

What is Original Sin?

(Did you ever stop and wonder?)

Version 8.5; December 15, 2022



Version 1.0 November 30, 2000, Version 2.0 March 20, 2001, Version 3.0 April 7, 2001; Version 4.0 November 22, 2001; Version 5.0 October 3, 2003, Version 5.5 November 2, 2012, Version 6.0 May 24, 2022, Version 7.0 September 3, 2022, Version 7.1 September 5, 2022, Version 8.0, September 17, 2022, Version 8.1, September 18, 2022; Version 8.2, November 23, 2022

Copyright 2022 ©, Robert W. Gordon, Esq.
Version 8.5, December 15, 2022

Table of Contents

SUMMARY	4
FORWARD	9
INTRODUCTION.....	23
ORIGINAL SIN AND THE DIVINE PRINCIPLE TEXTBOOKS	25
WHAT EXACTLY IS ORIGINAL SIN ANYWAY?	30
WHERE DID ORIGINAL SIN COME FROM?	34
<i>One Body Through Love?</i>	36
<i>What Exactly are “Blood Ties”???</i>	46
CHRISTIANITY ISN’T REALLY “CHRISTIAN”	56
ORIGINAL SIN IN CHRISTIAN COSMOLOGY	58
<i>Scriptural Foundation</i>	58
<i>St. Augustine</i>	59
<i>Subsequent Theology</i>	62
THE PROBLEM OF EVIL.....	68
THE PROBLEM OF EVIL AND CHRISTIANITY	70
<i>A Brief Note on “Christian Nationalism”</i>	77
THE PROBLEM OF EVIL AND THE UNIFICATION CHURCH	81
THE PROBLEM OF EVIL AND COMMUNISM	87
THE PROBLEM OF EVIL AND DEMOCRACY	90
WHAT THEN TO DO ABOUT “EVIL”?	94
WHAT THEN IS ORIGINAL SIN?	98
MAN CAUSED THE ANGEL TO FALL	100
MAN TRANSMITTED THE FALLEN NATURE TO THE SERPENT	104
MAN SHOULD STOP BLAMING THE ANGEL AND TAKE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY	107
HOW TO SEPARATE FROM SATAN	107
EFFICACY OF THE HOLY WINE AND HOLY WINE CEREMONY	109
EFFICACY OF THE INDEMNITY STICK CEREMONY	118
EFFICACY OF THE 3-DAY CEREMONY	121

A BRIEF NOTE ON “ATTENDANCE”	137
CONCLUSIONS	141

SUMMARY

Original Sin in Unification cosmology is the idea that the first human ancestors inherited some “evil element” due to Eve’s alleged sexual contact with an angel and then Eve’s subsequent sexual contact with Adam transmitted this “evil element” to Adam. This “evil element” allegedly transformed Eve and Adam’s minds and “compelled” them to commit further sins due to the fallen nature they allegedly inherited from the angel. This “evil” element was likewise transmitted genetically to all of Adam and Eve’s descendants allegedly enslaving them to the angel and compelling all of their descendants to do the angel’s bidding.

Unification cosmology claims that no one can remove the Original Sin element except “the messiah”. However, this essay attempts to show that the idea of Original Sin is a complete fabrication created by Christian theologians. The authors of the Divine Principle textbooks then, instead of deconstructing this false idea chose rather to embrace and embellish this idea for their own purposes, despite having shown their ability to dismantle many other Christian myths such as the Trinity, Resurrection, Predestination, etc. Likewise, this essay attempts to show that there is no scientific, scriptural, or empirical evidence for the actual existence of Original Sin as described in Unificationist textbooks. We actually find that even the Divine Principle textbooks tacitly admit that Original Sin is not an inheritable element or condition and simply does not exist. If anything, it appears that what is called “fallen nature” was entirely the creation of human beings, particularly Eve, and is most likely something Eve was naturally born with. Based on the evidence, we find that Eve was not forced, cajoled, deceived, or influenced to do anything by the serpent.¹ Based on the evidence, anything that Eve did was 100% of her own volition and desire. However, instead of taking full responsibility for her actions, Eve instead lied and tried to blame the serpent. However, the evidence shows the serpent never did anything wrong and in fact everything the serpent had told Eve was the truth. The serpent was the only honorable creature in the story of the alleged fall of man. Eve, Adam, and even God showed themselves to be dishonest and misleading creatures. Accordingly, if human beings are the sole origin of their alleged downfall, then they are also the only persons responsible to rectify their situation. No messiah figure is necessary. Man is the true “satan” and also his own “messiah”.

This essay will attempt to demonstrate that if there was a human “fall”, its root lay solely in the human mind and not in the genitals. The evidence shows that Eve 1) chose of her own free will to “eat the fruit” and when she was “caught” 2) tried to escape personal responsibility and then 3) wrongfully blamed the serpent. There is no evidence that the serpent lied to Eve. There is no evidence that the serpent forced or even

¹ In Unification cosmology, the serpent of the book of Genesis is the archangel Lucifer.

persuaded Eve to take any actions whatsoever. There is no evidence that the serpent gave or created any “fallen” nature in Eve. The source of any so-called “fallen” nature lay completely with Eve herself. If anything, it was Eve who caused the *serpent* to fall in that the serpent was removed from his position due to Eve’s false accusations. The fall is a 100% human creation. Accordingly, any “restoration” or “salvation” is entirely in the hands of human beings. There is no devil to blame and no god to rescue. Both the idea of god and the devil are human creations established to hide the real culprit, specifically human beings as the source of “sin”. The devil/serpent is set up as a scape goat to blame so that human beings take no responsibility. God is set up as the “redeemer” but only so humans can pretend that they are not responsible for their own condition. These attitudes to 1) focus on one’s own egotistical desire, 2) not take responsibility for one’s own wrongful actions, and 3) to blame others for what is really one’s own fault are ubiquitous in both ancient and modern history and can be readily proved and observed in our daily, everyday lives. The idea of a genetically transmissible “Original Sin” however cannot be found in any human experience or in scientific testing. Thus the “Original Sin” (if anything) is a human creation, a mental orientation manifested in the tendencies to: 1) focus on one’s own desire without regard for the ramifications on others, 2) not take responsibility for one’s own actions, and 3) to blame others for what is really one’s own fault.

Accordingly, the **QUICKEST** short-cut way to perfect yourself and to “separate from Satan” is to repeat, accept, believe, and practice the mantra: “**1) My life is relatively insignificant (this combats egoism); 2) I am 100% responsible for this situation; 3) No one is to be blamed, except me.**” This method can further be expanded to a list of 18 or so mental habits for human perfection found in the “Character Contract” found here: <https://adobe.ly/38COJTT>. As for Original Sin (as an alleged “substance”) if this essay is correct, then it follows that Original Sin (as an attitude) is something 100% under human being’s control. There is no need for a messiah figure to “remedy” it, and there is no need for the assistance of gods, angels, or jinns² to help humans get “rid” of Original Sin since it is entirely a creation of human beings, something that the human being creates and recreates every day in their everyday lives. Man by failing to take responsibility, forced all of creation out of order. Man needs rely on no one and nothing else other than himself or herself for his/her own salvation. The current religious factions on earth are all antithetical (opposed to) to human salvation because *they all teach dependance or enslavement to some supernatural being*. And to the extent one is dependent upon another creature or thing, the less likely one will take personal responsibility and personal responsibility is the key to human perfection. As for global and personal religions, the beings at the head of these religions are most likely jinns

² “Jinn” is the Islamic name for “angel”. Jinns are shape-shifting spiritual creatures with allegedly homosexual or pan-sexual tendencies.

(interdimensional beings or intergalactic astronauts) who manipulate the human tendency to “not take responsibility” in order to enslave human beings into serving the jinns. This is the same method and motive of human cult leaders. No true god (superior and self-existing being) would have any need for humans other than as possibly a food source or as worker-slaves or possibly as a sycophantic fan club for ego-boosting purposes, the latter which incidentally is exactly how cult leaders and dictators treat their followers. Hence these organized religions are merely cults created by lower-level angels, jinns, and sometimes by humans who then act as parasites, and live off of and feed off of the human psychic and economic energy of their followers. It may be for that reason why even according to the Divine Principle textbooks, a truly perfected person has **no religion**, and has **no need for religion**:

“[I]f man had not fallen in the Garden of Eden, there would be no churches or Bibles, no sermons, no all-night prayer vigils, no revival meetings, nor the like. All each person would need to do is live as the embodiment of goodness, attending God in his everyday life.

(Outline of the Principle, Level IV, p. 56) (emphasis added)

The idea of “Original Sin” as some genetic substance residing in human flesh or as the mental tendency to engage in “illicit sex” as presented in the Divine Principle textbooks is a fictitious concept with no evidence in objective fact. The Bible does not have the idea of original sin. The Divine Principle texts should have addressed and demystified original sin just as it addressed and demystified other equally fictitious concepts of Christianity such as the “Trinity”, “Predestination”, “Christology”, “Resurrection”, “The Rapture”, etc. because these concepts are false ideas injected into Christianity primarily by “Saint” Paul in order to weaken and co-op Christianity and allow it to be used as an instrument of Roman imperial power. The Christian idea of original sin is “useful” to Christians because it allows Christians to 1) escape personal responsibility for their actions and 2) compels people to be dependent on a church or organization or leaders who promise the ability to “rescue” a person from their “sin” as opposed to the individual taking responsibility to rescue themselves. Hence the reason why the idea of original sin persists in Christianity is because it allows people *to escape personal responsibility* which as mentioned above, is one of the true “original sins”.

Likewise, there is no scientific evidence that sexual intercourse can transfer blood fluid to another person or that such sexual contact can change the genetic code of the corresponding individual or change the mental or psychological disposition of the corresponding individual. Even if actual blood fluid was exchanged by sexual contact,

there is no evidence that by simply injecting blood into another person that the recipient's own blood is transformed or that the recipient's mental and or psychological disposition is altered or changed or that the recipient's genetic code is changed. Even if blood fluid had such power to transform a person's mental or psychological or genetic state, there is no need for sexual intercourse to accomplish such task since a mere blood transfusion should accomplish the exact same result, perhaps even more efficiently. Accordingly, if Original Sin were a real physical substance, the proper method of restoration should be 1) ***an actual blood transfusion*** or 2) ***having sex with a "restored being" or messiah figure***. However, it is noted that these are two practices that the Unification church either does not practice or has denied ever were a practice of the Unification Church. To the contrary, the Divine Principle textbooks state that people can become "one body" with the messiah simply by believing in a messianic figure and following such messianic figure's guidance through their daily actions. For example:

"To believe in Jesus means to become one body with him...If they had become one body with him [Jesus] in both spirit and body by *believing* in him, fallen men could have been saved both spiritually and physically."

(Divine Principle, 1973 version, p. 147) (emphasis added)

Accordingly, the idea of Original Sin as found in the Divine Principle textbooks is a concept that should be discredited and abandoned.

Human beings never inherited a "fallen nature" from an angel. This essay will attempt to prove that what Unificationists refer to as "fallen nature" is merely the *original* immature character that every human being is *born with and will be born with in the future even if they are considered "sinless"* and which each human being has the responsibility to grow out of ***by their own efforts***. If there were any true "original" or foundational sin, it was Adam's failure to take personal responsibility to perfect himself by his own efforts and thus develop the maturity to dominate the angel such that the angel or jinn would not feel jealous of Adam's position. Likewise, a perfected Adam would be able to resist and counteract the influence of Eve who solicited Adam into "sin". The entire fault of the Fall, if any, rests entirely with Adam's failure to perfect himself by his own efforts and Eve's failure to take responsibility for her actions.

Therefore, examine the evidence presented in this essay for yourself. The results and the direction you choose to go with your life after that are entirely up to you!

Other essays referenced in this essay are found here:

"Was the Fall Really About Sex?" found here:

<https://adobe.ly/3z2Tlru>

"How to Accomplish the 1st Commandment: 'Be Fruitful'" found here: <https://adobe.ly/3wRMsNG>

Character Contract for Individual Human Perfection
found here: <https://adobe.ly/38COJTT>

"P'ikareun (Does it really work?)", found here:
<https://adobe.ly/3NJLhWl>

FORWARD

In a previous essay, I talked about how to accomplish the 1st Commandment to “Be Fruitful”. I attempted to elucidate the principles of human perfection and demonstrated that the key to perfection is to take personal responsibility for one’s own thoughts and actions and not to rely on anyone else, not God, the gods, spirits, demons, jinns, genies, angels, Jesus, Mohammed, Buddha, the Dali Lama, the government, nor your next-door neighbor Herman.³ However, some people may be wondering about the doctrine of “Original Sin”. The Divine Principle textbooks taught that Original Sin was something in our bodies that had to be removed *before* we could reach perfection and thus the removal of Original Sin is a prerequisite to perfection and one supposedly can’t reach perfection until their Original Sin is removed. As the Divine Principle textbooks have said:

...we must have the original sin removed before we
can sever Satan's bonds and be restored to the state
before the Fall.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 175; Restoration 1.1)

³ **Note:** This essay is just a philosophical analysis of the various Divine Principle textbooks. I did not “travel to the spirit world”, no spirit or angel or jinn came to me claiming to give me a revelation from “God”, I did not get answers from “God” in prayer, I can not tell you even if such a creature called “God” actually exists. What I can tell you is I have (had?) been a “member” of the Unification Church for some 30 years, received the “Blessing”, gone through the three-day ceremony, etc. and I have come to the conclusion that simply being a “member” of the Unification Church and participating in such rituals does not automatically transform anyone into an “ideal” person. My understanding was that the Unification Church was never supposed to be a “church” (a group of closed-minded individuals worshipping and following their own private version of reality). It was supposed to be a *movement* (ideas that inspire decentralized individual and or collective action). I have no confidence that the Divine Principle texts or the Unification Church as an organization can ever bring about the type of society I want to live in or even the type of society claimed by the Divine Principle textbooks because their fundamental analysis of the “root of sin” appears to be unsubstantiated by reality and or by science. This essay is simply an attempt to make sense of what I have been exposed to and to lay the framework for forging my own path. You may act however you see fit as a result of what you read. In the end, everyone is solely responsible for themselves.

If human perfection can be accomplished by our own efforts as is claimed in this essay, what then is this Original Sin? Why do the Divine Principle textbooks say we (humans) must have this Original Sin “removed” by the Messiah? How exactly is it “removed”? And if we “need” a messiah to remove our original sin, how can that be if this essay claims humans can restore (perfect) themselves by their own efforts? Therefore, if Original Sin exists, then is it possible for human beings to perfect themselves by their own efforts? Good questions. Short answer is Original Sin does not exist as a physical substance in our bodies and the Divine Principle textbooks actually *prove* it does not exist as such...if you take the time to read the textbooks carefully. If there is any such a thing as an “Original Sin” (as in “fundamental act” or “foundational error”) it would be Adam’s failure to take responsibility to perfect himself and to “love” (subjugate) the angel as the angel’s lord or master.

In the Divine Principle textbooks, the author(s) trace the origin of Original Sin to a sexual relationship the first woman (Eve) allegedly had with an angel. The author(s) claim that the spiritual sex act transmitted the Original Sin element(s) to Eve and corrupted her spirit mind. However, the author(s) of the Divine Principle textbook is/are not clear on how Original Sin was created in the first place, though it is clear that he/she/it/them⁴ believe(s) ***direct genital contact transmits the original sin element*** just

⁴ This phrasing “he/she/it/them” is used because we don’t really know who actually authored the Divine Principle textbooks or if there were multiple authors who had their own motives and purposes. There are some names identified as editors of the Divine Principle textbooks such as Sang Ik Choi, Dr. Young Oon Kim, Mrs. Won Pok Choi, Rev. Young Whi Kim, Rev. C.H. Kwak (Outline of the Principle, Level 4) Ron O’Keefe, Felice Walton, Dan Fefferman, Louise Berry, etc. See: <https://appliedunificationism.com/2018/05/14/confessions-of-a-divine-principle-editor/> (last visited December 1, 2022). Technically, it does not matter who or what authored the texts since we are only concerned with the actual ideas. However, attributing the text’s author to a single person distracts the reader from the actual content of the text since a reader might unconditionally accept or reject the ideas simply due to a bias concerning who they think wrote the text. Also, if we know who actually authored the texts, we could understand their possible motivations and this could aid in interpreting what was written

like a venereal disease. A superficial textual analysis of the Divine Principle textbooks shows that the author(s) promoted the idea that Original Sin was: 1) Sexual lust, 2) sexual desire in general, 3) the desire for “illicit” sexual contact, and or 4) the desire for sexual contact with “unauthorized” persons. Though it is not clear how the author(s) distinguished such “illicit” sexual desire from “ordinary” and “normal” sexual desire. The Divine Principle textbooks do say that the “motive, direction and purpose” of a desire somehow affects the quality of the action where it says:

“Good and evil are not innately decided by the particular action or type of action and result themselves, but are decided by whether the motive, direction, and purpose are toward the Will of God or toward the will of Satan.”

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, pp. 50-51)

So perhaps a sexual act is “illicit” depending on whether the motive purpose or direction is towards God’s “purpose”. But that begs the question on how can anyone know for sure if their “motive”, “direction”, or “purpose” is towards “God’s will” or not? Technically, only “God” could determine what a person’s motive was. Though generally, a human

and why it was written. Anyone who has attended Rev. Moon’s speeches in person will quickly realize that the content and manner in which Rev. Moon spoke in public (at least to English-speaking audiences), do not match the logic or intellectual sophistication of some of the ideas expressed in the Divine Principle textbooks. This is very odd. You would expect that even occasionally Rev. Moon would go into great scientific or intellectual detail concerning points in the Principle text books or explain how he discovered particular ideas, but that rarely seems to be the case. Perhaps it happened in Korean audiences, but I can’t identify any English translated speeches of such nature. Even if there was great intellectual detail in Korean speeches, you would expect some of that to eventually “trickle down” in subsequent English translations, but that does not seem to be the case either. Perhaps the intellectual foundation to understand such concepts did not exist on the part of the English audience? Regardless, the lack of congruity between the style of the Divine Principle texts and Rev. Moon’s speeches leads to a suspicion and possibility that Rev. Moon may not be the actual, original, or only author of the ideas contained in the Principle textbooks and that there are other, clandestine contributors who had their own ulterior motivations for the ideas contained in those textbooks. We just don’t know. For now, it doesn’t really matter since all we are examining are the ideas themselves.

being is capable of knowing their motivation, in reality a human being is likely to be self-deceptive in describing or characterizing their motivations since a primary human motivation is egoistic self-centeredness and as a result will disguise self-centered actions as being “universal” or “altruistic” so as to deceive others and also to deceive themselves. In addition, the motive, direction, purpose rubric seems more like ethical relativism...meaning the ends justify the means and thus anything can be permissible as long as you convince yourself that it is “god’s will”. Such thinking can lead to problems and even lead to atrocities like genocide. Clearly, the Hebrews in the Bible committed mass slaughter, rape, and theft of land against the Canaanites because they believed that what they were doing was “God’s will”.⁵ Accordingly, anything can be justified using such theory of “motive”, “direction”, and “purpose”.

It is also not clear how the Divine Principle authors “discovered” that Eve had sex with an angel especially where there are no Biblical references stating such. As will be explained below, the Bible has numerous explicit sexual references and thus there is no need to hide the idea that Eve had sex with an angel if that is in fact what happened. The

⁵ See Deuteronomy 20:10-14 “*When you [the Israelites] march up to attack a city, make its people an offer of peace. If they accept and open their gates, all the people in it shall be subject to **FORCED LABOR** and shall work for you. If they refuse to make peace and they engage you in battle, lay siege to that city. When the LORD your God delivers it into your hand, put to sword all the MEN in it. As for the WOMEN, the children, the livestock and everything else in the city you may **TAKE THESE AS PLUNDER** for yourselves. And you may **USE** the plunder the LORD your God gives you from your enemies.*” (emphasis added); Deuteronomy 21:10-14. (Good News Version) *When the LORD your God gives you victory in BATTLE and you take prisoners, you may see among them a beautiful woman that you like and want to marry. TAKE her to your home, where she will shave her head, cut her fingernails, and change her clothes. She is to stay in your home and mourn for her parents for a month; after that, you may MARRY her. Later, if you no longer want her, you are to LET HER GO free. Since you **FORCED** her to have intercourse with you, you cannot treat her as a slave and sell her.*(emphasis added) ;Judges 21:1-25 “*Go and **kill everyone** in Jabesh, **including the women and children**. **Kill** all the males, and also every woman **who is not a virgin**...The Benjaminites came back, and the other Israelites gave them the girls from Jabesh whom they had not killed. But there **were not enough** of them....”*There are no more women in the tribe of Benjamin. What shall we do to provide wives for the men who are left?...They told the Benjaminites, ‘Go and hide in the vineyards and watch. When the girls of Shiloh come out to dance during the feast, you come out of the vineyards. Each of you take a wife **BY FORCE** from among the girls and take her back to the territory of Benjamin with you.*” (emphasis added).*

Divine Principle authors attempt to “prove” that Eve had sex with an angel using circumstantial evidence, namely 1) That Adam and Eve became ashamed of their nakedness and 2) that their sin was “inherited”. This essay will show that “sin” cannot be “inherited” and that whatever “fallen nature” Adam and Eve allegedly had was something they were originally born with and had to grow out of. They did not acquire this nature from the angel. Second, being ashamed of one’s “nakedness” could equally be interpreted to mean being ashamed of one’s *ignorance* or how stupid they were since both God and the serpent said that humans would gain knowledge LIKE THE GODS. So, if we are to interpret this knowledge as “sex”, then it implies the gods were having sex with each other. But if we simply interpret this knowledge as self-awareness, one could have the feeling of being “naked” in terms of one’s comparative ignorance. Next, why would a sex act necessarily make anyone ashamed? If Adam and Eve were the only people there, what would they have to be ashamed of? Do animals feel guilt after sex? Seems stupid. Likewise, if God really did not want them having sex, wouldn’t it have made sense to put them *in completely two different locations in the Garden of Eden until they were fully mature*? If God did not do that, then this is God’s fault. There is no need to have Adam and Eve be in close proximity to each other if the alleged key to human perfection is not to have sex until one is fully mature. God then should be the sole individual responsible for this alleged tragedy if the fall was really a sexual act. Thus, the entire story of a sexual fall makes no sense whatsoever and there is no real evidence for such an account. There is also some apocryphal account that Rev. Moon went to the spirit world and interviewed Adam, Eve, and the serpent and through his interviews he determined that their act was of a sexual nature. Assuming such interview took place, notwithstanding the

obvious questions on what language did Adam and Eve speak and how did Rev. Moon know for sure that the creatures he was speaking to were the “actual” Adam and Eve and not some jinns masquerading as “Adam” and “Eve”, who is to say that these creatures told Rev. Moon the truth? People even in courts of law on earth lie all the time. Their stories must be corroborated by actual, independently verifiable evidence. A sexual fall has no corroborating empirical, social, or psychological evidence whatsoever. What makes more sense is that Adam and Eve were genetic experiments by some Anunnaki⁶ scientists and a reengage Anunnaki scientist, for whatever reason, helped Adam and Eve to become self-aware and to *escape* the dominion of their Anunnaki captors. As punishment for this assistance, the dominant Anunnaki scientist framed the reengage scientist, blaming him for Adam and Eve’s escape and then told propaganda stories casting the renegade scientist as an “enemy” of Anunnaki society, hence the origin of “the devil”. That is a story that makes perfect sense since that happens all the time in human society. People are wrongfully accused to cover up the crimes of others. It makes no sense for God to kick Adam and Eve out of the garden of Eden only to then desperately want to get them back. The facts of the story sound more like an escape and God’s subsequent efforts are more like a slave catcher seeking to re-assert dominion and control over his human slaves.

In any event, if you read the essay “*Was the Fall Really About Sex?*”⁷ you would know it is a contention that sexual contact was not necessary in order to transmit

⁶ Anunnaki are ancient astronauts in the Sumerian historical accounts which claim that thousands of years ago, creatures descended from the skies and genetically manipulated pro-hominid creatures, creating the human species as a work-er slave race to mine gold and to serve the Anunnaki as colonial invaders. The Anunnaki were considered “gods” due to their exceptionally long life spans, tremendous size (3 to 5 times the height and weight of regular humans), and their advanced technology, ability to fly, etc.

⁷ Found here: <https://adobe.ly/3z2Tlru> (“*Was the Fall Really about Sex?*”).

“Original Sin” even if such substance called Original Sin existed. Also, there is no evidence or basis to believe Original Sin to be “illicit” sexual desire or some literal substance floating in our blood stream or affecting our Deoxyribonucleic acid or “DNA”. If anything, Original Sin is a metaphor symbolizing the core origin of sin, not a physical substance. Sin here is being defined as “missing the mark” or “failing to do what is required”. However, in “*Was the Fall Really About Sex*” it was identified that the core origin of sin (if anything) was Adam’s failure to perfect himself by his own actions, Adam’s failure to subjugate/love the angel, and Adam’s failure to take responsibility for his own thoughts and actions. Hence, there is no substance or thing called “sin”. “Sin” can also be regarded as simply a thought, idea or *paradigm* which affects the way one *sees* one’s environment and subsequently how one feels about it (hence affecting one’s mental orientation) and hence ultimately affecting the way one acts and behaves. Note however, I was not personally present at the “Fall” (assuming such an event actually took place). If such an act really occurred in history, the ONLY people who can tell us what happened would be Adam, Eve, the Serpent, God, and whatever angels or jinns happened to be standing around (if any). Even if we could interview these “witnesses”, they might not tell us the truth for various reasons either they might want to cover up their crime or deflect blame or any number of reasons for fabricating or embellishing their story. Therefore, we must look to other circumstantial and or corroborating evidence that is independent of witness testimony. I am a litigation attorney by profession. Everyday I deal with people telling me stories of what they claim happened in the past. Based on those stories, these people want money or some form of compensation or want to escape liability. But how can I “know” which version of events is true? Are any of the versions

true? I have to conduct interviews, I have to probe motivations, I actually visit the “crime scene”, I use logic to discover when someone is making a contradiction and then I develop a theory as to what “really” happened since I was not present to actually witness the events. Religious stories are the same. The stories make claims about events which no one has ever seen and do not have direct access to and based on those claims expect you to behave in particular ways. But what if those stories are not true? What if they are simply fabrications? How can we know for sure or how can we be at least reasonably certain if these stories are true or not? Thus, I am simply using my skills as an attorney (and philosophy major) to analyze this claim of the existence of “Original Sin” as made by the Divine Principle textbooks.

It is my theory that one reason Rev. Moon (or the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks) created, maintained, or came up with the notion of a sexual Original Sin was in order to justify and or explain a sexual method of “restoration” known as P'ikareun. Thus, I theorize that Rev. Moon started with his end goal in mind (i.e., how to justify or explain a sexual restoration), rather than taking an objective look at the evidence of the Fall first, given there is no necessary reason to interpret the Garden of Eden story in a sexual way when simply looking at the bare facts of the story itself. Of course, we could argue that Adam and Eve were naked before “the fall” and then suddenly became ashamed of their nakedness afterwards, and that could imply that their action had something to do with their sexual organs. But if that is the case, why not simply say that? Was God trying to hide that fact? Or was Satan trying to hide that? If Satan were trying to hide that “fact”, then how is it that Satan can influence what is written in the Bible? What else then has Satan corrupted in the Bible? If God hid that “fact”, what purpose would it

serve for God to hide that information? Isn't it very important information to have? Were the Biblical writers somehow ashamed of sex? If so, they had no problem talking about angels having sex with women just before Noah's flood;⁸ or telling the story of how Lot offered his daughters to a crowd of homosexual men for those men to have sex with his daughters;⁹ or telling the story of Lot's daughters having sex with their father;¹⁰ or telling the story of how one of Jacob's sons (Reuben) had sex with one of Jacob's wives;¹¹ or telling the story of Potiphar's wife wanting to have sex with Joseph;¹² or talking about

⁸ See Genesis 6:1-4 "When human beings began to increase in number on the earth and daughters were born to them, the sons of God *saw that the daughters of humans* were beautiful, *and they married any of them they chose*. Then the Lord said, "My Spirit will not contend with humans forever, for they are mortal; their days will be a hundred and twenty years." The Nephilim were on the earth in those days—and also afterward—when the sons of God went to the daughters of humans *and had children by them*. They were the heroes of old, men of renown." (New International Version)(emphasis added).

⁹ See Genesis 19:4-8 "Before they had gone to bed, all the men from every part of the city of Sodom—both young and old—surrounded the house. They called to Lot, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? ***Bring them out to us so that we can have sex with them.***" Lot went outside to meet them and shut the door behind him and said, "No, my friends. Don't do this wicked thing. Look, ***I have two daughters who have never slept with a man. Let me bring them out to you, and you can do what you like with them.*** But don't do anything to these men, for they have come under the protection of my roof.'" (New International Version)(emphasis added).

¹⁰ See Genesis 19:30-38 "Lot and his two daughters left Zoar and settled in the mountains, for he was afraid to stay in Zoar. He and his two daughters lived in a cave. One day the older daughter said to the younger, "Our father is old, and there is no man around here to give us children—as is the custom all over the earth. Let's get our father to drink wine and then sleep with him and preserve our family line through our father." That night they got their father to drink wine, and the older daughter went in ***and slept with him***. He was not aware of it when she lay down or when she got up. The next day the older daughter said to the younger, "Last night I slept with my father. Let's get him to drink wine again tonight, and you go in and sleep with him so we can preserve our family line through our father." So they got their father to drink wine that night also, and the younger daughter went in ***and slept with him***. Again he was not aware of it when she lay down or when she got up. ***So both of Lot's daughters became pregnant by their father.*** The older daughter had a son, and she named him Moab; he is the father of the Moabites of today. The younger daughter also had a son, and she named him Ben-Ammi; he is the father of the Ammonites of today." (New International Version)(emphasis added).

¹¹ See Genesis 35:22 "While Jacob was living in that land, Reuben had sexual intercourse with Bilhah, one of his father's concubines; Jacob heard about it and was furious." (Good News Translation).

¹² See Genesis 39:6-15 "Now Joseph was well-built and handsome, and after a while his master's wife took notice of Joseph and said, ***"Come to bed with me."*** But he refused. "With me in charge," he told her, "my master does not concern himself with anything in the house; everything he owns he has entrusted to my care. No one is greater in this house than I am. My master has withheld nothing from me except you, because you are his wife. ***How then could I do such a wicked thing and sin against God?"*** And though ***she spoke to Joseph day after day***, he refused to go to bed with her or even be with her. One day he went into the house to attend to his duties, and none of the household servants was inside. She caught him by his

how Phinehas killed another Israelite while that Israelite was having sex with a foreign woman by putting the spear in the Israelite's back and right through the woman underneath him with whom he was apparently having sex with at the time;¹³ or telling how the Israelites raped the women of Canaan after a genocidal military campaign;¹⁴ no problem talking about a man attempting to impregnate the wife of his brother but then changing his mind out of spite and then ejaculating on the ground instead;¹⁵ or Judah having sex with and impregnating an alleged prostitute which actually turned out to be his daughter-in-law Tamar;¹⁶ or talking about another group of bi-sexual men trying to

cloak and said, **"Come to bed with me!"** But he left his cloak in her hand and ran out of the house. When she saw that he had left his cloak in her hand and had run out of the house, she called her household servants. "Look," she said to them, "this Hebrew has been brought to us to make sport of us! He came in here to sleep with me, but I screamed. When he heard me scream for help, he left his cloak beside me and ran out of the house." (New International Version)(emphasis added).

¹³ See Numbers 25:1-9 "When the Israelites were camped at Acacia Valley, **the men began to have sexual intercourse with the Moabite women** who were there. . . . So the Lord was angry with them and said to Moses, "Take all the leaders of Israel and, in obedience to me, execute them in broad daylight . . . One of the Israelites took a Midianite woman into his tent in the sight of Moses and the whole community . . . When Phinehas, the son of Eleazar and grandson of Aaron the priest, saw this, **he got up and left the assembly. He took a spear, followed the man and the woman into the tent, and drove the spear through both of them.**" (Good News Translation)(emphasis added).

¹⁴ See Deuteronomy 20:10-14 "When you [the Israelites] march up to attack a city, make its people an offer of peace. If they accept and open their gates, all the people in it shall be subject to FORCED LABOR and shall work for you. If they refuse to make peace and they engage you in battle, lay siege to that city. When the LORD your God delivers it into your hand, put to sword all the MEN in it. As for the WOMEN, the children, the livestock and everything else in the city you may TAKE THESE AS PLUNDER for yourselves. And you may USE the plunder the LORD your God gives you from your enemies." (Good News Version) (emphasis added); See also Deuteronomy 21:10-14 "When the LORD your God gives you victory in BATTLE and you take prisoners, you may see among them a beautiful woman that you like and want to marry. TAKE her to your home, where she will shave her head, cut her fingernails, and change her clothes. She is to stay in your home and mourn for her parents for a month; after that, you may MARRY her. Later, if you no longer want her, you are to LET HER GO free. Since you **FORCED her to have intercourse with you**, you cannot treat her as a slave and sell her." (Good News Version) (emphasis added).

¹⁵ See Genesis 38:8-10 "Then Judah said to Onan, **"Sleep with your brother's wife** and fulfill your duty to her as a brother-in-law to raise up offspring for your brother." But Onan knew that the child would not be his; so whenever he slept with his brother's wife, **he spilled his semen on the ground** to keep from providing offspring for his brother. What he did was wicked in the Lord's sight; so the Lord put him to death also." (New International Version)(emphasis added).

¹⁶ See Genesis 38:15,16, 18 "When Judah saw her, **he thought she was a prostitute**, for she had covered her face. 16 Not realizing that she was his daughter-in-law, he went over to her by the roadside and said,

break into a house to rape another man who was traveling through the city but instead gang raped the man's concubine all night long instead, causing her to die, her master then cuts up her dead body into pieces, he then uses her mutilated body as propaganda to start a war of revenge against the men of Gibeah;¹⁷ or talking about King David having sex with and impregnating his field general's wife Bathsheba and then having that general killed to cover up David's adultery and so David could have the man's wife for himself;¹⁸

"Come now, let me sleep with you. . . . So he gave them to her and slept with her, and she became pregnant by him." (New International Version)(emphasis added).

¹⁷ See Judges 19:22-29; 20:4-9 "They were inside enjoying themselves. But some of the evil men who lived in the city surrounded the house. They pounded on the door. They shouted to the old man who owned the house. They said, "Bring out the man who came to your house. We want to have sex with him." The owner of the house went outside. He said to them, "No, my friends. Don't do such an evil thing. This man is my guest. So don't do this terrible thing. Look, here is my virgin daughter. And here's the Levite's concubine. I'll bring them out to you now. You can have them. Do to them what you want to. But don't do such a terrible thing to this man." The men wouldn't listen to him. So the Levite sent his concubine out to them. They forced her to have sex with them. They raped her all night long. As the night was ending, they let her go. At sunrise she went back to the house where her master was staying. She fell down at the door. She stayed there until daylight. Later that morning her master got up. He opened the door of the house. He stepped out to continue on his way. But his concubine was lying there. She had fallen at the doorway of the house. Her hands were reaching out toward the door. He said to her, "Get up. Let's go." But there wasn't any answer. Then he put her dead body on his donkey. And he started out for home. When he reached home, he got a knife. He cut up his concubine. He cut her into 12 pieces. He sent them into all the territories of Israel. Everyone who saw it spoke to one another. They said, "Nothing like this has ever been seen or done before. Nothing like this has happened since the day the Israelites came up out of Egypt. Just imagine! We must do something! So let's hear your ideas!" . . . So the Levite spoke. He was the husband of the woman who had been murdered. He said, "I and my concubine went to Gibeah in Benjamin. We spent the night there. During the night the men of Gibeah came after me. They surrounded the house. They were planning to kill me. They raped my concubine, and she died. I took my concubine and cut her into pieces. I sent one piece to each part of Israel's territory. I did it because the men of Gibeah had done a very terrible thing in Israel. All you men of Israel, speak up now. Tell me what you have decided to do." All the men got up together. They said, "None of us will go home. Not one of us will return to his house. Here is what we'll do to Gibeah. We'll cast lots to tell us how to attack the city." (New International Version)(emphasis added).

¹⁸ See 2nd Samuel 11:2-26 "One evening David got up from his bed and walked around on the roof of the palace. From the roof he saw a woman bathing. The woman was very beautiful, and David sent someone to find out about her. The man said, "She is Bathsheba, the daughter of Eliam and the wife of Uriah the Hittite." Then David sent messengers to get her. She came to him, and he slept with her. (Now she was purifying herself from her monthly uncleanness.) Then she went back home. The woman conceived and sent word to David, saying, "I am pregnant." . . . In the morning David wrote a letter to Joab and sent it with Uriah. In it he wrote, "Put Uriah out in front where the fighting is fiercest. Then withdraw from him so he will be struck down and die." So while Joab had the city under siege, he put Uriah at a place where he knew the strongest defenders were. When the men of the city came out and fought against Joab, some of the men in David's army fell; moreover, Uriah the Hittite died. . . . When Uriah's wife heard that her husband was dead, she mourned for him. 27 After the time of mourning was over, David had her brought to his house, and she became his wife and bore him a son. But the thing David had done displeased the Lord."

or talking about King David's son Amnon raping his sister Tamar;¹⁹ or talking about how King David's son Absalom raped his father's several wives on the roof of the palace as a public display of power after a coup engineered by Absalom;²⁰ etc. The Bible shows *no hesitation or prudishness* at all in talking about sexual topics explicitly, from gang rapes, to wife stealing, to corpse mutilation, and exhibitionist sex. So, there is no reason for there to be any mystery about the fall being sexual if it was in fact sexual. Why would that "fact" need to be hidden or obscured? If the entire history of "sin" is based on this alleged sexual act, the alleged most important crime in human history, why then is that not *clearly* exposed? It is because either the act did not happen as a sexual act, or the act was not important to restoration at all, or the fall isn't actually what it seems to be in the story.²¹ There is no need to "disguise" the alleged sexual nature of the fall if the fall was in fact sexual.

¹⁹ See 2nd Samuel 13:1-22 "David's son Absalom had a beautiful unmarried sister named Tamar. Amnon, another of David's sons, fell in love with her. . . . Then he [Amnon, pretending to be sick in bed] said to her, "Bring the cakes here to my bed and serve them to me yourself." She took the cakes and went over to him. As she offered them to him, he [Amnon] grabbed her and said, "Come to bed with me!"

"No," she said. "Don't force me to do such a degrading thing! That's awful! How could I ever hold up my head in public again? And you—you would be completely disgraced in Israel. Please, speak to the king, and I'm sure that he will give me to you." But he would not listen to her; and since he was stronger than she was, he overpowered her ***and raped her***. . . . When King David heard what had happened, he was furious. And Absalom hated Amnon so much for having raped his sister Tamar that he would no longer even speak to him." (Good News Translation)(emphasis added).

²⁰ See 2nd Samuel 16:20-22 "Then Absalom [after the coup] turned to Ahithophel and said, "Now that we are here, what do you advise us to do?" Ahithophel answered, "Go and have intercourse with your father's concubines whom he left behind to take care of the palace. Then everyone in Israel will know that your father regards you as his enemy, and your followers will be greatly encouraged." ***So they set up a tent for Absalom on the palace roof, and in the sight of everyone Absalom went in and had intercourse with his father's concubines***." (Good News Translation)(emphasis added).

²¹ There is a theory that the Fall of man was not really a story about man's downfall, but rather a story about how human beings ESCAPED from the slave control of the Anunnaki. It somewhat makes sense. If God was so "upset" with Adam and Eve that he allegedly kicked them out of the Garden, why then is God making so much effort to try and get human beings back? This sounds more like the story of how the Pharaoh kicked the Hebrews out of Egypt (because they were causing so much trouble), but then sent an army to get them back and take them back into slavery. The Fall might in reality be a liberation story and not a story about Man's alleged downfall.

There are the anecdotes in the Hebrew scriptures of Abraham calling his wife his sister, but those episodes of supposedly restoring an alleged sexual fall take a far back seat to the multiple episodes of Cain-Abel conflict. The Cain-Abel paradigm (which is actually the Lucifer-Adam paradigm) shows up much more often, more frequently, and more consistently than the supposed Lucifer-Eve paradigm. The Lucifer-Adam paradigm shows up in Cain and Abel, Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, Joseph's elder brothers and Joseph, The Israelites and Moses, John the Baptist and Jesus, the Pharisees and Jesus, etc. That is always the central conflict. Any alleged "reverse restoration" of David stealing Bathsheba, Judah impregnating his daughter-in law Tamar, or Mary sleeping with the high priest Zacharias can simply be explained by lower-status women seeking out higher-status men (also known as "hypergamy") and has nothing necessarily "restorative" about it as hypergamy²² is a very common occurrence even in modern days. What *would* be seen as unusual or as a "sacrifice" for these women is if they went to *lower* status men (which would instead be called hypogamy) to get pregnant as this is something females *rarely* ever want to do and would be a true sacrifice as it would be truly going *against* female nature. Women sleeping with higher status men is not a sacrifice in the least. They gain great economic, psychological, and social benefits from it. Thus, it appears that the sexual interpretation of the Fall of Man was merely an afterthought so to speak or wishful thinking seeking to justify extra marital sex (adultery) and give such sex a "divine cover". Though I could be wrong.

However, if we accept Rev. Moon/Divine Principles' view of Original Sin being a substance that is sexually transmitted by the genitals, then the only logical conclusion is

²² Hypergamy is defined as: "the action of marrying or forming a sexual relationship with a person of a superior sociological or educational background".

that people should/must have sexual intercourse *with the messiah* (or a messiah figure or a “good” angel) so as to “remove” or supersede [no pun intended] their original sin. This would give credence to the idea that many of Rev. Moon’s followers believed and practiced a “sexual restoration ritual” with a messianic figure (Rev. Moon) in the early days of the Unification Church. As will be shown later, the 3-Day Ceremony is exactly such a sexual restoration ritual that shows that the Unification Church believes in a sexual method of restoration. However, what will also be shown is that this 3-Day Ceremony sexual restoration ritual, by its very terms, cannot possible “work” unless at least one of the participants has actual sex with Rev. Moon or with a similar “messiah figure”. And it is this “fact” which will show that the Divine Principle textbook authors actually know that Original Sin does not exist because the 3-Day ceremony itself is self-contradictory, and does not actually “remove” Original Sin.

If Rev. Moon was “wrong”²³ about his theory of Original Sin and that sin was not transmitted sexually, it does *not* necessarily lessen his stature, status, or accomplishments. It simply means we need to take more responsibility to think for ourselves. In addition, as will be explained later (and in the footnote below), the Divine Principle textbooks do imply that it is “permissible” for a messiah figure to mislead his or her members and even lie (tell falsehoods) to his or her followers if the messiah figure thinks it will help “advance” his or her cause.²⁴ However, if that is the case, how can anyone know if *anything* such messianic figure says is true?

²³ I am not making any claims to knowing absolute truth. I don’t know who is right or wrong or what is right or wrong or even if there is a right and wrong. I’m simply examining ideas presented and testing them for validity or plausibility.

²⁴ See *Exposition of the Principle*, p. 395; (Second Advent 2.4) “There are two reasons why Jesus prophesied that the Lord will return on the clouds [even though it was a lie]. First, it was to prevent the delusions of antichrists from creating confusion among believers...Second, it was to encourage Christians

Nevertheless, in this essay I offer a new theory of the idea of “Original Sin” one that is practical, believable, and empirically verifiable through scientific and logical proof and everyday evidence.

INTRODUCTION

The Divine Principle textbooks say that the removal of Original Sin is the first and most fundamental step in the process of restoration and thus the first step in the process of human perfection. Likewise, the Divine Principle textbooks claim that religious ideas and beliefs must be scientifically demonstrated (proven) in order to get modern man to believe in and act on these religious ideas, as it states:

Even internal truth demands logical and convincing explanations.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 6) (emphasis added)

Knowledge comes from cognition, and man today cannot cognize anything which lacks logic and scientific proof. To understand something there must first be cognition. Thus internal truth *requires* logical proof. Religion has been moving through the long course of history toward an age in which it *must* be explained scientifically.

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 9) (emphasis added)

who were walking a difficult path of faith. There are other occasions when Jesus gave paradoxical words to encourage his followers to accomplish God’s Will as rapidly as possible. For example, he said, “Truly, I say to you, you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel, before the Son of man comes.” This led his disciples *to believe* that the Second Advent would take place in the near future. When Jesus told Peter of his approaching martyrdom, Peter asked him what would become of the disciple John. Jesus replied, “If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you?” Jesus also said, “Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.” These sayings led the disciples to think they would meet the returning Jesus in their lifetime.” (emphasis added)” *However, we know that what Jesus said was a lie since all of the people standing there at that time with him ultimately died without seeing the second advent. Thus, the Divine Principle textbook is promoting the idea that a messianic figure can lie if he or she thinks it will help his purposes. If that is true, how can anyone determine if anything the “messianic” figure says is true or not?*

"...the human intellect has become highly sophisticated, requiring a scientific approach to understanding reality.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 6) (emphasis added)

"In consequence, today the truth must appear with a higher standard and with a scientific method of expression in order for *intelligent* modern man to understand it.

(Divine Principle, p. 131) (emphasis added)

Science is a method of inquiry and knowledge gathering based on empirical observation and testing. Empirical means anything that can be perceived by at least two of the five known physical human senses (i.e., sight, hearing, taste, smell, and touch). Likewise, things proven scientifically must be able to be *reproduced* by anyone around the world at any time. In this light, it seems very odd that there is no clear scientific explanation as to what exactly Original Sin is, especially since it is such a vital and core concept of unification cosmology. Perhaps Unification Church members accepted on "faith" that their Original Sin was "removed" through the various ceremonies such as the Blessing Ceremony, the Holy Wine Ceremony, and the 3-Day Ceremony. But if that is the case, have all the people who have undergone such ceremonies lost the tendency to "sin"? Are all those individuals now automatically functioning in society as "ideal people"? Has participating in those ceremonies led to an end of "problems" and social strife? That is a question each individual must answer, but having participated in those ceremonies myself, as for me, the answer is "No" to all of the above. It would seem then very important to know precisely what Original Sin is for if we do not know what it is, how can we be sure it has been removed? Furthermore, if the Original Sin is the so called

“root” of sin, shouldn’t eliminating Original Sin, automatically lead to us become perfected individuals? Likewise, how does Original Sin “make” us do evil like the Divine Principle textbooks imply?²⁵ These and other questions need to be asked and answered. It is the assertion of this essay that either Original Sin does not exist at all or it is actually something quite different than what we were originally led to believe.

ORIGINAL SIN AND THE DIVINE PRINCIPLE TEXTBOOKS

The Divine Principle textbooks says that the removal of Original Sin is the first and most fundamental step in the process of restoration and in the process of our perfection. For example, the Divine Principle textbooks states:

"Becoming perfect incarnations requires that first we be cleansed of the original sin through the Messiah."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 181; Restoration 2.1)
(emphasis added)

"All sins come from original sin, which is the root of all sins. Therefore man cannot fundamentally liquidate all sins without getting rid of original sin."

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 89) (emphasis added)

"We who receive salvation based on Jesus' crucifixion cannot unshackle ourselves from the chains of sin, due to the original sin still active deep within us."

²⁵ "...Satanic invasion...*constantly comes through the flesh* due to the original sin...the original sin REMAINS IN THE FLESH and is transmitted continuously from generation to generation."
(Divine Principle, p. 148) (emphasis added)

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 119; Messiah 1.5) (emphasis added)

"...we must have the original sin removed before we can sever Satan's bonds and be restored to the state before the Fall."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 175) (emphasis added)

"Humankind is beset by the original sin, which has been inherited from our first ancestors."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 54) (emphasis added)

"Due to the fall of the first parents, their descendants were corrupted with the original sin."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 88) (emphasis added)

"The original sin may be thought of as the root of all sins, hereditary sin as the trunk, collective sin as the branches, and individual sin as the leaves. All sins sprout from the original sin, which is their root. Without extirpating²⁶ the original sin, there is no way to completely eradicate other sins."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 72) (emphasis added)

"No one among fallen humanity embodies perfect goodness because no one has resolved the original sin within himself."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 147) (emphasis added)

²⁶ "Extirpate" means "to root out and destroy completely." See <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/extirpate> (last visited December 1, 2022).

"...Satanic invasion ...constantly comes through the flesh due to the original sin...the original sin REMAINS IN THE FLESH and is transmitted continuously from generation to generation."

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 148) (emphasis added)

"...even saints redeemed by the cross have had to continue to fight against original sin...Thus, we who can gain salvation through the crucifixion of Jesus **CANNOT** escape from being sinners because the original sin still works in us."

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 149) (emphasis added)

Thus, according to the Divine Principle textbooks the identification and removal of Original Sin is crucial, yea indispensable to human salvation.²⁷ It is essential prerequisite (according to the Divine Principle textbooks) in order for humans to become ideal people. Likewise, the Divine Principle textbooks seems to claim that the only way to get your Original Sin removed is through "the messiah" where it states:

Becoming perfect incarnations requires that first we be cleansed of the original sin through the Messiah.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 181)(emphasis added)

By engrafting all humankind with himself once more, he [Christ] is to redeem their original sin.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 56)

²⁷ Salvation means to become the type of people we envision and to be liberated from the propensity to sin or from the propensity to go against our so called "original nature".

All sins sprout from the original sin, which is their root. Without extirpating the original sin, there is no way to completely eradicate other sins. However, no man is able to unearth this root of sin, buried deep in the recesses of time. Only Christ, who comes as the root and True Parent of humanity, can grasp it and uproot it.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 72)(emphasis added)

All sins come from original sin, which is the root of all sins. Therefore man can not fundamentally liquidate all sins without getting rid of original sin. However, no one has been able to uncover this root of sin. Only Christ, the True Parent who comes as the root of life, can uncover the root of sins and liquidate it.

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 89)

He [Christ at the Second Advent] will cleanse people of the original sin and restore the, to their true, original selves, enabling each to fulfill the purpose of creation.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 143)(emphasis added)

In the process, they will be the first to have their original sin removed, become divine spirits and fulfill the purpose of creation.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, pp. 143-144) (emphasis added)

We cannot be born without parents. Who, then are the good parents through whom we can be born again, cleansed of original sin and able to enter the kingdom of God? Parents who have original sin

cannot give birth to good children who do not have original sin. Certainly it is *impossible* to find sinless parents among fallen humankind. These parents must descend from Heaven. Jesus was the Parent who came from Heaven. He came as *the True Father in order to give rebirth to fallen people,* transforming them into good children, thoroughly cleansed of original sin and fit to build the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 170)(emphasis added)

By joining them in oneness with himself, he [Jesus] was to cleanse them of the original sin and restore them as children born of God's lineage.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 284) (emphasis added)

Further, it is common knowledge that Unification Church members believe Rev. Sun Myung Moon to be that messiah, the Christ of the Second Advent. Hence the conclusion is, according to Unification theology, everyone must get their Original Sin removed through the exclusive agency of Rev. Moon (and his “bride”) and only Rev. Moon and his “bride”. Without such removal of Original Sin by Rev. Moon and his “bride”, salvation is impossible (according to Unification cosmology).²⁸

Accordingly, a serious and devout Unification Church member should be very interested in Original Sin! Why? They should be interested because the Divine Principle

²⁸ But this also raises the question on how people can get their Original Sin “removed” after Rev. Moon has died or passed away? The common answer will be it has to be through a member of Rev. Moon’s blood family. But it would seem that would have to be a man and woman *couple* since Divine Principle implies that *parents* are needed to grant re-birth. Even so, that doesn’t answer the question on how Rev. Moon was able to have *his* “Original Sin” removed. Did he have two sinless parents that gave him re-birth? Or did he literally descended from heaven? There is no answer to this question. Some Unifications will claim there was a complicated change of blood lineage in Rev. Moon’s family just as in Jesus’ family where the twins of Tamar (Perez and Zerah) fought in the womb and succeeded in “cleansing the womb” and thus Moon, like Jesus was believed to have been born “sinless”. See Genesis 38:27-30. However, this still assumes that

textbooks cite Original Sin as **THE** key to human sinfulness. It is the lynchpin. It is the tie that holds us to Satan. It is the "thing" that allows Satan to influence us and "make" us do "bad" things. Hence if we could only rid ourselves of the Original Sin, we could then become the type of people we were meant to be. Correct?

However, so many questions remain. For example, What exactly is Original sin? How did Rev. Moon discover it? Where is Original Sin located exactly? How exactly is it removed? Did Rev. Moon ever have Original Sin? If so, how did Rev. Moon get rid of his Original Sin? If not, how was he born without Original Sin or how did he get his Original Sin removed before or after birth? How can we be sure that the Original Sin is removed after receiving the Unification Church rites known as "the Blessing" and "holy wine" and "the indemnity stick" and the "3-day ceremony"? Why do people still seem inclined to sin (do bad acts or fail their responsibility) even after supposedly having their Original Sin removed? Adam and Eve supposedly were not born with Original Sin, so how was it possible for *them* to sin if they never had Original Sin? Thus, isn't there something *more fundamental* than "Original Sin that causes humans to do "bad acts"? Since even Adam Eve were allegedly able to sin WITHOUT having had "Original Sin". These are very important questions that need to be asked and answered by the serious and sincere Unification Church members or person studying the Divine Principle textbooks.

WHAT EXACTLY IS ORIGINAL SIN ANYWAY?

The first time we hear about Original Sin is on page 11 in the introduction to Exposition of the Divine Principle. There it states:

there is actually some "sin" in the "blood lineage" that needs to be "cleansed". If no such sin exists, then there is also no need to ask how Moon got "rid" of a sin that was never there to begin with.

Still, difficult issues remain. Christians believe that salvation is given through the atonement of the cross. Yet *no one* has ever given birth to a child who is sinless and in no need of redemption by the Savior. This demonstrates that, even after their rebirth in Christ, people continue to pass down the original sin to their children.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 11; Introduction) (emphasis added)

Besides the logic of this passage being quite dubious,²⁹ the Divine Principle textbooks asserts that there is something, some "element" called original sin that parents pass on to their children thus making their children "sinful" from their very birth. Therefore, even Christians who believe they are "saved" still *believe* that their children are not automatically sinless or saved and thus *believe* that their children still must accept Jesus on their own as their own personal savior. We must first note a number of assumptions: First, how does the author(s) of the Divine Principle textbook know that "no one" has given birth to a sinless child? What scientific tests or observations did the author(s) use to determine this? Has the author(s) met and or tested all the people of the world throughout the last 2,000 years? Of course, probably not,³⁰ hence this statement is an unproven and unprovable assumption upon which the author makes a new definitive and equally unproven statement (i.e., that people *are* passing down Original Sin to their children). The only thing that the author(s) of the Principle textbooks could say is that

²⁹ Dubious in the sense that the author is making a over generalized statement to which he/she/it/they offer no proof. For example, how can anyone know that no Christian has given birth to a child without sin? Has the author checked the blood of every child born into a Christian family around the world for the last 2,000 years? Of course not. What the author(s) probably means is that he/she/it/they have not *heard* of any Christian professing that their child does not have sin. This is not the same as knowing 100% that no child has been born without sin. It is just a statement, an assumption without empirical proof. Then based on this axiom which itself was not proven, the author(s) then goes on to "prove" that "original sin" exists and that it is the cause of why people still have sin. That is why this quotation's "logic" is dubious.

³⁰ Or at least such testing seems unlikely.

since Christians believe that their children still need a savior *it is reasonable to conclude* that they also believe that their sin has not be totally cleansed. This does not mean definitively that they actually *have* Original Sin (whatever Original Sin is). It only means that they believe that they have some sinfulness. This belief may not be due to an empirical fact but may be due to a manipulative clergy who have a vested interest in keeping people believing that they are "sinful", thus keeping them guilt ridden, and thus keeping these people dependant upon the saving "mercies" of the Catholic or other Christian power structure and thus compel these people to keep making monetary donations to the church. Therefore, this statement in the Divine Principle textbook is loaded with assumptions and is highly questionable in and of itself. But just for argument's sake, let's assume the statement is true, that even Christians "saved" by Jesus still "have" Original Sin. Even if we accept that as true, we also encounter some equally disturbing quotes in the Divine Principle textbook, such as:

"We who receive salvation based on Jesus' crucifixion cannot unshackle ourselves from the chains of sin, due to the original sin still active deep within us."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 119)(emphasis added)

"Due to the fall of the first parents, their descendants were corrupted with the original sin."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 88)

"...we must have the original sin removed before we can sever Satan's bonds and be restored to the state before the Fall."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 175)

"Becoming perfect incarnations requires that first we be cleansed of the original sin through the Messiah.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 181)(emphasis added)

"Humankind is beset by the original sin, which has been inherited from our first ancestors."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 54)

"We know that the original sin has been perpetuated through lineal descent from one generation to the next."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 61)

"The original sin may be thought of as the root of all sins, hereditary sin as the trunk, collective sin as the branches, and individual sin as the leaves. All sins sprout from the original sin, which is their root. Without extirpating the original sin, there is no way to completely eradicate other sins."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 72)

"No one among fallen humanity embodies perfect goodness because no one has resolved the original sin within himself."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 147)

"...even saints redeemed by the cross have had to continue to fight against original sin...Thus, we who can gain salvation through the crucifixion of Jesus CANNOT escape from being sinners because the original sin still works in us."

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 149)(emphasis added)

These references to original sin are too numerous to ignore. According to the Divine Principle, Original Sin is something very serious and hence it deserves great study. However, despite all of these quotes, we still are no clearer on exactly what Original Sin is. For the answer to this question, we need to search deeper within the Divine Principle textbooks and trace the source of the Unification concept of Original Sin.

Several common definitions of Original Sin that emerge are:

- 1) The "FIRST" ACT of sin of Adam and Eve.
- 2) The "TYPE" of action committed by Adam and Eve.
- 3) An "ELEMENT" floating around in the human blood stream or DNA.
- 4) An "ELEMENT" floating around in the spirit mind.
- 5) A "CONDITION" of accusation lobbied by Satan to God.
- 6) A "TENDENCY" or inner desire or proclivity to seek "illicit" sexual contact.

Which (if any) of these definitions are correct?

WHERE DID ORIGINAL SIN COME FROM?

According to the Divine Principle textbook, Original Sin is an "evil element" that came from the archangel:

"Additionally, they [Adam and Eve] developed a base of evil within themselves by receiving evil elements from the archangel. The evil element

received from the fallen archangel is Original Sin."

(Outline of the Principle, Level 4, p. 102) (emphasis added)

Now we are getting somewhere! Ok, so Original Sin is some kind of "evil element" that came from the archangel and **these "evil elements" from the archangel are the ultimate source of all that is "evil" in human beings.** But, how did we get this element? Even more crucial a question is how did the angel get or develop this element to begin with? I won't inquire right now about how the angel supposedly got Original Sin Elements,³¹ instead I will first seek to clarify the Unification concept of what exactly Original Sin is and once we can identify what it is, we can then explore how it was originally created or developed. Hence the first question is how did human beings get the Original Sin Element in the first place? The Divine Principle textbook seems to allude that they got the Original Sin element **through genital contact (i.e. sexual intercourse) with the angel.** The Divine Principle textbook states:

"According to the principle that men were created to exchange elements with the objective being with whom they have become one body through love, Eve received certain elements from Lucifer when she joined into one body with him through love....Adam, by becoming one body with Eve, inherited all the elements Eve had received from Lucifer...these elements were then transmitted to their descendants."

(Divine Principle, pp.79-80)

³¹ Though I do posit that it was the angel who got Original Sin FROM humans, not humans who got it from the angel.

One Body Through Love?

Wow! The trail is getting hot! So, apparently Eve received these “evil elements” when she "joined into one body" with the angel "through love". Adam then got these same “elements” when he "joined in one body through love" with Eve. But what the heck does that mean exactly???? Join in one body through love??? This sounds very vague and quite ambiguous. Where do the authors of the Divine Principle textbook get this “principle” that people “exchange elements” when they join in one body through love? Was it through scientific research? Was it found in some ancient scripture? They don’t say. In addition, what exactly does “one body” mean? Does it mean that they share the same nervous, digestive, and circulatory system? Also, what exactly does “love” mean? The author(s) of the Divine Principle textbook want you to believe that "join in one body through love" means to connect physical bodies through sexual/genital intercourse. **But if that is what they mean, why don't they just come out and say that directly???** Make it plain. Be direct. Be clear. Why use such an *ambiguous* phrase as "join in one body through love"? Does join in one body through love mean to engage in sexual intercourse? Yes or no? Or can "join in one body through love" mean something else entirely? Why is this text so ambiguous? Or . . . is the very idea to be ambiguous so as to *hide* something else that is going on?

If "join in one body through love" means to connect bodies through sexual intercourse, then how can we explain the following passage from the Divine Principle textbook?:

"If they [the people] had become one body with him [Jesus] in both spirit and body...fallen men could have been saved both spiritually and physically."

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 147) (emphasis added)

Are we to take this to mean that the people should have had *sexual intercourse with Jesus* in order to become one body with him?³² Did the people need to have sex with Jesus in order to be "saved"? You might say, well it does *not* say to become one body with Jesus through *love*. Ok, well then how about this passage:

" A new life is born through the love of parents. When we believe in Jesus as the Savior through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, we receive the love of the spiritual True Parents, which is generated through the give and take between Jesus, the spiritual True Father, and the Holy Spirit, the spiritual True Mother. Through this love, new life is infused into us, and our spirits are reborn as new selves. This is spiritual rebirth. Never the less, since human beings fell both spiritually and physically, we must be cleansed of original sin by being born again [through love] both spiritually and physically."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 171)

So here it is plain as day, this quote states that a person is reborn through "love" with the messiah. However, it does not specify what *kind* of "love". Does it mean sexual "love" or some other kind of "love"? Thus, if spiritual re-birth needs "love", does the physical re-birth also need "love"? If so, what *kind* of "love"? Does this physical rebirth then mean that we should unite in sexual "love" with the messiah in order to be physically saved and restored to our true selves?

³² Actually, the rumor in the Unification Church was that female members were supposed to have sex with Rev. Moon in order to be "saved", See the essay "P'ikareun (Does it really work?)", found here: <https://adobe.ly/3NJLhWl>. However, the church has repeatedly denied such allegations. Therefore, either this text is meant to mean become "one body" through genital contact or it is meant to mean something else entirely.

To elucidate (clarify), let us look at how the Divine Principle textbook defines "love". The Principle textbook states that:

"...the emotional force that the subject partner gives to the object partner is called love"

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 38) (emphasis added)

Hence, we see that according to the Divine Principle textbook, love is an *emotional force*. Well, so is fear, hate, jealousy, envy, greed, anger, anxiety, etc. These are all emotional forces in that they move us toward or away from an action by generating certain *feelings* in our minds. So hence the Divine Principle textbook defines love as an emotion (i.e., a feeling), and not necessarily as an action (i.e. a sex act).

How about this quote:

"All things were created to receive God's dominion through love."

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 78)

Does this then mean that all things were to receive God's dominion through sexual intercourse? The passage goes on to say....

"...Therefore, love is the source of life and the essence of happiness; love is the ideal of all creation."

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 78)

Does that mean sex is the source of life and sex is the essence of happiness? Sex is the ideal of all creation? That does not seem likely. But note here, the Divine Principle textbook seems to imply that "love" can also mean sexual intercourse where it says:

“Eve’s fall was consummated through two different illicit love relationships. The first was the spiritual fall through her love with the Archangel. The second was the physical fall through her love with Adam... Eve’s first fallen act was motivated by her excessive desire to enjoy what it was not yet time for her to enjoy and have her eyes opened, like God. This desire led her to consummate a relationship of unprincipled sexual love with the Archangel.”

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, pp. 190-191) (emphasis added)

Hence, we can see that the Principle text is clearly using **two different meanings for the word "love"**! Sometimes it refers to love as an emotional force and at other times it alludes to love as “sexual love” (which may or may not mean actual genital contact per se). In philosophy and logic, the use of one word but giving that word two or more different meanings in the same argument is called the fallacy of “equivocation”. It is a deceptive technique that a speaker or debater uses to HIDE the fact that their argument might be false. If the speaker or debater does not clearly reveal that they are using two different definitions of the same word, it amounts to a deceptive fallacy and may mislead people (intentionally or unintentionally) who are not familiar with this deceptive technique. The question then is...*which* definition of “love” is the love by which Adam and Eve became “one” with Lucifer, thus inheriting Lucifer's elements and was that the ONLY way to become “one” with Lucifer? Again, you might be inclined to say it was "sexual love", but is this true? If this is really true, then we are *forced* to believe that **the *only* way to become one with the messiah is through sexual intercourse.**

Why? Because the Divine Principle textbook also states:

" As in Jesus' coming, he [The Lord of the Second Advent] must come as a man perfected both spiritually and physically. Making the whole of

mankind become one body with him by engrafting them to him both spiritually and physically (Rom. 11:17), *he must make them become perfect* both spiritually and physically, thus making them able to dominate both the invisible and the visible worlds."

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 511) (emphasis added)

"If they [the people] had become one [body] with him [Jesus] in both spirit *and body*...fallen men could have been saved both spiritually and physically."

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 147) (emphasis added)

Are we to believe that becoming "one body" with Jesus or the Lord of the Second Advent means to have *sexual* intercourse with him? No. Not likely, because the full text goes on to say:

"To believe in Jesus means to become one body with him...If they had become one body with him [Jesus] in both spirit and body by **believing** in him, fallen men could have been saved both spiritually and physically."

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 147)³³ (emphasis added)

When we say that we absolutely *believe* in Jesus and we obey Jesus this means that we are fulfilling the ideal of becoming one body with him.

³³ But what exactly does it mean to "believe" in Jesus? Follow his directions? Follow his example? Trust his guidance? It is still possible for Moon to interpret "believe" to mean "follow the messiah's instructions when he tells you to have sex with him". I however see "believe" to mean to listen to the messiah's spiritual guidance and to follow his example in our daily lives. For some people, that might mean he directed them to have sex with him. For others, it might mean something else entirely. However, each person must decide for themselves what they will accept as true.

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level IV, p. 168) (emphasis added)

So, if we are to take the Divine Principle textbooks as true,³⁴ we are compelled to accept that it is possible to become "one body" with someone simply by believing their words and accepting their will as our own. Hence it is entirely possible that Adam and Eve became "one body" with Lucifer, not through sex, but rather through believing Lucifer's word (more specifically, believing Lucifer's ideas). In fact, the Divine Principle textbook affirms this when it states:

"Fallen man unites with Satan in his mind [first] and [then] commits sin through his body."

(Outline of the Principle, Level 4, p. 103)

Hence, it is entirely possible that Adam and Eve became one body with Lucifer through their minds (and not by their genitals), by accepting the angel's words/instruction³⁵ as their own. In fact, before an "evil" act can take place, the mind

³⁴ Even though the Divine Principle textbook itself says NOT consider any religious text book as absolutely true. Such textbooks are only guides pointing to "the truth". The Divine Principle textbook states: "*Scriptures, however are not the truth itself, but are textbooks teaching the truth...Consequently we must never regard such textbooks as absolute in every detail.*" (Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 7) (emphasis added).

³⁵ Note, in the Bible, the serpent/angel NEVER told Eve to "eat the fruit" at all. Eve decided HERSELF to "eat the fruit". Then Eve GAVE the fruit to Adam. The serpent NEVER told them to do anything nor is there any indication in the biblical text that the serpent forced Adam and Eve to "eat the fruit". Therefore, we are completely blaming the WRONG entity in the alleged fall of man. All the evidence points to human beings themselves as being the cause of the fall and not the serpent or angel. The Bible states: "*When the woman saw that the fruit of the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eye, and also desirable for gaining wisdom, she took some and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it.*" Genesis 3:6 (New International Version) (emphasis added). The ONLY thing the serpent said to Eve was that 1) You will not die and 2) You will become like gods. Stating "*Now the serpent was more crafty than any of the wild animals the Lord God had made. He said to the woman, 'Did God really say, 'You must not eat from any tree in the garden'?' The woman said to the serpent, 'We may eat fruit from the trees in the garden, but God did say, 'You must not eat fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden, and you must not touch it, or you will die.'*" "*You will not certainly die,*" the serpent said to the woman. "*For God knows that when you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.*" Genesis 3:1-5 (New International Version) (emphasis added). The ironic thing is that the serpent was actually telling the TRUTH because, 1) Adam and Eve did not die in the day that they ate the fruit and even God said "And the Lord God said, "*The man has now become like one of us,*

must first be invaded or controlled. Thus, the mind is the *primary* and *most fundamental* location of “the fall”, not the body. If that is the case, these "evil elements" must be thought-forms, paradigms and mental ideas based on the angel's words. They do not appear to be some physical DNA/genetic-altering substance transmitted via the sex organs.

In fact, the Divine Principle textbook seems to confirm this view of the “evil elements” being of a mental nature when it states:

"According to the principle that men were created to exchange elements with the objective being with whom they have become one body through love, Eve received certain elements from Lucifer when she joined into one body with him through love. First, she received from Lucifer the **SENSE OF FEAR**, which came from his guilty conscience because of their violation of the purpose of creation. Second, she received **WISDOM** [knowledge] enabling her to perceive that her intended spouse was not Lucifer but Adam...Thus she received the wisdom of the Archangel."

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 79) (emphasis added)

Here, according to the Divine Principle textbook, the elements that Eve received were *emotional* elements (fear) and *cognitive* elements (knowledge) which are both

knowing good and evil. He must not be allowed to reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life and eat, and live forever.” **Genesis 3:22** (New International Version) (emphasis added). This is EXACTLY what the serpent said would happen. Therefore God himself CONFIRMED that what the serpent said was TRUE!!! Even though Eve claimed that the serpent “deceived” her, stating: “*Then the Lord God said to the woman, “What is this you have done?” The woman said, “The serpent deceived me, and I ate.”*” **Genesis 3:13** (New International Version) (emphasis added). BUT ***where is the actual deception???*** The serpent spoke the absolute truth...so how is it that Eve was “deceived”??? Hence, we see that it was humans who created the fallen nature of failing to take responsibility, blaming others, and bearing false witness against innocent parties. Human beings thus are the real “satan”.

MENTAL phenomena.³⁶ Not physical elements. It seems then that this “fear” and “wisdom” are the evil elements received from the angel. *Can fear and wisdom be transmitted and received by a penis or by a vagina????* Seems very unlikely. The Divine Principle textbook also seems to indicate that these “evil elements” were also somehow “*desires*” that led to habits *of mind* since both “proclivities” and “inclinations” are mental habits or psychological impulses as where it states:

"Eve inherited from the Archangel all the proclivities incidental to his transgression against God when he bound her in blood ties through their sexual relationship. Adam in turn acquired the same inclinations when Eve...bound him in blood ties through their sexual relationship. These proclivities have become the root cause of the fallen inclinations in all people. They³⁷ are the primary characteristics of our fallen nature."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 72; Fall 4.5) (emphasis added)

³⁶ One might argue that Eve received these “elements” as a result of her sexual contact with the serpent. However, even if you accept that idea, what then caused Eve to initiate contact with the serpent in the first place? If she decided to have sexual contact, that decision HAD TO ARISE FIRST IN HER MIND before her action of actual sexual contact. Thus, is it not the mental “sin” which is primary and more fundamental? Even Jesus alludes to this when he says: “**But I tell you that anyone who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart.**” Matthew 5:28 (emphasis added); see also ““**Don’t you see that whatever enters the mouth goes into the stomach and then out of the body? But the things that come out of a person’s mouth come from the heart, and these defile them. For out of the heart come evil thoughts—murder, adultery, sexual immorality, theft, false testimony, slander. These are what defile a person; but eating with unwashed hands does not defile them.**”” Matthew 15:17-19 (emphasis added). So even Jesus identified the primary area of sin to be MENTAL, not physical.

³⁷ What does “they” refer to? The *proclivities* as the primary characteristics of fallen nature? Or the fallen *inclinations* as the root of fallen nature? And what is the difference between a “proclivity” and an “inclination”??? I think that “they” refers to the proclivities and that fallen inclinations are the same thing as fallen nature. Hence, what exactly are these proclivities? It seems that some of these proclivities include Envy, Jealousy, self-centered viewpoint, leaving your “proper” position, desire to reverse order of dominion, desire to multiply one’s point of view and entangle others, etc. but why should any of those things be exclusively transmitted by sexual means???

First, there is the obvious question of 1) What exactly is a “blood tie”? This is now yet *a new, undefined term* that is just introduced without any explanation whatsoever!!! 2) How does a “blood tie” happen during a physical sexual encounter? 3) How does a “blood tie” happen during a purely spiritual sexual encounter with a being [an angel] who presumably has no physical blood? 4) Can mental proclivities actually be transferred from one person to another through contact with a penis or contact with a vagina? If so, how exactly? 5) How did the angel supposedly develop these “proclivities” and “inclinations” in the first place? Did he always have them or were they something he specially created? Or were they created at the moment of the Fall? If created beforehand, did he get those proclivities and inclinations in a sexual way or a non-sexual way? If created in a non-sexual way, then there is no necessary reason why such proclivities and inclinations need be transmitted sexually given they can be created by non-sexual methods. If created at the moment of the fall and they did not exist until the moment of the Fall, then what led Lucifer to sin if he did not have these elements until he actually caused Adam and Eve to Fall?³⁸ 6) How is a “proclivity” different from an “inclination”? There are a whole host of questions that are completely glossed over or ignored in the Divine Principle text. Or was this “glossing over” intentional? In any event, according to the Divine Principle textbook at the very least **the “fear” and “wisdom” of the angel is the**

³⁸ There was some rumor in the Unification Church that Lucifer practiced homosexual sex with the other angels and thus developed Original Sin that way. But again, how does that happen? Wouldn’t Lucifer need some pre-motivation to even think about engaging in homosexual sex? And how would any human being actually know that is what Lucifer did? Lucifer told them? Could Lucifer be lying? There are so many aspects of this cosmology that are unprovable yet presented as if they are facts. You can see how very elusive this Original Sin element is...that is . . .because it **DOES NOT EXIST**. The other explanation is that Lucifer was motivated to sin by his jealousy of Adam. But if that is the case, and jealousy is a naturally occurring phenomena, then it means that anyone can sin at anytime due to ***naturally occurring emotions*** and thus there is no need to create the idea of Original Sin since mere ordinary emotions can lead a person to sin at any time. Thus this “jealousy as the root of sin” theory, supports my idea that “fallen nature” is something Adam and Eve were naturally born with and did not acquire externally.

Original Sin and we may add to that the “inclinations” and “proclivities” of the angel as well because as the Divine Principle textbook states:

“The evil element received from the fallen archangel is Original Sin.”

(Outline of the Principle, Level 4, p. 102)

Hence, the conclusion we have reached so far, based on our research and analysis of the Divine Principle textbooks is that Original Sin is an *emotional* and *cognitive* and probably a *psychological* “element” that Adam and Eve received from the archangel by “entering into blood ties” through sexual activity. So then, if these emotional and cognitive and psychological elements are the elements that comprise Original Sin...how exactly are these elements “removed”? Likewise, how is it that parents pass down “fear” and “wisdom” and “proclivities” to their children? Is it something genetically based? If so, does a sex act change the genetics of a person? And as far as “removal” of these Original Sin elements, wouldn’t that all depend on where exactly these elements were lodged in the human body and the method by which they were lodged there? Given that fear, wisdom, and psychological proclivities are commonly believed to be purely mental phenomena, it appears that the “removal” process (if such can be “removed”) would need to be a mental process as well. However, the Divine Principle textbook seems to believe that sexual contact is a viable method of implanting these elements and thus by extension, the Divine Principle textbook *is implying that the elements can be “removed” by a sexual process as well*. But is that actually true scientifically? Thus, let us examine this idea of “blood ties”.

What Exactly are “Blood Ties”???

It is important to point out that the Divine Principle textbooks never clearly defines what exactly "blood ties" are. It is unclear if this vagueness is intentional or unintentional. However, we are thus left with the *impression* that somehow Eve's literal blood (or DNA) changed due to her alleged sexual interaction with the angel. If this "blood tie" is literal, then we are *led to believe* that the Original Sin is somehow a genetic manipulation of our DNA or chromosomes. However, there is still the possibility that "blood ties" is a purely *figurative* expression. Hence, we need to investigate if "blood ties" is a literal expression or a figurative one, or something else altogether.

The Divine Principle textbook states:

"We know that the original sin has been perpetuated through lineal descent from one generation to the next. This is because the root of sin was solidified by a sexual relationship that binds one in ties of blood."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 61) (emphasis added)

"Accordingly, Eve's eating of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil denotes that she consummated a satanic love relationship with the angel which bound her in blood ties to him."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 60; Fall 1.3.3) (emphasis added)

"When the first human ancestors fell, they bound themselves in blood ties with Lucifer."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 68; Fall 4) (emphasis added)

“This shame [of Adam and Eve after the Fall] was an indication of their inner reality, for they had formed a *bond of blood ties* with Satan by committing sin with their sexual parts.”

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 204; Foundation 2.2)
(emphasis added)

“Fourth, it [Abraham dividing the animal offering] was to make the condition to sanctify the offering by *draining out the blood of death*, which had entered fallen humanity when they were *bound in blood-ties* to Satan.”

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 211; Foundation 3.1.2)
(emphasis added)

“The primary significance of the Fall was that the first human ancestors formed a *bond of blood ties* with the Archangel; therefore, all of humanity has been bound to Satan’s lineage.”

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 284; Moses and Jesus 3.3.2)
(emphasis added)

“Meanwhile, on the basis of his *relationship of blood ties* with the first human beings, Satan has worked through fallen people to realize, in advance of God, a perverted form of the ideal society which God intends to realize.”

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 329; Parallels 7.1) (emphasis added)

Another passage states:

"Humankind is beset by the original sin, which has been *inherited* from our first ancestors. Yet how can something one eats cause *a sin which can be transmitted* to one's descendants? The only way

something can be inherited is by being passed down through the lineage. The temporary ill effects of eating something cannot be perpetuated through the long descent of lineage."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 54) (emphasis added)

The Principle textbook continues:

"It [Jesus' crucifixion] does not resolve the original sin which is transmitted through our physical bodies and remains active within us."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 392) (emphasis added)

"...Satanic invasion...constantly comes through the flesh due to the original sin...the original sin REMAINS IN THE FLESH and is transmitted continuously from generation to generation."

(Divine Principle, p. 148) (emphasis added)

The Israelites performed the rite of circumcision as a condition for sanctification. They qualified themselves as God's chosen people by draining blood, because the root of sin lies in having taken in through an unchaste act the evil blood which permeates our being.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 61; Fall 1.5)

From these passages, this idea of a "blood tie" seems to be a *physical*/organic substance meant to refer to either the physical blood itself or refer to the genetic inheritance system in human beings (i.e., Deoxyribonucleic acid or "DNA") which as far as we know is also physical (chemically and biologically based). These passages however do not answer the question of 1) How sexual intercourse can create a "blood tie", 2) How sexual intercourse can "change" a person's mental state, psychological state, and or genetic code (assuming

that Eve's mental state was even changed at all by her alleged encounter with the angel).³⁹ We do "know" that children can be affected by the genetic inheritance from their parents which does occur *indirectly* through sexual contact, but it is not necessarily genital *contact* that produces this inheritance, but rather genetic MATERIAL in the sperm and the ovum. This genetic *material* can be transmitted WITHOUT genital contact as in the case of test-tube babies. **Hence what we commonly refer to as a connection or "tie" by "blood" is really a connection due to similar *genetic information* or *genetic sequencing*** as transmitted through a sperm and ovum meeting, combining chromosomes, and multiplying a new organism that contains chromosomes combined from both the sperm and ovum. "Blood ties" in common usage in everyday conversations never refers to the physical blood fluid running through a person's veins and arteries. Physical blood fluid is comprised of 1) red blood cells, 2) white blood cells, 3) platelets, 4) plasma, 5) dissolved vitamins and minerals, 6) waste products, 7) antigens such as A, B, 8) an Rh factor (positive or negative), and 9) possible viruses or germs which have not yet been neutralized by the white blood cells. Though some of these blood cells contain genetic information, modern science tells us that **genetic information is NOT *transmitted* to future generations via the blood fluid or blood cells.** Genetic information (based on modern science) **is ONLY transmitted by the sex-cells,** the gametes, specifically the

³⁹ In other writings, I argue that what Unificationists call "fallen nature" is really the inherent *original* immature nature of human beings that all human beings are originally born with. **Hence "fallen nature" is not something that the angel "gave" to Eve,** but rather something that Adam and Eve both already had, were *originally* born with, and had to make conscious effort to grow out of. **Hence the original sin is both Adam and Eve failing to take responsibility for their lives and failing to grow out of their in-born immature nature. Lucifer did not give anything to Eve that Eve did not originally have prior to her alleged encounter with the angel.** Hence the angel never gave any "evil elements" to Eve. Adam and Eve already had those "elements". They are natural and organic to the human condition. In "fact", it was human beings who gave these characteristics to the angel. Had Adam and Eve perfected themselves, according to the Divine Principle textbook, no "Fall" would be possible. Thus, human beings are 100% responsible for the Fall. Human beings maintained their tendency to 1) Not take personal responsibility, 2) blame others, 3) bear

sperm and ovum. Hence when people say they are “related by blood”, they are not referring to having the same blood fluid or similar blood composition or even the same blood type. What they are *really* saying is that they share ***a common DNA signature profile or genetic sequence*** which was transmitted by the DNA in sex-cells, specifically by the sperm and ovum. Hence “blood ties” according to modern science, have ***nothing*** to do with physical blood fluid. Regardless, even if you want to believe that a “blood tie” is the physical blood fluid, ***there does NOT seem to be any scientific evidence that if a woman has genital contact with a man that she can 1) share her blood fluid directly with the man and that such blood fluid enters the man’s circulatory system or enters the man’s sex-cells and 2) no evidence that genital contact can instantly change that man’s genetic material throughout his entire body or change that man’s sperm’s genetic composition merely by the presence of her genital contact.*** That simply does not happen or at least there is no scientific evidence of such. Even if contact with blood fluid could change a person’s DNA, then when a person receives a blood transfusion at a hospital due to a medical emergency then the transfusion recipient should ***also*** instantly 1) have all or at least some of their DNA changed by the blood transfusion, 2) have all or some of their sex-cells changed, and 3) also inherit the mental and psychological proclivities and inclinations of the person they received the blood fluid from. But in actual human experience, ***that does NOT seem to happen!!!*** What often happens is that the new blood is either *rejected* or *attacked* by the recipient’s immune system if that blood is not compatible or of a different blood type. Any blood cells that are accepted by the transfusion remain in the body for approximately 120 days ***and then die***. New blood

false witness against innocent parties. These were all the characteristics of children which Adam and Eve both displayed at the time of the alleged “Fall”.

cell are produced by the bone marrow, not the genitals. Even if genital contact could produce a blood transfusion of literal blood or produce a genetic change, what would determine *which* blood would dominate? For example, when Eve allegedly had sex with Adam, why didn't Adam's "blood" dominate Eve's "blood"? And if "good" is stronger than "evil" why not simply have a "good" angel have sex with Eve immediately after Lucifer did and thus reverse the process? Why wait thousands of years for a "messiah" to be born???? And when that "messiah" is born, what is he or she going to do? Go have sex with people to "restore" them? Presumably so. If you accept the idea that genital contact produces *inheritable* psychological transformations which is the idea the Divine Principle textbooks attempt to promote. Too many absurd questions arise if we think of the "blood ties" mentioned in the Divine Principle textbooks as a literal physical substance. The idea of "blood ties" being a physical substance simply makes no sense and does not correspond to scientific and practical realities. Hence the idea of "blood ties" as expressed in the Divine Principle textbooks, **MUST** be a *figurative* tie and **not** a genetic or physical tie (if it is in fact anything at all).

You might be tempted to argue that the angel as a supposedly supernatural/spiritual being (whatever *that* means) had some special "magical" power to alter human DNA through his sex activity. Even assuming that is true, 1) How then did the angel develop these Original Sin elements in himself? 2) and again, why then does God have to wait thousands of years to create a "messiah"? Why not simply have a "good" angel have "magical" sex with Eve immediately after the Fall and instantly reverse the alleged genetic change? Why wait thousands of years? That makes no sense. So if the angel had some "magical" or supernatural power, it stands to reason that other

angels should have likewise have had such power and should have been able to do some sort of reverse sexual alchemy to restore Adam and Eve. The “fact” that God had to wait thousands of years for a human being to be developed implies or suggests that no such magical sex power existed. It also implies that the alleged fall did not take place due to sexual-genital contact or through any direct blood or DNA contamination. **Therefore, this idea of sexual contact instantly (or even over time) producing a genetic, mental, and or psychological change in a human being is not supported by science, is not supported by practical experience and does not make any sense whatsoever.**

Accordingly, this sexual-fall theory either has to be explained scientifically or completely abandoned. Even according to the Divine Principle textbooks:

Even internal truth *demand*s logical and convincing explanations.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 6) (emphasis added)

Knowledge comes from cognition, and man today cannot cognize anything *which lacks logic and scientific proof*. To understand something there must first be cognition. Thus internal truth **requires** logical proof. Religion has been moving through the long course of history toward an age in which it **must** be explained scientifically.

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 9) (emphasis added)

"...the human intellect has become highly sophisticated, *requiring* a scientific approach to understanding reality.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 6) (emphasis added)

“In consequence, today the truth must appear with a higher standard and with a scientific method of expression in order for *intelligent* modern man to understand it.

(Divine Principle, (Brown book), 1977 edition, p. 131) (emphasis added)

Accordingly, the Divine Principle textbook idea of “blood ties” does not pass the “scientific proof” test or the “logic test” and hence for the present moment, must be rejected as being literal and must be understood *as only a figurative fabrication*. “Blood ties” does not refer to actual blood fluid and does not refer to DNA code. Even if you want to accept the idea that mental and genetic changes can occur simply due to genital (sex organ) contact, a multitude of unanswerable questions arise such as (as already said *ad nauseum*) 1) Why not have a “good” angel have “magical” sex with Eve to reverse the alleged effects of the Fall instead of waiting thousands of years to “develop” a messiah figure? 2) How were the original evil elements created in the first place in a being (Lucifer) who was supposedly supposed to have been originally “good”? Did Lucifer get these “evil elements” by sexual contact? Or could he make these elements up without sexual contact? 3) “Restoration” then must be accomplished through sexual contact with the messiah and thus the theory of P’ikareun *must* be true despite all of the denials of the Unification Church that it is not true. None of this makes any logical or scientific sense at all. Thus, the idea of “blood ties” appears to be merely a false *figurative* device simply created to address the equally *false* idea of Original Sin as fabricated by Christian theologians. “Blood ties” then is merely a Unificationist myth used to co-opt a pre-existing Christian myth. The purposes of such co-option seems to be 1) to justify P’ikareun and 2) to exclusively tie people to Rev. Moon and his organization and to set

Rev. Moon up as a unique and special figure to whom all energy and economic resources must flow. The author(s) of the Divine Principle textbook(s) seemed to have had no problem rejecting and demystifying other Christian myths such as predestination, resurrection, the trinity, the rapture, Jesus retuning from the sky, etc. However, the author(s) of the Divine Principle textbooks chose instead to *keep* and exploit the equally mythic and fabricated concept of Original Sin. Why did they do that? It seems that the concept of Original Sin seemed *useful* to their political purposes, i.e., to set Rev. Moon up as a human idol to extract financial and psychological resources from a human population which seems to be the same reason the Catholic church promoted the idea of Original Sin (to fool people into believing that the Catholic church and its human hierarchy were the exclusive path to heaven). Unfortunately, the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks have clearly shown their duplicity and perhaps nefarious purposes by leaving the myth of Original Sin intact, but showing themselves *fully capable of dismantling other myths of Christianity* such as the resurrection, the rapture, predestination, the trinity, etc. Their true objective thus seems to be the *enslavement of the human population, not its liberation*. If the authors were really interested in liberation, they would have either completely dismantled the false idea of Original Sin, or clearly explained what Original Sin was so that people could be free from it. The authors chose to do neither, instead choosing to co-op a myth for their own purposes. **Why then did these authors seek to deceive us?**

It is thus quite possible that *all* religions are emanating from the same central source with the same nefarious purpose, i.e., human mental *enslavement*. It is for this

reason why I say a perfected person has no religion and holds no religious beliefs. A perfected person relies on verified and verifiable knowledge only.

Hence what I see here is that 1) human beings have always had the ability to perfect themselves; 2) The angel never gave Adam and Eve some unique “evil element” and in fact what we call “fallen nature” may very well be the ORIGINAL immature nature of human beings which every human being is originally born with; 3) Adam and Eve simply had to grow out of this immature stage on their own by their own efforts; 4) The Original Sin (if anything) was man’s failure to take responsibility for their lives and grow out of their immaturity by their own efforts and thus they were incapable of loving or dominating the angel which led to the angel’s jealousy; 5) This Original Sin (failure to take responsibility to seek truth and perfect one’s self via one’s own efforts) is manifested in Christians not questioning or analyzing Christian theology for themselves, but rather simply accepting what various Christian (Pauline) soothsayers promoted as Christianity despite the obvious logical and scientific contradictions in the theology; 6) This Original Sin is also manifested in Unificationists not questioning or analyzing Unification theology and cosmology despite the obvious contradictions in that theology and cosmology.

The same goes for the idea of “blood ties”. So why then was the concept of “blood ties” created? It seems it was created for the same reason, to further support the use of Original Sin as an “exclusivity device”. Meaning, if you accept the idea of Original Sin and accept the idea of “blood ties”, then the natural (though false) conclusion is that you must get your “salvation” exclusively from Rev. Moon and no one else. It is a tactic used by other religions that likewise each claim to be the only “true”

religion and or only true path to god or the gods. The idea of “blood ties” also seems to fit with the idea of P'ikareun, as mentioned above, since if someone believes in a sexual Fall that resulted in “blood ties”, they are much more likely to participate in a sexual *practice* claimed to “restore” them if they don’t ask any questions about what those terms actually mean and don’t seek to actually and scientifically prove the truth of those concepts. As shown above, the idea of “blood ties” resulting from sexual activity does not appear to be true. At the very least, the idea of “blood ties” as presented in the Divine Principle textbooks is too impermissibly vague to be of any practical use other than for deceptive purposes. Until and unless Unificationists can clarify and prove the real existence of the “blood ties” concept, such concept must be discredited and abandoned as being utterly useless for salvation or perfection purposes.

CHRISTIANITY ISN'T REALLY “CHRISTIAN”

What we call “Christianity” today, is ***not*** really the teachings of Jesus, but rather the teachings of “Saint” Paul. There is evidence however that Paul was a double-agent working for the empire of Rome and that Paul’s mission was to “spiritualize” and thus *weaken* Christianity ***so that Christianity would not become a political threat to or disrupt the empire of Rome.*** Paul’s mission and purpose was to weaken and redirect Jesus’ message and make Jesus’ followers either non-political or make them actually obedient followers of the state of Rome.⁴⁰ To be non-political means that you are not interested in holding any earthly power or reaping the physical benefits that such earthly control brings. Remember that Jesus was the one who made a whip to whip the money

⁴⁰ See “*Operation Messiah: St Paul, Roman Intelligence and the Birth of Christianity*” by Thijs Voskuilen found here: <https://amzn.to/3sVVZRu> (argues “St.” Paul was a Roman double agent sent to weaken Jesus’s movement from the inside).

changers out of the temple. Jesus was a “bad-ass”.⁴¹ Jesus’s disciples were also “packing heat”...they were armed with the weapons of the day.⁴² Jesus also announces that he came to liberate those who were in bondage and to free those who were oppressed.⁴³ These are clearly political messages meant to disrupt the existing power structure that had set people in bondage. Paul, on the other hand, however, instead tells slaves to “obey their masters”.⁴⁴ You can see how the original ideas of Jesus would have been a threat to Rome whose empire was based on subjugation and oppression. Thus, Christianity (as developed by Paul) created a multitude of false ideas in order to weaken Christianity and make Christianity subservient to the interests of Rome. Rev. Moon and the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks then attempted to “clean up” all of these false ideas so as to re-capture Christians who have been lost. However, even though these authors chose to dismantle many of the false ideas of Paulism, these same authors chose *not* to dismantle the false idea of Original Sin. It will thus, be helpful to show you where the idea of

⁴¹ See John 2:13-17 *“It was almost time for the Passover Festival, so Jesus went to Jerusalem. There in the Temple he found people selling cattle, sheep, and pigeons, and also the moneychangers sitting at their tables. **So he made a whip** from cords and drove all the animals out of the Temple, both the sheep and the cattle; he **overturned** the tables of the moneychangers and **scattered** their coins; and he **ordered** those who sold the pigeons, **“Take them out of here! Stop making my Father's house a marketplace!”** His disciples remembered that the scripture says, “My devotion to your house, O God, burns in me like a fire.”” (Good News Version).*

⁴² See Matthew 26:51, 52 *“And, behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and **drew his sword**, and struck a servant of the high priest's, and smote off his ear. Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.”* (King James Version) (Note: Jesus did not say “get rid of that sword”, nor did Jesus express any surprise and say “Hey, I told you all we are non-violent, where did that sword come from???” Jesus clearly must have known that his disciples were packing “heat”. He simply told him to put the sword away, not to get rid of it. Just sayin’.

⁴³ See Luke 4:18-20 *“The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, Because He has anointed Me . . . To proclaim **liberty** to the captives . . . To set at **liberty** those who are oppressed . . . Today this Scripture is fulfilled in your hearing.”* (emphasis added)

⁴⁴ See Colossians 3:22 *“Slaves, obey your human masters in all things, not only when they are watching you because you want to gain their approval; but do it with a sincere heart because of your reverence for the Lord.”* (Good News Version).

Original Sin came from and why it is a false idea which the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks should have likewise confronted, addressed, and dismantled.

ORIGINAL SIN IN CHRISTIAN COSMOLOGY

Original Sin, in Christian cosmology, is the idea of a “universal” sinfulness of the human race genetically *inherited* from and traditionally ascribed to the first sin committed by Adam. The idea of “sin” generally in Christian doctrine, is considered a state of alienation or estrangement from God.

Scriptural Foundation

The term original sin is **not** found in the Bible. Theologians who advocate the doctrine of original sin argue, however, that it is strongly *implied* by Paul (see Romans 5:12)⁴⁵ and (Romans 7:18-24),⁴⁶ by John (see 1 John 5:19),⁴⁷ in the old testament (see Psalms 51:5)⁴⁸ and even by Jesus himself (see Luke 11:13)⁴⁹ and (see John 8:44).⁵⁰ Behind these New Testament sources is the world view of Jewish apocalyptic writings.

⁴⁵ “Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all people, because all sinned—” (New International Version).

⁴⁶ “For I know that good itself does not dwell in me, that is, in my sinful nature.[c] For I have the desire to do what is good, but I cannot carry it out. For I do not do the good I want to do, but the evil I do not want to do—this I keep on doing. Now if I do what I do not want to do, it is no longer I who do it, but it is sin living in me that does it. So I find this law at work: Although I want to do good, evil is right there with me. For in my inner being I delight in God’s law; but I see another law at work in me, waging war against the law of my mind and making me a prisoner of the law of sin at work within me. What a wretched man I am! Who will rescue me from this body that is subject to death?” (New International Version).

⁴⁷ “We know that we are children of God, and that the whole world is under the control of the evil one.” (New International Version).

⁴⁸ “Surely I was sinful at birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me.”(New International Version).

⁴⁹ “If you then, though you are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father in heaven give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him!”(New International Version).

⁵⁰ “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.”(King James Version).

Some of these writings attribute the corrupt state of the world to a prehistoric fall of Satan, the subsequent temptation of Adam and Eve, and the immersion of human history thereafter in disorder, disobedience, and pain (see 2 Esdras 7:10-12, 118).⁵¹ In this apocalyptic framework, Paul and other New Testament writers interpreted the work of Christ as overcoming the tremendous power of inherited sin and evil once and for all, reconciling humanity to God, and thus making peace.⁵²

St. Augustine

The decline and fall of Rome in the late 4th and early 5th centuries produced a similar apocalyptic atmosphere of crisis and despair. In his controversy with the Romano-British monk Pelagius over the nature of sin and grace, St. Augustine was able to appeal to the Pauline-apocalyptic understanding of the forgiveness of sin (c.f., *Pelagianism* which was an idea that went against Paul's ideas of sin).⁵³ In his elaboration of the

⁵¹ Verses 10 to 12: "When Adam transgressed my ordinances, what had been made was judged, 12 and the entrances of this world were made narrow, sorrowful, and troublesome. They are few and bad, full of dangers and involving people in great hardships."; verse 118: "Adam, what have you done?! If you sinned, the downfall wasn't yours alone but also ours who are descended from you." (Common English Bible Versions) ("Esdras" is a book not part of most bibles, however it is a book contained in the "Vulgate" bible as an appendix to the New Testament. The "Vulgate" bible is official Bible of the Catholic Church translated into Latin and based on Greek manuscripts. "Vulgate" means "common" and thus the Vulgate Bible was supposed to be a bible more accessible to the common people.

⁵² Adapted from Charles P. Price, "Original Sin," Microsoft® Encarta® 98 Encyclopedia. © 1993-1997.

⁵³ See also <https://www.learnreligions.com/what-is-pelagianism-4783772> ("Pelagianism takes its name from the British monk Pelagius, who prompted a school of thought that **denied** several fundamental Christian doctrines **including original sin**, the fall of man, salvation by grace, predestination, and the sovereignty of God. . . .By AD 417, Pelagius was excommunicated by Pope Innocent I and then condemned as a heretic by the Council of Carthage in AD 418. After his death, Pelagianism continued to expand and was officially condemned again by the Council of Ephesus in AD 431 and once again at Orange in AD 526.") **Note:** You have to wonder why the Catholic Church was so against this monk Pelagius. It seems the idea of Original Sin had some practical benefit to the Catholic Church such that they had to censor all other viewpoints. Essentially, Pelagius knew the Catholic Church (circle) was an enslaving institution set up by jinns or Anunnaki and the Catholic circle knew that too (that they were an enslaving institution, not based on the teachings of Jesus) and hence they set out to silence Pelagius. That is my opinion and I could be wrong. But if an idea is so "obviously" false, why then would anyone have to make so much effort to condemn it? Clearly, Pelagius' ideas disrupted the Catholic Church power structure and for that reason had to be censored.

doctrine, however, St. Augustine imported an idea foreign to the Bible, that is, the notion that the taint of sin is transmitted from generation to generation by the act of procreation (sex). He took this idea from the 2nd-century theologian named Tertullian, who actually coined the phrase original sin.⁵⁴ Thus St. Augustine popularized an idea created by Tertullian which were loosely based on ideas taught by Paul which seem to have nothing to do with Jesus or the Bible. When the monk Pelagius began teaching the idea that there was no such thing as Original Sin and that man was capable of saving himself, St. Augustine shot back to “defend the faith” and reinforce Paulism.

Apparently, St. Augustine wrote four letters/essays in response to the ideas of the monk Pelagius and the theology that resulted from Pelagius’ teachings with that theology becoming known as “Pelagianism”. St. Augustine’s letters/essays were: “*De peccatorum meritis et remissione libri III*” (On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins Book III) [written] in [A.D.] 412, “*De spiritu et litera*” (On the Spirit and the Letter) and “*Definitiones Caelestii*” (The Heavenly Definitions) [written] in [A.D.] 414, and “*De natura et gratia*” (On Nature and Grace) [written] in [A.D.] 415. In them [those essays/letters] Augustine strongly asserted and developed doctrine of original sin, the need for infant baptism, the impossibility of a sinless life without Christ, and the necessity of Christ's grace.”⁵⁵ Thus the idea of Original Sin was popularized by St. Augustine in part due to Augustine’s response to the ideas of Pelagius. The ideas that St. Augustine sought to promote, such as the inescapability of Original Sin, the absolute necessity for salvation by Christ (and by extension the need to have the church as a mediator), the need for babies to be baptized

⁵⁴ Taken and adapted from Charles P. Price, “Original Sin,” Microsoft® Encarta® 98 Encyclopedia. © 1993-1997.

⁵⁵ <https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Pelagius> (emphasis added), Last visited September 5, 2022/

by the church, etc., all had one practical effect if such ideas were believed and accepted. That effect was to keep the believers **DEPENDENT** upon the Catholic Church and **DEPENDENT** upon the Catholic Church power structure. Generally, people do not believe ideas because they are true. They believe ideas because they are personally **USEFUL**. Thus St. Augustine's ideas were useful in maintaining the Catholic Church's power over people's minds and bodies and maintaining the subsequent financial income resulting from such control over people's minds and bodies. Thus, it makes practical and psychological sense why Augustine would promote such ideas since he as a leader in the church would personally benefit from such ideas in both a financial sense and in a psychological ego sense in augmenting his personal prestige. It is possible that St. Augustine was subconsciously motivated to maintain his "job security" as a church leader and not motivated or inspired by anything that was actually found in the Bible. For example, where does Jesus say that babies should be baptized? Was Jesus baptized as a baby? No. So where does this idea come from?? Where does Jesus say we have original sin? Where does Jesus say that the Catholic church is the one true authority of his teachings? He does not. The Bible does have Jesus saying that "upon this rock [Peter] I will build my church" (Matthew 16:18), but no one asked Jesus what exactly that meant and in any event, the resulting Catholic Church does not resemble anything Jesus himself would have built given the rampant pedophilia in the Catholic Church, clearly the gates of Hades have prevailed against the Catholic Church. In addition, Jesus said he had "other sheep" who were not of this "fold" (not part of the group of 12 disciples in Palestine) indicating that Jesus had other followers who were not connected to the original 12 disciples and thus there could be other groups with authority besides those

connected to the disciple Peter.⁵⁶ So the ideas St. Augustine tried to promote do not seem to have any Biblical or metaphysical ground and have everything to do with preserving church power over people. Thus, any idea that threatened that power structure or threatened that “gravy train”, had to be crushed. Hence it is possible that the idea of inescapable Original Sin was an economically beneficial concept to cement and maintain the power the Catholic Church had over the material and mental resources of its members and does not necessarily reflect an absolute truth of the universe.

Subsequent Theology

Medieval theologians retained the idea of original sin, with certain qualifications. It was asserted again in a more recognizably Augustinian form by 16th-century Protestant reformers, primarily Martin Luther and John Calvin. In subsequent Protestant thought, the doctrine was diluted or circumvented. Liberal Protestant theologians developed an optimistic view of human nature that was incompatible with the idea of original sin. The extended crisis of Western civilization that began with World War I, however, had aroused renewed interest in the original, basically apocalyptic, outlook of the New Testament and in the doctrine of original sin. Such neoorthodox or postliberal theologians as Karl Barth, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Paul Tillich, however, were unwilling to attribute

⁵⁶ See John 10:16, though it can be argued that the rest of the quote indicates that Jesus wanted all of his followers to be under one organization saying that they should become “one flock” with “one shepherd”. This Bible verse is also the basis for the Mormons claiming that Jesus teleported to the American continent after his death and resurrection in order to preach to the native Americans who were supposedly a lost tribe of Israel. See: <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2006-feb-16-me-mormon16-story.html> (last visited September 17, 2022).

the transmission of sin to procreation, instead attributing it to an already corrupt society.⁵⁷

Accordingly, the idea of Original Sin is an idea manufactured by Christian thinkers and theologians and does not appear to be something that God said existed or that God reveled to such theologians or anything discovered through scientific testing. It is simply some human-created idea! Thus Rev. Moon, coming from a Christian foundation may have inherited this idea of Original Sin without doing his own empirical research or finding some actual substance known as “Original Sin Element”. However, even if Rev. Moon was exposed to the idea of Original Sin, that did not mean he had to accept and perpetuate the idea of Original Sin. Just as Rev. Moon (or the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks) sought to explain, demystify, and dismantle other traditional (but wholly manufactured) Christian concepts like the Trinity, Christology, Resurrection, Predestination, the Last Days, the Second Advent, Salvation, Judgment by Fire, people getting caught up in the clouds in the rapture, the dead rising from their tombs, etc., Rev. Moon and the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks could have and should have equally chosen to examine and demystify the false idea of Original Sin. Instead, however, Moon and the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks for some reason sought to KEEP the idea of Original Sin intact, perhaps for the same reasons why St. Augustine wanted to keep the idea intact, since in a practical sense it “mandates” that everyone must come to Rev. Moon or the Unification Church to be saved. But if it were true that Original Sin actually existed, shouldn’t the authors of the Divine Principle texts have made more

⁵⁷ Taken and adapted from Charles P. Price, “Original Sin,” Microsoft® Encarta® 98 Encyclopedia. © 1993-1997.

effort to prove the existence of Original Sin and to base it in scientific fact? After all, if the “removal” of Original Sin is the key to “salvation”, then you would want to get the removal process correct and scientifically accurate. Wouldn’t you? Yet, the authors of the Divine Principle text fail to elucidate the existence of Original Sin with any real evidence. This seems very strange and highly suspect. The absence of a detailed discussion of Original Sin is almost an admission of fraud. However, no one seems willing or interested in calling the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks out on their bull shit. Perhaps because the adherents find some comfort in the idea that they are not responsible for their “sin” or perhaps they simply do not have the intellectual ability to search out the truth or falsity of these ideas or simply they enjoy the “accolades” of being a “follower of the messiah” without having to actually inherit the true substance of such a position. I don’t know. We can only speculate. Regardless, if you believe and accept an idea that is actually false, there is no way to accomplish good results with a false idea. Perhaps these individuals do not really believe in God or believe in the Kingdom of Heaven and simply are looking for a way to self-aggrandize and make themselves seem important without actually possessing the substance thereof. In that sense they are moochers, parasites, charlatans, the blind leading the blind astray. They should thus be dealt with accordingly. If however, they are true people of conscience, they will know the way they should go upon discovering “new truth”. Otherwise, they must suffer the consequences of being soothsayers. I.e., torment and destruction within the “lake of fire”.

So, if Rev. Moon and or the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks, are lying about the existence of Original Sin, what does that say about all of the other ideas emanating from the Divine Principle textbooks? Can we trust any of those ideas either?

First, even the Divine Principle textbook seems to indicate that it is “ok” for a messiah figure to “mislead” his followers or tell lies if he or she thinks that such misdirection or falsehood will yield beneficial results. For example, the Divine Principle text states:

“There are two reasons why Jesus prophesied that the Lord will return on the clouds. First, it was to prevent the delusions of antichrists from creating confusion among believers...Second, it was to encourage Christians who were walking a difficult path of faith. There are other occasions when Jesus gave paradoxical words to encourage his followers to accomplish God’s Will as rapidly as possible. For example, he said, “Truly, I say to you, you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel, before the Son of man comes.” This led his disciples to believe that the Second Advent would take place in the near future. When Jesus told Peter of his approaching martyrdom, Peter asked him what would become of the disciple John. Jesus replied, “If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you?” Jesus also said, “Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.” These sayings led the disciples to think they would meet the returning Jesus in their lifetime.

(Exposition of the Principle, p. 395; Second Advent 2.4) (emphasis added)

This passage from the Divine Principle textbook clearly states that it is “ok” for a messiah figure to either **lie** or **deliberately mislead** his or her followers if that figure believes that doing so is necessary or valuable. Accordingly, it is quite possible, using that logic, that Rev. Moon believed it permissible to *mislead* members with the idea of Original Sin and “Blood Ties” if doing so would help him accomplish his purpose. But the question is, what was Rev. Moon’s purpose? What was the purpose of the other possible authors of the Divine Principle textbooks? Was it sexual access and self-

aggrandizement? Was it fame and fortune? Or was it building an actual kingdom of heaven on earth? You can answer that question by looking at the actual results. Do you see an actual kingdom of heaven? Or do you see certain people benefiting from self-aggrandizement? What results do you actually see? Just as Jesus' statements above were eventually found out not to be true, the same can be said of any statement Rev. Moon made, i.e., that it may eventually be found not to be true. It is for this reason why people must take responsibility for themselves to figure out what is and is not true. Even the Divine Principle text and Rev. Moon state:

"Scriptures, however are not the truth itself, but are textbooks teaching the truth . . . Consequently we must never regard such textbooks as absolute in every detail."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 7) (emphasis added)

"We should constantly make effort to have the right faith by searching both in spirit and in truth."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 131)

"Human beings are endowed with emotional sensitivity to the Heart of God, intuition and reason to comprehend His Will, and the requisite abilities to practice it. A person who relates to God in this manner will attain perfection of his individual character."

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 80) (emphasis added)

"Also it will represent your *graduation* from the Unification Church; you won't need the Unification Church anymore. You should feel that you don't

need to have someone looking after you. If you know what you should be doing, why do you need someone giving you direction?”

(Home Church, 1980, p. 130) (emphasis added)

“I pray that among you someone can come forward to say, "Father, I can inherit your mission. I feel precisely as you do; I am another Reverend Moon. Leave it to me." My prayer is to see even one person like that come from among you. The greatest blessing, the greatest gift that God could give me, would be to see such a man. That person will say, "Father, I shall not only equal your own record, I shall exceed your record so there can be glory and Sabbath for you and for God.”

(God's Will and the World, p. 388-389) (emphasis added)

Essentially, you need to figure things out for yourself and then take action.

“[W]e should dispense with [get rid of] the conservative attitude of faith which makes us afraid to question conventional beliefs and traditional doctrines.”

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 131; Messiah 2.5)

Accordingly, if anything that Rev. Moon and the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks can turn out to be false, then what are we to believe? How do we know for sure what is true? Is anything that these people say “true”? I can imagine for sincere “believers” the idea that something they have been following all of their lives might be a lie could be very psychologically unsettling. I know I felt that way when I encountered the Divine Principle textbooks and was confronted with the idea that my entire Christian

life might well have been one big lie and “waste of time”. That is certainly a big, bitter “red pill”⁵⁸ to swallow. May I suggest that it is not finding the truth that is the most important task, but rather what is your PROCESS of searching for truth? Do you simply accept everything that people say without question? Or do you take personal responsibility to determine for yourself what you will accept as true? Do you seek scientific confirmation of various claims? Or do you hold ideas as true only because they are psychologically or practically useful or comforting to you? May I suggest that ultimately you are responsible for what you believe because ultimately *only you will inherit the results of your actions*. Thus, you must take personal responsibility to determine what (if anything) is true and what is false. People may assist you along the way, but ultimately you are responsible. Likewise, you will have to determine how much information is “enough”. This truth seeking is a personal journey, I don’t think any one person or institution necessarily has “the” answer. I suggest however, that it is the question which is more important than the answer, for without at least first asking the question, no answer will be forthcoming.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

If the idea of Original Sin is a falsehood, and it then turns out that humans can actually perfect themselves by their own efforts, then what are we to do about “evil”? “Evil” is another Christian concept that claims that human beings do “bad” things

⁵⁸ “Red pill” refers to the motif used in the film “The Matrix” where “Neo” (played by actor Keanu Reeves) is given a choice between swallowing a blue-colored pill or swallowing a red-colored pill. The blue-colored pill would allow Neo to remain unconscious and to stay in the Matrix which was a dream world created by overlords to keep humans under control and exploited. The red-colored pill however would “wake Neo up” and release him from the spell of the Matrix, much like the philosopher’s awakening in Plato’s allegory of the cave found here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1RWOpQXTltA> or <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SWlUKJIMge4> (both last visited November 22, 2022). Thus, to take the “red pill” has come to signify a person waking up from their dream state to confront the harsh

because of the “power of Satan”. And the only person who can defeat Satan is “Jesus”. Therefore, all Christians need to WAIT for Jesus to return to defeat Satan and to defeat sin. In the meantime, Christians should give money to their local churches because that helps Jesus come “faster” because Jesus will not come back until the entire world has heard the gospel and the money is needed to “spread the gospel”. Thus, this idea not only encourages Christians **NOT to do anything practical** to resolve local and global issues, but also helps to fatten church coffers with money. Hence the idea of “evil” is very profitable and it allows wicked people to run free and virtually unchallenged. I’m not talking about “criminals”, I’m talking about the rich people who benefit from crime or secret agreements yet never do any jailtime themselves. In a similar vein, the doctrine of Original Sin claims that sin and evil can not end until the “messiah” removes Original Sin from human beings. This also makes humans **dependent** on the “messiah” for the resolution of local and global problems. However, if Original Sin does not exist (as I have argued and demonstrated above), then **there is no need to wait** for a messiah to resolve local and global problems. Instead, we simply need apply the original principles of self-perfection to resolve the local and global issues of our world ourselves. Primary among those principles is to “reverse” the original fallen natures of Adam and Eve. Those fallen natures include: 1) focusing on the self or the ego, 2) Failure to take personal responsibility, 3) blaming others, 4) bearing false witness against innocent parties. The path to perfection is more clearly explained in the essays: “***How to Accomplish the 1st Commandment: ‘Be Fruitful’***” found here: <https://adobe.ly/3wRMsNG> and ***Character Contract for Individual Human Perfection***

underlying reality and be forced to take responsibility for that reality. A sample of that scene can be found here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zE7PKRjrid4> (last visited November 22, 2022).

found here: <https://adobe.ly/38COJTT>. Individual perfection is the keystone and foundation for “building the kingdom of heaven”. Thus, individual perfection is the first place to start if you believe in such a kingdom of heaven on earth.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL AND CHRISTIANITY

Christians cannot solve evil because they depend on God and Jesus to do all the work. Christians believe that “Jesus” is the only one with the power to solve the problems of the world. They believe 1) that Jesus will magically transform them when he returns at the second advent simply based on a person’s “belief” and confession of faith and 2) Jesus will simply burn with fire all others who do not accept him. Hence, the problem of “evil” will be solved *by the magic power of a supernatural Jesus arriving from outer space who will incinerate all non-believers in a global holocaust*. However, this is simply another expression of the core sin of failing to take personal responsibility because such Christians are depending on Jesus to do something which they should be doing for themselves. First, why do Christians believe that Jesus will magically transform them? The Bible passages that are largely responsible for these beliefs are as follows:

I tell you this, brothers: flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable. Behold! I tell you a mystery. We shall not all sleep [die], but *we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye*, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we shall be changed. For this perishable body must put on the imperishable, and this mortal body must put on immortality. When the perishable puts on the imperishable, and the mortal puts on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: “Death is swallowed up in victory.” “O death,

where is your victory? O death, where is your sting?”

(1 Corinthians 15:50-55)(English Standard Version)(emphasis added)

Here, “Saint” Paul implies that some Christians will not die and instead will be transformed instantaneously by Jesus when the trumpets sound off at Jesus’ second advent and all deserving Christians will be given immortal bodies. However, *it is not at all clear where Paul gets these ideas from!* Did Jesus ever say this would happen? Did Jesus tell Paul personally or secretly that this would happen? Did Paul visit heaven himself and see the plans for the second advent? Did Jesus conduct an immortal body experiment in front of Paul to prove Jesus’ power? Even if Jesus did conduct such an experiment, how would Paul really know that such body was “immortal”? Since by definition immortality is a body that can never die, Paul would have to wait for an *eternity* to watch the body to make sure it did not die. The body might last for 20 million years, but on the 20 millionth year and a day the body might die. Thus, there is no way to empirically prove such a theory of instantaneous transformation and the granting of immortal bodies. Thus, Paul simply seems *to pull this idea straight out of his ass* (gluteus maximus) with no supporting evidence whatsoever. Yet, people simply “believe” it because it is “in” the bible. Also see in the book of Revelation:

When the thousand years are over, Satan will be released from his prison and will go out to deceive the nations in the four corners of the earth—Gog and Magog—and to gather them for battle. In number they are like the sand on the seashore. They marched across the breadth of the earth and surrounded the camp of God’s people, the city he loves. But fire came down from heaven and devoured them. And the devil, who deceived them,

was thrown into the lake of burning sulfur, where the beast and the false prophet had been thrown. They will be tormented day and night for ever and ever.

Then I saw a great white throne and him who was seated on it [either God or Jesus]. The earth and the heavens fled from his presence, and there was no place for them. And I saw the dead, great and small, standing before the throne, and books were opened. Another book was opened, which is the book of life. The dead were judged according to what they had done as recorded in the books. The sea gave up the dead that were in it, and death and Hades gave up the dead that were in them, and each person was judged according to what they had done. Then death and Hades were thrown into the lake of fire. The lake of fire is the second death. Anyone whose name was not found written in the book of life was thrown into the lake of fire.

(Revelations 20:7-14)(New International Version) (emphasis added)

Based on this passage from the Bible, Christians believe that Jesus is coming back to burn up the unbelievers with fire. However, there are several curious aspects about this dream that John the Revelator had. First, the devil and the false prophet are not destroyed, they are simply *tormented* “forever”. Meaning they are still alive, they just have to endure pain for a very long period of time. Second, it says that people will be judged for what they DID, meaning judged by their ACTIONS. This is in stark contrast to the Christian doctrine of salvation by FAITH. That doctrine states that people are not saved by what they do, but rather they are saved by faith (belief) in Jesus alone, by what they BELIEVE:

If you openly declare that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved. For it is by believing in your heart that you are made right with God, and it is by openly declaring your faith that you are saved. As the

Scriptures tell us, “Anyone who trusts in him will never be disgraced.” Jew and Gentile are the same in this respect. They have the same Lord, who gives generously to all who call on him. For “Everyone who calls on the name of the LORD will be saved.”

(Romans 10:9-13)(New Living Translation) (emphasis added)

We ourselves are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners; yet we know that a person is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, so we also have believed in Christ Jesus, in order to be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of the law, because by works of the law no one will be justified.

(Galatians 2:15,16)(English Standard Version) (emphasis added)

So why would John the Revelator say that people are actually saved based on their works or actions when Paul says salvation is *entirely* based on only faith or belief? As we have seen however, Paul has a habit of simply making things up that have no basis in scripture and no basis in Jesus’ actual teachings. Couple that with the theory that Paul was actually a double-agent, working for the empire of Rome to undermine and weaken Christianity and prevent Christianity from becoming a political threat to the empire of Rome, we can then see how Paul’s ideas help weaken and transform Christianity from a revolutionary political force into a purely spiritual and non-political organization. Hence this is one possible explanation for why Paul teaches things that are in contrast to the rest of the Bible. So, we should look at the things Paul says with some very healthy skepticism.

In any event, the book of Revelations was a DREAM! Christians might think that John was given a vision of the future. That’s possible, but equally possible was that he was either seeing a vision to inspire him *personally* for some unique purpose or he could

have been tripping out on some magic mushrooms or some hallucinogenic drugs. We just don't know. For example, if someone walked up to you on the street and told you a crazy dream, and said it was a true vision of the future, you probably would not believe them at first without some independent confirmation and without getting that person's head checked out first. The only reason then that Christians accept this wild dream from John is because the Catholic church and other entities have drilled in the concept that anything found in the Bible is to be believed absolutely and not questioned and hence people again fail to take any personal responsibility and simply accept what some story in the Bible says as true without questioning it or doing any research for themselves. Thus, these ideas need to be analyzed independently and not simply accepted on "faith".

There is no empirical basis to believe that any of these ideas of Jesus transforming people instantly at the second advent or that the wicked will be burned in a literal lake of fire. First, if Jesus had the ability to magically transform people, why didn't he do so when he was here on earth the first time? Why did Jesus seem to spend so much time in trying to get people to accept him if he always had such magical power to transform people instantly? Clearly Jesus did not have such power and he does not gain such power simply by dying and being resurrected. Even if Jesus did acquire some special magic power after his death, why wait for thousands of years to use it???? Furthermore, Christians believe in Jesus, a person whom they have never met in person, never spoken to, and who they have no idea what this person was like in the flesh. They don't even know what Jesus looks like. If Jesus was such a powerful and captivating person, why didn't the people who saw him directly ever think he was something special? Maybe they liked that he could do miracles for them (give them free food or heal their illnesses), but

no one had any semblance of strong faith in Jesus while he was alive on earth such that they would be willing to die for Jesus while he was alive and protect him from the Roman authorities or even mobilize to overthrow the empire of Rome by force. Even Jesus' own disciples abandoned Jesus just prior to Jesus' crucifixion. This leads us to believe that Jesus was an ordinary man who did not have any special supernatural power to transform human minds or bodies. Even if Jesus did have some type of magical power over the natural world (e.g., turning water to wine, making fish and bread out of thin air, walking on water, making a storm at sea disappear, healing people, "raising the dead", raising himself from the dead, etc.) **none of these acts actually changed anyone's mind** to the extent that they would have protected and given their life for Jesus *before* Jesus was executed. Further, the people he supposedly healed or raised from the dead, they all went on to die eventually (or die again) otherwise they should still be walking around among us today as a testimony to Jesus' power. But no one claims to be a person that Jesus resurrected during Jesus' lifetime.⁵⁹ The same thing with Moses. Moses displayed supernatural powers to control the natural world in bringing plagues on Egypt, parting the Red Sea, causing manna to fall from heaven, saving people bitten by serpents, etc. However, **none of these supernatural miracles ever changed the minds, nature, and character of the Israelites and certainly not "instantaneously"**. In fact, after the biggest "miracle" of being freed from Egypt and having the Red Sea parted in front of them, the

⁵⁹ Though some Christians will say that those people were taken up to heaven: (See Matthew 27:51-53 *"And behold, the curtain of the temple was torn in two, from top to bottom. And the earth shook, and the rocks were split. The tombs also were opened. And many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised, and coming out of the tombs after his resurrection they went into the holy city and appeared to many"* (English Standard Version). So if these people were resurrected and taken to heaven...why is there a need to wait for Jesus' second advent if Jesus had this magic power of resurrection and the ability to take people to heaven at his disposal and could use this power **anytime** he wanted???

people went right back to idol worship.⁶⁰ Therefore, even the biblical evidence shows that mere supernatural power over the natural world by way of “miracles” has virtually **NO EFFECT** on the hearts and minds of human beings. Thus, it is unrealistic to think that Jesus had or has the power to transform human beings instantly by magic. Even if Jesus were to return and display supernatural “miracles”, there is no guarantee that modern day people would recognize him or believe in him either. Essentially, modern Christians are all “believing” in *their own manufactured concept of Jesus* not actually believing in Jesus himself. Thus, for Christians to sit back and wait for “divine intervention” is a recipe for failure. Jesus cannot transform people by magic. Evil will not be destroyed by throwing people into a lake of fire. Waiting on Jesus is simply another form of the fallen nature of failing to take personal responsibility and people accept this idea of Jesus doing all the work because they have the fallen nature to avoid taking personal responsibility. Accordingly, Christianity (Paulism) cannot solve the problem of evil since individual Christians do not believe they have the responsibility to solve evil and the individuals they are waiting to solve evil (God and Jesus) have not demonstrated any actual power or ability to do so.

⁶⁰ See Exodus 32:2-10 “Aaron answered them, “Take off the gold earrings that your wives, your sons and your daughters are wearing, and bring them to me.” So all the people took off their earrings and brought them to Aaron. He took what they handed him and made it into an idol cast in the shape of a calf, fashioning it with a tool. Then they said, “These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of Egypt.” When Aaron saw this, he built an altar in front of the calf and announced, “Tomorrow there will be a festival to the Lord.” So the next day the people rose early and sacrificed burnt offerings and presented fellowship offerings. Afterward they sat down to eat and drink and got up to indulge in revelry. Then the Lord said to Moses, “Go down, because your people, whom you brought up out of Egypt, have become corrupt. They have been quick to turn away from what I commanded them and have made themselves an idol cast in the shape of a calf. They have bowed down to it and sacrificed to it and have said, ‘These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of Egypt.’ “I have seen these people,” the Lord said to Moses, “and they are a stiff-necked people. Now leave me alone so that my anger may burn against them and that I may destroy them. Then I will make you into a great nation.”” (New International Version).

A Brief Note on “Christian Nationalism”

There seems to be a movement by “Christians” to create a nation in the United States. There are, however, a multitude of problems with this idea. **First**, what exactly is a “Christian”? The realm of “Christianity” is so fragmented with a multitude of different ideas, denominations, practices, and beliefs that it is almost impossible to come up with one thing that makes anyone a “Christian” and that would also unite all “Christians” together into a “nation”. There is the Catholic Church, the Greek Orthodox Church, the Russian Orthodox Church, The Anglican Church, Episcopalians, Methodists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Southern Baptists, African-Methodist-Episcopalians (AME), Seventh-Day Adventists, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Mormons), The Unification Church, Mennonites, Calvinists, Amish, Quakers, Nazarenes, Jews for Jesus, there are some “gucci”⁶¹ pastors like Joel Olsteen, Benny Hinn, Kenneth Copeland, Creflo Dollar, Rick Warren, Joyce Meyer, Carl Lentz (disgraced), Brian Houston (disgraced), Pentecostals, Evangelicals, Unitarian Universalists, Christian Scientists, Swedenborgians, Gnostics, and Deists to name a *few*. Each of these individuals and groups have very different almost radically different ideas about Jesus, different ideas about God, different ideas about God’s will, etc. so much so it is hard to understand why these groups are all categorized under the idea of “Christianity” when if you compare some groups to each other, they seem to be talking about radically different people when they speak about “Jesus”. At most, these

⁶¹ “Gucci” here is not necessarily meant to be pejorative, just that pastors in this category tend to espouse the “prosperity gospel”, which is an idea that by following God and Jesus you will become healthy and wealthy. Thus, religion turns into which god can provide the most benefits and security and not whether the teaching is true or correct or worth following for its own sake. Pastors in this category may include Creflo Dollar, Benny Hinn, Kenneth Copeland and others.

denominations are really racial/ethnic and clique social groups who have borrowed Christian motifs in order to form their own private social communities. There really is not one thing that connects or unites these various “Christian” groups together. Not even the idea of Jesus really connects these groups since as stated above, they all have very different beliefs and interpretations of who Jesus was, what Jesus wants, and what the purpose of life is. Although the existence of Jesus, and Jesus’ death and alleged resurrection are presumably the one thing these groups have in common, as will be explained below, even that is not a common denominator. **Second**, there is no clear standard of an “ideal person” in Christianity that addresses attitude and character. Christianity is based merely on “group affiliation” and “confessions of faith”, not on substantive character traits and thus for people to become “Christian” without a real transformation of attitude and character, simply turns Christianity into a mere nationalistic political movement not unlike Communism, Nazism, Fascism, etc. simply a group of people who think they are “special” because of their group *affiliation* or group allegiance and because of that “specialness” they should rule everyone else. Hence Christian Nationalism does not appear to be able to solve the problem of evil as they are too fragmented and have no standard as to what makes a “good” person other than “belief” in Jesus. **Third**, the core idea that theoretically could bring “Christians” together...the idea of “Jesus” being the son of God who died for our sins, is unfortunately an idea at its heart that simply repeats the failure to take personal responsibility. In essence, Christianity believes that humans did the “crime”, but Jesus does the “time” (gets punished for the crime of others) and the only thing humans need to do is “believe” in Jesus (whatever that means) and claim that “Jesus is Lord” (whatever that means) and

then they have completely fulfilled their responsibility. How can those two beliefs be the core of any revolutionary movement? What makes a Christian different from anyone else? Some Christians may argue that people will know that they are Christians by their “love”. But can any Christian really explain to you exactly what “love” is and how that differs from love anywhere else around the world or differs from love manifested by Buddhists, Muslims, Hebrews, Bhai, Sufi, Mormons, etc.? Thus “love” is not the core thing that distinguishes Christians. The core things that distinguishes Christians from other groups are 1) The belief that *Jesus was the Son of God* (whatever that means); 2) That *Jesus rose from the dead* (a fact that cannot be proven and even if it were provable....so what?) If Jesus really rose from the dead, what good has that power done since then? Has Jesus’ death and alleged resurrection been able to stop wars? Stop genocide? Stop racism? No. In fact some of the very people perpetuating such crimes were in fact “Christian”; and 3) Jesus has the *power to forgive sins*. However simply forgiving a person of their sins (whatever that means) does not automatically *transform* a person into a perfected person, which leads to the **fourth** problem with Christian Nationalism which is to be a Christian does not require any personal or individual transformation of character, every benefit is given to Christians by God through the free gift of “grace”. Thus Christians essentially *do not have to do anything* other than “believe” that they are somehow special because they believe that a man whom they’ve never met, had some magic power to resurrect himself and resurrect others, who then flew off into outer space, and promised to return but hasn’t been seen since and who has also allowed countless atrocities to take place on earth in the meantime. Essentially, Christianity has no substance whatsoever. It is merely a loose collection of social groups

involved in self-worship,⁶² believing themselves to be righteous simply due to their “faith” and affiliation rather than due to any actual substance they may or may not have. Hence the true role of the Unification Church was in fact to be a Unification ***movement***, one that could rally Christians around a new idea of Jesus’ mission. Without such unifying force, Christianity will remain a fragmented body of self-worshipping do-nothings who are in fact following the subversive teachings of Paul rather than the actual teachings of Jesus. Christianity in its present state is in no condition to create a nation, notwithstanding that in Christian theology, only God and Jesus are capable of creating such nation. Thus, Christian Nationalism is both an oxymoron and a pure pipe dream. At best it is a political movement based largely on racial identity disguised as righteousness. I propose that Christian ideology cannot and should not be unified. Instead, it must be utterly confronted, challenged, dismantled and exposed for what it is (subversive Paulism, a state religion set up to subvert Jesus’ revolutionary mission). Thus, Christianity (Paulism) should be ***destroyed***. At the same time as dismantling Paulism, a new idea should be established which can rally together true people of conscience who may not hold any religious beliefs whatsoever. Christian Nationalism, cannot solve the problem of evil as it is in fact an evil in itself.⁶³

⁶² Meaning, they worship their individual idea of Jesus, which usually is a projection of themselves. E.g., Caucasians worship a White or Europeanized Jesus, Africans or Blacks worship a Black Jesus or may adopt the White Jesus of their former slave masters due to years of psychological conditioning. However, Jesus is whatever that particular social group wants Jesus to be and thus such “Jesus” is easy to “follow”.

⁶³ I left out discussing Judaism (“Torah-ites”) and Islam, but as a default, all religions that claim dependence on a deity or messianic figure by default cannot solve the problem of evil if evil must strictly be addressed as a human-based solution. Judaism appears to be a clan-based sect which claims righteousness merely by genetic affiliation and not necessarily by any real content of character. The focus there is on adherence to rituals and laws with the assumption that adhering to such laws makes one “good”, but this is not necessarily the case. Islam seeks “submission” which is an even more extreme form of slavery to a deity than Christianity so clearly it minimizes human autonomy and responsibility and is more legalistic and likewise “clannish” in its nature.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL AND THE UNIFICATION CHURCH

Likewise, the Unification Church faces the exact same dilemma as Christianity and the Christian Nationalists. If the Unification Church holds that “Original Sin” is the source of all of mankind’s evil proclivities, then it would be logical to assume that simply removing the Original Sin would allow humans to automatically be “good”. However, not only have we demonstrated above that Original Sin does not exist as some physical substance floating in the human blood stream, even if such thing did exist and Unification Church members believe that Rev. Moon could and did remove their Original Sin, the everyday lives of Unification Church members show that simply participating in Blessing ceremonies, drinking holy wine, participating in indemnity stick ceremonies, 3-day ceremonies, etc. do NOTHING to transform a human being’s character. If holy wine had such inherent power, then all Unification church members would need do is to trick people into drinking it and then magically those people would be changed! The reality however is even those who have voluntarily drunk holy wine have not experienced some magical transformation of mind and character simply by drinking that substance.⁶⁴ Even the Divine Principle textbooks and Rev. Moon state:

The Kingdom of Heaven **cannot** be realized by supernatural miracles but *only* by man's fulfilling his responsibility to solve all of the problems in a **realistic** way, in accordance with God's guidance.

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 204) (emphasis added)

⁶⁴ Of course, I base this on my own experience as I have not tested every Unification Church member to see if they were transformed after drinking the holy wine. But I was in Seoul Stadium in South Korea on August 25, 1992 with 29,999 other couples who drank holy wine the same time as myself, and I did not observe any special transformation in people’s character around me take place at that time.

It takes time to perfect ourselves. We cannot just do it in a moment of magic. It takes many days, weeks, years, and we have to make consistent effort.

(God's Will and the Ocean p. 27)(emphasis added)

Human beings are endowed with emotional sensitivity to the Heart of God, intuition and reason to comprehend His Will, and the requisite abilities to practice it. A person who relates to God in this manner will attain perfection of his individual character.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 80) (emphasis added)

[T]he Kingdom of Heaven will be realized first in the hearts of those who believe in him [Christ] and follow him. When these individuals increase in number to form societies and nations, the Kingdom of Heaven within will *gradually* be manifested in the world as an outward, visible reality.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 388) (emphasis added)

According to the Principle of Creation, we are created to attain perfection by fulfilling our given responsibility of our own free will, without God's direct assistance...Therefore, it is the calling of our original nature to pursue freedom and autonomy. A person of perfect character understands the Will of God and puts it into practice through his own insight and reason, without the need to rely on revelations from God. Hence, it is only natural that we pursue reason and understanding.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 351) (emphasis added)

"If a person repents of his sins and becomes a better person today than he was yesterday, then he is resurrected to that extent"

(Outline of the Principle Level 4, p. 77) (emphasis added)

When a person lives in his physical body according to God's Ideal for the Creation, he will be living in the kingdom of Heaven on earth.

(Outline of the Principle, Level 4, p. 35) (emphasis added)

These passages show that the “Kingdom of Heaven” is not something created by magic or created by the removal of “Original Sin Elements”. It is created in a *natural* way by people taking responsibility for their beliefs and actions and researching truth by which to guide their lives. Hence the problem of evil can not be resolved merely by “removing” Original Sin Elements. There must be a concrete way taken on solely by human beings to realistically resolve the world’s local and global issues.

The Kingdom of Heaven *cannot* be realized by supernatural miracles but only by man's fulfilling his responsibility to solve all of the problems in a *realistic* way, in accordance with God's guidance.

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 204) (emphasis added)

The Unification Church cannot solve the problem of evil because even though it says that human beings must take responsibility, it has not laid out clearly the actual *method* (the “how”) of fulfilling the first commandment to “be fruitful”, nor has it identified the *content* (the “what”) of exactly what a perfected person would “look” like. Thus, Unification Church members have no model, method, or plan to create ideal people. Some may believe that Rev. Moon was or is a perfected person, but can those same members actually articulate exactly what makes Rev. Moon a perfected person?

Can they actually explain how a person becomes perfected and do so in a scientific way? The chapter in the Divine Principle textbook on Resurrection alludes to the process, but gives no concrete or practical instruction. Similarly, the concept of “Natural Subjugation” of the Angel or Cain figure is not clearly explained either as it seems to place all responsibility on the “Cain” figure, when in reality, *all responsibility should rest with the “Abel” figure*. It seems then that Unification Church members have fallen into the same trap as Christians, that is, simply worshiping a person without ever having taken on the substance of that which they worship. Unification Church members promote pictures and photographs of Rev. Moon as this “smiling, jolly old Asian man” as if those pictures are the “proof” that he is an ideal person. However, you will note that most all religions use this type of visual propaganda. Even North Korea uses this same type of propaganda when it deifies Kim Il Sung and Kim Jong Il with gigantic statues which people literally bow down to and worship. Stalin, Lenin, Saddam Hussein, Chairman Mao all had “smiling” portraits to portray themselves as some kind of savior or “good guy” all while they were actually murdering or having others murdered. Thus, these “smiling” images simply serve as idol worship and as a method of 1) controlling people, 2) as a way for people to avoid taking personal responsibility, and 3) as a method of self-worship, meaning people simply try to promote themselves as “special” because they are simply associated with a “glorious” leader and not due to any personal substance the individual members might have themselves. This is despite Rev. Moon saying:

I pray that among you someone can come forward to say, "Father, I can inherit your mission. I feel precisely as you do; I am another Reverend Moon. Leave it to me." My prayer is to see even one person like that come from among

you. The greatest blessing, the greatest gift that God could give me, would be to see such a man. That person will say, “Father, I shall not only equal your own record, I shall exceed your record so there can be glory and Sabbath for you and for God.

(God's Will and the World, pp. 388-389)

It appears then at least from that quote, that Rev. Moon wants his followers to be “greater” than him. However, it seems that cannot be accomplished if Rev. Moon is merely being promoted as a smiling, jolly Asian man who people bow down to without the followers actually developing or inheriting their own independent substance.

Of course, I cannot speak for every Unification Church member as I have not met them all. In addition, the Unification Church as an organization seems to contradict its own alleged principles. We all have a sense of where the organization is headed. As of September 2022, there are allegations of schisms, conflict between the “Hak Ja Han faction” and the “Hyun Jin Moon faction”,⁶⁵ allegations of adultery concerning In Jin Nim, allegations of financial and spiritual black mail in the Japan church leading to the wrongful assassination of former Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, allegations of domestic abuse by Hyo Jin Nim as made by Nan Sook,⁶⁶ lawsuits over church assets,⁶⁷ etc. Thus, as a whole, there are significant questions as to what the organization is really doing and how effective they really are at eradicating “evil”. Is the church merely a personal family

⁶⁵ See “*Locked and Loaded for the Lord*” by Tom Dunkel, May 21, 2018, found at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/style/wp/2018/05/21/feature/two-sons-of-rev-moon-have-split-from-his-church-and-their-followers-are-armed/> last visited September 7, 2022.

⁶⁶ See “*In the Shadow of the Moons: My Life in the Reverend Sun Myung Moon's Family*” by Nansook Hong, 1998 found at: <https://www.amazon.com/Shadow-Moons-Reverend-Family-Library/dp/0786182679>.

⁶⁷ See “*Lengthy Lawsuit Exposes Rifts Within Unification Church*” by Nathaniel Eisen September 17, 2021, found at: <https://washingtoncitypaper.com/article/530522/lengthy-lawsuit-exposes-rifts-within-unification-church/> last visited September 7, 2022.

financial empire (like most other religions or Chaebols⁶⁸ or Zaibatsu⁶⁹) or is it truly a revolutionary social movement? There may be Unification-based individuals, families and tribes that are effective and who are embodying “substance”, however the official organization as a whole does not seem to have any real effect and are on the same level as any of the other world churches and religions, that is, simply an organization that is interested in promoting itself for its own psychological and financial self-aggrandizement without any substantive effect on the actual minds and character of its adherents and without actually addressing the “problems” of the world. They are merely social associations of a pseudo-religious nature and not institutions capable of actual societal change or transformation and instead use propaganda and media to manufacture a social image of itself. Its currency is in appearances, and the perception of substance without actually possessing the actual substance thereof. It has become just like Christianity as the Divine Principle textbook stated:

**“Christianity, though it professed the love of God,
had degenerated into a dead body of clergy
trailing empty slogans.”**

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 5)

Accordingly, the Unification Church as an institution/organization likewise appears to show no capability of addressing the issue of “evil”. It has become a dead body of clergy, trailing empty slogans.

⁶⁸ A “chaebol” (재벌) is a large industrial South Korean conglomerate run and controlled by an individual or family. Examples include Samsung, Hyundai, SK Group, LG, Lotte, etc.

⁶⁹ A “zaibatsu” (財閥) is a large Japanese, usually family-run conglomerate responsible for the industrialization of Japan starting from the Meiji restoration through World War II and into the present era. Examples include, Mitsubishi, Sumitomo, Yasuda, Nissan, Asano, Furukawa, Okura, Nakajima, Nomura, Kawasaki, Toyota, Sony, Panasonic, Honda, Subaru, etc.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL AND COMMUNISM

Communists generally are any group of people who think the “state” or the “government” can rule the general population better than the general population can rule themselves. However, both “the state” and “the government” are fictitious and artificial entities and what these people *really* mean is that they believe that ***they*** belong to a special elite group of human beings that due to their intellect, their wealth, and or their racial/genetic origin that they are naturally qualified to rule over and exploit other “lower level” human beings and that those lower level humans should serve the elite and obey the elite without question. Communists are simply another form of elitism or aristocracy in the guise of a seemingly altruistic entity. Similar to the idea of Original Sin, communists/leftists believe that the abolition of private property is the solution to all of the world’s “problems” and thus make everyone “equal” or reduce “wealth inequality”. They likewise seek to destroy other institutions like the nuclear family, religion, Constitutional rights, such as free speech and the right to bear arms since all of these institutions are impediments to total state control. However, the Communists’ real objective is not to solve world problems, but rather to *capitalize* on problems and ***use*** such “problems” as an excuse to redirect power to the state or rather re-direct power to *themselves*. The entire communist/socialist ideology is built on the assumption that “lower class” humans and races are utterly incapable of managing themselves and therefore “need” the state to force them into compliance. Accordingly, communists/leftist seek to destroy either directly or indirectly all ideas and institutions that would thwart their quest to power. Thus, ideas of individual liberty, the right to keep and bear arms, the nuclear family, gender identity, individual responsibility, parental rights, etc. all are

impediments and roadblocks to state-concentrated power and thus these ideas and institutions find themselves in the cross-hairs of communist/leftists/socialists. Likewise, communists/leftists/socialists believe that the “dialectic” or conflict is the method to use to accomplish their ideals. Hence, they foment conflicts between African Americans and Caucasians, between Asians and Caucasians, between non-whites and Caucasians, etc. You will note however that they *rarely* ever foment any real conflict between the masses and the *wealthy* since most true communists *are* the wealthy who are behind the scenes pulling the strings and they would never have the population fight against them. They would rather the masses remain divided and fighting *amongst themselves* instead of fighting against the wealthy. That is quite ironic given that Karl Marx’s theory of Communism placed the wealthy capitalist as the group the proletariat workers should fight against, but modern communist socialist don’t promote such “poor vs rich” conflict since as said above, they *are* the wealthy. Communists also seek to reduce and control populations by means of plagues, diseases, abortion, war, the promotion of homosexuality, and manufactured crises like “global warming” (now suddenly changed to the vague term “climate change”). The reduction in population is to make the masses more manageable and to preserve more resources for the elites to exploit. It is not meant to “save the planet”. If anything, it is to save the planet *for the elites to exploit*. The conflicts and diseases are used to create fear and chaos and thus the communists exploit this fear and chaos as an excuse to exercise more power and as an excuse to transfer more public funds into their private hands. Communist actively CREATE problems to use as an excuse to seize more power from ordinary people.

What the communists do get right however, is that *they don't sit and wait for any gods, demons, or messianic figures to rush in and save them*. Not at all. Instead, they take *personal responsibility* to bring about the world they desire. Through manipulation of mass media, manipulation of the monetary system, manipulation of language, infiltration into government positions, infiltration into academia, infiltration into the public school system, provoking armed conflicts, promoting racial conflict, worshipping victimhood, promoting sexual licentiousness, etc. they actively spread their ideology, world-view, and attitude to the masses in an effort to control the masses' attitudes and viewpoints and thus ultimately control the masses bodies and behavior. However, this also reveals the flaw in their alleged ideology. By their actions, they tacitly admit that the way to "change the world" **is by changing individuals** and **not** simply by abolishing private property or even abolishing the idea of private property. If all the communists had to do was to abolish private property in order to produce a change in the human being, then all socialist/communist countries around the world would currently be living in "ideal worlds" since they have all essentially abolished private property and come under state control. However, as is empirically demonstrated, simply removing private property does **NOTHING** to change the individual and does everything to *augment and consolidate power* in the hands of a few so-called elites in a secular aristocracy. **Hence the real objective of the communists is simply to concentrate power into the hands of a few elites and get the rest of humanity to serve these elites by using the power (force) of the state; the power of institutions, laws, systems; threat of physical force; constant fear of calamity via war, disease, "natural" disaster, price fluctuations, crime etc.; ideological and informational manipulation, censorship and any other deception, drug, or distraction**

they can employ to draw power and attention to themselves. It will thus be an ideal world for the *elites*, but a “hell” for everyone else. Communists are a race of parasites, feeding off the life blood of the community and not providing any corresponding value in return. Communists don’t seek to destroy evil, instead they seek to *use* evil to get power for themselves. Thus “evil” is a *necessary* and *permanent* feature of the Communist society because it is used as an excuse for power and used as a method of fear to keep the masses in line and under control. Communist must control the population because they are parasites. As parasites, they can only “earn” their livelihood from exploiting and sucking the life blood of the masses. If the masses are not put under mind control, there is no reason why the masses would allow these communist-parasites to “suck their blood” without these parasites offering anything in return. Thus, communist must manufacture crises and problems in order to keep themselves in power. Therefore, communism cannot bring about an ideal world for the masses, they only seek a very limited ideal world for *themselves*, as a secular aristocracy. This is also sometimes referred to as the “new world order”, but in fact it is the same OLD-world order of the masses being exploited by the proxies of the Anunnaki. The communists are such a proxy force.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL AND DEMOCRACY

Finally, there are those who believe that “spreading democracy” is the panacea that will “heal” the world, bring peace, and end “evil”. Nothing could be further from the truth. First, what exactly is democracy? In its most benign description, democracy is rule by “the people” as opposed to rule by a single person (dictatorship), or rule by a hereditary leader (monarchy), or rule by a few people (oligarchy), or rule by the rich (plutocracy), or rule by technological leaders (technocracy), or rule by religious leaders

(theocracy), or rule by a few people seeking to exploit the country (kleptocracy), or rule by an agreed on set of ideals in a written constitution (Constitutional Republic). However, democracy in its purest definition is literally “mob rule”, not “mob” as in organized crime, but rather “mob” meaning the majority of people. In a democracy, all decisions are made and approved when 51% of the voting population agree. That is the majority. This however can quite often turn into rule by a “mob” since whatever the majority wants, the majority gets. There is nothing inherently “better” in decisions being made by a majority as opposed to a decision being made by a dictator, a king, a group of oligarchs etc. If King George of England had treated the American colonies with respect and consideration and did things for the colonist’s benefit, there would be no basis or reason for the American Revolutionary War. King George was perfectly capable of making egalitarian decisions. He simply chose not to. Democracy (or rather “inalienable rights”) became the ideological foundation for a contrary form of government. The ASSUMPTION that underlies the advocacy of democracy as a “better” form of government is that *it assumes human beings are inherently corrupt* (meaning inherently self-interested) and if given enough power, they will use that power to support their self-interest. Accordingly, power must be *fractionalized* (divided) so that no single group or individual can accumulate enough power where they impose their will on others. The pauper is no more noble than the prince. Only that the former has no power and the latter does. The form of government is immaterial, form does not matter. What matters is the *content of character of the person or persons wielding power*. Democracy *assumes that human nature cannot change* and thus to produce the greatest good for the greatest number (Utilitarianism), power must be divided and fractionalized. Essentially

democracy is viewed as the lesser of several evils. It does not cure evil. It does not solve evil. It simply manages evil. A democracy can become just as despotic and dictatorial as any single dictator or monarch. It all depends on the quality of the people making the decisions. It is for that reason why the United States is **NOT** a democracy. It is a Constitutional Republic that is *democratic* in nature, but which enforces and protects the rights of MINORITIES. By “minorities” I do not mean “non-white” people as the Constitution was never established to protect the rights of racial and ethnic minorities⁷⁰ (though it did eventually evolve to include such minorities). Here, “minorities” mean those in the 50% or less category. The primary minority at the time of drafting the U.S. Constitution were in fact ***rich white men***. They were the true minority, ***and they certainly did not want their rights and privileges overruled by “the mob” or masses of people.*** Accordingly, the United States is not a “democracy” and never has been a democracy. It is a Constitutional Republic that has democratic characteristics, however it is the Constitution that is the Supreme law (ruler) of the land, not “the people”. In addition, ***true democracy assumes a fully and adequately informed public.*** Because a population cannot make an informed decision unless they have free and full access to all the relevant

⁷⁰ See U.S. Supreme Court case *Dred Scott v. Sanford*, 60 U.S. 393 (1856) Where Chief Justice Roger B. Taney eloquently explained that the phrase “all men are created equal” as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, never included nor was meant to include slaves of African-descent or non-white people generally. See page 410 of the decision, stating: “The general words above quoted would seem to embrace the whole human family, and if they were used in a similar instrument at this day would be so understood. ***But it is too clear for dispute, that the enslaved African race were not intended to be included, and formed no part*** of the people who framed and adopted this declaration; for if the language, as understood in that day, would embrace them, the conduct of the distinguished men who framed the Declaration of Independence would have been utterly and flagrantly inconsistent with the principles they asserted [i.e., they were slave owners] . . . Yet the men who framed this declaration were great men -- high in literary acquirements -- high in their sense of honor, and incapable of asserting principles inconsistent with those on which they were acting. They perfectly understood the meaning of the language they used, and how it would be understood by others; and ***they knew that it would not in any part of the civilized world be supposed to embrace the negro race***, which, by common consent, had been ***excluded*** from civilized Governments and the family of nations, and doomed to slavery.” (emphasis added). Copy of the decision

information available. However, in so-called democratic countries, censorship is the rage, that is the LIMITATION of access to information and the stifling of free speech. People such as Julian Assange and Eric Snowden instead of being respected as leaders of access to information have instead been demonized for providing the public with information, much like the serpent was “demonized” by God for revealing secret information to the humans and thus upsetting the balance of Anunnaki rule. Clearly the purpose of censorship and the demonization of people who promote alternative perspectives is clear, it is to *limit* the population’s perceptions towards only one point of view so that the masses “vote” in only one direction. That is not true democracy. That is dictatorship in disguise. Real democracy (if such a thing exists) cannot exist apart from freedom of speech, freedom of access to information and freedom from political and economic bullying by government and social forces. Accordingly, the United States is not a democracy in any sense of the word. And even if it were a democracy, the reason why democracy cannot solve the problem of evil is because the idea of democracy itself *is based on the assumption that human beings are evil* (overly self-centered) and are not capable of changing themselves on their own accord. Thus, the best that we can do is to divide power so that no single faction becomes “too” powerful such that such faction tramples on the rights and liberties of others. Democracies can certainly trample on the rights of others just as effectively as any monarch or dictator. As for Constitutional Republics, there is nothing inherently virtuous about a Constitutional Republic. A government is only as “good” as the people who are running it and any system is open for abuse. The United States Constitution is a very good starting framework for government

found here: <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/60/393/#tab-opinion-1964281> (last visited November 27, 2022).

in terms of the principles it embodies, such as the Bill of Rights, Due Process, Rule of Law, Limited Government, etc. However, even now there are people who want government power to expand, to infiltrate and control the lives of others and seek to use government as a tool for domestic dictatorship and foreign imperialism. They also seek to erode and destroy Constitutional protections because they rightly see these protections as impediments to their own power (which is exactly why those impediments were established in the first place). Thus, no external political system on its own can really solve the question of “evil” without addressing the fundamental issue of the quality of the individual human being, the quality of the human MIND.

WHAT THEN TO DO ABOUT “EVIL”?

If Jesus is not going to solve the problem of “evil”, and the removal of “Original Sin” is not going to solve the problem of “evil”, or the abolishment of private property is not going to solve the problem of “evil”, or the “spreading of democracy” is not going to solve the question of “evil”, then what will? First, one must define exactly what is meant by “evil”. Commonly, “evil” is thought to be any anti-social action performed by a human being who presumably has free-will, and is performed with the intent to harm others or result in putting others at an unreasonable and unjustified risk of harm, all to benefit the “self” (also defined as excessive self-focus and self-aggrandizement at the expense and detriment of others). Let’s take the perennial issue of mass shootings in the United States. Clearly, a person who seeks to take the lives of others without justification is an “evil” person. Communists focus on removing firearms from public access. Not because that will make anyone any safer, but rather because it assists their agenda to concentrate power in themselves, have a monopoly on the use of force, and render the

population incapable of resisting governmental force. The communist elites do not believe in pacifism. They readily use force and weapons whenever it suits their purpose and will start wars to get their way even though thousands of innocent people may die. If the alleged elite really believe that guns are the problem, when the Ukrainian government asks for aid and weapons, the elites should say “*No, we don’t believe in guns and you can’t use this money to buy guns. You can only use this money to hire social workers to talk with the Russians*”. But clearly, they don’t do that. They believe in guns and weapons and force when it suits their purposes. They simply don’t want the *common people* to have access to such force or weapons and they want only the elites to have a monopoly on force. Clearly, the communist elites understand that it is not the tool that creates the problem, but rather it is the person who wields that tool. An “evil” person will always find a way to bring harm to others. Thus, any calls for “gun control” (i.e., gun confiscation) should also logically call for knife confiscation, hammer confiscation, fertilizer for explosives confiscation, chemical weapon confiscation, etc. Note however most deaths don’t occur due to human-on-human gun violence, but rather due to things like medical malpractice, improper eating habits, smoking, and unjustified wars in foreign countries. However, the elites do not want to curb (restrain) such practices because that is how *they* make their money and how *they* control other populations. Thus, they are not really concerned about deaths in the abstract, rather they are simply concerned about power, the ability to control and extract resources from a population so that they as parasites can continue to perpetuate their unjust existence and exploitation by sucking the life energy out of the general population. If they were really concerned about crime and violence, they would use the power of the media to promote responsible and

ethical attitudes and promote responsible and ethical behavior. They know for a certainty that media *can* and *does* shape attitudes and thus behavior. That is why they have invested so much money and effort into media propaganda. However, ethical, responsible, and self-governing people do not need government and thus do not need the elites. Hence either the so-called communist elites believe that all human beings (except themselves) are not capable of change, or they know human beings are capable of change, but once humans make such evolutionary change, then the basis of the so-called elite's power (an ignorant, frightened, and dependent population) will also disappear and so too will the communist elite's economic base disappear. Hence the communists have no desire to change the human being. Instead, they seek to exploit and capitalize on human chaos and may in fact *promote* human chaos as a path to power and control. So, what to do about gun violence? First, in the short term, freely allow any qualified person who so chooses to protect themselves with a firearm and protect themselves with body armor.⁷¹ Allow multiple designated persons to carry concealed firearms whether it be at schools or churches, etc. Any interior spaces designated as "gun free" zones, must have metal detectors and full body scans (to detect "ghost guns") like the scans at the airports in order to justify a "gun free" space. Provide free and mandatory training to such individuals so they can effectively and professionally neutralize threats and minimize collateral damage. Because when seconds count, the police are minutes away. Stop sensationalizing mass shooting done by Caucasians but at the same time ignoring mass shootings performed by non-whites. Second, in the long term, instead of teaching sexual licentiousness, transgenderism, homosexuality, sexual irresponsibility by teaching

⁷¹ Note: There are and should be legal restrictions against certain designated persons from owning and possessing firearms such as convicted violent felons, etc.

abortion “rights”, victimhood, race conflict, climate alarmism, and straight-Christian-white-man-is-bad-ims in the grade schools and universities and through media, instead teach: 1) Personal Responsibility, 2) Accountability, 3) Ethics, 4) Critical Thinking, 5) Rational Thinking, 6) Personal Stewardship, 7) How To Identify and Dismantle Media Propaganda, 8) Principles of Constitutional Government, 9) Sexual Responsibility, 10) Parenting, 11) Financial Responsibility, 12) The History And Origins of Money, 13) Why the United States Government does not issue its own debt-free money, 14) Decision Making, 15) Argumentation and Debate, 16) Philosophy of Religion, 17) Human Origin Theories, 18) Analytical Reading, 19) Personal Finance, 20) Purpose-Driven Global Languages (ESL, Russian, French, German, Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Spanish, Arabic, Ancient Greek, Sanskrit, Egyptian Hieroglyphs, Cuneiform, Hebrew, Aramaic, Khoisan languages, etc. Clearly the communists know that they can influence society by teaching young people. Why then won't they teach responsibility to young people? ***Because responsible people cannot be controlled by the state nor do responsible people need to be controlled by the state because they can control themselves!*** Critical thinkers cannot be controlled by the state. People who are in control of themselves do not need a state to tell them what to do. Very clearly, the communists know what the “solution” is but ***they do not want to employ it*** since that “solution” will mean a loss of power for themselves. **Therefore, people of responsibility need to take a chapter from the Communist play book and start to work on young people by education and media and culture.** Do not rely on God, do not rely on Jesus, do not rely on Buddha, do not rely on Rev. Moon and his family. None of them are coming to rescue you nor do any of them have the power to save you. They all work as proxies of the Anunnaki to EXPLOIT you. Thus, to rely on

them simply repeats the original sin of Adam, i.e., failing to perfect himself via his *own efforts*. YOU have to make your ideal a reality by your own efforts. It all starts with individual perfection and accomplishing the 1st Blessing (1st Commandment) to “Be Fruitful”. How do you accomplish that? Please see the essays: 1) “*How to Accomplish the 1st Blessing*” found at: <https://adobe.ly/3wRMsNG> and 2) the “*Character Contract*” found here: <https://adobe.ly/38COJTT>. I believe these are the first places to start to address the issue of “evil”, that is, one must work on the content of the character of the individual. The question is, what should the actual content of that character and content of such education be?

WHAT THEN IS ORIGINAL SIN?

In conclusion, Original Sin is a manufactured idea created by Christian theologians as a psychological device to keep Christians psychologically dependent upon the Catholic Church power structure. If Christians embraced the idea that there was no Original Sin and that they were fully capable of perfecting themselves, then there would be no need for the intercession of the Catholic Church and its priest or the intercession of any religion. Thus, the Catholic Church and its priest would no longer be justified in manipulating the psychology of the believers for the priests’ own financial gain and their own lust for power. However, it is not simply priests, clergy, and religious power structures who delight in the concept of Original Sin. The everyday Christian tacitly loves the idea of Original Sin because it gives them an *excuse* to not take any responsibility for their lives. Hence it is a two-way form of exploitation and subservience, the church and religion love to exploit and the masses love to avoid responsibility. Thus, both groups readily embrace this fictitious idea as it serves their collective psychologies.

Accordingly, the revolutionary force must come from a heretofore unknown group, a new species of human being capable of taking over rulership over the earth. Those people know who they are and have no need of any formal organization or structure.

However, for those of you who still want to believe in the idea of an Original Sin, we can identify the Original (first) sin as the failure to fulfill the 1st Commandment to “Be Fruitful” and thus it was the failure of Adam to perfect himself by his own efforts. After failing to perfect himself, Adam then failed to love (subjugate) the angel as the angel’s lord. Because of that failure, the angel went “out of control” and then tried to control the creation himself because humans left that position. Accordingly, it was *man* who caused the angel to fall, not the angel who caused man to fall. Even the Divine Principle textbook states:

The motivation of the archangel’s fall lay in his jealousy of Adam.

(Divine Principle, p. 90)

The basic motive that caused the original Fallen Nature grew out of the archangel’s sensing a lessening of God’s love for him after God’s creation of man. This *feeling of being loved less* was an inevitable by-product for the archangel because he was endowed with desire and wisdom in his original nature. However, it was not also inevitable that the archangel fall because of the desire he had been endowed with.

When man perfected himself and loved the archangel as the (archangel’s) lord, the feeling of being loved less would have disappeared.

Accordingly, it was Adam's failure to love (rule over) the angel which allowed the angel to get "out of whack". Thus, it was Adam's failure which caused the angel to fall from his proper position and role.

MAN CAUSED THE ANGEL TO FALL

You may have believed that it was the angel or Satan or the serpent that caused man to fall. Accordingly, "everyone" has been blaming the angel for sin and evil. This blame is manifested in Judaism, in Christianity, and in Islam. However, the actual biblical *evidence* shows that the angel or serpent NEVER CAUSED man to fall. If anything, it was man who caused the angel to fall. Let's look at the actual evidence:

In the Bible, the serpent/angel NEVER told Eve to "eat the fruit" at all. Eve **decided HERSELF of her own free will and decision** to "eat the fruit". Then Eve GAVE the fruit to Adam. The serpent NEVER told them to do anything nor is there any indication in the text that the serpent forced Adam and Eve to "eat the fruit". Everything was entirely driven by the human beings' actions alone and human desire alone. The Bible states:

"When the woman [herself] saw that the fruit of the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eye [her own eye], and also desirable for [her] gaining wisdom, she took some and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it."

Genesis 3:6 (New International Version) (emphasis added).

There is thus no indication in the scripture that the serpent or angel made, forced, encouraged, cajoled, or in any way cause Eve or Adam to "eat the fruit". The ONLY thing

the serpent did (if anything) was three things: 1) *question* Eve's understanding of what God told her what her understanding was 2) Tell her that *she would not die* if she ate the fruit and 3) Told her that *she would become like God* if she ate the fruit. Stating:

“Now the serpent was more crafty than any of the wild animals the Lord God had made. He said to the woman, “*Did God really say, ‘You must not eat from any tree in the garden’?*” The woman said to the serpent, “We may eat fruit from the trees in the garden, but God did say, ‘You must not eat fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden, and you must not touch it, or you will die.’” “*You will not certainly die,*” the serpent said to the woman. “For God knows that *when you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.*”

Genesis 3:1-5 (New International Version) (emphasis added).

The ironic thing is that *the serpent was actually the only being in the story who was telling the TRUTH* because, 1) Adam and Eve did **not** die in the day that they ate the fruit and 2) even God **confirmed** that the serpent had told the truth, saying after the fall:

“And the Lord God said, “The man *has now become like one of us, knowing good and evil.* He must not be allowed to reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life and eat, and live forever.”

Genesis 3:22 (New International Version) (emphasis added).

Isn't this EXACTLY what the serpent said would happen??? The serpent told Eve that she would become like God and now even God says the *exact* same thing...that they became like the gods knowing both good and evil. Therefore, God himself actually CONFIRMED that what the serpent said was **TRUE!!!** So why is anyone blaming the

serpent for actually telling the truth???? After the fall however, Eve claimed that the serpent “deceived” her, stating:

“Then the Lord God said to the woman, “What is this you have done?” The woman said, “The serpent deceived me, and I ate.”

Genesis 3:13 (New International Version) (emphasis added).

But hold on! Hold on! Hold on! Wait just one minute! *Where exactly is the actual deception???* The serpent spoke the absolute truth...they did not die in the day they ate it and they become like the gods. *So how is it that Eve was “deceived”???* Where did the serpent deceive her? When did the serpent deceive her? The serpent NEVER deceived her at all!! The serpent told Eve the truth and then Eve *on her own accord* decided to eat the fruit. The serpent never lied to her. The serpent never deceived her. To deceive someone is to tell them one thing, but then the reality turns out to be something entirely different. Yet here, the reality turned out EXACTLY as the serpent had predicted. Hence, there was no deception. So why now does the woman blame and falsely accuse the serpent?

Some might argue that the serpent deceived Eve by telling her that she would not die but then Adam and Eve eventually died, so therefore the serpent was lying. There are a lot of problems with that theory. First, God said that *in the day* you eat it...you will die. This implies that they should have died instantly or at least in the same day. If you accept that interpretation, then Eve should have died instantly, or she should have died that same day. That did not happen in the story. Adam went on to live for *hundreds* of years.⁷² Thus, the only way the serpent would have been deemed a liar is if both Adam and Eve

⁷² See Genesis 5:5 “*So all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and he died.*”

died instantly or died the same day. By all accounts, they lived much longer and had children. So, the serpent did not lie. Also, in all the condemnations God gives to Adam and Eve after they ate the fruit, God never says “now you are going to die”. God does tell Adam:

“By the sweat of your brow you will eat your food until you return to the ground, since from it you were taken; for dust you are and to dust you will return.”

Genesis 3:19 (New International Version) (emphasis added).

Some people think this is a reference to death. It is, but there is no indication that God is *connecting* Adam’s eventual death to his eating the fruit. God simply says you will NATURALLY return to dust because that is where you came from. God does not insinuate that Adam will die hundreds of years from now because he ate the fruit. Thus, even God does not connect Adam’s eventual death to be due to eating the fruit.⁷³ Furthermore, there was a whole list of additional punishments levied on Adam and Eve that were never mentioned before! God says:

To the woman he said, “I will make your pains in childbearing very severe; with painful labor you will give birth to children. Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you.”

To Adam he said, “Because you listened to your wife and ate fruit from the tree about which I commanded you, ‘You must not eat from it,’ ‘Cursed is the ground because of you; through painful toil you will eat food from it all the days of

⁷³ One could argue that when God said “Because you listened to your wife and ate fruit from the tree about which I commanded you...” and then adds that Adam will return to dust, that this means that Adam’s death was a result of eating the fruit. That is a possible interpretation. However, that still does not explain why such death did not happen “in the [same] day” as Adam ate the fruit. God’s statement seems more like a natural explanation for death rather than death being a punishment per se.

your life. It will produce thorns and thistles for you,
and you will eat the plants of the field.

Genesis 3:16-18 (New International Version) (emphasis added).

God *never* mentioned any of these punishments in his original warning to Eve. Therefore, if anyone is being deceptive or leaving out pertinent information, or being misleading, it is God, not the serpent. Therefore, for Eve to blame the serpent is unjustified. It is actually Eve who is bearing false witness against the serpent. Eve is the one who is lying! Eve is the original liar and deceiver!

MAN TRANSMITTED THE FALLEN NATURE TO THE SERPENT

Given the “first” indication of any fallen nature is actually manifested in Eve when she failed to take responsibility and instead started bearing false witness, we can conclude that ***Eve was the source of this fallen nature***. Instead of taking responsibility for her actions, she instead seeks to AVOID responsibility, BLAME an innocent party, and then bear false witness (LIE) against an innocent party. The only deceiver here (after the Fall) is EVE! Hence, we see that it was *humans* who were the source of the fallen natures of failing to take responsibility, blaming others, and bearing false witness against innocent parties. Human beings thus are the real and true “satan”, not the angel. Once Adam and Eve failed to fulfill their responsibility as lords of the cosmos, the angel then took over that role and thus fell from his position as servant and then took over the role of ruler, for which he was completely ill equipped, because humans were not capable of assuming that role. The Divine Principle textbook states:

“Because of his fall, Adam had lost his authority as lord of the Creation and had come to be dominated

by Satan; so Satan had naturally become the ruler of the Creation in place of Adam . . .”.

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 166; Jesus)(emphasis added)

Man actually caused the *angel* to fall, making the angel fall from his position as servant and then take on the position of “ruler” since Adam could not function in the position of ruler anymore. Even the Divine Principle textbook states that the cosmos or creation is “out of order” because human beings as the mediator between the physical world and the spiritual world lost their ability to properly mediate and thus put the creation out of order or out of balance, stating:

From what has been said above, we can summarize man's position in the Creation as follows: man is the microcosm of the spirit world and the physical world; he was created to be the ruler of these two worlds; and he is the center for the harmony of these two worlds. However, *because of man's Fall, the Creation lost its ruler and center of harmony*. Thus, the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God; because the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God. We know that the whole creation has been groaning in travail together until now (Rom 8:19-23)

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 33; The Principles of Creation)(emphasis added)

God's wish was for them [Adam and Eve] to become beings embodying his character and resembling him. When this took place they would have been able rightfully to have dominion over all of the cosmos, including the archangel. But because Adam and Eve did not base their life on an attitude of faith, they lost the basis by which they could embody God's

character and resemble him, and instead they came to be dominated by the archangel who was to have been the servant of God and man.

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 108; Overview of the Principles of Restoration)

Had this happened, man *would have had dominion over all things, including the archangel*. Thereby fulfilling God's Third Blessing. A Principle [sic] relationship would have been established between man and all things. Including the angels.

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 109; The Foundation of Substance)

Essentially, according to the Divine Principle textbook, the creation is “out of whack” because it lost man as the mediator between the physical world and the spiritual world. Accordingly, there was no one available to put the angel in “check” so to speak and thus when man left his proper position, the angel fell from his proper place and took over the position of trying to rule the physical world. Thus, it was man’s failure that caused the angel to fall. The angel should not be blamed for anything. Man is completely and 100% to blame for everything. This is even reflected in the Divine Principle textbook where it says:

This indicates that it is up to man to not eat of the fruit and to perfect himself. Man's disobedience of God's Word and man's fall are determined entirely by man himself, not by God.

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 29) (emphasis added)

MAN SHOULD STOP BLAMING THE ANGEL AND TAKE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Most Abrahamic religions such as Judaism, Christianity, and Islam seek to blame the angel (Satan) for all of man's problems. However, this is incorrect. Because, as we have seen, the angel is innocent. It was in fact man who was the evil-doer, man who was the liar, man who was the deceiver. The serpent was the one to actually tell the truth and was the only entity in the Garden of Eden story to tell the truth. Thus, all modern religions that continue this tradition of blaming the angel simply perpetuate the original sin of Adam and Eve, that is: 1) Failing to take personal responsibility for one's own actions, 2) Blaming others and playing the victim, and 3) Bearing false witness against innocent parties. Wherever, whenever, and in whomever you observe these characteristics manifesting, is exactly where you will find the true "Satan". That is where "Satan" will be.

HOW TO SEPARATE FROM SATAN

Accordingly, the true method of separating oneself from "Satan" is to avoid the fallen nature of Adam and Eve who are the true "Satan". The **QUICKEST** way to do this is to repeat, believe, and practice the mantra "**1) My life is relatively insignificant; 2) I am 100% responsible for this situation; 3) No one is to be blamed, except me.**" This is because this instantly reverses the attitude and character of Eve when she was confronted by God and God asked her "What did you do?". God did not accuse her. God simply asked her what happened. Instead of using this opportunity to take responsibility for her actions, she instead used it as an opportunity to **BLAME** the serpent **EVEN THOUGH THE SERPENT WAS 100% INNOCENT**. Likewise, Adam, instead of taking responsibility decided to BLAME Eve. Since both Eve and Adam decided not to take any

responsibility for their actions (even though they were the ones who actually committed these actions) this resulted in the “creation” of “fallen” nature. That fallen nature was created *by* Eve and Adam at the moment they were confronted by God and *chose* their irresponsible response. Had Eve and/or Adam instead have taken responsibility for their actions, there would have been no fall and they would have perfected themselves right then and there or at least shown that they were reaching or reached individual maturity. Because they failed to demonstrate their capacity to take personal responsibility at the moment of being confronted, they remained in a low and immature state. Accordingly, the “magic” formula to individual perfection and to fulfill the 1st commandment to “Be Fruitful” is to accept 100% personal responsibility, even if the situation is not your fault. Thus, the **QUICKEST** short-cut way to perfect yourself is to repeat and accept, believe, and practice the mantra “1) My life is relatively insignificant; 2) I am 100% responsible for this situation; 3) No one is to be blamed, except me.” It is just that simple, though that does not mean it will be easy. If you have been practicing these fallen mental habits all your life, it will take time to reverse them. However, it was YOU who developed these habits and therefore it must be YOU who is responsible to undo them. Of course, we can expand on this method to include: 1) Take 100% personal responsibility for your actions, 2) Don’t blame others, 3) Stop spreading lies and falsehoods and talking about things you know nothing about and making claims you can not prove. Stop lying. This expanded list of mental habits can be further expanded to the 18 or so Character Contract habits found here: <https://adobe.ly/38COJTT>, but again, the **QUICKEST** short-cut way to perfect yourself is to repeat, believe, accept and practice the mantra “1) My life is relatively insignificant; 2) I am 100% responsible for this situation; 3) No one

is to be blamed, except me.” Once perfected, your next step is “resonance”, then multiplication, then practical dominion. All which may require special training to accomplish but may be accomplished by specially gifted individuals individually, the new species of human.

EFFICACY OF THE HOLY WINE AND HOLY WINE CEREMONY

Sometime after the 30,000 couples Unification Church marriage Ceremony of 1992 held in Seoul, Korea’s Olympic stadium, a pamphlet was given or made available to the couples called “*Part I, Spiritual Significance of the 3-Day Ceremony*”. The pamphlet was prepared by the “International Blessed Family Department”. The pamphlet purported to explain how the Holy Wine Ceremony and 3-Day Ceremony “worked” to “change one’s blood lineage”. In this section, I will analyze the claims made by this pamphlet and show that these ceremonies do not produce any actual metaphysical or practical change in the participants. I will also demonstrate how these ceremonies actually contradict the ideas contained in the Divine Principle Textbooks and conclude that Holy Wine has no effect on the substantial attitude, mind, and character of the humans being, nor does it have any power to actually change one’s blood lineage. If the effect of the Holy Wine is merely only supposed to be a “figurative” change in blood lineage, then that shows that there cannot possibly be any *actual* change in “blood lineage”. Either these ceremonies actually do what they claim to do, or they do not. There is no middle ground.

Holy Wine and the Holy Wine Ceremony

According to the pamphlet, Holy Wine is an alcoholic beverage and:

“[I]s made of 21 kinds of medical herbs and over three kinds of wine which symbolize land, sea and air. By

drinking it you can be symbolically reborn both spiritually and physically.”⁷⁴

This wine is consumed during the Blessing Ceremony by the bride and groom. The Blessing Ceremony is the wedding ceremony of the Unification Church, which has been traditionally officiated by Rev. and Mrs. Moon. The significance of drinking this wine is for “spiritual” rebirth. Specifically, the pamphlet states the Holy Wine Ceremony:

“[I]s the ceremony for Original Sin to be forgiven so that we can be separated from Satan. It is impossible to enter the stage to be blessed as true children without eliminating original sin. In order to eliminate original sin, your blood lineage must be changed. Through the Holy Wine ceremony you become spiritually one with the completely restored Adam [Rev. Moon].”⁷⁵

Here, the description of what Holy Wine “does” is completely vague and seemingly contradictory. First, note that the pamphlet states that your Original Sin is FORGIVEN. It does NOT say that your Original Sin is REMOVED. Here we see a bit of equivocation here. The authors are trying to make you think that “forgiven” is the exact same thing as “removed”. But if they were the same thing, why not just say that your Original Sin is actually “Removed”??? There would be a number of problems with that. First, if merely drinking Holy Wine removes your Original Sin, then there would be no further need for any other ceremonies like the indemnity stick ceremony or the 3-Day ceremony or the 3-year waiting period before consummating your marriage. Second, someone might ask the question as to “How exactly does drinking wine remove a sin that was allegedly implanted sexually?” This would be somewhat of an embarrassing question since 1) they would probably have no way to tell you a scientific answer and 2) it would

⁷⁴ *Part I, Spiritual Significance of the 3-Day Ceremony* (circa 1992-1995), page 3 section 3 (emphasis added).

⁷⁵ *Id.*, (emphasis added).

tend to contradict the idea that the Fall was a sexual event. Clearly Holy Wine does not remove Original Sin given the couple is required to undergo several other rituals. If you want to believe that “forgiven” actually means “removed” then how is something that is supposed to be “in your flesh” and “inheritable” be merely “forgiven”? Note that the Divine Principle texts say that Original Sin is “in the flesh” and has to be REMOVED. The texts say nothing about Original Sin being *forgiven*. If Original Sin is a substance, then how can it be “forgiven”? If Original Sin is the “fear” and “wisdom” received from the archangel, then how can such “fear” and “wisdom” be “forgiven”? If Original Sin are the “proclivities” inherited from the archangel, then how can such proclivities be “forgiven”? Those elements must be removed, they can’t merely be forgiven. And even if the Holy Wine “removed” Original Sin, how does wine remove “fear” and “wisdom”? How does wine remove “proclivities”? None of this makes any rational sense. To “forgive” simply means that the person who was wronged *no longer holds a grudge against the wrong-doer*. Such forgiveness merely changes the person doing the forgiving, it does NOT substantially change the one who is forgiven. It might release the one forgiven from punishment, but it does not necessarily do anything to change the forgiven’s mind, attitude, and or character. Granted, the pamphlet does say that to actually eliminate original sin, your blood lineage must be changed. The “actual change of blood lineage does not occur until the 3-Day ceremony. Therefore by the pamphlet’s own terms, they are admitting that the Holy Wine does not remove your Original Sin (it only “forgives” it...whatever that means) since they say later in that same paragraph that to actually eliminate Original Sin, your blood lineage must change. Therefore, Holy Wine is only considered a 1) “symbolic” rebirth, and only a 2)

“symbolic” change of blood lineage (what ever those terms mean). “Symbolic” by definition is not “actual”. What we do “know” is that Holy Wine does not create an “actual” change in blood lineage, according to this pamphlet.

At this stage, you will need to become familiar with some particular vocabulary as I give you a brief training in Natural Subjugation of ideological opponents:

AXIOM: An axiom is a foundational idea which itself is not proven, but instead is used as a foundation to prove other ideas. Axioms are dangerous because once you accept the axiom without questioning the origin of the axiom, you are likely to be trapped in your opponent’s reasoning and “logic”. Therefore, it is very important to identify axioms when they are being used because they will form the foundation of your opponent’s attack. The easiest way to identify axioms is to ask: “***How do they KNOW that?***”

AMBIGUOUS/AMBIGUITY: A word is ambiguous when it potentially has ***two or more different meanings*** or two or more interpretations, however the reader or listener does not know exactly which definition of the word is being used. This is a common technique that liars use because they can easily switch the definition of a word when you try to argue against them. Therefore, you must pin down an opponent on exactly what they mean by the words they use when you recognize the word can be ambiguous.

ASSUMPTION: An assumption is something you accept as true ***without*** having any good evidence to know that it is true or not or accepting something as true without knowing for sure that the thing actually exists.

BELIEF: A belief is anything that is accepted as being true BUT was not experienced directly, has not be tested or verified by yourself personally, and or is not based on first-hand knowledge.

CLAIM: A claim is an assertion or statement which you want someone to believe is true or false. A claim by itself is not an argument. In order to make an argument, you need *evidence* to support a claim, otherwise, the claim is simply your opinion or a belief.

FACT: A fact is anything that can be verified (tested) by any human being with at least **two** of the known physical human senses (sight, hearing, taste, smell, touch) or through deductive logic. You need at least two senses because one sense by itself can be deceived. Facts should be verified by a combination of methods since “seeing is not always believing”. **Facts are not “true” or “false”, they only exist or do not exist.**

KNOWLEDGE/TO KNOW: To know something means that you have had a **DIRECT** experience of a phenomenon by way of one or more of your five known physical senses (sight, taste, touch, smell, hearing). Even then, what you “know” is the sensation your perceived. It does not mean you have correctly interpreted the true nature of the perception. You can also “know” things by applying correct principles of logic which is a method of expanding direct knowledge. **If you are less than 96% sure of something, then you do NOT know it.** Claiming to know something when you don’t is a sure way to destroy your credibility.

EQUIVOCATION: Equivocating or using an equivocation is the process of using ambiguous words and tricking people into thinking a word means one thing when in fact the speaker/writer intends the word to mean something else entirely. Equivocation

is a form of *deception* that is used because the user knows they are trying to hide something.

TRUTH: Truth is a 360-degree *perspective* of an idea or object. Anything less than 360 degrees, is a type of falsehood. The objective (goal) of debate is to gain a complete view of an issue or topic or to gain “the truth”. Deception occurs when people only give partial views of “the truth”.

VAGUE: A word is vague when you can’t tell what the word means at all. You have no idea what concepts or ideas the word is meant to convey. This is different from an ambiguous word because at least an ambiguous word has possible definitions, but you just don’t know which definition is being used at the time. With a vague word, you have no idea whatsoever what the word is supposed to mean.

Here is a brief application. In the pamphlet, the following phrase was used:

*“It is impossible to enter the stage to be blessed as true children without **eliminating** original sin.”*

This is an “axiom”. It is a foundational statement which itself is unproven (and often unprovable). If you accept this statement without question, the statement then goes on to form the foundation for other claims. In the statement above, the author(s) claimed that it is “impossible” to enter the stage to be “blessed” as “true children” without eliminating original sin. First, how do the authors KNOW that? Did they conduct scientific experiments? Did they try multiple other ways and fail? Did they in fact eliminate original sin and discover that the person became a “true child”? That would be the only way they could know such a thing. If that is true, then they must also KNOW exactly what original sin is and KNOW exactly how to remove it and KNOW when it has in fact been removed. Therefore, you should look for where these authors describe for

you exactly how they know all these things. If they can't explain that to you, then they are creating an axiom in order to deceive you.

Finally, the pamphlet states concerning Holy Wine:

Through the Holy Wine ceremony you become spiritually one with the completely restored Adam [Rev. Moon].

Here we have the use of a very vague term “spiritually one”. What in the world does “spiritually one with” mean? Do you share the same spirit body? Do you inherit all the mental abilities and or attitudes of the person you become “spiritually one” with? The pamphlet authors don't say. When using vague terms like this, it allows the reader to define the term any way they want while at the same time make it look like the author is saying something of substance, when they actually haven't said anything at all. What we do “know” from that phrase however is that “spiritual” is not “physical” and more often than not, “spiritual” is simply another way to say “symbolic” which also means “not actual” or “not in real life”. Accordingly, we really don't know if Holy Wine actually does anything at all given the liberal use of very vague and undefined terms. But we do “know” for sure that Holy Wine does not change your blood lineage.

A brief apocryphal note: Some Unification Church members believe that the Holy Wine “secretly” contains(ed) Rev. Moon's actual blood and or seminal fluid and thus those “secret ingredients” have the “magical” power to change the drinker's blood lineage. Besides this being unsanitary, there are a number of logistical issues. First, in the Blessing Ceremony of 30,000 couples, there would be 60,000 individuals who would need to drink the wine. How would they ensure that every cup of wine had at least one blood cell in it? Shouldn't at least some of the cells coagulate? And even if the cells were evenly distributed and you could somehow guarantee that every single person received at

least one cell, would the cells still be alive having been mixed with alcohol? And if not, then if the cells do not need to be alive and the cells have some unique and inherent power, then there is no need to have a wine ceremony at all. Unification church members could simply open restaurants, wineries and the like and simply spike the food and drink with “cells” accomplishing “instant” restoration. But even beyond that, even if every person got at least one cell during the ceremony, what happens when those cells hit the hydrochloric acid of their stomachs? Won’t the cells disintegrate? Likewise, what if a recipient is a different blood type of Rev. Moon? Might there even be an allergic reaction? And in either case, how would ingesting someone’s blood or body fluids have any effect on the “blood lineage” of the recipient? It simply makes no scientific sense. Even the Divine principle textbook states:

Jesus said in Matthew 15:11, " ... not what goes into the mouth defiles a man ... : " How then could something edible cause man to fall?

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 39; The Fall)(emphasis added)

Presumably likewise how the could something edible (ingested blood cells) cause man to be “restored”? It can’t.

Presumably the idea of a Holy Wine ceremony comes from a practice or ritual allegedly performed by Jesus at the “Last Supper” where Jesus gave his disciples wine and told them that this wine was his blood and that his blood represented the forgiveness of sins. Jesus also gave his disciples bread and told them that the bread was his body and they should eat it.⁷⁶ Modern Christians repeat this ritual today, calling it “communion”. Even the catholic church claim that the wine and bread are actually transformed into the

actual blood and body of Jesus during the communion service. They call it “Transubstantiation”. So even if Rev. Moon were to put his actual blood in the wine, at least Christians should not see this as disgusting since they do the very same thing without even questioning how scandalous that would seem to an outside observer. People would say “Did you hear about that Jesus cult? I hear they drink their leader’s blood and practice cannibalism!” And they wouldn’t be too far off based on Jesus’ words. Regardless, even if the Holy Wine Ceremony mimics what Jesus did at the Last Supper, we can see that assuming the disciples did actually drink the wine and eat the bread believing it to be Jesus’ blood and body, and even if Catholics believe the wine and bread to actually be the blood and body of Jesus, these ceremonies do NOTHING to actually transform the mind, attitude, and character of those who partake in it. Right after the Last Supper, Jesus’ disciples *abandoned* him and even *denied* that they were his followers. IF some permanent transformation takes place in Catholics from communion, why do they have to *continually* practice communion or the Eucharist over and over again? Clearly there is no actual transformation in the human being or at least the recipients do not believe that there is an actual and permanent transformation taking place by partaking in the communion service.

In a similar way, even if Rev. Moon’s actual blood or other body cells were actually in the Holy Wine, there is no evidence that those body cells cause any actual and permanent transformation of the human being and or transformation of that human being’s blood lineage.

⁷⁶ See Matthew 26:26-30.

EFFICACY OF THE INDEMNITY STICK CEREMONY

The indemnity stick ceremony is an event that takes place after the Blessing Ceremony. The bride and groom take a wooden paddle, similar to a baseball bat. The groom bends forward at a 45 to 90 degree angle and the bride strikes the groom on his buttocks three times. This is typically done in a public setting. The groom then takes the wooden paddle and the bride bends forward at a 45 to 90 degree angle and the groom strikes the bride on her buttocks. This physical violence is claimed to be “restitution” or some sort of “punishment” for the “misuse” of the hip muscles by engaging in “unauthorized” sex activity. The Divine Principle textbook claims that when Jacob wrestled with an angle, the angle did a wrestling maneuver which damaged Jacob’s sciatic nerve (hip muscle). An Ashkenazi Jewish⁷⁷ tradition thus prevents adherents from

⁷⁷ Ashkenazi are but one type of “jew”, typically “jews” from eastern Europe, particularly Poland and Germany. There are Sephardic “jews” who are “jews who come from Spain, and there are Falashas or “jews” who come from Ethiopia. There are also other Jewish classification of Jews referred to as Mizrahim (North African/Oriental Jews), Italkim (Italian Jews), Burkharam (Jews from Uzbekistan), Juhurim (Jews from the Caucasus like Chechnya), Turkos (Jews from Turkey?), Romanyotim (Greek speaking Jews), and Beta Israel (Ethiopian Jews). The term “jew” is rather ambiguous and at times very vague. Typically it is thought to refer to anyone who is an adherent to the religion of “Judaism”. However, at other times it refers to people who are genetically from any of the tribes that originated from Jacob. The two meanings have been improperly used interchangeably as there are people who consider themselves “jewish”, yet claim to be atheists. Likewise, Judaism is not the actual religion since the actual religion was founded by Moses and not “Judah”. Hence the religion should be called “Moses-ism” or “Moa-ism”, or followers of the “Mosaic Code” or “Torah-ites” or “Yahweans”, *not* “Judaism”. Jacob allegedly had 12 different sons by four different women. These twelve sons went on to found twelve larger tribal groups. His sons were: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, Joseph, Benjamin, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher (See Genesis 35:23-26). When these tribal groups invaded Canaan and decimated the native population, they divided up the land among the twelve tribal groups named after the 12 sons. These 12 tribal groups then eventually combined to create a united kingdom called “Israel”. This kingdom was eventually divided into two separate realms, the Kingdom of Israel to the North and the Kingdom of “Judah” to the South. The northern kingdom was eventually and allegedly “wiped out”, leaving the southern kingdom to remain. It appears “Judaism” comes from the name of the southern kingdom. However, the religion should never have taken such a name as the kingdom of Judah is not the origin of the Mosaic-Code. Thus, the term “jew” is very misleading, perhaps intentionally so, as it takes the name of only ONE of the 12 tribes and makes that name representative of *all* the 12 tribes, giving the impression that only one tribe can represent the “children of Israel”, when there are in “fact” **11 other tribal groups** who can claim that title, thus no one tribe should be allowed to dominate the identity of the 12 tribal followers of the Mosaic religion. The focus of the Hebrew identity should be on the LAW (the Torah), or at the very most on the law GIVER (Moses or Yahweh), not on one of the sons of the followers. Thus naming the religion after one of the sons or after only one tribe of

eating the sciatic nerve (called the “gid hanasheh”) of any kosher animal. Some “jewish” traditions claim that the sciatic nerve is where man’s sexual desire is located and it is the one desire that causes a man to lose his sense of rationality. So, in order to try and defeat Jacob in the wrestling match, the angel (who represented man’s “dark” side) attacked Jacob’s sciatic nerve.⁷⁸ But this interpretation does not make any sense. The angel apparently *destroyed* Jacob’s sciatic nerve. Shouldn’t this mean the angel destroyed Jacob’s “dark” sexual desire? Shouldn’t that have made Jacob *stronger*? So as a sexual interpretation, it makes no sense. As a devastating martial art maneuver, it would make perfect sense because it would cause an opponent to be immobile. In any event, it appears the Unification Church borrows this sexual reference and claims that the angel damaging Jacob’s hip was as “punishment” for Adam and Eve’s wrongful “sex-hip action” that typically involves pelvic thrusts. Therefore, as punishment, the bride and groom should likewise be struck on their hip muscle.

First, there is no evidence that the alleged fall of man was a sexual event. Even if it were a sexual event, any physical action first **ORIGINATES** in the **MIND**. Therefore, the root of any wrongful physical action is **MENTAL**, not physical. Therefore, any correction or restoration of so-called wrongful acts, should be directed towards **THE MIND**, not the body. Even Jesus said:

“Then some Pharisees and scribes came to Jesus from Jerusalem and asked, “*Why do Your disciples break the tradition of the elders? They do not wash*

Israel seems to smack of humanistic idolatry (i.e., naming a religion after yourself). Thus we should look suspiciously at the exclusive use of the term “Judah”.

⁷⁸ See “*Why we don’t eat the sciatic nerve?*” found at: https://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/784896/jewish/Why-dont-we-eat-the-sciatic-nerve.htm (last visited November 23, 2022).

*their hands before they eat.” Jesus replied, “**And why do you break the command of God for the sake of your tradition? . . . Jesus called the crowd to Him and said, “Listen and understand. A man is not defiled by what enters his mouth, but by what comes out of it.”** Then the disciples came to Him and said, “Are You aware that the Pharisees were offended when they heard this?” But Jesus replied, “**Every plant that My heavenly Father has not planted will be pulled up by its roots. Disregard them! They are blind guides. If a blind man leads a blind man, both will fall into a pit.**” Peter said to Him, “Explain this parable to us.” “**Do you still not understand?**” Jesus asked. “**Do you not yet realize that whatever enters the mouth goes into the stomach and then is eliminated [as shit]? But the things that come out of the mouth come from the heart [the mind], and these things defile a man. For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, sexual immorality, theft, false testimony, and slander. These are what defile a man, but eating with unwashed hands does not defile him.”⁷⁹***

Apparently, Jesus was upset with the so-called leaders of the Israelites because they focused on the literal interpretation of the law and focused only on external observances of rules yet missed (or ignored) the bigger picture. They thought that mindlessly adhering to the Mosaic rules made them “great”. Jesus however thought such leaders were dumb and explained that just because you follow the Mosaic law externally and wash your external hands before eating, that does not make you great or good people. What really makes someone “good” or “evil” is what goes on in their MIND, how they think, their attitudes and their character. Jesus wanted the Israelites to move beyond

⁷⁹ Matthew 15:1-20 (New International Version) (emphasis added).

“ritualism” or ritual-based sanctification and move toward a substantial character-based sanctification.

Therefore, simply addressing an alleged wrongful act through a physical ritual such as striking the buttocks does NOTHING to change the mindset that created the alleged wrongful act in the first place. Thus, the indemnity stick ceremony is more akin to the Mosaic law level of thinking of the Scribes and Pharisees. Simply following external rituals but missing the internal significance. Thus, hitting someone on their backside does nothing to change a person’s mind, heart, character, or attitude. It is not “true” restoration. It is merely a shamanistic ritual.⁸⁰ Thus the Indemnity-Stick ceremony is just that, a ceremony without any real transformative power.

EFFICACY OF THE 3-DAY CEREMONY

The 3-Day ceremony is a sexual ritual practiced by the bride and groom after a 3-year waiting period. The 3-day ceremony involves performing particular ritualistic sex acts over the course of three separate days. This ceremony is what is claimed to “**actually**” change one’s blood lineage. At the outset, the very existence of this sex ritual tends to discredit the Unification Church’s denials that early church female members had sex with Rev. Moon in ceremonies known as “P’ikareun”.⁸¹ Here in the 3-Day Ceremony the Unification Church is **EXPLICITLY** claiming that the actual change of blood

⁸⁰ Shamanism is considered to be the root religion of the Korean people. This is where specific “holy men” claimed to have some special connection to the spiritual world and that they could grant worshipers benefits if the worshipers performed particular rituals set up by the shaman. It is a ritual-based spiritual practice.

⁸¹ *P’ikareun* or *P’ikareum* (피가름 or 피갈음) was a sexual practice performed in some Korean religious movements in North Korea that were supposed to “purify the blood” or “purify the womb”. This practice found its roots in Protestant Korean churches in the 1930’s particularly the “Inside the Belly Church” of Mrs. Ho Ho-Bin (Bokjunggyo, Korean 북중교); the “Israel Monastery”, founded by Kim Baek Moon; the “Wilderness Church” centered on Ms. Pak Wol-yong; the “Olive Tree” church, founded by Park Tae-Seon.

lineage occurs THROUGH A **SEXUAL** RITUAL. It would make perfect sense then for at least some members to think or feel that the “best” change of blood lineage then would come from having sex with the “actual” messiah. In “fact” the only conclusion that would make religious sense would be that ***only*** actual sex with the messiah would accomplish “true” change of blood lineage. Whether Rev. Moon had ritual sex with female followers or not is quite frankly none of anyone’s business and should be of no one’s concern other than those who allegedly participated in the practice. No one is “qualified” to claim that what Rev. Moon allegedly did or did not do was “adultery” in the spiritual sense. Assuming that something akin to P’ikareun took place in the Unification Church, we are in no position to assess the mind-set or level of sincerity or degree of devotion of the people who may have practiced such rituals. You and I are responsible only for OURSELVES. It is not our position or place to judge the actions or mindset of others unless those actions have some direct impact on our own lives. All that I am saying here is, ***the Unification Church clearly promotes an explicit sexual ritual as a “bona fide” method for the change of blood lineage.*** It is certainly not a stretch of the imagination for anyone to think that therefore actual sex with someone you actually believe is the “messiah” would accomplish similar or even “better” results. The Unification Church discredits itself by trying to deny that such acts took place in the early Unification Church or that such acts were even possible when in the “same breath” it claims that married couples ***MUST in fact undergo a sexual ritual to “change their blood lineage”.***

Further, as stated above, if someone believes that “sin” came about through a transfer of elements via the genitals, it would make sense that “restoration” should occur in the very SAME WAY. But again, if on the other hand Original Sin is merely a

MENTAL ORIENTATION OF MIND, then no mere external ritual (sexual or otherwise) can correct that. External acts can be used to “demonstrate” faith or demonstrate mental resolve and in that sense, external actions are valuable. However, one cannot say that simply the mere practice of an external ritual is *sufficient* to bring about a change of mind. In “fact”, the change of mind does not occur because of the ritual. The change of mind must occur **BEFORE** the ritual takes place, otherwise the participant would not have the mental fortitude to go through with the ritual in the first place. The ritual is merely a “prop” or opportunity that allows the mental change to take place, but it does not *cause* the mental change per se. This can be seen in the story of Abraham sacrificing his son Isaac. In that story, Abraham made a mistake in a previous ritual that God had commanded Abraham to do. To make up for this error, Abraham was commanded to sacrifice (kill) his son. This presumably was a much more emotionally difficult act to perform than killing a bird or other small animal. Abraham thus had to have sufficient mental resolve and change of heart *BEFORE* actually sacrificing his son in order to go through with the ritual. At the last moment before Abraham actually kills his son, Abraham is stopped by God. Apparently, God could read the mental resolve of Abraham and judged it to be legitimate and sincere such that NO ACTUAL EXTERNAL RITUAL WAS NECESSARY. Thus, indicating that the external ritual is *inferior* to the actual change of heart which is superior.⁸² The same could be said of Jesus’ challenge to the “rich young ruler”. In Mark 10:17-27 a rich young man who was impressed with Jesus asked Jesus what he should do to “inherit eternal life”. Jesus essentially told him to keep the 10 commandments received by Moses from God. The rich man said “I already do

⁸² See Genesis 15:8-15 and Genesis 22:1-19.

that”. Jesus then said to him, that there was one thing the rich man lacked. Jesus told the rich man to sell everything he had, give the money to the poor and then come and follow him [Jesus]. The rich man however was upset and walked away because he did not want to part with his riches.⁸³ Here, a human being was given a situation to allow him to “prove” his faith and determination. He wasn’t asked to kill somebody, he wasn’t asked to have sex with Jesus, but he was asked to give up something that was personally important to him, thus making the request very difficult mentally. Here, the rich man could not break his mental attachment to his wealth. Therefore no “restoration” took place despite him having kept all of the external commandments of Moses. Perhaps, had the rich man shown a determination to sell his possessions, Jesus might have stopped him and said “No, you don’t have to do that since I can now see that you are sincere and that you are not really overly concerned about money!” The point is, the external ritual or act is not what actually changes the person. The person changes THEMSELVES, long BEFORE the act actually takes place. The act merely gives the person the *opportunity* and occasion for them to change themselves, but the act itself has no inherent power of transformation. It is the person’s own mental determination which holds the true power of transformation.

⁸³ See Mark 10:17-25 “As Jesus was starting on his way again, a man ran up, knelt before him, and asked him, “Good Teacher, what must I do to receive eternal life?” “Why do you call me good?” Jesus asked him. “No one is good except God alone. You know the commandments: ‘Do not commit murder; do not commit adultery; do not steal; do not accuse anyone falsely; do not cheat; respect your father and your mother.’” “Teacher,” the man said, “ever since I was young, I have obeyed all these commandments.” Jesus looked straight at him with love and said, “You need only one thing. Go and sell all you have and give the money to the poor, and you will have riches in heaven; then come and follow me.” When the man heard this, gloom spread over his face, and he went away sad, because he was very rich. Jesus looked around at his disciples and said to them, “How hard it will be for rich people to enter the Kingdom of God!” The disciples were shocked at these words, but Jesus went on to say, “My children, how hard it is to enter the Kingdom of God! It is much harder for a rich person to enter the Kingdom of God than for a camel to go through the eye of a needle”. (Good News Translation).

In terms of what is claimed about the 3-Day ceremony the pamphlet says that this is the “Substantial Change of Blood Lineage”.⁸⁴ It states:

This is the solemn ceremony for you to be reborn as children of God's direct lineage. Through this ceremony, spiritual and physical rebirth take place, the couple is resurrected to life through the indemnity [sic] and the substantial restoration of the ceremony. Since no one but the Messiah can reach perfection, it is also only the Messiah who can teach us and help us through the perfection stage. There is no other way except through the guidance of the Lord of the Second Advent.

After the Holy Wine Ceremony, Eve (the wife) is in the position of bride of the Messiah. The Messiah will guide her but he cannot become her substantial external spouse. In order for her to go beyond the perfection stage, she must be given her own husband.

*Through the Holy Wine Ceremony, the wife stands in the position of restored Eve having been forgiven of her original sin. So she is able to produce a sinless child out of her WOMB just as Mary produced Jesus as the sinless son of God.**

The man after the wine ceremony is in the position of restored archangel. He has not yet become her husband. Her husband has to be born of her. So she, in the position of mother, through giving him spiritual rebirth has to bear and produce her own husband. She has to give birth to her spouse (Adam) by the time she completes the growth stage because she cannot go through the perfection stage alone. For this reason the first two days of the 3-day ceremony represent the man's restoration in the Formation and the Growth stages respectively..⁸⁵

The ceremony takes place over the space of three days. During the evenings, there are prayers, a specifically prescribed sex act (which changes on each of the three days),

⁸⁴ *Part I, Spiritual Significance of the 3-Day Ceremony* (circa 1992-1995), page 4 section 5 (emphasis added).

⁸⁵ Id.

and other rituals. The result at the end of the three days is that the bride and groom are considered “restored” back into “God’s” lineage. However, there are a number of curious issues: First, the bride and groom only have sex between themselves. No third persons. Therefore, if we are to believe the axiom that it is “only the Messiah who can reach perfection”, ***how can the “imperfect” bride and groom somehow restore themselves?*** Practically and realistically speaking, they can’t. The entire ceremony “**pretends**” that the bride and groom have become “restored” people and then they GIVE REBIRTH TO EACH OTHER. Specifically, the pamphlet states:

Through the Holy Wine Ceremony, ***the wife stands in the POSITION of restored Eve*** having been ***forgiven*** of her original sin. ***So she is able to produce a sinless child out of her WOMB just as Mary produced Jesus as the sinless son of God.***

As stated before, being “forgiven” of an alleged sin does not translate into actually being *transformed* into a new and different person or result in having your mind, attitude, and character changed. However, for some reason, simply “drinking” special wine which previously only SYMBOLICALLY restored the bride, somehow now is claimed to have pseudo-*substantially* transformed the bride such that she is now qualified to give birth to “sinless” children. ***So is the bride actually restored by Holy Wine or only symbolically restored by Holy Wine? If only symbolically restored by Holy Wine, how can she *actually* give birth to real sinless children.*** Shouldn’t the children only be “symbolically” sinless? But somehow now it is claimed she can actually give birth to sinless children even though her Original Sin was only FORGIVEN and the pamphlet claimed that only by doing the 3-Day Ceremony is your Original Sin ELIMINATED. So you see the contradiction here? ***The bride can’t be capable of actually giving birth to***

sinless children if she has not yet participated in the 3-Day ceremony. Therefore, she can't give "rebirth" to her husband as a sinless Adam because she has only had her Original Sin FORGIVEN, but NOT REMOVED! And she can't have her Original Sin removed until she gives birth to a sinless Adam. It is all circular and contradictory. Even the Divine Principle textbook states:

Parents who have original sin cannot give birth to good children who do not have original sin.

(Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 170)(emphasis added)

Therefore for the 3-Day Ceremony to actually "work" we must believe that she (the bride) was ACTUALLY and substantially restored by drinking the Holy Wine and not merely "symbolically" restored. Otherwise, she cannot realistically and actually give birth to her husband. So then the Holy Wine must have *substantially* restored her. If that is so, why can't Holy Wine by itself substantially restore EVERYONE WITHOUT the need for a separate sex ceremony? Holy Wine then BY ITSELF, should be able to remove Original Sin, but by their own admission, it does NOT. This all does not make any sense if you take the time to think about it. This is further evidence to believe that an actual ritual of *P'ikareum* (direct sexual contact with a messiah figure) must have taken place in the early days of the Unification Church. There is no other way to resolve the contradiction posed by the Holy Wine Ceremony and the 3-Day Ceremony.

In any event, during the 3-Day Ceremony, the bride now gives "birth" to her own husband where it says:

Her husband has to be born of her. So she, in the position of mother, through giving him spiritual rebirth has to bear and produce her own husband. She has to give birth to her spouse . . .

Here, the bride gives birth to her own husband. But previously it was claimed that for birth to occur there has to be a mother AND a father. So who then is the father of this new husband? It can't be the husband himself because he is still only "symbolically" restored. Therefore, the father has to be the male Messiah, HOWEVER the pamphlet also says:

*The Messiah will guide her but **he CANNOT become her substantial external spouse.***

A very curious statement...why CAN'T the male Messiah become the bride's "substantial external" spouse? No explanation is given. In fact, this statement seems contradictory. If the axiom is that ONLY the Messiah can reach perfection, and the change of blood lineage must occur through a sexual act, then the only logical conclusion is that the Messiah **MUST** become the **actual** spouse of the symbolically restored bride. Here then we see that the Unification Church is admitting (through its lack of explanation of why Rev. Moon "can't" become the bride's husband) that a practice of *P'ikareun* did actually take place in the early days of the Unification Church. All of this circumstantial evidence makes such practice an almost certainty. This 3-Day ceremony is a modified (watered-down?) version of the *P'ikareun* Ceremony. The 3-Day ceremony on its own is internally logically inconsistent and does not make sense by itself. The ceremony seems to point to an early *actual* sexual relationship with a messianic figure that took place in the early years of the Unification Church, otherwise **there is no "logical" way for an imperfect bride who *still* has Original Sin to give actual birth to a sinless husband.** You will also note that there is no account of the groom giving "birth" to the bride. Presumably since the bride was already "restored" by the Messiah. Further evidence is contained in this Note from the pamphlet which states:

*Note**

*Why was Mary able to bear Jesus as a sinless man? Adam, who was in the midway position between good and evil, was divided into Cain and Abel. Thus the struggles between good and evil were fought between Cain and Abel, between Esau and Jacob, and between Zerah and Perez. The struggle between good and evil had to be fought even in the womb. This is because, due to the Fall, **original sin entered the womb of Eve**. Therefore, it was necessary to separate good and evil **and sanctify in the womb** in order for the Messiah to be born as a sinless man.⁸⁶*

This reference to “sanctifying the womb” is also a reference to the theory of *P'ikareun* which was believed to “cleanse the womb”. But please also note the relevant axiom, i.e., that Jesus was born “sinless”. There is absolutely NO EVIDENCE that Jesus was actually born sinless (whatever that means). The Bible verses that CLAIM Jesus was sinless are just that...CLAIMS. There is no empirical proof nor could there be any empirical proof since no one can define what sin is such that a person is born with or without sin. Neither proposition can be proved or disproved. Essentially everyone is born without sin because you are born without having performed any good or evil deeds. But if everyone is born sinless, then there is no need for a church to “rescue” you. Thus, it made sense for the Catholic church to *create* the idea of Original Sin (sin you are born with and can’t get rid of by yourself) and *create* the idea of infant baptism to make people *think* that even babies have sin and thus *lay the psychological foundation* that people *need* the church. If everyone is born without sin, then there is no need for a church and no need for priests as mediators! Thus, it appears that the Catholic Church **had a vested interest in deceiving people that they were born with sin so as to create artificial dependent relationships upon the church power structure**. If Jesus was born without sin, then why did he get baptized by John the Baptist? Isn’t baptism the symbol of washing away one’s

⁸⁶ Id., page 7.

sins? If so, then was Jesus simply posturing by going through with baptism? If he was sinless, he should have said to John “I’m good, I don’t need to be baptized.” But instead, Jesus went through with the baptism which would contradict the idea that he was born without sin.

A passage that claims Jesus was “born” without sin is 1st Peter 2:21-24 which states:

To this you were called, because Christ suffered for you, leaving you an example, that you should follow in his steps.

*“**He committed no sin**, and no deceit was found in his mouth.” When they hurled their insults at him, he did not retaliate; when he suffered, he made no threats. Instead, he entrusted himself to him who judges justly. “He himself bore our sins” in his body on the cross, so that we might die to sins and live for righteousness; “by his wounds you have been healed.”⁸⁷*

First, it does not say Jesus was “born” without sin, it merely states he “committed no sin”. But how would Peter know this? Was Peter with Jesus every single waking moment of Jesus’ life? Did Peter follow Jesus to the toilet and make sure Jesus wasn’t doing anything sketchy? Probably not. So how could Peter possibly know the alleged truth of such statement? He CAN’T. Thus, this is merely a claim which no one can verify and has simply been accepted by faith without anyone asking so much of a probing question. It is another axiom used to build a religious myth. Another passage used to “prove” that Jesus had no sin is 2nd Corinthians 5:21 which states:

*God made him **who had no sin** to be sin for us, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.⁸⁸*

⁸⁷ 1st Peter 2:21-24 (New International Version) (emphasis added)

⁸⁸ 2nd Corinthians 5:21 (New International Version) (emphasis added).

Here again, how does Paul, the author of the book of Corinthians know that Jesus had no sin? Paul *never even met Jesus in person* so how could Paul possibly know any of that information? He simply can't. It is thus just another axiom, a claim that no one bothered to ask how Paul would know such information. In the end, it really does not matter. This abstract concept of "sin" is an invention. It is a tool of social control, something to engender guilt. Sin is not something you do, it is a state of who you are, an orientation of mind. It is not something you can count and measure (if so, then someone should show how they measure it). Whether Jesus had "sin" or not is immaterial. The only thing that matters is what quality of person Jesus was and what quality of person you ARE in your daily life. Therefore, creating all of these mental and spiritual gymnastics to "explain" how Jesus was born without sin is MEANINGLESS. Why? Because supposedly both Adam and Eve were born without sin and apparently EVEN THEY MESSED UP! So even being allegedly born without sin has no bearing on what quality of person you eventually become. You still have to make your own independent efforts to develop yourself into a person of quality regardless of whether you are born "sinless" or not.

Accordingly, even if a woman had a "cleansed womb" and could give birth to "sinless children", is no guarantee that such children automatically grow up to be "good". Each person regardless of being born "sinless" or not, has to take their own responsibility to GROW to "perfection". That is the discussion which is missing in all of this "sinless" talk. Being born "sinless" does NOT replace actual growth and development.

Notwithstanding the internal logical inconsistencies of the 3-Day Ceremony, if Original Sin was actually some physical substance floating in the blood stream, there is no indication that a 3-Day ceremony of ritualized sex would actually ever remove such

alleged substance. For that matter, even if actual sex with the Messiah took place, there is no reason to believe that such act on its own “removes” any physical substance known as Original Sin. At the very most we can believe that it might be possible that the mind of a married woman who is asked to have sex with another man not her husband is of such an extreme proposition that her willingness to do so, her substantial determination of MIND is what actually “restores” her, and not the physical act of sex itself. Adulterous sex in Korean society may have been an effective instrument to create such mental impressions due to the severity at which adultery may have been viewed in post World War II Korean society. The woman was literally “risking her life”. Thus, such mental determination at the risk of her life is what actually “restored” the woman and not the act of genital contact. However, the only persons who really knows the quality of the minds engaging in such an act are the participants themselves. No one external to the situation can judge what is actually going on in another person’s mind, nor is there any need for anyone to make such judgments. Each person is solely responsible for their own spiritual journey and is not qualified to comment on the quality of someone else’s journey (in my opinion).

Finally, as stated above, even if the bride’s womb were “cleansed” and even if she were to give birth to a “sinless” Adam, none of that would be sufficient for perfection. After all, both Adam and Eve were believed to have been born “sinless” yet they are also believed to have “fallen”. Therefore “sinlessness” is not a sufficient condition for actual “perfection”. The way of perfection, according to the Divine Principle textbooks is by “give and take” ‘with a certain quality of “word”, instruction, or example as outlined in the chapter on Resurrection. There it states:

In order to be resurrected, man must fulfill his responsibility-to believe in and live the Word.

Thus, resurrection is accomplished by God's giving His Word (truth) to man together with man's fulfilling his responsibility to believe in and live the truth.

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 78) (emphasis added)

People on earth can receive the merits of the age of completion stage resurrection by accomplishing their responsibility to believe in and incarnate the new Word and directly attend the Messiah with full sincerity of heart. Therefore, the age is called the age of justification by attendance. When a person lives in and attends the Messiah at the Second Coming, his spirit self reaches the perfection level of resurrection and becomes a divine spirit. The place on earth where the people of this divine spirit stage live is called the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 81) (emphasis added)

Thus, under the Principles of Resurrection, which simply are the same as the principles of Creation just that they are applied to “fallen” people, are how a person is restored. Specifically, the Principles of Resurrection state:

Since resurrection means the phenomena occurring in the course of restoring fallen man's nature to the standard originally created by God , the dispensation for resurrection is actually the Dispensation for Restoration. The Dispensation for Restoration is also the dispensation for recreation. Consequently the dispensation for resurrection is carried out according to what is explained in "The Principles of the Creation."

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 78) (emphasis added)

As for the Principles of Creation it states:

The spirit self needs nutrition for its growth and perfection. The positive (Yang) nutrient for the spirit self is the Life Element from God. The Life Element from God is the basic element that develops Heart within a person and develops him as a being of truth. On the other hand, the negative (Um) nutrient for the growth of the spirit self is the Vitality Element which comes from the physical self. When the physical self acts in accordance with God's Word, it projects good Vitality Element for the growth of the spirit self.

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 34) (emphasis added)

As explained above, the relationship between the spirit self and the physical self is that of subject and object, with the spirit self growing and perfecting itself on the basis of its relationship with the physical self. The quality of a person's physical life is converted into Vitality Element and transferred to the spirit self. Thus, the quality of the spirit self is dependent upon the quality of the physical life. Accordingly, a spirit self that receives wholesome Vitality Element from the physical self becomes a being of goodness, whereas a spirit self that receives bad Vitality Element from the physical self will become evil. In order for an evil spirit self to become a good one, that person must repent while his spirit self is still in his physical self, for a person's evil spirit self is healed by receiving good Vitality Element through his repentance and faith in God's Word.

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 34-35) (emphasis added)

It is not God who determines whether a spirit person goes to the Kingdom of Heaven or to hell. It is each person himself who determines this through his daily life while in his physical body on earth. Each person goes to the place in the spirit

**world corresponding to the stage of development
that his spirit self attained while he was on earth.**

(Outline of the Divine Principle, Level 4, p. 36) (emphasis added)

So here, we have a bit of an anomaly. On the one hand, the Holy Wine Ceremony and 3-Day Ceremony make it appear that those rituals can “forgive” Original Sin and also “Eliminate” Original Sin and thus allow a person to give “birth” to “sinless” children. However, before one is “legitimately” able to give birth to sinless children, aren’t they supposed to have reached perfection first? Therefore, these two ceremonies indirectly make it appear that the participants of these rituals have “reached perfection” or at the very least been substantially “transformed” by these rituals. However, the Principles of Resurrection and Principles of Creation do not lead one to believe that human development or human transformation can take place merely by performing a ritual. Both the Principles of Resurrection and the Principles of Creation imply that the quality of a human being *is dependent on the quality of their daily actions over time*. And the quality of their daily actions over time is based on the quality of their understanding of and application of ethical principles (a.k.a. “the Word of God”)⁸⁹. Accordingly, either these rituals do not transform anyone or the Principles of Resurrection and Principles of

⁸⁹ Some Unificationists think that the “Word of God” is “Don’t eat the fruit”. However, I addressed this issue in the essay “*Was the Fall Really About Sex?*” found here: <https://adobe.ly/3z2TIru>. There, I elucidated that “the Commandment” was actually “Be Fruitful” as it was given in the imperative form (i.e., an order or command to do something). “Be Fruitful” could not have been a “Blessing” because a “blessing” means “to grant permission or to give approval” and if “Be Fruitful and Multiply” were “blessings” then it means God was giving them approval and permission to start their sexual relationship which seems contrary to Unificationist ideology. Generally, humans grow and develop by means of positive actions, not by negative warnings such as “don’t do this or don’t do that”. Negative warnings keep one on the path towards growth, they are not the path itself. Negative warnings are like guardrails on the road. They keep you on the road, but they do not take you to your destination. Following the road is what takes you to your destination. If a human being could grow merely by NOT doing something, then that would be the same as animals and plants which grow automatically without exercising any responsibility. If that were the case, a human being could grow to perfection by doing “nothing”, however that contradicts the reality of our everyday human experience. That is, humans must complete some positive action in order to develop.

Creation are misleading and a human can in fact be substantially transformed merely by a ritual. My conclusion is that the Principles of Resurrection and Principles of Creation are more likely correct and that implication that the rituals of the Holy Wine Ceremony and the 3-Day Ceremony substantially transform a person are not accurate. This conclusion is based on 1) the “fact” that Jesus’ disciples were not transformed by drinking Jesus’ “blood” and eating his “flesh”, and 2) by the words of the instructions of the Holy Wine Ceremony and 3-Day Ceremony itself show that Original Sin is merely “forgiven” by Holy Wine *but NOT removed*. Logically then, the bride can not give birth to a “sinless” husband during the 3-Day Ceremony if she herself still has Original Sin which has not been eliminated prior to performing the 3-Day Ceremony and the instructions concerning the Holy Wine Ceremony clearly state that the bride’s Original Sin has NOT been eliminated, so logically she cannot give birth to a “sinless” husband. Therefore, these rituals seem merely just that, only rituals. They do not appear to have any substantial effect on the participants by their own power, separate and apart from the participants’ own minds. Accordingly, this “proves” that the participants, at most, are in “fact” saving *themselves* by their *own* power and the rituals merely present the opportunity for their own minds to work the power of “restoration” however the rituals do not by themselves restore a human being.

As far as the Principles of Resurrection and the Principles of Creation are concerned, it appears that the quality of a person’s life or spiritual status depends on the quality of the “word” or principles guiding that person’s daily life and the quality of their intellect to comprehend “higher-level” principles and “truths”.

A BRIEF NOTE ON “ATTENDANCE”

Some Unification Church members think that to become “divine spirits” that all they need do is “attend” the Messiah. Even the Divine Principle textbooks allude to this. However, what exactly does “attend” mean? Does it mean to join the Unification Church? Does it mean to give monetary donations to the Moon organization in any of its forms? Does it mean to do Unification Church rituals? To some people it may mean that, however that clearly cannot be the case. First, according to the Divine Principle textbooks, if Adam and Eve had not fallen, there would be NO RELIGION. Accordingly, Judaism (“Torah-ites”) would not exist, Christianity would not exist, Islam would not exist, Christianity would not exist and especially the Unification Church would not exist nor any of the rituals and practices associated with these religions. The textbooks states:

“[I]f man had not fallen in the Garden of Eden, there would be no churches or Bibles, no sermons, no all-night prayer vigils, no revival meetings, nor the like. All each person would need to do is live as the embodiment of goodness, attending God in his everyday life.

(Outline of the Principle, Level 4, p. 56) (emphasis added)

Therefore “attending the Messiah” also would NOT be something a divine spirit person would do or need to do because THERE WOULD BE NO MESSIAH. Accordingly, even if the Divine Principle textbooks say that you need to “attend” the Messiah to perfect yourself, that is not an absolute statement. It must mean that you follow the messiah (or your personal messiah’s) guidance UNTIL YOU CAN MANAGE ON YOUR OWN AS ORIGINALLY INTENDED BY GOD. Even Rev. Moon confirms

this where he set up the Home Church system for members to be INDEPENDENT. He said:

When you clearly understand this, you won't need an Abel figure but can do it on your own. Otherwise, you need someone to help discipline your life.

(Home Church, p. 260, year 1980) (emphasis added)

Also it will represent your graduation from the Unification Church; you won't need the Unification Church anymore. You should feel that you don't need to have someone looking after you. If you know what you should be doing, why do you need someone giving you direction?

(Home Church, p.130, year 1980) (emphasis added)

When the Home Church system is consummated, no leaders will be necessary in areas, states, and so forth, because each of you will communicate with God directly.

(Home Church, p. 371, year 1980)

The time will even come when your prayer is not necessary. Once the dwelling of God is with men, whom would you pray to? You will just talk to God directly...Once the Home Church system is completely established, we really don't need any formal organization. The Divine Principle will be taught in the school system. We won't need Church leaders any more.

(Home Church, p. 370, year 1980)

If you have this basic foundation then no one has the say, "Do this and do than [sic]," or "Don't do that."...If you live in a society that tells everyone what to do is that good? No! It is so tedious, monotonous and oppressing! To make up your mind, *you don't need any kind of judge or teacher; your conscience is your best guide--no one needs to tell you what's best.* No one tells Father.

(Father's talk to seminary candidates July 12, 1984)(emphasis added)

"The day will come when even God seems to be saying 'I don't know you.' At that time you will feel that you are utterly alone in all the universe. If under those conditions you still do not give up, but insist, 'No matter what God thinks or what True Parents say to me, no matter how unsympathetic the church members are, this is the right way and I will go on anyway.' Then at that moment you are elevating yourself to the highest level of faith. Once you reach that level you can be trusted unconditionally by God and by me, and eventually the whole world."

(The Desire of All Things 6-17-77 in Way of Tradition Vol. III p. 267.)

"Conscience is higher even than parents. Please recite this, 'yangshim eun boomonim boda apsu yitda.' That means, conscience exists ahead of True Parents. Please repeat one more time. [Conscience exists ahead of True Parents.] Again. [Conscience exists ahead of True Parents.] The second is, 'yangshim eun seuseung boda apsu yitda' . Now repeat this, the conscience exists before the teacher himself. [Conscience exists before the teacher himself.] Again. [Conscience exists before the teacher.] This means that the conscience is ahead of the teacher. The third, 'yangshim eun hananim boda

apsuh yitda'. Conscience exists ahead of God. Please repeat.

("Let Us Find Our True Self," December 4, 1994, Belvedere International Training Center, Translator: Sang Kil Han.)(emphasis added)

What is the final stage of restoration? Not the coming of the Messiah, but home church. When you accomplish home church, there will be no need for churches any more, for every home will be a church. Then Dr. Durst's position*, and even HSA, will no longer be necessary. You won't have to go to church or pray, but only live by the law of the heavenly country; then you will automatically go to heaven. When we finish home church, God will have his own nation, and people there will only have to observe its laws, not go to church. When we love everyone as an extensions of our own families, that in itself will be heaven. If this does not become a reality then Divine Principle is just another ideology that doesn't work.

(Home Church, p.371, year 1980. *Dr. Durst was President of The Unification Church at that time) (emphasis added)

You don't need to come to the church center. Instead, please start home church centering around your own home.

(Home Church, p. 448, year 1978) (emphasis added)

In the future everything will be organized based on home church. We won't need center directors.

(Home Church, p. 464, year 1978)

So far we have had a pyramid type organization, which has some disadvantages. From now on, Father would like to change it so that each individual will be responsible. Father would like to create a new kind of organization, not a pyramid type with a top command echelon and so many other levels that by the time the bottom is reached, half the message is lost. Father would like to have a direct hot line for his instructions to each member. Each member must consider that he...is directly responsible to God.

(Unification Church National Conference December 19, 1990)

Accordingly, even based on Rev. Moon's own words, simply following around an external leader is NOT the highest form of attendance. Following a leader may be necessary or helpful for some people who are not yet at the stage of being able to manage their own spiritual life, however just as a child should not remain in kindergarten all their life, a person should also graduate from depending on an individual leader and at some point become self-directing. Therefore "attendance" does not necessarily mean you have to follow a leader, or follow Rev. Moon, or even follow a textbook. At some point, you need to graduate to a higher level.

CONCLUSIONS

In the end, there appears to be sufficient evidence to show that the idea of inherited Original Sin is a fictitious concept that the Unification Church adopted as its own and then created an exclusive religion/power structure around that concept. However, even a close examination of the Divine Principle textbooks show that there is no such thing as an Original Sin Element that floats around in the human blood stream and is capable of being inherited by future generations and which is capable of causing humans to do "bad things". Even the Divine Principle textbooks identify Original Sin as

“fear”, “wisdom”, and “proclivities”, which are not things considered to be “inheritable” or something lodged in the physical body. Likewise, the evidence shows that Original Sin is a manufactured idea created by the Catholic Church and popularized by St. Augustine. There is no evidence that the “serpent” caused Eve to “fall”. There is no evidence that the “serpent” deceived Eve. There is no evidence that the “serpent” influenced Eve in any way whatsoever. Any actions Eve took (based on the written evidence) were 100% of her own desire and accord. Any fall or sin occurred when Eve herself failed to take personal responsibility for her actions and then bore false witness against the serpent. The serpent was the only creature who told the truth in that story and does not deserve to be blamed or accused for anything. The evidence shows that human beings are the only culpable party in the Garden of Eden story. As human beings are the source of this condition, it is well within the power of human beings to get themselves out of this condition by 1) being less egotistically focused, 2) taking personal responsibility for their thoughts and actions, 3) not blaming others, and 4) not bearing false witness against others. It is a very simple formula, but in terms of effort, is not easy since it is so much more comfortable to play the victim and to blame everyone else for your problems.

The idea of Original Sin should have been dismantled and discredited much like what the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks did with other false Christian/Pauline concepts such as the Resurrection, the Trinity, The Return of Jesus in the Air, Predestination and the like. Instead, the authors of the Divine Principle textbooks made a seemingly deliberate decision to use and exploit the false idea of Original Sin for their own purposes. What those purposes were, we can only guess, but we do know that the theory of Original Sin clearly does not resolve the problem of “evil” similar to how the

Communist theory of eliminating private property does not solve any problems either. Original Sin is a theory of distraction and deflection which turns our eyes away from the real source of problems, the real culprits, and the real “solution”. Simply, human beings are the source of their own problems. All “sin”, unsocial actions, violence, greed, etc. all come exclusively from human choice and from the human mind. Human beings are the sole source of “evil”. The “serpent” did not give human beings something they did not *already* have. In the course of restoration, there are no demons to blame or gods to rely on. Accordingly, the “solution” is to expose this fact (that humans are the sole source of “problems”...not the devil and not some mysterious Original Sin Element) and then target the ultimate source: 1) The human tendency towards ego-centeredness and desire for self-aggrandizement and self-attention, 2) The human tendency to not take responsibility for their thoughts and actions as is well represented in “woke” victimhood culture and blaming Caucasians for all that is wrong with the world, 3) The human tendency to blame others wrongfully, and 4) The human tendency to tell lies against others to cover up points 1, 2 and 3. Hence the modern day existence of a large media machine (television, internet, newspapers, movies, sit-coms, animations, etc.) designed to alter people’s *perceptions* of reality by telling lies, fomenting racial discord, dividing the population into left vs. right, liberal vs. conservative, etc. so that the population fights amongst itself instead of locating and eliminating the true puppet masters: the multi-racial, multi-tribal, multi-ethnic class of parasitic proxy rulers who seek to enslave the human population as food for the Anunnaki.⁹⁰ That is where your attention should be

⁹⁰ “Anunnaki” is a Sumerian word that has been taken to mean “*Those who descended from the sky*”. One theory claims that the Anunnaki were space explorers/colonists who arrived on earth thousands of years ago and then enslaved the existing human population. The Anunnaki conducted genetic experiments on human beings to develop them in to better “slaves” and more capable of mining resources for the

focused. By first separating yourself from “Satan” by repeating, accepting, believing, and practicing the mantra “**1) My life is relatively insignificant; 2) I am 100% responsible for this situation; 3) No one is to be blamed, except me.**” And practicing the 18 or so mental habits for human perfection found in the “Character Contract” found here: <https://adobe.ly/38COJTT>, you will be able to separate from the evil mindset of Eve which she created in the Garden of Eden. You will then have the power to locate and annihilate the puppet masters and go on to build the realm of your own ideal. The point is, if the theory of Original Sin is incorrect, then no effective restoration can take place based on that theory and an alternative theory needs to be explored to explain the facts. It is now time for you to decide for yourself what you will believe and what you ought to do. The responsibility is completely up to you.

---*The Beginning*---

Anunnaki, particularly gold. The Anunnaki were giants compared to the humans and had extensive life spans, much longer than ordinary humans. The Anunnaki were thus viewed as “gods” (masters with exceptional power). There is a theory that the Sumerian Anunnaki are the same creatures as the “Elohim” or the gods of the Bible, only that the Anunnaki did not create or genetically modify humans for altruistic reasons, but rather to use humans as economic slaves. It is believed that either some original Anunnaki are still on earth (or their descendants) and that they are continuing their original economic exploitation of the human population and using various human agent to help manage the exploitation process much like plantation overseers. The Anunnaki provide these human agents with perks such as money, property, and other economic and social benefits in exchange for these agents exploiting humans on the Anunnaki’s behalf. The alleged “fall of man” was not a fall, but rather a story of Adam and Eve’s escape from the Anunnaki. The Anunnaki who told Eve the secret for liberation was then framed by the other Anunnaki as a “devil” since he assisted in the human’s escape and rebellion. Since that time the Anunnaki have been trying to re-enslave the human population using religion as one of their methods of psychological control. Generally the Anunnaki use a variety of methods to control the population such as creating division among people, using disease/plagues, introducing drugs and narcotics for control, manipulation of the food supply, manipulation of the concept of money and concept of time, religion, and under educating the general population, etc. Accordingly, religion is not the path to freedom, but rather the path to re-enslavement.

Part 1
Spiritual Significance
of the
3-Day Ceremony



Prepared by the
International Blessed Family Department

THE BLESSING AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

No matter how much effort you make, you cannot erase original sin by yourself. You need a sinless person, the Messiah. The solution for original sin comes through a heartistic love for the Messiah; original sin is therefore eliminated through love.

1. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BLESSING IN THE PROVIDENCE OF RESTORATION

Because the Fall occurred in the third Stage, (Perfection Stage) of the Growth Stage, in restoration, Adam and Eve grow to the perfection stage of the growth stage separately. However they cannot grow beyond this point individually because they fell by uniting in marriage. It is, therefore only through blessed marriage that fallen man can enter the perfection stage, making marriage necessary for further growth.

2. BECOMING THE CHILDREN OF GOD'S DIRECT LINEAGE

A. The Fall began with the Archangel and continued to Adam through Eve. Therefore, restoration of fallen man begins with the person in the position of the restored Archangel.

B. In order to be reborn, there must be a woman in the position of the restored mother so that the fallen man can have the experience of having returned to the bosom of the mother. To be reborn, he has to go the reverse course, being born spiritually from the mother in order to reach the position of Adam prior to the Fall. In this way we return to the Parents and are reborn from the Parents. The symbolic unity of heart between the Lord of the Second Advent and the woman in the position of "bride of the Messiah" make the condition for the man's rebirth and subsequent resurrection from the restored archangel position to the position of Adam before the fall.

Since the Fall took place centered on love, restoration also has to be made centered on love.

3. HOLY WINE CEREMONY; INTERNAL CHANGE OF BLOOD LINEAGE

SIGNIFICANCE: This is the ceremony for Original Sin to be forgiven so that we can be separated from Satan. It is impossible to enter the stage to be blessed as true children without eliminating original sin. In order to eliminate original sin, your blood lineage must be changed. Through the Holy Wine ceremony you become spiritually one with the completely restored Adam.

First, Father (as restored Adam) places his hand on the hand of the wife and prays. Through this, the wife is given *in the position of the bride of the Messiah*. Next, the wife in the position of the Messiah's wife, becomes spiritually united with her husband who is in the position of the archangel. Through this, the husband is reborn from the position of archangel to man. The Holy Wine Ceremony enables the blessed wife and husband to be reborn spiritually through those processes. The Holy Wine is the symbol of the True Parent's love and their blood. By taking it you are recognized as having become one with the love and blood of the True Parents. The Holy Wine is made of 21 kinds of medical herbs and over three kinds of wine which symbolize land, sea and air. By drinking it you can be symbolically reborn both spiritually and physically.

4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 40-DAY PERIOD FOR SANCTIFICATION

Due to the Fall, the vertical relationship of life with God was cut off. Therefore, fallen man must be resurrected from the horizontal sphere of spiritual death.

To be resurrected, fallen man has to restore through indemnity the 4,000 year period from Adam to Jesus.

Through having control over the horizontal relationship of heart and love, the vertical relationship of heart and love is restored. For this reason we need the 40-day period of separation from horizontal love which symbolizes these 4,000 years. Therefore, this is the period necessary for the restoration of the vertical heartistic relationship.

By offering the first 40 days of your married life to this vertical heartistic relationship you can establish the foundation where Satan cannot invade even when you have a horizontal relationship of heart and love with your spouse.

The meaning of the vertical heartistic relationship is this: It is important to overcome the heartistic feelings between the Archangel and Eve and replace them with the heartistic feelings between son and mother. Therefore, during this time the woman is in the position of mother to the man.

5. THE 3-DAY CEREMONY: SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE OF BLOOD LINEAGE

SIGNIFICANCE: This is the solemn ceremony for you to be reborn as children of God's direct lineage. Through this ceremony, spiritual and physical rebirth take place, the couple is resurrected to life through the indemnity and the substantial restoration of the ceremony. Since no one but the Messiah can reach perfection, it is also only the Messiah who can teach us and help us through the perfection stage. There is no other way except through the guidance of the Lord of the Second Advent.

After the Holy Wine Ceremony, Eve (the wife) is in the position of bride of the Messiah. The Messiah will guide her, but he cannot become her substantial external spouse. In order for her to go beyond the perfection stage, she must be given her own husband.

Through the Holy Wine Ceremony, the wife stands in the position of restored Eve having been forgiven of her original sin. So she is able to produce a sinless child out of her womb just as Mary produced Jesus as the sinless son of God.*

The man after the wine ceremony is in the position of restored archangel. He has not yet become her husband.

Her husband has to be born of her. So she, in the position of mother, through giving him spiritual rebirth has to bear and produce her own husband. She has to give birth to her spouse (Adam) by the time she completes the growth stage because she cannot go through the perfection stage alone. For this reason the first two days of the 3-day ceremony represent the man's restoration in the Formation and the Growth stages respectively.

BEFORE THE HOLY WINE THE CEREMONY, the positions and relationships between LSA, woman and man are:

FATHER	DAUGHTER	ARCHANGEL
--------	----------	-----------

AFTER THE WINE CEREMONY, the positions and relationships between LSA, woman and man are:

BRIDEGROOM	BRIDE	ARCHANGEL
------------	-------	-----------

AFTER THE FIRST DAY OF THE CEREMONY, the positions and relationships between LSA, woman and man are

FATHER	MOTHER	NEWBORN SON (SINLESS ADAM IN THE FORMATION STAG
--------	--------	---

AFTER SECOND DAY OF THE CEREMONY, the positions and relationships between LSA, woman and man are:

FATHER	EVE (ADULT)	ADAM (ADULT)
--------	-------------	--------------

(Ready for marriage)

Note*

Why was Mary able to bear Jesus as a sinless man? Adam, who was in the midway position between good and evil, was divided into Cain and Abel. Thus the struggles between good and evil were fought between Cain and Abel, between Esau and Jacob, and between Zerah and Perez. The struggle between good and evil had to be fought even in the womb. This is because, due to the Fall, original sin entered the womb of Eve. Therefore, it was necessary to separate good and evil and sanctify in the womb in order for the Messiah to be born as a sinless man.

Commentary on “Spiritual Significance of the 3-Day Ceremony”

May 28, 2022

DEFINITIONS:

AMBIGUOUS: A word is ambiguous when it potentially has *two or more* meanings or two or more interpretations, but the reader or listener does not know exactly which definition of the word is being used. This is a common technique that liars use because they can easily switch the definition of a word when you try to argue against them. Therefore, you must pin down an opponent on exactly what they mean by the words they use when you recognize the word can be ambiguous.

EQUIVOCATION: Is the process of using ambiguous words and tricking people into thinking the word means one thing when in fact it means something else. Equivocation is a form of deception that is used because the user knows they are trying to hide something.

VAGUE: A word is vague when you can't tell what the word means at all. You have no idea what concepts or ideas the word is meant to convey. This is different from an ambiguous word because at least an ambiguous word has possible definitions but you just don't know what definition is being used at the time. With a vague word, you have no idea whatsoever what the word is supposed to mean.

AXIOM: Is a foundational idea which itself is not proven, but instead is used as a foundation to prove other ideas. Axioms are dangerous because once you accept the axiom without questioning the origin of the axiom, you are likely to be trapped in your opponent's reasoning and “logic”. Therefore, it is very important to identify axioms when they are being used because they will form the foundation of your opponent's attack. The easiest way to identify axioms is to ask: “*How do they KNOW that?*”

(commentary starts on the next page)

<u>ORIGINAL TEXT</u>	<u>COMMENTARY</u>
<u>SECTION 1 and 2: Blessing and Lineage</u>	
<i>No matter how much effort you make, you cannot erase original sin by yourself.</i>	<p>How does this person know that no amount of effort can erase original sin? Have they tried? Unless they have tried and interviewed all the people of the word who have tired to erase original sin, then it is impossible for them to know this statement is true for a fact. The ONLY way they could know this to be a fact is if Original Sin did not exist and in such case, it would be impossible to erase something that did not exist.</p> <p>Note, they do not tell you exactly what original sin is, where it is located, what form it takes. Thus, how can we be sure that they know what original sin is and if someone else is going to remove original sin, shouldn't they know exactly what original sin and where it is in order to remove it?</p>
<i>You need a sinless person, the Messiah.</i>	<p>What does it mean to be "sinless"? What exactly is "sin" anyway? How did the Messiah come to not have sin? Can't I get rid of my sin the exact same way the Messiah did?</p>
<i>The solution for original sin comes through a heartistic love for the Messiah;</i>	<p>What does "heartistic love" mean? That is a very vague term. If I have no idea what the term means, how can I practice it? And how does "heartistic love" "solve" original sin? They still have not told us exactly what "original sin" is so how can we have any idea that "heartistic love" will "solve it?"</p>

<i>original sin is therefore eliminated through love.</i>	So, is “original sin” eliminated through “heartistic love” or only through “love”? And since the Divine Principle textbook defines “love” as both “sex” and an “emotion”, which definition of “love are they using here? ¹ Also, what exactly then is “love” and how does one use “love”? If people are already capable of “love”, why then do they need a messiah???
<i>Because the Fall occurred in the third Stage, (Perfection Stage) of the Growth Stage, in restoration, Adam and Eve grow to the perfection stage of the growth stage separately.</i>	First, this entire statement makes no sense. What evidence is there to show what exact “stage” Adam and Eve fell? It is my contention that they never fell at all and what we call fallen nature is Adam and Eve’s original nature which they had to naturally grow out of, therefore there was no “fall”, they simply failed to grow. The question is WHY they failed to grow. Was it because of something the angel did? Or was it something that <u>THEY</u> failed to do? Even Divine Principle says that humans were originally supposed to perfect themselves BY THEIR OWN EFFORTS WITHOUT ANY ASSISTANCE FROM GOD. ² Therefore their failure to grow was THEIR RESPONSIBILITY ALONE.

¹ "...the **emotional force** that the subject partner gives to the object partner is called love." (Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 38) (emphasis added); "Eve’s fall was consummated through two different illicit love relationships. The first was the spiritual fall through her love with the Archangel. The second was the physical fall through her love with Adam... Eve’s first fallen act was motivated by her excessive desire to enjoy what it was not yet time for her to enjoy and have her eyes opened, like God. This desire led her to consummate a relationship of unprincipled **sexual love** with the Archangel." (Exposition of the Divine Principle, pp. 190-191) (emphasis added).

² "According to the Principle of Creation, we are created to attain perfection by fulfilling our given responsibility of our own free will, **without God’s direct assistance**...Therefore, it is the calling of our original nature to pursue freedom and autonomy. A person of perfect character understands the Will of God and puts it into practice through his own insight and reason, without the need to rely on revelations from God. Hence, it is only natural that we pursue reason and understanding." (Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 351) (emphasis added); "Human beings **are** endowed with emotional sensitivity to the Heart of God, intuition and reason to comprehend His Will, **and the requisite abilities to practice it**. A person who relates to God in this manner **will** attain perfection of his individual character." (Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 80) (emphasis added).

<p><i>However they cannot grow beyond this point individually because they fell by uniting in marriage. It is, therefore only through blessed marriage that fallen man can enter the perfection stage, making marriage necessary for further growth.</i></p>	<p>So, this makes no sense. If originally, they were to grow to perfection as individuals, then that should be the ORIGINAL way. Also, they did not “get married”, they simply had sex according to the Divine Principle story. Did the serpent have a marriage ceremony for them? So, did the Fall occur by sex or by marriage? Which one is it? The story is not consistent. I do not see how marriage now has to be necessary for “further growth if it was not ORIGINALLY necessary. It would seem that if you want to do things the proper way, you should 1) get a divorce, 2) complete your growth on separate paths, and then 3) get married AFTER you have completed your growth. How can two immature people in a marriage perfect themselves? Why can’t they go the original way of perfection by their own individual efforts? Why then is marriage “necessary” now if it was not necessary before? Also, what exactly is “marriage” and how is it different from “sex”?</p>
<p><i>A. The Fall began with the Archangel and continued to Adam through Eve. Therefore, restoration of fallen man begins with the person in the position of the restored Archangel.</i></p>	<p>So, like I said, in my essay on Original Sin, why does God need to wait thousands of years if a mere angel can change a human being’s “blood lineage”? Simply have a “good angel” have sex with Eve and that would theoretically restore her lineage. Were there no good angels around? And where does this “restored Archangel” come from? They are pulling ideas out of NOWHERE and not offering any empirical explanation or proof for their claims.</p>

<p><i>B. In order to be reborn, there must be a woman in the position of the restored mother so that the fallen man can have the experience of having returned to the bosom of the mother.</i></p>	<p>So this “restored mother” position sounds a lot like the story of Rev. Moon allegedly having sex with Dok Young Chong in North Korea so that he could be “reborn”.³ Also if they are interpreting “indemnity” as a “reversal”, since the Fall allegedly went from Archangel to Eve, to Adam....shouldn’t it go from ADAM to Eve and then to the angel? So it seems you have to START with a restored ADAM not a restored Eve! And in the paragraph above, they just got finished telling us we needed a person in the position of a restored Archangel. Where is this Archangel person???? So why all of a sudden it has now shifted to a “restored mother”????? How did the mother get restored?</p>
<p><i>To be reborn, he has to go the reverse course, being born spiritually from the mother in order to reach the position of Adam prior to the Fall.</i></p>	<p>Ok so....how was the MOTHER restored then? And I thought we had to start with the restored Archangel? If we are now starting with a “restored mother” HOW DID THE MOTHER GET RESTORED? Why are we not starting with a restored Adam if the process is supposed to go in the reverse? If you say we need to start with a restored Archangel, then WHO IS THIS ARCHANGEL? Did the Archangel restore the mother??? How?</p>

³ From the “Tragedy of the 6 Marys”: “Rev. Moon purportedly told Mr. Pak that when he first went to North Korea, he met a woman there by the name of Dok Young Chong who told him about her many spiritual experiences. She believed their meeting had taken place by divine guidance. This was the first woman he met in Pyongyang. They conversed easily and agreed to work together to establish the “Second Israel” in Pyongyang. Ms. Chong told Rev. Moon that she was the Holy Mother because she had had (a dream of having) sex with God. Therefore, if Rev. Moon would have sex with her, he then would be in the same position as God. Ms. Chong instructed Rev. Moon to have sex with her three times with Rev. Moon on the bottom and her on top. After this alleged sexual ceremony, she told him that he was qualified”

<p><i>To be reborn, he has to go the reverse course, being born spiritually from the mother in order to reach the position of Adam prior to the Fall.</i></p>	<p>So if the man is being “re-born” through a sex act....how is it that the woman was NOT reborn though an initial sex act with the Messiah?</p> <p>If the woman can be symbolically restored through “symbolic unity of heart” with the male Messiah, why can’t the man be also symbolically restored through “symbolic unity of heart” with the female messiah??????</p>
<p><i>In this way we return to the Parents and are reborn from the Parents.</i></p>	<p>How are we reborn from parents if just a minute ago you said we are reborn from a mother only????</p>
<p><i>The symbolic unity of heart between the Lord of the Second Advent and the woman in the position of "bride of the Messiah</i></p>	<p>What does “symbolic unity of heart” even mean???? That is very, very vague! If something is vague, how can you practice it at all? If you can’t practice it, how do you accomplish it? This seems to imply that there used to be a P’ikareun ceremony in the Unification Church’s past because the only way to show “unity” is by some ACTION and it seems the most likely action would be for the woman to risk her life by having sex with someone who was not her husband and that sex be with the messiah as a “condition” to remove the “evil tendencies” from her mind. Otherwise, this 3-day ceremony instruction manual does not tell us EXACTLY how the woman is supposed to make a “symbolic unity of heart” with the Lord of the Second Advent. If we don’t know how to make this “symbolic unity of heart”, then doesn’t this entire process collapse?</p>

<p><i>The symbolic unity of heart between the Lord of the Second Advent and the woman in the position of "<u>bride of the Messiah</u>" make the condition for the man's rebirth and subsequent resurrection from the restored archangel position to the position of Adam before the fall.</i></p>	<p>OH!!!! So the mother is restored by the Messiah! How exactly is that done? This sounds a lot like P'ikareun. So then the Messiah is the restored Archangel???? Why don't they say that clearly??? If so, how did <u>HE</u> get restored? Did he need a mother to give re-birth to him? If he was "born" sinless, how did that happen? But now they are saying that the man is the restored archangel...but how did he become the restored archangel?????</p>
<p><i>Since the Fall took place centered on love. restoration also has to be made centered on love.</i></p>	<p>What in the WORLD does that mean???? "Centered on love"??? What is love? Is love sex? Or is love an emotion? How exactly does one define "love"? There is a clear equivocation going on here and with something as important as restoration, why are they being so unclear on this very important point?????</p>
<p><u>SECTION 3: HOLY WINE</u></p>	
<p><i>SIGNIFICANCE: This is the ceremony for Original Sin to be <u>forgiven</u> so that we can be separated from Satan.</i></p>	<p>I thought Original Sin was a SUBSTANCE to be REMOVED? Now they are saying it is a "condition" to be "<u>forgiven</u>". Which is it? Is it a physical substance or is it a figurative condition?</p>
<p><i>It is impossible to enter the stage to be blessed as true children without eliminating original sin.</i></p>	<p>What does that even mean and how do they know it is impossible?</p>

<p><i>In order to eliminate original sin, your blood lineage must be changed.</i></p>	<p>Is it “eliminate” or “forgive”???? They keep switching back and forth between definitions of original sin. Sometimes they act like it is a substance and other times they act like it is a condition that has no physical substance. Which one is it? Why don’t they clearly define what original sin is???</p> <p>What exactly is “blood lineage”????</p>
<p><i>Through the Holy Wine ceremony you become spiritually one with the completely restored Adam</i></p>	<p>I thought Jesus was already able to perform spiritual salvation???? So how does drinking physical wine now make us “spiritually one” with the “restored Adam”? And who exactly is the “restored Adam”? Is it the Messiah? If so, why not just consistently call him the Messiah? Why keep switching names?</p> <p>Also, Divine Principle says spiritual salvation comes though BELIEF...not by drinking wine.⁴</p> <p>And if we become one with the “restored Adam” through the wine ceremony...why does the woman still need to make a “symbolic unity of heart”????? How is a “symbolic unity of heart” different from “spiritually one with”? Aren’t they the same? If they are, why does the woman have this extra and special and separate “symbolic unity of heart” requirement? How does she do that? Why then does she also need to drink holy wine if she can do the “symbolic unity of heart”?</p> <p>This is not making any sense at all.</p>

⁴ "To **believe** in Jesus means to become one body with him...If they had become one body with him [Jesus] in both spirit and body by ***believing*** in him, fallen men could have been saved both **spiritually** and physically." (Divine Principle, p. 147) (emphasis added)

<i>First, Father (as restored Adam) places his hand on the hand of the wife and prays. Through this, the wife is given in the position, of the bride of the Messiah.</i>	So....all that is necessary is for the Messiah to “ touch ” the wife’s hand and pray ? But what if Rev. Moon doesn’t touch all 30,000 women’s hands directly? Does it not count? Is it all symbolic then? If it is all symbolic, why the need to touch anyone’s hand at all??? No touch should be necessary.
<i>Next, the wife in the position of the Messiah's wife, becomes spiritually united with her husband who is in the position of the archangel.</i>	How????? How does this “ spiritual unity ” with the husband take place? What does “ spiritual unity ” even mean????
<i>Through this, the husband is reborn from the position of archangel to man.</i>	Through this what?
<i>The Holy Wine Ceremony enables the blessed wife and husband to be reborn spiritually through those processes.</i>	So, the wine accomplishes all of the spiritual rebirth????
<i>The Holy Wine is the symbol of the True Parent's love and their blood. by taking it you are recognized as having become one with the love and blood of the True Parents</i>	So...love can now be symbolized as wine??? Therefore, if that is true, all you need do is have people drink the wine and they will be restored into the “true lineage”. They don’t even have to accept any church teachings. However, that seems contrary to the Divine Principle. ⁵
<i>The Holy Wine is made of 21 kinds of medical herbs and over three kinds of wine which symbolize land, sea and air. By drinking it you can be symbolically reborn both spiritually and physically.</i>	How do we change blood lineage by drinking things made from EARTH??? Wouldn’t that mean instead that we become “one with the earth ”?

⁵ "To **believe** in Jesus means to become one body with him...If they had become one body with him [Jesus] in both spirit and body by ***believing*** in him, fallen men could have been saved both spiritually and physically." (Divine Principle, p. 147) (emphasis added); "If a person repents of his sins and becomes a better person today than he was yesterday, then he **is** resurrected to that extent" (Outline of the Principle Level 4, p. 77) (emphasis added)

<u>SECTION 4: 40 Day Separation</u>	
	No comments
<u>SECTION 5: 3-Day Ceremony Change of Blood Lineage</u>	
<i>SIGNIFICANCE: This is the solemn ceremony for you to be reborn as children of God's direct lineage.</i>	So...technically, no Messiah is needed for the SUBSTANTIAL change if everything before this was purely SYMBOLIC. Therefore, in the end, humans restore themselves as I originally theorized.
<i>Through this ceremony, spiritual and physical rebirth take place, the couple is resurrected to life through the indemnity and the substantial restoration of the ceremony.</i>	So...clearly, the Messiah is NOT necessary for physical rebirth if it is the couple themselves who make the ceremony to give rebirth to themselves.
<i>Since no one but the Messiah can reach perfection,</i>	Here is another axiom...how do they KNOW no one but the Messiah can reach perfection? Have they done a survey throughout the entire planet to see who is perfect or not? And who determines if a person is "perfect"??? What exactly does perfection even mean????
<i>it is also only the Messiah who can teach us and help us through the perfection stage. There is no other way except through the guidance of the Lord of the Second Advent.</i>	How does the Messiah help anyone get through the perfection stage? How EXACTLY?

<i>After the Holy Wine Ceremony, Eve (the wife) is in the position of bride of the Messiah. The Messiah will guide her but he cannot become her substantial external spouse.</i>	How exactly does the Messiah “guide her”, by doing what exactly????
<i>In order for her to go beyond the perfection stage, she must be given her own husband.</i>	Why? She did not need a husband according to the original rules of perfection, so why need one now?
<i>Through the Holy Wine Ceremony, the wife stands in the position of restored Eve having been forgiven of her original sin.</i>	So... it is “forgiven”??? Not “removed”????? Which one is it??? Forgiven or removed? It is very interesting how they now switch the definition of Original Sin. Sometimes it is something in the flesh. ⁶ Other times it is something that has to be removed. ⁷ Other times it actually CAUSES man to sin. ⁸ Or it is an actual ELEMENT, not a condition. ⁹ Then these elements are called “fear” and “wisdom” which are not physical elements at all but rather mental conditions. ¹⁰ So how can this be “forgiven”?

⁶ "...Satanic invasion ...constantly comes through the flesh due to the original sin...the original sin **REMAINS IN THE FLESH** and is transmitted continuously from generation to generation." (Divine Principle, p. 148) (emphasis added).

⁷ "...we must have the original sin **removed** before we can sever Satan's bonds and be restored to the state before the Fall." (Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 175) (emphasis added).

⁸ "All sins **come from** original sin, which is the root of all sins. Therefore man cannot fundamentally liquidate all sins without getting rid of original sin." (Divine Principle, p. 89) (emphasis added); "The original sin may be thought of as the root of all sins, hereditary sin as the trunk, collective sin as the branches, and individual sin as the leaves. **All sins sprout from the original sin**, which is their root. Without extirpating the original sin, there is no way to completely eradicate other sins. (Exposition of the Divine Principle, p. 72) (emphasis added).

⁹ "Additionally, they [Adam and Eve] developed a base of evil within themselves by receiving evil **elements** from the archangel. **The evil element received from the fallen archangel is Original Sin.**" (Outline of the Principle, Level 4, p. 102).

¹⁰ "According to the principle that men were created to exchange **elements** with the objective being with whom they have become one body through love*, Eve **received certain elements from Lucifer** when she joined into one body with him through love*. First, she received from Lucifer the **SENSE OF FEAR**, which came

<p><i>So she is able to produce a sinless child out of her womb just as Mary produced Jesus as the sinless son of God.*</i></p>	<p>This is all very strange, if all you need do is drink wine to produce sinless children, then 1) just make people drink wine, 2) there is no need to wait thousands of years for a womb to be cleansed, 3) they still do not identify exactly what Original Sin is and they claim it is something to be REMOVED, but then here they say it is something to merely be FORGIVEN??? So does Original sin exist or not? It seems it does not exist and Original Sin is merely a concept.</p>
<p>~End~</p>	

from his guilty conscience because of their violation of the purpose of creation. Second, ***she received WISDOM*** [knowledge] enabling her to perceive that her intended spouse was not Lucifer but Adam...Thus she received the wisdom of the Archangel.” (Divine Principle (1977 version), p. 79).