

Reverend Moon's Contribution to the End of the Cold War and a Vision for World Peace¹ **[Working Draft]**

By

Thomas J. Ward
President and Professor of Peace and Development
Unification Theological Seminary

Sun Myung Moon became a household name in the United States and in many other parts of the world in the 1970s. This text recognizes the lack of awareness of the many serious dimensions of his work and, in particular, his sense of calling to address the Cold War heightened in its level of threat by the pervasiveness of nuclear weapons that held the world hostage. If the communist world that produced Josef Stalin, Mao Zedong, Pol Pot, and the Berlin Wall represented the bad side, that side had plenty of shortcomings in the democratic world to point to, including dictatorships in Latin America, the Middle East, across "Free" Asia, as well as Apartheid in South Africa and what was then known as Rhodesia. Dominated by self-interest, a decline in moral values, and, for several decades, a laissez-faire approach to injustices committed in the developing world so long as the perpetrators of such acts were "allies," the West needed to be challenged, reminded of what was honorable in their founding, and be engaged not only by arguments but by example. Reverend Moon's legacy is still not well understood. Here we concisely reference some of the humanitarian and value-inspired dimensions of work carried out by him and by his spouse Dr. Hak Ja Han Moon. More substantively, however, we outline his initiatives aimed at addressing the ideological and related dimensions of the Cold War and his efforts to circumvent a conflict that potentially could have led to the annihilation of so many of the noble dimensions of the human experiment.

Reverend Sun Myung Moon lived until the age of 92; he spent the last days of his life in Cheongpyeong, Korea, which this World Summit, commemorating the hundredth anniversary of his birth, will visit in the coming days. He and his wife Dr. Hak Ja Han Moon spent some forty years of their lives together in the West and primarily in the United States. They came to the United States, not because they wished to establish permanent residency and live their version of the "American Dream." They came to the United States because they saw it as a country that had been prepared by God to impact positively upon world culture and governance, while also serving as the best place from which to launch what Reverend Moon referred to on July 1, 1973 as "the March to Moscow."

Misunderstood and frequently characterized by the Western media as a right-wing "Korean industrialist" and a "religious charlatan," Reverend Moon left behind a legacy that those who review it carefully have to be spellbound by because of the unrivaled number of achievements that he realized during his nine-plus decades on the earth.

¹ While the first nine pages of this article are largely new, the latter part of the text is excerpted with minor editing from an article that I wrote for the Fall 2017 *International Journal of World Peace* entitled "Reflections on a Civil Society Actor and Conflict Transformation on the Centennial of the Bolshevik Revolution."

Early on, less than a year after the end of World War II, Reverend Moon, safe in the US-protected portion of Korea, did what few others dared to do. When he felt called by God to return to travel to the North and to its capital city of Pyongyang, not far from his birthplace, to begin missionary activity there, he did not hesitate to do so, even though a communist regime with draconian levels of control had been installed with the help of Stalin and his Soviet proxies.

Japan, in its ambitious drive to become an imperial power annexed the Korean peninsula into its Empire in 1910, some fifteen years after Taiwan had also become an imperial colony. Following the war, in exchange for the Soviet Union having agreed to declare war on Japan in the final ten days of World War II, the United States granted the U.S.S.R. not control of a part of Japan, as it had done in the case of Germany. But, ironically, it allowed the Soviets to take control of the fate of the northern portion of Korea, Japan's former colony. Korea, which had already endured four decades of colonial control, found itself once again a pawn in the maneuvering of the world's new "ruling powers."

Rev. Moon, at the time only 26 years of age, traveled to the North. He arrived on June 6, 1946. Within fourteen months of his arrival, he was arrested and tortured for his evangelical activities. On September 18, 1947 he was badly beaten by North Korean interrogators for his "subversive" religious activity in a country whose leader Kim Il Sung, in spite of his Presbyterian roots, embraced the Marxist critical view of religion serving as a means to preserve and justify capitalism's oppressive structures rather than religion's asserted intent to free humankind of the burden of sin, guilt, and spiritual confusion.

In February 1948 Reverend Moon was sentenced to five years in prison. As a prisoner of conscience, he endured beatings, near starvation, disease, and a seemingly unending regime of hard labor. He escaped in October 1950 when Heung Nam Prison, where he had been confined, was liberated by United Nations forces that arrived approximately one month after General Douglas MacArthur's remarkable landing of UN military forces at Incheon, South Korea over a four-day period in mid-September 1950.

Following his release, Reverend Moon returned to Pyeongyang to attempt to gather those followers whom he had left behind at the time of his imprisonment. Given the disarray and havoc resulting from the war, he had difficulty relocating most of the members of his Pyongyang congregation, some of whom had been imprisoned, others who had been tortured and killed and still others who either escaped to the South or hid for protection, Reverend Moon left the North with only two of his followers. He traveled by foot to Pusan, the southernmost city on the Korean peninsula, arriving at the end of December 1950. His future wife Hak Ja Han, just a young girl, escaped from the North at about the same time.

Beginning from Pusan, Reverend Moon initiated his ministry, spending most of the next twenty-one years in Korea and then moving on to the United States where he would spend an additional forty years.

He would create what Swiss writer Jean-Francois Boyer would refer to disparagingly as the “Moon Empire.”² A part of the “Empire” everyone seems to be aware of is the entourage of media organizations that he pioneered and supported for decades, including the *Washington Times* in the United States, *Sekai Nippon* in Japan, and *Segye Ilbo* in Korea. Another part that gathered significant attention was CAUSA International, an organization that first developed in Latin American and then reached out to other parts of the world, highlighting the threat that communism posed to the world because of the sanguinary implications of the application of Marxism-Leninism in any of the societies, which embraced and implemented it.

Unheralded Dimensions of Reverend Moon’s and Dr. Hak Ja Han Moon’s Work

While the focus of this paper is the role that Reverend Moon played in the ending of the Cold War. I do want to note before entering into that topic that Reverend Moon and Dr. Hak Ja Han Moon were about improving the well-being of all of humanity. Again, it would not be appropriate to divert too far from the central topic here, but I want to recognize a few, certainly not all of the humanitarian projects initiated by the Moons. These necessarily include the humanitarian work of organizations founded by Reverend Moon and Dr. Hak Ja Han Moon that are especially tasked in the humanitarian domain, including Women’s Federation for World Peace (WFWP), the International Relief Friendship Foundation (IRFF), Causa World Services and Religious Youth Services (RYS). These organizations, and WFWP, in particular, literally poured millions of dollars into supporting the building of schools for primary and secondary education in Africa and Latin America. WFWP offered scholarship opportunities for students in developing countries to pursue university-level study in the United States, Europe and Asia. IRFF, WFWP and CWS facilitated the distribution of food to victims of war and natural disasters in the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bolivia, Japan, Burma, Nicaragua, and Democratic Peoples’ Republic of Korea. IRFF medical teams from Japan and the United States have also provided free medical care for years to those afflicted by war and natural disasters in Southeast Asia, in Africa, and in Central America.

The Moons established accredited institutions of higher education in Asia³ and in the Americas, including Unification Theological Seminary, where I currently serve as President that have provided full scholarships for undergraduate and graduate students, from the developed and the developing world. Following the Cold War, the Moons salvaged the University of Bridgeport just as it was about to close. In the decade that followed, they brought young, promising leaders from Africa, Latin America, Eastern Europe, and Southeast Asia to Bridgeport, providing them with full scholarships to study there, when the majority of these students would never have been able to do so otherwise.

The Moons sponsored conferences through the Professors World Peace Academy (PWPA) beginning in 1973 to further dialogue amongst feuding parts of the world. Long before, it was permitted in those countries, he promoted and created venues for dialogue between those who

2 Jean Francois Boyer, *L’Empire Moon*, (Paris: Editions La Découverte, 1986).

3 Hyo Jeong Universal Peace Academy Graduate School in Korea, Sun Moon University also in Korea, International Peace College in the Philippines and Unification Theological Seminary in the United States.

supported and those who endured Apartheid, and between Palestinians and Israelis at a time when such exchanges were forbidden, as well as other feuding parties.⁴

Reverend Moon constantly reminded us that he felt personally responsible to find a way to feed a world where he constantly grappled with the reality that 21,000 people, many of them infants and young children, still die of hunger every day.⁵ He initiated vast efforts to raise cattle, develop fish-farming, protect land through reforestation and other projects aimed at educating people from less developed countries about how to increase and stabilize food production while insuring sustainable development and protecting South American waterways and wetlands, notably in Brazil and in Paraguay through what is known as the Pantanal Leda Settlement.⁶ He sponsored youth leaders from Africa to learn the techniques being developed. Dr. Hak Ja Han Moon also recently invited African leaders to study and adapt the techniques that they had developed in Hawaii to build a highly successful coffee industry, which can be implemented in African countries with the appropriate climate for coffee.

Reverend Moon and Dr. Hak Ja Han have also long been concerned by the potential of an eventual conflict between the followers of Christianity and Islam. They have encouraged others to recognize the positives and the ways in which the Creator has worked through every major faith. They themselves have dedicated their large-scale outreach efforts through organizations that they have created such as Inter-Religious Federation for World Peace⁷ to foster understanding among faiths and support reconciliation over past divides. They continue to sponsor an annual dialogue amongst women leaders of the region through the Women's Federation for World Peace International. The 24th annual conference took place in November 2019.⁸ The Universal Peace Federation⁹, a key partner in the World Summit, also remains keenly involved in Middle East initiatives through the work of Dr. Thomas Walsh, Dr. Michael Jenkins, and Dr. Taj Hamad.

In 1972 Reverend Moon initiated the International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences (ICUS) to study "science and absolute values." By "absolute values" Reverend Moon was referring to those values which, rooted in longstanding religious and cultural traditions, further

4 Partial listing of several hundred PWPA Conferences that took place from 1974 until 1999 can be found here <https://www.pwpa.org/pwpa-conference-list/>. A record of more recent PWPA activity is available here <https://www.pwpa.international/>.

5 *Voice of America*, "World Hunger Day," May 28, 2019, accessed on January 20, 2020, <https://editorials.voa.gov/a/world-hunger-day-2019/4935420.html>.

6 *Pantanal Leda Settlement*, last accessed on January 16, 2020 <https://www.ledaproject.com/history-and-motivation>

7 Inter Religious Federation for World Peace, accessed on January 20, 2019, <https://www.irfw.org/wp/>

8 Women's Federation for World Peace International, 24th Annual Women's Conference for Peace, November 15, 2019, accessed on January 16, 2020 <https://www.wfwp.org/news/24th-annual-womens-conference-for-peace-in-the-middle-east>

9 Universal Peace Federation, accessed on January 20, 2020, <http://www.upf.org/>

the purpose of all human beings, each of whom, as a Creation of God, is understood to be a being with Divinely endowed value and potential. Many scientists from communist countries and scholars attended these global gatherings of scientists around the world.

Yes, Reverend and Dr. Moon, as this particular session punctuates, have worked based on a vision for peace. Did they claim that theirs alone was a complete vision? No, they did not.

It is a developing vision. Indeed, the teachings and public lectures of Reverend Moon and Dr. Moon promote the view that each human being is what is referred to in Unification teachings as an “individual truth body.”¹⁰ What this means is that each of us carries something within us that separates us from everyone else and indeed is what is referred to in Unification Thought as our particular “genius.”

On this occasion that marks the centennial of Reverend Moon’s birth, we are invited to reflect on and develop a greater understanding of his vision of peace and our speakers are encouraged to share their own based on their experiences. I would like to devote the remainder of this article to share what I understand as the Moons’ vision for peace, having worked in this movement for almost half a century and having had the good fortune to have worked closely with the Moons during a quarter of a century. I also welcome the visions and perspectives that each of you bring to the table during these sessions that we are fortunate enough to be able to share together.

1946-1972 Reverend Moon’s Initial Efforts in Korea and his Approach to Peace there and internationally

Following the end of World War II, Reverend Moon began what has been described as his “public ministry.” During that period, he understood that he was not meant to create a new church or a new religion. Instead he felt called to build on what was already in place and support the established churches and religions. With his efforts to reach out to the Christian world, he faced rejection. In some ways, this was understandable because of his challenging assertion that he had not only had a spiritual encounter with Jesus but that he had been charged to complete the task that Jesus had begun some 1900 years before.

When he could not find safe harbor for his message within the Christian world and, after seven years of attempting to do so, he did finally, and with reluctance, begin his own **Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity** less than a year after the armistice agreement concluding the Korean armed conflict.

Shortly after this, he also began a movement aimed at educating the Korean public about the ideological limitations and false assumptions within the Marxist worldview, the pervasive ideology of the Democratic Peoples’ Republic of Korea, South Korea’s neighbor to the immediate North. Reverend Moon began his work with one of his early follower Mr. Yong Seok Choi. A few years later, he began what would be a four decade-long collaboration with Dr. Sang

10 *Essentials of Unification Thought—The Head Wing Thought*, “1. The Universal Image of the Individual Truth Body,” accessed on January 20, 2020
<http://tparents.org/Library/Unification/Books/Euth/Euth02-01.htm>.

Hun Lee. Based on his own experience with Marxism-Leninism during his imprisonment in North Korea, Reverend Moon had identified crucial limitations within the Marxist worldview. One of those remains as a personal learning experience for me until this day.

When I met Reverend Sun Myung Moon for the first time in March 1972, I was thrilled by the prospect of having a chance to listen to him over three days in a very intimate setting of only some forty people. I looked forward to him addressing a variety of topics. However, I had reservations about what I understood as his decidedly negative view towards Marxism-Leninism.

When I came to hear him at that time, I anticipated that he would inform us, as Stephane Courtois did decades later in *The Black Book of Communism*, of the ways in which the population of the USSR had been decimated under Stalin's dehumanizing rule or of how Mao's megalomaniacal pursuit of "revolutionary immortality" had allowed him to brutalize tens of millions during his delusional Great Leap Forward followed by his senseless annihilation of at least an additional one to two million more during the Cultural Revolution.

I had little sympathy for an argument that focused on the "cost" of communism. I was painfully aware of the damage caused by so-called anticommunist governments such as the Republic of South Africa, which enforced Apartheid; and the Dominican Republic which had destroyed the lives of so many Haitians under the regime of Rafael Trujillo. I was also aware that the dictatorships of Gen. Park Chung Hee of South Korea, President Ferdinand Marcos of Philippines, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek in East Asia had each suppressed and annihilated tens of thousands who had dared to challenge their authority.

My concern had been that Reverend Moon might list all of the wrongdoings of the communist Left while maintaining silence regarding the atrocities and the wrongdoings committed in hardline, rightist, so-called anticommunist regimes. However, he mentioned neither of these matters in his talk to us.

As noted, he uttered not a single word about Stalin or Mao but instead he went to the very crux of the matter, to the metaphysical underpinnings of communism, or what Russians referred to as the "*Diamat*," that is dialectical materialism. He demonstrated that this dynamic in which conflict was defining and unity was ephemeral was not the way in which the universe functioned. He simply observed a principle from his religious teaching, clarifying that the relationship, for example, between a proton and an electron, as argued by Engels and even by the Soviet ideologue Victor Afanasyev still at that time in the Soviet Union was not a conflicting, subject-subject, adversarial relationship as Engels had indicated but instead a cooperative, reciprocal relationship. What Engels had depicted in the *Dialectics of Nature* as a conflict in a seed between the covering or seed coat and the developing embryo within was not one where the seed coat hardened and became more resistant as the embryo grew. In fact, it became more supple as the embryo advanced towards maturity, facilitating the emergence of the sprout at the proper moment. This, he made clear, represents a reciprocal rather than a confrontational dynamic.

When I heard Reverend Moon's explanation of this dynamic, my fear of communism being "true" but wrongly implemented dissipated. I recognized, like the socialist reformer Eduard

Bernstein did in the late 19th century, that although Marx may have had good intentions in his effort to address injustice, his formula that rationalized change was untenable. As Bernstein put it, Marx was “not great because of the dialectic but in spite of it.”¹¹

Yet it was that very dialectic that inspired Lenin, Stalin, and Mao and justified their revolutionary, genocidal zeal and led them all to elaborate further on dialectical materialism. Through Rev. Moon’s analysis, I understood that they were misguided and that communism, had misinterpreted the underlying dynamic of nature, and was thus destined to fail in its efforts to create a new, just society.

Living in France and a student at the University of Paris at the time when I met Reverend Moon, I had numerous encounters with French Marxists both before and my first meeting with Reverend Moon. Prior to that meeting, I had sympathy for Marxist militants, convinced that Marxism was true but that it had been poorly or wrongly applied. Following that meeting, when I challenged Marxists regarding the veracity of the materialist dialectic as the underlying dynamic for progress in nature and in society, I found that they were unable to refute the explanation of cooperation and give-and-receive reciprocal relations, rather than contradiction and conflicts, as the guiding dynamic or phenomenon through which multiplication of living beings and maintenance of order in atoms, ions, and matter were established and preserved.

A few years later, I was exposed to the entire body of Rev. Moon’s and Dr. Sang Hun Lee’s work on communism. I realized that his work had covered every aspect of communism: Marxist political economy including the Labor Theory of Value, the Theory of Surplus Value, and Marx’s Laws of Economic Movement. It also pointed to the falsehood of Marx’s View of History and Marx’s interpretation of Alienation. I found each of those critiques as satisfying as the initial critique of Dialectical Materialism that Reverend Moon had introduced me to in Paris in that early spring of 1972.

A Few Comments on Reverend Moon’s Critique of the Theory of Surplus Value

In this paper, I will not attempt to elaborate on all of the work that Reverend Moon did in this field but I will take a moment to comment on Marx’s Theory of Surplus Value, which was described by Vladimir Lenin as the “cornerstone”¹² of all of his work. Marx maintained that in the production of any commodity, there were three contributors to the transformation of raw or semi-raw material into a commodity: Raw or unfinished materials, machinery, and labor. Marx

11 John Rees, *The Algebra of Revolution*, p. 127. Accessed on January 20, 2020, <https://books.google.com/books?id=05iEAgAAQBAJ&pg=PA127&lpg=PA127&dq=Bernstein+not+great+because+of+the+dialectic+but+in+spite+of+it.&source=bl&ots=Yn8aZXLLxU&sig=ACfU3U0G-RS9D07Wb0ryN8sDBbCcdvNqkQ&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjzta2xxpPnAhXIMd8KHWriDeUQ6AEwAHoECAGQAQ#v=onepage&q=Bernstein%20not%20great%20because%20of%20the%20dialectic%20but%20in%20spite%20of%20it.&f=false>.

12 Vitaly Vygodsky, “Surplus Value,” *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, accessed on January 20, 2020, https://www.marxists.org/archive/vygodsky/unknown/surplus_value.htm

argued that the profit derived from the production process could not originate from raw materials because the cost of such materials remained unchanged or only varied slightly from one purchase season to another. Secondly Marx argued that Machinery wears out and thus monies have to be put aside in a depreciation account to replace such machinery. Marx thus concluded that the only source of profit was derived from laborers. In his view, capitalists put aside a portion of the just wages that laborers should receive for their profit. Laborers thus only received necessary or survival wages so that they could stay alive, reproduce, and assure a new generation of working people for the next generation.¹³

The Unification critique of the labor theory of value observes that there is no magic principle whereby, once the funds in the depreciation account have reached the sum necessary for a new machine, the machine ceases to function. Many times, particularly in modern practice, the depreciation of the machine is covered in accounting ledgers in as little as one year after their purchase. That allows such machines to contribute to profit for the remainder of their shelf-life and not just laborers.

More importantly, however, Unificationism points out that the essence of value is found not in labor alone. Labor is one form of creativity but numerous other types of creativity also exist including the creativity of the inventor, the designer, the entrepreneur, the marketing director, the sales person, the advertising agent, even the investor who decides that a given product is worth dedicating a portion of his capital.

The labor theory of value also assumes that profit is automatic; it is not. Oftentimes, ventures collapse and owners can lose “their shirts.” To assume that labor is the pivotal force for all profit was at the least naïve, and at worse calculating, provocative and cynical. Success or failure in enterprise resides in human creativity not just labor. Human creativity is inherited from God, and propelled by the human drive to succeed and produce something of value.

In place of the Labor Theory of Value that Marx adapted from David Ricardo, Unification teachings speak of what is referred to as “the Effect Theory of Value.” According to the Effect Theory of Value where the Inventor or designer or the entrepreneur who acquires them should produce good that brings joy and inspiration to the consumer, first and foremost. It is only the secondary goal of such initiatives to earn a profit.¹⁴

According to the Effect Theory of Value, the consumer for his or her part should want to recognize and appreciate the efforts of the creator or distributor of a product that he or she chooses to acquire through the transaction. Secondly, it is the goal of the consumer to acquire a product at a reasonable price. I could resonate with this because of the developments which I had seen in the automobile industry during my early years of growing up in the United States. Most

13 Karl Mark, *Capital* Vol. 1, “Chapter Eight: Constant Capital and Variable Capital, accessed on January 20, 2020, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch08.htm>

14 Communism: A New Critique and Counterproposal, Questions and Answers, V. Economic Theories of Capitalism, accessed on January 20, 2020, <http://www.tparents.org/Library/Unification/Books/cncc/cncc-05.htm>

people my age in the United States can easily distinguish between a 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 Chevrolet or Ford. The changes in the model from one year to another were so dramatic that one soon felt uncomfortable traveling in a certain car that was a few years old. One would have to endure the jests of those reminding you that we were living in 1958 and the 1954 model of Ford hardly matched that.

When the Japanese automobile industry came onto the scene in the 1970s, they were soon well on their way to surpassing American automakers' sales. Their approach to business was not motivated just by an immediate short-term profit but by their intention to build long-term service relations with those who purchased their automobiles. They did not do a "makeover" of their automobiles every year. They learned to build their automobiles to last and they also emphasized quality customer service and confidence-building customer relations. These dimensions of the Japanese automakers, in many ways, explained why they could advance beyond their favored American competitors. Buyers of Japanese automobiles felt cared for, appreciated, and connected to the Toyota or the Subaru family. This approach to sales and customer relations, in my view, approximate what Unification Theory describes as the Effect Theory of Value. Indeed, by the 1990s, the American automaker and auto sales culture had been drastically transformed and had largely adopted the Japanese paradigm, building cars to last with significant changes in automobiles design occurring only once every few years.

More can be said regarding the critique and counterproposal to Marxism-Leninism but this article will not delve further than we have gone until now. Interested parties can certainly consult original texts that are available that describe and also do a critical view of Alienation and Marx's view of history from the years when these topics were covered in international conferences and review such matters including the *Causa Lecture Manual* (1985).¹⁵

The On-the-Ground Trajectory of Addressing Ideological Issues

Once he had established a foundation for his church in South Korea, Reverend Moon collaborated extensively with Dr. Sang Hun Lee, a trained medical doctor and a former communist who had become one of his earliest followers. This research was largely completed in the 1960s and, from the 1960s through the 1980s, Reverend Moon's refutation of Marxism was taught extensively in Korea, Japan, the United States, Latin America, Southeast Asia, Africa, Australia, and Micronesia.

As already illustrated from my personal experience with him in 1972, Reverend Moon was not interested in distorting or presenting a caricature of Marxism's tenets. Rather, he was interested in real solutions to human problems that Marxism and Leninism had only made worse. Unification writings and presentations on communism consisted of an accurate articulation of each of the Marxist pillars of thought (The Concept of Alienation, Marxist Political Economy, Dialectical Materialism, and Marx's View of History), followed by the introduction of a critique and counterproposal based on Reverend Moon's analysis of the underpinnings of Marxism, and his conclusion that, regardless of the setting, Marxism-Leninism could not bring about a just society or elevate human dignity. Those materials from the 1960s and 1970s supplemented by the later elaboration known as the *CAUSA Lecture Manual* was taught throughout the world in the 1980s.

¹⁵ *CAUSA Lecture Manual* (New York: CAUSA Institute, 1985) accessed on January 17, 2020, <http://tparents.org/Library/Unification/Books/CausaLM/0-Toc.htm>.

It reached the highest echelons of the governments of the Philippines (during the Aquino administration), Thailand, Honduras, El Salvador, Uruguay, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Bolivia, Colombia, and many other countries that had been affected. In the United States, at one point more than 50% of all four-star generals and admirals (active and retired) had attended a CAUSA seminar. Speakers at CAUSA programs included Geraldine Ferraro, Jack Kemp, John McCain, Maureen Reagan, Dr. Ralph Abernathy, and scores of other luminaries.

Reverend and Dr. Moon's Related Efforts in Other Parts of the World

At the same time, Reverend Moon founded the Professors' World Peace Academy (PWPA) in Korea and then Japan. The PWPA mission reads as follows: "The Professors World Peace Academy (PWPA) is an educational organization founded to support the academic community's role in the pursuit of world peace."¹⁶ Many of the scientists attending ICUS conferences joined PWPA, which established its international headquarters in the United States, and chapters in 70 countries in 1983. It has become an important resource and information center for dialogue and exchange amongst academics around the world.

Early academic critiques of communism took both the ideological and the human rights dimensions of the struggle into consideration. Among the most notable writers and scholars who had come to the forefront were Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Andrei Sakharov, Natan Sharansky, Sidney Hook, Alain Besancon, Bernard Henri Levy, Leszek Kolokowski, Robert Conquest, and Richard Pipes. Any response to Marxism needed to recognize and build on the important contributions of such individuals and be cognizant and appreciative of the many other areas of academic pursuit that contribute to the furtherance of peace and development.

PWPA members like renowned University of Chicago political scientist Dr. Morton A. Kaplan and Alexander Shtromas built on their work and integrated the more moral and spiritual dimensions of Reverend Moon's thought into their critique. Shtromas, a lawyer trained at Moscow State University, considered himself to be one of the last "true believers" in Marxism in Russia in 1957 and he had a clear understanding of the inner workings of the dysfunctional system that it had created. After leaving the Soviet Union, Shtromas worked with Sidney Hook at the Hoover Institution, and later became professor of political science at Hillsdale College.

In 1985, while imprisoned in the U.S., Reverend Moon provided the PWPA funding for an international conference in Geneva, Switzerland, where 90 of the top world experts on communism discussed the iconoclastic "'Fall of the Soviet Empire': Prospects for Transition to a Post-Soviet World,"¹⁷ PWPA chapter presidents from 90 countries were invited to attend so they could explain the fallacies, dysfunction, and real goals of communism, as its evangelists and activists were still very active promoting revolution social turmoil. The conference resulted in a

16 Professors World Peace Academy, "Overview," <http://www.pwpa.org/about-2/> accessed on May 10, 2017.

17 *Professors' World Peace Academy*, "Second International Conference: "'The Fall of the Soviet Empire': Prospects for the Transition to a Post-Soviet World," August 20, 1985; <http://www.pwpa.org/events/second-international-congress-the-fall-of-the-soviet-empire-prospects-for-transition-to-a-post-soviet-world/> accessed on May 21, 2017.

four-volume work entitled *The Soviet Union and the Challenge of the Future* (1989) and PWPA was recognized by the *National Interest* in Spring 1993, along with Zbigniew Brzezinski, as being one of the two academic sources that rightly anticipated the demise of the Soviet Union.¹⁸

As already suggested, the critique and counterproposal to Marxism-Leninism developed by Reverend Moon's organizations concerned with Marxism were comprehensive and based on the original writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Successors to these three such as Stalin, Mao and Pol Pot, for example, were downplayed. CAUSA, for its part, did not want to have its views dismissed because of citing figures whom mainstream communists might view as guilty of a new heterodoxy. The critique concentrated on four areas: Marx's views on Alienation (the Young Marx); Marxist metaphysics or dialectical materialism; Marx's views of history and Marxist political economy including the Labor Theory of Value that Marx had borrowed and built upon as well as his unique Theory of Surplus Value, the consequent Laws of Economic Movement and Lenin's Theory of Imperialism. In his explanation of Imperialism, Lenin pointed out that the West's colonies provided new markets where imperialist powers such as the United Kingdom and France could export not only finance capital but use that capital as leverage to pressure the recipients to purchase specified export products and benefit both from higher interest rates on capital exported overseas and likewise profits resulting from the sale of finished products to what Lenin described as the "backward countries." Imperialism, "the highest stage of capitalism," thus played a salvific role, prolonging capitalism's existence in Europe and allowing capitalism to spread "its net over all countries of the world."¹⁹ Lenin's thus emphasized the need for communists to foment revolution in "backward countries" as a precondition for revolution in the developed world or, as Lenin explained it, "The Road to Paris lies through Peking."²⁰

The *CAUSA Lecture Manual*, based on Reverend Moon's pioneering work with IFVOC and Dr. Sang Hun Lee, points out that Marxism's metaphysics and belief system, not just a wrong application of Marxism-Leninism, had devastating social implications. Communism's militant denial of God obviated the human identity as a child of God, and therefore a being of infinite value. Its advocacy of the dialectic served as an apologia for violence. Its dehumanizing views of capitalists and socialist revisionists justified, in their minds, purges of huge sectors of the human population. The suffering perpetrated under Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Ho Chi Minh, Kim Il Sung, Pol Pot, Castro, Ceausescu and other communist "epic heroes" was thus not due to an "abuse" of Marxism-Leninism; it was a logical consequence of Marxism-Leninism.

In his book *Jesuitas, Iglesia y Marxismo 1965-1985*, Dr. Ricardo de la Cierva, a respected historian and the former Minister of Culture of Spain, wrote, "the CAUSA International Movement has published a lecture manual (1985) that seems to me to be the best generic study of Marxism from within the anti-Marxist camp."²¹ William Rusher an American conservative thinker and editor of *National Review* described CAUSA's work in this way:

18 *The National Interest*, No. 31, Spring 1993, "Sovietology: Notes for a Post-Mortem" by Peter Rutland, p. 111.

19 Vladimir Lenin, *Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, (NSW, Australia, 1999) p. 71-73.

20 Robert V. Daniels, *Russia: The Roots of Confrontation*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), p. 146.

21 Ed. Thomas J. Ward, *An Idea whose Time has come*, (New York, CAUSA Institute, 1989), p. 22.

“I have enormous respect for the work CAUSA does, for the analysis, which is clear, accurate and honest and looks in the round at these questions. These conferences are organized and conducted all over the United States to call to the attention of leadership personalities like yourselves the rather intricate aspects of communism that get overlooked in our daily debates²² .

CAUSA developed its new generation of instructional resources for the audiences that it targeted, largely state legislators and municipal leaders in the United States who eventually aspired to seek federal office and thus needed a better understanding of world affairs. Because of the interest that state legislators expressed in CAUSA’s educational programs, this led first to three successful conferences that were co-sponsored by CAUSA and Dr. Cleon Skousen’s National Center for Constitutional Studies. This in turn led to the creation of the American Leadership Conference (ALC), where Dr. Cleon Skousen was a frequent featured speaker. ALC conducted scores of major educational programs for legislators between 1986 and 1992, most of which took place in Washington, D.C. The ALC conferences focused on comparing the political systems of the communist and democratic spheres but also provided a substantive background on the underpinnings of Marxism-Leninism. It offered a critique of the Marxist worldview and contrasted Marxism’s underpinnings with those found in American constitutional government and in the institutions associated with it. Follow-up field work for the ALC conferences in Washington, D.C. was done through the American Freedom Coalition (AFC), which, in the tradition of Christian Voice, also developed scorecards comparing the political values and voting records of the competing candidates for public office in targeted voter districts. Dr. Robert Grant, President of Christian Voice, served as President of AFC and the respected civil rights leader Dr. Ralph Abernathy who worked closely with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. for many years in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) served as the Vice President.

In Latin America, where Reverend Moon’s education efforts had focused in the early to mid-1980s, he developed the Association for the Unity of Latin America (AULA). AULA’s outreach centered on former heads of state. Some of the more notable heads of state involved with AULA included Peruvian President Belaunde Terry, Costa Rican President Mario Echandi, and former Mexican President Luis Echeverria Alvarez. Presided over by Ambassador Jose Maria Chaves, a seasoned Colombian diplomat and academic, AULA, in conjunction with a Pan-American board of legal scholars, researched and proposed a constitutional framework to deepen inter-state collaboration among Latin American states. AULA highlighted the value of an economic union amongst Latin American states to enhance leverage in trade and political dealings with the major powers of the time, including the United States, Japan and the European Union. The more than twenty Latin American heads of states closely involved with AULA also served as founding members of a broader expansion of activity through the Summit Council for World Peace (SCWP). SCWP brought together former statesmen from around the world to offer proposals and strategies on issues meriting international attention. The Summit Council, along with PWPA and the World Media Conference that we will discuss next added the leverage needed to “seal the deal” and facilitate the meeting between Reverend Moon and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in April 1990.

Media Outreach

Reverend Moon also developed an international media network and started newspapers in Seoul, Tokyo, New York, Washington, D.C., Cairo, Buenos Aires, and elsewhere. An underlying editorial theme of all these papers was value-based reporting, world peace, and the human

²² *Ibid.*

family. Ultimately, the Washington Times became important for Reverend Moon's "March to Moscow."

The Washington Times, the World Media Association and Inroads to Moscow

Following his speech to an audience of 300,000 at the Washington Monument on September 18, 1976, Reverend Moon held a celebration on October 4 where he declared his intention to have his next rally in Moscow. Within three months after the 1976 declaration, Reverend Moon initiated a newspaper in New York, *Newsworld*, which later became the *New York City Tribune*. This daily newspaper was published from December 1976 until August 1985. Many of the reporters of the *Tribune*, including Bill Gertz and Josette Shiner, joined the *Washington Times* in 1983, which Reverend Moon had resurrected on the location of the defunct Washington Star. The *Washington Times* soon garnered a major readership in Washington, D.C. Within the first three years it became recognized as one of America's most quoted newspapers.²³ The three issues that appear below help to illustrate the *Times*' role in the Cold War.

Washington Times support for the Nicaraguan Resistance or Contras

The Washington Times' investigations and reportage lent credence to executive and legislative efforts to support the Nicaraguan Resistance forces or Contras, as they were known, in their efforts to derail that country's move into the Soviet-Cuban sphere of influence. When on April 24, 1985, the U.S. Congress voted down a bill to provide \$14,000,000 in humanitarian aid to the Nicaraguan resistance, *The Washington Times* took the U.S. Congress to task, announcing on May 6, 1985 its intention to seek private humanitarian funding for the Nicaraguan contras²⁴. The *Times* also provided the first \$100,000 seed money for the project. In its news coverage, the *Times* revealed a trip to Moscow immediately following the vote by Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega Saavedra to secure additional Soviet aid. It also reported on new shipments of Soviet military supplies to Nicaragua²⁵. The *Times*' attention to this story continued until the Congress reversed its position in June 1985, resulting in a new \$27,000,000 commitment of humanitarian assistance to the Nicaraguan resistance²⁶, a decisive factor in the eventual wearing down of the Sandinistas, allowing for the 1990 elections that brought Violeta Chamorro to the presidency.

Washington Times Support for the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)

23 Alex Jones of *The New York Times* reported in 1985 that officials of *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, AP and UPI say that "they regularly review *The Washington Times* for news leads and pick up important news items." He called the *Times* the "third most-quoted newspaper in America," after only *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times*, and reported that AP alone cited the *Times* in more than 80 major dispatches from D.C. in 1985. *The New York Times*, May 26, 1985, p. 44.

24 Arnaud de Borchgrave, "Editorial," *The Washington Times*, (May 6, 1985) : A1.

25

A Tribute (Washington, D.C.: *The Washington Times*, 1990), "Our Times: The Life of an American Newspaper."

26 The U.S. House reversed its April 24 position and passed on June 12, 1985, a bill for Contra nonlethal aid. The U.S. Senate reaffirmed on June 6 and June 20, 1985 its prior support for Contra humanitarian aid. A compromise between the chambers, allowing \$27 million in nonmilitary aid to the Contras, was reached on July 26, 1985 with final approval and submission to the White House on August 1, 1985.

On November 1, 1983, *The Washington Times* produced a high profile, full-color article on the space-based anti-missile system known as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). In its editorial policy, the *Times* rigorously advocated in favor of the system's development.²⁷ Indeed, when President Reagan unveiled SDI in a March 23, 1983 TV address, the *Times* editorialized that this address was "maybe President Reagan's best ever," adding that the idea of a space-based shield has "had our interest and support for months" and cited its potential leverage in future arms negotiations.²⁸ This advocacy by the *Washington Times* can be contrasted with the position taken by the *New York Times*.²⁹ The *New York Times* derided the program as "a pipe dream, a projection of fantasy into politics," "science fiction," and "dangerous folly," and described SDI as "a harebrained adventure that will induce a ruinous race in both offensive and defensive arms."³⁰ President Reagan's commitment to SDI, buoyed by the *Washington Times* editorial support led to a shift in the Soviet Union's policy. Whereas they originally demanded that the United States abandon SDI efforts in exchange for a reduction in the Soviet nuclear arsenal, President Gorbachev reversed this position. The Soviet Union accepted the United States' intention to have not parity with the Soviet military but superiority.³¹ This was a crucial change in Soviet policy and opened the way to the end of nuclear blackmail by Soviet leaders for the first time since Stalin.

***Washington Times* role in the Cancellation of Plans for President Mikhail Gorbachev to address a Joint Session of Congress in Washington, D.C.**

In November of 1987, *The Washington Times* ignited a nationwide controversy, which resulted in the United States Congress rescinding an invitation for Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to be the first communist leader to address a joint session of Congress. This privilege had previously only been accorded to foreign dignitaries who were strong allies of the United States such as Lafayette, Winston Churchill, Margaret Thatcher and François Mitterrand. Nonetheless, the White House and Democratic congressional leaders had negotiated behind the scenes to afford this honor to President Gorbachev on December 9, 1987 during the Reagan-Gorbachev Summit in Washington, D.C. *The Washington Times* broke this story on November 13, 1987 and headlined it on November 17. Its follow-up coverage and editorials helped to generate furor

27 "Editorial: Let's defend America," *The Washington Times*, (March 25, 1983) : A11; Tom Carhart, "Time for High Frontier," *The Washington Times*, (March 25, 1983) : A11; "Editorial: ABM: security vs. serenity," *The Washington Times*, (October 21, 1985) : A9; "Editorial: Hanging tough," *The Washington Times*, (October 13, 1986) : A11; "Editorial: Budget essentials," *The Washington Times*, (October 14, 1986) : A9; "Editorial: Not dead, only sleeping," *The Washington Times*, (October 15, 1986) : A9; "Editorial: SDI in the near term," *The Washington Times*, (October 16, 1986) : A11.

28 "Editorial: Let's defend America," *The Washington Times*, (March 25, 1983) : A11.

29 "Editorial: Nuclear Facts, Science Fictions," *The New York Times*, (March 27, 1983) : E18; "Editorial: The War Over Star Wars," *The New York Times*, (October 15, 1986) : A26; "Editorial: In the Reagan World, With No Missiles," *The New York Times*, (October 19, 1986) : 22;

"Editorial: In the Real World, With the Bomb," *The New York Times*, (October 19, 1986) : 22.

30 "Editorial: Nuclear Facts, Science Fictions," *The New York Times*, (March 27, 1983) : E18; "Editorial: In the Reagan World, With No Missiles," *The New York Times*, (October 19, 1986) : 22.

31 McGeorge Bundy, George Kennan, Robert McNamara, and Gerald Smith, "Reykjavik's Grounds for Hope," *The New York Times*, (October 19, 1985) : 23.

among conservative lawmakers, given that Soviet troops continued to occupy Afghanistan.³² The swelling chorus of opposition led the White House and the congressional supporters of the invitation to begin backpedaling by November 20 and to totally abandon these plans by November 22. In the months following this public embarrassment, President Gorbachev took a number of steps, including his announcement two and a half months later on February 8, 1988 to withdraw Soviet troops from Afghanistan, which clearly established *glasnost* as more than a political ploy and represented a major shift in Soviet foreign policy.

***The Washington Times*' Impact on other World Media**

The impact of Rev. Moon's *Washington Times* extended to the news disseminated in other parts of the world, including in communist and frontline countries. In 1988, Nobel peace laureate Oscar Sanchez Arias, then president of Costa Rica, a country bordering on Nicaragua, told the American Society of Newspaper Editors that Costa Rican newspapers depended on *The Washington Times* for news of their world. He went on to say that the only American newspaper Costa Rican citizens know exists is *The Washington Times*, and that if Costa Rican newspapers published something from the U.S. it was from the *Times*.³³ In 1990, future Nicaraguan President Violeta Chamorro Barrios, owner of *La Prensa*, the only daily newspaper which dared to defy Nicaragua's Sandinista government, confided to *The New York Times*' editorial board that the Sandinistas themselves regarded *The Washington Times* as "the newspaper of the Nicaraguan opposition."³⁴

Reverend Moon's 1990 Rally in Moscow

During much of the 1980s the World Media Association (WMA), a media organization for journalists that was founded by Reverend Moon and headquartered at *The Washington Times*, provided opportunities for journalists from numerous publications to participate in fact-finding tours abroad and acquire first-hand exposure to numerous vortices of the Cold War. In 1982 Reverend Moon charged Mr. Larry Moffitt, Executive Director of WMA to begin to bring journalists from the West to the Soviet Union. These fact-finding tours eventually led to breakthroughs in ties between the Moon Organization and the Soviet leadership beginning with leaders of *Novosti* Press Agency. It was with the help of *Novosti* that in Spring 1990 Reverend Moon was able to visit Moscow and hold a conference or "rally" there.

After the *Washington Times* had played an important role in reversing efforts to have President Gorbachev address a joint session of Congress in 1987, *Novosti* officials paid a visit to the *Washington Times* editorial offices in December 1987. The World Media Conference and *Novosti* began to explore ways to collaborate. These efforts led to *Novosti* co-sponsoring a Washington, D.C. conference with the World Media Association in 1989. In 1990 *Novosti* reciprocated and the World Media Association was invited to co-

32 Jeremiah O'Leary, "Gorbachev Arrival set for December 7," *The Washington Times*, (November 13, 1987) : A5; Jeremiah O'Leary and Gene Grabowski, "Gorbachev may Address Congress," *The Washington Times*, (November 17, 1987) : A4. The role of *The Washington Times* in leading the editorial campaign and stopping the planned address was encapsulated by *The Times*' Editor-in Chief, Arnaud de Borchgrave, in a December 4, 1987 speech before the American Leadership Conference.

33 Oscar Arias, address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, J.W. Marriott Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 14, 1988. Cited in *A Tribute* (Washington, D.C.: The Washington Times, 1990).

34 Cited in *A Tribute*.

sponsor a Conference with *Novosti* in Moscow. Through that Conference it finally became possible for Rev. Moon to realize his intent of hosting a rally in Moscow.

The program took place before a large audience in the Convention Center of the Mezhdunarodnaya Hotel in Moscow in April 1990. Local organizing staff included Russian followers of Reverend Moon who had been met by underground missionaries. A PWPA conference and founding meeting for the Russian chapter was held concurrently at the Ukraina hotel across the river, and international PWPA leaders also participated in the World Media Conference.

While in Moscow, the Reverend and Mrs. Moon met with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev on April 11, 1990. In their meeting, Rev. Moon urged President Gorbachev to allow full religious freedom inside the U.S.S.R. The two leaders explored possible ways for future cooperation in the areas of business and education.

On the closing evening of a highly successful cultural program that featured the Little Angels, a renowned Korean children's folk dance troupe, also founded by Reverend Moon, he spoke to a blue-ribbon delegation of Soviet officials that included Soviet First Lady Raisa Gorbachev. Reverend Moon addressed the participants warmly but frankly, choosing to reflect publicly on his private meeting with Gorbachev:

“Yesterday, I had a remarkable meeting with President Gorbachev. I respect and admire his courage and leadership. I assured him that I would cooperate in every way I can to support his program of peace. I told President Gorbachev that the secret for the success of the Soviet Union is to place God at the very center of every endeavor.”³⁵

The American journalist Georgie Anne Geyer wrote an article commenting on the April 1990 Moscow *Novosti*-World Media Conference meetings. In her editorial, entitled “Most Unlikely Conference Meeting,” Ms. Geyer commented as follows:

Of all the impossible events that have occurred in the Soviet Union in the last five years, probably none has been as unlikely as the happy meeting in recent days between Mikhail Gorbachev and the Reverend Sun Myung Moon. The *Moscow News* called Mr. Moon “the most brilliant anti-communist and the No. 1 enemy of the state”—and then added, please, that it was ‘time to reconcile.’³⁶

Ms. Geyer went on to write that “this was after Reverend Moon, the head of the Unification Church, had lectured the Soviet people on Adam and Eve.” Ms. Geyer added that “the highest-level Soviet officials present—atheists all—listened impassively.” Among those in attendance were Albert Vlasov, Chairman of the Novosti Press Agency and Yuri Ossipian, a key advisor to President Gorbachev.³⁷

The historic encounter between Rev. Moon and President Gorbachev in April 1990 led to the Soviet government supporting an effort to bring Soviet legislators to Washington, D.C. where they participated in American Leadership Conferences (ALC) and then on to New York. In December of 1990 and February of 1991, the ALC sponsored seminars for more than one hundred Soviet legislators (federal, republic and

35 Thomas J. Ward, *March to Moscow—The Role of the Reverend Sun Myung Moon in the Collapse of Communism*, (St. Paul, MN: Paragon House, 2005, p. 97.

36 *Ibid.* p. 98.

37 Bo Hi Pak, *The Truth is my Sword*, Vol. II, (New York: HSA-UWA, 1999). P. 594

municipal levels) as well as delegations of cabinet ministers and members of parliament from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia. Soviet attendees included former KGB General Oleg Kalugin, *Izvestia* editor Lev Kornishev, and U.S.S.R. Minister of Justice Sergei Lushchikov. Some 3,000 Soviet young people were sponsored by Rev. Moon to visit the United States and participate in an exchange program under the auspices of the International Educational Foundation (IEF), an organization founded by Rev. Moon to promote education, reconciliation, and dialogue amongst the young people of the free and the communist worlds.

From April 30 to May 2, 1991, the American Leadership Conference sponsored a second American Leadership Conference and fact-finding tour for Soviet officials in the United States. This program included approximately 200 high-ranking government officials and political leaders from all 15 republics of the Soviet Union. This was the only time during this very intense period of Soviet history that any person, government or private organization brought together representatives from all 15 Soviet republics. In attendance were 26 deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet and some 75 deputies of the Supreme Soviets of various republics, as well as Republic vice-presidents, cabinet ministers, and ambassadors. The officials who visited the United States received an introduction to the work and views of CAUSA as well as briefings on American government, business and trade. While in the United States, the participants met with federal officials in Washington, D.C. as well as with city and state officials and business leaders in New York City. CAUSA sponsored a reception for them with New York business leaders at the New York Hilton. This led to lasting commercial ties being established, in some cases, between American corporations and CIS governments and industries.

A Few Reflections for Skeptics

When Reverend Moon arrived in the United States in 1971, skepticism towards anticommunism ran high. Since the “witch hunts” of U.S. Senator Joseph McCarthy in the 1950s, those who expressed concern about the spread of communism were routinely portrayed as McCarthy clones. The Liberal Left seemed to attack anticommunism with religious fervor, unable to distinguish between reactionary and constructive criticism of Marxism-Leninism. The American Left also seemed to have a deep-seated, kneejerk disdain for authoritarian Asian allies to the United States such as Ferdinand Marcos, Chiang Kai-Shek, Nguyen Cao Ky, and Park Chung Hee. Their disdain for these leaders far outweighed their reservations towards the far more brutal and dehumanizing acts of Stalin, Mao Zedong, Pol Pot, or Ho Chi Minh. I am tempted to attribute it to an unreasoned racial and ideological stereotyping. Asian authoritarian figures who fit on the right side of the political spectrum were depicted by the establishment media as spineless pro-American sycophants who, to maintain power and enrich themselves, curried favor from the United States, and opposed progress. Reverend Moon, a Korean, was placed in that same “box” as the Asian rightist authoritarians despised by the American media; and thus, he and his followers were fair game for calumny. As noted, Reverend Moon was often portrayed by major American publications not as a religious leader but disrespectfully as a “Korean industrialist” who swindled Americans under the guise of Bible thumping religion and flag-waving anticommunism.

But Reverend Moon was not just the object of disdain in the Western media. The official Soviet daily *Izvestia* in its August 25, 1984 edition described CAUSA as a “pseudo-religious organization” that “took upon itself a significant share of the expense in the battle against national liberation movements of Central

America.”³⁸ On March 23, 1987 *Pravda* “revealed” that “CAUSA” was used by the CIA not only as a channel for collecting and transferring funds to the Nicaraguans as well as other “contras” but also to subsidize anti-Soviet emigres within the context of Moon’s proclaimed “strategy of encirclement of the USSR.”³⁹

Regardless of how the Soviet Media and the mainstream U.S. media portrayed him, there is no doubt that Rev. Moon’s work and the CAUSA message struck a chord in Latin America, which was the center of the Cold War struggle in the 1980s. Honduran Minister of International Information Ambassador Amilcar Santamaria expressed it this way:

I am convinced that Rev. Moon and this movement offer genuine hope to the people of Central America. Surrounded by underdevelopment, filled with corruption, destroyed by violence and attacked by Soviet totalitarianism, our countries urgently need a worldview capable of mobilizing their moral resources to support liberty, justice and peace. The vision of CAUSA offers such a worldview.⁴⁰

In short, reflecting back on all the different labels people used to describe Reverend Moon—cult leader, Korean industrialist, rightwing extremist, McCarthyite, charlatan, media mogul—turned out to be projections of those delivering the accusations. By being a person genuinely seeking to improve the world—something most people find hard to believe—Reverend Moon was like a mirror reflecting the fears and prejudices of persons and groups. I discovered that people who had a genuine interest to study CAUSA or other of Reverend Moon’s activities, often ended up impressed by them.

“Blood is Thicker” than Water: From Moscow to Pyongyang

In April 1988 Yu Kikimura, an operative of the Japanese Red Army (JRA)—an organization with established ties to North Korea—was arrested on the New Jersey Turnpike for arms possession and was detained. At the time of his apprehension, Kikimura’s car was filled with high-powered weapons and explosives. His terrorist activities in the United States were meant to coincide with the JRA’s bombing of a USO club in Naples, Italy, which took the lives of five persons including an American servicewoman. The FBI confiscated Kikimura’s notebook which indicated his targets in America; Rev. Moon was informed by the FBI that he figured prominently on the list.

Regardless of ostensible hostilities, Rev. Moon had determined that it was time to return to Pyongyang. He began to reach out through back channels to North Korea. In April 1990, DPRK officials turned down a request from Rev. Moon’s World Media Conference that North Korea permit some of the attendees of the spring 1990 World Media Conference program in Moscow to travel on from there to Pyongyang.

Later in 1990, Soviet journalists joined a World Media Conference fact-finding tour that included South Korea. During their stay in Seoul, the Soviet journalists met personally with Reverend Moon, who requested that they visit Pyongyang on his behalf. He asked them to convey to the North Koreans that Reverend.

38 Ed. Thomas J. Ward, *An Idea whose Time has come—The History of CAUSA International*, (New York: CAUSA Institute, 1990), pp. 58-59.

39 *Ibid.*, p. 59.

40 *Ibid.*, p. 17.

Moon was not their enemy, and that he wished to meet with President Kim Il Sung. The journalists complied with this request and met with government officials in North Korea.

After several unsuccessful attempts, Rev. Moon finally received an official invitation to travel to Pyongyang in November 1991. He was both affable and frank during his visit there. He was, in fact, so frank that some of those who accompanied him wondered whether they would ever see Seoul or Washington again. In a meeting with top DPRK officials, Rev. Moon stated unequivocally that neither Kim Il Sung's brand of communism (known as *Juche* thought) nor the guiding political philosophy of South Korea could bring about Korea's reunification. He emphasized that his teachings of "headwing" (as opposed to right or left) were meant to play a central role in facilitating reconciliation between the North and South. Rev. Moon's bold pronouncement that *Juche* could not bring the Koreas together shocked Kim Il Sung's followers as well as his own.⁴¹

Apparently over the protest of some of his subordinates, Kim Il Sung, decided to meet with Rev. and Mrs. Moon on the last full day of their visit to the North. In spite of their marked philosophical differences, their encounter proved to be positive.⁴² Reverend Moon was soon publicly recognized by North Korea as one of the "heroes" promoting North-South reconciliation. Collaboration soon followed on a number of projects including an automobile factory.

In May 1992 a delegation of former U.S. government officials traveled to Pyongyang under Reverend Moon's sponsorship and I was a part of that delegation. Our delegation was chaired by former Missouri Congressman Richard Ichord, President of the American Freedom Coalition (AFC). On the occasion of our visit to Pyongyang, Congressman Ichord hand-delivered a letter from the White House for President Kim Il Sung. The delegation members included two-time Olympic Decathlon Gold medalist and former Congressman Bob Mathias, former CIA Deputy Director Max Hugel, and Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II, former U.S. Ambassador to Japan and Iran and the nephew and namesake of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who had served as the Supreme Commander of the UN troops that had repulsed the 1950 aggression against the South by North Korean leader Kim Il Sung.

Congressman Ichord had briefed President George H.W. Bush's National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft prior to his departure for Pyongyang and he met with President Bush on his return. That visit was the third significant goodwill gesture spearheaded by the Moons to improve relations with Pyongyang over a seven-month period beginning in late 1991. The first was the Moons' own December 1991 visit to Pyongyang and their meeting at that time with President Kim Il Sung. This was followed by *Washington Times* reporter Josette Sheeran's interview with President Kim that then appeared in the *Times*.

The delegation headed by Congressman Ichord decided in consultation with the White House to target the cooling of abusive language (toward the U.S. and South Korea) by DPRK officials and government media as the principal diplomatic objective of the visit. The delegation addressed this and other topics with high-ranking Party officials, including Kim Young Sun, the DPRK's highest official on foreign affairs, and President Kim Il Sung himself, who hosted the delegation at a luncheon and in a private meeting. Kim spent more than three hours with the AFC group.

Congressman Ichord requested that I remain in Pyongyang after the AFC visit. I spent seven additional days, during which I time I crafted a statement that called for restraint in communications between the two

41 *Youtube*, MBCNet Special Report on Reverend Sun Myung Moon English, August 22, 2013, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_N-HIC4q_tc accessed on May 1, 2017.

42 *Ibid*.

countries that would include avoiding demeaning language. In a meeting with Kim Young Sun, the key architect of foreign policy under President Kim Il Sung, I was informed that the DPRK foreign ministry officials did not have consensus on a statement that I had drafted but would make a gesture of reconciliation that I would be informed of at a later date. I departed from Pyongyang on June 6, 1992.

Three weeks later, on June 23, I received a telephone call at my New York office from a North Korean diplomat at the United Nations who was requesting a meeting with Congressman Ichord, American Freedom Coalition leader Gary Jarmin and myself. We met at a restaurant on New York's upper East Side, where the DPRK official informed us that, as a gesture of appreciation for our visit to Pyongyang, the DPRK had made a unilateral decision to cancel its annual month of anti-American demonstrations, which took place every year since the end of the Korean War during the period between June 25th (date of the start of the Korean Conflict in 1950) to July 27th (date of the truce ending the conflict in 1953). The official asked Congressman Ichord to convey this officially to the Bush administration, which he did on June 24, 1992, both by telephone and by facsimile. Congressman Ichord and I also drafted a commentary piece, which appeared in the *Washington Times*, announcing the Pyongyang policy decision.

We were informed by DPRK officials that this step had been taken as a gesture of recognition for the efforts made by Reverend and Mrs. Moon and as an expression of goodwill to the former US government officials that had visited Pyongyang in June 1992. The DPRK official asked Congressman Ichord to report directly to the White House, noting that this normally would be conveyed through the U.S. Embassy in Beijing. He explained that the decision to inform Congressman Ichord rather than go through normal channels was due to the DPRK's desire to highlight to the US government the importance that they attributed to Reverend and Mrs. Moon's role in this dramatic policy change.

Epilogue

Channels of communication between Pyongyang and the Unification Church have remained in place since that time, and this has proven of use for US-DPRK exchanges on some occasions. The high profile of the Moon's organization in North Korea was highlighted in a February 7, 2012 article in *The Daily Beast* entitled "The Bush Administration's Secret Link to North Korea." The *Daily Beast* article pointed out that, in addition to working with former U.S. President Bill Clinton, the Bush Administration, between 2003 and 2008, had utilized Mr. Dong Moon Joo, the former President of the *Washington Times* and a Reverend Moon confidant, as a Track II emissary between the United States and Pyongyang. Indeed, individuals and organizations associated with the Reverend Moon have played a liaison role with Pyongyang since 1991 when Reverend Moon first visited Pyongyang.

On August 15, 2012, Charles K. Armstrong, Columbia University Professor of Korean Studies, described in a *New York Times* opinion piece how posters and billboards in North Korea are almost exclusively devoted to promoting the views of the ruling party and its leadership. He did note that there was one exception:

In recent years, however, one company has been allowed to advertise its products: Pyonghwa Motors, a joint venture between the Rev. Sun Myung Moon's South Korea-based Unification Church and North Korea's state-run Ryonbong General Corporation. A few signs promoting the company's Whistle sedan can be seen in Pyongyang and surrounding areas. Essentially a Hyundai, the Whistle is an increasingly common sight on Pyongyang streets.⁴³

43 *New York Times*, "The View from Pyongyang" by Charles K. Armstrong; August 15, 2012; <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/16/opinion/the-view-from-pyongyang-north-korea.html> accessed on October 11, 2012.

Immediately following his passing on September 3, 2012 numerous tributes were paid to Reverend Moon. Perhaps one of the most significant ones was the bestowal of the "National Reunification Prize" on Reverend Moon by the Presidium of the Supreme People's Assembly of the Democratic Republic of Korea (North Korea). The Reverend Moon's youngest son, Hyung Jin Moon, received the award. In reporting on Reverend Moon's passing and on the bestowal of this award, the DPRK commended Reverend Moon because he had "positively contributed to realizing the nation's reconciliation and unity and the country's peaceful reunification and achieving the prosperity common to the nation."⁴⁴

Peace Scholar John Paul Lederach is the first scholar to distinguish between "Conflict Resolution" and "Conflict Transformation." Lederach defines "conflict transformation" as follows:

Conflict transformation is to envision and respond to the ebb and flow of social conflict as life-giving opportunities for creating constructive change processes that reduce violence, increase justice in direct interaction and social structures, and respond to real-life problems in human relationships⁴⁵.

"Conflict Transformation" recognizes that problems cannot be "resolved" without having addressed the deeper, invisible roots that lie at the heart of any given conflict. By viewing conflict through this lens, it helps us to address conflict in a way that allows for widening levels of partnership and cooperation between those who once perceived each other as enemies.

The positive outcomes that Rev. Moon experienced in Pyongyang in 1991 and in Moscow in 1990 represented the culmination of a process that he had initiated in June 1946 when he traveled North to Pyongyang from Seoul. Reverend Moon's efforts in the years that followed his 1990-1991 visits confirm that, from the very beginning, the enemy of Reverend Moon was never the communists but the ideology that restrained them from achieving ideals of peace, justice, and prosperity. He wanted individuals, in the free world and the communist world alike, to recognize the tragic implications of implementing a worldview that decrees the non-existence of a transcendent source of nature and the universe and thus delimits humanity's quest for meaning and realization by imposing a flawed ideology with hubris that makes enemies expendable. I believe Reverend Moon's accomplishments in Russia and North Korea can be viewed as "conflict transformation." Since his meetings with Soviet President Gorbachev, and Kim Il Sung in North Korea, the world has become complicated and exacerbated by new forms of violence and conflict. New ideological absolutisms must be met with new initiatives. Nevertheless, there is value in studying and reflecting on the extraordinary efforts that Reverend Moon made both to address communism constructively and to seek peace and reconciliation with those who had seen him as their enemy. Those efforts continue today through his spouse Dr. Hak Ja Han Moon and many followers who remain active in promoting North-South and US-DPRK dialogue.

44 *Youtube*, "Reverend Moon awarded National Reunification Prize," September 7, 2012; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7BZQBXETwK8> accessed on January 14, 2017.

45 *Restorative Justice*, "Defining Conflict Transformation?" by John-Paul Lederach, <http://restorativejustice.org/10fulltext/lederach.html> deaccessed on May 31, 2017.