

The “Other Women”

By D. Michael Hentrich

Let me just say that I’m no spokesman for the Church, for True Father or True Mother, for the True Family members, nor for anyone but myself. I cannot speak for anyone, and cannot give any kind of official word on anything. But, based on countless face-to-face personal experiences I’ve had with Father, and even one-on-one conversations, I do have some basis to have a reasonable viewpoint about the man we call True Father. I’m not an expert judge of character, but I’ve been around the block a few times and I’m confident that I know what kind of man Father is, and what kind of man he isn’t. I can’t think of any special encounters, or particular events that stand out or speak to me. It’s just the accumulation of experiences, the little things, the kind of character I experienced in him, the way he was, consistently, every time I saw him, with no exceptions. There’s really no way to explain it to anyone in words. You just had to be there. I feel sad that our children don’t have that perspective to draw upon in this era of controversies.

The question is, was Father a weak-willed man driven to lustful escapades, or was he “in control” of himself and doing whatever he did during his life out of some providential purpose? Father never wanted to talk about some of the deeper aspects of his life course. He said if he did, we would feel compelled to follow in his footsteps, and he didn’t want that. Clearly, some aspects of his life constituted a course that only he had to go; not us.

We know something about Father’s first wife. She was a devout Christian woman. When we read about her sometimes extreme and offensive behavior in the face of Father’s leaving her to go to North Korea, and then not rejoining her, even after he returned from the North, she seems very different from True Mother. Certainly, she had reasons for her angry outbursts and feelings. But, she did not strike me as “True Mother” material. It’s curious to me that, as important as every word spoken by Father was, and as important as every action taken by Father was, that he did not even choose this woman to be his wife. She was matched to Father by his aunt. We also have no indication that she had any special personal or ancestral preparation for such a role, unlike Mother. If she were really a candidate to become the True Mother of humanity, as some suggest, then how could it be that she was not personally chosen by Father, himself? Of course, even if this woman represented the Cain lineage, and fulfilled a providential and restorational role, Father had to love her and treat her and even speak of her as a candidate for True Mother. Otherwise, he could be accused by Satan of being insincere.

Another striking thing about this marriage was that it was officiated by a Christian minister in a traditional manner. Father is quoted as saying in the First Edition of the CSG, page 1247, that:

“Weddings not officiated by the parents are officiated by the archangel. When an eminent person comes to officiate at a wedding, alone, like an odd shoe, he is conducting the wedding as the archangel.”

This helped me to conclude that Father’s first marriage was a providential restoration of the marriage of Adam and Eve in the Garden by the Archangel. Father married this woman, gave her a son, loved them both with the heart of True Adam, and then

proceeded on to the next stages and chapters in his providential course. That's how I see it, in light of the Principle. It makes perfect sense to me.

Then, we also heard that Father had a son by a woman who was raped in Japan and subsequently hid in a cave for many years, in shame. Father did not officially marry this woman. The curious thing is, from numerous unofficial statements here and there, I've come to understand that Jesus, the 2nd Adam, tried to have a child before leaving this world, although he did not marry. Whether it was with Mary Magdalene, the Samaritan woman at the well, or someone else, is not clear. In any case, the similarities are obvious. Neither woman was officially married. In Father's case, he gave her a son and again loved her with the heart of True Adam. In my view, Father's relationship with her was probably purposeful in restoring the relationship Jesus had with whomever.

Another element that comes to mind is a comment made by a member of the True Family during a visit to our Church community. This person said in front of many of us - and this is only a paraphrase - that:

We need to understand that the Fall happened through a sexual act and that fallen history has been characterized by the misuse of sexual love ever since. So, we may not realize the extent to which the course of restoration has involved the restoration of sexual relationships.

(I think that captures the spirit and meaning of what was said.) If we think about that in the context of what I've already talked about, then *what* can we see - *just in the Biblical record* - that might apply to this? Just think about it. We can point to David and Bathsheba. We can recall Judah and Tamar, and the story of Ruth. We can consider Solomon and his 700 wives and 300 concubines. What about Abraham and Hagar, and Zachariah and Mary? Need we go on and on? What kind of course might Father have had to go to reconstruct the history of restoration that was lost?

It's also interesting to note a couple of things that Father is quoted as saying, also in the First Edition of the CSG, on page 535:

"There is a saying that goes, "Chastity for woman and purposefulness for man." What this means is that chastity is for the sake of fulfilling God's will concerning love, and purposefulness is for the sake of fulfilling God's purpose. Since it is said that chastity is for women, women should know only one love, and since it is said that purposefulness is for men, men should go forward unwaveringly for the sake of one purpose only. Adam and Eve should have known the right path and should have maintained purposefulness and chastity, yet they did not and they fell."

"Up until now, women have been strictly directed to maintain their chastity, but from now on, men should be directed likewise."

I take the first quote to mean that Adam and Eve BOTH should have maintained purposefulness and chastity, yet they did not and they fell. That way, the second quote would make sense in indicating that, in the position of restored Adams and Eves, both men and women now need to maintain their chastity. I pondered these quotes for years, but now I'm beginning to see how they fit into the puzzle. It makes sense to me now. I

think Father is talking here about himself, and the course of restoration that he had to walk. It leads me to think that there was a lot of “purposeful” mud that Father had to wade through in restoring fallen history; mud that we don’t even want to know about, because it wouldn’t help us, and could easily confuse us, and distract us from the course we need to go.

Then, there was Father’s statement in a speech that I attended, many years ago, where Father said, in front of Mother who was sitting near him on the stage, that Mother needed to be the kind of woman who, if her husband had sex with a woman in their bed, that Mother would change and clean the sheets with no complaint, whatsoever. Wow. That says a lot. What kind of “purposeful” course did Father have to put Mother through, in order that she be totally free from Satan’s accusations and stand as the True Mother of humanity? We may never know.

There were also numerous providential occasions in which the wife of the Central Figure seriously damaged God’s providence in the face of the “other woman”, such as when Sarah “dealt harshly” with Hagar, and drove her out of her home; and perhaps something similar between Elizabeth and Mary. And, didn’t Father say clearly that Jesus, the son of the “other woman”, should have been raised in the house of Zachariah, by him and Elizabeth, and I suppose together with Mary? Does that situation sound familiar? What if Father had to restore these huge mistakes in the providence? We need to think more deeply about the process of restoration? Sometimes we don’t see the connections between things.

So why should I think Father might be restoring historical problems and mistakes through activities that normal people would view as questionable? That’s simple. One only needs to understand how restoration works, and understand who Father is, to answer that question. Why should the actions of Tamar with her father-in-law Judah help to pave the way for Jesus’ sinless birth? If one doesn’t understand that, then a review of the *Divine Principle* is needed, especially of the Principles of Restoration.

So, if what I’m saying has any merit, then it would be natural to wonder why didn’t Father explain what he was doing, so we could all understand? Why doesn’t Mother explain things to us now? I think we need to focus on how restoration works on the heartistic level. Father once said that if Jacob had complained, even once, during his 21 years of being tricked and deceived by his uncle Laban, then he would have lost his qualification to be the central figure. If God had explained that point to Jacob, saying: “Now Jacob, you’d better not complain or you’ll disqualify yourself,” then Jacob’s offering would not have counted for much. Satan could accuse it, and the value of his offering to God would be limited. He had to persevere, without complaint, naturally, from his heart. He had to BE a person who didn’t complain; not play the role out of duty. So, God couldn’t explain. If we’re to “Love our enemy”, for example, we can’t fulfill the condition if we go through the motions because the Principle says we should, or because we were told we HAD to. If we’re to love our enemy, then both God and Satan will be watching to see if we REALLY DO love our enemy, in the depths of our sincere heart. In other words, we need to BE the person who fulfills the condition, not just externally do it out of an understanding of our responsibility within the Principle. We need to genuinely LOVE our enemy, in our heart-of-hearts. Sometimes I see people pretending to love their enemy, or Cain, or their central figure, because they’re “supposed to”. That doesn’t really count for much. If people need to restore something historical by loving the son of the

“other woman”, for example, then we need to just genuinely and sincerely love that person, from the depths of our heart-of-hearts, not because it’s a historical “condition” that needs to be fulfilled; or a “role” that needs to be acted out. So, I think for that reason, Father needed people to fulfill their responsibilities in various roles WITHOUT knowing why, or what they were doing. Father said many times that he didn’t even explain to Mother why he did certain things. I think that’s why no explanations have come, and I suspect no explanations WILL come.

So, in the end, we can’t know with certainty anything about Father’s life that we did not personally witness. Even if we did, could we know Father’s motivation and purpose for what he was doing? We mistakenly questioned his motivation about so many things over the years; about treating Mother so harshly for a period of time after their Blessing in 1960, about starting UTS, about buying various properties, about his support for the Nixon administration. What’s so painful to me is seeing people who have a limited understanding of the *Divine Principle* – which is ALL of us - passing judgment on Father’s motivation and purpose in his nearly impossible course of historical restoration. It’s absurd for us to try to evaluate Father by our parochial understanding. And, people who have no personal experience with him can recklessly claim license to think whatever they want.

So, can we come to any reconciliation in our minds and hearts? For me, the simplest reconciliation comes through knowing Father, personally. I didn’t have the blessing of living with Father. Therefore, I can’t say I know him as well as others. But, I think I know him well enough. I can at least stand with conviction and say that the Father that I watched and knew and talked with over the past 37-plus years was not “out of control”, was not overcome by lustful thoughts, was not whimsical, and was absolutely focused and knew what he was doing, and why he was doing it, every moment of every day of his life. I can say that with certainty. That’s the Father I witnessed and knew.

I feel heartache for the future generations that won’t have the chance to know him in the flesh. He’s hoping and expecting that the future generations will know him through us and our descendants. We were blessed beyond measure to know him. We’re still blessed beyond measure to know THEM. There’s no doubt in my mind that Father’s legacy and teachings will cause a revolutionary change in the course of human history in the generations to come. That much, I know.