

# THE YOU-BE

Vol 3 No. 2

May, 1983

## A FORUM FOR ISSUES OF CONCERN TO STUDENTS OF THE URANTIA BOOK.

### FROM THE EDITOR

Matthew Rapaport

San Francisco, CA

To date there have been two dominant themes in our discussion of the future of our planet and *The URANTIA Book*. Some people have said that we must not "focus" on the Book, rather concentrating on becoming living reflections of the Divinity of Jesus. Others have suggested that this, being a time of consuming process, is better when joined to concerted efforts to get more people to read the Book; the Book itself being like the seed that the sower sows. But the spirit we reflect is also seed, and so, as is often the case, there is truth in both points of view. In fact, there can be little doubt that sincere efforts to do either cannot help but strengthen one's ability to do both.

The decisions of the Brotherhood may have a significant impact on the future potential of the Urantia Movement. As such it behooves this organization (along with every one else "involved" with the Urantia Movement) to understand the philosophic, social, and political consequences of various issues that the Brotherhood will raise simply by being here.

There are several issues being explored in aggregate by the authors of this month's *YOU-BE*. One is the need for, and difficulty in, generating a dynamic and self-perpetuating cult of service-oriented religionists. This cult must be based on goals, rather than creeds, and, therefore, it must accept persons *who have not read The URANTIA Book*. At the present time, any requirement to have read *The URANTIA Book* as a prerequisite to membership in the strictly religious association, would automatically exclude over 99% of the world's population — elite indeed for a group that would have to exhibit a tolerance for others seldom seen in the religions of this world.

Another issue is the relation between the Foundation and the Brotherhood. The Urantia Brotherhood represents perhaps 1/3 of the known reader population. Within the "visible" fraction of all readers, this group is the most deliberate in its impact on the world through its various centers of concentration. It does seem reasonable that one might be required to read *The URANTIA Book* prior to becoming a member of this body. This being the case, the Urantia Brotherhood will not soon become the cult that *The URANTIA Book* says must arise (pp. 1091, 1135). This does not preclude the Brotherhood from functioning as an important center of balance for the developing cult

(in fact, it could foster multiple cults world-wide), and the Urantia Brotherhood does, occasionally, see itself in this role. But the nature of the relationship between the Foundation and the Brotherhood has been perceived as a problem, and the source of confusion respecting the potential courses of action that might be chosen by the Brotherhood.

Both of these issues are related to the three concentric circles, the Satania symbol of the Paradise Trinity. For the future cult, this symbol is an obvious rallying point. It is simple, directly associated with the revelation, and, alas, available only after pledging a loyalty oath to a secular entity. To some this is unacceptable. Some would say that the Brotherhood's belief that the Foundation has the moral authority to bestow the symbol of Michael is, of itself, enough to undermine the value of the Brotherhood in the spiritual development of the world. For others, it is a good thing; an essential part of the balance which the caretakers of the text can provide the world.

We offer these articles in the hope of stimulating discussion of these matters. The truth never suffers from honest examination; perhaps we will find it to lie between all of the divergent points of view. The publishers of the *YOU-BE* all thank you for your continuing support. Over the course of six issues, our readers have provided almost half of the costs of publishing. We appreciate this support, and continue to encourage you in it. This forum is reflecting more and more of the diversity of the Urantia Movement. If you have not yet contributed to the maintenance of the *YOU-BE*, please consider it. Remember that contributions come in many forms. We need thoughtful ar-

Unless otherwise indicated by the text, all quotations are from the URANTIA BOOK © 1955 URANTIA Foundation. All rights reserved. The material used herein from the URANTIA BOOK is used by permission. Any artistic representation(s), interpretation(s), opinion(s), and/or conclusion(s)—whether stated or implied—are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of URANTIA Foundation or URANTIA Brotherhood or any of its affiliated Societies.



ticles, names of readers who would be interested in receiving the *YOU-BE*, and of course, financial contributions where possible. Again I want to thank everyone who has supported us so far. The Tortoise wishes everyone a very good summer.

---

## FEMINISM REVISITED

Janet Quinn

Lebanon, OR

The authors of the Book stress that Jesus was not a revolutionary in any sense but one — his unfailing demonstrations of support and fairness to women. This lack of sexism outraged Jesus' enemies and apostles alike. They were offended and perplexed by his aggressive and positive inclusion of women in all phases of the Kingdom. To the man assaulting his wife at Tarantum, Jesus proclaimed that man has no God-given dominion over woman unless she has freely and voluntarily given such authority.

Some feminists might be initially offended by the presentation of God as a Father. Jesus presented God not as an arbitrary patriarch, but as a LOVING father. The father comparison is validated by our experience. Maternal love for offspring has its roots in our mammalian chemical makeup; it is not exclusively a human trait. The love of a human father for his child is a new and refreshing phenomenon. Fatherly love is a somewhat more difficult achievement than maternal love. It is an acquirement connoting spiritual recognition and growth; a mature assumption of cosmic responsibility. I find men to be most God-like when they cheerfully and kindly minister to the needs of small children.

Many of the complaints voiced by feminists are based on the age-old habit of men choosing "picket duties," leaving the "dirty work" to women, and then scorning her for her menial labor. Feminism is a reaction to rudeness and disregard for women's immense contributions to civilization.

One of Caligastia's most evil legacies is this arrogant disregard of women's and children's rights. This manifests, in our society, as wife battering, rape, and many kinds of child abuse. Celestial observers will regard our civilization as barbaric so long as sexual oppression exists. The grass-roots, world-wide feminist movement is a reflection of our Father's will, and it will persist as long as sexism is with us.

---

## THE OFFICIAL WAY: AN EXPLORATION OF SEVERAL OPTIONS

Phil Eversoul

Fairfax, CA

There is an implication in the relationship between the Urantia Foundation and the Urantia Brotherhood which is that the Brotherhood is an essential cornerstone of the Brotherhood of Man on Urantia according to the will of Michael. This implication exists because the Foundation bestows its approval upon the actions and decisions of the Brotherhood by means of granting that Brotherhood the legal right to utilize the Satania symbol of the Paradise Trinity; not to mention the name of the planet as a descriptor in the names of its outlying Societies. The Brotherhood, in all seriousness, accepts these things from the Foundation, essentially affirming the Foundation's right to use the symbol in this manner in the first place.

If the Foundation is not acting on behalf of Michael in bestowing its legal approval upon its licensees, then why is

it claiming ownership of Michael's symbol and the name of the planet? If the Foundation claims to have no spiritual or ecclesiastical authority, then why does it legally license the Brotherhood to carry out its Primary Object, which is, among other things, to spread the Religion of Jesus. If the official Urantia Brotherhood is not essential in some way to the guardianship and evangelism of the Religion of Jesus, then why should it presume to accept Michael's Symbol of God and the name of our planet as exclusive legal privileges granted by the Foundation?

The explanation may have its roots in the history of the Brotherhood. Perhaps the Brotherhood was set up as the Foundation's licensee in order to lead and overcontrol, as much as possible, the evangelism concerned with bringing the UB to the world. The flaw in this plan was the assumption that knowledge of, and belief in, the UB would save the world. In fact, what will save the world is the Religion of Jesus, even if it is not known by that name, as practiced by religionists of all persuasions. The UB is not a living revelation; the primary revelation is we ourselves, when and as we practice the Religion of Jesus.

The official organizations have wisely retreated from any sort of active, public evangelism concerning the UB itself. But the structure of the Foundation-Brotherhood relationship still embodies the earlier, mistaken ideas about the Brotherhood's function in the world. Clyde Bedell's critique of the Foundation and Brotherhood is based on his holding onto those earlier ideas about the Brotherhood's purpose. He sees the official organization as betraying their original purpose rather than as growing to a better understanding of their purpose.

This better understanding is that the Foundation has no power to license spiritual brotherhoods, and that the authority of the Foundation is strictly secular. In fact, the Brotherhood is solely a creature of the Foundation's imagination (from a judicial point of view). Since the Foundation has always claimed that its granting of licensee status is only a legal right, and not a spiritual right by way of God's authorization, it follows that: 1) the Foundation has originated its licensing procedures on its own; it was not "so instructed" from above; 2) the Foundation has no permission from Michael to bestow his God-symbol as a sign of spiritual mission or approval; and 3) the Urantia Brotherhood is not a spiritual entity by virtue, if for no other reason, of its official status as the Foundation's licensee.

There is, then, a misrepresentation in the relationship between the Foundation and the Brotherhood. As far as anyone is willing to reveal, Michael did not authorize the bestowal of the three concentric circles and the name of the planet upon an organization that, by virtue of its use of "official authority," cannot help but be perceived as an ecclesiastical entity. For the sake of honesty, this relationship needs to be restructured. This suggestion has been dismissed as impractical, but I believe that the credibility of both these organizations will suffer in the long run without this restructuring.

This is not to say that such restructuring would be easy. Two possible options suggest themselves, and I mention them to illustrate the potentials and problems of making changes at this stage in the evolution of the UB on this planet.

First, the Foundation could withdraw any use of the concentric circles and the word 'Urantia' used in an identifying sense. No group, besides the Foundation itself, would be able to use the circles or the name Urantia. Further, the Foundation would have to shift its statement



of purpose to reflect its real concerns — the protection and maintenance of the text of the UB in print and inviolate. This would eliminate any ecclesiastical implications in owning the marks, and at the same time, insure that they remain identifiers of the genuine text. No group (including the Foundation) would have an implied spiritual right to exclusive use of the marks. The disadvantage of this approach is that it completely ignores the question of the circles as a symbol of the "religious cult" that might spring from the Book. By restricting the use of the marks even more tightly than is the case now, we emulate the peoples of 4000 years ago who refused to use Melchizedek's emblem because it was too sacred!

The second option corrects this flaw but creates problems of its own. The Foundation could deliberately release the circles into the public domain. This would allow anyone to use them (including any religious cults) while at the same time insuring that no other person or entity could re-trademark the circles. This solution is appealing on some levels. The Brotherhood could continue to use the marks and circles but would no longer give the appearance of having some sort of spiritual privileges as a result since anyone could make use of them. But this creates even greater problems for the Foundation whose job is to protect the text. In this case, the Foundation would have to select some other trademarks with which to identify the real UB. This could cause untold havoc and confusion especially in the future whenever the copyright runs out.

Neither option appears to be fully satisfactory, but neither is the status quo. Perhaps debate on this subject would help to clarify the possibilities and the needs of this movement in the future.

---

## SOCIALIZING RELIGION

Stephen Finlan

Fairfax, CA

Sorting out the separate functions of secular and religious groups (Paper 99) is the great untried task of the Urantia movement, both within and outside "official" circles. And it is a built-in problem at that.

Of the four previous epochal revelations, only one (Jesus') involved no relationship with secular organizations. The first two revelations were really prototypes of World Government and world culture. But Melchizedek's school at Salem, while it taught several secular subjects, was for the most part a prelude to the Bestowal Son mission: teaching the independence of religion, and attempting to inaugurate a faith-community that would not be tied to any one culture. The great challenge for Abraham was to learn to separate his political and religious group-functions. The great challenge for the Urantia movement in future generations will be to evolve religious groups without secular attachments, for "religion has little chance to function until the religious group becomes separated from all other groups" (1091). I believe the Spirit of Truth fosters this separation.

And it will indeed be a challenge, because the Urantia movement has a built-in secular aspect: the celestial authorization of the original Urantia Forum to copyright and publish the Book, which necessitated the creation of a legal entity to defend the copyright. The Forum folks thus set up the Foundation. But they did not set up an independent religious group. From early on, the Foundation has taken on both a religious and a secular function. Its main activity is in the courts of secular society, yet it has

religious goals in its Statement of Purpose, and it controls the use of the principle symbol of the "new cult" (965-6): Michael's three-circle emblem (606).

There is a big difference between having authority over the copyright, and having authority over religious symbolism. The copyrighting of the text and the trademarking of the circles are two entirely different matters. The implications for the movement are different, and the origins are different. The copyright protects the physical revelation-product, and appears to have been part of the revelation instructions. But the trademarking of the circles involves a certain amount of control over the developing new cult — the socialization of religion — and appears to have been the Foundation's own idea.

No one's freedom to worship is curtailed by restrictions on the use of the circles, but as the single most important symbol of the movement, they have tremendous social-religious significance. The circles, all by themselves, are irrelevant. But they raise a lot of important issues in the socializing of religion. The circles are only a symbol, but their restricted use is itself symbolic of the current dormancy of the social-religious potentials of the Urantia movement. The Foundation is not suppressing anyone's individual religious freedom; respect for *personal* religion is an insight which pervades all circles of the Urantia movement. But the religion of UB-readers has yet to declare its independence on the *group* level. The Brotherhood seems to accept that it should be subject to the Foundation instead of the other way around.

Despite the unmistakably religious goals contained in its Statement of Purpose, the Brotherhood does not claim to be the type of religious group described on page 1092. It seems to think of itself as a secular organization of religious individuals. Yet the Book-insert describes the Brotherhood as "a social and fraternal organization with a religious objective." *Is it a spade or a club?* If the Brotherhood is *not* a religious group, then what does it exist for? If it *is* a religious group, shouldn't it be free of even the slightest control by a non-elected group? Shouldn't all forms of human religious leadership be formally subject to the will of the brotherhood through democratic techniques? Jesus invested the judicial, executive and legislative functions of the religious fellowship in the whole group, not in a special apostolic succession (1761-3, 1764A, 1747C).

The Urantia Papers are a unique revelation; like the Dalmatia and Eden revelations, they involve both religious and secular teachings; but the UB was not accompanied by a visible superhuman administration overseeing both the religious and secular aspects of the revelation. Rather, in this Post-Bestowal Son era, religion must observe the "separation rule" vocalized by Jesus and in Paper 99. The Book clearly warns of the dangers of groups with religious purposes becoming involved in secular matters (1089-92; 2082-6), and the Urantia Foundation as it now operates is a secular organization. But it can hardly reverse its present relationship to the Brotherhood, becoming formally subject to the decisions of the religious fellowship, until the Brotherhood is willing to redefine itself as a religious group.

The reluctance of Book-readers to form a full-fledged religious group is mainly due to the profound emphasis upon *personal* religion within our movement, and our fear of ecclesiasticism. This is both our strength and our weakness. The potentials for service are largely untapped when there is little mobilization for religious function. But how unique such mobilization could be! — how different



such a group would be! — when all its members have such a surety of personal religion — the strongest defense against dangers of institutionalism (1591-2, 1864-6, 2041-2, 965-6). On page 1930, Jesus points out that in addition to our duty to God, we should also “voluntarily assume the sacred obligation (of) service to the brotherhood of God-knowing believers,” which, on page 1763, he refers to as “the congregation.”

We need independent religious groups founded upon personal religion, having a spiritual unity derived from a “common motive for life service...to do the will of the Father” (1592). The time has come to sort out our

unclearities in group purpose, and allow the social-Jesuanian function to emerge. In friendships and personal deeds, we already have this function, but as a clearly understood group purpose, we do not. Paper-99-type religion is something other than a network of study groups.

This process has been going on, in a small way, in San Francisco. The Tortoise, like the Brotherhood, had a declared religious purpose, but was unwilling to call itself a strictly religious group. Some people here are now in the process of forming a religious group which attempts to fulfill the recommendations of the revelators about the socialization of personal religion.

## RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION AND THE URANTIA BROTHERHOOD: A QUESTION OF OWNERSHIP

Charles Lamar

San Francisco, CA

I used to think that the students of *The URANTIA Book* could not become a religious movement *per se* because the Book deals with philosophy and science, as well as religion. This may still be true for students of *The URANTIA Book* taken as a group, but not for the above reason. One page 1090 we are told that *The URANTIA Book's* unified revelatory presentation of philosophy, cosmology, and religion portrays the emergence of matter, mind, and spirit from the Paradise Trinity and their unification in the Supreme. *The URANTIA Book* is clearly a presentation on behalf of Deity, and thus all of it, for us, is intrinsically “religious.”

While it remains true that many of the things which people will be legitimately led to do by *The URANTIA Book* can not be appropriately done by a religious group, I do believe that the Urantia Movement is intrinsically and fundamentally a religious movement. This is true even though the Book is a book; even though it deals with matter and mind as well as spirit; and even though its students can claim no exclusive pathway to salvation. The whole movement must be, basically, a religious movement, because the Book itself is a revelation, and therefore, sacred.

Before Christy died she expressed two wishes for the Urantia Movement and I agree with both. She wanted to protect the integrity of the text, and spiritually unify the movement. But the main problems in spiritually unifying the movement arise from the methods that have been chosen to protect the text.

The problem lies in the matter of ownership of the three concentric circles: the Satania symbol of the Paradise Trinity. After the copyright expires, it is intended that the symbol shall be used to identify the real text apart from possible versions or counterfeits. This is a good idea. It is also intended that the symbol shall be used to identify a social organization of those who may responsibly follow and defend the Book and, we hope, exemplify what it teaches. This is also a good idea, but there are problems with the current organizations.

Is the Brotherhood a religious group? By what mechanisms are its legislative, executive, and judicial functions of government performed? If the same symbol is to be used to identify both the Book and the Brotherhood, can the Brotherhood be a self-governing, participatory Jesuanian religious brotherhood if it does not own its own identifying symbol?

In our actions as a social body we might do well to bear one axiom in mind. The Fifth Epochal Revelation can best be advanced only by methods which are consistent with the teachings of the revelation itself. Whenever we set about to achieve any goals in response to the Book, we should always check to see if our procedure is according to its teachings.

What can we derive from *The URANTIA Book* about the revelation of a social religious group associated with a particular physical artifact and an artistic symbol? We can see that Jesus put the “...social and economic features of the association of men and women as fellows of the kingdom” into human hands (1747). We see that in legislative and judicial matters the wisdom of the group should prevail (1764). We see that “Religion has little chance to function until the religious group becomes separated from all other groups” (1091).

In the Urantia Foundation and the Urantia Brotherhood we have two groups with identical — religious — purposes. But by means of the trademark of the circles, and the licensing agreement, the Urantia Foundation now controls the Brotherhood. The autonomy and independence of the Brotherhood is subject to the edicts of the Foundation. The legislative and judicial functions of the Brotherhood's councils can all be superceded by the mandates of the Foundation.

Clearly this is not according to the teachings of *The URANTIA Book*. It's not that there should be NO body of judicial review, or guidance for the Brotherhood. But the Brotherhood should not be wholly without recourse with regard to such a body or its doings. The problem lies only in the complete independence of the Foundation from the Brotherhood, not in the existence of two (or even three) separate branches *per se*.

I believe that the ramifications of this problem were not foreseen by those who set up these two legal entities. The present situation is held together by the personal relationships of those who constitute the Foundation and the high councils of the Brotherhood; and this is sufficient for the present. In the long run however, who would want to join a Brotherhood organization that has no control of the symbol of its own identification? Sooner or later, the Brotherhood must come to own both the Book and the three concentric circles. The guidance we need is in the Book.

SEND ADDRESS CHANGES, LETTERS, AND DONATIONS TO:  
Matthew Rapaport, 127 14th Ave., San Francisco, CA 94118