JOURNAL OF UNIFICATION STUDIES

●●●

JOURNAL OF UNIFICATION STUDIES

Articles

BookReviews

THE DA VINCI CODE
AND DIVINE PRINCIPLE

Michael L. Mickler

T*he Da Vinci Code*, a "theological thriller" which purports to uncover hidden truths about Christ embedded in Leonardo Da Vinci's paintings, has been a publishing phenomenon since its release in March 2003. It debuted atop the *New York Times* best-seller list, sparked a November 2003 prime-time ABC special entitled "Jesus, Mary and Da Vinci," and celebrated its first anniversary as "the bestselling adult novel of all time within a one year period" with 6.8 million copies in print.[1] In late 2004, author Dan Brown's web site claimed more than 17 million copies of the novel were in print worldwide. Sony Pictures Entertainment reportedly purchased film rights for $6 million, and *The Da Vinci Code* "effect" raised sales of at least 90 related books on religion, history and art.

The phenomenal success of *The Da Vinci Code* is due not only to its literary merits but also to its theological content. Though expressed within the genre of a popular thriller, Brown develops a coherent, though unconventional set of religious ideas. Essentially, *The Da Vinci Code* attempts to deconstruct two millennia of interpretation as to the "true history of Jesus Christ." Utilizing a potpourri of esoteric sources, Brown's novel debunks the New Testament, Christ's divinity, original sin, the church hierarchy, and the apocalypse. In their place, it substitutes Gnostic gospels, Da Vinci's paintings, a married messiah, the sacred feminine, the Knights Templar and Priory of Sion, sacred sex (*hieros gamos*), and the Age of Aquarius.

Not surprisingly, the novel provoked polemical attacks from conservative Christians. A front-page article in the April 27, 2004 *New York Times*

Michael L. Mickler is Professor of Church History and Vice President of the Unification Theological Seminary. He is the author of *The Unification Church in America: A Bibliography and Research Guide* (1987), *A History of the Unification Church in America, 1959-74* (1993), and *40 Years in America: An Intimate History of the Unification Movement, 1959-1999* (2000) as well as articles and reviews on the Unification Church and other movements.

announced that no less than ten books were being released "with titles that promise to break, crack, unlock or decode *The Da Vinci Code.*"[2] However, efforts to marginalize, dismiss or brand Brown's novel heretical highlight a disconnect between orthodox Christianity and popular culture or at least the mass audience to which *The Da Vinci Code* and its ideas appeal. For this reason, rather than highlighting differences, this article takes an ecumenical approach, attempting to bridge the gap between Brown's novel and the broader Christian tradition.

As a first step, the article explores affinities between *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine Principle* [DP], Unification theology's core text.[3] Unification theology also deconstructs traditional views as to the true history of Jesus Christ and seeks to restore the sacred feminine. It offers similar though not identical ideas about the Bible, creation, human sexuality, the Church, and the end times. However, whereas Brown's novel relativizes the historical record ("history is written by winners") and classical sources ("every faith in the world is based on fabrication"), Unification theology takes the historical record and biblical texts more seriously. In this way, certain of *The Da Vinci Code's* assertions which otherwise would be dismissed can be understood within the context of the *Principle* to have a resonance within the Christian tradition as a whole. At the same time, the seriousness with which DP takes the historical record and biblical revelation can work to curb some of the more exotic views expressed in Brown's novel. To this end, the bulk of the article undertakes a comparative analysis of *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine Principle*, highlighting points of contact in seven areas:

1. The Use of Allegory and Symbol
2. The Sacred Feminine
3. Creation
4. Christ
5. Human sexuality
6. The Church
7. Eschatology, or Last Things

Having pointed out similarities and differences between *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine Principle*, the article's concluding section offers preliminary observations intended to relate the revisionist content of both texts to the broader Christian tradition.

Comparative Analysis

1. Allegory and Symbol

As stated, both *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine Principle* attempt to deconstruct two millennia of interpretation as to the "true history of Jesus Christ." In so doing, both texts maintain that much of Christ's "true history" is conveyed through allegory and symbol. *The Da Vinci Code* attempts to extract truth as to Christ's true history from Da Vinci's paintings and the Holy Grail legend by reinterpreting their core symbols. DP extracts clues as to Christ's true history by reinterpreting symbols in the Bible. Though working with different sets of materials, both texts employ similar methods of interpretation and arrive at similar conclusions, as will be shown.

The basic premise of *The Da Vinci Code*, and codes in general, is that *hidden meanings exist within familiar settings*. Thus, Brown links several of his core assertions to symbols embedded within famous paintings by Leonardo Da Vinci, notably the *Mona Lisa* and *The Last Supper*. Brown's key assertion and the lynchpin around which his novel turns is the identification of the Holy Grail with Mary Magdalene. In making this argument, Brown first attempts to deconstruct the familiar image of the Grail as "the cup Jesus drank from at the Last Supper and with which Joseph of Arimathea later caught his blood at the crucifixion." (162) He writes,

> The Holy Grail is arguably the most sought-after treasure in human history. The Grail has spawned legends, wars, and life-long quests. Does it make sense that it is merely a cup? If so, then certainly other relics should generate similar or greater interest—the Crown of Thorns, the True Cross of the Crucifixion, the Titulus—and yet they do not. Throughout history, the Holy Grail has been the most special. (164)

Dispensing with the Grail as a literal cup, the text instead identifies it with "the ancient symbol for womanhood." Brown maintains, "The chalice... resembles a cup or vessel, and more important, it resembles the shape of a woman's womb. The symbol communicates femininity, womanhood, and fertility." The "Holy Grail," he states, "represents the sacred feminine." (238) The text next attempts to identify the generic symbol of womanhood and the sacred feminine with a particular woman, Mary Magdalene. Brown does this through discussions of, among other things,

- Da Vinci, "one of the keepers of the secret of the Holy Grail" who, according to Brown, "hid clues in his art," (230) notably *The Last Supper* in which he allegedly portrays Magdalene to the right of Christ (239, 242-43);

- the vested interest of the early Church in covering up her identity (232-34);

- passages from gnostic texts such as the *Gospel of Philip and* the *Gospel of Mary Magdalene* which allegedly depict a liaison with Jesus (245-48);

- an etymological explanation of San Greal ("Holy Grail") meaning "royal blood" (250); and

- "scores of historians" and their works, including *The Templar Revelation, The Woman With the Alabaster Jar, The Goddess In the Gospels,* and *Holy Blood, Holy Grail,* all of which are cited in the novel. (253)

Having identified the Holy Grail with Mary Magdalene, the text finds confirmatory evidence virtually everywhere. The novel's protagonist Robert Langdon, who is appropriately enough a Professor of Symbology, asserts, "Once you open your eyes to the Holy Grail… you see her everywhere. Paintings. Music. Books. Even in cartoons, theme parks, and popular movies." (261) He states, "Legends of chivalric quests for the lost Grail were in fact stories of forbidden quests to find the lost sacred feminine. Knights who claimed to be 'searching for the chalice' were speaking in code as a way to protect themselves from a Church that has subjugated women." (238-39) Disney productions, ranging from *Cinderella, Sleeping Beauty,* and *Snow White* to *The Little Mermaid,* in one way or another, deal with "the incarceration of the sacred feminine." (262)

Divine Principle does not use "code" language but also purports to reveal hidden truths within the familiar, in this case, not within Da Vinci's paintings but in the Bible, specifically *The Book of Genesis.* Here, DP's key assertion and the lynchpin around which the text turns is its identification of "the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil" with "Eve's love." (74) In making its case, DP, like Brown, first attempts to deconstruct a familiar image, in this case that of fruit in the *Genesis* account. Just as Brown questions whether it made sense that the Holy Grail was "merely a cup," DP asks whether it makes sense that the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil was merely "fruit of an actual tree" (66),

> How could something edible be the source of sin or the cause of transmitting that… sin to the children? … What a… [person] has eaten cannot be transmitted from one generation to the next…

> We cannot understand why Adam and Eve, who were far from starvation, would disobey God's command at the risk of their lives. The fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil must have been extraordinarily stimulating and so ardently desired that fear of punishment—even death—could not deter them from eating it. (66-67)

DP concludes, "The fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil was not a material fruit, but a symbol." (67) It then undertakes a further allegorical exegesis of scripture, identifying the Tree of Life with Adam, the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil with Eve, and the serpent with Satan. (67-71) This leads to an identification of the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil with "Eve's love." DP uses a combination of biblical sources, circumstantial evidence and common sense to make its case that "eating" the fruit symbolized having sexual intercourse. Examples include,

- Scripture passages attesting to intercourse, including sexual intercourse between fallen angels and human beings (71, 73, 77-78);

- The contrast between Adam and Eve's original condition of being "unashamed of their nakedness" with their subsequent shame and act of sewing fig leaves together to cover their lower parts (72);

- The contention that sexual intercourse was an act humans could have performed at the risk of their lives (72); and

- Sexual intercourse provides the means by which the original sin of adultery "is transmitted from generation to generation." (75)

Having identified the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil with "Eve's love," DP also finds confirmatory evidence virtually everywhere: from strictures against adultery in "every religion" to the contention that the "principal cause of the downfall of numerous nations, national heroes and patriots was adultery." (75) More than that, it finds the "pattern" and "result" of the human fall reflected throughout human society. (83-91)

2. The Sacred Feminine

Recovery of the sacred feminine is important for both *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine Principle*. However, the texts undertake recovery efforts from different points of reference. *The Da Vinci Code's* references ancient Goddess worship rooted in "pagan, Mother Earth-revering religions." (95) DP's reference point is the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which it reinterprets in

feminine terms. (215 ff.) Nevertheless, both texts agree that Christianity either directly or indirectly suppressed the sacred feminine and perpetuated societies centered on the "masculine logic of power" rather than the "feminine logic of love."[4]

Conveniently enough, Robert Langdon, Brown's main character in *The Da Vinci Code*, had just completed a work entitled *Symbols of the Lost Sacred Feminine*, and is at pains to lecture its content throughout the novel. For example, in the pre-Christian world, we are told,

> [G]ods and goddesses worked to keep a balance of power. Yin and Yang. When male and female were balanced, there was harmony in the world. When they were unbalanced, there was chaos. (36)

The Jews, according to Langdon, "believed that the Holy of Holies in Solomon's Temple housed not only God but also His powerful female equal, Shekinah. Even their sacred name for God—YHWH, he says, "derived from Jehovah, an androgynous... union between the masculine Jah and the pre-Hebraic name for Eve, Havah." (309) However, Christianity suppressed and demonized the sacred feminine as "a threat to the rise of the predominantly male Church." (238) This situation, according to Langdon, has degenerated into "testosterone-fueled wars, a plethora of misogynistic societies, and a growing disrespect for Mother Earth." (126)

Divine Principle does not traffic in speculation about ancient goddesses. Its contribution to the discussion of the sacred feminine lies primarily in its identification of the "Holy Spirit" as a "female Spirit." (215) DP states,

> There are many who receive revelations indicating that the Holy Spirit is a female spirit; this is because she came as the True Mother, that is, the second Eve. Again, since the Holy Spirit is a female Spirit, we cannot become the "bride" of Jesus unless we receive the Holy Spirit. Thus, the Holy Spirit is a female Spirit, consoling and moving the hearts of the people... She also cleanses the sins of the people in order to restore them. (215)

The risen Christ and Holy Spirit together are called the "True Parents," through whom humankind attains "spiritual rebirth." (216) However, it regards spiritual rebirth as a limited form of salvation. (147-49) Because the Holy Spirit failed to materialize in the flesh, humankind continues to groan in travail, awaiting the redemption of our bodies. One consequence of this is the continuance of male-dominated societies and oppression of women.

3. Creation

For both *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine Principle*, creation is a gateway to the divine. Both texts develop arguments in favor of intelligent design, reflective of the divine order in nature. Brown identifies a code, known as the "Divine Proportion," embedded not only in Da Vinci's works, but also in the fabric of creation. DP likewise contends that the natural order mirrors the divine and cites Biblical revelation as support. Both texts utilize their views of creation to buttress arguments in favor of the sacred feminine.

Brown's hero, Robert Langdon, claims in *The Da Vinci Code* that the "mystical mathematical" number 1.618, otherwise known as PHI or the Divine Proportion, is "a fundamental building block in nature." As he notes, "plants, animals, and even human beings all possessed dimensional properties that adhered with eerie exactitude to the ratio of PHI to 1." (94) Examples he cites include,

- The number of female to male honeybees in any beehive in the world;

- The ratio each spiral's diameter to the next on chambered nautilus seashells;

- The ratio of consecutive seed head spirals in sunflowers,

- Ratios on pinecone petals, the leaf arrangement on plant stalks, and insect segmentation;

- The distance from tip of one's head to the floor divided by the distance from one's belly button to the floor;

- The distance from one's shoulder to fingertips divided by the distance from one's elbow to fingertips; hip to floor divided by knee to floor; finger joints; spinal divisions, etc. (94-95)

According to Brown, "Nobody understood this better than Da Vinci," who "was the first to show that the human body is literally made of building blocks whose proportional ratio always equal PHI." (95) He asserts that artwork of Michelangelo, Dürer, Da Vinci and others demonstrated "each artist's intentional and rigorous adherence to the Divine Proportion in the layout of their compositions," that PHI underlay the architectural dimensions of the Greek Parthenon, the pyramids of Egypt and even the United Nations Building in New York, and that PHI appeared in the organizational structures of Mozart's sonatas, Beethoven's Fifth Symphony as well as in the works of Bartok,

Debussy, and Schubert." (96) The ancients, Brown says, "were sure they had stumbled across God's building block for the world, and they worshipped Nature because of that." (95)

    Divine Principle agrees that the natural order mirrors the divine but bases its position on Biblical revelation, specifically, Paul's insistence that,

> Ever since the creation of the world, namely, his eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse. (Romans 1:20)

Using the artist as an analogy, DP states, "Just as the work of an artist is a visible manifestation of its maker's invisible nature... so we can perceive God's deity by observing His creation." (20) DP proceeds to examine "common factors" found in creation as a way "to know the nature of God's deity." (20) DP holds that the first of these is "Positivity and Negativity" or male and female. A second is "external form and internal character." A third, reminiscent of The Da Vinci Code's mystical mathematical numbers, is the repetition of the numbers 3, 4, and various permutations of these two numbers in creation. (31-41, 51-54) These elements of creation all contribute to Unification theology's understanding of the divine.

    Both *The Da Vinci Code* and DP utilize their creation-based theologies to buttress arguments in favor of the sacred feminine. Brown notes, "The ancients envisioned their world in two halves—masculine and feminine." (36) As a consequence, early religion, which was "based on the Divine order of nature," had a place for the sacred feminine and goddess. DP's contention that "dual characteristics" in the created order, including that of male and female, reflect "dual characteristics of God" likewise establishes a foundation for upholding a feminine aspect of Deity.

4. Christ

As stated, both *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine Principle* attempt to deconstruct two millennia of interpretation as to the "true history of Jesus Christ." They take different approaches, but reinterpret the divinity and humanity of Christ in convergent ways. With some qualifications, *The Da Vinci Code* considers Jesus to be a "mortal prophet" (233), "married man" (245), "father" (249), and originator of a "royal bloodline." (249) DP attempts to be more even-handed in reconciling conflicting claims as to Christ's divinity and humanity but similarly associates Jesus with marriage. In so doing, it contends there were "dual prophecies" as to Christ's coming as "Lord of Glory" which would have included the elements of marriage and lineage or "Lord of Suffering" which, in fact, led to his crucifixion and atoning sacrifice.

    The Da Vinci Code qualifies the radical quality of its interpretation by a postmodernist sleight-of-hand. At several points, the novel posits a wholly

subjectivist depiction of truth so that whether one accepts the orthodox or alternate versions of the Christ-story is a matter of inclination. As one of Brown's characters states, "In the end, which side of the story you believe becomes a matter of faith and personal exploration." (256) Nevertheless, the quest for the Holy Grail is a quest for certitude. The Grail-seekers in Brown's novel are convinced that the "Sangreal" or Holy Grail literally consists of documents authenticating Christ's "true history" and Magdalene's true identity. These documents, which the novel describes as "carried in four enormous chests," (256) purportedly make explicit and provable what Da Vinci and others were forced to conceal in code. As Robert Langdon, states, "There is an enormous difference between hypothetically discussing an alternate history of Christ, and... presenting to the world thousands of ancient documents as scientific evidence that the New Testament is false testimony." (341)

Brown's protagonists never gain access to this "scientific evidence." However, this does not stop them from defining Christ as "a historical figure of staggering influence... the prophesied messiah... a great and powerful man, but a *man* nonetheless." (231, 233)

In addition, as Da Vinci's "code" and the "historical record" (primarily Gnostic gospels and recent popular histories) make clear, Jesus and Mary Magdalene "were a pair." (244) Brown's Grail-seekers define Magdalene, allegedly pictured to the right of Christ in Da Vinci's "The Last Supper," as "a powerful woman... of the House of Benjamin... of royal descent." (248) Her union with Jesus, "who *also* had royal blood... of the House of David... fused two royal bloodlines, creating a potent political union with the potential of making a legitimate claim to the throne." (249) Not only was Magdalene of royal descent, but according to *The Da Vinci Code*, she "was the female womb that carried Jesus' royal bloodline." (249) That is, Magdalene was pregnant at the time of the crucifixion and fled to France, then known as Gaul, with the assistance of Joseph of Arimathea. There she gave birth to a daughter Sarah, and a line which "grew undercover in France until making a bold move in the fifth century, when it intermarried with French royal blood and created a lineage known as the Merovingian bloodline." (257)

Divine Principle does not engage in speculation of this sort and attempts to be even-handed in reconciling conflicting claims as to Christ's divinity and humanity. It affirms that Jesus was a "perfected man," i.e., one who had "attained the purpose of creation." (208-210) It also affirms "the attitude of faith held by many Christians that Jesus is God, since it is true that a perfected man [person] is one body with God." (209) Continuing in its effort to balance Christ's humanity and divinity, DP argues,

> Jesus, being one body with God, may be called a second God (image of God), but he can by no means be God Himself. It is true that he who has

> seen Jesus has seen God (John 14:9-10); but Jesus did not say this to indicate that he was God himself. (211)

There is a degree of ambiguity in this position. Nevertheless, there is more resonance between DP and traditional Christologies than in The Da Vinci Code.

Divine Principle and *The Da Vinci Code* converge more in their conception of Christ's work, i.e., the inauguration of the reign of God (though *The Da Vinci Code* conceptualizes this more along the lines of a restored Davidic monarchy). As noted, DP maintains that there were two kinds of prophecy concerning Jesus, dependent upon human response. Jesus Christ would have been able to fulfill his work "in glory" and in companionship had the people received him. According to DP,

> Jesus came as the True Father of mankind, with the mission of the Tree of Life (Rev. 22:14); that is, as the second Adam. (1 Cor. 15:45) Then, it would only be logical that there should come the True Mother of mankind, with the mission of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil; that is, the second Eve. (216)

Both DP and *The Da Vinci Code* associate marriage with Jesus. *The Da Vinci Code* contends that Christ actually married Mary Magdalene and fathered her child. DP is again more nuanced. It maintains that Jesus, as the "second Adam," was originally supposed to marry and, together with his Bride, become the second Adam and Eve. Here the text of *Exposition of the Divine Principle* is clear:

> God intended to exalt Jesus and his Bride as the second Adam and Eve to become the True Parents of humanity. However, the resurrected Jesus and the Holy Spirit in oneness with God could... fulfill only the mission of spiritual True Parents. (172)

Jesus' earthly marriage did not occur, DP maintains, because the people's disbelief and rejection resulted in Jesus going the way of the cross. Rather than an earthly Bride, God sent the Holy Spirit who together with the risen Christ are the "True Parents of mankind" through whom fallen humanity is "born anew." (217) Who was to be Jesus' earthly Bride? There are tantalizing hints that Mary Magdalene was a candidate. Rev. Moon holds her in high esteem; more then any of the disciples, "It was Mary who loved Jesus most."[5] A manuscript of Wolli Wonbon, the earliest version of Divine Principle written in Rev. Moon's own hand, states that Mary Magdalene was Judas Iscariot's wife or lover and that Jesus "planned to accomplish the Principle will by taking Judas' wife," choosing her as "Eve." This subsequently was the underlying motivation for Judas Iscariot's action in selling his teacher for thirty pieces of silver.[6]

Rev. Moon further hints at Mary Magdalene's role in several sermons where he refers to Jesus' appearance to Mary in John 20:17, where Mary apparently runs to embrace Jesus and he prohibits her:

> After the resurrection of Jesus, Mary Magdalene was in the position of the bride. Yet when she tried to touch him, Jesus could not help stopping her. This was because she did not have the bridal qualifications through which Jesus could receive her. Satan's accusations will be dropped only when the bride stands in the position where she indemnifies all the historical grudges.[7]

As Rev. Moon explains, Mary's grief at being unable to touch her bridegroom epitomizes the situation of anyone who would approach Jesus:

> Now we are facing Jesus with the cross placed in the middle, and someone must resolve the grief and suffering caused by the cross. Without resolving it, we cannot graft onto Jesus and call him our bridegroom. This is the reason when Mary Magdalene called out, "Oh Lord!" right after the resurrection, Jesus stopped her.[8]

5. Human Sexuality

In addition to the sacred feminine, both *The Da Vinci Code* and Unification theology attempt to restore the sacredness of human sexuality. Again taking his lead from Da Vinci, Dan Brown discusses, in relatively explicit terms, "The once hallowed act of *hieros gamos*—the natural sexual union between man and woman through which each became spiritually whole." (125) Contrasting this with the view of sexuality as a "shameful act," Brown argues that the *hieros gamos* ritual enacted by the ancients was "a deeply sacrosanct ceremony" (309), kept alive by certain secret societies today including the Grail's guardians. Unification theology also attempts to sanctify human sexuality, or what it terms "absolute sex." In several of his speeches, Rev. Moon refers to the sexual organs as the "palace of love" and God's "dwelling place."[9] He contrasts the sacredness of "absolute sex" with both celibacy and shame-inducing qualities of "free love." Although not utilizing *hieros gamos* terminology, proponents of Unification theology consider "the Blessing" a sacrosanct ceremony, the consummation of which includes specific sexual rites for couples.

Brown's starting point in his discussion of human sexuality is "code language" embedded in Da Vinci's painting, this time not *The Last Supper* but the *Mona Lisa*. According to Brown, "Da Vinci was a prankster, and computerized analysis of the *Mona Lisa* and Da Vinci's self-portraits confirm some startling points of congruency in their faces." In short, "his *Mona Lisa* is neither male nor female... [but] carries a subtle message of androgyny... a

fusing of both." (120) Da Vinci also left a "big clue" in that the name, "Mona Lisa," is an anagram of Amon, the horned male Egyptian God of fertility, and his counterpart goddess Isis "whose ancient pictogram was once called L'ISA." According to Brown, this is "the reason for Mona Lisa's knowing smile." (121)

Hieros gamos, as Brown explains it, "looked like a sex ritual... [but] had nothing to do with eroticism. It was a spiritual act." (308) He states,

> The ancients believed that the male was spiritually incomplete until he had carnal knowledge of the sacred feminine. Physical Union with the female remained the sole means through which man could become spiritually complete and ultimately achieve *gnosis*—knowledge of the divine. Since the days of Isis, sex rites had been considered man's only bridge from earth to heaven... By communing with woman... man could achieve a climactic instant when his mind went totally blank and he could see God. (308-09)

Brown claims, "The early Jewish tradition involved ritualistic sex... In the Temple, no less... Men seeking spiritual wholeness came to the Temple to visit priestesses—or hierodules—with whom they made love and experienced the divine through physical union." (309) Christianity's unwillingness to acknowledge Magdalene or the sacred feminine, Brown contends, led it "to demonize sex and recast it as a disgusting and sinful act." (309) According to him, "more than a dozen secret societies around the world," including the Grail's guardians, "still practiced sex rites and kept the ancient traditions alive." (310)

Unlike *The Da Vinci Code,* which regards original sin to be a fabrication designed to denigrate women (124), DP accepts the fall account but interprets it in sexual terms. As previously noted, DP understands the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil to be a symbol "Eve's love" and "eating" the fruit to be code language for sexual intercourse. As pointed out by one of its leading expositors, DP's understanding of the human fall "is largely in agreement with the historical-critical understanding of Genesis 3 as a polemic against the adulterous idolatry of the fertility cult generalized into a description of humanity's alienation from God." Stated differently, "The sin which disrupted the original bond between God and humanity was more than disobedience of God's commandment; it was that act of illicit love euphemistically termed eating the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil."[10]

Although *DP* offers a sexual interpretation of the human fall and original sin, it does not follow that Unification theology is anti-sexual. DP's brief is against disordered and premature sexuality, not against sexual intercourse itself. In fact, Unification sources rhapsodize over the joy of sex. Rev. Moon peppers his speeches with references to male and female sexual organs (both *The Da Vinci Code* and Rev. Moon traffic heavily in concave and convex

imagery), explosions of love, and admonitions that married couples over-come inappropriate squeamishness as to physical contact. The tradition goes so far as to postulate that conjugal love in the afterlife extends beyond the bedroom to fields, the beach and mountainsides.[11] As in *The Da Vinci Code*, Rev. Moon affirms that the divine is expressed and present in the sexual act. The "Blessing," which includes ceremonial and a female superior sexual initi-ation rite, is the gateway to this new realm of experience and knowledge in Unification tradition. However, the sanctification of human sexual relations is confined to married couples and do not involve public ritual enactments as in *The Da Vinci Code*.

6. The Church

Although *The Da Vinci Code* and DP both criticize institutional Christianity, Brown's novel is significantly more anti-clerical. Essentially, it depicts the Church as an illegitimate institution, based upon lies from its very inception. DP is critical of the Church's shortcomings and failings. However, it regards the Church to have had a legitimate religious mission which continues. Both perceive that the Church's proclivity toward violence derives in some measure from its glorification of the cross. Both also view the Bible through histori-cal-critical lenses. The difference is that *The Da Vinci Code* adheres to a more materialist reading of scripture, regarding it as "a product of *man*... Not of God." (231) DP, though not holding the Bible to be "perfect and absolute in itself," (9) acknowledges it to be "a revelation from God." (16)

    The Da Vinci Code is profoundly anti-clerical. The novel's first substan-tive reference to the Church refers to its "deceitful and violent history," specif-ically its "brutal crusade to 'reeducate' the pagan and feminine-worshipping religions." (124-25) Brown's protagonist claims, "The Catholic Inquisition published the book that arguably could be called the most blood-soaked publi-cation in human history, *Malleus Maleficarum*—or *The Witches' Hammer*" which "indoctrinated the world to 'the dangers of free-thinking women' and instructed the clergy how to locate, torture and destroy them." (125) "During three hundred years of witch hunts," we are told, "The Church burned at the stake an astounding five *million* women." (125)

    These horrific methods were not exceptions to the Church's normally good offices but rather part of an orchestrated campaign extending back to Christianity's origins. Christ, the novel asserts, "intended... the future of his Church to be in the hands of Mary Magdalene... And Peter had a problem with that." (248) According to Brown's protagonist, Da Vinci "was well aware of how Peter felt about Mary Magdalene" and depicted Peter's animosity in *The Last Supper*. The novel claims that the figure to Jesus' immediate right, with "flowing red hair, delicate folded hands, and the hint of a bosom" (as well as a complementary robe to Jesus) was not the beloved disciple John, as is

commonly thought, but, in actuality, Mary Magdalene. This, it is said, explains why Peter "was leaning menacingly" toward Magdalene in the painting "slicing his blade-like hand across her neck." (248) It also explains why "the Church, in order to defend itself against the Magdalene's power, perpetuated her image as a whore and buried evidence of Christ's marriage to her." (254)

The Church continued its disinformation campaign, "propagating lies" that scripture eventually canonized. Collated by the pagan Roman Emperor Constantine the Great, the Bible which he "commissioned and financed... omitted those gospels that spoke of Christ's *human* traits and embellished those gospels that made him look godlike." (234) In other words, the Bible "was compiled and edited by men who possessed a political agenda—to promote the divinity of the man Jesus Christ and use His influence to solidify their own power base." (234) The "long-stemmed Christian cross" used by the Romans as a "torture device" was an apt symbol of the Church's determination to maintain its power. Brown contrasts its "violent history" with that of the square or equal-armed "peaceful" crosses which predated Christianity by fifteen hundred years, "balanced vertical and horizontal elements [to] convey a natural union of male and female," (145) and were "symbolically consistent" with the philosophy of those who truly understood Christ.

Divine Principle contains anti-clerical elements but does not consider the Church to have been distorted from inception. In fact, the text's first substantive mention of Christianity refers to "the Christian spirit which cast forth... a brilliant light of life... even in the days of persecution under the Roman Empire." (6) DP does not take the position that Constantine was a pagan politician but holds that "Jesus influenced the Emperor Constantine spiritually, and moved him to recognize Christianity publicly in 313." (409) Still, the text is critical of the Church's failings. "Medieval society," it contends, "buried ... Christianity alive." (6) In its most memorable anti-clerical line, *DP* states,

> Christianity, though it professed God's love, had turned out to be in reality a dead body of clergy trailing empty slogans. (6)

Despite its failings, DP contends, "Jesus and the Holy Spirit," a female spirit, "have been leading Christianity directly." (409) Therefore, the possibility of reform continually exists.

However, *DP* asserts that Christianity's reformation at the present time hinges on its meeting two conditions. First, the Church must evidence openness to "new truth." (9) This, in turn, rests upon a correct view of scripture:

> It may be displeasing to religious believers, especially to Christians, to learn that a new expression of truth must appear. They believe that the Bible, which they now have, is perfect and absolute in itself... The Bible,

> however, is not the truth itself, but a textbook teaching the truth. Naturally, the quality of teaching and the method and extent of giving the truth must vary according to each age, for the truth is given to people of different ages, who are at different spiritual and intellectual levels. Therefore, we must not regard the textbook as absolute in every detail. (9)

Scripture, according to DP, "can be likened to a lamp which illuminates the truth... When a brighter light appears, the mission of the old one fades." (10) In addition to its other tasks, the mission of "new truth" is "to explain lucidly all the difficult problems of Christianity," including "difficult Biblical mysteries which are written in parables and symbols." (14-15)

Secondly, Christianity must take down the cross. According to DP,

> A vast number of Christians throughout the 2,000 years of Christian history have been confident that they have been completely saved by the blood of Jesus' crucifixion. Yet, in reality, not one individual, home or society has existed free from sin. (15)

For DP, this highlights "a central contradiction between the present reality of Christianity and the belief in complete redemption by the ransom of the cross." (15) In fact, DP teaches that the Jesus' crucifixion was not the original will of God or inevitable but a secondary course prompted by failures of those in positions of responsibility to support his mission. (139-63) Unification theology likewise recoils from the "violent history" of the cross, perpetrated by Christians confident of their complete salvation. It views the cross as a barrier between Christianity and other religious traditions as well as a barrier between Christianity and Christ.

7. Eschatology, or Last Things

Neither *The Da Vinci Code* nor DP view the end times as a cataclysmic scenario, characterized by supernaturally-induced natural disasters. Both texts instead view the end time as a period of historical transition. *The Da Vinci Code* utilizes Age of Aquarius language to describe the transition while DP uses biblical imagery. However, they both understand the last days within the context of unfolding historical processes. Both also emphasize the role of new truth as a harbinger of the new age and the ideal of persons "being the truth" as the new age's primary characteristic.

Brown's villain, Sir Leigh Teabing, a Grail enthusiast who will stop at nothing to reveal the "truth" of the Holy Grail, tells the novel's heroine, Sophie Neveu, a putative lineal descendent of Mary Magdelene,

> [W]e are currently in an epoch of enormous change. The millennium has recently passed, and with it has ended the two-thousand-year-long astrological Age of Pisces—the fish, which is also the sign of Jesus. As any

astrological symbologist will tell you, the Piscean ideal believes that man must be told what to do by higher powers because man is incapable of thinking for himself. Hence it has been a time of fervent religion. Now, however, we are entering the Age of Aquarius—the water bearer—whose ideals claim that man will learn the truth and be able to think for himself. The ideological shift is enormous, and it is occurring right now. (268)

It falls to Brown's protagonist, Robert Langdon, to make the connection between astrological and biblical prophecy. He describes the "end of the world" or "Apocalypse" as a "common misconception." Agreeing with Teabing, Langdon contends that "the End of Days... refers not to the end of the world, but rather to the end of our current age—Pisces, which began at the time of Christ's birth, spanned two thousand years, and waned with the passing of the millennium." (268)

Though agreeing in part, Langdon and Teabing part company over the methods they are willing to employ in exposing the "truth." Teabing believes that public exposure of Grail secrets will precipitate the new age. He perceives that the Grail's guardians have suffered a failure of nerve or that the Church has launched a preemptive attack to destroy the Grail documents. Teabing's willingness to employ espionage and murder in pursuit of the Grail and the goodness it will foster is the driving force of Brown's novel. Langdon also is motivated by the promise of a more egalitarian world. He, like Teabing, believes that "the gods of destruction and war" had taken their toll and "The male ego had spent two millennia running unchecked by its feminine counterpart." (125) However, he is of a distinctly less conspiratorial frame of mind and is unwilling to employ the methods of the old age in service of new. In the end, Sophie Neveu's grandmother, a higher-up among the Grail's guardians, terms the "End of Days" a "legend of paranoid minds," stating there is nothing in the guardian's doctrine that "identifies a date in which the Grail should be unveiled." (444)

Divine Principle utilizes biblical rather than astrological prophecy to deconstruct literalist interpretations of the end times. Its chapter on the "Consummation of Human History" (99-136) considers but rejects the literalism of a variety of biblical passages which point to such end time phenomena as the heavens being kindled and dissolved (II Peter 3:12); or the sun being darkened, the moon not giving light and the stars falling from heaven (Matt. 24:29); or the dead in Christ rising and those alive being caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. (I Thess. 4:16-17) DP concludes that such Last Days phenomena are "stated in symbolic terms" (100) and that the "last Days... will not be a day of fear in which many natural calamities will take place." (112) Like *The Da Vinci Code*, DP contends that the Last Days to be a transitional age. Unlike *The Da Vinci Code*, DP does not understand this transition to be between Piscean and Aquarian ages but

rather from "the sinful world under Satanic dominion" to "the world of good sovereignty." (111)

Divine Principle is not a novel and, therefore, does not personalize conflicting perspectives as Brown does with Langdon and Teabing. It does, however, factor in dramatic tension by asserting that the new age must ward off powerful "satanic" imitations which utilize vile means to realize "non-principled" pseudo-forms of the new age. (445) Interestingly, recent Unification theology, like Brown's protagonist Langdon, sees one such usurpation to be that of the male ego. Rev. Moon has touted the necessity of "the age of women" to counterbalance patriarchy and its habitual abuses. Mrs. Moon, in a speech previously cited, stated, "in past history the 'logic of power' had been ruling" but that the new age demanded the "feminine 'logic of love' to solve … problems and lead history in a proper way."[12] DP likewise emphasizes the role of "new truth" in solving problems and inaugurating a new history (9-16), as well as the necessity of human beings to embody the truth or in its terminology to become "individual truth incarnations." (36)

Affinities to Christian Tradition

Having pointed out similarities and differences between *The Da Vinci* Code and *Divine Principle*, it remains to assess how the revisionist content of both texts relates to the broader Christian tradition. This section will highlight resonances between the two texts and the broader tradition both in terms of theological method and content in each of the seven areas considered, i.e., the use of allegory and symbol, the sacred feminine, creation, Christ, human sexuality, the Church, and eschatology or last things. The intention in each case is to offer preliminary observations rather than to be definitive. I will conclude by assessing the principal contribution of both texts to contemporary theological discourse.

The use of allegory, symbol and typologies of various hues is by no means unprecedented but has an ancient and ongoing pedigree within Jewish and Christian traditions. Apocalyptic literature (Daniel, Revelation) is crammed with code language, in part to mislead would-be persecutors of the faith, i.e., Rome depicted as a beast, harlot or seven-headed dragon. The notion that there is a "secret inner meaning" to Scripture which "stands on a quite other level than its obvious surface meaning" has a distinguished heritage extending from the earliest Biblical exegetes to today's literary critics.[13] However, the most significant warrant for the use of allegory and symbol is Jesus' use of parables. In noting their effect, one modern scholar writes,

> [H]owever we evaluate the parables of Jesus themselves, our main point is
> their effect in guiding Christian readers to the conclusion that the Bible

contains much material that does not mean exactly what it says. The surface
expressions are a coded representation of a hidden and more spiritual mean-
ing.[14]

Of course, it is a major leap to move from acknowledging the use of allegory
and symbol in Biblical materials (or non-Biblical materials such as Da Vinci's
paintings and Grail legends) to accepting the specific interpretations offered
by *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine Principle*. Both texts offer internal ratio-
nales and justifications for their positions as noted. Unification exegetes also
have attempted to corroborate DP's sexual interpretation of the human fall by
referencing Genesis language and symbols which would have conveyed obvi-
ous sexual meanings to Ancient Near East audiences.[15] However, regardless
of their respective interpretations, it is clear that both texts' use of allegory
and symbolism is consistent with methods historically and widely employed
within the Christian tradition.

Both *The Da Vinci Code* and *DP* undertake efforts to recover the sacred
feminine, which they claim has been suppressed within the Christian tradition.
These efforts obviously are consistent with a broad spectrum of
feminist/womanist theologians who have insisted that Christianity go *Beyond
God the Father*.[16] *The Da Vinci Code* rightly references the Shekinah, or
feminine presence of God in Judaism. Within Christianity, the grammatically
feminine Hebrew *Ruach haKodesh* (Holy Spirit) was rendered masculine or
neuter. The resultant loss of the feminine was compensated for by feminine
portrayals of Jesus ("Oh Jerusalem... How often I would have gathered your
children as a hen gathers her brood under her wings," Matt. 23:34), by ascrib-
ing functions to the Holy Spirit commonly associated with women (comfort,
consolation, inspiration, warmth, birth),[17] and in some sectors of the Church
by elevating the status of Mary "Mother of God" to that of a virtual co-
redemptrix. To be sure, efforts to reclaim the divine or sacred feminine are
gathered at the margins of Christian faith, in part due to the threat they repre-
sent to a predominantly male church. Nevertheless, these efforts are gaining
in force and momentum. In this respect, *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine
Principle* resonate with an emergent theme in Christian theology.

The Da Vinci Code and DP's arguments in favor of intelligent design in
creation are consistent with what has generally gone under the name of "natural
theology" within the Christian tradition. There was a tendency within twenti-
eth century theology, under the impress of two world wars and global depres-
sion, to disengage from creation-based theologies in favor of "revealed
theology" which was considered to be more attuned to the human propensity
for evil. However, new age physics as well as renewed creation-evolution
controversies have revived interest in creation-based theologies and spiritual-
ities. There is little in *The Da Vinci Code* or *DP* which is at cross-purposes to

traditional natural theologies apart from the manner in which they both utilize creation-based arguments to buttress their positions in favor of the sacred feminine. That is, they both view the *yang* and *yin* in the natural order to be reflective of the Divine nature. *The Da Vinci Code* is more militantly creation-centered than *DP* in that it discounts the human fall. Hence, it exhibits a radical openness to any number of Mother Earth-based spiritualities as have a procession of Christian mystics from Meister Ekhardt to Matthew Fox. DP is more moderate in attempting to balance its doctrine of creation with doctrines of the fall and redemption, or what it terms "restoration." In this way, the texts resonate with a spectrum of natural theologies within the Christian tradition.

The Da Vinci Code and DP's doctrines of Christ, or Christologies, are best understood within the context of the modern quest for the historical Jesus. Both texts, like those produced by several generations of quest proponents, attempt to lay bare the "true history of Jesus Christ." The distinctiveness of the two texts' findings is their common association of Jesus with marriage, actual according to *The Da Vinci Code,* intended according to DP. The Christian tradition as a whole spiritualized and universalized Jesus' marital status, utilizing metaphors such as the marriage supper of the Lamb, Jesus as bridegroom, and the Church or human soul as his bride. However, Jesus' association with a literal marriage in his lifetime presupposes a re-visioning of his saving work. Apart from the question of marriage, neither *The Da Vinci Code* nor DP evidence belief in "complete redemption by the ransom of the cross." (DP, 15) In fact, both suggest that glorification of the cross furthered violence, thereby increasing rather than lessening sin. There is a small but vocal group of contemporary theologians who are likewise critical of the blood atonement.[18]

Hence, in terms of their respective Christologies, *The Da Vinci Code* and DP may be difficult to place within the Christian tradition as they self-consciously deconstruct previous positions. However, it must be acknowledged that deconstruction and reconstruction is an ongoing dynamic within Christian theology and life. In particular, each generation and culture interprets Jesus anew as has been documented.[19] If Jesus can be conceptualized as the world's greatest salesman, a Marxist guerrilla, a sage, a hippie, a superstar, an illiterate Mediterranean peasant, a magician, or any number of other personas, there would appear to be no inherent reason why he couldn't also be conceptualized as the world's greatest husband and father.

In their depiction of human sexuality, *The Da Vinci Code* and DP straddle the divide between repressive, anti-sexual tendencies within the Christian tradition and libertinism of the sexual revolution. Affirming a disciplined yet joyful attitude toward sex is fairly commonplace within contemporary Christianity. What is distinctive about *The Da Vinci Code* and Unification theology is their mutual emphasis on sexuality as an expression of and path-

way to the divine. Extraordinarily sensuous language describing the union of
the soul with Christ is not uncommon in Christian mystical writings or even
sermon-cycles such as Bernard of Clairvaux's sermons on *The Song of
Solomon*. However, Christianity as a whole has stopped short of embracing
sacred sex. Given widespread sexual confusion and misconduct, notably
among clergy, it may be that the tradition ought to reconsider its position.

It might be questioned how the profound anti-clericalism of *The Da
Vinci Code* interacts with the Christian tradition in any meaningful way. After
all, Brown's characters judge Christianity to be guilty of virtual genocide in
its treatment of "free-thinking women" and claim both it and the Bible to be
illegitimate, based upon lies from their beginnings. DP, again, is less radical
in attempting to balance criticism with an acceptance of Christianity's legiti-
macy and ongoing mission. However, it must be remembered that anti-cleri-
calism, charges of illegitimacy (including distortions of scripture) and
sectarian violence have been all too common fixtures in the history of
Christianity. Churches have subjected their rivals to the harshest denuncia-
tions. Various Protestant sects have regarded Roman Catholic Church and its
offices as the invention of power-crazed human beings, or the devil, not God.
Roman Catholics have applied similar phases of opprobrium (i.e., "first-born
of Satan") to a long line of heretics. In this regard, anti-clericalism, even of
the most radical sort, ought not disqualify either text from consideration any
more than it has disqualified previous claimants to truth. Though mainstream
in its doctrine of the Church, DP's doctrine of God's continuing revelation may
be problematic, depending upon how it is interpreted. Christianity typically
finessed claimed encounters with the supernatural by such personages as
Francis of Assisi, Ignatius Loyola or Bernadette of Lourdes by distinguish-
ing between divine inspiration and revelation. However, there has never been
a shortage of those who believe that God has "more light to shed from his Holy
Word."[20]

Both *The Da Vinci Code* and DP deconstruct literalist readings of the end
times. In so doing, they chart an eschatological course midway between cata-
clysmic end time scenarios envisioned by Biblical fundamentalists and skep-
ticism as to end time scenarios at all, especially claims as to their imminent
occurrence, which characterizes the views of liberally minded Christians. The
texts resonate with fundamentalist readings in that they accept (though rede-
fine) the end time, posit decisive change, and perceive signs of its immanent
arrival. At the same time, the texts resonate with liberal readings in repudiat-
ing outmoded cosmologies and crass supernaturalism but affirming the ideal
of persons "being the truth" (though this also has continuities with the
Orthodox doctrine of humankind's divinization). Mediating theologies are
typically rejected by contending parties on either side and form third wave
alternatives. Perhaps the two texts' ultimate eschatological vision could appeal

to Christian liberals. However, it is questionable whether the eschaton's imminent dawning, which both texts uphold (though *The Da Vinci Code* hedges its bets), would garner widespread acceptance.

In the end, *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine Principle* are compelling because of their audaciousness. This is most evident in their efforts to deconstruct two millennia of interpretation as to the "true history of Jesus Christ." Whether or not one accepts their conclusions, the boldness of their undertaking is striking. Mainstream theology tends to be predictable, if not boring. Theologians face the unenviable task of inspiring interest in questions for which the answers are already known. Stated differently, their job is to think inside the box. From this perspective, *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine Principle* challenge the mainstream paradigm, calling upon theology to recover its vocation as a high stakes enterprise with meaningful consequences. The two texts, in effect, are saying that theology needs to be breathtaking. It also needs to be imaginative, even fun. To be sure, *The Da Vinci Code* and *Divine Principle* are not the only texts asserting this. However, they reinforce the truism that the more interesting and cutting edge theologies emerge from the periphery rather than from the center.

Notes

1. Ron Charles, "*Da Vinci Code* sets a record, inspires a genre," *Christian Science Monitor*, March 19, 2004.

2. See David Neff, "Da Vinci Dissenters: Four Books Try to Break, Crack, or Decode the Deception," *Christianity Today*, June 2004, p. 57.

3. *Divine Principle* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1977). There are various translations of the Korean *Wolli Kangron* (1966), the most recent being *Exposition of the Principle* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1996).

4. Hak Ja Han Moon. "World Peace and the Role of Women," speech delivered at Opening Convention of the Women's Federation for World Peace. Seoul, Korea, Aug. 24, 1992.

5. Sun Myung Moon, "Let Us Become Survivors," *Sermons of the Reverend Sun Myung Moon,* vol. 4 (New York: HSA Publications, 1995), p. 191.

6. Text and accompanying discussion provided by Professor Andrew Wilson, Unification Theological Seminary.

7. Sun Myung Moon, "God and Humanity Should Live Together," *Sermons of the Reverend Sun Myung Moon,* vol. 5 (New York: HSA Publications, 1995), p. 106.

8. Sun Myung Moon, "Jesus is Searching for Us in This Way," *Sermons of the Reverend Sun Myung Moon,* vol. 1 (New York: HSA Publications, 1994), p. 40.

9. See Sun Myung Moon, "In Search of the Origin of the Universe," *True Family and World Peace* (New York: FFWPU, 2000), pp. 57f.

10. Andrew Wilson, "Sexual Interpretations of the Human Fall," in *Unification*

Theology in Comparative Perspectives, ed. by Anthony Guerra (Barrytown, NY: Unification Theological Seminary, 1988), p. 63.

11. Sang Hun Lee, *Life in the Spirit World and On Earth* (New York: FFWPU, 1998), p. 34.

12. Hak Ja Han Moon, "World Peace and the Role of Women."

13. See James Barr, "Allegory and Typology," in *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Theology*, edited by Alan Richardson and John Bowden (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), pp. 11-15.

14. Barr, p. 12.

15. Wilson, "Sexual Interpretations of the Human Fall," pp. 52-62.

16. Mary Daly, *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993).

17. See www.spiritbride.com.

18. See J. Denny Weaver, *The Non-Violent Atonement* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).

19. Jaroslav Pelikan, *Jesus Through the Centuries* (New Haven: Yale, 1999).

20. See Y.O. Kim, *Unification Theology* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1980), pp. 37-42.

THE MARGINALITY OF THE CROSS

Robert M. Price

Has the significance of the cross in the New Testament has been over-rated? Can it be that, at least in significant portions of the New Testament, we have become used to reading familiar texts through the even more familiar lens of Western atonement theologies? It is hard some-times to remember that doctrines have grown from the seeds of individual verses and that, by themselves, those verses have a more modest meaning. I grant that in most of the Pauline epistles and 1 Peter we find a great, even a central, focus on the redemption wrought through the crucifixion death of Jesus. But I wonder if another look at the gospels will support a similar eval-uation of the "cruciality" of the cross there. I suspect not. It will be a ques-tion of what significance the cross has, for the sheer amount of space all the gospels devote to the Passion certainly means the event was important. But are the gospels based on a Pauline-type (or later orthodox) belief in world atonement? Not exactly. For my contention will be that the gospels place the significance of the cross in theological contexts largely alien to subsequent Christian theology.

Mark: "Rim Crater of Redemption"

Theodore J. Weeden, in one of those truly ground-breaking books in New Testament scholarship, *Mark: Traditions in Conflict*,[1] sets forth the case that Mark has taken over a then-familiar pattern of Jesus-faith that cast Jesus in the role of a divine man (*theios aner*), an inspired superman or demigod.[2] There are many such characters in the religious literature of the time, includ-

---

Dr. Robert M. Price is a visiting professor at UTS in 2005. He is Professor of Scriptural Studies at Johnnie Colemon Theological Seminary and a Fellow of the Jesus Seminar. His books include *The Widow Traditions in Luke-Acts*, *Deconstructing Jesus*, and *The Incredible Shrinking Son of Man*

ing Empedocles, Pythagoras, Apollonius of Tyana, even Moses as the Hellenistic Jews Josephus and Philo of Alexandria depict him. Connected to such a conception of Christ would have been a charismatic, triumphalistic "enthusiasm" such as that discerned in first-century Corinth by Ernst Käsemann[3] and others. For them the apocalyptic glory of the Kingdom of God was already present in the miraculous powers at work in Jesus and in Christians as they practiced supernatural arts of healing and prophecy. In the fashion of later messianic movements like that of Jacob Frank in the seventeenth century,[4] such Christians may have been libertines, regarding the prohibitions of the Torah as obsolete in an age of perfection when nothing could any longer count as sin. Martyrdom would take such Christians by surprise, and Gnostic Christians considered themselves fully entitled to engage in dissimulation[5] to avoid suffering to which they viewed themselves as superior and thus exempt in Christ.[6]

Weeden acknowledged that Mark's Jesus is still a superman, walking on water, silencing demons, feeding the multitudes with heavenly supplies. But Weeden sees Mark as periodically trying to bring the hot air balloon of such hero-cult faith safely down to earth or, to change the metaphor, to recall Icarus from his high-flying proximity to the sun before it was too late. Weeden's Mark took seriously the martyrdom facing Christians and feared, like the writer to the Hebrews, that the close approach of martyrdom would shatter superficial faith, puncture the balloon. He fears for the fair-weather believers he builds into the interpretation of the Parable of the Sower (or, as some call it, of the Soils, Mark 4:16-17). And so Weeden's Mark pauses the gospel train to glory periodically to warn the reader that the way of discipleship to Jesus is the way of suffering, the way of the cross.

The most important such pressing of the brakes occurs in the Caesarea Philippi scene of Peter's confession (Mark 8:27-38). No sooner does Peter confess his faith in Jesus as the Christ than Jesus tells him the Son of Man must soon be martyred, though he will also rise from the dead. There follows the summons to the crowd (really, to Mark's readers, since no one on the scene could have made the connection)[7] that if you are to follow Jesus, you must take up your own cross and follow him to your own Golgotha.

Mark's apocalypse (chapter 13) goes into some detail outlining the persecutions Christian readers may expect if they are faithful (verses 9-13). The storm clouds have gathered in Mark's day, and he is trying to prepare immature Christians for the storm, lest they become disillusioned by it, like a child who repudiates faith in God when his prayers for a pony go unanswered.[8] To borrow a term from Reinhold Niebuhr, Weeden's Mark was trying to sketch a Christology of "Christian Realism." But it is important to note that even on Weeden's reading, the heightened import of the cross has nothing really to do with soteriology. Rather, the cross is a model for dedicated discipleship in a

time of martyrdom.

In a sense, Weeden comes close to positing not a mere change of emphasis in Mark's retelling of the gospel tale, but to making Mark the inventor of the Passion Narrative. This is because he argues[9] in great and convincing detail that, of the New Testament evangelists, Mark and John evidence such striking parallels with Josephus' account of the arrest, interrogation, flogging, and eventual death of the Jerusalem prophet Jesus ben-Ananias (*Wars of the Jews* 6.5.3) that they simply must have known the story and even borrowed it for Jesus. Mark and John must have known of previous preaching of "Christ crucified" (such as we read in the Pauline epistles, albeit—and this is significant—with absolutely no narrative or socio-political context). But when it came time to tell a story, Mark and John borrowed one that lay ready to hand, that of "another Jesus" (2 Corinthians 11:4).

The pre-Markan version of Jesus as a divine hero would have contained some form of a trial and martyrdom, and the presence of such plot elements in no way infringes on the nature of the narrative as that of a triumphant superman who cannot be kept down. Indeed, the trial and execution of Jesus would make sense (I think most sense) as the darkness before the dawn. Just as Apollonius easily escapes the ire of Domitian (Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 8.8), so Jesus finally eludes the grasp of Pontius Pilate. Whether Jesus was originally shown surviving the cross, as several data in the gospels imply (see my *Deconstructing Jesus*)[10] or as rising from genuine death hardly matters. Even if truly dead, he is dead for only a day and a half. The Passion Narrative then, does not in itself imply a focus on the saving death of Jesus Christ. It is rather that predictable portion of a heroic saga in which the initial glory of the hero is set aside by a temporary reversal of fortune so that his final victory does not seem to come too cheap and easily.

It seems to me that we are in the presence of atonement talk only at the Last Supper, Mark 14:24, "This is my blood of the [new?] covenant, which is poured out for many" and its twin text, Mark 10:45, "For the Son of Man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." What we have here, as Loisy pointed out, is a piece of cult liturgy, not historical memory.[11] But what is the intended scope of this sacrifice? Without reviewing the whole history of the tradition, it is sufficient here to note that the language of "giving one's life as a ransom for many" is martyrdom language familiar from Hellenistic Judaism and expresses the hope that the sufferings of the persecuted righteous may avail in the eyes of God to expiate the sins of those unfaithful Jews whose laxity has caused God to send the persecution (2 Maccabees 7:38, "Through me and my brothers, may there be an end to the wrath of the Almighty that has justly fallen on our whole nation." Also 4 Maccabees 6:28-29, "Be merciful to your people, and let our punishment suffice for them. Make my blood their purification, and take my life in

exchange for theirs."). To find here a statement that Jesus means to die for the human race as a whole, and in future ages, is gratuitous. The scope of the language, which is all we have to go on, is more restricted and modest.

"Blood of the covenant" represents a midrashic attempt to understand the death of Jesus as a sacrifice performed to seal or renew a covenant between God and the Jewish people, as in Exodus 24:8. Such a theology is spelled out in great detail in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Matthew uses similar language, derived from Mark, and the whole structure of his gospel justifies it, as we will see in the next section. But in Mark, it falls like a bolt from the blue. It makes no more sense in the narrative context than does the fleeing away naked of the young man in the Garden (Mark 14:51-52). The formula seems to have been carried along by Mark since he found it present in the bit of liturgy known to him from his congregation's sacraments. But he does not bother working it into the plot or even into the teaching of Jesus as he presents it elsewhere.

Is the cross as a saving deed pivotal for Mark? Even important? Perhaps not. At most, to borrow Albert Schweitzer's metaphor for the marginality of Justification by Faith in Pauline theology,[12] the cross in Mark is at best a "rim-crater" on the literary lunar surface.

Matthew: Sanguinary Seal

Matthew's gospel, a wide-ranging expansion of Mark's, provides a theological context, if only by suggestion, in which Mark's eucharistic utterance makes sense. His Jesus elaborates: "This is my blood of the [new?] covenant, which is poured out for many for forgiveness of sins" (Matthew 26:28). We should love to know the precise significance of the added phrase "for forgiveness of sins." Does it imply something deeper, a la Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews, about the expunging of the moral failures and flaws of the contrite heart, in contrast to the apparently purely ritual expiation of ritual trespasses entailed in the Mosaic sacrifice system? If the sacrifice of the blood of Jesus is taken to inaugurate a *new* covenant, as in several manuscripts of both Matthew and Mark, would this added moral and/or psychological dimension be the relevant novelty? It might be that the purification of Gentile sinfulness (Galatians 2:15) is in view here. As Sam K. Williams argued in *Jesus' Death as Saving Event*,[13] the death of Jesus may first have taken on sacrificial coloring in the minds of Hellenistic Jewish Christians as a means whereby God might make the newly converted Gentiles (reeking of ham sandwiches and shrimp cocktails) acceptable to himself, something Jewish believers did not need, having already grown up in the covenant with its purifying taboos and sacrifices. Such a question must have engaged Matthew's attention, given his own identity as a Hellenized (trilingual) Jew committed to the niceties of

Torah, probably resident in Antioch, the hub of the Gentile Mission.

The echo we hear in Mark/Matthew of the Mosaic saying, "Behold the blood of the covenant which Yahweh has made with you in accordance with all these commandments" (Exodus 24:8) makes ample sense in Matthew because of the Matthean "new Moses" theme. As is well known, Matthew likes to depict Jesus issuing revelation atop a mountain, whence he delivers the Sermon on the Mount (Q apparently gave no location, since Luke has a Sermon on the Plain) and issues the Great Commission. He is transfigured like Moses on the mountain top, a scene borrowed from Mark, but brought into closer conformity to its Mosaic prototype by having Jesus' face (not just his clothing) glow like the sun (compare Mark 9:3; Matthew 17:2; Exodus 34:29). And if Moses was the mediator of the original Pentateuch, Matthew deems it scarcely less fitting for Jesus to be the messenger of a new one. This is why he divides (somewhat arbitrarily) the teachings of Jesus into five great sections: the Sermon on the Mount (chapters 5-7), the Mission Charge (10), the Parables (12), the Manual of Discipline (18-19), and the Denunciation of the Pharisees/Olivet Discourse (23-25). Given its inconsistently topical organization, we may feel there ought to have been a Hexateuch, dividing the last section into two, but the fact that Matthew joined the last two topics in such a forced manner only shows how determined he was for the thing to come out to five. It is to these five "books" of the teaching of Jesus that we must look for the content intended in the Great Commission: "Make disciples of all nations, teaching them to observe everything I have commanded you" (28:19-20). Furthermore, the wording of the Commission at this point again recalls that of Moses' phrase "in accordance with all these commandments" (Exodus 24:8).

In view of these Mosaic parallels, especially to Exodus 24:8, surely we are to understand Jesus' eucharistic saying in Matthew as a counterpart to the Exodus prototype, "Behold the blood of the covenant." The parallel may go even further as we will shortly see, but for the present let us note that the general trend of the parallel is to appropriate Jeremiah's theme of the post-Exilic New Covenant (Jeremiah 31:31-34), whence also the addition "for forgiveness of sins" also probably comes: "for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin I will remember no more" (Jeremiah 31:34). Thus it is a matter of indifference, at least in Matthew, whether the original text had Jesus speak of the covenant or of the *new* covenant. The point is the same.

A final Matthean parallel to the scene of Exodus 24:8 must claim our attention. To what, precisely, was Moses directing the attention of the Israelites on that fateful day when he bade them "Behold the blood of the covenant"? Back up just a little, if you please: "Then he took the book of the covenant and read it in the hearing of the people, and they said, 'All that Yahweh has spoken we will do, and we will be obedient.' So Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, and said, 'Behold the blood of the covenant, which

Yahweh has made with you in accordance with all these commandments"
(Exodus 24:7-8). These words seem to possess a familiar ring, and yet what
a surprise to realize where their counterparts occur! "Once Pilate realized he
was getting nowhere, only that a riot was brewing, he took water and washed
his hands in plain view, saying, 'I am innocent of this man's blood! See to it
yourselves!' And all the people said, 'His blood be on us and all our chil-
dren!'" (Matthew 27:24-25).

On any traditional reading, Matthew is signing the death warrant of
future generations of "Christ-killing" Jews. They have invited divine reprisal,
albeit unwittingly, as if a sincere but mistaken person should exclaim, "And
may God strike me dead if I'm wrong!" Persecutors of Jews in the name of
Jesus Christ have too often read these words and satisfied their consciences,
saying, "Well, they asked for it!" But is this Matthew's intent?

Admittedly, Matthew regarded the fall of Jerusalem as judgment for the
generation that rejected Jesus' call to share the banqueting table of his Father.
Matthew has interpolated such an unmistakable lesson (Matthew 22:6-7) into
the middle of the Great Supper parable which he had from Q (Mathew 22:2-
5,8-10; Luke 14:16-24). If he means to have the Jewish mob before Pilate
represent the people as a whole, then the reference to "all our children" at least
need denote no more than the very next generation, an adjustment required
to link the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE with the death of Jesus a generation
before.

But one dares to wonder, in light of the parallel to Exodus 24:7-8,
whether what Matthew intends here is the embrace by the Jewish people,
perhaps despite themselves, of the covenant sacrifice of Jesus, about to tran-
spire. We would then have an exact parallel to John 11:47-53, with its Balaam-
like prophecy of the saving death of Jesus: "'it is expedient for you that one
man die for the people, and that the whole nation not perish.' Now he did not
say this on his own initiative, but being high priest that year, he prophesied
that Jesus was going to die for the nation, and not for the nation only, but that
he might gather together into one the children of God who are scattered
abroad" (John 11:50-52).

If this should prove to be the real intention of Matthew, the implications
would be far-reaching indeed. But for our purposes, the point is that the
passage would complete the parallel between Exodus 24:7-8 and various
portions of Matthew, implying strongly that the evangelist intended the death
of Jesus as a saving event in the particular sense that it inaugurated a new
covenant of faithful observance of the Torah and the commandments of Jesus,
the new Moses.

We are far here from any sort of Pauline, much less traditional orthodox
soteriology. One might invoke the theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews,
which is usually located in the Pauline orbit: does it not similarly suppose that

Christ brought a new covenant, sealed in his blood? And is not the result apparently the wholesale dispensing with the ritual regulations of the Torah? Not at all. (Our task here is to expound the teaching of the gospels, not the epistles; the relevant issue is whether Hebrews casts any light on Matthew.) The sympathies of Hebrews would seem to lie more in the direction of the Dead Sea Scrolls community, given (among other things) the mention of repeated baptisms (Hebrews 10:22) and the esoteric doctrine of Melchizedek (chapter 7). It is not evident that the writer to the Hebrews envisioned believers as forsaking ritual observance. All his talk about the superannuation and obsolescence of the temple sacrifice system is better understood as a kind of theodicy for the fall of the temple in 70 CE.[14] The end of the sacrifices need not have entailed suspension of other laws, as the Javneh deliberations of Rabbinic Judaism make perfectly clear. But absolutely no doubt can remain about Matthew: he certainly believed exhaustive legal observance was incumbent upon every disciple. Matthew 5:17-19 even condemns Pauline Christians for so much as relaxing commandments, and the least important ones at that. Remember, too, that Matthew 23:23 congratulates the Pharisees for tithing garden herbs, though he faults them for neglecting weightier issues (unlike the Q original, preserved for us only in Marcion's text, where Luke 11:42 lacks "without neglecting the others").

Is the cross central to this plan of salvation? Hardly. One senses that Matthew would have been quite satisfied with a Jesus who died at a ripe old age, like his brother Simon bar-Cleophas, like Jochanan ben-Zakkai, and like Moses, at 120 years. Matthew can make a place for the cross, as inaugurating the New Covenant, but this is just because he finds the fact of Jesus' death unavoidable. The Dead Sea Scrolls sect lived the life of the New Covenant, too, but they did it without any doctrine of human sacrifice. (Indeed, Robert Eisenman suggests[15] that the Markan/Matthean "new covenant in my blood" is a pun on and derivative from the Qumran term "new covenant of Damascus," since the Hebrew for "blood" is *dam*, while "cup" is *chos*. Paul and others, initially part of the Dead Sea Scrolls community and partakers of their communal "messianic" meals, Eisenman postulates, carried the idea of the supper (and even the original Hebrew phraseology for it) with them when they apostatized from the Torah-zealous movement and preached a law-free gospel to Gentiles instead. The "Covenant of Damascus" thus became the "covenant of the blood cup," assimilating the rite to the Mystery Cult sacraments with which the Gentile converts were already familiar. Thus the connection with the death of a divine savior, Jesus, would represent a secondary understanding of the ritual.

Luke: Mission and Omission

The Third Evangelist's antipathy for cross-based soteriology is well known, if not entirely understood. It is not that he denies the reality of the crucifixion in the manner of Christian Docetists, Basilides, or the Koran (4:156-159). No, it is just that, for Luke, the cross is important in a secondary sense. While not a sufficient condition for salvation as it is for Paul, it is a necessary condition. That is, while the cross is not the thing that saves believers, it forms a necessary hurdle for him who would be Christ. This is the thrust of the scripture survey the Unknown Christ imparts to his Emmaus disciples on the road: "Was it not required of the Christ to suffer these trials, and only then to enter into his splendor?" (Luke 24:26). They had entertained the vain hope (as they came to view it) that Jesus might be the one to "redeem" (i.e., to liberate) Israel. But, they concluded, Jesus' terrible fate disqualified him. Back to the drawing board. Next time maybe Menachem the Zealot. But no. Jesus tells them they had it all wrong: the crucifixion was predicted. It was on the true messiah's agenda. Thus any candidate who shunned the cross could never qualify! Thus the crucified Jesus deserves a second look.

It is a brilliant *tour de force*, albeit a manifest case of transforming necessity into virtue. At any rate, we are not surprised to read this much. What may surprise us is the utter lack, here or anywhere else in Luke-Acts, of any mention of the saving virtue of the cross. When Jesus teleports back to Jerusalem (thoughtlessly leaving the Emmaus pair to hoof it under their own steam), he reasons similarly with the eleven: "Scripture stipulates that the Christ must needs suffer and, on the third day following, return from the dead, and that [a message of] repentance and forgiveness should be preached in [association with] his name to all nations, radiating outward from Jerusalem" (Luke 24:46-47). What is "missing" from this scenario? Any link between the death of Jesus and the efficacy of repentance for forgiveness. True, if Jesus had not died, repentance would not be preached in his name. If Christ had not died, our faith should be in vain. But there is not a word of his death enabling or effecting our salvation.

The same tendency can be seen in the apostolic speeches (all Luke's work, if that even needs to be asserted anymore). In Peter's Pentecost sermon we learn of a startling reversal: "this Jesus, delivered by the fixed plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified and killed by the hands of unwashed pagans. But God raised him up" (Acts 2:23-24a). Whence salvation? That is another matter. It stems from Jesus' exaltation to heaven: "having received from the Father the promise [of Joel] that he would dispense the Holy Spirit, he has poured out [the signs] that you see and hear" (Acts 2:33a). "Repent and be baptized, each one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38).

Again, one looks in vain for any link between the death of Jesus (itself no mistake, but a predestined milestone) and the salvation of believers. We read only that Jesus is the name which makes baptism effective and entitles one to the reception of the Spirit.

Peter proclaims both the death of Jesus (with its dramatic reversal and foreordination, 3:13-15; 18-19) and the salvation available through his name (Acts 3:16), but the one remains unconnected with the other save as successive events in the same story. The same situation obtains in Acts 5:30-31: Jews killed Jesus, God raised him up, he gives repentance and forgiveness to Israel, no connection. The import of Philip's coaching of the Ethiopian eunuch had naught to do with the salvation wrought by the old rugged cross; rather, the point again is that the Christ had to suffer as (Deutero-)Isaiah had laid down (Acts 8:34: "Sir, of whom does the prophet predicate these things? Himself? Or someone else?") To Cornelius Peter explains how God reversed the seeming triumph of Jesus' foes (Acts 10:39-40) and how "every one who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name" (10:43), but he does not intimate that the death makes that forgiveness possible. Acts 13:27-30 has Paul reiterate the secret plan for Jesus' death and the unwitting cooperation of Jesus' enemies, an act of murder that God reversed. And he goes on to say that (13:38-39) forgiveness and freedom are to be had through him. Not through his death, though.

The single possible exception to the otherwise consistent trend is Acts 20:28, a reference to "the church of God which he obtained with his own blood" or, as other manuscripts have it, "the church of the Lord [or, "of the Lord and God"], which he obtained with his own blood" (or, as others read, "with the blood of his own [Son])."[16] Textual uncertainly of this kind often marks interpolation, even scribal harmonization of different interpolations. It appears that someone has sought to import into Luke's text some of the "butcher shop religion" (Harry Emerson Fosdick) that Luke sought so fastidiously to avoid.

Evangelistic tracts often diagram the gospel, representing the sinner on one lip of a great chasm with heaven on the far side and hell yawning in between. He is enabled to cross over only when, in the next frame, the horizontal beam of Jesus' cross forms a bridge over the abyss. Such a diagram does not fit Luke's understanding of salvation, where the cross is not the bridge. A Lukan tract would show a series of huge block letters spelling out the name "Jesus" as a bridge across the ravine.

We saw that Matthew retained the two scant Markan references to Jesus' coming death as a ransom for many, supplying a more elaborate theological context, that of the new covenant and its sealing in sacrificial blood. Luke does just the opposite: he cuts them both! Where Mark had Jesus say, "the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for

many" (10:45), Luke has, "which is the greater personage, the one who reclines at table? Or the one who serves? Surely, it is the one who reclines, no? And yet I conduct myself among you as one who serves" (Luke 22:27). Conspicuously absent are both the Son of Man references (given the context, a simple mark of self-abnegating humility anyway) and the business about him dying, much less as a ransom.

Some suggest that Luke preferred a parallel tradition (another version of the saying) to Mark's, others that Luke just rewrote Mark. The only difference between the two opinions is that the former opens the possibility that Mark had added either or both the ransom and the Son of Man phrases to a prior, simpler tradition, represented by Luke, to which Luke had independent access. Only it is hard to see why Mark would have changed it, since at least the ransom notion is so comparatively unimportant for him, as we have seen. In either case, Luke, who knew Mark, did not want to carry over Mark's reference to Jesus' death as a ransom.

The same tendency is at work in Luke's treatment of the Last Supper, where Luke has trimmed, really truncated, Mark's Words of Institution. Mark had, "And as they were eating, he took bread and blessed and broke it and gave it to them, saying, 'Take it—this is my body.' And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said to them, 'This is my blood of the [new?] covenant, which is poured out for many. Amen: I tell you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it anew in the kingdom of God.'" (Mark 14:22-25). Luke's version looks rather different: "'I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I tell you I will not eat it [again?] until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.' And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, 'Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I tell you that henceforth I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it anew in the kingdom of God.' And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them, saying, 'This is my body'" (Luke 22:15-19a). This must be the original text, contra the efforts of Joachim Jeremias [17] and others who prefer those manuscripts that continue thusly: "'which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.' And the same with the cup after supper, saying, 'This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood'" (22:19b-20). The Lukan original is abrupt enough, but the attempt to bring it closer to Mark, Matthew, and 1 Corinthians 11:24-26 is so clumsy that the interpolator does not even mind adding a second eucharistic cup just to fit everything in!

We see, then, that Luke has taken the knife to Mark's text again, aiming to remove any impression that the bread and wine have anything to do with a redemptive sacrifice.

John: Banner Held Aloft

On our topic, as with some others, the Gospel of John seems conflicted, pointing in two directions. It would be no surprise if the cause were simply the evangelist's own lack of closure, a failure to think systematically. But, given the patterns that seem to form, it appears more likely to me that our present text of John is the result of a late harmonization of the recensions cherished and redacted by two competing Johannine factions: the Gnosticizing group condemned in 1 and 2 John and the Catholicizing group who condemned them as false offshoots. My guess is that each had its version of the gospel, and that later scribes, perhaps oblivious of the obsolete debate, decided to combine readings from both versions, thinking in that way not to risk losing any of the precious text. It seems to me that the vast majority of Johannine salvation texts understand Jesus as the Gnostic Revealer come to earth to break the silence of eternity, which not even the imposter Moses was able to penetrate (John 1:17; 10:8). He gives authority to become God's children only to those who believe in him and his word. Without his light, one walks forever in darkness. Without his water, one thirsts with the thirst of Tantalus. Without his resurrection, one remains among the hordes of living dead.

On the other hand, there are a few passages which seem to approximate something like Pauline soteriology, though without spelling it out. Let us briefly survey them. First, John the Baptist speaks with the voice of the evangelist when he calls Jesus "the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" (John 1:29). That imagery, though succinct, certainly seems to posit Jesus dying as an atoning sacrifice. Raymond E. Brown posited an earlier meaning of the phrase, though, one which had no sacrificial slant. Brown thought the evangelist might be employing a traditional saying of John the Baptist which prophesied the advent of a warrior messiah along the lines of the messianic Ram of 1 Enoch 90:38. For such a one to "take away the sins of the world" need denote no more than his conquering the reign of sin by vanquishing the wicked.[18] Brown does not think that the evangelist had this in mind, but rather that he was reinterpreting such a traditional Johannine oracle in the framework of Christian soteriology. I think Brown's guess is probably correct; still, while we are reopening the question of precisely what sort of soteriology John's Gospel may feature, perhaps we ought to hold open the possibility that John the evangelist intended the meaning Brown ascribes only to John the Baptist. The well-known "realized eschatology" of the Fourth Gospel need not militate against this possibility, since the evangelist would simply be understood as applying one more traditional messianic designation, albeit in a demythologized way.

And though the echo is fainter, we catch a Pauline note in John 3:16, that "God... gave his only-begotten Son" so we might "have eternal life." And yet

the Son is not said to be "delivered up" or "handed over" to *death*. The Father's gift of the Son might simply refer to his sending him as a revelation.

Twice the Johannine Jesus speaks of "being lifted up," presumably on the cross. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whoever believes in him may have eternal life" (John 3:14-15). "'I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself.' He said this to specify the mode of his death" (John 12:32-33). Interestingly, without the narrator's comment, we might very well understand the "lifting up from earth" to refer to the ascension (John 6:62; 20:17), as in a larger sense it does seem to do, as if the cross is a stairway to heaven, the means or the beginning of the ascension (John 17:1-5, where the impending arrest is said to mark Jesus' return to his Father's side in heavenly glory). In any case, this elevation of Jesus like Moses' apotropaic caduceus in Numbers 21:9 serves to make Jesus visible, figuratively, to the crowds who only need believe in him to be saved. There is nothing here of a blood sacrifice.

Thrice Jesus speaks of laying down or giving up his life or flesh for the sake of others. "The bread which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh" (John 6:51). This verse occurs in the midst of a sacramental section added by the Ecclesiastical (or Catholicizing) Redactor, as Loisy and Bultmann clearly saw.[19]

"I lay down my life for the sheep" (John 10:15b). Here is a reference, reminiscent of both Calvinism and Gnosticism, whereby Jesus' saving death avails only for his predestined elect, no one else, though the sentence may merely be telescoping intention with result: Jesus dies to save, and those who heed him are saved by that death.

"This is my commandment: that you love one another as I have loved you. No one has greater love than this, that he should lay down his life for his friends" (John 15:12-13). Yet Paul could think of a greater: "Why, it is rare for one to die for a righteous man, though it is conceivable that someone might. But God shows his love for us in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us" (Romans 5:7-8). That is not necessarily what the Johannine Jesus is doing. His "friends" implies they are already identified as his in some important manner, suggesting the Gnosticism which this gospel is otherwise so frequently redolent.

We see, then, that the first passage, part of a Catholicizing interpolation, may be discounted, and the second and third seem to tend in a Gnostic direction in that the focus is on the elect, who in a sense are already saved by nature. We may be seeing the first steps from a Gnostic soteriology of receiving the word of the extra-cosmic Revealer, toward a more Catholic notion of the sacrifice of the Redeemer of the cosmos. Whether this transformation is occurring in the mind of the evangelist or in the process of textual interpolation and harmonization is impossible to say.

Conclusion

Why do we find merely the hints and intimations of a doctrine of salvation by the crucifixion of Jesus in the gospels? There is nothing in them like the exposition of Paul on the subject. Granted, the very character of the gospels as narratives is going to limit the amount of exposition on any topic, but there remains much teaching in their pages, and that teaching bears little resemblance to that of the Pauline epistles. But perhaps the question of genre does hold the key. As Helmut Koester suggested some years ago,[20] the very nature of a hero biography or hagiography implies a certain kind of faith among those by and for whom it is written. Among such Christians there was a great interest in Jesus as a hero to admire and to emulate. The gospels are largely aretalogies (though Mark, followed by Matthew, Luke, and John, decided to combine that narrative form with the teaching materials which, circulating at first by themselves in non-narrative collections like Q and the Gospel of Thomas, presupposed a more disembodied faith in a sage and his words, a "talking head"). In the epistles, by contrast, the plot and action are replaced by the flow and development of argument. Ideas and doctrines take the place of characters and locales. And I suggest that the conception of Jesus' death as a saving event fits more naturally into the epistles' world of ideas than into the gospels' world of events. So the death of Jesus winds up meaning something very different in the one genre than in the other. Salvation by the cross seems to be central to the epistles, but marginal in the gospels.

I do not mean to say that it *only seems*, in reading the gospels, that there is a lighter emphasis being placed upon the redemption of the cross, whereas in fact the evangelists must also have believed in something like Pauline soteriology. No, to the contrary, we have absolutely no right to assume that all early Christians held unanimously to the same creed. That is the fantasy of apologetical harmonists. We have no right to ascribe any belief to the writer of a document that is not set forth in its pages. Granted, one might yet believe something even if one had no occasion to write it down, but in the case of "gospels," accounts of the Good News of Salvation, we must assume the writers were putting down in black and white what they thought essential to that salvific message. So if a gospel lacks one version of soteriology, we can rightly infer that its author did not believe in it. If the historical fact was otherwise, we have no way of knowing it. Certainly wishful thinking is no adequate reason. No, I mean rather to say that various versions of Christian soteriology evolved in the course of early Christian preaching, exhorting, and evangelism, along the lines of different media, oral and written. And we may discern how, during that propagation, genre considerations led to very different theologies of salvation. A "Gospel Christian" held a different sort of faith than an "Epistle Christian" did. Not all whose faith was nourished by admonitory epistles

necessarily read much in the way of cross-soteriology (good luck finding it in James, Jude, or the Thessalonians!).

Beyond the question of implicit genre trajectories, we have to account for the fact that the developed gospels we possess in the canon are by no means shy of Christological teaching, implicit and explicit. So had their authors wished to propagate something like Pauline soteriology, there was nothing stopping them. Why didn't they do it? All we can say (though it may be enough) is that the evangelists' rather different depictions of the death of Jesus and its importance show no anxiety about departing from a Pauline norm, implying that there was no such norm to reject or modify. Luke's treatment seems to be as close to this as we come, since admittedly it does seem to avoid, and not merely to be innocent of, relevant Markan materials. Whether or not Mark intended such texts as Luke bypasses to be hints of a cross-soteriology we cannot say, but Luke apparently took them as such and rejected them. Even here what we are seeing is a period of Christianity in theological flux. The Pauline option, which seems to undergird eventual Western Catholic soteriology, is but one voice in the early Christian canon, and it had its work cut out for it shouldering aside Gnostic, *theios aner*, nomistic covenant sealing, and other understandings of the cross. Once we know this, our own theologies, even if we fancy ourselves still to be Biblicists in some manner, must partake of the same freedom of interpretation. Theological experimentation on the cross has never really ceased, as witness the theories of Francis Turretin, Hosea Ballou, Karl Barth, Donald M. Baillie, Charles Fillmore, and the Reverend Sun Myung Moon. And there is no reason that they should.

Notes

1.   Theodore J. Weeden, *Mark: Traditions in Conflict* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), Chapter II, "The Christological Conflict," pp. 52-69.
2.   Gail Anne Paterson, "The Divine Man in Hellenistic Popular Religion." A Ph.D. dissertation for Drew University, 1983 (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1996). Clyde Weber Votaw, *The Gospels and Contemporary Biographies in the Greco-Roman World*, Facet Books Biblical Series 27 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970). Charles H. Talbert, *What Is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977).
3.   Ernst Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today,* trans. W.J. Montague (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), Chapter V, "On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic," section 2, pp. 124-27.
4.   Gershom G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (NY: Schocken Books, 1973), Eighth Lecture: "Sabbatianism and Mystical Heresy," pp. 287-324. Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*

(NY: Schocken Books, 1971), Lecture Four: "Redemption Through Sin," trans. Hillel Halkin, pp. 78-141. Arthur Mandel, *The Militant Messiah, or The Flight from the Ghetto: The Story of Jacob Frank and the Frankist Movement* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1979).

5.   Or as some have called it, "heavenly deception"; see Frederick Sontag, *Sun Myung Moon and the Unification Church* (NY: Abingdon Press, 1977), pp. 184-187.

6.   Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Gospels* (NY: Random House, 1979), Chapter 4, "The Passion of Christ and Persecution of Christians," pp. 70-101. Sami Nasib Makarem explains the same practice of holy dissimulation among the Druze sect in *The Druze Faith* (Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1974), pp. 100-101.

7.   Robert M. Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), pp. 76-77.

8.   Gordon W. Allport, *The Individual and his Religion* (NY: Macmillan, 1950, 1974): "The child who finds his personal advantage not immediately and satisfactorily served by his prayers may discard his conceptions and terminate once and for all his religious quest. Sometimes the issue comes to a head only later in life, in conjunction with acute personal need. 'Prayer does not stop bullets,' was the refrain of many [WW2] veterans; 'they perforate both devout and infidel.' ... A faith centered in self-advantage is bound to break up" (p. 120).

9.   Theodore J. Weeden, "Two Jesuses," a paper delivered to the Jesus Seminar of the Westar Institute, Fall, 2003.

10. Robert M. Price, *Deconstructing Jesus* (Amherst: Prometheus Books, 2000), pp. 221-24.

11. Alfred Loisy, *The Birth of the Christian Religion*, trans. L.P. Jacks (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1948), p.249.

12. Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle,* trans. William Montgomery (NY: Seabury Press, 1968), p. 225. Montgomery renders the phrase "subsidiary crater," which loses Schweitzer's typically striking visual imagery.

13. Sam K. Williams, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept,* Harvard Dissertations in Religion 2 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975).

14. John C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1961), pp. 83-93.

15. Robert Eisenman, "Qumran's 'New Covenant in the Land of Damascus' and the New Testament's 'Cup of the New Covenant in (His) Blood'" *Journal of Higher Criticism* 10/1 (Spring 2003): 121-36.

16. Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 87-88. Ehrman holds for "the church of God which he obtained with the blood of his own [Son]," but I think the original was simply, "the church of God."

17. Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. Arnold Ehrhardt (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 87-106.

18.   Raymond E. Brown, "John the Baptist in the Gospel of John," in Brown, *New Testament Essays* (Garden City: Doubleday Image, 1968), pp. 179-181.
19.   Loisy, *Birth of the Christian Religion*, p. 243. Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G.W. Beasley-Murray, R.W.N. Hoare, and J.K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975), p. 219.
20.   Helmut Koester, "GNOMAI DIAPHOROI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity," in James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 151-153.

"THEY SHALL BE ONE FLESH":
FULFILLING THE IDEAL OF CREATION
THROUGH THE FAMILY

Robert S. Kittel

Social scientists are asking theologians to help them. In their own words, they want religious leaders to "work out a fuller theology of marriage."[1] There are two basic reasons for this unusual phenomenon. First, there is "a mountain of scientific evidence"[2] in "published literature over the past few decades,"[3] that documents the value of marriage and family. The data supporting the personal and social benefits of marital unions is overwhelming and indisputable. Second, sociologists know the religious voice, which sets social norms and moral standards, is too important and too powerful a social force to be sidelined or silenced.

Maggie Gallagher, in a paper delivered at the Interreligious and International Federation for World Peace [IIFWP] *Assembly 2000* titled "The Moral and Social Significance of Marriage in the Global Context," could hardly have stated it any stronger when she said that there is "powerful [cross-cultural] evidence, not just that marriage is important to society, but that human beings are in some basic sense made to be married."[4] In his book, *Why Marriage Matters: Reasons to Believe in Marriage in Postmodern Society,* author Glenn Stanton concurs by noting, "All the data presented in this book points to one conclusion: Lifelong, monogamous marriage matters, and matters deeply, in the lives of adults, children, and societies."[5]

In a major statement by 13 prominent sociologists, researchers, marriage

Dr. Robert S. Kittel is Director of the IIFWP Office of Peace Education. His publications include: "Uganda's Success Can Be Replicated: Cooperation Between Government and Faith-Based Organizations in the Fight Against AIDS" and "CLUE 2000," the first character-based abstinence education curriculum for adolescents exclusively aligned with the eight-point Federal guidelines. He has been a visiting professor at the Unification Theological Seminary and received his doctorate in education from the University of Bridgeport, Conn.

counselors, and family-life educators,[6] data was compared in five areas: 1) the family, 2) economics, 3) physical health and longevity, 4) mental health and emotional well-being, and 5) crime and domestic violence. In unanimity they too agreed, "Our fundamental conclusion: Marriage is an important social good, associated with an impressively broad array of positive outcomes for children and adults alike."[7]

The data is unarguable: marriage is so valuable that social scientists cannot remain silent as this most basic institution is debated and devalued. This is why they are pushing their theological kin to weigh in loud and clear in the debate on marriage. This clarion call is not only because of the numerous, positive benefits that are derived from successful families, but also because of the documented damage resulting from families that fracture or fail to form. Stanton acknowledged that sociologists

> understand the comprehensive negative consequences of marital breakdown and what it does to those involved [and this] is why [they] must rage against this cultural trend away from marriage. *It is bad, not because it fails to live up to some nostalgic ideal, but because it hurts people.* [Italics original][8]

Hence, sociologists have the scientific evidence to say, with unquestionable certainty, that marriage plays a significant role in personal development, social stability, economic prosperity, and national civility. They, therefore, stand on solid ground in soliciting theologians to come up with a complementary religious framework that unequivocally supports society's most fundamental institutions.

A Double Message

Within the New Testament, there are two different standards on marriage and sexuality. One is pro-marriage; the other pro-celibacy. The letter to the Hebrews unhesitatingly supports marriage.

> Let marriage be held in honor among all, and let the marriage be undefiled; for God will judge the immoral and adulterous. (Heb. 13:4)

On the other hand, in Paul's letter to the Corinthians celibacy is held in higher esteem than marriage. Marriage almost appears to be an opt-out for the weak.

> He who marries his betrothed does well; and he who refrains from marriage will do better… For it is better to marry than to be aflame with passion. (I Cor. 7:38, 9)

A mixed message can be a problem, in the religious realm as in any field. Andrew Tanenbaum in his book, *Computer Networks*, points out "competing standards become a source of confusion, division, obsolescence, and duplication of effort instead of an enhancement to usefulness."[9]

The philosophical argument behind America's debate over sex education in public schooling likewise revolves on the issue of an apparent mixed message: Is the message of abstinence until marriage diluted if teens are also taught the proper use of condoms as a safety net? In other words, does a mixed message—stay abstinent and learn to use a condom—influence a teenager's commitment to sexual purity? In, *The Effectiveness of Abstinence Education Programs in Reducing Sexual Activity Among Youth,* Robert Rector of The Heritage Foundation states categorically that a mixed or double message, "substantially weakens an admonition against early non-marital sexual activity."[10]

Likewise, does the theological double message—honor marriage, but it is better to be celibate—weaken the canonical commitment to marriage? Apparently sociologists think so.

The Original Paradigm

How can theologians speak candidly in support of the institution of marriage? How should they "work out a fuller theology of marriage"? Stanton points us in the right direction by acknowledging the origin of the problem. "Our [ability to] love is sure to be imperfect because we, as lovers living in the fallen shadow of humanity's original parents, are imperfect."[11] Let's start there— with our first human ancestors.

In the Garden of Eden, our Creator laid out three broad goals. Genesis 1:28 states that God blessed Adam and Eve, directing them to: 1) be fruitful, 2) multiply, and 3) have dominion over creation. God also gave our first human ancestors very specific objectives and a methodology for accomplishing these ideals.

> Therefore, shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh. (Gen. 2:24)

This particular verse can be compared to the objectives in the mission statement of a business enterprise. They are specific and measurable; they drive the clarity of vision, the depth of thinking, and the details of a strategic plan. Steven Covey says in the *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* that a successful person begins with the end in mind. God wanted Adam and Eve to be successful, so He gave them the final goal first. There are three reasons for positing that Genesis 2:24 is a heavenly axiom outlining God's method for

achieving His purpose of creation.

First, this verse appears *before* the fall of man. The fall occurs in the third chapter of Genesis; this heavenly axiom is in chapter two. Theologically, Genesis 2 is also called the second creation story, complementing Genesis 1 which chronicles the six days of creation and concludes with God making man in his image, male and female. (Gen. 1:27) Genesis 2, on the other hand, provides another story of creation, beginning in verse 4: "This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created." Here God created man from the dust of the ground, breathed into him His spirit, and man became a living being. (Gen 2:7) Eve was created to stand side-by-side with Adam because it was not good that he be alone. (Gen. 2:8) The point is that Genesis 2:24 is part of the second chapter of Genesis and therefore part of what is called the second creation narrative. It is not part of the fall.

Examining the next verse, Genesis 2:25, lends further strength to this argument. This is the very last verse in the second chapter of Genesis and, in essence, builds a firewall between the ideals of creation set out in the first and second chapters of Genesis and the tragedy of the fall described in chapter 3. The verse reads, "And the man and his wife were both naked, and were not ashamed." Clearly, Adam and Eve were in their original, pre-fallen state.

The second rationale supporting Genesis 2:24 as a heavenly axiom is drawn from the fact that it is one of the most repeated verses in the Bible. This verse is repeated, nearly verbatim, four times: first in the Old Testament (Gen. 2:24), twice by Jesus in the Gospels (Matt. 19:5 and Mark 10:7-8), and once in St. Paul's letter to the Ephesians (5:31). It is also referenced in two other places: in Malachi 2:15 (Old Testament) and in I Corinthians 6:16 (New Testament). Why, then, is this verse referred to a half dozen times?

This question can be answered by asking an easier question, "Why do parents repeat themselves?" After all, God's heart and love is that of a parent. Anyone who has raised children knows the need for repetition. Parents repeat themselves for two reasons. First, their children did not understand or hear what they were told the first time it was said. Second, parents repeat themselves because what they said was important. If a child gets it the first time, then there is no need for it being repeated. Also, if it was not really important then it would not need repeating, even if the child didn't get it. So God repeated the content of Gen. 2:24 four times and referenced it another two times, making it one of the most frequently repeated verses, because: 1) we did not get it, and 2) it is important. How important? It is directly related to the original purpose of creation—the reason God created us.

Third, Genesis 2:24 outlines the final goal of Adam and Eve because it is part of the original packaging, so to speak. Any potentially dangerous appliance comes with both warning labels—usually printed in red—and an instruction manual. God our Maker and our Creator, cautioned Adam and Eve

adequately and gave them detailed directions.

In the case of Adam and Eve, the warning labels are found in Genesis 2:17, which reads, "but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die." The Divine Principle teaches that this verse is a warning not to misuse love.[12] Like any warning label, the language is terse, prohibitive (i.e., "Do not..."), and precedes more detailed instructions.

Following the prohibitions (i.e., the don'ts), God gave the instruction manual (the dos). Its language is instructive, more detailed, and affirmative. The instruction manual— Gen. 2:24— has three parts to it, namely:

a)   Leave your father and mother

b)   Cleave to your wife (spouse), and

c)   They (the two) shall become one flesh

Genesis 2:17—the warning, and 2:24—the instruction manual, complement each other. They were given to our first ancestors not only to prevent their fall, but also to guide their growth to maturity. This is relevant here because if Adam and Eve had heeded God's warnings and followed His instructions, then the fall would have never occurred. God never wanted the fall to happen. Never.

In review, the three reasons Genesis 2:24 describes God's original ideal for Adam and Eve are: 1) it appears before and is therefore unrelated to the fall, 2) it is one of the most repeated Bible verses, and 3) it complements God's warning found in Gen. 2:17 indicating that God never intended for His children to fall. With this sense of importance and urgency, let's explore the meaning behind Gen. 2:24, examining each of the three parts separately.

1) Leave Your Father and Mother

This is the first part, Gen. 2:24a. To "leave your father and mother" means, implicitly, you must be living with them. You cannot leave your parents if you are not already living with them. So why did God want us to grow up living together in families?

The sociological data leaves no doubt that stable families add value to the lives of individuals (both parents and children) as well as to the larger society. Children from intact families do better in school, are less likely to engage in delinquent or criminal behavior, and more likely to be productive, contributing members of society.[13] The converse is also true: children fare poorly without the loving environment of a family. Stanton puts it in crude broad strokes, and the statistical evidence supports his generalization that "while boys without fathers [more likely] turn to guns and crime, girls without fathers seem to turn to having babies."[14] Other studies support this and acknowledge the

importance of marriage to parenting:

> Two adult parents are more likely to remain together and raise their children if the adults are married... Marriage continues to benefit the participating adults (better health, higher measures of socio-economic status, etc.), but also protects adolescents from sexual activity and its associated risks.[15]

But the focus of this paper is not sociological, it is theological. So what is the theological justification for growing up within a family?

The loving two-parent family is, in many ways, like a womb. Both protect and nourish; both are temporary residences where the child, or fetus, prepares for life outside that special incubator-like environment. The analogy between the womb of a mother and the love of parents can also be understood in the selection of words. The Bible uses the language of childbirth, saying we are to "leave" our father and mother. It helps to understand this using the analogy of when a baby leaves its mother's womb. At the time of birth two things occur: a physical relocation and a metamorphosis. The fetus moves outside the uterus (a relocation) and at the same time is transformed to a newborn baby that must now live and breathe on its own. In the birthing process, the relocation does not sever the relationship between the mother and child, their bond actually grows deeper. In other words, leaving is more metamorphic than residential.

Therefore, when the Bible says that a child leaves his parents, like childbirth, it is speaking primarily about a transformation, not a new address and phone number. Leaving, in this sense, means a change in position from that of son or daughter to that of a husband or wife. Traditionally a child leaves home at the time of marriage, and through taking on new marital responsibilities he or she is also transformed. The conjugal relationship is a powerful force that reshapes men and women into husbands and wives, and their union is the anchor of a loving marriage. Sociologist Linda Waite from the University of Chicago put it this way, "It's the role of husband—not boyfriend or father—which seems to be key: Having children by itself does not work the same transformation [as marriage] in men's lives."[16]

Marriage, therefore, is the birth of a new family. And like childbirth, it is in many ways a life-and-death situation, thus drawing the support of the entire family together. Additionally, just as the bond between the mother and child deepens after the fetus leaves the womb, allowing the father to be directly involved in the care of the newborn for the first time, so too the parent-child relationship grows when children leave home. Parents play a primary role in helping support and stabilize the new marital union. And as everyone knows, they have a vested interest in the success of the newlyweds as they await with great anticipation the coming of grandchildren.

The heart of parents acts like a *womb of love*; it not only nurtures children, it also protects them. An article in the *American Educator* magazine discussed the protective nature of the father-daughter relationship. In a research project that studied 253 Baltimore girls it was noted that 25 percent surveyed had a child before they were 19 years old, but *"not one* who had a good relationship with a live-in father had a baby" (italics original).[17] An absentee father was a destabilizing factor, especially in the lives of young girls, because those with "close relationships with a *residential* father or long-term stepfather simply did not follow the teenage mommy track" (italics original).[17] The report emphasized the residential aspect, since "a close relationship with a father not living at home did not help."[19]

The love of a father protects his daughter for two reasons. First, the child is loved. Therefore, she is not starving for masculine attention and, consequently, vulnerable. Secondly, she has a litmus test, a clear standard. If a boy tries to sweet talk her, saying, "I love you," she'll know what that means. She can ask, "When you use this word 'love,' I know what it means. My father married my mother and is committed to make their marriage work. Is that what you mean when you use the 'L' word?"

Research by Linda Waite and Maggie Gallagher warns that the trendy myth, i.e., that there are no consequences if young people live together outside the bonds of marriage, misses the mark. "Cohabitation," say the co-authors of *The Case for Marriage*, "not only deprives people of the benefits of marriage now, but it makes it at least somewhat less likely they will achieve a successful marriage in the future."[20]

There is another interesting aside to the analogy of the family as the womb of love. While intrauterine, the fetus grows physically preparing to breathe and live on its own at birth. It does not actually breathe on its own until birth, even though it is fully prepared and capable. In the womb of our mothers, our bodies grow physically; inside the womb of our parents' love we are growing spiritually, specifically we are developing our ability to love. Accordingly, just as the first breath is taken only upon birth, so too the first conjugal love should be experienced only after we *leave our father and mother*, i.e., at the time of marriage. Justifying pre-marital sex as a trial run to make sure everything works, is like saying a fetus should try breathing inside the womb to be sure the lungs work properly.

How then does a child develop the ability to love without actually experiencing love? To answer this question, it is first necessary to realize that there are four fundamental expressions, or spheres, of love. They are: filial piety (children to parents), sibling love (brother and sister), conjugal love or fidelity (husband and wife), and parental love (parents to children). The family is where all of these loves are most easily and naturally learned and most fully experienced. Additionally, being raised in a family is vital because this

is where the standard for the proper use of human sexuality is established, meaning, sex is only between a husband and wife (not between parents and children, nor between brothers and sisters).

Of the four spheres of love there are two broad categories: social (public) love and sexual (private) love. Social love consists of parental love, sibling love and filial piety. These three form the basis for all interpersonal relationships in society. For example, we should love older people as our own parents or grandparents. We should treat people of the same age as we would our own brothers and sisters. And we should love those younger than us as younger siblings.

Sexual love, in contrast, does not form part of the spectrum of social relationships. In other words, sexual intercourse is not a form of social love. Human sexuality should be reserved for marriage because it is the means by which a couple forms a unique love that has the potential of bonding them together in the image of God, as will be explained more fully later. The marital union, therefore, is not only were sex is safe, but also sacred.

So, yes, children need to experience love and learn how to love prior to marriage. But the fundamental dynamics of love—receiving, giving and sharing—are learned within familial relationships, the social loves. Through the love *from* their parents, children can learn the unconditional nature of love and how to receive love; through the love *for* their parents they can learn the selfless giving of love; and through brotherly and sisterly relationships they learn sharing love. In addition, through the example of their parents, children learn the intimate and private nature of the conjugal relationship.

In summary, to *leave your father and mother* is a birthing process—the birth of a new family. The newly married couples form another link in the chain of an ancestral lineage. This would create a family tree—or what Terry Hargrave calls "a braided cord"[21] of interconnected generations. Not only interrelated through shared genetic traits, such families are interconnected through legacies of love inherited from their ancestors and bequeathed to future generations. If there had been no fall, this lineage of love would weave back through time, all the way back to our original human ancestors, Adam and Eve, and even to God.

When Adam and Eve fell, the consequences went far beyond breaking their own individual relationship with God, or even the tragedies in their immediate family. It meant that every person born from this Adamic lineage would inherit a defective standard of love. This is why the Bible teaches, "For as in Adam all die..." (I Cor. 15:22)

It is here that we begin to see Adam and Eve's unique situation as the original parents of humankind. Their position was critical because the family is the *womb of love*, and Adam and Eve were to set the prototypes of the four spheres of love. In terms of lineage-building, our first human ancestors should

have been the anchor, or first link in the chain of lineage, connecting us to God. Seen from this perspective, setting the right tradition of love was imperative. In I John 4:8 we read, "Whoever does not love, does not know God, because God is love." God wanted us to love one another so we could experience love in our families and societies, and with this heart and conscience more easily come to know Him. We were created to live in loving families because this is the most natural environment to learn to love and, as a result, the best foundation to know the loving heart of God.

In a word, *leaving your father and mother* means the continuity of the lineage and legacy of true love.

2) Cleave to Your Wife (Spouse)

Next, what does the second part of Gen. 2:24 mean? The word "cleave" is an old English word, meaning to hold fast, to be unwavering. The example that comes to mind is 6-year-old Elian Gonzales cleaving to an inner tube for nearly three days while floating alone in the Gulf of Mexico after the boat of Cuban refugees that he and his mother were on sank the night of November 22, 1999. While floating on the inner tube he didn't just hold on; he held on for dear life; he *cleaved* to the tube. Literally it was a life-and-death situation. If young Elian had let go, he would have died. It was that simple and that treacherous.

Therefore, when the Bible says to *cleave to your wife (spouse)* it means that the conjugal love between spouses is rather like a life-and-death relationship. But why so absolute? Why does the love between a husband and wife have to be so, well, uncompromising? There's no wiggle room! Why should the marriage commitment be so steadfast?

Understanding God's purpose for marriage will help answer that question, and Mrs. Moon addressed this in her 16-city tour across America in 1996. She explained,

> We marry in order to resemble God. God exists as a being of dual characteristics. Thus, husband and wife united return to God. Together, they are a reflection of His original image... We need marriage because it is the way to develop true love.[22]

In essence, she is saying marriage serves two purposes: 1) to reflect God's nature, and 2) to develop true love. Here the first point will be considered. The second part will be discussed in the next section.

The theological base for positing that marriage allows us to reflect God's image is Genesis 1:27. It reads, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them." The first eight words of this Bible passage fueled a revolution; in fact, several. This was used to justify self-rule by the 13 original colonies when Thomas Jefferson

wrote in the *Declaration of Independence*, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." But it didn't stop there. The Civil War leading to Abraham Lincoln's *Emancipation Proclamation*, the civil rights movement of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the women's rights movement all tapped into the biblically inspired phrase *created equal* before our Maker. Equality before God is a powerful image, divinely inspired.

However, it is time to revisit this verse and look more closely at the second part, the last fourteen words which read, "in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them." This says that the image of God, after which humankind is created, consists of both masculinity and femininity.

In fact, it is not self-evident that all people were *created equal,* as Jefferson suggested. Yes, this concept is biblically based, but like many religious ideals it needs to be taken on faith. Without intending any disregard for the Founding Fathers, our equality is not readily self-apparent. The differences are many: gender, skin color, stature, disposition, race, social status and intellectual gifts, to name a few. Jefferson would have been more correct to say, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all things are created in pairs." Look around. Not only are human beings created male and female, but everything in creation is created in complementary pairs: buck and doe, cock and hen, drone and queen bee, stamen and pistil, etc. It's even in the molecular world: proton and electron, cation and anion, positive and negative charges.

Why are the paired partnerships of male and female (or positive and negative) so ubiquitous? Quite simply, it is because everything was created by God and therefore reflects the nature of the Creator. Basically, the creation resembles the Creator, just as a painting reflects the nature of the painter. This is the basis of natural theology—seeing God in nature—and is acknowledged by St. Paul who said,

> For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown
> it to them. Ever since the creation of the world his invisible nature, namely,
> his eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that
> have been made. So they are without excuse. (Rom. 1:19-20)

The theological implication is enormous. A man alone cannot reflect the image of God; nor can a woman by herself. Only together can they even have the potential to reflect God's nature. The word "potential" is used here because it depends on the nature of the relationship. Indeed, it is precisely the relationship between a man and woman that determines whether they can actually reflect God's nature. What sort of relationship enables a man and woman to mirror God's image? Can a "one night stand" reflect God's nature? Is being married enough? How long should they be together? How about a man and woman living together for ten, twenty or even a hundred years—is time the

key element? What exactly is the nature of the relationship that fuses a man and woman together, that they might reflect the image of God? To answer this, we need to know nature of our Creator.

God is eternal, unchanging and unconditional. Therefore, in order for the relationship between a man and woman to reflect the nature of God, the bond that binds them together must have these very qualities. The conjugal relationship between a husband and wife must be eternal, unchanging and unconditional in order for them to stand together in the image of God. Man, in essence, needs woman to be complete; and woman, likewise, needs man. This bond, however, cannot be forced on them from outside. No such external force would be strong enough. The bond binding a man and woman together in the image of God must go beyond the contractual side of marriage. Just being married, though necessary, is not enough. Marriage is the framework around which the relationship between a husband and wife is created. But it is that relationship of love, not the framework of marriage, which ultimately binds them together so they can reflect the nature of God. A man and woman will merge together in the image of God as their conjugal love reaches the qualities of being absolutely eternal, unchanging, and unconditional.

In this regard, researchers David Popenoe and Barbara Dafoe Whitehead from The National Marriage Project are concerned about the widespread practice of cohabitation, now more popular than marriage as a first-time relationship. They attribute the rise in the number of non-marital couples to:

> a broad cultural shift from a more religious society where marriage was considered the bedrock of civilization and people were imbued with a strong sense of social conformity and tradition, to a more secular society focused on individual autonomy and self invention.[23]

This weakening of marriage norms is troubling to University of Chicago sociologist Linda Waite and syndicated columnist Maggie Gallagher, who warn in their book *The Case for Marriage*:

> Marriage cannot thrive, and may not survive, in a culture that views it as just another lifestyle opinion... At the heart of the unacknowledged war on marriage is the attempt to demote marriage from a unique public commitment—supported by law, society, and custom—to a private relationship, terminable at will, which is nobody else's business.[24]

It is no arbitrary social convention that law, social custom, norms, family, friends and religious tradition traditionally supported the institution of marriage. This social support is justifiable, even essential, because it benefits people at the most fundamental level—to realize their full potential in the image of God.

Sociologists see another rationale for marital union: it actually promotes satisfying love between the partners:

> The marriage contract is in one sense liberating: the security of a contract frees individuals to make long-term exchanges that leave each person better off. But any contract also necessarily constrains the parties involved: They are less "free" to break the terms of the contract. Marriage is no exception.... The marriage contract specifically prohibits sex with those besides the marriage partner. By making this vow, a couple changes the nature of their sexual relationship; they are no longer free to find a new sex partner who is more attractive. In exchange, each has more confidence in the fidelity of his or her partner, less anxiety about sexual performance, fewer fears of sexual abandonment, and less cause of sexual jealously. The benefits and constraints of marriage are not so much trade-offs, as flip sides of the same coin.[25]

Here, the cultural debate of marriage vs. love should be put to rest. It is not *marriage hell-or-high-water* and it is not *just give me love, all I need is love.* It's actually both. The institution of marriage is like scaffolding, it is needed while the conjugal bond of love develops and matures. However, once mature, that marital bond, like the awe-inspiring edifice that stands free from the temporary supports, will be held together by it own internal strength. This was the type of *cleaving* that God wanted Adam and Eve to develop at the very beginning of human history. This type of eternal, unchanging and unconditional love would have allowed them to stand together *in the image of God.* Sadly, this didn't happen. Nevertheless, it was God's ideal at the beginning of human history and, it has never changed.

The point here is that the love of a husband and wife needs to become unbreakable. The real question therefore is, "How can a man and woman create an unchanging, unconditional, eternal love?"

The Bible verse Rev. Moon quotes most frequently is, "Whoever seeks to gain his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life will preserve it." (Luke 17:33) He has taken this as a motto for his life, and rephrased it saying, "Live for the sake of others." This is a lifestyle of total unselfishness. Living for others is the very core of all the spheres of love.

Parents seek so passionately the well being of their children that they willingly make whatever sacrifice needed, even giving up their lives. Children, in turn, learn to love and care for their parents at great sacrifice, especially as their parents advance in years. Old age is like a second infancy. It is the time when the children can give unconditionally to their parents, just as their parents had done to them when they were infants. Jesus spoke of this type of love among friends, saying, "Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." (John 15:13)

Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of modern India, knew the sacrificial nature of true love. Inscribed in stone on his *samadhi* in New Delhi, at the eastern gate overlooking the Jumana River, is Gandhi's prescription for a better world:

> I would like to see India free and strong so that she may offer herself as a willing and pure sacrifice for the betterment of the world. The individual, being pure, sacrifices himself for the family. The latter for the village, the village for the district, the district for the province, the province for the nation, the nation for all. I want *Khudai Raj*, which is the same thing as the kingdom of God on earth. The establishment of such a Rajya would not only mean welfare of the whole of the Indian people but of the whole world.

Gandhi identified the relationship between sacrifice, purity, family-building and nation-building. He knew the nature of love, "the individual, being pure, sacrifices himself for the family." That's were it begins—with sacrifice. The direction of this sacrifice, however, is not for personal gain. It is rather easy to make sacrifices that advance our career, fortune, social status and power-base. However, Gandhi is not talking about this type of sacrifice. He said, "sacrifice for the family," for something greater than the self.

Rev. Moon, who for more than thirty years has been speaking about the power of unselfish love, had a unique insight into the dichotomy between self-benefit and self-sacrifice:

> It is the nature of man to be self-centered and to work for himself. This will not change, but it must be redirected. Man has to learn that in order to benefit himself, he must give his whole self to others. This will bring the change in the world order.[26]

In other words, sacrifice is very much a part of genuine love. Yes, love hurts; it is a sacrifice. But the suffering vanishes as dew at dawn by seeing the benefit that sacrifice brings to others. This type of love is in the image of God. In the context of a conjugal relationship, in order to embody that depth of love, a husband and wife must each be willing to live fully for the sake of their spouse.

That's the scary part of marriage—it requires giving up ones self. In this sense, marriage is a death and rebirth experience. But when couples achieve this level of unqualified giving, then together they create a conjugal love that reflects the quality and nature of God's love. In essence, each dies to themselves to be reborn with their spouse in the image of God.

In summary, the biblical injunction to "cleave to your wife (or spouse)" means that together a husband and wife create an eternal, unchanging and unconditional love between them, not just for the sake of themselves, but so

that together they create a new *womb of love* that will nurture and protect the next generation.

3) Become One Flesh

Genesis 2:24c is about the proper use of human sexuality. God definitely wanted Adam and Eve to have sex and conceive children. After all, the two should not remain two; no, He instructed that *they become one flesh.* However, according to this biblical model two vitally important conditions should precede the proper human sexuality.

First, children should be raised in the womb of their parents' love. Not only would they be loved, but they would also learn by experience the proper way to love. That would translate into an undying respect and honor for both their parents. In the case of Adam and Eve, it meant they would respect and honor God as their Parent and be raised in His love. Then, after inheriting the values and norms of their parents' love, the children, now young men and women, would be prepared to create their own God-centered marriage and family. Upon *leaving their father and mother* (Gen. 2:24a), each spouse would be prepared to lived for the sake of the other and bequeath these traditions of love to their children.

The second condition before *becoming one flesh* would be that both the man and the woman make a total, public commitment to *cleave* to each other (Gen. 2:24b). Private commitments are easily made, and easily broken. Public commitments, on the other hand, are more difficult to make, and harder to break. A commitment of total unselfishness is needed to make a marriage successful. Therefore, the marriage commitment should be as public as possible, including legal obligations. Both sets of parents, brothers and sisters from both families, cousins, aunts, uncles, as well as friends of the bride and groom should attend the wedding. Thus, religions the world over and from time immortal have had traditions that invoke the blessings of heaven and good fortune on the bride and groom.

The commitment of the newly weds is imperative. Although this is no guarantee, it is nevertheless much better that both the husband-to-be and wife-to-be make this pledge of total commitment up front. Making marriage as public as possible, tests the unselfishness of the commitment of both parties in advance. Going into marriage with false or selfish expectations will cause difficulties and may destroy the relationship. After all, no one likes changing the rules in the middle of the game.

An examination of the traditional wedding vows, demonstrates the totality and unconditionality of the commitment each person had to make at the outset of their life together.

> Do you take this woman [man] whose right hand you now hold to be your
> lawfully wedded wife [husband]; to love her [him], to cherish her [him], in

> sickness or in health, in prosperity or adversity, for better or for worse; do
> you promise to be true to her [him], forsaking all others and cleave unto
> her [him] and her [him] only, until death do you part?

Such a commitment made in public will strengthen a marriage union, and so it should. But in another sense, the wedding vows are not just for the couple themselves, nor for the family and friends present. They are, in a very real way, for those who are not even there: the couple's future children. This adds a new dimension to conjugal love.

The commitment of marriage includes the emotional, spiritual, financial and legal responsibilities of raising and caring for children born from that relationship. In fact, one of the best ways to love your child is to love your spouse. In researching the sensitive issues of divorce, marriage, and the impact on children, Judith Wallerstein, America's leading divorce specialist, notes:

> The first thing we need to acknowledge is the close link between the marital bond and the parent-child relationship... When the marriage is working and the couple is content, the parent-child relationship is nourished and rewarded by the parents' love and appreciation for each other and supported by their cooperation.[27]

As mentioned earlier, the first eight words of Genesis 1:27 support our most fundamental civil rights. The second part of this verse speaks for the rights of the unborn: only when a man and woman are united in love, can they reflect God's image. Through this level of oneness of heart, God becomes a vibrant part of that relationship. Furthermore, this secures our ultimate human right— *the right to be conceived in and born into a family where God's love abides.* Having parents who are married and committed to each other more likely secures the newborn's most basic entitlement.

> If we were asked to design a system for making sure that children's basic needs were met, we would probably come up with something quite similar to the two-parent ideal. Such a design, in theory, not only ensures that children have access to the time and money of two adults; it also provides a system of checks and balances that promotes quality parenting. With both parents having a biological connection to the child, there is greater likelihood that they will identify with the child and be willing to sacrifice for it; further, it reduces the likelihood that either parent would abuse the child.[28]

In review, the bedding for human sexuality was to be a tradition of love inherited from our original parents and passed on through an absolute commitment of marriage between a husband and wife. In this environment, when *they become one flesh* children are not only conceived, but the legacy of love is

bequeathed to the next generation.

Additional Insights

In 2001 Rev. Moon conducted a national speaking tour throughout America, speaking in all 50 states in 50 days! In an effort to educate primarily religious leaders, he stressed the importance of ancestry, lineage, and family-connectedness. These concepts are very natural in the oriental way of thinking, but less familiar to the western mind. In this spirit, one recurring topic in Rev. Moon's speech was the theme of love, life and lineage. To make his point, asked repeatedly:

> Among these [love, life and lineage], which do you think has most value?
> Many people think that it is love. However, no matter how valuable love
> and life are, they are horizontal in nature. They appear and conclude within
> one generation. On the other hand, lineage is vertical in nature and contin-
> ues forever, generation after generation.[29]

This exegesis of Genesis 2:24 elucidates the notions of love, life and lineage— even providing the correct priority with lineage being first. To "leave your father and mother" (Gen 2:24a) is about the birthing of a new family, the continuity of *lineage*. Second, "cleaving to your wife (spouse)" (Gen. 2:24b) is concerned with the relationship between a husband and wife, i.e., creating true conjugal *love*. Finally, "they shall become one flesh" (Gen. 2:24c) is about the conception of new *life*.

Genesis 2:24 highlights other fundamental principles. For example, it explains the timelessness of love. *Love of the past*, through honoring your heritage and ancestral lineage by loving your parents. *Love for the present*, through a husband-and-wife love that bonds two people together into the fullness of God's image. Then finally, *love of the future*, through the conception of new life to whom the tradition of love will be bequeathed.

When comparing the above standard of love to the popular view of human sexuality, which frequently focuses on personal pleasure, the difference becomes even more pronounced. In the *Playboy* philosophy, Hugh Hefner says, "If we recognize [sex] as not necessarily limited to procreation, then we should also acknowledge openly that it is not necessarily limited to love either."[28] This notion of human sexuality appears to disregard the children, the "partner," and even love itself.

In public schools in the United States, this brand of sex education translates into a form of sexual self-protection. Human sexuality is deemed okay if it is disease free, infertile and consensual. People are more concerned about catching a disease than infecting someone. They are more concerned about

the personal consequences of becoming pregnant (or getting someone pregnant) than the life of the child. And they are more worried about being accused by their "partner," than his or her heartbreak. The moral values of this type of relationship are truly self-centered.

Ironically, the character of true love based on Gen. 2:24 is just the opposite; it's all about others—your parents, your partner and your children. Sexuality is for the sake of my parents and the continuity of the family lineage. Sexuality is for the sake of my spouse so that, together, we build a bond of love that reflects the image of God. And sexuality is for the sake of our children. Personal pleasure is not mentioned at all, but that does not mean it is not part of the equation. Sex was meant to be pleasurable. The key is to forget about yourself, to be more concerned about your partner than yourself.

> Love and a concern for one's partner shifts the focus away from the self in
> a sexual relationship and toward the other person. This selfless approach
> to sex, paradoxically, is far more likely to bring sexual satisfaction to both
> men and women.[31]

This denial-of-self model in the long run ends up being the most fulfilling, because living for others is the basis on which love itself is created.

Blueprint for Social Development

The importance of marriage goes far beyond the institution of marriage itself. Some see a successful family as the paradigm of successful leadership in the corporate world. In *Parenting Your Company to Profits*, John Brandt, former editor-in-chief of *Industry Week* and currently CEO of the Manufacturing Performance Institute, observes, "There are a lot of complicated theories about how to lead and manage... Yet what if it's really no different than good parenting?"[32] Brandt noted four similarities between good parents and effective CEOs:

Establishing boundaries:

Good parents set boundaries delineating clearly what is right and wrong. Children respond to what is expected of them, knowing their limitations.

Wise leaders set goals and appropriate guidelines for achieving them. This drives performance, innovation and success.

Coaching with praise and positive correction:

Good parents provide constant feedback, criticizing the behavior (when needed) but constantly loving the child. A childhood of belittlement and ridicule is fertile ground for unsuccessful adulthood; a model likely replicated in the next generation.

Wise leaders coach for success. They provide positive feedback that increases both the individual's and the team's chances for winning. On the other hand relentless carping establishes a fear-based leadership where employees lack innovation, are unhappy and unproductive.

Allowing for Growth

Good parents allow room for their children to grow, knowing they will become more independent and begin questioning their parent's decisions. Mistakes are seen as teaching moments for the parent and learning opportunities for the child.

Wise leaders view the workforce in similar manner. Employees will need time and training to be empowered. And similar to a parent, the goal of a good leader is to one day become unneeded in day-to-day operations, but always there just in case.

Pushing for Success

Good parents judiciously encourage their children to try new things, even if a child lacks confidence. Taking calculated risks will give the child the opportunity to fulfill their individual greatness.

Wise leaders nudge employees out of their comfort zones realizing an employee's confidence and newfound ability will outweigh temporary discomforts and losses of productivity.

Successful marriages and stable, loving families, in addition to developing good leadership skills, embody moral values which become the social norms essential for economic development. Daniel Yankelovich explains:

The success of a market-based economy depends on a highly developed social morality—trustworthiness, honesty, concern for future generations, an ethic of service to others, a humane society that takes care of those in need, frugality instead of greed, high standards of quality, and concern for community. These economically desirable social values, in turn, are seen as rooted in family values.[33]

Conclusion

God surely knew the value of the family as society's most fundamental institution. He also knew that the center of a successful family was a loving couple. If Adam and Eve had heeded God's warning (Gen. 2:17), then the fall of man would have never occurred. Moreover, if they had actually obeyed His instructions regarding the essential components of family building (Gen. 2:24), there would have been no need to expel them from the Garden of Eden. IIFWP Chairman, Rev. Chung Hwan Kwak, put it rather succinctly, "Without the restoration of marriage and family in accordance with God's original ideal, we cannot achieve peace. Without restoring marriage and the family, we will work in vain for peace."[34] God's strategic plan for creating an ideal world was to build ideal families. It has not changed.

Notes

1. Glenn T. Stanton, *Why Marriage Matters: Reasons to Believe in Marriage in Postmodern Society* (Colorado Springs: Pinon Press, 1997), p. 173.
2. Ibid., p. 100
3. Ibid., p. 70.
4. Maggie Gallagher, "The Moral and Social Significance of Marriage in the Global Context," paper presented at the Interreligious and International Federation for World Peace, Assembly 2000. Retrieved Dec. 23, 2002, from http://www.iifwp.org/Activities/2000/UN/Proceedings/Gallagher.shtml.
5. Stanton, *Why Marriage Matters: Reasons to Believe,* p. 30.
6. William J. Doherty, William A. Galston, Norval D. Glenn, John Gottman, Barbara Markey, Howard J. Markman, et al. *Why Marriage Matters: Twenty-One Conclusions from the Social Sciences* (New York: Institute for American Values, 2002). William J. Doherty is a professor of family social science and the director of the marriage and family therapy program at the University of Minnesota; William A. Galston is a professor at the School of Public Affairs at the University of Maryland, and the director of the university's Institute for

Philosophy and Public Policy; Norval D. Glenn is a professor of sociology and American studies at the University of Texas in Austin; John Gottman is a professor of psychology at the University of Washington and the co-founder or the Gottman Institute; Barbara Markey is the associate director of the Center for Marriage and Family at Creighton University, and the director of the Catholic Archdiocese of Omaha's Family Life Office; Howard J. Markman is a professor of psychology at the University of Denver and the co-director of the Center for Marital and Family Studies at the University of Denver; Steven Nock is a professor of sociology at the University of Virginia; David Popenoe is a professor of sociology and the co-director of The National Marriage Project at Rutgers University; Gloria G. Rodriguez is the founder and president of AVANCE, Inc., in San Antonio, Texas; Isabel V. Sawhill is a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C., and the president of the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy; Scott M. Stanley is the co-director of the Center for Marital and Family Studies at the University of Denver; Linda J. Waite is a professor of sociology at the University of Chicago; and Judith Wallerstein is a child psychoanalyst and a marriage and divorce researcher in Belvedere, California.

7.   Doherty, *Why Marriage Matters: Twenty-One Conclusions*, p. 6.

8.   Stanton, *Why Marriage Matters: Reasons to Believe*, p. 163.

9.   Denis Howe, *The Free On-line Dictionary of Computing* (2001). Retrieved Nov. 29, 2004, from http://foldoc.doc.ic.ac.uk/foldoc/index.html.

10.   Robert Rector, "The Effectiveness of Abstinence Education Programs in Reducing Sexual Activity Among Youth," (Washington DC: The Heritage Foundation, April 8, 2002), p. 4. Retrieved Oct. 28, 2004 from http://www.heritage.org/Research/Family/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&PageID=6203,

11.   Stanton, *Why Marriage Matters: Reasons to Believe*, p. 173.

12.   *Exposition of the Divine Principle* (New York: Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity, 1996), pp. 53-78.

13.   See Patrick F. Fagan, "How to Reconstruct Education and Family: A Proposal from the US," presented at the Pure Love Alliance-Japan sponsored, International Education Symposium, Tokyo, April 24, 1999, p. 8. And Patrick F. Fagan, "The Child Abuse Crisis: The Disintegration of Marriage, Family and The American Community," The Heritage Foundation Backgrounder No. 1115 (Washington DC:, June 3, 1997), pp. 9-10.

14.   Stanton, *Why Marriage Matters: Reasons to Believe*, p. 113.

15.   "Comment: Teens from Two-Parent Families Are Significantly Less Likely to be Sexually Active," *The Medical Institute for Sexual Health*, November 6, 2000, p. 1.

16.   Linda Waite and Maggie Gallagher, *The Case for Marriage: Why Married People are Happier, Healthier, and Better Off Financially* (New York: Doubleday, 2000).

17. Barbara Dafoe Whitehead, "The Importance of Fathers in the Lives of Girls," *American Educator* 18/4 (1994): 22-29.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. Waite and Gallagher, *The Case for Marriage,* p. 46.
21. Terry D. Hargrave, "The Essential Humility of Marriage," Keynote Presented at the Fourth Annual Smart Marriages Conference, Denver, 2000, Retrieved April 26, 2003 from http://www.smartmarriages.com/hargrave.html.
22. Hak Ja Han Moon, "Blessed Marriage and Eternal Life," HSA-UWC, April 1-16, 1996.
23. David Popenoe and Barbara Dafoe Whitehead, *Should We Live Together? What Young Adults Need to Know about Cohabitation before Marriage,* The National Marriage Project: The Next Generation (Piscataway: The State University of New Jersey at Rutgers, 2002), p. 10.
24. Waite and Gallagher, *The Case for Marriage,* p. 11.
25. Ibid., pp. 23-24.
26. Sun Myung Moon, in W. Farley Jones, ed., *A Prophet Speaks Today* (New York: HSA-UWC Publications, 1975), p. 117.
27. Judith S. Wallerstein, Julia M. Lewis, and Sandra Blakeslee, *The Unexpected Legacy of Divorce: A 25-Year Landmark Study* (New York: Hyperion, 2000), p. 10.
28. Sara McLanahan and Gary Sandefur, *Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), p. 38.
29. Sun Myung Moon, "God is Our King and True Parent," May 8, 2001. Retrieved Jan. 24, 2005, from http://www.wewillstand.org/statements/harlem_20010515.html.
30. Hugh Hefner, "The Playboy Philosophy," *Playboy Magazine.* Retrieved August 8, 1997, from http://www.uk.Playboy.com/fag/faq/PBFAQ/pp.txt.
31. Waite and Gallagher, *The Case for Marriage,* p. 89.
32. John R. Brandt, "Parenting Your Company to Profits," *Industry Week,* March 1, 2004, p. 23. http://www.industryweek.com/Columns/asp/columns.asp?ColumnID=1001.
33. Stanton, *Why Marriage Matters: Reasons to Believe,* p. 119.
34. Chung Hwan Kwak, "The Providential Role of IIFWP," *Today's World,* 25/9 (Nov.-Dec. 2004): 24.

UNIFICATION POLITICS IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Tyler O. Hendricks

As he introduced the Reverend Sun Myung Moon on a national speaking tour in October 2004, George Augustus Stallings, leader of the American Clergy Leadership Conference, called for the formation of a "religious democratic party." While this announcement came late in his ministry, Reverend Moon is no stranger to politics. He created the "Party (a.k.a. 'House') of Unification and World Peace" in Korea in the mid-90s, which many observers took to be a political party. More recently he launched the "Family Party" in Korea, an outright political organization. His Interreligious International Federation for World Peace (IIFWP) and Interreligious International Peace Council (IIPC) convene regular conferences on global governance, inviting current and former presidents and prime ministers. The affiliated World Association of NGOs (WANGO) is striving to engage the UN and various NGOs in discussions on policies for peace and freedom. Nonetheless, we see no comprehensive Unificationist platform on government and politics. The Unificationist position on politics begs examination both on the grounds of its theory and its practice.

Based upon its practice, the movement is ambidextrous. It is generally seen as archconservative. Reverend Moon founded the conservative daily, *The Washington Times*. Movement-related organizations aligned with the right in opposing communist movements in Latin America and on campuses in Japan and South Korea. Unificationists have allied with Republican candidates in the US and conservative politicians in Japan and France. Reverend Moon is strident in his denunciation of divorce and homosexuality and disfavors abortion and birth control.

At the same time the movement displays characteristics counter to the conservative label. Unificationists have a communitarian ethos and at times

Dr. Tyler Hendricks is President of the Unification Theological Seminary.

have been called communists. Reverend Moon embraced Mikhail Gorbachev and Kim Il Sung; Yassar Arafat (R.I.P.), Kim Jong Il and Louis Farrakhan send him gifts. Liberal theologians and African American clergy, virtually all Democrats, befriend Reverend Moon. In recent years the movement has spawned environmentalist activities and advocated "global governance" and the stripping away of national boundaries. Reverend Moon has stated that, with God's involvement, either democracy or communism would provide a sufficient basis for governance. He has called this the "headwing" position. But perhaps monarchism is the Unificationist ideal government. Over the past year, the "crowning" of God and Jesus Christ led to the crowning of Reverend and Mrs. Moon as king and queen of peace in a United States Capitol Hill. What are we to make of all this in terms of the Unification approach to politics?

While failing to build alliances with major incumbent political leaders or parties, Unificationist efforts are gaining momentum and audience. One initiative set forth by Reverend Moon in the late 90s was to create an "upper house" of the United Nations comprised of respected leaders of the world's religions. This group would balance the secular orientation of the General Assembly with spiritual wisdom, hopefully, and bring leverage with the world's powerful religious leaders and their populations. Having gone through numerous revisions, this proposal is now on the official UN agenda, sponsored by the Philippines government. The Unificationist impulse for governmental reform seems genuine, and their language of peace and understanding opens doors of good-hearted leaders. But what is the Unificationist view on the political process? How would government go about its business? How would leaders be selected?

The purpose of this paper is to think about the Unificationist approach to politics. The leading expositor of Unification ideology, Dr. Sang Hun Lee, was vague on the subject. He concluded his work on the "new cultural revolution" with the assertion that "politics and economy will be based on God's love."[1] He explained that this will take the form of "vertical and horizontal love... realized in the workplace, the nation and the world." He goes on to extol love's power to reconcile, harmonize, embrace, transform, tranquilize and "even out all differences" between rich and poor and different races.[2] How does this translate into political practice? To suggest answers to this, I will work with some basic Unificationist theological stances informed by observation of Unificationist practice. This examination of actual practice takes on greater significance in light of Dr. Lee's assertion that "The Unification movement, which the Rev. Moon has been conducting up to the present, is the movement to try to establish this very culture of Heart, or culture of love, on earth."[3]

A Federalist Utopia

In theory, Unificationists are utopians. The answer to every question begins with reference to the ideal, the sinless state toward which all things, peoples, the world and God himself are tending. The order of creation in the natural and human worlds includes discrete levels, the individual, family, tribe, society, nation, world, cosmos and God. This is important politically, for it asserts a separation of social functions in the original order of things. In the social world, these orders of creation begin with the individual and expand to the family and tribe. To fulfill their needs and interests, people create the mediating institutions that make up the next discrete level, called society. Society is that arena of collective human interaction that occupies the God-given space between the family and the nation. We fill it with churches and denominations, factories and businesses, political parties and publishing houses, clubs, charities, museums and libraries, schools, advertising agencies, insurance agencies, banks and investment firms, sports, recreation, entertainment and so forth.

In its opening chapter, "The Principle of Creation," the *Divine Principle* sets forth the way that these various entities come about.

> When the body acts according to the will of the mind, and the mind and body thus engage in give and take action, the individual will live a purposeful life. This individual will then attract like-minded people. As these companions work together productively, their group will grow.[4]

This describes the creation of social entities by creative individuals freely associating with each other in a supportive environment, to create, as the text goes on to say, "myriad substantial manifestations of God's original internal nature and original external form... in the pursuit of the purpose of creation."[5] These institutions would offer us ways to organize and affiliate by location, profession, avocation, lineage, religion, ideology and so forth. They would allow us to combine our energies in productive ways. Here is where politics comes into play.

Moving beyond society, we come to the category of nation. The nation stands on the list with the world, society, family and individual. Multiple societies of peoples who own land and establish sovereign government constitute a nation. Reverend Moon normally describes a nation as constituted by people, land and sovereignty. The *Divine Principle* text differentiates between feudalistic society and a nation. The feudal society has "political power... diffused among many lords, each ruling over his territory in the *absence of any national authority*." (Emphasis the author's)[6] In fact, kings in medieval Europe "had limited power and were no more than great feudal lords."[7] The stage beyond feudalism is called "monarchic society" or "kingdoms," beginning with the

Merovingian kings, which had "national borders."[8]

Thus the historical referent for nations, in the primary Unification text, is the medieval Christian kingdoms, which "flourished until the French Revolution in 1789."[9] By this account, democracy is a temporary expedient that arose in order to tear down corrupt monarchic societies and "commence a new providence for rebuilding a sovereign nation fit to receive the Messiah... as the King of Kings."[10] Christian democracies, according to the Divine Principle prediction, will nurture societies in which the people grow to the level of spiritual maturity necessary to recognize the Messiah when he returns and allow him "to establish God's sovereignty upon the earth with the wholehearted support of the people."[11]

Thus Unificationism affirms the essence of democracy, for the Messiah will not ascend without the people's support rendered within a democratic environment. At the same time, the Messiah is called a king. The conclusion of this Divine Principle discussion of the messianic ideal is that the "paths of religion, politics and economy" will converge on the foundation of a worldview that integrates religion and science, i.e. the ideals of the mind and needs of the body. "The religion founded upon this truth" will enable humankind to become "one with God in heart. Such people will build an economy in accordance with the divine ideal." This religion and economy will be "the foundations for a new political order... a messianic kingdom built upon the principles of interdependence, mutual prosperity and universally shared values."

In this heady vision the characteristics of the "nation" in the order of creation has been left in the dust, and yet it remains in the pantheon. Interestingly, the text envisions a religion in this ideal society as well, which other texts indicate will disappear. To shore up the enduring place of nations, the discussion of give and take action between nations is an illustration of the dynamics of the original creation idea: "The give and take actions... among the nations of the world are essential for them to live together in harmony and peace."[12] The community of nations that fill the earth constitutes the next level, the world.[13]

I would interpret that the placement of a social entity in the Unification pantheon means that the level has inalienable rights and responsibilities, its own integrity and *raison d'etre*. Thus Reverend Moon's theology is not totalitarian. The individual and family are not hung out to dry in a "naked public square." Multiple God-given social categories stand with their own integrity within the order of creation. Because the Principle of Creation affirms national sovereignty, Unificationists are not "one worldists."[14] Unificationism affirms a federal system, levels of power arrayed on a tier system from the local to the global. Within nations and the world, Unification theory affirms the place of diverse corporations and other associations, which are created as "likeminded people... work together productively" and "see their group grow."

Politics Makes Strange Bedfellows

While one divine principle pervades this totality, God did not ordain the perfect ordering of this totality by fiat, nor does He plan for human beings to do so. That ordering requires, at every step, human responsiveness to God and ethical human interactivity. In the Unification ideal, all members of the multi-leveled body interact harmoniously in manifold structures, creating a prosperous and joy-filled society. Those who would attempt to achieve this by force are doomed to failure. At every step, the free human will is a paramount, irreducible value. Voluntarism is intrinsic to the Unification theoretical framework.

In this framework, the *Divine Principle* compares political party functioning to the body's nervous system. Just as the nerves transmit the impulses of the mind to the rest of the body, the political parties convey God's word to the general society.[15] While I espouse the value of the body analogy in many respects, I find it to have limited value when it comes to illuminating the significance and function of political parties. The analogy of the body does not lend itself to the give and take of multiple parties. God is one and the individual body is one. The rough and tumble between the mind and body, with the mind understood as superior to the body, is not a happy analogy. Who would want to join the political party representing the body?

The mind does not convey competing options to the body, over which the cells and organs deliberate, at least in a way that does not stretch the analogy. The body is designed as a monolithic entity, a one-party state. The mind does not need politics in relating to the body's organs. All it needs is the means to communicate its directives to the body and receive information in return, and this is the nervous system. This not a political process; it is more akin to media (information flow) and education (training).[16] Of course there are feedback loops in the body, and each cell makes decisions, but we see no organization of coherent platforms, no substantive options concerning what functions organs or cells play. As long as one utilizes the analogy of the body, one will come up short in explaining diverse political parties.

I find the analogy of marriage to better describe political parties within the Principle framework. This draws upon the theological assertion embedded deep in the Principle that all creation exhibits masculine and feminine natures reflecting the *logos*. Just as a family needs a father and mother, so too society needs distinct, consistent and articulate voices representing masculine and feminine values in the body politic.[17] To any problem, masculine and feminine approaches can be applied. Men can advocate feminine approaches and women can advocate masculine ones. Sometime these are mutually exclusive options, but they can often be applied simultaneously, in a complimentary fashion. The relationship between these two voices would be like that

between husband and wife in sound marriage.

Reflecting on this, between the two American parties, I would see the Republican exhibiting the more masculine character, and the Democrat the more feminine. Ronald Reagan exemplified the masculine, as in his forthright explanation of his cold war strategy to Gorbachev, "We win. You lose." Margaret Thatcher and Condoleezza Rice are modern examples of women championing a masculine approach. Bill Clinton exemplified the feminine, with his announcement that he felt our pain. Social security is a feminine approach to the problem of aging, assuring that all are taken care of irrespective of their personal initiative. Privatization is a masculine approach, calling individuals to invest for the future and take a risk. The Republican worldview rewards individual initiative, innovation and risk-taking, and considers the successful person as deserving the maximum fruits of his or her efforts. The Democratic view rewards community values, lifting up the weak or disadvantaged, leveling the playing field, striving not just for equal opportunity but equal results.

In theory, masculine and feminine impulses are mutually supportive and equally necessary. The common humanity uniting the masculine and feminine is stronger than the power of the traits that separate them. Hence the two parties can co-exist in one government. But we need two distinct parties in order for each aspect of the *logos* to have a voice and sustain a creative tension and, ultimately, joy. Let's face it; elections are fun. Nations admire venerable leaders and also are stimulated by new approaches from innovative upstarts. Elections would allow voters to determine the dominant way to approach issues society is facing at any given moment.

As does marriage, civil society rests on a shared commitment to unity among parties. In Reverend Moon's thinking, unity comes through one, or both, of two motives. One is more masculine, shared purpose, and the other is more feminine, love.

> What makes the mutual relationship one? A common purpose is required here. A common purpose can create unity. There are only two ways of achieving unity. One is to have a common purpose, but even without a common purpose, people can unite when they love one another.18

Those who would best lead such a society would be those most adept at articulating a shared vision and/or practicing love. Focusing on purpose, or vision, is the masculine nature. George W. Bush is a contemporary example of this. Long on vision and goals, short on care and conciliation. Focusing on love is the feminine nature. John Kerry, in the 2004 presidential campaign, strived to exemplify this. For Kerry, more important than the goal were the people, the relationships. He criticized President Bush for going it alone in Iraq and set forth confidence in his ability to build coalitions. Of late, Democrats

defend Social Security, which calls the workers to sacrifice some of the fruits of their labor for the sake of others. Republicans, with the view that a person works for him or herself, advocate a change that would give workers greater ownership of the fruits of their labor, with a vision that this will lead to greater prosperity for all.

Note well that both motives adapt to the way leadership is authorized in a democratic open society. An open society relies upon consensus. Successful leaders are those who can create the greatest consensus. Uniting people through a shared purpose, on the one hand, and through community values, on the other, are *consensus-building* strategies. They both assume, or take it as a given, that the people come first and that the people need to be won over. Thus, Reverend Moon's identification of shared vision and love as the twin sources of unity aligns his theory with the values of an open, democratic system. Physical power, dazzling knowledge, and money are not legitimate sources of social authority in his thought. In societies that respect the sovereignty of the individual, family and mediating institutions, power is granted those who create consensus.

Practices of the Unification Movement Viewed from the Perspective of Politics

This rendition of Unificationist theory may or may not reflect the deepest Unificationist impulse. In order to better capture that impulse, we should examine the actual practice of this global movement. It has been functioning as a global network of organizations for decades. The members of the founding cadre have been grandparents for some time now. The movement is maturing; it is hard to call it a new religious movement anymore. I now would like to examine some characteristics that might obtain in a Unificationist political society on the basis of how the movement actually functions.

Mediating Institutions

Free societies contain a multitude of empowered mediating institutions; dictatorial societies lack them. As already noted, Unificationism grants a distinctive position within the order of creation to the realm called society, the God-created space for mediating institutions. In other words, the Unificationist God designed the space for human beings to create mediating structures between the family and tribe and nation. Reverend Moon's establishment of a dizzying plethora of associations, foundations, businesses, schools and other organizations distinct from and independent of each other puts teeth into the theory. The list runs into the hundreds.

He began with a church and then inspired the church members to create

businesses, associations of students, of professors, of clergy, of scientists, lawyers, medical practitioners, and more. His people created publishing houses, schools, think tanks, service organizations, and more. Of late one observes the emergence of sports and hobby clubs, soccer teams, fishing and golf tournaments, and a mountain-hiking association. He is very supportive of alumni associations. Associations of members based upon vocation will surely develop, including professional societies such as the North American Educators Conference and affinity-based associations such as the Pocono's Family Ministries and renewed Blessed Family Association.[19] Once the Founder's guiding hand is gone, these institutions will have to take on a life of their own. Those that best serve the public good will flourish; surely others will fade away.

Separation of Powers

The *Divine Principle* states that the separation of powers also characterizes the order of creation. "From the beginning, the separation of powers was to be characteristic of the political structure of the ideal society which God has been working to realize."[20] It illustrates this with the separation of functions of the stomach, heart and lungs, comparing these with the legislative, judicial and executive powers of government (which represents which is not specified). In the movement, however, we see the consolidation *and* separation of powers co-existing. Within the church *per se*, Reverend Moon consolidates in himself legislative, executive and judicial powers, much as parents do in a family. He decided the three core laws of the heavenly constitution. He gives the commands to church action and inspires members to extra-church activities. Leaders come to him to resolve matters of conflict. This consolidation is replicated throughout the hierarchy of the church. Using the body analogy, the stomach, heart and lungs are collapsed into one.

I believe that his consolidation of the three powers is short-term, persona and race-based. Even as consolidation obtains within Unificationist organizational units, the existence of mediating institutions brings a separation of powers and checks and balances *between* organizational units. The separation of young adult ministry from the church, in the form of The Collegiate Association for the Research of Principles (CARP), is one example. Young adults have options, and once one option is provided, the door is open to choice as a right. Now the "Second-Generation Office," the Religious Youth Service, the International Relief Friendship Foundation and Service for Peace, as well as the church itself all offer options for youth with equal claim to spiritual blessing. Youth now can choose to enlist in the "Special Task Force" in America, Japan or Europe, on a regional level (RTF), or not at all.[21]

Another alternative ministry is Ocean Church, which, when it was operative, consisted of a system of witnessing centers separate from the church *per*

se, with a different leadership. Another is the Cheong Pyeong Training Center activity, offering a spiritual path and financial structure separate from the institutional church. The Unification community contains various fundraising organizations, carrying out basically the same activity using the same methodology. Unificationists run four seminaries, two founded by Reverend Moon and two by younger leaders, none in communication regarding theological orthodoxy or practical standards for ministry. Unification businesses and non-profit organizations each proffer salvific promises. This allows business and non-profit leaders to offer members alternative paths for spiritual growth and theological justification.

These various independent organizations each check the authority of the church leader and of each other. From this perspective, the title "unification" is ironic. A church leader may be displeased with those who do not hand out flyers for a speech, and even criticize them for lack of church activity, but members can simply say, sorry, I'm distributing newspapers, or I'm fundraising, or I'm managing a hotel, or I'm organizing a religious dialogue, and have no qualms about their theological justification.

The only unifying force one witnesses in the movement is the True Parents, Reverend and Mrs. Moon, when their actions apply to every locality. The most common example is their speaking tours. But once the one uncheckable, never-to-be balanced call to attend an event with the True Parents curtails, no absolute religious force is apparent on the Unification horizon. Will this separation of powers between organizations lead to rationalization of authority and opening out of communications within organizations as well? The signs that I observe, together with my faith in human nature and what Unificationism calls "the merit of the age," tell me it will.

Federal System

The Unification Church[22] is organized as a federal system, based on continents, nations, regions, states or provinces, and finally local churches. The larger Unificationist movement contains multiple global and national federal systems, including World CARP, Kodan, the WFWP, the networks of national messiahs, various international business enterprises, and the loose-knit global congregation—perhaps "list" would be a better word at this point—of the Ambassadors for Peace. Among major leaders, I have witnessed fierce competition horizontally. Vertically, local leaders often assert their precedence over national authority. Church entities in the same industry operate independent of each other. I recall strident vituperation on the part of the owner of one Unificationist travel agency against the practices of another Unificationist travel agency operating in the same city. Turf battle over fundraising territory in America took place between rival leaders for years. The author witnessed, as a normal course of events, proclamations by a leader taking on a new

church post, relating the magnificence of the foundation he established in the church from which he had just departed, and the miserable state of the church into which he was now arriving.

In general, Unificationist vertical, or federal, integration has been so strong that horizontal integration has been practically non-existent. The vertical integration, however, is weakening. The major leader of the next generation, Hyun Jin Moon, calls teamwork a core value of the movement. He, as well as Reverend Chung Hwan Kwak, Reverend Moon's designated deputy over all movement affairs, is attempting to bring together leaders of diverse movement entities into meaningful conferencing regarding shared challenges. These meetings have begun by sharing reports; one hopes that meaningful dialogue and planning will follow. Being optimistic, I believe that horizontal integration, or teamwork, will prevail as an external method and that vertical integration will settle down as a spiritual practice. As it does, some parts of the movement will disintegrate and others will blossom. Longevity will depend upon leaders' ability to integrate as colleagues horizontally. Institutions that serve others' needs and interests will prosper.

Merit over Inherited Position

Until the late 1980s, Unificationists anticipated a passing of substantial authority to Reverend Moon's lineal descendants, even in the face of his well-publicized statement that "we are all messiahs, or should be." In practice, lineage is not shaping into that significant a factor. Reverend Moon has democratized the spiritual authority upon which substantial authority is based by delegating to all blessed couples the keys to the Unificationist kingdom, the priesthood, the power to change blood lineage through the marriage blessing. He has called each couple to replicate his messianic course of blessing expanding circles of couples. He has granted them the authority to match and bless their own children. In October of 2004 he set up the twelve tribes of which he has spoken for years. Each is headed by a little-known Korean blessed couple.[23]

Reverend Moon's sons are more outspoken than anyone in advocating merit over inherited status, ending, in the arenas they govern, Unificationist institutional paternalism. Less and less do seniority in the church, or number of children, determine income and status in a church-related business or non-profit. The Unification teachings are found capable of expression equally well through the vocabulary of management theory as through theology. A significant emerging leader considers the hire of non-Unification Church personnel more likely of success than that of Unification Church member, because of what he considers the entitlement mentality inculcated by the church culture. The Reverend Moon is often impressive in his ability to give soft landings to leaders who are removed; other leaders are not as parental.

In contrast with Reverend Moon's dealings with people as individuals, he often demands abrupt changes in position on the basis of a lottery. Early in 2004 Reverend Moon broke down the church leadership structure in Korea, dispersing all the settled congregations into house churches and disrobing two-thirds of the established ministers of their clerical authority and their livings. One expects that it will not be long until church leaders also are chosen by virtue of merit as well as race and personal vocation.

Law over Personality

Reverend C. H. Kwak recently has stressed the dictum of law over personality. Now this has little meaning if one really thinks about it, because it leaves open many questions, including that of who makes, interprets and enforces the law. Nonetheless, it is a symbolic turn away from a movement guided by personal charisma or inherited status.

Representative Government

The people are sovereign in a democratic regime. To establish government, they consent to alienating a portion of their sovereignty to those whom they duly elect to represent them in the greater spheres of social organization (town, county, state, nation). In the Unification Church, leadership is normally designated not through election but through appointment. This is changing simply because fewer are agreeing to participate in it. By the mid-90s, the church in America lacked people willing to be appointed to every state. In those states, the members got together and elected their own leader. The frequency of this taking place has slowed with the arrival of more Asian and African leaders who are relatively happy to be assigned leadership positions in America.

Nonetheless, the die has been cast, and it is significant that when no appointees were available, the election of church leaders created not so much as a blip on the radar screen. In Reverend Moon's above-mentioned decentralization of the Korean church, he directed that the newly formed house churches in each district elect a representative to serve on a council that oversees district-wide activities. Here we see a mix of Congregationalist and Presbyterian polities. At the Unification Theological Seminary in 2001-02, the students made democratic demands upon the administration. This replaced the administrative appointment of the Student Council president and class officers with an open election by all students. It led to the Student Council president sitting on the seminary President's Cabinet. Prior to this, students had requested the end of the team system, in which each student was assigned to a team. Again, this transition was smooth.

When Reverend Moon delegated the authority of matching children to all parents, a parent's voice arose requesting church facilitation, in particular for the purpose of meaningful exchange blessings beyond nation. Objections

arose immediately from other parents, and the church did not act on the request. The desire for familial sovereignty outweighed the desire to adhere to the exchange marriage mandate. Sovereignty once granted is not easily given up.[24]

Moral Authority

Unification spiritual sovereignty, or priesthood, has shifted from the institutional church to the blessed couple. This brings a host of religious and, hence, political implications. If families, not church leaders or individuals, own the keys to the kingdom, then the values, principles and practices that promote healthy family life become primary goals for a society to be pursued through politics. The values, principles and practices that degrade family life clearly are de-legitimated. Priesthood bestowed upon all families, and *only* families, would tend to mean that in the Unification society, marriage would no longer be a choice, in the same sense that getting an education, learning a trade or skill, or making a living through adding value to society is not a choice. I want to balance this observation, however, with reference to other Unificationist characteristics. One is "heart," which manifests as a willingness to accommodate situations "case by case." A second is the related inability of Unification organizations to carry out strict administrative functioning. A third is an ultimate Unificationist pragmatism.[25] For example, non-married members with capability do establish themselves in positions appropriate to their skills and non-Unificationists at times assume positions of power.

Here we can make an aside concerning today's political landscape in the United States. Most people accept the conventional wisdom that the Republican Party is more comfortable with the institution of the traditional family than is the Democratic Party. But under the surface is a riptide: the Republicans also enshrine the sovereignty of the individual and freedom of commerce to respond to market demands, and the Democrats advocate the community good and collective values. Democrats point out that the people of the "blue states," supposed champions of moral values, gorge themselves on televised immorality. They debunk the Republican appeal to moral values as hypocritical, and question the merits of the "moral issues" vote in the 2004 election by noting that moral issues have been the primary factor in all recent presidential elections, and that the percentage of voters who voted on moral issues decreased in 2004.

The Republicans are succeeding, however, because they still hoist the values flag, however tattered, which the Democrats have lowered to appease those who would weave abortion-on-demand and homosexual marriage into its fabric. By sorting out these mixed threads it may be possible for Unificationists to articulate what Reverend Moon calls a head wing position, which maintains the distinction between the parties but allows them to

discourse and cooperate in a way befitting a civil society. The Unificationist hope, one befitting a movement that is religious at its core, is that a supernatural grace bestowed upon society through the Blessing of marriage will open this possibility.

Unificationist Foundations of Sovereignty

Sovereignty, in the American tradition, is grounded in the individual's status as a child of God. The individual is created to fulfill God's purposes, and God, being just, endows each and every person with the powers necessary to do so. Human beings have the God-given right and responsibility to exercise these powers; hence they are *inalienable*. To remove these powers forcibly is a violation of God's purposes. The purpose of government, in the American tradition, is to protect this God-given individual sovereignty. Individuals voluntarily turn over, or "alienate," a portion of their sovereignty to the government in order to more effectively exercise it. Each hands over to the collective their personal right to set laws, judge transgression against them, and execute punishments. In exchange, the individual has a hand in the determination, judgment and execution of laws through elected representatives.

This is consistent, I believe, with Unification theology. Consider the question of God's purposes, for the fulfillment of which he grants human beings power and political rights. In the Anglo-American tradition, God's purposes were expressed as "life, liberty and (private) property." The Anglo-American foundation recognizes the God-given right to maintain our own physical life, to act according to our will, and to own property. The America founders, at the last moment of the writing of the Declaration of Independence, substituted, "the pursuit of happiness" for "property." The Unificationist understanding of God's purposes affirms ownership as a cardinal principle. Thus it would affirm, in theory, the right to private property. In practice we do not see this affirmed equitably. Members are requested to give up *all* their property to the church—albeit with a quick assurance that it will be re-instated with godly approval. One of the three rules of the heavenly constitution demands respect for public property—not private. The movement trades on the virtue of poverty in its message to the bulk of its members. It asserts that utilization of expensive cars and homes by some leaders is necessary socially, to convey the proper image of the church. Thus the use of worldly assets is regulated in the name of religion at this time.

Unification theory also provides a gloss on "the pursuit of happiness." Reverend Moon teaches that God's purposes that bring happiness are elucidated in the blessing given Adam in Genesis 1:28, to be fruitful, multiply and have dominion over the earth. This is understood to mean that each individual has the God-given purpose of attaining individual maturity in oneness with

God, create an ideal marriage and family and participate in an ecologically-sound society of, to employ a standard Unificationist phrase, "peace, freedom, unification and happiness." Western political thought asserts that since God purposed that we accomplish these things, and since God is benevolent and just, He gave us the powers necessary to realize our blessings and we have the right to exercise those powers. The purpose of government, therefore, would be to enable humankind, and each of us, to achieve these things. Unificationism would accept this logic. God created partnerships through which our purposes can be fulfilled and he empowered human beings to be the "rulers of the universe," the "mediators and centers of harmony of the cosmos."[26]

Unificationist theory does not indicate the pro-activity with which governments should enable human beings to fulfill their purposes. Does government exist to clear away obstacles? Should government do more than that and tutor, endow, encourage and even provide for this fulfillment? The spirit of Unificationism cuts both ways. On the one hand, there is a strong ethic of individual responsibility, each person's "five-percent," without the fulfillment of which one could live in the Kingdom of Heaven but still be in a personal prison. No free riders on this side of the picture. On the other hand, Unificationism tends to view individuals and even nations as perennial children in need of parental guidance and nurture. Nations are fixed as father, mother, elder son and all the younger siblings. A 70-year old is still treated as a child by his/her 90-year old parent. These diverse views reflect the assent to both a masculine approach (you are on your own) and feminine approach (your parents are always with you).

Let us examine the implications of the movement's practice with respect to the concept of sovereignty.

Individual Sovereignty

The western view that sovereignty resides in the individual has its modern roots in the Reformation (Luther) and Enlightenment (e.g., Locke). Like Luther, Reverend Moon upholds a strong view of individual sovereignty. One of his favorite maxims is "I am my own Lord in all heaven and earth," attributed to the Buddha, which could be seen as an eastern equivalent of Luther's legendary "here I stand; I can do no other." Reverend Moon himself is a strong individualist who listens to no one other than God, bucking in God's name every social, religious and political convention that stands in his way. Understanding himself to have fulfilled the requirements of a perfect servant, nay, son, of God, Reverend Moon assumes absolute sovereignty. Thus, for Luther as for Moon, the qualification to be sovereign, or free, is granted only in the context of perfect service to God and others. Implicitly, those who fulfill perfect association with God are promised complete sovereignty. Perfect

sovereignty attends perfect servanthood. Luther perhaps said it best, "The true Christian is Lord of all, serving none. The true Christian is servant of all, Lord over none."

For Locke, the qualification to be sovereign, or free, begins with tacit consent to the form of democratic government and responsible participation in it. Consent to the constitutional government allows one to participate in the shared sovereignty of the political sphere. Gaining public support, one may personify, for a period of time, the social authority granted to elected leaders.

As per the above discussion, Unification theory and practice seem to harmonize with both pillars of the democratic spirit. In fact, Reverend Moon's teaching on the sovereignty of the individual based upon service to God and others could not be more decisive. Individual sovereignty is the exact human gift that allowed the fall to transpire. Even at the cost of separation, God would not use force to assert his power as a ruler. His teaching is aptly set forth in the following passage.

> Why did God not intervene in the human fall? God's love for human beings means that He would have dominion over them through their own initiative. In all love in Heaven and on earth, the main element is not "I" but "the other." Hence, God *respects and serves* His object partner [human beings], and if He rules over [them] instead, this will ruin the fundamental basis [purpose of creating them]. So God could not intervene lest He should become a reverse ruler."[27]

The Principle affirms the categories of rule, dominion, and governmental authority, but it clarifies the legitimate grounds for these as *respect* and *service*. Reverend Moon rails against unregulated seizure of power; e.g., "What is communism? They are a self-centered group of people. They will do anything to take and keep power."[28] God, for Reverend Moon, is the first public servant. His commitment to respect Adam and Eve's personal sovereignty overrode His desire to protect their position as His children. There were no entitlements in the Garden of Eden. Failure to "respect and serve," in Reverend Moon's words, ruins life, defeats the purpose of being alive, and makes of God, and certainly of any human being, a "reverse ruler," the opposite of what a governor or government should be. A ruler or government that does not respect and serve the people is a false ruler and false government. A true government would be one in which leaders are chosen and who govern by the will of the people. The governors are granted their authority on the basis of the people's own "initiative." God, in allowing the fall, was respecting Adam and Eve's personal sovereignty.

Reverend Moon takes this principle to its next logical step, a step that, to my awareness, no Christian theologian has ever taken. *God can be God only when the people make Him God.* This was the premise that led to Reverend

Moon's coronation of God, January 13, 2001. The Unification God was not completely a sovereign, or king, until His children crowned Him. Legitimate sovereignty is given up by the beloved in response to love, and in no other way. Sovereignty is granted reciprocally in return for love given. The greatest indeed is the one who serves all.

Family Sovereignty

In Lockean theory, individual sovereignty is granted automatically at age 21, with the assumption of tacit consent to the rule of law. Age 21 is the time of assuming individual responsibility for one's life separate from one's parents. The Unificationist theory is not that simple. Unificationism rejects the division between parents and children inherent in the Lockean view. This does not contradict the affirmation of perfected individuality, but affirms that the individual is deeply embedded in a relational context, the primary one being that of the family, and that is not severed at age 21.[29]

For Unificationists, one never ultimately leaves one's parents. Individual perfection is accomplished only in the context of the three-generational family. Individual perfection is meaningful, but only in relation to one's parents, spouse and children. One enters God's direct dominion of love through the blessing of marriage. One gains eternal felicity only with one's family. Thus, since perfect obedience to God requires a family, sovereignty is granted to the individual only in the context of the family. The rights and powers, or sovereignty, granted the individual *per se* under Locke and Luther are thus tempered by relationship with one's grandparents, parents, brothers and sisters, spouse, children and grandchildren. Here Unificationists are legates of the New England Puritans, who mandated that unmarried adults live in a household with a family.

How this will work out in political practice remains to be seen. It did not work for long in Boston. In practice, Unificationists have not even attempted a thoroughgoing family-based ethic. In fact, the movement is individualistic. The price of joining the movement, for most people, was separation from their family. Members have been expected to separate from spouse and children for extended periods of time. In Japan, the blessed husband living in a different city from his wife and children is normal, in line with the larger culture. Everywhere, members are expected to work long hours, and time spent with the family in excess of that devoted to mission is frowned upon. The movement displays no mechanism to recognize "the family" as a political or social unit. It does not even begin to address tough questions in this arena, such as the merits of having both parents work, day care, educational policy, taxation, and so forth.

This Unificationist denial that family matters could change. Discussion of the discouraging results of such practices upon many of the offspring of

church marriages, as well as on the marriages themselves, is becoming commonplace. I believe that Unificationist pro-family teachings sooner or later will have an effect upon the movement. A current example of this is the shift of the movement's locus of spiritual authority from the institutional church, led and managed by heroic individuals, to the blessed family. Numerous families have taken the step of rejecting the church community in the name of family spirituality, arguing that the family is the real church. The ecclesiastical playing field is leveled, in theory and, in Korea, in practice. All blessed parents are ordained as clergy in relation to the church sacramental system.[30]

Further questions in need of answers have to do with the extent of authority that the people might be willing to alienate from themselves to those among them chosen to rule, what is the method of choosing rulers, and what *Divine Principle* would identify as the fundamental unit of the political society—the individual or the family.

National Sovereignty and Multiplicity of "Kingship"

A focused discussion of national sovereignty will have to wait, but I would like to discuss the question of whether Unificationism sees the leader as a public servant, a more democratic notion, or as a parent or monarch, a more traditional notion.

The contemporary democratic paradigm does not bestow much power upon leaders. America's elected leaders are subject to checks and all powers are balanced by other powers. They rule temporarily, and are chosen on the basis of merit, not ancestry. The United States has no hereditary aristocracy to which society gives deference. Citizens serve for two to six years as legislators, before the voters evaluate their performance. They serve for four years as the chief executive, with an option for only one more term. Judges have the longest tenure, for life, but the status is not passed on automatically to their offspring. The people can change the laws, even the constitution. No one in government can act unilaterally, but for extreme circumstances, and that for a brief period. All have others with power balanced over against them; all are checked, all efforts are subject to debate and compromise. The winner is indeed the one who is best at building consensus.

In terms of Unification rhetoric, this power delegated to political leaders would be seen as puny.[31] Unificationists idealize themselves as kingmakers. God wanted Adam to be king and all Adam's descendents to be royalty. But as the recent movie, *The Incredibles,* expresses, when all are superheroes, none are superheroes. How can there exist a society of multiple kings?

A society can embrace multiple kings when it is able to demarcate effectively the kingdom over which each king exercises dominion. For Unificationism, the person with mind-body unity is monarch over him/herself.

Parents are monarchs of the home and family.[32] Directors, chairpersons and organizational presidents are monarchs over their club, business or association, according to the nature of the entity. If this is nothing more than democracy writ with blue blood, why use the vocabulary of royalty at all? Let us first observe how Reverend Moon defines kingship. The monarch is the one who respects and serves his/her people. Therefore, God is the king. The king is the first and greatest public servant. In the Unificationist belief, service brings unity; unity brings love, and love brings the desire of the beloved to be controlled by the lover. The only true dominion is the dominion of love. All else is false dominion, temporary and unsatisfying. People cannot trust those from whom they feel no love. Political revolution is inevitable until true dominion is established.[33]

Since the world in which we live is bereft of love, the best government is that which limits its own power, namely, democracy. This limitation built into the democratic system of laws and practices. Yet here is Reverend Moon, declaring that absolute love has been incarnated in him and his wife and family and is, in theory, possible for all to realize. Well, in theory we arrive at the same conclusion. If all can love perfectly and equally, then Unificationism still boils down to democracy. Since taking a leadership position, as a servant leader, requires incredible sacrifice of personal life, people of true love would not wish to place that burden on anyone for very long. Therefore, the Unification leaders would have short terms of office. Since all have an equal spiritual foundation to serve others, that is, equality in the realm of heart, the individuals whom society would want serving as governors and administrators would be those who *also* have exemplary training, talent and skill in that area. Since all have equal value based upon love, it would seem that the choice of exactly which person is going to be the one to govern during a given governmental cycle should be decided by election.[34] It seems that the proliferation of messiahship indeed implies a democratic system of governance.

In a regime in which all are royalty, one would expect that the state would exist for no reason other than to facilitate administration. The state, the governing apparatus, would serve to facilitate the life of the people, expressed in culture and family. The state would require formal legislative, executive and judicial apparatus. The state would be multi-level and each level should have powers appropriate to its responsibility.

The individuals running the government on its various levels, from village to nation and world, would have their position on the basis of their merit in terms of leadership, communication, technique, diplomacy, creativity, teamwork and so forth. As government officials they would be responsible for concerns of public interest, such as transportation, communications, public relations, exchange processes, standards of weights and measures and

the environment. Many of these are technical questions on which people of good will can research, develop, implement and improve. I suggest that the Unificationist affirmation of discrete levels of the created order, each with inherent dignity, rights and responsibilities, is consistent with the Catholic social principle of subsidiarity, by which decisions are made by those in closest proximity to the appertaining causes and results.

In the state and most if not all social organizations, people would relate as colleagues, brothers and sisters. Paul's saying that "there is neither male nor female" would apply here. People work at shared tasks for the public good, the common weal. Leaders would be elected; to do otherwise would rob all the people of their sovereignty, of the dominion over the earth with which God blessed our ancestors.[35]

Popular Sovereignty and Elections

Then what of political parties? I will address this by returning to the statement on political parties set forth on page 361 of the EDP. It defines political parties, those interesting entities that the *Divine Principle* has conveying God's word to the larger society. Here is the passage:

> Just as the commands of the brain are transmitted to every part of the body through the peripheral nervous system branching out from the spinal cord, in the ideal world God's guidance is conveyed to the entire society through Christ, who corresponds to the spinal cord, and God-loving leaders, who correspond to the peripheral nervous system. The peripheral nervous system branching out from the spinal cord corresponds to a nation's political parties. Thus, in the ideal world, people of God led by Christ will form organizations analogous to today's political parties.

As I argued above, the *Divine Principle's* body analogy breaks down when pressed to explain competing political parties within a single body politic. The biological body does not have to rule between alternative approaches to attend to its functioning.[36] The nervous system is autonomous; it is a smoothly functioning administrative and managerial regime. It is part and parcel of the order of nature, making no moral choices. The body politic, on the other hand, is rife with moral choices. Every individual, family and larger institution is making moral choices. These congeal into large-scale alternatives for a nation as a whole. This is why marriage is a useful analogy for politics in government, in particular because marriage stands outside the determinism imposed by lineage.

The choice between relatively masculine and relatively feminine approaches to government are not contests of good and evil, but rather are different paths toward the greatest good. Therefore, electoral politics in the Unificationist ideal world will have significance. In theory, elections will

serve to reveal God's will to a world in which all are equal and authentic monarchs, people of nobility. The small-scale elections that I cited above signify that once the appointment system wears away, and once the people expect to participate in self-government, elections will emerge as the method to choose the leaders of government.[37]

The Unificationist ethos has it that all people would be monarchs for the sake of others—Lords of all and servants of all. All people would have dominion and responsibility over a personal and familial realm, by nature, and some over greater realms, by vocation. The quality of life is to matter more than the quantity of assets. The Divine Principle introduces the category of monarchy in its primal discussion of the position of man and woman as true husband and wife, establishing that position as that which in and of itself fulfills God's purpose of creation.[38] Social status, in this cosmology, is incidental, a passing dream. It is to be self-evident that a small kingdom of holiness and peace provides greater joy than an empire of profanity and conflict. Conventional wisdom has it that a middle-class citizen in a modern society has benefits and powers far greater than the kings and queens of old. The royal dignity of the parent, the priest and the servant leader is God-given and God-imbued. It is of the highest order of value. And I posit that this is why Reverend Moon utilizes the vocabulary of royalty.

Some Books and Articles on Unificationist Politics[39]

Anderson, Gordon. "American Democracy and the True Society." *Journal of Unification Studies* 2 (1998).

Casino, Bruce. "Thoughts on Unification Theology and Democracy," *Currents*, Fall 1989.

_____. "Suggestions on a Unificationist Social Policy." *Currents*, Spring 1990.

Durst, Mose. *Unification Culture and the 21st Century*. New York: HSA-UWC, 1991.

James, Gene. "Family, Spiritual Values, and World Government." Pp. 255-68 in *The Family and the Unification Church*. Barrytown, NY: UTS, 1983.

Johnson, Kurt. "Social Action and Politics." Pp. 73-91 in *Lifestyle: Conversations with Members of the Unification Church*. Ed. by Richard Quebedeaux. Barrytown, NY: UTS, 1982.

Kelly, David F. "Religion and Society in Unificationism." Pp. 357-64 in *Hermeneutics and Horizons*. Ed. by Frank Flinn. Barrytown, NY: UTS, 1982.

Kittel, Robert. "The Two Shall Become One Flesh: Fulfilling the Ideal of Creation through the Family." *Journal of Unification Studies* 6 (2005).

Kliever, Lonnie. "Unification Social Hermeneutics: Theocratic or Bureaucratic?" Pp. 365-71 in *Hermeneutics and Horizons*. Ed. by Frank Flinn. Barrytown, NY: UTS, 1982.

Lee, Sang Hun. *The New Cultural Revolution and Unification Thought*. Tokyo, Japan:

Kogensha, 1987.

Mickler, Michael. "The Ideal Society and Its Realization in Unification Tradition," Pp. 313-330 in *The Ideal in the World's Religions*. Ed. by Robert Carter and Sheldon Isenberg. St. Paul, MN: Paragon House, 1997.

_____. "The Politics and Political Influence of the Unification Movement." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Washington, D.C., 1992.

Notes

1. Dr. Sang Hun Lee, *The New Cultural Revolution and Unification Thought* (Tokyo, Japan: Kogensha, 1987) p. 95.
2. Ibid., p. 94. Lee defines vertical love as that expressed between parents and children, and horizontal love as that expressed among siblings or between spouses.
3. Ibid., p. 91.
4. *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, p. 31.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., p. 336.
7. Ibid., p. 337.
8. Ibid., p. 338.
9. Ibid. p. 339.
10. Ibid., p. 340.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid., p. 23. The same sentence articulates give and take action "between the government and citizens in a nation," but fails to identify give and take actions among societal entities. Give and take actions take place only "among people" and "between the government and citizens."
13. I will not discuss the final level, the cosmos, as its relevant to this paper introduces too many diverse understandings.
14. I interpret Reverend Moon's calls for the elimination of boundaries as a call to pacify borders and rationalize relations among nations, not to collapse national sovereignties.
15. *Exposition of the Divine Principle* (EDP), p. 361. I reserve a discussion of this passage for the end of this article.
16. It may be no accident that every time Reverend Moon has established an organization that resembles a political party, his lieutenants have clarified that the purpose of the new organization is education.
17. I am no political scientist, but my lay opinion is that a mature democracy hosts, for all intents and purposes, two major parties representing the left and the right.
18. *Father's Words on the Divine Principle I* (The House of Unification for World Peace, 2003), p. 56.
19. I believe that associations created based upon an initiative from the higher level will either fade away or will self-transform into structures with a grassroots base.

For example, the BFA generated from above in the 1980s faded away, and is being renewed out of an impulse proper to its nature and purpose in a modern context.

20.   EDP, 361.
21.   In a church in the author's vicinity, the CARP leader himself is creating an extra-CARP ministry to attract Unificationist college students who are unmoved by the CARP message.
22.   In this article, the term Unification Church refers also to the Family Federation for World Peace and Unification.
23.   Reference to the occasion is found in the caption of the photograph on p. 7 of *Today's World*, October 2004.
24.   As of this writing, once again Reverend Moon is matching church offspring in marriage, in the process pointedly excluding parents from participation and even presence. It is difficult to judge the members' reaction to this without knowing the number of families who could have participated and comparing it with the number that did. The number of couples in the first such even, in New York, was 121. The number in the second, six weeks later in Korea, was lightly lower.
25.   For an illuminating discussion of this Unification pragmatic adaptation to the environment, see Mickler, "The Ideal Society and Its Realization in Unification Tradition," pp. 313-330 in *The Ideal in the World's Religions*.
26.   EDP, pp. 46-47.
27.   Ibid., with copy-editing, italics and insertions by the author, p. 68.
28.   Ibid., p. 70.
29.   Robert Kittel provides a useful discussion of a man "leaving" his parents upon marriage, which distinguishes the Unification understanding from the Lockean: "Marriage, therefore, is the birth of a new family... drawing the support of the entire family together... the parent-child relationship grows when children leave home. Parents play a primary role in helping support and stabilize the new marital union... they have a vested interest in the success of the newly weds." "The Two Shall Become One Flesh: Fulfilling the Ideal of Creation through the Family," *Journal of Unification Studies* 6 (2005).
30.   Unificationists have in Korea a national president with significant power, and what the top leadership deconstructs, the top leadership can construct again. The structural change has endured for a year. At the same time, we note that this reform is not being carried out in Japan or America, despite the Founder's encouragement to consider it.
31.   Yet, ironically, compare the power of the President of the United States with that at the command of most kings today and in history.
32.   The similarity of Unificationist family practice with that of the bourgeoisie family, for which "a man's home is his castle," is apparent here and, I believe, in other respects not covered in this paper.
33.   The Divine Principle discusses the godly sources of the "rise and fall of nations" and constant social unrest as human beings strive to achieve their ideals. See EDP,

pp. 98-101, 347-51.

34. Gordon Anderson suggests a combination of lottery and election. See "American Democracy and the True Society," *Journal of Unification Studies* 2 (1998).

35. This implies that all Adam's children, male and female alike, inherited his dominion. Monarchists traditionally held that the eldest son alone inherited the paternal dominion. Unification theory seems to agree with this, but does not directly address the matter of the inheritance by the youngers. Unification practice, however, does not insist upon the eldest son's unique rights. The doctrine of individual responsibility is a counterweight to *pro forma* inheritance rules.

36. Dr. Andrew Wilson points out a parallel between the body and the two-party system, "as the nerves run in pairs: motor nerves and sensory nerves, sympathetic nerves and parasympathetic nerves." [Note to the author, Nov. 30, 2004]

37. Gene James presents an illuminating discussion of the relationship between Unification family and public ethics, in "Family, Spiritual Values, and World Government." pp. 262-67 in *The Family and the Unification Church* (Barrytown, NY: UTS, 1983).

38. EDP, p. 30.

39. With recognition to Mike Mickler for providing much of this list.

HEADWING PHILOSOPHY
AND THE LAW OF NATIONS

....

Gordon L. Anderson

I n the 1970s, as the Green Party organized, they adopted a slogan "Neither
left, nor right, but in front." It was a slogan of environmental activists and
sought to promote certain neglected values in opposition to the values
championed by the established political parties. Nevertheless, the Green Party
has spent most of its time fighting corporations. Although not in the traditional
left wing, the idea of "fighting for peace" is ingrained in its rhetoric[1] and is,
in fact, an adversarial model of peacemaking. Philosophically, this is consis-
tent with Marx's elaborations on Hegel's dialectic.

Anything is made up of its parts, and if a society is made from conflict
it will contain conflict in its essence. The opposite view is that unity grows
out of reconciliation rather than struggle, with love and sacrifice creating the
society of true peace.

The Desire to Impose One's Own Peace

Environmentalists and Marxists are not the only people who say that fighting
war can bring peace. President Woodrow Wilson labeled World War I "The
War to End All Wars." In fact, most wars are fought in order to end wars and
to gain peace. Today Americans are fighting in Iraq with the aim of bringing
peace to that country. In his *City of God*, St. Augustine noted that "even when
men are plotting to disturb the peace, it is merely to fashion a new peace near

---

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

to the heart's desire; it is not because they dislike peace as such."[2] This state-
ment could equally refer to the plots of modern terrorists or to revolutionary
movements to throw off oppressive governments—even to the American revo-
lutionaries in the 1770s.

All men want peace, but they tend to want it on their own terms, and they
tend to want to control it. They do so out of fear and insecurity as much as
the lust for power. Few men seek to fashion a just peace that views all men as
equal. An unjust peace is, according to Augustine, the characteristic of sinful
men:

> Sinful man hates the equality of all men under God and, as though he were
> God, loves to impose his sovereignty on his fellow men. He hates the peace
> of God which is just and prefers his own peace which is unjust.... Anyone
> who is rational enough to prefer right to wrong and order to disorder can
> see that the kind of peace that is based on injustice, as compared with that
> which is based on justice, does not deserve the name of peace.[3]

Today we see people everywhere attempting to impose an unjust peace on
other people. In the world order, larger and more powerful states attempt to
impose their views of world peace on smaller and less powerful nations.
Within states, economic, ethnic, or other social groups attempt to impose
their view of peace on the other groups through control of the machinery of
government. In extreme cases of injustice, like Rwanda, genocide can be the
result. However, we must view the contentious cultural wars between liberals
and conservatives in the United States in a like manner. Neither the liberals
nor the conservatives display the big-hearted concern for the entire nation
grounded in the principle that "all men were created equal," as proclaimed at
the founding of the United States.

At a time when the world is concerned about whether the United States
is trying to create an unjust empire, and Americans are concerned about
special interest groups controlling the Republican and Democratic parties, it
is important to revisit these basic questions of peace and justice in order to
pursue a more just peace.

Headwing Philosophy

Since the 1980s, Reverend Moon has championed a "Headwing Philosophy"
that incorporates the best element of the right and the left and based upon
"Godism." Let me quote a bit from what he has said to explain this concept:

> Neither left-wing ideology nor right-wing ideology will work. Both in the
> left-wing world and right-wing world, Cain and Abel came into being.
> Who can bring unity there? The left wing cannot do it, nor can the right

wing. Therefore, we conclude that we need a movement through which will bring together a new advanced right-wing type can be supported by the left-wing, and a new advanced left-wing type can be supported by the right-wing...

What we should uphold is the Headwing, not the left wing or the right wing. Then what is the Headwing? It is "under Godism." The Headwing exists under God. With Godism above Headwing, God and heaven above and the [parties of] the earthly world below are completely connected. In other words, humanists whose life is based on materialism need the concept of Headwing; they cannot object to that. Religious people need Godism; with it they cannot dispute. These two words, "Godism" and "Headwing," are persuasive to two different types of people, religious people and secular people.

Headwing is a body-centered ideology that is necessary for humans to live in this world. Godism is an ideology based on spirit. Unificationism means to join these two, Headwing and Godism, into one, making a wholesome person... Since humans came from the origin, God, as a motivation of the subject being, in order to bring total unity, we should connect that origin to our physical body. Otherwise, we can conclude that such unity is not complete.[4]

In the teachings of Reverend Moon the characteristics of Cain and Abel symbolize the divisions within individuals and within societies. Cain represents the son without faith; he is looking toward the earth, toward his body. He is a secularist, a humanist. He tries to fashion his world and his peace out of his knowledge of the material world. Abel is the faithful son who looks upward for God's approval. He is driven by his conscience, but is often ignorant of worldly principles. Thus he does not try to build a Kingdom on Earth but often simply waits for God's kingdom to be miraculously imposed—to drop down out of the sky.

Neither one of these brothers alone has the big picture; neither alone is capable of building a world of true peace. Reverend Moon's text, *Divine Principle,* traces these types through history, from Cain and Abel, to the Egyptians and the Israelites, to Hellenism and Hebraism, to the Emperor and the Pope, and on down to politics, ideologies, and economic practices of the modern world. God's goal for the tragic human history since the original Human Fall is restoration of unity between the Cain and Abel types.

Bridging the Liberal/Conservative Divide

In the recent elections in the United States, it is apparent that voters have been given two options in some ways analogous to this Cain/Abel typology. Neither candidate represents all of the values necessary for a peaceful and just society. As a result, many of the votes cast were not "for" a candidate but "against" a worse candidate. I heard one reporter say that half of the votes cast "for" Senator Kerry, were actually votes "against" President Bush. In other words, in the eyes of many voters neither candidate was truly worthy of becoming the President of the United States. If, in fact, the results of the election meant that the winner was viewed as the better of two bad choices, then it cannot be said later by the winner that he had a "mandate" from the voters. Rather, it was a mandate to reject the platform of the loser.

In a good election, a vote should be cast for a choice between two worthy candidates. That way, whoever wins will be viewed as legitimate. This same principle applies to other elected political officials.

To understand why more worthy candidates are not placed on the ballots, it is necessary to understand the nature of the political parties that advance candidates for election. United States politics is characterized by the opposing positions of the Democratic and Republican parties. The organization and structure of both parties reflects the interests of the social groups that provide financial support for the parties, not a philosophical position adequate to the maintenance of the country as a whole.[5] This contributes to the incivility of the so-called culture war in the United States. Both parties must broaden their partial philosophies if they are to be viewed as legitimate contenders or the door will be open for the formation of a new party that has wider voter appeal. Throughout the world, we are witnessing widespread attempts to control the politics of a nation for the selfish purposes of one group at the expense of another. There is no reason why, in principle, this polarization in the United States could not lead to widespread voting fraud, violent conflict, or a constitutional crisis.

In the United States, like Rwanda and many of the countries that have required UN military intervention, at the root of the political division is economic selfishness which places the interest of one group above the interest of the whole. In Paul Tillich's language of "ultimate concern," it manifests as a "false god" because it attempts to make a part more important than the whole. This concept is as politically dysfunctional as it would be for an individual person to place more value on one part of his or her body, or one appetite, at the expense of overall health.

Interest groups, including industrial lobbyists, unions, civil rights organizations, state bureaucracies, religious groups and the military, use the rhetoric of cherished values to justify their positions to the wider public. This

rhetoric attracts voters who believe in the values being espoused. In an age of ill-informed voters and media sound-bytes this tactic can be easily used to sway voters to support the political privileges of one group over another. As voters have figured this out, they have become increasingly dissatisfied with the partial goals of both the Republican and Democratic parties, thus they vent their frustration by voting for whom they feel is the "least dangerous," or in the case of Jesse Ventura's election as Governor of Minnesota, the promise of something different. Unfortunately, Jesse Ventura's administration failed to develop an Independent Party philosophy that was rooted in a broad enough set of values to support an enduring political system.

The primary values espoused by both parties are essential to the maintenance of a healthy society and the partial set of values espoused by either party is inadequate. Republicans tend to emphasize freedom, security, faith, and protection of private property. They promote protection against any government interference with the pursuit of happiness. Democrats, on the other hand, emphasize social justice, economic equality, and protection of the environment. They tend to promote larger government bureaucracies and legislation to accomplish these ends. Neither party advocates a full set of necessary values.

Greater peace will come when the right wing broadens its agenda to include such things as social justice, environmental protection and a safety net for the indigent, and when the left wing broadens its agenda to recognize the efficiencies of the market, the protection of private property, and the importance of humility before the Creator. Elements of both parties make these claims, but in practice veto legislation that promotes the values of the other party. When both parties are able to put forth broad-minded candidates who will represent all of the necessary values of a stable society, then voters can truly vote for one candidate over the other, instead of against the least desirable. In such a situation, most voters will be satisfied with the election of either candidate instead of dissatisfied with both choices.

The United States and the Law of Nations

Since September 11, 2001 we have become more aware of problems of world peace. We recognize the limitations of international organizations and the tendency of both state and non-state actors to use force to achieve their ends if they feel it will bring peace on their own terms.

The United Nations was established to keep world peace after the World War II, but has been unable to address either the issues of within-state conflicts or the unilateral behavior of members of the Security Council with veto power. Because of its theoretical respect for the absolute sovereignty of states, the UN cannot, according to its own founding principles, interfere in within-state

conflicts. Genocide and civil war are outside its mandate, although it has acted numerous times—for example, in Bosnia and Cambodia—when the situation became unbearable from a humanitarian standpoint.

After the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 as a "preemptive attack," the world became more alarmed because (a) a preemptive attack is not consistent with prevailing just war theory, (b) there was not international support through the United Nations, and (c) it appeared to undermine the democratic peace thesis promoted by the U.S. State Department, which says that "democracies do not initiate war." This invasion sparked lots of discussion about the behavior of the United States changing from a nation-state to an "empire." Some recent books on the topic include *The Sorrows of Empire* by Chalmers Johnson at the University of Chicago, *The Empire Has No Clothes: U.S. Foreign Policy Exposed* by Ivan Eland at the Independent Institute, *American Dream Global Nightmare* by British authors Ziauddin Sardar and Merryl Wyn Davies, and *Gulliver Unbound: America's Imperial Temptation and the War in Iraq,* by Stanley Hoffmann at Harvard University.

While the United States may not be a traditional empire in terms of political integration of territories, it does have tremendous influence in the world. This can be illustrated by the fact that the 2004 presidential election had an international television audience of 268 million viewers in Indonesia, 50 million in Thailand, and 100 million in India. The Voice of America broadcast the election in 44 languages.[6] These statistics tell us both that people around the world are concerned about who leads America and that the United States wants to influence the rest of the world by broadcasting its elections.

In my recent book, *Philosophy of the United States: Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness,* I discuss a parallel situation which developed in Rome as it grew from a Republic based on its civil law *(jus civile)* developed by the patricians and the plebians on the Italian Peninsula to an empire that stretched from Spain to Israel. The civil law of Rome was not designed for or adequate to address Rome's relations with non-Roman citizens under its sphere of influence. Eventually a body of law known as *jus gentium* (the Law of Nations) developed. This law established international principles of justice based on Rome's own domestic legal experience.[7]

The Romans spoke of the Law of Nations as being based on natural law, but that understanding of natural law was overturned by Thomas Hobbes, the "father of political science," when he said, "The state of nature is a state of war." Hugo Grotius, "the father of modern international law," rescued the Law of Nations with his magnum opus, *The Law of War and Peace* (1625). Upset with the cruel Machiavellian politics of his day, Grotius integrated traditional Roman law with Christian ethics and natural law. This was further developed by Swiss legal philosopher Emmerich de Vattel in his work *The Law of Nations, or Principles of the Law of Nature Applied to the Conduct*

and Affairs of Nations and Sovereigns (1758).[8]

The Law of Nations, as understood by these Enlightenment authors, is not legally binding on the world's governments except as they enter into agreement as sovereigns. This was also a principle of Immanuel Kant's *Perpetual Peace*, which served to inspire the League of Nations and the United Nations. Like international human rights or just war theory, it is a body of discourse on the legal behavior of nations articulated variously by different authors. It is not exactly embodied in any institution, be it the United Nations or the World Court, nor is it legislation deriving from these institutions.

The works of Grotius and Vattel were read by many of the founders of the United States. In the United States Capitol a marble relief portrait of Hugo Grotius is one of several historical figures central to the principles of American law that oversee the House Chamber. The American Founders considered Grotius' jurisprudence authoritative.[9] Grotius' treatise contained many Biblical references, as his source documents were from the Holy Roman Empire.

Today, when we speak of international law, we do not speak of a legal order in the sense that laws are enforced in nations. There is no international executive or legislative power to pass laws and enforce them. The International Court of Justice in The Hague decides cases only when both sides agree to accept the decision. Yet its decisions are greatly influenced by the body of law that evolved through Grotius and Vattel. It is based on principles of justice rooted in Enlightenment morality: treat all nations equally, and treat other nations as you would have other nations treat yours. The United States was a strong force behind the International Court. American Churches lobbied hard for its creation. Andrew Carnegie provided the money to build the house for the Court. Theodore Roosevelt helped negotiate one of its first victories in bringing an end to a war between Japan and Russia in 1905.

But the International Court has been ineffective in keeping world peace when nations refused to agree to arbitrate. Both it and the League of Nations were powerless to stop Mussolini's North African expansion in 1928 or to prevent World War II. Such prevention can only take place when great powers exercise their power for the sake of protecting others. This was the rationale behind the UN Security Council, and has been the stated task by leaders of most empires when they feel a responsibility to keep order within their sphere of influence.

While the Constitution of the United States gave the executive branch of the government authority to conduct foreign policy, the founders did not expect that the president would violate the Law of Nations. For the first 100 years, the United States followed a principle established by its first president, George Washington, who in his farewell address asked the United States to "observe good faith and justice towards all nations," and "to steer clear of

permanent alliances with any portion of the world."

It was not until U.S. corporations began seeking to expand foreign markets for products, about 1890, that the U.S. abandoned its isolationist policy, built a navy, and began to exercise what has been called "gunboat diplomacy." Since that time, three philosophical traditions have sought to guide the United States' foreign policy: (a) a return to isolationism, (b) full participation in international legal organizations, and (c) the pursuit *realpolitik*. After World War II, political realism, a throwback to Machiavellian politics, emerged victorious in Washington. When push comes to shove, national self-interest prevails over treating other nations as equals. Now that the United States has become the world's sole superpower, the temptation to use that power for the continued pursuit of national self-interest is causing great alarm in the rest of the world.

The philosophy of political realism, even though not consistent with the founding ideals of the United States, has prevailed because of the failure of the other two traditions. Globalization has made isolationism an impossibility. The failure to create satisfactory international organizations, on the other hand, has caused "the Law of Nations" to become confused with injustice.

Headwing Philosophy and International Law

A new appeal to *jus gentium* must be made, and it must be made apart from an absolute embodiment in any particular state or international organization. It is my contention that the Law of Nations should be subject to no king but God, and in addition no fallible human being or political power should claim a monopoly on interpreting or representing God to others. In short, the Law of Nations should derive from a Headwing Philosophy that respects the proposition that all human beings are created with equal dignity and deserve the equal opportunity to lead happy and fulfilled lives.

Left wing ideology would promote international justice through international law backed by some international military authority. While this sounds "equal" and "fair," it, like communism in Russia, could quickly degenerate into centralized oppression. Socialist-style laws do not allow for the new, invention, and the creativity of the human spirit that would take us beyond the world of today. Those in charge of such laws become a new class, a *nomenklatura,*[10] who use their legal authority to gain benefits for themselves.

The right wing, on the other hand, tends to use power to protect its own will to pursue happiness, either by defining its own self-interest or enforcing what it believes to be the will of God. Such a pursuit often interferes with the pursuit of happiness by others who are not party to the project or marginalized by it. It could be as egregious as the Nazi elimination of Jews in the Holocaust or as mild as a good emperor in China, lacking omniscience, not

thinking of what is best for people in the outlying province of Tibet. In either case, the will of a central power interferes with the pursuit of happiness by another group.

Before the United States was founded, the British thought the Americans were behaving like terrorists because they failed to obey laws that the British believed to be fair and just. However, the colonists believed that British laws prevented their own pursuit of happiness. Today the situation is reversed as the United States tries to keep peace in Iraq. In both cases there is an imperial power attempting to create a just order and marginalized people who believe that order to not be in their best interest.

Headwing ideology addresses the problems that arise by the imposition of either a right-wing solution or the left-wing solution to world affairs. What this means practically is that no human power can claim absolute legal authority, and that all legal institutions are continually in the process of perfection. The United States founders knew this, which is why they used language such as "a more perfect union" rather than the language of absolutes. The absolute is transcendent, and all governments must be subjected to it. The Founders recognized that ideally leaders should be good, but also that their powers must be checked to avoid extremes on the left like communism in Russia or on the right like National Socialism in Germany. All people and all governments must remain humble and recognize that ultimately all power derives from a higher power than any human individual or institution.

In short, neither the United Nations with some system of law based upon it, nor the United States as a sole superpower, can claim absolute sovereignty in a world created by God. Neither can be viewed as perfect or infallible.

First, we should work to improve the leadership of the United States so that its behavior in the world ever more reflects respect for the dignity of every human being and their right to freely pursue happiness. Unificationists would equate the pursuit of happiness with the right to freely pursue the fulfillment of the Three Great Blessings. The arbitrary foreign policy of the United States in the world today often impedes the ability of some people to accomplish the fulfillment of the Three Great Blessings. We must both work to perfect the Law of Nations we have been bequeathed through providential history, and to demand those people and nations that wield the power to keep order do so in accordance with the Law of Nations as we can articulate it.

The United States has rightly resisted signing some international treaties designed to compromise its legitimate sovereignty or as a covert form of theft or forced redistribution of wealth in the name of the Law of Nations as defined by secularists on the left. On the other hand, it has also arrogantly ignored actions that represent the Law of Nations as it is embodied in its own founding principles. In other words, it has often, in practice, refused to accord others the same rights and dignity it demands for its own citizens. Such internal

inconsistency is wrong.

Norman Swazo in the *International Journal on World Peace* has recently argued a proposal that would improve this situation: *The executive branch of the United States should not have the authority to violate the Law of Nations without the approval Congress.* This principle is consistent with the Constitution and the beliefs of the Founding Fathers. It is appropriate, at a time when American influence in the world is analogous to that of Rome in the first century A.D., that the United States, like Rome, develop some form of *jus gentium*, so that its behavior in the world can be righteous and predictable, rather than the arbitrary will of the executive branch.

Second, we should work to reform the United Nations and other international bodies so that they can better function to promote the Law of Nations as a Headwing ideal, rather than as secular legal institutions manipulated by self-serving nations and alliances. Based on Headwing Philosophy, the United Nations should reform in a way that places appropriate checks and balances on the selfish use of power, but promotes the positive use of power based on a concept of true justice, one in which all people are treated with equal dignity as children of God, each with the right to pursue happiness (the Three Great Blessings). Reverend Moon's proposal to establish a religious council at the United Nations would create a check on the vested interests of the leaders of the nation-states that currently constitute it. Such a religious council would be more aware of those who are marginalized and help insure that any UN action considers their well being. If the United Nations could not be reformed along these lines, some other institution would need to arise to accomplish this purpose. If the United Nations fails to reform, those who understand the importance of headwing ideology should be in the vanguard to bring such an international institution into existence.

Conclusion

Throughout human history, people out of fear and greed have sought to impose their own form of peace on others. This is not a true peace, one that treats everyone from the point of view of God or an impartial spectator.

The idea of Headwing Philosophy can be used to bridge the gaps between various interests in modern politics within nations by providing a set of values that includes the best of both conservative and liberal ideals. It also can inspire a new respect for international law by reference to universal truths that transcend all human political institutions, domestic and international.

Human beings are ultimately subject to both the laws of nature and to the just laws of society. The laws of nature—physics, biology, etc.—are given to us and can be understood by the study of science and history. The just laws of society are developed from philosophy, history, and a spiritual sensibility

that views all human beings with the love a true parent has for his or her children. The Law of Nations is an expression of the philosophy of society as it has developed over centuries of human experience. It is not arbitrary and should not be violated lightly. However, no human expression is an absolute expression of truth. Every society faces new changes and developments. Therefore it is necessary at times for us, like Socrates, Jesus, Gandhi, or Martin Luther King, to stand firm for righteousness when laws are unjust, even in the face of peril to oneself.

Notes

1. As this paper was drafted, one of the news items on the homepage of greens.org was "Fight Software Patents." http://www.greens.org/

2. Augustine, *The City of God* (New York: Image Books, 1958), p. 452.

3. Ibid., p. 454.

4. Sun Myung Moon, *The Way of Unification,* Section 6, Part II, http://www.unification.net/wu1/wu1-5-6.htm.

5. Various interest groups including corporations, unions, state bureaucracies, the military, and NGOs try to hijack state policy for their own ends. This common-sense theory is articulated by Jack Snyder in *Myths of Empire* and discussed by Ivan Eland in *The Empire Has No Clothes: US Foreign Policy Exposed* (Oakland, CA: The Independent Institute, 2004) p. 37.

6. Jennifer Harper, *The Washington Times National Weekly Edition,* November 15-21, 2004, p.1.

7. Gordon L. Anderson, *Philosophy of the United States: Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness* (St. Paul: Paragon House, 2004), pp. 12-14.

8. Emmerich de Vattel, *The Law of Nations or Principles of the Law of Nature Applied to the Conduct and Affairs of Nations and Sovereigns.* Available online at http://www.constitution.org/vattel This background is covered by Vattel in his Preface.

9. Acton Institute, *Religion and Liberty,* vol. 9, no. 6 (November and December, 1999), p. 1. http://www.acton.org/publicat/randl/liberal.php?id=330.

10. Michael Voslensky, *Nomenklatura: The Soviet Ruling Class, An Insider's Report* (NY: Doubleday, 1984).

A UNIFICATIONIST RECONSIDERATION OF THE JEWISH ROLE IN EARLIEST CHRISTIANITY: 30–70 C.E.

By Mark W. Callahan

Did God intend to set up Christianity as a new religion apart from Judaism? Did God and Jesus continue to love the Jews, or were they cursed and punished as many influential early church writings suggests? Was the cross really an obstacle for the Jews as Paul believed? In this paper, I propose that after Jesus' death and resurrection, God called the people of Israel to once again become the central people in God's providence and prepare the world for the Second Advent.

I believe it is important to reassess God's providence for the people of Israel.[1]Historical evidence does not support the popular contention, found both within Unificationism and in traditional Christian circles, that God cast off the Jews from their central position as God's chosen people *as soon as they crucified Jesus*. The period from Pentecost to the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem was a forty-year period (30-70 C.E.). Jews like James, Paul and Peter led the first forty years of Earliest Christianity.[2] The Jerusalem 'Mother Church' apparently was the headquarters of the Jesus party in Judaism. I contend that Earliest Christianity was still Judaism.[3]

Exposition of the Divine Principle, as does much of historical Christianity, overlooks this earliest period before the gospels were written. The precedent began with the Lukan writer of Acts and has continued ever since. For various theological reasons, this 'gentilization' of Christianity ignored the central role of James the brother of the Lord as the first 'pope' or 'caliph' of

---

Mark W. Callahan holds an M.Div. from UTS (2004) and a B.A. in History from the University of Indiana. He currently works in the Education Department of the Family Federation.

Earliest Christianity. *Exposition* as well overlooks this crucial first forty years and disregards its unique value by integrating it into the four hundred years of Roman persecution. Instead of Peter, James or Paul, it mentions Roman emperors Constantine and Theodosius. The Divine Principle suggests the immediate dismissal of the Jews as God's Chosen people after Jesus' crucifixion and God's turning favor towards the Germanic tribes who appear some five centuries later in Western Europe:

> When the Jewish leadership persecuted Jesus and led him to the cross, Israel lost its qualification to be the founding nation of God's Kingdom. Within a few generations, the people of Israel would be scattered over the face of the earth. They have suffered oppression and persecution ever since. This can be viewed as the tragic consequence of the mistake their ancestors committed when they condemned to death the Messiah, whom they should have honored.[4]

Exposition of the Divine Principle notes that "within a few generations" the people of Israel would be scattered and oppressed because of their ancestors' mistake. But what about the *first* generation? I contend that Israel had not yet been forsaken. Granted, a bad collective spiritual fortune was created by the Jewish representatives who rejected the earthly (historical) Jesus and allowed the Romans to murder him. But one must wonder how bad the Jewish fortune really was if Jesus while dying on the cross asked God to forgive their sin. Moreover, Jesus called it ignorance rather than sin (Luke 23:34). The risen Jesus appeared for forty days in his resurrected form to the very people who had forsaken him. Jesus revived his dispirited followers; he did not punish them but rather gave them a second chance. Israel too, I believe, was given a second chance to believe in the resurrected Jesus as their returning king and Messiah. Far from being the evildoers and a people with a lost qualification, the Jews were Jesus' instruments in constructing a new religious expression in Judaism, as a foundation for the Second Coming. Earliest Christianity can be considered a kind of Jewish Reformation.

Recent historical biblical research supports what the Bible unwittingly attests: James the brother of Jesus became the leading spokesperson for Jesus, surpassing Peter, who by conventional wisdom led the initial Jesus party.[5] James is the predominant authority, as noted in the first-hand accounts by Paul (Gal. 1:19; 2:9, 12). In Paul's letters this authority is acknowledged but not necessarily accepted. The Book of Acts, written later, also acknowledges James' authority but refuses to explain it. James first appears without explanation in Acts 12:17. He presides over the council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:13-21).

In a position similar to John the Baptist, James was to make straight the way of the Lord. The Book of Acts notes his success, especially among the

Pharisees who held similar beliefs and concerns (Acts 6:7, 15:5, 21:20). In this way, the people of Israel could have initiated a receptive base for Second Coming. It seems plausible that the prophecies about Jesus' imminent return within a generation (Mt. 10:23, 16:28, 24:34) could have been fulfilled if Israel fully supported this Jewish Reformation led by James and centered on Jesus.

James the Just modeled the virtuous life of a truly observant Jew. He practiced what scholars called the extension of the Law into the heart (circumcision of the heart) that the disciples of Jesus were encouraged to possess so as to surpass the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees (Mt. 5:20):

> For I tell you that unless your righteousness surpasses that of the Pharisees and the teachers of the law, you will certainly not enter the kingdom of heaven.

The Gospel of Matthew continues this Jerusalem Church tradition that Jesus came to not only fulfill the Law but also to extend it to include inner sins of the heart (e.g. Mt. 5:21-22).[6]

Robert Eisenman, author of *James the Brother of Jesus*, depicts the early Christian 'new covenant movement' inside Judaism correctly as a force of contention between Paul and James.[7] But Eisenman goes further. He blurs the distinctions between Jamesian Christianity, the Zealot party and the Qumran sect that wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls. He contends they were all a singular messianic movement inside Israel that led to Israel's violent demise. He describes this messianic movement's ethos as 'zealous' for the Law, xenophobic, puritanical and nationalistic for the elite chosen few. It provoked the ire of the pro-Roman Herodian rulers, as well as the Jewish historian Josephus. In contrast to this, Eisenman posits Paul, who may have married into a pro-Roman Herodian family and had an Idumean (i.e. Arab) mother. Paul was the 'mirror reversal': he sought a cosmopolitan gospel that did not distinguish between Jews and 'the nations.' As Paul understood it, the 'new covenant movement' ought to be inclusive.

It seems to me that Eisenman has oversimplified earliest Christianity by dividing it into violent elitist separatists (Jamesian) and egalitarian inclusionists (Pauline). The issues that divided James and Paul had to do with authority and purification. Perhaps Jamesian Christianity had some sort of attractive appeal to those violent anti-Roman patriots zealous for Israel's ascendancy over 'the nations.' However, although James promoted Israel *over* Rome, it is this writer's opinion he did not promote Israel *against* Rome, or for that matter against any nation. Eisenman doesn't consider this more moderate stance for the Jerusalem Christians. I posit James to be an inclusionist, seeking world salvation through Israel with Jesus as its returning king. Paul, having differences with policies emanating from Jerusalem, bypassed the

whole concept of Israel as God's medium and promoted Jesus alone as the sole instrument of world transformation.

According to the existing traditional accounts, Jamesian Christianity exalted the ideal of the Herodian Temple—inclusivist yet relegating the Gentiles a peripheral role in God's kingdom. As leader of the Jerusalem Church (which also directed policy outside of Palestine), James was not against Rome but seeking its proper subordinate position to Israel. Like many Jews in his time, he believed the biblical 'Last Days' had arrived, when Gentile sovereignty over the earth would come to a decisive end by divine intervention. For the Christian Jew, this meant Jesus' return as the King of Glory. James wanted Israel to acknowledge Jesus as its king and indemnify its ignorance over Jesus. To do this, James promoted the Jewish character of Jesus' teachings. Jesus was a devout Jew. This was not just a pragmatic stance to make Israel believe. It was the sincere belief that since Jesus was a devout Jew, therefore everyone—even the pagans—should either be Jews or become their servants. Unlike the hate-filled nationalists seeking divine vengeance against their pagan enemies, James held a larger scheme of liberation that included Gentiles, though in an inferior subordinate position.

In 2003, Unificationists and their Christian brethren began visiting Jewish leaders in Israel. Their rapprochement with Jews seems in many respects like a return to Jamesian Christianity. The goal was to have Israel and the Jews embrace Jesus as their king and repent about their past ignorance towards Jesus. Reverend Moon organized a ceremony that had Jews, Moslems and Christians all crown Jesus as king of Israel. In like manner to the Jamesian party, there was no Pauline salvation through the cross.

Major Beliefs of Jerusalem Christianity

Temple Worldview

The Mother Church centered its worship on the Jerusalem Temple (Acts 3:1). James went there every day according to legend to intercede on behalf of Israel in the capacity of Israel's unofficial high priest.[8] Eisenman calls this the priestly position held by James the "Zaddik." For Eisenman, Zaddik means a pillar, which upholds the world.[9] Paul calls James a "so-called pillar" (Gal. 2:9). The Temple's layout was very telling in how Jews regarded Gentiles. Gentiles were allowed to make offerings only on the fourth and outermost court. This reflected how the Jerusalem Church valued Paul's mission to Gentiles; it was a peripheral 'outer court' concern and not most central. In the fourth court realm, daily sacrifices at the request (and financial support) of Caesar were made to the God of Israel. This continued until after James'

death, when in 66 C.E. radical nationalist priests stopped the imperial offering of respect, thus plunging Israel into war and destruction. Moving inward, the third court was for male and female Jews. The next inner court was only for Jewish men. The innermost court was reserved for the Temple priests to make offerings.[10]

Some Jews did not appreciate these hierarchal divisions in Judaism. Understandably, Grecian Jews downgraded the Temple's value and importance. These divisions also existed in the Jerusalem Church. Reflecting this, the Book of Acts notes the dispute in the Jerusalem Church between Grecian and Hebraic Jews regarding the significance of the Jerusalem Temple for the worship of God (Acts 6:1). The Hellenist Stephen believed God did not reside in man-made structures; His divine throne was in heaven (Acts 7:8-9). Stephen was tried before the Sanhedrin court and stoned to death, becoming the first Jew martyred for Christ. Other Hellenistic Jews who believed in Jesus but not the Temple complex, like Phillip, were expelled from Jerusalem (Acts 8:4-5). Those in the Jerusalem Church like James that supported worship through the Temple and accepted its worldview were allowed to remain by Sanhedrin decree (Acts 8:1).

Pauline Christianity perpetuated the initial Grecian Jew challenge to the Temple and its worldview, which valued Jews in the central position and Gentiles on the periphery. The Temple worldview was expressed in a popular Jewish division of the world into two human races: those of Abraham (blessed) and those from Adam (cursed).[11] Paul rejected this division and believed all were made anew through Jesus as the new obedient Adam (1 Cor. 15:45).

Paul also spoke about another kind of temple in competition with the Jerusalem Temple (1 Cor. 3:16):

> Don't you know that you yourselves are God's temple and that God's Spirit lives in you? If anyone destroys God's temple, God will destroy him; for God's temple is sacred, and you are that temple.[12]

Although most Christians today are more familiar with and identify with Paul's stance, Unificationists resonate with the stance held by James, namely that God works through a central nation to save the world. They espouse the central position of Korea and Koreans in God's providence. But this does not mean God loves the central people more than others. It merely acknowledges how God works his dispensation and how he expands the providence. In Earliest Christianity—the Jamesian one—God had not abandoned Israel but was still working through it as the central nation to save the world. The Temple mode of worship mirrored this, and James was its high priest and Zaddik.

Purpose of the Messiah

Israel has two understandings of Messiah: during the First Temple period he was the righteous king and a son of God, and the during Second Temple Judaism he was seen in a more mystical sense as the liberator 'Son of Man.' National religions were the norm prior to Alexander the Great's conquest of the Middle East in 332 B.C.E. National religions could be ruthless. There was no concept of an individual's right to choose his or her own religion, since it could bring unfortunate national consequences. To defeat personal choice (idolatry) and uphold the nation's integrity, Jehovah promised a messianic king. The prophet Nathan declares to king David (2 Sam. 7:12-16):

> I (the Lord) will raise up your offspring to succeed you, who will come from your own body... and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and *he will be my son* [emphasis mine]... Your house and your kingdom will endure forever before me; your throne will be established forever.

Nathan established the idea of Messiah as a king. He will be the son of the Most High God. This kind of Messiah has an earthly origin, though Heaven claims him. The prophet Isaiah reaffirmed the kingly messiah as expressed in the Davidic covenant that exuded favoritism towards the then-exiled southern kingdom of Judah (Is. 9:2-7). The Immanuel child would live in a dark age but promised a bright future. There would be a cleansing of the land, refining the good and destroying the evil.[13] Judaism could accept the title 'son of God' for their kings. It did not yet have the late first-century Johannine interpretation of divine pre-existence.

Second Temple Judaism broadened the concept of Messiah as 'Son of Man' and liberator—the latter out of necessity since Gentile nations had subjugated Israel politically and culturally.[14] The Messiah was understood to possess a more immediate mission as a national liberator and just governing king. Cyrus the Persian was the first Messiah from this viewpoint (Is. 45:1), but was later reassessed as something much less. It was not enough just to free Israel: the messianic liberator must reverse the unjust world order that subjugated Israel and turn the world right-side up with Israel on top over 'the nations.'[15] Second Temple Judaism expanded the concept of Messiah as one who not only ruled righteously over Israel but also over the world. Some Jews in the Second Temple era combined this with the First Temple idea of a Davidic monarchy and others did not. Those who rejected a messianic monarch believed that only God could be king over Israel.

The Jerusalem Church saw Jesus as both the returning liberator and the king who would soon reign physically in Jerusalem.[16] Paul saw Jesus as a messianic liberator but not a kingly one since God alone will reign as king (I

Cor. 15:24). Paul downplays the Messiah's physical qualities (the historical Jesus, ethnic and kinship blood preferences, a physical reign and physical resurrection). He believed physical resurrection was the transformation of the ever-changing inferior material substances into an incorruptible spiritual substance (1 Cor. 15:42, 44).[17] The later gospel accounts drop the older nationalistic kingly Messiah held by Jamesian Christianity as dangerous, *Jewish* and anti-Roman.

The Crucifixion

The crucifixion of Jesus was not the obstacle for Jews that Paul assumed (1 Cor. 1:23). Crucifixion, after all, was a Roman punishment for political sedition against Imperial Rome. Had Jesus been accused of a Jewish heresy, he would have been condemned and stoned by the Sanhedrin like Stephen, but this did not occur. This fact that crucifixion was a Roman death penalty was attractive to potential Jewish recruits into the party led by James. S.G.F. Brandon notes the following three reasons. First, there was much to be gained by emphasizing Jesus' martyrdom at the hands of the hated Roman overlords. Jesus could be perceived as a Jewish patriot. Second, Jesus was victimized by Rome but not defeated by it. Despite the worst treatment Rome could possibly administer, Jesus' resurrection was a sign that Jehovah's power as greater than Rome's and of His favoritism towards Jesus personally and to Israel in general over and against the Romans. Third, Jesus was perceived as the first fruit of the distinctly Jewish belief in the physical resurrection of the dead (as opposed to the Greek belief in the immortal soul). Jews could use the resurrection event to reaffirm distinctly Jewish hopes and beliefs. I would add one additional advantage to the crucifixion motif. For Jews, it signaled the beginning of the end times—the beginning of the biblical last days: Jesus was the first fruit of the hoped-for resurrection of not only righteous Jews but Israel as a whole. For these early Jewish followers of Jesus, Jesus' death and resurrection signaled the beginning of the end times when the beastly ungodly six hundred year rule by Gentiles would come to an end and the prophesied Kingdom of God would finally appear.[18]

The Gospel of John continues this very Jewish Jamesian approach to the crucifixion. It is belief in Jesus rather than belief in Jesus' atoning death that leads to life. Like Jerusalem / Jamesian Christianity, the Johannine account portrays the crucifixion as a sign story, a testimony of God's favor towards Jesus as the Messiah.

The Jerusalem Church believed Jesus would return with the resurrection of past prophets and righteous martyrs, and they would live eternally on the earth in the everlasting Kingdom of God. This would occur shortly, once Israel had fully believed in the miraculous victory had by Jesus over the Roman attempt to crush him with physical death.

Was the crucifixion salvific? No. The Jerusalem Church did not believe Jesus' death had the power to forgive sins.[19] Paul was unique in his understanding of the atoning dimension of the crucifixion. As Paul understood it, everyone died together with Christ on the cross in some mystical sense (2 Cor. 5:14).

Physical Resurrection

Many Jews believed in the physical resurrection of the righteous dead that would occur when Jehovah ushers in the Kingdom of God (i.e. the Kingdom of Israel) on the world. Many Jews had suffered unjustly under the six hundred years of Gentile oppression and even died as martyrs under unjust rulers (e.g. the Seleucid king Antiochus IV). Believing ultimate justice could not be served unless the righteous dead participated in the future promised Kingdom of God, Jews of the Pharisee party began to believe in the physical resurrection of the righteous dead at the time of the Messiah. It was believed their God of justice would awaken those righteous Jews who had "fallen asleep" (Dan. 12:1-2; Mt. 27:52) and give them their deserved reward.[20] The Jerusalem Mother Church and the Zealot party also believed in the physical resurrection of the dead.

This belief encouraged some to accept martyrdom and holy war against the Romans; Jehovah would vindicate their noble deaths and resurrect them. Because Jesus resurrected in what Unificationists call a secondary dispensation, the phenomenon of Jesus' resurrection caused new affinities to occur in Jewish society that might otherwise not have. The belief in physical resurrection takes on a new relevance as the only way to explain Jesus post-crucifixion appearances.[21] In other words, the distinctly Jewish belief in physical resurrection might not have had any lasting significance to first century Jews if Jesus had lived a full earthly life as the Messiah of Israel.

The belief in physical resurrection became central in God's providence after Jesus' death because it was the only explanation Jews could fathom to explain to Jesus' appearances. Apparently, it would have been difficult for Jesus' disciples to speak about a spiritual resurrection. S.G.F. Brandon notes Jews were forbidden to communicate with ghostly apparitions who lived in the dark shadowy world of Sheol located below the earth (Lev. 19:31; 2 Kgs. 21:6; Is. 8:19).[22] Jesus' appearance was not shadowy. It had flesh and bones (Luke 24:39). He ate physical food (Luke 24:42-43). At that time, such phenomenon could only be understood and interpreted as a physical resurrection.

This belief in a physical resurrection created a natural affinity between the justice-minded Pharisees, the martyr-like Zealots and the Jerusalem Church, and affinities of this sort naturally lead to political ones. Under James' leadership, a political alliance most likely developed between these three groups. During his lifetime, James' inclusionist agenda tempered the more radical and violent extremists, but not so after his untimely murder in 62 C.E.[23] In the succeeding four years leading up to the unsuccessful Jewish

revolt, leadership in the Jerusalem Church was rudderless amidst the turbulent political waters of unrest, hatred and fanaticism. In his *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius does not record any successor for James until 70 C.E. when the revolt was put down.[24] The new leadership no longer lived in Jerusalem, and it never regained the supreme position over the church outside of Palestine. Between 62 and 70 C.E. there is an eight-year gap in ecclesiastical authority when the Jerusalem Church was sorely needed as a guiding light in Jewish politics! With James removed, I believe the Jerusalem Mother Church was unable to find or agree upon a single central figure. It is reasonable to imagine the splinters within the Jerusalem Church, with some of its followers tending toward violent radical zealotry of the kind supposed by Eisenman.

The Sadducee party, on the other hand, did not believe in any form of life after death, and they were not interested in becoming martyrs in a holy war against Imperial Rome. This aristocratic priestly elite was viewed as Roman collaborators. They saw themselves as pragmatic realists, upholding the older Jewish tradition that denied any life after death. To their critics (including James), they supported the unacceptable status quo whereby the Gentiles, who held a peripheral role in God's providence at best, unjustly held the dominant position of power.

Unificationists argue against physical resurrection: "Resurrection does not refer to physical life and death, it must refer to the life and death of man's spirit."[25] As far as I know, Unificationism does not explain the disappearance of Jesus' body. What happened to the body if it did not physically resurrect? Yet we can surmise what would have happened if Jesus appeared only in his spiritual resurrected form while his corpse still lay in the tomb: there would have been no Earliest Christianity. Such truth might have convinced Hellenist pagans to believe in Jesus, but not the devout people of Israel. It would have been most difficult to interpret that kind of phenomenon in Palestinian Judaism. One either resurrected physically or not at all. There was no other accepted Hebraic view.

James the Just, Brother of the Lord

The second half of this paper investigates the role of James, Jesus' half brother. Though his important position is acknowledged in Paul's writings and the Acts of the Apostles, his prominence is decidedly low-key. Oddly, the Lukan writer is almost silent about his role in the early church, even though he claims to write an accurate historical account. Paul and Luke are actually hostile witnesses to James' ecclesiastical authority. My paper seeks to explain why this was so. I will also assess James' role in the providence according to Unification-inspired reflections.

James the Disciple

Matthew's gospel mentions Jesus having four brothers; one of them named James (Mt. 13:55). Only Paul's letters describe "James, the Lord's brother" as having unique authority over the Jerusalem Church and the universal church (Gal. 1:19; 2:9; 2:12). The Book of Acts mentions James but never explains who he is and why he has authority (Acts 12:17; 15:13; 21:18). This may cause some confusion to the reader who may wrongly assume Acts is referring to James the apostle, son of Zebedee. This cannot be, because Acts mentions the death of the apostle James previously (Acts 12:2).

The only reports in the New Testament about the first leader over the Jerusalem Church are hostile witness accounts that grudgingly acknowledge his commanding presence. Why? James was zealous for the law, and so was Jerusalem Christianity. The Lukan writer was embarrassed by this and did not believe it came from the Holy Spirit. Consequently, he wanted to downplay the fact, though it could not be ignored. Christianity after 70 C.E. rejected the zeal for the law that had characterized the Jerusalem Mother Church. Luke wanted to testify to the saving work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the early church, and he did this with a superficial treatment of unity between Peter and Paul when, in fact, Peter ultimately sided with the Jerusalem Church against Paul after the clash in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-13; Acts 15:39).

By the second century, James's continuing legacy, especially in Palestine, could not be erased yet was too disturbing to remember. The role of James had to be reclaimed, explains John Painter. Church tradition accepted the then-popular titles emanating from Palestine: "James the Just" and "James the Righteous." These titles acknowledged his purity before God and his concern for social justice. Eusebius, the fourth-century Church historian, records several legends that mix fact and myth about James the Just from Josephus, Hegesippus and Clement of Alexandria.

What kind of believer was James the brother of the Lord during Jesus' earthly ministry? There is no solid evidence from any existing historical documents. The synoptic gospels show 'the Jews' as old wine skins unable to receive the new wine covenant with Jesus.[26] Mark, writing from Rome to Gentiles after the Jewish revolt, notes Jesus' hostility to his blood relatives, preferring a spiritual adopted family instead (Mk. 3:33-35). Only the Gospel of John shows a popular broad support for Jesus from the Jewish populace that the Temple high priests had to violently suppress. Only the Johannine gospel portrays Jesus' family as believers but on a superficial level (John 7:2-5):

> But when the Jewish Feast of tabernacles was near, Jesus' brothers said to him, "You ought to leave here and go to Judea, so that your disciples may see the miracles you do. No one who wants to become a public figure acts in secret. Since you are doing these things, show yourself to the world." For

even his own brothers did not believe in him.

John's gospel posits two kinds of believers: those who believe because of external signs and those whose inner conviction is born of the Holy Spirit.[27] The 'external' sign believers are not really believers at all, explains Painter, as they lack the sustaining power of the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete. Yet in the Johannine account, it is not just the Lord's brothers who are superficial believers but all of Jesus' *named* disciples,[28] including Peter, because the Holy Spirit had not yet come.

When did James believe in and follow Jesus? Paul notes the risen Lord appeared first to Peter, then the Twelve. Then over five hundred believed. Then the resurrected Christ appeared to "James, then to all the apostles,[29] and last of all he appeared to me also." (1 Cor. 15:5-8) From Paul's account, it is not clear if the resurrected Jesus appeared to James during the crucial forty-day period. This became an important issue in Earliest Christianity because any appearance by the risen Jesus after his forty-day ministry was popularly believed to be an inferior vision. Paul was criticized on this point. His critics in the Jerusalem Church thought his vision of Jesus lacked the full bodily presence and was only an apparition.[30]

James was among those at Pentecost (Acts 2:1), but this is after the resurrection appearances; Jesus had already ascended. The Book of Acts records the presence of Jesus' brothers and mother with the Apostles staying in Jerusalem and waiting to receive the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:14) after Christ's ascension. This seems to suggest the risen Lord appeared to his physical family during the crucial forty days after Easter. The Gospel of Thomas records the resurrected Jesus giving James a special prominence over the twelve (Thomas 12):

> The disciples said to Jesus, "We know that you will depart from us. Who is to be our leader?"

> Jesus said to them, "Wherever you are, you are to go to James the righteous, for whose sake heaven and earth came into being."[31]

Eusebius records an account of James by Clement of Alexandria's work, *Institutions*. From its seventh book Eusebius excerpts the following:

> The Lord imparted the gift of knowledge to James the Just, to John and Peter after his resurrection, these delivered it to the rest of the apostles, and they to the seventy, of whom Barnabas was one.

In this excerpt, James is one of the three main disciples—like the 'pillars' mentioned by Paul (Gal. 2:9). By naming him first, Clement is indicating his preeminence. Clement's version differs from Paul's account in that Christ's appearance to James is simultaneous to Peter's and before the rest of the Twelve.

The two travelers on the road to Emmaus suggest close ties between the resurrected Jesus and his physical family as early true believers. These travelers encountered the risen Jesus on Easter morning after he appeared to Mary Magdalene but before he appeared to the Twelve. These travelers must have been important. One was named Cleopas (Luke 24:13-18) and the other Simon (Luke 24:33-34). Jesus had an uncle named Cleophas and a physical brother named Simon. Simon 'the Zealot' was also an apostle and present at Pentecost. (Luke 6:15, Acts 1:13) Cleophas was Joseph's brother. These two similar names—Cleopas and Cleophas—may be referring to the same person. Why the subtle name change? There are three plausible reasons for this. Firstly, the stories were passed between different languages, Greek and Aramaic. Secondly, when the oral tradition was written down, the way names sounded and were spelled by the writers may have varied. Finally, names may have been shortened, as in the case of Simon, the second traveler, because there was an advantage to conceal his real identity by later Gentile writers not wishing to promote Jesus' preference of kinship and ethnicity over others. Other reasons also exist for name changes (nicknames and contractions), but they are not relevant here.

To complicate matters, Jesus' mother had a sister also named Mary the wife of Clopas (John 19:25). This is very confusing and may require some unconventional reasoning. Firstly, these three names may be referring to the same person. Eisenman believes this Clopas (Cleopas / Cleophas) was actually Jesus' physical father.[32] I do not go that far since I support Reverend Moon's position by faith that Jesus' father was another well-known New Testament figure—Zechariah. But Eisenman offers another possibility: Clopas may have been Jesus' stepfather. As caregiver towards mother Mary and her family, this may explain the sisterly Mary. Origen, writing in the third century, believed Clopas was the father of James the Just.[33] This would make sense if Joseph was not alive during Jesus' later life (note his absence in scriptures) and his brother Cloepas/Clopas had assumed his duties as a stepfather to Joseph's family. Jesus' resurrected appearance to his own believing physical family would surely have been one of his first priorities.

Mission of James

Moses had a brother, Aaron, who spoke Moses' words to the Pharaoh. Together, these two brothers did God's work and led the enslaved Hebrews to freedom. Jesus had a half brother—John the Baptist according to Reverend Moon. John the Baptist and Aaron held similar roles for their liberator-type brother. James, another half-brother of Jesus, held a position similar to John the Baptist. Eisenman notes an even stronger connection as *successor*—a Joshua figure to the Moses-type liberator.

According to Unificationism, John the Baptist did not fulfill his respon-

sibility. James seems to have had a role was very similar to John the Baptist's in a third providential attempt to get Israel to accept Jesus as its messianic king.[34] Both were called to make straight the way of the Lord. It seems rather clear that James was restoring the failure of John the Baptist, which Unification theology acknowledges as the main cause for Jesus' failure to be recognized and accepted by Israel. Now James, the half-brother of the Lord, was reversing the ignorance that sent Jesus to the cross. In John's position, he was alerting the people to believe in Jesus as their king and liberator. James had no intention of abolishing the older Noachic, Mosaic and Davidic Covenants. He wanted to stand upon their historical foundation and expand it through Jesus' new covenant. It should be noted that the Jewish experience of covenantal blessings were not spiritual otherworldly rewards but very down-to-earth blessings of long life, good health, fertility, prosperous land and abundant wealth while on earth.

One significant difference between John the Baptist and James the brother of the Lord was the means of religious purification and repentance. John used water from the Jordan River while James used the Temple in Jerusalem. Why the difference? I believe John went into the desert like the Zealots and ascetic Essene party at Qumran; they were 'resistance fighters' against Rome. (Jerusalem was incorporated directly into the Roman Empire in 7 C.E. The Jewish province of Galilee was not and it was in non-Roman Galilee that Jesus grew up). Thus John was a spiritual renegade against Rome. He saw the Herodian Temple and its builder, the Idumean King Herod, as Roman collaboration, and he, like the Essenes, wanted nothing to do with it. John emphasized separation from the outside tainted culture and called for Israel's purification. This is why he used water from the Jordan River rather than sacrifices at the Temple.

John the Baptist wanted Israel's independence from Rome and Israel's triumph over the Gentile world—and possibly even its destruction. Jesus on the other hand, had a message of love, integration and reconciliation: he wanted interdependence between Israel and Rome. I believe John could not agree with this position, and it became the task of James to indemnify this mistake.

James was not a renegade. Following the Herodian Temple model, he believed there was a place for Gentiles in God's kingdom, but on the periphery and not as the central favored people.[35] Gentiles were to be subjugated but not eliminated. It was with this understanding that James sanctioned Paul's mission to the Gentiles: it was a *lesser* mission than Peter's to the Jews of the Diaspora. In other words, the Jerusalem Council had sanctioned Paul's work as a 'fourth court' endeavor. Paul, however, assumed otherwise. From the internal Pauline perspective there was no fourth, third, second or first court of favoritism. Everyone was equally important to God: everyone was a temple

of God. In a sense, the conflict between the Hellenist Jews like Stephen and Phillip were resurrected through Paul—a man who legend has it was closely connected with the death of Stephen and seems, on some level, to be his replacement.[36]

According to legend, James behaved like John the Baptist in other ways as well:

> This apostle was consecrated from his mother's womb. He drank neither wine nor fermented liquors, and abstained from animal food. A razor never came upon his head, he never anointed with oil, and never used a bath.[37]

According to Hegesippus, James the brother of the Lord went into the Jerusalem Temple every day:

> He alone was allowed to enter the sanctuary. He never wore woolen, but linen garments. He was in the habit of entering the temple alone and was often found upon his bended knees, and interceding for the forgiveness of the people; so that his knees became as hard as camel's, in consequence of his habitual supplication and kneeling before God.[38]

Whether James actually was allowed into the innermost court reserved for high priests is questionable. Nonetheless, there is usually a core truth surrounding later legendary elements. James seems to have personally taken upon himself the intercessory role as the high priest to his brother Jesus, the king. These two roles of high priest and king respectively represent the spiritual role of archangel (James) and the temporal position of Adam (Jesus). These two roles seek to accomplish what later providential roles like Charlemagne and Pope Leo II were to accomplish: a foundation to receive the Messiah. If James acted in a priestly capacity, it was not in the inherited aristocratic Sadducee priestly role but the Pharisaic one. One could be a Pharisee priest regardless of background. Pharisees wanted to take possession of the Temple from the corrupt Sadducees. They did this in 66 C.E. It began the Jewish Revolt.

If Hegesippus' report is true, what sins of the people was James asking Jehovah to forgive? One can only conjecture. I believe James was asking God to forgive the collective sin of the Jewish nation for not receiving and welcoming Jesus as its anointed king. As a consequence, Jesus had no base upon which to remain on earth; he was left unprotected and wrongly killed by the Romans. God, however, vindicated Jesus by raising him up and nullifying the Roman attempt against him. James expected further vindication of Jesus when Israel removed its ignorance and collectively awaited his return. I believe James felt personally responsible for this national awakening to Jesus' true identity. If this is true, then it is another valid reason why Gospel Christianity

concealed James' historical position and beliefs. Gospel Christianity believes Jesus came to die on the cross; Jamesian Christianity did not. Gospel Christianity believes Jesus came to replace traditional Jewish purification rites with atonement through the cross.

If James was repenting everyday in the Temple on behalf of Israel's ignorance toward their heaven-sent earthly king Jesus, then Jamesian Christianity was very close to the present Unificationist stance that Jesus did not come to die on the cross.

Death of James

There are three different stories about James' death recorded by Eusebius. The shortest version comes from Clement of Alexandria: James "was thrown from a wing of the Temple and beaten to death with a club."[39] A more detailed version comes from Hegesippus in the second century.[40] According to Hegesippus, many Jews in Israel believed in Jesus on account of James' preaching. Nonetheless, the Scribes and Pharisees somehow believed they could use James to stop the preaching of Jesus as the Messiah before all of Israel believed. James was placed upon a wing of the Temple and asked to denounce Jesus. Instead of denouncing Jesus, he testified all the more and many at the Passover festival believed. The Jewish leaders then cast James from the Temple mount. They stoned him on the ground as well and beat him with clubs.[41]

The third version recorded by Eusebius comes from Josephus' *Antiquities*. Historians believe it is the most credible. The Roman governor Festus was dead and the new governor Albinus was on his way. Momentarily freed from Roman restraint, the high priest Ananus the Younger abused his priestly authority to convene a meeting of the Sanhedrin against James and others. Josephus writes that Ananus "accused them of having transgressed the law and delivered them up to be stoned." Josephus writes:

> Those of the inhabitants of the city who were considered the most fair-minded and were strict in the observance of the law were offended at this... Albinus angrily wrote to Ananus threatening to take vengeance upon him. King Agrippa, because of Ananus' action, deposed him from the high priesthood, which he had held for three months and replaced him.[42]

In Josephus' account it is not clear why the fair-minded and strict observers of the Law rallied to James' defense. Josephus does not mention the crime James committed against the Law. Were they supporters of Jesus? Details are lacking. With obvious Pharisaic support behind James (Acts 15), and possibly Zealot support as well, Ananus may have been battling the early stages of religious division in Israel over the control of the Temple. 'Throwing James from the Temple mount' suggests removing *Pharisaic* James from his posi-

tion in the Temple as a mediator on behalf of Israel. The Sadducee priests could retain their position and their policies of submission to Rome.

Like Jesus, James too seems to have challenged the ruling aristocratic elite class of priests in the Temple, and this prompted his murder by jealous rivals who wanted to keep their position of authority. Brandon notes that Jesus' cleansing of the Temple was not against the moneychangers as now supposed but against the 'den of thieves'—that is, the elite Sadducee aristocrats pocketing large sums of money, protected by the Roman authority and not helping the poor.[43]

After James: Israel Adrift

I believe the Jerusalem Church, like Jewish society as a whole, was increasingly divided between two extreme social forces: the submissive conservative Sadducees and those seeking a new world order where true social justice for the righteous (Law-observant) oppressed would appear. In the absence of James, significant portions of the Jerusalem Mother Church, already aligned with the lower Pharisaic priestly class (Acts 6:7, 15:5, 21:20) and the oppressed rural peasants (Lukan Beatitudes), increasingly identified themselves with the radical Zealot party. This would explain Josephus' failure to mention a Jesus party inside of Judaism.

Eisenman closely aligns the Jamesian party with the Zealotry from the beginning and believes Josephus' description of the Zealot party referred to Jamesian Christianity. I do not think this is fully accurate. Jamesian Christianity sought separation but for ultimate union. James sought an empowered Israel centering on the resurrected Jesus and through this, the returning Lord would upright Israel's position over the nations. Then true justice for all could be served. The Jamesian pursuit was not through hatred, exclusivity or violence. It was through attending Jesus and becoming more perfect: a deeper internalization of the law for a righteousness that could exceed the existing standard.

After James's death, Jerusalem Christianity probably splintered into peaceful and violent factions. However, any traces of this dissension perished, initially with the destruction of Jerusalem and later in cover-ups and concealments by the embarrassed Gentile community of believers who wrote the Gospels.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, the Gentilization of Christianity became providential. Israel had been destroyed and the Kingdom was given to new 'tenants.' Josephus himself believes he personally experienced this dispensational transformation. He believed the Roman Emperor Trajan—a Gentile—was the new messianic leader for Israel. This spiritual awakening of sorts motivated him to switch sides in the Jewish Revolt.

Escape to Pella?

Eusebius writes that an angel warned the Jerusalem Christians to escape to the town of Pella in the land of Decapolis beyond the Jordan River.[44] According to this legend, the Jewish believers in Christ escaped the judgment that God sent upon the disbelieving Jewish state for rejecting Christianity. Scholars have recently challenged this legend.[45] If the Mother Church had indeed escaped, then why once ensconced in Pella did it cease being the head-quarters of the Christian religious movement? We question whether Jerusalem Christianity really escaped. Eusebius couldn't have imagined otherwise, since God always saves his elect from undeserving judgment.

It is hard to imagine Jerusalem Christianity forsaking Israel when the Jewish state was its prime concern. The goal had been to prepare Israel for the Second Coming. I think it is most incredible to imagine the Jerusalem Church forsaking Israel in its most desperate hour requiring God's interven-tion. In Israel's very moment of life-and-death struggle, the Jews knew their own military prowess was not enough. Perhaps they saw themselves in the position of David fighting Goliath or the Maccabean family fighting against Antiochus Epiphanes once more. Perhaps they believed God would once again intervene and protect their righteous cause. Perhaps they concurred with the Zealot belief that a martyr's death assured one's future physical resurrection in the Kingdom of God. It seems reasonable to conclude that a large portion of the Jerusalem Mother Church died inside the burning Jerusalem Temple alongside their Jewish brethren while awaiting the Messiah's supernatural appearance from Daniel's heavenly clouds above.

The Book of Acts never mentions the fall of Israel. This is an incredi-ble cover-up that can hardly be comprehended. It is surprising that something of such magnitude was not mentioned. If the escape to Pella by angelic reve-lation were true, why didn't the author of Acts gladly mention it? He didn't because it never happened. There are many embarrassing episodes in Earliest Christianity that the Lukan author and other gospel writers deliberately refused to write about.

The Jewish Revolt and destruction of Israel was not God's vindictive wrath. Unificationists disagree with Eusebius, Augustine, and Luther who formulated this traditional position. It was ignorance and division, not God, which destroyed the nation of Israel. When people harbor only division, with no later union stage, they walk outside of the principle—outside of God's protection—and become vulnerable to hostile, destructive forces. When Jerusalem fell, it was not God's triumph but God and Jesus' lament:

> As he approached Jerusalem and saw the city, he wept over it and said, "If you, even you, had only known on this day what would bring you peace —but now it is hidden from your eyes. The days will come upon you when

your enemies will build an embankment against you and encircle you and hem you in on every side. They will dash you to the ground, you and the children within your walls. They will not leave one stone on another, because you did not recognize the time of God's coming to you." (Luke 19:41-44)

Conclusion

What then will the owner of the vineyard do to them? He will come and kill those tenants and give the vineyard to others. (Mk. 12:9)

The Gospels were written after Israel was destroyed. Their Gentile writers assumed the Jews were cursed and no longer central in God's providence. This seemed evident in 70 C.E. but not when Jesus was crucified sometime around 30 C.E. Christians and Unificationists use the parable of the Vineyard (Mk. 12:1-12; Mt. 21:33-46; Lk. 20:9-19) to demonstrate with Jesus' words God's disfavor towards the Jews who killed Christ.[46] Killing Christ was wrong. But not receiving the resurrected Jesus who preached again in Israel was also wrong. And it was this second wrong that caused the Jews to lose their central position in God's providence.

James the Just, the brother of Jesus, wanted Israel to amend its ignorance. He prayed for Israel to receive the resurrected Jesus. He sought to prepare Israel to receive Jesus as its king and liberator. This Jewish party most likely did not believe that Jesus came to die on the cross as the means to salvation. It believed God had not yet forsaken Israel or the Jews. The Second Coming was imminent if the people of Israel quickly recognized the resurrected Jew named Jesus as their Messiah and king. The day they longed for—the appearance of True Israel reigning supreme over the nations—could have come to pass. The Jerusalem Church upheld the Temple worldview that espoused the centrality of Jews and the inclusion of Gentiles on the periphery of the providence.

We will never know whether, if James had not been murdered, Jerusalem Christianity could have succeeded as a moderate force inside Israel in restraining the nationalistic urge to separate from the world it hated. Today the Unification Movement returns to Israel with a message in many ways similar to Jamesian Christianity. Israel has another opportunity once again to believe in Jesus as its Messiah and king.

Notes

1.   'People of Israel' is a term that the Jews used for themselves in the period under study. The term, 'the Jews' is Greek and Roman, used by Gentiles and the gospel

writers. Whenever the term 'the Jews' appears in the gospel accounts, it is a revisionist Gentile writer, not a Jew. See Pierre-Antoine Bernheim, *James, Brother of Jesus,* trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1997), p. 49.

2.   *Earliest Christianity* is a term I use in this paper to define the forty-year period after Pentecost until the destruction of Israel. It has two forms: Jamesian or Jerusalem Christianity and Pauline.

3.   This can shed some insight into some of Josephus' writings about 'Jews' causing mischief both inside Israel and in the city of Rome in this period prior to Israel's destruction.

4.   *Exposition of the Divine Principle* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1996), p. 117.

5.   I use the word 'party' in the scholarly sense that recognizes various Judaic expressions inside first century Judaism. The religion was hardly uniform. The word *party* should not be confused with *denomination,* which are churches. Jewish parties recognized Israel as the medium through which God would set up his world order. Denominations have replaced Israel with 'the church.'

6.   This has caused some scholars to speculate that this gospel was written somewhere outside of Paul's influence, possibly in Alexandria, Egypt. See S.G.F. Brandon, *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth* (New York: Stein and Day, 1968), pp. 60-61.

7.   Robert Eisenman, *James the Brother of Jesus* (New York: Penguin Putnam, 1997).

8.   *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus,* trans. Christian Frederick Cruse (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991), p. 76.

9.   Eisenman, *James the Brother of Jesus,* p. 136.

10.   Bernheim, *James, Brother of Jesus,* pp. 66-67.

11.   N.T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God,* vol. 1 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 262-263.

12.   All Bible quotes are from the NIV.

13.   Bernard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament,* abridged fourth edition (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1998), p. 300.

14.   Israel was politically independent for nearly a hundred years under the Maccabean/Hasmonean rulers but Hellenism was persuasive and vied for dominance over Hebraism.

15.   The subjugation of Israel can be *just* punishment, but once Israel repents and makes itself righteous once more, the subjugation becomes *unjust.*

16.   Jerusalem Christianity believed in the physical resurrection of the dead—a relatively new concept in Second Temple Judaism that was likely introduced into Palestinian society in response to Persian-Zoroastrian challenges regarding universal justice and Western Greek notions of the soul's immortality after physical death. Jewish belief in physical resurrection was a wholly alien irrational concept to the Hellenes (note the Athenian remarks to Paul in Acts 17:32). The Gentilization of Christianity continued this belief in Jewish resurrection but with a twist: it sought a physical resurrection *from the earth* into the clouds with Jesus.

17.   Both east-Persian and west-Hellenist possessed ideological biases against the physical-material world in their worldviews from Socrates and Plato in the West and Zoroaster in the East. Between these two cultural 'pinchers' was Israel, insisting on the innate goodness of the physical creation.

18.   Brandon, *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 92.

19.   Johannine Christianity has a similar belief. In the Johannine version, the death and resurrection account is one more miraculous sign story testifying to Jesus as Son of God.

20.   *Milestones of History: vol. 1 Ancient Empires*, 2nd ed., edited by S.G.F. Brandon (New York: Newsweek Books, 1973), pp. 80, 112-13. John Bright, *A History of Israel,* 3rd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981), p. 451.

21.   In some respects, Judaism was not prepared for Jesus' return in spirit. There was no basis for this in Judaic thought. If one returned at all, it could only be physically.

22.   S.G.F. Brandon, *Religion in Ancient History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968), p. 80.

23.   John Painter, "Who was James?" in *The Brother of Jesus, James the Just and His Mission,* edited by Bruce Chilton and Jacob Neusner (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), p. 59.

24.   *Ecclesiastical History*, 99

25.   *Outline of The Principle, Level 4* (New York: HSA-UWC, 1980), p. 77.

26.   Note the wine analogy I have drawn from Mt. 9:17. The Jerusalem conference, where the Pauline and Jamesian parties clashed, forbade the drinking of blood. (Acts15:29) Paul ignored this by proclaiming the drinking of the Lord's blood. (1 Cor. 10:15-16) Note the Jewish restriction against consuming blood in the Noahic and Mosaic covenants. (Gen 9:4; Lev. 17:10)

27.   Painter, "Who was James?" p. 28.

28.   There is one unnamed beloved disciple that doesn't seem to fit into this superficial non-believer category. Who this man or woman was is unknown. Some scholars wonder if it is a symbolic ideal believer. Others believe it was a real person who was the core founder of the Johannine community located somewhere outside of Ephesus in Asia Minor.

29.   In Paul's account, the word 'apostle' applies beyond the twelve.

30.   Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Gospels* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), pp. 9-10.

31.   James M. Robinson, general editor, *The Nag Hammadi Library,* revised ed., trans. by members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity (New York: HarperCollins, 1990), p. 127.

32.   Eisenmann, *James the Brother of Jesus*, p. 143.

33.   Ibid.

34.   In the two previous attempts, Jesus relied on John the Baptist in the first course and miracles in the second. This 'third course' differs from the first two in that Jesus was now a resurrected spirit. To have Israel accept Jesus in spirit and body, *something or someone* had to step in to represent the bodily dimension of Jesus.

For Jerusalem / Jamesian Christianity, this providential need was had through obedience to Jesus' half brother James (and possibly the whole extended family including mother Mary and the other brothers). For Paul, the bodily presence of Jesus was not through Jesus' kin family but the feast ceremony where Jesus transferred his bodily presence into the blood-wine and body-bread of the Christ sacrament. In this second scenario, though Jesus gave up his body on the cross, in another respect, the holy essence of it was not defiled but transferred to something that remained on the earth.

35.   The word 'favored' may be misleading. I use the word to show preference but this preference by God is in connection to position, role and responsibility. God favors 'Abel' for certain tasks. Abel is closer to God in terms of a role or position. In the same way, God and Father Moon work closely (i.e. favorably) with certain leaders who have certain abilities or positions. But this does not mean God or Father Moon loves them more. God's heart and Father Moon's heart is also extended favorably to the people who have no position. It is possible that such people are even loved more.

36.   Other outstanding issues also existed between Paul and James (blood purification, role of Jesus as progressing former Jewish covenants or replacing them). These issues cannot be fully developed in this limited article.

37.   *Ecclesiastical History,* p. 76.

38.   Ibid.

39.   Ibid.

40.   Eusebius put great credence in Hegesippus' account because he wrongly believed Hegesippus lived in the apostolic age.

41.   Ibid.

42.   Painter, "Who Was James?" p. 49.

43.   Brandon, *Trial of Jesus,* pp. 83-84.

44.   *Ecclesiastical History,* p. 86.

45.   Brandon, *Trial of Jesus,* pp. 32, 59.

46.   *Exposition of the Divine Principle,* pp. 396-97.

WHAT CAN THE BLACK CHURCH AND BLACK THEOLOGY CONTRIBUTE TO THE UNIFICATION MOVEMENT AND UNIFICATION THEOLOGY?

Roderick M. McLean

W hat can the Black Church and Black Theology contribute to the Unification movement and Unification theology? To attempt to grapple with this question with any degree of resourcefulness presupposes, on the one hand, that the Black Church and Black Theology possess certain religious and socio-cultural elements that are universal and/or exportable. On the other hand, it presupposes that the Unification movement and Unification theology are susceptible to incorporating religious and socio-cultural elements of other belief systems. It is evident from the ongoing ecumenical relationship between the Black Churches and the Unification movement that such a process is occurring. This gives validity to these presuppositions and invites us to consider the above question.

In this paper I will contend that the Unification movement, in its effort to provide a link with the Black community of faith, can derive benefit from the historical Black Church as both an "invisible" and a "visible" institution. Likewise, Unification theology can benefit from elements of Black Theology in its "priestly" and "prophetic" formulations/functions. Such contributions on the part of the Black Church and Black theology can enhance the Unification movement's ministry to and with Black people.

Rev. Dr. Roderick M. McLean is Assistant Professor Ministry and Director of Field Education and at the Unification Theological Seminary. He served as a Pastor and District Superintendent of the United Methodist Church for over 25 years, and held the post of Assistant General Secretary for Mission Education and Leadership Development of The General Board of Global Ministries in New York from 1997-2001.

The Black Church as "Invisible" and "Visible" Institution

The very presence of the Black Church today bespeaks of the fact that American Christianity never fully faced the issue of race. The early Black Church began as an "invisible" institution in the days of slavery because it was not possible or acceptable to worship in the religious institutions of that day. The Black Church came into being when Euro-American Protestantism denied the inclusive nature of the community of believers, thereby fostering division and separation among the people of God, although they are brothers and sisters of the One God, Our Father.

The Black Church emerged as an invisible institution because the Black slaves felt the compelling need to worship and serve God, not out of a particular revelatory experience / principle that overshadowed their spiritual and physical conditions, but based on the notion of God who was personally involved in His creation. However, He was also understood as being outside of and beyond His creation, hence the Black slaves maintained the balance by creating a body of spirituals that represented an other worldly theological stance. For Black people in that invisible institution, God was thus simultaneously transcendent and immanent.

This balanced view of God, coming out of the historical Black Church as an invisible institution, which is at the core of the African conception of God, can, I submit, add a significant dimension to the doctrine of God as portrayed in Unification theology. The concept of God as Parent in Unification theology also seems also to provide a balanced view of God, and it can be a healthy symbol for dialogue with the Black Church and Black theology.

Nevertheless, Unification theology stresses the fact of polarity as the main clue for understanding the essential nature of God—belief in the Father-Mother God, and the fact that God reveals Himself in two ways: through nature as a whole and through human beings. Whereas, Black theology, arising out of the invisible institution, held fast to the transcendent quality of God both as a means of survival and solidarity with other races.

Upon this element of transcendence the Black Church pinned its theology of hope. Without claiming any unique revelatory experience or "divine principle," the Black Church as an "invisible" institution drew from the existing heritage of the God of all ages and all peoples. Thus was created a worshipping, serving "church without walls." It was born out of necessity, similar to the birth of the Unification Movement in Korea from a mode of suffering and persecution, rather than from some particular ideational/philosophical stance as seems to be the case of the Unification Movement in the United States.

The Black Church as an invisible institution was a continuation of existing beliefs about God—the God of Africa whose existence is known almost by instinct. This is summarized in an Ashanti proverb, "No one shows a child

the Supreme Being." This belief undergirded the Black Church's existence as an invisible institution. As the Unification Movement also seeks to maintain the tendency of a "church without walls," it can benefit from this understanding.

However, the Unification Movement must know that the concept of the "house church" or "church without walls" which it portends at this time will not be able to gain credibility, effectiveness, and longevity in the Black community if it is conceived as an intentional, structural, strategic base of operation in the community. For the Black Church as invisible institution was born out of necessity. It became "visible" precisely because Euro-American Protestants excluded, segregated, and organized it into being. The Unification Movement can learn from the Black Church as invisible institution that such paradigms are tenuous in a community and society where visible structures, organizations, and institutions provide belonging and self-identity.

The Black Church as invisible institution also became visible because of the need to preserve and interpret the rich heritage of Black Americans. It became a visible institution in spite of its other-worldly theology and its expectation of the imminent breaking in of the Kingdom of God to deliver the Black slaves. In its "visible" state the Black Church made its most valuable contribution, namely, the development of Black leadership and the unification of the Black family.

The Unification Movement can benefit from this movement from "invisible" to "visible" in the Black community at the points where it can foster and develop indigenous Black leadership within its "visible" institution, and strengthen and undergird the Black family as a whole. The visibility of Black leadership and Black presence in the Unification Movement and its literature can truly enhance its image as an inclusive church. In the Black community the Black Church is still presently the major visible institution, and the Black preacher is still one of the major creative and dynamic figures. For the Unification Movement to have any impact in that community it must learn from the Black Church the need to create parallel visible institutions with creative and dynamic leadership, or seek to strengthen existing Black churches and other Black institutions in their witness and ministry to the whole community, nation and world—to the end that we may all become one.

The "invisible" Black Church became "visible" so as to develop, create, support and incorporate other institutions and structures such as schools, economic business ventures, social, civic, cultural and political organizations as well as provide stability for the family. Therefore, the Unification Movement must become a "visible" institution in the community in order to impact the life of the family at all levels, and to develop and create other institutions in the community that will address the spiritual and physical needs of all of the people. The Unification Movement cannot remain an "invisible"

institution and expect to develop and attract Black leadership in the Black community, well as absorb the talents and resourcefulness of Blacks from other denominations. It must learn from the "visible," stable setting. In such a context Black people can exercise authority, develop self-identity, and be creative.

The fact that the Unification Movement is becoming established in the community suggests that the need for a ministerial profession and develop-ment of lay leadership will arise as an indication of *institutionalization*. The Black Church can serve as a model for the Unification Movement in the development and equipping of its leaders. As it becomes a "visible" institu-tion such as the Black Church of today, it is developing both lay and profes-sional leadership. By becoming a "visible" institution, the Unification movement can reach both lay and professional leadership, build stronger social and familial ties in the community at large, and be a more authentic force in the process of building the Kingdom of God.

Black Theology in its "Priestly" and "Prophetic" Formulations / Functions

From the very outset I would content that Black theology grew out of the Black Church as "invisible" and "visible" institution. Therefore I would see as its major thrust its "priestly" and "prophetic" formulations / functions. These twin foci constitute the norm of Black theology and can offer a contri-bution to Unification theology. For indeed, the Unification Church in the United States of America needs a creative upsurge with regards to worship.

By "priestly" formulation/function I mean the role of *worship* – preach-ing, administering the sacraments, and pastoral care. In the Black Church the Bible is important for the theological task, and therefore preaching at its best is biblical in nature. However, the Black preachers bring a perspective of the community in which they live. Consequently, the entire worship service embraces a variety of elements out of that tradition. Songs, chants, prayers, and communal sharing are all derived from the rich religious, socio-cultural heritage of the community at large. Symbols and memory play a vital part of the ritual of worship. The administration of the sacraments and the rites of passage are constant reminders of our link with the past, and our solidarity with other communities of faith. Healing is still a natural ministry of the Black Church, physically and spiritually, and therefore through its worship the dimension of pastoral care becomes very evident. The elements of ritual all lend themselves to healing, wholeness, and restoration.

Worship enables the celebration of a God who both hears and answers prayers; a God who both challenges and shapes human destiny; a God who is

both worthy of praise and seeks the praise and adoration of His people; a God who heals and equips healers; a God who calls us into being and sends us forth to be about our Father's business. Black theology in its "priestly" formulations/functions asserts discipleship through identification with/in a worshipping community, and proclaims the message of redemption and salvation of God who is Father of all.

The centrality of worship in the Black religious experience gives validity to the Black Church as "visible" institution for teaching and learning divine principles, expressing one's gifts and talents, and fostering communal solidarity as the people of God. The "priestly" role embraces both the gathered and scattered community of the Black Church. It stresses the value of memory and symbols as it recaptures the past, creates in the present, and attempts to give shape to the future.

Unification theology seems to lack an ecclesiology where memory and symbols, on-going spiritual teaching and communal solidarity are developed and nurtured. Maybe this is a harsh statement when one considers that it is a young movement. However, let's not assume that the gifts of the spirit are given only to a select few, or that the fruits of the spirit are fully expressed in our works. We are part of a larger community of faith. Therefore, let us share with others the praise and ecstasy, the hopes and aspirations, the faults and failures of a people seeing the One God Our Father. Let us not seek to withdraw into our cell groups and apart from the larger community. In a gathered community meeting expressly for worship, where we hear and respond to God's dealing with us throughout human history, we have the opportunity to reach out to each other with brotherly and sisterly care, regardless of our status or condition in the community. Worship, where memory and symbols, rites of passage and the needs of the people of God are expressed, can offer healing and provide human solidarity for all who are willing to participate.

Black theology as "priestly" formulation and function show the way for Unification theology to fill the need for a broader base of communal gathering, and develop a Theology of the Church. The worshipping community of the Black Church not only recaptures the past, but acts out the present, and commits itself to the future where divine principles and faith are taught and lived out in company with others. Unification Theology needs to develop a Theology of the Church as "visible" institution where spiritual nurture and growth can take place, and where the gathered community can reflect the diversity of peoples and culture that the Unification Church embraces in its service with and to others. We need each other. God's heart is yearning for us to be one and to unite in the task of building the Kingdom of God.

Black theology in its "prophetic" formulation/function speaks from the womb of the Black Church as "visible" and "invisible" institution where labor pains are felt for freedom, justice, and equality for all. It is the task of Black

theology to keep both the historical, biblical and the present day communities in perspective as it seeks to be faithful in its proclamations to speak meaningfully about God in the contemporary situation.

Black theology arises out of an existential situation of oppression and alienation, and therefore is not wedded to universals or abstractions apart from the questions and the yearnings that issue forth from the human community and the Black community in particular. The Korean experience in the early days of the Unification Movement should serve as a reminder that we are brothers and sisters in the struggle. Moreover, Black theology as a "prophetic" formulation / function seeks to address the human condition not from a revelatory mode that occurred at some point and time in history, but from the nature of God and the nature of man/woman. The prophetic voice must be both judgmental and redemptive. As Micah the prophet puts it, "love, justice, and mercy" must be the yardstick. Black theology offers such a perspective because of its willingness and commitment to spell out a God who is both transcendent and immanent, and who chose to manifest Himself in His Son Jesus Christ. Therefore, Jesus is the Liberator, the focus, the essence of the message of salvation and the hope for the Black community of faith and the world. Black theology affirms Jesus as Immanuel, "God with us." Jesus the Christ is at the core of the faith. He came to reveal who God is and what we were meant to be. This reality is the cornerstone of the prophetic formulation/function of Black theology—in Christ there is no East or West, North or South.

Finally, Black theology challenges Unification theology to re-center its focus on Jesus Christ, not solely in terms of soteriology but ontology, as the incarnational reality of God. Unification theology makes a distinction between Christ and the historical Jesus, and portrays Christ as the Ideal of God. However in addition, Unification theology needs to focus on Jesus Christ as Living Reality and Presence if lives are to be altered in terms that we all come under the Lordship of Christ, and dialogue with the Black Church is to be enriched that "we all may be one." Certainly there is a link for dialogue in the Unification movement's focus on the Word of God, and its assertion that Christ is the center of God's work. However, the divine revelation in Jesus Christ is central in Black theology. This is a span that Unification theology would do well to strengthen. It is prophetic and profound, mystery and manna, principal and principle.

TAKING RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OUT OF THE CLASSROOM: SERVICE LEARNING AS AN EFFECTIVE CONTEXTUAL PEDAGOGY

Kathy Winings

A s one who has been called to teach within our faith community, I have a critical concern to create the means whereby my students can begin to grapple with meaning and sacredness while, at the same time, feel interdependent and interconnected with others—both those who are like us and those who are unlike us. The question comes down to how best to do that. What can I do as a religious educator to challenge my students to develop a "multi-dimensional hermeneutics through which both centers and margins can be challenged and transformed?" as Boyoung Lee asks. (Moore 2004, 295) How can I help religious education be more than the act of "transmitting a heritage" and become a process of "learning, living, and growing within a community which must relate to larger and larger communities until it encompasses the entire world"? (Thompson 1988, 19) Or, as Paolo Freire saw it, how can we as educators create the environment "by which people deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world"? (Brelsford 2001, 323) These questions have led me to consider what clues service learning holds for the field of religious education in general and for myself as a specific educator. In this regard, we will examine what is service learning and how it can pedagogically address the needs of religious education.

Dr. Kathy Winings is Associate Professor Religious Education and Ministry, Dean of the New York Extension Center and Director of the Doctor of Ministry Program at the Unification Theological Seminary. Her books include *Building Character through Service Learning* (2002).

What is Service Learning?

Randolph Crump Miller once offered tremendous insight when he stated that the "clue" to religious education is theology and theological interpretation that enables us to interpret our experiences. Another clue to effective religious education is the experience itself—experiencing one's own truth in relationship to other lived truths. As Cate Siejk understood it, the changes within today's society require a new perspective of religious education. For Siejk, "An age characterized by confusion and the devaluing of orthodox Christianity" requires "a pedagogy that enables people to understand for themselves and to commit to the concrete living of Christian meaning and values." (Siejk 1999, 155) Certainly religious education has looked more and more to experiential education as an arena of promising methodologies. At the same time, educational theory has informed our work as religious educators through such methodologies as role-play, dialogue, discussion, interactive learning, and case studies. But there is one methodology that is not well-utilized, it seems, in our field. This methodology is service learning.

At its heart, service learning is essentially experiential education par excellence. Students engaged in service learning programs are challenged to wrestle with their own perceptions, viewpoints, stereotypes, prejudices and attitudes through continual reflective activities, while working together on a service project that meets a real community need. The lessons learned and the objectives achieved will vary due to the context of the project and the particular issues being addressed through the program and the reflection sessions. Character development, interfaith religious education, ethnic conflict resolution, religious education as a process of liberation, the individual in community, gender roles, and personal growth and development are just a few of the issues for which service learning can be utilized for effective teaching and learning.

When people hear the term "service learning," they often think of community service projects and volunteer programs. However, these are not the same as service learning programs. Nor is the learning in a simple community service project the same as what is gained in service learning. An act of service in and of itself is "good" and can be a powerful learning experience. However, if nothing more is done with the experience, it can, and often does, fade into the backwaters of the student's memory, with the probable result of having learned little or nothing at all. Why? There is no anchoring action or component in the project that anchors the experience to a learning task. That is the limitation of straightforward "service projects" or "community service work." These programs have no clear anchor or learning component. Consequently, any learning that takes place is contingent on the student's experience of feeling good or feeling satisfied by the act of service. Because

that feeling is not easily sustained, it fades into his or her memory as a "nice experience."

Service learning is different, however, because there are two dynamics at work in a service-learning program. First is the service act itself. Through that selfless act, our attitudes, emotions, and feelings are gradually awakened and stimulated. We experience what Thomas Lickona calls "moral feeling." (Lickona 1991) The service activity triggers moral feeling which in turn opens us up to begin to experience the holy. It also creates a fertile seedbed for a sense of humility that allows us to see and learn those things that we may have been too closed and set in our ways to see before. This then sets the stage for the second dynamic of service learning: reflection.

Reflection is the heart of service learning. It is the place where learning takes place in a service-learning program. Reflection is an intentional and guided activity that takes place before, during and after the service activity. It is where educators have the greatest opportunity to facilitate real growth and learning. As Janet Eyler and Dwight Giles point out, "Learning occurs through a cycle of action and reflection, not simply through being able to recount what has been learned through reading and lecture." (Eyler 1999, 7) Through the reflection periods, participants are encouraged and challenged to reflect on and evaluate their deepest held beliefs, address their personal perceptions and stereotypes, and generally question what they hold to be true. This is also where they connect theory to a lived experience. They do this personally, socially in relationship with the other participants in the project, and contextually. As the Vanderbilt Study on National Service indicated: "In practice it is critical reflection… that provides the transformative link between the action of serving and the ideas and understanding of learning." (Winings 2002, 110)

This is why, in my opinion, service learning holds so much promise for sound religious education practice. The student's reflections on his or her service experience become filled with the energy and spirit of the project. This generates an environment of love, humility and faith that Paolo Freire sees as being so important for true dialogue and understanding. (Fleischer 2000, 220) Yet, the learning goes way beyond just environment and feeling. It allows the student to experience what Ronald Cram calls a "mindful transcendence" and to "socially locate" him/herself within a particular community at a particular time and in a particular context. (Cram 2001, 167) In essence, reflection in service learning challenges and supports each person in confronting their own perceptions while trying to hear each other and understand each other's perspective, maybe for the first time. It allows all participants to be in the kind of relationship that Katherine Turpin described in her analysis of a multicultural future:

> To be in relationship across cultural boundaries requires wrestling with
> real differences about important issues, addressing differences of power and
> privilege, and struggling to hear one another when people speak in differ-
> ent languages and metaphors, and express diverse values and ways of being.
> (Moore 2004, 299)

Service learning also addresses the lack of connectedness that was the focus
of Norma C. Everist's article a few years ago. There is no better way to "meet
the peoples of God in the many arenas of their daily, public lives, and help each
other speak about beliefs in those terms" and to "become a multilingual learn-
ing community, meeting God in new ways" than through service learning.
(Everist 2001, 309)

I would like to look more deeply at some of the key components of an
effective service learning program and how they connect to the areas that
have I outlined above. Then I will offer two active and diverse service-learn-
ing programs as a way of highlighting the need for religious educators to
utilize this methodology in their coursework. A few testimonies will be
included so that the richness of service learning can be experienced through
the students' eyes.

Elements of an Effective Service Learning Program

Project Site and Contexts

A standard service-learning program involves creating a project that meets a
real and specific need in the community. Once the type of project is identi-
fied, it becomes a question of determining the student participants and then
organizing them into smaller groups or teams. In creating the project, it is
important to keep in mind that besides filling a felt need within that commu-
nity, the project should be such that the participants can see that they are
making a contribution through their work. The care we take in selecting the
project is important when considering that students will be "participating
meaningfully and consciously and actively in the ongoing processes that shape
their own present context," as Freire would describe it. (Brelsford 2001, 311)
The younger the participant, the more important it becomes that they be able
to see some level of accomplishment by the time they finish their time on the
project.

This may seem like a small point, but it is actually quite important. If
the students are working on a project that seems like window-dressing or is
simply a cosmetic change in the community, their disappointment will affect
their experience and limit the overall learning that takes place.

For example, on one of the early service learning programs that I devel-

oped for mid-range teenagers, the project site was not well organized and the work assignments seemed trivial to the teens. And to some degree they were trivial. After arriving at the project site, we learned that the equipment and building supplies were not there and probably would not arrive at all. So, instead of preparing a foundation for a new school building, one group had the task of taking boulders out of a fenced off area to prepare it for the crew that would come later to pour concrete for a basketball court. The other group had an equally boring task of literally sifting through two large piles of crushed rock so that the fine-grained rock and powder that resulted could become concrete. Of course we had another more exciting job that came a few days later, but in essence, the damage was done. The teens had a difficult time in feeling that they were doing something of value and in reflecting about their work. Thus, a bad or ill-prepared project can have a profound impact on the level of reflection of the students and therefore, the level of learning. However, by working together with the different levels of community leadership, it should not be difficult to find a project that meets the requirements of an effective service-learning program.

The value of the project site is intimately tied to the issue of contextualization. Though the reflection component is the main learning aspect in service learning, the particular project is the context for learning. One project in the Dominican Republic highlighted the role of context particularly well. The project brought together Haitian and Dominican college students to restore a 4-room school building in one of the poorest communities just outside of Santa Domingo. For the Haitians, just entering the country was a challenge, not to mention working side-by-side with the Dominicans.

The Haitian young men and women were stopped at the border of the Dominican Republic and forced to wait more than eight hours until the border authorities decided that their papers were in order. Darker-skinned Haitians were questioned more harshly than lighter-skinned Haitians, who could pass for Dominicans. Thus the stage was set for a tense beginning. Language was the next barrier. The initial reflection sessions were quite challenging, and communication became a combination of translation and pantomime. The Haitians felt an underlying resentment and anger because of their border incident and contemporary history, which flavored their communication. The Dominicans, on the other hand, were more accepting and happy in the beginning and seemed eager to start the project. Only a few of the Dominicans were critical or suspicious of the Haitians.

The first day of work was especially difficult, as the Haitians waited to see what kind of jobs they were given in comparison to those of the Dominicans. Tensions eased up considerably once they were assured that they were given equal tasks, or that positions would frequently be changed if one of the Haitians were asked to do a particularly dirty job while a Dominican

was given a "nice" job. But what helped set the stage for a real breakthrough
in the reflection periods came after the project was finished and everyone
could see the end result. The Haitian participants could witness tears of joy
and gratitude in each of the Dominican children who would be using that
school. Hugs, kisses and small gifts of gratitude they received from grateful
Dominican parents transformed them.

It was this particular context that set the stage for this learning to take
place. It challenged the Haitian participants to reflect anew as to their presup-
positions concerning the Dominican people as well as their understanding of
themselves. I doubt that a different type of context would have had as power-
ful an ending as experienced in this project.

For educators concerned about context, we have to say that service learn-
ing provides religious educators with the most complete range of contexts
possible. What do I mean by this? Karen Tye's succinct text, *The Basics of
Christian Education,* offers valuable insight into the diversity of context as she
reminds us that it is not simply the "place" in which we teach. Context neces-
sarily challenges us to consider the hidden contexts of a place, the inner
contexts that our students carry with them, and the theoretical contexts toward
which we teach. As Tye expresses it, context "includes attitudes, emotions,
relationships, cultural qualities, and many other factors that shape the envi-
ronment." (Tye 2000, 30) Staying in the classroom limits the types of contexts
that we can address and the degree of contextualization that can take place.
But in service learning those limitations need not be present.

Consider the Dominican project discussed previously. We have the phys-
ical context of the poor, rural Dominican villagers. We also have the larger
context of Hispaniola and all that it means historically and emotionally to both
the Dominicans and the Haitians. There are the inner contexts of the two
cultures and nationalities as well as the individual contexts of each participant.
For example, several of the Haitians were from poor communities themselves,
while one young woman was the daughter of the former President of the
legislative body and grew up in Pétitionville, an historically wealthy section
of Port-au-Prince. Many of the Haitians were college students, but some of
them were not and did not hope to be. Denominationally most of the Haitians
were Evangelical Christians, though possibly some of them grew up in homes
that also practiced indigenous expressions of faith and possibly magic. The
Dominicans similarly represented diverse contexts, with an added context of
representing Catholic Christianity. A smaller sub-group was a group of
Japanese students from the University of Bridgeport, many of whom were
Unificationists. This group often acted as a mediating force in the project, thus
adding another dimension of context.

There was also the context of the living quarters, a small but nice facil-
ity where the men slept in three large rooms and the women slept in four

rooms scattered around the property. The main meeting area was a small amphitheater-like structure with a gazebo nearby that was reached by crossing a small but quaint footbridge over a small pond. There was a swimming pool and two other small meeting areas—one in the living room of the main house and the other by the pool. The pool brought the participants together in a joyful spirit while the amphitheater was where many of the large group reflection activities took place, including a closing "bridge-of-peace" ceremony. Each area of the property evoked a different feeling in the participants. In fact, the pool meeting area was utilized intentionally for a more serious conflict-resolution reflection activity because of the warm and joyful feelings it evoked in the participants. At that point in the project, the program directors wanted to challenge the participants' stereotypes and self-perceptions more directly, and felt that it would be more conducive to learning if the sessions were conducted in this "warmer" context.

These diverse contexts and diverse contextualizations allowed the "crossing-over" and "border exchanges" that took place—culturally, ethnically, religiously, emotionally and personally. All in all, context played a critical role in the program and was an essential component of the learning and changes that took place.

Participants, Partnerships and Networks

A service-learning program is about the participants. For religious educators, the primary participants will be our students. Nevertheless, a project does not need to be confined to one class. Depending on what is to be learned from the experience, other participants can be invited to join the project. Several courses could come together to do a project. Alternatively, students can work with residents of the community in which the project is situated or with an organized group of participants from the community. Special religious groups can be invited to join in the project if inter-religious understanding or challenging religious misperceptions is part of the lesson. There are no restrictions on who can participate other than the size of the project, the budget and the program objectives.

Involvement of the local community is highly encouraged, especially as projects should be addressing real needs. This means that the community will need to know what its needs are before engaging a project. Beyond this, local residents can contribute to and complete the learning cycle with the participants. They provide an element of the contextualization that takes place in the project because, more than likely, the students will be interfacing with them at some point. Consider also the issue we may be addressing as religious educators. If we engage in the effort to see our students experience a "lived Christian faith," as Thomas Groome sees it, then what better way to do that than by working together in partnership with the local community during the

service learning program. The local community, through the project, provides a real context, a context of flesh and blood with which the participants must live and interact during this period of time. A lived faith, then, is no longer a theoretical construct that is discussed in the classroom. It becomes a "shared praxis" in the best sense of the phrase. (Groome 1980)

While it isn't a necessity, involving the local community in the reflection sessions can be quite cathartic and insightful for the students. It is also possible that the community in which the project is conducted is similar to that of the students. Including the community in the reflection allows the students to gain a greater perspective of both themselves and their own community.

Service learning is particularly valuable in projects that are interfaith in nature. Taking a lesson from the Catholic theologian Hans Küng, a service learning program involving multiple faith expressions takes participants out of their own faith community and brings them face-to-face with the "other" while living and working in a third community. (Küng 1993) While working in this third community—the objective context—each participant is encouraged and challenged to look at who they are, what they represent and what they believe in relationship to others, while practicing the ethic of living for the greater good. The combination of a fresh or objective context outside the participating students' faith communities and the opening up of their moral feelings through the act of service creates a formula for success in interreligious understanding and harmony. A project of the Religious Youth Service (RYS) that took place in the countryside of Italy, for example, allowed the Palestinian and Israeli participants to address some of the issues that they faced and the resentments that they harbored because they were out of their own contexts. By the end of the project, the participants from these two faith communities were already tearfully planning similar projects because they felt that these would be the most effective way to bring healing and reconciliation to their region.

What motivated the Palestinian participants and the Israeli participants to embrace as brothers and sisters under God, thus shedding years of anger and resentment? It was the combination of situating the service-learning project in a totally different, unrelated community that had real needs, plus the actions of service and reflection. The Italian community served, in effect, to de-center the conversation. As Katherine Turpin expresses it, "Rather than working from a paradigm of inclusion, bringing people from the margins to the center, multicultural efforts need to dismantle the very idea of the center and to engage in collaborative planning and leadership at every turn." (Moore 2004, 208) The community in which the project is conducted has the potential to play that role.

Reflection

Once the project and the students are set, the second most important feature, the reflection period, becomes a clear focus of the program. Reflection allows students to question, challenge, and to generally look back on our experiences in the project in order to help "shape our future, actions, goals, and beliefs." (Goldsmith 1995, 1) In terms of religious education, it can also be seen as "present action in light of the Christian Story and its Vision toward the end of lived Christian faith." (Groome 1980, 184) Through the questioning process of reflection, students begin to see what they may not have seen before or see more clearly than they did before. Reflection gives shape and voice to their experiences. At the same time, it isn't just about the student's personal experience. It is also about what each student experienced in relationship with others—other participants and people from the project community.

Participants should know clearly what is expected of them in the reflection sessions, as this helps them prepare. The length of the project often dictates the number and frequency of reflection sessions. The longer the project, the more opportunities there are for reflection. While the shorter projects do not need a lot of reflection time, the longer projects do if the participants are going to fully explore what it is that they are learning. For these longer projects, this might mean a reflection period before the project begins, during the project, and at the conclusion of the project.

Regardless the length of the project, a good standard is to schedule a minimum of two reflection sessions: before the project begins and again after the project is finished. The pre-project reflection time prepares the students for their experience. It may ask some initial questions anticipating possible issues for the student to consider. The post-reflection period brings the different learning points or threads together.

While journal writing and verbal sharing are often used as reflection methods, reflection should not be confined to these forms. Just as we know that diversity of teaching methods in the classroom is important to match the diversity of learning styles, so too should the methods of reflection vary so that all the students are challenged to reflect deeply on their experience. Art, music, journals, letters, poetry, small group discussion, and special activities can and should be utilized to encourage deep reflection.

While there are no hard and fast rules for the reflection component of a service-learning project, Eyler and Giles posit four principles to observe for effective reflection. It needs to be: continuous, connected, challenging, and contextualized. (Eyler 1996, 16) Reflection is something that needs to be carried out continuously throughout the project – from beginning to end – if students are to develop a habit of reflecting on their experience. Naturally, reflection must also be connective. Connecting students' theoretical work from the classroom to their experiences in the project is what unleashes the

power and dynamism of service learning. It is a search for that "ah hah!" moment. We can also understand that reflection needs to challenge our students. It needs to stretch their thinking, emotions, attitudes, and beliefs. Reflection sessions should dare to ask those questions that we are afraid to give voice to: "Is violence the only way to deal with our grudges?" "Where is this self-righteousness coming from?" "Who am I to say that it should be done this way?" And of course reflection needs to be contextualized. What will help this particular group at this particular time and in this particular setting reflect more deeply and powerfully? When these principles are addressed, the reflection sessions will trigger the learning that needs to take place.

Two Examples of Service Learning Programs

Of the numerous service learning organizations, the two I am most familiar with are Service For Peace (SFP), is a secularly-based leadership training program that targets adolescents and young adults primarily, and the Religious Youth Service (RYS), a religiously-based organization bringing together older teens and young adults from among the world's faiths in order to achieve inter-faith harmony and understanding through the practice of service to others.

Service For Peace

Service For Peace is a fairly new service-learning organization. As stated on their website, "Service For Peace prepares conscientious people to take on the role of peacemakers. A Peacemaker is one who can work with the populations to address critical issues and offer real solutions."[1] Organizers feel that this is best done through the vehicle of service learning. SFP was launched in the summer of 2002 with a program called "Summer of Service." The organization gathered more than 300 teens and young adults in Washington, D.C. for a series of service learning projects conducted in and around the metropolitan D.C. region. Projects included cleaning up public schools, cleaning and planting in public parks, tutoring, working with sports leagues and numerous other projects.

    The following summer, SFP expanded its Summer of Service program, attracting over 1,000 teens and young adults in projects scattered in cities from Miami to Portland, Maine. The organization partnered with the Points of Light Foundation, the YMCA, Americorps, and various churches and organizations in many project sites. Throughout the programs, all participants reflected on their experiences. Some participant reflections from those summers:

I was so glad to meet a group of kids who weren't apathetic to the world, and who were willing to work to change things.

I learned that doing just a little thing can mean a lot. Like picking up trash, people were like "I can't believe you're doing this during your summer vacation!" They were really happy and surprised.

I was amazed by the camaraderie of the different cultures and the diversity. Everyone worked together and they got the job done.

SFP launched statewide chapters. The Florida chapter in particular developed a synergistic relationship with a large university in Miami-Dade County. This relationship has developed a program within a program, so to speak, devoted to service learning on two levels: the university students are involved in a tutoring program with at-risk teens, while the teens are involved in a service learning program devoted to leadership skills within their communities. Time will tell how effective this will be in addressing some very serious social issues in that city.

By the end of 2003, it became clear that SFP might be beneficial in some international hotspots. Therefore, after a great deal of investigation, SFP launched a project in Israel that took place between July and August of 2004. Participants came from the international SFP chapters with a particular focus on SFP-Japan, SFP-USA, and SFP-Europe. Though the focus was not religious education, so to speak, the very nature of the project and the context of the project make it a good example for us to consider.

There were twenty-one students from eight countries on the project, including some Israeli Jews and Arabs. The purpose of the project was to understand the Arab-Jewish conflict first-hand, and to become leaders capable of helping offer solutions to such conflicts. The projects included working with children in summer camps, aiding young children in an orphanage, working with senior citizens in an elder care facility, and cleaning up an archeological site, beach, and park. As a feature of the program, the participants stayed in Jewish homes—the first time that the community welcomed Palestinian youth into their homes in the extremely conservative Jewish city of Beit Shemesh. During the project, the participants were also able to visit such sites as the Dead Sea, the Negev Desert, Bethlehem, Haifa and Jerusalem.

All of the participants were deeply affected by the project, including the Arab and Jewish students. Each participant faced different issues and had different learning points. While many of the deeper reflective thoughts came during different sessions and were not always conducted in written form, the following comments do give a taste of some of the changes that took place in

the hearts and minds of a few of the participants as they wrote down some of the final thoughts after the program was finished. Zvi Raviv, an Israeli participant, wrote:

> The first day in Beit-Shemesh included work with children. Usually children don't internalize prejudices—while working with them I felt how I left the world of grown-ups, in which I have to constantly care about things as image, and cover myself with cynicism. Working with the children helped me. Later on that day, when we went to the Yad Vashem Holocaust museum, I tried to explain to the participants of my group that the Nazis weren't only against Jewish people, but against universal values as civil and religious rights—if we believe in those values, we should act together against prejudice and intolerance.
>
> While working with children I noticed how curious they are about other cultures—they showed great interest in the Japanese culture, and since there is a great influence of the Latin-American culture in Israel, seeing how much the Arab and Jewish children wanted to learn Spanish was fascinating.
>
> While we were visiting the desert, a monk called Phrejek joined us. He works for humanitarian causes in Palestine. He showed us what real commitment to a goal is, and explained to us the philosophical meaning of life in the desert. In the desert we had a presentation of the main characteristics of the monotheistic religions that started in the Middle East, and it made me feel great respect towards other religions.

Tareq Ghaith, a Palestinian, spoke about what it felt like to be a Palestinian and the concern that he had that the killing stop so that Israelis and Palestinians could live in love and peace. The service-learning project was especially profound for Tareq because he was asked to homestay with an Israeli family in Beit-Shemesh. As a village of staunch conservative and orthodox Jewish families, this would be the last place that a Palestinian would want to stay. Yet the team stayed there for several days, Tareq included. On the first night, the Israeli families spoke about themselves. One mother in particular talked about her son who was a soldier in the Israeli army. During her testimony, Tareq prayed to God that he not be placed with that family. As luck would have it, he found himself asked to live with that very same family. It was a most profound experience for Tareq. As he shared with the group, "I talked with this family all night about the occupation in Palestine, the wall, bombs and many things, and then I felt better. Finally, I left Beit-Shemesh with love for this family, and a hope to see them again."

On the last night, the entire team came together for reflection with the families with which they home-stayed. One volunteer, Katherine Andrews from the United States, was moved as she watched how Tareq and the Israeli

mother with whom he stayed seemed to have bonded profoundly:

> On our last night in Beit Shemesh, I could see how well [Tareq] had managed to bond with his Jewish family despite their underlying political differences. I stood next to the Arab in a circle in the community center as we prepared to learn traditional local dances. As his host mother approached us and motioned for me to let her stand beside him, she pointed toward him and said, "My son," as the two reached for one another's hand. This friendship epitomizes how personal attachments among humans can supersede divisions along ideological lines.

The Israeli-Palestine conflict can never feel as distant to us camp members as it might have before visiting the region and getting to know its people. We have memories of real conversations, real accounts, and real images from which to draw upon in any future discussion of the Middle East struggle for peace. And the increased understanding we gained about this particular conflict is valuable towards grasping other global conflicts.

It is also important to keep in mind that some of the more profound changes often come after the project has concluded and the students have returned home. This factor alone should tell us that service-learning programs tied to regular courses offer a far stronger context for learning and growth compared to the programs of organizations. Regular teachers interacting with their students over a longer period are there to encourage this long-term reflective process and to securely anchor any changes.

Religious Youth Service

Religious Youth Service (RYS) was created to foster inter-religious, intercultural, and interracial understanding and development. Since its founding in 1986, RYS has conducted several hundred projects and has been the inspiration for student clubs around the world. The initial projects were chosen to address some key issues and problems within the interfaith world. Participants were recommended by leaders within their faith communities, as individuals with the maturity to reflect deeply and the willingness to change their perceptions and stereotypes. As stated on its website,[2] the goals of the RYS program are:

- To encourage, promote and contribute to meaningful dialogue between young people who represent the religions of the world.
- To contribute to a deeper understanding of common values that can serve as a basis for world peace studies.
- To provide a setting within which inter-religious, intercultural, and interracial experiences combine to allow insights from dialogue to be immediately applied and tested in purposeful interaction.

- To serve and work for communities in need, and in so doing, to model a vision of the possibilities for harmony and accomplishment among the world's diverse cultures.
- To develop skills in leadership for peace in religious youth from around the world.
- To provide an experience in which individual youth have the opportunity to develop spiritually and to cultivate a worldwide perspective of the human condition.

The very first project site was the Philippines. There were approximately 60 participants representing many of the world's faiths. They ranged in age from 18 to 32 and represented diverse degree programs from liberal arts to electrical engineering and medicine. They were divided into three project sites, with each site targeting real needs in the Philippines. The one project with which I was most familiar took place in a small town called Cavite. Cavite was an interesting site because it was physically divided by a small river, with Christians on one side of the river and Muslims on the other side. The Christians were the poorer of the two communities, and most of the social and civic services were located on the Muslim side.

Lack of a bridge spanning the river did not present a problem for residents of Cavite during the dry season. During each monsoon season, however, the river swelled over its banks and flooded the Christian side of the village. The Christian children could not attend school, and disease often ran rampant in the Christian side of the town because medical personnel could not reach them. The RYS participants would build a simple concrete bridge over the river, allowing the families to have access to schools, doctors, hospitals, work, and services in both rainy and dry seasons.

During the day, the participants worked on the bridge, with pre-med students working side-by-side with art history majors and business majors. In the late afternoon after cleaning up from the project, participants learned about the local culture or their own faiths or the faiths of other participants. Reflection sessions allowed them to look at diverse issues and concerns such as: What can I do about poverty? What does my faith mean when it says that all people are children of God? Do Muslims really believe in violence? Do Buddhists believe in God? What should my relationship be to those I consider as "the other?" Powerful questions indeed for these young adults to consider.

By the end of the Cavite project changes were noticeable—both in the village among the residents of Cavite and within the hearts and minds of the participants. To this day the "Bridge of Love" (as they dubbed it) stands as a testimony of that change.

Subsequent projects have addressed relations between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland, Orthodox/Muslim/Catholic relationships in

Croatia and Serbia, Muslim/Ethnic Albanian/Orthodox issues in Albania, Muslim/Tamil/Hindu conflicts in Sri Lanka, Jewish and Muslim relations in the Middle East, Aborigine/Maori/Christian concerns in Oceania, and tensions between Dominicans and Haitians in the Dominican Republic, to name just a few. Though the participants may change, the focus is the same. Utilizing service learning as a methodology, the program challenges participants to examine their own personal and faith perspectives and to re-examine those perspectives in relationship to others—whoever those "others" may be.

Concluding Remarks

As religious educators, we are learning and developing in terms of what we do. We have come a long way from the mostly didactic and transmissive heritage of religious education that often did not recognize the multiple communities in which we live and find our being. In our classrooms, we can talk about contextualizing and about finding our essential identity within a religiously plural community. We can also examine our understanding of what our faith calls us to do or be. But at the end of the day, many of the methods that we choose to use will be limited in their ability to situate our students in real life. Hence, I feel that we must consider such pedagogical tools as service learning to complement what we do in religious education.

Toinette Eugene offers some valuable food for thought in her article in the Spring 2002 issue of the *Religious Education Journal*. Addressing the challenges of living in a culture of disbelief, she suggests that, as most people "find themselves in multiple worlds of reference," religious education must "utilize this form of contextualization" and make it a part of our "process and praxis." (Eugene 2002, 184) Ultimately, Eugene sees this as redefining religious education to mean a "religious pedagogy" that presents students with "a configuration of textual, verbal, and visual practices that seek to engage the ways in which they engage their social and cultural environment." (Eugene 2002, 188)

Service learning is a pedagogy that sees contextualization as central to its effectiveness; it allows students to engage the environment fully. Norma Thompson once taught that religious education "should not devalue the process of growing up in a faith community," but also provide the means or the context for individuals of one faith to relate to those of another, going beyond dialogue to recognize "the issues and problems which separate human beings." (Thompson 1988, 21) This is precisely the strength of service learning pedagogically.

Certainly the interplay of the multiple contexts at work in a service learning program and the reflection that students are led to do while in these diverse contexts makes service learning a valuable methodology for our field.

Students' perceptions of who they are, while situated in a particular time, in a particular setting, and with particular others, will be challenged in such a program. The questions they raise and the conclusions they reach may very well change, in a constructive sense, from what they held before beginning our courses. As a religious educator, I certainly hope so. And hopefully they will be able to reflect, as one participant of a SFP project in Miami shared:

> Working with a diverse group of people really made me grow as a human being as well. I learned the true meaning of compassion, cooperation and attentiveness. I've learned to put the needs of others before my own, and because of this new knowledge the chains of intolerance and selfishness are quickly dissolving all around me.

References and Related Readings

Brelsford, Theodore. 2001. Educating for Formative Participation in Communities of Faith. *Religious Education* 96:310-325.

Cram, Ronald. 2001. The Future of Christian Religious Education in an Era of Shrinking Transcendence. *Religious Education* 96:164-174.

Dykstra, Craig. 1999. *Growing in the Life of Faith: Education and Christian Practices.* Kentucky: Geneva Press.

Eugene, Toinette M. 2002. Live by the Word and Keep on Walking. *Religious Education* 97:178-191

Everist, Norma Cook. 2001. Connecting the Learning Community and Vocation in the Public World. *Religious Education* 96:294-309.

Eyler, Janet and Dwight E. Giles, Jr. 1999. *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eyler, Janet, Giles, Dwight E., Jr. and Schmiede, A. 1996. *A Practitioner's Guide to Reflection in Service-Learning: Student Voices and Reflections.* Nashville: Vanderbilt University.

Fleischer, Barbara J. 2000. Practical Theology and Transformative Learning: Partnership for Christian Religious Education. *Forging a Better Religious Education in the Third Millennium.* Birmingham, AL: REP.

Gerics, Joseph. 1991. From Orthodoxy to Orthopraxis: Community Service as Noblesse Oblige and as Solidarity with the Poor. *Religious Education* 86: 250-264.

Goldsmith, Suzanne. 1995. *Journal Reflection: A Resource Guide for Community Service Leaders and Educators Engaged in Service Learning.* Washington, D.C.: American Alliance for Rights and Responsibilities.

Groome, Thomas. 1980. *Christian Religious Education: Sharing Our Story and Vision.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hammer, Rhonda, Douglas Kellner. 2000. Multimedia Pedagogy and Multicultural Education for the New Millennium. *Religious Education* 95:475-491.

Kung, Hans. 1993. *Global Responsibility*. New York: Continuum.

Lickona, Thomas. 1991. *Educating for Character*. New York: Bantam Books.

Moore, Mary Elizabeth, et al. 2004. Realities, Visions, and Promises of a Multicultural Future. *Religious Education* 99:287-315.

Ng, Greeg Wenh-In. 2002. Contextualization of Religious Education in an Age of Disbelief. *Religious Education* 92:192-203.

Schein, Jeffrey. 1991. Moral Thought and Moral Action: Toward an Agenda for Future Research in Jewish Education. *Religious Education* 86:234-249.

Siejk, Cate. 1999. Learning to Love the Questions: Religious Education in an Age of Unbelief. *Religious Education* 94:155-171.

Thompson, Norma. 1988. *Religious Pluralism and Religious Education*. Birmingham, AL: REP.

Tye, Karen. 2000. *The Basics of Christian Education*. St. Louis: Chalice Press.

Veverka, Fayette B. 2002. Practicing Faith: Negotiating Identity and Difference in a Religiously Pluralistic World. *Religious Education* 99:38-55.

Winings, Kathy. 2002. *Building Character through Service Learning*. Chapel Hill: Character Education Publishing.

Notes

1. www.serviceforpeace.org/aboutus.htm
2. www.religiousyouthservice.org/about/goals.htm.

WHAT IS THE MATTER?
UNDERSTANDINGS OF MATTER IN
UNIFICATION THOUGHT AND
MODERN PHYSICS

David Burton

In any given age, the understanding of matter and material beings underpins the thought of that age. This is because our fundamental categories for understanding existence derive from our view of matter. Ontology has therefore been an important branch of philosophy, and hence in Unification Thought, ontological concepts are the foundation for the whole structure.

Historically the investigation of matter was carried forward through the construction of philosophical models, and for centuries the philosophy of matter originating with Plato and Aristotle was the dominant view. Christian theologians were influenced by this philosophical tradition, and incorporated some parts of these philosophical models of matter into their doctrines on God and Creation.

Physics subsequently became the inheritor of this quest and has made huge advances in our understanding of matter. The key additional technique of physics was experimental comparison of conceptual models with the observed universe. The modern culmination of the quest to understand matter is found in two theories: the Standard Model of modern particle physics and Einstein's Theory of General Relativity. This work is primarily concerned with the Standard Model, because, for the last thirty years or so, the Standard Model has reigned supreme in answering the question of what matter is made of.

In Unification Thought there are a handful of ontological concepts that are fundamental to its structure. Found in the first chapters of the text, the

David Burton teaches chemistry and manages the chemistry labs at the University of Bridgeport. He holds a doctorate in chemistry from the University of East Anglia in Norwich, England. He and his wife graduated from the Unification Theological Seminary in 1990 and served as campus ministers at Yale University.

chapters on the Theory of the Original Image and Ontology, these concepts also make profound statements about the nature and existence of matter. With the advent of physics that has overturned aspects of Platonic and Aristotelian theory, Christian thought has tended to retreat from areas of scientific explanation. Thus, in introducing a theological discussion on the nature of matter that hopes to be consistent with physics, Unification Thought attempts to contribute to the relationship between science and religion. This paper explores and compares the modern understanding of matter, Platonic and Aristotelian theory, and Unification Thought's fundamental ontological concepts.

Concepts of Matter

1. The Legacy of Plato and Aristotle

Plato (428-348 BC) and Aristotle (383-323 BC) framed the dominant view of matter for about two thousand years, and possibly even until the time of Dalton's presentation of his atomic theory in 1803. Their view of matter was pivotal in many areas of western philosophy and Christian theology, and in places Dr. Lee incorporates their philosophy into the framework of Unification Thought. For this reason it is important to address the basic concepts of their philosophy of matter here and compare that to the modern understanding of the Standard Model.

Both Plato and Aristotle consider material beings to consist of form and matter, where matter is the material "stuff" of the being, and form is the intangible and nonmaterial idea or pattern of the being. For Plato, forms exist independently of material beings in their own realm. This realm is considered to be more real than what we perceive. Aristotle, on the other hand, rejected the independent existence of forms and regarded the form and matter of a being to be inseparable. Making this distinction of form and matter of necessity leads to the notion of some kind of prime matter, the "stuff" of the being, that has no inherent formal content, but that is able to accept the form and be shaped by the form. For Plato, space itself is the undifferentiated, structureless, material stuff out of which things are made. Aristotle, on the other hand, regards form and matter as inseparable. Thus for Aristotle, prime matter cannot have an independent existence but refers to the stuff of things that is capable of changing and accepting new forms.

From this concept of existing beings both Plato and Aristotle derive a concept of soul, where, in a human being, soul would correspond to form.[1] Both also associate soul with mind.[2] For Plato the forms have independent existence; thus the human soul too is capable of independent existence, but

in an immaterial way. This Platonic view is the source of the mind-body dualism found in western thought. Aristotle, on the other hand, regards form and matter as inseparable; thus the human soul cannot exist independently and must cease to exist with physical death. For Aristotle the human being is a single substance, whereas for Plato mind and body are different substances. Thus the categories of existence derived from this view of matter describe the universe in terms of a material part and an immaterial mind part. Traditional Christian thought has appropriated Plato's concept of the independent existence of immaterial mind as the philosophical basis for explaining spiritual existence.

Plato and Aristotle both rejected the atomist philosophy of Leucippus and his student Democritus. In the atomist philosophy existing beings are seen to consist of indivisible physical particles called atoms. Platonic and Aristotelian theory requires that matter be continuous rather than existing as discrete particles. Prime matter must be a smooth continuous stuff without form. We see this theory in Dr. Lee's analogy with the macroscopic properties of water.[3] This smooth continuous stuff is shaped by an immaterial form or pattern in existing beings. As will be shown below, these key points in the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy of matter are challenged by modern atomic theory and particle physics.

2. The Standard Model

The Standard Model[4] of particle physics combines electroweak theory (electromagnetic and weak interactions) with quantum chromodynamics (strong interaction) into a single framework that describes subatomic particles and their interactions. It does not include gravitation.

In the Standard Model there are two kinds of fundamental matter particles, quarks and leptons. They are considered point-like and structureless.[5] There are six quarks and six leptons, arranged in three generations of particles as shown in Table 1.

Each of these fundamental matter particles has a corresponding antiparticle. Combinations of these fundamental particles and anti particles can describe all the atomic and subatomic particles found by particle physics.

Table 1. The Fundamental Particles of Matter

The Generations of Paticles			
I	II	III	Charge
Up	Charm	Top	+2/3
Quarks			
Down	Strange	Bottom	-1/3
Electron	Muon	Tau	-1
Leptons			
e-Neutrino	m-Neutrino	t-Neutrino	0

The physical universe exists because these fundamental physical parti-cles interact with each other. There are four possible interactions between particles in the physical universe: gravitational, electromagnetic, strong, and weak. Since the 1930's physicists have described the four interactions in terms of field theory, where a field is something that varies continuously through space and time, such as a magnetic field around a bar magnet. One of the key differences between quantum mechanics and classical physics is the quanti-zation of energies rather than the continuum of energy described in classical physics. This quantization extends to the quantum mechanical description of fields in electroweak theory and quantum chromodynamics. Thus the quan-tum mechanical description of the field of an interaction describes its action in terms of additional subatomic particles that "carry" the interaction, in other words, quantized particles of the field. These interaction-carrying particles are called bosons, and each interaction has its own particle or particles (Table 2).

The interactions operate between matter particles through an exchange of these interaction-carrying particles. The exchanged particles are considered "virtual," in that we cannot directly observe them.

Table 2. The Three Quantized Interactions

	Interaction		
	Weak	Electromagnetic	Strong
Boson	W+, W-, and Z°	Photon	Gluon
Acts on	Quarks and leptons	Quarks and charged leptons	Quarks

Matter, then, is composed of atoms, each consisting of a nucleus of protons and neutrons surrounded by a cloud of electrons. Protons consist of two up quarks and one down quark, and neutrons consist of one up quark and two down quarks. Normal matter, the stuff we see around us in the physical universe, is therefore composed only of first generation matter particles. The total number of protons in the nucleus, called the atomic number, determines the identity of the atom. In an electrically neutral atom there is exactly the same number of electrons as protons in order to balance the charge. The atoms themselves interact with each other via a residual electromagnetic interaction. Thus, the electromagnetic interaction is the most significant interaction for macroscopic matter and living beings. The duality of positive and negative charge is indirectly the source of the pair structure we observe in the universe.

3. Some Philosophical Implications

Despite precise agreement between quantum mechanical calculations and experimental observation, there remain some ontological mysteries inherent in quantum mechanics. These mysteries currently appear unsolvable. In particular, the wave function describing a particle in Schrödinger's wave equation has no physical correlate in the way as say velocity does in Newton's equations of motion. It is mathematically evaluated in terms of probabilities, but we don't know what in the wave function is actually doing the waving. This situation has led to enormous amounts of speculation over the meaning of quantum mechanics, yet with little or no experimental support for that speculation. Heisenberg, for example, was of the opinion that even the fundamental particles at their root are mathematical—a kind of mathematical Platonism.

In a previous paper,[6] I proposed a method for inquiry into Unification Thought that combined an inner deductive four-position base with an outer inductive base. The outer base represents a comparison with existing beings. Now since physics has a well developed outer base rooted in experimentation, it is possible to substitute the outer base in Unification Thought's method with explanations from physics, but only insofar as they have experimental support. Therefore, in keeping with this method, the speculation surrounding quantum mechanics will be avoided in this paper as much as possible. The Standard Model itself has ample experimental support. Thus it is appropriate to use it here.

However, even limiting physics to experimentally confirmed theory does not remove all the ontological mysteries of quantum mechanics. There is still a certain indeterminism in the exact ontological status of the fundamental particles. They have a dual wave-particle nature, a fact that has been experimentally demonstrated. This has led to the term "wave packet" to describe both the wave nature and the discrete particle nature in one term. The term "particle" will be used here, since it is the discrete nature of the Standard Model that is important for the current discussion.

Despite these ontological problems of quantum mechanics, there are still important implications of the Standard Model for any philosophy that would utilize Platonic and Aristotelian theory.

The Standard Model describes existing beings in terms of discrete particles, not as a continuum of stuff. Energy is quantized and does not exist independently of physical particles, so it cannot be regarded as a continuum. Moreover, even apparently immaterial fields are quantized into particles and are not continuous. This discrete nature of existence in the Standard Model demonstrates that the continuous nature of matter in Platonic and Aristotelian theory is incorrect. A continuous physical prime matter without form, even in its Aristotelian formulation, is untenable. This also brings into question the concept of form, since it in turn is defined with respect to prime matter and existing beings. Since there is no continuous prime matter, there can be no form in the Platonic or Aristotelian sense to give it shape. It is possible to retain some notion of form and matter, but, as shown below, it would require significant modification of Platonic and Aristotelian theory to accommodate the discrete nature of existence in the Standard Model. The Standard Model demonstrates that matter is significantly more complex than Platonic and Aristotelian theory suggests. Thus it is clear that Platonic and Aristotelian theory can no longer be directly applied to material beings.

Furthermore, since all things are seen to exist through particles, the Platonic description of mind or soul as an independent immaterial existence is also overturned. This in turn brings mind-body dualism into question. Proponents of the dualism of mind and body hold to this view not because of

the preponderance of evidence for it, but because they acknowledge a spiritual existence. If we are limited to the categories of existence derived from Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy, then denial of this dualism is tantamount to denial of spiritual existence. Indeed, many scientific materialists who point out that natural science disproves the dualism of mind and body do exactly that.

Fortunately, Unification Thought offers new categories for existence that can embrace the functional materialism of physics yet still uphold spiritual existence. We see the emergence of these new categories in Unification Thought's description of the structure of a human being. In Unification Thought, each human being has a four-fold structure.[7] There is the spirit person consisting of spirit mind and spirit body, and the physical person consisting of physical mind and physical body. Now since it is assumed that God created the cosmos after the model of the human being, as the image of God,[8] it seems natural to apply this four-fold structure to the cosmos as a whole. Neither Divine Principle nor Unification Thought takes this additional step, but it has important consequences for our view of existence.

If we extend the four-fold structure of the human being to a four-fold structure in the created cosmos, then in the cosmos there is a spiritual universe consisting of spiritual *sungsang* and spiritual *hyungsang*, and a physical universe consisting of physical *sungsang* and physical *hyungsang*. This view of the cosmos does not require the duality of mind and body in order to acknowledge spiritual existence. Rather it points to a dualism of spiritual universe and physical universe where mind and body exist in both. Thus it has the potential to be compatible with physics. Moreover, when this fourfold view is compared with the Standard Model we can see that physical *sungsang* and physical mind, as part of the physical universe, cannot exist independently of physical particles. This is more Aristotelian than Platonic. The question then becomes, not how do mind and body interact, but how do spirit mind and physical mind interact? It is to this question that explanations such as the quantum mechanical views of Eccles and Penrose, described by Otani,[9] can be applied.

There are additional ramifications of this view. Based on a correspondence to the physical universe, where matter and material beings consist of physical *sungsang* and physical *hyungsang*, the existence of spiritual *sungsang* and spiritual *hyungsang* leads us to postulate the existence of some kind of spiritual matter in spiritual beings. Thus the new categories of Unification Thought describe a material spiritual existence, not an immaterial Platonic one. A concept of spiritual matter and all the connotations that go along with it, such as divisibility and notions of body, are an anathema to traditional thought. However it is their very lack in traditional thought that requires the duality of mind and body in order to account for spiritual existence. Perrottet[10]

documents this problem in traditional thought.

Adopting this four-fold view of Unification Thought will of necessity also require redefining terminology, since spirit in traditional thought is essentially synonymous with mind, but is clearly distinct from mind in the fourfold structure. What is needed is an ontology that includes the spiritual universe in a consistent way. Wilson[11] begins to attempt this. His approach of deductively working from existing testimonies of the spiritual universe is probably the only way forward at this time, but he is hampered by the existing definitions of fundamental ontological concepts in Unification Thought itself. The remaining task of this work is therefore to examine some of these ontological concepts in the light of deductive logic and the particle-based understanding of the Standard Model.

Sungsang and Hyungsang in Unification Thought

In Unification Thought the fundamental ontological description of existing beings is given by two sets of dual characteristics, their relationships as described by the four-position base, and Universal Prime Force. The two sets of dual characteristics are *sungsang* and *hyungsang*, and *yang* and *yin*. All existing beings are seen to exist, act, grow and multiply through give and receive relationships between these dual characteristics, mediated by Universal Prime Force. The *sungsang* and *hyungsang* relationship is, however, considered most fundamental. Thus the primary description of matter in Unification Thought is through the concepts of *sungsang* and *hyungsang*, which will be the focus of the rest of this paper. *Yang* and *yin* and Universal Prime Force will be addressed elsewhere.

In *Essentials of Unification Thought,* Dr. Lee gives his initial description of *sungsang* and *hyungsang* as aspects of the Original Image. Correspondingly, all existing beings are seen to have an invisible aspect, or *sungsang*, and a visible aspect, or *hyungsang*. *Sungsang* corresponds to mind, both in God and human beings

> The Original Sungsang, or God's Sungsang, is the part of God corresponding to mind and represents the fundamental cause of the invisible aspect, or functional aspect, of all created beings. The invisible aspect of created beings corresponds to mind in human beings, to instinct in animals, to life in plants, and to physicochemical character in minerals.[12]

This passage contains the core concepts of *sungsang* as mind (and instinct), life, and physico-chemical character. *Hyungsang* refers to the visible physical manifestation of existing beings. This core explanation of *sungsang* and *hyungsang* in Unification Thought is essentially identical to the explanation

given in Divine Principle. Unification Thought, however, is substantially more complex than Divine Principle. There are additional layers of explanation, the concepts have been developed through a deductive process,[12] and Dr. Lee has tried to place Unification Thought in the context of philosophical thought in general.

This has led to a number of additional explanations of *sungsang* and *hyungsang* beyond the view presented in Divine Principle, additions which have differing effects on our understanding of the terms. The concept of *sungsang* as a "functional aspect" in the above passage is one such addition. What is meant by "functional aspect" is not immediately clear. There are hints in this context in the examples of mind,[14] life and physico-chemical character,[15] but a clear consistent explanation is not given. A clear picture of the meaning of function would aid in understanding the meaning of *sungsang*, but picture is thusfar incomplete.

Another striking addition relates to the philosophical context of Unification Thought. Dr. Lee retains, or rather reintroduces, Platonic and Aristotelian theory of matter by placing both the forms and unformed matter within God. Thus God's *Hyungsang*, as a kind of pre-energy or pre-matter, is treated as the unformed prime matter required by the form and matter distinction.

> God's Hyungsang is the fundamental cause of the material aspect of human beings, animals, plants and minerals. In other words, the human body, the body of animals and the materials of plants and minerals are manifestations of God's Hyungsang in different dimensions. The visible aspect of all created beings consists of matter and form, the essential cause of which is the fundamental matter and the potential for a limitless number of forms within God's Hyungsang.xvi

And

> Matter (hylé), as mentioned by Aristotle, originally refers to pure material without any determination. Why, then, does Unification Thought call it "Hyungsang," which, in Chinese characters, has the connotation of "form"? The reason is that Hyungsang has the potentiality to assume specific forms. This can be explained by taking water as an analogy. Water has no form of its own, but it can assume numerous forms depending on the container in which it is contained. Therefore, it can be said that water, though formless, has a limitless number of forms. Likewise hylé is also formless, but it has the potential to manifest a limitless number of forms. For that reason, it is appropriate to call it "Hyungsang."[17]

God's act of creation is then seen to take place in two stages.[18] The first stage is creation of the Logos for a being in an inner developing four-position

base. In this Dr. Lee's explanation is very Platonic. The Logos for a being would correspond to the Platonic form with independent immaterial existence within God.[19] Subsequently the second stage is creation of the material being from the interaction of Logos and *Hyungsang* in an outer developing four-position base. Thus in the outer developing base prime matter *(Hyungsang)* is given form resulting in an existing being. The description of this process of creation, for the creation of a bird, is explicitly laid out in *Explaining Unification Thought.*

> Once the Purpose for creating something – such as a bird – is formed by Heart, the Inner Sungsang interacts with the idea or image in the Inner Hyungsang... The concrete plan of the bird is its logos. Logos is the unity of the dual characteristics of Inner Sungsang (reason) and Inner Hyungsang (law)... The actual bird is the result of the give-and-take action between Logos and Hyungsang (pre-matter). Logos is in the subject position: pre-matter in the object position.[20]

Although this complete description does not appear in *Essentials of Unification Thought,* it is still implied, as the same structure of the Original Image is presented in that text.

Since the Standard Model shows that Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy of matter can no longer be directly applied to existing physical beings, it is important to address Dr. Lee's use of it in Unification Thought. By placing both prime matter and the forms in a Platonic sense within God, Dr. Lee removes them from the physical universe and avoids direct conflict with the Standard Model. However, in doing so he breaks the Divine Principle's principle of resemblance, whereby attributes of God are deduced from common characteristics of existing beings.[21] Thus his retention of the form and matter distinction by placing prime matter and the forms within God is a purely logical construct required by using concepts derived from Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy, and is not based on observation of existing beings.

Using this form and matter distinction is tempting. It allows simple explanations about God, material beings, the creation process, and God's connection to creation, using familiar terms that have a history of interpretation. Moreover, since God's existence and purpose in creating are underlying assumptions of Unification Thought, we must presuppose some conception of material beings within God's mind. This suggests that some notion of form at least should be retained.

Breaking the principle of resemblance is, however, a more serious problem than the explanatory benefits derived from using Greek philosophy. I believe that the principle of resemblance is one of the key points in Unification Thought's method for inquiry, and that it is the only methodological justification for the view of God presented in the texts. If we adhere to that princi-

ple, then since the Standard Model teaches us that the Platonic and Aristotelian concepts of form and matter can no longer be directly applied to understand matter and material beings, they should not be directly applied to the Original Image either. Specifically we cannot justify regarding Logos and God's Hyungsang as form and prime matter in the Platonic sense.

Hence, this second additional concept beyond Divine Principle does not initially contribute to an improved understanding *sungsang* and *hyungsang*. There is, however, one addition in Unification Thought that is extremely important for developing our understanding. That is the presentation of a connected two-stage structure of inner and outer four-position bases, where mind is treated as the inner base. This is most clearly explained in the Theory of the Original Image as the "Two-Stage Structure of the Original Image," and the "Two-Stage Structure of Creation."[22] It opens up a whole new way to regard *sungsang*, allows a clearer definition of the term itself, suggests some novel definitions of mind and life, and allows us to revisit notions of function and Greek philosophy in a consistent way that is also compatible with physics.

Sungsang as an Inner Base

1. Deductive Developments

When the two-stage structure is applied to the Original Image in Unification Thought the inner base, consisting of an inner *sungsang* and an inner *hyungsang*, is seen to correspond to mind. The inner *sungsang* is said to consist of intellect, emotion, and will, and the inner *hyungsang* of ideas, concepts, laws and mathematical principles.[23] In the chapter on Ontology, however, Dr. Lee does not apply this inner four-position base to all existing beings in this same way. Rather he sees the inner and outer structure of the Original Image reflected in a beings' existence as an individual truth body and as a connected body.[24] This changes the inner and outer structure from one that applies to a single being to one that involves more that one being. In the process the nature of the inner and outer bases are changed somewhat. In particular, the outer base is no longer a mind and body (*sungsang* and *hyungsang*) type of relationship within a single being.[25] Again, this compromises the principle of resemblance.

If we strictly apply the principle of resemblance, then all existing beings should also be seen to have this same basic two-stage structure of inner and outer four-position bases as found in the Original Image. Thus in human beings mind (*sungsang*) would consist of an inner *sungsang* and an inner *hyungsang* in an inner four-position base comparable to the inner base of the Original Image, and the outer base would simply be the mind and body rela-

tionship. Similarly, inner four-position bases in existing beings would also describe life and physico-chemical character. In other words, applying the principle of resemblance allows us to characterize *sungsang* in general as an inner base for all existing beings. Or rather, if existing beings are seen to have a two-stage structure, where *sungsang* exists as an inner base, we can then apply that structure to the Original Image. For human beings this kind of structure is suggested in the Theory of Art, where the creation of a work of art begins from an inner four-position base that is equivalent to the inner developing four-position base of the Original Image.[26] However, as shown above, this is not consistently applied throughout the text. In order to gain more insight into this structure in existing beings we look again to the results of natural science.

2. Comparison with Natural Science

Up to this point in our discussion of *sungsang* and *hyungsang* we have been using logic to derive and support a two-stage structure for existing beings. In this section we will look at some insights for the notion of *sungsang* as an inner base derived from considerations of modern neuroscience and biology, and then address implications of the Standard Model.

The main seat of the physical mind in the physical body is the brain, and in recent years neuroscience has made rapid progress in unraveling its functioning. Memory, emotion, reasoning, sensory experience and movement are known to depend upon the chemical and electrical pathways in the brain.[27] Memories, for example, are laid down by the establishment and strengthening of connections between neurons in specific parts of the brain. In other words, neuroscience shows that the contents of the inner *sungsang* and inner *hyungsang* of the physical mind exist and act in the chemical and electrical connections of the brain.[28] They have direct relationship to the physical structure of the brain and are not separate substances in themselves. The physical mind does not exist independently of physical particles. Moreover, the contents of the inner *hyungsang*, memories, prototypes, ideas, concepts, laws, mathematical principles, etc., can be generically regarded as information. Thus the contents of the inner *hyungsang* of the physical mind can be regarded as information coded onto the physical structure of the brain. The inner *sungsang* can then be regarded as the faculties which access and express this information, described in Unification Thought as intellect, emotion and will.

Life, like mind, is very difficult to define. At its root, however, the life of any organism is life at the cellular level. The cell should thus exist and act through both inner and outer four-position bases. In this model, life (*sungsang*) can be seen to consist of an inner *sungsang* and an inner *hyungsang* in an inner four-position base that depends on the chemical and electrical pathways in the cell. Similar to mind, the inner *hyungsang* of life is information coded into the

physical structure of the cell. Primarily, but not exclusively, we can see this in the information coded into the DNA. The cell also has an inner *sungsang,* functional components that "read" and express this information in the proteins of the cell through RNA transcription.

The *sungsang* of matter is described in Unification Thought as its "physico-chemical character" or function.[29] The text does not, however, clearly explain what physico-chemical character actually is. I believe that with this model of *sungsang* as an inner four-position base we can begin to address this problem, although the situation is not as clear-cut as it is for life and mind. Since the fundamental particle of matter is the atom, let us consider an atom in this context. An atom has a clear *hyungsang*; it has shape and mass, and, as the Standard Model shows, is composed of smaller particles. It is more difficult to apply the inner base of *sungsang* to the atom because its complexity is not sufficient to support the discrete structures of an inner *sungsang* and inner *hyungsang* such as we find in a cell or the brain, but we can still discern this structure in a vestigial or rudimentary way.

As a generalization, the inner base can be regarded as an inner *hyungsang* that is information coded on material particles, and an inner *sungsang* that reads and expresses the information. Now in the atom we do not have the constant electrical and chemical signaling of the same sort that we find in living beings. However, the type of atom and its chemical and physical properties are determined by the nucleus of the atom. In particular, the character and identity of the atom is determined by the number of protons in the nucleus. It is therefore possible to view the informational content of the atom as a whole to be coded onto the structure of the nucleus, which is "read" and expressed through the quantum interactions within the atom.

In addition to this basic picture, the Standard Model gives important additional insights concerning what is "physico-chemical character." At first sight the Standard Model appears to challenge the pair structure concept contained within Divine Principle and Unification Thought. This is because the strong force has a threefold color charge and protons and neutrons are composed of three quarks in a way that cannot be explained in terms of *sungsang* and *hyungsang*, or *yin* and *yang* pairs. Unification Thought does, however, contain an often-neglected threefold structure: the intellect, emotion, and will of the mind.

Since mind exists through a threefold structure, *sungsang* in general may also exist through a threefold structure. Thus the apparent conflict of Unification Thought with the strong force can be resolved by regarding the threefold structure of the nucleus as structure of the *sungsang* of the atom. This view of threefold structure within the *sungsang* is strengthened by the fact that quarks do not exist independently of each other in the present universe. Additionally, this triplet structure of protons and neutrons can be

regarded as coding information in the inner *hyungsang*. Thus the code for a proton is two up quarks and one down, whereas the code for a neutron is one up quark and two down, and the code for the atom is contained in the total triplet structure of the nucleus.

This further demonstrates that physical *sungsang* is not independent of physical matter, and interestingly brings us to an additional correspondence with living beings. The informational content of a cell is primarily encoded in the DNA of the cell's nucleus, where a sequence of three bases in the chemical structure of DNA codes for a particular amino acid.[30] The basic informational coding of DNA for storage and expression of protein information is a triplet structure. Thus, at the heart of the *sungsang* of living beings there is again the threefold structure that we find in the *sungsang* of mind and of atoms.

3. Form, Matter and Function

With this understanding of *sungsang* as an inner base, we are now in a position to revisit the notions of function and Greek philosophy in Unification Thought. If mind is considered to exist as an inner four-position base, then the inner *sungsang*, as the part that does the thinking, can be regarded as the functional aspect.[31] Similarly, if *sungsang* in general is considered to exist through an inner four-position base, then the inner *sungsang*, not *sungsang* as a whole, can be regarded as the functional aspect of an existing being that reads and expresses the information coded in the inner *hyungsang*. Thus, this model of *sungsang* allows us to reintroduce a concept of function in *sungsang* in a consistent way that can be clearly defined for all existing beings. The inner base of *sungsang* can then be described as an inner *sungsang* of a functional aspect and an inner *hyungsang* of an informational aspect. *Sungsang* is therefore connected to patterns of information storage and processing as it relates to existing beings.

With respect to Platonic and Aristotelian theory of matter, it is the more complex discrete nature of the Standard Model that is at odds with the relatively simple model of a continuous unformed prime matter. Although we cannot apply Greek philosophy unchanged to existing beings, this does not mean that we must discard all its concepts. The notion of form is the starting point here. The concept of form contains both idea and pattern of existence; it is information and three-dimensional structure that somehow impresses itself into the unformed prime matter, almost as a kind of mold. Form does not directly say anything about the stuff of the prime matter itself. Similarly the two-stage structure of *sungsang* and *hyungsang* developed in this paper does not directly address the stuff of matter either. It is rather part of a universal image, or universal pattern of existence, that contains both information and structure. It shows how a being exists and how information is coded onto the

structure in an inner base. The two-stage pattern of *sungsang* and *hyungsang* in existing beings can therefore be seen to correspond to, and develop, the Platonic and Aristotelian concept of form.

In the Standard Model, the fundamental particles are seen as point-like and structureless. Three-dimensional structure arises only from the relationships of these particles. In other words, the Standard Model describes the stuff of matter and the stuff of relationship. The relationship between the information / pattern of existence in Unification Thought and the particles of the Standard Model can then be seen to be one of form and matter. The ontological structure of Unification Thought provides the form, and the particles of the Standard Model provide the matter. Thus physics and Unification Thought can be seen as complimentary. They do not describe exactly the same things.

Additionally, natural science shows that for physical beings this relationship is Aristotelian in that the information and pattern do not exist independently of the particles. However, since the independent source of the pattern is found within God in Unification Thought, the overall structure is also Platonic. That is, this revised concept of form and matter combines Plato, Aristotle, the Standard Model and Unification Thought in a comprehensive structure.

Furthermore, when this two-stage pattern of *sungsang* and *hyungsang* is applied, as form, to God's existence, it does not address the actual stuff of God Himself. The integrity of Unification Thought does not require that we address what God is made of, rather just the formal content. Indeed, since God is separate from His creation, we can say nothing about the actual composition of God, but can only infer from observation of existing beings about the informational content and pattern of His existence.

Conclusion

The understanding of matter in modern physics throws up challenges for philosophy and theology that are not well met by the traditional categories of Platonic and Aristotelian thought. Unification Thought has the unique potential to integrate traditional thought and modern physics, if it can be made logically consistent and in agreement with observation of existing beings. That is, it should be compatible both with experimentally confirmed theories in physics and with theology. The analysis presented here demonstrates some of that potential in new categories for existence that are compatible both with spiritual existence and the scientific denial of mind-body dualism. Furthermore, the Standard Model also has implications for Unification Thought where its concepts are obtained from Platonic and Aristotelian theory. This leads us to the proposal of describing *sungsang* as an inner base and to

redefining the Greek concepts of form and matter to be consistent with Unification Thought and the Standard Model, respectively. I believe this move will help to make Unification Thought more logically consistent and compatible with physics.

Notes

1. Samuel Enoch Stumpf, *Socrates to Sartre* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1982), p. 187.
2. Plato's concept of soul has parallels with Unification Thought's concept of mind as emotion, intellect, and will. Aristotle, on the other hand, applies a concept of soul to plants and animals too. His description is more reminiscent of the stepped structure of *sungsang* described in Unification Thought.
3. Sang Hun Lee, *Essentials of Unification Thought* (Tokyo: Unification Thought Institute, 1992) p. 7.
4. The Standard Model has been extensively described in popular science and scientific literature. In this work I have found the online Encyclopaedia Britannica to be of particular use. A good starting point for further reading is: "Standard Model." Encyclopaedia Britannica. 2004. Encyclopaedia Britannica Online. 20 May 2004 <http://search.eb.ecom/eb/article?eu=71193>.
5. This is challenged in String Theory, where the fundamental particles are seen as vibrating strings rather than structureless points.
6. David Burton, "Unification Thought's Methodology and the Dual Characteristics," *Journal of Unification Studies* 5 (2003): 81-84.
7. Lee, *Essentials*, p. 93.
8. *Exposition of the Divine Principle* (Seoul: Sung Hwa Publishing Co., 1996), p. 45.
9. Akifumi Otani, "A New Idea for the Mind-Brain Problem," *Journal of Unification Studies* 5 (2003): 113-14.
10. Claude Perrottet, "Conceptual Roadblocks to an Understanding of Spiritual Reality in the Western Philosophical Tradition," in *Unity of Sciences and Unification Thought: Proceedings of the 15th International Symposium on Unification Thought*, Moscow, November 27-30, 2003.
11. Andrew Wilson, "Research into the Ontology of Spirit World and Spirit Persons in Unification Thought," *Journal of Unification Studies* 5 (2003): 145-174.
12. Lee, *Essentials*, p. 3.
13. Burton, "Methodology," p. 84.
14. Lee, *Essentials*, p. 5.
15. Ibid., p. 43.
16. Ibid., p. 6.

17. Ibid., p. 7.

18. Ibid., pp. 32-33.

19. As pointed out by Wilson (Wilson, "Ontology," 150.) Logos as presented in Unification Thought is a little different to the Platonic sense of form since Logos also contains individual image. However the relationship between the immaterial Logos, which is seen to have independent existence, and Hyungsang is the same as that between form and prime matter in Platonic Theory. It is the specifics of this relationship that is of concern here rather than the precise contents of Logos.

20. Sang Hun Lee, *Explaining Unification Thought* (New York: Unification Thought Institute, 1981), p. 35.

21. *Exposition*, p. 16.

22. Lee, *Essentials*, pp. 32-33.

23. Ibid., p. 23.

24. Ibid., p. 68.

25. David Burton, "An Exploration of Questions in the Ontology of Unification Thought," *Journal of Unification Studies* 4 (2002): 48 - 50.

26. Lee, *Essentials*, p. 231.

27. *Scientific American* 289 (September 2003). This is a special issue dedicated to neuroscience.

28. Neuroscience cannot as yet explain consciousness. That is a more intractable problem and will probably require invoking the spiritual mind as well.

29. Lee, *Essentials,* p. 43.

30. See, for example, Stephen J. Freeland and Laurence D. Hurst, "Evolution Encoded," *Scientific American* 290 (April 2004): 84-91.

31. Lee, Essentials, p. 5.

BOOK REVIEWS

Stephen G. Post.
Unlimited Love. Templeton Foundation Press, 2003.

True love, being the core value and supreme ideal of creation, is certainly an appropriate topic for scientific study as well as theological reflection. Yet few philosophers or social scientists have devoted themselves to its investigation. A number of factors have conspired in its neglect. Twentieth-century psychological and social sciences were dominated by mechanistic theories of behavior and social organization. Evolutionary biology has been dominated by the view that altruism is disguised self-interest, e.g., Richard Dawkins' 'selfish gene'; given the dominance of fallen nature, such views seem to have some basis. Theologians and Christian ethicists have made some progress, yet absent dialogue with the sciences.

Moreover, love confounds study by its many-sidedness and ubiquity. Science cannot proceed without clear definition, yet love is often poorly defined. Its common use in English often assumes some sexual expression, yet friendship, parental love and compassion are all forms of love. The Greeks had different words to distinguish different aspects what we call 'love': *eunoia* means benevolence, *physike* means solidarity with members of one's own community or race, *xenike* means kindness to guests and strangers, *eros* is impassioned attraction, *philia* is friendship, *storge* is parental care, and *agape* is universal affection. Christianity lifts up *agape* as the essential nature of God's love, as exemplified in the universal and unconditional love of Christ for all humankind.

Dr. Stephen G. Post (U.T.S. '78) has been devoting much of his professional life to pursue the study of love. Now in collaboration with John Templeton of the Templeton Foundation, he has founded the Institute for Research on Unlimited Love to promote this field of study by providing research grants and publishing monographs. Questions for study include: love and human development, the therapeutic value of love, biological mecha-

nisms by which love affects health, the relationship of love to social behavior, evolutionary perspectives on the origin and purpose of love, and the nexus between love and spirituality.

This is important work can be seen as a logical development out of Post's seminal participation in the International Conferences on the Unity of the Sciences [ICUS] in the 1970s and 80s while a graduate student at U.T.S. and then at the University of Chicago. In defining the purpose of ICUS, Rev. Moon called on scientists, philosophers and theologians to collaborate around the theme of 'absolute values,' which he specified as 'true love.' Though ICUS is no more, the need for such collaborations remain, and even more urgently so in this time of coarsening values.

Unlimited Love is a definitional work, and as such it is foundational to the enterprise of the scientific study of love. What is love—'unlimited love' that is enduring and has no boundaries, in contrast to the debased and fleeting love of romantic involvements or the intense but narrow love of kith and kin? What are its chief qualities? Can love be quantified and measured? Is a biology of love hard-wired into the human brain? Can the full range of human love be explained by evolution? Or does the fullest expression of love require a connection with a divine Source? Post explores these questions, and more. Being a trained theologian, he treats the subject from a broadly Christian perspective, informed by the best work of theologians from Luther to Tillich and well versed in theological issues that recur in secular guise in scientific discussions of altruism and selfishness.

Let's begin with the definition offered by the Institute for Research on Unlimited Love:

> The essence of love is to affectively affirm as well as to unselfishly delight in the well-being of others, and to engage in acts of care and service on their behalf; unlimited love extends this love to all others without exception, in an enduring and constant way. Widely considered the highest form of virtue, unlimited love is often deemed a Creative Presence underlying and integral to all of reality: participation in unlimited love constitutes the fullest expression of spirituality. Unlimited love may result in new relationships, and deep community may emerge around helping behavior, but this is secondary. Even if connections and relations do not emerge, love endures. (vii)

We can see in this definition the classical Christian ideal of *agape* love; indeed Post remarks that "unlimited love captures the essence of *agape*." (17) God is present when humans practice unlimited love. It is love without any boundaries, extending to all humanity. It is love without any self-interest, love that continues regardless of the beloved's response or lack of response. Jesus Christ certainly exemplified this sort of love when he went to the cross to offer

salvation to people who were rejecting and persecuting him.

However, the last sentences may give one pause. Is love an end in itself, or is love for the purpose of building relationships and community that make life worthwhile? Reverend Moon teaches that the purpose of life is joy, and joy is manifest through the relationship between subject partner and object partner, lover and beloved. In *Exposition of the Divine Principle,* he defines love to include this element of purpose:

> When two entities, discrete manifestations of God's dual characteristics, form a common base and seek to unite as the third object partner to God and establish the four position foundation, they will engage in give and take action. In accomplishing this, the emotional force the subject partner gives the object partner is called love, and the emotional force that the object partner returns to the subject partner is called beauty. (EDP, 38)

For Rev. Moon, the end of love is family. When God created human beings, He endowed them with love for the purpose of forming God's first family. Had the human ancestors not fallen, the quality of love in their family would be divine, unlimited love. The loving bonds of their family would naturally extend to include all people without exception, making the whole of humanity one family—the Kingdom of God on earth. However, when Jesus went to the cross, dying without establishing the Kingdom of God on earth, his unlimited love was left unrequited, not establishing the divine community that God and Jesus had intended. Hence, although Jesus was the greatest exemplar of love, as a model of true love his example is flawed because it lacks the element of fulfillment.

To his credit, Post does not fix upon Jesus as the central model of love. Instead, he draws upon the Judeo-Christian tradition of God as Parent to offer the hypothesis that the origin and basis of true love is parental love. He develops this idea from multiple directions: From evolutionary theory, where parenting in animals can require self-sacrifice and intense care for the young, and humans, whose young remain a more helpless state for many years, require far more parental investment than any other creature. From theology, where in reflecting on the parental love of God, he suggests, "Perhaps *agape* or unlimited love is God's *storge,* for like parental love, it even loves us when we are unlovable." (106) From Christian ethics, where he describes the extensivity of parental love as regards adoption, caring for the sick and needy as if one's own children, and loving all humanity as God's children. In grounding unlimited love in God's parental love, Post offers some of his best work and keenest insights into the theology and nature of true love. He is also reflecting Rev. Moon's teaching.

Let's turn to the measure of love. Post builds upon the important sociologist Pitirim A. Sorokin, whose classic, *The Ways and Power of Love,* set

up a five-dimensional model to measure the qualities of love. Sorokin's five dimensions are: intensity, extensivity, duration, purity and adequacy. The *intensity* dimension ranges from minor acts of charity to extreme self-sacrifice. *Extensivity* measures the degree to which love is focused on close family or extends to encompass strangers and enemies. *Duration* ranges from a single moment, as in the heroic action of a passer-by who dives into the water to rescue a drowning man, to a lifetime of care for a disabled spouse or parent. *Purity* describes the extent to which love is free from egoistic motivation and personal profit. *Adequacy* distinguishes between "love that is objectively genuine but has adverse consequences" such as spoiling a child with excessive pampering, from love that endowed with wisdom that builds character and virtue in the beloved. (31-33)

This five-dimensional measure allows a researcher to "grade" the love of individuals. Sorokin argued that

> The greatest lives of love and altruism approximate or achieve 'the highest possible place, denoted by 100 in all five dimensions,' while persons 'neither loving nor hating would occupy a position near zero.'" (33) He also considered the role of the Divine in empowering those saints, such as Jesus and Gandhi, who despite persecution could "maintain a love at high levels in all five dimensions. (34)

In describing the profound spirituality of love, Post elaborates theologically upon these five dimensions. He describes love at its most intense in the self-sacrifice of Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Martin Luther King, Jr. and all those who in caring for others experience the intensity of God's presence. In treating extensivity, he discusses the Parable of the Good Samaritan and the Judeo-Christian ethic of hospitality to strangers, and to give charity to the needy regardless of their beliefs. In treating the purity of love, he dwells on the theme of selflessness in a Mother Theresa or Christ on the cross. In discussing love's duration, he remarks on the 'fleeting love' of casual sex and the romantic affections that make for short-lived marriages. Indeed, Post has a low opinion of conjugal love unless it is redeemed by unlimited love, for "unlimited love saves romantic and sexual love from themselves." (149)

This is all well and good, except when it comes to conjugal love, for which Post has little positive to say. Yet is there not an inconsistency here? We have seen that Post regards parental love as the origin and model of unlimited love, even identifying the source of unlimited *agape* love with God's parental heart. Conjugal love is every bit as much ordained by God as parental love, and just as much a part of the natural order that conspires to love's expression. God, which the Divine Principle describes as the harmonized center of dual characteristics, is just as essentially the source of conjugal love as of parental love. Yet while Post considers parental love to be in line with God's love, he

regards conjugal love as merely the love of the flesh—weak and in need of salvation. The devaluation of the body implied by this line of thought does not cohere well with the Christian affirmation of the goodness of the created world.

There are countless examples of strong and lasting marriages where husband and wife give each other affection, support and wise counsel to do great good for communities and nations. Yet the Sorokin measure of love cannot readily deal with such righteous conjugal love. Can true conjugal love score high on the scale of extensivity? Clearly not: it is meant for one partner and one only. As regards purity, there is dispute as to what is meant by truly 'selfless' love, and whether mutuality can truly characterize it: "Mutuality... is never the indispensable condition for unlimited love or any love of an elevated type. Mutuality must be left to take care of itself." (151)

In his quest for a natural theology to explain love (102), Post would do well to look again at Rev. Moon's teachings on love, for he would find in them the means to overcome some of the inconsistencies and weaknesses of current theories of love. In Rev. Moon's teaching of the Four Great Realms of Heart lies a sophisticated typology that better describes the excellencies of the different types love than the one-size-fits-all Sorokin measure. In his teaching of the Four-Position Foundation lies the germ of a more complete natural theology, one that includes the dimensions of conjugal love and children's love alongside parental love as constitutive of divine, unlimited love.

Dr. Post and his Institute for the Study of Unlimited Love are doing important work to untangle and make sense of a subject of utmost significance. We wish him well.

—Andrew Wilson, Unification Theological Seminary

Michael Breen. The Koreans: Who They Are, What They Want, Where Their Future Lies, revised edition. New York: Thomas Dunne Books/ St. Martin's Griffin, 2004.

Although originally targeted for foreign business readers, Michael Breen's *The Koreans* has emerged as a modern-day classic on the Korean character and culture. It is often recommended by Korean studies scholars, alongside such earlier general works as Donald S. Macdonald's *Koreans: Contemporary Politics and Society* (now in its third edition, revised by Donald Clark). In its 1999 Korean translation from the original 1998 British edition, *The Koreans* rocketed to the top ten list of Korea's bestsellers, revealing Koreans' own

enthusiasm to understand themselves from an outsider's perspective. The American hardcover edition also appeared in 1999, and the 2004 paperback edition reviewed here is slightly revised with a new chapter on events since 2000.

Breen, a British journalist, originally went to South Korea as *The Washington Times'* Seoul correspondent. He ended up living there for 15 years, during which time he also served for three years as president of the Seoul Foreign Correspondents Club, and wrote for *The Guardian* and *The Times* of London. He later became managing director of the Seoul office of public relations firm Merit/Burson-Marsteller, and now runs his own company, Insight Communications Consultants.

Unificationists will remember him authoring in 1997 the meticulously researched *Sun Myung Moon: The Early Years, 1920-53,* based on in-depth interviews with early followers of Reverend Moon. No book has appeared in English since to rival it. This year, Breen's popular new book, Kim *Jong-Il: North Korea's Dear Leader,* builds on his reputation with *The Koreans.*

For the first-time reader of *The Koreans,* there is one caution: it is not a straightforward read. Breen's technique is to interweave stories and vignettes as examples of what he describes. A given chapter typically is strung together by numerous stories, making the book almost conversational in tone; yet it works. While it takes getting used to, in the end, this technique may be why the book succeeds so well. Breen's book contrasts with the unnerving style of fellow journalist Bradley Martin's new 880-page tome, *Under the Loving Care of the Fatherly Leader: North Korea and the Kim Dynasty,* which poorly employs a similar technique of interweaving personal stories and experiences.

The underlying reason *The Koreans* succeeds is Breen has the depth of experience, sensitivity and skill to explain things Korean to a foreign audience. He comes close to knowing what it is like to being Korean without being one, and thus gives the reader a very intimate feeling about the internal universe and perspective of Koreans. It is that quality that surely has astonished Korean readers themselves.

The Koreans is divided into four parts: "Society and Values," "History," "Economy," and "Politics" (with a new concluding chapter on the "Next Generation"). The first part is the strongest and undoubtedly the most valuable. Here Breen's storytelling technique is used to maximum effect. The other three parts function really as an adjunct to the first, and while written as well as could be expected given the book's scope, do not stand as well on their own. Interested readers would do better to consult Bruce Cumings' *Korea's Place in the Sun: A Modern History* for an adequate historical overview; Mark L. Clifford's *Troubled Tiger: Businessmen, Bureaucrats and Generals (rev. ed.),* for an economic and business overview of South Korea; and, Don Oberdorfer's *The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History (rev. ed.)* for

a solid political history of North-South relations.

There are also several Unificationist-related references in the book. Breen mentions that in 1989 police had to use tear gas to separate students and demonstrating Protestant Christians in Chonan when the Unification Church obtained government approval to turn its seminary there into Sun Moon University. Just one paragraph is devoted to the Church's founder, in which Breen notes that only Rev. Moon is internationally known among at least 70 South Koreans who have claimed to be the messiah since the 1960s. Sprinkled throughout are mentions of Sun Moon University professor Lynne Kim (her views on male/female relationships in Korea); University of Bridgeport religion scholar Mark Setton (his observations on child-rearing in Korea); and short vignettes on the *Segye Ilbo* and the Tongil Group.

This reviewer was especially intrigued by Breen's discussions of North Korea. We were both guests of the late President Kim Il Sung in April 1994 as part of a visiting delegation of former heads of state and government (accompanied by journalists and academics) led by the Summit Council for World Peace. Breen properly took note of Kim's earthy but poignant explanation to the luncheon guests of *juche,* North Korea's philosophy of self-reliance, which to my knowledge has never appeared in any other publication, before or since. It bears repeating:

> "It's anathema to me to follow others. We can learn from foreigners, of course," he said. "You must chew first. If it's agreeable you can swallow. If it's disagreeable, spit it out. East European countries got indigestion because they swallowed the Soviet Union. If it rained in Moscow, people put up their umbrellas in Berlin. You have to chew first. Then you eat it – in other words, you make it your own. Otherwise, you'll get sick."

Save for the new last chapter, *The Koreans* is up to date only as far as 1999. It covers contemporary Korean history and politics only as far as the first year of Kim Dae Jung's presidency (1998). The new chapter itself takes us to 2003, including the June 2000 summit between Kim Dae Jung and Kim Jong Il and the 2003 election of Roh Moo-hyun with the emergence of a new generation in Korean politics.

The problem is that, as timeless as Korean culture might seem, a lot has changed in South Korea over the last five years, with important implications. Notwithstanding the valiant effort in the short new chapter, some material in Parts Two through Four has become dated. Korea's most recent changes are profoundly cultural and sociological, not just economic and political.

For example, today foreign businessmen readily admit that South Korea has come a long way since the 1997-98 Asian Financial Crisis, and now welcomes foreign investment; yet the reader would conclude from this

"revised" edition that Koreans do not. There has been a huge growth in South Korean civil society since 1998, with its consequent impact on political culture, which is only touched upon in the concluding chapter. The nature of anti-Americanism is given only minimal treatment. And recent socio-cultural changes (admirably detailed elsewhere by Seoul-based scholar Edward J. Button) affecting the span of Korean life, including family values, sexuality, racism and anti-foreigner bias, education, and regionalism, are only briskly mentioned if at all in Breen's closing chapter.

The publisher would do well to commission from Breen a genuinely revised and updated *second* edition. If *The Koreans* is to retain its value in coming years to general audiences as well as students of Korean affairs, Breen will have to continue to employ his effective journalistic style in keeping us abreast of how the Korean people are changing and where they are headed.

—Mark P. Barry, Unification Theological Seminary