

From: nealwaldrop@earthlink.net
Sent: Saturday, September 7, 2019 11:15 PM
To: Neal Waldrop - gmail (nealwaldrop606@gmail.com)
Subject: Global Endeavor / Revelation Revealed / webinar on August 31
Attachments: 2016-07-17_RR-T08_P088-146_Q059-077.pdf; 2019-06-24_v2_Living-the-real-religion-of-Jesus.pdf

Dear fellow readers of *The Urantia Book* and friends of the Global Endeavor,

On Saturday, August 31, we conducted our twenty-first webinar based on topic 8 of *Revelation Revealed*, a topic that is entitled, “Comparing and contrasting the true teachings of Jesus with the traditional tenets and practices of organized, institutional Christianity.”

This session was the final webinar in phase 4. We are now taking a break for approximately one month and plan to resume on some suitable Saturday in October (a date not yet chosen).

“Living the Real Religion of Jesus” (June 24, 2019)

During the entire webinar, panelists analyzed and commented on ideas expressed on the first two pages of my new essay “Living the Real Religion of Jesus.” I began by asking another participant to read the excerpt from Jesus’ second discourse on religion (section 6 of Paper 155) that appears near the bottom of the first page of the essay:

I have called upon you to be born again, to be born of the spirit. I have called you out of the darkness of authority and the lethargy of tradition into the transcendent light of the realization of the possibility of making for yourselves the greatest discovery possible for the human soul to make — the supernal experience of finding God for yourself, in yourself, and of yourself, and of doing all this as a fact in your own personal experience. And so may you pass from death to life, from the authority of tradition to the experience of knowing God; thus will you pass from darkness to light, from a racial faith inherited to a personal faith achieved by actual experience; and thereby will you progress from a theology of mind handed down by your ancestors to a true religion of spirit which shall be built up in your souls as an eternal endowment.

Your religion shall change from the mere intellectual belief in traditional authority to the actual experience of that living faith which is able to grasp the reality of God and all that relates to the divine spirit of the Father. The religion of the mind ties you hopelessly to the past; the religion of the spirit consists in progressive revelation and ever beckons you on toward higher and holier achievements in spiritual ideals and eternal realities. [*The Midwayer Commission, 1731:1-2 / 155:6.3-4*]

I then asked the panelists whether Jesus’ remarks were exclusively directed to the apostles, or whether they are also directed to us approximately 2,000 years later. Everyone who responded stated

that these remarks are also addressed to us, without any doubt. One participant called attention to the fact that although Jesus' bestowal occurred on Urantia, it was for all the worlds in his local universe of Nebadon. Another participant agreed that what Jesus said was addressed to every person in the entire universe; he was calling for us to move into a live relationship with God and as sisters and brothers in a spiritual family.

Next I called for reactions to certain phrases contained in the first paragraph of the excerpt: ["the darkness of authority and the lethargy of tradition ... and so may you pass from death to life, from the authority of tradition to the experience of knowing God."](#)

One participant said that there is no doubt that tradition can be a drag on spiritual progress for the human race, but the revelators also tell us that tradition can be supportive of the religious life of individuals and religious groups. Jesus has called us out of ["the darkness of authority,"](#) but he has not condemned authority in itself or tradition as a general matter. He called attention to the angels of the churches, the third corps of master seraphim [[the Chief of Seraphim, 1255:6 / 114:6.7](#)], pointing out that they seek to preserve the best of tradition as we go forward, whereas the angels of progress [[the Chief of Seraphim, 1255:5 / 114:6.6](#)] focus on moving into the future. In his view, tradition and progress are complementary, not contradictory.

I replied that on a personal level, I am inclined to interpret these remarks in the early part of the first paragraph as a paraphrase of ideas that Jesus expresses in the paragraph's final lines, ["... thereby will you progress from a theology of mind handed down by your ancestors to a true religion of spirit which shall be built up in your souls as an eternal endowment."](#)

Another participant commented that Jesus' remarks in the first paragraph are quite strong, including ideas whereby he calls for us to "pass from death to life." He noted that the great majority of the corps of master seraphim are progressive, perhaps ten out of the twelve.

I focused on wording that appears in the fourth and fifth lines of the first paragraph of the excerpt, ["the supernal experience of finding God for yourself, in yourself, and of yourself, and of doing all this as a fact in your own personal experience."](#) I asked whether this meant that we would separate ourselves from all other human beings, or whether the other panelists would look on this statement about finding God for oneself as implicitly including one's relationships with other human beings.

One participant responded that the revelators tell us that everything that relates to religion has to be socialized; otherwise it becomes fanaticism. Another panelist called attention to two areas of focus that relate to moving into a more dynamic relationship with God and our interactions with other human beings:

(1) The actual decision to be engaged in personal spiritual experience is always the decision of the individual religionist, by individual choice, versus the dead level of religious authority or cognitive traditions.

(2) Religious tradition and the leadership of religious tradition can be attempting to establish and maintain their own authority or to teach doctrine that is simply intellectual, or they can actively be engaged in the effort to encourage people to move into a living relationship and involvement with God. This can be part of the tradition.

I reacted to these remarks by stating that the other participant seemed to be interpreting the phrases “the darkness of authority” and “the lethargy of tradition” so as to emphasize an insistence on particular teachings as a matter of compulsory doctrine, as opposed to group associations that could be understood as a kind of fellowship or cooperation for mutual edification, mutual encouragement, and inspiration. In this context, I compared the underlying ideas that he seemed to have expressed with remarks by a Melchizedek that appear in section 5 of Paper 103:

When a member of a social religious group has complied with the requirements of such a group, he should be encouraged to enjoy religious liberty in the full expression of his own personal interpretation of the truths of religious belief and the facts of religious experience. ... There is great hope for any church that worships the living God, validates the brotherhood of man, and dares to remove all creedal pressure from its members. [A Melchizedek, 1135:2 / 103:5.12]

A different participant commented that he is in great sympathy with this, but declared that in his view, there is a difference, at least in principle, between creedal pressure and creedal guidance. He then stated that most people need some sort of guidance, intellectually and spiritually, and that they will be the first to admit this. On the other hand, there are some people, such as many readers of *The Urantia Book*, who feel that they can figure out all these matters by themselves, so that they do not want anyone to tell them what to think; they, however, tend to be the exception. Therefore he believed it conceivable that there can be a group practice of religion where there are a body of shared beliefs and certain people who are better trained and better able to explain these beliefs, without necessarily establishing institutional authority to force people to believe one way or another. Most people will not explicitly take issue with ideas or doctrines put forward by a priest or minister; they are more likely to say, “You know much more than I do, and I do not want to take the time and energy to investigate it thoroughly; therefore I will accept your interpretation for the time being, since I do not know any better.” This approach, in his view, is not necessarily evil, for it allows such a person to function with some sense of security in his or religious and philosophic beliefs.

Another participant returned to the concept of leadership, one that he had previously mentioned. The revelators tell us that substantially less than one percent of the human population are gifted leaders, and he believed that this is true of spiritual leadership as well as leadership in other contexts. He believed that there are people who are called to provide spiritual leadership; he thought that any group of people would be wise to discover that leadership talent and motivation, and then to equip it, so as to hone the person’s abilities and give him or her a sanctioned role and responsibility. He pointed out that Jesus had people who moved through a training process to become apostles and to become teachers, after which they went out and preached. Therefore, in his view, Jesus had ways to develop and establish leadership, thereafter giving it a sanctioned role within which it functioned. In

his view, any group function must include these features in order to operate effectively, so as to resolve the issues around good leadership and eliminate bad leadership. In his view, nothing that Jesus said in this excerpt should be understood to speak against the evolution of spiritual leadership in groups of people.

In contrast, the participant who had distinguished between creedal pressure and creedal guidance pointed out that when you talk about leadership, you also talk about authority. Leadership, in his view, can be wielded in ways that are spiritually fragrant, or in ways that are not. In any case, he said, leadership implies authority.

A different panelist referred to the revelators' assurance that Jesus' true teachings will eventually prevail. There must be some kind of cosmic balancing act that relates to conserving positive values and meanings, while also stimulating progressive advances. He called attention to a sentence in section 2 of Paper 195 in which the Midwayer Commission explains the role of the Spirit of Truth:

And now that he [Jesus] has personally left the world, he sends in his place his Spirit of Truth, who is designed to live in man and, for each new generation, to restate the Jesus message so that every new group of mortals to appear upon the face of the earth shall have a new and up-to-date version of the gospel, just such personal enlightenment and group guidance as will prove to be an effective solvent for man's ever-new and varied spiritual difficulties. [*The Midwayer Commission, 2060:6 / 194:2.1*]

COMMENT. I agree that aspects of group functioning and leadership deserve to be considered independently, on their own merits. On the other hand, I find it difficult to understand any of these remarks about leadership as an interpretation of what Jesus actually said in the passage that the panelists were analyzing [*the Midwayer Commission, 1731:1-2 / 155:6.3-4*]. If we use the statement by a Melchizedek as a criterion, I am not aware of any branch or denomination of Christianity that "dares to remove all creedal pressure from its members" [*a Melchizedek, 1135:2 / 103:5.12*] — unless one were willing to cite the Quakers as an example of that approach. To the best of my understanding, however, many traditional Christians are inclined to deny that the Quakers are a Christian denomination.

Another panelist declared that she did not see how distinguishing between leadership and creedal pressure would help her to learn about God, to find him and love him, and to cause her soul to grow toward God consciousness. She could not do that through leadership or through any other person. After you find God and grow in that understanding, you socialize these achievements and share your inner life with others because that relationship with God is so vast and so extraordinary. In her experience with organizations, she did not remember people sharing their spiritual lives and really talking about finding God and how that had transformed them. Tradition is tradition; it is just rote and what you are accustomed to, and it is also habit-forming. If tradition actually helps someone move forward, that is wonderful; but she said she had met many people who, sadly enough, are stuck and are waiting for the message of a personal relationship with God that would enliven them and enable them to be born again.

[The final sentence in the second paragraph of the excerpt]

“The religion of the mind ties you hopelessly to the past; the religion of the spirit consists in progressive revelation and ever beckons you on toward higher and holier achievements in spiritual ideals and eternal realities” [the *Midway Commission*, 1731:2 / 155:6.4].

In relation to this sentence, I asked participants to focus on the contrast between the religion of the mind and the religion of the spirit.

One panelist responded by identifying three levels of mind: (1) the superconscious mind where the Thought Adjuster spiritizes our thoughts and builds the threads of the soul; (2) the conscious mind, the part that human beings have to deal with on a day-to-day basis; and (3) the sub-conscious mind, the level that he saw no reason to discuss. In his view, the religion of the mind operates on the conscious level and is essentially stuck in current time frames, whereas the religion of the spirit needs to operate in the superconscious mind where the soul is being built, the only framework within which the Thought Adjuster can act.

Another panelist remarked that the religion of the mind seems to be defined in the first sentence of the second paragraph as “the mere intellectual belief in traditional authority.” In his view, the essential problem is not tradition, but mere intellectual belief. One can have mere intellectual belief in anything, including non-traditional authority, revelation in general, or authentic revelation such as the teachings of *The Urantia Book*. In response to a specific question of mine, he confirmed that he was distinguishing between intellectual belief and spiritual experience, stating that this distinction can pertain to any context, whether traditional or non-traditional.

Yet another participant declared that the final sentence in the second paragraph of the excerpt refers to something that is past, static, and not growing, in contrast with new, evolving realities that are active and growing because they constitute living relationships. During the 1980s he had learned about the role of leadership in relation to institutions by studying the writings of the French sociologist Émile Durkheim (1858-1917), who is considered the father of modern sociology. Durkheim coined the term “charisma” and associated it with “charismatic leadership.” According to this understanding, a charismatic leader is someone who gives voice or expression to the needs of a group of people, thereby creating a partnership or implicit contract that links a charismatic leader and the people who will follow him or her. He then directed personal remarks to me, saying that in this endeavor, I am the leader, and in this sense a charismatic leader. That, in his view, is because I have an idea and a sense of moving the discussion forward, whereas all of the other panelists have an idea of participating actively. This, he said, is natural and happens all the time in group functions. From the perspective of spiritual growth, legitimate and effective leadership gives expression to a pathway that helps persons move from the past into the future, in terms of their spiritual desires. From these perspectives, Jesus was a profoundly charismatic leader for his people and for us.

I responded that this was the first time in my life that anyone had called me charismatic. I supposed that I should welcome this, for I believed that the other participant intended it as a favorable reference to my role as the leader of these webinars. I agreed that this role is a fact, but identified an

aspect of that role that contrasts with the leadership roles that others assume in other contexts. This difference centers on the fact that there is no principle of authority: I am not telling the participants what to say or what to believe, and I am welcoming logical comments from time to time that criticize me, my views, or something I have written. All this is part of the context of the webinar wherein my function, if you wish, is essentially to facilitate broad discussion. Therefore we have separated the function of leadership from the authority to insist upon or foster conformity. Well, that authority to foster or insist upon conformity is unfortunately part of the religious tradition that the Christian movement inherited from the Roman Empire, a reality that we previously discussed. In sum, I agreed that leadership can function without authority aimed at or pursuing conformity, but cited that as an important difference.

COMMENT. After the webinar, I looked up the word *charismatic* in several dictionaries and found significant aspects that I cannot agree with or welcome. For simplicity and brevity, here are key excerpts from what I found in the *Chambers Dictionary of Etymology* (1988):

charisma *n.* 1875, grace, talent bestowed by God, gift ... Later a specific sense developed, “gift of leadership or power of authority” (1947) and was extended to “strong personal appeal or magnetism,” especially in reference to political figures (in the early 1960’s).

charismatic ... *adj.* 1882-83 ... *n.* Christian who believes in divine gifts, such as the power to heal by the laying on of hands. 1970, from the adjective.

The panelist who had spoken immediately before declared that the underlying authority always flows from the group. He stated that the reason that I can function in the leadership role that I described is because he and the other panelists wish to participate with me in that kind of endeavor, and because they give me the authority to operate in these ways. In his view, the same is true for any religious group; its members sanction leadership to take them where they would like to go because that leadership can do this effectively. This, in his opinion, was what happened with the followers of Jesus: They yearned for spiritual growth and development; they trusted him to provide that leadership; and they sanctioned his leadership and followed him. In sociological terms, he said, that is just the nature of leadership and group authorization of that leadership, in whatever form it takes. This principle applies to the form of leadership that I have been exercising or to the papal form of leadership; authorization always flows from the desire of a group of people who will follow.

I then replied that there is a functional difference between authority that is basically consensual, which is what the other panelist had just described, and authority that, at least, claims to have a mandatory character. This mandatory character is, in effect, the idea of compelling someone to do something or to follow certain instructions, to accept certain teachings. That, I said, is fundamentally different. When people have joined together voluntarily and are participating in some group activity as a matter of their own views, that contrasts quite substantially from a situation in which authority is imposed from above and seeks to ensure or promote conformity of views. So our recent remarks

pertained to talking about leadership, but we were talking about different *patterns* of leadership and also different patterns of authority.

A different panelist said he agreed that I am not inducing any kind of conformity among the participants, but declared that I am nonetheless exercising authority, of which the root is the word *author*. He went on to declare that his personal view of this document (my essay “Living the Real Religion of Jesus”) is that it is very tendentious and certainly embodies an agenda, so that he and the other participants need to respond to that agenda, or at least that he felt he did. He stated that even though I do not impose conformity of response, I do impose some form of structure and tendency based on the contents of my document.

In addition, he went on to disagree with a previous speaker who had appeared to go along with the idea that anything from the past is dead and amounts to a constriction, whereas anything going forward into the future is freeing and more spiritual. He reiterated his view that the reason that the angels of the churches exist is to preserve everything from the past that is spiritually fragrant and alive. This, he said, is why symbols and slogans and any kind of symbolic activity have their roots in the past. If these aspects did not have their roots in the past, they would not have any relevance or validity for the present or the future. So to construct a dichotomy declaring that the past is bad and the future is good, or that the past is regression and the future is progression, is inaccurate and a dangerous way to think.

COMMENT. The participant whose remarks I have summarized immediately above called my essay “very tendentious.” Since this is not the first time in our series of webinars that the adjective *tendentious* has arisen, here is the definition that I found in the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (copyright 2002 and 2007):

tendentious *adjective*

Having an underlying purpose; (of writing etc.) composed with the intention of promoting a particular cause or viewpoint.

I respond that we are all well aware that Jesus’ true teachings have not been implemented in the world; that is intuitively obvious. Therefore it is my intention to do everything I can to identify and promote the true teachings of Jesus, so as to contribute to and facilitate our task of comparing and contrasting his true teachings with the traditional tenets and practices of organized, institutional Christianity. This is my cause, this is my viewpoint. Further, I intend to persist.

I then asked another participant to examine two words that appear in the final sentence of the excerpt, “[progressive revelation](#).” In that short phrase, does the word “[revelation](#)” refer to words, or to some form of inner personal experience?

The panelist replied that “[revelation](#)” refers to both aspects. When the apostle Peter declared, “[You are the Deliverer, the Son of the living God](#)” [*the Midwayer Commission, 1746:2 / 157:3.5*], Jesus

treated that as an individual revelation of the type that all of us can have. When we gain spiritual insight, the Thought Adjuster reveals to us psychic truths that we need in order to move forward through the cosmic circles and understand more and more of the Father-Infinite. On the other hand, he believed that the word “progressive” in the phrase “progressive revelation” causes the concept to operate both ways. For example, the efforts of Adam and Eve and Melchizedek, as well as the teachings of *The Urantia Book* and the work of the Spirit of Truth, are inherent in causing revelation to progress in terms of current understanding and paradigms. In addition, he had been interested in previous comments to the effect that a leader moves the group from the past into the future. From this perspective, the paradigm is moving forward, and leadership is the structure enabling the group to achieve that.

At this point, I said I would finally yield to an impulse that had affected me for the preceding half-hour, one involving an association with contemporary science fiction. In such stories that involve an alien landing on earth, the first thing that he is usually reported to say is, “Take me to your leader.” By implication, the alien believes that the leader has the authority to do something that will benefit him. I realized that this was not the idea of leadership that the other participant had been advocating, but I believed that it is part of the popular conception of leadership. Therefore we can relate to the fact that leadership has been entangled with authority and an insistence on conformity of belief, at least in the history of religion in the Western world. I said I did not advance the idea that we can do away with leadership, but was convinced that we have to purify it, so that leadership is not entangled with the authority to insist on particular views. In my opinion, it is essential for us to bear in mind what a Melchizedek states: “There is great hope for any church that worships the living God, validates the brotherhood of man, and dares to remove all creedal pressure from its members” [*a Melchizedek, 1135:2 / 103:5.12*].

A different participant declared that she was not interested in leadership; from her perspective, leadership has nothing to do with personal religion, the topic that we were discussing. While she may have been in her twenties, the superconscious level of reality had helped her transform the animal self so as to eradicate selfishness and the mark of the beast, while acquiring humility. This led her step by step to the personal experience of a relationship with God. There was growth and growth and growth, a gradual process that did not happen suddenly. Little by little, the spirit led her forward. In other words, she said, she had the spiritual insight first, the experience first, before she acquired an understanding of what she was experiencing. When she found *The Urantia Book*, she began to understand.

[The first sentence in the first paragraph on page 2 of the essay]

“The supernal experience of finding God cannot be compressed, condensed, or confined so as to fit within the covers of a book, nor be delimited by the intellectual adaptations required to read and understand it.”

One participant commented that the thrust of this sentence is to declare that God is infinite and eternal, and knows no boundaries; the experience of finding God cannot be confined in any way. The revelators declare that all of us must function within some frame of reference in which we think and experience, but that this frame of reference is constantly being remade in higher ways. The dilemma

is that we have to have an understanding of what Jesus is suggesting that is simple enough to keep in our consciousness all the time, and also simple enough to convey to others when we share spiritual truths with them. In section 7 of Paper 87, a Brilliant Evening Star points out that a cult or spiritual culture “will not function if it is too complex” [*a Brilliant Evening Star, 966:5 / 87:7.10*]. From his perspective, his understanding that we are living in the family of God permits him to do what the sentence envisions.

I then said that instead of just asking participants to comment on the sentence, I would have to be more direct: How does reading *The Urantia Book* compare with “the supernal experience of finding God”?

A different panelist responded that for him, *The Urantia Book* was a scaffold, or part of a scaffold. His experience was learning about Christ in *The Urantia Book* and in Christianity, a dual influence. In the summer of 1971, he had just finished reading *The Urantia Book* and was in the process of reading the *Confessions* of Augustine of Hippo. While riding on the subway, he had had a spiritual experience that seemed to have come from outside himself. Reading *The Urantia Book* had had an effect, but reading the *Confessions* had also had an effect. He was influenced by the tremendously powerful connection that one can have with God, as had occurred in the case of Augustine of Hippo.

I expressed appreciation for that reply and then refined my question once again: What is the relationship between reading *The Urantia Book* and the supernal experience of finding God? Does finding God depend on reading *The Urantia Book*?

One participant responded to the last part of my question by saying, “Of course not.” He believed that finding God is a process and that the desire to find God means that God has already found you. The process cannot be confined, and spiritual insight must take over.

This led me to ask another participant whether someone who does not read *The Urantia Book* can have the supernal experience of finding God. She replied, “Of course, for God is available.” If we have a sincere desire to know and love God, the other side of the equation is that he has an insatiable appetite to love us and wants all of us to find him. In her view, a relationship with God is there for the taking.

She said she could always feel the presence of God, an experience that was powerful during some of her meditations. This security helped her grow as a human being, for she knew that she was not alone and that God would not let her fail. Little by little, there was a lower level of defensiveness, and the animal side of her slowly disappeared. During decades of growth, she learned new spiritual habits that God waited all her life to convey to her.

On the other hand, she said, she did not understand these experiences until she found *The Urantia Book*. From that point, it took her almost one year to find the harmony, to get mind, body, and spirit to synchronize, to be receptive to the spirit. Associating with other readers of *The Urantia Book* has helped her to grow in intellectual ways, and this was why she is participating in our webinars.

In response to a leading question of mine, this panelist confirmed that her supernal experience of finding God had begun well before she found *The Urantia Book*, but that doing so helped her continue that experience, while expanding and enhancing her relationship with God.

Another participant said that he would like to reverse the question, so as to ask whether someone can have *The Urantia Book* but not have discovered a living relationship with God. In his experience, he said, there are many people who actually fall in that category, readers of *The Urantia Book* who sometimes have a very sophisticated intellectual understanding of the teachings and who pursue their involvement with the material, but will themselves concede that they do not have much of a connection with God and that this is a mystery to them. In his view, this was almost a variation on the theme of possibly having a religion of authority or a religion of the mind in relation to the teachings of *The Urantia Book*, and not much more beyond that.

I said I had been inclined to ask him about the phrase “intellectual adaptations” but now believed he had already commented on that by stating, in effect, that intellectual adaptations to understand the teachings of *The Urantia Book* are not, in themselves, the supernal experience of finding God.

In reply, the panelist described his own yearning and search before he found *The Urantia Book*, a search for understanding that he would not call the search for God. Instead, he said, he was asking what is going on here, what is the bigger picture, what is happening in the universe, what is the purpose of existence. He searched in Eastern religions, in yoga, and in various other teachings, but found only bits and pieces. When he encountered *The Urantia Book*, he had a profound sense that this material would answer all his questions, followed by three to four months of steady reading that led him to understand that the venture human beings are engaged in is a huge cosmic reality and that the text he had encountered is a major revelation. One key realization was that he had an opportunity for a personal, intimate connection with Deity. He then faced the question of how he could create a living relationship with another person, the living presence of God inside him — followed by the question of what he was supposed to be doing in return, how he should live his life in accordance with these ideals. In the end, this became a never-ending process, an eternal unfolding of new ideas, new realizations, and new ideals.

I agreed that the experience of each person is diverse in terms of the range of possibilities that are available; there is no single pattern that is obligatory for every single human being. To the contrary, I said, the possibilities of adaptation are open to all of us, and intellectual adaptations are not the whole answer. This was part of my reason for asking participants to interpret the sentence.

[The second sentence in the first paragraph on page 2 of the essay]

“Our experience of finding God can and must be personal, mindal, and spiritual, and we should remain intensely aware that God is not just an infinite being who resides on distant Paradise, but also an active presence who pervades and animates all reality, whether material, mindal, or spiritual, as well as all intelligent beings who inhabit our planet Urantia and every other living environment dispersed throughout the grand universe.”

One participant interpreted this sentence by stating that God cannot be appreciated or related to as an intellectual exercise. The relationship must be experiential as well as intellectual. God can be realized through experience without being realized intellectually; there are many spiritually fragrant people who have little or no understanding of who God is. If the reality of God is expressed in their lives, that lack of understanding does not matter. God is real, and that is first; God is also an idea, but that may be 25th. He commented that to an extent, religion in the Western world has tended to focus on mindal matters, at the expense of the spiritual dimensions. He believed that spirituality is experiential in nature.

Another participant understood the phrase “an active presence who pervades and animates all reality” by associating it with the seven absolutes of infinity that a Melchizedek of Nebadon explains in section 3 of Paper 105, although God the Supreme pervades all aspects of the finite level.

Yet another panelist called attention to the spiritual circuits, commenting that spirit gravity literally pulls the soul of man toward Paradise. God’s presence comes in many forms, material, mindal, and spiritual, and these realities enable us to function on a higher level.

[The first sentence in the second paragraph on page 2 of the essay]

“As we cooperate with and seek to inspire numerous other human beings, we are also seeking to enhance and cooperate with God’s presence within them, as well as his plans for their destiny and the destiny of our tumultuous and troubled planet Urantia.”

One participant declared that the questions that burned within him really related to the Supreme: What contribution could he make, what could he give back as his contribution to the accomplishment of destinies and the unfolding of the Supreme? He believed that a major part of his duty pertained to his responsibilities to his sisters and brothers, how he could help them to find some sense of solace and meaning in their lives. He believed that he and they are all in the midst of living a life in a spiritual family.

I then asked another participant whether we should refrain from looking at salvation (survival) and spiritual engagement solely for our own purposes, so that we will also immerse ourselves in the welfare of other human beings, and for that matter in God’s plans for our planet, to the degree that we can.

The other participant agreed that we should do this, commenting that the reality of our spiritual gift and our spiritual relationship with God exists only in the ways we express it. Our love for God, in his view, exists only in our expression of that love to others.

Yet another participant commented that the seraphim have always guided her and have guided people to her through sharing God with others. These profound realities open up a course to salvation (survival).

A different participant declared that this sentence resonated in him because it evokes the work of the Thought Adjusters as the revelators have described it. In his view, the sentence also suggests the

cosmic intuitions of discovering, recognizing, interpreting, and choosing. Just as Jesus sought to console and encourage the young man who was fearful and downcast, urging that he live his life in the flesh “as a son of God, a mortal dedicated to the ennobling service of man on earth and destined to the superb and eternal service of God in eternity” [*the Midwayer Commission, 1438:1 / 130:6.4*], so also should we do our best to help other human beings develop and ultimately become altruistic themselves.

Plans for phase 5

As previously stated, we are currently taking a break. We are likely to resume our series of webinars on some Saturday in October, a date that we have not yet chosen.

PRACTICAL FACTORS

Since the recordings of our webinars remain available on YouTube, you could watch any or all of them whenever you wish. Here is the link that would take you to the specific location on the Internet:

https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC_6QHPLuABZojhdjE8XJRQg

As a workaround that would help you if you do not have this link immediately to hand, you could log onto the main site for YouTube and then search for “Global Endeavor.” The results would include a reference to our programs, although it may not appear at the top of the list.

Regards, Neal Waldrop.

Chairman, the Committee for the Global Endeavor

[September 7, 2019 at 11:15 pm]

P.S.: At the very end of the webinar, I quipped, “I am now heading toward the supernal experience of writing the report” (rather than the supernal experience of finding God). Having completed the task, I cannot lay claim to the word “supernal” but would settle for “successful,” if that indeed is the verdict that my readers reach.

List of attachments

1. Topic 8 of *Revelation Revealed*.
 2. “Living the Real Religion of Jesus” (a new essay of mine that I completed on June 24, 2019).
-