

*John*  
Carolyn Kendall

TO: The Members of the Executive Committee  
FROM: Carolyn Kendall  
DATE: December 28, 1984

In November I wrote the members of the Executive Committee inviting comment about a proposed trip to Clayton to attend the 20th Anniversary Celebration of Family of God. I promised to abide by the majority, or with the reasoning of a minority, if they thought it would not be in the best interest of the Brotherhood if I attended.

Ten people phoned; 2 wrote letters, and one did not respond. Five other people including 2 Councilors and the President of the Bay Area URANTIA Society advised me. Several Executive Committee people expressed surprise that I asked advice, saying they would not have consulted others but would have just gone. It seemed natural for me; John Hales always checks with other officers before any new undertaking; Tom Kendall always sought the approval of fellow Trustees.

The solicitation of views proved worthwhile in terms of personal communication. It presented a chance to get a current reading of the situation, and I was heartened by what seemed to be a lower level of intensity of feeling about Vern and the people in Clayton. I noted a detachment and objectivity and a desire to think about more productive endeavors.

Six people on the Executive Committee urged me to attend the celebration, 3 of whom said they would go themselves if it were only possible. Another actually went. One Executive Committee member called but declined to express an opinion as to whether it would be wise or unwise. Four committee people felt it would be unwise. A 13th member wrote his views in an "either/or" type of letter. (See # 9 below.) I thought the comments of the E.C. members and the other 5 who advised me would interest you. (Tom and Vern are not included.)

1. "We are not a church. No one has any right to meddle in your personal affairs, or (control) where you go, or with whom you associate."
2. "If we can't go visit our friends because of our official positions, we've got a problem. We shouldn't have to sacrifice our friendships."
3. "Personal friendships must, in my opinion, come first."
4. "As long as leaders maintain their friendships, their loyalties, and unity of purpose, it would be unfortunate and dangerous to be overly concerned about appearances."
5. "Despite the fact that I feel that conflict of interest is a real issue, I fully support your intention to go. There is apparently not very widespread agreement on the conflict issue, and as you said, the General Council did not take any action."



6. "I don't believe the messages, but I certainly don't believe there is a conflict of interest between FOG and the Brotherhood, or that you would be disloyal to the Brotherhood if you went. I hope you will go."
7. "I don't question your loyalty to the Brotherhood, but I don't see anything positive coming out of the trip. In fact, I see a lot of negatives. Friendships have to take second place to organizational considerations."
8. "I understand how you feel about your friends, but you are a 'position' not a 'person'. As an officer you are<sup>a</sup> public person when you attend a conference."
9. "If you attend you are showing support for Vern in his self-proclaimed role of New Contact Personality. How you can feel justified in remaining an officer puzzles me in view of the resolution passed by the General Council. I think you should either resign from the Brotherhood and follow Vern more fully, or renounce your belief in this false prophet."
10. "We have always applauded diversity. The Brotherhood has a non-exclusivity of membership clause in the Constitution. It would be inappropriate for leaders to be censured for their associations."
11. "There is such a thing as guilt by association, and no matter how wrong they are, some people might judge you negatively if you go. But I will respect you more if you want to go, and go, than if you don't go because several people thought you shouldn't."
12. "The Brotherhood passed a resolution dissociating itself from messages and if you went, a lot of people might be confused about the official position toward Vern's messages."
13. "I don't think Vern will capitalize on your attendance, but others will."
14. "Its quite possible Vern would use your attendance as a means of regaining status and reputation. He would not do it consciously, but he might in subtle ways."
15. "Vern's messages are not the kind of phenomena I can accept. I don't believe he is a reservist or contact personality. I don't think a reservist would advertise it if he were one. But I do keep thinking how I would feel if I were in Vern's shoes and believed I was getting messages, and no one was listening to me."
16. "I don't believe Vern's messages, but he hasn't acted improperly. He's been above board. I think his broadcasts are great!"
17. "Vern is in God's labor force. FOG is doing good work."
18. "Its still a sensitive<sup>time</sup> I thought things had quieted down, but I've realized recently that the attitudes are still very much alive out in the field."



19. "The Society consists of some who believe the messages, some who are on the fence, and some who do not believe them --mostly the latter. The Society was formerly a shadow organization for FOG. Now members want it to be separate and distinct. Records and materials are kept in homes, not at the Institute; mailings and computer work are done at home. The Society is becoming an active group; books are being placed in bookstores and libraries; there are more frequent meetings; meeting locations are rotated around the Bay area; there is fostering of more study groups; we are referring new readers to all of the groups. Please spread the word about the Society."

20. "Please notice that the latest FOG publications, Spiritual Renaissance Herald and Update do not mention The URANTIA Book or URANTIA Brotherhood, and that Developments will be reporting only on Society activities."

Many of the preceding are composites, but are expressive of specific ideas. While I detected less defensiveness and rigidity in positions, still I decided on the side of prudence. I don't admire people who act solely to prove their strength, individuality or independence. I didn't attend the celebration in Clayton. I thought attendance by an officer at a public FOG celebration might polarize attitudes among Councilors again. Also, I felt the two groups in Clayton are getting their respective acts on the road again--FOG, broadcasting the good news about the Father and the Society distributing and studying the book. Neither group needs further notoriety as a consequence of the attendance at a FOG party by the vice-president of the Brotherhood.

Tom went to California, as much to visit our children, as to attend the party. Reportedly, several Councilors who don't believe the messages, sent warm wishes to Vern and FOG, commending their work. Nevertheless, two mean-spirited things happened which were intended to mar the festivities. On Saturday, just as things were getting under way, each member of FOG received a 6-page letter from Hoite rehashing charges previously circulated. Also, a registered letter, return receipt requested, arrived from a Councilor and his wife requesting that their names be removed immediately from FOG's mailing list. From my conversations, the majority of Executive Committeemembers prefer more progressive activities. Those who will, will go on punishing Vern; will keep trying to minimize his work and its effectiveness.

We have dwelled on the issue of messages long enough. I doubt that the Brotherhood leadership will ever again be approached by anyone claiming to receive messages. Certainly, a definitive statement was communicated to our superhuman friends, to wit:

"If you wish to tell us something important, do not employ a human carrier pigeon. There is no one whom we regard as above suspicion. Find another means."

Or, we could be saying:

"If that is your only approved technique, at

least tell it to someone who will conceal the source, and make sure it is someone who can persuade others to take appropriate action."

Between now and next summer we must concentrate more on how the cause of the revelation can be served. How will the truth of the Fatherhood of God be proclaimed? How can The URANTIA Book be introduced and distributed? How can more teachers be prepared and leaders trained? How can more study groups be established? How can translations be developed and paid for?

The Green Lake conference considered all of these matters, but the General Council ignored virtually every one of them. When will the Council assume the leadership in promoting these activities more aggressively?

Meanwhile, thank you for your responses. I hope you all had a wonderful Christmas and that the new year will be healthy for each of you.