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| **Abstract:** The ‘seeds’ Thoughts proposed by YU Youngmo and HAM Sukhun may each be summed up by propositions expressed in “People are a May-fly seed” and “Seeds embody the eternal sense”. They used “seed” to refer to humans or people on the one hand and placed the notion of seed in the holistic context of the Eastern Asian tradition on the other. Then, I seek to connect the anthropological notion and the holistic notion via cheng(誠) or integration. *Zhungyong-The Doctrine of the Mean,* one of 4 Confucian texts, says that the ultimate integration(至誠) is to reflect the total nature of objects involved (盡性) so that it will show that self realization and all other realizations are one and not two(成己成物) and it will ultimately reach the stage of holiness(聖). Important elements of cheng intentionality can be read out of the two thinker’s various conceptual aspects. YU’s interpretation of history to be internalistic, his view of Hangul(Korean written language) as a revelational medium, his hermeneutics of Christian God as the emptiness cannot be understood on the dichotomous model of human-nature. HAM’s seed holism, his beliefs that humans’s minds are the heavenly mind and that all things under the heaven should come to be unified are best to be understood on the model of cheng intentionality of integration.**Keywords:** Nature of objects, Realization of objects, Dualism, Union of all, YU Youngmo, HAM Sukhun,  |

The ‘seeds’ thought proposed by Yu Youngmo and Ham Sukhun is one of popular thoughts which have been influential in the contemporary South Korea. How could one explain what’s called ‘seeds’? On the one hand, ‘seeds’ was assumed to denote people, human or a special way of human existence. They referred by ‘seeds’ a conception which is more than a simple object or an imaginative metaphor. On the other hand, their conception of seeds was placed in the context of East Asian tradition. They personalized a biological notion of seed into a metaphysical notion of seed. Then there seems to be a possible connection as well as a clear distance between the biological basis and the metaphysical aspiration. The present article seeks to maximize a possible connection and to minimize the clear distance.

(1) Yu-Ham’s seeds propositions: Yu Youngmo’s seeds thought can be summed up by one statement(Yu 2006: 975). It is that humans are a mayfly seed. Yu observed how the word ‘human’ behaves. He conjectured that the meaning of ‘human’ is a person who expresses words to God or who spares flares of thoughts(Yu 2006: 290-291). Such persons are a mayfly and a seed. He preferred an expression ‘anima’(eol). But expressions like ‘seed’, ‘mayfly’, ‘anima’ are not separate or independent from each other but they occupy a base of networks which are organically interwoven in the system of his thought. The structure of this web is to be enlightened by Yu’s exposition on concepts like God, Jesus. Eventually, his anima and his seeds are inter-changeable.[[1]](#footnote-1) Yu’s God is the void, the empty nut. An answer to the question of the reality of Yu’ God is concrete: there is only one not two.

Yu has a semantic argument for his hypothesis that humans are a mayfly seed. A Korean locution ‘onul’ (today) consists of two parts: ‘o’ means an expression of exclamation (Oh!) of surprise or joy and ‘nul’ means immortality or infinity. Whenever ‘onul’ (today) is uttered there is a speech act of performance of wishing the realization of eternity, admitting that humans are a mayfly. Yu’s notion of ‘nul’ as eternity expresses what he held the message of God and Jesus to be. The message is that humans seem to live in a margin of the relativistic world but humans as God’s creation should place themselves in the focus of the world, consolidating at the center absolutely(gaonchigi, ㄱ, ㄴ; Yu 2006: 390). He wrote “Living today means to live wholesomely, to live a heaven, living with God’s words, living with God, living with burning today, living while burning myself, living without myself, living with light without fire. For it is what today means”.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Ham Sukhun’s seeds thought can also be put in a nutshell, “every seeds realize each meaning of all involved”. The meaning of ‘seed’ to Ham literally means grain and kernel, and philosophically implies people. ‘Humans’ is indifferent to discrimination but ‘people’ means <bare humans>, <humans without positions>, or <humans who are ruled over>(Ham 1993: 14/323-325). Ham specified the extension of seeds and proposed the characteristics or the constitution of seeds: when seeds talk to each other, crying together and feeling together, they are greater than the sum of their parts, one’s voice becoming the voice of all since one is in all and all is in one.(Ham 14: 332-336)

(2) Integrational intentionality: “The ultimate integration(至誠) is to reflect the total nature of objects involved(盡性) so that it will show that self realization and all other realizations are one and not two(成己成物) and it will ultimately reach the stage of holiness (聖)”. I take this to be the gist of *Zhungyong-The Doctrine of the Mean*(Zisi 1999). *Zhungyong* does not limit its gist only to humans but universalize it to all things. Then what I am going to discuss is a following hypothesis which this gist presupposes.

 (2.1) Integration(誠) is a capacity not only of humans but also of all other

 things.

For discussion of the hypothesis, I will choose one strategic proposition as follows.

 (2.2) Mind is a capacity not of the human species but of all species and of inanimate kinds differently at degrees of their complexities.

Mind can be claimed neither to be a soul nor to be the human capacity but can be understood to grant degrees of complexities 0~1 in processing informations.[[3]](#footnote-3) Schematically put, one can picture to allocate 0.1 to inanimates, 0.2 to vegetables, 0.3 to non-mammal animals, 0.4 to mammals, 0.5 to humans. If there are more intelligent aliens, they may have a higher degree of complexity. The proposition (2.2) may be argued for from perspectives of naturalism of Dretsky or Millikan, of proto-phenomenalism of Chalmers[[4]](#footnote-4) but will be here advanced from a conception of evolution and case application.

What is integration? The Chinese character 誠 for integration consists of two parts, 言 for logos and 成 for realization. How could one say that integration(誠) reflect the causal order of the physical world(所以然: 至誠之盡性) and the moral order of the human world(當以然: 至誠之 成己成物)? Some texts[[5]](#footnote-5) in *Zhungyong* help to understand the question: what integration brightens is nature(自誠明 謂之性); where integration takes place there is expression(誠則形); without integration not a thing(不誠 無物). These texts afford various hypotheses and the following is one of them.

 (2.3) Integration of an individual entity is a property of the entity’s performance to realize its embedded objective(道理) in connection with objectives of all others.

What this hypothesis implies is that all things have its own integration and that integration is the activity of its identity. But what is integration? I would like to propose to interpret the notion of integration in terms of yinyang intentionality.

 (2.4) x performs its ultimate integration toward y at tn

 ≎ x performs the yinyang intentionality execution in the context of transformation from tn-1 to tn toward y in accordance with the mandate of realizations of all things dictated by the embedded objectives of the intersubjective systems of S1 and S2 to which x and y belong.

Suppose that one can allow all things to have the integrational capacity of mind’s yinyang intentionality which is consistent with the degree of each complexity in processing informations, how could they be exposed to us? It would be worthwhile to confirm integrational capacities of inanimates, vegetables, animals and humans.

Integrational capacities of inanimates are exhibited in their inner-workings or in their inter-actions(maintenance, adjustment, resignation) with the surrounding systems. Integrational capacities of vegetables have directional movements which are absent in inanimates. They spread their roots and leaves toward sunlight or water, accept inputs of nutrition from earth and sunlight in the forms of informations, and carry out information processing in order to undergo metabolic change. Integrational capacities of animals are more complex. They bring out purposeful movements, displaying behavioral modality of food collection, baby protection, attack, reporting of food or danger, escape, mating, herd crowding.

Human’s integrational capacities are sufficiently complex as we witness. Humans have many of integrational capacities of inanimates, vegetables and animals and go further to have capacities of realizations of self as a person. Humans interact with others like inanimates, vegetables, animals and other humans and perform toward the direction of eliminating negative conditions and advancing positive conditions in accord with the embedded objectives in each system for the realization of all things(Chung 2005: 73-88).

(3) Integrational intentionality of Seeds: It appears on the surface that Yu and Ham took seeds as an extension of humans or people. But on a deeper level seeds carry a universal implication from a cosmic point of view. Though they did not relate the notion of seed directly with that of integration of *Zhungyong* one can trace the integrational intentionality of seeds from its speculative orientation.

Yu’s conception of integrational intentionality can be delineated from some of his

rumination moments. Some of his contemplations are that Korean language is a revealed language or that Korean language is a special object for interpretation. Either way he had a high regard for Korean language which he tended to believe to be a pathway to a metaphysical understanding of the world. It would be hard to explain Yu’ concneption of language in terms of dualistic intentionality. The notion of integrational intentionality is more plausible to explain his view of language.

Another of Yu’s contemplation is his belief that historical documents are never finished(歷史文思未定稿). Whatever is good or right is bound to be subject to a possible change and anything to be complete should wait for the final judgement until the end of human history. The notion of never-finished-document is open to various interpretations, which may be transcendental or Hegelian. But Yu preferred to remain immanent in his system of the world in his hermeneutics of historical direction or processes. Then the notion of integrational intentionality is more consonant with his thought.

Yu reconstructed the notion of Christian God in terms of language of East Asian tradition. To him God is the void(虛空)(Yu 2006: 507). the empty, being without existence(Yu 2006: 387). Questions whether such God is real are answered by saying that originally is one but not two(元一勿不二), that this is Buddha, Jehova, God(Yu 2006: 747). Yu’s God is void as one. In the system of Yu’s internalistic thought the integrational intentionality could not be a dualistic intentionality which is limited to the human persons.

Ham Sukhun’s seeds anthropology does not exclude things other than humans. Ham’s core thought used to be emphasized by repeating that when seeds talk to each other, crying together and feeling together, they are greater than the sum of their parts, one’s voice becoming the voice of all since one is in all and all is in one. Ham’s seeds are individualistic as well as holistic so that integrational intentionality is more plausible than dualistic intentionality.

Ham’s statement “people’s mind is heavenly mind” is based on a conception that heaven and human beings are one, doing away with a dualistic anthropology. Even though many people seems to think in their own ways differently, it is still to be said that they reflect the heavenly will. And this is difficult to explain in a way other than integrational intentionality. When Ham made sojourns in some various thoughts of East and West, they do not reflect an analytical-critical method but shows a trust on the model of integrational intentionality on the basis of presupposition that people’s mind is heavenly mind.

Ham’s view on the historical development is also indicative of the archetypal of integrational intentionality. Many interpretations of historical development used to be Hegelian. Of course, in Ham’s notion of historical development it is not that there are no influences of Christianity, Hegel, Darwin, Chardin. But later stages of Ham’s thoughts are inclined toward an internalistic development rather than an externalistic one. Eastern Asian tradition is flowing into his frame more and more. If these readings are plausible then the notion of integrational intentionality is deemed to be more a strong element in his thoughts.

(4) Integrational intentionality in East Asian tradition: Yu and Ham discussed topics originated from the Christian tradition. In their earlier days they tended to side with Christian perspective but in their later days they showed what may be termed as a ‘post-Christian’ attitude. Though they mention expressions like ‘God’, ‘Jesus’, they interpreted them from East Asian view point, resulting a different metaphysical frame. One can say that the metaphysics of their seeds transmit a peculiar model of naturalism in its integrational intentionality rather than exclusively anthropological intentionality. I would like to have a care on some topics of their seeds thoughts.

(4.1) Truth or Fitting?: The leading tradition of Western metaphysics, in spite of dangers of oversimplification, can be summarized as an attempt to bridge two worlds by the means of conceptual logic, ‘this’ world as an ever-changing phenomenon and ‘that’ world as ever-lasting reality. But the dominant tradition of East Asian metaphysics has been an internalized world view, taking contexts as parts of the grammar of a language and employing principles of fitting(通道中) as proverbs of an integral living.

Yu and Ham developed their seed thoughts from such an East Asian perspective. Yu’s commentaries on classical writings or Ham’s insights on historical developments can be criticized by the canon of consistency but may be appreciated by the standard of fitting as executing a learning in accordance with the East Asian tradition. An example from each of them can be shown as follows.

 “Descartes was sceptical to existence of others but was sure of his own existence. For he could not get out of his own thinking. . . Who is I? It is a thinking spirit. What is heaven? What is Buddha? All are thinking. Say that I exist. Then, my thinking becomes my master.” (Yu 2006: 890-891)

The interpretation Yu proposed on Descartes’ notion of thinking is not relevant when it is viewed by the criterion of consistency. But when it is evaluated by the idea of fitting, two observations may be made on the interpretation. First, Yu may be taken as an interpreter of Descartes not in accord with Cartesian dualism but in terms of insights shared in people’s ordinary language. Second, one needs to remember that Descartes used a locution ‘thinking’ not to denote the narrow extension which contemporary use of it imply but to refer the wide extension which includes ‘doubting’, ‘dreaming’, ‘deceiving’, or whatever human consciousness would cover. Therefore we can say that since Descartes understood ‘thinking’ as the grammar of ordinary language dictates it to mean then Yu also interpreted ‘thinking’ in a way that most insights in ordinary language may be fitted into an integrational system(Yu 2006: 466-467).

 “Soldiers who shaft enemies, brahmanas, kshartriyas, vaishyas, sudras! what you are doing is to be from true selfness, what is distributed by nature.” (Ham 13: 375~377)

The above is Ham’s translation of Chapter 41 of Bhagavad Gītā. Viewed from the consistency criterion, His silence about the caste system is not in accord with his claims on seed thought. Would Pariah Harijan Dalit who do not belong even to 4 caste classes be happy to accept Ham’s position on Chapter 41?[[6]](#footnote-6) Evaluated from the context of fitting, should Ham’s hush on the caste be allowed? Would the silence be admitted as a case of limitation of the then circumstances? This difficult question may be open to an interpretation in the wider context of Ham’s theorization.

The consistency principle displays a criterion for the truth relation among sentences under consideration. To say that any two sentences are consistent is to admit that there is a possible world where the two sentences are true together. But one can say that the criterion which Ham and Yu appealed to is something like the notion of fitting rather than that of truth. The notion of fitting includes the consistency relation as well as relations of survival, morality, aesthetics, greetings, manners, encouragements. The idea of fitting requires the fittest relation among alternative fitting relations(Chung 2008: 109).

One of core ideas in the seed thought is that reality is not the reality as the representation of truth of the transcendent but that reality is the reality as the fitting of all things of the internal. The notion of the internal fitting can be illustrated by other elements of the seed thought. For an example, whereas act of complaining has been evaluated negatively in the tradition of Korea Yu interprets it positively. To him, “complaining is an effort to seek a peace”(Yu 643). How could this be so? His logic can be traced as follows. Complaining is a form of criticism in the process of ‘change wrong, near good(改過遷善)’. Yu’s insight is to take complaining as a proper form of criticism rather than to devide complain into good one and bad one. Yu’s notion of complaining is nothing other than a way of integration(誠) in the process of fitting oneself with all others.

Ham demonstrated an insistent coherence between national sense he found in the history of Korea on the one hand and personal sense he tried to embody in his words and deeds on the other hand. This coherence arises out of his idea of ‘becoming oneself’(Ham 14: 360). He thought that his own words and deeds should be consistent with the national sense of history as well as they are what fills the vessel called ‘history’. He tried to fit his words and deeds to the fabric of history. Ham’s view of history is that historical truths are not independent of human beings and that human beings are neither observers nor witnesses of history. It is rather that human beings realize the historical truths, fitting themselves to the historical sense. It is human beings who integrate(統全, 誠) elements in history in accord with varying contexts.

(4.2) Epistemological union and integrational union: As Yu and Ham tried to move from the union of God and human to the union of all, the notion of union sounds very East Asian. But what is this union? How could it be understood? What’s their prescription against idealism which the idea of union tempts to lead to? Does the East Asian tradition have a prescription? In order to help to grasp their notion of union, one may look in the concept of epistemological union, contrasted with that of integrational union.

Hegelian union of all appears to be an epistemological union. Suppose that there is an opposition between knowing subject and object known. Then there should be an assumption that object known depends on a description posed by knowing subject. From a perspective of such an epistemological structure, Hegelians would judge that it will be hard to reach an authentic picture of reality in the context of tension between subject and object. They ascribe what’s called ‘alienation’ to the opposition of subject and object. The experience of alienation, whether the experience is physical or social, is due to the conflict between subject and object. Then only if the antithesis of subject and object is denied, union of all would be available.

Hegelian notion of union is such that its diagnosis is epistemological and its prescription is idealistic. I think that its epistemological analysis is plausible. In context of any knowledge of an object, it would be hard to avoid a description of an aspect of the object. It should be impossible that an object has ‘all possible descriptions’ at a particular point of time. It is obvious that the total description of an object is not given to a human being. But it will be a leap of logic to move from this step to the next stage. The rejection of the epistemological distance between subject and object does not guarantee a conclusion that there should be a holistic picture of a reality of the object.

What is it like for Yu and Ham to have the notion of union of all things? Their notion is metaphysical and speculative rather than epistemological. Yu talked about ‘God without having existence’ and says that the emptiness is God. Ham believed that God and people are not two but one. God and seeds are this end and that end of the one same reality, being selfsame. Ham expressed his claims about ‘union of the total’ in terms of integration(Ham I-375). One can foresee how an intellectual work could proceed in a way that all things are to be integrated. Since there could not be a contradiction under the Sun there should not be any proper place for a moment of contradiction. Hangi Choe(1980: II-39) anticipated this logic by saying that there is not a thing outside of logos (無物外理). This sentence is open to two readings, the first of which is that an object has its own logos and the second of which is that all things are placed in one logos. There is a choice between an individual logos and a holistic logos. The second analysis looks preferable to the first one in view of the East Asian tradition or Ham’s assimilation.

It’s worthwhile to note the way how Yu and Ham emphasized the connection of two simple words ‘one’ and ‘God’, or ‘hana’ and ‘hananim’.[[7]](#footnote-7) They make speculations to understand Christian God in terms of roots of an East Asian language, perhaps in order to make a point that God is the Power of integration of all things into One. The contemplation that all things are united into one should mean that all things are integrated into one single system. God will end up to be the power of integration system. Insomuch as the seed thought impute a sense of embedded objective of an entity to an act of integration of the entity, the system comes to have a personhood.

Intentionality which Yu and Ham presupposed for their views of union of all turns out to be integrational. Human specific intentionality is a higher order of intentionaltiy which is not open to analysis of extensiosnal logic, unlike intentionalities of animals and plants. But the seed thought of union of all does not only suppose continuity of natures and humans but also demands this strongly. Such a notion of union cannot be analyzed in terms of human specific intentionality. One may need a comprehensive view of integrational intentionality rather than Brentano’s dualistic intentionality.

(4.3) Today: Yu introduced yet another speculation about how to understand ‘today’, or ‘onul’ in Korean. He seemed to take in this particular word game in order to facilitate his view on time or history. He took ‘onul’(today) as a complex word consisting of ‘o’(Oh!) and ‘nul’(forever!) to refer a particular time span called ‘onul’(today). He allowed a special meaning to awakening and sleeping. To him, awakening and sleeping are a special phenomenon. A day starts with awakening and the day ends with sleeping and dreaming. Dreaming of a day is special and different from dreaming of other day.

Yu’s ‘today’ is open to two different kinds of interpretations. The difference between the two is significant so that they are helpful for understanding Yu’s views on time and anthropology. These two may be given a structure respectively under the name of ‘historical today’ and ‘metahistorical today’.

(4.31) Metahistorical today: Today or onul is a referent for a complex name of ‘o’(Oh!) and ‘nul’(forever!). Today is the real meaning of this complex name. Today is a type of eternity for the unit called ‘onul’ or ‘today’. Today is a complete and autonomous system of time. There is no meaning to be given to ‘today’, meaning other than samsara of yesterday and tomorrow. Therefore, today is metahistorical.

(4.32) Historical today: Today or onul is a referent for a complex name of ‘o’(Oh!) and ‘nul’(forever!). Today is the metaphoric meaning of this complex name. People should be able to live today as an eternity of a temporal unit. Today has a meaning in the context of yesterday and tomorrow. Therefore today has a structure to be filled with historical developments.

Two interpretations of ‘today’ are positioned in different directions. Yu himself did not appear to support one interpretation over the other. But a problem arises right here. On the one hand, Yu’s system of thought which consists of union of all, capacity of integration and so on seems to incline to back the interpretation by ‘historical today’. On the other hand, the way Yu himself talked suggests that he leaned toward the interpretation by ‘metahistorical today’. Yu’s important students look closer to the latter.

Would there be a recipe to overcome the difference between the two interpretations? There may be many plans possible. One of them can be a suggestion that metahistorical today is introduced as a metaphor to emphasize historical today. This assumption can be refuted or supported. For its support, one may turn to Yu’s notion of ‘not making a sense’. Though Yu himself knows that an argument he advances does not make a sense, he employes that argument to highlight a more general point or to persuade. Then it may be a fair assumption that Yu regarded the metahistorical today to be non-sensical and yet to have a role to help to focus on the historical today.

If the explanation of Yu’s historical interpretation about ‘today’ is plausible, then Yu’s view of time is more consistent with the model of integrational intentionaltiy rather than that of dualistic one.

(4.4) Emptiness: Yu’s notion of emptiness constitutes Yu’s holistic metaphysics in conjunction with his other ideas of vacuum, gap, blank. Here one may compare Yu’s emptiness with notions of emptiness in other traditions, like traditions of Lao-tzu, Chuang-tzu, and Hegel

(4.41) Emptiness of Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu: It can be said that all human troubles arise from human minds. Minds are to be all matter of willings. When willings are emptied body and mind should become one. As winds breeze through leaves winds breeze in human bodies to become a breathing. As winds breeze on holes of all things to sound each voice, winds preserve the natural union as all things stay as they are.

(4.42) Hegelian emptiness: All human troubles are nothing else but opposition between subject and object. Opposition between subject and object arises from human minds. Overcoming of opposition between subject and object starts with emptying minds. The relation of subject and object is neither Ptolemic nor Copernican but is to be union of subject and object. As overcoming of opposition of subject and object is realized I become one with the world or the absolute.

(4.43) Zisi’s emptiness: Realizations of myself and all others are due to the virtues of benevolence and knowledge(成己仁也, 成物知也). These virtues are to be advanced and other desires are to be emptied. Natures(性) of all things can reach their realizations (成) through their ultimate integrations(至誠). Their holinesses(聖) will show up at the stage of “realizations of self and all others are one”. The content of the union of all is the holiness.

One conjecture can be made about Yu’s notion of emptiness. It is a proposition that Yu’s emptiness is integrational. When Yu underlined the notion of emptiness, the emptiness is neither of Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu nor of Hegelian idealism, but it is the emptiness as a means of incorporating a genuine language. “Emptying what’s inside is to assimilate authentic language. . . Bodies, minds and all others which we draw from God are natures”(Yu 174). Yu’s ‘authentic language’ is identifiable with the logos(言) as the objective for realization(成) which is the focus of integration(誠) of Zhungyong. All things in the world are equipped with their natures as their logos. Therefore all things are tasked to the ultimate integration to realize their natures. “Since the true is integration, there’s no way to avoid it. When one manifests one’s own nature, the precious of the true shall turn out”(Yu 249).

In sum, Hegelian emptiness works within the grammar of dualistic intentionality. The way to overcome the opposition of subject and object is the way in which the subject is unified with the object, not as the object of knowledge but as the object of experience. The union experience as overcoming of alienation experience presupposes the primacy of subject and this implies the prioirty of dualistic intentionality. But the ideas of emptiness in Lao-tzu, Chuang-tzu and Zisi are not grounded on dualistic intentionality. The intentionality in Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu is what is involved as winds breeze on holes of all things to voice. Zisi’s intentionality is not specifically limited to human beings but is ubiquitous to all things(不誠無物).

(4.5) Sense: A Korean locution ‘뜻’(ddus, sense) plays an important role in the frame of Ham’s thought. A moment is memorable, which is when he revised his writing “Chosen History Viewed from a Scriptural Perspective” 1934-35 into his book “Korean History Viewed from a Sense Perspective”. A following classification may clarify what he meant by his locution.

(4.51) Non-natural(lingual) sense: ‘South Mountain’ denotes the mountain south of Gyeongbok Palace, Seoul.

(4.52) Natural sense: South Mountain means the mountain in the middle of Seoul which is surrounded with Inwhang Mt., Bukhan Mt., Chonma Mt., Namhan Mt., Chonggye Mt., Gwanak Mt., Gyeyang Mt.

(4.53) Metaphysical sense: South Mountain represents the ever independent and autonomous spirit of the Korean nation with all its pine trees on the mountain.

Ham might have used the locution naturally or lingually for certain occasions. But when he inserted the word to the title of his book, what he meant should have been metaphysical. For he tried to brighten a particular metaphysical dimension in Korean history. He strived to see a metaphysical sense in Korean history that the suffering in Korean history has played a role in the salvation of the world.

The structure of Ham’s thought in his last half period is not like that of his first half period, loaded with complex dimensions and various aspects. More careful examination should be directed to the multi faceted structure. One possible attribution may be made in a way that though he did not give up a religious orientation characteristic of his first half period he progressed more toward the frame of a universal history. His analysis of Korean history as he moved toward his last half period was more interwoven by concepts like democracy, protests, non-violence, autonomy. His interpretation of Korean history seemed to move away from a religious architecture to somewhat universal fabric. Then I can suggest the following.

(4.54) Integrational sense: South Mountain means a source of oxygen for citizens of Seoul which lacks rich natural resources of surrounding public parks.

When Ham worked to highlight a local history and to relate it the world history, this was the achievement of his first half period. Then he tried on the one hand to did not forsake his religious perspective and on the other hand to loosen that perspective to generalize the sense of Korean history in his last half period. Toward this goal he wrote on many topics like politics, society, economics, religion, education.

If this apprehension is plausible then it may have a point to say that the frame of Ham’s seed thought may be better interpreted under the light of integrational sense.[[8]](#footnote-8)
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