

## The Locus of Power and Authority

In light of the (very predictable) schism in the Unification movement since the passing of Rev. Moon, I thought it might be helpful to reveal an alternative way of thinking about it and how I, for one, cope with these matters. My testimony is posted on [tparents.org](http://tparents.org) under the title “The Deep Years” and it remains the essential document. It explains why and how I was compelled, in 1980, to strike out on an independent course, as an independent missionary, to find and restore my own spiritual children, thus forming a substantial foundation. Since I walked a course exactly parallel to Jacob’s course, the outcome was comparable: centered upon my wife Mary and I, as a Blessed Couple (Blessing date June 18, 2000), we are now a “company of people” numbering, by my estimate, several dozens. I consider them all “spiritual children,” not in the sense that they’re Unificationists (they are not) but that they are connected to us in a providential way. I consider it the fulfillment of my own home church mission.

Being independent from the rest of the movement has its upside and its downside. The latter has to do with a deplorable sense of isolation and disconnectedness, and a profound kind of loneliness, such as that described by Rev. Moon himself. The former, however, is extremely important: it serves to shield me from the satanic accusation that has been ripping the church apart for years. I am not in a position to be accused. It also gives me a vantage point to see things a little more clearly.

I would further recommend getting a copy of my just-published book *The Rhetoric of Jesus* (available at [amazon.com](http://amazon.com)). Among the topics discussed are the historic Christian efforts to “deify” Jesus so that he can be worshipped as God. A similar trend is taking place in the Unification movement these days regarding the True Parents; I will address that issue as we go along. What does it mean to *deify* something or someone? It means to turn it into something it’s not, making it a substitute for God. Thus, it is a textbook example of idolatry—which is putting something other than God in God’s place. The Unificationist view of the Messiah is, as we know, closer to the traditional Jewish view of a Davidic Messiah than the later, supernaturalized Christian view. Therefore, the Messiah is by definition a standard-issue human being, no different from the biblical Adam and Eve created by God in Genesis. The sole difference between him and us is that he belongs to a bloodline conditionally cleansed of sin (Judah-Tamar), thus not subject to Satan’s accusation. Otherwise, Christ is just as human as the rest of us. Making this distinction is very important because it is our shared humanity that makes salvation (or restoration) possible. If Christ were actually a god or some superluminal deity, I don’t see how it would be possible. We are called upon to “imitate Christ” and incorporate him into ourselves; but how do you imitate *God*? I don’t know about you, but I could never imitate God.

We can, however, emulate another human being, copy his pattern of thought and behavior, pursue the same overall mission in a specific way, etc. I call this *Deep Christianity*, which means the locus of authority and power is not “out there” somewhere, but deep within your own being. Deep Christianity. This way of accepting Christ is as old as the Apostle Paul, but tends to be frowned upon by the priesthood, the clergy, etc. Why? Deep Christianity is democratic and self-governing, thus it is a threat to the authority of church hierarchies, who prefer to maintain their power; it is in their vested interest to keep the laity docile and ignorant. I know how cynical that sounds, but it

happens to be the truth. Those who look outside themselves for leadership and authority—who look to priests and clergy, to the institutional church, or even to Holy Scripture—are practicing a different style of faith, what might be called Standard Christianity.

That's not to say that our religious institutions don't serve a useful purpose, for they do. I'm not arguing against their function or legitimacy, only against the tendency to overstep their bounds for self-serving reasons. Mine is an argument against *corruption* and a plea for purity, just as Jesus once argued against the scribes and Pharisees.

When a religious or political figure is deified, certain attributes are assigned to him (or her), among them *infallibility* and the notion that they possess *divine knowledge* and *divine power*. They are also thought to occupy a state of being that is unknown to mortal man, closer to that of gods and angels than earth-dwellers like us.

Let's take a look at the concept of "infallibility." Is it possible for any man (or woman) to be infallible? The Principle teaches that we must fulfill the purpose of creation by becoming perfected individuals, or "one-body" with God, but does that mean we're infallible? A man of perfection is completely sinless, which means he cannot be accused by Satan. However, that's not the same as being infallible. Even if he is pure as the driven snow he could still make a mistake or "get it wrong." For example, when making a decision he might be missing some crucial bit of information and thus make an ill-fated choice; or perhaps he puts his trust in someone who later proves untrustworthy (Judas, for instance); the resulting damage can be significant. Anyone can make these kinds of mistakes simply because he lacks the omniscience of God. As Father says, "Only God knows all things completely."

In Rev. Moon's teaching there is a mild sort of criticism of Jesus in his attempt to fulfill the role of Messiah: 1) that he appealed to the people through phenomena (healings, exorcisms, etc); and 2) that he had no back-up plan in case the Jewish people rejected him. So Jesus put all his chips on the table, so to speak, then crapped out! His life became forfeit. And Rev. Moon has admitted to making mistakes as well, particularly in his role as a New Human Ancestor. He doesn't appear to have been especially attached to conventional monogamy, citing the examples of Jacob and other Old Testament figures. How one chooses to interpret that is one's own business. Myself, I give him the benefit of the doubt. I know where I stand with my own morals, and that's good enough for me.

Another factor contributing to human fallibility is the nature of physical existence itself; our bodies are made of the same atoms and molecules as the rest of creation, and are thus bound by the same limitations. Our brain—the seat of earthly consciousness and thought—is made of atoms, too. All physical systems decline with age. When I read some of Rev. Moon's latter-day speeches, they often sound rambling and incoherent. They lack the sharpness and focus of earlier talks. I once saw a speech televised on C-Span (about 2005-6) and it was uncomfortable to sit through; the audience was clearly displeased. I was aghast: this was *nothing* like the truly awesome oratory he gave at Washington Monument (to cite one example). But I just chalk it up to old age; he was already in his 80s.

My understanding of God is this: he does not expect men to be miracle-workers or mistake-free; what he does expect is that we make a wholehearted effort and *take responsibility* for our errors. That means, don't blame others or the environment, or even yourself. Repent, indemnify, and move on. Any serious person is capable of that much. The upshot is this: *there is no such thing as an infallible human being*, at least not on earth. It is neither expected nor required. The Messiah during his earthly life cannot be any different from the rest of us in that regard.

What about divine knowledge and power? By that I mean knowledge and power that ordinary men cannot possess. That would include the ability to predict the future (with unerring accuracy), to know what others are thinking and planning, to perform superhuman feats like walking on the Sea of Galilee, changing water into wine, and so on. Although the Messiah appears to have knowledge and abilities that far outstrip those of regular people, they are still within the bounds of what is possible for man. Just knowing the Principle and acting upon it gives you enormous spiritual power compared to people in the fallen world. I would be the first to point out that Rev. Moon's understanding is light-years beyond the rest of us, but it is still a *human* capacity. Not even he knows all there is to know.

### **A Case Study: Jesus is Deified**

If I may, allow me to quote from *The Rhetoric of Jesus*:

All four of the canonical gospels indulge the tendency to deify Jesus, some more and some less. In Mark, the oldest gospel, it is there but only in limited doses; Matthew and Luke share equal amounts but shift their emphases in different directions—the former from *within* the Judaic tradition (one sect of Jews attacking another), and the latter from *without* (Christianity beginning to emerge as a separate faith). Both, however, go much further than Mark in transforming Jesus from mortal man to a demigod. John, as should be abundantly clear by now, takes that tendency to its farthest extreme.

The canonical gospels, as indeed the entire Bible, are characterized as “historical fiction”—a genre of writing based upon real people and events, but the writer is free to embellish the accounts as he wishes. The Gospel of John is considered a work of almost pure fiction by New Testament scholars, and I tend to agree. Jesus as depicted in the Fourth Gospel is more like a character out of Marvel Comics than a real human being. To get a feel for the “historical” Jesus I'd suggest a close reading of Mark.

This is what Rev. Moon had to say about it: “Jesus Christ is the one man who lived God's ideal in its fullest realization. He was the first man of perfection ever to walk the earth, and he came to restore the true relationship between God and man. But after Jesus' crucifixion, Christianity made him into God. This is why the gap between God and man

has never been bridged.” When I was hearing Divine Principle lectures for the first time in 1977, I remember Christianity being taken to task for this; the lecturer called modern Christianity a “personality cult” that wanted to worship Jesus-as-God. While we recognize the need for the Messiah as a mediator between God and sinful man, it is nonetheless *God* that we want to worship, not the Messiah himself. Again, turning the Messiah into an object of worship is just another form of idolatry.

The doctrine of the Virgin Birth was part of this effort, of course: Jesus was conceived by the Holy Spirit and born of the Blessed Virgin. Unification Theology denies this for the mythology it is, but why would Christians make this claim? In the ancient world it was common practice to say that certain heroes or kings were in fact the sons of gods; typically that meant Zeus (for instance) had slept with a man’s wife and the resulting child was Hercules. The claims made about Jesus appear to be aimed at countering the “imperial Roman theology” of Caesar—i.e. that Caesar Augustus was actually the son of a god. It says to the world, “You think Caesar is a god? Jesus Christ is the true Lord... he is the *Son* of God.”

The Nicene Creed etches this theology in stone, saying that Jesus was “begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father by whom all things were made.” He “...came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary, and was made man...”

The term “begotten of the Father” is used to draw a sharp distinction between Jesus, who was thought to have pre-existed all creation, and mortal man, who was made by God out of clay: “... then the LORD God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being.” (Gen. 2:7) Therefore, mortal man was “made” or created by God, using the earth as raw material. Jesus, on the other hand, was “begotten, not made...” according to the Creed. This comes dangerously close to docetism, however, declared a heresy by the early Church. References to Jesus as God’s “only begotten Son” are thus appeals to his deified status, meaning that he is something more than mortal man. It shouldn’t be at all surprising that Jews found this impossible to accept; in their view, the Davidic Messiah was never anything more than a man.

As I pointed out before, a “human” Messiah can be emulated, his example incorporated into one’s own being: *if he can do it, so can you!* But a “divine” Messiah is beyond anyone’s reach. Ordinary folks such as you and I cannot hope to emulate him; it is madness even to try. All we can really do is worship him. Therefore, a priestly caste is necessary to mediate between the Divine Being of Christ and mortal men; the locus of power and authority, then, rests in the *Church*.

It might be helpful to know that in the ancient world, “holiness” was not thought of as a moral quality as it is today, but as a *power* similar to electricity or natural gas. Holiness was potentially dangerous, and if not handled correctly, the consequences could be deadly. 2 Samuel 6-7 tells the story of the ark of the covenant being moved to Jerusalem; it was placed in a cart pulled by two oxen, with two men to attend it. “When they came to the threshing floor of Nacon, Uzzah reached out his hand to the ark of God and took hold of it, for the oxen shook it. The anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah; and God struck him there because he reached out his hand to the ark; and he died there beside the

ark of God.” Uzzah’s motive (protecting a sacred artifact) was irrelevant; he lacked the qualifications necessary to handle the ark, to his detriment.

I’ve thought long and hard about *why* there is this tendency to deify Christ, and that’s the only answer I can come up with: it mandates the need for a priestly caste—that is, trained professionals who are qualified to approach the Divine Being directly; ordinary people such as you and me are *not* qualified.

### **Why Are True Parents Deified?**

The best way to answer that question is to ponder who it serves to benefit: the rank and file membership? The Unification Church/Family Federation organizational structure? Leadership in general? The answer is obvious: the priestly caste benefits the most. They wind up with the power, the prestige, the wealth—all the things that men desire. Why is there corruption and abuse in the UC/FFWPU? For the same reason there is corruption and abuse in the Catholic Church, U.S. government, or any other collective entity: it is composed of *men* who tend to be corruptible. One of my favorite quotes about power and corruption comes from science-fiction writer Frank Herbert: “It is not that power corrupts, but that it is magnetic to the corruptible.” Take the example of Catholic priests who become sexual predators. Is there something inherent within the priesthood that drives them to be perverts? Is the requirement of celibacy to blame? Or is it that the priesthood is somehow attractive to men with abnormal sexual proclivities? I would suggest the latter. The same thing is true with police brutality: is there something about policing that induces brutality in cops, or is it that a career in law enforcement appeals to men with violent dispositions? Again, I think the latter is true. Not all cops are rotten apples, needless to say, and not all priests are pedophiles. But there is something about these professions that attracts the bad guys.

I wouldn’t go so far as to call church leaders—Unification or otherwise—a gang of hypocrites (as Jesus famously did). The majority may in fact be sincere in their belief that their position and authority serves the will of God. Thus, any opposition to it, or criticism of it, may be seen as “satanic.” If we were living in medieval Europe, I’ve no doubt whatsoever that my opinions would get me dragged in front of the Grand Inquisitor. Thank God Almighty for the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights! I can freely say these things without fear for my safety.

As we all know, Rev. Moon often mused upon the vagaries of human language, and he was forever coining new terms. It is not at all surprising that he would ponder the phrase “only begotten son” and follow it with “only begotten daughter.” That is just another way of saying, where there is Adam there has to be Eve. They must always appear together. 2000 years ago God found his new Adam (Jesus) but Eve could not be located. This resulted in the crucifixion. But why the hell are we now turning this rather archaic phraseology into High Theology? I assumed that these matters had been settled to everyone’s satisfaction years ago.

There are a number of things in RM’s teaching that I have difficulties with. For example, he gives a providential explanation for King David’s seizure of Bathsheba and their resultant child, Solomon. According to the story, Uriah is a commander in the Israelite army and Bathsheba is his wife. One day while Uriah is away, King David

espies Bathsheba from afar and orders her brought to him. Soon she is pregnant with David's child. Fearful of the potential scandal should this become public, David sends Uriah out to battle where he knows he'll be killed; once Uriah is out of the way, the King takes Bathsheba to wife. One of their subsequent children is Solomon. Now, RM interprets this whole sordid affair from a Principle point of view as an example of "restoration," to prove that even adultery can sometimes serve God's purposes, but I have serious doubts about this. We know that King David was tormented by guilt over it for the rest of his days, going so far as to seek absolution from the priesthood before his death. The prophet Nathan condemned him for it. What if David had sternly disciplined himself when tempted by Bathsheba and denied his lust for her? Are we to think this would have thwarted God's will? It is a ridiculous argument. I think it more likely that Rev. Moon saw things in scripture that weren't really there; in fact, his whole method of biblical interpretation—the "allegorical meaning" method—is quite archaic.

That doesn't mean he isn't the Messiah, though. His position as Lord of the Second Advent and True Parent doesn't hinge upon his exegetical skills. Neither does it hinge upon whether I agree with everything he says (I don't). He is who he is. Some of the things Jesus taught in the gospels don't resonate with me either, but what difference does it make? He is still Christ. The most important part of the term "True Parents" is the latter part: they are *Parents*—not overlords or deities or monarchs. They are Parents. Is it somehow disloyal or unfilial to have a difference of opinion with one's folks? Not really. The parent-child relationship transcends all of that. Same thing is true with our relationship to God; our position as children far outweighs anything else. God is actually willing to follow *your* lead if it contributes to the whole purpose. In fact, I believe nothing would delight the Creator more than to see his sons and daughters "take over" the mission of establishing the kingdom of God, making it their own. The fact that most people fail to do this is a big problem.

It doesn't surprise me that Mrs. Moon, who now has the burden of leading this feisty movement, would want to put her own feminist spin on things. She must have known that male-chauvinist Koreans, especially, would challenge her every move. The feminist agenda doesn't appeal to me that much, either, but I don't take it seriously. The "only begotten daughter" theology has little to do with the Principle; it has more to do with legitimizing her authority, which is under siege. Who knows what it's like to be standing in her shoes right now?

### **There Can Be No Succession**

Disputes between the "designated heir" sons Hyun Jin (Preston), Hyung Jin (Sean), and their mother over succession are essentially meaningless. The mission of the Messiah can only be consummated once on earth (9/18/76); the kingdom of God can only be founded once. After it is established, it is eternal. To suggest otherwise is to say the Principle isn't true and God probably doesn't exist. While the three-way schism is disheartening and disappointing (not to mention embarrassing), it will prove to be a surface phenomenon in the end, like a non-life threatening injury. Give it time and it will heal itself.

According to Principle the advent of True Parents is a once-in-human-history event: it has never happened before and will never happen again. The fact that a "successor" was

selected and consecrated by the Parents (Preston or Sean, you decide) may have some symbolic or sentimental value, but such a position is honorary at best. It's not like we now have a new set of "True Parents." No one else can be *the* True Parents.

What is True Parenthood? It is equivalent to the kingdom of God itself... it represents the Ideal fulfilled. The word "True" means absolutely God-centered, "Parent" means they represent God's parental rights and duties toward all men as his children. The kingdom of God belongs to all of us, it is our collective inheritance. The Blessing represents God's sovereignty, and to receive the Blessing means we are responsible for it. *Fulfilling the Blessing means to solidify God's eternal sovereignty on earth*; this is something that each couple and family has to work out for themselves. My way of doing it may not be appropriate for you, and vice versa. As I see it, however, maintaining and developing God's sovereignty on earth is *my* personal responsibility, regardless of what others may do. I just have to make the best offering possible, and God will take care of the rest.

While movements to cure social ills like racism and male-chauvinism are necessary to achieve a truly just society, the problem is that they tend to degrade to what I call a "turn the tables" push for comeuppance. Taking a cue from the New Testament about the first being last and the last first, we think that when the kingdom of God comes those now rich will be poor, and those now masters will become slaves, etc. But how could that be? In the kingdom of God there is no dichotomy of rich/poor or master/slave. All stand on an equal footing before God. Take the Civil Rights movement as a prime example. The basic idea is admirable: why shouldn't peoples of color have equal access and equal opportunity? Justice demands it. Unfortunately, that has degraded to a mind-numbing grievance narrative which accuses *all* whites of benefiting from "white privilege," followed by demands for reparations for slavery. Thus, we have someone like Michael Eric Dyson calling for white people to have mandatory "reparations accounts," funds to be deducted from their paychecks, I suppose. Too much of this talk conceals a hidden desire to turn the descendants of slaves into a new privileged class. Similarly, in the feminist agenda there seems to be a push for female-chauvinism, calling the devaluation of men "justice." But I believe in calling a turd a turd: bigotry is bigotry, no matter who spews it.

In God there is an Ideal to accomplish: man represents the *will* or the *desire* to accomplish it; woman represents its fulfillment. Both are absolutely necessary. A desire by itself is nothing but a wraith, an intangible idea; physical accomplishment without divine purpose is just an empty shell. Only when the two are combined do we have a "living being" (Gen. 2:7). The Principle is quite clear: Adam has to be established first, then Eve is raised up *through Adam*. That is the order of creation and re-creation.

When a Blessed Couple is separated by death, the surviving spouse is faced with a dilemma: how to proceed with half their former strength. And how to maintain God's sovereignty which is held in trust between the two (note that the Blessing can only be given to couples, never to individuals). I cannot speak for True Mother; I suppose she's dealing with it the best way she can. If she has somehow gone off the rails (as her accusers allege), that will have to be fixed by God. We are in no position to do so. I personally am in a similar position: my blessed wife passed away four years ago. And brother, let me tell you: Satan has been coming after me ever since, trying to push me into the position where I would forfeit the Blessing. I've had to spend a lot of time in prayer to make sure this doesn't happen.

## The Power of Thought and Language

Rev. Moon tells us,

All you have to do is think about how you are doing this work for God and mankind. Of course, we are not working for mankind as it is, but for the day when all mankind will come to the ideal world. It is our responsibility to each feel that we are re-creating and reclaiming the original world. Since a man lost it, through “me” everything is regained. We are going through the indemnity course to restore all lost mankind to God’s side. This is the way to live your life.

In 2009 I experienced what I call a “refocusing” event in my spiritual life; it wasn’t that I was spiritually dead or anything, but I was unfocussed. I had stopped believing that the Unification movement would usher in the Kingdom of Heaven. People were discussing publicly whether the Second Advent had “failed” and if perhaps we should look towards a Third Advent. I found myself willing to settle for “church” in lieu of the Heavenly Kingdom, for “religion” instead of fulfilling the purpose of creation. I was drifting towards relativism. In the *refocusing* event I found myself re-reading RM’s speeches with heightened intensity and spontaneously praying for about an hour or so each day. That was surprising because I have never been one for long prayers; I’ve always been more action-oriented.

But the prayers altered my pattern of thinking in subtle ways. I realized that settling for anything other than God’s Ideal would automatically create distance between us, cause separation. Part of the problem was the language itself. For years we had tossed around the terms “Heavenly Kingdom,” “Kingdom of Heaven,” or even “HK” until the phraseology was meaningless. People said it out of habit without thinking about what it meant. So I went back to the New Testament’s *kingdom of God*—which is the preferred term. If my goal in life is anything other than that—God’s kingdom on earth—I will find myself being separated from him. That means I would be drifting back towards Satan.

Is it simply a matter of semantics? Are we playing word games here? There is more to it than that. Linguists have long debated whether it is language that makes thought possible or the other way around; current consensus is the latter: thought produces language. How we perceive reality is affected by it as well; I would even go so far as to say that the greater one’s language skills—flexibility, adaptability, imagination, etc.—the greater one’s chances of being well grounded in the *real*. Poor language skills means that you are in danger of being trapped in a bubble of unreality. In other words, although thought produces language (and not vice versa), the language we use profoundly influences our ability to think clearly. That was one of the themes in Orwell’s *1984*—the official language of Newspeak was designed to render the populace incapable of revolt; by eliminating the *words* that evoke rebellion, it became impossible to even think about it.

In the past I have found that if I have questions about God or providence that go unanswered for a long period of time, it might be because *I’m asking the wrong question*. For example, I know that we are supposed to love God as he loves us. But if I ask myself the question, “Do I love God?” it is very hard to answer. I’ve dedicated my entire life to



God's cause but I don't really feel "love" in that way. One day I realized that I was asking the wrong question. The right question is "Am I united with God's purpose?" If you can answer in the affirmative, then you're on the way to fulfilling your responsibility.

Another phrase that I've grown wary of is "Our True Parents." I read somewhere that even RM had become weary of it, saying, "I'm sick and tired of it." What could that possibly mean? It means that church members had long been in the habit of invoking "True Parents," to the extent that all significant meaning had fled from it. Practice becomes ritual, ritual becomes rote, and God retreats from it. So I stopped praying and doing things in True Parents' name; now I pray in the name of the Blessing Realm. Who belongs to the Blessing Realm? God, of course, True Parents (the focal point), all Blessed Families and Blessed Couples. In short, it connotes the kingdom of God.

In the course of everyday life it is not easy to think that what we do contributes to the building of God's Ideal world. It seems as though nothing changes, no matter how hard we try. But getting caught up in the "result" (or lack of it) is foolish. Our job is to sow the seed; it might take many generations for the outcome to reveal itself. My advice: dedicate yourself to a life of sowing (indemnity), never mind the result. What you do outwardly isn't the issue, even if you're just working at McDonalds. What matters is investing your work with the proper thought and motive. Rev. Moon spent almost three years working in a North Korean prison. Externally he was assisting the North Korean war effort, but internally he was serving God. Heaven knows where we are and what we're doing at all times (and why we're doing it); anything, literally anything, can be an offering to God if we have the right motivation. Cultivating that is every person's individual responsibility. RM said, "Don't worry about me or my family. Worry about fulfilling your own responsibility."

I intend to do just that, regardless of what happens "out there." Common sense as well as the evidence of my senses tells me that I'm taking an enormous risk: throwing my life away fighting for a hopeless cause. I already *know* that's not the case, but that's how it seems. The Principle says that by fulfilling the purpose of creation, man inherits "God's creative nature." What is *God's* creative nature as opposed to human creativity? All people, fallen or not, display a certain creativity. God's creativity is deeper than that: it consists of his ability to conceive an image in his mind, then bring it into tangible reality. The entire universe is convincing evidence of this ability. If we inherit it, that means *we* form the image in *our* minds (the kingdom on earth), then work until it becomes reality. With the help of God, it shall come to pass.

So does my advocacy of Deep Christianity—and thus democratic self-governance—represent a break from tradition? Is it heretical to think this way? I've spent the last 41 years studying Rev. Moon's teaching and it's obvious to me *this is exactly what he teaches*. And the fact that only a handful of people seem to "get it" frustrated him to no end. One can almost see him pulling his hair out (what little he had left) on occasion, addressing rooms full of obstinate people. In his 1976 *Newsweek* interview, he said, "... if I falter for some reason, then millions of new Reverend Moons will spring up. The work of God will go on." I envision that happening: new Reverend Moons rising up everywhere you look! Anyone who commits his life to the kingdom of God can call himself "Reverend Moon" if he wishes, or even "Jesus."

What about the nagging thought, tormenting at times, that all of this is just some mass delusion? Do we really expect our efforts to yield an Ideal condition? Ultimately it comes down to faith—meaning unconditional *trust* in the benevolence of God. Satan always tries to convince believers that God is not to be trusted, that he will let us down in the end. I've been listening to this BS for years. If we cannot trust God, who or what do we trust? Physical reality? The world of (fallen) men? Ourselves? I say only God can be trusted absolutely. The real question is, Am I willing to risk everything on that premise?

Let me close with an anecdote about a careless mistake I once made and how it was resolved. One day I was browsing in a book store and I picked up a book about “cults.” Of course there was a chapter on the Unification Church which I skimmed through. All the usual accusations were there: the religion is just a front for economic/political purposes, the blatant abuse of hapless church members, Rev. Moon's nefarious dealings in China, North Korea, Japan, America, etc. After I went home I found myself being tormented by the thought, “What if it turns out that he's really *not* the Messiah?” For a couple of days that question was like a worm in my brain. Finally, I shook it off, saying, “I don't care if he's the Messiah or not! I am going to follow him anyway... I believe what he teaches is the truth, I believe what he's doing is right.”

After that, there has never been a shred of doubt in my mind. I made a bold determination about what to do and how to proceed, no matter the outcome. That incident occurred about 30 years ago, and everything that's happened since then only reinforces the conviction. *This* is what we do, regardless. That's the power of thought in action, the power to remake reality.