

Reflections on the Abandoned “Cross of the Heart”

By John (& Cathy) Williams

There are several points I want to share about Mother Hak Ja Han that I haven't heard anyone discuss elsewhere.

Mother's essential indemnity foundation

The first is that Mother's indemnity foundation is supposed to be her forbearance with all the emotional pain that she experienced as a result of taking her mission and from her relationship with Father Sun Myung Moon. This is especially true regarding his involvement with other women.

From what I recall of reading Father's words and hearing him speak, this is supposed to be the “cross of the heart,” I think it was called, that she is to bear without complaint. Sharing her husband with other women is exactly what Sarah could not do, Elizabeth could not do, and a parallel was the challenge that Judas could not face, Joseph could not face, and others—Lucifer being, of course, the first one who could not share his beloved with another.

Thus, Mother's complaining about Father's involvement with other women, calling it his sin and mistake, declaring this as a new part of God's teaching and spreading this assertion to us as her children, is seriously problematic. This is possibly negating her indemnity foundation, a catastrophic development. Given that she did not suffer externally the way that Father did, it seems like she is now destroying her own “claim to fame” that was to have brought her into equivalence with Father (her new claims of divine lineage notwithstanding).

It is perhaps similar to Jesus retracting his revolutionary forgiveness of his enemies on the cross. If Jesus could not forgive his enemies, demonstrating God's love for Satan's people, if Father had not demonstrated forgiveness of his enemies, then they would've been disqualified as the representative of God on earth. It was their incomprehensible level of love that brought Satan to a natural surrender before them.

The comparison may appear too extreme. But she does appear to be voicing a grudge that either she harbored in her heart for decades or that gradually came to her in the course of her grief after Father's death. It certainly sounds like personal resentment, and this represents a monumental failure of forgiveness for Father and possibly women who participated.

If so, she appears to be repeating a grave providential error and negating her qualification as the bride of Christ.

Making Father vulnerable to accusation

My second point is that Mother is bringing up the previously unspoken subject of Father's involvements with other women in the worst way possible. Alleged adultery is the most vulnerable point of attack on Father's character and his qualification as the Christ—the one Satan is most delighted to use and the one his earthly skeptics are most delighted to hear.

Indeed, Father has intimated that though Jesus was officially charged with and executed for blasphemy, he ultimately died due to rumors of his questionable associations with women. When Pilate asked the crowd if he should spare Jesus's life, the masses turned against him because of these rumors. This is why they shouted for his crucifixion instead of Barabbas. In the same way, the charge that Father committed numerous infidelities without providential justification is the easiest and most potent and provocative way to discredit him.

The only person that can defend Father and legitimate what he did is obviously his wife and his co-founder. She's in a position to go on record as saying, "These involvements with other women were providentially necessary. It was part of my course to have to digest these realities on behalf of all women, especially those in providential roles in the past who couldn't do it—like Sarah and Elizabeth. Ultimately, this is what Lucifer could not endure, and I had to prove myself superior to him." After all, if she stands with Father in this matter, it is harder for others to judge him.

It is critical that Mother not succumb to sexual jealousy, and to clear Father's name. But she seems to be doing exactly the opposite.

Other issues

An obvious question arises: Why didn't she share her complaints and struggles with her husband when he was alive? If Father's behavior was wrong, why didn't she use her power to stop him or in some way moderate or mitigate the damage? She stood by him, accommodating and enabling his activities; for example, she was living with some of the women and knew clearly about the son born to one of them. If his actions were wrong, both she and Father are responsible for them. It would seem she needs to acknowledge this.

She cannot claim that she was simply intimidated, dominated or silenced by him all those decades. (Yes, we know she had a subordinate position in the early years of her marriage, for restorative reasons, but this was no longer true in the many latter years, after Father declared her a full equal to him, and co-founder.)

Belvedere staff members have overheard loud arguments in True Parents' bedroom; she had a voice. She made her contrary opinions known. She was not a helpless victim.

If she is implying that she was indeed a victim, that she was silenced and dominated by Father against her will, then she is declaring that her smiling and steadfast show of unity and support for Father over all those decades was at least partly dishonest. This too needs to be acknowledged and she needs to take responsibility for that.

More seriously it would mean the marriage was abusive on some level, that their male-female dynamic was just a tired repetition of the fallen dynamics of history and especially traditional Asian culture. It would mean there was no complete restoration of husband-wife relations. There was no real unity and oneness of heart. They were not co-equal founders. This would be a serious providential failure.

Further, if she is regularly conferring with him now in spirit—this is what she said she did with him at least during those first three years after his death—what does he think about all this now? Does he agree with her? If so, why didn't she declare this, as in, "Father and I agree that his unwise actions have left behind a 'tail' we need to deal with"?

Finally, on a simply horizontal, humanistic level, for a widow or widower to poison the memory of their deceased spouse with such allegations of his moral failures—when they are not there to explain themselves—is one of the most dishonorable things that a partner and parent can do. Many ordinary people take great pains not to do so, despite their legitimate grievances. If they are struggling with old resentments, they know to share and process these with trusted elders, not vent them to their adult children and the world. When and if they do share their deceased spouses' indiscretions, they do so in the most respectful way, seeking to explain them with compassion and in context of their spouses' strong points. From what I have heard and read—I don't claim in any way to be up to date on what she's been saying and doing—this doesn't seem to be the spirit with which Mother is discussing Father's so-called mistakes.

I don't want to judge Mother; I cannot understand all the ways that she suffered in the years of partnering with Father. (Indeed, I only have to remember Mother standing with Father, having just given birth, arm outstretched and holding that position for an interminable period during my Blessing ceremony.)

However, I cannot dismiss countless concerns about her behavior now. I am having a huge problem respecting her now as a representative of Father and True Parents. Her previous achievements stand forever, and I want to believe the True Parents' foundation stands forever, but I am wondering if the True Parents even exist anymore at this point. This is very distressing to me.