

RESPONSE TO A. JAMES RUDIN'S REPORT "JEWS AND JUDAISM IN REVEREND MOON'S *DIVINE PRINCIPLE*"

Prepared by

Unification Church, Department of Public Affairs; Daniel C. Holdgreiwe, Director, and
Unification Theology Study Group; John Andrew Sonneborn, Coordinator
March 1977

PREFACE

In the course of preparing this response to the report "Jews and Judaism in Reverend Moon's *Divine Principle*" by A. James Rudin of the American Jewish Committee, various limitations inherent in the report have kept this response from becoming either as comprehensive or as reconciliatory as would otherwise be desirable.

Considerations of length have prohibited the taking up of any issues other than those introduced by Rabbi Rudin in his citations from *Divine Principle*. As a result several serious issues have been omitted, which the Unification Church would have preferred to discuss.

Also the spirit of reconciliation with which the Unification Church would like to enter into dialogue has been hampered by the hateful tone of Rudin's attack. This report was not given to the Unification Church to stimulate dialogue but was issued to the public and the press without the Church having been even informed that a study was in progress. Furthermore, the report is filled with sweeping denunciations of the Church and attacks on the personal character and motivation of Reverend Moon.

We ask that all who read this response will be indulgent toward its limitations, and realize that it is not a definitive pronouncement but only a first step toward a dialogue of reconciliation.

INTRODUCTION

The members of the Unification Church learned with shock and surprise in December, 1976, that a report issued under the name of the American Jewish Committee had denounced them as anti-semitic. This accusation was so far from the day-to-day attitudes and beliefs of Unification Church members that it was difficult at first even to take it seriously—much less to believe it was made by honest or well-intentioned persons.

Later it became apparent that the study of the American Jewish Committee was conducted in a vacuum: no evidence was included about the attitudes (anti-semitic or otherwise) of Unification Church members; or about the content of Unification Church lectures, seminars, and training sessions (an oral tradition that is the primary source and expression of the Church's teachings); or about various books, pamphlets, and proclamations explaining Church positions. Instead the study was limited to one text, written twenty years ago in Korea.

The *Divine Principle* was not written by Reverend Moon, rather it represents the efforts of several members of the Unification Church of Korea to systematize the teachings of Reverend Moon (whom the Church believes to be a prophet) within the context of post-war Korean Christianity. As the most complete expression of those teachings available, it remains the basic text of the Unification Church.

Because there are almost no Jews in Korea, there was no danger of a careless phrase abetting anti-semitism as it might in other countries; however, the AJC report ignored the social context in which the book was written.

The *Divine Principle* does not teach anti-semitism; to do so would contradict its basic message of the universal brotherhood of men. Yet it can be argued that in countries where anti-semitism is a danger, social responsibility calls for positive steps against anti-semitism. The Unification Church is ready to recognize and participate in positive action against anti-semitism, and to clarify its teachings so that they can never be misused to justify hatred of Jews.

It is deeply regrettable that no one contacted the Unification Church about such actions before unleashing a hate-campaign in the national press.

2

RESPONSE TO A. JAMES RUDIN'S REPORT "JEWS AND JUDAISM IN REVEREND MOON'S *DIVINE PRINCIPLE*"

OUTLINE

- I. The Criticisms of *Divine Principle* itself in the Rudin report
 - A. *Divine Principle* citations in the report
 - B. The alleged lack of positive references to Judaism in the *Divine Principle*
- II. Portions of the Rudin report which do not refer to *Divine Principle*
 - A. References to anti-semitic elements in Christian tradition
 - B. References to various repudiations of anti-semitism by Christian Churches
 - C. References to other criticism of the Unification Church
 - D. Undocumented allegations against the Unification Church and Reverend Moon

SECTION I: THE CRITICISM OF *DIVINE PRINCIPLE* IN THE RUDIN REPORT

A. *Divine Principle* citations in the Report

Allegation 1—Page 1, paragraph 5 of the Rudin report:

The "faithlessness" of the Israelites is mentioned four times on a single page (p. 330).

Response:

On that page in *Divine Principle* two stories of faithlessness of the Israelites under Moses are given. In the first instance, Moses struck a rock twice in rage against the faithlessness of the Israelites. In saying this, *Divine Principle* accurately summarizes the Jewish Scriptures, specifically Numbers 20:1-13.

Now there was no water for the congregation; and they assembled themselves together against Moses and against Aaron. (v. 2) And why have you made us come up out of Egypt, to bring us to this evil place? It is no place for grain, or figs, or vines, or pomegranates; and there is no water to drink. (v. 5) And Moses and Aaron gathered the assembly together before the rock and he said to them, "Hear now, you rebels; shall we bring forth water for you out of this rock?" (v. 10)

In verse 11 Moses strikes the rock twice and in verse 12 the Lord reproves him, saying that therefore he would not bring the people into the promised land. The lack of faith is clear in the Scriptures, which also add the fact of rebellion. The anecdote is referred to in a paragraph which centers on the fact that when people lacked faith in Moses, Moses could still give them water, but could lead them only spiritually and not physically into Canaan. This whole story is told as a parallel to the later story that when people lacked faith in Jesus he also could give them spiritual leadership but could not physically lead them to a Messianic Kingdom. The paragraph occurs during fifty pages of the book almost exclusively concerned with relating the events during Moses' life. Therefore, it was necessary to give the Biblical account as to why Moses was not at the head of Israel when it entered Canaan.

Divine Principle on page 342, in a paragraph concluding the whole discussion of Moses and the Israelites with him, points out that God gave the grace of the water from the rock (Num. 20:8) on the merits of the Israelites' faithful suffering for forty years in the wilderness. This is to show God's love and patience with His people, even in their momentary doubting. *Divine Principle* considers it of great importance that the Israelites did establish a nation in Canaan.

The report suggests this telling is "perjorative." It would appear that *Divine Principle* is milder than the Biblical account. Moses, according to Deut. 9:24, said to all Israel: "Ye have been rebellious against the Lord from the day that I knew you."

The second story referred to on p. 330 of the *Divine Principle* concerns faithlessness of the Israelites which resulted in God's sending fiery serpents to them to bite them to death. This also accurately summarizes a passage in Numbers, Num. 21:6-7:

Then the Lord sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people, so that many people of Israel died. And the people came to Moses, and said, "We have sinned, for we have spoken against the Lord and against you; pray to the Lord, that he take away the serpents from us."

This story is told in a paragraph concerning God's redemption of those who repent of faithlessness and believe in God's redemption. A parallel is drawn: After Jesus' crucifixion, some came to believe this a redemptive act of God and repented of previous lack of faith; similarly, Moses made a bronze serpent on a pole, and the repenting and believing people were saved. The lesson is also being drawn that it would have been better to believe in the flesh-and-blood Moses (and the living Jesus) than in the bronze serpent (and crucified Jesus). Again, in the concluding summary of p. 342, the emphasis is on the fact that the people did repent and acknowledge Moses and God when they were bitten, and so received the grace of the healing bronze serpent.

Again, *Divine Principle* is less harsh than Jewish Scripture, as it emphasizes the repentance of the people and God's love and grace, where Moses in Deuteronomy remembers only the "rebelliousness."

Allegation 2—Page 2, continuation of paragraph from page 1:

The accusation is leveled collectively: “The Israelites *all* fell into faithlessness” (p. 315). “*All* the Israelites centering on Moses fell into faithlessness” (p. 320). “The Israelites *repeatedly* fell into faithlessness” (p. 343). (Emphasis added.)

Response:

The quotation cited as being on page 320 of *Divine Principle* appears actually on page 319. The passage gives a mild and accurate summary of the episode reported in Exodus 32. “So all the people” (verse 3) gave Aaron their earrings for his making into a metal calf which they then worshipped and around which they danced naked. In verse 9 the Lord says, “I have seen this people, and behold, it is a stiff-necked people.” And in verse 10 the Lord would dispose of all the people and let Moses alone be ancestor of a new people.

The story is told in the center of the history of the journey from Egypt to Canaan. The overall story of that journey, as told in the Bible and in *Divine Principle* is a mixed one in which God, the leadership of the people, and the people in groups and as a whole show varying degrees of unity and disunity. *Divine Principle* is highlighting the aspect that when there was full unity, the journey progressed. When there was severe disunity, it halted; but that any previous unity in the journey remained a foundation for later advance even if there were intervening setbacks. Thus the very next sentence in *Divine Principle* after the one cited reads, “Since they were already on the foundation of having drunk the water from the rock at Rephidim (Ex. 17:6)... God could appear again to Moses, after he had broken the two tablets of stone and tell him to cut two tablets like the first.” The book has made it clear that the partaking of the water is indication of the basic faithfulness and election of the people. This story in *Divine Principle* is relating how the tabernacle with its tables and ark was finally established, through Moses’ patience and sacrifice and through the people’s repentance and service to the Lord, as is told on the next page of *Divine Principle*.

Again, the telling is less harsh than the Bible’s. *Divine Principle* emphasizes not the character of the people but their lack of understanding of God’s providence. Thus it is Exodus 32:8 that is reported in *Divine Principle*, and not verses 7 and 9. Also, the telling downplays the orgiastic aspect of the pagan moment and plays up the fact that progress in the journey was made, that the incident was a momentary lapse in faith and was compensated by Moses’ second 40-day fast and the people’s true worship.

The citation from page 315 shows that *Divine Principle* is accurately reporting Exodus 16:1-6. The previous sentence in *Divine Principle* has recounted how God miraculously led the Israelites through the Red Sea; it summarizes the events recorded in Exodus, Chapters 5 through 15. Thus, the sentence cited may be located as condensing the opening of Exodus 16. Ex. 16:2: “And the whole congregation of the people of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron in the wilderness.” In verse 3 it is clear that the murmuring is due to lack of faith that there will be enough food, and in verses 4-6 the Lord’s response is to promise them food so that they will have faith and know that the Lord is God.

Here *Divine Principle* desires to explain why the establishment of the tabernacle with its ark and tablets was the will of God. If a people can unite around God and *practice* in faith the standards of conduct which he has shown (in revelation and by the standards of life demonstrated by providential persons) there would be no need for external forms and reminders of these standards. Where there is division, then, as *Divine Principle* points out in the paragraph under consideration, God sets up the external forms so that the survival of the group’s faith and mission does not depend on specific humans, but that as long as one person is faithful and honors the external reminder then others may gather around him. The whole congregation doubted, and even Moses might conceivably fail, but so long as there is “one man of absolute faith,” God can work His providence of election.

The citation from page 343 refers to a sentence in *Divine Principle* explaining why there is no lasting unity of God’s people from the time of leaving Egypt to the destruction of the temple by Rome. Ascribing the cause of division and disaster to repeated infidelity to the Lord accurately reflects the view of Jewish Scriptures. Deuteronomy 9 recounts repeated infidelities in the wilderness. Thereafter, countless prophets and narrative texts describe how the people worship strange gods. In I Kings 19:10, Elijah reports that “the people of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thy altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left.” Isaiah 30:9: “For they are a rebellious people, lying sons, sons who will not hear the instruction of the Lord.” Isaiah 59:4: “No one enters suit justly, no one goes to law honestly; they rely on empty pleas, they speak lies, they conceive mischief and bring forth iniquity.” Hosea 10:13: “You have plowed iniquity, you have reaped injustice, you have eaten the fruit of lies. Because you have trusted in your chariots and in the multitude of your warriors.” Neh. 9:26-27: “Nevertheless they were disobedient and rebelled against thee and cast thy law behind their back and killed thy prophets, who had warned them in order to turn them back to thee, and they committed great blasphemies. Therefore thou didst give them into the hand of their enemies, who made them suffer.” (This chapter recounts a whole history of infidelity and forgiveness.) Finally, II Chronicles 36:14-16 reports as history that “All the leading priests and the people likewise were exceedingly unfaithful, following all the abominations of the nations;... till there was no remedy.”

Why does *Divine Principle* make this observation? The didactic purpose of the passage is the same message given by Moses in Deuteronomy 9, namely, that we must all be humble before God and not think we are chosen for our great steadfastness. The passage is ultimately used in warning all persons today, especially Christians (including Reverend Moon’s own followers) to be firm in faith to God.

4

Historically, its purpose is to explain the pattern of endurance amidst disunity and to account for the fact that Jesus found such division as is known to have existed in his time; so that, according to *Divine Principle's* teaching, God needed a prophet (who should have been John) to unify the people in faith and inspire them to recognize Jesus as the Messiah.

Commentary on 1 and 2:

This concludes Rabbi Rudin's criticism of the *Divine Principle* account of the history of Israel prior to the coming of Jesus.

Out of the more than 150 pages of *Divine Principle* which discuss the history of Israel prior to Jesus, Rabbi Rudin has cited as offensive passages on only four pages. In each case, the *Divine Principle* reference is an accurate summary of Jewish scriptures; and is often less pejorative than the original. Also, Rabbi Rudin neglects the many times when *Divine Principle* teaches that the faithfulness and obedience of the Jewish people enabled God to advance His providence.

This last point is most significant: *Divine Principle* teaches that God can accomplish His will only when man fulfills his own portion of responsibility (pp. 55-60). Therefore, the parting of the Red Sea was accomplished on the foundation of the Israelites' faithfulness in following Moses out of Egypt (p. 309), and the eventual entry into Canaan was accomplished on the foundation of the Israelites' faithfulness during the 40 years of wandering in the wilderness (p. 323). Every success in God's providence from Abraham to John the Baptist is a testimony to the faith of the chosen people according to the *Divine Principle* view; even the coming of the Messiah was made possible by the faithfulness of Israel during the period from the rebuilding of the temple until Jesus' birth (p. 397).

Allegation 3—Page 2, paragraph 1:

the Jewish people of Jesus' day (were) "filled with ignorance" (p. 162)

Response:

The words "filled with ignorance" do not, in fact, appear on page 162. The word "ignorance" appears on page 162 in the following context:

In the passage, "From John the Baptist until now, the Kingdom of Heaven has suffered violence," Jesus was not referring to the failure of the people in general, but that of John the Baptist himself. If John had acted wisely, he would not have left Jesus, and his deeds would have remained for eternity as righteousness; but, unfortunately, he blocked the way for the Jewish people to go to Jesus, as well as his own way.

Here, we have come to understand that the greatest factor leading to the crucifixion of Jesus was the failure of John the Baptist. Paul lamented over the ignorance of the people, including John the Baptist, who crucified Jesus, saying:

None of the rulers of this age understood this; for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. (1 Cor. 2:8)

The ignorance (lack of understanding) referred to by St. Paul, is linked in the book with a speech of Jesus recorded in Matthew. The emphasis is on the fact that those who were best able to judge (John, the leaders of the community, and the Roman authorities), and who might have known that Jesus was God's agent, did not understand. Thus, the desertion and even the crucifixion of Jesus did not occur through malice but through lack of understanding (as Jesus is reported to have prayed while on the cross, "they do not know what they are doing".) Another level of ignorance is also being discussed and that is the ignorance of the people in general. The passage says that the people were unable to believe that Jesus was Messiah, because John "blocked the way."

Allegation 4—Page 2, paragraph 1:

the Jewish people... "persecuted" (p. 155)... Jesus

Response:

The *Divine Principle* text reads:

This young man emerged unknown, calling himself the Lord of the Sabbath, and yet violated the Sabbath which the Jews strictly observed (Matt. 12:1-8). Therefore, Jesus came to be known as one who wanted to abolish the law, which was the symbol of salvation to the Jews (Matt. 5:17). Therefore, Jesus was persecuted by Jewish leaders and had to gather fishermen to be his disciples.

As in the previous citation, this passage in *Divine Principle* records the opposition of the religious leaders to Jesus. In doing so, it accurately summarizes and quotes Christian scriptures. Matthew 26:3-4:

Then the chief priest and the elders of the people gathered in the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, and took counsel together in order to arrest Jesus by stealth and kill him.

Jesus himself is cited in the same passage of *Divine Principle* as having said, according to Matthew 21:31, "the tax collectors and the harlots go into the Kingdom of God before you (the Jewish leaders)." Therefore, the paragraph is not a criticism of the

5

common people. More importantly, the section of *Divine Principle* in which the passage occurs is exculpatory towards the events recorded in the New Testament. i.e., *Divine Principle* is saying that if the people judged Jesus by any traditional standards they could not find him credible. However, John was very credible. Therefore, when Jesus and John disagreed as to whether or not John was the second advent of Elijah, "it was only natural" to believe John and therefore to think Jesus an impostor. Then Jews who thought that Elijah must return before the Messiah would come (as predicted in Malachi) "were compelled to choose the way of disbelief in Jesus."

Commentary on 3 and 4:

Rabbi Rudin claims that *Divine Principle* attributes "ignorance" and "persecution" to the "Jewish people of Jesus' days." In fact, the cited passages clearly refer to "John the Baptist" and "Jewish leaders."

Secondly, the claim that such passages are "viciously anti-Jewish" is irreconcilable with the exculpatory nature of these passages: i.e., that the Jewish people are not to blame because the failure of specific individuals made it all but impossible for the rest of the people to accept Jesus.

Allegation 5—Page 2, paragraph 1:

The Jewish people... "derided" Jesus (p. 135.)

Response:

The *Divine Principle* text reads:

Christ will come again at the close of the New Testament Age as the center of the new heaven and earth, and will give us new words for the building of the new age. (Rev. 21-7). Therefore he is apt to be rejected and persecuted by Christians at the time of the Second Advent just as Jesus was persecuted and derided at his coming by the Jews, who said he was possessed by Beelzebub, the Prince of Demons (Matt. 12:24).

Therefore, Jesus predicted that first the Lord must suffer many things and be rejected by the generation at the time of the Second Advent. (Luke 17:25).

Commentary on 5:

Matthew refers to "Pharisees" while the *Divine Principle* account uses the generalization "Jews." The use of such a generalization arises out of the fact that this is a brief reference to first century Judaism in a section primarily concerned with the generalization "Christians."

If such a generalization holds the danger of inadvertently encouraging anti-semitism, the Unification Church is eager to make whatever clarifications are necessary to render such misinterpretations impossible.

Allegation 6—Page 2, paragraph 1:

the Jewish people (were

Response:

This quotation from *Divine Principle* is different from the ones cited above. The former focus on specific groups of people rejecting Jesus. The present paragraph concerns the fate of the Jewish people as a whole. Not only is the word "rebellion" used, but the paragraph opens up many other weighty matters.

God had been with the chosen nation of Israel until the time when Jesus appeared as the Messiah. Nevertheless, from the moment of their rebellion against Jesus, who appeared as the Messiah, God was compelled to deliver them, His elect, into the hands of Satan. Thus, God, together with His son, who was betrayed by the Israelites, had to abandon and turn against His chosen nation. Nevertheless, God's purpose of sending the Messiah was to save not only the chosen nation but also the whole of mankind. Therefore, God intended to save the whole of mankind, even though He might have to deliver Jesus into the hands of Satan. On the other hand, Satan tried to kill one man, Jesus, the Messiah, even if he might have to hand over to God the whole of mankind, including the chosen nation, which was now on his side. This was because Satan thought that he could break the purpose of the whole providence of God by killing the Messiah, for he knew that the first purpose of God's 4,000-year providence of restoration had been to set up one man, the Messiah. Thus, God finally handed Jesus over to Satan, as the condition of indemnity, in order to save the whole of mankind, including the Jewish people, who turned against Jesus, and were now on Satan's side. (p. 359, par. 2)

According to this paragraph, God had been working through one nation in a way unique from the ways He had been working in all other nations. He had been guiding this chosen people to establish a nation, a community, where God's word would be law and God's way would be practiced. God is said to be "with" the nation that is responding to His word and power; that nation is said to be "on God's side." Other nations—although peopled by humans all created as God's children—not being directly associated with God's providence, are said to be "on Satan's side." Satan's side is where all humanity has generally been after

6

Satan seduced the first human ancestors. In the chosen nation of God's side, God intended to raise up one man to be Messiah. According to this paragraph, God did just that: Jesus appeared in Judah among God's elect. God's purpose in sending the Messiah is to "save" His chosen nation and "also the whole of mankind." God's line of salvation goes first through His Messiah, then through His chosen people or Israel (victors of faith), and thence to all the world. Once the Messiah has come, God must work through Him. If, for whatever reason, the chosen people are not united with the Messiah they are as the *Divine Principle* puts it in "rebellion" against the Messianic mission and against God's providential will. Then God must recognize that that nation is no longer special but is like all the other nations, "on Satan's side." The paragraph closes by saying that God still intended to save all mankind, including the Jewish people.

By no means does the paragraph indicate any special humiliation of the Jewish people or nation or religion. The value of the Jewish nation and religion is in no way denied. The paragraph denies only that Judaism continues to hold a particular providential role, namely, that of being the nation chosen to receive the Messiah.

Divine Principle strongly teaches that God will again send Christ to earth; and that Christ will not come on literal clouds but will appear among humanity on earth. Therefore, he must first appear to some nation. This paragraph lays the ground for saying that Israel has no longer has the claim, once valid, for assuming that she will be that nation. In later chapters of the book, it is taught that since Jesus became a spiritual leader, the chosen nation came to be a spiritual nation of Christians throughout the world who carried on the tradition of Abraham and Jacob according to Jesus's leadership. There is nothing to indicate that the Jewish people, religion, or nation are not beloved by God.

Allegation 7—Page 2, paragraph 1:

[The *Divine Principle*] specifically links the Jews with Satan in bringing about the death of Jesus [p. 510]:

Nevertheless, due to the Jewish people's rebellion against him, the physical body of Jesus was delivered into the hands of Satan as the condition of ransom for the restoration of the Jews and the whole of mankind back to God's bosom; his body was invaded by Satan.

Response:

The material in this quotation is fully covered in the discussion of the citation immediately above.

Commentary on 6 and 7:

Rabbi Rudin does not make clear his objection to these passages; rather he is content to take a few words out of context in an effort to support his allegation that *Divine Principle* teaches hatred of Jews.

These are deep theological issues upon which many opinions are possible. The question of anti-semitism, however, is more circumscribed:

—Are these statements motivated by hatred of Jews? Unequivocally they are not.

—Are these statements part of a belief-structure which includes hatred of Jews? Again, this is unequivocally not the case.

—Might the *Divine Principle* text induce hatred of Jews or be used to justify anti-semitism? No one could simultaneously embrace *Divine Principle* and anti-semitism because *Divine Principle* teaches love for all races, peoples, nations, and beliefs. (p. 12, 101, 189, etc.). If however, there exists some danger that persons not sharing this belief could take statements out of context to justify religious hatred, then the Unification Church is eager to clarify its position so that such misuse of its teachings becomes impossible.

Allegation 8—Page 2, paragraph 1:

The Jewish people [were] filled with, . . . "disbelief" [p. 146 et passim].

Response:

These references to the disbelief with which Jesus was met occur in a section of the book whose message is that *if* Jesus had met with belief he would *not* have been crucified, and that it was his will and God's original plan that Jesus *should* be received with belief. The specific reference by the report is to the top paragraph on page 146 of the *Divine Principle* which repeats the parallel discussed earlier in this paper, between the doubts of Israelites who then were bitten by fiery serpents and saved by belief in a bronze serpent and those who doubted Jesus and were saved by faith in the crucified Messiah. Jesus is said to be "deeply sorrowful" over this. There is no anger, but sorrow that salvation was not swifter and more complete as would have been the case if the living Messiah had been accepted. However, the use of the term "disbelief" in this larger section of *Divine Principle* has wider application than it does on page 146. On page 144, *Divine Principle* states:

Jesus lamented over the disbelief and stubbornness of the people, saying:

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you would not! (Matt. 23:37)

As noted above, "disbelief" is applied to those who met and rejected Jesus, and lack of belief is the necessary fate of those who are kept from finding out about him.

Commentary on 8:

The report cites only the word "disbelief," which as the context makes clear, means disbelief in Jesus. Surely Rabbi Rudin does not contend that the Jewish people of that time believed Jesus to be the Messiah. The report, however, does not clarify that disbelief in Jesus is meant; rather it encourages the misinterpretation that *Divine Principle* accuses the Jewish people of Jesus's time of disbelief in God.

Allegation 9—Page 2, paragraph 1:

[The *Divine Principle*] specifically links the Jews with Satan in bringing about the death of Jesus:

As a matter of fact, Satan confronted Jesus, working through the Jewish people, centering on the chief priests and scribes who had fallen into faithlessness, and especially through Judas Iscariot, the disciple who had betrayed Jesus. [p. 357]

Response:

In *Divine Principle* Satan is considered to be the root cause of all disunity opposed to God's work. *Divine Principle*, page 84, says: "Satanic power, conveyed by evil spirits, results in the evil physical activities of earthly men." Evil activity is any activity in which God's word is not heard and which results in the absence of a foundation through which God can develop His creation (or re-creation). The passage in *Divine Principle*, page 357, referred to by the report continues to say that as the result of Satan's work as described, the people had no foundation to receive Jesus as Messiah and did not.

This passage tells well-known New Testament history, but it also recognizes that Satan has already been working: people do not fail in a vacuum. If anyone rises above his limitation and follows God's call, he is worthy of great praise; if he fails, God will be sorrowful, but cannot assign the blame to the individual alone. *Divine Principle* recognizes that Jesus was very obscure in his time; the failure of people to believe in him, while representing a huge opportunity lost, is understandable as one more example of Satan's work of which there are so many examples. *Divine Principle* emphasizes that the people of Jesus's time thought they were doing God's will.

Commentary on 9:

The implication of Rabbi Rudin's text is that *Divine Principle* portrays the Jews as uniquely linked with Satan; the truth is exactly opposite: *Divine Principle* teaches that prior to the coming of Jesus, the Jews were the only people *not* on "Satan's side." When Jesus was not accepted by the people they again became "linked to Satan" only in the sense that all men in the fallen world are under Satan's rule. (p. 83ff.)

Allegation 10—Page 2, paragraph 1:

The Jewish people. . . "betrayed" (p. 453). . . Jesus.

Response:

The *Divine Principle* text reads:

"As already discussed in the previous chapter, if the Jewish people had become one centering on Jesus by believing in him, the Roman Empire of that time could have become the Messianic kingdom centering on Jesus. If so, Hebraism could have absorbed Hellenism, thus forming a worldwide Hebraic cultural sphere at that time. Nevertheless, this will was not fulfilled because of the Jewish people's betrayal of Jesus, and Hebraism remained under the control of Hellenism."

The major point of the paragraph and of the two pages in which it lies is to state that Hebraism is superior to Hellenism as an interior perspective to one's exterior. The next page of *Divine Principle* notes that the representation of the two world-views continued into modern times. The thesis that Judaism would have become dominant in the Mediterranean if the Jewish people had become united by believing in Jesus and centering on him is raised here to indicate why there has been the delay in the total victory of Hebraism. (*Divine Principle* indicates that a Hellenistic viewpoint is still present in atheistic communism.) Thus there is not yet a world-wide Hebraic cultural sphere, which God wills. The fact that Jesus was not followed is here condensed to the words "the Jewish people's betrayal."

Commentary on 10:

The harsh connotations of the English word "betrayal" seem unnecessary to the meaning and purpose of the passage and inconsistent with the treatment of this topic elsewhere in the *Divine Principle*.

Allegation 11—Page 2, paragraph 1:

The Jewish people. . . "delivered him to be crucified." (page 200)

Response:

This is a passing reference to the non-acceptance of Jesus in a section dealing with predestination. New Testament foundation for the wording can be found in Matthew:

When morning came, all the chief priests and the elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death; and they bound him and led him away and delivered him to Pilate the governor. (Matt. 27:1-2)

Commentary on II:

The teaching that the Sanhedrin handed Jesus over to Pilate to be crucified originates in the New Testament, not *Divine Principle*. If there is danger that this passage might be used to justify or arouse hatred of Jews, it could be clarified to make such misinterpretation impossible.

Allegation 12—paragraph 4:

“The Jewish nation was destroyed” (p. 431)

Response:

This is one of several passages which link the destruction of Jerusalem to the failure of the people to accept Jesus as the Messiah. The context reads:

The Roman Empire, which had persecuted Christianity, finally . . . decreed Christianity as its national religion. However, if in the beginning the Jewish people had become one in faith and service to Jesus as the Messiah, the ancient united world on the Mediterranean Sea, centering on the Roman Empire. . . would have erected a kingdom centering on Jerusalem; exalting Jesus as their king. However, due to the Israelites' faithlessness, the Jewish nation was destroyed, and the Roman Empire, which was to be the foundation for the kingdom of the Messiah, began to decline. . .

This interpretation of history is based on Jesus's account reported in Luke 19:41-44:

And when he drew near and saw the city he wept over it, saying, “Would that even today you knew the things that make for peace! But now they are hid from your eyes. For the days shall come upon you, when your enemies will cast up a bank about you and surround you, and hem you in on every side, and dash you to the ground, you and your children within you, and they will not leave one stone upon another in you; because you did not know the time of your visitation.

It is important to understand why this history and these dynamics are taught in *Divine Principle*. God sends leaders such as Moses and Jesus neither to do everything for the people nor to be rejected by them; rather, all men are responsible to seek out God's agents and believe them. When God again sends the Messiah, the religious leaders, especially Christians, are responsible for perceiving him and attending him. They might, however fail to do so and in that case, people must not follow them blindly, but judge for themselves where God is working.

Divine Principle affirms the standard Christian view that Jesus accomplished spiritual salvation, but it teaches that the full work of restoration was obviously not accomplished. This is why God must send Christ again. The whole of mankind, individually and collectively, must be responsible for uniting with each other and for receiving God's message.

Allegation 13—Page 2, paragraph 4:

Due to “the Israelites faithlessness, God's heritage (has been) taken away from the Jewish people.” (p. 519)

Response:

This passage does not appear on page 519, although the same general topic is discussed:

Therefore, the Bible clarified that the center of God's providence of restoration has been shifted from the Israelites to the Gentiles (Acts 13:46), by saying, “Through their (the Jews) trespass, salvation has come to the Gentiles, so as to make Israel jealous.” (Rom. 11:11) Therefore, we may understand that the chosen people of Israel, who are to establish the foundation for the Messiah of the Second Advent, are not the lineal descendants of Abraham, but the devout Christians who have taken up the faith of Abraham.

This is a concept taught by Paul, most extensively in his Letter to the Romans. As understood by *Divine Principle* it means only that the special status of “chosen people” was shifted from Judaism to Christianity. In no way does *Divine Principle* teach that the Jewish people have a status inferior to the rest of mankind. “Chosen people” refers to special status as immediate agent of God: it does not refer to the general heritage of all mankind, nor to a heritage of land and religion. God uses a nation as his special agent when it is in a position to serve Him by leading in the spreading of His word. To say that his mission was transferred from Israel could not be “anti-Jewish,” for in the light of the discussion above about chosen nations, *Divine Principle* readers will understand that a nation losing its special role in no way becomes sub-normal but simply normal. Moses says strongly in

Deuteronomy 9 that the Israelites are chosen not because they are any better than others, but because God can use them: a chosen people endowed with God's special blessing is not any better in themselves than other people. Therefore, transference of the special mission does not downgrade the people. This in no way denies the unique heritage of the Jewish people: either in the sense of the land promised to Abraham, or in the sense of the religious insights which the Jewish people were uniquely prepared to receive.

Commentary on 12 and 13:

Rudin's criticism of these points is unjust in two ways:

—It is unjust to criticize *Divine Principle* or "Christian anti-Jewish polemic" for doctrines found in the New Testament.

—It is unjust to imply (without the slightest attempt at providing evidence) that these beliefs are somehow anti-semitic. Neither in Christianity as a whole nor in *Divine Principle* in particular, do these beliefs imply hatred of Jews or justification for persecuting them.

Allegation 14—Page 2, paragraph 4:

"The chosen nation of Israel has been punished for the sin of rejecting Jesus and crucifying Him." (p. 226)

Response:

The *Divine Principle* passage reads:

"The next thing we must know is how to set the condition of indemnity. When we are to restore anything to its original status from the circumstance of having been perverted from the original position and status, we must set a condition to indemnify, taking a course to reverse what we have gone through. For example, the chosen nation of Israel has been punished for the sin of rejecting Jesus and crucifying Him. Therefore, in order for them to be restored to the position of the elect, having been saved from sin, they must reverse their position, love Jesus, and even bear the cross and follow Him (Luke 14:27). This is the reason Christianity became a religion of martyrdom."

A doctrine is set forth that where there is failure in one attempt those who make the next attempt face harder circumstances. Those who met Jesus before his crucifixion might have followed him without the cost of martyrdom; upon their failure Jesus was crucified; then those who met him later, spiritually, had to bear martyrdom in order to follow him. Thus the punishment has fallen on the Christians who take the responsibility for following a crucified Lord. *Divine Principle* is concerned that today's Christians may have forgotten this. This paragraph in *Divine Principle* sets forth a striking parallel to the one cited by the report: Jesus himself was punished on account of the sin of Adam; "Here lies the complex reason why God had to forsake Jesus when he was crucified."

Commentary on 14:

This passage contradicts Rabbi Rudin's allegation by calling the martyrdom of Christians indemnity for the crucifixion of Jesus. This is an example of the *Divine Principle* teaching that *all men*—not only Jews—are collectively responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus. Rabbi Rudin badly distorts this teaching when he states, "The Jewish people are depicted as collectively responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus." (p. 7, cont. of paragraph from preceding page)

The subject of collective responsibility, the difference between responsibility and blame, and the meaning of this responsibility in the modern day are areas in which the Unification Church is eager to dialogue. Properly expressed, the *Divine Principle* teachings will offer no basis for anti-semitism; the contribution of Jewish and Christian leaders toward that expression are most welcome.

Allegation 15—Page 2, paragraph 4:

Reverend Moon brings his teachings up to modern times:

Jesus came as the Messiah; but, due to the disbelief of and persecution by the people, he was crucified. Since then, the Jews have lost their qualification as the chosen people and have been scattered, suffering persecution through the present day. (p. 147)

Response:

Two subtle theological points should be made about this paragraph:

—The *Divine Principle* understanding of the diaspora is based on the view that the purpose of the chosen nation was to receive the Messiah. On the one hand, since the Messiah came and was not received, the chosen nation lost its reason to exist; on the other hand, God's promises are eternal and His providence is to save all men. Therefore, the *Divine Principle* sees the reestablishment of Israel as a sign of the last days.

—The suffering of Jews is not the will of God nor is their persecution justified. Rather, Satan has been the cause of their suffering, and every man who joins in their persecution will be punished for his crime. When the Jewish people did not fulfill their portion of responsibility (accepting Jesus), God became unable to prevent Satan from persecuting them. (p. 55)

Allegation 16—Page 2, paragraph 4:

The sole mention of the Nazi holocaust is on page 485:

Hitler imposed the strict primitive Germanic religious ideology by concluding a pact with the Pope of Rome, thus founding a national religion, and then tried to control all Protestantism under the supervision of bishops throughout the country. Therefore, the Catholics as well as the Protestants were strongly opposed to Hitler. Furthermore, Hitler massacred six million Jews.

Response:

Of related interest is the description of Hitler in *Divine Principle* (page 488):

Satan always realizes, beforehand, the world in a pattern similar to the world which Jesus intended to realize. Therefore, at the consummation of history, there will no doubt be realized a non-principled world. . . centering on a Jesus-type personage on the Satanic side. . .

The Jesus-type personage on the Satanic side was Hitler. Therefore, the life of Hitler was very similar to that of Jesus in the aspects of his thinking on a worldwide scale, his single life, his miserable death, and his missing corpse, though his will was exactly opposite to Jesus'. Consequently, Hitler of Germany, who provoked the Second World War, was the Adam-type personage on the Satanic side. . . Thus, he realized the non-principled world in the pattern of having perfected the three great blessings on the growth level, centering on Satan.

Thus, the Holocaust is clearly shown to be an act of Satan—not the punishment of God.

Commentary on 15 and 16:

On examination, neither of these citations justifies persecution of Jews. Rather, the persecution of Jews is linked to Satan. An argument could be made that the former passage should be clarified to avoid misinterpretation or misuse; this would be an area of easy reconciliation.

Allegation 17—Page 6, paragraph 5:

From Abraham until the present day, Jews are seen only as a people, devoid and emptied of any genuine faith and spiritual qualities. "The inner contents are corrupt." (p. 532)

Response:

The *Divine Principle* states:

The period of the First Advent and that of the Second Advent are the periods of providential time-identity. Therefore, all the situations developing centering on the Christianity of today are similar to those which developed centering on the Judaism of Jesus' day.

To take examples: first, there is the point that today's Christianity, like Judaism, is attached to the authority and rites of the church, while the inner contents are corrupt. The leading class of people, the chief priests and rabbis of Jesus' day, enslaved by the conventional principles of the Mosaic law, were all corrupt in their spiritual lives. Therefore, the more conscientious the people were in their faith, the more they desired to relieve their spiritual thirst by following Jesus, who was at that time branded as a heretic. In like manner, the leading class of today's Christianity, including the priests and ministers, is captive to the traditional church rites and authority and is becoming spiritually darker every day. Therefore, it is the actual situation today that devout Christians are wandering in the spiritual mountains and plains in search of new leaders and true ways to experience the inner light of faith, apart from external circumstances.

The passage refers only to Judaism at the time of Jesus (not "from Abraham to the present day"). Also, it distinguishes between "the chief priests and rabbis' who are called corrupt and the "people" who are called conscientious. The passage is a warning to Christians not to be guilty of the same superficiality of faith which Jesus describes in Matthew 23:13-36

Commentary on 17:

Here Rudin has obscured the clear distinction between certain Jewish leaders at the time of Jesus and the people as a whole. His inclusion of Judaism "from Abraham until the present day" is contradicted both by the cited passage itself and by the *Divine Principle* teaching that the Jews were the chosen people and the *only* nation on God's side prior to the time of Jesus. (p. 280 ff)

Concluding commentary on the citations:

Rabbi Rudin makes reference to over 125 examples of "an unremitting litany of anti-Jewish teachings" (page 6, paragraph 6). How Rudin arrived at that figure is unclear, as he cites only 22 passages from *Divine Principle*.

In four of those 22 passages, Rudin distorts outright the *Divine Principle* teaching (3, 4, 14, 17); in four more, he obscures the content of the passage to draw inferences which the full text would never justify (6, 7, 8, 9). All seven of the citations dealing with Israel prior to the coming of Jesus are accurate summaries of Jewish scripture (1, 2), and three more are solidly based on the New Testament (11, 12, 13). One reference (16) even Rabbi Rudin does not call anti-Jewish.

Presumably Rabbi Rudin chose the best 22 of the alleged 125 references; yet on examination only 3 out of these 22 citations even superficially support his charges.

An additional criticism must be made of Rabbi Rudin's methodology: He deals with semantics rather than with meaning. Instead of compressing criticism of as many as 9 out-of-context words into one paragraph, Rabbi Rudin should have inquired into the meaning and substance of *Divine Principle's* teaching on Jews and Judaism.

B. The alleged lack of positive references to Judaism in the *Divine Principle*

Rabbi Rudin repeatedly asserts that the *Divine Principle* contains not even one positive reference to Jews, whether ancient or modern:

A systematic analysis of this 536 page document reveals an orientation of almost unrelieved hostility toward the Jewish people. . . (page 1, paragraph 3)

There are over 36 specific references in *Divine Principle* to the Israelites of the Hebrew Bible (Old Testament)—every one of them pejorative. (page 1, par. 5)

Divine Principle records some 65 specific references to the attitudes and behavior of the Jewish people towards Jesus and their role in his crucifixion—again, everyone hostile and anti-Jewish. (page 2, par. 1)

(On modern Judaism) There are some 26 pertinent references in *Divine Principle*. Once again, in tone and in substance, they are viciously anti-Jewish. . . (page 2, par. 4)

Nowhere in *Divine Principle* does Reverend Moon acknowledge the authenticity and integrity of Jews or Judaism, either ancient or modern. (page 6, par. 6)

Much of the emotional impact of Rabbi Rudin's report is achieved by these accusations. The following citations not only refute Rudin's charges but also raise the question of how his "systematic analysis" overlooked them.

Abraham, in obedience to God's command, left his father's house in Haran. (page 263)

At the time of offering Isaac as the sacrifice, Abraham had set up the condition of faith for the offering of Isaac by establishing the symbolic condition of indemnity to restore Adam's family, just as he had done at the time of his symbolic offering. (page 272)

Abraham's loyalty, combined with that of Isaac, which was not any less, caused the success of the offering of Isaac, thus enabling the separation from Satan to occur. (page 275)

Jacob. . . triumphed. . . restored. . . (and) received the blessing of God. (page 278)

With unchanging loyalty and fidelity to the lineage of the chosen nation, he (Moses) left the Palace, preferring to suffer with God's people rather than to enjoy the sinful ephemeral pleasure of Pharaoh's house. (page 298)

Joshua kept and exalted the tablets of stone, the tabernacle, and the ark with unchanging faith. (page 329)

The internal Israelites, born during their life in the wilderness when they exalted and served the tabernacle, could cross the Jordan bearing the ark of the covenant in utter loyalty. (page 338)

The Jewish people, after having returned to Canaan, their homeland, rebuilt the temple and walls, and thus stood as a nation to receive the Messiah according to the prophecy of Malachi the prophet. (page 397)

God, by choosing a special nation from among all the nations, and having it walk the typical providential course of restoration to receive the Messiah, directs the chosen nation to be the center of His providence and to lead the history of mankind. The nation chosen for such a mission is called the "nation of God's elect," or "God's chosen people." (page 406)

The Southern Kingdom of Judah, centering on Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, continued from King David to King Zedekiah in orthodox line, producing many righteous kings out of the 20 who ruled for 394 years. (page 417)

While the passages dealing with Jesus's time are critical of the chief priests and scribes, *Divine Principle* is exculpatory toward the people as a whole. (See responses 3, 4 and 17 in section A of this paper.)

The *Divine Principle* does not specifically discuss modern Judaism except to specify that the Messiah's second coming will be to a Christian rather than a Jewish nation. *Divine Principle* does teach that all religions are inspired of God to lead men to the knowledge of His truth. Modern Judaism, like Buddhism, Islam, Confucianism, etc. is therefore considered a valid and authentic religion, inspired by God. (p. 3-6, 9-10, 105-108, 189-190)

12

SECTION II. PORTIONS OF THE RUDIN REPORT WHICH DO NOT DEAL WITH *DIVINE PRINCIPLE*

A. References to Anti-semitic Elements in Christian Tradition

None of the anti-Jewish teachings cited on pages 3 and 4 of Rudin's report have any connection or relationship with the *Divine Principle*. In the absence of any effort by Rabbi Rudin to document such a connection, the inclusion of these passages appears to be an attempt to establish guilt by association.

B. References to Various Repudiations of Anti-semitism by Christian Churches

Rabbi Rudin is grossly unjust to conclude that Reverend Moon and the Unification Church give "no echo and no acknowledgement" to various Christian pronouncements on the basis of a book which was written before any of those pronouncements were issued.

The only fair basis for comparison would be the "Statement on Jews and Israel" signed by Reverend Moon on August 10, 1976. Had Rabbi Rudin made a simple inquiry, he could have received a copy of that document; but Rabbi Rudin never inquired about Unification Church documents. (After Rudin's study appeared, that statement with an introduction was published in the *New York Times*.)

C. References to Other Criticism of the Unification Church

Rabbi Rudin seeks to reinforce his criticism of the Unification Church by citing the statements of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York and by individual persons associated with the National Council of Churches.

The statements by Father LeBar of the Catholic Archdiocese amounts to no more than that Unification theology differs in some points from Catholic theology, and does not relate to the question of anti-semitism.

The statement which Rabbi Rudin erroneously attributes to the National Council of Churches is in fact a working paper which the NCC has specifically refused to endorse. Its principal author, Dr. William L. Hendricks, is publicly linked to the campaign of religious intolerance which flourishes under the euphemism "deprogramming."

Furthermore, the excerpt of that paper quoted by Rudin is grossly inaccurate in its representation of Unification theology.

D. Undocumented Allegations Against the Unification Church and Reverend Moon

Rabbi Rudin and Tanenbaum have on several occasions (e.g., the Barry Farber Show, WOR radio, 1/6/77) attempted to excuse their failure to meet with Unification Church officials prior to issuing the Rudin report by claiming that the report was exclusively a "review" of the book *Divine Principle*. (Rabbi Tanenbaum's statement on the occasion cited was to the effect that one need not meet with the author to review the book.)

The following citations demonstrate that Rabbi Rudin's report and Tanenbaum's introduction to it go far beyond a "review" of *Divine Principle*. In fact, both make highly offensive statements about the Unification Church, which have the effect of legitimizing religious intolerance. Rabbi Tanenbaum insults the Unification Church and calls for its expulsion from American society.

theologically reactionary mentality. . .reinfest the spiritual blood stream. . .cancerous version of contempt. . .expose the Moon infection. . .horrendous baggage of bigotry. . .ersatz spiritual phenomenon. . .land mine of fanatic hatred. . .seduced to become a "Moonie". . .

Christians and Jewish leaders (should be) vigilant of the need for combatting any effort of Reverend Moon and his followers to enter the mainstream of American religion and culture. . .

Rabbi Tanenbaum combines spurious allegations of political activities with spurious allegations of anti-semitic motives to link the Unification Church with ideological movements which the Church has repeatedly and consistently condemned:

The recent revelations that Rev. Moon and his Unification Church are allegedly involved as a front group for the South Korea Intelligence Forces in this country who are charged with illegal lobbying and bribery raises the serious issue of whether Moon's anti-semitism is intended to be used for the ideological objectives of his political backers. If that is the case, then the American people must be alert to the emergence in the Moon phenomenon of an ideological campaign whose antecedents clearly would trace back to the Nazis and to Stalinist Communism, those totalitarian movements in this century who consciously and cynically employed anti-Jewish hatred as a major vehicle for realizing their apocalyptic goal of undermining the Biblical and democratic values of Western civilization.

Furthermore, Rabbi Tanenbaum slanders Reverend Moon by reference to unnamed "backers" and even stoops to include the "totalitarian brainwashing" charge, which has so often been used to justify harassment and persecution of the Unification Church.

Both Rabbi Tanenbaum and Rabbi Rudin are guilty of outright factual errors: Rabbi Tanenbaum overestimates the Jewish membership of the Unification Church by 300 percent; Rabbi Rudin alleges that there is a Congressional investigation "of Reverend Moon's tax-exempt status" when, in fact, there is none. Rudin's attribution of authorship of *Divine Principle* to Reverend Moon is similarly in error, as is his account of the "revisions and enlargements" of the original text.

Rabbi Rudin accuses the *Divine Principle* of "sweeping accusations," yet Rudin himself makes the following sweeping accusations which (as has been shown above) are not substantiated by his citations of *Divine Principle*:

...an orientation of almost unrelieved hostility viciously anti-Jewish...virulent teachings... (positive) developments find no echo and no acknowledgment in Reverend Moon's teachings...unremitting litany of anti-Jewish teachings...*Divine Principle* is feculent breeding ground for fostering anti-semitism...

These statements go far beyond a "review" of *Divine Principle*; they constitute an attack on the motivation, integrity, theology and practice of the Unification Church. The decision of Rabbis Rudin and Tanenbaum to issue such an attack without hearing the Church's response to their allegations; and without any openness to a dialogue of reconciliation, is inexcusable.