

JOURNAL OF UNIFICATION STUDIES

VOLUME II

1998

The Unification Doctrine
of the Trinity

THEODORE T. SHIMMYO

Amorous Archons in Eden and Corinth

ROBERT M. PRICE

“A Friendly Biography
About an Extraordinary Man”:
Michael Breen’s *Sun Myung Moon:
The Early Years, 1920-53*

MICHAEL L. MICKLER

A Study of the Formation and History
of the Unification Principle

JIN-CHOON KIM

A Reappraisal of Typologies of
New Religious Movements and
Characteristics of the Unification Church

YOSHIHIKO MASUDA

American Democracy
and the True Society

GORDON L. ANDERSON

Visions of the Spirit World: Sang Hun Lee’s
Life in the Spirit World and on Earth
Compared with Other Spiritualists’ Accounts

ANDREW WILSON

R

RESERV]]

Editor: Andrew Wilson
Editorial Board: Michael Mickler
Theodore Shimmyo
Andrew Wilson

Production Editor: Jonathan Gullery

The *Journal of Unification Studies*, a journal of the Unification Theological Seminary, is a forum for committed engagement with Unification theology and practice, addressing concerns of the theological community and the professional ministry. To clarify foundational issues in Unification theology, the *Journal of Unification Studies* welcomes commentary and critical studies of texts and doctrines, as well as historical studies of the Unification Church and the life of its founder. To promote dialogue and understanding, it invites papers from diverse viewpoints which engage Unificationist themes, as well as papers which build bridges to other communities of faith. To foster living spirituality, it welcomes essays discussing the relationship between theology and practice. To address contemporary social, cultural, political, scientific and economic issues from a Unificationist perspective, the journal solicits social commentaries and reviews of current books, films and media.

The *Journal of Unification Studies* is published annually by the Unification Theological Seminary, 10 Dock Road, Barrytown, New York, 12507. Annual subscription rates are \$10 in the United States, \$14 overseas, and \$15 for institutions; discounts are available for multiple issues. Make checks payable to the Unification Theological Seminary. To order call 914-752-3013. Submissions and inquiries may be sent to the editor by mail at the above address, or by e-mail at awilsn@epix.net.

ISSN: 1097-1769

© 1999 Unification Theological Seminary

Printed in Canada

JOURNAL OF UNIFICATION STUDIES

Vol. II

1998

Articles

- | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-----|
| The Unification Doctrine of the Trinity | <i>Theodore T. Shimmyo</i> | 1 |
| Amorous Archons in Eden and Corinth | <i>Robert M. Price</i> | 19 |
| “A Friendly Biography About an Extraordinary Man”: Michael Breen’s <i>Sun Myung Moon: The Early Years, 1920-53</i> | <i>Michael L. Mickler</i> | 35 |
| A Study of the Formation and History of the Unification Principle | <i>Jin-choon Kim</i> | 49 |
| A Reappraisal of Typologies of New Religious Movements and Characteristics of the Unification Church | <i>Yoshihiko Masuda</i> | 71 |
| American Democracy and the True Society | <i>Gordon L. Anderson</i> | 95 |
| Visions of the Spirit World: Sang Hun Lee’s <i>Life in the Spirit World and on Earth</i> Compared with Other Spiritualists’ Accounts | <i>Andrew Wilson</i> | 123 |

Book Reviews

- | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----|
| The Ideal in the World’s Religions: Essays on the Person, Family, Society and Environment, edited by Robert Carter and Sheldon Isenberg | <i>Robert M. Price</i> | 149 |
| Principled Education, by Mose Durst | <i>Kathy Winings</i> | 153 |
| Boundless as the Sea: A Guide to Family Love, by June Saunders | <i>Dietrich Seidel</i> | 155 |

Editor: Andrew Wilson
Editorial Board: Michael Mickler
Theodore Shimmyo
Andrew Wilson

Production Editor: Jonathan Gullery

The *Journal of Unification Studies*, a journal of the Unification Theological Seminary, is a forum for committed engagement with Unification theology and practice, addressing concerns of the theological community and the professional ministry. To clarify foundational issues in Unification theology, the *Journal of Unification Studies* welcomes commentary and critical studies of texts and doctrines, as well as historical studies of the Unification Church and the life of its founder. To promote dialogue and understanding, it invites papers from diverse viewpoints which engage Unificationist themes, as well as papers which build bridges to other communities of faith. To foster living spirituality, it welcomes essays discussing the relationship between theology and practice. To address contemporary social, cultural, political, scientific and economic issues from a Unificationist perspective, the journal solicits social commentaries and reviews of current books, films and media.

The *Journal of Unification Studies* is published annually by the Unification Theological Seminary, 10 Dock Road, Barrytown, New York, 12507. Annual subscription rates are \$10 in the United States, \$14 overseas, and \$15 for institutions; discounts are available for multiple issues. Make checks payable to the Unification Theological Seminary. To order call 914-752-3013. Submissions and inquiries may be sent to the editor by mail at the above address, or by e-mail at awilsn@epix.net.

ISSN: 1097-1769

© 1999 Unification Theological Seminary

Printed in Canada

THE UNIFICATION DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

Theodore T. Shimmyo

The doctrine of the Trinity is one of the most difficult and mysterious Christian doctrines. For one thing, the word “trinity” is not found in the Bible. Although the New Testament many times refers to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit together as a group, nowhere can we find the word “trinity” to describe their relations. “Trinity” is a technical term coined in a later era. Theophilus of Antioch in the second century was the first to use the word *trias* in Greek, and Tertullian in the beginning of the third century used the word *trinitas* in Latin.

Since the doctrine of the Trinity is a central doctrine in Christianity, we are willing to make a concession and accept this non-biblical term as authoritative. But there is yet a second difficulty even more disturbing than the first, for the word contains a numerical contradiction. The contradiction is evident when the word intends to say that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are each God, and also at the same time that there is only one God. The three are equal to the one. This is beyond intellectual comprehension. Hence the doctrine of the Trinity has been called a *mysterium logicum*. Thomas Aquinas decided that this doctrine belongs to revealed theology which is to be accepted by faith beyond reason.

The doctrine of the Trinity is thus truly difficult to comprehend. Despite its central position in Christian theology, therefore, it has long tended not to be dealt with very openly. In the words of a contemporary Catholic theologian, “Among the doctrines and symbols of Christianity perhaps none has been subject to theological neglect as that of the Trinity” due to its received status as a mystery.¹ According to another contemporary theologian, one wide-

Dr. Theodore T. Shimmyo is the President of the Unification Theological Seminary, where he is Associate Professor of Theology. His recent publications include *Explorations in Unificationism* (1997) co-edited with David A. Carlson. Dr. Shimmyo is a member of the Karl Barth Society of North America.

spread reaction to the doctrine of the Trinity today is “one of hostility, dismissal or indifference” because this inherited dogma is “of no interest or relevance to the modern mind.”²

The present essay will attempt to solve the mystery of the doctrine of the Trinity, first by analyzing why it became a mystery historically, and then by explaining the Unification doctrine of the Trinity,³ which offers a good solution. By so doing, we aim to restore the original central importance of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, which should never be abandoned as an unintelligible or troublesome thing. We must reach its essence and understand what it was intended to explain. If we do so, we will be able to see what Christianity originally sought to accomplish through this doctrine.

In this century, theologians including Karl Barth, Karl Rahner and Jürgen Moltmann revived the doctrine of the Trinity by making it more relevant to the domain of creation. This was an important phenomenon from the standpoint of restoring the original importance of the doctrine. Hence, the present essay will also assess and appreciate their new views on the Trinity from the viewpoint of the Unification doctrine of the Trinity.

1. Why the Doctrine of the Trinity Became a Mystery

The reason the doctrine of the Trinity became a mystery, beyond intellectual comprehension, stems from the Church’s combat with the two heresies of Monarchianism in the third century.

Monarchianism, in describing the relations of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, sought to defend the unity of God and his sole rule or monarchy (*monarchia*). In so doing, it had as its laudable motive to combat the errors of pagan polytheism. Unfortunately, perhaps even because of its good motive, Monarchianism ended up being heretical. Monarchianism had two different schools: Modalistic Monarchianism and Dynamistic Monarchianism. Their positions can be described concisely as follows: Modalistic Monarchianism defended the unity of God by maintaining that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are three different successive modes of one and the same God. As modes of God the three are all one and the same and equally divine. By contrast, Dynamistic Monarchianism defended the unity of God by regarding the Father alone as God and deciding that the Son and the Holy Spirit are merely creatures, although very close to God. Modalistic Monarchianism, because of its teaching of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit as three successive modalities of the same God, held that God the Father suffered as the Son at the time of the crucifixion. Hence this Monarchian school is also called Patripassianism. Dynamistic Monarchianism asserted that the Son, a created man subordinate to God the Father, received a power (*dynamis*) from the Father at the time of his baptism to be adopted as the Son of God. Hence this

school is also called Subordinationism or Adoptionism.

These two Monarchian schools had a laudable purpose to defend the unity of God, but their views on the Son sounded extreme to many in the Church. The former regarded the Son as one mode of God himself, neglecting his human nature, whereas the latter viewed the Son merely as a man, disregarding his divine nature. Christian leaders such as Hippolytus vigorously opposed both schools.⁴

Historically, Modalistic Monarchianism became more popular than Dynamistic Monarchianism. Even so, the former was still a heresy in the eyes of the Church, which therefore sought to refute it. Tertullian's refutation was outstanding and accepted by the Church. In a nutshell, his refutation rejected both Monarchian schools, going beyond their two extreme positions to pioneer a middle position belonging to neither of the two schools. As will be seen, this middle position turned out to be obscure and difficult (perhaps profound, if taken positively). In our opinion, this is the reason why the Christian doctrine of the Trinity became a mystery beyond intellectual comprehension.

2. Tertullian's Doctrine of the Trinity

The trinitarian position of Tertullian was presented after he left the Church to join a heretical spiritual group called the Montanists, yet even so it became the orthodox formulation of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. The mainstream of the Church, being unable to accept either of the two Monarchian schools, thought that Tertullian's formulation succeeded in properly representing Church teaching by avoiding both. He first used such terms as *persona* and *trinitas* which became indispensable in later formulations of the doctrine.

Tertullian first refuted Modalistic Monarchianism.⁵ He complained that Modalistic Monarchianism favored the monarchy of God over his dispensation or economy (*oikonomia*). He asserted that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are not one and the same, as the Modalistic view suggested, but three persons (*tres personae*) which are distinct from one another in the divine economy. According to Tertullian, this distinction (*distinctio*) among the three persons of the Trinity can be clearly understood and definitively established in the context of the divine economy in which the salvific activities of the Trinity historically occur. In this sense, the word "person" (*persona*), as used by Tertullian, assumed much more individuality than the Modalistic word "mode."

What we have to know carefully here, however, is that the Latin word *persona* in the days of Tertullian never meant what the modern English word "person" means, i.e., a self-conscious individual person. The term meant only legal ownership or a mask used at the theater. According to Tertullian,

therefore, there is no separation (*separatio*) among the three persons (*tres personae*), although there is a clear distinction (*distinctio*) among them, given the divine economy. The three persons are of one substance (*una substantia*). In this way Tertullian was also able to criticize the error of Dynamistic Monarchianism.

To explain his own position further, Tertullian gave illustrations from nature, referring to the relations of root, tree and fruit, of fountain, river and stream, and of sun, ray and apex.⁶ In each of these cases, the three elements involved are distinctly three by procession, but they are inseparable from one another because they are correlatively joined. To these relations he likened those of the three persons, which he called *trinitas*, Trinity.

3. *The Doctrine of the Trinity after Tertullian*

The trinitarian formulation presented by Tertullian determined the course of the development of the doctrine of the Trinity for centuries to come. The terms he coined, *una substantia* and *tres personae*, had a considerable influence on the Councils of Nicea (325) and of Constantinople (381), the first two Ecumenical Councils in the history of Christianity. The Council of Nicea affirmed the consubstantiality (*homoousion*) of the Father and the Son against Arianism, while the Council of Constantinople in turn upheld the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son against Semi-Arianism. The Cappadocian Fathers (Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa), who were instrumental in the decision of the Council of Constantinople, made a distinction between the two Greek words of *ousia* and *hypostasis*, having them mean substance and person, respectively. They made their distinction in accordance with the thought of Tertullian because they wanted to maintain that God has only one *ousia* (substance) but three *hypostases* (persons). Since the time of the Cappadocian Fathers many people have made various statements about the Trinity, but the fundamental trinitarian teaching about one substance and three persons has never altered.

But what does it really mean to say that God has *one* substance, while there are *three distinct* persons? How can there be three distinct persons, each one God, and yet be just one God? It seems that this notion cannot escape the apparent numerical contradiction between the threeness and the oneness of God. This problem was newly created by Tertullian and his followers. Neither of the two schools of Monarchianism had this problem; for Modalistic Monarchianism the oneness had the priority, while for Dynamistic Monarchianism the threeness had the priority. The problem was created because Tertullian avoided both Monarchian schools and came up with a middle position which turned out to be rather unintelligible: "By way of a quick evaluation, we note that there is something of a vagueness about this view of

the Trinity [by Tertullian]. Any effort to come up with a more exact understanding of just what it means will prove disappointing.”⁷⁷ With Tertullian’s formulation, the doctrine of the Trinity became a difficult mystery.

At least three significant attempts were made during the early centuries of Christian history to solve the problem of the Trinity’s numerical contradiction. Yet each one ended up compromising the real distinction among the three persons by securing some kind of additional unity among them in view of the one substance of God. Therefore, each of these attempts ended up with a tendency towards Modalistic Monarchianism, leading to a strong tendency in the Latin trinitarian tradition to emphasize the intradivine unity of the three persons in God. Hence none of them really succeeded in solving the problem. Let us briefly look at these attempts, however.

One attempt to address the problem, put forth by Athanasius, the Cappadocian Fathers and Augustine, was to propose the mutual indwelling or interpenetration of the three persons. According to this, one person is as inevitably in the other two as they are in the one. This mutual indwelling of the persons was later called *perichoresis* in Greek and *circumincessio* (or *circuminsessio*) in Latin. This proposal emerged from mysticism rather than from any serious logical thinking of the matter.

Second, as a natural result of the first proposal, Medieval theologians after Augustine suggested that although God’s three main external operations of creation, redemption and sanctification may be attributed primarily to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, respectively, nevertheless these external operations of the Trinity are indivisible (*opera trinitatis ad extra indivisa sunt*), so that all the three persons are involved in each of those operations. But this suggestion makes it difficult for us to have any understanding of the real distinction of the three persons.

A third attempt to address the problem in question was Augustine’s doctrine of relations in the Trinity, which encourages us to say that in God there are not three particular persons but only one person:

Because the Father is a person, the Son a person, and the Holy Spirit a person, there are assuredly three persons; because the Father is God, the Son God, the Holy Spirit God, why, therefore, are there not three gods? Or since these three together are one God on account of their ineffable union, why are they not also one person, so that we cannot say three persons, even though we call each singly a person, just as we do not say three gods, even though we call each singly God, whether the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit?⁸

This approach clearly had a tendency towards Modalistic Monarchianism, even though Augustine himself was aware that he should be on guard against that heresy.

4. *The Unification Doctrine of the Trinity*

How does Unificationism propose to cope with these difficulties? Instead of taking a middle position between Modalistic and Dynamistic Monarchianism, Unificationism seeks a comprehensive doctrine of the Trinity which can contain both schools of Monarchianism without any contradiction.

First of all, the Unification doctrine of the Trinity contains an element of Modalistic Monarchianism. Recall that this Monarchian school regarded the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit as three modes of God which are all divine. In a similar vein, the Unification doctrine of the Trinity describes three main attributes of God which are all divine: Heart, Original *Sungsang* and Original *Hyungsang*, and regards them as equivalent to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, respectively.⁹ Heart is equivalent to the Father. As “the core of the attributes of God,” Heart is his irrepressible impulse to obtain joy by loving his objects of love, and this impulse makes it “absolutely necessary” for God to create human beings as his objects of love.¹⁰ The Original *Sungsang* is equivalent to the Son, because as “the part of God corresponding to mind” it entails the formation of the Logos within itself.¹¹ Finally, the Original *Hyungsang* is equivalent to the Holy Spirit because it is “a kind of energy” in God.¹² When within God the Original *Sungsang* (the Son) and the Original *Hyungsang* (the Holy Spirit) “engage in give-and-receive action” centering on Heart (the Father), they form a “harmonized body” or “union.”¹³ This union within God can be called the “inner Trinity.”¹⁴ This threeness within God is acknowledged also in the Divine Principle: “God is the one absolute reality in whom the dual characteristics interact in harmony; therefore, He is a Being of the number three.”¹⁵

At the same time, the Unification doctrine of the Trinity contains an element of Dynamistic Monarchianism. As was previously seen, Dynamistic Monarchianism regarded God alone as the Father, while declaring that the Son and the Holy Spirit are merely creatures. In much the same way, Unificationism, when treating God alone as the Father, places perfected Adam and perfected Eve outside of himself as his creatures, and regards the two as the Son and the Holy Spirit, respectively. When perfected Adam (the Son) and perfected Eve (the Holy Spirit) engage in give-and-receive action centering on God (the Father), they together with God form a harmonious union, which constitutes what can be called the “outer Trinity.” Regarding this, the Divine Principle says:

Originally, God’s purpose for creating Adam and Eve was to form a trinity by raising them to be the True Parents of humankind united in harmonious oneness as husband and wife centered on God in a four position foundation. If Adam and Eve had not fallen, but had formed this trinity with

God and become the True parents who could multiply good children, their descendants would have also become good husbands and wives with God as the center of their lives. Each couple would thus have formed a trinity with God.¹⁶

Thus Dynamistic Monarchianism and the Unification notion of the outer Trinity agree that the Father alone is God. It is noteworthy, however, that the two traditions somewhat differ from each other regarding the creaturely status of the Son and the Holy Spirit. For the sense in which Unificationism says that perfected Adam and perfected Eve of the outer Trinity are creatures is interestingly different from the sense in which Dynamistic Monarchianism said that the Son and the Holy Spirit are creatures. Unificationism has a unique theological ontology of fundamental affinity between God and creation. Accordingly, it teaches that perfected Adam and perfected Eve are created humans who have perfected “the purpose of creation,” assumed “deity” (divinity), and are perfectly united with God.¹⁷ By contrast, Dynamistic Monarchianism, lacking the theological ontology to see this sort of basic affinity between God and creation, regarded the Son and the Holy Spirit as mere creatures without divinity. Because of this fundamental difference in the ontology of the two traditions, perfected Adam and perfected Eve of the outer Trinity in Unificationism are much closer to God than are the Son and the Holy Spirit in Dynamistic Monarchianism.

It should be clear from the above that Unificationism has a comprehensive doctrine of the Trinity, involving both an inner Trinity and an outer Trinity, which are similar to the trinitarian formulations of Modalistic and Dynamistic Monarchianism, respectively. What, then, is the relationship between the inner Trinity and outer Trinity? The latter is the substantial manifestation of the former as a result of God’s act of creation. This outer manifestation is completely realized when God’s purpose of creation is perfected in the realm of creation. Furthermore, it is important to know that in Unificationism the outer Trinity, once it is completely realized, becomes the perfect reflection of the inner Trinity. By “return[ing] joy to God,”¹⁸ it is taken up into the inner Trinity. Thus the two types of the Trinity have an inseparable, mutual relationship. Therefore, Unificationism sees a close relationship between the two, while at the same time making a clear distinction between them. In this way, the Unification doctrine of the Trinity avoids the obscure middle position as first formulated by Tertullian. Thus it is able to solve the difficult mystery of the traditional doctrine of the Trinity.

In the Unification doctrine, the inner Trinity is constituted by three “attributes” of God, while the outer Trinity is constituted by three “self-conscious” individual entities, who are discrete yet deeply related centering on perfect fulfillment of the purpose of creation. Therefore the obscure word

persona, which means neither an attribute of God nor a discrete self-conscious individual entity, is no longer needed in the Unification doctrine of the Trinity.

Jesus' Death and the Doctrine of the Trinity

We learned that the Church adopted Tertullian's middle position between Modalistic and Dynamistic Monarchianism. The question remains: Why this formulation? From the viewpoint of Unificationism, theologians such as Tertullian had no choice but to take such a position because Jesus, who was supposed to be in the position of perfected Adam, died on the cross 2,000 years ago and thereby formed the "spiritual Trinity." According to the Divine Principle, "the resurrected Jesus and the Holy Spirit in oneness with God could form only a spiritual trinity."¹⁹ The spiritual Trinity can be located somewhere between the inner Trinity and outer Trinity.

God's original will during the life of Jesus Christ was that the inner Trinity be substantially manifested to constitute the outer Trinity. Specifically, Jesus as the Logos incarnate was expected to become the Son of the outer Trinity as the second, perfected Adam and to find his bride who was to be the Holy Spirit of the same outer Trinity as the second, perfected Eve. Unfortunately, however, he was murdered on the cross, thus losing his physical body. Therefore, the outer Trinity, which is the substantial manifestation of the inner Trinity, was not formed with respect to the Son. For the same reason, this substantial manifestation was not formed with respect to the Holy Spirit as well. That is to say, Jesus was not able to find his bride in the position of perfected Eve in the outer Trinity.

Under those circumstances, the resurrected Jesus, having lost his physical body, could only unite with a manifestation of the Holy Spirit whose locus and identity were not clear. The spiritual Jesus and the Holy Spirit united centering on God to form the spiritual Trinity. The status of this spiritual Trinity is very unclear because it is, strictly speaking, neither the inner Trinity nor the outer Trinity. The mysterious and obscure nature of the traditional doctrine of the Trinity can, in actuality, be attributed to this status of the spiritual Trinity.

5. The Immanent Trinity and the Economic Trinity

As was discussed above, the Unification doctrine of the Trinity includes within its scope both the inner Trinity and outer Trinity, which are clearly distinct yet closely related. In truth, however, this is not a patent of Unificationism; it can be seen also in the Christian tradition in a vivid way. For there are also two sorts of the Trinity in the Christian tradition, called the "immanent Trinity" and the "economic Trinity." The former refers to the rela-

tions of the Father, the Son (the eternal Logos) and the Holy Spirit immanent within the essence of God; hence it is also called the “essential Trinity.” By contrast, the latter pays attention to God’s economy of creation, salvation and sanctification, which is the outer expression of his essence and purpose; hence the economic Trinity refers to the relations of the Father, the Son (the Logos incarnate) and the Holy Spirit as they concretely work in the divine economy. Many observe that the Bible, early creeds and liturgical doxologies were much more concerned with the economic Trinity than the immanent Trinity, basically regarding God and the Father as synonyms.²⁰

It is easily surmised that the inner Trinity in Unificationism is quite similar to the immanent Trinity in the Christian tradition, while the outer Trinity is quite similar to the economic Trinity. Strictly speaking, however, the outer Trinity in Unificationism and the economic Trinity in Christianity are not completely equivalent. The divergence between the two traditions concerns the identity of the Son and also the identity of the Holy Spirit. The Son of the outer Trinity in Unificationism is perfected Adam as a discrete, self-conscious individual man, who has perfected the purpose of creation, assumed divinity and united with God perfectly. On the other hand, the Son of the economic Trinity in Christianity is not a discrete, created individual man; it refers rather to the Logos incarnate, whose *hypostasis*, given that Christ’s human nature has no *hypostasis* of its own, is still identical with the *hypostasis* of the eternal Logos within God himself.²¹ Similarly, the Holy Spirit of the outer Trinity in Unificationism is perfected Eve as a discrete, self-conscious individual woman who works as the bride of the Son in the domain of creation. On the other hand, the Holy Spirit of the economic Trinity in Christianity is identical with the Holy Spirit within God himself, still with the gender of masculinity, emerging out of God to work in the outer realm of economy. This divergence emerges from the fact that due to the death of Jesus, Christianity has not yet been able to find perfected Adam and perfected Eve as bridegroom and bride in the realm of creation.

Despite this divergence, however, Christianity is still very similar to Unificationism in that it makes a distinction between its own two sets of the Trinity. In fact, Tertullian was aware of this distinction. So was Hippolytus, his contemporary. They both believed the economic Trinity to be more important than the immanent Trinity because God’s will should be realized in the world through the divine economy. We saw that it was based on their appreciation of the economic Trinity that they could refute Modalistic Monarchianism. Yet they also wanted to avoid the error of Dynamistic Monarchianism. Hence they chose a middle position, which fell short of what is called the outer Trinity in Unificationism and therefore failed to be thoroughly economic. In this way was established the obscure and incomprehensible tradition of the doctrine of the Trinity.

In the years following the formulation of this obscure, middle trinitarian position, theologians unfortunately tended to downplay the importance of the economic Trinity while engaging in ever more discussion of the inner divine life of the immanent Trinity. This tendency was noticeable especially in the Latin West, which was interested in the priority of the oneness over the threeness of the triune God.

6. *A New Direction*

The traditional doctrine of the Trinity has always occupied a central part of Christian dogma. But with all its obscurity and mystery, it has long been neglected as not very useful and relevant. Even the Reformers of the sixteenth century were not particularly interested in the doctrine of the Trinity. They simply accepted the past trinitarian tradition. They had little new to comment on it from the viewpoint of the Bible that they so adored. To that degree, the doctrine of the Trinity has not been a matter of much concern.

This changed with the twentieth century, as new departures in formulating the doctrine of the Trinity emerged from European theologians including Karl Barth, Karl Rahner and Jürgen Moltmann. These thinkers reemphasized the economic Trinity as they sought to overcome the failure of the traditional trinitarian doctrine to be thoroughly economic. From the viewpoint of Unificationism, their theologies moved in a healthy direction, helpful for solving the mystery of the doctrine of the Trinity. This new direction in twentieth-century thought about the Trinity helped to revive people's interest in that hoary doctrine. Since the time of Karl Barth there has been much serious theology written on the Trinity, and many books and articles on the Trinity were published. It seems that today people throughout the Christian world are more and more recognizing the importance of the doctrine.

The new approaches of Barth, Rahner and Moltmann will each be briefly discussed. It should be noted at this point, however, that we cannot expect them to find a perfect solution. None of their formulations of the doctrine (perhaps with the exception of Moltmann's) is as thoroughly economic as we desire. But as they are moving in the right direction, we treat them with appreciation.

a. Karl Barth

Karl Barth took God's special revelation in the realm of creation very seriously. Hence he attached importance to the economic Trinity in which God's special revelation is witnessed. According to Barth, the economic Trinity should be sharply distinguished from the immanent Trinity because the former does not result from the latter out of necessity but rather through God's own freedom to reveal himself.²² But Barth also recognized a close connection between the two kinds of the Trinity, as it is the immanent Trinity that is

the “basis” and “prototype” of the economic Trinity.²³

Given his great appreciation of the economic Trinity, did Barth maintain, as Unificationism does, that the Son and the Holy Spirit of the economic Trinity (the outer Trinity in Unificationism) are not any more God himself but discrete perfected human individuals in the domain of creation? Unfortunately, not. To Barth, the Son and the Holy Spirit of the economic Trinity, even if they are outer manifestations of the immanent Trinity, are each still basically God. This is the reason why he was afraid that his new appreciation of the economic Trinity could lead to tritheism, if it continued to use the traditional word “person,” which today is taken to mean a self-conscious individual entity.²⁴ Hence he proposed that we not say three persons but three “modes of being” (*Seinsweisen*).²⁵ Here we can see Barth’s continuous allegiance to monotheism.

Nevertheless, Barth’s emphasis on the economic Trinity would give rise to a more appropriate understanding of the status of the Son of the economic Trinity. For in his lecture *The Humanity of God*, delivered in 1956, he acknowledged that Jesus Christ is God’s loyal partner as the true man.²⁶ To be God’s partner as man means to be different from God himself. Also, in his lecture *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, delivered in 1962, Barth made an appropriate distinction between God and Jesus Christ, saying that the former is “the primary partner of the covenant” while the latter is “the other, the secondary, partner of the covenant.”²⁷ This was a celebrated shift of emphasis in the later years of Barth. It evinced a strong tendency towards the idea of the Son of the economic Trinity as a discrete, perfected individual man. Although he showed no shift or change regarding the status of the Holy Spirit, Barth’s appreciation of the economic Trinity coupled with his new Christological understanding is very encouraging and noteworthy.

b. Karl Rahner

Karl Rahner complained of the lack of relevance of the traditional doctrine of the Trinity for the rest of the system of Christian dogma, as well as for our practical life of piety:

The treatise on the Trinity occupies a rather isolated position in the total dogmatic system. To put it crassly, and not without exaggeration, when the treatise is concluded, its subject is never brought up again. Its function in the whole dogmatic construction is not clearly perceived. It is as though this mystery has been revealed for its own sake, and that even after it has been made known to us, it remains, *as a reality*, locked up within itself. We make statements about it, but as a reality it has nothing to do with us at all... In final analysis, all these statements *say explicitly* in cold print that we ourselves have nothing to do with the mystery of the Holy Trinity except to know something “about it” through revelation.²⁸

In order to solve this problem, Rahner took God's self-communication to us in the world seriously and emphasized the importance of the economic Trinity as where we experience that self-communication of God. It is in this context that he identified the economic Trinity with the immanent Trinity: "*The 'economic' Trinity is the 'immanent' Trinity and the 'immanent' Trinity is the 'economic' Trinity.*"²⁹ This was not a statement of ontological identity between the two, which would result in pantheism, but was rather a way of saying that the economic Trinity is the starting point of theology. Rahner still saw a "relative" or "relational" distinction between the two sets of the Trinity, saying that the economic Trinity is "grounded" in the immanent Trinity.³⁰

Did his avowed emphasis on the economic Trinity, then, lead Rahner to go so far as to say, as the Unification doctrine does, that the Son and the Holy Spirit of the economic Trinity are discrete, self-conscious human individuals? The answer is No. Regarding the Son, Rahner still basically followed the Nicene-Chalcedonian tradition, maintaining that the Son of the economic Trinity, in spite of his human nature assumed through the incarnation, is identical with the Son of the immanent Trinity: "here the Logos with God and the Logos with us, the immanent and the economic Logos, are strictly the same."³¹ Regarding the Holy Spirit, Rahner did not believe the Holy Spirit is an incarnation. It is in this context that he tried to avoid tritheism, proposing that we not say three persons but rather three distinct "manners of subsisting" (*Subsistenzweisen*).³² This proposed term is similar to Barth's "modes of being" (*Seinsweisen*).

This may seem a bit disappointing. But the language of Rahner's discussion of the theology of symbols in his *Theological Investigations* has a tendency towards the idea of Jesus Christ as a discrete exteriorization of God: "in [God's] self-exteriorization he goes out of himself into that which is other than he."³³ Whether or not this language was a result of his emphasis on the economic Trinity is not known. But his celebrated identity of the two sets of the Trinity has had a great impact on theology, and as a result many people started paying more attention to the economic Trinity.

c. Jürgen Moltmann

Jürgen Moltmann accepted Rahner's axiom that the economic Trinity is the immanent Trinity, and vice versa, but his way of doing so was uniquely eschatological because it meant to take up the economic Trinity into the immanent Trinity upon the eschatological completion of the former in history:

The economic Trinity completes and perfects itself to immanent Trinity when the history and experience of salvation are completed and perfected. When everything is 'in God' and 'God is all in all', then the economic Trinity is raised into and transcended in the immanent Trinity.³⁴

What is unique about Moltmann's eschatological affirmation of the identity of the economic and immanent Trinity is that it comes from his keen interest in the theology of the cross and also in the history of God. On the cross Jesus experienced the agony of being forsaken by the Father, according to Moltmann. The Father in turn experienced the suffering of separation from the Son. But by surrendering to this kind of misery for the sake of the salvation of sinful humanity, the Father and the Son experienced a new unity with each other in the Holy Spirit. Thus the economic involvement of the Trinity is constitutive of the internal divine life of the immanent Trinity. Hence the unity of the economic and immanent Trinity. Therefore, Moltmann did not approve of separating the economic Trinity from the immanent Trinity, according to which usually "the cross comes to stand only in the economy of salvation, and not within the immanent Trinity."³⁵

Interestingly, Moltmann's idea that the economic Trinity, once completed, is taken up into the immanent Trinity is very similar to the Unification assertion that the outer Trinity, once completely realized, returns its result in the form of joy to the inner Trinity.

Moltmann in his radical appreciation of economic history regarded the three persons of the economic Trinity as "three distinct centers of consciousness and action,"³⁶ thereby avoiding Barth's "modes of being" and Rahner's "manners of subsisting." Moltmann wanted to see the genuine work of each person of the Trinity in the economy of the salvific love of a suffering God. This, we declare, was a very healthy development in the history of the doctrine of the Trinity. Although Moltmann did not go so far as to say, as Unificationism does, that the Son and the Holy Spirit of the economic Trinity are discrete, self-conscious human individuals, nevertheless he noticed independent self-consciousness in each person.

With his new emphasis on the real threeness of the Trinity, Moltmann critiqued Barth and Rahner for being still too preoccupied with the monotheistic oneness of the Trinity despite their openness to the economic Trinity.³⁷ The God of monotheism, according to Moltmann, is cold and uninvolved in the suffering of humans. He declared that monotheism should be replaced by genuine trinitarianism, which understands the love of God. Moltmann did not believe that this was tritheism. His thesis was that the one God has alienated himself from himself on the cross and is returning to himself through the Holy Spirit.

7. Significance of the Doctrine of the Trinity

As was seen above, the new trinitarian insights of theologians including Barth, Rahner and Moltmann have been attempts to overcome the difficult mystery of the traditional doctrine of the Trinity. At the same time, these

insights have helped people in Christendom towards a better understanding of the original significance of the doctrine of the Trinity.

What, then, is the original significance of the doctrine of the Trinity? It consists in the completion of the economic flow from the immanent Trinity to the economic Trinity, so that the economic Trinity may manifest its completeness to the immanent Trinity as its perfect reflection. Thus we should not hold to the immanent Trinity alone without embracing the economic Trinity; otherwise, the doctrine of the Trinity is but an empty theory which has nothing to do with the world of reality. Neither should we hold to a formulation of the Trinity that is somewhere in between the immanent and economic Trinity; otherwise, the doctrine of the Trinity will remain as mysterious and incomprehensible as the traditional trinitarian doctrine. A complete comprehension of the economic Trinity is vitally important in the doctrine of the Trinity. After all, it is through the economic Trinity that God's essence and purpose is completely realized on earth. Barth, Rahner and Moltmann all developed their theories in view of this, although whether they were successful or not is another question.

According to Unificationism, the problematic of the economic Trinity in Christianity is due to the premature death of Jesus. Christianity has not yet borne witness to restored perfected Adam and perfected Eve as the Son and the Holy Spirit of the economic Trinity. Because of this, there remains quite a gap between the economic Trinity in Christianity and the outer Trinity in Unificationism. Even Barth, Rahner and Moltmann, despite their newly developed tendency towards the idea of the Son as a discrete, self-conscious individual (and of the Holy Spirit as another discrete, self-conscious individual in the case of Moltmann), could not bridge this gap completely. Shall we have recourse to the present-day trend amongst liberal-minded theologians, such as Edward Schillebeeckx, Hans Küng, Hendrikus Berkhof and John Hick, to regard Jesus Christ as a man discrete from God and without real divinity?³⁸ No, we shall not have recourse to this, since their liberal views, denying Jesus' divinity, place him too distant from God.

Perhaps Christianity can learn from the insight of Unificationism that there is an ontological affinity between God and creation. If Christian theology could secure some kind of divinity even within the realm of creation, and therefore have the courage to regard the Son and the Holy Spirit as created human individuals who are discrete yet somehow divine, then it could bridge the gap to a thoroughly economic Trinity. So far, Christianity has not had that type of theological ontology; on the contrary, Christian ontology has isolated God from creation, looking upon him as "supreme substance" or "absolute subject," in the words of Moltmann.³⁹ Moltmann once suggested replacing these notions with genuine trinitarianism which would have "a new kind of thinking about God, the world and man."⁴⁰ Such a new thinking might be able

to help Christianity eventually to introduce a theological ontology of affinity between God and creation. It is beyond the scope of the present essay to explore this kind of theological ontology.

Although the gap still remains, we regard the very fact that Barth and others in the twentieth century attempted to appreciate the economic Trinity as signifying that the time has come when God (the Father), perfected Adam (the Son) and perfected Eve (the Holy Spirit) of the outer Trinity in Unificationism emerge in the world as husband and wife to fulfill God's "second blessing" based on "the four position foundation in their family."⁴¹ Furthermore, today's heated discussions on the gender of the persons of the Trinity, especially from feminist perspectives, might somehow show the way towards a view of the Trinity in which the divine economy is understood in terms of the relationship of husband and wife centering on God the Father.⁴² In our opinion, the doctrine of the Trinity in the end serves to point us towards this second blessing. It also points us towards the realization of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth⁴³ and the completion of the divine economy. The real significance of the doctrine of the trinity consists in this.

Notes

1. William J. Hill, *The Three-Personed God* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1982), p. xi.
2. Colin E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), p. 2.
3. The Unification doctrine of the Trinity can be found in *Exposition of the Divine Principle* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1996), pp. 171-72. It can be seen, if implicitly yet importantly, also in "Theory of the Original Image," *Essentials of Unification Thought: The Head-Wing Thought* (Seoul, Korea: Unification Thought Institute, 1992), pp. 1-40. This Unification doctrine has been discussed briefly by Young Oon Kim and Sebastian A. Matczak. See Kim, *Unification Theology and Christian Thought* (New York: Golden Gate Publishing, 1975), pp. 127-28; and *Unification Theology* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1987), pp. 180-81. See also Matczak, "God in Unification Philosophy and the Christian Tradition," in M. Darrol Bryant and Herbert W. Richardson, eds., *A Time for Consideration: A Scholarly Appraisal of the Unification Church* (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1978), pp. 241-44; and *Unificationism: A New Philosophy and Worldview* (New York: Learned Publications, 1982), pp. 305-9, 418-20. Kim and Matczak have two very different assessments of the same Unification doctrine of the Trinity, perhaps because the former has a somewhat liberal Protestant bias and the latter a Roman Catholic perspective.
4. See "Triumph of the Logos Christology in the West," in Williston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed. (New York: Scribner's, 1970), pp. 67-71.

5. See his "Against Praxeas," in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. III (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), pp. 597-627.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 602-3.
7. Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, vol. I (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983), p. 333.
8. *The Trinity*, trans. Stephen McKenna (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1963), 7.4.8, p. 232.
9. To get acquainted with these terms, read "Theory of the Original Image," in *Essentials of Unification Thought: The Head-Wing Thought*, pp. 1-40.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5, 22-25.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
14. I coined this term as well as "the outer Trinity" which will be discussed right below. See my "Unification Christology: A Fulfillment of Niceno-Chalcedonian Orthodoxy," in Theodore T. Shimmyo and David A. Carlson, eds., *Explorations in Unificationism* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1997), pp. 30-31.
15. *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, p. 41.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 172.
17. For this kind of theological ontology and the notions of "the purpose of creation" and "deity" in Unificationism, see "The Principle of Creation," *ibid.*, pp. 15-51.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 172.
20. See, for example, Catherine Mowry LaCugna, *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life* (San Francisco: Harper, 1991), p. 215.
21. Traditional Christology in Christianity has a doctrine of the *physis anhypostastos* and the *physis enhypostatos*, which asserts that the human nature of Christ has no hypostasis or person of its own, so that it finds its *hypostasis* only in the *hypostasis* of the eternal divine Logos within God. For a detailed discussion of the difference between Unification and traditional Christologies, see Theodore T. Shimmyo, "Unification Christology: A Fulfillment of Niceno-Chalcedonian Orthodoxy," *Explorations in Unificationism*, pp. 17-36.
22. *Church Dogmatics I/1*, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975), pp. 172, 371.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 383.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 349-51.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 355, 359.
26. *The Humanity of God*, tr. John Newton Thomas and Thomas Wieser (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1960), p. 46.
27. *Evangelical Theology: An Introduction*, trans. Grover Foley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), pp. 19-20.
28. *The Trinity*, trans. Joseph Donceel (New York: Seabury Press, 1974), p. 14.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 22. Italics his.

30. *Ibid.*, pp. 101-3.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 103-15.
33. *Theological Investigations*, vol. IV, trans. Kevin Smyth (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1966), p. 239.
34. *The Trinity and the Kingdom*, trans. Margaret Kohl (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981), p. 161.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 160.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 146.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 139-48.
38. For the liberal views of Christ, see, for example, Klaas Runia, *The Present-day Christological Debate* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1984) and John Hick, ed., *The Myth of God Incarnate* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977).
39. *The Trinity and the Kingdom*, trans. Margaret Kohl (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981), pp. 10-16.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
41. *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, p. 34.
42. Rosemary Radford Ruether, for example, considers the option of regarding the Holy Spirit as feminine, although she doubts that it is a good option. *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology* (Boston: Beacon, 1993), pp. 60-61.
43. *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, p. 36.

AMOROUS ARCHONS IN EDEN AND CORINTH

Robert M. Price

A preoccupation with the textual minutiae of Scripture may stem from either a strict belief in verbal inspiration or simply the scholarly love of trivia, but in any case few Bible students can resist a good exegetical puzzle. One of the most intriguing of such puzzles is Paul's command for women to remain veiled while prophesying "because of the angels." (1 Corinthians 11:10) I would like to consider the advantages of what I believe to be a new explanation of Paul's cryptic sanction. To anticipate, I believe that the best guess is that Paul is referring to a myth according to which the naked (unveiled) Eve was taken from her husband for whom she was created and raped by lustful angels in the Garden of Eden, a myth attested by its later doctozing reinterpretation in the Nag Hammadi texts, *The Hypostasis of the Archons* and *On the Origin of the World*.

1. Two Previous Explanations

A very early explanation of Paul's admonition in 1 Cor. 11:10 is that of Tertullian, that (as in my proposal) the unveiled Corinthian prophetesses were inviting the unwelcome attentions of lustful angels. Only in Tertullian's view, which I will call the "sons of God" theory, the reference is to Gen. 6:1-4, the strange story of the unholy betrothal of the daughters of men to the sons of God. It was assumed these sons of God remained at liberty and had not changed their ways since antediluvian times. Another major early explanation is that of John Chrysostom, who saw the angels as unfallen angels present at Corinthian worship and liable to be offended at the presence of unveiled

Dr. Robert Price teaches New Testament at Drew University and has been a visiting professor of New Testament at the Unification Theological Seminary. His publications include *Being Born Again: Towards Evangelical Maturity* (Hypatia Press, 1993) in addition to numerous articles on New Testament, Theology and Missiology.

women. I will call this the “worshipping angels” theory. It is tempting to wonder whether, as was so often the case, these church fathers have borrowed their theories from contemporary Jewish exegesis. “The rabbis had a number of reasons why women should have their heads covered: out of respect for the angels who keep the order of creation, in which women were subject beings, lest evil spirits infest homes, attracted by a woman’s uncovered hair.”¹

Both explanations have remained influential up to the present, and the second has recently been refurbished by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, who appeals to Qumran evidence for possible parallels. (1QSa II, 8f; 1QM VII, 4-6; 4QDb)² His theory, though influential, has been challenged by Herbert Braun and Hans Conzelmann.³

2. *“That is why . . .”*

It seems to me that a serious difficulty besetting both explanations is that neither comes to grips with the puzzling structure of Paul’s sentence. As C. K. Barrett points out,⁴ when Paul says, “That is why a woman ought to have authority on her head,” the clause should ordinarily be understood as pointing backwards to the preceding words, the statement that “woman [was created] for man.” (verse 9) Yet since the words “because of the angels” follow immediately, ought we not rather understand the words “That is why, etc.” as pointing forward? If so, then Paul would seem to be suddenly breaking any connection with the preceding discussion of the creation of man and woman (Adam and Eve). “The *δια τουτο* which opens the verse concludes the theological argument of vv. 3-9; therefore *δια τους αγγελους* appears as an unexpected afterthought.”⁵ Similarly F. C. Baur states:

Here the apostle is admonishing the Corinthian women not to let themselves be seen with uncovered head, and for this he gives a reason: For this cause ought the woman have a sign of the power . . . upon her head, because of the angels. Women are thus to wear a veil; but why, what is the connexion between the one thing and the other? . . . The apostle’s main proposition is this: the woman must wear a veil as a sign of the man, for she is, as the apostle explains, *εξ ανδρος* and *δια τον ανδρα*. Therefore *οφειλει η γυνη εξουσιαν εχειν*. It is clear that *δια τουτο* refers to what goes before; so far the argument is clear. But how is it interrupted and confused if *δια τους αγγελους* be added, as if a parallel to *δια τουτο*? The reason given before was quite sufficient; there is no place for this new and foreign reason, a thing to which not the slightest reference is made either in what precedes or in what follows.

Baur therefore concludes that *δια τους αγγελους* is a later interpolation.⁶

I suggest that “because of the angels” is neither an afterthought nor an interpolation. It neither confuses nor destroys the logic of the argument, and it does not represent anything “new and foreign.” The answer to the apparent difficulty is that the words “That is why, etc.” point both backward and forward; in other words, “That is why, etc.” introduces the culmination of the Adam and Eve line of argument, and “because of the angels” is the final conclusion of the same line of thought, the capper, as it were. “If *dia touto* (verse 10) refers back to what precedes, as seems most natural, then the following *dia tous angelous* ought also to have some connection with the creation,” remarks Wayne A. Meeks.⁷ We need, then, if possible, one schema of which angels and the creation of man and woman would form integrated parts. Neither the “Sons of God” nor the “worshipping angels” theory supplies such a schema.

Interestingly, we have a similar structure serving the same purpose in chapter 10, where Paul concludes his discussion of unity around the Lord’s table thusly: “Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread.” (10:17) Here, too, Paul presents a conclusion (“we who are many are one body”) flanked on both sides by parallel, cumulative reason-clauses.

But how can woman’s having been made for man form part of the same argument as the presence of the angels? Neither the “sons of God” theory nor the “worshipping angels” theory gives the slightest clue. This strange linkage between the creation of woman for man on the one hand and the mysterious angels on the other provides the clue for a new solution of the problem.

In the Nag Hammadi text, *The Hypostasis of the Archons*, we meet with one of many Gnostic interpretations of the early chapters of Genesis. Just after the joyous recognition by Adam of the woman (Eve), the Gnostic text reports,

When they [the archons] saw his female counterpart speaking with him, they became agitated with great agitation; and they became enamored with her. They said to one another, “Come, let us sow our seed in her,” and they pursued her. And she laughed at them for their witlessness and their blindness; and in their clutches, she became a tree, and left before them her shadowy reflection resembling herself; and they defiled [it] foully... And they defiled the form that she had stamped in her likeness. (89:19-29)⁸

We find the same story told in *On the Origin of the World*:

When they [the archons] saw Eve talking to him, they said to one another, “What sort of thing is this luminous woman?... Now come, let us lay hold of her and cast our seed into her...” Then Eve, being a force, laughed at their decision. She put mist into their eyes and secretly left her likeness with

Adam. She entered the tree of [knowledge] and remained there. And they pursued her, and she revealed to them that she had gone into the tree and become a tree. Then, entering a great state of fear, the blind creatures fled. Afterwards, when they had recovered from the daze, they came; and seeing the likeness of this woman with him [Adam], they were greatly disturbed, thinking it was she that was the true Eve. And they acted rashly; they came up to her and seized her and cast their seed upon her... And they erred, not knowing that it was their own body that they had defiled; it was the likeness that the authorities and their angels had defiled in every way. (116:14-117:15)⁹

These texts are usually dated in the third century C.E., but I suggest that they attest the existence of an earlier form of a myth of which they offer a characteristically Gnostic reinterpretation. Clear precedents exist both for the prototype of the myth and for the docetic approach involved.

3. *You'll Escape in the Final Reel*

To take a running start toward my conclusion, let me hark back to a much earlier set of occurrences of the basic docetic mytheme, that what first seemed to be a shameful and violent act turned out to be a deceptive sham, and that all turned out well despite initial appearances. In all cases, it seems what we are dealing with is a retelling of an earlier story designed to save face for the characters, to safeguard the sensibilities of a later generation of readers. Such later rehabilitation of earlier, more pungent stories is familiar from the higher-critical comparison of the Yahwist and Elohist versions of common tales. For instance, the Yahwist does not mind portraying Abraham as hen-pecked by Sarah to the point of desperation, whereupon he callously boots Hagar and her infant into the desert (Gen. 16:5-6): *good riddance!* The Elohist, on the other hand, makes Abraham unwilling to eject Hagar until a divine visitation assures him it will be all right, and then he makes sure she has ample provisions for her hike. (Gen. 21:10-14) Again, the Yahwist makes no bones about it: Abraham tells a bald-faced lie to save his miserable hide: Sarah is his sister, not his wife (Gen. 12:10-20): *take her!* The blue-nosed Elohist, however, tries to get Abraham off the hook by conveniently positing that Sarah was actually Abraham's cousin, so she could be considered sister and wife at the same time—well, sort of. (Gen. 20:1-12) The Elohist's version was in each case no doubt intended to replace the earlier version, more faithfully represented by the Yahwist. Neither compiler anticipated his work would be placed alongside the other version. The logic is basically one of docetic substitution: it wasn't as bad as it looked. And the shameful events thus expunged were in the one case abandonment to death by exposure, in the other sexual impropriety.

We are closer to what has traditionally been dubbed docetism, the feigning substitution for death, in another group of ancient tales. (Again, I am trying to review the logic of docetism so we can recognize it better when we see it in unexpected places.) Rene Girard juxtaposes two versions of a myth. In the first, the infant Zeus is in danger from his ravenous father, the Titan Kronos, who eats all his children to forestall the possibility of one of them one day usurping his throne, even as he himself had displaced his own father, the divine Uranos. The Curetes, mighty warriors, form a circle around the baby to hide him. To drown out his crying, which might attract the evil Kronos, the Curetes clash their spears against their shields. This noise frightens baby Zeus all the more, hence he cries more frantically, which leads his protectors to greater clangor. Finally, Kronos leaves, his head pounding, and Zeus is saved. Girard sees this myth as a piece of docetism, a rewritten version of an earlier myth in which the young god was in fact collectively murdered by those now presented as protecting him from murder. And in fact, he suggests, that version of the myth still survives. It is the Orphic protological myth of Dionysius Zagreus. In this tale, the infant Dionysius is surrounded by Titans who tempt him with shiny objects, then close in on him, kill him and eat him. Alerted to this foul deed too late, Zeus finds only the beating heart of his son, swallows it and begets him anew. Meantime, Zeus has smitten the offending Titans with his lightning and created the human race from their ashes. Those who contained a portion of the devoured Dionysius became the oft-reincarnated Orphic elect. Once one abstracts the gnosticizing soteriology, one is left with another, more primitive, version of the myth of the Curetes. Zeus is even the star of both shows, since, as Gilbert Murray points out, “Dionysius” seems originally to have meant “young Zeus.”¹⁰ In the Dionysius version, the murder has already been mitigated by the rebirth of the godling, whereas in the Curetes/Kronos/Zeus version, the death is simply prevented from occurring.¹¹ Why such surgery? “The dignity of Zeus is incompatible with his death at the hands of the Curetes.”¹²

We can also compare two versions of the sacrifice of Iphigenia, necessary to placate the peevishness of the gods who prevented the Greek fleet from leaving port to sail for Troy. In Homer’s version, the maiden’s blood is shed by the hand of her father, the Generalissimo Agamemnon. The terrible death was real, and one day Clytemnestra would repay the debt. But when we read Ovid’s version, the tension is relieved in another way. At the last minute, there is a strategic substitute.

King Agamemnon, while her servants wept,
Took Iphigenia to a blood-stained altar
Where she was well-prepared to give her life.
Even the goddess felt something go wrong:

She wrapped a fog around them, closed their eyes,
 And as the scene grew slightly mad with weeping,
 She placed a red-haired doe upon the altar—
 So someone said—and spared Mycenae's child. (Book XII)

The sacrifice was made, but it was not Iphigenia who paid the price, though the switch was hidden from all eyes by the obscuring cloud.¹³

A similar story is that of the Binding (*Akkedah*) of Isaac (Gen. 22), which, as it stands, seems to be a docetic rewrite of (or substitute for) an earlier version, still known by persistent oral tradition to later commentators, which spoke of Abraham burning the corpse of his son and scattering his ashes, and of God raising a slain Isaac from the dead. "When Father Isaac was bound on the altar and reduced to ashes and his sacrificial dust was cast onto Mount Moriah, the Holy One, blessed be He, immediately brought dew upon him and revived him." (*Shibbole ha-Leket* 9a-b)¹⁴ In an earlier case, that of the implied Uranos-like castration of Noah by his sons (Gen. 9:20-27), ancient scribes have simply snipped the offending element, leaving it for the reader to infer "what his youngest son had done to him."¹⁵ In the case of Isaac, a narrow escape has replaced a bloody death like that of Adonis or Attis. With the biblical roots of docetism going this deep, no one should be surprised when, many centuries down the line, the same maneuver is brought to bear to obviate the scandal of the cross of Jesus.

A striking parallel to the canonical (docetic) version of the *Akkedah* Isaac meets us in the story of the crucifixion of Jesus in the Nag Hammadi *Apocalypse of Peter*. Peter recalls the arrest of Jesus:

I saw him seemingly being seized by them. And I said, "What do I see, O Lord, that it is you yourself whom they take...? Or who is this one, glad and laughing on the tree? And is it another one whose feet and hands they are striking?" The Savior said to me, "He whom you saw on the tree, glad and laughing, this is the living Jesus. But this one into whose hands and feet they drive the nails is his fleshly part, which is the substitute being put to shame, the one who came into being in his likeness. But look at him and me." But I, when I had looked, said "Lord, no one is looking at you. Let us flee this place." But he said to me. "I have told you, 'Leave the blind alone.'" (81:4-30)¹⁶

The crucifixion scene in the *Acts of John* has many of the same features. This time Christ is not on the cross but is visible above a cross of light.

And the Lord himself I beheld above the cross, not having any shape, but only a voice... saying unto me: "...This cross of light is sometimes called the word by me for your sakes, sometimes mind, sometimes Jesus, sometimes Christ... But this is not the cross of wood which thou wilt see when thou goest down hence; neither am I he that is on the cross... I was reck-

oned to be that which I am not, not being what I was unto many others; but they will say of me something else which is vile of me and not worthy of me... Care not therefore for the many, and them that are outside the mystery despise... Nothing, therefore, of the things which they will say of me have I suffered.” (98-101)

The true Christ ascends; John returns to the multitude and “I laughed them all to scorn.” (102)¹⁷ Note the many points of similarity. In both crucifixion accounts we are told that only a substitute likeness of Christ is killed. He is treated shamefully or vilely. The true Christ, while not being crucified, is nonetheless seen on, or above, or somehow identified with a tree or cross. And Christ tells his disciple to despise the ignorant outsiders. Christ or John laughs at them.

All these features occur also in *The Hypostasis of the Archons* and *On the Origin of the World*, but it is the “passion narrative” of Eve in which they occur. In these texts she, too, is seized by an evil multitude who mean to treat her shamefully. She, too, is somehow identified with a tree in her concealment. She, too, laughs in derision of her blind and witless enemies. It is hard not to conclude that the Gnostic exegete is docetizing the shameful fate of Eve just as Gnostics had docetized the shameful fate of Jesus Christ. Such a fate for their heroine Eve would be just as offensive to Gnostics as the fate of Christ was, so, like the latter, the former might be explained away and in precisely the same manner. All this implies the Gnostic interpreters were retelling a pre-existent version of the Eden story in which Eve was raped by the lustful angels, just as the docetic crucifixion scenes presuppose passion narratives in which Jesus truly died.

Do we have evidence for such a variant of the Eve story? We do not, of course, have any actual telling of this tale. But we do have highly suggestive circumstantial evidence. There are at least two striking parallels. The first, I will suggest, represents a docetic revision along the lines we have already seen. It is the ancient myth of Ixion, he who for his hubris was crucified on a white-hot metal wheel in Hades.

Improper love... came upon Ixion also. Ixion made love to what was only a cloud, embracing it in a false dream, completely unaware as he was—for the cloud appeared in the shape of Hera, the daughter of Kronos and queen of the gods. The hands of Zeus had placed the cloud before him as a deceit and a beautiful source of misery. (Pindar, *Pythian Odes* II)

Ixion had set his sights on Hera and meant to have her. This Zeus forestalled by his deceit. Eve as she appears in *The Hypostasis of the Archons* and *On the Origin of the World* is not far removed from the divine Hera, and she is spared from a similar indignity, or rather rescues herself. And just as the

newly fabricated false Eve continues on in the story to bear the bad seed of the wicked archons, so does the false Hera continue as a distinct character, given the name Nephele, “Cloud.” She goes on to bear children and figures in the myth of Athamas and his near sacrifice of their son Phrixus (a parallel to, really another version of, the *Akkedah* of Isaac). Thus, neither the false Eve nor the false Hera was simply a phantom. The stories are almost exactly parallel, which shows how old the underlying mytheme was. Both, I am convinced, are docetic substitutes for earlier versions in which the shaming of the heroine was complete. The fact that Nephele is also an actual fleshly woman and yet a double for Hera implies a bifurcation in which, so to speak, Hera is both conquered by Ixion and saved from his sweaty hands. The teller of the tale thus succeeded in having his ambrosia and eating it, too. Think also of the severe punishment dealt out to Ixion. Zeus might well have been angered even at Ixion’s intent, but does not his extreme vindictiveness argue for a real liaison of Ixion with the real Hera? But a later raconteur felt it just too unseemly that Hera be depicted in such a fashion, just as the Elohist made sure heaven hands were not laid on Sarah, despite the Yahwist’s ribald implications.

How different at the crucial juncture is our second (otherwise) strikingly parallel story of the near rape of Istahar, the last virgin innocent of the deprivations of the Sons of God before the Noahic Flood:

In those days only one virgin, Istahar by name, remained chaste. When the Sons of God made lecherous demands upon her, she cried: ‘First lend me your wings!’ They assented and she, flying up to Heaven, took sanctuary at the throne of God, who transformed her into the constellation Virgo. (*Liqqute Midrashim*, 156)¹⁸

The same astrological myth underlies the wing-borne escape of the virgin from the dragon in Revelation 12, and in both cases it is clear that the original identity of the virgin was the goddess Ishtar (= “Istahar”), as is evident from the crown of stars, etc. Like Hera and the Gnostic Eve (= the Greek and Phrygian Hebe), the threatened woman is divine. But the difference between the stories of Istahar on the one hand and of Hera and Eve on the other is that Istahar experiences a last-minute clean getaway, while the other two share the revealing motif of the doubling of the original victim into both victim and escapee. If the story of Eve’s near-violation as we read it in *The Hypostasis of the Archons* preserves an original tale in which she was never actually raped, why does it not read more like the story of Istahar—a simple escape? The doubling motif tells the tale: originally Eve was raped.

We have evidence aplenty that among both Jews and early Christians, variants of the Eve story were circulating which involved sexual intercourse between Eve and Satan or demons. Declares F. R. Tennant, “It is beyond question... that various legends concerning the monstrous intercourse of Adam

and Eve with demons, and especially of Eve with the serpent or Satan, were both widespread and ancient among the Jews.”¹⁹ This striking reading of the Eden story served as a Jewish doctrine of a genetically transmitted taint of sin. The idea of the sexual seduction of Eve by Satan occurs in several Talmudic tractates including *Sabbath* 146a, where Rabbi Jose asks,

Why are the Cuthites contaminated? Because they did not stand at Mt. Sinai; for when the serpent had intercourse with Eve, it injected poison into her. The Israelites, who stood at Mt. Sinai, have lost this poison; the Gentiles, on the contrary, who did not stand on Mt. Sinai, have not lost this poison.

Rabbi Abba ben Kahana suggests that the sexually transmitted taint had disappeared from the house of Israel earlier, by the birth of Jacob’s twelve sons. Rabbi Jose’s view, however, is echoed in *Yebamoth* 103b and in *Aboda Zara* 22b.

Other early Jewish writings attest the idea. The mother of the seven martyr-brothers in 4 Maccabees 18:7-8 recalls her life of virtue: “I was a pure virgin and did not go outside my father’s house; but I guarded the rib from which woman was made. No seducer corrupted me on a desert plain, nor did the destroyer, the deceitful serpent, defile the purity of my virginity.” In short, she was not another Eve.

2 Enoch 31:6 seems to refer to the same idea, as is clear in R. H. Charles’ translation: “And [Satan] understood his condemnation and the sin which he had sinned before, therefore he conceived thought against Adam, in such form he entered and seduced Eva, but did not touch Adam.”²⁰ F. I. Anderson’s translation, “In such a form he entered paradise, and corrupted Eve. But Adam he did not contact,”²¹ retains the word “paradise” supplied in some manuscripts, an option Tennant, following Morfill, rejects, arguing that the verb *vnilde*, often used in the Slavonic Bible in a sexual sense (“he came in unto her”) is best understood as taking “Eve” as its object. And should we not recognize the presence (insertion) of “paradise” in some manuscripts as another case of sanitizing a shocking story for the more delicate sensibilities of later readers?

The same tradition recurs in the second-century Christian text, *The Protevangelium of James*, when Joseph, seeing his betrothed Mary is pregnant, immediately assumes she has been unfaithful to him: “Who has thus deceived me? Who has committed this evil in my house, and seducing the Virgin from me, hath defiled her? Is not the history of Adam exactly accomplished in me? For in the very instant of his glory, the serpent came and found Eve alone, and seduced her. Just after the same manner it has happened to me.” (10:4-7)

Another version of the Eve story made Cain the offspring of the sexual union of Eve and Satan. Epiphanius (*Haer.* XL.5) records a Gnostic version

of this story: “they report... the devil came to Eve as man to wife and begat from her Cain and Abel.” The rabbis also suggest that Satan begat Cain, though not Abel. Just as the Chronicler felt it inappropriate for Yahweh to have prompted David to number Israel (2 Sam. 24:1) and substituted the name Satan (1 Chron. 21:1), so the rabbis felt uneasy with Gen. 4:1, where Eve has Cain “by the help of Yahweh.” Apparently they thought the text implied Yahweh had actually fathered Cain sexually, so they suggested “Satan” be substituted again: “I have gotten a man with the help of Satan.”²² Tennant claims that the two medieval rabbinical sources which attest this belief (*Pirke di R. Elieser* and *Yalkut Schim*) contain very ancient traditions, as suggested by their concurrence at many other points with ancient Jewish pseudepigrapha.²³ Cain as the physical offspring of Satan and Eve may well be presupposed in 1 John 3:8-12, where haters and murderers are said to be children of Satan, “like Cain who was [born] of the evil one.”²⁴ Similarly, John 8:44 brands Jesus’ Jewish interlocutors as offspring of the devil in view of their manifest desire to murder Jesus.

As Richard J. Arthur points out,²⁵ these Johannine passages seem to presuppose the same mytheme made explicit in another literary product of the Johannine movement, *The Apocryphon of John*, where we read, again, that Eve was seduced by the archon of this world:

And the chief archon saw the virgin who stood by Adam, and that the luminous Epinoia of life had appeared in her... And when the foreknowledge of the All noticed, she sent some, and they snatched life out of Eve. And the chief archon seduced her and he begot in her two sons; the first and the second, Eloim and Yave... Yave is righteous but Eloim is unrighteous... And these he called with the names Cain and Abel with a view to deceive. (II:24.15-25)²⁶

Here, as in the other two Gnostic texts, the sexual encounter between Eve and her exploiter(s) is of a quasi-illusory nature, since in all three cases, the superior spiritual aspect of Eve has been rapt away just in time.

Enough has been said, I believe, to indicate that a version, indeed more than one version, of the Eve story was circulating in early Christian times, according to which Eve was sexually molested by Satan. In extant sources, this molestation takes the form of seduction, even in a Nag Hammadi text, *The Apocryphon of John*. The myth of Eve’s rape by the archons implied by the “docetizing” exegesis of two other Nag Hammadi documents, *The Hypostasis of the Archons* and *On the Origin of the World*, would simply be still another variant. The existence of this variant in Paul’s day would neatly explain his coupling in 1 Corinthians 11 of the argument from woman’s creation for man (verse 9) and his argument from the angels (verse 10) as one and the same argument: Women are created for their husbands who alone should see their beau-

ty unveiled—thus “woman is the glory of man” (verse 7c), just as Eve was created for Adam; yet as Eve, still naked, unveiled, aroused the lust of the archons, so the unveiled Corinthian prophetesses may arouse the lust of the angels.

Incidentally, some criticized the patristic “sons of God” explanation because they could not see why the angels would be attracted to the women only in church.²⁷ This qualm might arise at my suggestion as well. It is probably expecting too much of Paul to imagine him considering all sides of what is obviously a rather contrived *ad hoc* argument. Paul is only thinking of women unveiled on this public occasion as opposed to other public occasions in which he assumes they would be veiled, since it is only in church, as prophetesses, that the Corinthian women wish to take off the veil and so directly reflect the glory of God (cf. 1 Cor. 11:7). And at this point *The Hypostasis of the Archons* offers another tempting, though admittedly tenuous hint: just before the archons attack Eve she is called in the text “the spirit-endowed Woman.” (89:11)²⁸ Was it the spiritual endowment of the Corinthian women in the prophetic state that Paul feared might attract the notice of the angels, who would then begin to lust after the women’s unveiled beauty?

4. Supplemental Considerations

I believe that a sufficient case has been made to support the claim that the best available explanation of 1 Cor. 11:10 is that Paul was referring to a variant form of the Eve myth in which the uncovered Eve is taken from her husband for whom she was made and raped by the angels. *The Hypostasis of the Archons* and *The Origin of the World* seem to presuppose such a myth as the basis for their docetizing exegesis, and such a myth closely parallels other variants circulating in the early Christian period. The likely existence of such a myth and the sense it would make of Paul’s otherwise puzzling statement in 1 Cor. 11:10 ought to be sufficient to secure for the “amorous archon” theory at least the credibility accorded the two previous theories, since neither makes as much sense of Paul’s statement. But obviously the case would be further strengthened if there were further evidence making Paul’s use of such a variant likely. I believe there is some such evidence, admittedly circumstantial.

It seems quite likely that Paul knew the more commonly attested version in which Eve was sexually seduced by Satan. I refer to 2 Cor. 11:2-3, “I feel a divine jealousy for you, for I betrothed you to Christ to present you as a pure bride to her one husband. But I am afraid that as the serpent deceived Eve by his cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ.” The language of Paul’s analogy suggests that Eve was led astray from her pure virginity instead of saving herself for her fiancée Adam. What kind of purity is possessed by a virgin awaiting her betrothed that can be seduced away from her? What form must such seduction take? Note the

very close similarity of the language here to that in 4 Macc. 18:7-8, where the point is that the serpent deceived Eve out of her virginity.²⁹

If, then, Paul did know the tradition of Eve's seduction by Satan (Jewish tradition apparently already equated the serpent with Satan—see Wis. 2:23-24; Rev. 12:9),³⁰ is it likely he would also have accepted an alternative version of the story, one in which Eve is not seduced but raped? We do have evidence that Paul could use now one, now another version of a scriptural story, even of the story of the Fall. In 2 Cor. 11:3 Paul seems to lay the blame on Eve for the Fall, but in Rom. 5:14-19 and 1 Cor. 15:22 he holds “one man,” Adam, responsible. Similarly, in the story of Moses receiving the Law on Mt. Sinai, Paul can alternate between a version in which Moses dealt directly with God himself (2 Cor. 3:7, 13, 16 [cf. Exod. 34:34], 18) and another according to which Moses received the Law from the hands of angels, not God, since if only God were involved, Moses the mediator would not have been necessary. (Gal. 3:19-20)³¹ If Paul felt free in these cases to juggle available versions of scriptural stories, why could he not have made use of two versions of Eve's sexual Fall as each proved more useful in different circumstances? After all, we find within the Nag Hammadi corpus the very same alternation between a seduction of Eve (*The Apocryphon of John*) and an (attempted) rape (*The Hypostasis of the Archons* and *On the Origin of the World*).

We have just seen that Paul could go from one (God) to many (angels) in the Sinai story. Surely moving from a single seducer, Satan (2 Cor. 11:3), to many rapists, the angels (1 Cor. 11:10) would have posed no great difficulty. In fact Paul elsewhere moves from Satan to the evil angels. The “god of this age” (2 Cor. 4:4) would seem to be the equivalent of “the rulers of this age.” (1 Cor. 2:6, 8) Ephesians similarly speaks interchangeably of “the prince of the power of the air” (2:2) and of “principalities, powers, world rulers of this present darkness, spiritual hosts of wickedness” (6:12) and then again of “the evil one.” (6:16) And these “rulers” are, in Greek, “archons,” just as in the Gnostic text. Of course, debate continues to rage over the question whether the “rulers of this age” are to be understood on analogy with the “debater of this age” (1 Cor. 1:20) as worldly human rulers,³² or on analogy with “world rulers of this present darkness... in heavenly places” (Eph. 6:12) as evil angels,³³ or possibly as a combination of both, as evil angels are the powers behind earthly thrones. (Dan. 10:13)³⁴ I think it is of little avail to point to the fact that in all other New Testament instances, “rulers,” archons, refers to human officials, as do, e.g., Trevor Ling³⁵ and Gordon D. Fee,³⁶ as if the numerical majority of instances control the meaning of the word. This is simply one more instance of the “Kittel mentality” rightly decried by James Barr.³⁷ What makes the best sense in the context? It seems to me that the “evil angels” interpretation as reflected in Gnostic literature supplies the more nat-

ural meaning. Finally, remember that the same variation between a single archon seducer and many archon rapists occurs between *The Apocryphon of John* on the one hand and *The Hypostasis of the Archons* and *On the Origin of the World* on the other.

5. Conclusion

I hope to have shown that Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 11:10 seems to make most sense if his references to woman's creation for man and to the angels are seen as moments in one continuous argument, a reference to a version of the Fall story in which Eve was raped by evil angels who lusted after her unveiled beauty. Such a story seems presupposed by the docetizing exegesis of *The Hypostasis of the Archons* and *On the Origin of the World*. Similar stories of a sexual liaison between Eve and Satan were apparently current in Paul's day; indeed he seems to use one such version in 2 Cor. 11:2-3. It is likely that in 1 Cor. 11:10 Paul made use of a variant of that story in which Eve was raped by a gang of evil angels. The "amorous archons" theory proposed here makes sense of Paul's connection of woman's creation and the angels, something that neither the "sons of God" theory nor the "worshipping angels" theory can do adequately.

Notes

1. Bernard P. Prusak, "Woman: Seductive Siren and Source of Sin?, Pseudepigraphical Myth and Christian Origins," in Rosemary Radford Ruether, ed., *Religion and Sexism* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974), p. 112.
2. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Corinthians 11:10," *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957): 48-58; rpt. Fitzmyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971), pp. 187-204.
3. Herbert Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1966), pp. 193f. Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, trans. James W. Leitch, Hermeneia Series (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 189.
4. C.K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 253.
5. Richard Boldrey and Joyce Boldrey, *Chauvinist or Feminist? Paul's View of Women* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976), p. 37.
6. Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine*, trans. A. Menzies (London & Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate, 1875) vol. 2, p. 254.
7. Wayne A. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in

Earliest Christianity,” *History of Religions* 13 (1974): 201.

8. Bentley Layton (trans.), “The Hypostasis of the Archons,” in James M. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977), pp. 154-155.
9. The translation is that of Hans-Gebhard Bethge, Bentley Layton, and the Societas Coptica Hierosolymitana, in James M. Robinson, ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 3rd. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1988).

The peculiar detail of the spiritual Eve escaping from the drooling archons by the device of turning into a tree is certainly to be accounted for as a vestige of the ancient story of Daphne’s last resort in evading Apollo, who like the Edenic archons enamored of Eve, was pursuing Daphne, smitten with her beauty. She prayed to lose her beauty at the last minute, and her prayer was answered when the gods at once transformed her into the laurel tree, henceforth sacred to Apollo.
10. Gilbert Murray, *Five Stages of Greek Religion* (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, n.d.), p. vi.
11. In the same way, the resurrection (i.e., restoration) of Jesus ought to be understood as a variant of the same docetic logic that elsewhere has Jesus secretly escape death. It is ultimately a matter of indifference whether the avoidance of death occurs before or after death. It is the same plot-logic either way.
12. Rene Girard, *The Scapegoat*, trans. Yvonne Freccero (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), p. 71.
13. The closest biblical parallel to the sacrifice of Iphigenia by Agamemnon is that of Jephthah’s fulfillment of his vow, entailing the sacrifice of his daughter in Judg. 11:29-40. There is no later version, known to me, in which the daughter is rescued, but it is just worth noting that pious latter-day Bible readers have tried to find some other way of reading the text to avoid being stuck with a story in which Yahweh receives a human sacrifice. In so doing, they are themselves recapitulating the ancient logic of docetic apologetics.
14. See the larger discussion in Shalom Spiegel, *The Last Trial: On the Legends and Lore of the Command to Abraham to Offer Isaac as a Sacrifice: The Akkedah*, trans. Judah Goldin (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights, 1993), pp. 28-44.
15. Robert Graves and Raphael Patai, *Hebrew Myths: The Book of Genesis* (New York: Greenwich House, 1983), p. 122.
16. Roger A. Bullard (trans.), “Apocalypse of Peter,” in Robinson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Library*, p. 344.
17. M. R. James (trans.), “The Acts of John,” in *The Apocryphal New Testament* (London: Oxford University Press, 1972), pp. 254-255, 256.
18. The quoted passage is a summary by Graves and Patai, p. 101.
19. F. R. Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin* (New York: Schocken Books, 1968), p. 156. The translations of rabbinical sources that follow are Tennant’s.

Indeed, the same conclusion has been independently drawn in similar midrashic fashion by sectarian exegesis in modern times. “Here is what really hap-

- pened in the Garden of Eden. The Word says that Eve was beguiled by the serpent. She was actually seduced by the serpent... This beast was so close to a human being that he could reason and talk. He was an upright creature and was somewhat in between a chimpanzee and a man, but closer to a man. He was so close to being human that his seed could, and did, mingle with that of the woman and cause her to conceive... That's one of the mysteries of God that has remained hidden, but here it is revealed." (William Marrion Branham, *An Exposition of the Seven Church Ages* [Jefferson, IN: William Marrion Branham, n.d.], pp. 98-99).
20. R.H. Charles (trans.), "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," in R. H. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vol. II (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 451.
 21. F.I. Anderson (trans.) "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. I (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), p. 154.
 22. Nils Alstrup Dahl, "Der Erstgeborene Satans und der Vater des Teufels," in *Apophoreta*, Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen, (Berlin, 1964), pp. 70-84; Henry Ansgar Kelly, *The Devil, Demonology and Witchcraft: The Development of Christian Beliefs in Evil Spirits* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1974), pp. 14-15.
 23. Tennant, p. 159.
 24. Brown mentions the "rabbinic tradition that Eve had intercourse with the devil; and Cain was the son of the tempter, while Abel was the son of Adam" and admits "It is tempting to invoke this idea as background for I John's contention that Cain 'was from' the devil (3:12a); but it is not clear that the legend was known in the first century A.D." (Raymond E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* [Garden City: Doubleday, 1982], p. 443. Yet so strikingly does the legend seem to fit and to illuminate the Johannine text that I would venture that this text is itself first-century evidence for the legend's circulation.
 25. Richard J. Arthur, "John 8:44 and the Sethians," paper delivered at the Northwest Sectional Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, 1986. Let me also thank Professor Arthur for pointing out to me the relevant passage in *On the Origin of the World*.
 26. The translation is that of Frederik Wisse in Robinson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Library*.
 27. Barrett, p. 253.
 28. Bentley Layton (trans.), "Hypostasis," in Robinson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Library*, p. 154.
 29. H. S. J. Thackeray suggested this meaning of Paul's words in *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought* (London, 1900), pp. 50-57 .
 30. See George Foote Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), Vol. 1, pp. 478-479. It is not, however, all that clear that either of these passages refers to the serpent of Eden rather than to Leviathan or just to the serpent metaphor.
 31. The idea of angels as mediators of the Law at Sinai seems to have developed as an attempt to explain certain differences in depictions of God in Exod. 15:3 and

24:10f. In the former, God was understood to be depicted as young, as just, and with the name Yahweh, while in the latter he was seen as older, merciful, and using the name Elohim. Could there then be two deities, as some radicals held? Or might the various Exodus theophanies instead be angelophanies? See Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), pp. 50-53, 68-69, 211.

32. Scholars who see the “rulers” as human officials include Goudge, Parry, Plummer, Robertson, and Fee.
33. Scholars who see the “rulers” as evil angels include Dibelius, Bultmann, Moffatt, Lietzmann, Schmiedel, Weiss, and Bousset.
34. Scholars who see the “rulers” as evil angels behind human thrones include Cullmann, H. Berkhof, Schlatter, Macgregor, and Ling.
35. Trevor Ling, *The Significance of Satan: New Testament Demonology and its Contemporary Relevance* (London: SPCK, 1961), p. 75.
36. Gordon D. Fee, *New Testament Exegesis* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983), pp. 88-89.
37. “We may then sum up these criticisms of TWNT by saying that the great weakness is a failure to get to grips with the semantic value of words in their contexts, and a strong tendency to assume that this value will on its own agree with and illuminate the contours of a theological structure which is felt to be characteristic of the New Testament and distinctively contrasting with its environment.” James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 231.

"A FRIENDLY BIOGRAPHY ABOUT AN
EXTRAORDINARY MAN"
MICHAEL BREEN'S *SUN MYUNG MOON*:
THE EARLY YEARS, 1920-53

Michael L. Mickler

The publication of Michael Breen's *Sun Myung Moon: The Early Years, 1920-53* is something of an event within the evolving tradition of Unification historiography.¹ This is the case for three reasons. First, Unificationists are, if anything, a people who take their history seriously. Rev. Moon continually treats divine providence and its historical applications in his speeches and sermons, which now number more than two hundred volumes.² *Wolli Kangron* (1966), variously translated into English as *Divine Principle* (1973) and *Exposition of the Divine Principle* (1996) and which serves as Unificationism's chief theological text, also focuses to a large extent upon historical matters, devoting more than half of its content to a comprehensive survey of salvation history.³ Members, likewise, are encouraged to see themselves as being responsible for "all the unaccomplished missions of past prophets and saints who were called in their time to carry the cross of restoration."⁴ In this respect, a providentially-ordered historical consciousness is integral to the identity of most Unificationists.

A second and more compelling reason why Breen's book is an event is because it departs from this prevailing tradition. Within the context of Unification historiography and spirituality, events, personalities, circumstances, ideas and even chance or odd occurrences have substance, meaning and significance to the extent that they serve providential ends. Breen diverges from this tradition because he considers Rev. Moon's life in purely human

Michael L. Mickler is Academic Dean and Associate Professor of Church History at Unification Theological Seminary. He is the author of *The Unification Church in America: A Bibliography and Research Guide* (1987) and *A History of the Unification Church in America, 1959-74* (1993) as well as articles and reviews on the Unification Church and other movements.

terms. Put differently, he suggests that Rev. Moon's life story is of interest and compelling in its own right, regardless of whether one accepts the underlying theological premises or providential interpretations.

A third reason why the publication of Breen's book is something of an event stems from the church's seemingly cordial response to it. This raises the larger question of whether Breen's rather bold departure marks a transition in Unification historiography and spirituality. To be sure, Breen published the book independently and nowhere identifies himself as a Unificationist, thereby avoiding what might be expected of an in-house work and writer. Nevertheless, the cooperation he was able to garner from church members, including numerous principals in the account, as well as the general receptivity, or at least lack of criticism, which the volume has thus far received from the church (it is distributed by HSA Publications, the major publishing organ of the Unification Church in America, and advertised in *Unification News*, an official newspaper), may signal a readiness to tackle the oftentimes competing pulls of faith and history.

The volume itself is best understood as a foundational work. Obviously, it is foundational for any subsequent volumes Breen might write in taking his account forward. However, it is more broadly foundational in being the first serious biographical study of Sun Myung Moon. Most church accounts of Rev. Moon's life are constructed as "gospels," often rich in detail and insight but intended finally to edify or convert. On the other hand, external accounts tend to be exposés intended to vilify. Breen attempts to stake out a middle ground between edification and vilification and does so more effectively than any other biography to date. More than that, he breaks new ground in reconstructing the social, cultural and religious milieu surrounding Rev. Moon during his formative years.

These factors alone are enough to establish the volume as an important work. Nevertheless, as a foundational study and one with implications for Unification historiography, it is important to subject this book, and the pattern it establishes, to scrutiny and evaluation. This would include questions as to the work's methodology and content. Methodological questions relate to the nature of the study as biography, Breen's overall approach and orientation, and his sources. Content questions include consideration of the consistency of the work, both in outline and specific detail, with existing accounts of Rev. Moon's life, new or fresh information and departures, and the unanswered or unresolved problems that remain. However, beyond questions of method and content, the reader finally must assess the portrait that emerges. Does one know Sun Myung Moon better or more intimately for having read the book? Does the young Sun Myung Moon "live" in its pages? In the following two sections, I will describe how Breen handles questions of methodology and content. In the concluding section, I will offer an assessment.

1. *Methodology*

Biography is an ambiguous literary form and includes several different types. Breen himself refers to the common distinction between authorized and unauthorized biographies, noting that his “is unauthorized work.” (10) He did not seek any input from his subject directly, he tells us, due to stories circulating among Unificationists of Rev. Moon’s displeasure with previous efforts to depict him.⁵ Another common distinction is between scholarly and popular biographies. Breen incorporates scholarly elements and a significant amount of research but acknowledges linguistic limitations and states that the “full story of this period... remain[s] to be written.” (10) He simply expresses the hope that his work sheds “at least partial light on the formative and least known part of his [Rev. Moon’s] life.” (10-11) In other words, he makes no claim that his research is exhaustive or finally definitive.

Nevertheless, Breen approaches his subject, at least in part, as a professional historian might. That is, he attempts to confront the past on its own terms. He does not seek to impose meaning from without or occupy a privileged vantage point. He rather seeks to immerse himself in the period, bringing it to life as it was experienced. This diverges from the tendency in most church accounts to project present understandings or theological presuppositions about Rev. Moon into the past, according immense significance to what may have been obscure and unnoticed details at the time.⁶

Breen, however, claims his book is “the work of a journalist.”⁷ To him, this primarily means the sustained quest to be factual and objective. He, thereby, presents details “with a minimum of comment,” and expresses hope that his work will “help readers in making their own assessment.” (11) At the same time, having striven “to avoid hagiography,” Breen contends that he is “not required to remain neutral” and, in a memorable turn of phrase, conceives his book “as a friendly biography about an extraordinary man.” (11) In true journalistic fashion, Breen bases the information in the book “mainly on interviews... conducted over several years.” (10) Those interviewed include “Moon’s family members, fellow prisoners, and early followers, some of whom are still with him and some who later opposed him.” (10) All of his sources, he tells us, were “primary” and he “took no account of commentators who did not have first-hand experience.” (10) He also expresses skepticism about written Unificationist sources, most of which, he contends, were published “for the purpose of uplifting or converting audiences” and “are suspect as history.” (10)

Breen, of course, recognizes that primary sources “present their own set of problems,” including “dishonesty” as well as tendencies to “exaggerate their importance,” to “minimize incidents which placed them or their family members in a poor light” (10), and to forget details. When sources differed,

Breen judged their “relative credibility” (10) or explained their differences in endnotes. He also includes an appendix of more than one hundred Korean names which appear in the text, indicating their relationship to Rev. Moon. This is immensely helpful in sorting through identical surnames. There are, for example, twenty-four Kims, twenty-one Moons, twelve Lees, ten Paks and numerous other persons with the same last name who figure in the narrative.⁸ When sources were unavailable, Breen relied on “previously published information.” (10) On occasion, he exercises a kind of fictive license in reconstructing thought processes and even conversations on the basis of his sources’ recollections.⁹

2. *Content*

Unificationist accounts of Rev. Moon’s life tend to organize themselves around decisive moments and major turning points. With reference to the period covered in Breen’s biography, three frequently emphasized benchmarks are Rev. Moon’s birth in 1920, his “Easter” revelation of 1935 (sometimes reported as having occurred in 1936¹⁰), and the beginning of his public ministry following the end of World War II on August 15, 1945. Breen does not deviate from this outline but tends to downplay or qualify the significance of decisive moments. For example, in discussing Rev. Moon’s birth and childhood, Breen repeats many of the stories familiar to most Unificationists but does not treat them as radical in-breakings of the Divine or signs that set him apart from his immediate village environment or attest to his future world-level significance.¹¹ Instead, he lays greater stress on the youthful Sun Myung Moon as a “stereotypical Pyongan Province character” and his life as being “that of the typical, poor farming family.” (23) Similarly, while Breen acknowledges that the young Rev. Moon’s life was “forever changed” following his pledge to take up the resurrected Christ’s work, he departs from the church’s “standard explanation” of a one-time divine commission and heroic religious path by suggesting that Rev. Moon’s sense of mission developed over a lengthy period of time and included questioning.¹² Finally, in the period of flux immediately following World War II, Breen notes that Rev. Moon sought out Christians and “people in high positions,” but asserts that there is little to suggest that this constituted a decisive starting point for a global public ministry or differed markedly from his previous activities.¹³

Thus, while not departing from the overall design of previous accounts, Breen lays far greater stress on the continuities rather than on the discontinuities between Rev. Moon and his immediate environment. In so doing, he brings fresh information to the surface. However, this is not uniformly the case. For example, there is nothing particularly new in his treatment of Rev. Moon’s childhood, education, ancestry or hometown, all of which already

have been well-mined. Perhaps the only real departure is Breen's identification of South Hill (or Namsan), a small rise a half mile from his home, as the site of Rev. Moon's early encounter with Jesus rather than the more majestic Mt. Myodu which overshadowed it and which is so identified in official accounts.¹⁴

Breen's treatment of Rev. Moon's time in Japan (1941-43) also is for the most part unremarkable. Limiting himself entirely to Korean sources, Breen appears to have made no attempt to establish contact with the Tokyo civic official, Mitsuhashi Kozo, or his family at whose home Rev. Moon boarded while a student at the technical high school affiliated with Waseda University. As a consequence, little is added to our knowledge of this interlude other than Breen's assertion that Rev. Moon traveled under the Japanese name, Emoto Ryumei, and that his two closest friends among the Korean students were both communists.¹⁵

If Breen's treatment of Rev. Moon's hometown and time in Japan are undistinguished, his reconstruction of the religious milieu and churches with which Rev. Moon associated during two separate interludes in Seoul more than compensates. The first of these interludes, between 1938-41, followed the young Sun Myung Moon's decision to enroll in the electrical engineering department of the Kyongsong Institute of Commerce and Industry in the district of Heuksok-dong, on the south bank of the Han River. The second, between 1943-46, followed Rev. Moon's return from Japan when he married, took employment and settled again in the same area. What is so compelling about Breen's account is the way in which it counters and fills out existing descriptions of Rev. Moon's religious path.

The conventional image of Rev. Moon during his student days, especially in Seoul, is that of one utterly absorbed in tearful identification with the sufferings of Jesus and by extension, the suffering land of Korea. Solitary all-night prayer vigils, missed vacations and visits to beggar quarters are some of the outward manifestations of his lonely quest. Rather than attempting to deconstruct this image, Breen effectively enlarges it and adds an important communal dimension by charting Rev. Moon's trajectory from his roots in the Presbyterian denomination to services at a Pentecostal church in Heuksok-dong, to a more substantial involvement with the Myongsudae Worship Hall, a branch of the newly-formed Jesus Church.¹⁶ As the first denomination started by Koreans, the Worship Hall's emotional services, which earned it the nickname of "The Crying Church," were compatible with Rev. Moon's understanding of the suffering heart of Jesus at that time.

Rev. Moon's second sojourn in Seoul is marked by his association with Kim Baek-moon's Israel Jesus Church.¹⁷ Kim's group was an offshoot of the Jesus Church and several spiritualist groups which reflected revived national sentiment, emphasizing Korea's role in God's providence. Unificationist

accounts claim Kim Baek-moon was to play a “John the Baptist” role, connecting Rev. Moon to Korean Christianity, but are generally sketchy as to details. Breen is more specific, noting that Kim’s Seoul congregation, though small, “around fifty people,” nevertheless, “comprised many intellectuals and other influential figures” including the wife of the owner of the *Chosun Ilbo*, Korea’s main daily paper, and the wife of Lee Bom-sok “who in 1948 was to become Korea’s first prime minister.” (68) Breen also notes that Kim received “continuous revelations concerning Korea’s apparent role as the new chosen country,” (69) a point which Rev. Moon would develop in his teaching.¹⁸

Breen adopts a moderately revisionist stance in discussing Rev. Moon’s break from Kim’s group and departure north to Pyongyang in June 1946. Unificationist tradition, emphasizing the decisiveness of the break once Kim Baek-moon could not respond, recounts that Rev. Moon received a sudden revelation while out buying rice for his wife and newly-born son that “he should immediately go to North Korea.” Breen questions the suddenness of the call and suggests that Rev. Moon “may have wanted to go to North Korea anyway.” (70) He also conveys a different picture of the departure, asserting that on June 5, 1946, Rev. Moon joined Kim Baek-moon and several of his followers who were traveling to Pyongyang for a revival meeting. Thus, rather than a lone figure going north against the flow of thousands fleeing south from the solidifying communist regime, Breen contends that Rev. Moon joined Kim’s party at Munsan where they took a train to Kaesong, “sneaked across the border to the next station and caught the train for Pyongyang.”¹⁹

Breen’s account of Rev. Moon’s activity in Pyongyang, then a dynamic center of Korean Christianity, his arrests and torture by communist authorities, his encounter in prison with the “In-the-Belly Church,” which had highly specific messianic expectations, his trial and his sentencing, does not depart in any significant way from existing sources. However, Breen’s chapter on Rev. Moon’s time at the Heungnam “Death Camp” (1948-50) adds significant detail and is an important contribution. Drawing on interviews with eight camp survivors, only one or two of whom ever became followers, Breen manages to corroborate Unificationist accounts while deconstructing some of their more excessive claims. For example, he notes, “Of the labor camps in north Korea at the time, Aoji Coal Mine in North Hamgyong Province,” not Heungnam, “was considered the most severe.” (90) He also contends that of Rev. Moon’s twelve “disciples” in prison, only two “understood [him]... to any extent” and that the rest could be defined as such only in a broad, symbolic way. (102, 179-80) Breen points out as well that prisoners were allowed four gallon tubs of rice powder by which they supplemented the meager prison diet. (104)

Breen’s account of Rev. Moon’s release from Heungnam is of note as, in his words, it differs from the “standard version taught to Unificationists.” (181) According to the standard version, “South Korean troops liberated the camp,

just before Moon was scheduled to be called out for execution.” (181) Breen recounts a different scenario according to which guards attempted to march prisoners in groups of twenty north to Aoji Prison Camp. However, realizing that their prisoners’ weakened state would make this impossible, the chief guard of Rev. Moon’s contingent elected to release them outside Hamheung, northwest of Heungnam, after securing promises from the prisoners to come back once the war was over and finish their sentences! (111-112)

Following his liberation on October 14, 1950, Rev. Moon returned to Pyongyang, a ten-day walk, and attempted to recontact followers, many of whom had deserted him or were missing. Just before Chinese communist forces took Pyongyang, he fled south with two followers, one of whom had a broken leg, and joined the refugee trail, making his way by a torturous circuit to Pusan at the southern tip of the Korean peninsula. Breen’s account does not differ materially from existing sources except that he tends to reduce the superhuman quality of Rev. Moon’s exertions. In an often-cited episode, one account maintains that Rev. Moon carried his broken-legged companion (symbolizing broken humanity) on his back two-and-one-half miles across an ocean inlet at low tide to an island in the vain hope of catching a ferry south. Breen treats the incident more matter-of-factly, setting the distance at a “few hundred yards.” (130) Although Breen notes several instances of Rev. Moon’s spiritual insight and even clairvoyance, he avoids casting any of them in messianic terms. For him, simply avoiding advancing North Korean and Chinese forces, South Korean vigilante-style village patrols, and American warplanes that attacked presumed infiltrators among columns of refugees was miracle enough.

Breen’s concluding chapter, which recounts Rev. Moon’s new beginning in refugee-swollen Pusan (1951-53), brings together a number of strands in the narrative and serves as a recapitulation of much that had gone before. There, Rev. Moon again meets family members from his home village, acquaintances from his student days in Seoul and Tokyo, disciples from his aborted mission to Pyongyang, and at least one fellow prisoner from Heungnam. Some of them follow and became part of the nucleus that would become the Unification Church. Others continue to reject him. Undoubtedly, Rev. Moon’s most painful and problematic reunion was with his wife and then six-year-old son, with whom he had been separated and out of contact since 1946. Here, Breen is more forthcoming about the alienation, acrimonious encounters and saltiness of language than would be the norm in most Church accounts. The irony, of course, is that Rev. Moon’s group was coalescing just as his marriage was breaking apart.

Here, just prior to the formal establishment of the Unification Church, Breen ends his narrative. As previously noted, he makes no claim that his account is the “full story” of the period, and at several junctures he raises ques-

tions that his research has left unanswered. Some of these, such as whether Rev. Moon's early Confucian (*so-dang*) education lasted four or seven years, are minor, factual, and mostly covered in footnotes. Other questions are more interpretive and have a substantial bearing upon how we understand Rev. Moon's early years. Breen, for example, is unsure why Rev. Moon decided to marry in November 1943 and unclear how it connected to "the next stage of his spiritual path." (62) He also raises a number of unsatisfactorily answered questions about the relationship and ultimate split with Kim Baek-moon, abbot of the *Israel Sudowon* and Rev. Moon's putative link to Korean Christianity. Breen states,

What we do not know is how seriously Kim acknowledged Moon's 'wisdom.' Did he see Moon as a gifted student—clever, but inferior to himself? Or did he not even see Moon as a student?... On the other hand, was Kim perhaps too consumed by his own spiritual search to recognize the spirituality in Moon, which had impressed the other members of the group? Or did he indeed recognize it, and feel threatened by it? Or, in the end, was there just a predictable split between two inspired men? (70)

Even more fundamental are unanswered questions as to Rev. Moon's self-understanding, or what might be termed his "inner history." Breen notes that his narrative "was not written with a conscious view to making Moon's spirituality more accessible to his followers." (11) Thus, while he raises questions about Rev. Moon's encounter with Jesus and his sense of public mission, he scarcely touches the question of Rev. Moon's messianic consciousness.²⁰

3. Assessment

Breen's study deserves recognition as a serious biographical effort that seeks to establish a middle ground between hagiographic inside accounts and external attacks. It also makes several positive contributions to our understanding of the formative influences in Rev. Moon's early life. Nevertheless, the book finally fails to satisfy. It fails first because the middle ground it seeks to establish does not address the fundamental concerns of either those who regard Rev. Moon as the embodiment of their faith or those who regard him as a menace to society. It fails second because the formative influences and circumstances it describes do not illuminate the young Sun Myung Moon's soul or even the less immediately accessible portions of his personality. I will seek to substantiate these assessments in this section and to explain why Breen's volume is not as successful as it otherwise might have been.

In his Preface, Breen acknowledges that "many non-Unificationist readers have serious and genuinely-held concerns about the impact of Moon's

teachings.” (11) Yet he makes little if any effort to address their concerns. Rather, after a token summary of Rev. Moon’s several arrests and assorted other problems, he announces,

[T]here are two Sun-myung Moons, the widely-known disturber of society, and the man who does not want to hurt God’s feelings. This book is about the lesser known man. And it should be, for if religious leaders are remembered, it is for their faith, their convictions and how those were expressed in their life and in the lives of their followers, not for the people they upset. (9)

Although possessing a certain rhetorical flair, this passage essentially dismisses widely-held public perceptions and those holding them. It also elevates religious leaders, Rev. Moon included, to a privileged and rarefied status whereby all that really matters is their or their followers’ faith and convictions. Such an approach can only be regarded by those outside the Unificationist circle as one-sided and soft. It also makes for questionable history or biography. Thus, while Breen tones down the didacticism and some of the more extreme claims in Unification texts, he offers a semi-secularized, journalistic version of the same plot line. In this respect, his work transcends hagiography but not apologetics.

Breen’s “middle ground” has no more place for distinctive Unification teachings about Rev. Moon than it does for the allegations of critics. For while Breen is content to treat the young Sun Myung Moon as authentically “spiritual” or even “extraordinary,” he stops short of any explicit acknowledgment of him as the Second Coming of Christ, which of course is the crux of the matter for Unificationists. More than that, he dismisses accounts that so depict Rev. Moon, terming them “suspect” as history. Thus, Breen gives as little credence to insider treatments which type Rev. Moon as the Lord of the Second Advent as he does to external attacks which depict him as a social menace. Breen maintains that his biography is not “neutral” but “friendly.” However, any approach which isolates facts from faith or sets facts and faith in opposition can only be regarded by Unificationists as self-defeating. For most insiders, it would make little sense to gain credibility at the expense of losing transcendence.

Breen’s failure to address the fundamental concerns of Rev. Moon’s critics and followers is exceeded by his failure to probe very deeply into the young Sun Myung Moon’s character. Biographies typically afford authors the opportunity to explore intricacies of personality, sometimes in minute detail. This is not the case in Breen’s book. Instead, the narrative and setting take precedence. Although Breen did not have direct access to Rev. Moon, he had ample exposure to his contemporaries, to Rev. Moon’s voluminous speeches (admittedly, much of them retrospective), a wide variety of church

documents, and secular commentaries. Nevertheless, there is in Breen's account a conspicuous lack of interpretation, much less penetrating insight. Breen himself notes that he presented "details with a minimum of comment." (11) There is very little effort to penetrate beneath the surface, very little sense of development, complexity, points of tension or nuance—elements fundamental to living human experience. Thus, despite Breen's assertions about making "a spiritual man human," (11) the youthful Sun Myung Moon remains more persona than person. He is accessible only indirectly at best though the testimony of interviewees, some of whom stand out more distinctly than the book's central figure. Breen contends that "when the dust has settled, Sun-myung Moon will be remembered primarily for one lesson... that God has passion." (9) The irony here is that the Rev. Moon of his account is largely passionless.²¹

The main reason Breen cannot be more forthcoming about Rev. Moon is because he is not forthcoming about himself. Breen's persona is that of a journalist, and the reader is allowed not much further access. This is unfortunate, as Breen does not own up to the struggle in his own person between being a journalist and a believer. Had he done so, he would have been in a better position to explore ambiguities and tensions in his narrative. As it stands, he goes wholly over to the journalistic side. Even at that, there are some surprising suppressions of fact. For example, Breen does not let on, either in his text or footnotes, that Park Chong-hwa, his chief informant for Rev. Moon's "Death Camp" experience, return to Pyongyang, and journey south, was a highly questionable source, having drifted in and out of the church on numerous occasions and having penned a scurrilous account of Rev. Moon's early ministry in 1993.²²

Apart from being more explicit about his and his sources' motivations, Breen would need to demonstrate a significantly greater command of church literature, which is rapidly proliferating, for his biography to be even provisionally definitive. Beyond that, diaries, journals and letters which are as yet inaccessible will provide the grist for much future historical reflection. Nevertheless, *Sun Myung Moon: The Early Years, 1920-53* is an important contribution. Breen's exhaustive field work and interviews provide independent corroboration of many details in Rev. Moon's early life and thereby lend a stamp of authenticity to events which otherwise might be questioned. The book also turns up some useful leads for others to pursue.²³ Finally, Breen's boldness in conceiving the project and perseverance in bringing it to completion deserve commendation and imitation. It is to be hoped that he carries his account forward.

Notes

1. To some extent, Breen's biography has become overshadowed by the publication of Nansook Hong's, *In the Shadow of the Moons: My Life in Reverend Sun Myung Moon's Family* (New York: Little, Brown, 1998). Hong's volume is an expose by the divorced wife of Rev. Moon's eldest son. Although it has garnered a degree of publicity, Breen's study is of more long-term significance for Unification historiography. For a general discussion of historiographical themes in Unification thought, see my "Writing History and Making History: Practical Applications of Unification Thought's Theory of History," in Theodore T. Shimmyo and David A. Carlson, eds., *Explorations in Unificationism* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1997), pp. 171-81.
2. The complete set is available only in Korean. Work has begun on an English translation. Individual speeches published under the series title, "Reverend Moon Speaks," are available through HSA Publications, 4 West 43rd Street, New York, NY 10036.
3. *Exposition of the Divine Principle* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1996) devotes more than half of its text (236 out of 411 pages) to the history of "the providence of restoration."
4. *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, p. 187.
5. These stories included reports "that Moon had once taken a hammer to a statuette made of him by a follower, and declined to cooperate with a request by a Japanese follower to do a biography." (10)
6. This, of course, is a common practice in religion. The New Testament and writings of the early Christian apologists afford good examples of mining Jewish prophecy and tradition for proofs of Christ's divinity. One can see the same tendency in Islam as well as in numerous restorationist movements.
7. Front piece and cover material from Breen's book describe him as a consultant and writer who first went to Korea as a correspondent in 1982, covering north and south Korea at different times for *The Washington Times* and *The Guardian*. He was president of the Seoul Foreign Correspondents' Club for three years.
8. Breen reports that there are 275 Korean family names and 3,349 clans. All of the 400,000 or so Moons in South Korea belong to the same clan (162 n. 2).
9. These reconstructions are distracting for the most part, more creative writing than solid reporting. See p. 179 n. 24.
10. The problem here stems from the Korean method of counting age. In contrast to the Western pattern, a Korean child is considered to be one year old at birth. Some commentators who did not understand this, but knowing that Rev. Moon claimed to have had his encounter with Jesus when he was sixteen, concluded that his Easter revelation occurred in 1936, sixteen years after his birth in 1920. Breen reports that "On May 17, 1935 ... Jesus appeared to him" (31). See also Breen's discussion of that date in relation to Easter. (166 nn. 9-10)
11. Some Unificationist accounts mention golden birds and mandarin ducks which

came to a tree in front of Rev. Moon's parents' house three years before his birth (see "Father's Course" for 21 day seminars, CARP, n.d., 1). Breen notes the same incident but questions whether it was a real bird or a "phenomenon" which Rev. Moon's aunt "saw." (19) The CARP account also mentions "revelations" through dreams which several of Rev. Moon's relatives received concerning his birth. Breen recounts a fortune teller's prediction that "a great man" would be born in the Moon clan but states that the seven Moon households in Rev. Moon's village, "which were in a permanent baby boom, did not know which pregnant mother was being referred to and did not argue the point." (19) Some accounts connect Rev. Moon's birth to aspects of Korean history, especially the March 1, 1919 Independence Movement which is understood to have set the condition for Rev. Moon to be conceived. Breen notes Rev. Moon's unyielding will as a child and recounts the prophetic utterance of his uncle who remarked, "That boy will either become a king or a terrible traitor," (23) a comment also recounted in other narratives.

12. Breen cites Lee Yo-han, director of the church seminary in Korea and a longtime follower, on this point. (166 n. 10)
13. See pp. 64, 66, and 171-72 n. 13.
14. Breen cites *Footprints of the Unification Movement*, vol. 1 (Seoul: HSA-UWC International, 1996), p. 20 as the official source. (166 n. 8) Here, Breen expresses a minority view based on his interviews.
15. See pp. 48, 57. Takaaki Aikawa asserts in the *Japanese Christian Quarterly* (Spring 1975), p. 115, that Rev. Moon had the Japanese name of Tatsuaki Kawamoto.
16. Breen recounts the patriotic activities of Moon Yoon-kook, Rev. Moon's uncle and a Presbyterian minister who sold a good portion of the Moon family land to support Korea's government-in-exile during Japanese occupation. He also recounts the conversion of Rev. Moon's immediate family to Christianity, offers background information about the Jesus Church of the charismatic evangelist Lee Yong-do, and breaks new ground in covering Rev. Moon's religious involvements in Seoul. (20-22, 28-30, 41-46)
17. Kim Baek-moon's group is more commonly known as the Israel Monastery. Kim maintained a church in Seoul and a retreat in the countryside north of the city. (67-70).
18. See especially *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, pp. 399-407.
19. See Breen's account of the variant versions on pp. 70-71 and p. 173 n. 31.
20. I discuss this question and category in "Rev. Moon's Messianic Consciousness," paper delivered at the International Religious Federation for World Peace's Conference on Founders and Shapers of the World's Religions, Washington, D.C., November 1997.
21. Breen's Sun Myung Moon is nearly always controlled and serenely above the fray.
22. Park Chong-hwa's *Six Marias* was published in Japan. Some unpublished manuscript editions exist in English. Park alleged that Rev. Moon engaged in ritual sex practices during the early 1950s. Later, he stated that the allegations were untrue

and that he had written the work in anger over being ignored by the church.

23. Breen, for example, suggests that minutes of Rev. Moon's trial in Pyongyang which resulted in his "Death Camp" sentence may be among the tons of documents seized by American forces and stored in boxes in the U.S. National Archives, "where they remain, largely unsorted." (176 n. 28)

A STUDY OF THE FORMATION AND HISTORY OF THE UNIFICATION PRINCIPLE

Jin-choon Kim

“There is a much greater area of truth yet to be revealed. I have already received the revelation, but I am purposely reserving certain truths to be revealed in future days.” –Sun Myung Moon¹

The Unification Principle, or Divine Principle, was not revealed all at once but step by step over a period of some 50 years. In this paper we will examine the history of the formation of the Unification Principle. Among the questions we will explore: When and how were the contents of the Divine Principle revealed to Rev. Moon? What were the circumstances of its proclamation in the various texts of the Divine Principle? Is there any law or principle governing its proclamation in these texts? What is the relationship between these Divine Principle texts and the wider corpus of Rev. Moon’s speeches?² This paper will provide an overview of the primary texts of the Unification Principle, investigating the history of their formation and discussing their contents.

Seven periods can be distinguished in the history of the formation of the Unification Principle:

1. The first period was one of searching for the Divine Principle. It extended from April 17, 1935, when Rev. Moon accepted his call from Jesus Christ, to August 15, 1945, the liberation of Korea and the beginning of his

Jin-choon Kim is Dean of the College of Theology at Sun Moon University, Korea, as well as an Assistant Professor there, teaching Divine Principle and Rev. Sun Myung Moon’s Words. His education includes a Ph.D. in Physics from the University of Minnesota in 1993 and an M.R.E. from the Unification Theological Seminary in 1995.

public ministry.

2. The second period describes Rev. Moon's early ministry when there was no written text of the Divine Principle. It spanned Rev. Moon's ministry in North Korea and his early ministry in Pusan, from August 15, 1945 to May 10, 1952.

3. May 10, 1952 saw the completion of the hand-written manuscript of *Wolli Wonbon* [WW], Eng: *Original Text of the Divine Principle*.³ WW circulated as a handwritten manuscript during the next several years, a period continuing until August 15, 1957.

4. August 15, 1957 saw the publication of *Wolli Haesul* [WH], Eng: *Explanation of the Divine Principle*.⁴ Prepared by Hyo-won Eu, it was based upon the earlier manuscript of WW and added new insights from Rev. Moon's sermons. During this period, which ended in May 1966, WH was the standard Divine Principle text.

5. May 1, 1966 saw the publication of *Wolli Kangron* [WK] Eng: *Exposition of the Divine Principle*.⁵ It was also prepared by Hyo-won Eu, based upon WH and adding new insights from Rev. Moon's sermons. During the period from May 1966 until to September 1994, WK was the standard Divine Principle text.

6. On September 30, 1994 a new edition of WK was prepared with color-coded passages. We can refer to the years from September 1994 to October 1997 as the period of the Color-Coded *Wolli Kangron* [CWK].

7. At the end of October 1997, Rev. Moon began the tradition of *Hoon Dok Hoe* using anthologized passages from his many sermons. The *Hoon Dok Hoe* texts stand beside WK as complementary expressions of the Completed Testament Word. This last period, from November 1997 to the present, can be called the period of *Hoon Dok Hoe* texts.

1. The Revelation of the Unification Principle

a. Rev. Moon's Search for the Principle

On the morning on April 17, 1935 (Wednesday), while praying on Mt. Myodu near his home, Rev. Moon met Jesus Christ and received his call. Upon accepting his mission, Rev. Moon understood that he should not only accumulate knowledge and cultivate himself, but also solve the fundamental problems about God, humankind, nature and history. In preparation for his future work, he invested himself especially to seek for the truth, the Divine Principle.⁶

In the beginning of his search for the truth, Rev. Moon met Jesus and God spiritually and received their teachings. He recounted:

It was when I was sixteen years old that I started experiencing God in a poor situation... From then on for nine years I was always with almighty God and Jesus. Many times I entered into the spirit world. Heavenly Father gradually taught me the amazing truth. It was as if the sun was rising in the morning after a long, dark night. I was able to see the dawn of new, glorious civilization within that truth. (79.1; CS 102-289)

For nine years he continued studying for school, but at the same time he kept searching for the Principle through communication with God and Jesus. Nonetheless, the Principle was never gained with ease. The course seeking for the heavenly secrets required tremendous hardship, loneliness, tears, sweat and blood. He had to pass through intense suffering and overcome incredible temptation, sometimes battling with Satan and millions of evil spirits. Accounts of this serious search for the truth can be found in WK (p. 12) and WH (pp. 18-19).⁷

The first and most fundamental problem in elucidating the Divine Principle was to understand the question of God's existence. Rev. Moon agonized to know the truth about the living and almighty God, about the questions of life and death, the creation of the universe, and the proper relationship between God and human beings. The official church histories describe his search thus:

To Rev. Moon, the first prerequisite in the search for the truth was to grasp the existence of God. He wanted to systematize and make sure whether God exists and what kind of relationship God and humans have. By this procedure he came to develop The Principle of Creation in today's WK. The other principles were discovered consequent to this one during this period.⁸

Once Rev. Moon obtained a clear answer to the question of God, who is the origin of all beings, he proceeded to inquire about created beings. Recognizing the special position of human beings, he clarified the fundamental relationship between God and human beings:

The primary standard is the parent-child relationship between God and humankind. The parent-child relationship centering on heavenly heart and blood lineage is the rudimentary system of the universe. Therefore, the foundation of the universe is parent and child. All things make a garden for children. By solving problems in this way, the Principle of Creation became naturally systematized.⁹

The next step was to investigate the secrets of the human fall. Rev. Moon fought with Satan for a long time and eventually obtained God's confirmation of his conclusion about the root, process and result of the ancestors' fall.

While Rev. Moon was studying in Tokyo... he discovered the content of the theological doctrine of the Human Fall. One of the difficult problems which Rev. Moon wrestled with for more than seven years after he first encountered Jesus concerned the secrets of the first three chapters of Genesis. The essence of it was to uncover the identity of Satan and learn what happened at the fall of human ancestors.¹⁰

Having ascertained the Principle of Creation and the Human Fall, Rev. Moon proceeded to the problem of restoring the fallen world. In this way he was able to elucidate and systematize the Divine Principle step by step.

The last step in elucidating the Principle was to subject it to a complicated procedure of verification. It had to receive the stamp of approval from God, the saints, philosophers, and even from Satan. Rev. Moon recalled:

Without receiving God's stamp we cannot work for God's will on earth. In order to gain that stamp I had to enter the spiritual world and bring the saints and philosophers to their knees, subjugating them through arguments about what is the essence among the heavenly principles. (89.11.7; CS 195-141)¹¹

b. Progressive Revelation

Rev. Moon now had in his possession the truth of the Divine Principle, complete and entire. Nevertheless, he could not proclaim the Principle to anyone until after the liberation of Korea. Speaking of the war years, he said, "Although I had relations with some organizations, I could not tell the Divine Principle, which you are learning now, to anyone. I could not because God told me not to do so... God's will cannot be accomplished by one person; we must find object partners to work with." (71.12.27; CS 52-140)

Rev. Moon teaches that revelation is proclaimed in accordance with the development of human spirituality and intellect. Sometimes a truth cannot be revealed because there are no people on a level to receive it. Another factor in progressive revelation is the gradual development of God's providence. According to Rev. Moon:

Truth must become incarnate. It must be lived and fulfilled within a living person. Otherwise it can be taken away and misused by Satan. This is why I do not reveal truth until all the conditions are met or the truth is embodied to a certain point.¹²

Sometimes I cannot speak certain things to the members or even to the leaders, because they simply won't understand, not because I want to hide something from them. Each person's depth of understanding of the Principle is different.¹³

Still there are many things that I cannot speak... There are many programs that I have not started yet. This is the reason why many people who have followed me for thirty years, for a lifetime even, do not yet understand me. How can I relate to them the secrets of heaven? I teach them the secrets as I work with them. (90.6.27; CS 203-280)

2. *The Unification Principle as Wolli Wonbon*

a. Rev. Moon's Sermons between Korea's Liberation and Writing Wolli Wonbon

Korea's liberation on August 15, 1945 had a special significance for Rev. Moon, because it meant that the situation was ripe for him to start and expand a grand movement based upon the truth he had won.¹⁴

For six months he attended and worked at Rev. Paek-moon Kim's Israel Monastery. When the plan to work through Rev. Kim failed, Rev. Moon traveled to North Korea, arriving in Pyongyang on June 6, 1946. During his years in North Korea he was imprisoned twice, first for three months from August 11 to November 21, 1946 and again from February 22, 1948 until October 14, 1950. Hence, during the years Rev. Moon was in North Korea, he was only able to teach the Principle for about one year and two months.

In those days he gave sermons with tears and sweat, speaking aloud as if he were speaking out to the whole world. Those who attended and listened to his words accepted them, not as a man's words, but as God's message. They cried because they were deeply touched in heart.¹⁵ According to official sources, Rev. Moon did not give systematic Divine Principle lectures. Instead he explained the Divine Principle through his sermons:

Rev. Moon did not give a Divine Principle lecture, but while he interpreted the Bible verses he explained the Principle. The Divine Principle was introduced in the sermons, for instance, "The Principle of God's creation," "The process of the fall of Adam and Eve mistaken owing to the horizontal love with the archangel," "The tragedy of Jesus' cross caused by irresponsibility of providential figures such as Virgin Mary and John the Baptist," and so on. He elucidated the clear and persuasive meaning behind the lines of the Bible.¹⁶

According to Won-pil Kim, Rev. Moon was keeping a notebook with his notes about the Divine Principle, which he had carried with him into North Korea. But unfortunately it was lost during Rev. Moon's incarceration in Heungnam Prison.

When Father arrived at Pyongyang, he already had a notebook... in which he wrote the entire contents of the Divine Principle. One day when I visited Father in Heungnam prison, Father told me to take a “bookkeeping ledger” from Sang-soon Cha and keep it carefully. He was an old member, and by Father’s direction he was keeping that notebook during Father’s imprisonment. When I then inquired of him about that notebook, he told me that he had lost it.¹⁷

That notebook would have been the predecessor of *Wolli Wonbon*.

b. Writing *Wolli Wonbon*

Rev. Moon left Pyongyang on December 4, 1950 and arrived at Pusan on January 27, 1951. Around three months later he began writing WW at Won-pil Kim’s home in Pusan. He continued writing it after he moved into the hut that he built in August. It took around one year to complete, from May 1951 to May 10, 1952. According to an official history,

Around the end of April 1951, during the six months while Rev. Moon was staying at Mr. Kim’s home, a special event took place. One day Rev. Moon started writing WW. He titled its first section, “From the One to All Beings.” This was the beginning of the Divine Principle on the earth. He was absorbed in writing it for about a year.¹⁸

While he was writing WW, Rev. Moon sometimes cried, sang and prayed. Won-pil Kim testified about Rev. Moon’s manner of writing, and about one event in particular:

While Father wrote WW, I was working at a military base. Each day when I returned from work he would ask me to read what he had written. Yet Father never made any corrections on what he wrote... One day very early in the morning, Father woke me up and told me to prepare paper and pencil. It was very dark except for the light of a single lamp. He asked me to write down what he was saying. He did not stop the dictation session until he completed what he wanted to say. I noted on the last page of my copy that the date was November 18, 1951.¹⁹

c. Structure and Contents of *Wolli Wonbon*

Wolli Wonbon was composed of two volumes. It was organized like WK with its Part I and Part II. According to Gil-ja Sa Eu’s recollection of her husband’s ministry:

Pres. Hyo-won Eu... asked Elder Bong-woon Lee to show him if he had any book of Rev. Moon’s words. Elder Lee hesitated a moment and dis-

cussed with Mrs. Se-hyon Ok; then he lent him the first volume of WW, written in Father's own hand. Some time later Pres. Eu borrowed the second volume and read it seriously. Of course, he copied the entire contents into his own notebook. As he was reading and copying WW, Pres. Eu exclaimed many times his admiration... He read and re-read his copies of the two volumes again and again.²⁰

I obtained three copies of WW, including Won-pil Kim's. The three copies are somewhat different in their expressions and section titles. According to Kim's testimony, his copy was exactly identical to what Rev. Moon himself wrote, not only in content but also in its expressions and order. Kim made his copy at Rev. Moon's direction, beginning in September 1953. The other two copies were written by anonymous members, one in June 1958 (after the publication of WH) and the other in July 1969 (after the publication of WK); the latter included only the first volume.

Kim's copy does not have clear division into a Part I and Part II, nor is it organized into distinct chapters and sections, but the 1958 copy has these divisions. According to his testimony, the text of WW in Rev. Moon's hand is organized only by section headings. Although Kim's copy has a table of contents which indicates such a system of organization into chapters, sections and subsections, he claims that it was attached later by someone else.²¹ The section headings of WW are given in Table One.

Table One: The Section Headings of *Wolli Wonbon*

1. From the One to All Beings
2. The Origin of Life from the Pre-existent Being
3. The Fundamental Significance of the Harmony between the Physical and Spiritual Worlds
4. Reciprocity between the World of Spirit Selves and the World of Physical Selves in the Principle of Creation
5. The Center of God's Ideal Is Approached through a Religion of Attendance
6. The Principle of Creation and the Principle of the Fall Originated from Love
7. One Can Know God by Knowing Oneself
8. In Uncovering the Principle, the Bible Cannot Directly Teach It to Us
9. Why God Could Not Directly Undertake the Providential Work from Moses
10. The Fundamental Meaning of the Tree of Life

11. The Fundamental Significance of Why God Could Not Undertake the Providential Work from Adam, but Instead Dealt with Satan from Abel to Noah
12. The First Period of the Providence of God's Responsibility, from Noah to Jesus
13. The Fundamental Significance of the Providential Period of the Responsibility of Jesus, Who Came as the Person Responsible to Accomplish God's Will
14. The Fundamental Significance of the Responsibility of Jesus Working after His Ascension
15. The Fundamental Meaning of Resurrection
16. The Fundamental Meaning of the Angels' Trumpets and of the Second Coming
17. The Fundamental Meaning of the Judgment
18. The Fundamental Significance of Providential Courses Called for to Restore the Forty Days
19. The Proof as Seen from the Development of Human History and God's Providence
20. Proof from the Viewpoint of Restoration that Progress in History Is Limited
21. Proof by the Principle that in History Goodness Is Victorious over Evil
22. The History of Human Development Is the History of Restoration
23. The Theory of the Ideal in View of the Restoration of Creativity
24. The Lord of the Second Advent Is the Foundational Person for the Completion of the Theory of the Ideal
25. The Principled Solution to the Thread of History Begins in Korea

Without a detailed investigation into these contents, one can still discern considerable correspondence between these headings and the content of WH and WK. This is shown in Table Two.

One notable point concerns the term "Reciprocity... in the Principle of Creation" in the fourth heading. We do not have such expression in WK or in WH. But Sang-hun Lee used this expression several times in the channeled communications collected in the recent book, *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*.²²

Table Two: Comparison of the Chapters of *Wolli Kangron* and *Wolli Haesul* and the Sections of *Wolli Wonbon*

| | <i>Wolli Kangron</i> | <i>Wolli Haesul</i> | <i>Wolli Wonbon</i> | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---------------|
| | General Introduction | General Introduction | | |
| Part I | 1. Principle of Creation | 1. Principle of Creation | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 23 | |
| | 2. Fall of Man | 5. Fall of Man | 6, 10 | |
| | 3. Eschatology | 3. Eschatology | 17, 19, 21 | |
| | 4. The Messiah | 2. The Messiah | 7. Jesus' Second Coming and John the Baptist | 13 |
| | | 4. Resurrection | | |
| | 5. Resurrection | 4. Resurrection | 15 | |
| | 6. Predestination | 6. Predestination | 8 | |
| 7. Christology | 8. Christology | | | |
| Part II | Introduction | Introduction | 18, 20 | |
| | 1. Foundation for Restoration | 1. Foundation for Restoration | 11, 12 | |
| | 2. Moses and Jesus | 2. Age of the Providence of Restoration | 3. Prolongation of the Providence of Restoration | 9, 12, 13, 14 |
| | 3. Periods and Lengths | | | 18 |
| | 4. Parallels | 4. Completion of the Providence of Restoration | | 21, 22 |
| | 5. Preparation | | | 20 |
| | 6. Second Coming | | | 16, 24, 25 |

3. The Unification Principle as *Wolli Haesul*

a. Rev. Moon's Sermons between *Wolli Wonbon* and *Wolli Haesul*

The contents of Rev. Moon's sermons have a close relationship with providential events and activities. As God's providence unfolded during the period from May 1952 to August 1957, and new programs were begun, many heavenly secrets were also revealed. (90.6.27; CS 203-283) As new insights were gradually given, they could be well summarized and organized systematically in WH and later in WK. Hence, to better understand the Divine Principle as explained in WH, we should know some of the significant prov-

idential events and activities that preceded its writing.

Unfortunately, the records of Rev. Moon's early sermons are quite spotty. The multi-volume series *Collected Sermons of the Reverend Sun Myung Moon* contains his speeches only since April 8, 1956. The first volume contains 20 speeches from 1956, and the second and third volumes contain 38 speeches from 1957. We do not have transcripts of Rev. Moon's sermons covering the more than ten years between August 1945 (the start of his public ministry) and April 1956. The extent of the missing material is partly indicated by a document in the records of Sungwha, the official publishing company of HSA-UWC in Korea. It lists Rev. Moon's sermons in 1954 prior to the establishment of HSA-UWC: on January 22, January 24, February 7, February 9 (celebrating his 34th birthday in Taegu), March 8 and April 3. After the establishment of HSA-UWC on May 1, Rev. Moon preached nearly every Sunday in 1954, and sometimes on weekdays. According to this document he spoke 26 times in 1954, 66 times in 1955, 84 times in 1956 and 73 times in 1957. Thus, we are missing most of the sermons given during the period in question. Nonetheless, the essential truths conveyed in those sermons would be expected to be found in WH.

b. Writing Wolli Haesul

Former President Eu, who joined the church on December 24, 1953 and ascended on July 24, 1970, was the central figure for the composition of WH and WK. Under Rev. Moon's direction, he summarized and organized the Divine Principle in those books.

According to his wife, Gil-ja Sa Eu, the first time Hyo-won Eu studied the Divine Principle he gave it his whole heart. He was desperate to know the truth, feeling that otherwise he could not find any hope for living. When he understood, he was so deeply moved with gratitude that he wept.²³ The hot atmosphere of that workshop, taught by Rev. Moon himself, became the example of early workshops. According to the account in *Tongil Segae*:

On December 24, 1953 Rev. Sun Myung Moon returned to Pusan from Seoul to meet Hyo-won Eu. During the workshop Rev. Moon gave lectures on both part I and II of WW, beginning with "The irresponsibility of John the Baptist." The workshop continued day and night. The direct lecture in Rev. Moon's own sorrowful voice made a startling impression on Eu. The workshop continued for 21 days with sermons, prayers, hymns, testimonies, etc. The atmosphere was so exciting, as hot as a blast furnace, that all the participants deeply experienced rebirth... During the workshop many of the participants were spiritually open. Eu also could see the spirit world—for a while it appeared as if he were watching a movie—and ascertain the contents of the Divine Principle.²⁴

In the spring of 1955 Eu started writing WH based on WW and Rev. Moon's sermons. For almost two years he invested himself in this work, making effort to follow Rev. Moon's detailed guidance exactly and to write the manuscript accurately and systematically.²⁵ WH was published on August 15, 1957.

Why, among the many notable figures in the early history of the Unification Church, was Hyo-won Eu asked to write WH? Was it because he was the president of the church? Or was it because he was eager to write and had knowledge adequate for writing it? Rev. Moon explained the reason from a different perspective:

Pres. Eu was six months older than Father. John the Baptist was six months older than Jesus. So Pres. Eu stood in the position of John the Baptist. He must explain the Divine Principle in the position of John the Baptist. He did not write the book by his own will. When he wrote it I directed him to write this way and that way. (71.12.27; CS 52-138-14)

John the Baptist was supposed to have testified to Jesus, followed Jesus and attended Jesus. As if the reincarnation of John the Baptist, Eu was to fulfill this mission before the Lord at the Second Coming, testifying to Rev. Moon by writing WH. Rev. Moon also said that only when a person unites completely with the returning Messiah centered on a new world-level expression of truth (Divine Principle) can he indemnify John the Baptist's failure. Eu accomplished this task; hence, Rev. Moon said he could acknowledge his words. Although others had the ability to write well, Rev. Moon would not permit them to write the Divine Principle. Rev. Moon said that Unification Church members should follow the book written by Hyo-won Eu. (72.9.25; CS 62-186-47) This tells us that Eu's chief qualification to write WH was his oneness with Rev. Moon.

Why, then, did Rev. Moon himself not write WH? If Rev. Moon wrote a book explaining the Divine Principle, people could surely understand its meaning more profoundly. Rev. Moon once explained the reason in the Principle itself why he did not write it. He said, "While my mission is to fit with the indemnity conditions for the matters of the completion stage, Pres. Eu's mission is to teach the Divine Principle for the completion level of growth stage." (67.4.10; CS 157-284) Until Rev. Moon's work reached the completion level of growth stage, Rev. Moon would teach the Principle himself. But since by that time Rev. Moon had already gone beyond the growth stage, he asked Eu to write the text explaining the Divine Principle. Though it is difficult to conjecture, we may presume that Rev. Moon had reached the completion stage by 1955, when he asked Eu to write WH. He wrote it representing John the Baptist introducing Rev. Moon as the Messiah.

Eu suffered from a physical condition that made it extremely difficult for him to write WH. He could not write for long stretches of time. Also, at

that time HSA-UWC could not afford to give him a private office where he could focus on writing. He would find an empty corner or sometimes go to a coffee shop to write. Nevertheless, he went over the manuscript ten times to correct its grammar and phrasing before its publication. Without a doubt, WH allowed members to better comprehend the Divine Principle and witness much more effectively.

c. Contents and Structure of Wolli Haesul

The Introduction of WH states:

This truth, although it is only a portion of the truth, was first proclaimed only three years ago. This book is just a record of the lectures given daily by some disciples, as they try to explain what they heard and witnessed from their teacher. We do not understand either the extent or the nature of all that was revealed to him. But we are very sure that in the future more of this truth will be proclaimed, according to the capacity of Christians to understand it. This author (writer) is truly sorry that owing to his lack of ability in description, he is unable to explain this truth's deep meaning. (WH, p. 19)

This passage tells us that WH is the record of lectures explaining the Unification Principle—evidence that it was systematized from WW and Rev. Moon's sermons. Generally speaking, the basic contents of WH are similar to those of WW and WK. The Table of Contents of WH is given in Appendix A—a more detailed analysis being beyond the scope of this paper. Yet even from a cursory examination of its chapter and section headings, one can recognize its close structural resemblance to WK, even as it is quite different from WW (see Table Two, above).

Interestingly, in this passage from WH Eu refers to himself as the “author (writer)”; he does not refer to himself at all in WK.

One year after Eu commenced writing WH in the spring of 1955, he began to publish its contents serially in the HSA-UWC magazine *Sungwha*. “The Principle of Creation” was published in volume 7, on June 15, 1955. Consisting of seven sections, its content was similar to what was later published in WH. More of WH was published in succeeding issues of *Sungwha*: “The Advent of the Messiah and the Necessity of His Second Coming” in volume 8 (August 1956), “How Human History Will Be Consummated” and “Resurrection” in volume 9 (September 1956), “The Human Fall” and “Why God Permitted Humans to Fall and Then Commenced the Providence” in volume 10 (October 1956), “Predestination in View of the Providence of Restoration” and “John the Baptist's Coming as Elijah and the Second Coming of Jesus” in volume 11 (November 1956), “Christology” in volume 12 (December 1956), “The Course of Human History as the Providence of Restoration through Indemnity” in volume 13 (February 1957), and “The

Age of the Providence to Lay the Foundation for Restoration” and “The Age of the Providence of Restoration (2,000 Years)” in volume 14 (June 1957). This series finished just two months before the publication of WH.

Before ending this chapter it may be interesting to comment on the earliest English translations of the Principle. Young-oon Kim published the first English version of the Principle, *The Divine Principles*, on September 25, 1956. This was more than one year after Eu started writing WH but one year prior to its publication. *The Divine Principles* has an organized structure, with chapters and sections similar to the serialization of WH in *Sungwha*. It was based on WW and especially on the unfinished manuscript of WH.

Dr. Kim published a second English version of the Principle, also titled *The Divine Principles*, in August 1960, three years after the publication of WH. It is not an exact translation of WH. For instance, instead of WH’s Introduction it has Dr. Kim’s own preface. Its structure of chapters and sections also differs from WH, having no division into Part I and II, and with some differences in chapter names and chapter order. Dr. Kim might have added some of her theological perspective and knowledge for the sake of westerners. Significantly, it contains many of the English terms that would be utilized thirteen years later by Won-pok Choi in her translation of WK.

4. *The Unification Principle as Wolli Kangron—and Beyond*

a. *Writing Wolli Kangron*

Early in the 1960s Rev. Moon directed Eu to write a new text of the Divine Principle which would better fit with the new age. It was to have an improved theoretical structure and more descriptive explanations in view of the needs in delivering the message. During the nine years between the publication of WH and WK we have about 430 sermons of Rev. Moon in the *Collected Sermons of the Reverend Sun Myung Moon*. Presumably, Eu took on the difficult task of abstracting from these sermons certain essential teachings to be included in WK. As mentioned earlier, the structure and contents of this book are very close to those of WH. A detailed discussion of the formation of WK is beyond the scope of this paper.

Three years in preparation, WK was published on May 1, 1966. It has become the official text of the Divine Principle. On September 30, 1994, HSA-UWC published an edition of WK with added colors to distinguish several levels of the message.

b. Rev. Moon's Words and Limitation of Wolli Kangron

In the 32 years since the publication of WK, Rev. Moon has proclaimed and taught numerous new concepts and revealed many heavenly secrets. Such topics as Tribal and National Messiah, the Four Great Realms of Heart, the Three Great Kingships, the Realm of the Royal Family, absolute sex, the importance of the sexual organ, the Three-Subject Thought, the Cosmic Sabbath of the Parents of Heaven and Earth, the unified blessing of spiritual and physical worlds, etc. are not found in WK. Four-fifths of the sermons in the 233 volumes of Rev. Moon's collected sermons published to date—about 2,000 sermons—were delivered after the publication of WK. In this sense WK suffers from a limitation.

Strictly speaking, the Korean WK has no such words as “true love,” “true family” and “purity.” The phrase “true love” in the English version of WK (EDP, p. 50) is a translation of “perfect love,” and the phrase “original, true love” (EDP, p. 97) is a translation of “original love.” Also, the phrase “the true love of parents, the true love of husband and wife, and the true love of children” (EDP, p. 283) is a translation of “the love of parents, the love of husband and wife, and the love of children” in the Korean text. How about the word “purity”? The phrase “the purity of the people” (EDP, p. 81) is a translation of “sinless people,” the phrase “a life of purity” (EDP, p. 316) is a translation of “a life of separation from Satan,” etc.

Yet surprisingly, Rev. Moon had already spoken about “true love” even before the publication of WH in August 1957. For instance,

Judaism, having been prepared for 4,000 years until Jesus' advent, should have given a true love that would have made Jesus rejoice. (57.2.17; CS 2-40)

When humankind comes to realize its ignorance, unable to distinguish true truth, true life, and true love... (57.3.17; CS 2-131)

Before a movement of true love occurs, there will be a movement of false love. (57.3.17; CS 2-139)

All human beings should find the standard of true love, true life, and true hope by which they can overcome this age of obstacles and horrors. (57.4.7; CS 2-164)

Between the publication of WH in August 1957 and WK in May 1966, Rev. Moon also spoke many times about true love. For example,

Our hope is to restore the parent-child relationship with God centering on true love. (57.9.15; CS 3-25-4)

Jesus' three years of public life was a life of true love, the course of one with a parental heart sacrificing for his children. (58.1.26; CS 3-297-6)

God's will was to realize true love on earth with heaven's thought at the center. (58.2.16; CS 4-7-6)

A nation which professes religion and seeks for God should ever be a witness for true love. (58.5.18; CS 4-235-7)

True Parents come with true love, by which they can protect human history and eliminate the invader. (66.3.22; CS 16-177-10)

Why, then, is there not an single word about true love in the WH and WK? Rev. Moon once said,

We should have given an explanation of the origin of true love in WK, but I did not because the time had not yet come. If I had written about it, people would have said, "Rev. Moon put in this sweet word to deceive love, because he has a devilish nature." Hence I left the word out. But in the end I must explain in words that the origin of true love is God. I am the only person who is allowed to change the content of WK. (91.11.24; CS 224-194-20)

This reason is consistent with the idea that the Divine Principle is proclaimed to humankind in stages, according to the level of human intellect and spirituality and the development of God's providence.

Furthermore, WK explains that the main reason why Jesus had to die on the cross was due to the ignorance and disbelief of John the Baptist. (EDP, p. 130) But if we read the relevant story about Jesus' death in the speech "View of the Principle of the Providential History of Salvation," we learn that there were far more complicated, serious problems in the families of Zechariah and Joseph. The difficult Cain-Abel relationship between Elizabeth and Mary and the issue of Jesus' marriage were added obstacles in Jesus' path. Rev. Moon said, "The younger sister of John the Baptist was to have been the wife of Jesus... It is not in WK, but it is true, and I can explain it in detail." (91.10.14; CS 220-45-6) WK has many other limitations, as Rev. Moon has mentioned:

So far the Unification Principle has taught only how to indemnify as individuals. It does not teach how to indemnify as a family. (71.4.18; CS 43-37-13)

Now I will explain why we cannot go beyond unless we love our enemy. Though it is not in WK, you should know it because it is very important. (71.12.22; CS 52-60-28)

Three generations of grandmother, mother, and daughter should become one and attend the Lord at the Second Advent. That is according to the Principle, although it is not in WK. (91.7.14; CS 218-121-15)

Finally, although WK elucidates when the Messiah comes, how he comes, and where he comes, it does not state clearly who the Messiah is. Nor does WK describe what kind of life he has lived, nor what course he must follow to fulfill God's providence. Rev. Moon once said, "We need to add to the Divine Principle the history of Unification Church, which includes Father's history." (69.6.8; CS 23-255-1)

c. Promise of a New Text of the Principle

Reverend Moon has confirmed that WK needs correcting: "I know that there are some things to correct in the WK written by Pres. Eu, but I have not said anything about them because he wrote it with sincerity." (70.8.9; CS 33-1-1) Rev. Moon has mentioned several times that he himself will write the new text of the Principle:

In the future I would like to leave another book that includes such contents that, although I understand, humankind cannot understand even some thousand years later. I want to write it with prayer and utmost sincerity... In the future, I intend to write a Principle book with a new perspective. (92.12.9; CS 239-296-11)

What shall I do after the third seven-year course finishes? I will rearrange the Principle and all the publications of Unification Church. I should put my hands on WK, and who knows whether I will make it thicker or thinner. (75.4.1; CS 77-96)

On February 3, 1977, during a nine-hour interview with Frederick Sontag, Rev. Moon said that although the basic content of the revelation will never be altered, he will standardize the Principle by himself and leave it to history:

Sontag: "As I understand it, the original Divine Principle was oral in nature. The earliest disciples told me that they heard it in sermon form, and the disciples in Pusan said that they were with you when the Principles were finally written down. In contrast to the very earliest writing, the present book is more elaborate, more detailed. Do you foresee the possibility again of any change, elaboration, addition, or subtraction of the present Divine Principle book? Is its form fixed now?"

Rev. Moon: "The expression of parts of the Principle here and there have been greatly experimented with. But from the very beginning to the end, the basic content of the revelation has never altered. For example, in "The Principles

of Creation,” “The Fall of Man,” and “The Mission of Jesus,” the central ideas have never changed. I know there are difficulties in expressing certain concepts and ideas of our philosophy, so one of my projects, which will take a great deal of time and efforts, is once again to standardize the Principle myself and leave it to history. This job remains to be done. The Divine Principle is not the kind of truth that you have a conference about, and if people do not like it, you can change it. That will never happen.”²⁶

Although Rev. Moon has often spoken of his intention to write a new book about the Unification Principle by himself, without yet fulfilling this wish, on October 13, 1997 he established the tradition of *Hoon Dok Hoe* and set up several texts as readings. They are mostly anthologies of excerpted sermons: *Blessed Family and Ideal Kingdom I, II*, twelve volumes of *Selected Speeches of Rev. Sun Myung Moon*, *Prayers of Rev. Sun Myung Moon*, *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, and more to come.

What is the relationship between WK and this expanding corpus of *Hoon Dok Hoe* texts? As I see it, WK may be regarded as the textbook introducing the Messiah, while the *Hoon Dok Hoe* texts are like companions for attending and living together with True Parents in the Completed Testament Age.

5. Conclusion

To receive the revelation of such profound heavenly secrets as are found in the Unification Principle must have required incredible sacrifice and indemnity. Knowing that, we can surmise that the completion of WW must have been a day of rejoicing for God and Jesus Christ. Rev. Moon not only discovered the Principle, the hidden truth of God. He also did an amazing job to systematize the bits and pieces of revelation accumulated over many years into the theoretical structure we find in WW, and further refined in WH and WK.

This paper examined the heretofore hidden history of the development of the texts of the Principle, from WW to WH to WK. In the future we hope to compare and contrast the contents of these three books in detail. We also intend to scrutinize the development of specific Principle concepts. As further research, it will also be valuable to study how content from Rev. Moon’s speeches during the mid-50s influenced the development of WH from WW.

Appendix A: Table of Contents of *Wolli Haesul*

Introduction

Part I

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Chapter 1 | The Principle of Creation |
| Sect. 1 | The Dual Characteristics of God and the Created Universe |
| Sect. 2 | The Completion of Created Beings and their Growing Period |
| Sect. 3 | Universal Prime Energy through Give and Take Action |
| Sect. 4 | The Purpose of the Creation of the Universe |
| Sect. 5 | The Invisible Substantial World and the Visible Substantial World Centered on Human Beings |
| Sect. 6 | The Relationship between the Spirit Self and the Physical Self |
| Sect. 7 | Love and Its Purpose |
| Chapter 2 | The Purpose of Messiah's Coming and the Necessity of the Second Advent |
| Chapter 3 | The Consummation of Human History |
| Chapter 4 | Resurrection |
| Sect. 1 | The Meaning of Resurrection |
| Sect. 2 | The Resurrection of Earthly Saints |
| Sect. 3 | The First Resurrection |
| Sect. 4 | The Resurrection of Spirits |
| Sect. 5 | The Transmigration of the Soul as Taught by Buddhism |
| Sect. 6 | The Descent of All Kinds of Evil Spirits |
| Sect. 7 | The Unification of Religions by Means of the Descent of the Saints from the Spirit World |
| Chapter 5 | The Human Fall |
| Sect. 1 | The Root of Sin |
| Sect. 2 | The Fall of the Archangel and Eve and the Fall of Adam |
| Sect. 3 | The Cause of the Human Ancestors' Deviation from the Principle |
| Sect. 4 | Freedom and the Human Fall |
| Sect. 5 | The Primary Causes of the Fall |
| Sect. 6 | Satan and Fallen Humans |
| Sect. 7 | The Reason God Did Not Intervene in the Fall |

- Chapter 6 Predestination in Light of the Providence of Restoration
- Sect. 1 The Meaning of Predestination
- Sect. 2 God's Predestination and the Human Portion of Responsibility
- Sect. 3 New Testament Passages upon Which the Doctrine of Predestination Is Based
-
- Chapter 7 John the Baptist's Coming as Elijah and Jesus' Second Coming
- Sect. 1 Elijah and John the Baptist in Light of the Providence of Restoration
- Sect. 2 Jesus' Second Coming in Light of the Providence of Restoration
-
- Chapter 8 Christology
- Sect. 1 Adam and Jesus as Regards the Restoration of the Tree of Life
- Sect. 2 The Meaning of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil
- Sect. 3 Adam and Jesus as Regards the Dual Characteristics of the Logos
- Sect. 4 Jesus and the Holy Spirit in Light of the Principle of Restoration through Indemnity and the Significance of Rebirth
- Sect. 5 The Trinity
-
- Part II: The Providential Course of Restoration through Indemnity Centered on the Restoration of the Four Position Foundation
-
- Introduction
- Chapter 1 The Age of the Providence to Lay the Foundation for Restoration
- Sect. 1 The Dispensation of Restoration with Adam's Family
- Sect. 2 The Dispensation of Restoration with Noah's Family
- Sect. 3 The Dispensation of Restoration with Abraham
-
- Chapter 2 The Age Providence of Restoration (2000 years)
- Sect. 1 The Age of Persecution in Egypt (400 years)
- Sect. 2 The Age of Judges (400 years)
- Sect. 3 The Age of the United Kingdom (400 years)
- Sect. 4 The Age of the Divided Kingdoms (400 years)
- Sect. 5 The Age of the Israelite Captivity (70 years)
- Sect. 6 The Age of the Israelites' Return (140 years)

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Sect. 7 | The Age of Preparation for the Coming of the Messiah (400 years) |
| Chapter 3 | The Prolongation of the Providence of Restoration (2000 years after Jesus) |
| Sect. 1 | The Age of Christian Persecution in the Roman Empire (400 years) |
| Sect. 2 | The Age of Church Patriarchs (400-800) |
| Sect. 3 | The Age of Christian Empire (800-918) |
| Sect. 4 | The Age of Divided Empires, East and West (918-1305) |
| Sect. 5 | The Age of the Babylonish Captivity of the Papacy (1305-1375) |
| Sect. 6 | The Age of Returning (1375-1517) |
| Sect. 7 | The Age of Preparation for the Second Advent (1517-1917) |
| Chapter 4 | The Completion of the Providence of Restoration (1920—) |
| Sect. 1 | The Development of History in Light of the Providence of Restoration and the Significance of World War III |
| Sect. 2 | From Where Will the 6,000-Year Providence of Restoration Finally Be Solved? |
| Sect. 3 | The Cause of the Chaotic Profusion of Languages and the Necessity for Their Unification |
| Sect. 4 | The Mission of the Korean Nation in the Last Days |

Notes

1. Frederick Sontag, *Sun Myung Moon and the Unification Church* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1977), pp. 140-47.
2. Compilation Committee of Rev. Sun Myung Moon's Speeches, *Collected Sermons of the Rev. Sun Myung Moon*, 240+ vols. (Seoul: Sungwha, 1984-1997), henceforth termed CS. Passages will be cited as "68.11.20; CS 21-181" where "68.11.20" is the date of the speech, i.e., Nov. 20, 1968, and "CS 21-181" means page 181 of volume 21. Sometimes a passage will be cited as "CS 11-179-22" for the 22nd subtopic of a list which started on p. 179 of vol. 11. This is the notation used in the *TPSpeech* CD-ROM.
3. *Wolli Wonbon*, handwritten manuscripts, 1953, 1958, 1969.
4. Hyo-won Eu, *Wolli Haesul* (Seoul: Sungwha, 1957).
5. [Hyo-won Eu], *Wolli Kangron* (Seoul: Sungwha, 1966-1994); translated as *Divine Principle* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1973) and *Exposition of the Divine Principle [EDP]* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1996).
6. Unification Church History Committee, *Field of Sufferings* (Seoul: Sungwha, 1983), p. 15.

7. See also the recollections in Rev. Moon's sermons and speeches, e.g., "The Role of Peninsular Nations in the 21st Century," Federation of Peninsular Nations for World Peace, Inaugural World Convention, Keynote Address, August 21, 1996, Sheraton Walker Hill Hotel, Seoul.
8. Unification Church History Committee, *Sabo* 44, pp. 8-9.
9. *Unification Church History I* (Seoul: Sungwha, 1978), p. 26.
10. *Footprints of the Unification Movement I* (Seoul: Sungwha, 1996), p. 24.
11. See also 1968.5.19; CS 159-304.
12. Sontag, *op. cit.*, and CS 91-125
13. Sontag, *op. cit.*, and CS 91-129.
14. *Unification Church History I*, p. 36.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
16. *Ibid.*
17. Won-pil Kim, interviews on August 7, 8 and 13, 1988.
18. *Unification Church History I*, p. 95.
19. Won-pil Kim, interview.
20. Gil-ja Sa Eu, "Pres. Eu as Seen by His Wife," *Tongil Segae* 116 (1980): 100-101.
21. Won-pil Kim, interview. Kim was living in Pusan and working at the U.S. military base when, in September 1953, he made this copy from Rev. Moon's original manuscript. Rev. Moon requested it as he was about to depart for Seoul to lay the foundation for the church there.
22. Sung-han Lee, *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth* (New York: FFWPU, 1998), pp. 58, 62.
23. Gil-ja Sa Eu, *Tongil Segae* 116 (1980): 111.
24. "On the Tenth Commemoration of Former President Eu," *Tongil Segae* 116 (1980): 101.
25. *Sabo* 137 (Sept-Oct 1994): 27. See also *Unification Church History, Enlarged* (unpublished).
26. Sontag, pp. 146-47, and CS 91-124.

A REAPPRAISAL OF TYPOLOGIES OF NEW RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UNIFICATION CHURCH

Yoshihiko Masuda

If we want to have an enlightened discussion on the Unification Church (UC) or any new Religious Movement (NRM),¹ we must acquire a clear understanding of typological concepts and terms. Sometimes scholarly discussion of NRMs suffers from typological ambiguity and confusion (e.g., various concepts of cults). Misunderstanding of the UC has been made worse by ignorance of typological terms and concepts, which are intellectual tools to distinguish and to articulate the characteristics of religious groups from a comparative perspective. I am convinced that clarifying typological conceptualizations and categories is a prerequisite to an enlightened discussion of the UC or of any religious group.

In this paper, we will review and reappraise contemporary typologies of NRMs presented by the following scholars: 1) Robert Ellwood, 2) David Aberle, 3) Charles Glock and Robert Bellah, 4) Dick Anthony, 5) Frederick Bird, 6) Barbara Hargrove, 7) Frances Westley, and 8) John Lofland and James Richardson. In introducing each typology, we will examine how scholars identified, or would have identified, the UC in applying each typology. As a Unificationist, I am ever desirous of criticizing some scholars' erroneous characterizations of the UC and appreciating other scholars' helpful identifications. It is important for Unificationists to be aware how the church is characterized in scholarly works and to offer articulate critiques of misleading analyses.²

Yoshihiko Masuda is Associate Professor in Unification Ethics and Sociology of Religion and Dean of the Graduate School of Theology at Sun Moon University, Korea. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion in 1993.

1. Ellwood's Typology

In *Religious and Spiritual Groups in Modern America*, historian of religion Robert S. Ellwood introduced many NRMs in America by organizing them into six categories primarily on the basis of their historical origins.³ The following are his six categories, his elegant phrases to sum up each category, and the religious and spiritual groups Ellwood classified in each category:

1) Groups in the Theosophical and Rosicrucian Traditions: “New Vessels for the Ancient Wisdom”

The Theosophical Society in America, The Full Moon Meditation Groups, Anthroposophy, Rosicrucianism, Modern Gnosticism, The “I Am” Movement, The Liberal Catholic Church

2) Spiritualism and UFO Cults: “The Descent of the Mighty Ones”

The Spiritualist Church, Giant Rock Space Convention, Understanding, Inc., Amalgamated Flying Saucer Clubs of America, The Aetherius Society

3) Initiatory Groups: “The Crystal Within”

Gurdjieff Groups, The Prosperos, Scientology, Abilitism, Builders of the Adytum, The Church of Light

4) Neo-Paganism: “The Edenic Bower”

Feraferia, Church of All Worlds, Ceremonial Magic and Witchcraft, Satanism

5) Hindu Movements in America: “The Ganges Flows West”

The Ramakrishna Mission and Vedanta Societies, The Self-Realization Fellowship, The Maharishi Mahesh Yogi's Transcendental Meditation Movement, International Sivananda Yoga Society, The International Society for Krishna Consciousness

6) Other Oriental Movements: “The East in the Golden West”

Western Zen, Esoteric Buddhism in America, Nichiren Shoshu of America, The Baha'i Faith, The Lovers of Meher Baba, Subud, The Unified Family

Ellwood classified the American UC in the 1960s, which its members previously called “The Unified Family,” as one of the Other Oriental Movements.⁴ He also described it as one of the rare non-Western Christian cults in America.⁵ In his Introduction to an annotated bibliography entitled *New Religious Movements in the United States and Canada*, Ellwood revised his earlier classificatory scheme and presented nine categories to classify the NRMs.⁶ Based largely on the historical and geographical origins of the NRMs, the nine are as follows:

- 1) Theosophical, Rosicrucian, Gnostic
- 2) New Thought
- 3) Spiritualist/UFO Groups
- 4) Occult/Initiatory Groups
- 5) Neo-Paganism and Its Allies
- 6) Eastern Religions I: From India
- 7) Eastern Religions II: From East Asia
- 8) Eastern Religions III: From Islamic Countries
- 9) Christian Movements

It is noteworthy that Ellwood classified the UC as among the Christian Movements. When we consider the UC's historical origin and theological tenets, it is certainly fair to classify the UC as a group belonging to a Christian family.

Ellwood's nine categories for classifying the NRMs make his scheme less reductionistic than many of the sociological typologies of NRMs that employ a very small number of categories—frequently two or three.⁷ This is, however, a typology for those who are interested in the location of the historical hometown of the NRMs from the East. On the basis of their historical origins, eastern religions are divided into those stemming from India, from East Asia, and from Islamic countries. Sociologists of religion who are interested in understanding a NRM's social role in its current host society tend to find this typology inadequate. Many historians of religions, however, appreciate this typology because it presents an accurate classifying scheme for NRMs on the basis of historical and theological data.

2. Aberle's Typology

Anthropologists have also contributed to the classification of social and religious movements. David F. Aberle in his book *The Peyote Religion among the Navaho* presented one of the most influential classifications among them.⁸ According to Aberle,

Social movements may be classified by reference to two dimensions. One is the dimension of the *locus* of the change sought. The other is the dimension of the *amount* of change sought. As to locus, a movement may aim to change individuals or some supra-individual system—the economic order, the technological order, the political order, the law, a total society or culture, the world, or indeed the cosmos. As to amount of change, movements may aim at total or partial change. These two dimensions give rise to four types...⁹

Utilizing these two dimensions, Aberle presented the following four types of social movements: 1) *transformative movements*, which aim at a total change in supra-individual systems, 2) *reformative movements*, which aim at a partial change in supra-individual systems, 3) *redemptive movements*, which aim at a total change in individuals, and 4) *alterative movements*, which aim at a partial change in individuals. Because Aberle clearly acknowledged that religious movements constitute one class of social movements, we will be allowed to present Aberle's typology of social movements as a typology of NRMs as well. It is illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Aberle's Typology of New Religious Movements¹⁰

| | | Locus of Change | |
|------------------|---------|------------------|------------|
| | | Supra-individual | Individual |
| Amount of Change | Total | Transformative | Redemptive |
| | Partial | Reformative | Alterative |

A number of scholars applied Aberle's typology of social movements to their studies on NRMs.¹¹ Bryan Wilson referred to Aberle's typology in his *Magic and Millennium*.¹² In "*Moonies*" in America, David Bromley and Anson Shupe discussed Aberle's classification as a framework to understand the Unification movement.¹³ Keith Roberts in his textbook also discussed Aberle's typology in the section on the NRMs.¹⁴

Following Aberle's typology, Bromley and Shupe identified the Unification movement as a "transformative" movement that aims at a total change in the supra-individual system. In fact, they called it "a world-transforming movement." I have acquired, however, certain reservation about their identifying the Unificationist movement as a "transformative" movement on the basis of Aberle's typology.¹⁵ It appears to me that Bromley and Shupe underestimated the UC's efforts for a total change of individuals—an aspect of a redemptive movement. In my view, the Unification movement attempts to bring about a total change of individuals and subsequent to or almost simultaneously with a total change of supra-individuals (culture and social structures). Aberle's category of the "redemptive movement" does not fit the Unification movement well, not because the UC is indifferent to the total change of individuals, but because movements in that category are assumed to be rather indifferent to changing the culture and social structures. Neither category is totally appropriate for the Unification movement, which is concerned with both.

In contrast to Bromley and Shupe's emphasis on the "supra-individual" world-transforming goals and activities of the Unification movement, Joseph Fichter found the UC essentially evangelistic and individualistic in its strategy of building the Kingdom of God on earth.¹⁶ Even though the *CAUSA Lecture Manual* might be assumed to be evidence for the movement's world-transforming goals, the thrust of its content is rather more in agreement with Fichter's analysis than with Bromley and Shupe's.¹⁷ In my view, however, Fichter's description of the UC somewhat underestimates the significance of its supra-individual "transformative" or "reformatory" activities.

One must be fully aware that Aberle's typology presents so-called "ideal types" or pure types. Ideal types are not labels, but yardsticks to understand reality. Therefore, as Aberle himself cautioned, real movements always have a combination of elements from different types.¹⁸

3. Glock and Bellah's Typology

In *The New Religious Consciousness*, Charles Glock and Robert Bellah's celebrated book on NRMs in the San Francisco Bay area, they provide us with a threefold classification of the NRMs:¹⁹

- 1) New Religious Movements in the Asian Tradition
- 2) New Quasi-Religious Movements
- 3) New Religious Movements in the Western Tradition

Although these categories are too simple to constitute a systematic typology, this threefold classification is a commonsensical and convenient one. Tipton followed it in his research, selecting a typical NRM from each of these three categories (The Living Word Fellowship, Erhard Seminar Training [est], Pacific Zen Center) as subjects for his study.²⁰

Strangely enough, Glock and Bellah's book did not include any research on the UC, despite Lofland and Stark's prior extensive research on it in the San Francisco Bay area and tremendous controversies about the UC in the mid-1970s.²¹ Apparently, Glock and Bellah's classification was determined not inductively but deductively. The threefold classification was decided first, and then nine representative NRMs—three of the most typical NRMs for each of the three types—were selected afterwards. However, the UC is not a representative type of any of Glock and Bellah's three categories. In light of its *geographical* origin from Korea, the UC is somewhat close to the "NRMs in the Asian Tradition"; on the other hand, in light of its *theological* origin, because its teachings are unmistakably based on the Judeo-Christian tradition, it is one of the "NRMs in the Western Tradition." If we were compelled to choose just one type among the three in classifying the UC, it would be

“NRMs in the Western Tradition.” Yet because of its Korean roots, the UC is not a typical example of NRMs in that category. Glock and Bellah’s threefold classificatory scheme is too simple to deal with syncretic or eclectic NRMs such as the UC.²²

4. Anthony’s Typology

One of the most systematic and influential typologies of NRMs was formulated by Dick Anthony. He first introduced his typology in *Sociological Analysis* in 1978, revising it in later years.²³ It was originally developed as a device for summarizing his team’s research into the mental health effects of the new religions.²⁴ We will begin by discussing his first presentation of the typology, where it became widely known and influential.

Viewing the contemporary emergence of NRMs as rooted in a normative breakdown or value crisis, Anthony classified NRMs into *dualistic* and *monistic* movements in accordance with their different responses to increasing moral ambiguity. In this classification, dualistic movements “reaffirm elements of traditional moral absolutism,” whereas monistic movements “affirm relativistic and subjectivistic moral meaning systems.”²⁵ Anthony noted the characteristics of dualistic and monistic movements as follows:

Dualistic movements such as “Jesus movement” groups and neo-Pentecostal groups can be viewed as articulating a fervent protest against relativistic and “permissive” trends in American culture through the strident reaffirmation of theocentric ethical dualism...

Monistic or “eastern” mystical groups in America tend to project a vision of the universe in which there is an ultimate metaphysical unity or “oneness” which dissolves polarities and imparts an ultimately illusory or epiphenomenal quality (Maya) to the material world... Such [monistic] movements are thus often associated with notions of immanence and conceptions of divinity or ultimate reality as a depth of self.²⁶

Furthermore, in his early typology Anthony subdivided contemporary American dualistic religious movements into (a) “neo-fundamentalist (e.g., ‘Jesus movement’) groups” and (b) “revisionist syncretic movements.” It is noteworthy that Anthony and his team classified the UC as a typical dualistic movement of the latter type, calling it “fiercely Manichaeian.”²⁷

Anthony also advocated a systematic sub-typology of monistic movements by focusing on the means to monistic enlightenment from two different perspectives: *technical* versus *charismatic* approaches to spiritual realization and *one-level* versus *two-level* conceptualizations of consciousness expansion.²⁸ Technical movements employ standardized and repetitive “tech-

niques” which can be taught and which are regarded as instrumental in acquiring the enlightenment. Charismatic movements, on the other hand, “seek... enlightenment through veneration and emulation of leaders who are regarded as exemplars of advanced consciousness.” Put differently, in such charismatic movements, “a personal devotional relationship to a ‘master’ is considered more spiritually vital and meaningful than the practice of standardized techniques.”²⁹

The Anthony typology’s second variable involved a distinction between “one-level” and “two-level” conceptualizations of how to attain enlightenment. One-level monistic movements regard the monistic vision as having existential and experiential validity for its believers as soon as they are converted to it as a worldview. Therefore, members of these one-level movements regard themselves as already “having achieved a state of enlightenment towards which others are evolving.” They make no distinction between immediate and ultimate levels of monistic truth. Accordingly, Anthony and his team noted that one-level monistic movements generally lack explicit ethics of self-denial or self-sacrifice, and that some scholars’ critiques of NRMs as “narcissistic” and “socially complacent”³⁰ “may apply primarily (though not exclusively) to one-level monism.”³¹

Two-level monistic movements, on the other hand, make a distinction between immediate wisdom and the ultimate monistic consciousness characteristic of an advanced and rare stage of spiritual evolution. Devotees of these two-level movements see not only those outside their own movements but also themselves within the movements as being on a “lower level” of spiritual awakening. Consequently, they are likely to accept “moral prohibitions” appropriate to their lower level of consciousness as a necessary condition in order to reach the higher level of consciousness. Therefore, Anthony noted that the teachings of these two-level movements provided their believers with a rationale for self-discipline and moral restraint.

Combining charismatic versus technical and one-level versus two-level variables, Anthony and his team thus generated four subtypes of monistic movements. Accordingly, they presented their classification of NRMs in contemporary America as follows:

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| 1) Dualistic movements | a) Neo-fundamentalist movements Alamo Foundation; Children of God |
| | b) Revisionist syncretic movements Unification Church |
| 2) Monistic movements | a) One-level technical movements Erhard Seminar Training, TM, Scientology, Nichiren Shoshu |

- b) One-level charismatic movements
Manson Family, Mel Lyman's
American Avatar Cult, Allan
Noonan's Messiah's One World
Crusade, OM cult
- c) Two-level technical movements
Hare Krishna, Integral Yoga, Tibetan
Buddhist groups, Zen groups,
Yogi Bhajan [3HO]
- d) Two-level charismatic movements
Meher Baba, Baba Muktananda,
Bubba Free John, Maharaj-Ji

Robbins, Anthony and Richardson noted that “the one-level versus two-level and the technical versus charismatic distinctions also have some value in typing *dualistic* groups and movements.”³² Agreeing with their note, I stated in my earlier evaluation of the Anthony typology in 1987 as follows:

I believe that to subdivide dualistic movements by these two variables would make the typology more comprehensive. This would contribute to the understanding of salient characteristics of the UC. As indicated by Anthony et al., neo-Pentecostalism may be classified as a technical movement since glossolalia or baptism of the Holy Spirit is a standardized process for their salvation. We can also see that dualistic charismatic movements are guided by what Weber called “ethical prophets” in contrast to monistic charismatic movements that are centered on “exemplary prophets.” In this scheme of classification, neo-fundamentalist groups that emphasize “justification by faith,” “salvation by the blood of Jesus,” or “immediate ‘once and for all’ redemption” may be classified as one-level movements. In contrast, those groups that emphasize paying the cost of discipleship and the future attainment of “sanctification” or “perfection” subsequent to conversion may be viewed as two-level movements.³³

As I recommended, Anthony later advocated classifying not only monistic groups but also dualistic groups by the same criteria. The revised Anthony typology assesses all NRMs along three dimensions: 1) its metaphysics in terms of monism or dualism, 2) its central mode of practice in terms of technical or charismatic type, and 3) its interpretive sensibility in terms of unilevel versus multilevel (previously called one-level versus two-level) sensibility. The new Anthony typology is illustrated in Figure 2:

Figure 2: The Anthony Typology³⁴

| | | Monism | Dualism |
|------------|-------------|--|---|
| Multilevel | Charismatic | Multilevel monistic charismatic groups | Multilevel dualistic charismatic groups |
| | Technical | Multilevel monistic technical groups | Multilevel dualistic technical groups |
| Unilevel | Charismatic | Unilevel monistic charismatic groups | Unilevel dualistic charismatic groups |
| | Technical | Unilevel monistic technical groups | Unilevel dualistic technical groups |

In this revised typology, Anthony and Ecker classified the UC as “a unilevel, dualistic, charismatic movement.”³⁵ Here, I strongly disagree with their classification of the UC as a unilevel movement. In my assessment, the UC is most definitely a multilevel movement. Its emphasis is not on instantaneous redemption, but on “paying indemnity” throughout one’s life until attaining the goal of perfect unity of mind and body and an ideal family. Even then, one must keep on walking the path of self-sacrifice until completing the mission of the “Tribal Messiah.” Thus, the UC encourages each member to practice self-discipline and self-sacrifice in order to reach complete unity with God, first in himself or herself on the individual stage, second in his or her blessed family on the family stage, and third in his or her tribal or clan community on the tribal stage. Moreover, in each stage the member is to “pay indemnity” in order to go up step by step in terms of relations with God, from the level of “servant of servant” to “servant” to “adopted son” to “real son” and so on to complete unity with God. This is the gist of what Reverend Moon has repeatedly taught UC members: “we need to pass the eight stages of restoration of indemnity vertically and horizontally.”³⁶

As for its metaphysics, it must be noted that the ideology of the UC deviates considerably from strict dualism. I regard Anthony and Robbins’s labeling of the UC as “fiercely Manichaeic”³⁷ or “extreme exemplary dualism”³⁸ as too hyperbolic to be an accurate description. The UC’s most authoritative textbook, *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, predicted the coming in the near future of the peaceful unified world centered on God, after the struggles between the forces of good and evil have come to an end.³⁹ In particular, the seemingly dualistic struggle between democracy and communism was never more than provisional.

After repeatedly predicting the collapse of the communist world in our time, in 1990 Reverend Moon went to Moscow, delivered a speech in the

Kremlin, and embraced then President Gorbachev. In 1991 he also visited North Korea, spoke in its Parliament, and embraced Kim Il-sung. Though some people regarded his embracing of communist leaders as a sign of change in Unification theology, I regard it as a sign that the leaders of the communist world had softened towards Reverend Moon's teaching. Reverend Moon has consistently preached that people should forgive and love their enemies. It was not so difficult for communist leaders, especially in their weakened condition and fearful of revenge by their enemies, to endorse his philosophy of forgiveness, true love and social unity.

On the question of dualism, Eileen Barker's description of Unification theology is more careful and accurate than is Anthony and Robbins'. Barker noted:

As well as the "soft dualism" of complementarity, Unification theology also exhibits an almost Manichaeic dualism of the competing forces of good and evil. I say "almost Manichaeic" because in Unification theology the forces of good and evil have not got an eternal character.⁴⁰

James Beckford also critiqued Anthony and Robbins, cautioning them against uncritically bundling the UC with Western fundamentalisms into the class of dualistic movements. Beckford noted,

If the distinction between eastern religious movements and fundamentalist movements has any heuristic value in helping to generate understanding of the sociological distinctiveness of the Unification Church it probably lies in the fact that the Rev. Moon's movement combines the two extreme types within itself. I am reluctant to accept that it can be meaningfully classified without severe qualification with any other kinds of Christian fundamentalist groups. And there are no fewer problems in likening it unreservedly to other eastern movements. It is a hybrid.⁴¹

Presenting another taxonomy of NRMs, which is less systematic than the above, Anthony and Robbins also referred to the dualistic NRMs that synthesize political and religious themes as *civil religion sects*. In contrast, monistic, apolitical NRMs were divided into "eastern mystical movements" (e.g., Zen Buddhism, Meher Baba) and quasi-mystical therapeutic movements or "human potential movements" (e.g., est, Scientology).⁴²

Anthony and Robbins pointed out the UC as the best example of the civil religion sect.⁴³ I have no basic objection to their calling the UC a typical civil religion sect, insofar as their meaning of civil religion lies within the bounds of what was originally proposed by Robert Bellah in his seminal essay, "Civil Religion in America," which did not attach any negative connotation to the concept of civil religion.⁴⁴ My objection lies rather in their description of the

UC under that rubric, which was preoccupied with an analysis of affinity between the UC and American civil religion, especially its degenerate type. Therefore, they failed to recognize the fact that the UC has promoted a prophetic type of not only American but also *global* civil religion.⁴⁵

As Robbins noted, the Anthony typology contains “an explicit normative focus involving the discrimination of ‘authentic’ from ‘inauthentic’ paths to transcendence.”⁴⁶ Particularly through its distinction between unilevel and multilevel movements, it offers a diagnosis whether or not a particular NRM is likely to lead to destructive social and psychological consequences. I agree with Robbins that the unilevel versus multilevel distinction is “really the key critical dimension of the [Anthony] typology.”⁴⁷ I appreciate the unilevel versus multilevel distinction, despite Anthony’s erroneous classification of the UC as a unilevel movement, because I agree with Anthony’s judgment that unilevel-type movements can be harmful to their believers’ spiritual growth.

5. Bird’s Typology

Canadian sociologist of religion Frederick Bird also saw the emergence and growth of NRMs as a response to the contemporary moral dilemma. Bird’s thesis was that these movements tend to encourage among their adherents “reduced feelings of moral accountability” or “enhanced feelings of innocence.”⁴⁸

Bird developed a classification of NRMs according to a tripartite typology of their adherents, as: 1) devotees of a spiritual leader or Truth, 2) disciples of a spiritual discipline, and 3) apprentices of some sorcerer or magic/science.⁴⁹ In other words, he based his typology of NRMs “according to the relationship of followers to masters or the relationship of the religious seekers to the sacred power they revere.” His threefold classification of NRMs is as follows:⁵⁰

- 1) Devotee groups
 - UC, Catholic and Protestant Charismatics, Divine Light Mission, Nichiren Shoshu, ISKCON
- 2) Discipleship groups
 - Integral Yoga Institute, Dharmadatu groups
- 3) Apprenticeship groups
 - Psychosynthesis, Silva Mind Control, est, Arica, TM, Scientology

According to Bird, 1) members of the *devotee* groups ultimately surrender themselves to a holy master or ultimate superhuman truth; 2) members of the *discipleship* groups “progressively seek to master spiritual and/or physical dis-

cipline in order to achieve a state of enlightenment and self-harmony”; and 3) participants of the *apprenticeship* groups “seek to master particular psychic, shamanic and therapeutic skills in order to tap and realize sacred powers within themselves.” As Bird noted, apprenticeship groups correspond roughly to what Robbins, Anthony and Richardson called monistic, one-level, technical groups; likewise, discipleship groups correspond roughly to monistic, two-level, technical groups. Devotee groups, on the other hand, correspond roughly to what the earlier Anthony typology classified as charismatic groups, which in its revised version belong to either monistic or dualistic groups.

I can agree that in Bird’s threefold typology the UC should be classified as a devotee group. I have strong misgivings, however, about his sweeping assertion that NRMs of this type “all foster among their participants reduced feelings of moral accountability or enhanced feelings of innocence” *in contrast to* traditional Jewish and Christian denominations that “heighten or at least reinforce feelings of moral accountability.”⁵¹ Many people have come to know that the UC enhances its members feelings, not of innocence, but of *guilt*, especially prior to their marriage under the founder’s “Blessing.” Furthermore, the UC emphasizes the importance of individual moral responsibility in building a better society, although Bird did not equate moral accountability with moral responsibility.

I critique Bird’s typology, first, because the terms he employs are somewhat ambiguous and not self-explanatory. It is particularly difficult to conceive the differences between the *devotees* and *disciples* of NRMs exactly as proposed by Bird unless told of their distinctions in advance. A second weakness of Bird’s typology is that NRMs are classified according to types of followers without reference to the types of their leaders or founders. For example, taking Weber’s typology of religious leaders/founders into consideration, I can conceive that NRMs where groups of *devotees* follow *ethical prophets* might belong to a different class from NRMs where groups of *devotees* follow *exemplary prophets*. Finally, Bird’s sweeping assertion that *all* contemporary NRMs foster among their participants reduced feelings of moral accountability *in contrast to* traditional Jewish and Christian denominations remains very questionable in the absence of any empirical evidence.

6. Hargrove’s Typology

Focusing on the function of NRMs and the personality types of their members, Barbara Hargrove proposed a twofold classification of NRMs: *integrative* and *transformative* religions.⁵² She conceptualized conditions leading to susceptibility to NRMs as *alienation* or *anomie*. Furthermore, following Loye, she viewed these two concepts as foci of concern of liberal and conservative personality types, respectively.⁵³ In other words, *alienation* may be

seen as the malady for the liberal personality type, who is concerned for “growth, reaching out, [and] new experience,” whereas *anomie* may be seen as the bane of our life for the conservative personality type, who is concerned about a lack, or confusion, of moral codes (norms). Thus, she saw the alienated or liberal personality-type persons as having “growth needs” and often resorting to “anti-institutionalism.” In contrast, she discerned the anomic or the conservative personality-type persons as having “identity needs and desire for community.”⁵⁴

Hargrove thus classified NRMs attracting the anomic as integrative religions and those attracting the alienated as transformative religions. She also found certain parallels between these NRMs and Troeltsch’s three types of Christianity: church, sect and mysticism. She compared the integrative NRMs to his “sect” type, and the transformative NRMs to his “mysticism.” In her view, the extreme privatization in the mainline churches facilitated the rise of the integrative NRMs, which offer strict moral codes and a clearly identifiable community. She mentioned the UC as an example of the integrative religion. Likewise, she considered secularization or bureaucratization of the mainline churches to be the source of the emergence of the transformative NRMs, which “tend toward celebrating individual awareness and growth.”

I agree that by Hargrove’s bipolar typology the UC is to be located as one of the integrative NRMs. My criticism is that, in spite of her neat presentation, no bipolar classification of NRMs can avoid the criticism of being excessively reductionistic. There is also a question whether or not alienation and *anomie* are sufficiently contrastable to serve as the basis for such a bipolar classification.⁵⁵

7. Westley’s Typology

Frances Westley presented another bipolar classification of NRMs in her book entitled *The Complex Forms of the Religious Life: A Durkheimian View of New Religious Movements*.⁵⁶ She developed her typology on the basis of where NRMs locate the sacred. One type of NRMs are “those which clearly locate the sacred as lying within the human individual,” while the other type are “those which clearly locate the sacred as lying outside the human individual.” She regarded these two types as “points at two ends of a continuum” and admitted that there are a variety of NRMs whose view of the sacred is ambiguous. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that, as her book’s subtitle shows, she followed Durkheim and called groups of the first type, which see the sacred existing within the human individual, “cult of man groups” or *cult-of-the-human-person groups*.⁵⁷ These, she noted, are frequently labeled “human potential groups.”⁵⁸ On the basis of her local research in the Montreal area, Westley classified as cult-of-the-human-person groups six NRMs:

Scientology, Psychosynthesis, Arica, est, Shakti and Silva Mind Control.⁵⁹

Westley treated the UC as not of the cult-of-the-human-person type because in her view the UC is a one of the groups that “see their leaders as incarnate deities.”⁶⁰ In other words, she regards the UC a group that sees the sacred existing only within the leader and not within the ordinary members. In contrast, in groups classified as cult-of-the-human-person type, members do not regard their leader as being any more divine than the followers.

I question, however, her categorization of the UC as typical of groups not of the cult-of-the-human-person type. It seems that she was not fully informed of the low Christology (emphasizing the humanity of Christ) in the UC, in contrast to the high Christology (emphasizing the divinity of Christ) found in Evangelical and fundamentalist Christian churches.⁶¹ My contention is that Unification theology generally supports low Christology and high anthropology (i.e., human perfectibility and the divine nature of perfected human beings), and therefore it is possible to find a certain agreement or compatibility between the UC members’ view of human beings and what Durkheim termed a cult of the human person.

It is important to note that, as Westley and Lukes described, the mature Durkheim did not attach any negative connotation to the term “cult of the human person.” By cult (Fr. “culte”) Durkheim meant not a small deviant religious group, but an act of worship.⁶² Cult of the human person meant a religious respect for the innate dignity and worth of each human person. Revising his earlier negative assessment of the cult of the individual,⁶³ the mature Durkheim reached the conclusion that, far from being detrimental to social solidarity, the cult of the human person “is the only system of beliefs which can ensure the moral unity of the country.”⁶⁴

Exposition of the Divine Principle asserts that perfected human beings will acquire “a divine value, comparable to God,”⁶⁵ and that all human beings have the potential to reach perfection as Jesus preached in Matthew 5:48, “You must be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect.” Some scholars suggested that Durkheim’s concept of the cult of the human person can be viewed as a source for a global civil religion.⁶⁶ Meanwhile, a number of scholars identified the UC as a promoter of a global civil religion.⁶⁷ Therefore, it is natural for us to wonder what kind of relations exists between the UC and the cult of the human person.

Furthermore, given Durkheim’s observation that Christian societies more than any other societies have promoted the dignity and worth of individuals—that is, human rights—we must find fault with Westley’s quick dismissal of all monotheistic groups (e.g., Christian groups) from consideration as cult-of-the-human-person groups. In *Suicide*, Durkheim noted the rise of the cult of human person in Christian societies as follows:

If it [disapproving of suicide] has become so formal and severe in Christian societies, this is not because of the idea of the State held by these people but because of their new conception of the human personality. It has become sacred, even most sacred in their eyes, something which no one is to offend.⁶⁸

In other words, according to Durkheim, mature Christian societies give rise to the cult of human person. There must be something of the cult of human person in the Christian tradition that has promoted the ideal of universal human rights. In my view, it is the Christian teaching of the *imago Dei* (image of God) in every human being. We can regard the Christian teaching that human beings manifest the image of God as the source of the dignity and worth of human beings, that is, the source of “the sacred” in human beings.⁶⁹

Thus, Westley’s typology, dichotomizing the existence of the sacred as either within or outside the human individual, is too rigid to explain many new groups of the Christian family, including the UC. Recall that the Bible (e.g., I Corinthians 3:16) calls Christians “God’s temple,” which means that God’s spirit dwells in them. Therefore, we cannot classify all new Christian groups as NRMs that locate the sacred outside the human individual. Moreover, in my view, it is more Durkheimian to acknowledge the existence of the sacred not only within but also outside the human individual. The mature Durkheim regarded society as the real object of worship as well as the real source of the sacred, but came to the view that society exists not only outside the individual but also within.⁷⁰

8. Lofland and Richardson’s Typology

John Lofland and James T. Richardson presented a typology of NRMs as “religious movement organizations.”⁷¹ Dissatisfied with the church-sect-cult typology of religious groups, Lofland and Richardson advocated a new classificatory scheme that focuses on the degree of their “corporateness.” Their classification focused on NRMs as organizations and distinguished them according to the “degree to which a set of persons actively promotes and participates in a shared and collective life.”⁷² Here we can see the influence of Mary Douglas’s typology based on grid control and group commitment.⁷³

Lofland and Richardson discerned five basic types of organization in religious movements. In order of their increasing corporateness, they are called *clinic*, *congregation*, *collective*, *corps* and *colony*. The degree of their corporateness is measured by the responses to six key questions concerning, 1) income or other sustenance producing work; 2) shelter or residence; 3) food provision and eating organization; 4) family or other emotional support circles; 5) collective promulgation of cognitive orientation; and 6) a belief that

the organization itself is ideal. We present Lofland and Richardson's typology of religious movement organizations in Figure 3.⁷⁴

Figure 3: Lofland and Richardson's Typology of Religious Movement Organizations

| | Question 1 | Question 2 | Question 3 | Question 4 | Question 5 | Question 6 |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Clinic | — | — | — | — | — | + |
| Congregation | — | — | — | — | + | + |
| Collective Work | + | — | — | — | + | + |
| Household | — | + | + | + | + | + |
| Corps | + | + | + | + | + | — |
| Colony | + | + | + | + | + | + |

Question 1. work/income generated?

Question 2. residence organized?

Question 3. organized provision of food and eating?

Question 4. family/support circles organized?

Question 5. collective dissemination of cognitive orientation?

Question 6. arrangement viewed as ideal?

Lofland and Richardson noted that there are various hybrids of these types of religious movement organization. They referred to the early centers of the UC in America as “hybrids of corps and household collectives.” For Lofland and Richardson, the corps is, “not the ‘new world in embryo,’” but “a stage through which the believer must pass in order to get to the new and qualitatively better new world.”⁷⁵ Such hybrids of corps and household collectives as were found in the early UC,

...view themselves as temporary organizations and establish household collectives but these households are not viewed as budding, ideal forms of a new world. Like a corps, they are expedient and not “prefigurative.”⁷⁶

For these reasons, Lofland and Richardson criticized other scholars for describing the UC in the West as a “communal” movement and its centers as “communes.” They properly pointed out that “in the literature the term commune is applied indiscriminately to collectives, corps and colonies,” and that it is imprecise to use the same word for all three of these very different organizations.⁷⁷ I fully agree. Such terms as “commune” and “communal” are ambiguous and misleading labels, especially when applied to the UC even in

its early years in Korea. Since Unification theology emphasizes the importance of the family unit (monogamous marriage), the UC centers in the 1970s, with their large number of live-in single members, must be seen neither as prefigurative of an ideal world nor as an ideal form of living, but as a temporary expedient form that was destined to fade away as the UC developed.

In fact, in its current development, the UC has evolved, using Lofland and Richardson's typology, from a hybrid of corps and household collective to a congregational type. The current diversification of the Unification movement has led many members to pursue various non-religious vocations in business, education, politics, journalism, arts and entertainment. Moreover, the number of married members in the UC has increased by leaps and bounds at every mass wedding (e.g., church members participating in the worldwide blessings of 360,000 couples, 3.6 million couples, 39.6 million couples and 120 million couples between 1995 and 1998). At the same time, the number of members living in centers has decreased. Today, married (Blessed) couples with children who live outside the UC centers are the most common type of membership and constitute a great majority of the local congregations of the UC in Korea, in Japan, in the United States and in many other nations. As a result of these developments, what Lofland and Richardson would describe as the Congregation has become the mainstay of the UC.

As for the ideal living arrangement of the future Unification movement, Reverend Moon has frequently mentioned that in the future, Blessed families should live as trinities. He envisions housing complexes where groups of three or four Blessed families live in private apartments surrounding a shared common living space, living cooperatively and helping each other in many ways. Among every group of three families living together there should ideally be families of different races and nationalities. By changing the constituent families of the trinity group every twelve years, families can acquire a record of having truly loved all races and nationalities here on earth.⁷⁸ Such a future lifestyle envisioned for the Unification movement would be much closer to the household collective type than to the current congregation type in the Lofland and Richardson typology of religious movement organizations; it may be regarded as a moderate type of communitarian lifestyle. Whether the Unification movement will become such an international and interracial communitarian movement remains to be seen.

Lofland and Richardson's typology and their discussion of the UC thus accurately illuminates the nature and characteristics of the UC centers in comparison to other religious movement organizations.

9. Conclusion

In this paper we reviewed most of the prominent typologies of NRMs.⁷⁹ By making use of various categories or ideal types set up by these typologies, we have attempted to illuminate the characteristics of the UC. Nevertheless, it is important for us to keep in mind that various categories or ideal types are yardsticks or heuristic tools to understand real movements. We have a tendency to use various types as labels; as soon as we attach a label to a certain NRM, we are liable to read all the attributes of that type into the concrete movement. To avoid this mistake, we should remember that for any defining variable, the two contrasting ideal types are the most extreme cases, while all concrete groups fall somewhere on a continuum between the two ideal types.

I hope that the typological discussions in this paper are helpful in understanding and communicating the characteristics of the UC and of other NRMs. By familiarizing ourselves with pros and cons of each typology of NRMs, we will be able to make wise use of these classificatory categories or ideal types as heuristic devices.

Notes

1. Contemporary sociologists of religion have frequently used the term "NRMs." See e.g., David G. Bromley and Phillip E. Hammond, eds., *The Future of New Religious Movements* (Macon, GA: Mercer Univ. Press, 1987); Eileen Barker, *New Religious Movements* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1989). Many historians of religion, however, prefer to avoid the term because many of what are called NRMs are not really new when seen from a global historical perspective. See e.g., Gordon J. Melton, "Another Look at New Religions," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 527 (May 1993): 97-112. Many are old traditional religions merely imported from other nations. Some of the terms historians prefer to "NRMs" are "alternative religions" and "nonconventional religions." See e.g., Timothy Miller, ed., *America's Alternative Religions* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995) and Melton, "Another Look at New Religions." Our review of typologies of NRMs will include not only those labeled NRMs but also what some have labeled religious movements or social movements.
2. For my discussion on other typologies of religion and characteristics of the UC, see the followings: Yoshihiko Masuda, "Typologizing Religious Groups: A Preliminary Presentation Towards a Better Understanding of the Unification Church," *Sun Moon Forum* 4 (Chonan, Korea: Sun Moon Univ. Press, 1995), pp. 207-36; Yoshihiko Masuda, "Theological Typologies of Religious Groups and the Identity of the Unification Church," *Journal of Unification Theology* 1 (1996): 318-50; Yoshihiko Masuda, "A Discussion on Miscellaneous Typologies of Religion and the Identity of the Unification Church," *Journal of Unification Theology* 2

(1997): 398-426.

3. Robert S. Ellwood, *Religious and Spiritual Groups in Modern America* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973).
4. It is noteworthy that, introducing the UC in *Religious and Spiritual Groups* (pp. 293-95), Ellwood reprinted a long passage from Arthur Ford, *Unknown But Known* (New York: Harper & Row; Signet Mystic Book, 1968) pp. 111-12. In this passage, Ford's spirit guide, Fletcher, clearly testified through the mouth of Ford in trance that Reverend Sun Myung Moon is "the voice of this Intelligence—Creative Mind—which you call God," and that "for the present moment he is, in my estimation, a most important spiritual light that shines in the darkness of your confused world." Fletcher further testified that:

Mr. Moon in deep meditation can project himself and be seen just as Jesus has been able to project himself and be seen by the saints. This is one of the marks of the messiahs always.
5. It is important to note that Ellwood did not attach any negative connotation to the term "cult." For his discussion of cults, see Ellwood, *Religious and Spiritual Groups*; Ellwood, "Several Meanings of Cult," *Thought* 61 (June 1986): 212-24.
6. Diane Choquette, comp., *New Religious Movements in the United States and Canada* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1985).
7. Gordon J. Melton, *Encyclopedia of American Religions*, 2d ed. (Detroit: Gale, 1987), attempted to classify all religious groups in the United States on a basis somewhat similar to Ellwood's classification. Melton presented 17 large classificatory religious families based on "common heritage, thought world (theology in its broadest sense), and lifestyle" (xiii-xv). Applying this classificatory scheme, Melton classified the UC as one of the groups in "Spiritualist, Psychic, and New Age Family." Julia Corbett called Melton's classificatory scheme a "family grouping" and made a distinction from the so-called "typological classifications" and "choice-point analyses." See Julia Mitchell Corbett, "Religion in the United States: Notes toward a New Classification," *Religion and American Culture* 3 (Winter 1993): 91-112. If we follow her threefold distinctions of classification, we can also regard Ellwood's scheme of classification as a "family grouping" of NRMs.
8. David F. Aberle, *The Peyote Religion among the Navaho*, 2d ed. (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1982), pp. 315-22.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 316.
10. *Ibid.*
11. For a fine summary and evaluation of Aberle's typology, see John Wilson, *Introduction to Social Movements* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), pp. 23-27.
12. Bryan Wilson, *Magic and Millennium* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), p. 491. Based on a misquotation, Wilson, followed by David Bromley, Anson Shupe, Keith Roberts and Gordon Marshall, renders one of Aberle's typological terms, "alterative" movements, as "alternative" movements.
13. David G. Bromley and Anson D. Shupe, Jr., *"Moonies" in America: Cult, Church, and Crusade* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1979), pp. 22-23.

14. Keith A. Roberts, *Religion in Sociological Perspective* (Homewood, IL: Dorsey, 1984) 204; 3rd ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1995) p. 182.
15. This is a change of my assessment and a departure from my previous uncritical acceptance of their classification of the Unification movement in my Ph.D. dissertation. See Yoshihiko Masuda, "Moral Vision and Practice in the Unification Movement: A Critical Interpretation of the Sociological Literature from a Unificationist Perspective," Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Southern California, 1987.
16. Joseph H. Fichter, "Home Church: Alternative Parish," *Alternative to American Mainline Churches*, ed. J. H. Fichter (New York: Rose of Sharon, 1983), p. 192; Joseph H. Fichter, *The Holy Family of Father Moon* (Kansas City: Leaven, 1985), pp. 111-30.
17. [Bo Hi Pak, Thomas Ward and William Lay,] *CAUSA Lecture Manual* (New York: CAUSA Institute, 1985), p. 242. For a further discussion on the relations between the redemptive (evangelistic) aspect and the transformative or reformatory (cultural/social reform) aspect of the Unification movement, see Masuda, Ph.D. diss., pp. 326-30.
18. Aberle, *Peyote Religion*, p. 317.
19. Charles Y. Glock and Robert N. Bellah, eds., *The New Religious Consciousness* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1976).
20. Steven M. Tipton, *Getting Saved from the Sixties* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1982).
21. E.g., John Lofland, "The World Savers: A Field Study of Cult Processes," Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of California, Berkeley, 1964; John Lofland, *Doomsday Cult: A Study of Conversion, Proselytization, and Maintenance of Faith* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966); John Lofland and Rodney Stark, "Becoming a World-Saver: A Theory of Conversion to a Deviant Perspective," *American Sociological Review* 30 (December 1965): 862-74.
22. In answer to my question, Professor Bellah confirmed that the omission of the UC from *The New Religious Consciousness* had not been intentional in the least, but was inadvertent. (Personal conversation, 1983.)
23. Thomas Robbins, Dick Anthony and James Richardson, "Theory and Research on Today's 'New Religions,'" *Sociological Analysis* 39 (Summer 1978): 95-122. Dick Anthony and Bruce Ecker, "The Anthony Typology: A Framework for Assessing Spiritual and Consciousness Groups," *Spiritual Choices*, ed. D. Anthony, B. Ecker, and K. Wilber (New York: Paragon House, 1987), pp. 35-105.
24. Anthony and Ecker, *Spiritual Choices*, p. 94.
25. Robbins et al., "Theory and Research," p. 101.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 101-2.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
28. In the revised version of the Anthony typology, Anthony and Ecker came to employ the terms *unilevel* versus *multilevel* instead of *one-level* versus *two-level*.
29. Robbins et al., "Theory and Research," p. 105.
30. E.g., Peter Marin, "The New Narcissism: The Trouble with the Human Potential

- Movement,” *Harper’s* (October 1975): 45-56; Edwin M. Schur, *The Awareness Trap: Self-Absorption Instead of Social Change* (New York: New York Times Book, 1976); Christopher Lasch, “The Narcissistic Society,” *New York Review of Books*, September 30, 1976, pp. 5-12.
31. Robbins et al., “Theory and Research,” p. 106.
 32. *Ibid.*, p. 100n.
 33. Masuda, Ph.D. diss., p. 79.
 34. Anthony and Ecker, *Spiritual Choices*, p. 37.
 35. *Ibid.*, pp. 60-62.
 36. See Zin Moon Kim, *The Fountain of Life: Based on the Words of Reverend Sun Myung Moon* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1993) p. 231, for an illustrated summary and explanation of Reverend Moon’s speeches on the eight stages of restoration.
 37. Robbins et al., “Theory and Research,” p. 101.
 38. Dick Anthony and Thomas Robbins, “Spiritual Innovation and the Crisis of American Civil Religion,” *Religion and America*, ed. M. Douglas and S. M. Tipton (Boston: Beacon, 1983), p. 246.
 39. [Eu, Hyo Won,] *Exposition of the Divine Principle* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1996), pp. 87, 89, 99-103.
 40. Eileen Barker, “Living the Divine Principle: Inside the Reverend Sun Myung Moon’s Unification Church in Britain,” *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions* 45 (January/March 1978): 84.
 41. James A. Beckford, “Through the Looking-Glass and Out the Other Side: Withdrawal from the Reverend Moon’s Unification Church,” *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions* 45 (January/March 1978): 100n. Cf. James A. Beckford, “A Korean Evangelistic Movement in the West,” Paper presented at the 12th International Conference for the Sociology of Religion, The Hague, 1973.
 42. Dick Anthony and Thomas Robbins, “Cultural Crisis and Contemporary Religion,” *In Gods We Trust*, ed. T. Robbins and D. Anthony (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1981), pp. 9-31; Dick Anthony and Thomas Robbins, “Spiritual Innovation and the Crisis of American Civil Religion,” *Religion and America*, ed. M. Douglas and S. M. Tipton, (Boston: Beacon, 1983), pp. 229-48.
 43. Anthony and Robbins, “Cultural Crisis,” p. 17; Anthony and Robbins, “Spiritual Innovation,” p. 235.
 44. Robert N. Bellah, “Civil Religion in America,” *Daedalus* 96 (Winter 1967): 1-21.
 45. For a view of the UC as a promoter of a global civil religion, see e.g., Warren Lewis, “Is the Reverend Sun Myung Moon a Heretic?,” *A Time for Consideration*, ed. M. D. Bryant and H. W. Richardson, 2d ed. (New York: Edwin Mellen, 1978), p. 211; Roland Robertson, “The Sacred and the World System,” *The Sacred in a Secular Age*, ed. P. E. Hammond (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1985), p. 354.
 46. Thomas Robbins, *Cults, Converts and Charisma: The Sociology of New Religious Movements* (London: Sage, 1988), p. 135.
 47. *Ibid.*, p. 137.

48. Frederick Bird, "The Pursuit of Innocence: New Religious Movements and Moral Accountability," *Sociological Analysis* 40 (Winter 1979): 335-46.
49. Frederick Bird, "Charisma and Ritual in New Religious Movements," *Understanding the New Religions*, ed. J. Needleman and G. Baker (New York: Seabury, 1978), p. 182-83. See also Anthony F. C. Wallace, "Revitalization Movements," *American Anthropologist* 58 (April 1956): 273, who presented "three orders of personnel: the prophet; the disciples; and the followers" in a campaign organization of what he called "revitalization movements."
- James A. Beckford, *Cult Controversies* (London: Tavistock, 1985), combined Bird's threefold typology of the followers of the NRMs and Wallace's "vertical" types of members within a religious movement, classifying social relationships internal to NRMs in terms of devotee, adept, client, patron and apostate. In my view, it is wise for him to include patrons and apostates in the discussion on the dynamics of the NRMs. Beckford also classified the external relationships of the NRMs vis-à-vis their host society as retreat, revitalization and release. Unfortunately, he did not develop his conceptual framework for the purpose of analyzing NRMs in the social contexts into a full-fledged typology of NRMs.
50. Bird, "The Pursuit of Innocence," p. 336.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 343.
52. Barbara Hargrove, "Integrative and Transformative Religions," *Understanding the New Religions*, ed. J. Needleman and G. Baker (New York: Seabury, 1978), pp. 257-66.
53. See David Loye, *The Leadership Passion* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977).
54. Hargrove, "Integrative and Transformative Religions," p. 262.
55. Cf. Thomas Robbins, Dick Anthony and Thomas Curtis, "Youth Culture Religious Movements: Evaluating the Integrative Hypothesis," *Sociological Quarterly* 16 (Winter 1975): 48-64, who discuss the relations between "the alienated" and "integration." Robbins and Anthony also discussed integrative, disintegrative and transformative functions of contemporary NRMs in the West. These three categories may be seen as a threefold typology of NRMs, although they did not formally present them as such. See Thomas Robbins and Dick Anthony, "New Religious Movements and Social System: Integration, Disintegration, or Transformation," *Annual Review of the Social Sciences of Religion* 2 (1978): 1-27.
56. Frances Westley, *The Complex Forms of the Religious Life: A Durkheimian View of New Religious Movements* (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983), p. 25.
57. For Durkheim's explanation of the "cult of the human person," see Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society*, trans. G. Simpson (New York: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 172, 407-8; Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society*, trans. W. D. Halls (New York: Free Press, 1984), pp. 122, 338; Emile Durkheim, *Suicide*, trans. J. A. Spaulding and G. Simpson (New York: Free Press, 1966), pp. 333-336; Emile Durkheim, "Individualism and the Intellectuals," *Emile Durkheim*, trans. M. Traugott; ed. R. N. Bellah (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1973), pp. 43-57. We have avoided the sexist language of Westley's typology by

- employing “cult of the human person” in place of “cult of man,” which she took over from older translations of Durkheim.
58. Because “human potential groups” are sometimes referred to as “humanistic religious groups,” Westley’s typology is somewhat similar to Fromm’s typology of “authoritarian religion” versus “humanistic religion.” See Erich Fromm, *Psychoanalysis and Religion* (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 1950).
 59. Westley, *Complex Forms*, pp. 31-34.
 60. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
 61. For a theological typology of religious groups based on the view of Christ and characteristics of Unification theology, see Yoshihiko Masuda, “Theological Typologies of Religious Groups and the Identity of the Unification Church,” *Journal of Unification Theology* 1 (1996): 318-50.
 62. For Durkheim’s positive view of the cult of the human person, see Emile Durkheim, “Individualism and the Intellectuals”; Westley, *Complex Forms*; Steven Lukes, *Emile Durkheim: His Life and Work* (Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press, 1985), p. 166.
 63. Durkheim, *Division of Labor in Society*, trans. G. Simpson, p. 172.
 64. Durkheim, “Individualism and the Intellectuals,” p. 50.
 65. *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, p. 164.
 66. E.g., Ruth A. Wallace, “Emile Durkheim and the Civil Religion Concept,” *Review of Religious Research* 18 (Spring 1977): 287-90.
 67. Lewis, “Is the Reverend Sun Myung Moon a Heretic?,” p. 211; Robertson, “The Sacred and the World System,” p. 354.
 68. Durkheim, *Suicide*, pp. 333-34.
 69. Nonetheless, some Christian theological traditions, notably the Lutheran tradition, emphasized the total loss of the *imago Dei* in human beings after the fall of our human ancestors. In my view, the Lutheran tradition’s teaching of the complete loss of the *imago Dei* in the fallen human beings, as well as its social ethical theory of two kingdoms, was a factor that had contributed to the Holocaust in Germany during the World War II. On the other hand, the Roman Catholic tradition, which influenced Durkheim, has taught the existence of the *imago Dei* in all human beings even after the fall and even among non-Christians. Roman Catholic theology considers human reason (rational faculty) and free will to be the essence of the *imago Dei* in human beings. See Van A. Harvey, *A Handbook of Theological Terms* (New York: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 125-27; Young Oon Kim, *An Introduction to Theology* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1983), pp. 47-51; Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), pp. 369-71.
 70. Emile Durkheim, in “The Determination of Moral Facts,” *Sociology and Philosophy*, trans. D. F. Pocock (New York: Free Press, 1974), p. 55, noted, “while society transcends us it is immanent in us and we feel it as such. While it surpasses us it is within us, since it can only exist by and through us... Thus, to love society is to love both something beyond us and something in ourselves.”
 71. John Lofland and James T. Richardson, “Religious Movement Organizations:

- Elementary Forms and Dynamics,” *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change*, ed. L. Kriesberg (Greenwich, CT: JAI, 1984), pp. 29-51; also reprinted in John Lofland, *Protest: Studies of Collective Behavior and Social Movements* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1985), pp. 179-200; James T. Richardson, ed., *Money and Power in the New Religions* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1988), pp. 7-12.
72. Lofland and Richardson, “Religious Movement Organizations,” p. 29.
73. See Mary Douglas, ed., *Essays in the Sociology of Perception* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982).
74. Lofland and Richardson, “Religious Movement Organizations,” p. 33.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
76. *Ibid.*
77. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
78. See e.g., Sun Myung Moon, *Onna-no Michi* [The Way of Women], Malsseum Pockets 2 (Tokyo: Kogensha, 1994); Sun Myung Moon, “Dai Hachikai Sekaitoutu-koku Kaitenbi Keireishiki-go-no Mikotoba [A Speech Delivered after the Pledge Service on the Eighth Foundation Day of the Nation of the Unified World],” *Shukuhuku* 87 (1995): 10-27.
79. Among prominent typologies of NRMs not discussed in this paper are those by Roy Wallis, Rodney Stark and William S. Bainbridge, and G. K. Nelson.

Roy Wallis, in *The Elementary Forms of the New Religious Life* (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), classified NRMs into three types: 1) *world-rejecting* NRMs, 2) *world-affirming* NRMs, and 3) *world-accommodating* NRMs. Wallis identified the UC as a world-rejecting NRM.

Stark and Bainbridge classified NRMs into three sub-types: 1) *audience cults*, 2) *client cults*, and 3) *cult movements*. They identified the UC in America as a cult movement. See Rodney Stark and William S. Bainbridge, “Of Churches, Sects, and Cults: Preliminary Concepts for a Theory of Religious Movements,” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 18 (June 1979): 117-31; Rodney Stark and William S. Bainbridge, “Concepts for a Theory of Religious Movements,” *Alternatives to American Mainline Churches*, ed. J. H. Fichter (New York: Rose of Sharon, 1983), pp. 3-25; Rodney Stark and William S. Bainbridge, *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival, and Cult Formation* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1985).

Geoffrey K. Nelson, “The Concept of Cult,” *Sociological Review* 16 (November 1968): 351-62, also classified NRMs on the basis of their organizational characteristics. Nelson described three types of NRM as 1) *cult*, 2) *permanent cult*, and 3) *centralized cult*. According to Nelson, a cult depends on the charisma of its leader and has minimal organization; a permanent cult depends on routinized charisma at a local level and has no national organization or bureaucratic structure; and a centralized cult rests on routinized charisma and has a national office and bureaucratic structure firmly established. Nelson opined that some cults become “new religions.” I wonder why we cannot refer to what he called cults as “new religions.”

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY AND THE TRUE SOCIETY

Gordon L. Anderson

This essay argues that the American system of government, with some reform, can provide a foundation for the “true society,” or the “Kingdom of Heaven on Earth” envisioned in the *Divine Principle*. While the basic principles enshrined in the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights provide the freedom required for people to form a true society, the system requires “true citizens,” that is, responsible, patriotic and self-directed people. When the United States was founded, people largely lived self-sufficiently on family farms or worked in family businesses. They were able to function well in a society of minimal government. As we enter the 21st century, this is no longer the case. Governments are bloated with large numbers of people dependent on those governments for their livelihood. To remain a functioning society and to be an example to newer democracies around the world, this situation must be reversed, with a weaning of dependence of citizens from the governments of the United States, and the creation of a responsible citizenry that can guide these governments. The goal of the Family Federation for World Peace should be the creation of these citizens and a true society movement.

Members of the Unification Church differ on their interpretations of the value of American democracy, variously championing or loathing it. As the Unification Church officially tries to remain neutral with respect to politics, most of the differences correspond to the backgrounds of the commentators,

Gordon L. Anderson is the executive director of Paragon House Publishers and the secretary general of the Professors World Peace Academy. He is the editor of the *International Journal on World Peace* and has published numerous articles and books related to religion and society, including *Morality and Religion in Liberal Democratic Societies* (1992) and *The Family in Global Transition* (1997). He earned his doctorate in Philosophy of Religion from the Claremont Graduate School.

and the most vociferous remarks are not usually published. The main alternatives to democracy voiced by members are theocracy, monarchy and socialism. One example of an article which champions democracy is Bruce Casino's "The Democratic Republic of Heaven."¹ He states, "The constitutional democratic structure with the separation of executive, legislative and judicial is clearly the system which will be in place in the Unification theology's ideal society." A less favorable view of Western-style democracy was given by Han Tai Soo, who wrote, "The ensuing dominant political system predictably stressed the rights of individual persons, and the law of the survival of the fittest came to be respected. Thus it was inevitable that communism should come forth to challenge the unequal distribution of wealth. The realization dawned that there were intrinsic defects in man-centered Western democracy and that it was a system ill-equipped to be the foundation of a new order."²

Certainly, America has figured prominently in the life and work of Rev. Sun Myung Moon, the founder of the Church. He was liberated from Heungnam prison by American forces in 1950, for which he has frequently expressed gratitude. In 1972, he moved to America to launch his world-wide ministry. The United States was the leader of the western world in the fight against communism, which he felt to be the most urgent battle of the time. He founded *The Washington Times* in Washington, DC as a vehicle to help bring an end to the Soviet empire. The United States is a free society in which Rev. Moon could freely preach his message. Also, the United States, being made up of immigrants from all nations, is a microcosm of the world. Therefore, we can see many reasons why Rev. Moon would appreciate the United States.

However, Rev. Moon has frequently criticized the United States for its moral decadence. Church members critical of America frequently come from traditional backgrounds with strong families where loyalty, sacrifice and honor were part of their culture. They sometimes regard Americans as soft and spineless. Ironically, since the 1950s and 1960s when many Asian missionaries joined the church, their own countries have come to suffer the same problems of modernity, with its social dislocation and moral relativism.

Church members have also been divided about their own role in American society. Should they join the Democrats, Republicans, form a new party or abstain from politics? Should they send their children to public schools and work to improve them, or create new private schools? Often members focus on their immediate missions and feel they will deal with social reforms later when they receive specific direction from Rev. and Mrs. Moon. In the 1970s, there was a lot of discussion about the possibility that Rev. Moon would reveal his blueprint for a true society as the final chapter of a promised "Completed Testament." Today, when he says that he has revealed everything, we see that the essence his message is true family values; we look in vain for a detailed vision of a new social structure.

While it is understandable that church members from different countries would be divided about the value of American democracy and their own role in American political life, our goal is to further the discussion to help foster a more enlightened citizenry.

My thesis that the structure of the United States government can provide a foundation for a true society is grounded on the following passage from the *Divine Principle*:

Let us next study how the providence of restoration has restored the social structure. There was in the course of historical development of Western Europe a period in which the king shouldered all the functions of the three powers of legislative, executive and judiciary, and of the political parties. However, this changed into another period in which the king held the three powers and churches centering on the pope took charge of the mission of the political parties. The political system of this age was again divided into the three powers of legislative, executive and judiciary due to the French Revolution, and political parties came to bear a marked political mission. Thus, by establishing the constitutional political system in democracy, they could at least realize the pattern of the system of an ideal society.

In this way, the political system has changed through the long period of history because the society of fallen men has been restored into an ideal society which resembles the structure and function of a perfect man, according to the providence of restoration. In this manner, today's democratic government is divided into three powers and produces many political parties, thus making itself finally resemble the structure of a human body. But this is, after all, like a fallen man who has not been restored, and naturally cannot display the original function endowed at the creation.

That is to say, the political parties, without knowing God's Will, may be compared to a peripheral nervous system centering on the spine that has lost the function of transmitting the command of the brain. Since the constitution is not made of God's words, the three organs of legislative, executive and judiciary become like three organs of a human body which are rendered unable, due to the severance of the nervous system, to feel and respond to commands from the brain; they cannot help opposing and conflicting with one another, and lack mutual harmony and order.

Therefore, the purpose of the ideal of the Second Advent of the Messiah is to make the present political system—resembling the structure of a fallen man—display perfectly its original function centering on God's will by connecting it to the perfect central nerve.³

The passage says that the providence to establish constitutional democracy has

restored the social structure. It states that the separation of powers and political parties are related to “the pattern of the system of an ideal society.” Further, this structure resembles a human body, with the various organs which perform different roles in its existence. However, the political parties, without knowing the will of God, fail to guide the society; much like the existence of a body with a spine that fails to receive direction from the brain.

The features of this restored social structure—separation of powers and political parties—can be found in the United States Constitution. These features distinguish American democracy from the ancient forms of democracy which were equated with mob rule or a tyranny of the masses. The founding fathers of the United States were well aware of the dangers of earlier forms of democracy and sought to devise a system of government which would avoid most of the pitfalls. While ultimate power rests with the people in the United States, their rule is generally indirect, through elected representatives and political parties.

The remainder of this article will examine the nature of democracy, its providential form and how the “brain” can be added to the body.

1. Democracy: Rule by the People

There have been many forms of democracy: majority rule, constitutional democracy, parliamentary democracy, representative democracy, social democracy, Christian democracy, and so on. Yet all of them are variants of a common idea—rule by the people. All of these forms of democracy share the common belief that rule should not be by monarchs, oligarchs or military dictators. Democracy symbolizes freedom from rule by an alien power and the end of political oppression.

Aristotle stated that “the foundation of the democratic constitution is liberty.”⁴ In order for a people to rule, they must be free to do so. They must not be ruled by another. However, within a democracy there are many ways in which the people can rule themselves. There are democratic concepts of liberty based on equality and others based on merit. There are those based on what is right, and others based on “live as you like.”⁵ Under this broad understanding of democracy, both the principles of the Democratic Party, with its egalitarian thrust, and those of the Republican Party, with its merit and moral thrust, fall under general classification of “democratic.”

The larger issue, given a situation of liberty in which people can organize a government of self-rule, is whether they have the capacity to rule themselves. As Aristotle commented, “The task... is not only to set up a constitution of a particular kind... but to keep it going. (Any kind of system can be made to work for a day or two.)”⁶ Self-rule requires self-discipline, an educated citizenry and an appropriate structure of government. Many of the

forms of democracy fail to provide a social environment conducive to self-rule. Take, for example, the failures of communism which, rooted in the envy of the wealthy by the masses, appropriated control of the economy through force only to destroy the means of production. On the other hand, the internal capacity for self-rule may be deficient, as in the case of Pres. Clinton, a leader who cannot control his own proclivities.

The primary pre-requisite for self-rule is a virtuous and self-sufficient citizenry. In this regard, Aristotle examined different types of populations and concluded that the agricultural and pastoral populations made the best democracies:

An agricultural population makes the best demos; so that it is possible to make democracy anywhere where the population subsists on agriculture or stock-raising and pastures. For having no great abundance of wealth they are kept busy and rarely attend the Assembly; on the other hand being constantly at work in the fields they do not lack the necessities. So they do not covet others' possessions.⁷

Like Aristotle, Thomas Jefferson thought that an agrarian society was more virtuous than an urban society. He predicted that the democracy he had helped to fashion might only last as long as America remained agricultural:

I think our governments will remain virtuous for many centuries, as long as they are chiefly agricultural; and this is as long as there shall be vacant lands in any part of America. When they get piled upon one another in large cities as in Europe, they will become corrupt as in Europe.⁸

These eminent political philosophers understood that democracy, with an agrarian population, had a limited function that was primarily related to protection of the citizens. It therefore needed a legal system, police and a military, and had to tax the population to provide these services; but it was not involved further in the economy or in the provision of social services which might cause economic dependence of the citizens on the government. In fact, they reasoned that the leaders of a democracy should not be paid, but be chosen from among those who were successful and had sufficient economic means. To quote Aristotle:

...persons to fill the most important offices be selected from among those possessing a certain amount of property, the greater the office, the higher the property qualification; or alternatively to use not property but ability as the criterion for holding office. In this way the governing of the country will certainly be well done; the work of ruling will be done by the best men and in accordance with the wishes of the people and without any jealousy.⁹

When elections are made from the popular leaders of masses in the cities, Aristotle noted that leaders tended to give away positions to as many people as possible as favors to secure their loyalty.¹⁰ Further, they would use courts to legally confiscate funds.¹¹ He also commented on the tendency for such politicians to give away money to people only to foster dependency, causing the coffers to be depleted like a jug with a hole in it.¹² Aristotle, understanding the necessity of self-sufficiency, promoted the idea of the government setting up the poor with a piece of land or a small business so they could become economically self-sufficient and not be a drain on society.¹³

While democracy is being championed throughout the world today, one is hard-pressed to imagine it working in many places where the masses are impoverished and not self-sufficient. The democracy which came to America came to a people and conditions very different from what we find today.

In addition to self-sufficiency, other important features of a sound democracy are civility and the legitimacy of the government in the eyes of the people. These conditions appeared after an evolution of hundreds of years of cultural development in the West, to a people who sought a life of self-sufficiency. Today the society has drifted into some of the worse scenarios posited by Aristotle and the founding fathers of the United States. Before we discuss how to successfully perpetuate American democracy, we need to understand how it could work in the first place.

2. *Why Democracy Could Flourish in America and Why It Is Endangered*

a. Self-Sufficiency

A society “of the people, by the people, and for the people” requires that “the people” are able to run it. If “the people” are to come together by compact to develop public services and common defense, they must first of all be able to take care of themselves. The most basic requirement of free citizens in a democracy is self-sufficiency.

Self-sufficiency can further be broken down into two components: (a) the *desire* to be self-sufficient, and (b) the *ability* to be self-sufficient. Ability and motivation are both cultivated traits. This means that people must be raised in a culture that nourishes both individual initiative and technical abilities. The most important providers of ability and motivation are *families*, *churches* and other *associations*, and *schools*. Of these, the family is the most basic social unit. In fact, sociologist Brigitte Berger at Boston University has proposed the idea that a certain type of family unit made modern democracy possible.¹⁴

There were three factors in the formation of the United States which contributed greatly to the self-sufficiency of the people when America was founded: *Protestantism*, “*natural selection*,” and *widely available lands*. These factors contributed to the conditions in America that made democracy both possible and sustainable over many generations.

(1) Protestantism

The Protestant Reformation was important in the psychological and spiritual liberation of individuals and in raising the idea of personal accountability. Medieval Christianity had taught that, in the moral universe, the Church would direct, intercede on behalf of, and care for the souls of the people. Medieval culture promoted a worldview in which one’s conscience was external. A person’s salvation was in the hands of the Church, whose spiritual leaders had moral authority and the keys to the Kingdom. One did not feel free to make moral decisions alone. Protestantism, on the other hand, taught that each person is accountable directly to God. In matters of the soul, one needed the church and scripture as a guide, but one’s final standing before God depended upon how one lived one’s own life.

Protestantism thus promoted self-responsibility guided by one’s internalized conscience. Protestantism helped to create a culture in which individuals pushed themselves to be self-sufficient and moral and loathed any kind of dependence, slavery or servitude. Sociologist Max Weber in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, and economist R. H. Tawney in *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* provided classical discussions of the link between belief in Christian perfection, individual motivation and the work ethic. For Luther and Calvin, work was not drudgery to be avoided but a way to glorify God. One’s vocation was a high ethical “calling” through which one’s eternal personal and spiritual identity was created.

The Puritans, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Dutch Reformed, Quakers, Baptists, Methodists and Lutherans who settled in America all shared this religious view of work. The “Protestant work ethic” became a basic feature of American culture which was adopted by immigrants from other backgrounds as well. In colonial America, perfectionism in work was not only taught in Protestant churches and families, but in the universities these religious bodies founded—Harvard, Yale and Princeton, to mention a few. A rigorous work ethic was a major factor in the production of wealth in America, helping all hard-working citizens to attain self-sufficiency.

The twentieth century began as “The Christian Century” in America, and “Christian” was generally equated with “Protestant.” This is reflected in the very naming of a popular Protestant newsletter, *The Christian Century*. As late as the end of World War II, with the formation of the National and World Councils of

Churches, Protestant religious leaders and laymen were invested in the creation of a Christian world order. The establishment of the United Nations and the UN Universal Declaration of human rights was part of this vision.

However, since the 1960s, the influence of Protestantism on American culture has waned. In discussing his book *American Mainline Religion*, Wade Clark Roof argued that while mainline Protestant religion “enjoyed a comfortable alliance with the culture and was seemingly all pervasive and diffuse in American life” in the 1950s, by the 1980s the churches had moved “from mainline to old-line, from Main street to Second street.”¹⁵ In 1988, then NCC General Secretary Arie Brouwer spoke of the “disestablishment” of the mainline.¹⁶ In 1993, the weekly Protestant magazine published in the NCC offices, *Christianity and Crisis*, came to its demise, alienated from the thought of mainstream America and devoid of financial support. While there has been a conservative Christian revival, I would argue that, at the core, America has become post-Christian.

The decline of Protestant influence in America brings with it the decline of the moral conscience that it created. The idea that an individual is personally responsible for biblical injunctions and stands accountable to God has been relativized. Self-sufficiency as a duty or goal has been lost; self-discipline and delayed gratification that were characteristic of Protestant culture have been supplanted with a relativistic culture of continual diversion and instant gratification. The loss of the Protestant American pioneer spirit of striving for self-perfection is a threat to the stability of democratic government, which requires self-directed people.

Despite the decline of Christian influence on America, it may be that the work ethic and many traditional values will be restored. However, this will not come about through a new revival analogous to the Great Awakenings. Rather, it will come about through passing through, on a national level, a “dark night of the soul.” I believe that Nietzsche was basically correct when he observed that science had forever unseated the unquestioned authority of tradition and that we may only realize how important our inherited values were when we no longer possess them.

This is perhaps no more evident than in the area of family decline. Social science is now generating growing evidence in support of marriage and two-parent families based on the social consequences for a generation that spurned traditional religious teachings for a lifestyle of sexual license.¹⁷ It may be that the Ten Commandments are forbidden from being posted in public schools, but “thou shalt not commit adultery” is rapidly becoming a position endorsed by the empirical findings of social science. Analogously, the Russians, who built a whole social system on a philosophy of redistribution, have learned the hard way the commandment “thou shalt not envy thy neighbor’s property.” These “commandments” may not be accepted as valid by future generations

because they are found in the Bible, but they may become accepted anew on the basis of what we today call “scientific knowledge,” after we learn the consequences of not obeying them.

(2) “Natural Selection”

America was settled by people who were “naturally selected” to care for and govern themselves. The people who came to America were those who wanted to become self-sufficient and had the courage to leave their old life behind. In the days before steamships, the passage across the Atlantic was long, expensive and dangerous. People who came to America either possessed sufficient means to establish new businesses or they were willing to work off their passage as contract laborers.¹⁸ As a result, America ended up with some of the most ambitious people of Europe (except in those areas populated by people deported from English prisons). Those in need of welfare or unwilling to live on their own remained in Europe. The trip across the ocean served as a “rite of passage” that gave America a large independent, hard-working population and an almost non-existent welfare class. Therefore, both the religious and the nonreligious people who came to early America were predisposed to self-sufficiency and suited to the type of limited government which was eventually established by the founding fathers.

However, the descendants of American pioneers did not endure the same hardships; many quivered in the face of similar challenges. Some were dependent on family enterprises, employers or others; they were not self-sufficient people. Even the first religiously rigorous Puritans to come to America had problems with their second generation. The “Halfway Covenant” was a compromise that allowed members of the second generation to become full members of the church even though they did not show the same signs of conversion as had their parents. The same phenomenon took place with regard to Americans in general; the children of the immigrants were not all as courageous as their parents and often did not maintain their traditions. Immigrants have been the backbone of productivity in America. Those who suffered oppression in another country, and then gained an opportunity to pursue their own fortune freely in America, have worked very hard to acquire wealth. It takes a strong family to transmit such virtues to succeeding generations. As Thomas Sowell has commented:

While the second generation is usually objectively better off than the first generation, they are often more resentful of remaining disparities from the general population, more delinquent and more violent.¹⁹

This has been true of Puritans, Italians, Jews and Chinese. After several generations in America the ethos of the original pioneers is lost. This is a serious

problem. We have a society which, like many other societies throughout the world, has many sheep and few shepherds; and the sheep have a hard time discerning the true shepherds.

With the United States now highly populated and immigration-restricted, and with the relative ease of making a trip to America by airplane, there is not a large influx of “the brave and the free.” Rather, in the twentieth century, many people have come to America for economic welfare and not to pursue a life of self-sufficiency. Thus, the “natural selection” process for self-sufficiency required to maintain a democracy, which was provided earlier by the difficult travel on ocean ships, is no longer operative. The factors present when the nation was formed that selected independent and highly motivated people have vanished.

The decline of this natural selection factor does not necessarily imply that the American people cannot be self-sufficient enough to make their democracy continue. However, it does mean that the hardships of immigration, which helped ensure a *demos* of self-sufficient people, will need to be replaced by some type of training and education for self-sufficiency. The difficulties that Americans currently have in maintaining self-discipline, delayed gratification and a hard work ethic will undoubtedly lead to economic hardships which may force a change in the American attitude towards self-discipline. In the long run this could be beneficial because, if the cultivation of self-sufficient and motivated men and women can be achieved, the country can remain prosperous without the necessity of out-dated traditions or external factors like crossing the ocean, which can be viewed as coincidence or good fortune for early America.

(3) Available land

Available land on the frontier was also extremely helpful in enabling early Americans to be self-sufficient. There were always lands on the frontier that could be settled for free or could be purchased for very little. Almost anyone could build a small house, hunt animals and grow enough vegetables to be self-sufficient without a formal education or significant accumulation of capital. In short, it was quite possible for anyone with motivation and land to be self-sufficient in the Americas.

There is no longer free land available to American immigrants and their descendants. At the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893, historian Frederick Jackson Turner developed the popular “Frontier Thesis” that, with the closing of the western American frontier, an era of American history had decisively ended, and with it had also disappeared the material factors that had hitherto served to “explain American development.”²⁰ By 1920 the fertile soil in America had been claimed. Those who went after the marginal cropland

in the 1930s were caught in the “dust bowl” and left penniless. The period of *The Grapes of Wrath* marked the end of the time when all Americans could be self-sufficient as farmers.

While one cannot simply reduce the success of American democracy to a frontier thesis, there is no doubt that the simplicity of life which enabled relatively uneducated but motivated settlers to create a life of self-sufficiency was a great boon to the American experiment. But like the other factors that served the cause of self-sufficiency in America, the “land frontier” factor no longer applies. At the turn of the nineteenth century over 70 percent of Americans lived on family farms. Today that number is less than two percent. Family farms cannot compete with industrialized farms.

Self-sufficiency is more complicated in an industrialized and urban world. One needs special skills and a job, but jobs are more transient and fleeting than a piece of land. It was much easier to attain self-sufficiency on free land in early America than in a highly competitive industrial world. While the “industrial frontier” replaced the land frontier, it, too, has limits. A new information age frontier is arising to lure people on. It is not a coincidence that many of the present generation have been moved by visions of new frontiers, of “virtual worlds” or the compelling *Star-Trek* theme of “space—the final frontier.”

There may indeed be new frontiers that will lead to prosperity for a maturing democracy, but these frontiers will entail yet more education, and will be of a different type than the lure of a plot of land for subsistence farming.

b. Civility

Civility refers both to the civil behavior that is equated with good manners and the idea of being “civilized” which pertains to a life of high refinement of culture. Many of the founders of the United States inherited the highest fruits of western civilization through aristocratic families. To cite Robert Goldwin:

When the United States was founded, the leading statesmen were advocates of constitutional liberal democracy; they were also gentlemen—not scholars, but learned—well schooled in the teaching of the ancients. Gentlemen were then repositories within themselves of the wisdom, customs and traditions handed down from other times and other ways of life. They established a new form of political society, but it was not wholly new because it did not eradicate to old standards of behavior. It relied on them, perhaps more than was realized.²¹

In Western civilization, ideas of civility evolved with the moral codes of the ancient Greeks and Romans, overlaid with moral codes of the Bible. Obedience to the Ten Commandments and practice of traditional virtues were

nearly universally assumed in the European aristocracy that elaborated and developed the responsibilities of a “gentleman.” The most basic of these codes were also infused in the masses through the churches.

Those who framed the American Constitution and led the new democracy were well-trained in civil conduct by the aristocratic families who raised them. Their civil upbringing helped them to resolve disputes, guided by a common loyalty to the new nation and the rational discussion of universal principles. This allowed the founders to put aside their differences in a civil manner and agree on the rules for governing the new democracy. The privileged upbringing of the founders, many of whom could read several existing and ancient languages, also enabled them to carefully study the teachings of ancient and classical writers. They were schooled in Plato, Aristotle and Virgil, and conversant with Montesquieu, Locke, Rousseau, Hume and Blackstone. They could anticipate events that might cause the collapse of their fair experiment, and hence they implemented the representative process and a system of checks and balances that would enable their democracy to last.

George Washington was one of those born into a family which inculcated good manners and codes of civility. We have inherited a treatise which he wrote when he was young, perhaps as a writing exercise, titled “The Rules of Civility and Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation.” Some examples are appended.²²

The American founding fathers based their government and behavior on what they perceived to be *self-evident truths* revealed in nature. They also had a high regard for the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. As a result, during the founding, the culture they envisioned was acceptable to that large number of citizens who were not of the cultured aristocracy, but nevertheless accepted the Christian Bible as true and normative. The period of the founding was a unique period in which rational, enlightened thinkers and evangelical Christians cooperated. Historian Sidney E. Mead called these two bodies “the head and the heart” of the American experiment.²³

Civil behavior was important for discourse among people of different religious and national backgrounds. Conditions in America encouraged it. For one thing, private ownership of property in a market economy encouraged dealings with persons of all persuasions.²⁴ Historian Alexis de Tocqueville offered the thesis that the pursuit of self-interest caused people to acquire civil habits.

By itself [self interest] cannot make a man virtuous, but its discipline shapes a lot of orderly, temperate, moderate, careful, and self-controlled citizens. If it does not lead the will directly to virtue, it establishes habits which unconsciously turn it that way.²⁵

Civil behavior, by being a form of restraint on the self in the public setting,

also forms the basis for restraint on power in the public sphere. But as James Q. Wilson has written,

The animating source of the ethos of self-control was religion and voluntary associations inspired by religious life, but it was not religion itself that produced the resulting social control; rather it was the process of habituation in the family, the schools, the neighborhoods, and the workplace that produced it.²⁶

Historian Ted Robert Gurr has commented that the nineteenth century witnessed the flowering of the civilizing process—that is, the acceptance of an ethos that attached great importance to the control of self-indulgent impulses.²⁷ This corresponds to the period in which “Victorian values” acquired widespread influence in England and America.

The founding of America was thus a product of the Western civilizing process which built on the accumulated experience of more than 2,000 years. The founders who stemmed from the European aristocracy were repositories of wisdom about the dangers of the tyranny of mass rule and the dangers of concentration of power in the hands of individuals or small groups. Displaying courage, honesty, moderation, compromise and vision, they acted as examples of the civil behavior required of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

In the twentieth century we have witnessed a rise in incivility, in parallel with a breakdown in the traditional social institutions that cultivated civility. In a highly competitive world in which each person seeks to maximize financial gain, civic notions of fairness and compromise are often lost. Instead of settling disputes among ourselves, we hire lawyers. Special interest groups pursue their specific social agendas by any means possible; even if it means the most uncivil behavior, like bombing an abortion clinic.

Universities are doing their part to delegitimize civility. University radicals call the aristocracy to which the American founders belonged the “oppressor class.” Their traditions, whether they be Hebrew, Ancient Greek, Latin or British, are viewed as something evil and repressive and from which modern society should flee. When the traditional foundations for civil conduct and the cultural ethos which made democracy are no longer seen as just and inclusive, the cultural basis of American civil society is undermined.

If our nation’s leaders and “civil servants” are no longer civil, democracy is imperiled. In a government of, by, and for the people, if the people are no longer civil, neither will be the government. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (BATF) raid on the Branch Davidians in Waco, Texas, and the retaliatory bombing of the BATF office in Oklahoma City, are one sign of this breakdown of civility in America today. Yet, civil behavior and cooperation are requirements for democratic self-rule.

Social theorist Edward Shils noted that the traditional repositories of civil behavior—universities, churches, government servants and rural communities—have become markedly uncivil themselves.²⁸ How will our leaders learn civil behavior and exemplify high moral principles in a nation adrift in self-gratification, squabbling, sensational media, and where traditional bastions of civility no longer exist?

The cultivation of civil behavior is one of the major challenges for democracy. While civility can be learned in and taught by basic social institutions—families, schools, and public institutions—these institutions are themselves in difficulty and frequently dysfunctional. There must be a concerted effort by citizens and social institutions to redevelop codes of civil conduct appropriate to democratic self-rule.

c. Legitimacy of Government

Any government must be seen as legitimate to those who live under it. In a democracy, the majority of the citizens must be persuaded that the government is worth supporting. Its laws and taxes must be viewed as just and necessary. There are several reasons why the founding documents of the United States were accepted as a legitimate basis for government. They help explain why early Americans were so willing to voluntarily subscribe to the laws of the land.

(1) Self-Evident Truths

The appeal to self-evident truths by the founders, and the idea that all human law must be consistent with natural (divine) law, gave great legitimacy to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. American citizens did not believe that they were serving the whims of a king or a ruling class, but believed that God had granted them inalienable rights and that the government they had created was supporting and defending these natural rights.

Today we no longer live in the philosophical universe of the founders. Truth which appeared to the founders as “self-evident” does not appear self-evident to the modern scientific mind. The revolution in physics reflected in quantum mechanics, the Heisenberg uncertainty principle and Einstein’s theory of relativity has had a corresponding impact on social and political science. Truth today is commonly seen as relative rather than fixed. Also, religious truth, as accepted by the Christian culture of the founders, has been relativized by the assimilation of non-Christian cultures into the United States, particularly in the 20th century. Natural law is no longer a popular concept. Thus the philosophical bases of American law appear antiquated or erroneous. The erosion of these philosophical underpinnings has contributed to

the delegitimation of the principles of the American founders and the government they created.

Further, Americans in the first century of the experiment by and large believed that the laws of government were a reflection of divine laws; that the American government was somehow connected to God's providence. Since the federal government was relatively small and concerned primarily with security, foreign trade and a minimal national infrastructure, citizens were not confronted with laws or acts which readily contradicted this belief.

However, the foreign adventurism in the Spanish-American War, the passage of the income tax, and the experience of World War I led Americans to have increasing doubts about the inherently good nature of their government; and they began to more closely scrutinize its behavior. Americans began to question whether government policy was a reflection of divine providence or based on personal and group quests for wealth and power. Today almost every person and group in America believes that some laws are unjust. When the government acts as a welfare state, many people believe that legislation is primarily designed to move money from one pocket to another, and that it has no connection to natural, universal or divine law whatsoever. As a result, people feel less moral compulsion to pay taxes, often doing so only for fear of reprisals. Loss of faith in the validity of the law contributes to the undermining of the legitimacy of the government today.

As in a marriage, it is hard to restore faith in one's partner after a betrayal. For the laws of America to be seen as legitimate, their rationale should be explained clearly to the citizens. Thick, obfuscated bills prepared by large legal staffs, with many conditions and financial benefits directed to specific supporters, raise the ire of citizens. Most traffic laws, for example, are easy to understand and are widely accepted because they promote the safety and welfare of drivers. However, tax laws, government contracts, exemptions and financial redistributions which are written in language which must be interpreted by lawyers are viewed as highly suspicious to the citizens who must live with the consequences of these laws.

(2) Minimal Government

The concept of minimal government meant that government would not intrude into normal civil affairs. American society was to be a moral society of responsible citizens caring for social concerns. Government was viewed as only having a role in the protection of life, liberty and property. A government that limited itself to the protection of life, liberty and property had little basis for criticism compared to a large redistributing welfare state. Historically, the American people have wanted to create their own destiny and wanted as little interference in that quest as possible. The idea of minimal government came as a relief to

those who had fled old arbitrary and oppressive monarchies in Europe.

Today the role of government has grown far beyond what is minimal and non-intrusive. We are faced with regulations and government programs that have accumulated over a period of two centuries. As a result, the government has increasingly become viewed as oppressive and like those regimes from which the early immigrants fled. Over the years, Americans have assigned to the government many of the tasks which had traditionally been their own responsibility. In the last century Americans have asked the government to provide jobs, to subsidize the unemployed, to mediate private and moral disputes, to take care of medical expenses, and to educate their children. Americans have also agreed to pay for these programs with taxes (or the taxes of others, if possible). The result is a Leviathan of the citizens' own making which pervades everyday life.

Many Americans who are self-sufficient and believe with Thomas Jefferson that they should be protected against government intrusion into private life no longer consider the federal government legitimate. The establishment of private militias in twenty-five states by 1995 is an indication that many citizens have come to feel threatened by government and want to defend themselves from its growing intrusiveness.

This intrusiveness is nothing other than the result of citizens of past decades asking government to solve social problems for which they did not want to take personal responsibility. Furthermore, today's government programs are staffed by citizens often cut from the same cloth—desiring to have someone else take responsibility. The government “servant” would prefer to be an administrator who hired other people to solve the problem—thus the bureaucracy bloats. The same is true of Congress. Representatives in Congress are supposed to understand the needs of their constituents and represent them in deliberations, yet Americans have witnessed a rise in blue-ribbon panels of experts paid millions of dollars by congressional committees to tell them how to vote on issues. Thus, much of the failure of American government is a failure of American people to take responsibility. The failure of the government to remain minimal is a failing of human nature that the founders well understood, but has been forgotten in America today.

(3) Checks and Balances on Power

The founders knew that a government of even the best intentioned citizens could be lost through usurpation of power. Human history is littered with schemes and plots to acquire excessive wealth and power through political conquest. The American founders were keenly aware that unscrupulous men would want to turn the nation into an engine for their selfish ends.

The old saying, “power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolute-

ly,” was a truism in the days of “the divine right of kings” in pre-Revolutionary France. An unbearable amount of bloodshed and suffering had resulted from the abuses of power in Europe. The founders therefore sought to ensure liberty by guaranteeing that no individual and no government could acquire absolute power. Therefore, when Thomas Jefferson wrote to James Madison from Paris trying to persuade him about the need for a Bill of Rights, he wrote, “A Bill of Rights are what the people are entitled to against every government on earth.”²⁹

To prevent the domination of citizens by government, the founders chose to establish the principle of the separation of powers among the three branches of government. They also created a balance between federal power and state power. In addition, they chose to enshrine in the Constitution basic liberties like freedom of speech, religion and the press through the Bill of Rights. For the most part, they succeeded in setting into motion one of the most durable political systems ever known.

New concentrations of power have arisen since the founding. The concentration of economic capital in industry was a serious threat in the 19th century. However, the rise of labor unions and the passage of anti-trust and monopoly laws helped to check these abuses of economic power. After 1935, Reinhold Niebuhr, a national spokesman on the industrial labor problems, believed that the unions had created a satisfactory balance to industrial power, so that the problem of industrial justice was effectively solved.³⁰ Legislation to protect racial and other minorities has also been enacted to limit the power of the Ku Klux Klan and other private organizations which might have designs on a racial monopoly.

3. Current Areas of Abuse and Thoughts on Reform

Today there are other areas of unchecked power which are becoming sources of abuse and causes for concern. While they should be checked, they have not thrown the nation entirely off course. The remedy to some of these problems is topical, while other areas require major surgery. A few of these areas and possible remedies are listed below:

a. Buying Politicians

Corruption in politics is often hard to resist. People with money are able to seek unfair financial advantages by tempting politicians through personal rewards or large campaign contributions. Today special interest groups provide large amounts of PAC money to persuade politicians to vote on their issues. When politicians vote on such issues, it is often at the expense of the citizens they are elected to represent.

Recent efforts to curtail this corruption in the United States have included term limits on office and campaign finance reform. While such measures can make it more difficult to buy politicians over the long term, they do not get to the heart of the problem. The American Founders initially encouraged service in congress on a voluntary basis by people who were already financially sufficient. They would have less chance of being bribed, but nevertheless, they might serve the interests of their own class and not truly represent the interests of the poor or middle classes.

On this issue, Rev. Moon made a bold proposal for a combined election/lottery system in a newspaper advertisement in Korea before the 1992 elections there:

DRIVING OUT ELECTION CORRUPTION BY USING A DIRECT- INDIRECT-DRAW SYSTEM FOR ELECTION

In addition to the above-mentioned points, all political parties that are damaging the election atmosphere by their corrupt way of campaigning and then try to slip from the grip of the law must stop such actions. The voters, too, must not allow their holy sovereignty to be controlled in exchange of some small benefits from the parties.

We have to demand strongly that a sense for fair election will be widely diffused, as well as a plan that offers suggestions as to how "no money needed elections" can be held. We should come to the point where we could have presidential elections without the transfer of political capital from the side of the candidates, only with the existing tax money from the citizen.

The mass media should make their best effort to report fairly, so that campaign speeches, TV discussions and newspaper interviews could be the basis for an election campaign with the lowest possible cost.

I want to suggest that the congressmen, as well as other representatives of the people are elected through a 2- or 3-step direct and indirect election, and that among those who have been qualified as presidential candidates a lot should be drawn. I believe that this method is the closest one to God's Will.

As the first step the citizens should elect directly among candidates with basic qualifications (between 100 and 1000 people), and as the second step the elected representatives should again elect about 10 candidates among themselves who then would draw lots to elect the president.

One condition for candidacy at the first step would be the donation of a certain amount of money which would be used as a special bank fund to stimulate the national economy. Using the money in this way, a presidential election would not give any burden to the economy, but on the contrary, would even improve it.³¹

Drawing of lots for office is an ancient biblical practice. However, if lots are drawn at random, they do not insure qualified leadership; and, if lots are drawn from among names proposed by the leadership as qualified, they may not eliminate nepotism. The three-step process advocated by Rev. Moon insures (a) the candidate is qualified, (b) the candidate has popular support, and (c) the candidate was not bought. This creative proposal for a revision of the election process as a way to curtail corruption in government might seem too radical for the United States with its long constitutional tradition, but it should be seriously considered by Korea, as well as by many of the fledgling democracies around the world.

b. The Power of Congress to Set Its Own Salary

Another area ripe for abuse is the ability of Congress to set its own salary. The American people have allowed legislators to give themselves salaries, benefits and resources with tax dollars they control. This power can lead to the creation of a political class that leads a fairy-tale life at the expense of the common person, as was the case with the Soviet *nomenklatura* before the collapse of communism. The citizen has, in effect, had his checkbook taken by Congress, which has said, "I'm going to write out a check for what I ought to be paid." Legislators have further abused this power by assembling (at the federal level) staffs averaging 27 lawyers, giving themselves the power of franked mail, and a number of other perks. This provides incumbent congressmen with unfair advantages over political challengers.

Anyone who has engaged in a successful business, and has a knowledge of human nature, knows that such a system doesn't work right. Congressmen and congresswomen work for the people and have no right to extract whatever they want from their "employer." They have no right to bias elections in their own favor.

One possible way to stop this type of abuse of power would be to have representatives and their offices paid by the states that send them to Congress. While the argument will be made that some states will pay more than others, I would suggest that such problems would be much less dangerous than the present situation. This would encourage representatives to work well for their constituencies.

c. The Power of Lawyers in a Legal System of Government

Another problem has been the extent to which lawyers, as a group, may have benefited from having their peers dominate legislation in the nation. Because the American democracy gives sovereignty to a constitution, it is at the core a legal system. Over the years, Congress has become more of a legal

profession than the interlude from self-sufficient business life which the Founders envisioned.

Bills have become increasingly complicated and are prepared by committees of lawyers on congressional staffs. Often a several-hundred-page bill is shown to the congressman just a short time before the vote. This process allows for items of self-interest to be buried in the legislation that only a lawyer can interpret. The sheer complexity of government laws and regulations has also been a boon for lawyers in the private sector, who are needed by companies which must navigate the minefield of regulations in order to do business.

A suggestion for reform would be to reduce the role of lawyers in the production of legislation and increase the diversity of professional representation in Congress.

Human nature is such that people will seek to enhance their own well-being. This is often done by finding avenues which bring the greatest results. The founding fathers devised a system of government with a profound understanding of human nature, but for their system to endure, the principle of checking consolidations of power must be continually applied to new circumstances. The legitimacy of the government depends on its ability to prevent undue concentrations of power.

The quotation from the *Divine Principle* in the introduction compared the political system to the human body. The ability of the immune system to seek out destructive imbalances in the body caused by viruses is an apt analogy to the function of spotting ever new concentrations of power that may overwhelm the health of the American political system. Freedom allows individuals to spot these imbalances and then spread their observations to others, thereby waging war against the parasite and eventually restoring health to the society.

Today the political situation is very different from that of the founding of America. The government of America in the initial decades enjoyed the general support of the population and was often praised as a most noble experiment.³² For the most part, people felt free to pursue their own life, felt little intrusion into their lives, and believed that the government represented God's laws and their own best interest. Even though politicians themselves were often criticized for falling short of the mark, the founding documents themselves gained an almost sacred status. The American Constitution has outlived all other contemporary constitutions and has been given nearly unparalleled legitimacy by the citizens of a democracy.

The factors we have discussed, including the rise in incivility, loss of a common morality, government intrusiveness, tax policies and political corruption, have all had the effect of undermining government legitimacy. The globalization of human life has also relativized the role of the nation-state in

human affairs. Nicholas Kittrie, in *The War Against Authority*, has noted that there is a declining sense of state legitimacy worldwide.³³

The restoration of government legitimacy will require behavior and actions of the government that can be explained and accepted by the majority of citizens as being right, fair, and a reflection of higher principles. But, while it is clear that the state cannot presume to be God and remain legitimate in the eyes of the people, it is also true that the citizens have too often asked the state to *play* God. Thus, without a virtuous and educated citizenry, it may be impossible to establish a legitimate state.

4. *The Main Solution: Creation of Virtuous Democratic Citizens*

The above discussion of democracy should leave the reader with the understanding that the basic solution to the problems of the American political system will come when proper guidance of the system comes from its "brain." The brain, in this case, represents the platforms and policies articulated by political parties and politicians that have consensual support by the citizens as a whole.

However, "consensus" in itself is inadequate. A mass of uneducated citizens could, for example, adopt the communist myth of appropriation of the means of production by the masses and end up with a hopelessly destitute society. The people could believe in pipe-dreams articulated by charlatans who promise voters a utopian world without connecting it to the actual laws of the universe necessary for its accomplishment.

The survival of modern democracy not only requires consensus, but consensus on goals related to a truly functioning society. Such a society must take into account the physical laws of the universe and the laws of human nature.

Again, we have to return to self-sufficiency as the primary virtue. Several years ago I asked Chung Hwan Kwak, an early disciple of Rev. Moon, about his concept of ideal politics. He spoke of the disappearance of politics and the flourishing of people like trees in a forest. Church members also frequently speak about Rev. Moon being born into a society "where people could live without law." Such concepts imply that people can be self-sufficient and can live with their neighbors without conflict.

A tree in the forest first puts down deep roots to draw out water and minerals for its life, before it forms branches which can be a home to the birds, before it generates oxygen for animals to breathe. A tree naturally knows its limits; it will share some resources with the roots of neighboring trees as it struggles to maintain itself in a competitive environment. The drive for life is basic. Trees are not out to deprive other trees of their right to grow, but a given parcel of earth can only support a given number of trees.

This image is somehow comparable to the intent of the founders of the United States: that each citizen have the right to pursue happiness. If one person overstepped his or her bounds and interfered with another person's pursuit, the government would be able to step in to protect the other person whose basic right to life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness was being violated.

An essential component of the pursuit of life and happiness was considered to be the ownership of property. Ownership of property, as a right, fits into the concept of the Third Blessing of "dominion" given in Genesis and emphasized in the *Divine Principle*. We can think of the tree, planting its roots deep in the soil and "owning" that property. It would be against natural law to uproot a full grown-tree and deprive it of its "property." The tree would die. It is also against natural law for a tree to become greedy and take more than it needs for its own sustenance, thus preventing other trees from living.

Human beings are capable of theft, taking more than they need and depriving others in the process. While the pursuit of basic necessities is not considered evil, taking more than one needs and depriving others is the basis of resentment and violence and considered evil. In small, face-to-face communities like the one into which Rev. Moon was born, the people had a culture in which each understood his or her place and responsibilities and could live among others without law. In such a society, there would be no need of taxes, lawyers or government. The people would live by virtue alone.

Is the creation of small communities of virtuous citizens alone adequate? In today's global society, where mighty armies and weapons of mass destruction could wipe out such an ideal community in an instant, can we abandon the concept of government and armies for defense? No. As much as Unificationists, like idealistic Christians and Marxists, believe in an ideal community based on love and virtue, we must secure the rights of all people to sustain themselves and raise their children. This requires securing and protecting the environment in which the basic goals of love, life and lineage can be carried out. Securing and protecting the environment requires a realistic understanding of the evil possibilities of human nature and concentration of power.

In my opinion, and in my interpretation of the *Divine Principle*, the basic securing of rights for a self-sufficient people has taken place through the long historical evolution of human civilization which culminated in the establishment of modern democracies with separation of powers and with the development of a consciousness of human rights. These are articulated in the United States Bill of Rights and the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. While not all human rights have necessarily been articulated or prioritized, we have developed the basic outlines of a system of government that can allow people to flourish and achieve life's blessings. Throughout most of human history evil has had the upper hand; lands and peoples have been dominated by force. The protection of basic rights and the separation of powers,

with ultimate control in the hands of the people themselves, has allowed for the possibility of a good society with free and happy people to emerge. However, such a society requires a virtuous and educated citizenry to function properly.

5. Increased Virtue Will Allow the State to Wither Away

The concept of “the withering away of the state” was prominent in Marxist ideology. However, because Marxists had a false understanding of human nature and the ownership of property, they were unable to create a free society in which the state could naturally wither away. The United States founders, on the other hand, set such a government in motion. However, the people, instead being virtuous citizens who could live without law, increasingly squabbled among themselves and asked the courts to settle disputes. The people, instead of being the responsible citizens that would sink their roots deep and spread out branches that would provide for their families and environment, increasingly asked for the government to care for them. The state did not wither away, rather it expanded dramatically. In order to perform its mandate it had to tax and redistribute, decreasing freedom and increasing opportunities for corruption and tyranny.

However, the creation of citizens of virtue can yet lead to a withering away of the state in many modern democracies. Let’s take the example of common recognition of the Ten Commandments. The Ten Commandments are a basic code of ethical behavior distilled through centuries of social life. To trespass against the last seven commandments that deal with relations to the neighbor is basically to trespass against the human rights of others. If citizens do not trespass against the rights of their neighbors, there will be no basis for lawsuits or police intervention. It follows that the more people who live by the commandments, the fewer courts, judges, lawyers and policemen will be required. From this follows the need for less government and less taxes.

Let’s take another example: suppose parents take more responsibility for the well-being of themselves and their children. They plan well for their children’s education and for their own retirement; they pull together in times of a medical crisis, and so on. In a society where families are basically intact and functional, there would be very little need for social welfare in a government budget. In the United States, approximately 47 percent of the federal budget currently goes to provide citizen welfare. Another 14 percent goes to pay interest on the federal debt. If American citizens cared for themselves and the government paid off its debt (something responsible individuals do), the tax burden could be reduced by 61 percent.³⁴

Of course, there may always be need of some safety net for the truly needy. While I would be opposed to paying for this at the federal level, means-

tested entitlements only account for 25 percent of social welfare spending, and many of these recipients could be liberated from the welfare system through education. Thus, by simply shifting back responsibilities to citizens who are currently capable of their own welfare, the federal government could be shrunk to 50 percent of its present size. Additional shrinking of the government would appear over the long term as the pensions for government retirees and portions of non-defense discretionary spending were reduced by citizens living with less need of government services.

Let's look at another national problem related to shifted responsibility: health care. It has been estimated that about 33 percent of the cost of health care is consumed by the costs of processing paperwork, which would not exist if individuals paid directly. An additional 33 percent of the health care costs arises because third-party payment systems prohibit the market from functioning properly in the health services sector. The current system does not have the natural built-in checks against overbilling by insurance companies, doctors or hospitals—features of a conventional market system, such as that which existed in health care prior to World War II. Today a typical family of four, or their employer, pays over \$500 per month in health insurance premiums and an additional \$1500 per year in out of pocket expenses, or \$7,500 per year total. The cost of maintaining catastrophic health insurance (\$1,500 per year) plus out of pocket payment of all routine office visits might total \$5,000 per year. If market forces were reintroduced into the health care industry, that amount would drop to about \$2,500 per year—without hurting the quality of medical service at all. In fact, lower market prices should reduce federal Medicaid and Medicare costs by 50 percent, further reducing the federal budget.³⁵

The above examples are two areas of large forced and unnecessary expenditure which, when citizens take back responsibility, could easily be reduced by 50 percent. If citizens had this windfall under their own dominion, they would have more possibilities to pursue happiness in a satisfying way and have more resources to give voluntarily to charities of their choice. All this would occur with no reduction in police security or military defense. Our wasted resources are simply the accumulated result of selfishness, laziness, political and fiscal ignorance, and irresponsibility—none of which contribute to a person's happiness or spiritual well-being. On the contrary, increased income from personal responsibility, and a habit of voluntarily contributing a significant portion of one's income to charities, can lead to an immensely rewarding life.

6. Increasing Knowledge and Virtue

Increasing knowledge and virtue is quite possible. When one cell in the body finds a virus and adjusts to fight it, the body rapidly mobilizes other cells to eliminate the threat. Likewise, in a healthy, functioning democracy in which citizens become aware of threats, a solution proposed by one citizen can advance quickly and other citizens will soon be mustered to fight the “disease.”

As mentioned earlier, the largest challenge for individuals and families is to begin practicing a lifestyle that is responsible and in accordance with the natural laws by which the world was created. Then they can prosper in an environment of freedom.

Abraham laid a foundation for the prosperity of his descendants because of his faith and dedication. This can happen in America to each and every family that establishes the proper conditions of faith. In *Something More*,³⁶ Catherine Marshall has a chapter titled “The Law of Generations,” in which she discusses the value of family traditions for raising people to be responsible citizens and instilling the basis for success in future generations. She cites as one example the family of Jonathan Edwards, an early American theologian. He and his family took care to begin each day with prayer and study to focus on life’s purpose and the day’s direction. He took care to help each of his children with problems and questions they had at the end of the day. From that one family, in the next four generations appeared hundreds of political, educational and religious leaders. Edwards’s descendants held dozens of high political posts, served missions in dozens of countries overseas, and produced mountains of books and journals.

Today, the Unification Church and the Family Federation for World Peace and Unification are attempting to accomplish this same thing. They are promoting a lifestyle akin to that described of the Edwards family through the tradition of daily *Hoon Dok Hae* readings and daily prayer. It is my firm conviction that families that establish such a lifestyle in 21st-century America will go on to prosper, inherit God’s blessings, and take responsible positions of leadership in society. Eliminating the government waste outlined above is only the tip of the iceberg of what such people will achieve.

The groundwork for a true society has been set. Personal and family responsibility connected to God’s Will or natural law can generate a “brain” to attach to that brainless nervous system in the American political system. We can look forward to a time when politics literally withers away—not because any laws have been revoked or the Constitution has been changed—but because virtuous people, who know how to sustain themselves and live in harmony with others, will have no need to call upon them. Further, if such a true society movement expands to other nations, the remaining portion of the fed-

eral budget—that devoted to defense—can also begin to wither away. The American Constitution can remain intact in a land known as Heaven on Earth.

Notes

1. *Unification News*, August 1985, pp. 16-17.
2. Han Tai Soo, "The Unity of Eastern and Western Civilizations through the Unification Principle," in *Research on the Unification Principle* (Seoul, Korea: Song Hwa, 1981), pp. 266-67.
3. *Divine Principle*, 2nd ed. (New York: HSA-UWC, 1973), pp. 470-71.
4. Aristotle, *The Politics*, translated by T.A. Sinclair (Baltimore: Penguin, 1974), Book 6, Chapter 2, p. 236.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 237.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 244.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 240.
8. Thomas Jefferson, Letter to James Madison, 20 December 1787, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. Julian P. Boyd (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958), p. 442.
9. Aristotle, p. 241.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 243.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 245.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 246.
13. *Ibid.*
14. From a personal conversation with Professor Berger.
15. Wade Clark Roof, address at Union Theological Seminary on Union Day, 1988, of his recent book with William McKinney, *American Mainline Religion: Its Changing Shape and Future* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987); see esp. pp. 239-242. Following the Roof and McKinney book, it became commonplace to refer to the liberal churches as "oldline" instead of "mainline" in such journals as *The Christian Century* and *Christianity and Crisis*.
A later book which pursues this theme is Thomas C. Reeves, *The Empty Church: The Suicide of Liberal Christianity* (New York: Free Press, 1996). The author states: "Since the cultural revolution of the 1960s and 1970s, the mainline churches have been in a series of unprecedented numerical decline, losing between a fifth and a third of their membership... A major reason for the numerical decline of the mainline churches is their failure to retain their own children once they have reached the age of decision."
16. *The Christian Century*, (Editorial), Dec. 21-28, 1988, p. 1171.
17. See, for example, Ralph Segalman, *Reclaiming the Family* (St. Paul, MN: Paragon House, 1998), pp. 25-70; Mitchell B. Pearlstein, "Fatherlessness in the United States," in *The Family in Global Transition*, ed. Gordon L. Anderson (St. Paul, MN: Paragon House, 1997), pp. 401-45.

18. See, for example, Thomas Sowell, *The Economics and Politics of Race* (New York: Quill, 1983), pp. 150-51.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 158.
20. Wilfred M. McClay, *The Masterless: Self and Society in Modern America*, pp. 107-112.
21. Robert A. Goldwin, "Rights, Citizenship, and Civility," in *Civility and Citizenship*, ed. Edward C. Banfield (New York: PWWA Books, 1992), p. 54.
22. *George Washington: A Collection*, ed. Wm. B. Allen (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1988), pp. 6-13.
 1. Every action done in company ought to be done with some sign of respect to those that are present.
 6. Sleep not when others speak; sit not when others stand; speak not when you should hold your peace; walk not on when others stop.
 25. Superfluous compliments and all affectation of ceremonies are to be avoided, yet where they are due they are not to be neglected.
 28. If anyone comes to speak to you while you are sitting, stand up, though he be your inferior, and when you present seats, let it be to everyone according to his degree.
 58. Let your conversation be without malice or envy, for 'tis a sign of a tractable and commendable nature, and in all causes of passion permit reason to govern.
 89. Speak not evil of the absent, for it is unjust.
 108. When you speak of God or his Attributes, let it be seriously; reverence, honor and obey your natural parents although they are poor.
 110. Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience.
23. Sidney E. Mead, *The Lively Experiment* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976).
24. That a fundamental feature of civil society is private ownership of property was an idea developed by Hegel and explained by Edward Shils, "Civility and Civil Society," in *Civility and Citizenship*, p. 2.
25. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, ed. Richard D. Heffner (New York: Mentor Books, 1956).
26. James Q. Wilson, "Incivility and Crime," in *Civility and Citizenship*, p. 99.
27. *Ibid.*
28. Edward Shils, "Civility and Civil Society," in *Civility and Citizenship*, pp. 11-13.
29. Thomas Jefferson, Letter to James Madison, 20 December 1787, *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, p. 440.
30. For example, Reinhold Niebuhr, "Johnson and the Myths of Democracy," in *Faith and Politics*, ed. Ronald H. Stone (New York: George Braziller, 1968), p. 246.
31. This is a translation of the newspaper advertisement provided me by PWWA Korea in December 1992. We went on to implement a modification of this system for the Blessed Family Association. Members would nominate candidates, those with the highest number of votes would then be advanced. The regional leader then drew names from among the remaining candidates in a public ceremony after Sunday service.

32. Alexis de Tocqueville noted this phenomenon in *Democracy in America*, p. 107: However irksome an enactment may be, the citizen of the United States complies with it, not only because it is the work of the majority, but because it is his own, and he regards it as a contract to which he is himself a party.

In the United States, then, that numerous and turbulent multitude does not exist, who, regarding the law as their natural enemy, look upon it with fear and distrust. It is impossible, on the contrary, not to perceive that all classes display the utmost reliance upon the legislation of their country, and are attached to it by a kind of parental affection.

33. Nicholas N. Kittrie, *The War Against Authority: From the Crisis of Legitimacy to a New Social Contract* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), pp. 228-29.
34. *A Citizen's Guide to the Federal Budget: Budget of the United States Government Fiscal year 1999* (Washington, DC: Office of Management and Budget), available on the Internet at www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/budget99.
35. Gordon L. Anderson, "Health IRAs Can Make the Difference," *The World & I*, August, 1994, pp. 90-95.
36. Catherine Marshall, *Something More* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974).

VISIONS OF THE SPIRIT WORLD: SANG-HUN LEE'S LIFE IN THE SPIRIT WORLD AND ON EARTH COMPARED WITH OTHER SPIRITUALISTS' ACCOUNTS

Andrew Wilson

Publication of Dr. Sang-hun Lee's messages from the other side, *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*,¹ comes at a moment when the salvation of the spirit world is at the forefront of Rev. Moon's concern. Each stage of the Blessing of 360 million couples on earth is reportedly accompanied by the blessings of billions of spirits.² In this context, Lee's book has nearly scriptural status. Rev. Moon endorsed it as suitable for *Hoon Dok Hoe* readings. Moreover, the book's reports were integral to a providential event: The fifth chapter is a record of Lee's interviews, at Rev. Moon's request, with mostly infamous personages—Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, etc. Within a month of that communication, at the Blessing of 120 million couples on June 13, 1998, these same personages were blessed as the representatives of all wicked people, thereby opening the gate for the liberation of hell.

Nevertheless, we will essay to better understand the vision of the spirit world reported in *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*. For this purpose it is helpful to locate Lee's book within the genre of reports on the spirit world and compare its vision with other such visions. For this study, we will compare it with four other books in the genre. Two are channeled books familiar to many Unificationists. *Life in the World Unseen* has long been a popular spirit world primer for Western members of the Unification Church. It is an account of a

Dr. Andrew Wilson is Associate Professor of Biblical Studies at the Unification Theological Seminary. His publications include *World Scripture: A Comparative Anthology of Sacred Texts* (1991) and *True Family Values* co-authored with Joong Hyun Pak (1996). He is currently engaged in writing a textbook on character education.

bright, busy and pleasant realm narrated by a former Anglican monsignor.³ *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands* was recovered from obscurity and republished by Philip Burley.⁴ Its vivid and passionate description of one soul's journey on the path of atonement reveals much about the course of restoration through indemnity for spirits. The other two books in this study were authored by earthly people who journeyed into the spirit world and returned. *Embraced by the Light*, a recent best-seller, is an account of a near-death experience that includes a meeting with Jesus and a journey through several locations in the spirit world before the narrator returns to her physical body.⁵ *Heaven and Hell* is a classic of reporting on the spirit world by Emanuel Swedenborg, who was the pioneer in this field.⁶

Lee's book stands squarely within this genre. Like both *Life in the World Unseen* and *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, it includes visits with people who were famous on earth. Like *Heaven and Hell* also, it describes various realms of graded quality and brightness, from the dark hells to the bright realms of heaven. It extols the natural beauty of the higher realms and describes the atmosphere of light and love which pours into these realms from the divine Source. Like Betty Eadie in *Embraced by the Light*, Sang-hun Lee meets Jesus. Like Franchezzo in *Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, Lee serves heaven by acting as an emissary to the lower realms.

1. The Predisposing Influence of Religious Belief

All five books convey a message to readers on this side of the grave; indeed that is their main purpose. They are more than just travelogues; they have teachings to impart. Yet there are differences between their teachings, some of which can be attributed to the authors' or mediums' differing religious beliefs. Whether he or she is male or female, from East or West, also affects the tone and mood of the revelations. For a critical evaluation of these accounts, it is necessary to be aware of beliefs and predispositions that might color these messages.

Revelation, we know, is never received in a pure state. The human heart upon which it is impressed is not a blank slate. The reception of revelation is colored by the character and beliefs of its human recipients. Since the quality of life in the spirit world itself is so greatly governed by thought, the very experiences of its inhabitants are likewise colored. Two visitors to the same spirit world might see and hear different things. *Exposition of the Divine Principle* states, "Although spiritually sensitive people are in contact with the same spirit world, because their circumstances and positions vary and their character, intellect and spirituality are at different levels, they will perceive the spirit world in different ways."⁷

In determining how the authors' religious beliefs might have influenced their accounts, we find that some have a connection with Spiritualism or the psychic sciences. From Swedenborg to modern Spiritualism, people drawn to this form of faith have distrusted conventional church teachings. They are often eclectic, drawing their understanding of reality from sources East and West. Could that be one reason why the protagonists of *Life in the World Unseen* and *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands* meet teachers from the East with names like "Ahrinziman" and "the Chaldean" but do not encounter Jesus or the Christian saints? On the other hand, Lee is by confession a Unificationist. In addition to teaching what is recognizably Unification theology, he meets people who are important for the Unification story: biblical figures like Adam and Eve, Noah, Abraham, Jesus and Mary, as well as leaders of the Communist world and of the Korean Christians who directly opposed Rev. Moon's ministry. What of *Embraced by the Light*? Eadie claims to have no connection to Spiritualism and few preconceived ideas about the hereafter. She describes herself as a Christian who has been searching for the correct understanding of God through experiences in many different churches. However, from outside sources we learn of her affiliation with the Latter-Day Saints,⁸ and Mormon theology colors many of its pages.

2. A Common Spiritual Philosophy of Life

A seeker for clarity would want to adjust for differences in religious belief or background by focusing on the teachings that these accounts hold in common. All of them affirm in clear tones that love is the essence of life in the spirit world. God is a God of love, who wants nothing else than to love each of His children as fully as possible. Nevertheless, most people enter the spirit world burdened with sin. It is not for God to judge or punish; rather, one's situation in the spirit world is self-made. The spirit world is where the internal fruits of one's earthly life become manifest. One brings to the spirit world the quality of character and love that one has manifested in earthly life, as well as the accumulated kindnesses and wrongs one has done to others. Earthly position, fame or reputation count for nothing. Love is all that matters.

Therefore, one should repent of attachment to material things, of the pursuit of power, or of selfish gratification of one's lusts. One should prepare for heaven by living a lifestyle that is fit for heaven, by cultivating genuine love while disciplining the desires of the flesh. The love and light of heaven emanate from God; therefore, to prepare for heaven one should cultivate a spiritual life of faith and charity such that one can receive God's love. However one cannot simply rely upon conventional religious dogmas, as their descriptions of what is needful to gain heaven and avoid hell are full of errors, misleading countless numbers of faithful believers.

This is a rough sketch of the philosophy of life held in common by all the books in our study. It may be termed the philosophy of the spiritual life. We need not be surprised that this thought is largely in agreement with Unification teachings. We should also not be surprised that this philosophy is also widely shared by sincere believers of many faiths who have found these and similar spiritual texts to be valuable guides for their spiritual life. We live in an age when God's truth is rapidly becoming known in all quarters.

An exhaustive list of the points of agreement and points of difference between these five accounts could fill many pages. Rather than enumerating them, I will give a brief assessment of each book's unique character and discuss in passing how its vision of the spirit world can help us better understand and appreciate Sang-hun Lee's special message.

3. *The Monsignor's Pleasant Paradise*

Life in the World Unseen opens with the narrator, who on earth went by the name Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson but in the spirit world is known simply as "the Monsignor," giving a rather typical account of the passage to the hereafter. He rises from his body, feels the lightness and freedom of his spiritual body, and is surprised and pleased to know that he is still whole and possessed of his faculties of perception and speech. He meets a friend and guide, and then journeys up and away from the earth plane to the spirit realm where he will make his home. It is a rather beautiful place, a slice of heaven that resembles the English countryside.

What makes *Life in the World Unseen* stand out as an exceptional work is the details with which he describes the comings and goings of spirit life. Whether a description of spirit clothing, an account of the creation of flowers or a description of inventors at work, no fine point is omitted. It answers many questions that any curious person might have: What do people wear? What do they eat? Do they need to sleep? Can you take a swim? How do you travel about? Can you travel between realms?

Life in the World Unseen, and especially its sequel *More About Life in the World Unseen*, contain meetings with famous people. Since Lee also met with many famous people, it is worth examining these accounts. First, they do not trade on their names or titles, nor does their earthly position have any meaning to their social life in the spirit world. A member of the royalty becomes just another citizen. A great composer or scientist puts himself or herself at the disposal of all. The Monsignor remarks, "The great, who have gained their greatness through the various expressions of their genius, consider themselves but the lowly units of a vast whole, the immense organization of the spirit world. They are all striving—as we are too—for the same purpose, and that is spiritual progression and development. They are grateful

for any help towards that end, and they are glad to give it whenever possible.”⁹ A meeting with Haydn and Tschaikovsky found them to be simple and unassuming, living in a small house, and happily composing new scores. Avoiding the distractions of worldly fame, these great men of music went about calling each other by their first names.¹⁰ Although the purpose of the visit was only to introduce a young newcomer, they did not, as one might expect, regard the youth (who on earth would be nothing but a tourist) as a bothersome distraction, but rather showed him warm hospitality. In comparison to some of Lee’s interviewees, they seem quite happy and well-adjusted. They seem to have little to be ashamed about and can easily converse with friends and guests.

The famous people whom Sang-hun Lee interviewed in hell were tormented; some lived alone and avoided all contact with others. However, many of the personages whom he met living in the good spirit world also spoke of regrets and shame over their earthly life. Their demeanor was due, I presume, to the exceptional nature of their visitor. They could not be at ease with him as they would be with an ordinary guest. As a messenger of God, Lee carried the authority and the purpose to connect to their deepest past and their highest hopes. His authority from True Parents also meant that he came bearing words of judgment. Presumably, a visit from the Monsignor need not have elicited such painful honesty.

The Monsignor does not dwell in the highest spheres, nor can he easily enter and see their abundance of jewels and other sights of incomparable beauty. Now and then heavenly emissaries visit his realm, where they are received with deep respect. He is given a mission by one of these emissaries, one which will help in some way to atone for his mistakes in his earthly life—chiefly that in his books and sermons he had perpetuated ignorance about the true nature of life in the hereafter.

Can we better pinpoint where the Monsignor was dwelling? Lee describes the realms of Paradise as divided into nations: Japan Town, Chinatown, etc.¹¹ This was certainly the case for the Monsignor, who lives in a place that bears striking resemblance to the English countryside. He confirms that such national distinctions disappear in the highest spheres, for, “this dividing of the nations extends only to a certain number of realms. Beyond that, nationality, as such, ceases to be. . . We shall cease to be nationally conscious such as we are upon the earth-plane and during our sojourn in the realms of less degree.”¹² The fact that he was being guided by a Chaldean who came from those higher spheres suggests that a true estimation of Paradise should include realms that are beyond nationality.¹³ The Monsignor’s experience suggests that he may be within the lower spheres of Paradise, among the realms that still maintained such distinctions yet not far from the border of those that do not.

Lee also says that people in the middle realms must work hard, yet they

are passive and lazy, with little hope or desire. The Monsignor lives in a place where the people are working, though they seem to be happy and content. Still, I wonder whether he or his friends have much aspiration to better themselves; they rather expect to remain in their tolerably pleasant surroundings for a long time. Sure, there's plenty of work to do, people to help, music to write and perform, inventions to create. Yet, I sense that after a few years, it might seem rather boring and dull. Something is missing, some spark... What is it? There are no marriages, no families! Everyone is single, living as friends with one another. Can that be truly heaven?

For this reason, *Life in the World Unseen*, despite its recounting the beauties of the spirit world, ultimately doesn't satisfy our taste for life. It is rather like a society of angels, or of monks who are required to be celibate. Furthermore, there is no account of any personal relationship with God among the dwellers of the Monsignor's realm. They live removed from the Source, only receiving communications indirectly, through emissaries. One can conclude that the love there, though full of brotherly and neighborly affection, is not quite true love. Neither is there full and complete knowledge, either of a personal God, or of Satan, whose existence is denied.¹⁴ This latter feature of his world could be a reflection of his liberal Anglican or Spiritualist beliefs. Swedenborg before him also denied the existence of a personal Satan.¹⁵ Can we accept these denials at face value, given Jesus' many sayings about Satan scattered throughout the Gospels?

4. Eadie's Near-Death Experience

In Betty Eadie's much briefer account of the spirit world, *Embraced by the Light*, she has a foretaste of this same spirit world. She marvels at its flowers, its halls of knowledge and invention, its music and colors so vivid and full of life. Its theme is a message of comfort and hope that there is indeed life beyond the grave.

For nineteen years after returning to life—for it was not yet her time to die—Eadie kept her experiences to herself and shared them only with those she loved. Finally, she set them down in a book. *Embraced by the Light* is significant for being a best-seller that has popularized the idea of life beyond the grave to millions of readers and spawned numerous similar titles.

Eadie's near death experience begins in the typical manner: rising from the sick-bed, meeting friendly spirit-beings, traveling for a while on the earth plane to see her family one last time, and then a long journey upward. But in her case, the person she meets at the end of her journey is none other than Jesus Christ.

When Jesus speaks to her, she nestles herself in his arms as a child. He fills her mind with knowledge about God and spiritual reality, answering her

many questions. Eadie's questions have a distinctly theological bent. What is death? How was the universe created? Why are there so many religions? What is the purpose of life? What are the spiritual laws by which we should live? Betty had always been a seeker for truth, with a mind full of such questions. Compare the cleric who narrates *Life in the World Unseen*, who probably had pretty definite opinions about most matters of faith. We never read that he sought the answers to great theological questions; his first queries were about practical matters pertaining to his new life in heaven.

As a result, *Embraced by the Light* is as theological as Lee's book, though we would more likely expect it from Lee, who in life was a philosopher and systematizer of Unification teachings. Perhaps Eadie shared with Lee a burning desire to know the answers to ultimate questions; hence her thoughts naturally turned in that direction. This sort of revealed theology however, claiming as it does to come from the highest spiritual source, still must be taken with several grains of salt, as it is inevitably mixed with the author's religious background.

5. *Teachings on the Pre-existence of the Soul*

In one of her visions, Eadie sees mature spirits who are about to be incarnated in their earthly bodies. She learns these pre-existent spirits are created in the spirit world and then incarnate to experience life in the physical body. They incarnate in families and in situations that reflect the friendships and bonds which they formed in their pre-existence. There they experience a lesson which is valuable for their spiritual growth.

The preexistence of the soul is not part of the teachings of the other accounts of the spirit world considered here. We don't find this idea in *Life in the World Unseen*, where on the contrary, the Monsignor reports, "In my travels through these realms of light I have yet to find a single solitary individual who would willingly exchange this grand, free life in the spirit world for the old life upon the earth-plane."¹⁶ Moreover, one of the truths Eadie learns is that pre-existence is not reincarnation: "I also learned that we do not have repeated lives on this earth."¹⁷ Pre-existence, however, is a pillar of Mormon theology. How much the author's own mind has conditioned this scene can be discerned from her own question to Jesus, "I wanted to learn the purpose of life on the earth. Why are we here? As I basked in the love of Jesus, I couldn't imagine why any spirit would voluntarily leave this wonderful paradise and all it offered... to come here."¹⁸ When on her sick-bed she first met her spirit guides, she said that she knew they had known each other for "eternities"¹⁹—a Mormon term for pre-existence. While the idea of the pre-existence of souls is foreign to most of us, Eadie already took it for granted.

This reader would have appreciated knowing in advance that the author was of the Mormon faith. To be fair, Eadie claims to have good reasons to avoid bringing up mention of her particular religion. She believes that the core of her experience is universal and can be had by a person of any faith. Therefore, she doesn't want to prejudice people of other faiths against hearing a universal message. Moreover, she teaches that the state of one's heart, not membership in a particular faith, is most important for deciding one's eternal life. She therefore says that she does not want people who are moved by her account to run and convert to the Mormon church.²⁰

Spiritual cognition, even of the highest beings, may be more or less true. Swedenborg recounts how the angels sometimes set up seemingly realistic scenes for troops of spirits, who do not question their veracity until they are revealed to be performances designed to teach a lesson.²¹ In *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, Franchezzo is instructed about astral shells which result from the magnetic emanations thrown off by earthly humans and spirit persons. They persist, though devoid of soul, and can be molded into various likenesses by the power of thought. He learns that spirits who wish to disguise themselves make use of this astral matter, as do spirits who wished to be photographed by earthly cameras.²² Thus there is room for much theater and pretense in spiritual experience. Still, regardless of their content, experiences of the bright realms of heaven are given in love and for the sake of love.

In a visit to the spirit world that would last only a few hours, it was not time to challenge Eadie's cherished beliefs. Swedenborg points out that instruction in the truths of heaven occurs only after several stages of adjustment.²³ In *Life in the World Unseen*, the Monsignor states, "adherents to any particular religious body will continue to practice their religion in the spirit world until such time as their minds become spiritually enlightened."²⁴ Eadie herself said in an interview, "I was told that God is so loving that he would not shock anyone out of their current belief system."²⁵ Furthermore, Eadie's belief that mature spirits take on earthly bodies to learn life lessons may have been a useful vehicle for impressing upon her the directive to return to the earth-plane to finish out her own life-mission.

6. *Visions of Time and Destiny in Realms beyond Time*

Questions of destiny and knowledge of the future do, however, loom large in many spiritual books. Psychically gifted people undoubtedly do see glimpses of the future, and time in the spirit world is not like earth time. In *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, Franchezzo is twice instructed by his teacher, Ahrinziman, on how the future interpenetrates the present. The first is a description reminiscent of Einstein's theory of relativistic space-time:

In the spirit world, where time is not reckoned by days or weeks or counted by hours, we judge of how long an event will take to accomplish or when an occurrence will happen by seeing how near or how far away they appear, and also by observing whether the shadow cast by the coming event touches the earth or is yet distant from it—we then try to judge as nearly as possible of what will be its corresponding time as measured by earthly standards... [M]any things may intervene to delay it and thus make the date incorrect. An event may be shown to be very near, yet instead of continuing to travel to the mortal at the same speed it may be delayed or held in suspense, and sometimes even turned aside altogether by a stronger power than the one which set it in motion.²⁶

In a second teaching, Franchezzo has a vision of a person's "star of destiny" whose path marks a person's life-course as long as they follow the ways of truth and right, but, "If the soul cease[s] to be pure, if it develop[s] its lower instead of its higher attributes, the star of that soul's destiny will grow pale and faint. . . die out and expire. . ." ²⁷ In both these teachings, the earthly person's destiny is predetermined in the spirit world, yet the individual has yet the free will to turn aside from destiny's path and thus delay its realization or even void it altogether.

This teaching of *A Wanderer in the Spirit Worlds* is clearly in agreement with Unification theology's doctrine of predestination contingent on human responsibility. What of the doctrine of pre-existence as presented in Eadie's vision? Perhaps in her vision Eadie had a glimpse of the distant land that is the future, and the mature spirits that she saw there were in fact from the predestined future kingdom in which all souls will achieve their God-ordained perfection. Or, maybe these spirits were astral manifestations symbolizing their future destinies. This could explain her sick-bed vision of the young child standing in the ballerina pose,²⁸ which was realized years later in the person of her adopted daughter Betty Jean.²⁹ On the other hand, when her mind was illuminated by the thought that she was one of countless spirits who were present from the beginning of time and assisted in the creation of the world,³⁰ we can surmise that she might have glimpsed her origin as one of the countless individual images within God as posited by Unification Thought.³¹

Eadie is predisposed to believe in Satan and the Fall, and so on these matters she receives wisdom.³² She learns that Adam was too satisfied with himself, while Eve was restless and "she wanted to become a mother so much that she risked death to obtain it." She recognized how women have an emotional structure that allows them to have an especially close relationship with God. Although in one sentence she reports the standard Mormon dogma that Eve chose to fall as "a conscious decision to bring about conditions necessary for her progression," a kind of *felix culpa*, two paragraphs later she describes how Satan tempts women and breaks up families:

I saw that he would use the same process of temptation in the world that had been used in the Garden. He would try to destroy families, and therefore humanity, by tempting women. This unsettled me, but I knew it was true. He would attack women through their restlessness, using the strength of their emotions—the same emotions that gave Eve the power to move when Adam was too satisfied with his situation. I understood that he would attack the relationship between husband and wife, distancing them from each other, using the attractions of sex and greed to destroy their home... I was told that once Satan had the women, the men would easily follow.

It is difficult to reconcile this truth with the doctrine that Eve chose to fall “to bring about conditions necessary for her progression.” Is Satan, the destroyer of humanity, at the same time a divine agent whose temptation makes it possible for Eve to progress? Is evil, therefore, good? Is lust, which smothers the spirit and stunts its growth, at the same time necessary for growth? The Fall resulted in an enormous weight of human suffering; how could it then be welcomed as part of God’s original plan? Yet by itself, the second revelation, which goes beyond Mormon doctrine, is uncannily accurate. This can be surmised by comparing it with Lee’s interview with Adam and Eve.

7. Encounters with Jesus

Certainly, Betty Eadie experienced Paradise. Just how high a realm she witnessed is evident when she describes that at her decision to return to earth “thousands of angels surrounded me.”³³ In her humility, she knew that the Paradise she saw was “only a tiny vestibule of heaven.”³⁴ But the most striking thing about her experience was her intimate fellowship with Jesus Christ, whose commanding and loving presence was ever her source of love, joy and guidance.

We are naturally led to the question of how Eadie’s encounter with Jesus can square with Lee’s encounter with Jesus—assuming that they were the same person. Lee states, “Even though Christians serve Jesus, fulfilling the highest goal of their earthly lives, Jesus feels lonely.”³⁵ What a surprising statement! Jesus has loneliness in his heart despite being surrounded by countless Christians. This is because they don’t understand Jesus’ mission or God’s will. They spurn the True Parents, in whose advent lies the key to God’s hopes and Jesus’ hopes. Instead they only want to stay with Jesus and praise Jesus. They “beg Jesus... ‘Oh! Our Lord! We want to go together with you!’”³⁶

From Lee’s perspective, when Eadie asked Jesus not to send her back to earth, saying, “No, no. I can’t go back. I belong here. This is my home...,”³⁷ she was acting like a typical Christian with whom Jesus could hardly begin to share his heart. In Eadie’s case, however, Jesus could take pleasure in the

fact that she accepted her mission and left him to return to the earth-plane. She could accept that she had to leave him because she knew her time on earth was not yet over. But of those Christian spirits who have finished their course on earth, how many understand Jesus' heart well enough to go forth from his presence and labor for God's will? Jesus' love is so all-embracing. It must be difficult to leave Jesus and return to the battlefield of life without a strong understanding that there is much more to do to establish the Kingdom.

Although as a divine spirit Jesus should be fit for the Kingdom of Heaven, he stays in Paradise out of affinity and love for his sheep. It is the same principle for any elevated spirit, as the Monsignor relates in *More About Life in the World Unseen*:

It may transpire that two people, between whom there is a strong bond, might belong to different planes of progression, and therefore inhabit different realms. In such cases it is not uncommon for the one entitled to live in the higher realm to remain with the one who is not yet advanced, until such time as the latter has progressed, and then, together, the two mount to their new realm, and so continue unseparated.³⁸

Jesus is lonely indeed, because there are so few followers with whom he can confide his hopes and dreams. He has to treat them like little children of slight understanding, as he does Eadie. But when he meets Lee, Jesus can share from a deeper part of himself. In his letter to Rev. Moon, Jesus declares, "The name 'Jesus' is always being made to stand out on earth, and no words can describe how ashamed I feel before you, Father, because of this.... Christians on earth will begin to have dreams about the wretched appearance of Jesus in the spiritual world."³⁹ In other words, Jesus wants to reveal himself more fully to Christians, that they might view him not as an all-powerful king or all-knowing parent, but as God's son who still grieves that his work, and God's plan, is yet unfinished. In this way, his followers may be able to relate with him in a more adult manner. If one doubts whether this view of Jesus is correct, or rather is simply a projection of Unification teaching, here is a testable prediction: Jesus will begin to manifest himself to sensitive Christians in a new way.

8. *Franchezzo's Path of Repentance and the Power of Love*

A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands is a richly detailed and moving account of a young man's awakening to life in the spirit world, his gut-wrenching realization of his vile and sinful life, and his efforts to do penance and rise to the higher spheres. Franchezzo's story is in many ways the most gripping and soul-stirring of all the accounts discussed here. There's little theology—our protagonist had rejected the church—but rather through a series of narratives

we are introduced to people in many situations of blessedness and (mostly) suffering. Dante's *Inferno* was never more graphic than this account of the hells and the sufferings of its denizens. Yet the overall theme is hope that God has for even the most miserable sinner to repent and rise to the higher realms.

Another feature of this book is its advanced discussion of spiritual substance and spiritual phenomena. Through his teachers, Franchezzo learns many lessons about the principles of mediumship, the deceptive abilities of spirits, the baneful effects of evil spirits on earthly people, the nature of astral matter, the methods of spirit photography, and the arts of foretelling the future. This communication was given during the heyday of spiritualism. Evidently an aspect of Franchezzo's mission, in addition to giving hope to sinners, was to instruct spiritualists on some of the finer points of spiritual communication so as to avoid being deceived by evil spirits.

In *Life in the World Unseen*, despite its picture of a bright world where most people are content with their lot, we also learn of spirits who, by dint of sincere remorse and penance, are able to rise up from the lower realms. We learn that one occupation for spirits of the bright realms is to minister to the spirits in the hells and bring them to repentance.⁴⁰ In *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, the entire story is about repentance and the upward struggle. Franchezzo, buoyed by the love of his earthly companion, is a champion among those who strive to go on the course of restoration through indemnity. At death, he arises as a frightened, ugly, deformed spirit, which was a reflection of his dissolute life, his love of self, and his deceit towards even the one he most loved. He wanders in the darkness of the earth-plane for a time, until he is invited to join what appears to be a monastic order, the "Brotherhood of Hope," which exists for the purpose of guiding spirits on their path of penance. From his sparsely-furnished cell, he goes out on missions to rescue others, along the way confronting situations and temptations that challenge him to personal growth. He must learn elementary lessons about self-control, followed by lessons about temptation and its causes, until he can finally learn the greatest lesson—to forgive and love his enemy.

The gray block building which housed the Brotherhood of Hope "was like a huge prison."⁴¹ Perhaps it is a model for the prison which Lee describes⁴² for residents in the Unification spirit world who committed grave sins, a place likewise devoted to indemnifying sin—not a cruel prison, but more of a reformatory. Living in the Brotherhood, Franchezzo's life is structured and guided as he takes on various tasks. As he grows stronger and more committed to the course of restoration, he is given more challenging missions. Stage by stage, his spirit—and his circumstances—improve. By the end of the book he is living in a beautiful villa in a bright realm, and he has taken his place as one of the angels of light in the providential struggle against the forces of darkness.

A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands is not least about romance and the power of love. Franchezzo gains the power to go forward only from the constant devotion of a pure-spirited woman whom he had left behind. She is his constant support and stay; the hope of eventually reuniting with her in the bright spheres motivates him to strive onward and endure any hardship in the course of indemnifying his many sins. She is the reason that he can advance so rapidly, while others around him backslide again and again and must labor for centuries before overcoming their lower natures. This is in agreement with the principle that resurrection requires a physical body. Lee also states, "If descendants sincerely offer their hearts for the sinners in the Spirit World, then such spirit people can come to the point of understanding themselves and how they must change."⁴³ How much more effective are the prayers and devotion of a spouse or a fiancée? Many times, the effect of Franchezzo's beloved's prayers was to help him understand himself, draw him away from temptation, and show him the way forward.

9. *Evil Dominions and Spiritual Influence*

Sang-hun Lee, like Franchezzo, visited the inmates of hell, so it is instructive to compare their accounts. When Lee visited Stalin, he found that Stalin still lived like a king. Although the houses were like hovels and the atmosphere was oppressive, his followers still honored him as their lord. His guards kept tight security around him. Yet for all that, Stalin was miserable and spent much of his time in seclusion.⁴⁴ On one of Franchezzo's journeys to hell, he met an Italian prince, his most illustrious ancestor, who had once ruled over the city of Rome with absolute power. In hell he was still enthroned, in a moldering castle, with servants and minions at his command.⁴⁵ While Stalin was humble before Lee's purity and divine love, this prince still gloried in his schemes to control the earth and sought to ensnare Franchezzo in his plans. Still, the effects of hell were to display his scheming as nothing but evil. Given this comparison, we see that kings on earth can sometimes still command a certain mock authority in the spirit world. Franchezzo's account of his meeting with the Roman prince gives verisimilitude to Lee's encounter with Stalin. What remains surprising about Stalin, in my view, is that he so readily opened his mind to Lee and became humble and repentant.

While Lee visited Stalin, some of Stalin's guards held him and threatened him, saying that if he returned he would face "serious danger." How can a spirit, which is eternal and incorruptible, be subject to danger? We can learn from Franchezzo's account of his journeys to the hells, where he is indeed many times in danger. On visiting the prince, he is almost captured and thrown into a deep pit, and would have been imprisoned there if not for the help of a companion who threw him a life-line. Apparently, if heavenly visitors to a

lower realm take on some of the realm's low magnetic energy, they can be trapped by the powerful beings of that realm. As Franchezzo learns through experience, even if a heavenly visitor has strong will, he can face danger if he has any give and take with hellish elements, either by partaking of its food and drink, or joining in its pastimes, or by the connection of lineage. Most damaging of all are the memories of the visitor's own sins; when these are called to mind by the hell-being, they can weaken even the strongest resolve.

Lee describes how sinful spirits send signals to people on earth who are related to them by blood or otherwise, causing mishaps, illnesses or criminal activity. Bad fortune assails them, without them ever being aware of its spiritual cause.⁴⁶ Such ancestral influence can be varied and subtle. When Franchezzo met the Roman prince, he became aware of the many occasions in which this evil ancestor had influenced his own earthly life—chiefly towards pride, arrogance and thirst for power. He relates how his ancestor had sought to mold him in his own arrogant image:

When I had felt most of ambition and a proud desire to rise and be again one with the great ones of the earth as had been my ancestors in the past, then had he been drawn up to me and had fed and fostered my pride and my haughty spirit, that was in a sense akin to his own. And he it was, he told me, who had prompted those acts of my life of which I felt now the most ashamed—acts that I would have given all my life to undo, after I had done them. And it was he, he said, who had from time to time sought to raise me in the world till I should be able to grasp power of some kind.⁴⁷

This is but one of many insights that *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands* gives into the nature of the spiritual chains of sin that bind people and drag them downwards.

10. Victims Enchained by Hate

In several episodes, Franchezzo meets a tyrant and his victims in the same hell, bound together by chains of hate as strong as any love on earth. In one scene that plays out the consequences of oppression on the earth,⁴⁸ he sees a man is chained to a dungeon wall while a crowd of people throw knives and rocks and curses at the wretch; these people were his victims on earth. They continue to attack him interminably but are unable to kill him. The man was a cruel judge in a city in South America acting in the name of the Spanish Inquisition. He coveted the beautiful wife of a local merchant; and finding a pretext to bind the merchant in prison, he seized the woman, who refused his advances and died. The wronged merchant nursed such a strong desire for revenge that once he entered the spirit world, he plotted the judge's death.

When the judge awoke in hell, chained to the dungeon wall as he had chained so many others, the merchant stood as foremost among the crowd throwing rocks and knives at the judge. Meanwhile, far away in heaven, the merchant's wife longed for him to give up his vengeful passion and join her. Yet until the softer feelings of love could weaken the thirst for revenge, this poor merchant remained in hell, tied to the villain who had destroyed his family. When Franchezzo comes with a message of hope from his wife, the poor merchant's gaze finally turns to higher things, and he begins the journey out of hell.

The scene is reminiscent of Lee's account of meeting Hitler.⁴⁹ He found him stripped naked and tied to a tree. A numberless throng of people shouting, "Kill him! Kill him!" pelted him with rocks and threw curses at him continually. They were Jews, victims of the Holocaust. The Jews were also bound in chains, some were covered with blood, some had fallen to the ground. Yet they cared about nothing except the opportunity to take revenge on their enemy. Lee wondered: between Hitler and the crowd of Jews, whom he should ask to repent first? Whom should he teach first about God and True Parents? One might think that these poor victims of Nazi cruelty deserve a better fate than to be bound in chains and living in hell, but such is the spiritual power of resentment and hate that it can overcome all other desires of the heart. Lee came to meet Hitler, but he could not help but pray with a heart of love for these victims, that they might cool their vengeful passions and resume their own spiritual progress.

Franchezzo confirms Lee's statement that each person is punished according to his crime.⁵⁰ The murderer is continually murdered; the evil judge finds himself in jail; the taskmaster finds himself a slave. Yet everywhere God and His agents are working to bring souls to repentance; in that sense, hope is never lacking even in the deepest hell. I have found no account more accurate, and certainly none more graphic, of the plight of spirits in the lower realms and the indemnity course they must walk for restoration, than is presented by *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*.

11. Swedenborg's Pioneering Vision

Emanuel Swedenborg pioneered the scientific description of the spirit world. Being gifted with exceptional clarity, he was able to separate much of the wheat from the chaff. *Exposition of the Divine Principle* mentions him by name⁵¹ and cites him for three significant contributions: First, his teachings have had widespread influence on modern religious thought despite the disapprobation of the established churches. Second, his teaching, which revealed many hitherto unknown secrets of the afterlife, is largely truthful.⁵² Third, he had a significant role in God's historical providence to elevate the Christian faith from the stage of rational adherence to doctrine to the higher stage of

inner, experiential relationship with God and the Spirit. Millions of ordinary people have followed in his footsteps, gaining knowledge of the spirit world through personal experience.

Swedenborg's theology differs significantly from Unificationism as regards several core teachings. He lacked any understanding of God's providence of restoration. He had no concept of the human Fall, and he denied the existence of Satan. He looked for the New Jerusalem to be established in heaven while Unificationism teaches that the Kingdom of Heaven must first be established on earth. Yet as regards his teachings on the spiritual world, the amount of agreement is striking.

In common with the other spiritual accounts we are discussing here, Swedenborg emphasized the substantiality of the spirit. After death, a person is possessed of all his senses, and of every memory and affection. He said that the angels in heaven (by "angels" he meant mainly good spirits) are handsome in appearance and stature, reflecting their inner wisdom and love, while the denizens of hell appear as monsters.⁵³ He taught that the quality of life on earth decides one's destiny in the next life, "To the extent that a man wills goodness and truth and does them... to that extent he has heaven in himself."⁵⁴

Swedenborg described heaven as constituted by two kingdoms, each with three levels. Within each level are heavenly societies marked off by religion, nationality and other common factors which distinguished people on earth. There are also many levels and realms in hell. He declared that God does not cast anyone into hell. After death, a spirit chooses to live in heaven or hell according to his or her own will. An evil spirit finds love of God uncomfortable to bear; he prefers to be among other spirits with whom he finds affinity. Thus he journeys to hell of his own accord.⁵⁵

Heaven is filled with people of all faiths; and so is hell.⁵⁶ In an earlier account of the spirit world written before his passing, Lee gave a similar view:

Many good Christians reside [in Paradise], as well as many non-Christians of comparable goodness, truthfulness and compassion... Just as the devout Christian lives by faith in Jesus Christ, there are believers of every religion who devote themselves to God with comparable sincerity, though they call Him by other names, including Allah, Krishna, Buddha, the Essential Self or the Unmanifest Source. Seekers and righteous non-believers also, who place dedication to the truth and right above worldly affairs, can attain this high level of spirituality and merit Paradise.⁵⁷

Swedenborg's observation on the particular receptivity of Africans⁵⁸ is surprisingly apt; in the recent Holy Blessings of 360,000 couples and 39.6 million couples conducted by the FFWPU, the largest number of participating couples were from Africa.

Swedenborg pinpointed the dividing line between heaven and hell in this way: those who direct the mind towards heaven's precepts and live for the sake of others go to heaven; on the other hand, those who pay attention to the world and live self-centered lives go to hell. Piety and charity must go together. He criticized those who gave only lip-service to Christianity, who thought that by attending church and believing in Christ they could automatically go to heaven while their minds were consumed with love of self.⁵⁹

Swedenborg also taught about spirit influence. Earthly men are influenced by both good angels and evil spirits, who can invade their bodies and minds and turn them according to their own desires. We are ever responsible to reject the evil and cleave to the good.⁶⁰ In that light, he regarded the doctrine of reincarnation as a mistaken view, a misinterpretation of the work of possessing spirits.⁶¹ He thus comes down on the Christian (and Unificationist) side of what has been a point of division and controversy within the new age and spiritualist communities.

12. Marriage in Heaven

Swedenborg agrees with Lee in affirming heavenly marriage and its rootedness in the divine polarity. Here we find several distinctive teachings that cohere with basic tenets of the Divine Principle. We enumerate several of them:

First, Swedenborg regarded God's fundamental nature as the duality of love (character) and wisdom (form). A corresponding duality of male and female fills all creation.⁶² In marriage, husband and wife take after the divine polarity as distinguished by the relative proportion of love and wisdom. This corresponds to the Divine Principle's teaching of the divine polarity of internal character and external form, masculine and feminine.

Second, Swedenborg taught that heaven is the macrocosmic expansion of Christ, the Divine Human.⁶³ It is constituted by all the elements of man's mind.⁶⁴ The Divine Principle likewise teaches that a human being is the microcosm of the cosmos. The cosmos consists of dual realms: the physical world and the spirit world, corresponding to the human body and mind.

Third, Swedenborg taught that the family is grounded in the image of God. As God is the conjunction of love and wisdom, of good and truth, so marriage is the opportunity for this divine polarity to be expressed in a reciprocal union. For this purpose, men and women are born. Each family that is centered on God completes the divine image by instantiating the divine polarity. Each becomes the receptacle of divine love. Furthermore, the pattern of the family is mirrored throughout the creation. Thus, Swedenborg gave ontological grounding for marriage in the divine life and remedied a weakness in traditional Christian doctrine, which had no clear understanding of marriage,

given the fact that Christ did not marry and the church knew only His example. This compares well with the Four Position Foundation in the Divine Principle.

Fourth, Swedenborg taught that the family is the seminary of the human race.⁶⁵ There our lower nature is gradually transformed and spiritualized into the purity of true conjugal love, which is the essence of heaven. Rev. Moon likewise teaches that the family is the school of love and the basic unit of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Finally, Swedenborg regarded conjugal love as the highest joy of heaven.⁶⁶ He admitted that among Christians no conjugal relations are totally pure,⁶⁷ and prophesied that at the Second Advent, “conjugal love will be raised up anew by the Lord.”⁶⁸ Here we recognize a prophecy of the Blessing, arriving some 200 years later to elevate marriage to its true ideal as the fulfillment of the purpose of creation.

In this regard, Swedenborg declared that marriage is a higher state than celibacy. He denied that the affections of priests, monks and nuns are necessarily chaste. On entering the spirit world, each is tried as to his or her purity of heart. Those full of inward lust are led away to hell. Those who truly and chastely loved the Lord will receive a marriage in heaven. Many who feel uncomfortable with the conjugal love which pervades heaven will depart and dwell in an outlying area.⁶⁹

13. *The Liberation of Hell*

Swedenborg’s greatest error as regards his spiritual teachings lies in his assertion that “those who are in the hells cannot be saved.”⁷⁰ It is the testimony of several of the spiritual books in this study that the angels and spirits of heaven have been laboring constantly to bring the spirits of hell to repentance. It is not an easy task, for most of them are ignorant. Lee writes, “spirit persons in the low levels don’t know how their present, terrifying world of punishment will change. For them there is no hope and nothing to wait for. Only continual pain and suffering.”⁷¹ Nevertheless, as Franchezzo declares to the poor merchant, “There is hope even here [in hell], for hope is eternal and God in his mercy shuts none out from it.”⁷²

Ultimately, the liberation of hell is part of the Good News that will precede the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth and in the spirit world. After all, how can the Kingdom of God be established on earth as long as the hells continue their baneful influence on the living? Lee relates that all his spiritual activities are alive with this gospel: “Now we lecture that the door of hell will be opened and hell will be liberated.”⁷³

This hope became a reality just on the eve of the publication of *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, when on June 13, 1998, Rev. Moon gave the

blessing to the Communist leaders, the war criminals and the Korean Christian leaders who opposed God's providence whom Lee interviewed for the book. Now through the Blessing, the spirits imprisoned in hell are being liberated and shown the way they can ascend to heaven. Though the burden of their sins is still heavy and their indemnity course may be long, they can all see the light of blessing and respond to the hope of resurrection. Ultimately, hell will disappear and all spirits will become heavenly beings, to the joy of God who loves the prodigal and wishes only for his salvation. Then the omnipotent God will be all in all.

14. *The Highest Heaven, the Realm of God's Love*

Throughout this study we have been remarking on the contents of *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*. Although it lacks the descriptive detail of *Life in the World Unseen* or the narrative power of *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, it has its own special quality that makes it unparalleled as a work of spiritual literature. Its quality derives from the fact that Sang-hun Lee goes to the spirit world representing the True Parents. He has a mission to assist the True Parents in the liberation of the spirit world and the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven. Stemming from this background and purpose, *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth* has several unique aspects.

For the first time in this book, one can glimpse life in the Kingdom of Heaven itself. Heaven is a world of love. Everything about it exudes love—God's love and human love. These are the two most notable features of Lee's experience, which signify that he is at a higher level than the other reporters we have encountered.

Lee describes his personal relationship with God, who calls him by name, in the intimate form used in addressing a close family member, "Sang Hun-ah."⁷⁴ He says,

I hear his voice clearly with my own ears. Then a brilliant, glittering, radiating and reflecting light appears in front of, behind and above my head. Amid the light, a streak of light, unidentified, captures my heart... my feeling is like the peacefulness when a baby in its mother's bosom meets the mother's eyes while listening to her heartbeat. Even this description cannot fully capture my experience. Then, as God's calling voice changes, the brightness of the beautiful light changes, and I go into an ecstatic state. My whole body seems to be melting. Then, suddenly, I am standing by myself: I cannot see God.⁷⁵

God's essence is love; his feeling is peace and rapture and joy; his appearance is as light.

Swedenborg described God as the Sun of the spirit world, whose light and heat radiate as love in gradations from the higher spheres to the lower spheres.⁷⁶ But he did not experience God speaking to him or directly shining upon him, lifting him up into a rapturous state. Neither did the Monsignor in *Life in the World Unseen* experience anything like it; he and his friends could at best have a visitation from God's representatives, coming down periodically from the higher spheres. When these visitors come down, they are accompanied by beams of light, beautiful music and wonderful sensations which fill the meeting hall for all to see and hear and touch.⁷⁷ Franchezzo occasionally hears mysterious voices, which always guide and instruct him. He never mistakes them for the voice of God, but knows them to be directions and guidance coming from the higher spirits who preside over his activities.

We can conclude, with Lee, that only in the highest heaven do people live with God on an intimate basis. This, Lee asserts, is the unique privilege of Unification Church members:

The thing that is hugely different is the position in relation to God. Limits exist which determine how well people belonging to another religion can hear, feel or talk to God. But Unification Church members by all means reside in a position where they may breathe together with God.⁷⁸

Is this just a triumphalist theology? No. It is consistent with spiritual laws, as Lee goes on to describe the shame and punishment endured by even Unification Church members who commit sin. It is consistent with the meaning and value of the Blessing for cutting off the satanic lineage and bringing human beings into God's family. Thus, by opening the gate of the Blessing to the whole world, the opportunity to live in the complete love of God has become available to all humankind.

The second dimension of love, human love, is dramatically experienced in heaven as nowhere else. When Lee arrived at his home in the spirit world, he and his wife had a new marriage.⁷⁹ In heaven, husbands and wives make love out in the open air, with the grass and flowers swaying in rhythm, the birds singing accompaniment, and all nature rejoicing. God answers their love with rays of brilliant light pouring down upon the couple and with strains of beautiful music; He embraces them and adds His love to theirs. On earth people hide their love-making in the bedroom and would feel shame and embarrassment should anyone else happen to look in, but love in heaven is regarded as beautiful to behold.⁸⁰

Swedenborg also taught that the pinnacle of heavenly love is marriage. Yet not even he could describe fully from direct experience what heavenly love is like. He knew in general that intercourse between husband and wife in the spirit world is similar to that on earth, though more interior and purer.⁸¹ But he did not know that it involved such a beautiful conjunction with the cre-

ation, nor that God Himself embraced the couple, nor that it is looked upon as a beautiful act which others can view without shame.

Yet Swedenborg did understand some things about conjugal love in heaven. He knew it had nothing to do with fornication or adultery, but must be chaste love for one spouse.⁸² He knew that it is guided and governed by spiritual love, conjoined with God's love. Hence he would assert what Lee experienced, that only those couples who had matured in their inner selves and who lived in accordance with God's will and desire can love each other in the true sense. There can be no deception or falsity. There must be genuine trust, compassion and forgiveness between husband and wife for their love to be comfortable and harmonious, able to receive the fullness of God's love.⁸³

15. *Sang-hun Lee, Heaven's Representative*

In Lee's journeying and interviews with other spirits we can see another unique aspect of *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*. While in the other accounts the narrators receive visitations from heaven's representatives who descend from the higher realms, Lee himself is heaven's representative, descending to other spirits from what may be the highest realm. He always comes in the position to teach Divine Principle; he always comes with the heart to help the others to advance towards heaven.

In *Life in the World Unseen* and especially in *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, the protagonists do sometimes act the part of ministering spirits to people in the dark realms below them. As Franchezzo describes it, the spirit world contains a vast hierarchical organization, with the higher spirits helping those on the next several rungs beneath them; and they in turn ministering to those beneath them, and so on down to the spirits who are close enough to the earth plane to be of direct service to its inhabitants and to those who dwell in the hells. Every repentant spirit takes his place in the work of helping others who committed similar sins, in order that he may atone for his own mistakes. Thus he has a place in the "great system of help for sinners ever being carried on in the name of the Eternal Father of all, who dooms none of his children to an eternity of misery."⁸⁴

Yet nowhere else but in Lee's book do we travel with a heavenly messenger whose visits are so comprehensive, from Jesus in the highest level of Paradise to Hitler and other war criminals deep in the darkest hell. In comparison, the other narrators can visit but a small part of the spirit world.

We noted that most of the people whom Lee interviewed, even those living in the good spirit world, felt some remorse for their failures in life. We cannot assume that they would reveal this to just anyone. For example, when the Christians come to attend Jesus, or the Buddhists venerate Shakyamuni, they only bask in their sage's glory, never thinking that within his heart might

be grief and worry. When Lee met Jesus and Buddha, their attitude was different. Lee came as the messenger from God and the representative of the True Parents. He could act as their confessor, their minister and their teacher.

What does Lee's exalted position teach us about the True Parents? Surely, if his narrative is true, then the True Parents are the most precious and most exalted beings in the cosmos. The True Parents' teaching is the highest teaching, above that of any religion. The True Parents alone can open the Kingdom of Heaven and make it possible for all people to experience God's original love. By attending the True Parents, their followers can share the glory of God and serve God together with them.

The True Parents show God's love to all people. From the greatest saints to the worst sinners, they show no partiality. Who else would have the overflowing love to want to save Hitler and Stalin? Attending True Parents is no different, no matter who one is. When Tojo began to repent, he asked Lee what he could do to be saved. Lee replied, "Let's work together to spread [True Parents'] words."⁸⁵ When Lee met Hwal-lan Kim, the former president of Ehwa Women's University who was responsible for expelling many Unificationist students, he told her the same thing: "Go to all Christian women and bear witness that Rev. Sun Myung Moon is the Lord... the True Parents and the Savior."⁸⁶ Jesus wrote the same thing in his letter: "I will... offer my prayers and hard work for the sake of the direction of the True Parents and the providence of restoration."⁸⁷ Is that not also the very thing we who call ourselves Unification Church members must do on earth?

The road of restoration centers on the True Parents, and it is the same for everyone. Heaven is open, and centering on the True Parents it is welcoming everyone. Its delights are worth every effort, so dwellers on earth should strive to make themselves fit for life in the spirit world. That is the kerygma of *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*. Readers who are members of the Unification Church will be confirmed in their faith and motivated both to improve their own spiritual standard and to work hard for the sake of God's will. Strangers to the church who pick up this book at a bookstore or in a library, particularly those who are already familiar with spiritual literature, should feel at once that they are on familiar ground, yet also be pleasantly surprised.

Notes

1. Sang-hun Lee, *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, recorded by Young-soon Kim (New York: Family Federation for World Peace & Unification, 1998). For consistency in citations of channeled works, we credit the spirit narrator as the author and list the earthly medium as the recorder.
2. On Blessings in the spirit world, see Taek-yong Oh, "Gate Opened for Blessing in

- Spirit World,” *Today’s World* 19/3 (March 1998): 16; Chung-hwan Kwak, “Pre-Blessing Prayer at the 120 Million Couples Blessing,” *Today’s World* 19/6 (June 1998): 2.
3. [Robert Hugh Benson], *Life in the World Unseen*, recorded by Anthony Borgia (London: Psychic Press, 1981).
 4. Franchezzo, *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, recorded by A. Farnese (West Grove, PA: Association for Internal Mastery, 1993).
 5. Betty J. Eadie, *Embraced by the Light* (New York: Bantam, 1994).
 6. Emanuel Swedenborg, *Heaven and Hell* (London: Swedenborg Society, 1958).
 7. *Exposition of the Divine Principle* (New York: Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity, 1996), p. 142.
 8. Eadie’s Mormon affiliation is an issue for hard-line Christian apologists who reject the theology of her near-death experience and even regard NDE’s as such as counterfeit religion. Cf. Richard Albanes, *Embraced by the Light and the Bible: Near-Death Experiences in Light of Scripture* (Horizon Books, 1995).
 9. *Life in the World Unseen*, p. 167.
 10. [Robert Hugh Benson], *More About Life in the World Unseen*, recorded by Anthony Borgia (London: Psychic Press, 1984), pp. 125-36.
 11. *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, pp. 20-21.
 12. *Life in the World Unseen*, p. 124.
 13. Cf. *More About Life in the World Unseen*, pp. 119-24.
 14. *Life in the World Unseen*, p. 84.
 15. *Heaven and Hell*, pp. 419-20.
 16. *Life in the World Unseen*, p. 148.
 17. *Embraced by the Light*, p. 93.
 18. *Life in the World Unseen*, p. 46.
 19. *Embraced by the Light*, p. 31.
 20. From transcripts of AOL and Prodigy discussion forums, June - July, 1996.
 21. Emanuel Swedenborg, *Conjugal Love* (London: Swedenborg Society, 1989), pp. 6-18.
 22. *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, pp. 101-07, 244-45.
 23. *Heaven and Hell*, pp. 389-405
 24. *Life in the World Unseen*, p. 19.
 25. Betty Eadie, transcript of Prodigy discussion forum, July 9, 1996.
 26. *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, pp. 209-10.
 27. *Ibid.*, p. 267.
 28. *Embraced by the Light*, p. 129.
 29. *Ibid.*, p. 145.
 30. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
 31. [Sang-hun Lee], *Essentials of Unification Thought: The Head-Wing Thought* (Tokyo: Unification Thought Institute, 1992), pp. 14-16.
 32. *Embraced by the Light*, pp. 109-11.
 33. *Ibid.*, p. 120.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 122.
35. *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, p. 79.
36. Loc. cit.
37. *Embraced by the Light*, p. 117.
38. *More About Life in the World Unseen*, p. 125.
39. *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, p. 142.
40. Their visit to a resentful businessman (*Life in the World Unseen*, pp. 76-78) evidently bore fruit some years later. Cf. *More About Life in the World Unseen*, pp. 108-15.
41. *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, p. 26.
42. *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, p. 25.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
44. *Ibid.*, pp. 117-20.
45. *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, pp. 170-75.
46. *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, pp. 37-38.
47. *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, p. 172.
48. *Ibid.*, pp. 139-42.
49. *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, pp. 121-24.
50. *Ibid.*, pp. 36-37.
51. *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, p. 357.
52. There is an apocryphal story that Young-oon Kim once had occasion to sit with Rev. Moon and relate Swedenborg's teachings, whereupon Rev. Moon remarked that his understanding of the spirit world was 80% correct.
53. *Heaven and Hell*, pp. 44-48, 50-51, 327-28, 336-37.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 313.
55. *Ibid.*, pp. 420-23.
56. *Ibid.*, pp. 220-29.
57. Sang-hun Lee, "Theory of the Spirit World in Unification Thought" (Korean), *Unification Thought Quarterly* 33 (Summer 1995): 28-36; excerpted in Joong-hyun Pak and Andrew Wilson, *True Family Values* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1996), p. 154.
58. *Heaven and Hell*, pp. 228-29.
59. *Ibid.*, pp. 411-415.
60. *Ibid.*, pp. 447-49.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 165.
62. *Conjugal Love*, pp. 91-92.
63. *Heaven and Hell*, p. 49.
64. *Ibid.*, pp. 328-29.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 281.
66. *Conjugal Love*, pp. 66-67.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 134.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 88.
69. *Ibid.*, pp. 138-40.

70. *Heaven and Hell*, p. 463.
71. *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, p. 57.
72. *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, p. 142.
73. *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, p. 3.
74. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
76. *Heaven and Hell*, pp. 77–82.
77. *Life in the World Unseen*, pp. 95-96.
78. *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, p. 24.
79. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
80. *Ibid.*, pp. 34, 67-68, 70.
81. *Heaven and Hell*, pp. 269, 273; *Conjugal Love*, p. 53.
82. *Heaven and Hell*, pp. 269–82.
83. *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, pp. 34-36, 54.
84. *A Wanderer in the Spirit Lands*, p. 86, cf. pp. 263-65.
85. *Life in the Spirit World and on Earth*, p. 131.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 135.
87. *Ibid.*, pp. 141-42.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Ideal in the World's Religions: Essays on the Person, Family, Society and Environment. Edited by Robert Carter and Sheldon Isenberg. St. Paul, MN: Paragon House. 1997.

These essays allow the reader to participate at arm's length in an Inter-Religious Federation for World Peace conference (August 20-27, 1995) on the theme "Realizing the Ideal." The essays, despite their common denominator, fall into five rather different categories. The result is almost five different mini-books, entailing a major or minor shifting of gears as one moves from one to the other.

The first section deals with broad and basic issues in ecumenical dialogue: how dare a member of one religion make criticisms about another without reverting to the imperialist condescension of the past? Should we assume that all religions have the most important things in common? If they don't, can they still mutually affirm one another? Can we take each other's religions seriously without sloughing off loyalty to our own? The questions are important and unavoidable, and several answers offered here strike me as truly ingenious, penetrating and promising.

Francis X. D'Sa sketches the basic problem of religious chauvinism as being a religion's inability to heed its own innate drive toward universalizing its truth by token of clinging to its own "scandal of particularity," the historical conditions in which its revelation was received. A religion understandably fears dissolving, losing its distinctive identity, if its message becomes so universal as to merge with the general ideals of humanity. But if it seeks universalization by means of universal conversion, we have a dangerous situation such as historically has begotten both imperialism and religious war. D'Sa makes a brilliant suggestion when he invokes the analogy (or is it a mere analogy?) of the hermeneutical task within each religion as it extrapolates from an ancient text, anchored in the original historical context, seeking to find guidance for new situations, for new generations, in a new age. The gap between the writer's and original readers' *Sitz-im-Leben* and that of modern interpreters and their communities of faith poses a challenge to all religions which they all accept already. They know, in the one case, they must make a

great leap into an unanticipated future in which the applicability of the original revelation has become problematical. They have no choice. What D'Sa suggests is that the religions might as well recognize as an identical challenge the present situation where several equally sophisticated and devout religions face each other. While the proper response to superstition or moral degeneracy on the mission field might once have been evangelism, it must today seem absurd for, e.g., Christians to demand that Buddhists, adherents of an equally venerable and noble religion, convert. Of course, the religions have hitherto felt justified in seeking conversions because they were ill-informed about the other faiths, accepting caricatures and disparagements: if a Hindu were really no more than a demon-cultist (see popular screeds like Bob Larson's *Hippies, Hindus and Rock and Roll*), then he could only benefit by changing over to Christianity. The tactic is essentially the same as that whereby a nation's wartime enemies are caricatured to the point of dehumanization: if Japanese troops are sub-human monkey-men, then an American need not scruple to shoot them. Interfaith dialogues such as the one that gave birth to the present collection of essays may be seen as peace conferences seeking to establish, first, a state of *detente*, then of lasting peaceful co-existence, and finally—who knows?

It is always a treat to read Ninian Smart's latest thoughts on the world's religions, and his essay here, "Measuring the Ideal: Christian Faith and the World's Worldviews," is no exception. Much more can and must be made of Smart's suggestion that future religionists will regard all the faiths not as competitors but as a smorgasbord of resources to be drawn upon to season and spice one's own faith.

The second section, dealing with the Ideal as it applies to the individual, is both informative and truly edifying. Several insights will challenge any reader's spirituality as well as providing hope that interreligious unity is far more than a pipe-dream. How wonderful that there are already holy tales upholding interfaith solidarity as a virtue. The famous Buddhist-Jainist-Sufi parable of the Blind Six and the Elephant is one. The martyrdom of Sikh Guru Teg Bahadur who gave his life to defend the religious freedom of Hindus, with whose practices he certainly disagreed, from the persecution of the Mughal Emperor Aurangzeb is another. Both are worthy of ceaseless commemoration in all faith communities. It is a new thing to build up an ecumenical sacred lore praising the virtues of ecumenicity!

Let me confess, though it cannot count as much of a criticism, since no symposium can cover every single base, that I regret the lack of any discussion of a few issues relating the religious ideal to the individual person of faith. For instance, it would have been interesting to read something on the Sufi ideal of the Perfect Heavenly Man (such as we find in Sayyed Hossein Nasr's essay "Who Is Man?" in Jacob Needleman [ed.], *The Sword of Gnosis*,

Penguin, 1974). Rudolf Bultmann denied that Paul's dialectic of the indicative ("If we live by the Spirit...") and the imperative ("... let us walk by the Spirit") constitutes an appeal to an ethical ideal but is instead a piece of apocalyptic existentialism (e.g., Bultmann, *The Old Man and the New*). This is an important claim by an important New Testament interpreter. I would love to have seen an essay grappling with Bultmann on the point. And Eli Chesen (*Religion May Be Hazardous to Your Health*) once raised a caveat not considered here: how does one avoid suppressing personal emotional growth while consciously attempting to shape oneself into conformity with a heteronomous religious character ideal? Erich Neumann, in his *Depth Psychology and a New Ethic*, raised a very significant question from a Jungian perspective: does the old ethic of perfection actually inculcate the very evil it seeks to suppress? Should we not rather seek to balance the Shadow and the Persona? I regard Neumann's book as a meta-ethical milestone, but it goes unnoticed in the present anthology.

The third section, that on the Ideal Family, strikes me as diffuse and weak in its impact. Anthony J. Guerra's "The Puritans and the Family" is informative, clearing the reputation of the Puritans from charges that they constituted a kind of Orwellian Anti-Sex League. An essay on the history of Roman Catholic teaching on the family is moderately interesting, though not too surprising. (One wonders for whom Joseph Martos thought he was writing: "The doctrinal letters of the New Testament, sometimes referred to as epistles..." "Great Christian leaders and thinkers of the second through the fifth centuries are sometimes referred to as the Fathers of the Church..." Has Martos adapted his essay from old Pre-Cana class notes?)

Jean Higgins's "The Healing Role of Religion in T. S. Eliot's *The Cocktail Party*" strikes me as a refugee from the days before Northrop Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism*, when literary studies were simply fodder for moralizing, or for author biography. One can overhear the editors choosing the contents for this book: "Well, it *sort of* fits the theme."

Sections four and five, on the social and environmental ideals, largely smack of a kind of apologetics, as various writers delve deep into Christian and Buddhist traditions to demonstrate, against popular opinion, that these religions *do too* have something good to say about social and ecological ethics. One often gets the feeling in such essays that their authors are trying to resolve their own crises of faith. They are committed to a particular religious identity as well as to a particular socio-political agenda. They first fear that the two may be incompatible (as Mary Daly, once a Roman Catholic, finally decided, when she gave up working for equality for women in the Church as being as pointless as seeking equality for blacks in the Ku Klux Klan!). But a search of the traditions and documents, usually neglected corners of these, furnishes sufficient proof-texts to ease the conscience. It is clear

that these Christians and Buddhists are committed to social and ecological activism. That's what they think is right. Presumably that's what they are going to do. So what is the urgency of digging up a religious license to engage in these things? Do they really need to wait for permission? Are they trying to cover themselves? Are bishops looking askance at them for their social involvements? (As to this last possibility, it has been suggested that John Dominic Crossan's sudden shift from postmodern literary criticism to historical Jesus studies was an apologetical attempt to provide a Jesus-proof-text for social radicalism once the Vatican had distanced itself from Liberation Theology.) Or would they really be prepared to drop their social activism if they could not find scriptural citations? What sort of game is being played here? Nonetheless, it is interesting to see what such investigations turn up, especially the Buddhist creation narrative and theory of government which Francisca Cho dredges up from the *Agganna Sutta*.

Michael L. Mickler's "The Ideal Society and Its Realization in the Unification Tradition" is another of Mickler's unflinchingly honest reports to outsiders on the Unification Church and its bumpy evolutionary path. Many religious scholars who have trouble sporting the hats of both historian and believer (see Van Harvey's great 1969 book of that title) could learn a valuable lesson from Mickler, who knows that the best apologetics for one's religious movement is complete and total openness, warts and all.

Victor Ehly's "From Cane Ridge to Human Community" might fit better in the book's first section, the one about the presuppositions of interfaith dialogue, since his intriguing autobiographical reflections suggest what many of us have come to suspect: a la Joseph Campbell, one is perhaps best able to approach and appreciate the riches of the world religions after the disappointment of personal faith. Renan once observed that, in order to write the history of a religion, one must have formerly belonged to the religion and equally one must belong to it no more. Lacking the former, one can never know what makes the religion tick. Without the latter, one has no hope of objectivity. Ehly's disillusionment with Evangelical Revivalism and with Southern Episcopalianism pushed him from any internalized religious identity to an omnivorous interest in all religions—as an outsider. Such is the experience of many of us. But then it is all the more remarkable that most of the contributors to this volume are walking that tightrope between academic agnosticism on one side and faith partisanship on the other. That is a difficult path, and probably the only path forward in interreligious evolution.

—Robert M. Price, Drew University

Principled Education. By Mose Durst. San Francisco: Principled Academy, 1998.

“There is no more honorable activity in a democratic culture than educating children toward the ideals of building a virtuous life and a virtuous society.” This statement aptly summarizes the focus of *Principled Education* written by Mose Durst. *Principled Education*, while not offering any new concepts in the field of character education, provides a heartfelt reminder of the desired purpose of education: intellectual growth and maturity that occurs on the foundation of a moral, loving individual who reflects the image of God.

This latest publication from Mose Durst reflects his research in support of the work of the Principled Academy, a private religious school in the Bay area of Northern California. The Academy, which covers grades K through 9, is based on the concepts outlined in the book. These concepts include “drawing out the full value of a human being who is a child of God, created in the image of God, and who has a divine potential.”

The book begins by making a case for the type of character-forming education which was prevalent in American schools and which emphasized the common values of truth, virtue and the common good. Durst then moves on to defining the historical development and key changes which have taken place during the past two centuries in public education. Ultimately, Durst points to the separation of God and our Judeo-Christian values from public education as the true beginning of our social and ethical problems today.

To emphasize his point, Durst devotes a great deal of time and space to the benefits of religious schools, demonstrating that because they unashamedly base their curriculum on moral and religious values as practiced and taught in Judaism, Christianity and most of the worlds’ religions, they succeed where public schools fail in producing well-educated students who are virtuous, loving and ethical. This then becomes the springboard to the next several chapters in which Durst focuses on the Principled Academy directly as a clear example of what he calls principled education in action. By using anecdotal experiences and conversations with the Academy’s staff, the reader can appreciate the challenges of creating a new school with a relatively innovative curriculum.

Of particular interest is the discussion of special programs and events utilized by the Academy to support their character education efforts. These special programs include daily morning assemblies, special holiday events and themes, and service projects. This was probably the most instructive aspect of the book. An aspect of character education that is sometimes ignored in the literature is the need to manifest one’s learning in order to heighten integration and learning. Service learning achieves this integration well. If I were to

find fault with the book's insights or the Principled Academy's work, it would be in confining their educational outreach to volunteerism rather than a strong service learning program.

Where this book differs from the usual character education publications is the inclusion of a chapter on "Principled Education at Home." Two families share their experiences with providing strong moral education in the home and the challenges they face daily in their endeavor. While the families draw on Durst's view of principled education as the foundation of their teaching, the families also offer the reader other resources and support activities that they have found to be particularly beneficial—which was most instructive.

The book concludes with a description of how the author uses literature as one means to teach character to his students. Durst then submits a brief annotated bibliography of character education literature that he has found to be most valuable in his work.

In essence, the book is a simplified and brief explanation of the beginning point of Unification Thought's view of education. Though not indulging in the complexities and philosophy of Unification Thought, *Principled Education* does present the basic message of Unification Thought's concept of education of heart and norm. While introductory in its content, it at least supports Unification Thought's contention that education of heart and norm must be the basis of intellectual development and mastery education. In addition, the book also offers a laymen's version of the "principle of creation," one of the primary chapters in Unificationism. Does the book present new insights into Unification Thought? No. Does it clarify some of the complexities of the view of education within Unification Thought? Again, no. Does the book offer new insights into character education? Not really. But then, I don't believe that that is the purpose of the book. For me, the book is more a gentle call to action or, at least an encouragement for our schools to return to a more traditional philosophy of education which embraces our commonly held religious virtues and values.

As an educator, I found the book to be a nice collection of inspirational essays written by a man who profoundly loves God, who loves his students, and who is deeply concerned about the unhealthy direction toward which our society is moving. If you are looking for a more substantial study of the dynamics of character education, I would suggest that you select one of the books from the bibliography provided at the end of the book such as Lickona's or Ryan's books. However, if you are interested in reading how one educator has applied Unificationist philosophy to the field of education and how one school is succeeding in utilizing this philosophy, then *Principled Education* is one place to start.

—Kathy Winings, Unification Theological Seminary

Boundless As the Sea: A Guide to Family Love.

By June Saunders. New York: Family Federation for World Peace and Unification, 1997.

Why should we read another book on family love? In my opinion, June Saunders would answer that the message of her book is not only innovative for its discussion of the whole spectrum of family love, but also because it contributes to the larger agenda of providing the resources for transforming the present divorce culture into a marriage culture. She is not alone in pursuing this noble endeavor. In fact, she cites a host of like-minded authors, drawing on their experience and imagination for illustrating her presentation, authors like Scott Peck, Erich Fromm, Barbara Dafoe Whitehead, Judith Wallerstein, Garry Smalley and Stephen Covey, to name just a few. However, it is unmistakable that *Boundless As the Sea* draws its unique insights into issues of family love from the monograph *True Family Values* (Pak and Wilson, 1996) in an effort to address a larger audience that is not particularly knowledgeable of Unification teachings.

Based on my reading, I would argue that the primary purpose of *Boundless As the Sea* is to present a vision of family love to a wider American public that is prepared to appreciate such a vision, based upon a general notion of God and a culturally defined Christianity that seems to be threatened by today's increasingly secular social climate. As can be expected, such an appeal to a general audience may, on the one hand, provide guidance and inspiration for reflecting on one's family relationships, but on the other hand, it may be inadequate for addressing the deeper issues required to solve the decline of contemporary family life. In order to explain why I would hold such an opinion about Saunders' book, I will focus on three aspects of her writing, identifying them as the social vision, the cultural setting and the theological content.

The Social Vision

Here Saunders is at her best. She skillfully paints the great canvas of human relationships by discussing the ideal of true love and how it applies to the individual, the family and the larger society. Based on the new paradigm of true love, we are able to discern the misapprehensions of love that pervade contemporary society. Such a discernment becomes possible based on the belief that as created beings we all have the ideal of true love engraved in our hearts. Therefore, overcoming any form of abusive love involves the process of tapping into one's God-given reservoir of true love.

As Saunders rightly emphasizes, the process of attaining true love is best described as a journey of discovery. The love we are looking for already resides within us as a potential of our original being. It is up to us to unearth this hidden potentiality and to apply the ways of true love in our daily interactions with other people. Thus, Saunders' admonition not to succumb to the pitfall of defining love through the person in front of us is well taken. Such a person-centered love would make us believe that all we need to do in order to enter into a fulfilling, loving relationship is to find the right partner. This mistaken notion propels people into a repetitive cycle of falling in and out of love. As Saunders point out, the real issue is to admit that we simply do not know how to love. We need to develop that still-hidden original faculty of being truly loving.

Once the new paradigm of true love is established, Saunders guides us on that long journey of discovery by examining its implications for marriage, family life and life as citizens. In my view, she is successful in translating for an American audience the basic tenets of *True Family Values*, specifically its vision of harmonious family relationships. Here, *Boundless As the Sea* fulfills the pastoral need of providing inspiration and guidance for what many marriage counselors consider to be the first necessary step for healing and improving marital life. Namely, a couple should develop and put down in writing their own vision for their unique marriage and family (see, for example, Harville Hendrix's book *Getting The Love You Want*).

When the goals for our human relationships are in place, we can focus on the business of applying them in our daily lives. Saunders succeeds in providing for couples a fertile soil of inspiration with which they can create their personalized vision of relationship. However, connecting that vision to our present situation involves the task of accounting for the cultural forces that surround us.

The Cultural Setting

In its discussion of family love, *Boundless As the Sea* includes a consistent effort to illustrate its message with a wide spectrum of references to our cultural heritage. In fact, over fifty authors are cited who endorse in their own unique ways the basic tenets of true family values. Rather than analyzing the contributions of any particular philosopher, social scientist, educator, psychologist or human rights activist, I will offer some general reflections on the implications of such a pronounced cultural contextualization.

Saunders employs her supporting evidence from culture in two ways. First, we find support from past and contemporary thinkers for her definition of the ideal and vision of family love. The impression is conveyed that core concepts like true love and the four realms of love in the family have been with

us all along within our Judeo-Christian heritage. Admittedly, it is a difficult task to find a healthy balance between apologetic arguments and the proclamation of a new expression of truth. That is to say, Saunders succeeds in telling the reader that the presented vision of family love is something that is already imbedded in the existing culture, and thus she can count on receiving the attention of her audience at this initial level of the discussion. However, once the reader is repeatedly told that the book at hand confirms what is common knowledge, his attention may wane. In my view, it would have been a more balanced, and thus more effective, approach to highlight Unificationism's unique religious and social insights into the concept of true love, while at the same time pointing out why past attempts at practicing true love were limited precisely on account of a lack of this new understanding.

Second, towards the end of her book, Saunders discusses true love in action on the level of community and society by means of numerous testimonies about unsung heroes as well as well-known 20th-century saints like Martin Luther King, Mohandas Gandhi and Mother Teresa. Indeed, to invoke stories about exemplary men and women has its own merit, providing much needed inspiration for people from all walks of life. However, it seems to me that the argument from culture assumes here a leading role, and the reader is still left with the question how these exceptional people could accomplish such outstanding results in the name of true love. Inspiration may lead us to new resolutions, but a real change in our ability to love comes, in my opinion, from a more profound understanding of truth.

Saunders' definition of true love, namely, "to act from the heart for the benefit of another," can be seen as embracing two dimensions, one transcendent, the other immanent. In other words, "acting from the heart" implies a reality that describes our God-given original nature, thus pointing to the transcendent quality of true love. On the other hand, "for the benefit of another" denotes the direction and result of our action in the temporal world and in this sense carries the quality of immanence. I would argue that Saunders succeeds in demonstrating the immanent dimension of true love through her numerous cultural references. However, she does not sufficiently explain the transcendent aspect of true love. As a result, she leaves the reader to his own devices in his desire to overcome his inability to practice true love.

The Theological Content

In what sense does the transcendent dimension of true love need further explanation? This issue concerns the theological content of *Boundless As the Sea*. My first impression of the book was its distinctly Christian appeal, as evidenced by its numerous references to the Bible and the presentation of family love as God's original plan for human beings. In particular, the explanation

of conjugal love includes the Unification understanding of the ideal of marital love, thus allowing the reader to gain a new perspective on traditional doctrines of the love of God. In all these areas of the theological discussion of family love, Saunders delivers excellent work, to the point where Christians and even non-believers would appreciate her effort.

However, I was struck by a missing theological dimension in her writing. Somehow she does not finish building the bridge for Christians to understand the Unification position on family love. After everything is said, *Boundless As the Sea* remains distinctly Christian. In my opinion, the reason for such a verdict lies in its adhering to the traditional concept of God. That is to say, if God is only seen as the transcendent Creator who possesses all perfections, and if God's love is seen as an outpouring of the infinite abundance contained in His own being, then there is little room for a genuine responsiveness on the part of God towards the love of human beings. To use the terminology of process theology, Saunders refers to God in terms of monopolar theism. Yet I would maintain that the ideal of true love can be fully realized only through understanding God in terms of dipolar theism, God who is perfectly responsive to created beings.

If true love means "to act from the heart for the benefit of another," we need to examine our hearts first. In other words, we need to make sure that our motivation for loving actions is congruent with the original ideal that God imprinted on our hearts. Once we understand that the original ideal is a genuine partnership of love between God and human beings, we will have discovered the first step in a long process of changing our hearts from selfishness to unselfishness. It is through such a process of transforming our hearts that we are able to benefit others, thus becoming modern day heroes and saints. At that point, we will understand that true love is not something we possess, but it is the power generated by God and humankind mutually submitting to one another. Adding this additional perspective, I can appreciate *Boundless As the Sea* as a significant contribution to our common journey towards that glorious destination, the ideal of true love.

—Dietrich Seidel, Unification Theological Seminary
