

Dec. 2, 1958

Dr. William S. Sadler
533 Diversey Parkway
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Dr. Sadler:

Received Mrs. Rawson's note and am puzzled to know what you may be referring to regarding criticisms made by Dr. Moss. This is the only criticism - the remark about historicity - which Dr. Moss has made in writing. I did report some of his comments at our meeting in October. He at that time said the treatment of the prophets was in line with the best scholarship of our day, the Urantia date and Bultmann date of the crucifixion agree, and he had some misconceptions about what the Book claimed (which I don't remember) but when we corrected them, he agreed with the point of view. We parted with Dr. Moss with no disagreement of anything discussed. I think, however, he is very skeptical about the book.

Recently I sent you a two page criticism written by Rev. Robert Chiles of Dayton, Ohio which I assume you have. But if you have lost it can send a copy.

Here are some criticisms which are taken from correspondence:

"I must have missed the basic key, or something, but thus far (and I DO want to meet and hear Sadler in re) I haven't been impressed. There is some fairly good philosophy of religion, and some pretty mediocre speculation. Some obvious history, and some rather sophomoric work in trying to reconstruct the "lost" years of Jesus life. The entire attempt to structure the lay-out of creation seems highly contrived and mechanical, and the sacred spheres of paradise seem as artificial, and threadbare as the categories from, is it Divinington to Ascendington, the totality of creation, as I know it is much more exciting, and in no place as crudely and mechanically organized and regimented as Urantia speculates." From Rev. Bert Helm, LaGrange Park, Ill., July 30, 1958

It appears that this is the only real negative criticism which I have received during the year except the copy of the criticism of the two theological professors from Mission House S^eminary which is as follows:

"Much of the material strikes one as Gnostic. The Church rejected Gnosticism because it substituted speculation for faith and pretended to know more about Jesus Christ than the commonly accepted tradition of the Church. One can only read this material having a warning of St. Paul in mind: (Col. 2:8).

"It would be an interesting study for a retired professor of Church History to evaluate the similarities between the Urantia Book and the ancient Gnostic systems. In want of a better suggestion, the problem may also be suggested for investigation in a S.T. M. thesis.

"I personally have a hard time penetrating the depths of the Bible and appropriating its rich vocabulary. If I should spend further time acquainting myself with the 'gobbledygook' of the Urantia Book, I would be ready to have my head examined!

"As Protestants we have no 'Index'. There is no objection to reading this book. But one may also recall: 'All things are lawful for me; but not all things are expedient.'"

"We must remind readers of the book that the Church acknowledges God's final revelation in Jesus Christ. To claim that the Urantia Book is a new revelation is to excommunicate oneself from the fellowship of the Church.

"This book adds absolutely nothing to our faith in God as Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier. It is superfluous."

Excerpt from a letter, Dr. Wagner to President Kroehler, Jan. 23, 1958.

These are all of the criticisms which I have that are of any value at all. Let me know if I can be of further help.

Cordially,

Meredith

Union House Professor