

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

PART VI: What Does *The UB* Say about Man and Salvation?

“Ancient man only attained consciousness of favor with God through sacrifice. Modern man must develop new techniques of achieving the self-consciousness of salvation.”
(89:10.1)

“For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.”
(Matthew 26:28)

Introduction

According to *The UB*, the “true” gospel of Jesus is the “brotherhood of man” and the “fatherhood of God.” Put in more succinct terms, “salvation” means becoming aware that we are already children of God, without the need for placing our faith in the atoning death of Jesus Christ for the remission of our sins:

“A Creator Son did not incarnate in the likeness of mortal flesh and bestow himself upon the humanity of Urantia to reconcile an angry God but rather to win all mankind to the recognition of the Father’s love and to the realization of their sonship with God.” (98:7.1)

“Simon Zelotes asked, ‘But, Master, are *all* men the sons of God?’ And Jesus answered: ‘Yes, Simon, all men are the sons of God, and that is the good news you are going to proclaim.’”
(140:10.7; emphasis original)

“This entire idea of the ransom of the atonement places salvation upon a plane of unreality; such a concept is purely philosophic. Human salvation is *real*; it is based on two realities which may be grasped by the creature’s faith and thereby become incorporated into individual human experience; the fact of the fatherhood of God and its correlated truth, the brotherhood of man.”
(188:4.13; emphasis original)

“Your mission to the world is founded on . . . the truth that you and all other men are the sons of God” (191:5.3)

Such quasi-universal supplications, while providing an appealing inclusiveness, are in fact deceptive in that they lend a false sense of security by relying on a person’s own self-worth as a means of salvation. *The UB* teaches us that our salvation should be taken for granted, and it is this cavalier attitude that ironically deems the concept of sacrificial atonement to be self-centered:

PART VI

“The ideal of religious philosophy is such a faith-trust as would lead man unqualifiedly to depend upon the absolute love of the infinite Father of the universe of universes. Such a genuine religious experience far transcends the philosophic objectification of idealistic desire; it actually takes salvation for granted and concerns itself only with learning and doing the will of the Father in Paradise.” (103:9.5)

“The gospel of the good news that mortal man may, by faith, become spirit-conscious that he is a son of God, is not dependent on the death of Jesus.” (186:5.4)

“All this concept of atonement and sacrificial salvation is rooted and grounded in selfishness. Jesus taught that *service* to one’s fellows is the highest concept of the brotherhood of spirit believers. Salvation should be taken for granted by those who believe in the fatherhood of God. The believer’s chief concern should not be the selfish desire for personal salvation but rather the unselfish urge to love and, therefore, serve one’s fellows even as Jesus loved and served mortal men.” (188:4.9; emphasis original)

But an implicit distinction is made in the New Testament between recognizing God as our Father (i.e., the Creator of all humankind; cf. Acts 17:28-29) and the point when we become adopted children through faith in Christ (Romans 8:14; Galatians 4:5; Ephesians 1:5). While the former is general and extends to all, the latter is particular and includes only some. The Bible never says *all* men are sons of God, but that we achieve the status of son or daughter of God only through faith in Jesus Christ (John 1:12; Galatians 3:26). Though the relationship whereby God adopts us as His children is conditional, it is nevertheless open to any and all who will turn to Jesus (1John 5:1).

The Atonement

Christian scholars have held throughout the centuries that the death of Jesus Christ is the very heart of Christianity. A reading of the New Testament certainly confirms this claim. The death and resurrection of Christ are absolutely crucial to the truth of historic Christianity (1Corinthians 15:1-4). In fact, Christ’s death, known in theological terms as the atonement, was necessary because of the universal sinfulness of all mankind. Genesis chapter three reveals how the first man used his free will to rebel against his Creator. This act of rebellion had far-reaching consequences. In fact, Adam’s disobedience caused enmity to exist between the Creator and himself. This hostility resulted in a permanent separation between God and man. And, as a result, mankind was forever excluded from the blessings of an intimate personal relationship with God. Not only this, but because of our unique association with Adam, and because of our own sin, we are all left in the desperate situation of being under the judgment of a righteous God.

According to the New Testament, the death of Christ is how God restored that broken relationship. Second Corinthians 5:19 states that “God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself.” In His death, Jesus is said to have suffered the penalty for our transgressions (2Corinthians 5:21). In fact, the separation between God and man has now been bridged by Christ. Christ’s sacrificial death enables man to approach God and establish a relationship with Him not only for time, but also for eternity. The heart of the Christian message is that Christ has accomplished what we were incapable of doing for ourselves; Christ has reconciled us to God. Through Christ’s death, God demonstrates both His perfect justice and His infinite love. As Peter writes: “For Christ died for sins once and for all, the righteous for

A BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF *THE UB*

the unrighteous, to bring you to God” (1Peter 3:18, NIV). God made Him who had no sin to become the sin offering for you so that in Him, you might have the righteousness of God.

But if there is one message that *The UB* wishes to emblazon on the minds of its readers, it is its absolute disdain for and rejection of the atonement doctrine. Indeed, one can find statements to this effect throughout *The UB* in all four parts. Devotees of *The UB* will claim to reject the doctrine of salvation through Jesus’ sacrificial death on moral and philosophical grounds. *The UB* itself does not reject the historicity of the cross (see Paper 187), but rather regards the alignment of Jesus’ death on the cross with the atonement doctrine as unjust, insisting that it is essentially irrational and immoral to punish an innocent person in the place of the guilty. This very sentiment is reflected almost verbatim in *The UB*’s pages when it states that God “would not be satisfied with the childish scheme of substituting an innocent sufferer for a guilty offender” (188:4.11). Below are but a few of the myriad choice words found in *The UB* stating that the atonement doctrine . . .

is a philosophic assault upon God:

“The erroneous supposition that the righteousness of God was irreconcilable with the selfless love of the heavenly Father, presupposed absence of unity in the nature of Deity and led directly to the elaboration of the atonement doctrine, which is a philosophic assault upon both the unity and the free-willness of God.” (2:6.5)

is an affront to God:

“The barbarous idea of appeasing an angry God, of propitiating an offended Lord, of winning the favor of Deity through sacrifices and penance and even by the shedding of blood, represents a religion wholly puerile and primitive, a philosophy unworthy of an enlightened age of science and truth. Such beliefs are utterly repulsive to the celestial beings and the divine rulers who serve and reign in the universes. It is an affront to God to believe, hold, or teach that innocent blood must be shed in order to win his favor or to divert the fictitious divine wrath.” (4:5.4)

is a travesty upon God:

“What a travesty upon the infinite character of God! this teaching that his fatherly heart in all its austere coldness and hardness was so untouched by the misfortunes and sorrows of his creatures that his tender mercies were not forthcoming until he saw his blameless Son bleeding and dying upon the cross of Calvary!” (4:5.6)

was not in God’s plan:

“It was man and not God who planned and executed the death of Jesus on the cross. . . . [T]he Father in Paradise did not decree, demand, or require the death of his Son as it was carried out on earth.” (186:5.2)

was not Jesus’ purpose:

PART VI

“Jesus did not die this death on the cross to atone for the racial guilt of mortal man nor to provide some sort of effective approach to an otherwise offended and unforgiving God; . . . the Son of Man did not offer himself as a sacrifice to appease the wrath of God and to open the way for sinful man to obtain salvation; . . . these ideas of atonement and propitiation are erroneous” (188:4.1)

is incompatible with what Jesus supposedly taught:

“The whole idea of ransom and atonement is incompatible with the concept of God as it was taught and exemplified by Jesus of Nazareth.” (188:4.8)

The UB, then, makes much ado about the wrath of God, to the point of suspicion. However, the God of the Bible is not “angry” with mankind for being human; rather, He is angry for their sin: “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all the ungodliness and unrighteousness of men” (Romans 1:18). It is a foregone conclusion for God to be angry toward unrepentant evil-doers, if His ultimate purpose is to rid the world of evil once and for all. On the other hand, God’s just anger is tempered with His deep mercy, so that “he loved us and sent his Son as an atoning sacrifice for our sins” (1John 4:10, NIV; cf. Hebrews 2:17; 9:26).

Nothing is more offensive to the human ego than the idea that salvation is unattainable by one’s own capabilities or self-worth. The notion that one’s needs are well beyond the reach of one’s abilities to achieve poses a threat to one’s pride. Even the apostle Paul hinted at this when he said “For the message of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing” (1Corinthians 1:18). But neither Paul nor any past orthodox Christian scholar have claimed that the cross was irrational. Conservative Christians have insisted all along that this historic Christian teaching is both logically consistent and self-evident. It is the unwillingness to swallow one’s pride, and not some alleged moral or logical inconsistency, that holds some back from accepting the gift of salvation that is made available to all.

The Blame Game

It should be abundantly clear by now that *The UB* teaches Jesus was not crucified on the cross as a propitiation for our sins. So if it truly was not Jesus’ mission on Earth to serve as an atoning sacrifice for all mankind, who does *The UB* blame for spreading the “false” gospel that Jesus died on the cross to save us from our sins? It is the apostle Paul, the writer of nearly two-thirds of the New Testament, who is made out to be the major culprit of this tragic interpretation (see “The Problem with Paul [Part I]” in previous article).

However, the doctrine of blood atonement was not an invention of Paul, but is rooted in the very words of Jesus Himself:

“ . . . the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many.” (Matthew 20:28; cf. Mark 10:45)

“This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins.” (Matthew 26:28; NIV)

A BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF *THE UB*

“He went a little farther and fell with his face, and prayed, saying, **‘O My Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from Me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as You will.’**” (Matthew 26:39)

“**I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd gives His life for the sheep. . . . No one takes it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This command I have received from My Father.**” (John 10:11,18)

“**The hour has come that the Son of Man should be glorified. Most assuredly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the ground and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it produces much grain. . . . Now My soul is troubled, and what shall I say? “Father, save Me from this hour”? But for this purpose I came to this hour. Father, glorify your name.**” (John 12:23,24,27,28)

But even the words of Jesus are not without precedent, for Jesus was and proclaimed to be fulfillment of the Old Testament messianic prophecies. The prophet Isaiah instructs us that it was the intentional plan and good will of God for Jesus to atone for our sins, and that He did indeed approve of the inglorious death of His Servant (Isaiah 53). Not only was Jesus’ sacrificial death by crucifixion approved by God, it was predicted (e.g., Psalm 22:16; Zechariah 12:10). The New Testament affirms that Jesus took our place by paying the penalty of death for us (cf. Mark 10:45; Romans 4:25; 1Peter 2:22; 3:18). Jesus rebuked the apostle Peter for suggesting that He did not have to die (Matthew 16:23). After His resurrection, Jesus reminded the disciples that His death was ordained in the Scriptures (Luke 24:25-26). Peter’s perspective had been changed by the time he proclaimed on the Day of Pentecost that Jesus was crucified “by the determined purpose and foreknowledge of God” (Acts 2:23).

Of course, as we have already seen, *The UB* finds the notion of Jesus being an atoning sacrifice “puerile doctrine.” But it should come as no surprise to a reader of the New Testament that the message of the crucifixion is offensive to unbelievers. Paul even referred to the “foolishness of the cross” (1Corinthians 1:18), and added that “it pleased God through the foolishness of the message preached to save those who believe” (1Corinthians 1:21). For “the foolishness of God is wiser than men” (vs. 25).

But Paul is not the only apostle to have preached the gospel of atonement. Upon addressing his first epistle to Christians scattered throughout Asia Minor, Peter proclaims that believers are not redeemed by material wealth or through their own merit, but “with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” (1Peter 1:19; cf. 1:2). And again, Peter is reminding his readers of Jesus’ fulfillment of Isaiah 53: “who Himself bore our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, having died to sins, might live for righteousness—by whose stripes you were healed” (1Peter 2:24). Likewise, John’s first epistle also refers to Jesus’ atoning blood sacrifice: “The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanses us from all sin” (1John 1:7; cf. 2:2; 4:10). We also have John, the author of the last book of the Bible, proclaiming that Jesus is “Him who loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood” (Revelation 1:5; cf. 5:6, 9-10).

Try as it might, *The UB* cannot fully explain how the apostles must have gotten it all “wrong” from the beginning. The “excuse” given by *The UB* for Peter and John’s “misgivings” goes all the way back to the Day of Pentecost. From the first two chapters of the Book of Acts, we learn that Peter had called a disciples’ meeting in Jerusalem shortly after Jesus’ ascension on the Mount of Olives. The account in

PART VI

Acts tells of the coming of the Holy Spirit, and of Peter's and the other apostles' miraculous transformation upon having been filled with the Spirit. And Paper 194 of *The UB*, aptly entitled "Bestowal of the Spirit of Truth," appears at first glance to follow suit. But *The UB*'s account transforms what was the turning point that led to the launching of Jesus' church on Earth as He Himself proclaimed (see Matthew 16:18) into a confused rabble of deranged fanatics:

"These men had been trained and instructed that the gospel which they should preach was the fatherhood of God and the sonship of man, but at just this moment of spiritual ecstasy and personal triumph, the best tidings, the greatest news, [all] these men could think of was the *fact* of the risen Master. And so they went forth, endowed with power from on high, preaching glad tidings to the people—even salvation through Jesus—but they unintentionally stumbled into the error of substituting some of the facts associated with the gospel for the gospel message itself. Peter unwittingly led off in this mistake, and others followed after him on down to Paul, who created a new religion out of the new version of the good news." (194:0.3; emphasis original)

The ramifications of this Spirit-empowered "error" were far-reaching, according to *The UB*. Section 3 of Paper 194 tells us "What Happened at Pentecost":

"Many queer and strange teachings became associated with the early narratives of the day of Pentecost. In subsequent times the events of this day, on which the Spirit of Truth, the new teacher, came to dwell with mankind, have become confused with the foolish outbreaks of rampant emotionalism." (194:3.1)

"This spirit was bestowed for the purpose of qualifying believers more effectively to preach the gospel of the kingdom, but they mistook the experience of receiving the outpoured spirit for a part of the new gospel which they were unconsciously formulating." (194:3.5)

Oddly enough, *The UB* sings the praises of the "Spirit of Truth" as that which was "bestowed upon all sincere believers" and that "every soul received him in accordance with the love for truth and the capacity to grasp and comprehend spiritual realities" (194:3.6). Why, *The UB* goes so far as to agree with the account in Acts, regarding the believers' spiritual unity: "It was literally true that 'there was but one heart and soul among the multitude of the believers'" (194:3.17; citing Acts 4:32). And yet, it was the apostles' "misguided" response to this "Spirit of Truth" that persuaded all other believers into going along with the launching of the "error-ridden" Christian church! Under the section entitled "Beginnings of the Christian Church," we read these words of "historical" note:

"What has happened to these men whom Jesus had ordained to go forth preaching the gospel of the kingdom, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man? They have a new gospel; they are on fire with a new experience; they are filled with a new spiritual energy. Their message has suddenly shifted to the proclamation of the risen Christ . . . The gospel of the kingdom, the message of Jesus, had been suddenly changed into the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ." (194:4.4,5)

"In the enthusiasm of Pentecost, Peter unintentionally inaugurated a new religion, the religion of the risen and glorified Christ." (196:2.1)

A BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF *THE UB*

And the rest, so they say, is history. Preaching Christ crucified — could the apostles have been more off-key?! However “sad” this state of affairs is portrayed in *The UB*, what the “celestial” authors do not seem to realize is how poorly this “outcome” reflects on their apparently misguided theological construct. Here we have their “Spirit of Truth,” supposedly a supernatural bestowal of deity, who enables true believers to “love the truth” and “comprehend spiritual realities.” And prior to this bestowal, the “Jesus” of *The UB* is instructing his hand-picked apostles to preach this “gospel of the kingdom” throughout the duration of his ministry on Earth. But in spite of all efforts made by the Master to prepare them and the divine assistance provided by the spiritual Helper, they still got it wrong when it came time to take matters into their own hands! This lack of foresight on the part of “Jesus” and the ineptitude of the “Spirit of Truth” leaves one wondering why anybody would swallow this tripe.

And as if this little theological fiasco weren’t bad enough, we have a dilemma of historical note to consider as well. Paper 194, entitled “Bestowal of the Spirit of Truth,” provides a grossly revised version of the Book of Acts, Chapter 2, which portrays the coming of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. *The UB* places this day forty days after the Crucifixion (193:5.1,3,5; 193:6.1,6; 194:0.1). But as anybody familiar with the Hebrew calendar will tell you, the Day of Pentecost, or the Feast of Firstfruits, is always observed fifty days, or seven weeks, after the observation of Passover. Because Jesus was crucified on Passover Day (which *The UB* gets right¹), the Day of Pentecost would have landed fifty days later, not forty as *The UB* wrongly asserts. Part IV of *The UB* even contradicts itself on the dating of this pivotal event by stating earlier that the feast of Pentecost is “seven weeks after Passover” (125:1.5)! Seeing as how the chief narrator of Part IV of *The UB* proclaims to have been an eyewitness to the events recorded therein (121:0.1), it strains credulity to understand how the narrator could have been so confused as to the dating of such a momentous occasion!

A Question of Reason

So why did Jesus go to the cross, if not to atone for the sins of mankind? It certainly was not the will of the Father, according to several *UB* passages that are to be found in and around the account of the crucifixion. We are told repeatedly that “the Father in heaven had nothing whatever to do with instigating” Jesus’ death on the cross (183:1.1), that the passion of Christ was “not in any sense a part of the divine will of the Father” (*ibid.*), and that “God in heaven did not will it” (183:1.2). Though the *UB* readily admits that Jesus did voluntarily submit himself to the cruelty of the cross, this decision should not be “confused” with his acquiescing to God’s will.

In light of this “clarification,” we are now able to “clarify” the original question: Why did Jesus go to the cross if it was not God’s will to do so? Again, the answer is provided in similar redundant fashion. It seems that, as a result of Jesus fervently praying to God in the Garden of Gethsemane (cf. Matthew 26:36-46; Mark 14:32-42; Luke 22:39-46), the answer to his prayer was something slightly less than it being his Father’s will to die on the cross. Though it was God’s will that Jesus experience mortal death prior to the cessation of his seventh bestowal mission, death by way of the cross was in no way condoned by the Universal Father. The message came through loud and clear from the angel who had come to comfort Jesus (cf. Luke 22:43). Among other things supposedly spoken to Jesus by the angel, he was informed that God desired him “to finish his earth bestowal by passing through the creature experience of death just as all mortal creatures must experience material dissolution . . .” (182:3.6). Subsequent to getting the low-down straight from the attending angel, Jesus was “at last convinced that the Father intended to allow natural events to take their course” and “was fully determined to employ

PART VI

none of his sovereign power as the supreme head of a universe to save himself” (182:3.7). And for good measure, we are given the “natural course of events” angle one more time: “Jesus was convinced that it was the will of the Father that he submit himself to the natural and ordinary course of human events just as every other mortal creature must, and therefore he refused to employ even his purely human powers of persuasive eloquence to influence the outcome of the machinations of his socially nearsighted and spiritually blinded fellow mortals” (186:2.3).

It seems, then, from the perspective of modern hindsight, that it was “Jesus” who was “confused” and not the authors of the Bible. Having taken the word of an underling angel, he convinced himself that it was alright to commit himself to the tortures of crucifixion, even though it was never the will of the Father! He could have chosen any number of paths subsequent to his baptism, when it is said he had fused with his “Thought Adjuster” (see Part VII) and his mission had been accomplished:

“At the time of the Master’s baptism he had already completed the technique of the required experience on earth and in the flesh which was necessary for the completion of his seventh and last universe bestowal. At this very time Jesus’ duty on earth was done. All the life he lived thereafter, and even the manner of his death, was a purely personal ministry on his part for the welfare and uplifting of his mortal creatures on this world and on other worlds.” (186:5.3)

This passage apparently brings closure to one of the directives given to Christ Michael (a.k.a. Jesus of Nebadon) just prior to his incarnation on earth: “It will ever be within your power-of-will to terminate the incarnation at any moment subsequent to the arrival of your Thought Adjuster” (120:2.9). But not until he found himself in this very hour in which a life-or-death choice presented itself by virtue of choices made of his free will did he ultimately choose death by crucifixion. It is disingenuous to suggest that he could not have thought about this years before the crucial moment had arrived, when all of a sudden he chooses to let things “take their course” when he could have just as easily led a quiet life and died of natural causes, or perhaps even staged an accidental death.

And this is where the “celestial” authors paint themselves into yet another theological corner, for it was Jesus’ actions that put him in this unenviable position of facing crucifixion in the first place. Jesus could have easily avoided the cross by any of several means that would have remained well within the bounds of being construed as “the natural and ordinary course of human events.” He could have decided not to enter Jerusalem on a donkey in a public display of his intentions to draw attention to his self-ascribed Messiahship (in fulfillment of Zechariah 9:9), which the crowd, by-and-large, recognized and voluntarily aided in its fulfillment by the waving of the palm branches. Jesus could have resisted the urge to overturn the sellers’ tables in the temple court, which incensed the people and drew the attention of both the Romans and the Sanhedrin. He could have announced to the other apostles of Judas’ intentions to betray him when Judas had left them, which would have set off a campaign to intercept Judas before he had reached the High Priests. The Master could also have avoided going to the Garden of Gethsemane altogether, knowing full well that this is where Judas would be leading the guards for his arrest. Instead of hanging out at Gethsemane all night waiting for the guards to arrive, Jesus could have left Jerusalem under cover of night. Any and all of these events would have been perfectly understandable as a natural reaction to he who did not wish to face the possibility of crucifixion, in deference to the “Father’s will.”

A BIBLICAL EVALUATION OF *THE UB*

And what do the *UB* authors say was the outcome of Jesus' death on the cross, if not to pay the debt for man's sin? Read on:

“. . . his bestowal on this world greatly illuminated the way of salvation; his death did much to make forever plain the certainty of mortal survival after death in the flesh.” (188:4.6)

“Though it is hardly proper to speak of Jesus as a sacrificer, a ransomer, or a redeemer, it is wholly correct to refer to him as a *savior*. He forever made the way of salvation (survival) more clear and certain; he did better and more surely show the way of salvation for all the mortals of all the worlds of the universe of Nebadon.” (188:4.7)

But contrary to this empty attempt at whitewashing Jesus of Nebadon as a cosmic “savior,” other authors of *The UB* would beg to differ. For not only is violent death not necessary for a bestowal Son to complete his bestowal, but it is not even the norm:

“When the bestowal Sons, Creator or Magisterial, enter the portals of death, they reappear on the third day. But you should not entertain the idea that they always meet with the tragic end encountered by the Creator Son who sojourned on your world nineteen hundred years ago. The extraordinary and unusually cruel experience through which Jesus of Nazareth passed has caused Urantia to become locally known as “the world of the cross.” It is not necessary that such inhuman treatment be accorded a Son of God, and the vast majority of planets have afforded them a more considerate reception, allowing them to finish their mortal careers, terminate the age, adjudicate the sleeping survivors, and inaugurate a new dispensation, without imposing a violent death. A bestowal Son must encounter death, must pass through the whole of the actual experience of mortals of the realms, *but it is not a requirement of the divine plan that this death be either violent or unusual.*” (20:6.6; emphasis added)

“When bestowal Sons are not put to death by violence, they voluntarily relinquish their lives and pass through the portals of death, not to satisfy the demands of “stern justice” or “divine wrath,” but rather to complete the bestowal, “to drink the cup” of the career of incarnation and personal experience in all that constitutes a creature's life as it is lived on the planets of mortal existence.” (20:6.7)

We therefore see that when it comes to providing an alternative explanation for the reason as to why Jesus voluntarily went to the cross, our celestial witnesses cannot even corroborate one another's story!

The other problem with this “cosmic savior” theme is the cosmological backdrop through which Jesus of *The UB* is presented. As we have learned, Jesus of Nebadon is but one of about 700,000 such “cosmic saviors” whose realm of influence only covers a fragment of the inhabited universe. This means that Jesus of Nebadon's role as “savior” only “showed the way” for a fraction of the universe's inhabitants, and that other sectors of the inhabited galaxies are not “saved” by this particular Creator Son's bestowal on Urantia. In contrast, the Bible states that Jesus' sacrificial death is offered for the sins of everybody in the universe, for “there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved” (Acts 4:12). Luke's passage in Acts emulates the prophet Isaiah, who quotes God saying “besides Me there is no savior” (Isaiah 43:11). Because *The UB* does not recognize any of the Creator Sons (such as Jesus of Nebadon) to be God, they all miss the mark under biblical standards.

PART VI

ENDNOTES

1. See 184:3.14; 185:0.1,3; 185:2.7; 185:3.8; 185:5.2,3,11; 185:8.2; 186:3.1,3,5; 186:4.4; 186:5; 187:0.2; 187:1.10; 187:5.7; 188:1.5; 188:2.2; 188:3.1.