

March 21, 2017

3rd Letter to Andrew Wilson: “Only One God”

Written by Kerry Williams

Dear Andrew,

I thought I was finished writing you letters. But here I am once again, providing an alternative to the feminist-driven agenda you and your colleagues stubbornly perpetuate.

Frankly, I continue to be baffled as to why all FFWPU members have not written their letters of resignation and come to Pennsylvania to repent to the second King. Do they not know that Hak Ja Han believes the purpose of 2000 years of Christian history was in preparation for *her* sinless birth as the Lord of the Second Advent, Dok-Seng-Nyu (female Jesus)? Are they not aware she has publically stated that Father was born with original sin, but she was not?¹ Indeed, early followers of Father such as Mrs. Han Shil Kang have rejected Mother’s unprincipled, non-biblical claims, and are now supporting the second King.

Anyone paying attention can see that the Han Mother has left her position, reversed dominion, and ensconced herself as a false subject over the true Lord of the Second Advent.

Your ongoing promotion of ditheism as the new canon of FFWPU dovetails nicely with Han’s bold self-promotion as the feminine incarnation of God.

You have abandoned the 6000 year Judeo-Christian monotheistic foundation by embracing Han’s new moniker “Heavenly Parents”:

“We must change the name. When we pray to Heavenly Father’ from now, please say ‘Heavenly *Parents*’. The name ‘Heavenly *Parents*’ is smooth in English and meaningful in Korean, too. Don’t you think?”²

You wholeheartedly support her pluralistic view of God when you write:

¹ Hak Ja Han, Speech to Blessed Couples, Cheon Jeong Gung, December 25, 2016.

² Hak Ja Han, Public Speech, January 7, 2013.

“...the core resemblance in creation is between *God whose essence is duality*, and human beings who were created male and female...Since *God has two genders*, no individual of one gender can incarnate the full image of God.”³

People reading your essay “Heavenly Mother” may think you agree with the Divine Principle explanation of God when you write:

“God in relation to the universe is male, and relates to the universe as ‘the subject partner having the qualities of internal nature and masculinity.’ [Divine Principle] asserts that God’s nature is primordial, existing prior to any relationship with the creation: ‘Before the creation God existed alone as the internal and masculine subject partner.’”⁴

In reality, though, you are critical of the “male-only” God. Giving priority to God's masculinity, you believe, can lead to a “reification of unequal roles between man and woman in the family.”⁵ You prefer:

“...a balanced view of God as the unity of the dual characteristics [which] leads to the concept that God is best represented by the image of True Parents, a divine couple.”⁶

Sanctuarrians, you claim, have created a new ontology by denying the duality of genders in God. Not accepting God’s duality leads to “a world of ugliness, a world where women never experience their full value...and where excessive testosterone leads inevitably to violence and war.”⁷

3 Andrew Wilson, “God as Heavenly Parent in Rev. Moon’s Early Teachings”, February 22, 2016.

4 Andrew Wilson, “Heavenly Mother”. *Journal of Unification Studies* Vol. 10, 2009: p.1.

5 Wilson, “Heavenly Mother”, p.1.

6 Wilson, “Heavenly Mother”, p.1.

⁷ Wilson, “God as Heavenly Parent in Rev. Moon’s Early Teachings”. In the comment section following his essay, Wilson writes on February 25, 2016: “As Rohan [Stefan Nandkisoré] says, Mr. [Pierre] Tardy and his fellow

The duality of which you speak is not merely metaphysical. At the 2001 Enthronement of God's Kingship, there were two empty thrones situated behind True Parents on the tiered stage. You believe they were intended to seat two invisible, substantial Gods: Heavenly Father and Heavenly Mother.⁸

Although you have described God as the "unity of the dual characteristics",⁹ your powerpoint presentation "Heavenly Parent and True Parents" describes two separate gods who possess conflicting wills and desires. In your lecture you list a number of strikingly disparate responses coming from the two celestial parents.¹⁰ In the Gospel according to Wilson, Heavenly Mother expresses greater sensitivity, compassion, and personal concern for her children than does her judgmental, goal-oriented male counterpart. For example, after Eve fell, you write that Heavenly Father "cursed her [and] decreed that she would have pain in childbirth."¹¹ Heavenly Mother, on the other hand, just wanted to "console Eve and help her recover."¹² This superficial, juxtaposed portrayal of the masculine and feminine qualities within God more closely resembles Greek mythology than Judeo-Christian beliefs.

Sanctuarrians, by denying the duality of genders in God, have created a new ontology, different from the Principle. It is one with far-reaching consequences, leading to a world of ugliness, a world where women can never experience their full value, where true love in the family can never be attained, and where excessive testosterone leads inevitably to violence and war."

⁸ Wilson, "God as Heavenly Parent in Rev. Moon's Early Teachings". In the comment section following his essay, Wilson writes on February 23, 2016: "Pierre [Tardy], as you can see from the photo at the top of this article, there are four thrones: the two in front for the True Parents, and the two in the back — for whom? — Heavenly Father and Heavenly Mother, the Heavenly Parents. Never in any of the ceremonies since the Enthronement of God's Kingship on January 13, 2001, when the four thrones were first set up, do True Parents sit on the two thrones in the back that are reserved for the Heavenly Parents. They respect and honor the God position, pray to God, and in so many ways show that they are individual embodiments of truth distinct from the God whom they attend. Furthermore, it was on January 13, 2001 that the symbolism of God's two thrones was first introduced. That was the day of God's enthronement, and the thrones were clearly for God. The True Parents made all the conditions of restoration to liberate God from the circumstance of being accused by Satan, who surrendered on March 21, 1999, so that God could reign unimpeded over the cosmos. At that time too, True Parents sat in their own chairs; they did not sit in God's seats. Given these facts, I cannot accept the notion that in the spirit world, Adam and Eve would sit on the thrones meant for Heavenly Father and Heavenly Mother. They didn't do that on earth, so they won't do it in heaven either. The four thrones in these earthly ceremonies precisely correspond to the plain sense of the passage, as I have explained it above."

⁹ Wilson, "Heavenly Mother", p.1.

¹⁰ Wilson, "Heavenly Parent and True Parents". February 2016. Powerpoint presentation. See slides 17-19.

¹¹ Wilson, "Heavenly Parent and True Parents". February 2016. Powerpoint presentation. See slide 17.

¹² Ibid.

Here are some of Father's words about God's response to the Fall of Adam and Eve:

“The moment Adam and Eve fell, God's heart was torn so painfully He almost went insane. You should never forget about the Father who was shaken so thoroughly as to almost forget Himself. Have you ever thought about that? Even when fallen people on the earth watch their children die, they feel their bone marrow melt. They want to save their children even at the cost of their own lives. How must the heart of God have been as He watched Adam and Eve walking the path toward the Fall and crossing the line of death? Unless you understand that heart, there is no way for you to become God's sons and daughters.”¹³

Father is expressing the agonized heart of the one true God who was consumed by grief and wanted to save His children at the cost of His life. As we know from the Principle, however, He did not intervene in the Fall, in order that Adam and Eve could one day still be blessed as the lords of creation. When one considers the painful consequences that befell Adam and Eve as a result of their transgressions, it must be remembered that those consequences came from *their rejection of God and His commandment*. God never left or rejected them.

Father expressed God's caring, empathetic nature more deeply than anyone else who has ever lived. However, he also spoke of the heavenly hammer of judgment that a God of absolute goodness sometimes has no choice but to use. We remember the compassionate Jesus who healed the sick and dying, but too easily forget the angry Messiah who overturned tables and expelled the merchants and money changers from the temple.

These different emotional qualities do not indicate that God is dualistic, as God is only one being of love. However, the expression of His love may change, based on our level of obedience to His will, as well as other factors that are often beyond our ability to fully comprehend.

Your list of the celestial parents' thoughts and actions in “Heavenly Parent and True Parents” contains some glaring omissions. Quite revealing is the absence of Genesis 3:15, which provided the greatest solace God could offer His fallen children. God said to the archangel Lucifer:

¹³ Reverend Sun Myung Moon, “The Toil of God as He Tries to Raise Up His Beloved Children”, October 11, 1959.

“I will put enmity between you and the woman,
and between your offspring and hers;
he will crush your head,
and you will strike his heel.”

Although He was speaking to Satan, Genesis 3:15 was a profound message of hope for Adam and Eve. In this passage, God prophesied the advent of Christ, the true Adam who would come to vanquish the devil and restore fallen humankind back to His lineage. But maybe you overlooked that verse because God promised a male Messiah, not a female one.

Your antipathy towards the Scriptures harmonizes amicably with the Han Mother’s belief in herself as the returning Christ. Rather than viewing the Bible as God-inspired, you see it as an imperfect document, written by men who, with only a few exceptions, didn’t consider the feminine perspective important enough to be recorded. You believe we are spiritually hindered as a Judeo-Christian world because the Bible does not reveal the heart of Heavenly Mother:

“The way God is portrayed in the Bible is almost entirely masculine. Consider Genesis 3:16, where God spoke to Eve immediately after the Fall: ‘Because you have done this, you will be cursed with pain in childbearing and cursed in that your desire will be for your husband and he shall rule over you.’ Do you think Heavenly Mother would have actually spoken to Her daughter like this?... the Bible was written by men who didn’t consider a female point of view when they were writing about the Fall. They saw everything in terms of judgment...Because the Bible does not disclose the heart of Heavenly Mother, we are disadvantaged as a Judeo-Christian world.”¹⁴

Your feminist critique of the Bible smacks of moral posturing; Judeo-Christian nations have conferred more rights to women than any other civilization in human history.

In addition, your hostility towards Scriptures clashes with the fact that the Bible was the primary book Father researched to receive the contents of the Divine

¹⁴ Wilson, “Some Thoughts on True Mother’s Proclamations”, February 3, 2013.

Principle. His approach to the Scriptures was one of great humility and respect. His nine year course of ceaseless study and prayer over its contents remains as an eternal testimony to his belief in the Bible as the Word of God. Father's ability to penetrate the hidden mysteries of the Holy Book was based on a heart of reverence:

“The Bible is like a love-letter written by a bridegroom searching for his bride and containing many secret codes. Why does God write in code? It is because God is a God of heart. Not everyone is meant to decipher the Bible, only the bride and bridegroom should be able to decipher it. In other words, only those who have prepared themselves to attend the Lord with a heart akin to God's heart can decipher the Bible; to anyone else it is an impenetrable mystery.”¹⁵

In his sermon “Change of Blood Lineage”, Father states: "This teaching is founded on the Bible, which is God's word.”¹⁶

But to you, the Bible is a flawed book, written and used by men to justify exploitation of women:

“...fallen societies always put men on top, while women were treated miserably, even as the man's property to do with as he wished. To make matters worse, this patriarchal attitude belittling women was inscribed in scripture, which led believers to justify it as if it were God's way. The Bible, after all, was written by men.”¹⁷

Your attitude towards the Scriptures bears more resemblance to Mary Daly¹⁸ than it does to Sun Myung Moon. Maybe the Han Mother can commission you to revise the Bible just like you helped revise Father's words,¹⁹ and give it a fresh

¹⁵ Reverend Sun Myung Moon, “World Scriptures and the Teachings of Sun Myung Moon”, p. 720.

¹⁶ “God's Will and the World”, p.42

¹⁷ Wilson, “Providential Necessity of the Only Begotten Daughter”, February 20, 2017.

¹⁸ Mary Daly, who referred to herself as a radical lesbian feminist, taught philosophy and theology at Jesuit-run Boston College for 33 years.

¹⁹ Andrew Wilson was an editor of “Chambumo Gyeong”, one of the three “Holy” Scriptures of Cheon Il Guk . These heretical texts were created after Reverend Moon's passing, and are being used by FFWPU to supplant the “Eight Great Textbooks” canonized by Reverend Moon before his death.

feminist spin. Who better than Dr. Wilson to correct the misogynistic views of all those oppressive, condescending graybeards?

It is FFWPU, not Sanctuary Church, that has created a new ontology by promoting a dualistic doctrine which deviates from the biblically-based teachings of Reverend Moon. How ironic that you, one of the editors of the 1996 authorized translation of “Exposition of the Divine Principle”, should now be a leading expositor of its bastardization.

At the intellectual root of your skewed ontology is the failure to comprehend the proper relationship between Sungsang (Internal Character)/Hyungsang (External Form) and Yang/Yin within the original being of God. “Exposition of the Divine Principle” makes it clear: “Therefore, original yang and original yin are *attributes* of original internal nature and original external form.”²⁰

God’s original internal nature is a single, masculine, subjective being. Father stated this simple, profound fact on many occasions:

“What is the Subject Being of masculine character? Do you think it would be good if God were the Subject Being of feminine character? *If there were a Subject Being of feminine character, there would necessarily be dualism because there must be a masculine (Subject) Being.* Since God is the only God, God has an original masculine form with a subjective nature as a harmonious being of masculinity and femininity. The reason God has a masculine form is for God to have dominion over feminine beings.”²¹

Although Hyo Won Eu worked directly under Father’s close supervision to write the “Exposition of Divine Principle”, he initially shared your misunderstanding of the relationship between the two sets of dual characteristics previously named. In a diary entry from January 31, 1966, he wrote:

“I asked him [True Father] whether Sungsang and Hyungsang are formed by the harmonization

²⁰ “Exposition of Divine Principle”, p.19.

²¹ Reverend Moon, “The Path of Religion”, October 14, 1988.

of Yin and Yang. Teacher's answer was the opposite. He said the harmonization of Sungsang and Hyungsang creates Yin and Yang. My world was turned upside down. He overturned the traditional theory that everything comes into existence through the harmony of Yin and Yang. He explained that it is true in the world of cause and effect but not so with God. If God already had Yin and Yang in Him, there would have been no creation. He then explained that God exists as the harmony of Sungsang and Hyungsang and is the Yang type of existence. Therefore, God had to create the Yin type of world."²²

When we understand that the dual characteristics of Yang and Yin emerged as the result of give and take between God's Sungsang and Hyungsang in God's original being, we can understand that God existed *before the creation* as the internal, masculine subject partner *only*. Yin existed solely as a latent trait within his Yang essence.

As Father explained to Hyo Won Eu, if the essence of God were both Yang and Yin, He would have had no need to create because He would already have been fulfilled. The object of His longing would already have existed within Him. This quality of being is reflected in man, who was created to become the body of God: "In people, a feminine nature is found latent in men..."²³ To say that man has a latent feminine nature, however, is not to say that he exists as two genders.

Scientific confirmation of this ontological reality can be found in the genetic makeup of man. Man, not woman, was created with both Y (male) and X (female) chromosomes. Because the Y is dominant and the X is recessive, the result is a male human.

Father explains God's beautiful, well-rounded personality in this passage from the Cheon Seong Gyeong:

²² Gil Ja Sa Eu, "A Testimony to God's Word in Regard to Divine Principle", pp.79-80.

²³ "Exposition of the Divine Principle", p.16.

“Externally God resembles man and internally He resembles women. While God is strong, all-knowing, and omnipotent, He²⁴ also has a merciful heart that can embroider flowers on Buddha’s smile. He should also have a heart like that of the most feminine woman. Only then will these two sides have life.”²⁵

After creation, God’s subjective masculine nature resided in Adam as God’s substantial body, and His latent feminine nature was now embodied within the person of Eve. As Father explained many times, Adam was to have become God’s body, and Eve was to have become God’s wife:

“Adam, who was to have become God’s body, would have become the progenitor of humanity. In other words, he would have been God incarnate. For the invisible God to exercise dominion over the world of substance, He had to have a substantial form, namely a body, through which he would then be able to see and hear; hence He created Adam to become His embodiment.”²⁶

“Who was Eve, then? She was Adam’s wife, the wife of the substantial form. If Adam was to be God incarnate, then Eve was to be the wife of God incarnate. You may be dumbfounded by the idea of the holy God taking a wife, but Adam was the body of God incarnate, and Eve was created as the wife of God incarnate.”²⁷

²⁴ It should be noted that in Wilson’s presentation “Heavenly Parent and True Parents”, he quotes this same passage from the Cheon Seong Gyeong, but replaces this particular “He” with “She” (see slide 15 of “Heavenly Parent and True Parents”). Father, though, only used the word “Hananim” to refer to God in the entire section. Wilson’s use of two different genders when naming God, therefore, is false and misleading.

²⁵ “Cheon Seong Gyeong”, p.69.

²⁶ “Cheon Seong Gyeong”, p.2241.

²⁷ “Cheon Seong Gyeong”, pp.2241-2242.

“For God, Eve was His future wife, because Adam was meant to become God Himself by becoming united with Him.”²⁸

Jesus showed us Adam²⁹ as God in John 14:9 when he said “Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father.”

But what about Eve? Should she feel like a lesser being as God’s wife? On the contrary, women should feel the flush of excitement that comes from knowing they are the object of His desire:

“Eve was born as a princess and also as God’s future object partner. God wanted to make her His partner in love, that is, His wife.”³⁰

It is for this reason Jesus is referred to as our Bridegroom³¹ in the Scriptures.

Women have been mistaken in believing that the objective position is one of inferiority. On the contrary, being in the object position means that they are the ultimate goal of God’s desire. Woman was created as His greatest masterpiece,³² absolutely equal in value to man.³³

Because of the Fall, however, women have suffered greatly as objects to men. They have been ruled by men who bore the lineage of the fallen archangel rather than the line of true Adam. As a result, women have rebelled against their role as “helper”³⁴ because they view serving their husbands through the lens of being dominated rather than through the lens of being loved.

Just as an electron forms a common base with a proton and moves in a spherical motion around that proton in a three-dimensional pattern, so the position of Eve is fulfilled by existing in spherical rotation of loving respect around Adam (see Ephesians 5:33). It was for this reason that God sent the Messiah, the unfallen Adam, so that she may have a true subject to respect, love, and attend.

²⁸ Reverend Moon, “Blessing and Ideal Family”, Volume 1, p.223.

²⁹ Jesus is referred to as the “last Adam” in 1Corinthians 15:45: “The Scriptures tell us, ‘The first man, Adam, became a living person.’ But the last Adam--that is, Christ--is a life-giving Spirit.”

³⁰ “Cheon Seong Gyeong”, p.58.

³¹ See John 3:29 for one of many examples in the Bible.

³² Reverend Moon, “Blessing and the Ideal Family”, Volume I, p.437.

³³ Reverend Moon, “Inauguration of the Abel Women’s UN”, July 16, 2012.

³⁴ See Genesis 2:18: Then the Lord God said, “It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make a helper fit for him.”

Man, as the seed bearer of God, has the primary subjective responsibility to embody God's love and truth. Father comments on man's duty in the "Wolli Wonbon"³⁵ when he writes:

"Husbands! Your duty is to stand up as a person of beauty in order to receive love from God, and then return beauty in order to perfect goodness. If you do this in the capacity of the Father who represents Heaven and who conveys love on behalf of Heaven, then you will manifest love towards your wife, who is the second object partner. Only in this way do you become a principled man who has qualification to rule."³⁶

He continues by explaining the position of the wife:

"The wife who relates to such a husband must appear as beauty and, as a representative body of Heavenly Mother, manifesting beauty and completing the second stage of goodness, becoming one body in love with her husband. She must find an orbit around the original circuit of goodness [i.e. the husband] in order to form the ideal goodness."³⁷

Man, then, becomes a subject of God's original circuit of goodness when he fulfills the objective position of returning beauty to God. By understanding Eve as the second object partner, the second goodness who orbits around her husband, the original circuit of goodness, we can then properly discern Eve's role as a representative of Heavenly Mother. Rather than remaining a separate entity, she was destined to become one with her subject in the position of his loving object.

³⁵ Upon arriving as a refugee in Pusan in the 1950's, Reverend Moon wrote and dictated a manuscript called "Wolli Wonbon" (Original Text of the Divine Principle). He then guided Hyo Won Eu, the first president of the Unification Church of Korea, to prepare a more systematic presentations of his teaching with biblical, historical and scientific illustrations. These efforts resulted in "Wolli Hesul" (Explanation of the Divine Principle) published in 1957, and "Wolli Kangron" (Exposition of the Divine Principle) published in 1966. For the past thirty years, "Wolli Kangron" has been the text of Reverend Moon's basic teaching. Out of the three Divine Principle texts, however, only the "Wolli Kangron" was canonized by Reverend Moon as one of the Eight Great Textbooks.

³⁶ "Wolli Wonbon", p.172.

³⁷ Ibid.

Confirmation of this heavenly blueprint for the husband-wife relationship can be found in Section 2 of the “Exposition of the Divine Principle”, one of the 8 Great Textbooks canonized by Father:

“...the object partner [the wife] revolves around the subject partner [the husband] in a circular motion, and thus they become harmonious and unified. In the same manner, the subject partner becomes an object partner to God, revolving around God and thus attaining oneness with Him. When the object partner becomes completely one with its subject partner, their union can stand before God as a new object partner resembling His dual characteristics. Moreover, the way for any object partner to stand as an object partner before God is by making oneness with its subject partner.”³⁸

If Adam and Eve had remained faithful by keeping the commandment, they would have both grown to spiritual maturity. Adam, as God’s body, would have taken the governing role in their relationship. Eve, in the object position, as God’s wife, would have received God’s pure, masculine love through revolving around her husband. The first couple’s relationship would have continued to grow and develop to the point that they would have become one in love:

“For humankind, love is an eternal thing – it is one, not two. When a man and a woman become joined through love, they are to grow old together for a hundred years on earth and live together eternally after death. Although the bodies are two, they join as one and rotate, thereby becoming one body. When the two bodies become one, God comes to rotate together with them, thus forming a four position foundation of love...”³⁹

In this manner, they would have fulfilled Father’s definition of a perfect person:

³⁸ “Exposition of the Divine Principle”, p. 26

³⁹ “Cheon Seong Gyeong”, p.387.

“The perfect person is the one who accomplishes oneness of mind and body, oneness with God, and oneness with their spouse.”⁴⁰

Father explains how husband and wife are able to manifest as the image of the one God in the spiritual realm:

“In the spirit world, God harmonizes with human beings through love and we become one with God through love. We become God-like. In the creation, we can see how God's dual characteristics are divided, but when man and woman become completely united in love, they will be like one person in the spirit world. If you were to just glance at a person, he would clearly look like a man, but on closer inspection, you will find a woman harmonized inside him.”⁴¹

Jesus spoke of this marital union in Mark 10:8: “... and the two will become one flesh. So they are no longer two, but one flesh.”

Through the standpoint of Christ, then, we can understand that the ultimate destiny of husband and wife is to become one, just as Heavenly Father is one:

“From this perspective, although we usually say, ‘Our Heavenly Father’, *because He is just one being*, the concept of God actually includes the idea of God being ‘Our Heavenly Father and Mother.’”⁴²

Centering on love, God was to have dwelt in Adam and Eve, becoming the horizontal True Parents to all humankind. After Adam and Eve went to the spirit world, God would have continued to manifest as the Divine Parent, now clothed in the image of the first couple.

By understanding the ontology of God’s nature *before and after creation*, we can resolve the seeming contradiction existent between the two principled descriptions of His essence i.e. God as the original masculine subject vs. God as the divine couple. A thorough review of origin-division-union action in the Principle of

⁴⁰ “Blessing and Ideal Family”, p.634.

⁴¹ “Cheon Seong Gyeong”, p.864.

⁴² “Cheon Seong Gyeong”, p.1476.

Creation will provide further confirmation that God does not exist in two genders, rather, *He created genders*.

Likewise, God does not exist within the spiritual world, *He made the spiritual world*. Adam and Eve, then, were created as the way for Him to substantially exist within His own creation.

It is my opinion that those empty thrones placed behind True Parents at the Cheon Jeong Gung symbolized the spiritual thrones reserved for True Father and True Mother after they ascended to the spiritual realm. For all of eternity, True Parents were meant to have reigned as the visible incarnations of the invisible God.

Although Adam and Eve were created as individual truth bodies, we must remember that the destiny of the perfected subject and object is to ultimately become one in love.

Reverend Moon, who was born as the third Adam,⁴³ became a perfected subject, and will eternally reign as the True Father, the King of Kings of all humankind:

“When you go to the spirit world, I will be governing everything. It will not be me, however, but God. I am God’s body.”⁴⁴

And it was God’s desire for Hak Ja Han to become a restored Eve and become the True Mother of all humankind. Through her absolute unity with Father as his loving object, she would have eternally dwelt as his Queen.

But, tragically, Hak Ja Han, in the final hour, chose to become a fallen Eve. She rejected True Adam and his lineage and propped herself up instead as a false subject.⁴⁵ Father publically acknowledged the cataclysmic loss of his feminine counterpart in his last public speech, given in July 2012:

“I raised up Mother, but now there is no Mother.
There is no one in the position of Rev. Moon's wife.

⁴³ “Exposition of the Divine Principle”, p.203.

⁴⁴ Cheon Seong Gyeong, p.937

⁴⁵ A partial list of her transgressions: changing the name of God, replacing the Eight Great Textbooks with the three “Holy” Scriptures, changing the CIG national anthem, changing the Family Pledge, changing the Blessing Vows.

Mother is acting as she pleases. Whatever she wants,
she does.”⁴⁶

Father confirmed, less than two months before he ascended to the spirit world, that Hak Ja Han had vacated her position as True Mother of humankind. Thus, her failure is of cosmic proportions.

Andrew, my brother, it is not our position to change the teachings of Christ. Rather, we should all seek to recreate ourselves according to His Word.

Please stop leading people away from Father.

Sincerely,

Kerry Williams

⁴⁶ Reverend Moon, “Inauguration of the Abel Women’s UN”, July 16, 2012.