Headwing Democracy: A Vision for Nepal

Robert S. Kittel

> Fighting and conflict cannot end in an era of democracy – of brothers. It will only come to an end in the era of parent-centered thought.[1]

Nepal is sandwiched between two of the most thriving economies in the world, China and India, yet it remains one of the poorest nations on earth. A decade-long communist insurgency from 1996 to 2006 has driven tourists and foreign investors away and left its people in ruins.

Nevertheless, emerging from ten years of civil war that killed an estimated 15,000 people and displaced ten times that number, the Nepalese people have done what no other country in the world has done in such a brief period of time. In six short years, armed rebels have voluntarily surrendered their weapons, former militants were brought into the peace process, an interim government was formed, peaceful elections were held, a Constituent Assembly was created, the 240-year-old monarchy set aside, the only Hindu kingdom on earth was transformed into a secular state, and a new federal democratic republic was born on May 28, 2008.

With such dramatic changes in such a short period of time, Nepalese leaders need support from both government and non-government sectors. The Universal Peace Federation–Nepal [UPF-Nepal] is the most active NGO in Nepal supporting the peace process. In fact, the day Father Moon came to Nepal to launch the Nepalese chapter of the Universal Peace Federation, Nov. 22, 2005, was exactly the same day the Maoist and the Seven Party Alliance signed the 12-point Memorandum of Understanding which launched the peace process. In other words, UPF-Nepal and Nepal's peace process are twins; they were born on the same day.

Building on this, UPF-Nepal has sponsored and organized numerous education programs directly aimed at helping move the peace process forward. Ten South Asia Peace Initiative (SAPI) programs have allowed leaders from all sectors of society, including former enemies, to dialogue face-to-face in a non-threatening environment.

In addition to building trust among leaders, these programs have been educational in nature. UPF leaders in Nepal have developed a concept called "Headwing Democracy." This is an application of the theory in Unification Thought called "headwing ideology." The purpose is to find ideological common ground between communism (also called socialist democracy) and western or liberal democracy.

Maoist Vice-Chairman Dr. Baburam Bhattarai, in a recent speech identified this as one of the main hurdles in Nepal's much delayed peace process. "This great ideological-political divide [between liberal democracy and socialist democracy] is so deep-rooted in Nepal that the prolonged impasse in the constitution drafting process in the CA basically hinges on this."[2]

Father Moon has said, "Fighting and conflict cannot end in an era of democracy – of brothers – but will only come to an end in the era of parent-centered thought (headwing ideology)."[3] The purpose of this paper is to more fully explain and clarify this model.

Analyzing Political Options

There are two dominant systems of government in the world today: liberal democracy and communism. These two ideologies are also at the center of Nepal's current impasse; indeed one system is used by its northern neighbor and the other by its neighbor to the south. Therefore, a natural starting point would be to look at the advantages and weaknesses of these two systems.

"Democracy is a political form of government in which governing power is derived from the people."[4] In the American tradition this is grounded in the status of a person created by God. Each individual, therefore, has a God-given purpose to fulfill. And, God, being just, has endowed each person with the rights and responsibilities to fulfill these ideals; hence they are called inalienable rights. The purpose of government, in turn, is to protect this God-given authority which is centered God's purpose of creating us—the individual.[5]

In this context, democratic governments attempt to harness people's original nature of goodness and devise a governing apparatus that will help manifest these innate qualities into human society. This is why John Adams, the second president of the United States, said the US Constitution "was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other."

The advantages of liberal democracy are well-known and many: strong incentives for rapid economic growth, private ownership of property and the means of production, free trade, the right to make and keep a profit (reward), belief in a supreme being, freedom of religion, limited government, strong advocacy of human rights, multiparty competitive elections, and the peaceful transfer of power.

However, an honest evaluation of democracy's tremendous benefits must also take into account its disadvantages. This is critical because the adage, "Amidst the fruits of prosperity are the seeds of destruction" is tried and tested. Unfortunately it holds true that as a civilization reaches its zenith its fall seems inevitable. To have any hope of avoiding some of these pitfalls we need to first identify them.

The shortcoming of a democratic government include: excessive individualism (selfishness infused into many aspects of society), under-regulated financial institutions (Great Depression and now the Global Recession), unchecked immorality (free sex lifestyle, same sex marriages, divorce on demand, liberal abortion laws), legalistic bottlenecks (everyone seems to have an axe to grind), individual freedom valued more than social responsibility, and a vague political philosophy. Due to these acknowledged shortfalls, Winston Churchill said, "Democracy is the worst form of government except all the others that have been tried." Maybe it is time to try something new.

But first let's also study the communist system of government. Communism by definition is "a sociopolitical movement that aims for a classless and stateless society structured upon communal ownership of property."[6] In modern terms, however, communism refers to states with "authoritarian governments that had centrally planned economies and ownership of all the means of production."[7]

In November last year, Time magazine ran a cover story entitled, "Five Things the U.S. Can Learn from China."[8] Some positive points of the communist system include: a centrally planned economy that can foster an ambitious "can do" spirit, the national interest placed clearly above that of the individual, a unified long-term education policy, a better check on social violence (gangs, drugs, guns, etc.), more focus on the distant future (not just the next election), social care for the elderly (verses dehumanizing old-age homes), fewer legal hurdles to economic development, and attempts to address societies "structural violence" (read: the privileges of the elite).

Despite China's miraculous economic development, a model many admire, there are still fundamental social issues that cannot be swept under the new carpet. Again the list is very familiar: the justification of violence and excessive use of force, diminished personal incentives, a poor human rights record, restrictions on the family (for example, one child per family), production of unsafe or substandard products, denial of religious freedom and lack of belief in a supreme being, limits on private property, party loyalties displacing familial relationships, one-party rule that lends itself towards authoritarianism and dictatorship, flare ups between religious and ethics groups (Muslims, Tibetans, Huns, etc.), floods of refugees escaping the iron curtain countries, and loss of life in extremely large numbers.

"Headwing Democracy": Beyond Democracy and Communism

Because the disadvantages of both systems of government are so significant, UPF-Nepal cannot whole-heartedly endorse either system in its present form. Both systems of government need remodeling.

Traditionally, these two governing styles have been termed "right wing" and "left wing" respectively. In Father Moon's interpretation, this concept originated 2,000 years ago at the time when Jesus was crucified. On his right and left side were two thieves being crucified together with him. The thief on Jesus' left side mocked, criticized and ridiculed him. Thus the communist world, with its condemnation of religion as an "opiate of the people" earned the title "left wing." Conversely, the thief on the right defended Jesus saying he was innocent and even asked to be with him after they die. So, the democratic world founded on Christian ideals has been labeled the "right wing."

Beyond the two wings, UPF-Nepal advocates a concept called "Headwing Democracy." For a bird to fly, it needs both a right and left wing. But even more important it needs a head to coordinate the movement of both wings and guide its flight. Headwing Democracy is not right wing or left wing; it is neither pro-democracy nor pro-communist.

Democracy and communism have certain fundamental weaknesses in common. For example, neither ideology correctly identifies the root cause of human suffering. In communism it is seen as private property. In democracy, although not clearly identified, it is often viewed as intrusive government or "big brother." But if you go to the doctor and he cannot identify the cause of your illness, there is little chance he will be able to provide a remedy. Correct diagnosis of a disease is a prerequisite to administering an effective cure. This is true both for sick people and nation-states.

What then is the fundamental cause of humankind's dilemma? It is actually two-fold. It begins with extreme selfishness, correctly called hubris, which then makes it impossible to build families of true love.

Likewise, neither system of government understands the magnitude of the importance that the family plays in every aspect of society, inclusive of educational achievements, social security, financial wealth, tax-paying citizenry, lowering of crime rates, reduction of violence, prevention of HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases, to name just a few.

The philosophical principles of Headwing Democracy include the spheres of economics, politics and ethics. According to Unification Thought, these spheres are interrelated and overlapping; they should function by to the principles of harmonious existence, mutual prosperity, and universal values.[9] In order to understand more fully the overall concept of Headwing Democracy it will be necessary to look at each principle separately.

Principle of Harmonious Existence

the principle of harmonious existence is a concept dealing with the economic dimensions of an ideal society, especially the aspects of ownership. In terms of ownership, in a capitalist economy there is private (individual) ownership, while in a socialist (communist) economy there is social or national ownership. Yet, in both economies the element of love has been neglected. That is to say, whether it is a private or socialist (public) economy, it is simply materialistic ownership without regard to the spiritual dimension.

By contrast, in Headwing Democracy, there is joint ownership based on true love. For example, the sky is the joint possession of all birds, the waters are the joint possession of all fish, and that the ground is the joint possession of all beasts, all based on God's original design and purpose of creation. No one species dominates everything. Birds of prey, like eagles, do not monopolize the sky. Beasts of prey, like tigers, do not monopolize the ground. Even violent sharks do not monopolize the sea.

God endowed human beings with the right to have dominion over all things with love. Human beings were to jointly possess the sky, the sea, and the land, as well as all living things, including birds, fish and beasts, with a heart of love and gratitude. Thus, nature is a joint possession. It is more than the right of shared ownership; human beings were to exercise stewardship over all things–with a heart of gratitude to God.

Nevertheless, due to the fall, human beings fell into self-centered individualism, and came to monopolize land and property in a greedy way. Today, under the banner of liberal democracy, people legally possess vast amounts of land, enormous property and tremendous wealth. Yet, they seldom experience any pangs of a guilty conscience. Even when they see their neighbors starving, they often do not seem to care, and just continue to live arrogantly. This is characteristic of capitalist societies.

The relationship between God and human beings is that of parent and children. This is also the vertical axis of a family. In a family, all the property such as the house, the garden, the yard, cattle, and so on belongs to the parents, and at the same time to the children. In other words, in a family, even if the property is legally owned by the parents, it is, in practice, jointly possessed by both parents and children. In the original world, parents always love their children; therefore, children always have a heart of gratitude towards their parents and take good care of the family property.

In the basic form of the family the three generations of grandparents, parents and children (brothers and sisters) live together. Therefore, joint ownership is, strictly speaking, joint ownership of the three generations. An extension of this joint family ownership is the joint ownership of organizations. For example, ownership of a company should be shared between three parties: God, who is the subject of true love; the executives, who are in the position of parents; and employees, who are in the position of children. In the original world, even when a company is founded by entrepreneurs, it should first be offered to God. Such a procedure is more than a mere formality; it changes attitudes and relationships. The owner actually becomes a steward or caretaker of his own property. His first priority would be to manage the company to please God, its true owner, not just to amass wealth for himself. This would fundamentally change how the owner distributes the profits, interacts with the employees and manages the waste products, for example.

In the future, all enterprises will naturally seek to contribute to the progress of the welfare of all humankind, rather than aiming only for the interest of the entrepreneurs. Therefore, the overall result of industrial activity will be the multiplication of beneficial goods for all humankind.

Principle of Mutual Prosperity

The principle of mutual prosperity is concerned with the political aspects of the future ideal society. The principle of mutual prosperity is, in short, a theory concerning joint ownership of government.

The framework of a nation will resemble the structure of the human body. Under the principle of mutual prosperity, the separation of the powers as originally proposed by Montesquieu, would not be so much for

the purpose of checks and balances, but more in the sense of a division of the labor. For example, the legislation, judicial, and administrative branches of government, which can be compared to the lungs, heart, and stomach of the human body, would not need to keep tabs on each other, but instead would work together in harmony for the mutual well-being of the nation.

The motivation to cooperate and work together would not be a compulsory force or physical power. Instead, by creating the spirit of a family, the desire to work together would be based on an emotional force of patriotism, or a willingness to live for the sake of others and for the greater good of the whole. In like manner the government or factory owner, being in the parental position, would look after the employees as his own children.

Democracy, as mentioned earlier, is an ideology wherein sovereignty rests with the people. Essentially, democracy is an ideology seeking to realize freedom and equality for all people. This is expressed very well in Abraham Lincoln's famous Gettysburg Address where he called for the "new birth of freedom" as a nation under God with a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Yet, what is meant by "the people"? In reality, the people are "the majority of the people." When human rights are only for the majority of the people, then the sovereignty of "the people" exists only in name. Due to this deficiency of liberal democracy, Communists accused democratic governments saying, "They are no more than a bourgeois democracy." And since World War II, Communists have maintained that they were for the laborers and farmers and thus a true "people's democracy."

Actually, in both systems of government power and prestige are utilized for the special interests of politicians who spend enormous amounts of money to get elected or stay in power. Today, elections are hardly more than a contest for political survival. Both liberal democracies and communist democracies have failed to become genuine governments of, by and for the people; rather, they have become "governments of the party, by the party, for the party."

The main reason for this is that democracies, which were established by overthrowing absolute monarchical rule, became closely tied to individualism. In the West, due to the policy of the separating church and state, the guiding principles needed to establish a God-centered society were unable to function. In Communist governments religions are often outlawed altogether. As a result individualism degenerated into excessive egoism. It was only natural then, as entrepreneurs persistently pursued profit and politicians developed an insatiable desire for power, that corruption, crime and various kinds of injustices would run rampant in democratic societies. Democracies, in which religion (i.e., moral and ethical values) are separated from the politics of governing, have the inevitable tendency to deteriorate into rampant, unchecked selfishness.

This is not to say that Western democracy has completely failed. Clearly, it has played an important role in securing freedom of religion and other human rights, in rapid development of technology and in generating enormous amounts of wealth. However, if the moral dimension of social order is not addressed, these other social advances will be undermined, as we are seeing in today's democratic societies. To address this, we turn to the next topic.

Principle of Universal Values

The principle of universal values is the very core of an ideal society. If we cannot find ethics and morals that resonate with all civilizations and religions, we will never be able to create a peaceful and prosperous world.

There are two universal principles upon which a global system of values can be developed. The first is the "Dual Purpose Principle" (i.e., mind and body), and secondly, the "Pair System Principle" (masculine and feminine). These two principles are universal because 1) they are beyond time, as they apply to the past, present and future, and 2) they are beyond space, meaning they transcend the barriers of culture, race, religion and nationality. I have explained these at length elsewhere.[10]

The dual purpose principle means that we put our public responsibilities above our private desires. This is done by living more for the sake of others than for ourselves. This is also how our physical bodies were created; the mind is above and the body is below. The highest human values emerge when we live our lives with these priorities. Virtues such as trust, responsibility, public-mindedness and altruism come from living sacrificially. This principle of living for others, or prioritizing the public aspects of our lives, is learned most easily and naturally in the loving environment of a loving family. This is why the family is essential for the individual's character development.

The pair system principle speaks to love, the most powerful emotion. Love cannot exist by itself. To create love, two people are needed: a man and a woman. Even for God to experience true love, He also needs a partner. This is actually the main reason we were created. We are to be the object-partners of God, giving Him the possibility to experience true love. We can say that without us, God could not

experience true love. All alone, that would be impossible. God is all-powerful, all-knowing and self-existing, but there is one thing He cannot create by Himself—true love.

Based on these two principles—the dual purpose principle and the pair system principle—we can establish a system of ethics and morals that is universal and inclusive of the fundamental teachings found in all religions.

Mind and body, the dual aspects of every person, are properly aligned when the public aspects of our lives are placed above the private. In this way, all religions teach that selfishness, greed, covetousness and avarice are wrong. Similarly, across the world and throughout history, religions have extolled their followers to be kind, generous, sacrificial, benevolent and charitable.

Here are a few examples: Jesus taught, "Whoever seeks to gain his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life will preserve it." (Luke 17:33) In the Qur'an it says, "By no means shall you attain righteousness unless you freely give of that which you love..."[11] "Noble men find joy in generosity," Buddha taught, adding "and this gives them joy in higher worlds."[12] Hindu scriptures teach that "a gift is pure when it is given from the heart... and when we expect nothing in return."[13] The Adi Granth of Sikhism states, "When there is greed, the love is false."[14] The universal ethic derived from the dual purpose principle is that each of us must be more and more public-minded. The more we are public-minded, the better.

Next, based on the pair system principle we can set up a universal system of moral values. The conjugal relationship between a man and woman is unique among all animals. For one thing, it is not seasonal. People do not have a mating season. We can have sex any season of the year, any time of the day. This means we were given full responsibility to control ourselves. The same concept stated in a positive way, we are full-fledged participants in creating true love.

The conjugal relationship is the most powerful emotional experience. It was designed to be that way. The purpose is not merely for an individual's ecstasy. The reason God made human sexuality the most powerful human experience was because true love is the glue that binds a husband and wife together and they are supposed to be bound together in the image of God eternally. If there was something stronger, or more desirable than love, then the union of a husband and wife would constantly be threatened. It would always be in jeopardy of being broken by this greater force. But fortunately, nothing is more powerful than love. God made it this way so that the love that brings a man and woman together would go unchallenged and last forever.

From this perspective we see another unique value of human sexuality and the ultimate importance in the union of man and woman. A couple united in an unbreakable love reflects most fully the nature of God.

The purity of conjugal love has two requirements: abstinence before marriage and fidelity thereafter. Not surprising, all religions uphold this moral value and in the strongest language warn about sex outside marriage.

> The man who goes to the wife of another... digs up the very roots of life. (Dhammapada 18:247)

> Do not come near adultery: for it is a shameful (deed) and an evil, opening the road (to other evils). (Qur'an 17:32)

> Sexual relationship with another's wife... is like eating poison: the enjoyer comes to grief, only to be reborn and waste their lives again. (Adi Granth, p. 1255)

> Do not commit adultery. (Ten Commandments, Exod. 20:14)

> Flee from sexual immorality. All other sins a man commits are outside his body, but he who sins sexually sins against his own body. (I Cor. 6:18)

In summary, from the dual purpose principle emerges the universal ethic of living for the sake of others. And from the pair system principle we can understand the sacredness of human sexuality and the importance of the institution of marriage. As an extension of this, it will become clearer why the family is absolutely necessary in order to establish a peaceful, prosperous world.

Importance of the Family

A distinctive feature of UPF-Nepal's approach is to lift up the importance of the family. Thus it affirms, without reservation, that the family is the most important institution in society. Families of true love are more fundamental and important to the well-being of society than the government, the military, educational institutions, the army or any other organization. But going beyond that, UPF-Nepal sees the family as the most effective model of government. Headwing Democracy proposes a new paradigm of government based upon the model of a loving, well-functioning family.

"Some thinkers have taken the position that what mattered [is] not the design of governmental institutions and operations, as much as the character of the rulers."[15] For this reason alone, the influence of the family looms large in any government because our basic attitudes and primary social relationships are learned in the family. Sociologists now understand this point quite well. "There is a mountain of scientific evidence showing that when families disintegrate, children end up with intellectual, physical, and emotional scars that persist for life."[16]

The formation of a family centers on the ceremony of marriage. Marriage, therefore, is absolutely critical to the well-being of society. Likewise the death of marriage will not only be the death of the family but also the harbinger of social decline. Syndicated columnist and sociologist Maggie Gallagher puts it this way.

> There is powerful evidence, not just that marriage is important to society, but that human beings are in some basic sense made to be married.[17]

Research in Western societies is now irrefutable and sociologists can see the fallacy in the concept of free sex. They are calling for politicians, religious leaders, educators and, indeed, civil society to change.

> After years of observing this sexual revolution, we have found, ironically, that sex does not need to be liberated. Rather, it simply needs to be confined to its proper and most productive domain. Decades of research show that this place is lifelong, monogamous marriage. It is time for a counterrevolution.[18]

In the United States, 16 of America's top scholars on the family published their findings entitled "Why Marriage Matters, Twenty-Six Conclusions from the Social Sciences."[19] This was a landmark study because many of America's most eminent social scientists agreed on numerous points highlighting the unquestionable importance of healthy families to children, parents and society. In the summary the report identified three fundamental findings:

1. Marriage is an important social good, associated with an impressively broad array of positive outcomes for children and adults alike.

2. Marriage is an important public good, associated with a range of economic, health, educational, and safety benefits that help local, state, and federal governments serve the common good.

3. The benefits of marriage extend to poor and minority communities, despite the fact that marriage is particularly fragile in these communities.

Here, then, is a question for lawmakers: What if marriage and family really are essential core institutions of society—as important as: free speech, private property, free enterprise, public education, health care, equal protection of the law, and a democratic form of government? Shouldn't we do everything in our power to protect and strengthen the institution of the family?

The Family: A Paradigm of "Good Governance"

This is a term used in development literature to describe how public institutions conduct public affairs and manage public resources in order to guarantee our basic human rights.[20] Governance itself is defined as "the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented)"[21] and is used to evaluate the effectiveness of economic or political institutions.

The family is the most basic unit of governance. Its "structure" is inclusive; it has both vertical and horizontal aspects. The vertical components would be: respecting elders or filial piety, honoring a family heritage and tradition, upholding cherished (religious or moral) values, living for the greater good, and obedience to law and order. The horizontal constructs of a family are equally important: a sense of shared ownership and opportunity, collective prosperity, sibling equality, and evenly allocated rights and responsibilities.

For this and other reasons, the family is an excellent model of governance. It is easily recognizable, as well as being participatory, scalable, replicable, and sustainable. A closer examination of each of these components will explain more.

Recognizable: Governments tend to be nebulous, at least from the common citizen's point of view. Lawmakers are often viewed as little gods living in ivory towers, having not only power and prestige, but also the authority to create laws, tax people, and make policies. Their position can appear sort of elusive and distant. At times, a politician's status may approach superstardom. Viewing government as a large family changes this. Immediately their roles are defined and a comfortable relationship emerges. People can think, "My leaders are like my parents." They are approachable. "I address a leader the way I would

my own parents." Like the relationship of a parent and child, the leaders and the people of a nation should be a team. Difficulties can be worked out in a cooperative manner.

Using the family as the model of government not only allows for the establishment of comfortable relationships, it also defines roles and sets limits. When a leader takes on the heart of a parent, he or she easily realizes the social responsibilities that come with that high office. First and foremost, parents live for the sake of their family. In the same manner, leaders must live for the sake of their constituents. In this model the higher the office the more sacrificial a person must become, because in the family the parents are most public-minded, the most sacrificial. In society, therefore, the higher the office one holds, the less private time one has. One of the main reasons people give for leaving public office is, "I just want to spend more time with my family."

Participatory: Suddenly governing is not something only lawmakers do. That is what parents do in the family. This means leadership is something everyone participates in whether it is on the level of building a family, society, nation or world. Even more to the point, good governance starts within each person. We all need to govern ourselves, to align our minds and bodies correctly by setting the right priorities between the public and private aspects of our lives. And just as the mind is placed above the body, so too our public responsibilities should be placed above our individual needs and desires. The task to align these dual aspects correctly is entirely the responsibility of each person. Parents, religious leaders and teachers can only guide and instruct.

Scalable: In other words, the model of the family can be expanded and applied to larger and larger systems of government. The structure of authority within the family is the model for organizing clans or tribes, societies, nations and ultimately the world. The family has all the components of government, for example: parent and child (government and people); brothers and sisters (citizens of the nation); parental guidance (education), the correct way to handle garbage (waste management), financial viability (gross national product) and in the family you celebrate three important dates: birth, marriage and death, which should also be recorded in a nation's registry. There are many more obvious similarities.

Replicable: This means the model of the family can be reproduced. It is an important element of leadership because learning is more experiential than intellectual. In this way, we all experience the challenges and rewards of leadership as we build our own family. Suddenly we become less critical and more empathetic to members of parliament, mayors, presidents and prime ministers—those who are trying to manage our towns, cities and nations. Through the experience of being a parent we too are trying to manage our families and lead our children. And just as parenthood humbles us, it also prepares us and teaches us valuable lessons of leadership. Neither parents nor leaders can be too dictatorial or authoritarian; children or constituents will rebel.

Sustainable: One of the Millennium Development Goals of the United Nations is to "Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes."[22] There are two components to creating an institution that is sustainable. Whether it is a family or a government, it requires basic managerial skills: administration of finances, delegation of responsibilities, call for accountability or homework, etc. Secondly, and much more fundamental, sustainability requires creating the spirit of oneness, or togetherness. In essence, this is the willingness to make sacrifices. Unbridled selfishness is destructive and never sustainable. Any member of the family—be it a parent or child—who insists on putting his or her self-interests above those of the well-being of family will end up damaging that institution. Whether it is the father who spends his time and money drinking or the child who ignores his parent's advice and authority, both in the end have inverted priorities of putting their own happiness above that of the family.

The Family: A Model for Social Change

Both free-market democrats and revolutionary communists seek social change and development. In this respect their desire for progress may be similar but their methods for achieving that goal differ greatly. The impetus for change in the democratic model occurs through private initiative and production. For this reason the government is often reluctant to be involved with a citizen's private matters. On the other hand, the communist perspective sees a planned economy and strict regulations as the most effective agents to change society. But there is a better model.

Could parents use either of these methods to raise children? Taking a democratic, or laissez-faire (French for "let do") approach would mean parents ultimately let their children do whatever they want to do. The child would most likely turn out to be spoiled: undisciplined and selfish. What about using a communist method, would it work better? Parents who try to strictly control their children's behavior through force or intimidation will quickly realize the outcome: rebellion. Human nature seeks freedom and rebels against tyranny.

Raising children is the model for personal growth and development. In this situation it becomes clear that parents are more like coaches on the sideline. Parents can instruct, guide, teach and even pray desperately

for their children, but in the end each child makes the final decision as to how they will live their lives. Because of this, the most effective coaches are those who have already been successful in that particular sport and coach with praise.

Importantly, parents must be role models for their children. Parents should live the lessons they what their children to learn. Then when the words and deeds of Mom and Dad match the guidance they give to their children their education will be effective. Add to this, a generous dose of constant encouragement. On this foundation of love, support, investment, and education parents may need to correct or scold occasionally, but it would be received as an expression of their parents' love.

Taking the model of good parenting into society, leaders are in the position of our parents. So they must first be role models for people; their words and deeds must match. Then they should constantly teach and liberally praise. This holds true for teachers in schools, owners of factories, CEOs of companies and congressmen in parliament because these leaders take on the parental position in those institutions.

CEOs are realizing that the principles of family-building also apply in the business world. John R. Brandt, formerly editor-in-chief of Industry Week and CEO of the Manufacturing Performance Institute (a research and consulting firm) began his article, "Parenting Your Company to Profit,"[23] by saying, "There are a lot of complicated theories about how to lead and manage. Yet, what if it's really no different than good parenting?"

Summary

In summary, the vision of UPF-Nepal is that "The Earth is Our Home and Humankind is One Family." Its goal is not new; it is to create individuals of good character, families of true love, societies and nations that are harmonious, interdependent, peaceful and prosperous. The method for bringing about this much needed change is educational self-empowerment. It sees education as the most effective agent for long-lasting personal and social change.

The content for this education initiative is derived from universal family values, namely, to be public-minded by living for the sake of others (universal ethics) and honor marriage which is one of society's most fundamental institutions (universal morals).

Headwing Democracy, therefore:

1. Elevates and unifies both the right-wing and left-wing ideologies

2. Balances the spiritual and material aspects of life

3. Focuses on creating a culture of living for the greater good, and

4. Finds common ground in universal family values.

In a nutshell, Father Moon has said, "Headwing thought is based on the parental heart and viewpoint."[24]
_____

Notes

[1] Sun Myung Moon, Cheon Seong Gyeong, Selections from the Speeches of True Parents (Family Federation for World Peace and Unification, May 2006), p. 272.

[2] Baburam Bhattarai, "Post-Conflict Restructuring," paper given at the Institute of South Asian Studies, National University of Singapore, March 25, 2011.

[3] Moon, Cheon Seong Gyeong, p. 272.

[4] "Democracy," in Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Democracy&oldid=381803995, Retrieved Sept. 1, 2010.

[5] Tyler Hendricks, "Unification Politics in Theory and Practice," unpublished.

[6] "Communism," in Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia., http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Communism&oldid=382068050, Retrieved Sept. 1, 2010.

[7] Op. cit.

[8] Bill Powell, "Five Things the U.S. Can Learn from China," Time, Nov. 12, 2009. http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1938671,00.html, Retrieved Sept. 2, 2010.

[9] New Essentials of Unification Thought: Head-Wing Thought (1993) uses the terms: "mutual existence, mutual prosperity, and mutual righteousness."

[10] Robert S. Kittel, "Understanding Nandi and the Shiva Lingam from a Principled Perspective," Journal of Unification Studies 10 (2009): 122-26.

[11] Qur'an 3:92

[12] Dhammapada 13:177

[13] Bhagavad Gita 17:20

[14] Adi Granth p. 161

[15] "Constitution," in Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Constitution&oldid=285685768 Retrieved April 24, 2009.

[16] Glenn T. Stanton, Why Marriage Matters: Reasons to Believe in Marriage in Postmodern Society (Colorado Springs, CO: Pinon Press, 1997), p. 100.

[17] Maggie Gallagher, "The Moral and Social Significance of Marriage in the Global Context," IIFWP Assembly 2000, p. 4.

[18] Stanton, Why Marriage Matters, p. 53.

[19] W. Bradford Wilcox, William J. Doherty, Helen Fisher, William A. Galston, et al., Why Marriage Matters: Twenty-Six Conclusions from the Social Sciences, Second Edition (New York: Institute for American Values, 2005). http:// americanvalues.org/pdfs/why_marriage_matters2.pdf. Retrieved July 2, 2009

[20] "Good governance," in Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Good_governance&oldid=373148313 Retrieved Sept. 1, 2010.

[21] "What is Good Governance?" UNESCAP, 2009. http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/ProjectActivities/Ongoing/gg/governance.asp#top. Accessed July 10, 2009.

[22] Goal 7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability, United Nations' Millennium Development Goals. http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/environ.shtml Retrieved Sept. 2, 2010

[23] John R. Brandt, "Parenting Your Company to Profit," Industry Week, March 2004.

[24] Moon, Cheon Seong Gyeong, p. 281.