More on a vegetarian diet

A reader interested in the article “Me, A Vegetarian?” (Dialogue 5:1) sent us from England a press report that appeared in The Independent, June 24, 1994: “People who do not eat meat are 40 percent less likely than others to die of cancer, researchers have found. Strong evidence that a vegetarian diet does protect against all types of cancer emerged from a 12-year study of more than 11,000 adults.”—The Editors.

Challenged to remain faithful

Finally, I was able to obtain my first copy of Dialogue! Since I am the only Adventist student at a Catholic university in this city, I really enjoyed the “First Person” story, which challenged me to remain faithful to my Lord. The rest of the articles, reports, and book reviews have given me lots to think about. I’m looking forward to the next issue!

FERNANDO J. IBÁÑEZ C.
Capital, Stgo. del Estero,
ARGENTINA

Questions on sociobiology

I wish to make two points in response to Ronald L. Carter’s article on sociobiology (“Do Genes Determine Morality?” Dialogue 5:3). While it has been traditional in Adventism to insist on a literal six-day creation, this has virtually nothing to do with the actual Hebrew text. In fact, some of the Jewish and Arab scholars from whom we expropriated our scientific attitudes piecemeal, taught theories of evolution centuries before Darwin was a gleam in his mother’s eye or a pair of gametes itching to unite. What is more, some of these scholars even maintained that the Bible taught such evolution.

Further, to contend that evolutionary theory and sociobiology in particular pose a threat to moral standards is nonsense. This view derives from
confusion as to what constitutes human and animal nature. If Carter is interested in a critique of sociobiology that demonstrates this, he should read Mary Midgley’s *Beast and Man.* If he wants buttressing for his sagging faith, somebody else is bound to provide it.

**Philip Farson**
Anchorage, Alaska, U.S.A.

I have reservations about the approach suggested by Ronald Carter in “Do Genes Determine Morality?” Sociobiology, as a theory, is valuable only to those who choose not to believe in a Creator. The weakness of sociobiology is that it tries to explain the cause by starting with the results. An animal that displays a certain behavior survives not because it has certain genes. Instead, it is able to pass on its genes because it has survived thanks to its altruistic behavior. Furthermore, there are logical problems with this theory (keep in mind that learned behavior will not be transmitted to the next generation): (1) Where does altruistic behavior come from? A single animal with a mutation toward kin selection will give its life for relatives that may not have this mutation. The genetic information won by this mutation is lost again. (2) Selfish genes are nonsense: (a) Having a single gene that seeks to increase the probability of perpetuation by repression of other genes is a disadvantage; only genetical variety is an advantage for survival in a changing environment; (b) On a molecular level, a single gene has no possibility of ensuring its own survival. (3) Sociobiology cannot explain altruistic behavior, for behavior is too complex to be determined by a single gene. One needs millions of years to explain the evolution of many genes acting together to provide altruism. Morality is not totally independent of genes, though I don’t believe that genes determine morality.

**Stephan Guenther**
Hannover, GERMANY

The author responds:

Mr. Farson needs to be reminded that nowhere in my article did I refer to a Creation week, nor was my point to defend it. However, I personally accept it by faith. There are reputable scholars who maintain that the writer of Genesis intended his readers to understand his words to mean a literal 24-hour six-day Creation.

Whether one accepts a God-directed Creation or an evolutionary process extending over long ages, the issue remains: Is morality the result of God’s intentional plan or is it a product of nature’s blind good luck? Herein lies my basic disagreement with Mr. Farson’s second point. My reading of sociobiology literature, and Midgley’s *Beast and Man,* only increases my belief that there are few substantive differences between humans and animals except those that are gifts of the Holy Spirit. Such a notion does not cause my faith to sag; instead it brings concordance to my faith and science.

We do not need to reject all the mechanisms of sociobiology just because its theoretical base is atheistic. Christians should recognize, however, that a wholesale acceptance of all the assumptions of evolutionary theory and sociobiology is dangerous because it makes morality merely an outgrowth of sexual fitness, which may be true only in a Godless social system.

I agree with Mr. Guenther that sociobiology and various other theories based on evolutionary assumptions are prone to commit the Is/Ought or Naturalistic Fallacy. Arguments from design, based on the belief in a Creator, can give reason for shared altruistic behaviors. But these arguments do not rule out post-Creation evolutionary change. Sociobiology is not without its weaknesses. Truly, it is a leap of faith to go from acts of ant “altruism” to human concepts of morality. However, sociobiologists use the “selfish gene” phrase symbolically to represent genetic material underlying the behavior. The study of behavior genetics provides many examples of complex behaviors controlled, to various degrees, by a single or few genes. Current medical advances at the molecular level demonstrate that numerous human behavior disorders are based in simple genetic systems.

Mr. Guenther refers to several technical issues that can only be alluded to in our limited space. Competition at a molecular level does seem to occur, at least for rates of replication and synthesis. Certain theories posit the reorganization of existing genetic material rather than the evolution of new sequences. This would allow for rapid evolutionary events. The main purpose of my article was not to provide a complete evaluation of sociobiology. Instead, I wanted the reader to recognize that within this theory there are scientific understandings that conform with a biblical view of man.

**Ronald L. Carter**
Loma Linda University, U.S.A.

The best paradigm

As a teacher of Bible and French, I’ve received Dialogue through the years. Thank you for a thought-provoking, issue-oriented journal!

Continued on page 33

**Letters**

We welcome your letters, but limit your comments to 200 words. Address them to: Dialogue Letters, 12501 Old Columbia Pike; Silver Spring; MD 20904-6600; U.S.A. If selected for this section, your letter may be edited for clarity or space.
Are humans and animals equal?
Animal rights advocates would say yes. Others would say that there are essential differences between the two. What is the Christian stand? Does the Bible say anything on the issue?

Christians, on the one hand, see the mystery and sanctity of all life, originating as it does from God. On the other hand, they are also conscious of the uniqueness of human life, made in the image of God. This difference between human and animal life needs to be underscored because animal-rights advocates believe that there is essentially no difference between the two. In an interview with *Harper’s Magazine*, Ingrid Newkirk, a defender of animal rights, argued that animals also possess those attributes that supposedly set humans apart from animals (such as tool use and use of language): “None of this differentiates humans from other animals. You cannot find a relevant attribute in human beings that doesn’t exist in animals as well.” In Newkirk’s world, humans would have no more rights than animals. “They would be just another animal in the pack.”

Without the Bible, we too would probably arrive at a similar conclusion. So we turn to what the Scriptures say on the issue.

**The use of “soul”**

The Bible does use the word *soul* for both humans and animals. Some understand from this usage that the Bible recognizes no difference between humans and animals, but the problem disappears once we understand what the word *soul* means in the Scriptures.

In the Old Testament, the word commonly translated soul is *nephesh*, “one of the primary meanings of the word *nephesh*, ‘soul,’ is ‘life,’ as it is translated 119 times (Gen. 9:4, 5; Job 2:4, 6; etc.), or ‘breath,’ as it is rendered in Job 41:21.... In Gen. 1:20, 30 the brute creation is said to have a *nephesh*, ‘life.’”

Another Hebrew word that deserves notice is *ruach*. Consider its usage in Ecclesiastes 3:19-21: “For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast: for all is vanity. . . Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?”

The word *ruach* is translated as “breath” in verse 19 and as “the spirit” in verse 21. This passage is discussing the fact that both humans and animals have the same principle of life or breath, and that humans have no advantage over animals in terms of what happens at death—the breath departs. The one thing that humans have in common with animals is the principle of life and the principle of death: “It is specifically stated that both animals and men have the same ‘breath,’ *ruach*, and that at death the same thing happens to both of them.”

The New Testament translates the Greek *psuche* as “soul.” “Psuche (plural, *psuchai*) is translated 40 times in the NT as ‘life’ or ‘lives.’...It is rendered 58 times as ‘soul’ or ‘souls.’”

The word for soul (*psuche*) is thus used of animal life as well as of human life. In Revelation 8:9 *psuche* is translated “creatures,” obviously referring to marine life. In Genesis 8:1 the Hebrew *nephesh* is similarly used of animals. So from the use of the word *soul* to both humans and animals, the only thing we can conclude is that they both have life. But we cannot conclude that there are no differences between the human and the animal.
Animals in Research? No!

Every year, tens of millions of animals die in U.S. laboratories. Experimenters force animals to ingest or absorb through the skin products such as nail polish and oven cleaner, torment them in devastating psychological experiments, infect them with “human” diseases, surgically impair them, addict them to alcohol or drugs, and shock, burn, drown, starve and mutilate them.

The U.S. government and private industry spend billions of dollars a year to fund such studies. Meanwhile, many people with cancer, heart disease, AIDS, substance addiction and other debilitating illnesses and injuries cannot get the treatment or assistance they need because of lack of funds.

Many makers of cosmetics and household products use cell and tissue cultures instead of animals, and many doctors and researchers rely on clinical and epidemiological studies, “skin” grafts, computer simulations, and mannequins to help them provide patients with the most up-to-date treatments.

Christine Jackson, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Washington, D.C.

The mode of creation

In fact, the Bible makes it clear that humans are definitely different from animals. When God made Adam, He “formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul” (Genesis 2:7). Picture the great Creator as He kneels down in the fresh dirt and molds and fashions the first human “in His own image,” breathing into him the breath of life. Animals were not created that way: “And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so” (Genesis 1:24).

Further, speaking about the creation of human beings, the psalmist says: “For thou hast made him [man] a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour” (Psalms 8:5). No such description can be found about animal creation.

Made in the image of God

Above all, the Bible affirms that human beings are made in God’s image: “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness...” (Genesis 1:26). The description is not applied to any other creature. Ellen White suggests that a large part of this “image of God” refers to human mind: “Man was formed in the likeness of God. His nature was in harmony with the will of God. His mind was capable of comprehending divine things.”

White identifies this difference as “a power akin to that of the Creator—individuality, power to think and to do.” Jack Provonshe elaborates on this distinguishing feature of humans over animals: “Objects—things—can only be acted upon. Living things...can also be acted upon, but they may...react.... Human beings share with both nonliving things and living plants and animals their being acted upon and reacting. But the truly human is unique in his or her ability to act in ways that are surprising and unpredictable.”

One feature of human activity that sets humans apart from animals is memory of the past and understanding of the future. Animals do not have this capacity. Our memory of history coupled with a concern for the future helps us to make decisions for today. We then modify our behavior based on the feedback we receive as a consequence of our actions. Many animals can modify behavior based on feedback but this is only a short-term function and is not based on memory of the past or a sense of the future.

A sense of right and wrong

Another aspect that distinguishes us from animals is our sense of right and wrong. Except for humans whose brains have been irreparably damaged, most people have some sense of what is right or wrong. It may be a very twisted moral sense but nevertheless it is there, and it governs the way an individual acts and reacts. Even the most intelligent animals do not appear to have any moral principles. That is not to say animals have no control over their behavior. They do have controls, but these are instinctive rather than thought-out principles based on a moral code.

Some may suggest that the great apes and other mammals are as intelligent as humans, and that they can act in surprising and unpredictable ways. Despite repeated attempts to show such intelligence in animals, humans are light years ahead of all other animals in moral reasoning, thinking, and doing. Furthermore, humans have a spiritual dimension that animals lack. God commanded us to worship Him and even set apart one day each week for that purpose. Animals apparently are incapable of worship.

Some others would suggest that animals are even better than humans. Animals did not plan and carry out wars that have marred our civilization. This only shows how much we have fallen from our original exalted state.

Another area in which the Bible distinguishes the human from the animal is the former’s stewardship of the latter. “And God said unto them,...have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living creature that moveth upon the earth” (Genesis 1:28).

The use of animals

The entry of sin brought in a sacrificial system, involving the lives of innocent animals. God instructed Adam and Eve on the meaning of sacrifice. In the concept that an animal was to die for human sin, we see that human life is different from animal life. But even in the sacrificial system, Satan introduced the idea that humans and animals were
no different, and instigated human sacrifice, putting human life on the same level as animal life.

In regard to animal sacrifice, God gave Moses detailed instructions on how these offerings should be carried out. No mention is made of avoiding animal sacrifice (see Leviticus 1-4). The Old Testament also has instruction on the use of animals as beasts of burden and as food, on the one hand, and on the care of animals in good surroundings and with gentleness.

**Human worth and animal care**

In the teachings of Jesus there emerges the clear idea that while we should care for animals, we should not forget that humans are of higher worth: “What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it falls into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep?” (Matthew 12:11, 12).

On another occasion Jesus said, “Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. ... ye are of more value than many sparrows” (Matthew 10:29, 31). This passage teaches two things. First, God watches over everything He made, even the tiny sparrows. This means that we too have a responsibility for protecting animals. We should protect them from suffering and their habitat from destruction. If God is watching a baby loon on Moss Lake in the Adirondack Mountains, I should be, too. If God is concerned about the quality of the water and the death of fish in the Chesapeake Bay, I should be, too.

Jesus has given “special direction in regard to the performance of acts of mercy toward man and beast... While the law of God requires supreme love to man and impartial love to our neighbors, its far-reaching requirements also take in the dumb creatures that cannot express in words their wants or sufferings.”

Second, humans are, in a way that may be only partially definable, “above” or “better” than animals. If it comes to a choice between an animal and a human, we should always vote for the human. Ellen White seems to support what might be called an animal-use/animal-welfare view: “He who created man made the lower animals also, and ‘his tender mercies are over all his works.’ [Psalms 145:9]. The animals were created to serve man, but he has no right to cause them pain by harsh treatment or cruel exaction.”

**Implications for the Christian**

Any discussion of animal use and welfare must make us sensitive to a dichotomy: God has an orderly universe but we live in a fallen world. In God’s perfect universe, nothing would die. Death in our sinful part of that universe was a result of sin. In our world death is a reality. Living in this sinful world, Christians attempt to apply principles of the coming kingdom. In practical terms, this implies that a follower of Jesus will be kind to animals while using them to benefit humanity. We should always foster animal welfare and good care. This is one of the reasons why many Adventists tend toward a vegetarian diet.

As we noted above, God gave us stewardship of animals. This implies, among other things, that we will have to make decisions about animals—in some cases, which ones live and which ones die. For example, a person may get malaria, caused by a microscopic protozoa. A human makes the decision to kill the protozoa and thus save the person’s life. Rats carry fleas which in turn carry causative agents of plague. We make the decision to destroy the rats and save people’s lives.

But when you throw out the Bible, the principle of stewardship goes with it. Then there is no control. If all life is equal, no one is in charge and chaos reigns.

This creates problems even for animal-rights advocates. I recently saw a video that advocated absolutely no use of animals by humans. It showed an animal farm where animals that have been rescued from slaughter are being allowed to live their lives in peace and harmony. The only problem is, What do you feed them? Of course the cows, sheep, and pigs can eat plant food. (So far I haven’t heard of any plant rights groups.) But what about the dogs they rescue from “cruel” research laboratories? Dogs are carnivores—meat eaters. Are you going to convince them to eat plants? No doubt there are people who feed their dogs only a vegetarian diet, but that’s not what dogs (or lions) eat naturally. Animal-
rights advocates try to make nature sound peaceful and happy, but any biologist knows that is a false picture.

We do live in a sinful world, one where an animal’s “freedom” may impinge on my health or survival. Ellen White advocated the killing of pests. “God has given no man the message, Kill not ant or flea or moth. Troublesome and harmful insects and reptiles we must guard against and destroy, to preserve ourselves and our possessions from harm.”

Behind human-animal equivalency

We have seen that the Bible places humans above animals. What, then, is the origin of the concept that all life is equal? The answer goes back to the father of all lies.

Think for a moment of the idea of organic evolution—that life originated as a result of unknown processes taking place in a “soup” of chemicals. The first living cell supposedly gave rise to other cells, which, over much time and many cell generations, eventually developed into all other forms of life on this planet. Humans, then, represent nothing more than the latest step in a long evolutionary development from the first living cell. Therefore, if you accept the organic evolutionary theory of the origin of living things, you will accept that all life is basically the same. The evolutionist sees only a quantitative difference—not a qualitative difference—between humans and other animals. Followed to its logical conclusion, this leads one to believe that a human life is no more valuable than a mosquito’s.

Of course, one may not be ready to go that far. Animal-rights advocates don’t usually try to stop people from killing mosquitoes. But it is important to see where these ideas lead. Animal-rights advocates want all human use of animals stopped—whether in medical research, as pets (unless they are treated exactly as members of the family), as food, or for pleasure (as in circuses).

The question, then, is: On what do we base value? On intelligence? On performance? Or on contribution to society? For the Christian, the answer is clear: on the basis of our creation in the image of God and our re-creation through Jesus Christ. No animal was made in God’s image, and no animal can ever experience the spiritual new birth.

Practical applications

Elsewhere I have discussed animal use in research and guidelines that ought to govern such use. But can doing research on animals ever be considered compatible with the Christian duty to treat all life with respect? Our discussion thus far leads me to say yes—if the research is potentially beneficial to humanity and is done with the highest regard for life.

Christine Jackson (see box, p.6) suggests that money should be spent on disease treatment rather than on research. This is like offering a Band-Aid™ to a child who is playing with a knife. Treatment is a temporary “solution” when we are dealing with a fatal disease like AIDS. Research has potential to find a cure or a vaccine. As Ronald G. Calhoun points out (see box, p.7), tremendous strides have been made against many human diseases by animal research. If researchers in years past had taken the Band-Aid™ approach, our life expectancy today would be about 40 years.

Where does all this leave us, as Christians? On the solid biblical ground that humans and animals are not the same. They are significantly different in worth, dignity, and destiny. While we are given dominion and authority over the animal kingdom, our stewardship should enable us to treat animals with kindness and care, even as we use them in legitimate ways.

Notes and References

2. Ibid., p. 51.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., vol. 5, p. 379.

Pontius Puddle
“In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.”
— Genesis 1:1

With such beauty, majesty, and simplicity begins the Genesis account of Creation. Yet an analysis of Genesis chapter 1 is not as simple and straightforward as a casual reading of the biblical text may suggest. Modern interpretation of biblical cosmogony (understanding of origins) in Genesis 1 is extremely complicated, divided between the non-literal and the literal. We will briefly describe seven such interpretations, and evaluate each in the light of the biblical data.

**Major interpretations of Genesis 1**

**Non-literal interpretations**

Scholars who hold a non-literal interpretation of Genesis approach the issue in different ways. Some see Genesis 1 as mythology¹; others view it as poetry²; some consider it as theology³; still others regard it as symbolism.⁴ Common to all these non-literal views is the assumption that the Genesis Creation account is not a literal, straightforward historical account of Creation.

**Literal interpretations**

Those who accept a literal reading of the Creation account also differ in their approaches to biblical cosmogony of Genesis 1. We may note three such views.

**Active-gap view.** This view is also known as “ruin-restoration” theory. According to this view, Genesis 1:1 describes an originally perfect creation some unknown time ago (millions or billions of years ago). Satan was ruler of this world, but because of his rebellion (Isaiah 14:12–17), sin entered the universe. God judged the rebellion and reduced it to the ruined, chaotic state described in Genesis 1:2. Those holding this view translate Genesis 1:2 as “the earth became without form and void.”

Genesis 1:3 and the following verses then present an account of a later creation in which God restored what had been ruined. The geological column is usually fitted into the period of time of the first creation (Genesis 1:1) and the succeeding chaos, and not in connection with the biblical Flood.

**Precreation “unformed-unfilled” view.** According to this interpretation, the Hebrew terms tohu (“unformed”) and bohu (“unfilled”) in Genesis 1:2 describe the “unformed-unfilled” state of the earth. The text refers to a state prior to the creation spoken of in the Bible. This view has two main variations based on two different grammatical analyses.

The first variation sees Genesis 1:1 as a dependent clause, paralleling the extra-biblical ancient Near Eastern creation accounts.⁶ So the translation proposed: “When God began to create the heaven and earth.” Therefore Genesis 1:2 equals a parenthesis, describing the state of the earth when God began to create (“the earth being . . .”) and Genesis 1:3 on describe the actual work of creation (“And God said . . .”).

The other major variation takes Genesis 1:1 as an independent clause, and as a summary statement or formal introduction or title which is then elaborated in the rest of the narrative.⁷
Genesis 1:2 is seen as a circumstantial clause connected with verse 3: “Now the earth was unformed and unfilled . . . . And God said, ‘Let there be light.’”

In the pre-Creation unformed-unfilled view, supported by either grammatical analysis mentioned above, Genesis does not present an absolute beginning of time for the cosmos. Creation out of nothing is not implied, and there is no indication of God’s existence before matter. Nothing is said of the creation of original matter described in verse 2. The darkness, deep, and water of Genesis 1:2 already existed at the beginning of God’s creative activity.

We might note in passing another pre-Creation view; it takes verse 2 as a dependent clause “when . . . ,” but it differs from the first variant in interpreting the words tohu and bohu, and the terms for “darkness” and “deep”—all as signifying “nothingness.” So verse 1 is seen as a summary; verse 2 says that initially there was “nothingness,” and verse 3 describes the beginning of the creative process.

Initial “unformed-unfilled” view. A third literal interpretation of biblical cosmogony is the initial “unformed-unfilled” view. This is the traditional view, having the support of the majority of Jewish and Christian interpreters through history. According to this understanding, Genesis 1:1 declares that God created out of nothing the original matter called heaven and earth at the point of their absolute beginning. Verse 2 clarifies that when the earth was first created it was in a state of tohu and bohu—unformed and unfilled. Verse 3 and those following then describe the divine process of forming the unformed and filling the unfilled.

This interpretation has two variations. Some see all of verses 1 and 2 as part of the first day of the seven-day Creation week. We may call this the “no-gap” interpretation. Others see verses 1-2 as a chronological unity separated by a gap in time from the first day of Creation described in verse 3. This view is usually termed the “passive gap.”

**Evaluation**

Space does not permit a detailed evaluation of all the pros and cons of each view we have summarized, but we will present the basic contours of the biblical data as they pertain to the theories on the origin of matter and life and their early existence.

**Non-literal interpretations**

In considering all the non-literal, nonhistorical interpretations, we must take into account two significant biblical facts:

1. The **literary genre** of Genesis chapters 1-11 indicates the intended literal nature of the account. The book of Genesis is structured by the word “generations” (Hebrew toledoth) in connection with each section of the book (13 times). This is a word used elsewhere in the setting of genealogies concerned with the accurate account of time and history. The use of toledoth in Genesis 2:4 shows that the author intended the account of Creation to be just as literal as the rest of the Genesis narratives. Other biblical writers take Genesis chapters 1-11 as literal. In fact, all New Testament writers refer affirmatively to Genesis 1-11 as literal history.

2. **Internal evidence** also indicates that the Creation account is not to be taken symbolically as seven long ages conforming to the evolutionary model—as suggested by many both critical and evangelical scholars. The terms “evening and morning” signify a literal 24-hour day. Elsewhere in Scripture, the word day with an ordinal number is always literal. If Creation days are symbolic, Exodus 20:8-11 commemorating a literal Sabbath does not make sense. References to the function of the sun and moon for signs, seasons, days, and years (Genesis 1:14), also indicate literal time, not symbolic. Therefore, we must conclude that Genesis 1:1-2:4a indicates seven literal, successive, 24-hour days of creation.

While the non-literal interpretations must be rejected in what they deny (namely, the literal, historical nature of the Genesis account), nevertheless they have an element of truth in what they affirm. Genesis 1-2 is concerned with mythology—not to affirm a mythological interpretation, but as a polemic against ancient Near Eastern mythology. Genesis 1:1-2:4 is very likely structured in a way similar to Hebrew poetry (synthetic parallelism), but poetry does not negate historicity (see, for example, Exodus 15, Daniel 7, and some 40 percent of the Old Testament, which is in poetry). Biblical writers often write in poetry to underscore historicity.

Genesis 1-2 does present a profound theology: doctrines of God, Creation,
humanity, Sabbath, and so on. But theology in Scripture is not opposed to history. In fact, biblical theology is rooted in history. Likewise, there is deep symbolism in Genesis 1. For example, the language of the Garden of Eden and the occupation of Adam and Eve clearly allude to sanctuaries and the work of the Levites (see Exodus 25-40). Thus the sanctuaries of Eden are a symbol or type of the heavenly sanctuary. But because it points beyond itself does not detract from its own literal reality.

Gerhard von Rad, a critical scholar who refuses to accept what Genesis 1 asserts, still honestly confesses, “What is said here [Genesis 1] is intended to hold true entirely and exactly as it stands.”

We therefore affirm the literal, historical nature of the Genesis account. But which literal interpretation is correct?

**Literal interpretations**

First, we must immediately reject the ruin-restoration or active gap theory purely on grammatical grounds. Genesis 1:2 clearly contains three noun clauses and the fundamental meaning of noun clauses in Hebrew is something fixed, a state, not a sequence or action. According to laws of Hebrew grammar, we must translate “the earth was unformed and unfilled,” not “the earth became unformed and unfilled.” Thus Hebrew grammar leaves no room for the active gap theory.

What about the pre-Creation unformed-unfilled interpretation in which the tohu-bohu state of Genesis 1:2 comes before divine creation? Some support this by translating verse 1 as a dependent clause. But major lines of evidence favor the traditional reading of Genesis 1:1 as an independent clause: “In the beginning, God created the heavens and earth.” This includes the evidence from Hebrew accent marks, all ancient versions, lexical/grammatical, syntactical and stylistic considerations, and contrasts with ancient Near Eastern stories. The weight of evidence leads me to retain the traditional reading.

Others support the pre-Creation unformed-unfilled view by interpreting Genesis 1:1 as a summary of the whole chapter (the actual creation starting only in verse 3). But if Genesis 1 begins with only a title or summary, then verse 2 contradicts verse 1. God creates the earth (verse 1), but the earth preexists creation (verse 2). This interpretation simply cannot explain the reference to the existence of the earth already in verse 2. It breaks the continuity between verse 1 and verse 2 in the use of the term earth. Therefore I conclude that Genesis 1:1 is not simply a summary or title of the whole chapter.

Against the suggestion that all the words in Genesis 1:2 simply imply “nothingness,” it must be observed that verses 3 and following do not describe the creation of water, but assume its prior existence. The word tohoh “deep,” combined with tohu and bohu together (as in Jeremiah 4:34) do not seem to refer to nothingness, but rather to the earth in an unformed-unfilled state covered by water.

This leads us to the initial unformed-unfilled position. A straightforward reading of the flow of thought in Genesis 1:1-3 has led the majority of Christian and Jewish interpreters in the history of interpretation to this position, hence this is called the traditional view.

**The natural flow of Genesis 1-2**

I concur with this view, because I find that only this interpretation cohesively follows the natural flow of these verses, without contradiction or omission of any element of the text.

The flow of thought in Genesis 1-2 is as follows:

a. God is before all creation (verse 1).

b. There is an absolute beginning of time with regard to this world and its surrounding heavenly spheres (verse 1).

c. God creates the heavens and earth (verse 1), but they are at first different than now, they are “unformed” and “unfilled” (tohu and bohu; verse 2).

d. On the first day of the seven-day Creation week, God begins to form and fill the tohu and bohu (verses 3 and following).

e. The “forming and filling” creative activity of God is accomplished in six successive literal 24-hour days.

f. At the end of creation week, the heavens and earth are finally finished (Genesis 2:1). What God began in verse 1 is now completed.

g. God rests on the seventh day, blessing and sanctifying it as a memorial of creation (2:1-4).

**The ambiguity of when**

The above points stand clear in the flow of thought of Genesis 1-2. However, there is one crucial aspect in this creation process which the text leaves open and ambiguous: When did the absolute beginning of the heavens and earth in verse 1 occur? Was it at the commencement of the seven days of Creation or sometime before? It is possible that the “raw materials” of the heavens and earth in their unformed-unfilled state were created long before the seven days of creation week. This is the “passive gap” theory. It is also possible that the “raw materials” described in Genesis 1:1, 2 are included in the first day of the seven-day Creation week. This is called the “no gap” theory.

This ambiguity in the Hebrew text has implications for interpreting the Precambrian of the geological column, if one roughly equates the Precambrian with the “raw materials” described in Genesis 1:1-2 (of course this equation is debatable). There is a possibility of a young Precambrian, created as part of the seven-day Creation week (perhaps with the appearance of old age). There is also the possibility of the “raw materials” being created at a time of absolute beginning of this earth and its surrounding heavenly spheres, perhaps millions or billions of years ago. This initial unformed-unfilled state is described in verse 2. Verses 3 and following then describe the process of forming and filling during the seven-day Creation week.

I conclude that the biblical text of Genesis 1 leaves room for either (a) a
young Precambrian (created as part of the seven days of Creation), or (b) much older fossil earth rocks, with a long interval between the creation of the inanimate “raw materials” on earth described in Genesis 1:1, 2 and the seven days of Creation week described in Genesis 1:3 and following. But in either case, the biblical text calls for a short chronology for life on earth. There is no room for any gap of time in the creation of life on this earth: it came during the third through the sixth literal, successive 24-hour days of Creation week.

Richard M. Davidson (Ph.D., Andrews University) is chairman of the Old Testament Department at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. He is the author of several articles and books, including Typology in Scripture (Andrews University Press, 1981), Love Song for the Sabbath (Review and Herald, 1987), and In the Footsteps of Joshua (Review and Herald, 1995).
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5. See, for examples, Arthur Custance, Without Form and Void (Brockville, Canada: By the Author, 1970); and the Scofield Reference Bible (1917, 1967).


22. Genesis’ Hebrew Grammar, p. 455 (par. 142 c), which identifies vs. 2 as a circumstantial clause contemporaneous with the main clause of vs. 1 (not of vs. 3).
October 22, 1994. Thousands of worshippers from all across the United States had crowded the small rural farmhouse in Low Hampton, New York. They had come not just to worship, but to contemplate on a religious phenomenon that occurred 150 years ago. They had come to commemorate the time when the “faithful” had sold their farms, made wrongs right, and gathered at the Low Hampton homestead to await the Second Advent. They had come to renew their commitment to a vision, for “the vision is yet for an appointed time... though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come” (Habakkuk 2:3).

They had come to remember William Miller, the man behind the story of 1844.

William Miller was born on February 15, 1782, in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, in the northeastern region of the United States. His father had fought in the American Revolutionary War. Even though he did not make a public profession of religion, he made his house available to neighbors for worship and preaching. His mother, Paulina Phelps, daughter of a Baptist minister, brought a religious heritage to the home.

The young William’s life parallels and reflects the early period of American history. He was the eldest of 16 children and “his was the classic story of poverty, uncommon zeal to learn to read, the necessity of diligence at farming to assure survival.”1 His heritage was a proud one of patriotism and religion, of the Yankee ideal of progress. His age, like his life, was one of “grinding uncertainties and shocking changes.”2

A self-made life

When William was barely four, his parents moved to a 100-acre farm, “an almost uninhabited wilderness”3 in Low Hampton, northeastern New York. The annual mortgage payment was 20 bushels of wheat. Only about six houses were scattered over the county. In this setting, where wild animals roamed, trees were felled to construct cabins, and land was cleared, the Millers lived by controlling nature through farming. It was a rugged life, and even young William was needed to help with the farming. Education was limited to three months schooling in the winter when the harvest was over. From ages 9-14 Miller attended the local school. During the long winter months, Mother Miller taught William how to read. He became an avid reader, thirsty for knowledge. But the only available material was the Bible, psalter, and the prayer book. Soon he outgrew the school but continued learning on his own.

Candles were a precious commodity, so William learned that pine knots made good light for reading. One night when he was up reading late, his father awoke, saw flickering light, and thought that the house was on fire. But when he
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realized that William was reading, he promptly sent him to bed. The ardent reader recognized the community as a good resource for reading material. Some folk lent him books, others were given to him at his request.⁴

In his teens William began to keep a diary. One entry dated July 10, 1791, carries the heading, “The History of My Life,” and has the statement, “I was early educated and taught to pray [to] the Lord.” His early life was typical of most young boys those days. However, William longed for more. He even tried to get some help from a generous local doctor for further study. His dream did not come true, but he did the best he could in self-learning. He learned to use words well and became the “scribe general” among the young people. If someone wanted a letter or poetry composed, it was to William they turned.⁵

The family moved again to Poultney, in the State of Vermont. Here he met Lucy Smith and married her in 1803. He joined the Masonic fraternity and advanced to their highest order. Six years after his marriage he was a deputy sheriff and also served his community as justice of the peace. Farming was not his prime concern, although he still tried to maintain a semblance of it. Not surprisingly, his writing and reading continued. He read from the public library the works of deistic writers, history, and philosophy. He wrote letters, notes, diary installments, and patriotic poems, one of which was used by his community for their independence celebrations. It seemed that this patriotic pull and the distinguished examples of his father and grandfather in previous wars were responsible for Miller’s decision to leave a secure job in his neighborhood and volunteer for military service in 1810. He fought in the 1812 American war against the British, and at the battle of Plattsburgh he saw the outnumbered Americans crush the vastly superior British—an incident that provided a turning point in Miller’s life.

### An unsatisfied deist

Although William had embraced deism, he was not quite satisfied. He was disturbed by the deist assumption that human nature was basically good and upright; his reading and observation showed just the opposite.⁶ The battle of Plattsburgh finally shattered his belief in deism. He recounted the incident: “Many occurrences served to weaken my confidence in the correctness of deistical principles... I was particularly impressed with this... when I was in the battle of Plattsburgh, when 1500 regulars and 4000 volunteers we defeated the British, who were 15,000 strong.... So surprising a result against such odds, did seem to me like the work of a mightier power than man.”⁷

The result of the battle made him challenge another deist tenet, that of God’s non-interference in human affairs. Additionally, during the 1812 War Miller lost a sister and his father in quick succession, bringing him face to face with death and his own mortality. These events propelled Miller to return to the religious heritage of his youth that he had opposed. Miller, like many of his time, was concerned with reforms in society. He was involved in temperance and other reforms. William Garrison (1805-1879), the American journalist famous for his denunciations of slavery, described Miller as an outspoken friend for the cause of temperance, abolition, moral reform, and peace. He seemed in favor of treating all human beings well, although there is no evidence that he was directly involved in the anti-slavery movement.

Even in the army, Miller continued to do all the things that he loved. He wrote to his wife often and was quite distressed if he did not receive letters from her regularly. He was well respected and untainted by the vices so common in military life. When he returned from the army in 1815, he had to attend to family business. His father had died, leaving a mortgage on the property in Low Hampton. He retired this and allowed his mother to continue to live in the house. Then he bought the farm about a half mile away and moved his family from Vermont to Low Hampton. He built a house in the typical New England style of the day, “white with green blinds and the back side red.”

Once more Miller became active in the community. Near his home was a beautiful grove that was chosen for the July 4, 1816 Independence Day party. His generosity of spirit also extended to opening his home for the minister, his uncle Elisha Miller, of the nearby church. Like his parents’, his home was open to visiting preachers of various denominations. There they would find food, and Miller would tease them about their faith, to the delight of his friends and the horror of family.⁸

Although not fully committed to Christianity, Miller attended church when the minister was there. When the pastor was out of town and the deacon read the sermons, Miller felt that “he was not edified by the manner in which deacons read” and absent himself. He also felt that if he could do the reading they would be much better. His godly and astute mother noticed his absence and, learning of the reason, promptly arranged for him to do the readings when the minister was absent. These readings must have imperceptibly influenced the thinking of Miller.

### A crucial change

Two events in 1816 brought him to a crucial point. On September 11, Miller and his friends were in high spirits about a dance to be held as the main event in the celebration of the Battle of Plattsburg. As part of the celebrations, a Dr. B. preached a few nights before the actual dance. The effect of the sermon was evident, according to Bliss: “On their return, Mrs. Miller who had remained at home observed a wonderful change in their deportment. Their glee was gone, and all were deeply thoughtful and not disposed to converse, in reply to her questions respecting the meeting, the ball.... They were entirely incapacitated for any part in the festive arrangements....In that vicinity meetings for prayer and praise took the place of mirth and the dance.”⁹

The following Sunday William Miller was again called upon to read the sermon that the deacons had selected. Miller was overwhelmed with emotion soon after he started reading the discourse on the “Importance of Parental Duties,” and had to discontinue the reading. At this point it seems that his
struggle with deist concepts ended, as he said later:
"Suddenly the character of a Savior was vividly impressed upon my mind. It seemed that there might be a Being so good and compassionate as to himself atone for our transgressions and thereby save us from suffering the penalty of sin....But the question arose, How can it be proved that such a Being does exist?"

This was the beginning of Miller’s conversion experience. William Miller, the deist, the scoffer, became a Christian. He immediately started family worship and opened his house for prayer meetings. Just as he had been a devoted and faithful soldier for his country, he now became a soldier for the Saviour. His friends regarded his conversion as a great loss, but Miller determined to conduct himself a worthy example of a Christian. As a critic of Christianity he knew all the criticisms; now he used all his rational powers to answer the very questions that he had formerly posed.

Miller began his search with the Bible. He gave up all his prior assumptions and decided to let the Scriptures speak for themselves. Out of this deep and extensive study, he developed the following ideas: The Bible is its own interpreter; some parts of the Bible, such as the prophecies, are figurative; the books of Daniel and Revelation foretell Christ’s literal return, which would occur soon, within 25 years.

While doing his research, Miller continued to farm, to serve as a justice of the peace, and faithfully attend church. Furthermore, he fathered eight children—six sons and two daughters. A son and daughter died in infancy and one at age four. Yet Miller found time for Bible study, driven by a thirst for truth. After two years of intensive study he told his friends and neighbors about the soon return of Christ, but found little excitement or acceptance. Soon after a religious revival wave reached Low Hampton, and Miller felt guilty that he was not sharing what he considered to be the most important truth of the day. Although he felt that God was calling him to preach, Miller resisted.

Finally he made a promise to God. In August 1831 he decided that if he was asked to preach, he would use this as a sign that God wanted him to spread the truth he had found. Within half an hour of his decision he received an invitation to speak in a neighboring town. From then on he went from town to town using the revival style of preaching. His message centered on commitment to Christ and His soon return. His logical approach based on Bible, his earnest sincerity, and powerful message won him many followers.

Yet most of the ministers of the day did not follow Miller, and in fact began opposing his preaching. Nevertheless, Miller revitalized the evangelicalism of the day. The principal method Miller and others associated with him used to convey their message was not different from that of any other evangelical revival. Miller, however, went against the popular view of his day when he preached that Jesus would come before the beginning of the millennium. He might have remained an obscure preacher traveling the backroads of New England were it not for the determination of Joshua V. Himes, a minister and publisher, to bring the Millerite message to Boston and other cities. There the message and messenger became more visible, as local newspapers ran stories of his meetings. In addition, Himes provided charts, posters, and other advertisements. Papers, tracts, and pamphlets were also printed and distributed.

By 1834, preaching invitations were coming so fast that Miller became a full-time preacher. A year earlier the local Baptist church had granted him a license to preach, but Miller was not willing to favor one denomination over another. He was concerned with getting people personally committed to Christ and ready for His soon return. Preaching full time was a struggle, for he received no regular salary and sometimes not even traveling expenses. He had two sources of income. One was his farm, which he now
entrusted to his sons, and received an allowance to meet his expenses. The other source was his savings. Only when his allowance was insufficient to meet his needs did he allow the churches to share his expenses.16

The spreading movement

As he interacted with Himes and other preachers who accepted his idea of a soon-coming Christ, Miller began printing his message. Papers, tracts, and pamphlets were distributed in increasing number. Miller’s movement also adopted the Methodist type of camp meeting, the first of which took place in Boston in May 1842. As a result, the movement continued to expand, attracting thousands.

Miller’s original message did include a time element, but he was not concerned to set a particular date. He did believe that Jesus would return, according to his calculations, somewhere around 1843. Then he finally agreed on the date of October 22, 1844. He, along with thousands of followers, was bitterly disappointed when Christ did not return, as expected. The next day, he wrote: “It passed. And the next day it seemed as though all the demons from the bottomless pit were let loose upon us. The same ones and many more who were crying for mercy two days before, were now mixed with the rabble and mocking, scoffing and threatening in a most blasphemous manner.”17

But Miller never wavered in his belief in Christ’s soon return. On November 10, 1844, he wrote to Himes, “I have fixed my mind upon another time, and here I mean to stand until God gives me more light—And that is Today, Today, and Today until he comes.”18 Miller continued to preach and encourage others with the Christian hope, although he had to contend with more disaffected persons and criticism.

In January 1848 Miller lost his sight, but this did not deter him from looking forward to the coming of Christ. In that same year he had a small chapel built on his farm, close to his house, where the faithful Advent believers might worship. Inscribed in the chapel are these words quoted from the Bible: “The vision is yet for an appointed time. . . though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come.”19 That was his position on the second coming of Christ until his death at 67 on December 20, 1849.

Miller’s ideas on Bible prophecy and the imminent return of Jesus can be better understood in the context of a broad religious movement that emerged during the first part of the 19th century.20 After the demise of the Millerite revival, many of these ideas coalesced in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, which continues to preach the imminent return of Jesus but without fixing a specific date.21

---

Joan Francis (Ph.D., Carnegie-Mellon University), born in Barbados, teaches history at Atlantic Union College, in South Lancaster, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Notes and References
2. Marvin Meyers as quoted in Numbers, p. 17.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
7. Bliss, pp. 52, 53.
8. Ibid., p. 64.
9. Ibid., p. 66.
10. Ibid., pp. 66, 67.
11. Ibid., pp. 67, 68.
12. See Bliss, chapters 6-8 for details of Miller’s conversion and method of Bible study.
15. Knight, pp. 54-55.
16. Ibid., p. 57-59.
21. Christ’s statements on this particular are clear; see, for example, Matthew 24:36, 42, 50, 25:13; Mark 13:32; Acts 1:6, 7. According to Gordon (Herald...), pp. 119-120, one of Miller’s eight children, Langdon, joined the Advent Sabbath believers.

---

Subscriptions

S...you’re out of school (finally!) and hard at work on your career (great!). That doesn’t mean you’ve stopped thinking, right? Keep connected to a worldwide network of Adventist professionals who share their thoughts on career and Christianity. Stay involved in our ongoing Dialogue.

One year subscription (3 issues): US$10.00; Back issues: US$3.00 each

Please subscribe me to Dialogue in: [ ] English [ ] French [ ] Portuguese [ ] Spanish

Issues: [ ] Begin my subscription with the next issue.
[ ] I’d like to receive these back issues: Vol., No.

Payment: [ ] I’m enclosing a check or money order
[ ] My VISA card No. is ______________________________
Expiration Date _____________

Please Print
Name: _______________________________________________
Address: ______________________________________________

Mail it to: Dialogue Subscriptions, Linda Torske, 12501 Old Columbia Pike; Silver Spring, MD 20904-6600; U.S.A. FAX: 301-622-9627
Christian history, faith, life, and hope are wrapped around the cross and the resurrection of Jesus. Deny this, and you have no Christianity.

Many scholars, including some liberal theologians, do not accept the resurrection of Jesus as a historical fact, even though the New Testament considers it crucial to the Christian faith. Why? Is there sufficient evidence for us to believe in a risen Jesus?

The importance of Resurrection

The New Testament considers the resurrection of Jesus as foundational to the Christian gospel and faith. Without that there can be no Christianity. Jesus staked His entire claim as God’s Son and the Savior of the world on the basis of His approaching Resurrection. He said to His enemies, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up” (John 2:19, KJV). Peter, empowered by the Pentecost, preached concerning “this Jesus” whom “God hath raised up” (Acts 2:22, 24, KJV), and in one day 3,000 people believed in the risen Christ. In the first extant letter ever written to a Christian church, the apostle Paul argued that the Christian hope for the future is directly linked to the resurrection of Jesus (see 1 Thessalonians 4:14). Paul also argued that the Christian faith is neutralized and destroyed if Christ’s resurrection did not take place: “If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile; you are still in your sins” (1 Corinthians 15:17, NIV). Indeed to Paul, Jesus “was declared with power to be the Son of God” because of His resurrection (see Romans 1:4, NIV). As Michael Ramsey summed it up: “No resurrection; no Christianity.”

J. I. Packer further emphasizes the strategic importance of the resurrection of Christ to Christian faith and theology: “The Easter event, so they [Christians] affirm, demonstrated Jesus’ deity; validated His teaching; attested the completion of His work of atonement for sin; confirms His present cosmic dominion and His coming reappearance as Judge; assures us that His personal pardon, presence, and power in people’s lives today is fact; and guarantees each believer’s own reembodiment by Resurrection in the world to come.”

Antony Flew, an atheistic philosopher and author of The Presumption of Atheism, who rejects the Resurrection as a historical event, admits that Christianity either stands or falls on this event. He accepts the New Testament definition of resurrection as the “rising from the dead” in a physical way, and says that to be an authentic believer one must adhere to the bodily resurrection. He states that a “distinguishing characteristic of the true Christian” is the acceptance “that the Resurrection did literally happen.” Surprisingly, he also contends that if the Resurrection were true it would prove that all other world religious and philosophical systems are “ruinously wrong.” No wonder the Bible presents Christ as the sole way to salvation (see John 14:6; Acts 4:12).

The Resurrection and the skeptic

In spite of such clear biblical evidence on the resurrection of Christ and the early Christians’ acceptance of it, why do we have so much skepticism on this account, particularly among the “intellectual” community? First, such intellectuals reflect a presuppositional bias against the miraculous and are convinced that the Resurrection could never have any historical credibility. Second, they assert that the Gospels are
This rejection of the Resurrection and the Gospel narratives was greatly influenced by the Enlightenment of the 18th century and the theory of naturalistic evolution of the 19th century. These movements provided the intellectual climate for a critical investigation of the Gospels, resulting in the “quest for the historical Jesus.” Rationalism and liberal scholarship voted for what they claimed as the authentic and moralistic Jesus of history, as opposed to the miraculous resurrected Christ of the Gospels.

This “quest” began with Reimarus in Hamburg, Germany, in 1789 and continued with successive scholars who explained away the miracles as natural occurrences, fabrications, misconceptions, or mythical interpretations of what really happened. This was in line with what the Scottish philosopher David Hume (1711-1776) had attempted earlier. Hume believed that for something to be true it must conform to the uniformity of natural law. If this is so, the laws of nature invalidate the miraculous. Such rejection of the Old and New Testament miracles dominated more than a century of biblical research and climax ed in Rudolf Bultmann, one of the most brilliant theological minds of this century. Bultmann viewed the Bible’s fundamental worldview as mythology. He set out to “demythologize” the Bible by extracting or reinterpreting the miraculous/mythical elements in order to discover their relevant existential moral value. So Bultmann concluded that “a historical fact which involves a resurrection is utterly inconceivable.”

But such a “scientific” historical-critical method assumes that history is a closed continuum in which human reasoning and observation are the measure of all historical reality. It excludes the possibility of the miraculous and the supernatural. It also prevents skeptical individuals from being objective in their analysis of the New Testament documents and the evidence for the reliability of the Scriptures.

### The reliability of the New Testament

Two of the primary reasons given for considering the Gospels unreliable are (1) that the text has been altered, corrupted, and tampered with by Christian scribes or (2) that legendary and miraculous elements were incorporated into the story of Jesus by the disciples and the early church. This resulted in a combination of legitimate eyewitness historical facts interspersed with “spiritual” fiction.

But facts prove otherwise. Paul’s letters (Galatians and 1 Thessalonians) predate the finished forms of the Gospel accounts and contain clear statements that Jesus was raised bodily from the dead. Paul wrote these letters within 16 to 21 years after the Resurrection. 1 Corinthians 15, which contains an early Christian creed affirming the Resurrection, was written around A.D. 55, only 25 years removed from the death of Christ. William F. Albright, this century’s most revered archaeologist, states that “every book of the New Testament was written by a baptized Jew before the forties and eighties of the first century A.D. (very probably sometime between A.D. 50 and 75 [sic]).” Even a critical scholar like John A. T. Robinson says “that all the Gospels were written in their final form before A.D. 70” and the fall of Jerusalem.

This confirmation of the early Gospel dating knocks out the worn-out accusation that the source of the miracle-claims of Jesus and His resurrection were mythological legends developed during the lengthy interval between the lifetime of Christ and the time the Gospels were written. Similarly, we can also dismiss the charge that the disciples created a fictional supernatural Jesus. To think of the disciples in such a role is a psychological absurdity in the light of what happened at the Pentecost and after: an illiterate, inhibited, frightened band of disciples transformed into bold defenders and proclaimers of the risen Jesus as eyewitnesses. They confronted a world with that message and created a community of believers that no opposition could silence. Donald Guthrie is right in saying, “The rise of faith demands a supernatural activity as much as the Resurrection itself, especially since it arose in the most adverse conditions.”

Any suspected legendary exaggeration written or preached by the apostles or other contemporary believers would have been immediately checked by hostile Roman and Jewish authorities who were alive when Christ was on earth. It would have been possible for them to refute publicly any false notion that He had risen from the dead. The fact that there were an impressive number of eyewitnesses guarantees the Gospels’ reliability.

British Prime Minister Winston Churchill was considered the saviour and preserver of Western Civilization during World War II. If someone now suggested that he performed miraculous feats in defending England through some supernatural power, there would be a public outcry. Eyewitnesses could confirm that Churchill was simply an ordinary man, though a competent leader and strategist. The length of time since World War II is longer than the gap between Christ’s death and resurrection and the written records about Him.

The procedure for assessing the reliability of the New Testament is the same as for any other ancient writing where the original has not survived. This test is technically known as the “bibliographic test.” It calculates the critical time interval between the original writing of the document and the number of the oldest copies that have survived. It has been estimated that there are at least 5,000 ancient handwritten copies of the Gospels in Greek. Tyndale House in Cambridge, England, is a center specializing in biblical research. They verify that there are hundreds upon hundreds of copies made before A.D. 1000. Today there are more than 22,000 copies of New Testament manuscripts in existence. These statistics for the New Testament manuscripts add further credence to the reliability of the Gospels.
Testament are staggering when you compare what is available of other contemporary ancient writings. Tacitus’ Roman History, which is considered to be a primary historical source for that era, can only confirm 20 surviving copies. Thucydides History and Caesar’s Gallic War can claim only 8 and 10 copies, respectively.

The dates of the surviving New Testament manuscripts are very close to the original writings. Two existing copies of the New Testament are dated 350, which is less than three hundred years after the original. Incomplete copies of the New Testament that contain the Gospels are dated before A.D. 250. This compares very favorably with the 1300, 900, and 700 years for the secular historians cited above. The most impressive discovery is the John Rylands manuscript in the British Museum, a fragment of John’s Gospel dated 130 A.D. John A. T. Robinson remarks: “To return to the textual transmission of the New Testament, the wealth of manuscripts, and above all the narrow interval of time between the writing and the earliest extant copies, make it by far the best attested text of any ancient writing in the world.”

The evidences for the Resurrection

There are two significant strands of evidence for Jesus’ resurrection. The first is the “empty tomb;” the second is the post-Resurrection experiences of the disciples in which they claim they saw the risen Lord.

The empty tomb. All four Gospels and 1 Corinthians agree that three days after Christ was crucified, His tomb was empty. The disciples insisted that the explanation for the empty tomb was that He was raised bodily from the dead. As lawyer Sir Norman Anderson comments: “It was the solid fact of the empty tomb and their totally unexpected encounters with the risen Lord Himself that brought them—although not always at once—from despair to triumphant joy.”

Critics have offered theories about the empty tomb. These theories were progressively developed during the popular “quest for the historical Jesus.” One such attempt is the “Wrong Tomb Theory” originated by Kirsopp Lake. He states that in the semi-darkness of the early morning hours the women mistak-

The appearances of the risen Jesus. The second significant evidence for the Resurrection are the post-Resurrection appearances of Jesus to His disciples and other believers. This most adequately explains what happened to His body: It was raised from the dead by the power of God. Even the more radical skeptical historians and theologians believe that historical investigation substantiates the record that the disciples were convinced that they had seen the risen Lord. This was the common testimony of the apostles from what the eyewitnesses had recounted. As C. H. Dodd writes: “Something had happened to these men, which they could describe only by saying that they had ‘seen the Lord.’ This is not an appeal to any generalized ‘Christian experience.’ It refers to a particular series of occurrences, unique in character, unrepeatable, and confined to a limited period.”

Nevertheless, these same critical scholars are not prepared to admit that Jesus actually rose from the grave. They rather give alternative explanations for the subjective and collective “Easter” experiences of the disciples. For example, Bishop James A. Pike, who embraced spiritism shortly before his son’s death and claimed to have communicated with the dead, wrote of his experiences in The Other Side: An Account of My Experiences With Psychic Phenomena. In this book he claims that the disciples did have encounters and visitations that transformed their lives. He interprets such experiences as a substitute for the bodily Resurrection. According to Pike’s “spirit Resurrection theory,” Jesus’ body did not rise, but His spirit escaped His body and He appeared to His disciples in spirit form or as a ghost. Spiritualists and many liberal theologians and laymen hold such a position.

However, this spiritualistic theory does not agree with the explicit state-
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Ingrid Klämberg is director of the Youth Counseling Center in the city of Boras, Sweden. She supervises a team of seven professionals who assist young men and women who come seeking help in matters of family relationships and sexuality. She also teaches sex education courses in the local high school and maintains a private practice in counseling for young adults. The Boras Youth Center is one of 150 counseling centers that the Swedish government operates in various parts of the country for young men and women 13-25 years of age.

Mrs. Klämberg completed her nurse’s training in 1976, received her midwife certificate in 1980, and in 1993 was awarded a graduate degree in sexology at Gothenburg University. She and her husband are actively involved in the life of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. For many years she has been the treasurer of her church in Boras, where she also gives Bible studies to young people. Her husband, Johnny, is one of the church elders. Mrs. Klämberg has served as a member of the Swedish Union Committee, and of the Trans-European Division Committee, with headquarters in St. Albans, England.

As a counselor and family-life specialist, Mrs. Klämberg frequently lectures in schools, conferences, and seminars. She will never catch a disease or get an unwanted pregnancy.” I’m also frightened by the number of younger adolescents who are suffering from sexually transmitted diseases.

How did you become a Seventh-day Adventist?

My mother was an Adventist, and her words and example encouraged me to surrender my life to Christ and join the church. I made my decision when I was 18. Johnny, whom I met when I was 17 and who later became my husband, was also a positive factor in my personal decision. Although we had never heard about Seventh-day Adventists before we met, we studied and decided together to become members of the church.

Would you describe a typical week in your professional life?

Every week I work 30 hours counseling at the Youth Center and 6 hours teaching sex education in the local high school. Last year more than 5,000 young people visited our center. I personally meet about 15-20 young people every day. These youth seek my counsel and the advice of my colleagues on issues such as the use of contraceptives, and tests or treatments for sexually transmitted diseases. Young couples want to talk about their relationship and a possible pregnancy. Some hesitate between seeking an abortion or keeping the baby. Once a week I also have a private practice for young adults who are older than 25.

What challenges do you face in your work?

Many of the young people who come to the center belong to broken homes and one-parent families. They struggle with their own identity while experimenting with sex. They experience rejection, anger, emotional pain, and loneliness. They ask all kinds of questions: “Am I normal?” “My parents are getting divorced, why? What can I do with my life?” The most difficult cases are raped girls and victims of incest. It is hard to be young today!

Some days I get very upset and sad because young people do not take care of themselves and get into trouble. They lack firm principles. Some seem to think, “It’s never going to happen to me!” or “I

How do you relate personally to these painful cases?

When I shut the door of the center in the evening I can’t leave the pain and the problems there. They keep on turning in my mind. Sometimes I even dream about some young people, whom I care a lot about. Fortunately, I have a wonderful, understanding family that gives me warmth and support. I also seek to live close to God and talk to Him in prayer. We all need someone who is willing to listen to us when we are sorry, angry, or confused. Once a month I meet with a psychologist to talk about some of the difficult cases I meet at the center.

What gives you satisfaction in your work?

To be able to help a young person take charge of his or her life and rebuild it on a solid moral foundation, in spite of disappointments and mistakes. It is so encouraging to see healing and a change for the better!
Do your Christian convictions play a role in your professional life?

Everyone in the area knows that I am a Seventh-day Adventist. In fact, frequently girls who come to the center ask to speak with “the Christian midwife.” As a result of my work as a counselor on sexuality at the center I have sensed a deeper need for God’s guidance and wisdom in my life. Every day He helps me to guide and encourage the young people who come to me with their questions and problems.

As a Christian, how do you see the sexual dimension of our lives?

Sex is a gift of God and we must take very good care of it. Within a loving relationship, it is a source of joy that fosters deep spiritual unity between husband and wife.

What questions are you usually asked as you meet with Christian young people?

Why do Christians connect sex with sin? Why is it wrong to have sexual relations before marriage? If two young people really love each other and are going to get married, why should they refrain from sexual intercourse? Even if promiscuity is condemned in the Bible, why do Christians see it as one of the most serious sins?

What advice would you give our readers, many of whom are still single men and women, in their mutual relationships?

Develop your own convictions based on the Bible and stand by your principles. Don’t let yourself be pressured by others. In your mutual relationships, treat each other with respect, as God’s creatures. Don’t enter into an intimate relationship that you will regret later. Remember that every action in the area of sexuality will affect the rest of your life. If you make a mistake, ask God for forgiveness and strength to change your behavior.

Having sex is like giving a piece of yourself to someone. Be extremely careful with that gift, because you can never get it back. In the waiting room of our youth center there is pen and paper for those who wish to write something in preparation for their visit. A young woman recently wrote: “Life is empty without you. I feel that a piece of me is still with you. Please, help me to get back that piece of me so I can be wholesome again!”

Do young men and women relate to sex differently?

I have rarely met a young man who was single and who regretted his first sexual intercourse, but most single women do. I remember a young Christian woman who was deeply in love and thought their love would last a lifetime. She trusted her boyfriend so much that they became sexually intimate. Then, suddenly, the relationship broke up. She was devastated. Now, instead of looking back to a deepening love experience, she could see only rejection and pain.

Please tell us about your family.

My husband is a businessman, and we have two children in their twenties. Patrik, our son, is married. He and his wife have recently given us our first granddaughter. What a joy! Our daughter Cecilia is a nurse and a world traveler, gifted in languages. God has blessed me with a wonderful family.

How do you combine your professional work with the rest of your responsibilities?

I have discovered that when you give God the best of your time—in study, prayer, and service—he grants you enough time and energy to accomplish the rest of your goals in life.

What is the status of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Sweden?

We are 3,300 Adventists in a country of approximately eight million. We operate two health centers and a secondary boarding school, Ekebyholmskolan, where I regularly lecture. At present our membership is not growing in Sweden as we would like it to.

Our own church in Boras is quite dynamic, with many young people and young families. We pay special attention to youth activities. There are also some students who attend Gothenburg University. We know by experience that if we devote time to our children and youth, involving them in the life of the church, most of them will embrace our faith and remain themselves committed to the message and mission we love so much.

Interview by Ronald Strasdowsky

Ronald Strasdowsky (Dr. Phil., University of Freiburg) is education director and Dialogue representative for the Euro-Africa Division in Bern, Switzerland.

Mrs. Ingrid Klämberg’s address is: Kvarnberga Pl 5508; 505 94 Boras; Sweden.

Hey, Jennifer! “Better-than-nobody” is here!
Milton S. Afonso

Dialogue With an Adventist Philanthropist in Brazil

Dr. Milton Soldani Afonso is a Seventh-day Adventist lawyer and businessman entirely committed to the advance of the church’s mission in the world. He and his family own more than 20 companies in Brazil, the most important of which is the Golden Cross, which is considered the largest health-insurance company in Latin America and the fourth largest in the world.

He also owns a modern university in the city of Sao Paulo, with 14 schools, including dentistry and medicine.

The Golden Cross Group employs 70,000 individuals, among them 18,000 physicians and 5,000 health insurance representatives. Golden Cross provides assistance to more than two million insured members.

During the past two years, Dr. Afonso and his family have contributed US$100,000,000 to Adventist education, welfare, and evangelism. In 1994 he donated 11 radio stations to the Seventh-day Adventist Church in South America.

In the midst of his business appointments and travels, Dr. Afonso graciously consented to answer questions for College and University Dialogue.

- Please tell us about your roots.
  I was born in the town of Nova Lima, near the city of Belo Horizonte in southern Brazil. Our home was extremely poor. I grew up in a shack that was damp and contaminated, at the rear of a lumberyard. From a human viewpoint, I had no future and very little hope during my childhood. However, I recently celebrated my 73rd birthday, thanks to God’s extraordinary goodness to me.

- Were you born into an Adventist home?
  No. My mother was involved in spiritualism while my father called himself Catholic, but never went to church.

- How did you become acquainted with the Seventh-day Adventist Church?
  In a most providential way! My father used to spend the little money he earned in gambling, drinking, and smoking. Every Saturday morning he bought a lottery ticket, hoping that he would become rich. One Sabbath, the man who sold lottery tickets in our neighborhood offered one to an Adventist member who was on his way to church. His reply was, “I don’t spend money on those things, but here is an invitation for you to attend a series of religious lectures.” The lottery salesman gave the announcement to my father. My mother saw the invitation, and one night she took me to an Adventist evangelistic meeting held in a lecture hall.

- Where did you begin your Adventist schooling?
  After joining the Seventh-day Adventist Church, my mother realized the great possibilities that life opened for me. After completing my secondary studies, I passed the entrance examination to law school. During my university studies I began supporting nine other students who needed help.

- Do you continue to help young men and women in their studies?
  Today we assist 8,000 students at all levels in Brazil, from preschool to
university. Many of them are taken care of in our 12 children’s homes.

**You seem to have a soft spot in your heart for orphans.**

It is the result of my own childhood experience of poverty and loneliness. Although I was not actually an orphan, my parents had very little time for me at home. My father was an alcoholic, and my mother had to make major sacrifices to sustain us. She even had to mortgage her sewing machine to help me pay for part of my early schooling.

**Do you have other interests?**

In addition to Adventist education, I am concerned about the health condition of many people in society. Having seen the dreadful effects of smoking, drinking, and other addictive drugs, I consider the health component of the Adventist message to be of great value. God has given us specific instructions on how to live healthy and useful lives. Personally and through our companies we seek to share those practical counsels on health with those who are not members of our church.

**What is the secret of your success?**

Faith in God and willingness to go to battle, tuned to His wisdom. Integrity in all transactions. I have learned to trust in God’s providence and to move forward with confidence. Many times I ignore the budget figures, and don’t even know how much cash is on hand. If God inspires me to make a donation, I do so independent of any other situation. God is the provider. I do not withhold, and always receive more. Looking back on my life, I can see how God has sustained and guided me at every step.

**What made you decide to purchase and donate several radio stations to the Church?**

I am a member of the Adventist World Radio Committee and became enthused with the miracles God is performing in unentered areas of the world through the radio. For those reasons, I decided to support the radio outreach in the South American Division.

**What do you consider the greatest blessing in your life?**

To be a Seventh-day Adventist, a member of this wonderful remnant people, and to have a part in giving the last message of salvation to the world.

**A special joy?**

To have a home, a loving wife, four children, 9 grandchildren... all healthy. To own a group of companies that make it possible for me to help the church in its mission.

**A regret?**

Not to have enough time to do everything that I would like to. This is why I am always in a hurry!

**A dream?**

To be in the kingdom of God one day, and to have there my children, brothers, family, and friends.

**A philosophy of life?**

To be in constant conversation with God. To ask for stronger faith. To nurture this faith so as to overcome the obstacles and problems we face, knowing that God is at my side and that some day I will meet Him face to face.

**A favorite Bible text?**

“I know whom I have believed, and am convinced that he is able to guard what I have entrusted to him for that day” (2 Timothy 1:12, NIV).

**Interview by Assad Bechara**

Assad Bechara (D.Min., Andrews University) serves as director of communication, public affairs, and religious liberty for the South American Division, in Brasilia, Brazil.
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Aileen C. Landero: 18; female; studying toward a Bachelor of Science Education degree, with major in Physics. Hobbies: letter exchange, swimming, reading, listening to soft music, making new friends; correspondence in English. Address: Notre Dame of Marbel University; Teacher College Department; Koronalad, South Cotabato; 9506 PHILIPPINES.

Moses Y. Majwa: 21; male; studying toward a Baccalaureate degree in Mechanical Engineering; hobbies: playing field hockey, swimming, reading, making new friends, indoor games; correspondence in English. Address: c/o HS-68, J.K.U.C.A.T.; P.O. Box 62000; Nairobi, KENYA.

John J. Washagi Masolo: 43; male; married, father of 3 children; technical lecturer in Mathematics; interests: youth camping and retreats, Christian story telling, stewardship promotion, welfare ministries; correspondence in English. Address: Nampanga Seventh-day Adventist Church; P.O. Box 1418; Mbale; UGANDA.

Catherine Nasara: 23; female; single; a civil engineer; hobbies: traveling, reading, collecting stamps, letter exchange; correspondence in English. Address: Kiara, Don Carlos; 8712 Bukidnon; PHILIPPINES.

Charmilyn S. Nasara: 21; female; single; studying toward a Bachelor in Science Education (Mathematics); hobbies: reading the Bible, singing, traveling, hiking, letter exchange; correspondence in English. Address: Mountain View College; 8700 Malayabalay, Bukidnon; PHILIPPINES.

Watson Nyoni: 25; male; single; holds a diploma in Education; interests: touring, sports, literature (poetry and drama), sharing faith, music; correspondence in English. Address: Skapo Seventh-day Adventist School; P. Bag 5871; Nkayi; ZIMBABWE.

Charles Ogindo: 24; male; single; holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Chemistry; hobbies: music, singing, Bible study, traveling, postcard exchange; correspondence in English. Address: Government Chemist Department; P.O. Box 20753; Nairobi; KENYA.

Gandhi Pant: 28; male; single; of Nepalese nationality; holds a degree in English Literature and is completing a Registered General Nurse course; interests: voluntary and humanitarian works, trekking, climbing, traveling, making new friends, literature, cooking; correspondence in English, Hindi or Nepalese. Address: Room 204 Nurses Home; Royal Sussex County Hospital; Eastern Road; Brighton; BN2 5BE ENGLAND.

Cristine Quizan: 23; female; single; vocational graduate; interests: arts, sports, meeting new people, gospel singing; correspondence in English. Address: Brgy., Zone 5, Manzanilla St.; Puolupandan, Negros Occidental; PHILIPPINES.

Gloria S. Quizan: 24; female; single; Nursing student; interests: reading, cooking, letter exchange, swimming, listening to music; correspondence in English. Address: 435-D. Barangka Drive; Mandaluyong, Metro Manila; PHILIPPINES.

Rija Johnson Razakamiandrisoa: 18; male; studying toward a degree in Mathematics; interests: music, reading, other cultures and languages; correspondence in English or French. Address: II O 1, Anjanahary; Antananarivo (101); MADAGASCAR.

Debbie Roach: 23; female; single; studying toward a diploma in Teacher Education at Bethlehem Teachers’ College; hobbies: traveling, reading, writing short stories, listening to religious music; correspondence in English. Address: Top Hill P.O.; St. Elizabeth; JAMAICA.

Miriam Rodrigues da Rocha: 39; female; single; studying Psychology; interests: reading Christian publications, religious music, excursions in the countryside, vegetarian cooking; correspondence in Portuguese or Spanish. Address: Rua Castro Teixeira, 31; Vila Carrao, Sao Paulo, S.P.; 03448-060 BRAZIL.

Doreen Sakata: 23; female; single; studying for a medical degree at the Medical University of South Africa; interests: music, piano playing, composing songs, letter exchange, church activities, especially in temperance; correspondence in English. Address: P.O. Box 1273; MEDUNSA; 0204 SOUTH AFRICA.

Adriana Sartori: 26; female; single; teacher and principal at an Adventist school; interests: traveling, reading, film, music, making new friends, working for Jesus; correspondence in Portuguese or Spanish. Address: Rua Jundiaí, 531; Santa Terezinha, Santo André, S.P.; 09210-760 BRAZIL.

Simone Shepherd: 18; female; single; studying toward a diploma in Secondary Education; hobbies: cooking, camping, hiking, stamp and coin collecting, gospel music, making new friends; correspondence in English. Address: 4 North Street; May Pen P.O.; Clarendon; JAMAICA.

Biwowa E. Shirley: 22; female; single; studying toward a higher diploma in Marketing; interests: letter and photo exchange, picnics, humor, reading; correspondence in English. Address: National College of Business Studies Nakawa; P.O. Box 1337; Kampala; UGANDA.

Elen Alvares da Silva: 34; female; studying Arts; interests: reading, music, piano; correspondence in Portuguese or Spanish. Address: Passeio 13, No. 1265, Coahab. Fragata; Pelotas, R.S.; 96050-340 BRAZIL.

Amparo Tarazona: 31; female; single; of Colombian nationality, studying and working in Panama; hobbies: music, reading, travel, sports, children; correspondence in English or Spanish. Address: Entrega General; Zona 3; Panama; PANAMA.

Ester Valfar: 37; female; single; working as a secretary; interests: making new friends, travel, music, sports; correspondence in English or Spanish. Address: Casilla 28, Villa La Reina; Santiago; CHILE.

Virginia Zarco: 27; female; single; studying Medicine; interests: letter and photography exchange, music, camping, and mascots; correspondence in English, French, Portuguese, or Spanish. Address: Casilla 263; Sucre; BOLIVIA.

If you wish to be listed here, send us your name and postal address, indicating your age, sex, marital status, field of studies or professional degree, hobbies or interests, and language(s) in which you would like to correspond. Address your letter to: Dialogue Interchange; 12501 Old Columbia Pike; Silver Spring, MD 20904-6600; U.S.A. Please write clearly. The journal cannot assume responsibility for the accuracy of the information submitted nor for the content of the correspondence that may ensue.
Abortion: Ethical Issues & Options, David R. Larson, ed. (Loma Linda, Calif.: Loma Linda University Center for Christian Bioethics, 1992; 272 pp.; paperback).

Reviewed by Samuel Koranteng-Pipim.

The vast majority of Seventh-day Adventists are opposed to wholesale abortions of convenience, including most of those performed because the child was not “wanted,” “planned,” or “loved.” However, they separate into pro-life and pro-choice factions on “therapeutic abortions”—those that are sought in cases of rape, incest, and “the most serious reasons.” The Seventh-day Adventist Church, in its official pronouncements, has oscillated between the permissive guidelines of the 1970s and the slightly more delimiting 1992 Statement.

This book takes its title from the theme of a 1988 conference held at Loma Linda University, under the auspices of the Center for Christian Bioethics. The purpose of the meeting was “to enable qualified Seventh-day Adventists from around the world to voice differing views concerning the morality of abortion in the atmosphere of open dialogue and Christian candor and cordiality” (p. xi). The 16 articles in the volume—mostly from North American authors—were selected from 36 papers presented at the conference. The appendix to the book contains the 1970 and 1971 “Abortion Guidelines,” the 1992 Annual Council recommendation, and the 1989 “Guidelines for Adventist Healthcare Facilities for Intentional Termination of Pregnancy.”


The book under review is an excellent reflection of the conflicting, and often inconsistent, ethical views that exist in our church. If we assume that our stance should be established solely upon a biblically consistent theological reflection, only the articles by Andreasen (pp. 43-53), Beem (pp. 155-169), and Terian (pp. 205-220) fully meet the demands of this criterion. Thus, the plurality of views presented in the volume should not be interpreted to mean that Adventists have many “ethical options” in the abortion debate. There are only two: either one is in favor of “therapeutic abortions” or against it.

Some Adventists see the expression “therapeutic abortion” as an oxymoron; for even if abortion may be therapeutic to the mother, it is definitely not therapeutic to the fetus or the baby! In order to endorse the willful taking of an unborn life, some critical ethical questions demand clear-headed biblical responses.

First, is abortion a justifiable killing or murder? The deeper issue here is this: Does the sixth commandment (Exodus 20:13) prohibit “murder” or is it against any form of “killing” of human beings? Rather than addressing this question by a serious study of all relevant biblical data on the text, some writers simply assume the former translation and argue that sometimes it is morally justifiable to take human life. For example, while pro-choice advocate Crosby (p. 58-59) will favor some wars, pro-life proponent Fredericks (p. 129) will endorse some form of capital punishment and self-defense—apparently oblivious of their inconsistency.

Second, if abortion is a justifiable killing, what kinds of moral reasoning can be offered in its defense? Should the unborn be killed because it was a “mistake,” the result of rape or incest, or because it might result in the child’s deformity, or cause the parents’ pain, unhappiness, or inconvenience? The basic issue is this: Should ethical decisions be based upon eternal principles or upon presumed consequences? While the former evokes a faith-response (see Beem, pp. 155-169), the latter depends on a pragmatic ethic that is shaped by “autobiographical and sociological determinants” (Pearson, pp. 143-153).

Third, is a fetus an independent human being separate from the mother, or a mere tissue of the mother? Should it be considered of lesser value than the mother? This raises the question of whether all human lives have equal value or worth. The crucial biblical passage dealing with this issue is Exodus 21:22-25. Should verse 22 be translated and understood to mean a “miscarriage” or a “premature birth”? Given the importance of the Bible in Adventist thinking (see Brunt, pp. 27-42), it is rather startling that not a single article is devoted to an in-depth exegetical discussion of this key passage. Even Andreasen’s brief, but excellent, exegetical treatment of the text (pp. 49-50) went unnoticed by Brunt (pp. 31-33), Crosby (p. 57-58), Walters (pp. 181-182), and Winslow (p. 240).

Despite its weaknesses, the book is a valuable starting point for discussion and study among Adventists. However, until the basic ethical issues listed above are thoughtfully tackled, Bible-believing Adventists cannot but conclude with Sara K. Terian that: “Providing abortions can be justified only
by complete acceptance of the theory of evolution, with both its biological and societal implications. When a church begins to merely mirror society rather than giving it moral guidance or even providing a haven from its problems, such a church has lost its primary reason for existence” (p. 215).

Myth and Truth About Church, Priesthood, and Ordination, by V. Norskov Olsen (Loma Linda, Calif.: Loma Linda University Press, 1990; 191 pp., paperback).

REVIEWED BY ALBERTO R. TREIYER.

The author is well equipped to deal with the topic of this book. A pastor, teacher, church historian, and university president, he has given a lifetime of service to the Seventh-day Adventist Church. He knows both the myth and the truth about the church, and he has the skill to distinguish between the two.

Olsen attempts to clear three myths surrounding the nature of the church, the ministry, and ordination. He shows that the church is those who respond to the Lord’s call to join into a covenant relationship with Him. As such the church is one, holy, catholic—that is, universal—and apostolic. The church retains these characteristics to the extent it remains linked to the Lord by being faithful to His Word and by fulfilling its Spirit-endowed mission.

With respect to ministry, Olsen’s emphasis is on service. This, of course, is in consonance with the biblical concept of the priesthood of all believers. Since the Aaronic priesthood is now fulfilled in the priestly ministry of Christ, Jesus is the only head.

How, then, did a system of priests and bishops get into the church? Here again Olson’s analysis is helpful. He reviews the early church as it tried to organize itself for a more efficient service. The model before it was the Jewish system of administration in the synagogue. At the same time, the church was charismatic as it recognized the believers’ right to the exercise of spiritual gifts. The early church thus had no hierarchical separation of clergy and laypersons. This came about later as a result of Greco-Roman influence. On the one hand, the Greek philosophy fostered a superior-inferior class structure by its deliberate negligence of the common people. On the other hand, Imperial Rome provided a hierarchical model with a distinction between the ruler and the ruled. These forces had their inevitable influence on the church. Little by little, the laity was neglected, the priesthood of all believers was ignored, and a clerical hierarchy developed in the church. It did not take long for the bishop of Rome to assert his primacy.

I wish Olsen had emphasized a third cause for this structural ascent of the bishops above the laity: The bishops’ desire to gain additional power in order to deal effectively with divergent movements that were tearing apart the church in the third century. Linked to that move, the non-biblical teaching of apostolic succession was introduced, establishing the supremacy of clergy over laity. Even the Reformation did not quite deal with all the issues involved in the clergy-lay cleavage. In order to avoid the trouble caused by many self-anointed clergy, the state pressed Luther and Calvin to introduce the laying on of hands for the ministers of the church. The Reformers did declare that this ordination responded only to a temporary need, equivalent to that which the apostles and the early church felt when they appointed the Seven.

The author is right in pointing out that there always will be a tension in the church. This tension has to do with the proper relationship and interaction between spiritual gifts and the appointed, organized ministerial offices. The point to be seen is this: These “two aspects of structure are not separate entities, for ecclesia is a body of which Christ is the Head” (p. 175). To the extent the author places these structural differences in historical perspective, he has made a valuable contribution to ecclesiology.

Alberto R. Treiyer (Doctorate in Religious Sciences, Univ. of Strasbourg, France) is a theologian, evangelist, and author. His latest book, The Day of Atonement and the Heavenly Judgment, has been published in English and Spanish.


REVIEWED BY LEONARDO SUESCUN.

George Knight has a compelling mission. Since the mid 1970s, when he began his prolific writing career, he has tried to motivate his readers to approach issues in education, philosophy, history, and theology with an open and analytical mind. His emphasis has been to explain the phenomenon of what happens between a formulated theory and their practical execution.

In this book, Knight presents a vigorous discussion of issues affecting educational philosophy and their practical
implications for the classroom, particularly in Adventist schools.

The book starts with the role of philosophy vis-a-vis education, introducing the reader to an analysis of basic issues in philosophy as they affect educational theory and practice. Questions of reality, truth, and value are discussed from both traditional and modern educational viewpoints. Out of the melting pot of such ideas, the author challenges the reader to develop a personal philosophy of education that is congruent with his or her values and professional practice.

Every educational system should be based upon a well-defined philosophic framework, but that does not guarantee its appropriate execution. It is one thing to have a theory, but another to put it into practice. In an effort to resolve the inconsistency, Knight suggests that we begin at the beginning. “The task of educational philosophy,” he says, “is to bring future teachers, principals, superintendents, counselors, and curriculum specialists into face-to-face contact with the large questions underlying the meaning and purpose of life and education” (p.3).

As a reader I wish the author had revealed his own personal philosophy and shown how he would put it into practice. By remaining silent, perhaps he wants the reader to explore new vistas in the wide and exciting world of education.

At the time of writing this review and before his premature death, Leonardo Suescun (Ph.D., Andrews University) was president of Universidad Adventista de Colombia, in Medellin.

Christ’s Resurrection

From page 19

ment of Jesus to His disciples. When Jesus appeared to the disciples in an upper room and they were startled thinking they were seeing a ghost, Jesus calmed their fears by saying, “ ‘It is I myself! Touch me and see; a ghost does not have flesh and bones, as you see I have’ ” (Luke 24:36-39, NIV). This theory also does not give any explanation for the missing body in the empty tomb, nor does it recognize that the Greek word for resurrection specifically refers to a body being raised and never to the departure of a spirit from a dead person’s corpse.

A naturalistic psychological theory that is often used to explain away the Resurrection encounters of the disciples is the “Hallucination Theory.” Hallucinations are almost exclusively confined to certain psychological types and are highly individualistic. It is impossible that 500 people hallucinated collectively in one place (see 1 Corinthians 15:6) and that on other occasions other individuals (see Mark 16:12,13; Luke 24:36-38; John 20:26-29; Matthew 28:16-20) could have had precisely the same fantasy.

These experiences are indicative of objective facts rather than subjective impressions. The psychological preconditions for these men to hallucinate are also lacking. Nor was Paul a candidate for hallucination about the risen Christ on the Damascus Road with his mind set to persecute Christians. Furthermore, the abrupt termination of the Resurrection appearances to all the disciples suggests that they were not hallucinatory.

The Christian’s certainty

When we consider the evidence as a whole, the only possible explanation for the fact of the empty tomb, the disciples’ witness of the post-Resurrection appearances of Christ, the transformation of these apostles, the subsequent conversion of thousands on the day of Pentecost, and the spread of the gospel throughout the world can be the Resurrection. As Wolfhart Pannenberg puts it: “The Easter appearances are not to be explained from the Easter faith of the disciples; rather, conversely, the Easter faith of the disciples is to be explained from the appearances.”

We as Christians not only have the certainty that Jesus rose from the dead, but we have the hope that because He lives, we too shall experience the resurrection from the dead. Our eternal life depends on the fact that He died and rose again. Our faith rests not on a hoax, but on a historical certainty.
Making the Most of Your College and University Experience

Ten Suggestions for Seventh-day Adventist Students

by Humberto M. Rasi

1. Seek a broad and solid education. Don’t narrow or specialize too soon in your studies. Be inquisitive. Allow your mind to be stretched in all directions. Learn to see all fields of knowledge from a God-centered and Bible-based perspective. If possible, take courses outside your area: if you are in the humanities, enroll in a few science courses, and vice versa. If that’s not possible, read basic books outside your discipline. Take foundational courses (“the philosophy of”) on your subject. Seek relationships among the various subjects and disciplines. God’s church needs broadly educated, versatile, and articulate leaders.

2. Get used to discussing ideas. Know what you believe. Don’t be afraid of unusual concepts that challenge your views. Biblical Christianity is built on the solid foundation of God’s revealed truth. Develop a Christian worldview and use it to screen other concepts. Ask questions in class that make you and your professors think. Build your personal library and file: Bible, concordance, commentaries, apologetics, books and articles that approach your discipline from a Christian perspective, as well as good bibliographies (see “Useful Resources”). Learn to explain and defend your views with tact and courtesy. Above information and knowledge, seek wisdom.

3. Make time for your devotional life. Establish a daily routine of reading your Bible, meditating, and speaking to God in prayer. Reflect on what God is telling you in each Bible passage you read. Pray. Share with Him your dreams and concerns. Have intercessory prayers for your friends and teachers. Ask God to guide your life day by day. As you finish praying, allow time to hear His voice. Talk with God anytime, anyplace, even in the midst of your daily activities. Memorize and sing hymns to yourself. Learn to see all around you evidences of God’s love, beauty, and power.

4. Cultivate Adventist friends. Locate other Adventist university students on your campus or in your church. Get together with them to share your academic concerns and to seek their support. If feasible, organize with them an association of Adventist students and register it with the university authorities. Seek counsel from the AMICUS representative in your area and from Adventist professors. Obtain a copy of the Handbook for Adventist Ministry on the Public University Campus (available free for chaplains and student leaders through AMICUS). Make sure that you and your fellow students receive Dialogue regularly. Keep a collection and use its articles as a basis for group discussions. From among your Adventist friends, look for a suitable one to establish a happy Christian home.

5. Maintain your mind and body healthy. If you respect your body, you will learn faster, be happier, and serve God better. Eat regular, balanced meals. Take time to rest and to exercise. Abstain from alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs. Refrain from sex until you enter marriage. Cultivate a positive attitude toward life. Remember that Christ has already redeemed you from the enemy; accept His salvation as a free gift. Trust in His promises, although you may not always understand why some things happen. Don’t waste time envying or criticizing others. Learn to forgive and to forget. Be thankful for what you have. Express daily your gratitude to God for His goodness to you.

6. Involve yourself in the activities of the church. Discover where your talents can be most useful to the local congregation: youth programs, Sabbath school responsibilities (you may start a class for university students), choral and instrumental groups, social and recreational activities, deacon or young elder, etc. Develop your special skills for outreach programs: Bible studies, public

Useful Resources


In addition, the Institute for Christian Teaching—a service of the General Conference Education Department—has on file 250 essays that show how to approach several academic and professional fields from a Christian-biblical perspective. If you are interested, request a free catalogue by writing to the Editor of Dialogue.
In the Power Game, Love Wins

by Philip Follett

Love and knowledge are partners. Knowledge without love is arrogance. Love without knowledge is sentimentalism.

Human might comes in three packages: muscle, money, and mind. At least, that’s the picture presented by Alvin Toffler in his best-selling book, *Powershift*.

For centuries, Toffler notes, human power depended primarily upon muscle—sheer force of body strength. The Industrial Age expanded that power through the symbolic use of money, which could purchase machines to leverage the strength of arms, legs, and backs. Our day has welcomed the Information Age, in which knowledge has redefined both physical and financial strength, and created whole new paradigms of power.

Jesus knew about all three sources of power. Roman swords vanquished Jewish patriots’ dreams of home rule. Lavish living by moneyed magnates—whether priests, politicians, or merchants—argued convincingly that money worshippers are winners. Even fishermen and peasants played mind games to prove their superiority.

The lure of one-upmanship

Jesus’ own disciples were snagged by that lure. Repeatedly, they joined the one-upmanship contest. Who gets to be prime minister or secretary of state or budget director in Jesus’ New Society? Or, how many points do I have in the “do good” game? Or, what grade do I get on my latest kingdom talk? Or, how many healings do you have to your credit? I can outscore you!

Jesus knew that His disciples, who didn’t have enough swords to outfence the Romans and who would have been fools to measure their worth by the bulge in their bags of gold, had fallen for the mind trap: You can outmaneuver others by your smarts. It’s so subtle and so smooth. If dummies finish last, then smart people must be God’s favorites.

Jesus had already warned them about this deception. When He heard them baiting one another about positions, He said, “Whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your slave—just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many” (Matthew 20:26-28).*

Nice rhetoric, but it didn’t seem to take well. Slave? Not an attractive word.

Later, as they climbed the staircase to the Upper Room, they were still playing mind monopoly for top positions. Still scrambling to sit in the right places. Still trying to impress Him and each other, while He prepared for Calvary.

At last they settled themselves around the table. They all saw the blood-red wine and crumbling bread. He knew the meaning, while they waited to outsmart one another.

Two ideas in contrast

When John wrote about this night years later, he wisely contrasted two ideas time and again in the story. For he came to see that one of the themes of this feast-event was the triumph of the power of love over the love of power through knowledge.

“Jesus knew that the time had come for him to leave the world and go to the Father. Having loved his own who were in the world, he now showed them the full extent of his love” (John 13:1).

Jesus knew the time, but He also loved His people. Being savvy of the times proves one’s knowledge, information, and mind-power. Today, we know the time. It’s time for Jesus to come. Social conditions, church situations, international problems—all cry out the times. Or perhaps we know our times. Some think that the church is behind the times. We’re waiting for its outdated values and beliefs to catch up to our age. We’re so smart. So well informed. When we talk about the times, are we displaying our knowledge or our love? Jesus knew, therefore He loved.

Again John states: “Jesus knew that
the Father had put all things under his power, and that he had come from God and was returning to God; so he got up from the meal, took off his outer clothing, and wrapped a towel around his waist. After that, he poured water into a basin and began to wash his disciples’ feet, drying them with the towel that was wrapped around him” (John 13:3-5).

Because Jesus knew who He was, He could afford to do an act of love, and perform the work of a servant for others. Later, He could allow degraded soldiers to ridicule Him, spit on His face, press thorns into His scalp. And He could pray, “Father, forgive them.” Because He knew who He was, He could love instead of retaliate.

**Inner worth**

Tender elbows and thin skin reflect our uncertainty about our inner core of worth. A young salesman once asked a veteran of the trade how he handled insults. “I’ve never been insulted,” the old fellow replied thoughtfully. Then he added, “Well, I’ve been sworn at, had the door slammed in my face, and even thrown down the stairs. But I never took things as insults.” He knew that we must give permission to others to insult us. Their behavior is their problem; our response is ours.

Next, it was Peter’s turn. But the seasoned fisherman tried to refuse Jesus’ service. He knew he should have done the work. Jesus’ lesson was too powerful. Then Jesus said, “What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter” (John 13:7, KJV).

Why didn’t Peter know what Jesus was doing? Because he had not yet learned the power of love. Later, after Peter’s denial and Jesus’ resurrection, when they met by the shore of the Sea of Galilee again, Jesus three times asked Peter, “Do you love me?” Peter protested the repeated question, but still affirmed his love each time. Then Jesus could repeat His commission to the fisherman: “Follow me!” (See John 21:15-19.)

At the table, Judas sat silent and sullen. John turned the spotlight on him: “He [Jesus] knew who was going to betray him, and that was why he said not every one was clean” (John 13:11).

Later in the story, John describes Jesus’ incredible patience with His betrayer. He let Judas know that He was aware of his intentions, but did so in such a subtle way that “no one at the meal understood” (John 13:28).

**The mark of discipleship**

John ends this part of the story by quoting Jesus: “‘A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another. By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another’” (John 13:34, 35).

Not only does the power of love mark Christ’s life, but it imprints His followers as genuine disciples of the Lord of love. Intellectual brilliance, creativity, quick wit—all are sharp tools to be used in the service of Jesus. But they are effective only to the extent that they are bathed in the oil of love.

At the height of the David Koresh disaster in 1993, when some of the media were connecting the Waco cult with the Seventh-day Adventist Church and some Adventists were writing disclaimers, a letter to the editor appeared in the *New York Times* from a professor in a Pennsylvania college. In essence he said, I don’t know the historical or theological connections between Adventists and Koresh. But I know Adventists. I met them in Vietnam. They were medics, most of them rural youths with simple faith and basic beliefs. I watched them under pressure during battle. Refusing even to carry sidearm, they were the bravest men I knew. They were consistent in practicing Christian values. I would trust any one of them with my life. And I want the world to see Seventh-day Adventists like I do: as genuine Christians who care for people and are worthy of society’s deepest respect and trust.

In reality, love and knowledge are partners. For while knowledge without love is arrogance, love without knowledge is sentimentalism. Yet, “the greatest of these is love” (1 Corinthians 13:13).

---

**Campus Life**

* From page 29

not studying or taking exams on that day. Live a life of simplicity and economy. Don’t be wasteful of your time or your resources. Dress neatly but modestly, avoiding provocative fashions. Don’t allow the surrounding secular culture to squeeze you into its mold. Select your reading, music, and entertainment critically to fit your Christian convictions. Respect the natural world. Be a responsible steward of the means God has entrusted to you.

9. Set an example of integrity.

Once people learn that you are a Christian and a Seventh-day Adventist, they will expect from you high ethical standards. Ask God to help you match your behavior with your Christian profession. Keep your motives pure. Speak truthfully. Be strictly honest in all your transactions, in and outside the school. Fulfill your promises. Refrain from activities that may bring disrepute to God and His church. If you stumble, ask forgiveness and make reparation. As an ambassador of Christ, be ready to suffer prejudice, ridicule, and even persecution.

10. Aim high in life.

The Christian life involves steady progress. Don’t be satisfied with mediocrity in anything you do. Learn to speak and write well. Set your spiritual and professional goals always high, and ask God for strength to reach them. Keep on learning, reading, growing. Encompass in your view the whole world and all its peoples. Be perseverant in your faith and in your efforts regardless of the difficulties. Plan for this life and for an eternity with God.

---

Humberto M. Rasi (Ph.D., Stanford University) is the director of education for the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, and the editor of Dialogue.

Philip Follett is vice president of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists for leadership development. He has served the church as a pastor and administrator, as well as script writer for Impact, a Los Angeles-based religious TV program.

* All Bible quotations are from the New International Version, except as otherwise noted.

The author acknowledges his debt to Dr. Des Cummings, Jr., vice president of Florida Adventist Hospital, for the key thought of the knowledge-love motif in John 13.
The desire to have children is strong among most married couples. At times, however, that hope is frustrated by their inability to conceive. Modern technology has opened many options which, in turn, create ethical dilemmas for Christian believers. The Christian View of Human Life Committee of the General Conference has developed a document intended to assist couples who face those sensitive dilemmas. The statement has been endorsed by the leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and is presented here for the benefit of our readers:

**Infertility and Technology**

*An Adventist Statement on Assisted Human Reproduction*

Developments in medical technology have led to a number of interventions designed to assist human procreation. Procedures such as artificial insemination, in vitro fertilization, surrogacy, embryo transfer, and cloning increasingly provide new options in human reproduction. Such interventions raise serious ethical questions for Christians seeking God’s will on these issues.

The hope of having children is generally powerful. When this hope is frustrated by problems of infertility, the disappointment of childlessness weighs heavily on many couples. Their sorrow deserves understanding and compassion. It is not surprising that many who suffer sadness because of infertility turn to new reproductive technologies to restore hope. However, with the power of such technologies comes the responsibility to decide whether and when they should be used.

Because of their conviction that God is concerned with all dimensions of human life, Seventh-day Adventists are committed to discovering and following God’s principles for human reproduction. The power of procreation is God’s gift, and should be used to glorify God and bless humanity. Through a careful study of the Bible and the ministry of the Holy Spirit, the community of faith can identify fundamental principles that guide in decision making regarding assisted reproduction. Among the most important of these are:

1. **Human reproduction is part of God’s plan (Gen. 1:28), and children are a blessing from the Lord (Ps. 127:3; 113:9).** Medical technologies that aid infertile couples, when practiced in harmony with biblical principles, may be accepted in good conscience.

2. **Childlessness should bear no social or moral stigma, and no one should be pressured to have children with or without medical assistance (1 Cor. 7:4, 7; Rom. 14:4; Matt. 19:10-12; 24:19; 1 Tim. 5:8).** Decisions to use or not use reproductive technologies are a deeply personal matter to be settled mutually by a wife and husband, without coercion. There are many acceptable reasons, including health and the special demands of some forms of Christian service (1 Cor. 7:32, 33), that may lead people to refrain from or limit procreation.

3. **God’s ideal is for children to have the benefits of a stable family with active participation of both mother and father (Prov. 22:6; Ps. 128:1-3; Eph. 6:4; Deut. 6:4-7; 1 Tim. 5:8).** For this reason, Christians may seek medically assisted reproduction only within the bounds of the fidelity and permanence of marriage. The use of third parties, such as sperm donors, ovum donors, and surrogates,
introduces a number of medical and moral problems that are best avoided. Moreover, family and genetic identity are significant to individual well-being. Decisions regarding assisted reproduction must take into consideration the impact on family heritage.

4. Human life should be treated with respect at all stages of development (Jer. 1:5; Ps. 139:13-16). Assisted reproduction calls for sensitivity to the value of human life. Procedures such as in vitro fertilization require prior decisions about the number of ova to be fertilized and the moral issues regarding the disposition of any remaining preembryos.

5. Decisions regarding procreation should be based on complete and accurate information (Prov. 12:22; Eph. 4:15, 25). Couples considering assisted reproduction should seek such information. Health care professionals should disclose fully the nature of the procedures, emotional and physical risks, costs, and documented successes and limited probabilities.

6. The principles of Christian stewardship are relevant to decisions concerning assisted reproduction (Luke 14:28; Prov. 3:9). Some forms of technology are very costly. Couples seeking reproductive assistance should give responsible consideration to the expenses involved.

As Christians seek to apply these principles, they can be confident that the Holy Spirit will assist them in their decisions (John 16:13). The community of faith should seek to understand their aspirations and the issues that childless couples face (Eph. 4:11-16). Among the alternatives that infertile couples may consider is adoption. As couples make careful decisions they should be able to rely on the compassionate understanding of the church family.

Letters

From page 4

I was especially impressed with Beatrice S. Neall’s approach to male and female roles from the “image of God” perspective rather than from our more typical emphasis on the “traditions of man” (“Another Look at the Battle of the Sexes,” Dialogue 6:1). She fairly summarized issues that have been debated for centuries.

As Adventists we have preached the Edenic ideal, but have been hesitant to view relationships (whether in the church organization or in the home) as able to succeed without the superior/inferior, ruler/servant mentality. My thanks to Dr. Neall for taking the risk of presenting what I believe is the best paradigm.

Cherry B. Harenicht
Wisconsin Academy, U.S.A.

Likes the new look

I like the new look of Dialogue and appreciate its excellent content. The article “Why Don’t You Understand Me?” (4:3) was particularly relevant, and has already proved its usefulness in pre-marriage and marriage enrichment seminars. Dialogue is an effective tool as our Church Ministries Department team seeks to improve the quality of pastoral relationships to Adventist university students in the North England Conference.

V. O. Harewood
Nottingham, ENGLAND

Delighted to know you

Along with seven other Adventist students, I’m attending Cyril and Methodius University in Veliko Tarnovo. Our local church has approximately 35 members. Our youth group is quite active, particularly now that we enjoy freedom to worship and share our faith. We distribute Adventist publications and invite friends to our church programs.

We were delighted to receive Dialogue and to learn of the AMICUS support program. We would love to exchange correspondence in English or French with other Adventist university students.

Theodora Ranguelova
G. Karaslavov 26 - Vx. D, Apt. 26
Plovdiv 4000, BULGARIA

Increasing admiration

With each new issue of Dialogue I receive, my admiration for the journal increases. As an Adventist teacher, I want to express my deep appreciation to all involved for this unique publication and for the spiritual encouragement it provides.

Raquel Dias de Souza
Guarulhos, Sao Paulo, BRAZIL

Expanding the ministry

Our son, who attends a non-Adventist university near Cape Town, has thoroughly enjoyed the copies of Dialogue that he receives sporadically from the South African Union. To make sure that he does not miss an issue, we are sending you a check to cover the cost of his subscription. There are dozens of Adventist students in this country who, I know, would appreciate receiving this journal regularly. We encourage you to find ways of expanding Dialogue’s ministry.

John F. Werner, M.D.
Bethlehem,
SOUTH AFRICA
Does God speak to you when you can’t speak at all? In my case, He did.

I must have been five or so when I had this compelling urge to be a teacher. Two years earlier my parents had become Adventists, and I grew up in the Adventist culture and advantages—church nurture, Sabbath school, Bible studies. Taking all these in and participating in church life strengthened within me the desire to become a teacher. Even as a teenager, living on a farm, one of the things I loved most was to conduct a little school for the farm workers’ children, and teach them to speak, read, and write English. I loved every minute of it, and the smile on the face of those children was reward enough. East London, South Africa, was not exactly a place those days where every child had equal opportunities for education and growth.

I was fortunate, though. My parents were of the “right” color, the correct status, and above all loved me dearly. My years of schooling sailed by easily. I spent quality time in church life, particularly camp meetings and youth activities. Many young people I met with talked about their adventures in mission life, some of them as student volunteers. Deep down in my heart, I too felt a pull toward being a missionary to a far away land. Would that day ever come?

Just before my high school final examinations, I had to choose my career. I knew exactly what that would be. Teaching, of course. Two weeks before the selection interview for teacher training, encephalitis struck me. The disease is as tough physically as it is difficult to pronounce. It is an inflammation of the brain and affects brain membrane and tissue. Its effect is unpredictable. The sickness left me unconscious for a month. I missed my interview and the high school examinations.

Struggles within

One year later, I tried again and got into the university with a scholarship. Studies were exciting. I made new friends. I looked forward to becoming a well-trained teacher. Then in the final year of my training, disaster struck again. Suddenly one morning as I was eating my cereal, my jaws jammed, got stuck, and I could not open my mouth. Fear overwhelmed me. It took three months for a proper diagnosis, and treatment took some more time. The doctors said I would not be able to speak normally again. Singing was out. Would I ever be able to teach? I wondered.

For a long time I was on liquids. Have you ever eaten liquidized pizza? Not exactly a delicacy. Even as I struggled with my illness, I continued my studies at home, passed the finals, and got into specialized education.

I could not quite figure all this out. One door closes; another opens. My jaws were locked. I could not speak clearly. But I could read. I could pray. I could listen. Then one day I heard distinctly the still small voice: God needed me for some special task, in some special way.

Soon after graduation, I got a job as a special-education teacher in my hometown. The job was satisfying. The pay was good. Within a year I bought a car, a house, and settled down comfortably. Three years went by. I could still hear that still small voice, but I was not quite sure. Meanwhile my jaw needed another surgery, requiring cartilage to be removed from my ear.

Was God speaking to me through all these sufferings? Yes, I would say to myself while in suffering, then forget the whole thing once I was well. After many such internal struggles, I wrote to the General Conference and offered my services.
To my surprise, I received a call, of all places, to Korea. What’s that? What are the people like? Where is it on a map? Will I fit in the culture? I did not have all the answers, and secretly hoped I would not have to go. But the locked jaw and the still small voice were reminding me that God had a purpose for me. And like any good Old Testament character, I demanded that God give me a sign. I had a house. If I could sell the house without losing money, I would go to Korea. A friend invited me to pray together. Ten minutes later a lady knocked at my door. The house was sold. The still small voice was now a big megaphone.

The land of the morning calm

Soon I was on a flight to Seoul, Korea. The land of the morning calm brought anything but calm to me at least for a while. I was a stranger in a foreign land. The food was strange. The weather was different. But within days I made friends. God’s family anywhere and everywhere is the same—in love, in worship, in work, in friendship. Culture does differ, and I learned that rather soon. You had to leave your shoes outside before entering a home. You had to respect the elders. You choose friends in your own age group. A date referred to the calendar, not an appointment with the opposite sex. But in spite of all these, I immediately sensed a family togetherness.

The Adventist Church in South Korea sponsors some 17 language schools. I was assigned to one in the beautiful island of Cheju in the East China Sea. I had to share an apartment with a Japanese and an American, and the melting pot of three different cultures in the midst of a fourth was good for our characters and our world understanding. I taught English and Bible. Classes were from 7 to 10 in the morning, and from 6 to 9 in the evening. In between I met with young people, one on one, talked to them, counseled with them, played with them, and learned to love them.

Communication can sometimes get us into trouble. Like the day when I said to someone, “See you later, alligator!” The boy took me seriously, felt offended, and timidly asked, “Teacher, is that a nice name for me? Do I look like an alligator?”

In spite of such minor misunderstandings, our students were just like young people everywhere—curious, fun loving, longing to find meaning in life. That longing is what kept us all together, the teacher and the taught. Together we explored finding life’s great purpose—in Jesus. This was the highlight of my experience in Korea. When you find from the Bible that there is more to life than mere existence, when you see someone’s face light up because of the workings of the Spirit within, when you realize that Jesus has become someone’s closest friend, you feel blessed. You feel lifted up. You feel the closeness of God.

The still small voice becomes so real, that you cannot but say, “Thank you, Lord, for revealing Yourself to me.”

Sherry J. Botha from East London, South Africa, is serving as a student missionary in South Korea.

Readers interested in short-term missionary service may contact the Dialogue representative listed on page 2 or write directly to: Adventist Youth Service; 12501 Old Columbia Pike; Silver Spring, MD 20904; U.S.A. In North America, call 1-800-252-SEND.
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