unified. Rational understanding alone is not sufficient to unify diverse drives within an individual. One needs power to unify them. This central axis of unity is the power of true love.<sup>11</sup>

Living for the sake of others, forgiving enemies, and giving without expecting the rewards are the phrases that express what true love is like. When one is empowered by the altruistic emotional feeling, the self is aligned in harmony with the cosmic order of good. The disorder within the self is fundamentally the disorder of love. The domination of sexual desires or desires for power and other desires that fight against the command of reason are rooted in the self-love. Caring for the self or loving the self lie at the root of these drives. Therefore, to gain self-control, the self love must be aligned to the cosmic order of love. This alignment means to turn the orientation of self-love to the public oriented direction which goes up to world, cosmos, and God. Because man already carries a chaotic disunity of drives within the self, and a selfish lifestyle is already built upon selfish habits, this alignment often demands the denial of the self, that is, the denial of the self-centered lifestyle and selfish love. When self-love is aligned to the cosmic order of love through the habit formation of true love, self-love does not become selfish but a necessary element for the constitution of the larger entity.

Love exists in the relationships. One cannot cultivate his or her love alone. When love is expanded to the cosmic scale, one's internal love is strengthened. To gain control within oneself, one must strengthen the internal power of love within the self. This empowerment is possible through the act of loving others. One can cultivate love only through interaction with others.

What is the final resort for human beings in terms of his or her return to authenticity? It is, I believe, the sensitivity to true love.<sup>12</sup> The sensitivity that can detect the truthfulness of true love and distinguish it from the false love is the most fundamental character of human beings. This sensitivity to truthfulness is considered a part of a genuine conscience. The teaching of true love presupposes that human beings are equipped with the sensitivity to the truthfulness of true love and this sensitivity exists regardless of one's reality. Even the most vicious and cruel individual cannot eliminate this sensitivity. One

---

<sup>11</sup>The order of the cosmos is made in such a way as to manifest true love. Complementariness of sex, that is, every natural entity exists and multiplies by male-female polarity, is a prime example.

<sup>12</sup> In Unificationism, true love is the central concept. Discussion of the authenticity and in-authenticity is impossible without dealing with the issue of love. In Heidegger's *Being and Time*, while he explains that one must listen to the "call of conscience" to return to authenticity, he does not discuss anything about love. The word love is not used even once in this work.

can cover up this sensitivity but cannot lose it entirely. In this sense, the sensitivity to the truthfulness of true love in conscience exists as transcendent to empirical reality of human existence. It exists in man as “beyond” and “above” himself.

Although the level of sensitivity differs from a person to person, the fact that man is born not from the self but from others (parents), that is, one’s existence is given by the love of people other than oneself, may have pre-conditioned one’s way of being. The origin of one’s being is not the self but others, in particular others’ love. One’s life begins with the act of giving by others. No matter how one may try, one cannot change this fact. This fact exists in a place beyond one’s reach. No matter what kind of love relationship one’s direct parents might have, this fact remains true.

If the conscience has the fundamental sense to detect the truthfulness of true love, and every individual is born with it, why is it so difficult to live according to this call of the original conscience?

## **C. Uncovering True Love of God: agonizing path of true love**

### **1) Rev. Moon’s Philosophy of True Love: agony of true love**

According to Unificationism, true love is exemplified in phrases such as “forgive your enemies,” “selfless giving,” and “living for the sake of others.” The conscience can see the truthfulness of true love. However, the world we live in is filled with deception, revenge, and selfishness, and this sad reality applies to everyone.

To live in such a world is truly painful, and to practice true love can also be painful. Here is a poem, entitled “The Crown of Glory” that Rev. Moon wrote when he was sixteen years old. The poem describes the pain of true love.

#### **CROWN OF GLORY<sup>13</sup>**

When I doubt people, I feel pain.  
When I judge people, it is unbearable.  
When I hate people, there is no value to my existence.  
Yet if I believe, I am deceived.  
If I love, I am betrayed.  
Suffering and grieving tonight, my head in my hands  
Am I wrong?

---

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.unification.net/misc/crown.html> August 30, 2003

Yes, I am wrong.  
Even though we are deceived, still believe.  
Though we are betrayed, still forgive.  
Love completely even those who hate you.

Wipe your tears away and welcome with a smile  
Those who know nothing but deceit  
And those who betray without regret.

Oh Master! The pain of loving!  
Look at my hands.  
Place your hand on my chest.  
My heart is bursting, such agony!

But when I loved those who acted against me  
I brought victory.  
If you have done the same thing,  
I will give you the crown of glory.

Who can live a life of true love if it is excruciatingly painful? It is almost impossible for an ordinary individual, including the most faithful, to live a genuine life of true love without compromise. Life of true love is difficult even to faithful religious practitioners who are committed to altruistic ideals. For example, did disciples of Jesus, whom Christians admire as saints, live a life of true love?

It is interesting to see Nietzsche's criticism against followers of Jesus. For Nietzsche, Jesus is the only person who actually lived in the way he taught and, for that reason, the only genuine Christian.

I go back, I tell the *genuine* history of Christianity. The very word "Christianity" is a misunderstanding: in truth, there was only *one* Christian, and he died on the cross. The "evangel" *died* on the cross. What has been called "evangel" from that moment was actually the opposite of that which *he* had lived: "*ill tidings*," a *dysangel*. It is false to the point of nonsense to find the mark of the Christian in a "faith," for instance, in the faith in redemption through Christ: only Christian *practice*, a life such as he *lived* who died on the cross, is Christian.<sup>14</sup>

While Nietzsche severely criticized Christianity, he did not criticize Jesus himself. He rather showed deep sympathy and respect for Jesus.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid. "*The Antichrist*" 39. p. 608-09

<sup>15</sup> Nietzsche praises Jesus' love on the cross. "This "bringer of glad tidings" dies as he had lived, as he had taught – *not* to "redeem men" but to show how one must live. This practice is his legacy to mankind: his behavior before the judges, before the catchpoles, before the accusers and all kinds of slander and scorn – his behavior on the *cross*. He does not resist, he does not defend his right, he takes no step which might ward off the worst; on the contrary, he *provokes* it.

Because no one other than Jesus in fact truly lived according to his teachings, Nietzsche said that there was only one genuine Christian: “*In fact, there has been no Christians at all.* The “Christian,” that which for the last two thousand years has been called a Christian, is merely a psychological self-misunderstanding.”<sup>16</sup>

From Nietzsche’s perspective, “redemption by faith” is the “invention” of the followers. They “invented” this doctrine in order to justify their failure of following Jesus.

Was Jesus truly understood by his followers? Probably not. His disciples came to Jesus for their own salvation, that is, their self-oriented love. Jesus, however, did not care much about himself but loved others. The followers’ love was self-oriented and Jesus’ love was selfless and others-oriented. Even this gap between Jesus and his disciples was probably not understood by disciples.

No matter how untrue and deceptive life may be, mankind tends to settle with the comfort of deceptive life rather than the pain of a true life. No one accuses the deceptive nature of life from the individual level to the collective level. The primacy of self-interest on national level is the norm of international politics.

Although the conscience can detect the truthfulness of true love, to live according to true love is nearly impossible for us because it is painful. Human beings live in this insoluble dilemma that one wants to live the truthful life one can hardly live.

As Kant noticed, even if one tried to live a truthful life, one may receive unjust treatment from society. In Kant’s philosophy, there is no guarantee for the accordance of moral goodness and happiness for a life on earth. One may suffer because one is just.<sup>17</sup>

Because one’s understanding of true love is limited to an abstract level, one’s understanding of God’s love remains abstract. Even if one claims that God is “God of love,” he or she cannot understand the reality of what His Love is like.

If one is serious about the reality of a living God, one may raise the same question as Nietzsche. Nietzsche asks, if God is watching the suffering of human beings as if He were a bystander, what kind of “love” is His love? Nietzsche calls God “cruel” if He has the truth and, at the same time, merely observes human beings who are struggling and suffering to find the truth.

---

And he begs, he suffers, he loves *with* those, *in* those, who do him evil. *Not* to resist, *not* to be angry, *not* to hold responsible – but to resist not even the evil one – to *love* him.” Nietzsche “*The Antichrist*” 35, *Portable Nietzsche*, p. 612

<sup>16</sup>Ibid. p. 613

<sup>17</sup> Kant conceives the unity of happiness and moral goodness in the notion of “supreme good.” In the life on earth, one may live a miserable life because he or she is just and morally good. Moral goodness does not necessarily lead one to a happy life. For Kant, it is the demand of reason to postulate God as the one who guarantees happiness to those who are morally good in a life after death.

*God's Honesty*—A god who is all-knowing and all-powerful and who does not even make sure that his creatures understand his intention – could that be a god of goodness? Who allows countless doubts and dubieties to persist, for thousands of years, as though the salvation of mankind were unaffected by them, and who on the other hand holds out the prospect of frightful consequences if any mistake is made as to the nature of truth? Would he not be a cruel god if he possessed the truth and could behold mankind miserably tormenting itself over the truth?<sup>18</sup>

Nietzsche refused a God who can observe human sufferings without any remorse. It is in fact “cruel” to take an indifferent attitude to someone whom one claims to be loving. No matter how good God might be, He cannot escape the charge of being “cruel” if Nietzsche’s charge is true.

Who is God? What kind of love is His love? What is His feeling for the human beings who are suffering?

## **2) God’s Suffering in Human History**

The poem entitled “The Crown of Glory” describes the commitment of Rev. Moon to live a life of true love. No matter how unthinkable it is to truly live a life of true love, he lived and lives his life with this philosophy.

Rev. Moon’s life of true love disclosed God’s deep heart of suffering. Or one may say that God could reveal His heart to Rev. Moon, because he is committed to live and suffer as God does. Rev. Moon wrote this poem when he was sixteen, and God’s revelation struck Rev. Moon on Easter morning of that same year. Since then, Rev. Moon embarked life long painful journey of breaking down barriers built upon hatred, selfishness, and deception. International, inter-religious, inter-racial marriages, ecumenical activities, revitalization of religious activities and the moral spirit, and other numerous activities started out of his deep understanding of God’s heart for humanity.

Rev. Moon’s quest for the truth started from the moment he made the commitment to liberate God from His suffering. He tried to find the answer to fundamental questions such as the origin of evil, the method of salvation, theodicy, God’s relationship to man and history, and others. To fully answer the question Nietzsche raised, for example, the full scale investigation of the truth is required. The discovery of God’s heart of suffering is one answer to Nietzsche’s charge of the “cruelty” of God.

What distinguishes Rev. Moon from others in disclosing the true living God is his profound lifelong commitment to live a life of true love. This is his

---

<sup>18</sup>Nietzsche *Daybreak* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997, p. 52.

philosophy of life. Without genuinely living a life of true love unconditionally, which is how God lives, one can never truly understand the living God. No matter how genuinely comforting the life of true love may be, the path of true love is painful and lonely. It is painful because the world is filled with deception, selfishness, resentment, hatred, and evil motives. It is lonely because a life of true love is hardly conceivable for the vast majority who live a life struggling between good and evil.

With a limited understanding of God's love one can hardly be compassionate to those who are not in the realm of one's social group. Rev. Moon's disclosure of God's heart for humanity gives an emotional basis for humans to be compassionate to fellow humans beyond the boundaries of race, nationality, religion, etc. Without this emotional basis, the conscience can be easily manipulated and disguised in order to serve only the good of a particular group. Fanatics who hold ideas of self-claimed righteousness can be cruel to others outside of their community because of the lack of this emotional basis. The disclosure of true love of God and the cultivation of true love within the mind are necessary to lead a life of true love. The conscience can manifest its authentic function upon this emotional basis.

#### **D. God as the Link between the Self and the Cosmic Good: Self-identity and Dispensational History<sup>19</sup>**

Why does one have to care and think about others? As I discussed, one can easily care about one's immediate family members and the collective entity that one can identify the self as a member. Although one may rationally understand the need of the alignment of good in the cosmic context, one may not strongly feel that way. How far can one go in identifying the self? Nationality, religious community, race, class or others? No matter how good to align all good in cosmic order, one can feel indifferent to anything beyond the collective entities that one identifies with. Even if one rationally understands everyone else as fellow humans, things outside the immediate group one belongs are so distant. How can one substantially link oneself with the cosmic good?

The link that overarches diverse individuals with the global good is God who loves everyone regardless of nationality, race, religious faith, and other differences. We find in God, a unique characteristic that can transcend diverse people and at the same time encompasses them all with His absolute true love. It is extremely difficult to love everyone regardless of who he or she is. Human love is very limited in its capacity and range. The range one's love can reach is limited by the range of one's identification, and the capacity of loving is also very limited. We are surprised of the capacity and the range of love a person like Jesus exhibited. God is distinguished from the rest of beings for His capacity and range of love. Unificationism holds true love as God's essential character.

---

<sup>19</sup> Unificationism views a human history from the perspective of God's dispensation.



His love does not favor one faith tradition over another, one nation over another, and one race over another. God's love transcends the barriers among collective entities and embraces all people.

One of the extraordinary things is that God's love is intimately personal and cosmic at the same time. God is your father and you can have the most intimate, personal relationship with Him. In other words, God relates with each one of us in a personal way. God also relates with every human being regardless of one's collective bond. The boundaries of nation, religion, race, and others are meaningless to His love. As I discussed previously, God's love must be understood in the deepest and the most profound sense of the idea. Only when one follows a path of true love, he or she will come to see its meaning to the extent to which he or she embodies it.

God relates with each individual in the most intimate way and links him or her to all other humans, to nature, and to the universe based upon his capacity of true love. There is no single being that can link everyone in this manner.

Through this link, one can gain the capacity to transcend the boundaries of collective entities to which one belongs and can take the cosmic world as his or her personal object of concern. In other words, because God is my Father, what He concerns falls into the range of my care.

Unificationism explains the entire human history as the history of God's dispensation. This view of history encompasses all histories of religious traditions, races, nations, and other collective entities. Through the link with God, the history of human race can be felt as one's personal history. God's history is my history. This is how one feels. One can identify him or her with the cosmic history. One can feel an intimate relationship with everyone who worked for God's dispensational history no matter which faith tradition or which racial group one belongs to.

The barriers that divide diverse collective entities can be broken down by having God as the link. The alignment of good of all kinds of collective entities including the personal good and the greater good becomes possible only when individuals are linked to the cosmic world and its history through God. Unificationist view of history, that is, a dispensational view of history provides the framework that makes this unity possible.

## **Conclusion**

When the work of one's conscience is paralyzed, we say that he or she has lost his or her mind. We often see the standard of "normalness" in the possession of the proper sensitivity of conscience. One can lose one's mind as an individual, but more so as a collective entity. As Nietzsche says, madness in collective entities is surprisingly common although it is often unnoticed: "Madness is rare in individuals – but in groups, parties, nations, and ages it is the rule."<sup>20</sup> There may be more madness going on everywhere today without being clearly

---

<sup>20</sup>Nietzsche *Beyond Good and Evil* p. 90.

noticed by those who are mad. What we conceive as “normal” may be quite abnormal in God’s eyes.

Unificationism provides a perspective to set the standard of “normalness” in a genuine sense. Through the proper prioritization of good, the orientation to seek good in one’s conscience is properly aligned. Through the link with the origin of true love, that is, God, the conscience will be empowered and the range will be expanded to cosmic level. The path of true love may be painful, but this is the only way to find a living God. The embodiment of true love is the condition for the liberation of the original conscience. Without this essential condition, the conscience can be easily deceived and fall into the narrow realm of self-righteousness. Through the break down of the barriers of limited good and the expansion of the range of love to the cosmic level, the conscience will be gradually liberated to its original state.

## Works Cited:

- Augustine *The Teacher in Ancient Christian Writers no. 9, St. Augustine, The Greatness of the Soul, The Teacher* (Westminster: The Newman Press, 1950).  
Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962).  
HSA-UWC. *Exposition of the Divine Principle* (New York: HAS-UWC, 1966).  
HSA-UWC Japan. *Dansei Houkan Syurenkai Mikotobasyu* (Tokyo: Kogensya, 1996).  
Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Practical Reason* (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1956)  
-----, *Critique of Pure Reason* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1929)  
Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil* (New York: Random House, 1966).  
-----, "The Antichrist" 39, *Portable Nietzsche*, translated by Walter Kaufman, New York: The Viking Press, 1968,  
-----, *Daybreak* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997

Web Source:

<http://www.unification.net/misc/crown.html> August 30, 2003