

A BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF *THE UB*
by Dale E. Essary

PART X: Other Unbiblical Concepts Espoused in *The UB*
and
Concluding Remarks

“. . . in making these presentations about God and his universe associates, we have selected as the basis of these papers more than one thousand human concepts representing the highest and most advanced planetary knowledge of spiritual values and universe meanings.”

(0:12.11)

“Has not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?”
(1Corinthians 1:20)

OTHER UNBIBLICAL CONCEPTS

On Satan (a.k.a. Lucifer, a.k.a. the Devil)

In *The UB*, Satan, Lucifer, and the Devil are three separate entities, each playing their individual role in a galactic uprising known as the “Lucifer Rebellion”:

“Very little was heard of Lucifer on Urantia owing to the fact that he assigned his first lieutenant, Satan, to advocate his cause on your planet. Satan . . . entered fully into the Lucifer insurrection. The ‘devil’ is none other than Caligastia, the deposed Planetary Prince of Urantia” (53:1.4)

Lucifer, being the highest-ranking galactian bureaucrat of the “rebellion,” is said to have led what reads like an attempted secession from the Universal Father’s celestial hierarchy. The uprising failed, and all but one of the insurgents have been captured and are currently being held in exile on a prison planet awaiting judgment. It seems, however, that Caligastia (a.k.a., the “devil”) is “still free on Urantia to prosecute his nefarious designs,” notwithstanding that he “has absolutely no power to enter the minds of men, neither can he draw near to their souls to tempt or corrupt them unless they really desire to be cursed with his wicked presence” (53:8.6). Citing a New Testament epistle, *The UB* assures us that those who are keepers of the faith are immune to Caligastia’s influence, because the person who is “born of God keeps himself, and the wicked one touches him not” (53:8.8; citing 1John 5:18). The devil has been given too much credit for the evil in the world because he had been rendered impotent “since the cross of Christ” (53:8.9), but more specifically, since the day of Pentecost when the “Spirit of Truth” (i.e., the “spirit of Michael”) was “poured out upon all flesh” (53:8.7).

The Bible, on the other hand, treats these three names (the Devil, Lucifer, Satan) synonymously. For instance, during the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness, Jesus was tempted by the “devil” (Greek *diabolos*; Matthew 4:1,5,8). In the same account, Jesus says “**Away from me, Satan!**” (Matthew

PART X

4:10); we are later told that “the devil left him” (Matthew 4:11). In Mark’s account of the parable of the sower, “Satan” takes away the seed on the wayside (Mark 4:15); in Luke’s account, it is “the devil” (Luke 8:12). In Revelation 12:9 and 20:2, the terms “Devil” and “Satan” are used interchangeably.

Contrary to *The UB*’s claim that Caligastia’s influence on humanity has been relatively benign since Pentecost, the apostle Peter, writing sometime in the A.D. 60s, warns us that our adversary “the devil walks about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour” (1Peter 5:8), in the present tense. This passage suggests an aggressive coercive nature exhibited by the “devil” (a.k.a., “Caligastia”) long after the Day of Pentecost, rather than the passive volitional demeanor suggested by *The UB* (53:8).

The case for Lucifer must, by its very nature, be treated as uniquely confounding. The only reference to Lucifer in the Bible is found in Isaiah 14:12, though the name is not used in some translations. Those who do not consider “Lucifer” a reference to the king of Babylon hold that it refers to Satan. At any rate, Lucifer of the Old Testament is not merely interested in setting up his own little autonomous city-state among the stars as the account reads in *The UB*. No, Lucifer of the Bible wants it all; he wants to usurp *all* of God’s authority and rule over *all* of God’s creation:

“How you are fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! How you are cut down to the ground, you who weakened the nations! For you have said in your heart: ‘I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will also sit on the mount of the congregation on the farthest sides of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will be like the Most High.’” (Isaiah 14:12-14)

Not much of this passage is repeated in *The UB*, save for verse 12, which credits Isaiah for having properly recorded celestial history in this regard and “properly” attributing the name Lucifer, except for one small difference. The account reworks the verse for a rendition that is more becoming of an interplanetary viewpoint:

“Your olden prophet saw his sad estate when he wrote: ‘How are you fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! How are you cast down, you who dared to confuse the *worlds!*’” (53:1.3; emphasis added)

Apparently then, even though Isaiah recorded and actually “saw” the incident, his vision was blurred to the point of being slightly nearsighted!

Unfortunately, the “celestial” author of Paper 53 has fallen prey to a common misconception among Urantia mortals. The passage in Isaiah does not refer to the devil (or any other celestial miscreant for that matter), but to the human king of Babylon. A reading of Isaiah Chapter 14 clearly reveals this, particularly verses 4, 16, and 22. The king of Babylon is later used as a foreshadowing of the “beast,” a man of ultimate evil who will lead the Babylon of the last days in chapters 13 and 17 of Revelation.

Paper 53 perpetuates this misapplication by attributing biblical passages from yet another prophet of old to Lucifer:

“Lucifer . . . was a created Son of the local universe, and of him it was said: ‘You were perfect in all your ways from the day you were created till unrighteousness was found in

A BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF *THE UB*

you'. . . . And Lucifer reigned 'upon the holy mountain of God,' the administrative mount of Jerusem. . . . Of Lucifer it was said: 'Your heart was lifted up because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom because of your brightness.'" (53:1.1,3)

Again, the *UB* author has mistaken the celestial sovereign of 1,000 inhabited planets for a mere mortal of Urantia. The biblical passages quoted (Ezekiel 28:15,14, and 17, respectively) do not pertain to Lucifer at all. Instead, these verses refer to the king of Tyre (see Ezekiel 28:1,11), whom God was prophesying against.

On Demon Possession

According to *The UB*, just as is the case for the devil's impotence, demon possession also has been impossible since the day of Pentecost:

“. . . the pouring out of the Spirit of Truth upon all flesh forever made it impossible for disloyal spirits of any sort or description ever again to invade even the most feeble of human minds. Since the day of Pentecost there never again can be such a thing as demoniacal possession.” (77:7.8)

In the *UB* world, a person who is supposedly under demonic influence is merely being subjected to their own “inherent and debased tendencies, being led away by their own natural propensities” (53:8.9). But these passages appear to be ignoring the accounts in the Book of Acts which, beyond chapter 2, describes events that took place during the early stages of the Christian church after Pentecost. Luke records that Peter and the other apostles went about Jerusalem healing great multitudes of people with unclean spirits (Acts 5:16). During Philip's ministry in Samaria, “unclean spirits, crying with a loud voice, came out of many who were possessed” (Acts 8:7). Paul had cast out a spirit of divination from a woman in Philippi (Acts 16:18), and caused evil spirits to leave many people in Ephesus (Acts 19:12). And Paul warned his parishioners to “put on the whole armor of God” in preparation for battle with “spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places” (Ephesians 6:11,12), and that “in latter times some will depart from the faith, giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines of demons” (1 Timothy 4:1). These and other New Testament passages seem to be implying that, although demonic possession is not possible in true believers, it is still a threat to those who have not accepted Christ as their Savior and received the Holy Spirit.

On the Twelve Tribes of Israel

The story of the Twelve Tribes of Israel is false, according to the celestial historians:

“There never were twelve tribes of the Israelites—only three of four tribes settled in Palestine.” (97:9.1)

But *The Urantia Book Concordance*¹ lists the names of Dan (66:5.7), Ephraim (97:9.2), Gad (128:1.14), Judah (97:9.2), Manasseh (97:9.23), Ruben (sic: Reuben; cf. 128:1.14), Simeon (122:9.2), and Zebulun (146:0.1)—in all, eight of the twelve tribes. While some of these are the names of people or places depicted centuries after the Israelites had settled in Palestine, there still needs to be some explanation as to how these people and places got such names. Typically, a famous name is traceable to the historic

PART X

figure behind the name (e.g., the tribes of Israel are named after the sons of the historic person Israel [formerly Isaac] and their descendants). Moreover, *The UB* has no explanation as to where the name “Israelites” came from, if not the father figure of the tribes. No compelling reason is given in *The UB* to deny the historicity of the Bible in this regard, other than the authors’ own words.

The *UB* authors obviously have an agenda to promote, as a continuation of the above passage reveals:

“The Hebrew nation came into being as the result of the union of the so-called Israelites and the Canaanites. ‘And the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites. And they took their daughters to be their wives and gave their daughters to the sons of the Canaanites.’ The Hebrews never drove the Canaanites out of Palestine, notwithstanding that the priests’ record of these things unhesitatingly declared that they did.” (97:9.1)

The UB author mangles the biblical passage quoted above in order to set up a sordid campaign to reduce the history of the nation of Israel as recorded in the Old Testament to that of the exploitations of religious zealots. Judges 3:5-6 reads as follows:

“Thus the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites. And they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons; and they served their gods.” (Judges 3:5-6)

The results of these cultural clashes are apparent in the verse following:

“So the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord. They forgot the Lord their God, and served the Baals and the Asherahs.” (Judges 3:7)

Note that the biblical account mentions five other tribes besides the Canaanites with which the Israelites intermarried. *The UB* is attempting to establish that the tribes of Israel (of which there supposedly were only three or four) had intermingled with the Canaanites instead of driving them out of Palestine, as the Old Testament record supposedly misrepresents. However, the alleged celestial author of Paper 97 does not have the facts straight. To be sure, the Old Testament records that the Israelites, under the leadership of Joshua, decisively conquered the land of Canaan (see the Book of Joshua). But remnants of the Canaanites lingered throughout Joshua’s campaign and thereafter until they regrouped and resided in several villages throughout the conquered land (Judges 1:27-33). It was not until after the tribes of Israel had divided up and firmly established occupation of the lands that they “put the Canaanites under tribute, but did not completely drive them out” (Judges 1:28; cf. vv. 29-33). In fact, a considerable population of Canaanites remained in Palestine well into the time of King David’s reign and afterward (2Samuel 24:7; 1Kings 9:16). Thus, the Old Testament does not “unhesitatingly declare” that the Hebrews drove the Canaanites out of Palestine, as Paper 97 falsely asserts. In retrospect, we realize that the author of Paper 97 is misquoting Judges 3:5-6 to imply that the Israelites intermarried with the Canaanites *instead* of displacing them. But as a simple reading of the early chapters of Judges reveals, it was not until *after* Israel had conquered Palestine that the intermingling occurred with the surviving Canaanite remnant. Celestial revisionism at its finest!

And this shortsighted recollection does not stop there. According to the celestial account, Jesus of *The UB* is reputed to have been given Joseph, his younger brother, a lesson in Jewish heritage while en route

A BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF *THE UB*

from Jerusalem one fine day at the tender age of 20: “Going down the Jordan, Jesus narrated Jewish history to Joseph and on the return trip told him about the experiences of the reputed tribes of Ruben, Gad, and Gilead that traditionally had dwelt in these regions east of the river” (128:1.14). However, there was no Israeli tribe called Gilead, nor was there any other non-Israeli tribe that went by that name. There was a district east of the Jordan River and southeast of the Sea of Galilee named Gilead, in which a fertile hilly region supported parts of the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh (Numbers 32:39; Deuteronomy 3:12-13). Because all three of these Israeli tribes settled in some part of Gilead, none of these three tribes (particularly Manasseh) could be attributed to being the “tribe of Gilead” as it were. Therefore, Jesus of *The UB* must not have been paying attention in rabbinical school when he was being taught his tribal history!

On the Christian Church

The UB claims that Jesus did not found the Christian church. The church as we now know it had supposedly corrupted the teachings of Jesus:

“. . . while so-called Christianity does contain more of the Master’s gospel than any other religion, it does also contain much that Jesus did not teach.” (149:2.2)

“When Jesus’ immediate followers recognized their partial failure to realize his ideal of the establishment of the kingdom in the hearts of men . . . , they set about to save his teaching from being wholly lost by substituting for the Master’s ideal of the kingdom the gradual creation of a visible social organization, the Christian church.” (170:5.14)

“The early Christians (and all too many of the later ones) generally lost sight of the Father-and-son idea embodied in Jesus’ teaching of the kingdom, while they substituted therefore the well-organized social fellowship of the church. The church thus became in the main a *social* brotherhood which effectively displaced Jesus’ concept and ideal of a *spiritual* brotherhood.” (170:5.15; emphasis original)

“Likewise, the Christian churches of the twentieth century stand as great, but wholly unconscious, obstacles to the immediate advance of the real gospel—the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth Jesus did not found the so-called Christian church, but he has, in every manner consistent with his nature, *fostered* it as the best existent exponent of his lifework on earth.” (195:10.8,9; emphasis original)

These third-person declarations of confusion do not take into account the unambiguous statement made by Jesus Himself:

“ . . . on this rock I will build My church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. And I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.” (Matthew 16:18-19; emphasis added).

The UB even provides its very own parallel, if not somewhat mangled, version of this very passage:

PART X

“I am led to declare that upon this foundation will I build the brotherhood of the kingdom of heaven. Upon this rock of spiritual reality will I build the living temple of spiritual fellowship in the eternal realities of my Father’s kingdom. All the forces of evil and the hosts of sin shall not prevail against this human fraternity of the divine spirit. . . . [T]o you and your successors I now deliver the keys of the outward kingdom—the authority over things temporal—the social and economic features of this association of men and women as fellows of the kingdom.” (157:4.5)

But as we have already seen (refer to “The Blame Game” section in Part VI of this series), *The UB* transforms what was the turning point that led to the launching of Jesus’ church on Earth into a confused rabble of deranged fanatics (Paper 194; cf. Acts 2). By its own admission, then, *The UB* is conceding that “Jesus” (of Nebadon) had misappropriated his authority by handing the keys of the kingdom over to a handful of befuddled zealots!

Note also the inherent internal contradiction between two of the passages cited above. In 157:4.5, Jesus of Nebadon is quoted as saying to his apostles, “I now deliver the keys of the outward kingdom—the authority over things temporal—the *social* and economic features of this association of men and women . . .” (emphasis added). And yet, we have this admission by the “celestial” authors: “The church thus became in the main a *social* brotherhood which effectively displaced Jesus’ concept and ideal of a *spiritual* brotherhood” (170:5.15; emphasis original). In other words, they blame the Christian church for doing precisely what “Jesus” had appointed them to do!

On Racism

Black-skinned peoples are intellectually inferior to their white counterparts, according to *The UB*’s anthropological section. About one-half-million years ago, so Paper 64 tells us, the “Sangik” family (a tribe of hominids) inexplicably produced children of six different skin colors (red, yellow, blue, orange, green, and “indigo” or black), who became the “ancestors of the six colored races of Urantia” (64:5.2). The modern Caucasian (Paper 80) and Mongoloid (81:4.7) classes are supposedly descended from the superior (“primary”) red, yellow, and blue races, while the Negroid (81:4.8) stock stems from the inferior “secondary” (orange, green, indigo) races. *The UB* is rife with statements that denote the inferiority of black ethnic groups. Below are just a few:

“The earlier races are somewhat superior to the later; the red man stands far above the indigo—black—race.” (51:4.2)

“The green race was one of the less able groups of primitive men, and they were greatly weakened by extensive migrations in different directions. . . . The green race split into three major divisions The southern nation entered Africa, where they destroyed their almost equally inferior orange cousins.” (64:6.17,18)

“As the red men were the most advanced of all the Sangik peoples, so the black men were the least progressive.” (64:6.25)

“The indigo race was moving south in Africa, there to begin its slow but long-continued racial deterioration.” (78:3.7)

A BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF *THE UB*

“Even such inferior races as the African Bushmen” (103:3.1)

The UB even holds the Christian church at least partly responsible for the lack of sufficient “progress” toward the elimination of “inferior” racial stock. The following passage reads as though it could have been pulled straight from the speech notes of a Grand Wizard at a Ku Klux Klan rally:

“The church, because of overmuch false sentiment, has long ministered to the underprivileged and the unfortunate, and this has all been well, but this same sentiment has led to the unwise perpetuation of racially degenerate stocks which have tremendously retarded the progress of civilization.” (99:3.5)

The idea of racial supremacy was gaining popularity at the time of the Social Darwinist movement of the 1930s, but has been rendered untenable today through genetic research. Such emotive terms as “backward,” “inferior,” and “racial deterioration” reveal the prejudices of the *UB* authors. The Bible, on the other hand, knows nothing of racial supremacy, but instead says that in the church “there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3:28; NIV). Moreover, the principle of boasting in one’s racial heritage is inconsistent with Christian virtues (Philippians 3:3-7). Furthermore, in stark contrast to the supposed six “Sangik” races that appeared and dispersed throughout the world, the Bible attests that God “made from one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth” (Acts 17:26). Modern science seems to agree with the biblical perspective rather than *The UB*’s apparent contrived derivation of early twentieth-century racism.²

On Eugenics

According to *The UB*, mankind would be better off if they eliminated inferior and unfit individuals through a program called eugenics, involving coercive sterilization and selective breeding. Listen to how casually *The UB* authors entreat us with what they consider to be the “normal” and “acceptable” course of action for dealing with those individuals regarded as “defective”:

“These six evolutionary races are destined to be blended and exalted by amalgamation with the progeny of the Adamic uplifters. But before these peoples are blended, the inferior and unfit are largely eliminated. The Planetary Prince and the Material Son, with other suitable planetary authorities, pass upon the fitness of the reproducing strains. The difficulty of executing such a radical program on Urantia consists in the absence of competent judges to pass upon the biologic fitness or unfitness of the individuals of your world races. Notwithstanding this obstacle, it seems that you ought to be able to agree upon the biologic disfellowshipping of your more markedly unfit, defective, degenerate, and antisocial stocks.” (51:4.8)

“The early development of a normal world is greatly helped by the plan of promoting the increase of the higher types of mortals with proportionate curtailment of the lower. And it is the failure of your early peoples to thus discriminate between these types that accounts for the presence of so many defective and degenerate individuals among the present-day Urantia races.” (52:2.9)

PART X

“. . . most worlds seriously address themselves to the tasks of race purification, something which the Urantia peoples have not even yet seriously undertaken. . . . It is the false sentiment of your partially perfected civilizations that fosters, protects, and perpetuates the hopelessly defective strains of evolutionary human stocks.” (52:2.10,11)

“It is neither tenderness nor altruism to bestow futile sympathy upon degenerated human beings, unsalvable abnormal and inferior mortals. There exist on even the most normal of the evolutionary worlds sufficient differences between individuals and between numerous social groups to provide for the full exercise of all those noble traits of altruistic sentiment and unselfish mortal ministry without perpetuating the socially unfit and the morally degenerate strains of evolving humanity.” (52:2.12)

The UB is not even the least bit ashamed to use the term “eugenics” when recommending an appropriate curriculum for the education of our youth:

“Civilization is in danger when youth neglect to interest themselves in ethics, sociology, *eugenics*, philosophy, the fine arts, religion, and cosmology.” (111:4.4; emphasis added)

The UB is also in favor of a program known as race amalgamation, whereby all the racial strains are to be intermingled through cross-breeding, thereby eliminating the “negative” aspects of the “inferior” races. But the *UB* authors see a eugenic “obstacle” to this “solution”:

“If the present-day races of Urantia could be freed from the curse of their lowest strata of deteriorated, antisocial, feeble-minded, and outcast specimens, there would be little objection to a limited race amalgamation. And if such racial mixtures could take place between the highest types of the several races, still less objection could be offered.” (82:6.4)

“As long as present-day races are so overloaded with inferior and degenerate strains, race intermingling on a large scale would be most detrimental, but most of the objections to such experiments rest on social and cultural prejudices rather than on biological considerations.” (82:6.7)

The pseudoscientific concept of eugenics is rooted in the theory of biologic evolution and is the stepchild of racial-ethnic superiority, intended to be carried out on a universal scale. In contrast, the Bible declares that man is created by God in God’s image and likeness (Genesis 1:27; James 3:9), and makes no distinction in this regard on the basis of intellectual capacity. It is only sin which makes mankind “defective,” and there are no racial or social classes that are genetically more predisposed to degeneracy or antisocial behavior over another. The concept of eugenics was popular in Hitler’s Germany in the 1930s and was practiced even among some American scientists during the early decades of the twentieth century. But just as is the case for racism, this archaic pseudo-scientific hypothesis lacks either biblical or scientific support.

It is interesting to note that one of the American scientists who was an ardent supporter of eugenics during its heyday was none other than Dr. Lena Sadler, the wife of Dr. William Sadler and a co-member of the Contact Commission, the small group of individuals who were in charge of “receiving” the Urantia Papers from the alleged “celestial” authors. The Third International Congress of Eugenics

A BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF *THE UB*

(TICE) was held in New York in 1932 (as was the Second, in 1921), in which the call for forced sterilization of the poor and the growing populace of the unemployed was taken up. The predominant theme of the papers collected for the TICE was the prevention of the “inferior” population from reproducing. The suggested means by which to carry out this form of “humanitarianism” included segregation, sterilization, compulsory abortion, and infanticide. This theme is reflected in the opening paragraph of Paper No. 27, entitled “Is the Abnormal to Become Normal?”, presented by Lena K. Sadler, M.D., F.A.C.S. To quote the wife of William S. Sadler:

“The various dysgenic classes which are so rapidly increasing in the United States constitute our vast ‘aristocracy of the unfit.’ They are an undesirable group of citizens which the more thrifty, intelligent, and superior stocks willingly tax themselves to support and perpetuate. This increasing horde will ultimately overrun and destroy the diminishing prosperity of the better classes unless a practical program of restrictive eugenics is adopted and effectively executed.”³

As Allan Chase explains in his 1977 biopic entitled *The Legacy of Malthus*⁴, Dr. Sadler’s suggested means of implementing eugenics was based on infanticide. The problem with the national welfare programs was that too many of those babies that would be deemed unfit for procreation by her and other eugenicists were surviving and going on to drain the resources of America’s school system. Of those that grew into adulthood, Dr. Sadler expected no less than compulsory sterilization:

“There is no question that a sterilization law, enforced throughout the United States, would result, in less than 100 years, in eliminating at least 90% of crime, insanity feeblemindedness, moronism, and abnormal sexuality, not to mention many other forms of defectiveness and degeneracy. Thus, within a century, our asylums, prisons, and state hospitals would be largely emptied of their present victims of human woe and misery. The indigent and aged paupers, and the unfortunate degenerates of various types would disappear as a troublesome factor in civilized society.”⁵

It surely must have been quite reassuring to Drs. Lena and William Sadler, being graced with an empathetic audience from the celestial realm!

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Let’s Be Honest

“Only a brave person is willing honestly to admit, and fearlessly to face, what a sincere and logical mind discovers.” (160:1.7)

It is hoped that this series of articles has made it abundantly clear that the teachings of *The UB* are completely incompatible with those of the Bible. Ironic though it may seem, the one literary source that *The UB* so heavily relies on for its theological constructs is the one source with which it so resolutely disagrees. *The UB* denies all major historical Christian doctrines, including: the triune oneness of God by virtue of the Trinity (three Persons, one God); the absolute deity of Christ as the second Person of the Trinity; the virgin birth, atoning death, and bodily resurrection of Christ; Jesus’ fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies; the existence of Hell as a place of eternal punishment for the unrepentant sinners

PART X

and the fallen angels, including Satan (a.k.a., Lucifer, a.k.a., the Devil); God's special creation of the first humans, Adam and Eve, and the perpetuation of the human race via their progeny; and the fallen nature of Man by virtue of original sin committed by Adam and Eve. *The UB* claims to "correct" or "enhance" the Bible, yet in reality it merely serves to diminish and deny.

I personally believe that a significant moral reason lies behind the abject denial of these crucial tenets of the Christian faith. A reading of Scripture and reflection on the history of human thought suggests that from the beginning of time men and women have striven to assert their own autonomy and to live their lives free from God's sovereign claim upon them. The inveterate tendency of human beings is to exercise their God-given religious proclivity while minimizing God's superior claim as Lord and Judge of their lives. *The UB*, I submit, is an exercise in this type of futility. It offers a way of engaging in religious discussion, while limiting God's lordship and sovereignty over persons who prize their autonomy.

It is also hoped that this introduction provides sufficient evidence that *The UB* is an utterly unreliable document by virtue of its own merit. *The UB* claims to be a "divine revelation," yet hesitates when it comes to proclaiming inerrancy. Without a declaration of inerrancy, we must accept that the authors of *The UB* are admitting to the possibility of error therein. With the possibility of error comes the necessity to consider that *The UB* is not a revelation from God at all, or at least not from an all-powerful, all-knowing God. *The UB* is careful to distinguish scientific error (for which *The UB* admits) from historic errors and/or errors pertaining to spiritual matters (for which *The UB* denies). However, to admit scientific error does not explain why the errors were allowed into *The UB* in the first place. Historic errors are without excuse, as *The UB* authors proclaim that their historic recollections are accurate (e.g., the Day of Pentecost—see Part VI of this series). And the spiritual information provided in *The UB* is not falsifiable in the sense that scientific or historical information can be confirmed or denied. We therefore cannot rely on the spiritual claims in and of themselves, regardless of how we may feel about them. Only through objective examination of that which is verifiable can we assess the authenticity of a self-proclaimed revelation. And it is by an abject lack of such merits that *The UB* fails miserably.

Why, then, does *The UB* attract so many faithful adherents, despite its questionable trustworthiness? The answer is simple: because *The UB* makes elegant use of (quite literally) the oldest trick in the book. It strokes the reader's ego by telling the would-be believer what he or she wants to hear (2Timothy 4:2,3); that despite their occasional tendency to "err," they have within them a divine agent that renders them Godlike. This same pretty package has been rewrapped countless times and continues to be offered today in the guise of the New Age movement. You can read about the first time this ploy was used (and its rather successful results) in the Bible (Genesis 3:5 et seq.).

Sincerity, Sincerity, Sincerity

"The keys of the kingdom of heaven are: sincerity, more sincerity, and more sincerity." (39:4.14)

One might be inclined to accept the notion that a loving and gracious God would overlook the mistakes of those who are sincerely seeking Him, but in their sincere efforts to find and place their faith in the truth, have unintentionally fumbled their way into egregious doctrinal errors. But do those who have devoted themselves to a cultic document such as *The UB* remain lost, despite their sincere intentions to do the will of God? This question ultimately is what this series has attempted to answer. Many

A BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF *THE UB*

Christians have little problem in accepting the fact that anyone rejecting Christ outright is lost. But what about the cultists who appear to be sincerely seeking after Christ—are they lost too?

When dealing with sincere cultists, we must realize that we are dealing with people who presumably give more than lip service to what they believe. As the Apostle Paul reasoned (2Corinthians 11), such men and women are either deceived or are themselves deceivers. Whatever the case, God still holds them accountable for their actions as He did Eve when she fell prey to the wiles of the serpent in the Garden (Genesis 2:13-16).

Paul pointed out in Romans 10 that the Jews who rejected Jesus, although sincere, were sincerely wrong because they tried to get a right standing with God by their works rather than by Christ's atoning sacrifice. Sincerely believing in someone or something does not automatically guarantee its truth or its power to save. You can be sincere, and still be sincerely wrong. For you see, faith is only as good as the object in which it is placed.

Let us also remember that it is God who first draws us to Himself (John 6:44) and not the other way around (Romans 3:11). So when we encounter people who appear to be earnestly seeking after God and yet continue to worship another god (or gods), we can only conclude that they were not really seeking after God in the first place at all. It might be that they were looking for a sense of spiritual security, gratification, knowledge, friendship, or anything other than God. In the case of *The UB*, many devotees no doubt have willingly accepted the seductive yet empty promise offered, which is a forged celestial endorsement of what the reader has innately wanted to believe all along—that the kingdom of Heaven is at hand without the need for acknowledging one's insufficiency.

Jesus promised that He would not cast out anyone who honestly comes to Him (John 6:37). In fact, if you're searching for light, God is inevitably going to give you more light. If a cultist is truly sincere, he or she can be saved; but this can only happen when they forego their false view of God and accept Jesus Christ for Who He truly is (John 8:24, 31-32).

For some, the human capacity for the willful suspension of disbelief will impair their ability to examine the evidence objectively. Those who have already committed their hearts and minds to a particular conclusion will tend to stay there, in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary. It is for those whose hearts and minds are open to a critical examination of the evidence that this effort has been undertaken.

Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Savior, the second Person of the blessed Trinity, offers people life. However, the life that He extends can be attained only through the experience of death—the death that comes by kneeling at the foot of the Cross, acknowledging one's sinful condition, and renouncing every element of self-sufficiency and autonomy. Today as yesterday, Jesus Christ represents the great Divider of persons (Matthew 7:21-23; 10:34-39; 25:31-46).

It was the apostle Paul who, under inspiration of God's Holy Spirit, predicted twenty centuries ago that false gospels such as *The UB* would come along claiming to derive "from on high," and provided us with an uncannily pertinent warning:

PART X

“But even if we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than what we have preached to you, let him be accursed.” (Galatians 1:8)

The UB will go down in history as yet another one of those cleverly derived “strange new gospels” of the early 20th century worthy of being discarded into the trash heap of irrelevance. It is my fervent prayer that you, the reader, will not get caught up into its web of spiritual deception.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

Biblical Authority

Archer, Gleason, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*; Chicago: Moody Press, 1994 (3rd ed.).

Bruce, F. F., *The New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable?* Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1964.

Geisler, Norman L., and Nix, William E., *A General Introduction to the Bible, Revised and Expanded*; Chicago: Moody Press, 1986 (2nd ed.).

Guthrie, Donald, *New Testament Introduction*; Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1990.

Little, Paul, *Know Why You Believe*; Wheaton: Scripture Press Publications, 1967.

McDowell, Josh, *Evidence That Demands a Verdict: Historical Evidences for the Christian Faith*; Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1979 (2nd ed.).

McDowell, Josh, *Evidence That Demands a Verdict: Historical Evidences for the Christian Faith, Vol. II*; Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1993.

Biblical Inerrancy

Archer, Gleason L., *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982.

Geisler, Norman L., and Howe, Thomas, *When Critics Ask: A Popular Handbook on Bible Difficulties*; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1992.

Holding, James Patrick, “Selling Snake Oil: A Select Review of C. Dennis McKinsey’s ‘Encyclopedia of Biblical Errancy’” [<http://www.tektonics.org/af/ebestart.html>]

Kaiser, Walter C., Jr., et al., *Hard Sayings of the Bible*; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996.

A BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF *THE UB*

Process Theology

Nash, Ronald (ed.), *Process Theology*; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987.

Gruenler, R. G., *The Inexhaustible God: Biblical Faith and the Challenge of Process Theism*; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983.

Urantia Movement

Gardner, Martin, *Urantia: The Great Cult Mystery*; Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1995.

House, H. Wayne, *Charts of Cults, Sects, and Religious Movements* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), chapter 18.

ENDNOTES

1. *The Urantia Book Concordance*; Chicago: Urantia Foundation, 1993.
2. "DNA Says We Are All Kin," *Oregon Scientist*, Fall 2000; *San Jose Mercury News*, 21 February 2001.
3. Sadler, Lena K., "Is the Abnormal to Become Normal?", in *A Decade of Progress in Eugenics; Scientific Papers of the Third International Congress of Eugenics, Held at American Museum of Natural History, New York, August 21-23, 1932* (Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins company, 1934), pp. 193-200.
4. Chase, Allan, *The Legacy of Malthus: The Social Costs of the New Scientific Racism*; NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.
5. *Third International Congress of Eugenics*, 1934, Sadler: pp. 193-200.