

## Britain and Korea in the providence

William Haines

April 2011

### The messiah should have married an English princess

In one of his passing comments at the ODP workshop, Reverend Yu said that Father Moon should have married an English lady, and that his wedding should have been arranged by the Queen of England. Obviously that didn't happen, but it set me to thinking about how it could have happened and why it didn't happen.

One of the most troubling questions for me has been the allegation that Britain had an important role to play in God's providence, namely that of the Eve nation, but had somehow failed and thus lost its position. Rev Yu reiterated this – after the Second World War the victorious nations should have 'connected' to Father and on that foundation the kingdom of heaven could have been quickly established. However Britain didn't connect and so 'failed'. But I have never been able to accept that Britain failed as Britain in my opinion never had the opportunity to succeed under this scenario. Father didn't, as far as I can tell, ever have any meaningful contact with Britain.

I think there was a possible way for Father to have met and married a prominent English Christian. In 1902 Britain made an alliance with Japan that enabled Japan to occupy Korea. This was to thwart the ambitions of Russia who also wanted to control Korea. Britain was trying to stop the eastward expansion of the Russian Empire. However, if Britain had been able to make Korea a British protectorate the outcome would have been very different. For example, instead of 40 years of oppression and attempted cultural extermination under Japanese occupation, Korea would have been ruled in an enlightened manner, Christianity would have been encouraged along with a liberal educational system, an uncorrupt civil service, the rule of law and the basic institutions of civil society including a love of freedom. Young scholars from the leading families of the colonies and protectorates of the British Empire, such as Nehru and Gandhi, were sent to school in England and often went on to university before returning to their own countries. It is not hard to imagine that Father, coming from a prominent family, would have had the opportunity to come here to study at Eton or Harrow. In such a world it would have been easy for Father to have entered the highest social circles and even come into contact with the royal family. One knows that Father, being Father, would have made a very favourable impression and . . . well the sky would have been the limit. A useful bonus for all of us of course would have been that Father would have learned to speak English fluently. Unfortunately it is hard, given the geo-political circumstances at the time, to imagine how or why Britain would have made Korea a protectorate as Koreans had violently rebuffed all earlier western attempts to make contact.

However, had Father married a prominent English Christian this would have produce a couple which would have naturally embodied and integrated the best of the East and West, it would have meant that the fruit of the Abel-type democracy that developed here: the rule of law, civil society, properly run institutions etc. would have been inherited and become the basis for Chung Il Guk.

Instead our polity is based on a very undeveloped, parochial, non-universal, tribal society. If Father should have married an English woman, but was unable to, we should perhaps recognise that the way things are is not the way God wanted things to be. In which case we should be making more effort in the Unification movement to inherit the Judeo-Christian foundation of Abel-type democracies such as the UK instead of thinking that something is best because it is Korean and that Korean political culture should be at the basis of Chung Il Guk whereas the way things are is, like much else, an accident of history.

## Britain's contribution to Korea's development

Britain made many contributions to the providential development of Korea. For example, the Bible was translated into Korean by a Scottish Presbyterian, by the name of John Ross, who hailed from the small village of Balintore in Scotland. He became known as the father of the Korean church. In 1872 he went to China as a missionary and within a year was giving weekly sermons in Chinese and had built up a congregation of 100. In 1877, sponsored by the National Bible Society of Scotland, he started to translate the New Testament into Korean. He distributed it throughout the Korean community in Manchuria and many congregations spontaneously formed under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. It was also taken by Korean converts into Korea itself where hundreds of churches were founded. Ross himself went to Seoul in 1887 to see for himself the fruit of his work. You can read more about Ross here <http://www.e-n.org.uk/p-3949-Father-of-the-Korean-Church.htm> Translation work was continued by the founding of the Seoul Bible House established in 1893 by the British and Foreign Bible Society. One of the main translators was the Anglican Bishop of Korea, Mark Napier Trollope, an ancestor of Ashley Crosswaite. <http://hompi.sogang.ac.kr/anthony/BishopTrollope.htm>

The first Protestant missionary to Korea was Robert Jermain Thomas who was born in Rhayadar, South Wales in 1839. His church in Hanover, Llanover, sent him out on mission and he went to China with the London Missionary Society. While teaching in Peking, he met some Korean traders and heard that there were Christians in Korea who didn't have Bibles. These were Catholics who had been growing in number since 1770 when a Korean envoy to China brought some of Matteo Ricci's texts back with him. The same year, 1865, he set off for Korea with Chinese Bibles as an agent for the National Bible Society of Scotland. He travelled through Korea heavily disguised as anyone found with a Bible could be beheaded by the authorities.

The following year Korea was threatened with invasion by Russia. Two Catholic Korean leaders suggested that the Prince Regent should consult the French Bishop, who was a secret resident, on the best way to respond. He suggested forming a triple alliance between England, France and Korea. The Prince Regent seemed open to this suggestion at first, but the anti-foreign (or anti-Christian) faction in the State Council prevailed and the bishop was executed in March, 1866 marking the beginning of the great persecution, which lasted until 1871, during which about 8,000 Korean Catholics and some French priests were killed. This was merely the latest, if worst, in a series of intense persecutions. So the argument that Korea was qualified to be the nation of the return of Christ because it did not persecute Christianity has always been rather unconvincing.

Despite these events Thomas travelled on a British owned merchant schooner up the river to Pyungyang distributing Bibles along the way. After an altercation with the Korean authorities the vessel was attacked but Thomas leaped into the river giving out his last remaining Bibles while shouting "Jesus, Jesus". He was arrested and gave his executioner his last Bible. A few days later an edict was issued threatening arrest for anyone found in possession of a Bible. Many were destroyed but some were gathered up and their pages used for wallpaper. After a while people started to read the texts on their walls and through this the Holy Spirit brought them to believe in Jesus as their Lord and Saviour and in this way a Presbyterian church was formed. You can read more about this here <http://www.byfaith.co.uk/paulkorea.htm>

So it would appear that Britain as the Eve and mother nation in God's providence gave birth to Christianity in Korea, the third Israel. It also gave birth to the second Israel, the United States, and the first Israel in 1948. Unfortunately Britain was unable to do much more for Korea as contacts with westerners were violently rejected by the xenophobic Hermit Kingdom. Had Korea made an alliance with

England and France it could have avoided 40 years of occupation by Japan. So perhaps it was Korea, not Britain, that failed to form the Adam-Eve-Archangel trinity and thus make a bridge to the messiah.

There is still more. In 1904 revival broke out at Moriah Chapel in Loughor, South Wales. It swept through the valleys and sparked off revival in parts of India. Word of the revival came to Christians in Pyongyang who were hungry for the Holy Spirit. Some of them set aside a week for fasting and prayer. Following a confession of sins there was an outpouring of the Holy Spirit and what came to be known as the Korean Pentecost began.

So it would appear that the Presbyterian faith that Father's family came to adopt came from this country. Of course it would have been nicer if he had become an Anglican. We would have a much more beautiful and deeper liturgy than the present rather spare Presbyterian one combined with Korean folk traditions. Still, I imagine this was the reason Father sent the first overseas missionary, David S. Kim, to Swansea in South Wales in 1954. Perhaps he wanted our movement to connect with its spiritual roots. And if that's what he wanted to do maybe we should too.

### Who made the foundation to receive the messiah?

According to the Principle in order for the Messiah to be born both a foundation of faith and a foundation of substance need to be made. As we all know, this was established first by Jacob and Esau which is why eventually Jesus was born as a descendant of Jacob. Along the way there were a number of times when the messiah could have been born but wasn't because the necessary conditions hadn't been made. The reason why these conditions need to be made is actually very practical. The messiah comes to establish the kingdom of heaven by bringing a new and complete expression of truth bringing enlightenment, and forgiveness of sin and salvation through bringing rebirth into God's lineage so that people know and feel that they are God's sons and daughters. Of course this is quite radical stuff and the danger is that he will be rejected and killed. So it was important that a religious society should come into being which was also tolerant of people with new ideas no matter how controversial. This is more likely to happen when there is a tradition of accepting, respecting or at least tolerating 'Abel-type' people instead of persecuting, imprisoning and killing them. This why the focus in Judaism is not on believing the right thing, but behaving in the right way, namely observing the law. Thus the importance of the rule of law, not men. So that no matter how disagreeable and eccentric and obnoxious a person may be in his opinions, as long as he doesn't break the law, he remains a free person protected by the law. This incidentally is what the word freedom means – free to do as one likes within the dom (dom is the old Anglo-Saxon word doom meaning law hence doomsday is judgement day).

In Palestine at the time of Jesus there were many different 'Judaisms' such the priestly caste focused on the Temple, the nationalistic Zealots, the Essenes, followers of John the Baptist, and at least two disputing parties amongst the Pharisees. This plurality of religious views and opinions is typically Jewish but it also created space for the messiah to come with his own ideas and compete for followers. Unity on the other hand would have meant uniformity and made it impossible for new ideas to have a chance. The main problem Jesus faced was that he was regarded as a political threat by the Jewish priestly class who were charged by the Romans with keeping the peace and stopping insurrection. The title 'messiah' had strong political overtones which is why Romans relished in executing them and why Jesus was crucified under the title "The King of the Jews."

So who created the foundation for the lord of the second advent to be born? This had to be done on a much bigger level now, uniting Hebraism and Hellenism which are the Abel and Cain cultural streams respectively. This happened in the United Kingdom where there has been religious pluralism and freedom, more or less, for 300 years. Unlike the French enlightenment which took a decidedly atheistic turn, the great philosophers of the English enlightenment sought to achieve a synthesis between

Christianity and philosophy and science. Thus the empiricist John Locke while also articulating and developing the theoretical basis of liberal democracy and religious toleration also published a book called Reasonable Christianity. One of the other great empiricists who also showed the limitations of rationalistic deism was Bishop Berkeley. Indeed the English enlightenment was quite religious and included several prominent churchmen such as John Wesley. In Scotland in what was known as the 'Athens of the North' there was a stunning constellation of great minds, all members of the Scottish enlightenment characterised by a thoroughgoing empiricism and practicality where the chief virtues were held to be improvement, virtue, and practical benefit for both the individual and society as a whole. The most well known are the gentle sceptic and empiricist philosopher David Hume and the economist Adam Smith, but there were many others as well such as Robert Burns and Francis Hutcheson. Although as individuals they were not particularly religious they all recognised the functional importance of religion for civilised society. This synthesis between Hebraism and Hellenism continued in the UK with the fruitful interaction of science and religion – Darwin's ideas of evolution were readily accepted by most nineteenth century clergymen and Christian scientists – and the Christian origins of even socialism and the trade union movement which on the continent were associated with atheism.

Thus were the principles and traditions of a religious liberal democracy – the rule of law, due process, separation of powers and functions of government, freedom of speech, freedom of religion etc. – established and spread and multiplied throughout the English speaking world and planted in Korea after its liberation from Japan. Without this western oversight Korea would probably have become an oppressive, closed, xenophobic society again in which it is very doubtful that Father would have had a chance. So even though Father was persecuted in South Korea, he was not killed. Even if he was imprisoned unjustly, he was later released. In America too, even although Father was persecuted and even sent to prison under a miscarriage of justice, he was allowed to do whatever he liked within the law which protected him. Even though he was a foreigner he was not deported. No other country in the world in the past or present would have allowed a foreigner to do the sort of things Father has done in America. So the foundation to receive the messiah and enable the messiah to start and continue his work without being killed was established in Britain and multiplied and spread throughout the world.

## Britain and the world wars

I guess I just have to work this thing out of my system – namely why Britain lost its position as the Eve nation in the providence of God. As an assiduous reader of the Principle will know, there is a providential significance attributed to the world wars of the twentieth century namely that they were Satan's final fling of the dice to achieve world dominion based on his vision of how things should be. Pitted against the countries that sought to implement this vision were the Allies led by the English-speaking world.

So if we turn to WWI, Britain went to war with Germany, Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire mostly due to a treaty to defend France if she was attacked. Now, there are a few British historians who think this was a mistake as Britain could have come to an arrangement with Germany allowing it to dominate the continent while Britain, protected by its navy, continued with its empire. This in Principle discourse would have meant 'giving in to Satan's temptation.' Britain did not and in 1914 became embroiled in a European war again, this time to prevent Germany from dominating the continent. (The last one had been to prevent France under Napoleon from ruling Europe). After the war, Britain followed its traditional policy of supporting independence for the smaller countries, and liberalism and democracy where ever possible. The cost for Britain and its empire was considerable – 1,100,000 killed, over 2 million wounded and \$35 billion spent. Normally in wars the victor ends up richer and more powerful. But the First World War was a pyrrhic victory leaving the UK culturally and economically weakened. But from a providential perspective the Allies, on God's side, made the condition of indemnity and paid the price for the messiah to be born. Maybe that should be added to all the war memorials? Lest we forget. I guess those who lost their lives in this cause, who were mostly good Christians, can look down from the

spiritual world and feel that their sacrifice had a meaning beyond what they could possibly have imagined.

Turning to WWII, again Britain became involved out of its own free will. Hitler did not want war with Britain as, for racial reasons, he saw her as a natural ally. Instead his search for Lebensraum was to be satisfied by going East, exterminating the Slavs and repopulating their lands with Germans. But Britain committed itself to the preservation of Poland and so when Hitler invaded Poland, Britain declared war on Germany. Again, there were influential elements in British society that admired Hitler and wanted to find an accommodation with Germany. But again Britain overcame the temptation to keep to itself, preserve its empire and make the necessary compromises with Nazi Germany. So Britain overcame 'Satan's temptation' and sacrificed itself to defeat fascism and again liberate the nations of Europe. Of course this was something Britain and the empire could not do single handedly and in the later stages of the war the Soviet Union, and still later the United States, became involved making the ultimate victory possible. As after the Great War, Britain did not benefit economically but instead was left economically bankrupt as much of its imperial wealth had been 'sold' or 'mortgaged' to pay for the war. The national debt stood at 250% of GDP and took 50 years to pay off, mostly to the US. But, was this huge sacrifice of blood and treasure worth it? It did not benefit the UK directly. In many ways we won the war but lost the peace and are now a minor power. Still, the English-speaking world brought a hopefully long lasting peace to Europe through fostering the development of stable liberal democratic institutions on the continent. Also, from the providential point of view, the nations on God's side made the condition of indemnity necessary to restore the ideal world, a world of freedom and democracy, creating the environment where God's three blessings could be realised. This of course included the liberation of Korea from Japanese domination and thus created the environment for the messiah to be able to start his mission. Again, if the men and women who gave their lives in the Second World War know this, I am sure they will feel that they served their country, not only by preserving its freedom and independence, but also by giving their lives so that Britain could fulfill its mission as the Eve nation in the providence of God, making the condition of indemnity necessary for the messiah to start his mission.

So, to come back to the rather difficult question of Philip – why did Britain lose its position as Eve nation, a position it had held since the time of Jesus? Well, I asked Reverend Yu and he told me what I had heard before. God did not transfer the position of Eve nation from Britain to Japan. It was Father himself who prayed and asked God to make Japan the Eve nation. He obviously had his reasons such as wanting to love and restore the enemy nation. Does it make any difference one might ask? Maybe not. Maybe it makes no difference whether a country is labelled the 'Eve nation' or not. Or maybe it does. If Father is who he claims to be, maybe God listens to him and maybe such things are an invisible reality. Maybe it means that the blessing, grace and responsibility that goes with having such a providential role is transferred from one country to another. Is this why God's grace appears to have left Britain so that the churches are now empty? If that is the case, what is one to say to the men and women who gave their lives, paying the indemnity so that God's providence for the Lord of the Second Advent could happen?