

Dear Tom;

June 5, 1978

Thanks for your long-promised letter of criticism, which is somewhat less amorphous than all I have heard from headquarters since your first criticisms in six years reached me last summer.

I am very sad that two supposedly valiant soldiers of the circles must spend their time needlessly quarreling. I say needlessly because I believe (1) you have somehow been euchered into a position of claiming the Concordex is actually bad (a gross exaggeration almost all Urantians would say), and (2) if it is bad now it was bad all thro these past 6 years, during which at any time by a friendly proposal from you we could have discussed and perhaps easily settled our differences.

Instead, in a most unUrantian way I am threatened with being put out of the Concordex business unless I "knuckle".

This letter will be long--and painful to write. And painful to read. Precisely as yours was painful to read. I do not believe yours was painful to write, for it was patronizing and condescending. People who write such letters from Jovian heights do not write in pain.

First, I will note a few things in your letter, and then I will enlarge in this, my final letter of appeal to your reason. (Or does some unfeeling lawyer who believes all Urantians are your obsequious serfs write your letters, in which case I am fighting a disembodied enemy of the Concordex?)

Your last letter clearly proves you do not really know or understand the Concordex. You simply cannot appreciate apparently, the part it has played in our Movement and most of our Movement's activities. It has played an astonishing part, I have been told, in view of the fact that only about 2 or 3 U Bk purchasers out of 10, learn that an index is available--thanks to your keeping it out of bookstores.

In your second paragraph you say: "let us clearly state that the body of references ... of the second (Cncrdx) edition, is useful to readers of the Urantia Book." This grudging crumb of acknowledgment from you proves you have no understanding whatever of the services for readers the Concordex was created to--and does--render readers.

#### ESSENTIAL PURPOSE OF THE CONCORDEX

You mention material which you feel is "not directly related to the essential purpose of the Concordex". You have never been interested enough in the Concordex to find out what its purposes are. I created the Concordex and no one else determined its essential, or its auxiliary, purposes. Your informants in Chicago and elsewhere have not done their homework well, Tom. They've put you in the middle of an issue your wisdom has not encompassed, and that I believe you are going to find it impossible to win. All of said purposes are important to readers. Easily proved.

Books by human authors do not carry the same introductory matter for a generation or more, Tom--if it is desired by the author or owner to make changes as editions come along.

You say: (my underlines): "If the body of the Concordex is inherently worthy as a study aid (and we believe it has value in this respect) then it should not be bolstered by personal opinion, even that of the author." (Further evidence that you are not familiar with the Concordex and what it's for.) My writing is not to bolster the reference list, but for much more than that. Please, if you have not time to read this letter thoughtfully about so small an issue as the Concordex, at least read the page at the end on which I list Concordex purposes.\* Some that I have not mentioned in past have proved more important than I heretofore knew. They are now in the list, thanks to letters from readers.

You remind me of the expert "taster" who bet he could name any potable blindfolded. After being correct on about 10 liquors, a wag placed water in his glass. He sipped, was puzzled, then said: "Well, you've got me. I don't know what this is, but I know it will never be a popular drink". You should become acquainted with the Concordex, well acquainted. Most of what you know about it stems from a few critics. Even the URANTIA Book has critics.

And even in your lordly position Tom, do you really believe you have authority to determine what authors of aids write? Anyone who will think, admits great men and great books need introductions to people. Humanly written books carry introductions. Our celestial Book has a Foreword but no floorplan or informal synoptic "inventory" of its contents. I have provided such as it appears to one human mind, and I take full responsibility before the reader. It is not your prerogative to make me say what you or Carolyn or John Hales would prefer me to say.

If you are human, please re-read the <sup>black</sup> underlined words above. Any ordinary reader of the URANTIA Book, prominent or obscure, would recognize--if he has used the Concordex to plan a program, write a speech, help plan a Study Group--that they are patronizing and condescending. Tom, I am surprised at you.

#### LETTERS RECEIVED FROM EVERYWHERE

The dozen biggie Urantians I wrote and a good many who responded to Bulletin and Agondonter appeals wrote me the criticisms and suggestions I requested. I received a good many constructive suggestions. I received quite a few that cancelled each other out. What some readers liked very much, others that could be eliminated.

There is no general sentiment, no significant minority even, agreeing with your dictum that fob matter should for the most part, be cut out in future.

Not one single letter has come to me justifying or echoing the expressions from 533 that the fob Concordex matter might hurt or injure the Book, the Foundation, or the Movement.

Your Field Representatives meet a good many more readers I believe than do most of you at headquarters. Bagemann, to my surprise, wrote an arrogant self-righteous letter attempting to teach me a lesson in humility, and a few other things. But he wrote from so uninformed a position that his letter had no value.

Berkeley Elliott, a long time ago, wrote me that the Concordex introductory matter was "a wonderful introduction to the URANTIA Book". (When she learns currently how successfully the fob matter is being used for that purpose, I believe she will reaffirm that view. (Ruth Burton, not a Field Representative, but an intelligent Urantian wrote about the same thing: "I'm sure (U Bk) readers will read that marvelous (Concordex) introduction. It's ideal, I think, for interesting people in the Book." These words written several years ago were the fruits of their own discovery, no suggestions from me.

Jim Mills has a great deal of contact with readers. He makes none of the criticisms your headquarters small group makes. And he believes as do most of the important people I addressed, that whatever may be the view of headquarters, my Concordex should say what I want it to say.

Helena Sprague praises the fob matter generously, but would like to see less "sell" in it. (The two or three people who have made that suggestion, have usually had several years of URANTIA Book reading before they ever saw a Concordex. It is quite natural, since they need no such "sell" that they forget the numberless prospective and new readers who find it very helpful in deciding whether or not they want to get into the URANTIA Book.)

Julia Fenderson, who I suppose is the most active of all the Field Reps, and who surely has more, and more extended, contacts with readers than anyone else, writes: "The reactions I have had about the use of the Concordex have all been positive...I would like to see p. 33 moved to p.1. That would place your beautiful and very humble attitude immediately in front of the reader". (This anent your fears that someone might think the Concordex an official index.)

The other Field Reps have not responded. I believe that if they had had criticisms of import, they would have sent them to me.\*

Many Urantians believe headquarters direct contact with readers and users of the Concordex is limited, altho you, of course, do not. However, relatively, mine are broad and general. Am I to believe that the great bulk of opinion you have been given about the Concordex is as negative as your position suggests? How many complaints have you received or heard about the Concordex compared with the opposite?

A highly placed Urantian suggested a quote from p. 1222 might apply to the headquarters attitude in this matter.

A human being can find truth in his inner experience, but he needs a clear knowledge of facts to apply his personal discovery of truth to the ruthlessly practical demands of everyday life.

#### THIS ISSUE IS VERY IMPORTANT

You may put this letter aside as unimportant. To a great many users of the Concordex it is far more important, apparently, than you know. How important is it to whoever dominates the critic's clique at headquarters? Is it important enough to bring about a real schism?

To me the matter is very important. The Concordex is the biggest thing in my life, apart from the URANTIA Book. I have abundant proof it is functioning as I wanted it to. I believe that if you weighed the mountainous evidence that the Concordex is very important to most Urantians who have it--in contrast to whatever testimony you can gather to support the (many) specious and unfair criticisms I have had from 533, you might withdraw your threats. Altho I am not going to duck an out and out fight if you insist, I would rather settle things as Urantians should. Therefore, I am going to add some facts and matter which may hopefully lead you to see you have been placed in a rather untenable position.

YOU CANNOT possibly contend that what you want in the Concordex is what the great body of Concordex users want. Headquarters erred when it first decided it wanted some changes in my fob matter, in making personal decisions toward that end (1) without seeking to work it out with me amicably, and (2) in not making sure how the Concordex was regarded by a great many people who use it in various ways you seem utterly ignorant of. You err I believe in letting several people's personal tastes foundation an official position. I say "personal" because there surely can be no official doctrinal views as to the interpretation and presentation of our

\* Indeed, because of their positions, they know it would be irresponsible not to do so.

Great Book, enforceable by the Trustees. Derivative book or not, you five Trustees can hardly afford to attempt to dictate how authors or aid creators shall emphasize, de-emphasize, select, elucidate, paraphrase, or communicate, their personal ministries of the Book. To attempt to do so would be Sanhedrist. I would again refer you to Jesus' words to James on p. 1591B. We all, as Apostles of the Book, can be expected to have unity in our devotion and basic faith, but none of us can command that others express only (orally or in writing) what we want expressed, or how they must express it.

I believe many Urantians might agree I have a greater grievance against you than you have against me. You have not evidenced the slightest concern that altho the Concordex has served several thousand readers superbly in their study and mastery of the Book, there are a great many URANTIA Book readers who have been deprived by your equivalent of suppression--not selling to bookstores. You must be fair enough to know that if a hundred users of the Concordex were matched against a hundred readers who have never heard of the Concordex, the Concordex owners would come up far more familiar with the URANTIA Book, far more capable of using it advantageously--in conversation, discussions, in Study Groups, in writing papers and speeches, et cetera.

What you officials have done, or been guilty of, is much worse than benign neglect. You have made decisions affecting readers and the Urantia Movement which in time, you may realize were positively detrimental to the movement.

Some Urantians may feel it is a strange group of Trustees to fulfill the Charter's requirements. NOT ONE TRUSTEE HAS EVER MADE A MODEST, LET ALONE A DETERMINED, ISSUE OF HELPING ALL URANTIA BOOK PURCHASERS KNOW THAT AN INDEX--A VERY GREAT AID--IS AVAILABLE FOR THE GREAT BOOK. Yet you all knew the Doctor's determination had behind it more than an idiosyncratic notion. IF THESE TRUSTEES THOT THE CONCORDEX NOT WORTHY OF THEIR SUPPORT, NOT ONE TRUSTEE HAS EVER SOUGHT TO DISCUSS THE MATTER WITH ME TO SEE IF IT MIGHT BE MADE SUITABLE.

In 7 long years you have kept thousands of readers from learning of an aid to their study that a host of Urantians will say is invaluable and has unlocked the Great Book for them. Many of those thousands who had the Book without an index have drifted away from our Movement because they had no helpful entry into the Book. If you don't know this is true, you are again uninformed of what the Concordex has done in winning such lost readers back.

You have all apparently been satisfied with doing the minimum in carrying out your twin responsibilities. Have you actively helped readers with any aid whatever to their study of the Great Book, comparable to one at your finger tips?

When I created the Concordex to SERVE READERS AS FULLY AS POSSIBLE, I naturally expected all U Bk purchasers would be informed that a valuable aid was available to them. YOU TRUSTEES HAVE A GOOD DEAL TO ANSWER FOR, I BELIEVE. Look at a Concordex. Flip thro it. You have given this proven aid to our movement no more consideration and support than you would to a school child's 50¢ aid.

#### THE SAD RECORD

Untill this moment it was my intention to enumerate here a numbered 30 point and subpoint step-by-step history of our Concordex affairs. I have decided to keep that sad record untill I am compelled to use it.

Instead, we will look at another record, and examine a little the validity of the kind of criticisms, I presume, that fuelled much of the sudden heated disapproval of a few things written in my fob matter. (Your group of critics do not mention the many, many, good things in the fob matter. Nor many uses of the Concordex.)

Since 533 criticisms have been vague and undelineated untill I insisted on details I could understand, and then the criticism became an edict--eliminate!--I am compelled to consider the specifics that came from headquarters but not from Trustees. I suppose it is impossible to separate the official. So I must perforce quote what I can. And this necessitates referring to persons.

If you people in authority will coolly and objectively face what I have had to face, you might come to conclusions different from those prevailing now.

Carolyn has written: The Concordex... "is simply designed to help people locate passages in The URANTIA Book." In view of Carolyn's intelligence and Urantian background this is an absurd statement. It could be made by no one who knows how variously the Concordex is used. It proves she has very little understanding of what the Concordex has meant in our Movement. Yet she carries a heavy voice at 533. She too should read the sheet behind this letter: "WHAT IS THE CONCORDEX? What is it for?"

Carolyn also wrote that "...the Concordex has taken the pressure off the Foundation to rush with the index". That sounds like an honest statement. The only Urantian I have told that to, said at once: "Perhaps that's why they almost suppress the Concordex. So they can save the market as much as possible for their own index."

I would suggest, on behalf of the Great Book and our movement that you render all possible service to U Bk readers by apprising all of them you can of the present Index. Then when you publish yours, do your suppressing of mine.

Carolyn has also pointed out that headquarters encourages no secondary materials and aids now, because "they all have flaws". How insular and reactionary can your board become? Jesus accepted flawed apostles and disciples and followers. But anything you people can identify with must be flawless. Dear God, what a Board!

NOW THAT BRINGS ME to the fact that I will never publish a book that anyone can believe is published by headquarters. This is abundantly clear in the Concordex now, and will be even moreso in future. Only you--at 533--believe the unclean Concordex, admittedly "flawed", is a discredit to headquarters, put out by headquarters.

Yes, the Concordex is innovative. Headquarters says "reference" books have no fob matter like mine. I have published quite a few books. I think all were innovative. They have all been successful. Our Great Book is innovative. But you want its aids not to be? You instruct all who would use the URANTIA Nook to put this new wine in old skins?

But--to continue with some of the headquarters criticisms. Some of what Carolyn condemns (in criticisms circulated at headquarters but not sent me), other good Urantians praise. It's worth illustrating a point or two only. But I could--and will gladly--do the same for a series of these criticisms when it becomes necessary.

The point here is to have you see that what headquarters condemns may hardly be worth all the furore and sticky postures headquarters is getting into.

Carolyn wrote: "Pp. 21-28 give thumbnails on many subjects. They oversimplify and distort, often with a negative twist. They seem to be for the purpose of overawing new readers." You, Tom, might better have asked for specific valid examples of twisting, distortion, and negative twists, instead of saying: "Kill your fob matter." If Carolyn cannot read my heart as can God, she should blush.

Ponder what others say: Letter from Louisiana, (male): "...the bold face samplings (Carolyn's thumb nails) are all very valuable. And the 'You-Admonitions' sections are especially valuable to me personally." Most of my headquarters friends have probably never discovered those sections.

From a woman writing from Germany: "I have just decided that I must stop

reading my URANTIA Book long enough to let you know that I...appreciate your Con-cordex travel guide (thro the Book) very much." She refers to Carolyn's samplings.

One of your Field Reps writes: "I have very much enjoyed 803 excerpts, pp. 41-48." A FUSLA young woman writes: "I found valuable your suggested way of marking (803) passages".

A man writes from Petaluma, Ca.: "I very much like the idea of the 803 excerpts and the way you have laid out for using them.

A man and woman both signed a letter from the state of Washington, saying: "...we really like the 803 goodies trip. A taste here, a taste there...Good way to let friends pick their way along from interest to interest."

But what does headquarters proclaim that suggests my fob matter should be eliminated? Well, Carolyn wrote: "Pp. 41-48 (803 excerpts) are just too contrived. It takes too long to figure them out". But what readers want and like is of small concern, Tom. Carolyn doesn't like it, so let's eliminate it from the Concordex. As in the old quip: "With the Concordex having a friend like Carolyn, it doesn't need enemies."

Carolyn wrote: "He (Clyde) says The URANTIA Book is the only way to save civilization, which seems most arrogant." I regret to say her careless reading leads her into error. What I really say in plain type is: "I believe the URANTIA Book is mankind's only prescription for saving civilization." The first two words and the word "prescription" make a lot of difference. I will refrain from further examples from Carolyn. I am sure she did not intend to be unfair. But had that been her intention, the damage she has done, would probably be no greater.

ASIDE from much of Carolyn's criticisms, the only devastating letter I got from headquarters was from John Hales. I do not believe his letter was of single parentage. In any event, the extremes of his objections to my fob matter, would be palpable to any good Urantian.

When I read only two of his numerous criticisms to a meeting I talked to -- about a dozen Urantians, a week ago--they evoked laughter.

John used the word "attack" eight times as he charged along demolishing the fob Concordex. For instance, he mentioned this sentence: (p. 23, under "JESUS". I was speaking of the New Testament.) "It is a superb Christian document, but is only meagerly Jesusonian." John says: That is "A direct attack upon evolutionary Christianity". I laugh even now myself. It is really very funny, as were a good many of his other irrational statements. However, the humor fades fast when one thinks that a headquarters harboring such chickenish champions of the URANTIA Book is in charge of disseminating the DYNAMIC, INNOVATIVE, "NO HOLDS BARRED" message of the URANTIA Book. How many readers of our Book do you think you can find who will agree with John's designation of that sentence--an "attack" on Christianity?

John quotes my following paragraph: "A progressive society is doomed that will not defend itself against those who would either exploit or destroy it--whether they be unwise do-gooders, animal men, criminal defectives, weak and lazy drones, or the wealthy powerful."

John's comment on that sentence (I could hardly believe it) is: "This implies that The URANTIA Book encourages one to become racist, as well as elitist." Are not all Urantians elitists? Was not Jesus elitist? And his apostles? I hope there are enough elitist Christians so we can overcome all those I mention before they complete their destruction of our western society. I stand by those words. I got all of that idea from the URANTIA Book. Of course it accords with my beliefs, not John's. A \$26 price on a book (that is desperately needed by an enormous mass of spiritually hung-y people) at a time when we are headed for recession and depression when people will have even less than now to spend, makes the URANTIA crowd elitist. Elitists can be quite OK, if they are the right kind of elitists. But racists? I laugh again.

John also quotes a sentence of mine and says: "That is a direct criticism of evolutionary Christianity". Perhaps you people at headquarters read a different URANTIA Book than I do. It is because traditional Christianity was, is, in need of change, of criticism, our Book is here.

I have the conviction that some 533 people believe readers should be seduced into the URANTIA Book--believing it to be a nice amplified statement of conventional Christianity. I will never stoop to that. The vast mass of our prospects for the URANTIA MOVEMENT are those spiritually confused, hungry, disillusioned souls who want our NEW BOOK OF THE NEW GOSPEL.

Others of John's "attacks" on the Concordex would either amuse or astonish you, but I will keep them for a more appropriate time. Now again, I do not believe John set out to make unsupportable attacks. (Since he likes that word.) I believe he has better judgment than his letter to me evidences. Nevertheless, no one can read what he writes, and not knowing the context of what I wrote, fail to believe that I am some sort of ghoulish anti-Christian monster. No wonder people laugh.

WELL, I am as tired of writing this as you are of reading it. But I must make another point or two.

You have demanded, Tom, that I do all the work of rewriting all of my fob matter, then submit it to headquarters for approval. Approval? Whose approval? I do not know what are the views of individual trustees--or of whoever would do the approving? Are they discriminating readers of the type of John and Carolyn? Would those two, because they have been leaders in denunciations be part of the group to straighten out my thinking and writing? I hope you can see how impossible is your demand in my eyes. And how ridiculous it will be in the eyes of anyone who ever becomes privy to this correspondence.

There has been no suggestion to me that changes you want are desired for the benefit of readers. I have not heard from Christy or anyone else that you have been instructed to get that "terrible fob matter changed to meet the gentle views of certain headquarters people". I daresay you cannot show me a hundred letters condemning my fob matter. But I can show you hundreds of letters lauding, and giving thanks for, the Concordex. Most of them, by the way, like the letters quoted above, from people I have never met or seen.

I even know of two instances, come to my attention within the past month, of men who read the FOB matter of the Concordex, and bought the URANTIA Book without taking it out of the carton. One a California man, the other a New Jersey man.

#### MY INTENTIONS FOR THE CONCORDEX

I have stated before, and repeat: Any subsequent editions of the Concordex will be as good, and as much improved, as I can make them--not to meet headquarters peculiar criticisms, but because I love the Book the Concordex serves, and because I will continue to seek to meet--insofar as I can discern them--the wishes of Authorities we all would please.

I PRAY for wisdom for you, and success in the difficult position you hold. Perhaps you pray for me. But I do not intend, Tom, to submit my work to the ravaging critical wolves of headquarters. There was a time when headquarters was different...

After Christy had had time to fully read and examine the Concordex, she added handwritten note to a typed letter, reading: "I hope the sales of your Concordex boom". And Bill Hales who once held the same elevated position you hold wrote, May 11, 1971: "...heartily compliment you on your Concordex! What a tremendous,

Your suggestions as to how to use the Concordex to get the most benefit from the Urantia Book sharpens it as a valuable tool for its purpose. The 803 excerpts tabulation is unique to me and intriguing," (To Carolyn these were too contrived, remember.) He continued: "I have already made much use of the Concordex and am appreciative for its existence. Thank you for your perseverance and talents in producing it. Your 'labor of love' will enrich the use and effect of the Urantia Book to individuals many times over. Sincerely, Bill".

Perhaps he was not wise enough, as you present Trustees are, to be ashamed of the Concordex. For on 2/13/74, after nearly 3 years experience with the Concordex, Bill confirmed those views to me via telephone, and gave me permission as my margin notes indicate, to use his letter any way I wished in connection with the second edition. (His is one of a great many great letters I have never used. Maybe I shall have to use them sooner or later, to combat the sophism at 533.)

Your last letter said you very much wanted to work with me. But working with you means submitting to unreasonable demands.

\*

Tom, I truly regret all this hassle. I regret I have felt compelled to fight back on behalf of a work that is better than you believe it to be. But that I know will never be perfect even tho I strive forever to improve it. I am interested in serving the URANTIA Movement. I do not cotton to try to learn from one year to another what criticisms a group of Trustees may be currently listening to so I may conform to their current personal opinions. I am determined to serve God and man to the best of my ability and to the extent of my resources.

I hope you can come to new conclusions from the above. I will not write another long appeal to reason such as this. Next time, if our differences continue, I will be available with an enormous backing of materials no letter can contain. And we will seek adjustment on the basis of what is best for our Movement.

Sincerely yours,

P.S. The following may interest you, even if it is thus far, less than you want. Several years ago, Julia suggested to me that the word "beatnik" was passe. I agreed with her and immediately marked it to come out. The editorial comment you dislike on pp. 178, 271, 402--are not needed and are coming out. A part of that on p. 333 is killed, and a part will go elsewhere in the listings, in all probability.

Now that the Concordex has been out a while, I am willing for it to be less personal, but not impersonal. Your official index should be neuter, cold, impassive. My Concordex is a labor of love, a very personal service to all readers I can help--a ministry of mine, some people call it. You MUST be able to see the difference or our difficulties will continue. Not a single experienced or mature Urantian wants me to make the Concordex an impersonal, cold, impassive, neuter work--so far as I have been able to discover. I do not ask that those who bitterly criticize the Concordex come to like it. Let them despise it. But because it does not suit their personal sociological "sets", they have no right to deprive thousands of URANTIA Book readers of it, unless I "knuckle" and adopt their "sets" instead of what I personally believe is right for the audience to which I seem to be successfully appealing.



To Tom Kendall:

I have far far too many exhibits, testimonials, et cetera to handle in a paper such as your letter is. But at the last minute I thot I should include this especially pat one. It is natural for people to judge the Concordex subjectively, how it fits their needs.

From a Staten Island, N.Y. woman I received a letter dated January 31, responding to the request for suggestions and criticisms.

She wrote, among very complimentary things. "I do not think of the Concordex in a selling role".

Finally, in responding to a great many writers I addressed her on May 8, and explained that the Concordex was deliberately planned for new and prospective readers, as well as for veteran readers. And to eliminate the discussion on the URANTIA Book, which she called "sell" would impair its usefulness to thousands of prospective and new readers. I expected no response from her. But one came.

In her second letter she wrote:

"Your letter gave me a fresh insight into the values of the Concordex as it is...I think timing had a bearing on my feeling about it. (I came to it after the URANTIA Book.) If I had seen it first, I feel sure it would have led me into the Book. The liveliness of it has special merit. Something prepared by an outsider, by contrast, might be dry as dust (the way you people want it Tom. Clyde)with all the "factual ORDERLY, MATERIAL". Yours is lively and full of caring.

Your Concordex has made its own place; I am thankful that we have it as a help--as a help in searching, and as a replacement for poor memory.

I hope to see you in Wisconsin this August. Thank you for an enormous contribution to us all."

It is strange to me how quickly ordinary readers and Urantians in general grasp and get the point, and how 533 cannot get it, no matter how much they are told and shown.

Clyde