

Bill's Comments Communicate - Text  
on Advices

TO: My colleagues on the Executive Committee and to their Departmental Committee associates who are concerned with the furtherance of the Book and the Brotherhood.

Our fourth meeting is scheduled for 2 May 1955. At that meeting a memorandum dated 2 May 1955 compiled by certain members of the General Council will be presented for the files of the Executive Committee. I would like to comment on this memorandum and also raise certain questions that are logically provoked by it.

1. The testing of delay. It would appear that we have survived the initial testing of delay. At least we are here and have accepted our various commissions of responsibility. So also did some of Jesus' followers survive the testing of delay "before he was openly published to the world." But even then, these veteran survivors exhibited impatience. They wanted action! They wanted things to happen quickly! Time after time was Jesus constrained to admonish his impetuous apostles, "This hour has not yet come." So also would it appear that the testing of delay is not yet over for us. We have survived the preliminary testing of delay, but I am not at all persuaded that we have completed our experiences with the continuing testing of delay. It is entirely possible that we could become victims of a dangerously subtle confusion -- the confusing of growth with swelling. The mere swelling of numbers is in no sense synonymous with true growth. An agglomeration is qualitatively different from a system. In a system, the parts have positional value and this results in a "meaning of the whole" which is completely absent in a mere agglomeration. Let us sincerely pray that our zeal be co-ordinated with wisdom and that our collective judgment will enable us to choose that sound course of action which avoids both the extremes of audacity and inertia.

2. The test of unity. Our first four months together have been to me a most intriguing disclosure of the unexpected values inherent in collective thinking. Our working association of forty-odd individuals has proved to embrace a refreshing diversity of Promethean, Epimethean, and intermediate viewpoints. We certainly do avoid the monotony of uniform thinking. At the same time there has been exhibited a willingness to give and take that speaks well for the existence of unity in the presence of no uniformity of thinking. I am sure that everyone has shared my own experience of having been greatly stimulated by ideas that were quite foreign to my habitual trend of thinking. I am sure that each one of us has had the experience of realizing that our collective planning has been superior to our individual planning.

In this connection, it is not amiss to draw some comparisons between the government of the Brotherhood and the government of an inhabited world. Do the celestial supervisors provide for uniformity of thinking in the departments of a planetary government? They do not! They provide for diversity of thinking by insuring that there will be twelve departments (of the Master Seraphim of Planetary Supervision) that will view planetary affairs from a particular angle of vision. These departmental viewpoints are not inherently harmonious. The Progress Seraphim, for instance, are inherently Promethean in their outlook -- and if they were not, they would not be Progress Seraphim. The Religious Guardians have simply got to be Epimethean in their viewpoint; and if they were not Epimetheans, they could not be guardians of the winnowed wisdom of the past ages. Wisdom, then, lies not in the dead level of uniformity of thinking but rather in the synthesis of diverse thinking -- the achievement of unity in the presence of diversity.

As a matter of interest, it is an engineering fact that a steel cable composed of twelve strands has a greater strength than a single cable of equal mass. Let us hope that the nine-strand cable of the Brotherhood will, in principle, be like the twelve-strand cable of the planetary government.

3. The test of trust and confidence. Here I can speak only for myself.

I have always had trust in this group. The past four months have given me a newly factual basis for confidence.

4. The test of trustworthiness. In considering the future challenge of the test of trustworthiness, I find that my heart is troubled by the frailties of human nature. This concern does not extend to the immediate group of those who are concerned with the furtherance of the Brotherhood. But it does extend to the mere peripheral members of the Forum.

It is so hard to keep a secret. It is so difficult to avoid the transient ego satisfaction of betraying the possession of esoteric information. Not all of those interested have proved trustworthy secret keepers in the past. I have no confidence that the future will be different from the past.

Let us then examine the several problems arising out of the probable untrustworthiness of some of our interested friends. Let us collectively consider how first to minimize and then to mitigate these indiscretions.

a. The Origin of the Book. As of this writing, it seems likely that those who are concerned with the origin of the Book will cause to be prepared a simple citation of those passages in the Book itself which comment on origin. It is my recommendation that we stand on these statements and go no further. It is my further recommendation that we blast as unfactual any other statements which may be made by any person.

b. Discussions about the Forum. The papers are dated in the middle of the 1930's. It would seem to me quite fitting and proper to disclose the existence of the past twenty years, during which we studied the papers and during which funds for their publication were accumulated. Any further discussions could well impinge on untrustworthiness.

c. The great value of humor. I for one, have, for a long time, been rehearsing my "attitude as it is to be manifested at the time of the publication of the Book." Of all the possible attitudes that have presented themselves, the exhibition of great and good humor has commended itself most highly. It is most difficult to make a "martyr" out of a person who laughs. In the past, martyrs were manufactured out of two situations: First of all, martyrdom was inherent in any circumstance where Caesar presumed to claim that which belonged to God. None of us are likely to encounter such circumstances in the twentieth century unless we should venture into those countries that lie behind the "iron curtain." The second condition that induced martyrdom was not an external circumstance, it was inside of the psyche of the believing martyr. It was the conviction that salvation of the soul was dependent on a particular belief in this or that particular saving gospel. We can be entirely free from these theological misconceptions, for the Keys of the Kingdom have been defined as, "Sincerity, sincerity, and more sincerity ..." and we have been further instructed that "...all men have these Keys." Therefore, we well know that the specific acceptance or rejection of the Urantia Book is not a necessary criterion of the survival or the nonsurvival of the accepting or rejecting mind. Survival of the soul is a matter of the relation of the loving son and the loving Father and has little or nothing to do with this or that creed, dogma, or doctrine. This being the case, it should be possible for us to enter the fields that have whitened unto the harvest begirt in the shining armor of great and good humor whereby we shall be enabled to deflect most of the persecution and ridicule that proved so harassing to our predecessors of the past.

my church only is right

that

Let us aspire to be the first of our kind who smiled and who laughed in their lives of service to their fellow men. In so doing, we may perchance resurrect the smiling countenance of Jesus and let men more perfectly feel that God is a friend.

William S. Sadler, Jr.