APPENDIX E — PART IV
The Matthew Block Discoveries — Part IV

Limitations on Sources

As we progress down through some supposed parallels we see them deteriorating into doubtful comparisons. The *Growth of the Trinity Concept* from *The Urantia Papers* and Hopkins's presentations on *The Triad* and *The Hindu Trinity* illustrated this lack of direct parallel.

This lack of direct parallel is found in other "sources." Consider, for example, Auguste Sabatier and his *Religions of Authority*. This is what Martin Gardner had to say:

Two discourses by Jesus, outlining "true religion," are in the UB on pages 1728-1733. As Block was the first to discover, it seems as if Jesus had somehow peered into the future to read a 1904 book by Auguste Sabatier, a Protestant theologian at the University of Paris. The heart of what Jesus taught, says the UB, is that true religion is of the Spirit, based on human experience, not on the authority of past dogmas such as the religion of the Pharisees. The phrase "religion(s) of authority" is used by Jesus more than ten times in his two brief talks. From religions of authority, he said, one must progress to the freedoms of a "religion of the Spirit . . . wholly based on human experience. "

Now this is precisely the central theme, including the same phrases, of Sabatier's work. Indeed, the title of his book is *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit.* His book attacks both Roman Catholic and Protestant religions of authority. Jesus could not, of course, have lambasted those faiths, but his attack on the authoritarianism of the scribes is essentially the same.

"Two systems of theology still confront one another" Sabatier writes in his preface, "the theology of authority and the theology of experience." He calls the latter "the religion of the Spirit." The gospel taught by Jesus, he writes (283), "implied the abrogation of religions of authority, and inaugurated as a fact the religion of the Spirit." The authority of the letter gave way to "holiness and love."

Sabatier (369ff.) distinguishes three stages of religious evolution. As Block recognized, they correspond to the "three manifestations of the religious urge" taught by Jesus on page 1728 of the *UB.* Sabatier's first stage is the uncivilized worship of nature in which persons fear mysterious powers." The *UB* calls it a "fear" of "mysterious energies." The second stage is a civilized one governed by mind. Superstitions give way to moral laws and religious dogmas--the age of rational theology and church authority. The third stage, initiated by Jesus, is uncompelled faith in God the Father, coupled with the love of others. Sabatier calls this religion's "beautiful mission." Jesus in the *UB* calls it a "glimpse of the beauty of the infinite character of the Father in heaven--the religion of the spirit as demonstrated in human experience."

Need I point out that this debt to Sabatier's book casts grave doubts on the accuracy of the *UB's* life of Jesus? This is not just copying by *UB* authors of prose material, but copying put into the mouth of Jesus!

Well, first of all, Gardner could not read! The first sentence of 155:5 says:

This memorable discourse on religion, summarized and restated in modern phraseology, gave expression to the following truths:

Obviously, no one is copying to put words in the mouth of Jesus!

Second, while Gardner drew out the parallel *sentiments* between the discourse by Jesus, and the writings of Sabatier, no direct word parallels exist except for title headings, and concepts. I attempted to find direct parallels but was unable to do so. Consider these statements from both:

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

155:5:3 1. Primitive religion. The seminatural and instinctive urge to fear mysterious energies and worship superior forces, chiefly a religion of the physical nature, the religion of fear.

155:5:6 The religion of the physical senses and the superstitious fears of natural man, the Master refused to belittle, though he deplored the fact that so much of this primitive form of worship should persist in the religious forms of the more intelligent races of mankind. Jesus made it clear that the great difference between the religion of the mind and the religion of the spirit is that, while the former is upheld by ecclesiastical authority, the latter is wholly based on human experience.

In the beginning, what does the uncivilized man do who believes himself to be surrounded and dominated by mysterious powers, spirits, or demons, from which he believes that he has equally everything to fear and everything to hope? He seeks either to win them as auxiliaries, or to protect himself against their ill-will. Formulas of magic, incantation, and gifts offered under the forms of sacrifice, serve him to command the will of the god or to secure its good graces. What then is the religious relation in this first degree, if not the relation of interest or selfishness between two unequal powers? The man of sensation is above all things impressed by strength, and among his gods, it is their force we is the object of his adoration. The Homeric Zeus is the first among gods only because by himself alone he is physically stronger that the others together. (370)

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Clearly, although *The Urantia Papers* and Sabatier express similarity in concept, we cannot say that Sabatier was a direct "source" for words used in the *Papers*. (Matthew has advised me that he considers Sabatier as a "reference" and not as a "source.")

(A far more crucial purpose exists for the presentation of discussions on *True Religion* in the *Papers*. Very shortly mankind will be desperately seeking clarification about their religions. The *Papers* were designed to serve that purpose. See further discussion below.)

What makes a good "human source?" A phrase of three words would not be considered a "source." Neither would mere similarity in sentiment.

When I began to examine Matthew's work I asked him about those which did not appear as direct "sources." As I show here, somewhat in the work by Hopkins, and now by Sabatier, I could find no direct parallel in words or phrases. His reply to one inquiry was, "Oh! That's a weak source." What he meant was that it was not a source at all, but merely expressed similarity in sentiment.

(In a later objection to my statement about not being a source at all, Matthew said: "No. What I meant was that it was a parallelism of concept rather than of expression.")

While the book by Sabatier may have helped to structure discussion for easier human conceptual recognition, we must question if it can be considered a "source." Surely, the midwayers had the power to recognize human conceptual needs without recourse to human inspiration.

As Matthew said:

I had always supposed that they had accessed some sort of celestial concept registry to locate appropriate human concepts and expressions . . .

I fully agree.

But then, under the impressive weight of his discoveries, Matthew succumbed to the idea that the midwayers needed the human expression to find their "revelation." He not only reduced immortal beings to purely human needs; he reduced them to the level of immature human mortals who had no compunction about borrowing other peoples literal words.

That is what the evidence told him, and that is the conclusion he reached.

Literally millions of books have been written over the past two thousand years, some religious, some secular, which express similarities in sentiments. As a Protestant child I was personally indoctrinated with the concept that there are no human authorities, neither individuals nor institutions. We go directly to God. Or, as Jesus said, "Call no man Father." This was an intimate part of the Protestant tradition of breaking the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore, we cannot say that religious authors borrowed from one another; we can only say that the same thoughts ran through many minds.

This line of thought brings us to another indication of Matthew being "hopelessly naive." Gardner had good reason for bringing that charge against Matthew; Matthew again succumbed to the view that immortal beings did not have the resources or the power to possess a "celestial concept registry to locate appropriate human concepts and expressions." But in so doing he did not exercise the intellectual discipline to establish rigorous standards for his sources. To this date he has not distinguished those sources with direct word parallels from those with mere conceptual inspiration.

Another example of Matthew's naivety was his assignment of passages to William Sadler as a human source. (These assignments were contained in his 1997 document.) But that is a double-edged sword. We do not know how Sadler may have borrowed words and concepts from the *Papers* for his own work. Unless Matthew can rigorously define dates, and establish influence of the *Papers* upon Sadler, he cannot, with intellectual integrity, assign Sadler as a "source."

(In later objection to my remarks he stated that he was merely showing the parallels between the *Papers* and Sadler. He had no intent to show Sadler as a source. Yet in earlier correspondence with me he boldly stated that he felt Sadler was the source of the material in the *Papers*. Clearly, I have had difficulty following Matthew's chain of reasoning, and his final position on these important matters.)

I asked another question: "Why did the Revelators feel it necessary or useful to borrow long sections of exact words from human sources?" If they were building upon human concepts they certainly had the power to rephrase those concepts. Why did they not limit themselves to concepts, as they stated in their acknowledgment; why direct words? There seems to be no need to use exact words.

Suppose I were writing a book, had considered other authors who wrote similar books along the same subject lines, and wanted to expand upon the conceptual themes. Would I borrow their words and place them into my text as my original work? Hardly. We just don't work that way. We have enough integrity and ingenuity to write our own words. We have a natural respect for the work of other people; this respect prevents us from borrowing lengthy direct passages. (Or, as Gardner pointed out, we may take lengthy notes, and then, in later transcription, forget that we borrowed direct words to illustrate the concepts we were marking.)

This difficulty was the foundation for Gardner's complaint about the use of human sources. We humans don't engage in such practices; why did immortal beings? Any person capable of the uplifting and ennobling thoughts and concepts found in the *Papers*, of the highest intellectual order, with the most profound theological implications, and with inspiring religious and spiritual meaning, exceeding our best modern minds, (Hartshorne was an example), certainly would have no need to use exact borrowing of words, phrases, and whole sections from other people's work. Why leave oneself exposed to the exact accusations brought by Gardner?

One could easily conclude that the authors, human or divine, did not have enough ingenuity to create their own essays. Then Gardner could easily bring charges of plagiarism. No wonder he had no respect for Sadler or for the Revelation.

In that dilemma lies a great answer. One that completely escaped Gardner.

Furthermore, if Matthew is correct, that . . .

The research so far has been so fruitful mainly because none of the books were obscure; they were all written by authorities in their respective fields (often by professors from prominent American universities) and many were reviewed in the popular and academic press.

. . . we would expect that, sooner or later, someone would stumble across the fact of "borrowing" from human sources. The parallels could not go unnoticed for very long.

In fact, when I asked Matthew about the first discoveries he replied:

The Breasted book was discovered by Scott Forsythe in the 1980's. Scott's an Egyptology enthusiast, so it's no wonder he bumped into Breasted in the course of his studies.

The Bundy book ("The Religion of Jesus," not the sequel, "Our Recovery of Jesus") was discovered by Edith Cook and Carolyn Kendall in the early 60's Carolyn found the book in a used bookstore, was intrigued by its title, and put it in her bookshelf unread. Edith noticed the parallels during an overnight stay at the Kendalls. According to Carolyn, Doctor Sadler was surprised by the parallels she and Edith showed him. (I suspect that Sadler had known about this book for years and just pretended to be surprised.)

Ruth Burton first told me about the Hartshorne parallel in the late 1970's, but I'm not sure if she discovered it.

Edith Cook told me about the Jones book in the late 70's, but I don't know who discovered it, or when.

(Note: Here again we see a surmise by Matthew which does not square with the nature of Sadler's character. Sadler undoubtedly was genuinely surprised.)

We are faced with the great question, Why? Why did the Revelators not have their own ability to phrase revelation most suitable to us, even if using the foundation of existing human concepts, exactly as they said in the Acknowledgments? Why build on direct human expression? Why borrow words directly?

A larger answer must exist.

The process just does not make sense, unless there was another motive.

Through considerable struggle I began to perceive that motive.

When I did my analysis of the "Christ" names in the *Papers* I caught a glimpse of the methods used by the Revelators. (Refer to my paper on that subject.) No human mortal, steeped in the traditions of Christianity, would have used the "Christ" name except for Jesus. But the name was not applied directly to Jesus in the *Papers*. *The Urantia Papers* do not identify Jesus as the Messiah, the promised deliverer. They demonstrate him as the Creator. They show Melchizedek as the future ruler of this world, exactly as the prophecies in the Bible show. See *Psalm* 110, and so on. We all were blinded by apostolic interpretations. See especially the erroneous logic in the *Book of Hebrews*. Jesus never informed the Apostles otherwise; they were left to their own devices. Hence, two thousand years of Christianity has lived under this false interpretation.

As I showed, Sadler was completely unaware of this application of the "Christ" names, as were all members of the Contact Commission, the Forum, and all readers since. The Revelators had placed into the *Papers* a key to perception which only deeper thinking minds would recognize. They buried a method by which we might come to recognize that the Revelation had to come from divine sources; it could not have been written by men.

When I wrote my letter to Gardner, while in the throws of composition of his book, he did not bother to read it. He had already made up his mind. He sloughed it off as worthless. He threw me into the same pot as all those other mindless followers of a cult.

Another item along this line of thought is the use of the name "Satania" in the *Papers.* This name would repel any good Christian, (or anyone else.) How in heaven's name did someone elect to use the word Satania for our local star system? That is surely demonic. No intelligent beings in their right minds would use that name. Human mortals would not assign such a name; that would be plain stupid. Neither would immortal beings use such a name. It carries an immediate cause for rejection of the Revelation. Yet if a deep thinking mind explores that choice he gradually comes to realize also that the Devil would not have chosen such a name. The choice focuses upon him. But he avoids all direct references to himself as a living, active, deceptive being. He cannot afford such focus.

Therefore, why did the *Papers* use this name?

Because it illustrates that some other logic applies to the validity of the Revelation which is not immediately evident. It applies to the use of the "Christ" names. It applies to the use of the word Satania. And It applies to the direct quote of lengthy passages in human books.

Rather than confirming that William Sadler borrowed from other people, the evidence shows that he did not borrow. If he had been capable of the lofty intellectual construction displayed by the Revelation he would have been far too smart to betray his hand by using extensive quotes of exact human words.

Even more, one cannot get to know Sadler — his religious background with all of its ideals, his intellectual and moral integrity, his service to his fellow men and women over all those years — and continue to believe that he would have been stupid enough to lift lengthy passages directly from human sources, and then pretend that they were from heaven!

Now I began to recognize the importance of Matthew Block's discoveries.

And I began to recognize how Martin Gardner undermined his own work. He just was incapable of such deep reflection.

Why was Matthew Block led down this path with so many stupendous pioneer breakthroughs? Many of us have expressed our amazement at his finds, and his ability to recognize the texts buried in the middle of so many books. We believe that he was led along by this Thought Adjuster, the angels, and the midwayers. He could not have made such remarkable discoveries merely by his unaided human intellect.

His discoveries have the earmark of heavenly assistance to bring the Revelatory methods to our attention.

The method in all these cases is one I call reverse logic. Normal logic would reject certain methods. We would not use other person's writings in such direct verbal copy, we would not use the name "Satania" if we were sensible, and we would not carefully alter the meaning of the word "Christ" if we came out of a Christian background.

Human mortals, capable of such a profound work, would not have betrayed their hand so carelessly. No single person, or group of human mortals, would have set themselves up for condemnation by using the word "Satania." No single person, or group of human mortals, would have altered the meaning of the word Christ do change its significance while hiding such redefinition in the Revelation. And no person, or group of human mortals, would have set themselves up by quoting whole passages so obviously borrowed from human authors.

This means that Matthew and myself, and perhaps others, have been used by our Planetary Supervisors to "prove" the validity of the Revelation. We have become instruments in the hand of God.

But what meaning has this for the future? Who will care about human sources in the future? A thousand years from now the men who wrote all those books will be forgotten. Furthermore, if our society is doomed, if a new social order is at our doorstep, with a world-wide disaster hanging over our heads, how many people will really be interested in an academic display of scholarly research? When one is scratching for survival, academics are thrown out the window.

Consider this thought. Unfolding earth events will bring a dramatic recognition of the validity of the Revelation. But many people will be questioning. They will need some means to reassure themselves of the validity of the Revelation.

The details of Matthew's discoveries will not hold people in the future. Future generations will be thoroughly convinced of the value of the Revelation, regardless of the techniques employed in its creation. But Matthew's work is important to coming decisions. The single fact that the Revelators use these methods to provide validity for their work will help with these decision processes now coming down upon us. Matthew may write the most erudite scholarly treatises expounding on his discoveries, and on the techniques use by the Revelators, but all that work will be summed up in the single conclusion of why the Revelators did it. Of course, until this remarkable design is recognized by large numbers of people, in order for it to be carried as a social tradition into the future, the mechanics of the steps must be made known.

Thus it is my concern that a synopsis of Matthew's work be published before events come crashing down upon our heads.

As Gardner pointed out, so importantly, why did the Revelators resort to taking a human author and putting his ideas into the head of Jesus? Surely, that is the greatest insult.

We should put the shoe on the other foot. Why did Sabatier arrive at the same ideas as those Jesus taught? Because they represent truth. Because they represent religious growth. Because they represent the further spiritual evolution of mankind. Then Sadler did not take the words of Sabatier and put them in the mouth of Jesus; Sabatier gave expression to the teachings of Jesus which did not make it into our historical record.

Coming decisions need clarification on loyalties to human institutions and authorities, and direct loyalty to God. Paper 155, and Sections 5 and 6, are a crucially important part of *The Urantia Papers*. Many persons will be consulting them in the imminent crisis. Does it really matter that Sabatier expressed those sentiments, sentiments that are so instrumental in turning our loyalties away from human institutions, and back to God?

Matthew's work certainly points a bold arrow at the importance of those instructions by Jesus.

I have one other thought on this amazing series of discoveries. Matthew's work has forced those of us who live in this current era to become aware of how human sources were introduced into the Revelation. My discoveries on the corruptions in the Revelation also force us to examine each passage with great care. In the first case the Revelators intentionally introduced human material; in the second case they permitted corruptions. They did not warn Sadler of what was transpiring at 533, and they did not inhibit the influence of Caligastia. As they illustrated in the Revelation, the good coming out of both the benign and corrupt activities far outweigh the dangers introduced thereto. We are being forced to become mature in our relationship with God, and our acceptance of this Great Gift.

Our planetary supervisors certainly know what they are doing.