

## A Review of Dr. Tyler Hendricks' Presentation "Thoughts on Sanctuary Church" Part 1

(Suggestion: refer to this review when listening to Dr. Hendricks' presentation step by step)

<https://vimeo.com/142711336>

Dr. Hendricks' Presentation	Rebuttal	Notes on the Rhetoric
What seems to me to be Sanctuary's logic, confirmed by the President.	If it is confirmed by the President of Sanctuary Church, how is it Dr. Hendricks' impression of the logic?	Question: Does Dr. Panzer agree that this is Sanctuary's position? Have the words been changed? If so, how?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. True Parents are doing fine.</li> <li>2. True Parents appoint Hyung Jin Nim's couple to be their heir.</li> <li>3. True Father dies and True Mother goes off track.</li> <li>4. Centering on True Father, Hyung Jin Nim's couple restores True Parents.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. False premise: Hyung Jin Nim has clarified that there was a problem developing before Father passed away. However, conditionally, Mother had not actually broken with Father.</li> <li>2. OK.</li> <li>3. OK.</li> <li>4. Misleading premise. Requires more explanation. Father does not need to be restored. Mother herself may need to be restored, but this is NOT the job of Hyung Jin Nim's couple. Rather, True Parent's position must be preserved and then completed. The final stage offering must be completed. True Parents position itself is intact.</li> </ol>	<p>NOT ACCURATE</p> <p>This presentation of "Sanctuary's logic" is not accurate.</p> <p>See below 2 out of 4 assertions are incorrect, or misleading.</p>
What's wrong with that picture?	Good question. What is wrong is that it does not actually represent the Sanctuary position.	This is a straw man argument. The rhetoric presents a false or misrepresented position, and then proceeds to pull it down. This does not address the Sanctuary viewpoint, but merely attempts to discredit it..
"Doing fine"	False premise = false negation.	NEGATING A FALSE PREMISE (misrepresented viewpoint) allows the presenter to 'score points' with the listener without actually addressing the actual argument, which is Sanctuary

**Dr. Hendrick's Presentation**

**Rebuttal**

**Notes on the Rhetoric**

		viewpoint vs. Dr. Hendricks' Viewpoint.
Perfection = cannot fall. I know its difficult to believe, but that is what the Principle says.	Is this difficult to believe? All faithful Unificationists who believe in the Principle uphold this principle.	NEGATING A FALSE PREMISE The rhetoric craftily implies that Hyung Jin Nim's is negating this part of the Principle. He is not. He affirms that Mother was not 'fine' in her relationship with Father, and that she also was not yet perfected – had additional responsibility to do.
"If human beings fell...."	A lecture on the Principle which has nothing to do with the Sanctuary position.	MISDIRECTION Continuation of the straw man argument, plus developing a bait-and-switch methodology. Distract listeners to with an accurate presentation of the Principle but misdirect by continuing to assert a position that is fundamentally not the Sanctuary position.
"Father said True Love is eternal, so if True Mother went off-track, then she and True Father did not have true love, which means they aren't True Parents"	This is false logic and is unprincipled. God and humans were meant to be one. When Adam and Eve fell, does this mean God did not have True love (eternal love) towards humans? Regardless of whether Mother went off track or not, if Father's love towards her is absolute and eternal, is this not True Love"? Also, was Mother perfect when she was married to Father in 1960? Was her love already perfected? Were Father and Mother not True Parents in 1960? Father explained that he had to take a bride who was at the top of the growth stage, where Eve fell. Was Mother already "perfected" at this time?	PRESENTATION OF LOGIC NOT BASED ON PRINCIPLE The rhetoric is intended to be convincing, but merely builds up a scaffold on the fundamental premise: Mother had finished everything and was perfect on all levels. In doing so, it ignores the need for Mother to walk a course to restore Eve. This argument, however, is consistent with Mother's assertion that her lineage was changed in her mother's womb, and that Father did not educate her. This, however, is NOT Sanctuary's position.
Normal logic: If the appointment is valid, then True Parents were fine.	Another explanation is that Father had the right, given by God, to appoint his heir and do many other things. As long as Mother worked in unity with Father, her own perfection was not critical. In	PRESENTATION OF LOGIC NOT BASED ON PRINCIPLE; NEW TEACHING All of this argument is based on the premise that Father only had authority as

	unity with Father, she could stand in the True Mother position. Whatever was accomplished while Mother is united with Father stands not because of Mother's merit, but because of Father's merit and position. However, in the end, everything had to be completed and finally offered on Foundation Day.	True Parent because Mother was also perfect. This is not the Sanctuary position, and is not borne out by history. Father could bless and do many things. This is the authority given to the LSA.
Characteristics of being off-track. 1. Separating from one's parents.	1. Unificationist had to separate from their parents in order to unite with Heaven's side. As did Abraham. Separating from one's parent is not a characteristic of being off-track if the parent is off-track themselves.	PRESENTATION OF DEFINITIONS NOT BASED ON PRINCIPLE – HUMANISTIC VIEWPOINT This is obviously weak and also unprincipled. The principle view is that whether separation or breaking up is "off-track" or not is determined by the purpose, not the external action.
2. Breaking up the family.	2. This was an accusation leveled against Father and the Unification Church when 1 <sup>st</sup> generation joined. Purpose defines value (on-track or off-track"). As above.	NON-PRINCIPLE : HUMANISTIC VIEWPOINT
3. Dividing the community.	3. God divided North and South Israel, North and South Korea, Catholics and Protestants. Is God off-track?	NON-PRINCIPLE : HUMANISTIC VIEWPOINT Separation of good and evil is a fundamental principle of the restoration process. The rhetoric uses a humanistic view of community value to besmirch Hyung Jin Nim's motive and purpose. Also, see above.
4. Sowing conflict and confusion	A good sign of being off-track, possibly. However, is Hyung Jin Nim sowing confusion, or bringing the truth to light? This is the point of dispute. The assertion that he is sowing conflict and confusion is an unsubstantiated premise. It is not the Sanctuary position.	NON-PRINCIPLE : HUMANISTIC VIEWPOINT Purpose defines value (on-track or off-track"). As above.
5. Complaint, accusation and blame.	The Prophets in the old testament "complained, accused and blamed". Were they off-track?	NON-PRINCIPLE : HUMANISTIC VIEWPOINT Purpose defines value (on-track or off-

		track"). As above.
	<p>Some True Characteristics of being off-track</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Separating from True Father (Christ, the LSA, the Messiah)</li> <li>2. Leading Father's family away from Father.</li> <li>3. Forcing division by leading Father's family away from Father. Erasing of Father's core traditions. Removal of Father's victorious Cain Abel sons.</li> <li>4. Proclaiming falsity, half-truths and untruths.</li> <li>5. Lack of transparency plus lack of accountability plus lack of trust. As well as "Complaint, accusation and blame" against Father.</li> </ol>	<p>Added rebuttal: Purpose defines value. The purpose of all these actions contradicts God's purpose of salvation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sounds like ... who?</li> <li>2. Sounds like ... who?</li> <li>3. Sounds like ... who?</li> <li>4. Sounds like ... who?</li> <li>5. Sounds like ... who?</li> </ol> <p>Should be judged on the facts, not innuendo.</p>
Sanctuary is rejecting True Mother	Misleading. Sanctuary is upholding Father. Sanctuary is rejecting Mother because she is separating from Father.	<p>MISLEADING PREMISE : PARTIAL TRUTH, MIXED WITH FALSE PREMISE</p> <p>As with all arguments in this presentation, this argument by Dr. Hendricks is based on the premise that Mother was completely perfected; that even before Foundation Day, everything was completed; that it is impossible for Mother to separate from Father. This is not Sanctuary's position.</p>
To reject Mother is to reject Father.	<p>Only if Mother has not separated from Father. Otherwise, to reject Mother is necessary to accept Father.</p> <p>Purpose of action defines value.</p>	<p>MISLEADING PREMISE : OMITTS PIVOTAL ISSUE</p> <p>Premise: Mother was completely perfected, and that even before Foundation Day, everything was completed. Etc.</p>
Sanctuary says "Changing things is wrong"	<p>A clear misrepresentation. Should read "Sanctuary says: Changing things that Father put in place without Father's permission is wrong".</p>	<p>FALSE PREMISE</p> <p>This requires judgment. The Sanctuary position is that Mother is changing these things WITHOUT permission and in contradiction to Father's will. This is A BAIT-AND-SWITCH. Present a plausible and valid assertion (Father</p>

Dr. Hendrick's Presentation

Rebuttal

Notes on the Rhetoric

		changed many things), then insert a false assertion (Sanctuary says changing things is wrong"),
"Unless through True Parents"	Father is the seed and core of True Parents. Mother separated from Father is not True Parents. True Parents (when Mother was following Father's lead) anointed Hyung Jin Nim's couple as the center and as the <i>Dae Shin Ja</i> (Representative and Proxy) of True Parents. If Mother has left True Father's will, she is no longer True Parents. Because True Father is now in SW, not on Earth, True Parents <i>Dae Shin Ja</i> represents "True Parents" and is thus qualified to bring changes, although NOT to contradict Father's will.	MISDIRECTION Dr. Hendricks' Premise: Mother was completely perfected, and that even before Foundation Day, everything was complete, and that Mother is changing things with Father's blessing and support. This is not Sanctuary's position.
The Structure, the role of the Mother Nation, Cheongpyeong, International HQ, the core staff, it's all wrong. → They were created by Father	Father put Rev. Kwak in place. Father established the group of companies in Tongil Group. Father appointed many leaders, etc. Each person has their own portion of responsibility. Despite Father's creation (establishment), Rev. Kwak left Father, the Tongil companies housed corruption and were hemorrhaging, In Jin Nim made mistakes. The reason these things (quoted at left) are wrong, is that over time, they became dysfunctional, diverged from Father and became corrupted because of the FAILURE of human responsibility. God created Adam and Eve. Does this mean Adam and Eve cannot (did not) sin? Creation is 95% responsibility. Fulfillment of personal responsibility after creation is human 5% responsibility.	NON-PRINCIPLE : HUMANISTIC VIEWPOINT This argument relies on weak logic and does not reflect the Principle. The rhetoric is spurious.
Sanctuary says "True Mother has no authority"	A clear misrepresentation. Should read "Sanctuary says: Without unity with True Father, True Mother has no authority".	MISREPRESENTATION This requires discernment. Is Mother in unity with Father? Sanctuary position is: No. IF Mother is united with Father, then

**Dr. Hendrick's Presentation**

**Rebuttal**

**Notes on the Rhetoric**

		she has authority.
Her authority was proclaimed by Father.	Father declared many things over all the stages of restoration. He also declared that Mother had responsibility remaining before Foundation Day. Because Mother's authority was declared by Father, that authority exists only when she is in unity with Father.	Dr. Hendricks' Premise: Mother was completely perfected, and that even before Foundation Day, everything was complete, and that Mother is changing things with Father's blessing and support. This is not Sanctuary's position.
To reject Mother is to not honor your father and mother.	Only if Mother has not separated from Father. Otherwise, to accept and honor Father, one must reject Mother.	MISDIRECTION Dr. Hendricks' premise. Mother was completely perfect, on all levels, prior to Foundation Day.
Let's see what the Bible says.		MISDIRECTION The rhetoric uses the Bible to argue against Hyung Jin Nim's position. This is merely persuasive. The argument does not correctly identify and address the Sanctuary position. Use of the Bible is irrelevant if the argument does not correctly identify and address the Sanctuary position
Jesus placed honoring one's father and mother above religion.	Jesus also said "Who is My mother and who are My brothers?" .... "For whoever does the will of My Father who is in heaven, he is My brother and sister and mother." Matt 12:48 Jesus uphold the principle that unity with the will of God is the FIRST criteria for applying loyalty.	NON-PRINCIPLE : MISAPPLIED EXAMPLE
God clearly says "respect your father and mother", and..... ....you nullify the word of God for the sake of your tradition. <sup>7</sup> You hypocrites! Isaiah was right when he prophesied about you"	The implication here is that Hyung Jin Nim wrong to "curse his mother". Whether he is wrong to do that or not is debatable. However, in any case is it as great a sin as to separate from the True father and hijack his foundation for a purpose other than what he wants?	MISDIRECTION Dr. Hendricks' premise. Mother was completely perfect, on all levels, prior to Foundation Day. Therefore, Hyung Jin Nim is wrong.
"These people make a big who of saying the right thing, but their heart isn't in it"	Is Hyung Jin Nim making a big show of saying the right thing? He is clearly saying what is unpopular – the "wrong" thing. Who is making a big show of	MISAPPLIED EXAMPLE? Sanctuary position is that FFWPU Leadership uses Father's name as a cover

**Dr. Hendrick's Presentation**

**Rebuttal**

**Notes on the Rhetoric**

<p>"They just use me as a cover for teaching whatever suits their fancy."</p>	<p>saying "the right thing"? Is it not the FFWPU Leadership? Was this not a large part of the culture of the FFWPU leadership (particularly the more corrupt and self-serving sections of the leadership)?</p>	<p>for self-interested promotion, at the expense of membership, and that they are teaching false things about Father (supporting changes unauthorized by Father).</p>
<p>"rules and traditions are not an excuse to weasel around the commandment to honor father and mother"</p>	<p>Is the assertion here that it is better to honor Mother even if she leaves Father and changes Father's legacy in clear contradiction to Father's instructions?</p>	<p>NON-PRINCIPLE : HUMANISTIC VIEWPOINT The rhetoric slips into humanistic argument, based on the premise "Mother cannot possibly be separate from Father" "everything was completed even before Foundation Day".</p>
<p>Is there a just cause? True Mother did not reject Hyung Jin Nim's mission?</p>	<p>Sanctuary position is that Mother rejected her own mission: to unite with True Father. She rejected her own mission, either in ignorance or in defiance, to uphold Father and his will.</p>	<p>RED HERRING The presentation here offers a red herring. By comparing with Jesus and Mary, the presentation sets up a false framework: that the issue is whether Mother rejected Hyung Jin Nim's mission or not, and also that Hyung Jin Nim is comparing himself to Jesus. The issue, from the Sanctuary perspective, is that Mother rejected her own mission to unite with Father. The just cause for opposing Mother is not because she rejected Hyung Jin Nim's mission, but because she rejected Father's clear instructions and her mission to uphold them.</p>
<p>True Parents gave him the mission! True Parents define the mission! True Parents are waiting for him to fulfill it!</p>	<p>Sanctuary position is that if Mother separates from True Father, she is not True Parents. Also, that True Father gave Hyung Jin Nim and Kook Jin Nim the mission to uphold his will come what may.</p>	<p>MISDIRECTION</p>
<p>His first responsibility is filial piety.</p>	<p>Agreed. This is consistent with Sanctuary position. However, the question still remains: Is Mother united and one with Father's direction?</p>	<p>VALID POINT HOWEVER, repeat of argument based on premise: "Mother cannot possibly be</p>

Dr. Hendrick's Presentation

Rebuttal

Notes on the Rhetoric

	<p>Sanctuary's viewpoint is that if Mother is not united with Father, Hyung Jin Nim's first responsibility is to honor Father. Father is the core and center of True Parents.</p>	<p>separate from Father" "everything was completed even before Foundation Day". QUESTION: Does Dr. Hendricks agree that IF Mother is not united with Father, Hyung Jin Nim's first responsibility and the responsibility of blessed members, is to Father first?</p>
<p>True Father told Hyun Jin Nim: put aside your external positions, and stay with me. True Mother has every right to follow True Father's example with Hyung Jin Nim.</p>	<p>Father already asked Hyung Jin Nim to "put aside your external positions, and stay with me" which Hyung Jin Nim did in obedience to Father. Is Mother asking Hyung Jin Nim to "put aside his external positions and stay with me?" or is she asking him "put aside your loyalty to Father, and cooperate with me"?</p>	<p>MISDIRECTION The rhetoric seeks associate Hyung Jin Nim with Hyun Jin Nim and then persuade the listener that instances of Mother not supporting Hyung Jin Nim (dismissing from 8 public positions, banning him from talking about Father's Absolute Sex message, etc) are merely Mother following Father's example. Shifty rhetoric, Bait-and-switch: "Father did it, why shouldn't Mother?" Premise: Hyung Jin Nim's reason for contradicting Mother is like Hyun Jin Nim's reasons. This is not Sanctuary position.</p>
<p>Right now, Mother is the horizontal True Parents. Does the son define....?</p>	<p>Sanctuary position is that if Mother is not united with Father, she is not in the position of the horizontal True Parents. Because Mother was united with Father when Father anointed Hyung Jin Nim as the <i>Dae Shin Ja</i>, Hyung Jin Nim is now the representative and proxy of True Parents on Earth.</p>	<p>MISDIRECTION More arguments based on repeat of premise: "Mother cannot possibly be separate from Father" "everything was completed even before Foundation Day".</p>
<p>The son, Jesus, was the True Parent, but in this case, it is the mother who is the True Parent.</p>	<p>False comparison. Correct comparison is: Jesus rejected Mary because she separated herself from the will of God (did not see her own role or Jesus from God's viewpoint). Hyung Jin Nim is contradicting Mother because she separated herself from the will of God (failed to see her own role from God's viewpoint, rejected Father's will in the end).</p>	<p>FALSE COMPARISON (NEGATION OF A FALSE PREMISE) The rhetoric seeks to distract listeners by drawing a comparison Jesus and Mary compared to Hyung Jin Nim and Mother. Sanctuary position is that if Mother is not united with Father, she is not in the position of the horizontal True Parents.</p>

<p>The case of Jesus rejecting his mother does not apply here.</p>	<p>Correct. This comparison does not apply here.                  Dr. Hendricks: Jesus case does not apply, so Hyung Jin Nim is wrong to defy his mother.                  Sanctuary position: Jesus case does not apply here, because the issue is not the mother (Mary) rejecting the son (Jesus), the issue is the mother (Eve) separating from the True Father (Adam), who is the True Parent.</p>	<p>CONVOLUTED                  Asks the question, does the case apply?                  Sets up a false premise, that Sanctuary position is that Hyung Jin Nim is in Jesus' position. Sanctuary position is that Hyung Jin Nim is in the position of the son of Jesus, who was asked by Father (Jesus) to be loyal, and uphold his instructions and words.</p>
--	--	--

**Part 1 Summary and Conclusion**

**ARGUMENT**

Dr. Hendricks' presentation begins from a misrepresentation of Sanctuary's position. Because of this, some of his conclusions are simply incorrect. Moreover, in his presentation, he fails to address the core Sanctuary assertion, which is that Mother has separated herself and the FFWPU from Father, that Mother is taking steps in clear contradiction to Father's instructions and disassembling Father's legacy purpose, and that this is a result of Mother's relationship with Father breaking down over time, primarily due to the influence of leaders and other courtiers who were failing in their responsibility to assist Mother in aligning with Father.

Dr. Hendricks draws on the Bible, but because his examples are misapplied against a misrepresented Sanctuary position, he misses opportunities for developing understanding and reconciliation.

Instead of addressing Sanctuary's actual position, Dr. Hendricks uses a combination of humanistic viewpoints, humanistic logic, and half-truths to negate Sanctuary's validity.

**RHETORIC**

Because Dr. Hendricks' presentation starts from a misrepresentation of the Sanctuary viewpoint, the presentation provides ample opportunity for him to score points with the listener by negating many varied premises (which are false to begin with). In addition to negating these false premises, there is a good deal of misdirection. By raising further misrepresentations of the Sanctuary viewpoint, the listener is misdirected from knowing about the actual issues that Sanctuary is raising, and the presentation goes on to offer a comforting reassertion of the basic FFWPU line, which is that Mother has NOT separated from Father and is NOT doing any actions which contravene Father, and that Hyung Jin Nim's motivation is off-track and unprincipled.

**CONCLUSION**

Whether intentional or not, this misrepresentation and rhetoric does not serve the Church or the Blessed Family membership. Indeed, one wonders that if the presenter must resort to misrepresenting the Sanctuary viewpoint in order to score points and shore up the FFWPU position, whether that FFWPU position is well-founded in the first place. It is possible that the presenter Dr. Hendricks merely misunderstands the Sanctuary viewpoint and

so presents it not as it is. However, this seems unlikely given the importance of the issues that are at stake here. It seems that more could be accomplished if Dr. Hendricks' presentation was based on actual Sanctuary positions, endorsed and agreed on by Sanctuary representatives, and if it dealt directly with the issues Sanctuary is raising. While it should be acknowledged that Dr. Hendricks (reportedly) sought to verify his starting point with Dr. Panzer, President of Sanctuary Church in the United States, one cannot help thinking that he somehow still got the story wrong. Perhaps Dr. Panzer can confirm or deny if Dr. Hendricks' starting point truly represents Dr. Panzer's own presentation of the Sanctuary viewpoint?