

Must the Crisis Continue?
The Review Votes to Leave Washington
Ellen White and Historical Interpretation

SPECTRUM

A Quarterly Journal of the Association of Adventist Forums

Volume 11, Number 3

FOOD

Vegetarianism: Pro and Con
Adventist Food Industries
Clean and Unclean Meats?
A Tour of Vegetarian Cookbooks

SPECTRUM

EDITOR

Roy Branson

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Richard Emmerson

EDITORIAL BOARD

Roy Branson
Ethics, Kennedy Institute
Georgetown University

Molleurus Couperus
Physician
Angwin, California

Tom Dybdahl
Editor
Allentown, Pennsylvania

Richard Emmerson
English
Walla Walla College

Alvin L. Kwiram
Chemistry
University of Washington

Gary Land
History
Andrews University

Roberta J. Moore
Journalism
Loma Linda University

Charles Scriven*
Theology
Graduate Theological Union

Ottilie Stafford
English
Atlantic Union College

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Carolyn Stevens
English
Walla Walla College

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Kenneth Fletcher
Walla Walla College

CONSULTING EDITORS

Kjeld Andersen
Physician
Lystrup, Denmark

Eric Anderson
History
Pacific Union College

Roy Benton
Mathematics
Columbia Union College

Raymond Cottrell
Theology
Loma Linda, California

Judith Folkenberg
Researcher
Washington, D.C.

Lawrence Geraty
Old Testament
SDA Theological Seminary

Fritz Guy
Theology
SDA Theological Seminary

Jorgen Henrikson
Artist
Boston, Massachusetts

Edward Lugenbeal
Anthropology
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Eric A. Magnusson
President
Avondale College, Australia

Margaret McFarland*
Law
University of Michigan

LaVonne Neff
Author
College Place, Washington

Ronald Numbers
History of Medicine
University of Wisconsin

Melvin K. H. Peters
Old Testament
Cleveland State University

Edward E. Robinson
Attorney
Chicago, Illinois

Gerhard Svrcek-Seiler
Psychiatrist
Vienna, Austria

Betty Stirling
Provost
University of Baltimore

Helen Ward Thompson
Administration
Walla Walla College

L. E. Träder
Education
Marienhoche Gymnasium,
W. Germany

Association of Adventist Forums

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President
Glenn E. Coe
State's Attorney
West Hartford, Connecticut

Vice President
Lyndry A. Niles
Communications
Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Executive Secretary
Claire Hosten
Attorney
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer
Richard C. Osborn
History
Takoma Academy
Takoma Park, Maryland

*Graduate Student

DIRECTORS Of Academic Affairs

Leslie Pitton
Youth Director
Central Union Conference
Lincoln, Nebraska

Of International Relations
Molleurus Couperus
Physician
Angwin, California

Of Membership
Ronald Cople
Business
Silver Spring, Maryland

STAFF

Legal Consultant
Bradley Litchfield
Attorney
Washington, D.C.

Systems Manager
Don McNeill
Computer Programmer
Spencerville, Maryland

Corresponding Secretary

Sean McCarthy
Undergraduate
Columbia Union College
Takoma Park, Maryland

REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Atlantic
Richard B. Lewis, Jr.
Advertising
Boston, Massachusetts

Central
Erwin Sicher
History
Southwestern Adventist College
Keene, Texas

Central Pacific
Paul Dassenko
Financial Analyst
San Francisco, California

Columbia
Charles Bensonhaver
Physician
Kettering, Ohio

Lake
Walter Douglas
Church History
SDA Theological Seminary
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Northern Pacific
John Brunt
Theology
Walla Walla College
College Place, Washington

Southern
David Steen
Southern Missionary College
Collegedale, Tennessee

Southern Pacific
Mike Scofield
Business
Monterey Park, California

SPECTRUM is a journal established to encourage Seventh-day Adventist participation in the discussion of contemporary issues from a Christian viewpoint, to look without prejudice at all sides of a subject, to evaluate the merits of diverse views, and to foster Christian intellectual and cultural growth. Although effort is made to ensure accurate scholarship and discriminating judgment, the statements of fact are the responsibility of contributors, and the views individual authors express are not necessarily those of the editorial staff as a whole or as individuals.

The Association of Adventist Forums is a nonsubsidized, nonprofit organization for which gifts are deductible in the report of income for purposes of taxation. The publishing of SPECTRUM depends on subscriptions, gifts from individuals and the voluntary efforts of the contributors and the staff.

SPECTRUM is published quarterly by the Association of Adventist Forums. Direct editorial correspondence to SPECTRUM, Box 431, College Place, WA 99324. In matters of style and documentation, SPECTRUM follows *The MLA Style Sheet* (rev., 1970). Manuscripts should be typewritten, double spaced. Submit the original and two copies, along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Due to limitations of space, responses from readers may be shortened before publication.

In order to receive SPECTRUM, send a membership fee (\$12 per volume, except \$14 in Canada and in other foreign countries) to Association of Adventist Forums, Box 4330, Takoma Park, Maryland 20012. Single copies may be purchased for \$3.50. Send correspondence concerning address changes to the same address, enclosing address labels. Pay by check made out to the Association of Adventist Forums. © 1981. All rights reserved.

Litho U.S.A. CP30123

In This Issue

Volume Eleven, Number Three, Published February 1981

SPECIAL SECTION: FOOD

Are Vegetarians Intellectually Honest?	Reo M. Christenson	2
A Radical Case for Vegetarianism	Barry Casey	7
Unclean or Unhealthful? An Adventist Perspective	John Brunt	17
A Tour of Vegetarian Cookbooks	Judy Rittenhouse	24
Adventist Food Industries: Recent Developments	Harrison W. John	28

ARTICLES

Ellen White, the Waldenses, and Historical Interpretation	Donald Casebolt	37
Must the Crisis Continue?		44
Why the Review Voted to Leave Washington	Richard C. Osborn	53

RESPONSES FROM READERS

60

B. E. Seton, R. H. Brown, L. T. Geraty, R. H. Brown
P. U. Maynard-Reid, H. N. Sheffield, E. Anderson

About This Issue

We are pleased to publish an in-depth report on Adventist food industries, an aspect of the denomination's institutional life that has been somehow overlooked. Although the author of the report indicates that he wishes he had been able to gather even more information, he and the editors wish to acknowledge the cooperation of key officers of the General Conference. Their assistance has made it possible to publish the fullest analysis yet to appear in print of a dimension of the Adventist community that is rapidly expanding into the general society. The report is accompanied by three articles and a review of vegetarian cookbooks to round out our special section on food. Two articles take opposing views of one aspect of the Adventist lifestyle — vegetarianism. The third studies the New Testament to understand its treatment of the distinction between clean and unclean foods, an important doctrine of the church that is quite unique in the Christian tradition.

This issue continues SPECTRUM's

commitment to publish short reports on important recent developments in the church. One report describes events since the Glacier View meeting, the subject of our last issue. These events have serious consequences for church unity and thus should be brought to the attention of all Adventists. Another report analyzes the recent decision of the Review and Herald Publishing Association to move its operations from Takoma Park.

It has been brought to our attention that in its last issue, SPECTRUM misplaced the last two paragraphs of the Consensus Statement. We incorrectly printed these two paragraphs at the end of the Ten-Point Critique. The error is worth noting since not only SPECTRUM readers may have been misled. Whereas *Ministry* accurately reproduced the two statements as adopted at Glacier View, *The Adventist Review* misplaced the last two paragraphs of the Consensus Statement. We relied on the church's general paper without noticing the error.

The Editors

Food

Are Vegetarians Intellectually Honest?

by Reo M. Christenson

Vegetarianism is one of the cherished beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Because it is a unique one, not shared by any other Protestant church (known to me), it is given a great deal of prominence by many Adventists — and by their church journals. And since a nationwide interest in vegetarianism has developed within recent years, considerable pride is taken in the church's pioneering role in advocating the merits of a vegetarian way of life. For many, strict adherence to it is one of the best indications that one is a truly loyal church member and is conscientiously preparing for Christ's return. Nonadherence is viewed by some as a sure sign of spiritual laxity, of a stubborn refusal to respect and obey the light which has been given the church on this matter. Vegetarian meals are *de rigeur* at official gatherings.

As it happens, however, vegetarianism is perhaps the least biblical of all Adventist be-

liefs. It is rather remarkable, considering the weight often attached to it, that this belief does not have the support of a single, clear-cut, admonitory verse in either the Old Testament or the New. Of equal importance to this inquiry, the church's treatment of the biblical and scientific evidence pertaining to the eating of meat often demonstrates a disturbing disregard for the basic requirements of intellectual integrity.

The effort to find indirect (there being no direct) biblical support for vegetarianism largely focuses upon the following: God's original diet for man was vegetarian; no meat was consumed in the garden of Eden. The children of Israel were rebuked for lusting after flesh when wandering in the wilderness; when the quail ". . . was yet between their teeth, ere it was chewed, the wrath of the Lord was kindled against the people" (Num. 11:33). Daniel and his companions ate a vegetarian diet in preference to the king's appointed fare, and "at the end of ten days their countenances appeared fairer and fatter in flesh" than the countenances of those who ate the king's meat (Dan. 1:15). John the Baptist, whose mission to call upon the Israelites to

Reo Christenson is a professor of political science at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. He is the author of a popular political science textbook.

prepare for their coming Messiah is seen as foreshadowing our mission today, subsisted on locusts and wild honey. Paul counseled, some have said, against eating meat by warning us not to “eat meat with the blood thereof”; since meat cannot be fully drained of its blood before it is consumed, this was basically a vegetarian counsel.

How conclusive is this biblical evidence? And how selective is it, taking the Bible as a whole? Since death was not a part of the divine scheme of things, it is reasonable to assume that vegetarianism was indeed the dietary practice in Eden. In order to eat meat, animals, birds or fish must die, and death was to appear only as a punishment for sin. Whether vegetarianism was best for man’s health or simply a necessary concomitant of a world in which death was absent, is not clear from this situation. On the other hand, once sin had appeared, clean meats were eaten with God’s specific approval. In fact, some of the food consumed by the Levites, who were God’s ministers to His people, consisted of the flesh sacrificed for man’s sins. If the Lord believed a vegetarian diet promoted man’s spiritual welfare, it is curious that His spiritual leaders were expected to subsist so largely on flesh. And the Israelites, as keepers of flocks and herds, were always flesh eaters, as numerous Old Testament references attest.

How much significance should be attached to the fact that the children of Israel improperly “lusted” after flesh, and that the Lord punished them for that lust? If we read the various passages associated with this event, we learn that the Israelites also lusted after cucumbers, melons and onions (Num. 11:5). Logic would dictate that if it were sinful to lust after flesh, it was equally sinful to lust after these. It is quite clear, however, that the Israelites’ offense was their dissatisfaction with what the Lord had given them — manna. Theirs was a complaining and fretful spirit, one of ingratitude despite the perfect diet given them by the Lord. And that spirit constituted their sin.

Rather than “defile” themselves with the king’s meat or wine, Daniel and his friends

desired “pulse to eat and water to drink.” They were given their preferred diet, and the results were gratifying (Dan. 1:15). But why, in fact, were they vegetarians during this period? We can only speculate, of course, but notice that the Babylonians made no distinction between the clean and the unclean meats. Nor were their butchery practices consonant with Mosaic law. This may well have accounted for the young Hebrews’ desire to confine themselves to a vegetarian diet. In any case, however, it does not appear that Daniel was a vegetarian as a matter of settled practice. In Daniel 10:3, Daniel says of a period when he was in mourning, “I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all, till three whole weeks were fulfilled.” The most reasonable interpretation of this passage is that Daniel did anoint himself and did eat flesh *after* the three weeks had elapsed. If you say, “I will eat no dessert for three weeks,” the natural assumption is that you will resume eating it after the three weeks have ended.

John the Baptist, while preaching in the wilderness, ate a vegetarian diet. But is the vegetarian diet of John more significant than the nonvegetarian diet of Jesus? Is the servant’s example greater than that of his Master? Jesus not only failed to endorse vegetarianism but repeatedly sanctioned the eating of flesh — by parable, by action, by miracles and by example. In the parable of the prodigal son, the father celebrated the return of his wayward child by killing the fatted calf. This does not directly endorse the eating of flesh, but since Jesus could construct His parables as He wished, His inclusion of meat eating as part of the festivities celebrating the return of the prodigal from a life of sin is not without some probative value. Moreover, when Jesus said, “If his son ‘ask a fish, will he give him a serpent?’” He is clearly comparing something desirable with something undesirable.

We are all aware that one of Jesus’ greatest miracles involved the multiplication of fish when the 5,000 were fed. Had He wished to suggest that a vegetarian diet was preferable, He could have multiplied the loaves alone and made the point dramatically. But He

didn't. After His resurrection, He helped Peter and some other disciples conduct an especially successful fishing expedition ["cast the net on the right side of the ship and ye shall find" (John 21:6)]. And though He was preparing to ascend to His Father, He ate flesh when the fishing party came to land.

Jesus had numerous opportunities to recommend vegetarianism, but He declined to do so. Every aspect of His life which bore any relation to diet gave support to flesh eating rather than to vegetarianism. It is passing strange that so many Adventists glide silently past the example of the Sinless One, whose life is the perfect pattern for us to follow, and proceed to advocate vegetarianism as the religious ideal. One can almost sense their unspoken disappointment with Jesus' example — if only He had been a vegetarian! If vegetarianism is the preferred diet, the one which best promotes our spiritual welfare and which most closely approximates God's will for us, wouldn't Jesus have set just a little better example for us if He had been a vegetarian? Was He truly perfect except for this one inexplicable shortcoming? The implication of many Adventists is precisely this — although, of course, they would never acknowledge it.

Paul admonished the converted Jews to abstain from "meats offered to idols and from blood and from things strangled." Is this a veiled endorsement of vegetarianism? Quite clearly not. While releasing these converts from a multitude of Mosaic restrictions, he reminds them that the Mosaic requirement remains in effect concerning the eating of blood and of flesh which was not bled properly. And he wants to give no symbolic sanction to idol worship by eating meat sacrificed to idols. If eating meat is forbidden because the blood is never totally drained from the flesh, the Israelites violated God's commands even when they ate meat Kosher-style. But Paul was clearly trying to discard unnecessary Mosaic requirements for Christians rather than make them more stringent.

While dealing with Paul, incidentally, vegetarians do not commonly quote his

warning that "in the latter times some shall depart from the faith . . . commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving" (1 Tim. 4:3). How many of us would feel uncomfortable in an Adventist religious gathering, even quoting this verse, if vegetarianism were being discussed?

There is other biblical evidence to consider. Exodus 16:12 reads, "At even ye shall eat flesh and in the morning ye shall be filled with bread; and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God." Deuteronomy 12:15 declares, "Notwithstanding thou mayest kill and eat flesh in all thy gates . . . according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which he hath given thee. . . ." Both of these verses seem to associate meat-eating with God's blessings and bounties.

Not only did Moses expressly permit the eating of clean meats, but also the three messengers of the Lord sent to assure Abraham and Sarah that she would bear a son in her old age, consumed a "calf tender and good" (Gen. 18:7). Presumably these were angels in human disguise. We do not expect angels, sent by the Lord, to conduct themselves in a manner displeasing to Him. But even more compelling, when God commanded the ravens to feed Elijah "by the brook Cherith," He could have ordered them to bring Elijah any food that he wished. But selecting from among the vast variety of edible substances upon the earth, God chose to have the ravens bring Elijah "bread and flesh in the morning and bread and flesh in the evening" (1 Kings 17:18). And this, remember, took place shortly before Elijah was "taken up by a whirlwind into heaven" (2 Kings 2:11). That is, he ate flesh, supplied by God, while preparing for translation. Suppose the Lord had given Elijah a diet of fruit, grain and nuts; is there any doubt that vegetarians would jubilantly cite that fact as clear evidence of God's preferred diet? Why, then, is this verse so studiously ignored when vegetarianism is discussed?

In sum, if it is reasonable to assume that vegetarianism was the preferred diet for un-fallen man, it is equally reasonable — all evidence considered — to assume that a diet which includes meat was God's preferred

diet for fallen man and for those as victorious as Elijah and Jesus as well.

There is, it seems, a total absence of credible biblical support for vegetarianism. But should we practice it because meat has become more diseased in our time and hence is less suitable for human consumption? This is possible, since there is no scientific basis for comparing the quality of meat today with that of centuries past. But even here, the evidence as a whole does not support vegetarian claims.

True, additives and plant accidents have occasionally caused worrisome meat contamination. Pollution of rivers, lakes and oceans has sometimes caused concern about the safety of eating sea foods. But there is also apprehension about the consumption of fruits and vegetables because of the large

“Jesus had numerous opportunities to recommend vegetarianism, but He declined to do so. Every aspect of His life which bore any relation to diet gave support to flesh eating. . . .”

amounts of poisonous sprays which are applied in our day. Moreover, aflatoxin — the product of a mold which grows in stored peanuts and grain — is one of the most lethal carcinogens known to man. William Tucker has observed that “stomach cancer is rife in underdeveloped countries in Asia and Africa” (200 times as high as in the U.S.) because, it is believed, of the presence of this substance in the popular diet.¹ Tucker notes that “the highest quantity of aflatoxin ever found in the U.S. by the Food and Drug Administration was in a jar of ‘natural’ peanut butter.”² If meat *can* be dangerous to the health under certain circumstances, so can grain and peanut butter.

As for the safety of meat products, it is important to note that tuberculosis, once rampant among cattle, has largely been eliminated in the U.S. So have Bang’s disease and hoof-and-mouth disease. Many other live-

stock and poultry diseases are minimized by today’s carefully prepared animal diet and by modern veterinary science. In previous periods, moreover, meat prepared for human consumption was not refrigerated, a practice which inevitably produced spoilage and contamination. It was also normally exposed to flies, dust and miscellaneous contaminants which can now be largely avoided. And while no informed person believes federal or state meat inspection practices are fully adequate, they are surely superior to the total lack of inspection which once prevailed.

It is not being urged that the church abandon its belief that meat may someday become so diseased or contaminated that its use should be discontinued. That day could come. But there is almost no cogent evidence that that day is upon us. While some non-Adventist writers do recommend a vegetarian diet, their evidence is almost entirely assertive and speculative rather than scientifically grounded.

But isn’t modern science vindicating vegetarianism, now that we know about cholesterol and its relation to the consumption of animal fat? The answer is “no.” What modern science has done is cast doubt on the advisability of eating *fatty* meat. But it has not demonstrated the undesirability of eating moderate amounts of lean meat, poultry and fish. Probably 99 percent of the nation’s nutritionists recommend these forms of flesh as healthful additions to the diet.

Since God has specifically approved the eating of clean meat, we should not rule out the possibility that He knew what He was doing. Let’s look at some recent evidence. *Consumer Reports*, a highly authoritative journal, has noted that vitamin B₁₂ is seldom found in plant foods.³ “A problem may arise among people who eat little or no animal protein,” the editors continue, “particularly if their diet is high in cereal grains.” They note that wheat contains phytates, which can make zinc “unavailable for absorption by the body.”⁴ They further note that “. . . the body absorbs only about five percent of the iron in vegetable sources, compared to about 15 percent from meats and fish. . . . If you eat little

meat, poultry and fish, you may already be iron deficient or at least headed that way. If you're a strict vegetarian . . . your iron consumption may be insufficient for your needs."⁵ The evidence quite clearly indicates that a strict vegetarian diet is a rather hazardous one.

The best the vegetarians can do is cite evidence that they can have an adequate diet without meat if they eat eggs and drink milk. But that is feeble support for vegetarianism, since it is equally possible to have an adequate diet without peanut butter, for example, or vegeburgers, and macaroni and cheese.

It is sometimes argued that meat eating should be discouraged because it involves a cruel and bloody business — that of butchery. Distaste for this practice is experienced by many people of humane tastes. But that meat eating requires slaughter is hardly a new discovery; Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Jesus and God the Father were doubtless aware of what was involved in the preliminaries to serving a steak or a fillet. Yet they approved of meat consumption. Were they thoughtlessly or somewhat callously sanctioning a practice which finer sensibilities in our day reject?

Finally, is meat eating, whether meat is diseased or not, somehow inimical to spiritual development? Do the Christian virtues flourish more readily when one confines his or her diet to a vegetarian or a lacto-vegetarian diet? If eating flesh really *is* a hindrance to spiritual health and growth, God would surely, somewhere in the 1,000 pages of Scripture, have warned us against its consumption. Would God have given Elijah a food that was detrimental to his spiritual welfare? Could Jesus be properly regarded as perfect, if His example encouraged His followers to consume a diet that militated against the highest spiritual achievements? True, God may make progressive revelations of His will for man, *but not in conflict with His prior revelations*: additional light, yes; contradictory light, no.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. William Tucker, "Of Mites and Men," *Harpers*, Aug. 1978, p. 56.

2. *Ibid.*

3. "Nutrition As Therapy," *Consumer Reports*, Jan. 1980, p. 24.

What is most perturbing about the attitude of most Adventist vegetarians is the quite flagrant selectivity with which they marshal evidence to support their views. A few biblical verses are cited, given a highly questionable interpretation, and all the other biblical verses on the subject are blandly ignored. A few contemporary writers on health are cited, whereas recognized authorities who disagree are disregarded. Is this consistent with intellectual integrity? If vegetarian Christians display less intellectual honesty and fairness in dealing with the Scriptures and with scientific evidence than do non-vegetarians, one wonders if vegetarianism is indeed promoting their spiritual development.

In general, the church believes that we should study *all* the biblical verses which pertain to a given subject before arriving at doctrinal conclusions. Why should this not apply to meat-eating? Adventist doctors typically do not draw medical conclusions without studying all the relevant medical evidence. Why should meat-eating be treated differently, insofar as scientific evidence is involved?

One should have no quarrel with those who say, "The evidence does not yet support the belief that eating lean meat, poultry and fish is injurious to health, but I have faith that that day will yet come." But we have a right to be distressed when people cite scientific and Scriptural evidence with misleading selectivity, to buttress a treasured view. Intellectual honesty is a virtue that is not inappropriate for Christians to manifest.

Mrs. E. G. White once wrote that "Before accepting any doctrine or precept, we should demand a plain 'Thus saith the Lord' in its support."⁶ How much emphasis, then, should the church devote to a belief which not only lacks biblical foundations but confronts an impressive array of contrary biblical evidence? As a people of the Word, this is a question that should be squarely faced.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

5. "Do Women Need Iron Supplements?" *Consumer Reports*, Sept. 1978, p. 504.

6. *The Great Controversy*, p. 595.

A Radical Case for Vegetarianism

by Barry Casey

It has long been a commonplace in Adventism that one was a vegetarian because the Bible seemed to recommend it and because the “health message” demanded it. Adventists, perhaps uncomfortably, found themselves trying to explain Deuteronomic health laws along with their particular slant on health reform to a secular and uncomprehending public. Indeed, until a few years ago, vegetarianism was probably considered by most people as an eccentricity confined to a few religious fanatics, nature freaks, and anemic-looking health nuts.

Much of the social ignorance about vegetarianism has vanished in the last decade in the shadow of the phenomenal rise of participatory sports, a mass market for dietary and health publications, and the growing awareness of ecological concerns. It is no longer as difficult as it used to be to order a vegetarian meal in many restaurants. It is almost chic to be a vegetarian in the circles in which it is obligatory to jog ten miles a day, wear designer sweatpants, and drink Perrier water. Society has finally seen the light. This means that all of us who were raised vegetarians, and were slightly embarrassed about it, can now “come out of the closet” and admit

that we have been practicing vegetarians for most of our lives.

However, dietary and religious convictions are not the only reasons for being a vegetarian. In fact, there is a good case to be made that the rights of animals and the inequities between the affluent nations and the Third World are more powerful arguments in favor of vegetarianism for a secular society than are religious convictions. Accordingly, this essay will deal first with some of the ethical issues involved in animal rights and suffering, and second, with economic and political factors involved in the production and consumption of meat. I will argue, furthermore, that on the basis of the arguments outlined in this essay, meat-eating in our affluent society is immoral.

The question of the rights of animals is intimately tied to the question of the nature of animals. Further, the question arises whether the rights of animals, if they indeed have any, imply obligations or duties on the part of humans toward animals. Traditionally, the answers to these questions have taken the form of further questions which seek to establish what capacities are required before it can be said that an animal has rights and that others have duties toward it, and again, to determine which animals have those capacities.

Three capacities have been considered essential before a creature, human or nonhu-

Barry Casey is completing his graduate work in systematic theology at the Claremont Graduate School.

man, can be said to have rights. One is *sentience* — the capacity for both pleasure and pain; another is *rationality* — the capacity to reason; and still another is *autonomy* — the capacity to make free choices based on the action of the will.

Philosophy has regarded these capacities in varying degrees of importance, usually with ill consequences for relations between animals and humans. The first philosophical interest in the question arises in Aristotle, writing in the fourth century B.C., who stated that the lower animals have much in common with humans, including the capacity to gain nourishment, to reproduce, to be aware of the world through their senses, and to feel, remember, imagine, and desire. According to Aristotle, humans alone possess the capacity to reason, rationality thus being the differentiating characteristic between humans and animals.

Thomas Aquinas' Aristotelian rationale concerning the nature and rights of animals was built on the premise that rationality is the characteristic which makes beings more or less perfect. The more perfect a being is, the more power and right it has to use those creatures or things below it for its own ends and purposes. Thus, animals use plants; humans may use plants and animals; angels may use plants, animals, and humans; and God, because he is "Pure Intellect," may use everything and everybody. Animals, in effect, were excluded from this system of morals because they lacked rationality and attacked human beings for reasons other than justice, "the consideration of which belongs to reason alone."¹ Thus, humans may kill and eat animals for food as their God-given right. But what about the question of animal suffering and cruelty to animals?

Aquinas had no room in his moral scheme for wrongs against animals because, he believed, animals simply have no natural and special rights of their own (natural rights being those intrinsic to their kind and special rights being those which are conferred upon them by someone else). For Aquinas, rights presuppose the capacity to reason. So even though animals are (as Aquinas believes) sen-

tient, their inability to reason means that they have no rights. Human beings, therefore, have no duty — no *direct* duty, that is — to treat animals kindly. Aquinas did allow, however, that human beings have an indirect duty to abstain from cruelty to animals, since such cruelty, he believed, would lead to cruelty against humans.

Aquinas' influence has been long-lasting and widespread. As recently as the middle of the nineteenth century, Pope Pius IX forbade the establishment of a Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in Rome on the grounds that such an action would imply humans had duties toward animals.²

Two objections can immediately be made to Aquinas' theory. First, one can agree with him that humans have duties to creatures with reason, but object by saying that there is evidence that some higher animals *have* reason and thus rights; therefore, we have certain duties toward them. Another objection, a more important one, is made by such philosophers as Plutarch, Jeremy Bentham, and Albert Schweitzer, and claims that the important question is not "What beings are rational?" but rather "What beings have sentience?" In this view, humans have a *direct* duty and obligation to animals not to cause them unnecessary pain. This approach has a great deal to offer, as we shall see later.

Aquinas' objection to the rights of animals were based primarily on animals' lack of rationality; Descartes, the seventeenth-century French philosopher, claimed that animals had neither rationality nor sentience nor autonomy, thereby denying all of the qualities which Aristotle proposed concerning the nature of animals. In fact, Descartes held that animals were mere *automata*, machines having no souls or minds, not conscious of anything. Thus the squealing of a pig cut with a knife was a merely mechanistic response, probably the screech of a "spring" set in motion by the slice of the knife.

There is a direct line from Descartes to the first experiments of seventeenth and eighteenth-century vivisectionists, who nailed dogs up alive on boards by their paws and slit them open so that the movement of the circulatory system could be studied. Descartes' assertions allowed the scientists to

rationalize that the animal's cries were not expressive of real pain but were merely mechanistic responses.

According to the eighteenth-century German philosopher Immanuel Kant, humans have no duties toward animals because animals are not conscious moral agents and do not have the capacity to act out of free will. He believed animals are merely means to an end and the end is humanity itself. Like Aquinas, Kant believed that cruelty to animals was not good for human nature since it could lead to cruelty toward humans, but there is no necessity to be kind to animals. This attitude has been described by philosopher Peter Singer as "speciesism," a term which we find especially applicable to the type of attitude toward animals which most of us carry. Singer compares the speciesist to the racist and says, "Similarly the speciesist allows the interests of his own species to

“Taking the suffering of animals seriously means regarding animals as having interests and rights of their own. . . . It means recognizing that animals *suffer* as people suffer. . . .”

override the greater interests of other species.”³

From my perspective, the definitive answer to Kant came in 1780 from Jeremy Bentham, who, in his *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, said of animals: "The question is not, can they *reason*? nor can they *talk*? but can they *suffer*?"⁴ Picking up on Bentham's utilitarian principles, Singer writes: "If a being suffers, there can be no moral justification for refusing to take that suffering into consideration."⁵ This draws the line sharply between the position of Aquinas and Kant on the one hand, and Bentham and Singer on the other. "This is why," concludes Singer, "the limit of sentience . . . is the only defensible boundary of concern for the interests of others."⁶

Taking the suffering of animals seriously means regarding animals as having interests and rights of their own. It means debunking the deeply-ingrained Kantian attitude that claims animals merely for the use and ends of human beings. It means recognizing that animals *suffer* as people suffer, that the torturing and killing of animals is as indefensible as our torturing and massacring of each other.

My thesis is that rights make a claim upon others and presuppose obligations and duties toward those who possess them. Philosopher Joel Feinberg has defined a right as "a claim *to* something and *against* someone, the recognition of which is called for by legal (or other institutional) rules, or in the case of moral rights, by the principles of an enlightened conscience."⁷ If we apply this definition to the case of animal rights, we meet three objections immediately.

First, as Aquinas and Kant have claimed, rights are only attributable to beings who have the intellectual capacity to reason and make moral choices. Since animals do not reason, they cannot have rights. Our answer to this is that the last word on animal reasoning capacity is not yet in. Who knows what we may discover concerning the levels of animal consciousness and reasoning capacity? If we truly have not reached the end of our knowledge about animal nature, it does not seem reasonable to deprive animals of their rights on the basis that they do not have the same capacity as humans.

A second objection to our viewpoint is that animals do not *know* that they have claims or rights, so they cannot make claims to or against others on their own. But here, by analogy, we must remember the cases of infants and the insane or handicapped who have representatives to speak for them in court and uphold their rights. Against the objection that animals cannot *choose* to be represented may be put the example of people who are defended in court by a state-appointed attorney, in spite of their possible reluctance to be represented by that particular person.

A final objection is that animals do not have interests, a point we have discussed pre-

viously. "Possession of interests," comments Feinberg, "by no means automatically confers any particular right or even any right at all upon a being. What it does is show that the being in question is the kind of being to whom moral or legal rights can be ascribed without conceptual absurdity." While the interests of animals may be small compared to those of humans, they are sufficiently obvious to make talk of interests and rights meaningful. Animals certainly sense pain and pleasure, and seem also to have purposes, desires, and a certain conative sense about them.

I believe, then, that animals *have* interests and therefore have rights also. Those rights presuppose that humans have obligations to honor animals and that we have *direct* duties to the animals themselves. A final quotation from Feinberg expresses this succinctly: "We ought to treat animals humanely but also we should do so for the animal's *own sake*, that such treatment is something we *owe* to animals as their *due*, something that can be *claimed* for them, something the withholding of which would be an *injustice* and a *wrong*. . . ."9

While I would agree to the main body of Feinberg's argument, I would go farther and say that as created beings made by the purpose of God, animals have an *intrinsic* right to life. Such a position is a reinterpretation of Augustine's affirmation that created things and beings have intrinsic value by virtue of their createdness at the hand of the Creator.¹⁰ It is also expressed by H. Richard Niebuhr's echo of that sentiment in the phrase, "Whatever is, is good."¹¹ This lays upon humans, as stewards of the earth, the responsibility to safeguard and protect the freedom from interference of wild animals, to treat domesticated animals with kindness and prevent unnecessary suffering, and finally, when it is necessary to kill, that it be done as painlessly as possible. It also means that killing of animals for food should be done only when absolutely necessary for the survival of humans. This rules out killing for sport and for the mere gratification of human palates. The question of using animals in research cannot be given serious attention in this essay except to say that the general rule of

the least pain possible applies, and that research should be done on animals only when the results of such research directly and vitally affect the survival and well-being of humans.

Although cruelty to animals is wrong, there may be instances where causing pain to animals is justified, just as it may be right in some cases to inflict pain on humans. Nevertheless, as James Rachels says, "there must be a *good reason* for causing the suffering, and if the suffering is great, the justifying reason must be correspondingly powerful."¹² Rachels goes on to cite an example of the needless and terrible suffering of civet cats who are kept in the darkness of heated sheds until they die. As a result of tortuous heat as high as 110°F., a musk is produced on the genitals which is then scraped off and used in perfume. Many people would regard

"Meat production is a billion-dollar business, and the helpless animals are treated as food-producing machines rather than living beings."

the giving up of perfume, as a way of protesting this suffering, to be a cheap price to pay, but the same argument can be used with even stronger force in the case of animals raised for meat production. We turn now to more direct arguments against meat-eating, based on the methods and practices of "intensive farming," the result of which is the extreme suffering of literally millions of animals each year.

The associations most people have about the meat in their local supermarkets rarely involve images of actual animals. If people stop to think of the process at all, they are likely to have some vague notions of a brief moment of pain to the animals at the end of a reasonably happy life. On the contrary, the slaughterhouse is often a welcome release from an awful life for most animals raised for

meat. Meat production is a billion-dollar business, and the helpless animals are treated as food-producing machines rather than living beings.

There are three factors in intensive farming which inevitably cause animals a great deal of suffering: methods of rearing, methods of transportation, and methods of slaughtering. While the last two are certainly areas that are chronically at fault, the methods of rearing as practiced in this country are the most critical, because they involve the prolongation of suffering for virtually all the animal's life.

The process of turning animals into meat is governed first and foremost by the profit margin. Today's large farms are basically factories, where the greatest number of animals that can possibly be accommodated are housed and fed at the lowest cost to the farmer. In practical terms, this means that the care and treatment of individual animals is nil, the cost of production and competition inevitably making possible only the most cursory attention.

For example, calves raised for veal are kept in pens too small for them to turn around in or even lie down comfortably — often they spend their short lives with their legs bent double under them. Since the aim of veal production is to raise the heaviest calves in the shortest amount of time, and to keep the meat as pale as possible, the animals are overfed and underexercised. This is accomplished by a process which would otherwise be called unhealthful, but under the circumstances works wonders at putting on weight. In order to get the calves to eat as much as possible, they are deprived of all water, their only source of liquid being the rich milk replacer which they are fed daily. Since the barns are kept fairly warm, the thirsty calves drink much more than they would if allowed water; this overeating causes them to sweat, losing moisture that they must replace by drinking again.

Because their liquid diet is high in protein and deficient in essential minerals, calves will, in their desperation, gnaw the wood of their stalls to get roughage and, if allowed to turn around, will attempt to lick their own

urine for the iron, although under normal circumstances they find this repugnant. They are allowed virtually no movement, for exercise burns up the calories needed for the expensive dinner cuts and builds muscles which are tough and stringy.

The poultry industry is another prime example of the Kantian principle drawn out to the extreme. Chickens are raised for two purposes: to lay eggs and to become table chickens, or "broilers" as they are usually called. The essential step in this process is for chicken farmers to get the birds out of the farmyard and indoors where they can be crowded by the thousands into windowless sheds. Usually, the chick broilers are raised in cages stacked in tiers and fed and watered automatically from hoppers suspended from the ceiling. As the chickens grow they are crowded, eight to ten at a time, into cages smaller than a newspaper page.¹³ The stress of extreme crowding and the lack of exercise and natural activities lead to outbreaks of fighting which often result in the stronger birds killing and eating their weaker mates.

Feather-pecking and cannibalism are regarded as "vices" by the poultry farmers, although such behavior is inevitable under the circumstances. Even though the farmer may personally regret the hardship and suffering caused his chickens by the crowding, there is little he can do to relieve the situation, unless he is willing to forego his profit margin. In the poultry industry, eliminating overcrowding usually means eliminating the profit; so in order to keep the birds from pecking each other to death, the farmer often utilizes very dim lighting. A more drastic, and almost universally used measure, is called "debeaking," which "involves inserting the chick's head in a guillotine-like device which cuts off part of its beak. Alternatively, the operation may be done with a hot knife."¹⁴ Although some poultry farmers claim the operation is painless, a British governmental committee formed to examine aspects of intensive farming found that, in fact, the process cuts through a layer of extremely sensitive tissue, causing severe pain.¹⁵

The life of a laying hen is hardly easier than that of a broiler. Layers are debeaked, forced to lay eggs on the slanted floor of wire cages

crowded with up to four or five other hens, and live out their lives in semidarkness until their egg productivity is over. The wire cages, although extremely uncomfortable, have an economic justification, it is claimed: the excrement drops through and piles up on the floor where it can be cleaned in one operation. Unfortunately, a chicken's feet are not adapted to crouching on wire and, consequently, many farmers report chickens actually becoming anchored to the floor of the cage as their toenails catch on the wire and eventually grow around it.¹⁶ Furthermore, the chickens often suffer from the constant chafing of the wires against their bodies, and bloody, raw patches of skin, especially near their rumps, are not uncommon.

“Vegetarianism represents something direct, effective, and immediate that we can do to contribute . . . to the relief of the suffering of animals.”

These are examples drawn from research conducted on several giant poultry farms across the country.¹⁷ Together with examples considered before, they suggest that even the most modern and advanced methods of intensive farming have raised profits at the expense of causing millions of animals to suffer. The huge American appetite for meat demands large-scale intensive farming methods, which, it seems, virtually guarantee that millions of animals will lead lives of boredom and unnatural conditions at best, prolonged and intense suffering and fear at the worst.

Given the evidence, we are faced with what William James called a “forced option” — we cannot *not* decide. What can and must we do if we are convinced of the suffering of animals raised for meat?

Certainly, we must attempt to influence our political representatives to work for legislation that will more closely regulate the practices of intensive farming so as to reduce the suffering in whatever ways possible. Not surprisingly, the agribusiness lobby is one of the most powerful in the country, representing millions of dollars spent yearly on influencing politicians. Further, the links between agribusiness and the U.S. Department of Agriculture are longstanding, powerful, and cordial. Two fairly recent examples: Clifford Hardin, secretary of agriculture in the Nixon administration, resigned in 1970 to become a top executive of Ralston Purina, one of the nation's largest agribusiness corporations; his successor, Earl Butz, resigned a position with Ralston to take over the secretariat.¹⁸ While efforts in this area may not be immediately effective, they are still part of a larger pattern of protest that can eventually make a difference.

Another indirect but substantial action is to raise our children as vegetarians, and to teach them to respect and protect the rights of animals. Further, supporting organizations dedicated to protecting wildlife and the environment, such as Greenpeace and Friends of Animals, Inc., can have international ramifications, as recent world legislation against whaling practices and quotas has shown.

The question might be raised that, if means could be worked out so animals could be reared, transported, and slaughtered humanely, what would be wrong with eating meat? The answer is, first, that even if such methods could be developed, they would raise the cost of meat production so high that only the very rich could afford meat. Intensive farming is successful because of the factory methods used in raising the animals. Humane methods are simply not profitable, no matter how just they may be for the animals involved.

Second, no matter how humane the procedures for raising and slaughtering animals for meat, it is highly unlikely that one could eat animals and continue to regard them as ends in themselves. If animals are being raised for the sole purpose of delighting our palates, it is hard to see how we could come to regard them as anything but creatures for

our use alone. Oliver Goldsmith, the eighteenth-century humanitarian essayist, characterised such people by writing: "They pity, and they eat the objects of their compassion."¹⁹ By eating animals, we help to reinforce the speciesism against animals that has existed for millenia. The basic issue, after all, is that because animals have sentience and can suffer, and have varying degrees of consciousness, they are entitled to the right to life as much as humans. The exact extent of the rights of animals is an open question, even among ardent conservationists, yet few would argue that animals, at least, have the intrinsic right to life. "Compassionate meat-eating," where meat-eating is not *absolutely* necessary for the survival of humans, is a contradiction in terms.

Finally, the question itself is only of theoretical interest because the actual situation and choice we face is buying the meat of animals which *have* been treated inhumanely.

If one is convicted about the part meat-eating plays in the abolition of animal rights, by far the most effective action is to become, or remain, a vegetarian. Vegetarianism is a form of boycott and an explicit protest against the cruelty of intensive farming methods. For most vegetarians, the boycott is a permanent one, since they rarely eat meat once they have made the initial choice to become or remain vegetarian. Although the number of omnivores certainly exceeds the number of vegetarians, still the thousands of vegetarians are not adding to the demand for meat. As health research goes on and as people become aware of the cruelties involved in the raising of animals for meat, the number of vegetarians will most likely increase. From the standpoint alone of concern for the rights of animals, we can be grateful for everyone who abstains from eating meat. The farmers who practice intensive farming methods do so because it is profitable and because there is a tremendous demand for meat by American consumers. Intensive farming methods will continue to be used as long as they are profitable, and farmers will continue to have the political resources to fight reforming legislation because they will use the argument that they are only providing the public what it wants.

But in addition to refraining from eating meat, we must also vocally protest the infringement of the rights of animals. While boycotting meat may be the most effective measure in the long run, persuasion and protest are important as well. In a sense we must be ready "to give an answer" to everyone who asks the reason for our protest!

It is here that we must face our speciesism. It is here that we must attest to our sincerity about our concern for the rights of animals and our desire to reverse the trend of the centuries against them. As long as we are meat-eaters, we are condoning and directly supporting the speciesism which has been directed at animals for millenia, and we are perpetuating the unjust economic structures which make cruelty to animals necessary and commonplace. Vegetarianism represents something direct, effective, and immediate that we can do to contribute, in however small a way, to the relief of the suffering of animals.

Another factor which is of considerable significance in the issue of vegetarianism is the cost-efficiency of meat production versus grain and plant production. Coupled with this is the inequity of food production and distribution between the affluent nations, particularly the United States, and Third World countries. When one considers how tightly interrelated and dependent upon one another the nations of the world are today, it does not stretch the imagination to see how what a farmer in Texas feeds his beef cattle directly affects the life expectancy of a baby in India.

In the last three decades, the productivity of American farmland has increased by 50 percent; in effect, the United States has had its own "green revolution."²⁰ In that time, corn yields have leaped to three times per acre the yields of the later forties and early fifties. With this abundance of food, it would seem that America could both feed its people and export a tremendous amount of food to hungry nations. Not so. With the increased productivity, the economic gap between the North Atlantic nations (Canada, the United States, Western Europe) and the Third

World countries continues to expand at an alarming rate. Because the poorer nations could not afford the grain and soy supplies they needed, the American farmer had the unique problem of producing too much food. The solution was to cut back production by holding back the amount of land used for crops. The American government paid farmers \$3.6 billion in 1972 to hold back one acre for every four and a half acres harvested.²¹ Still, the crops reached record highs. An interesting and startling development in this worldwide economic gap comes to light when we begin to examine the relationship of meat production to grain and plant production.

Among the meat-producing animals (cattle, pigs, turkeys, and chickens), cattle are by far the least efficient in the protein yield ratio of grain to meat. Frances Moore Lappé reports that “today an average steer is able to reduce 16 pounds of grain and soy to one pound of meat on our plates. The other 15 pounds? It becomes inaccessible to use, for it is either used by the animal to produce energy or to make some part of its own body that we do not eat (like hair), or it is lost entirely in manure.”²² It takes approximately 21 pounds of protein fed to a calf to produce one pound of animal protein for humans to use.²³ Lappé notes that the discrepancy in ratio figures is the object of a fierce battle today between the experts of the interest groups involved. The discussion turns on the difference in gained weight that a protein diet puts on a calf and its actual body weight. Needless to say, the figures which grain manufacturers arrive at are considerably lower than studies by government agencies! Nevertheless, an average ratio of 16:1 (16 pounds of grain protein to every one pound of animal protein) is a fairly accurate working figure.²⁴ Lappé’s characterization of the steer as “a protein factory in reverse” is well deserved.²⁵

Livestock other than steers are considerably more efficient: hogs consume six times the protein they give back, turkeys, four, and chickens, three. Milk production is even more efficient, as it takes less than one pound of grain to produce a pint of milk.²⁶

Still another way to understand the ineffi-

ciency of livestock as protein converters is by comparison with plants. An acre of cereals produces five times more protein than an acre used for meat production; legumes produce ten times more; and leafy vegetables approximately 15 times more.²⁷ Granting that an acre devoted to plant production is more efficient than one used for meat production, one might well question where the tremendous harvests in this country are going.

As a result of the over-production of protein crops (corn, barley, oats, soybeans, and wheat), a tight world market, and the increasing demand for meat, the feedlot operation came into being to help relieve, in part, the pressure created on the world market by too much U.S. grain.

If a calf grazes on land that produces only grass, or on land that is not arable, then the

“An acre of cereals produces five times more protein than an acre used for meat production; legumes produce 10 times more; and leafy vegetables approximately 15 times more.”

protein derived from that calf is a net gain to humans, since it required no loss of proteins to produce it. But if that calf is crowded into a feedlot with thousands of other cattle, then it must be fed. And what we feed it is grain that could otherwise be used as protein for humans.

It takes a ton of grain and approximately 300-400 pounds of high-protein feed to fatten a feedlot calf for slaughter. While in the 1940s only one-third of all beef cattle were grain-fed, by the early 1970s fully three-quarters of all marketed cattle were grain-fed. The effectiveness of American livestock operations in reducing the “surplus” protein crops has worked so well that “by 1973, American livestock consumed the protein equivalent of *six times* the recommended protein allowance of our human population.”²⁸ This means that we feed about 90 percent of our corn, barley, and oat crops to cattle.

Combining the two factors of the enormous plant crops consumed by animals and the inefficiency of animals in converting plant protein into animal protein, we arrive at some appalling statistics. Lappé calculates that of the 140 million tons of grain and soy fed to livestock in 1971, only 20 million tons returned as meat. The rest, close to 118 millions tons of grain and soy, was inaccessible for human consumption. This is enough to provide every human being with one cup of grain per day for a year.²⁹ When one considers that the United States produces three-quarters of the world's soybeans and feeds 95 percent of its yearly crop to animals, it becomes clear that the world cannot afford the expensive tastes of Americans.³⁰

Ironically, while feeding precious grain and soy proteins to cattle to fatten them up, we actually waste up to 20 percent of the carcasses of slaughtered cattle by trimming away excess fat. Instead of the high-quality protein feed going to make up animal protein, the actual emphasis in meat production is on the marbled fat, a USDA quality grading based on the proportion of fat present. "The result of this feeding for fat is incredible waste: much of it is simply trimmed away and discarded. . . . In 1973, some 2.5 billion pounds of excess fat were trimmed from beef carcasses at the retail level."³¹ The United Nations reports that livestock in affluent countries actually eat as much grain protein in *feed* as people in the poor countries eat directly as *food*.³²

What difference would it make to the world hunger problem if Americans were to reduce the amount of grain fed to cattle and cut back on their meat consumption? According to Lester Brown of the Overseas Development Council, "if Americans were to reduce their meat consumption by only ten percent for one year, it would free at least 12 million tons of grain for human consumption — or enough to feed 60 million people." Furthermore, "if Americans were to stop eating grain-fed beef altogether, the grain thus released would be enough to feed *all* the 600 million people in India and Bangladesh."³³

Waste of grain and overconsumption are not the only factors United States and the

affluent countries of Western Europe contribute to the crisis in world hunger. According to the United Nations, the rich, developed nations of the world imported, from 1955 to 1973, approximately twice as much food in dollars from the poor, developing nations as they exported in return.³⁴ The irony in the import-export balance is that the United States, one of the richest nations in the world, actually received, in 1972, \$1.5 billion more worth of food from developing nations than it exported to them. "It is not simply that North Americans consume five times as much grain as do most Asians," comments theologian Ronald Sider. "It is not simply that each day we eat twice as much protein as our bodies need. It is not simply that we devour so many unnecessary calories that more than 80 million of us are overweight. We can do all these foolish, unjust things in part because each year the poor world exports vast quantities of food to North America!"³⁵

One would assume that with the quantity of beef production in the United States, we would be in a position to export beef. That the United States is the world's largest *importer* of beef comes as no surprise when one considers that from 1950 to 1973 the average American's annual consumption of beef and poultry shot up from 60 pounds to about 250 pounds.³⁶ Our imported beef comes not only from Australia and New Zealand but from many Latin American countries as well; in fact, "America imports half as much Mexican beef as all Mexicans have left for themselves."³⁷ This raises another moral and political issue; that is, by importing beef from Latin American countries, we not only deprive them of a present major source of their diet, but we encourage and support unjust power structures within those countries. In Latin American countries such as Honduras and Mexico, the cattle are owned by a tiny minority of wealthy families who control a majority of the arable land and reap the profits. Honduras, for example, exports approximately 34.8 million pounds of beef a year to the United States, but virtually all the profits go to an elite making up 0.3 percent of the total population, who own 27.4 percent of the cultivable land.³⁸

It would be simplistic to assume that by merely cutting back or stopping our meat-eating, we could make it easier for the poor of the developing nations to survive. There are complex social, political, and economic factors involved which make easy solutions impossible. But by becoming aware of the importance that the role of meat production and consumption plays in the world market, we can understand, at least in part, the seriousness of the problems before us.

I wish to draw the issues as clearly as possible in conclusion. First, because I believe that animals have an intrinsic right to life and thus the right not to be exploited as a means to human ends, I have argued that it is ethically wrong, in fact immoral, to perpetuate the centuries of speciesism against animals by eating meat produced by the intensive farming methods. Since virtually all meat available through commercial chain supermarkets and other outlets is mass produced by the intensive farming method, it follows that eating meat is contributing directly to the suffering of animals.

Second, I have argued that the killing of animals for the mere tastes of the human palate is unjustified when so much food of other kinds is available. In an affluent country such as the United States, few people

need meat in their diet to survive and lead healthy lives. Therefore, it seems to me that what the suffering animals go through to gratify an acquired human taste far outweighs the necessity for meat eating. Thus, I believe that it is ethically wrong, and indeed immoral, for the citizens of affluent countries where food is abundant to insist on meat eating.

Third, I have argued that the increasing demand for meat, particularly beef, and the "green revolution" in crop production have tended to create a situation in which more grain is being used to fatten cattle than is consumed directly by humans — especially humans in the famine areas of the Third World countries. In addition, the wasteful inefficiency of converting grain and plant protein to animal protein not only contributes to spiraling costs and the greed of an overconsuming society, but directly affects the lives of the millions of malnourished and starving poor in the Third World. In short, the world is reaching the point where it can no longer afford the affluent countries' consuming many more times their share of the world's resources and goods. I believe that this, too, is immoral, and that a vegetarian diet is a first step toward alleviating world hunger and undermining support for oppressive economic and political structures, both in the affluent countries and in the Third World.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* II, II, Q159, art. 2. Quoted in Peter Singer, *Animal Liberation* (New York: Avon Books, 1975), p. 202. Singer is an authority in the field of animal rights; *Animal Liberation* provides a much more detailed and fuller exposition of the examples used in this essay. I am indebted to Singer for raising my consciousness about animal rights — and for much of the factual material relating to the intensive farming method and animal use.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 203.

3. Peter Singer, "All Animals Are Equal," in *Animal Rights and Human Obligations*, ed. Tom Regan and Peter Singer (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976), p. 154. *Animal Rights* is a collection of essays examining several questions concerning the rights of animals, as well as selections from the history of philosophy on the nature and rights of animals.

4. Singer relies on Bentham's utilitarian principles throughout *Animal Liberation*, building his argument for the equality of animals on Bentham's principle, "Each to count for one and none for more than one," and repeating the quoted question concerning sentience on p. 211.

5. Regan and Singer, *Animal Rights*, p. 154.

6. *Ibid.*

7. Joe Feinberg, "Can Animals Have Rights?" in *Animal Rights*, p. 190.

8. Joe Feinberg, "Human Duties and Animal Rights," in *On the Fifth Day: Animal Rights and Human Ethics*, ed. Richard Knowles Morris and Michael W. Fox (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, 1978), p. 55.

9. Feinberg, *Animal Rights*, p. 196.

10. Saint Augustine, *The City of God*, trans. Marcus Dods, The Modern Library (New York: Random House, 1950), p. 366.

11. H. Richard Niebuhr, *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture* (New York: Harper Torchbooks ed., 1970), p. 37.

12. James Rachels, "Vegetarianism and 'The Other Weight Problem,'" in *World Hunger and Moral Obligations*, ed. William Aiken and Hugh La Follette (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 187.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 189.

14. Singer, *Animal Liberation*, p. 99.

15. *Report of the Technical Committee to Enquire into the*

Welfare of Animals Kept Under Intensive Livestock Husbandry Systems, Command Paper 2836. Quoted in Singer, *Animal Liberation*, p. 99.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 92f.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 166.
19. Oliver Goldsmith, *Collected Works*. Quoted in Singer, *Animal Liberation*, p. 163.
20. Frances Moore Lappé, *Diet For a Small Planet*, new rev. ed. (New York: Ballantine Books, 1971), p. 7.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
22. *Ibid.*
23. Singer, *Animal Liberation*, p. 170.
24. Lappé, *Diet*, p. 382.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 13, 14.
30. Singer, *Animal Liberation*, p. 174.
31. Lappé, *Diet*, p. 17.
32. Ronald J. Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1977), p. 44.
33. Singer, *Animal Liberation*, p. 171.
34. Sider, *Rich Christians*, p. 153.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 157, 158.
36. Lappé, *Diet*, p. 40.
37. Sider, *Rich Christians*, p. 159.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 160.

Unclean or Unhealthful? An Adventist Perspective

by John Brunt

Many Seventh-day Adventists typically emphasize two distinct ways one may err with regard to diet. On the one hand, to eat meat, excessive sugar, or a generally unbalanced diet is seen as a violation of health principles. On the other hand, to eat pork, shellfish, or other foods specified as “unclean” in Leviticus 11 is seen as a violation of God’s law and is “sinful” in a way that mere lack of regard for health is not. This paper calls such a qualitative distinction into question.

There are two major problems with the way many Adventists use Leviticus 11 with respect to clean and unclean foods. First, Adventists are inconsistent. While parts of

Levitical rules concerning what is clean and unclean are accepted, other parts are rejected or ignored, and there is no valid basis for this selective acceptance. For example, while most Adventists would have no difficulty agreeing with the teaching of Leviticus 11:20 that insects which crawl should not be eaten, few would heed the teaching of Leviticus 11:24-25 and wash all their clothes and consider themselves unclean until evening because they touched the carcass of such an insect; yet both teachings are part of the same body of instruction. Nor do we consider new mothers unclean and exclude them from the sanctuary for forty days after the birth of a male and eighty days after the birth of a female (Lev. 12:1-5), yet this, too, is part of the same body of instruction.

Second, in their use of Leviticus 11, many Adventists are not biblical, for the New Testament explicitly abolishes distinctions be-

John Brunt holds his doctorate in New Testament studies from Emory University. He teaches theology at Walla Walla College and is the author of *Decisions*.

tween clean and unclean. This second aspect of the problem is the major concern of the present paper. We will examine the New Testament teaching, look at certain historical observations that help to explain the New Testament position, and study the significance of these findings for an Adventist presentation of diet and health.

There are several passages in the New Testament which speak of the distinction between clean and unclean — passages that Adventists too often ignore.

Mark 7 records a controversy between Jesus and the Pharisees. While the specific

“The relationship of diet to health was simply not an issue in first-century Judaism or Christianity. In Judaism, rules regarding clean and unclean were understood in terms of ritual purity. . . .”

issue is the ritual washing of hands before meals (the Pharisees are upset because Jesus’ disciples do not wash their hands in the proper manner), it is clear that Mark understands Jesus’ answer to the Pharisees in a broader way. Jesus teaches that one is not defiled by what goes into the mouth; rather, defilement is an inner matter. Mark adds his own parenthesis to show how far-reaching he considers Jesus’ advice to be:

And he called the people to him again, and said to them, “Hear me, all of you, and understand: there is nothing outside a man which by going into him can defile him; but the things which come out of a man are what defile him.” And when he had entered the house, and left the people, his disciples asked him about the parable. And he said to them, “Then are you also without understanding? Do you not see that whatever goes into a man from the outside cannot defile him, since it enters, not his heart but his stomach, and so passes on? (*Thus he declared all foods clean.*). And he

said, “What comes out of a man is what defiles a man. For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, fornication, theft, murder, adultery, coveting, wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, foolishness. All these evil things come from within, and they defile a man” (Mark 7:14-23).¹

On another occasion, the Pharisees express unhappiness with Jesus Himself over His failure to wash in the proper manner. Again, Jesus stresses that true spirituality is an inner concern, not a matter of outward ritual:

While he was speaking, a Pharisee asked him to dine with him; so he went in and sat at the table. The Pharisee was astonished to see that he did not first wash before dinner. And the Lord said to him, “Now you Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and of the dish, but inside you are full of extortion and wickedness. You fools! Did not he who made the outside make the inside also? But give for alms those things which are within; and behold, everything is clean for you (Luke 11:37-41).

Notice here that Jesus Himself declares everything clean.

Paul also emphasizes the cleanness of all things. In Romans 14:1 - 15:13, he addresses a situation in the Roman community where believers are divided over dietary practice. The “weak” eat only vegetables, whereas the “strong” believe they may eat anything. Paul does not try to bring about unity of practice, but rather tries to bring about a unity of fellowship that transcends the difference in specific practice. He affirms the freedom of both weak and strong to act according to their convictions. For the strong, regarding all foods as clean is right, but for those who do believe in distinctions between clean and unclean, going ahead and eating in violation of their convictions is wrong. Thus Paul can say:

I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself; but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean. (Rom. 14:14).

In addition, even though Paul identifies with the strong (Rom. 15:1), he also hopes that they will be so free that they will be able to adjust their practices (even where legiti-

mate) for the sake of the weak and unity with them. Thus he says:

Do not, for the sake of food, destroy the work of God. Everything is indeed clean, but it is wrong for any one to make others fall by what he eats; it is right not to eat meat or drink wine or do anything that makes your brother stumble (Rom. 14:20-21).

While it is impossible to identify the weak and to discover the origin of, or reasons for, their vegetarianism, it is clear that Paul, within the context of a debate over food, teaches that all things are clean.

Adventist expositors have often sought to explain these statements in Mark 7 and Romans 14 by emphasizing that in neither case is the specific topic under discussion Jewish food laws as such. It is not Leviticus 11 that is under discussion, they have said. Rather, the issue in Mark 7 is eating with unwashed hands, whereas the issue in Romans 14 is some kind of vegetarianism. According to this interpretation, the New Testament allows the distinction between clean and unclean foods in Leviticus 11 to remain binding.

While it is true that Jewish food laws are not the primary topic of discussion in either of these cases, it is also apparent that in both cases the focus of the statements regarding clean and unclean is much broader than the specific contexts in which they occur. Mark's comment transcends the question of unwashed hands and declares that *all* foods are clean (Mark 7:19). It is hard to imagine that first-century Gentile Christians would have taken that to mean all foods except those declared unclean in Leviticus 11. Likewise, Paul declares the cleanness of *all* things, and in no way implies that certain foods are to be excepted from this declaration. Readers in Rome could hardly be expected to conclude other than that all distinctions between clean and unclean were now abolished. Thus, even though both Mark and Paul raise the same issue of the cleanness of all foods within the context of more specific discussions, the broad, general nature of their conclusions cannot be ignored.

There are also other passages that could be included here, such as Titus 1:15 and Colossians 2:8-23, but the passages above are suffi-

cient to show that the New Testament explicitly rejects the distinction between clean and unclean foods. Before moving, however, to what significance this has for the Adventist prohibition of unclean meats, we must illuminate the cultural context of the New Testament teaching.

First, it should be noted that in the first century, no one considered Jewish food laws to have anything to do with health, nor is health an issue in any of the New Testament passages surveyed above.² The relationship of diet to health was simply not an issue in first-century Judaism or Christianity. In Judaism, rules regarding clean and unclean were understood in terms of ritual purity which directly affected one's relationship to God. God was not to be offended by that which was unclean; thus, one who was unclean was excluded from the temple. It made no difference whether the impurity resulted from eating forbidden foods, giving birth to a child, menstruating, touching a corpse, or failing to wash in the prescribed manner. While some of these rules concerning clean and unclean were originally intended to set forth conditions for worship in the temple, by the first century, groups such as the Pharisees probably attempted to be in a perpetual state of ritual purity, especially at mealtimes.³

There were, of course, Jews who tried to explain these rules on a rationalistic basis. They wanted to show that the rules were not arbitrary, but had a specific purpose. For instance, Philo, the first-century Alexandrian Jewish philosopher who attempted to wed Judaism with Hellenistic philosophy, explains Jewish food laws in the following manner:

All the animals of land, sea or air whose flesh is the finest and fattest, thus titillating and exciting the malignant foe pleasure, he (God) sternly forbade them to eat, knowing that they set a trap for the most slavish of the senses, the taste, and produce gluttony, and evil very dangerous both to soul and body. For gluttony begets indigestion which is the source origin of all distempers

and infirmities. Now among the different kinds of land animals there is none whose flesh is so delicious as the pig's, as all who eat it agree, and among the aquatic animals the same may be said of such species as are scaleless.⁴

According to Philo, God prohibited pork and shellfish because they tasted the best of all foods, and God wanted to curb pleasure and desire in His people. Philo shows a concern for health,⁵ but he nowhere intimates that pork itself is unhealthful. Rather, gluttony is unhealthy, and pork tastes so good that it leads to gluttony. In this respect, Philo is not alone; no extant Jewish writing from this period directly connects Jewish food laws and health.⁶

Jesus and Paul must be understood within the context of the issues of their time. The issue Jesus addresses is not health but a ritualistic understanding of the nature of religion, according to which food, corpses, unwashed hands, etc., cause spiritual defilement. Jesus and Paul are not saying that all food is healthful, but that all food is clean — i.e., it is not able to bring ritual defilement which cuts one off from the presence of God.

It is also important to recognize that Philo's rationalization for Jewish food laws was by no means the most common one. Most Jews of the New Testament period who sought a rationalistic explanation for their food laws saw these laws in allegorical terms (without denying their literal validity) and connected them with the issue of fellowship with Gentiles. *What* and *with whom* one ate were integrally related. God restricted what one ate to symbolize the kind of people with whom one should not eat. For example, one Hellenistic Jewish work from Egypt teaches the following:

When therefore our lawgiver, equipped by God for insight into all things, had surveyed each particular, he fenced us about with impregnable palisades and with walls of iron, to the end that we should mingle in no way with any of the other nations, remaining pure in body and in spirit, emancipated from vain opinions, revering the one and mighty God above the whole of creation. . . . And therefore, so that we should be polluted by none nor be infected with

perversions by associating with worthless persons, he has hedged us about on all sides with prescribed purifications in matters of food and drink and touch and hearing and sight.⁷

Thus the Jews refrain from eating unclean food to remind them that they are not to eat with unclean people.

This Jewish reluctance to eat with other nations is noted by Gentile authors, although it is always difficult to know where truth stops and exaggeration begins in such propaganda. Diodorus, writing in the first cen-

“While the New Testament rejects the distinction between clean and unclean, it is not speaking to the issue of health. It is rather addressing . . . problems of ritualism and exclusivism. . . .”

tury B.C., says that the Jews “made their hatred of mankind into a tradition, and on this account had introduced utterly outlandish laws: not to break bread with any other race, nor to show them any good will at all.”⁸

This connection in Jewish thought between unclean food and unclean people helps to explain the symbolism in Peter's vision and subsequent encounter with Cornelius recorded in Acts 10 and 11. As Acts 10:28 clearly shows, the point of that narrative is not food but *people*. The bottom line is that all people are to be considered “clean” and worthy of the gospel. But while *we* might wonder why unclean animals would be used in this vision that teaches the cleanness of all people, to the first-century Jew the connection would have been obvious. The uncleanness of pigs was understood as God's way of teaching Israel about the uncleanness of Gentiles, and thus a vision about eating unclean foods would naturally have to do with unclean people.

When we realize that one of the most crucial and hard-fought issues in the early church was the inclusion of Gentiles in salva-

tion (and the related issue of table-fellowship between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians), it is easy to see how Jewish food laws as they were generally understood in first-century Judaism could only be inimical to the gospel that Paul taught. This is probably another reason for Paul's emphasis that all foods are clean. In order to break down the imposing barriers that separated Jew and Gentile, the entire distinction between clean and unclean, which was so basic to Jewish thought, had to go. For this distinction, with its volumes of rules, could only contribute to a ritualistic understanding of the nature of religion and to an exclusivism that separated the pious from both things and people that were considered unclean.

Thus, while the New Testament rejects the distinction between clean and unclean, it is not speaking to the issue of health. It is rather addressing problems that were live issues in the first century, problems of ritualism and exclusivism, both of which had to be overcome if the true meaning of the gospel was to be grasped. As long as the traditional Jewish distinctions between clean and unclean were preserved, the overcoming of these problems was virtually impossible, for the clean-unclean distinction was understood in a ritualistic way, and the belief that certain people were unclean was part and parcel of that distinction.

In light of the New Testament teaching, should Adventists use Leviticus 11 to support the prohibition of pork and other foods listed there as "unclean"? Should a qualitative distinction be made between eating such foods and other unhealthful dietary practices?

The answer should be "no" to both of these questions. The use often made of Leviticus 11 can only be successful when two important factors are ignored: 1) the context of the passage — i.e., the rest of the instructions concerning clean and unclean presented in the same place — and 2) the rejection of the clean-unclean distinction in the New Testament.

There are two major (and closely related) reasons, however, why we have often continued this line of interpretation in spite of its

inconsistencies. First, we have been unwilling to acknowledge Ellen White's contribution to our health practice and have maintained instead that every facet of our practice is biblical, not only in principle, but in specific detail. Second, we have wanted to have specific biblical proof-texts to support each point of practice, whereas in reality it is not always so simple a matter that one can point to a specific proof-text for support of every belief and practice. Sometimes, in order to support a belief or practice which is valid biblically, one must carry out a more complex theological task by showing the implications of underlying principles in Scripture. But the penchant for proof-texting often mitigates against this theological task.⁹ It is precisely this theological task that is needed if Adventists are to give a consistent presentation of dietary practice and health reform.

What then are we to do in light of the difficulties which our traditional use of Leviticus 11 presents? Three specific suggestions follow.

First, we should accept without embarrassment the teaching of the New Testament that nothing is unclean, recognizing that the issue of health was not a factor in the New Testament discussions. The issues that concern us today must not be read back into the New Testament, and the New Testament must not be made to address questions with which it was not concerned. The time was not yet right for God to reveal the principles of health reform to His people in the first century; instead, other issues such as the internal nature of true spirituality and the unity of Jew and Gentile in Christ first had to be settled, and, as we have seen, the clean-unclean distinction, as commonly understood in the first century, confused both these issues.

That the time was not yet right for a presentation of health reform in the first century should hardly surprise Adventists, for even in 1858 Ellen White could say that the time for this truth had not yet come. She writes to one who is advocating the prohibition of swine's flesh in the diet of Adventists and says:

I saw that your views concerning swine's flesh would prove no injury if you

have them to yourselves; but in your judgment and opinion you have made this question a test, and your actions have plainly shown your faith in this matter. If God requires His people to abstain from swine's flesh, He will convict them on the matter. He is just as willing to show His honest children their duty, as to show their duty to individuals upon whom He has not laid the burden of His work. If it is the duty of the church to abstain from swine's flesh, God will discover it to more than two or three. He will teach His *church* their duty.

God is leading out a people, not a few separate individuals here and there, one believing this thing, another that. Angels of God are doing the work committed to their trust. The third angel is leading out and purifying a people, and they should move with him unitedly. Some run ahead of the angels that are leading this people; but they have to retrace every step, and meekly follow no faster than the angels lead. I saw that the angels of God would lead His people no faster than they could receive and act upon the important truths that are communicated to them.¹⁰

Second, the difficulties connected with our use of Leviticus 11 suggest that we must do our theological homework and firmly establish the importance of health reform on the biblical teaching of the wholeness of man and the value of physical life. This will give the whole matter of health reform a much firmer biblical foundation than could ever be provided by proof-texting from Leviticus 11. It is not within the scope of this paper to carry out this theological and interpretive task, but the paper is a plea for such work. It could make use of Paul's anti-Gnostic teachings about the importance of the body, the doctrines of the resurrection, creation, the non-immortality of the soul, and others.

The New Testament rejection of distinctions between clean and unclean would not in any way speak against this emphasis, for since health is not an issue in these passages, they in no way affirm that all foods are healthful (one who drinks arsenic still dies), but only that all foods are *clean* within the context of the ritualistic understanding of clean-unclean at that time.

Some will be disappointed that no one proof-text will support our understanding of health reform. However, in the long run, performing the theological task will yield results that are much more biblical. The result of such work should be *greater* rather than less *responsibility* with regard to health reform, for the emphasis will be on the responsibility to do *always* that which is *most* healthful, not merely on avoiding certain foods.

“For the Christian, all things are clean; true spirituality is a matter of the heart, not of ritualistic externals.”

Thus, the need is not for a change in our *practice* (the bottom line is *not* that ham sandwiches should take their place on Adventist tables, nor that the church should abolish its prohibition of pork), but for a clearer grounding of our concern for health in scriptural principles, not in dubious proof-texts.

Third, the difficulties attending the traditional view underscore our need to recognize our indebtedness to Ellen White and her health reform vision of 1863, and to admit that she is the vehicle through whom God has given light about the unhealthfulness of pork and other foods which God prohibited to Israel. What Ellen White affirms is that *in these particular laws* God's original purpose was health, that these foods are especially unhealthful, and thus that they should not be eaten.¹¹ Therefore, our rejection of these meats for food does not come directly from Leviticus 11 (or else we would be bound by all the other laws concerning clean and unclean, and this the New Testament explicitly rejects), but from Leviticus 11 as viewed and interpreted through the light which Ellen White received from God.¹²

It also follows from Ellen White's discussions of swine's flesh that the purpose of the prohibition for us today is health and health only. Pork is forbidden only because it is unhealthful. Thus there is not a *qualitative* distinction between eating pork and eating other unhealthful foods. Violation of health reform is

not one kind of sin, and violation of God's direct command in Leviticus 11 quite another. Rather, the difference is *quantitative*; pork is simply more unhealthful. Thus Ellen White says:

The tissues of swine swarm with parasites. Of swine God said, "It is unclean unto you: ye shall not eat of their flesh, nor touch their dead carcass." Deuteronomy 14:8. The command was given because swine's flesh is unfit for food. Swine are scavengers, and this is the only use they were intended to serve. Never, under any circumstances, was their flesh to be eaten by human beings. It is impossible for the flesh of any living creature to be wholesome when filth is its natu-

ral element and when it feeds upon every detestable thing.¹³

Seventh-day Adventists believe that physical existence is a gift of God, and therefore that care for the body is an important concern. The scriptural emphasis on the wholeness of human beings mandates health reform. They also believe (in accordance both with light given to Ellen White and with scientific evidence) that pork is especially unhealthful. It ought to be for these reasons that Adventists refrain from eating pork, not because the laws concerning clean and unclean in Leviticus are still binding upon Christians. For the Christian, all things are clean; true spirituality is a matter of the heart, not of ritualistic externals.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. All scriptural quotations are taken from the *Revised Standard Version* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1946, 1952).

2. The question of the extent to which Jewish dietary restrictions were originally understood as relating to health is a matter that falls outside the scope of this investigation.

3. See Jacob Neusner, *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1973) *passim*, especially pp. 80, 90.

4. Philo, "The Special Laws," 4:100, in *Philo*, vol. 8, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classics (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939), p. 69.

5. It is interesting that while Philo never directly connects health and food laws, he does give health as a reason for circumcision. See *Ibid.*, 1:4ff, in *Philo*, vol. 7, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classics (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937), pp. 103-105.

6. Some writers outside Judaism and Christianity emphasized health and related it directly to dietary concerns. For instance, Plutarch, the first-century Hellenistic philosopher, wrote an essay titled "Advice About Keeping Well." (In *Moralia*, vol. 2, trans. Frank Cole Babbitt, Loeb Classics [New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928], pp. 216-293.) Here he advises that light foods such as vegetables, birds, and fishes that do not have much fat are to be preferred over meat and cheese. While Prodicus had said that fire is the best of the sauces, Plutarch counters: ". . . but one might more truly speak of health as being the most divine and agreeable sauce. For boiled, baked, or fried foods afford no proper pleasure or even gratification to those who are suffering from disease, debauch, or nausea, while a clean and unspoiled appetite makes everything, to a sound

body, pleasant and 'eagerly craved,' as Homer has said, — that is agreeable."

7. Moses Hadas, ed., *Aristeas to Philocrates* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), #169, p. 165.

8. Diodorus, *Bibliotheca Historica*, 34:1:1-5, quoted in Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976), p. 182.

9. I recently saw an extreme example of this tendency to demand a proof-text for each point, rather than basing practice on a more principled biblical-theological foundation. An evangelist was speaking on the need to give up cigarettes. He used the following proof-text to make his point:

"Beware lest there be among you a man or woman or family or tribe, whose heart turns away from the Lord our God to go and serve the gods of those nations; lest there be among you a root bearing poisonous and bitter fruit" (Deut. 29:18).

He theorized that the root bearing poisonous fruit (which, according to its context, is obviously a figurative reference) was tobacco, and that in this passage God was forbidding the use of tobacco by the Israelites!

10. *Testimonies for the Church*, vol. 1, pp. 206-207.

11. *The Ministry of Healing*, pp. 311-17; and *Counsels on Diet and Foods*, pp. 292-93.

12. This recognition of our indebtedness to Ellen White is not a violation of the principle of *sola scriptura* or an example of a doctrine based on Ellen White rather than the Bible, for the basic principle of the importance of the body and thus of health is scriptural. But Ellen White does give quite specific information about the application of that principle, i.e., that certain foods are particularly unhealthful and should be avoided.

13. *The Ministry of Healing*, pp. 313-14.

A Tour of Vegetarian Cookbooks

by Judy Rittenhouse

“We eat meat when we eat out, but we never cook it at home” (oft-stated Adventist credo).

Being a vegetarian is like being a socialist — after you declare yourself, you must indicate a subspecies: Fabian or Trotskyite, vegan or fruitarian. Among vegetarians, what counts as being vegetarian will vary depending on the subspecies. (Not everyone would say with us that hot-fudge sundaes, for instance, are vegetarian.) So it is well to say at the start that in this short overview of vegetarian recipes, the recipes will include dairy products. A further limitation comes about because most people who become vegetarians need a dish to fill the hole left in the middle of the meal after flesh foods have been renounced — the entrée cavity. Therefore, our overview will concentrate on entrées, which will fill the protein gap.

A survey of our friends' kitchens reveals that three vegetarian recipe books appear to be the most popular. They are considered the best and used the most because the proportion of delicious food that can be made from these books is indeed wonderfully high. They are the *Diet for a Small Planet* books, the *Vegetarian Epicure I* and *II*, and *An Apple a*

Day, produced by the Loma Linda Women's Auxiliary.

The *Small Planet* series includes the titles, *Recipes for a Small Planet* (by Ellen Bachman Ewald, 1975) and *Menus for a Small Planet* (now out of print). These books have popularized the concept of protein complementarity, by which essential amino acids missing in some protein ingredients are supplied by amino acids in other ingredients within the same dish. Thereby the protein pieces fit together. A familiar result is the legume and grain (beans and rice) diet which has characterized cooking in poorer nations for centuries.

With third-world precedents for the protein scheme, *Small Planet* recipes often have a foreign flavor, but they have essentially been Americanized. They tend to be substantial foods, both due to their components and because protein is filling. The flavor combinations in the recipes are sometimes surprising (pineapple juice in the cheese-garbanzo loaf), often subtle, and usually widely appealing.

Diet for a Small Planet, by F. M. Lappe, is a survey of the world's crises in food and population. It offers the hope of a vegetarian alternative made possible by protein complementarity. The recipes in the three books overlap so that one kitchen doesn't require all three. They are from Ballantine Books.

The *Vegetarian Epicure*, volumes I and II, by Anna Thomas, is so widely popular that it must be included. Both volumes con-

Judy Rittenhouse is the former manager of a vegetarian restaurant in Washington, D.C. She lives in Allentown, Pennsylvania.

tain recipes of subtlety and sophistication. Many epicures enjoy these books for their foreign, especially Indian, flavor. The cold Russian pie in volume I also springs to mind. Volume I appeared in 1972, the first widely circulated vegetarian cookbook to convince skeptical meateaters that “no meat” doesn’t mean “no good.” Both volumes will be solving wedding gift dilemmas for years to come. (Volume I is from Vintage Books; volume II, Knopf, 1978.)

According to our informal survey, *An Apple a Day* is the most popular cookbook written by Adventists. Traditional, dinner-after-church Adventist cooking is characterized by meat analogs, of course, as well as unexpected combinations such as peanut butter with Chow Mein noodles and mayonnaise ice cream. Somehow the truest Adventist food combines the heft of Jewish cooking with the American flavoring of a Baptist potluck. Sometimes the exotic touch of a former missionary seasons vegeburger into ground lamb. This combination of influences creates such good cooking that the most indifferent backslider might reconsider.

Since their names are attached, the women of the Loma Linda Auxiliary must have parted with their best recipes when they created *An Apple a Day*. The book’s sales testify to the high percentage of excellent recipes in the volume. With no advertising beyond word-of-mouth and the Auxiliary’s own newsletter, *An Apple a Day* has sold 105,000 copies through its twelve printings since 1967. Mailed by volunteers to Adventist Book Centers, the book has returned profits averaging \$14,000 a year for the Auxiliary’s missions projects. It is refreshing to hear of a grass-roots effort so wonderfully successful.

But that is by the way. Rely on *An Apple a Day* for many great recipes. Not every one, of course; but the croissant recipe is excellent, and the French hot chocolate is the best we’ve ever tried.

An Apple a Day does not make a big point of avoiding processed foods, high-fats and sugars. Since many Americans are more conscious of these factors in their diets than they were in 1967, the Auxiliary now contemplates *An Apple a Day*, volume II, with

better nutrition criteria for recipe selection. Nutritional analysis will be supplied for each dish. It will be interesting to see if the dishes created from volume II will taste as good as those in volume I, which used much richer ingredients. It will also be encouraging if, in the intervening 13 years, the Loma Linda women have started using one another’s first names instead of calling each other Mrs. Wilbur Whoever.

A small, little-known volume that is rich in good taste is the *International Vegetarian Cookbook* by Sonia Richmond (Arco, 1965). The recipes call for interesting combinations of ingredients, with heavy emphasis on cheeses. The memory of Richmond’s Balkan spaghetti, in fact, has so crazed vegetarians cycling in England that they have cooked the sauce on a gas ring and mixed it with the pasta in their hotel sink. This illustrates the simplified preparations in this book. The exposition is also simple, in spite of what one might expect upon reading the author’s dedication to her yoga students.

That dedication might have presaged a common new-consciousness tendency to wax either spiritual or trendy about meatless food. The worst, most audacious example of this tendency that we have seen is *The Peter Max New Age Organic Vegetarian Cookbook*. This book urges the cook to “stir a little bit of yourself” into the soups. It is riddled with inspirational quotes from Kahlil Gibran and others and has the nerve to print a recipe for berries and cream under the title of “Merry Woods.” As this book is out of print, we mention it only to warn readers against new-consciousness opportunists. However, the best measure of a cookbook is the way its recipes taste, not what it does for your karma. When vegetarian cookbooks fail the cook, it is usually because they call for too few ingredients and settle for bland, uninteresting dishes. One suspects that the authors or editors of such books don’t really expect vegetarian food to taste good anyway, so they settle for dishes that are wholesome but insipid.

An unfortunate example of such a book is the New York Times *Natural Foods Cookbook*

by Jean Hewitt (NYT Quadrangle, 1971). In spite of emphasizing raw sugar and sea salt, its recipes frequently misfire or fizzle in taste and texture. One dish after another needs punching up. It's too bad that a renowned food editor like Ms. Hewitt doesn't eat at a fellowship potluck and discover what verve vegetarian food can possess.

We have cited four superior vegetarian cookbooks, but great vegetarian dishes turn up in books with recipes for both meat and no-meat foods. Almost any cookbook is likely to yield a vegetarian idea or two. One of the best ways to glean good meatless foods

“The best way to discover good vegetarian recipes is to ask a good cook for a favorite. Inquire in the kitchen at a potluck.”

from them is to study the rather complete collection of cookbooks found in most public libraries.

Such books as *Classic Italian Cooking* and *More Classic Italian Cooking* by Marcella Hazan (Knopf, 1978) are good sources for meatless dishes. Unfortunately, like many “serious” cookbooks, these annotate most of the recipes with tales of the author's experience or descriptions of how much the reader is going to love the next dish.

Among the nonvegetarian cookbooks that have really good meatless dishes are Julia Child's several books. We served the cream of mushroom soup from *Mastering the Art of French Cooking* at a vegetarian restaurant, substituting McKay's chicken flavoring for genuine chicken stock (and adding salt in the process). That soup is a rhapsody! Julia Child is an evangelist of omelet technique, ever useful to the vegetarian, although she's not one to simplify preparation. The continental emphasis of much of her work provides a vegetarian with recipes for soufflés, aspics, and vegetable dishes.

Almost any foreign cuisine, save perhaps British, is richer in meatless food than

American cooking. Therefore, a book like *Recipes from the Regional Cooks of Mexico* by Diana Kennedy (Harper & Row, 1978) is a good source for new vegetarian dishes. This particular book emphasizes authenticity of ingredients and technique, detailing refinements from one region to another. It is best used if you have access to Mexican food and spices such as cactus paddles and squash blossoms. In any case, it has valuable instruction about vegetable stocks, an essential usually overlooked even in vegetarian cookbooks.

One book which is also helpful with stocks, however, is familiar old *Joy of Cooking* by Irma S. Rombauer and Marion Rombauer Becker (Bobbs-Merrill, 1931-1975). This unsurpassed cookbook is nearly exhaustive on every food topic. It has a huge meat and seafood section, but the luncheon and brunch recipes are rich with egg and cheese dishes, including a peerless rarebit. The book provides recipes and preparation instructions for almost every fruit and vegetable. Many Adventist cooks ignore this great secular standard, but it's worth its price, even with all its instruction on boning a chicken. And its understated, winsome prose makes enjoyable reading while one waits for the pressure cooker to come to a hiss.

Although no particular thanks is due to the Adventist health message, vegetarian diet is now receiving some acclaim in chic circles. This may be partly due to the nouvelle cuisine wave, characterized as delicious-yet-light, which emerged from Paris several years ago, or it may be the natural result of rising health consciousness among more affluent, better-educated Americans. Whatever the reason, the trendier magazines now turn their practised gastronomical talents to meatless entrées, without ever mentioning vegetarian food. *Vogue* magazine — hardly quoted for its homemaking hints — often prints most interesting vegetarian recipes, including this one from the recent past: mix together fresh, steamed green beans, cooked ziti, lots of grated parmesan, sweet butter, chopped parsley and green onions and some salt. It's absolutely wonderful with fresh tomatoes and buttered carrots on the side. Be-

hind its painted eyelids, *Vogue* has wonderful secrets for the vegetarian cook who is tired of Tuno.

Gourmet magazine, that bastion of food-as-god, is also a fine source for meatless dishes. It doesn't stress vegetarian food, but in every issue there is something new and intriguing to a person who doesn't eat meat. Those dishes, often of foreign influence, are tucked in with the flesh dishes. Four or five seasons ago the traditional Thanksgiving fixing included an apple/currant/shallot turkey dressing that is very savory and piquant.

Finally, tofu. A number of tofu (or soy cheese) cookbooks have appeared recently, recommending this "natural" processed food to the industrialized west. One of them shows some promise: *The Book of Tofu: Food for Mankind* by William Shurtleff and Akiko Aoyagi (Ballantine Books, 1979). In addition to describing the apparatus and method

necessary to produce tofu at home, this paperback tells how to grill, deep-fry, and stuff tofu, as well as recommending preparations for eating it raw or making derivatives. It is a comprehensive book with stretches of exposition — all about how it's cooked in Japan — between the recipes. Other books on this food have lavished enthusiasm on what I considered to be insipid-tasting dishes that have no resemblance to the bean curd (tofu) in black bean sauce served in American-Chinese restaurants.

Finally, the best way to discover good vegetarian recipes is to ask a good cook for a favorite. Inquire in the kitchen at a potluck. Tell your mother to have her friends send recipes instead of pillowcases for your wedding. Or find the best cook in your congregation and offer to do his or her ironing in exchange for recipes.

Adventist Food Industries: Recent Developments

by Harrison W. John

Ever since Ellen G. White's health reform message of 1863, Seventh-day Adventists have had a "theology" of nutrition advocating the use of such natural foods as fruits, nuts, vegetables, grains and cereals. Ironically, while the health principles of the church have remained essentially the same over the last 117 years, Adventists have gradually accepted the use of certain highly-processed foods such as vegetable proteins and ready-to-eat breakfast cereals. Today, the church, through its food factories in 25 countries around the world, invests millions of dollars to manufacture and market various health-food products.

A few statistics will place the church's international food manufacturing and marketing program in perspective. According to the most recent figures available, total food sales by these Adventist manufacturing and marketing companies around the world amounted to \$188 million in 1979. This is an increase of more than 95 percent over 1974 sales of \$96 million. In 1970, total food sales of \$51 million were reported. Comparing the last two quinquennium periods, 1970-74 and 1975-79, sales were \$357 million and \$686 million respectively, an increase of slightly

over 92 percent. During the 1975-79 period, \$20.5 million was donated by the various food companies to the evangelistic program of the church. It is estimated that Sanitarium Health Food Company of Australia itself contributed about \$10.5 million (Australian dollars) toward this program.

Yet if one asked the average American Seventh-day Adventist about the church's health food industry, one would probably not learn much more than the fact that Loma Linda produces a wide variety of "vegetarian meats" or that Australia has a booming health food business. There are probably few institutions of the church about which so little is known, yet which involve so large a financial investment.

One reason, perhaps, is the difficulty of obtaining detailed financial statistics from World Foods Service, the church's "moth-balled" consulting agency in Washington, D.C., which once coordinated the activities of the ever-expanding food industries network around the world. Eric Howse, former director of World Foods, though cooperative and genial in providing information, could not supply SPECTRUM with meaningful financial statistics, other than some total sales figures, about the various industries. The church's published financial summary, compiled every five years for a General Conference session, does not list food industries as a separate category; rather, the food industries

Harrison W. John, a graduate of Spicer Memorial College in India, holds graduate degrees in English and journalism from the University of Maryland and Pennsylvania State University. He is a professional editor for a major corporation in Rockville, Md.

are lumped under a category called "Industries," which includes "Foods, etc." This method of listing the financial figures makes it extremely difficult to extricate meaningful data about the food industries from the church's official statistical records. Neither could General Conference treasury officials supply any financial information, though former treasurer Kenneth Emmerson did give SPECTRUM permission to obtain financial summaries from the General Conference Office of Archives and Statistics. However, even there, the kind of detail that SPECTRUM sought was not available.

In fact, there was a gaping hole in the financial records. For example, no financial information is available on the brightest star of the Adventist health food industry — the Sanitarium Health Food Company of Australia.* And therein lies an irony. There is little doubt that Australia has an impressively successful health food operation, but the extent of that success is known by only a few people within the church. Information reluctantly revealed by World Foods Service shows, for example, that in 1978 the Sanitarium Health Food Company had a net gain of \$6 million (Australian), and as of July 1979, total sales for the 1975-1979 quinquennium were \$400 million (Australian).

Sanitarium Foods' most popular product is

*When asked why the Australians were not filing the yearly financial summary (Form FN-49) required of all other food factories, the director of archives and statistics, Don Yost, said: "We are receiving all the financial data we are authorized to receive." Rudolph Reinhard, a retired assistant treasurer of the General Conference, told SPECTRUM that the reason the Australians do not file a financial summary is that Australian law and subsequent company policy permits Sanitarium Health Foods to refrain from filing a public statement as a means of protecting confidential information from competitors. An official in the economics section of the Australian Embassy in Washington, D.C., told SPECTRUM that, although some companies are not legally obliged to file public reports if the industry they serve is small, or if public disclosure would harm the industry, he was surprised that the breakfast-cereal industry in Australia would fall in that category. Willis J. Hackett, former General Conference vice president and adviser to World Foods Service, says that Sanitarium Health Foods provides a status report to the Australasian Division, and that the Division should be the contact point for information. SPECTRUM made several unsuccessful attempts to contact Frank Craig, president of Sanitarium Health Foods.

a ready-to-eat breakfast cereal called "Weet Bix," which is number one in total sales for a single breakfast cereal brand in Australia. Kellogg's Corn Flakes is number two, though in total sales of all breakfast cereal brands sold, Kellogg maintains the number one position because of its wider variety of products. Yet, Sanitarium Foods is number two in total breakfast cereal sales. In New Zealand, however, Sanitarium Foods is the front-runner in total breakfast cereal sales, having bought out its main rival, Nabisco.

The Australians run such a smooth operation that church leaders, recognizing their superb managerial and marketing expertise, have invited them to help struggling Adventist food companies in other parts of the world, including Britain and the United States.

In October 1979, the Northern Europe-West Africa Division and the British Union requested Sanitarium Health Foods of Australia to take over the management of the ailing Granose Foods facility in England, which has been a consistent moneyloser. Figures for 1975-1978 show that Granose Foods had a net operating loss totaling over \$406,000 for the four-year period. As a result, the total net worth of the company *decreased* from \$331,902 in 1975 to \$113,515 in 1978. The real situation of the company, however, was far more pathetic, since the company had received an appropriation (presumably from the British Union) of about \$95,000 in 1977. Without that appropriation, the total net worth of the company in 1978 would have been a mere \$19,000.

While more recent figures are not available, published reports show that perhaps the Australians are already making an impact as a result of the changeover. Manager Keith Adair of Granose reported in a recent issue of the *Adventist Review* that the company had a 20 percent increase in sales during 1979 for a total of \$2.9 million. No further financial details were provided, so the real picture is left to speculation. Nevertheless, according to Adair, the company employs 55 regular workers, 48 part-time workers, and 12 students. It manufactures 28 food products, the

major one being a breakfast cereal called "Sunny Bisk." It also manufactures various brands of meat analogs or vegetable proteins.

With the innovative Australians at the helm, the company hopes to gain an entrée into the large British grocery chains, which are very competitive and selective. While the Australians have proved themselves "down under," church officials will be monitoring with interest their attempts to financially straighten out Granose Foods and Loma Linda.

April 1, 1980, was a momentous date in the history of the Seventh-day Adventist health-food industry in America. On that date, without much fanfare and hardly a ripple of reaction, the management and control of Loma Linda Foods was quietly transferred to the Sanitarium Health Food Company of Australia. Although many North American church members probably gave this development little thought, it can be seen as a symbolic reminder of a kind of mild paralysis that had affected one of North America's proudest institutions.

Even church administrators, who naturally prefer to present denominational shortcomings in the best possible light, have hinted at some problems that plagued Loma Linda Foods (LLF). Willis J. Hackett, LLF board chairman (now retired), in reporting the merger via the *Adventist Review* in February 1980, noted that Loma Linda Foods had "more than doubled" its annual sales over the last three years. Yet, he added, expansion funds, operating capital, and equipment funds needed for continued growth were not available. The Australians, with their managerial, marketing, and research expertise, will help to enlarge and advance Loma Linda Foods, he said.

L. Delmer Wood, former president of Loma Linda Foods, agrees, saying that the merger will give financial strength to the company in a way the church in North America could not do. In a telephone interview, Wood said that since the Australians generate much of their capital from the "gentiles," or non-Adventist sources, the church would feel more comfortable in utilizing these funds rather than tapping the till of hard-earned offering income provided by

church members. He noted that the Australians will conduct a "serious investigation" into the feasibility of promoting Loma Linda's breakfast cereal product in a market which is "very tough" to crack.

Whereas Wood spoke diplomatically even though he was leaving his job as president of the company — obviously as a result of the merger — Eric Howse, former director of World Foods Service, described the situation more forthrightly. The changeover was basically a "rescue effort" to make LLF a more significant and viable operation, he said. Loma Linda lacked the marketing expertise to penetrate the large national supermarket chains; it did not have enough new capital to expand the business; and furthermore, LLF management was not prepared to risk new capital in a business that was not financially secure.

Howse's assessment seems to be borne out

"The Australians run such a smooth operation that church leaders . . . have invited them to help struggling Adventist food companies in other parts of the world. . . ."

when one looks at audited financial reports of the company obtained from the General Conference Archives. Although detailed sales breakdowns were not available, the record shows that over a four-year period from 1975 to 1978, the company's total net worth had *decreased* by over \$300,000 — from \$457,937 in 1975 to \$128,958 in 1978. While earned operating income (not including appropriations) during the four-year period rose from \$8.9 million in 1975 to \$11.7 million in 1978, the company had net operating losses of over \$1.3 million — \$637,000 in 1975, \$366,000 in 1976, and \$390,000 in 1978; in 1977, a gain of \$84,000 was reported.

In addition to this erratic and less-than-acceptable financial situation, the company was unable to penetrate significantly the highly competitive arena of the large super-

market chains, even though, according to figures provided by World Foods Service (WFS), 80 percent of Loma Linda's 15 varieties of vegetable proteins, three soymilk products, five gravy, and four cereal products are marketed through brokers, while only 20 percent of the products are marketed through denominational outlets. This is in sharp contrast to the Australian strategy, which allows for 99.5 percent of all products manufactured by Sanitarium Foods in its 18 factories to be marketed through wholesalers, and only one-half percent to be marketed through denominational outlets.

The Australian company has become a model for the Adventist health food industry. From a very small beginning in 1897 when 20 cases of various health foods were imported from Battle Creek, Michigan, and sold to denominational workers, the company has grown into a network of 18 factories and 73 retail shops with a work force of over 1,400 regular employees and 100 students. The retail stores have served over 41 million customers during the last five years. The company has captured about 20 percent of the total corn flakes market in Australia, sells its products aggressively in New Zealand, has spread its boundaries to New Guinea, England, and the United States, and has so impressed General Conference officials that the function of World Foods Service as an entity has, at least for the present, been transferred from international headquarters in Washington, D.C., to Sanitarium Health Foods.

At the Dallas General Conference session, no replacement was provided for Eric Howse, who has retired. The rationale, as explained by Willis J. Hackett, is that rather than trying to concentrate much of the coordinating functions of the food industry network in the hands of one man in Washington, it would be more effective to have the Australians, with their extensive technical and marketing know-how, provide, on a demand basis, any necessary consultation. Another explanation given is that this may have been part of an overall effort to cut down the administrative bureaucracy of the

General Conference. But the most plausible explanation seems to be that Howse's replacement would have had to come from the Australian company because it seems to be the only present source of knowledgeable, capable administrators in the health food field. Since Sanitarium Foods' extension into Britain and the United States has siphoned off some of its top administrators, it cannot at this time spare further talent for a Washington desk job.

For now, the functions of World Foods Service will be carried on by the Australians on an assignment basis, and coordination will be provided through the office of the president of the General Conference. The plan is to reinstitute World Foods Service at a later time after the situation at Granose and Loma Linda stabilizes and the Australians can return those institutions to local control.

At both Loma Linda Foods and Granose, the Australians are expected to put a strong emphasis on the sale of breakfast cereals. Loma Linda's emphasis up to now has been on the production of vegetable proteins, an area in which the Australians themselves have not made much progress in terms of penetrating the non-Adventist market. Since both Australia and the United States are heavy meat-producing countries, the sale of vegetable proteins has not been very popular.

Ready-to-eat breakfast cereals, however, are well accepted in both countries. United States per capita consumption of wheat breakfast cereals is 2.9 pounds a year, according to the latest department of agriculture statistics; in addition, the 1978 retail value of ready-to-eat cereal shipments in the United States was \$2.4 billion, as reported in a market analysis provided to SPECTRUM by Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith, which sees a possibility of a long-term growth rate of about 3 percent or more in this market. The Merrill Lynch report shows that the Kellogg Company of Battle Creek leads in American sales of breakfast cereals with 42 percent of the total market, followed by General Mills at 20 percent, General Foods at 15 percent and Quaker Oats at about 9 percent. The remaining 14 percent of the breakfast cereal market is shared by such food giants as Ralston-Purina and Nabisco. It is

probably this segment of the market that the Australians will have to penetrate before they can make a dent in the breakfast cereal market in the United States.

What effect the Australian preoccupation with breakfast cereals will have on the vegetable protein business remains to be seen. Loma Linda already has established some credibility with its vegetable protein products and seems to be well-positioned for expansion in this market if a demand for such products arises in the country. Yet food analysts are skeptical about any immediate or short-term prospects for growth in the use of vegetable protein and meat analogs by the

“Food analysts are skeptical about any immediate or short-term prospects for growth in the use of vegetable protein and meat analogs by the general population.”

general population. A food scientist with the Food Protein Council, a trade association of several food companies producing textured vegetable proteins (the raw product from which meat analogs are made), told SPECTRUM that a number of food giants such as General Mills, General Foods, Pillsbury, Nabisco, and Procter and Gamble utilize textured vegetable proteins in various food products. Yet they are chiefly used as “meat extenders,” i.e., as supplements to other meat products, a procedure which received the blessing of the department of agriculture in 1971. The same scientist told SPECTRUM that his company, a large manufacturer of textured vegetable proteins, had an opportunity to purchase General Mills’ vegetable protein business about five years ago but did not do so because even though company executives felt the product was good, they “could not see a market in the product for the next 10 to 15 years.” The American public does not seem to be ready for this kind of product at the present time, he said, unless it is for health or religious reasons. Furthermore, the meat analogs are not substantially cheaper than meat so as to provide a price

incentive, he added. Unless a product has mass appeal, with the prospect of subsequent higher volume and lower prices, it is not financially feasible for a company to invest heavily in it.

This view seems to be substantially backed by the experience of Miles Laboratories, which bought out Worthington Foods of Ohio (well-known to Adventists) in 1970 and launched a \$7.5 million television advertising campaign in 1974 to test-market, under the Morningstar Farms label, its Breakfast Links, Breakfast Patties, and Breakfast Slices — substitutes for sausage and ham. *The Wall Street Journal* documented Miles’ “soybean saga” in an October 25, 1977 article. About 10 million American families tried the Morningstar Farms breakfast line in the first 18 months after its introduction in 1974, but sales after that failed to measure up to expectations. By 1977, the *Journal* reported that Miles had chalked up pretax losses of \$33 million on its meat substitute products. One food analyst has remarked: “Changing consumer eating habits is difficult to do in the U.S.” Another added: “Miles is probably 25 years ahead of its time.”

But Loma Linda can wait. It has a steady built-in clientele, which it continues to serve admirably. When, and if, the time comes for this market to expand, Loma Linda should be ready.

The United States experience with soy-protein foods has served as an example to Adventist industries in other countries. For instance, in 1969, both Argentina’s Granix and Brazil’s Superbom wanted to plunge into the vegetable protein market, says Eric Howse. However, he was able to dissuade them from doing so. The companies were in a weak financial position, yet they had excellent products like breakfast cereals and fruit juices which were gaining favorable consumer acceptability. From his past experience with the textured vegetable protein market, Howse knew that such protein products need to be heavily promoted before they can be reasonably successful. His advice to the Argentinians and the Brazilians was

first to develop their existing business and then tackle the more tricky vegetable protein market.

About three years ago, Howse says, they were ready. The demand for vegetable protein products in the area served by the four companies under the umbrella (South American) Division Health Food Company has grown so rapidly that the factories (chiefly in Brazil and Argentina) are currently producing at the rate of 700 tons a year, according to Howse. The demand is caused in part by government-proclaimed "meatless days" instituted in Brazil and Argentina so that those countries can export more meat, he explained.

Of the four companies that form part of Division Health Food Company, those in Brazil and Argentina seem to be doing rather well. The Granix factory in Buenos Aires, Argentina, produces such items as breakfast cereals, bread, vegetable proteins and a high-quality multicereal, high-fiber cracker for which there is "a tremendous demand," according to Howse. After visiting the factory earlier this year, Alf Lohne, a general vice president of the General Conference, reported that in order to meet the demand for its various products, Granix keeps its 300 workers busy 24 hours a day in three shifts. He further reported that 40 percent of the company's net gain is passed directly into the church budget with "considerable sums" going to finance evangelism. Expansion plans call for an increase in production by 500 percent, he added. According to the most recent figures available, Granix showed an impressive rise in earned operating income from \$1.2 million in 1976 to \$6.7 million in 1978, with a total net worth increase of over \$2.4 million in 1978, up from \$315,330 in 1976 to \$2,807,441 in 1978.*

The Brazil Factory (Alimenticios Superbom) also seems to be doing an impressive business. The 1978 operating income was a little over \$7 million, as compared to \$4.3 million in 1975, \$5.6 million in 1976, and \$6.8 million in 1977. The total net worth of the company had risen from \$1.8 million in 1975 to over \$3 million in 1978. The factory produces excellent juices, according to Eric Howse, with yearly sales exceeding three

million bottles of grape juice, two million bottles of tomato juice, and two million bottles of pineapple juice. The high-quality juices are served throughout the country, on the airlines and in hotel chains, Howse reported.

But the most unusual feature of the Brazil Food Factory outreach is its chain of three restaurants — two in Sao Paulo and one in Belo Horizonte. By the end of 1980, three more restaurants are expected to open, Howse reported. Although financial figures were not available, church officials note that the restaurants are doing well. One of the Sao Paulo restaurants serves more than 1,000 persons a day, and includes a full-time chaplain on its staff, who generally maintains good public relations with the clientele, and invites them, when appropriate, to attend cooking classes, or Five-Day Plans to Stop Smoking, and even conducts Bible studies, which have resulted in several baptisms.

The two other companies which form part of the Division Health Food network — Superbom (Chile) and Fruitgran (Uruguay) — show a mixed picture. For example, the Chile plant (major products: dehydrated fruit and canned vegetables) reported a 1978 income of only \$11,323, yet had a total net worth of \$260,344 at the end of the year. The Uruguay plant, on the other hand (main products: tomato juice and purée), showed a considerably higher 1978 income than the Chile plant — \$235,187 — but it ended the year with a total net worth deficit of \$26,544.

The newest organization in the western hemisphere is the Inter-American Division Food Company, Coral Gables, Florida. Established in 1977, this umbrella agency now coordinates the functions of four already-operational food factories: Alimentos COLPAC, Sonora, Mexico (1969); Industries COVAC S.A., Alajuela, Costa Rica (1967);

*Recent reports suggest that the Argentinian food processor, Alimentos Granix, has had a remarkably successful 1980. Compared to net profits in 1979 of \$1,055,000, during the first nine months of 1980 profits reached \$1,452,000. This figure, furthermore, does not include the food company's contributions of \$871,000 to the Austral Union and the South American Division.

Productos Icolpan, Medellin, Colombia (1972); and Westico Foods, Ltd., Mandeville, Jamaica (1970). At presstime, the General Conference Office of Archives and Statistics did not have any details on these companies, although the 1978 financial summary for the umbrella company (Inter-American) showed that it had received an appropriation of \$86,200, presumably from the Inter-American Division.

It is in these relatively young factories of the Inter-American Division Food Com-

“Adventist health food administrators face a rather delicate situation in trying to maintain the proper balance between profits and religious goals.”

pany, however, that experiments have been conducted with wider implications for other areas of the world, especially the less-developed countries. For example, one problem that Adventists have faced in less developed countries is in the production of vegetable protein products within the financial reach of the local population. Realizing this, church administrators voted at the 1976 Annual Council to adopt what was called the “World Foods Service Expansion Program.” Under this program, a fund was to be established “to finance a worldwide program of expansion to countries where serious nutritional problems exist.” According to Eric Howse, this program enabled Adventist health food engineers to develop low-cost machinery employing simple technology for the production of textured vegetable proteins. Where previously the smallest unit for the manufacture of such proteins cost about \$25,000, Adventist technicians were able to bring the cost down to \$15,000, putting the machinery within reach of less wealthy nations. One of these units was erected for the Jamaica plant; others are to be introduced elsewhere.

Another development under the expan-

sion program was the introduction of a soymilk product via the Mexican food factory, according to Howse. He explained that packaging of products is always a problem where refrigeration facilities are poor. Adventist food technologists developed a soymilk product packaged in liquid form in an inexpensive plastic bag. But the problem of spoilage and of short shelf life remained.

Further testing and experimenting, which took researchers as far away as Germany, resulted in a highly protein-efficient powdered soymilk product that could be stored in a cardboard carton and had a shelf life of six months. The manufacturing breakthrough had come. Now it was time to expand the market. In May-June of 1979, the Adventist Health Education unit in Cairo, Egypt, began the production of powdered soymilk, utilizing locally-grown soybeans. No statistics about sales of the product were available, though Howse reported that the milk seems to be gaining favorable acceptance with the local community since Egypt faces a regular shortage of fresh milk, and the prospects of importing milk do not seem good. In fact, he said, efforts are underway to produce a similar product in Colombia and a number of other developing countries.

Another product that Adventist food researchers are investigating is a specially-formulated “textured soy cutlet,” which can be used quite effectively, Howse explained, with the kinds of native foods used in many developing countries. The cutlet is proving to be very compatible in such food items as Ghanaian soups and East Indian curries, Howse said.

While the developing countries continue to challenge the Adventist church’s health food industry to provide nutritious, inexpensive foods, the more industrialized nations of Europe also provide a market for the sale of the church’s health-food products. For example, the Germany company DE-VAU-GE had the highest earned operating income (\$12.2 million) of all Adventist companies (outside Australia) for 1978. Other high European income earners during 1978 were Nutana (Denmark), \$7.6 million;

Granose Foods Ltd. (United Kingdom), \$1.8 million; PHAG (Switzerland), \$1.3 million; Esdakost (Sweden), \$1.2 million; and Pur-Aliment (France), \$1.1 million. However, three of these companies — Granose, PHAG, and Nutana — also showed operating losses during the same year. Granose lost about \$295,000; PHAG, \$196,500; and Nutana, \$5,903. Of these three companies, PHAG showed a total 1978 net worth deficit of \$39,985. There were only two other Adventist companies which showed similar net worth deficits in 1978 — Fruitgran (Uruguay), \$26,544; and National True Foods Ltd. of South Africa, \$7,435.

Altogether, there are nine European food facilities, according to information obtained from the General Conference archives. Of the nine, DE-VAU-GE of Germany, Granose of England, and Nutana of Denmark manufacture some of their own products. The other six are only marketing organizations, i.e., they do not manufacture products. The marketing organizations are Esdakost (Sweden); Dagens Kost (Norway); Finn-Nutana (Finland); Pur-Aliment (France); the Australian Food Company, (Austria) and PHAG (Switzerland). Some of these marketing organizations are small — Finn-Nutana has only one employee officially listed on its staff; Pur-Aliment has 12; PHAG, 15. However, these companies provide a marketing outlet for the European manufacturing companies. For example, PHAG of Switzerland and Pur-Aliment of France are distributing the DE-VAU-GE products under their own labels. Esdakost of Sweden, Dagens Kost of Norway, and Finn-Nutana of Finland provide a convenient outlet for Nutana, the Danish production and marketing facility. This cooperative agreement seems to pay off for the manufacturing facilities. Nutana, the Danish company, for instance, reports a relatively substantial business with a ten-fold increase in sales over the past six years, and 1979 sales of over \$10 million, according to a March 1980 report in the *Adventist Review*. Audited financial statements show a rise in earned operating income from \$1.6 million in 1975 to \$7.6 million in 1978; total net worth of the company also showed a healthy gain from

\$382,293 in 1975 to \$1.2 million in 1978. During the four years under review, 1975-78, the only negative report came in 1978, when the company showed an operating loss of \$5,903. Yet gains were reported in previous years as follows: 1977 (\$324,000); 1976 (\$412,366); and 1975 (\$14,075). With an establishment date of 1897, Nutana shares with the Sanitarium Health Food Company of Australia the honor of being among the oldest Adventist health food industries. The company employs over 100 people and markets more than 400 products through more than 2,000 stores all over Denmark. The main products are vegetable proteins, as well as a high-quality margarine. In addition, the company imports Loma Linda's soymilk, which it packages under its own brand. While a vegetarian restaurant in Copenhagen reports a marginal business, according to Eric Howse, it does provide contact with people, he said.

This article has treated Adventist health food institutions in a somewhat non-traditional way by probing into facts in financial areas that church officials sometimes feel uncomfortable about revealing. After all, the church is a religious institution, they say, and our institutions should not be judged solely by secular financial standards. Ellen White has provided sufficient counsel in support of this view, cautioning the church about handling its food industries as a purely commercial enterprise. A few statements outline her views:*

. . . We are not to bend our energies to the establishment of food stores and food factories merely to supply people with temporal food and make money. . . (p. 69).

In the food business there is a snare for all who engage in it without realizing their danger. . . . No overburdening commercialism is to be brought into it . . . (p. 70).

. . . Better results will be seen if we devote our energies largely to the work of educating the people how to prepare simple,

*All quotes are from *The Health Food Ministry* (A compilation prepared by the Ellen G. White Publications, Washington, D.C., 1970).

healthful foods in their own homes, instead of spending our entire time in the manufacture and sale of foods which involve a large investment of means . . . (p. 86).

In view of such statements, Adventist health food administrators face a rather delicate situation in trying to maintain the proper balance between profits and religious goals. Obviously, the industries cannot operate with perpetual deficits. Nor can they be governed like the traditional corporation where the “bottom line” is the all-important consideration.

Although Adventist health food companies are not large by industry standards, they do involve substantial outlay of capital and human resources. One thing that seems clear in light of this is that the health food companies should be more open to the scrutiny of those who have a stake in these institutions — the constituency of the church. Presently, the managerial and financial accountability of these institutions is left in the hands of a select group of individuals and committees. The few public financial reports of these institutions are virtually meaningless, and the seeming paranoias about releasing financial information unnecessary.

In addition to financial accountability, another concern, voiced by numerous church members (denominational workers as well as laypeople) in discussions with this writer, has to do with the church’s emphasis on developing vegetable protein products. The concern focuses on these points: that meat substitutes are highly-processed, perhaps unnecessarily laden with salt, perhaps too protein-efficient for our needs,

and too expensive. The problem about even bringing up this issue is that the church has slowly drifted into such a heavy involvement in this area that even to discuss it may be anathema. To sidestep the vegetable protein issue, though, would be dishonest. Perhaps health food administrators ought to explain to the membership the church’s deep involvement in the production of these foods and how this development can be harmonized with the counsel of Ellen White, who stressed the importance of the use of “simple, inexpensive, wholesome foods.”

Another area of concern is the human contact and evangelical outreach that our industries are expected to provide through the development of a restaurant ministry. The church is doing this effectively in some areas of the world, particularly Australia and South America, but this aspect needs to be expanded more vigorously in other parts of the world.

The most drastic need, however, is the production of appropriate food products for use in developing countries. A start was made by the World Foods Service Expansion Fund, and that work must continue. The division leadership of the world fields in these developing countries must be convinced about the need for a viable food program; they must see the priority for this outreach. Perhaps, as a result of growing indigenous leadership in these divisions, we may see some changes.

The Adventist health food program has had, in sum, an interesting pattern of growth and development, but it seems that the greatest challenge to the church in this area may still lie ahead of us.

Ellen White, the Waldenses, and Historical Interpretation

by Donald Casebolt

Prior to Don McAdams' study of the relationship between *The Great Controversy* and Mrs. White's use of Protestant historians, the generally accepted Seventh-day Adventist view on this topic was that Mrs. White borrowed from historians *only* what had been *independently* corroborated by her visions.¹ This view has now been partially modified by the White Estate. In a paper entitled "Toward a Factual Concept of Inspiration II," released in 1978, Arthur White allows for a greater dependence on Protestant historians by pointing out that Mrs. White never claimed that her visions were the "sole source for all the details of history she presents" and by admitting that "some of the details of historical events apparently were not revealed to her." However, while in principle admitting that Mrs. White incorporated some inaccuracies from other historians, White would limit them to "a few apparent inconsistencies in matters of little

consequence." He further states that "we may be sure that whatever she [Mrs. White] drew into her writings from the various historians was substantially correct."

It is true that the problems which McAdams pointed out were mainly concerned with the proper sequence of events, their actual location and the correct identity of the persons involved in them. However, McAdams' main purpose was to document the close literary dependence of Mrs. White on Protestant historians, and only incidentally to point out some of the historical inaccuracies that her literary methods involved. Thus, it is the central purpose of this paper to explore the nature and extent of some of the inaccuracies to see if they are merely "apparent inconsistencies in matters of little consequence." It will show that, in fact, clear-cut, gross historical errors do exist in Ellen White's borrowings from historians.

One of the problems which McAdams might have discussed but did not involve the characterization of the Albigenses in *The Great Controversy*. Paraphrasing from Wylie, Mrs. White credits them, along with the Waldenses, with preserving the "true faith. . . from century to century" until the coming of

Don Casebolt, a graduate of Andrews University, lives in Roseburg, Oregon. He researched this article while a graduate student at the University of Chicago.

Huss.² Again, in her discussion of the French Revolution, she pairs the Waldenses and the Albigenses as a group:

Century after century the blood of the saints had been shed. While the Waldenses laid down their lives upon the Piedmont “for the word of God” and for the testimony of Jesus Christ, “similar witness to the truth had been borne by their brethren” the Albigenses of France.³

But in actuality, the Waldenses were opponents of the Albigenses,⁴ because the Albigenses’ teachings were based on a dualism which sharply differentiated between an evil material world and the pure world of the spirit. This basic tenet led them to reject or reinterpret any part of the Bible which did not fit into this scheme.

Thus, the creation of a material world as presented in the Old Testament they held to be the work of an evil Demiurge whom they even characterized as the devil on some occasions. In harmony with this view, they also rejected all those parts of the Old Testament which present this being as an avenging, jealous God whom they compared unfavorably to the New Testament God of love. Jesus was not viewed as the Son of God nor as a real man, but rather as a celestial messenger who had come to give man the essential knowledge necessary to enable him to eventually escape his body and the physical world. They also taught that Christ’s sufferings on the cross were fictitious, because they could not conceive of a good spirit’s being connected with, and suffering with, an intrinsically evil fleshly body. This belief, of course, also meant a rejection of Christ’s bodily resurrection and incarnation. In addition, they condemned the sexual act in marriage because it risked the result of imprisoning more souls within carnal flesh. Similarly, they repudiated the eating of meat, since this might arouse sexual passions, and also because they believed in the transmigration of souls. Finally, also to avoid contact with the material world, they rejected baptism by water, for which they substituted a baptism of light.⁵ Thus, to state that a group which denied practically all the most essential doctrines of Christianity was responsible for preserving the “true faith” down through the centuries

is hardly a minor misunderstanding of the facts.

The inaccuracies to be discussed here come mainly from the chapter entitled “The Waldenses” in *The Great Controversy*, which is substantially identical to the same chapter found in the fourth volume of *The Spirit of Prophecy*. An exhaustive comparison of this chapter with its original sources shows that they are a consistent paraphrase of two historians: J. N. Andrews, *History of the Sabbath* and James A. Wylie, *History of Protestantism*.⁶

Along with some other Protestant historians of his time, Wylie attributed to the Waldenses a great antiquity, even extending to apostolic times. The erroneous attribution of ancient origin was based mainly upon an early dating given to certain Waldensian manuscripts as well as on the alleged purity of their doctrines. However, it is now recognized by Protestant and Catholic historians alike that the Waldensian antiquity is merely

“It is the central purpose of this paper to explore the nature and extent of some of the inaccuracies. . . . It will show that clear-cut gross historical errors do exist in Ellen White’s borrowings from historians.”

legendary, and that they did begin with Peter Waldo (ca. 1170), a fact which Wylie specifically denies. Even the Waldenses themselves now recognize this fact. One of their pastors has written on the alleged early manuscripts and has dated them to a period following Waldo.⁷ Mrs. White, of course, did not argue the details of dating these manuscripts. However, her statement in the *Spirit of Prophecy* that “behind the lofty bulwarks of the mountains. . . the Waldenses found a hiding-place. . . . Here for a thousand years they maintained their ancient faith. . . .” is clearly dependent upon Wylie.

Related to the issue of their antiquity is the

matter of their doctrinal purity, Mrs. White's view being that the Waldenses, in contrast to contemporary Catholicism, represented the continuation of primitive Christian doctrine. Recent research has uncovered manuscripts in the Madrid National Library, including Peter Waldo's "Confession of Belief," which demonstrate that originally the Waldensian movement was not a schismatic sect, but rather a religious fraternity which stood *within* the Catholic Church. Waldo, a rich layman who experienced a dramatic conversion, wished to be permitted to preach, a right reserved to properly trained and certified clergy. Early sources disagree as to whether Waldo had an audience with the Pope, or whether he was examined in Lyon by a cardinal appointed by the Pope. In any case, about 1179/1180, Waldo signed a "Confession of Belief" in order to prove his orthodoxy and thereby gain permission to preach. As Antoine Dondaine has shown, the basic form of the "Confession" derives from a letter of Pope Leo IX to the Bishop of Antioch in 1053, and its redaction may even go back to the fifth or early sixth century.⁸ The "Confession" contains several doctrines that one might find surprising after having read Wylie's and White's descriptions of the Waldenses:

- 1) There is but one Church; catholic, holy, apostolic and without spot (*immaculatam*) outside of which there is no hope of salvation.
- 2) The baptism of infants is efficacious, if they should die before having sinned.
- 3) Alms, masses and other good works are able to benefit the dead.⁹

Though conflicts soon arose between Waldo's followers and the Catholic Church which led them away from some of the church's dogmas — the efficacy of good works for the dead, for example — these were secondary developments. And, even at the end of their existence as a separate body when they joined the Swiss Reformers in 1532, the Waldenses continued to believe in salvation by works. The Protestant writers recognize that they then did *not* hold a strong doctrine of righteousness by faith alone, but attempt to explain this by asserting that long persecution caused them to fall

away from their original purity of doctrine. This explanation, however, as is evident from an examination of Waldo's "Confession," is not viable. And the continued Waldensian emphasis on salvation by works is quite obvious in a question which they put to the reformers in 1532:¹⁰

If we recognize that Christ is our sole justification, and that we are saved only through His name and not by our own works, how are we to read so many passages of the Scripture which rate works so highly? The souls of the simple may easily be deceived thereby. Is it not written: "By thy words thou shalt be justified and by thy words thou shalt be condemned?" Do we not read: "Not everyone that crieth unto me: Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father, which is in Heaven?" And elsewhere: "Ye shall possess the kingdom for ye have given me to drink?" And again: "As water extinguishes the fire, thus do alms extinguish sin?" The alms and prayers of Cornelius seem to have had the effect of bringing about the appearance of the angel, and thus he may have been justified. We might think also that the publican who went up to the temple went away justified through his prayers. If Jesus loved John particularly, is it not because the latter loved him more than the other disciples? We read that Mary Magdalene experienced a better reception than Simon because she loved more. We should conclude from this that works count for something. Moreover, do we not read that on more than one occasion God revoked his chastisements upon seeing that the sinners repented? Is it not written that we shall be judged according to our works? And lastly it seems that there will be a difference, in paradise, between the just. We pray thee to enlighten us, especially on this point.

Thus, it is clear from Waldo's "Confession" and from the records of 1532 that during their 350-year existence, the Waldenses did not merit the glowing words of Mrs. White that they "saw the plan of salvation clearly revealed."¹¹

Nor is there any evidence that the Waldenses kept the Sabbath; rather, the contrary is true. This fact again can be documented by the records of 1532, by another question they asked of the reformers:¹² “Is it allowable on Sundays to occupy oneself with manual labour? Are there feast-days which we are bound to observe?” Given the nature of early Waldensian beliefs and this evidence 300 years later, it seems clear that the Waldenses did not keep the Sabbath, particularly when there is clear evidence that they kept Sunday during this period. For example, a Walden-

“It is clear that Mrs. White mistakenly identified certain groups as Sabbathkeepers when they were not, just as she mistook the Albigenses for preservers of the ‘true faith.’ ”

sian ecclesiastical calendar dating to before the end of the fifteenth century, and probably earlier, divides the year into four sections of 13 Sundays each. And another work expositing the Ten Commandments, which may date even earlier, states: “Those who wish to keep and observe the Sabbath of the Christians, that is to sanctify Sunday [*le dimanche*], have need of taking care of regard to four things.”¹³

The appendix to *The Great Controversy* alleges the existence of a reference to the Waldenses’ keeping Sabbath as did the Jews in Moravia “in the middle of the fifteenth century.” In a church history syllabus commenting on this same source, Mervyn Maxwell says that the document is “apparently as old as A.D. 1500.” According to these statements, then, the document dates 300 years after the Waldensian movement began and just slightly prior to the Reformation. Furthermore, upon examination, this document actually refers to a group known as the Bohemian Brethren or *Unitas Fratrum*, which arose out of the Hussite movement. Joseph Theodore Müller, in his classic history of the

Bohemian Brethren, points out that, very early in their history, the Brethren were called Picards or Waldenses by their enemies either out of hate or ignorance, and that the members of the group constantly combated this tendency.¹⁴ In this light, it is interesting to note that the title of the work referred to by *The Great Controversy* appendix is “Summary of the Impious and Pharisaical Religion of the Picards.” But more significantly, *The Great Controversy* neglects to mention that the document, immediately prior to the statement that “some [of the Picards] indeed celebrate the Sabbath with the Jews (*Nonnulli vero cum Judaeis sabbatum celebrant*),” states that in place of celebrating certain saints’ days, some observe “only the Lord’s day.” Since the statement regarding the Sabbath is surrounded by other slanderous accusations, and given the long-standing anti-Semitic atmosphere in Europe, it is doubtful whether much reliance can be placed on it. However, even if the statement did refer to Waldenses and was accurate, which is doubtful, it would not indicate that Mrs. White was correct when she stated that the Waldenses kept the Sabbath. The clear import and intent of Mrs. White’s statement are that throughout a *very long* period there were Waldenses who kept the Sabbath *in the Piedmont mountain area!* And it is in this heartland of Waldensianism that we have evidence of Sundaykeeping.

The source for Mrs. White’s erroneous idea that the Waldenses kept the Sabbath is J. N. Andrews’ *History of the Sabbath*. Andrews believed that they kept the Sabbath and quoted secondary sources at great length in support. Mrs. White paraphrased quite closely the introductory part of his chapter on the Waldenses, and it is clear that he is the source for her conception of them as Sabbathkeepers, since Wylie is here silent. Andrews is also the source for Mrs. White’s belief that Columba, a British Christian who died in A.D. 597, was a Sabbathkeeper, and that through his influence this practice spread throughout England and beyond. Here dependence is perfectly clear, for her statement is a direct paraphrase of Andrews, leaving

out only Andrews' qualification that he had only "strong incidental evidence" to support his contention.

The "incidental evidence" upon which Andrews based his conclusion comes from a story told regarding Columba's prophecy of the time of his death. The primary source, evidently unread by Andrews, is Adomnan's *Life of Columba*, a saint's life, written about a century after Columba's death, and replete with fantastical tales testifying to the saint's prowess.¹⁵ Because of the significance of the citation, it will be given in full as Andrews used it:

"This day," he said to his servant, "in the sacred volume is called the Sabbath, that is rest; and will indeed be a Sabbath to me, for it is to me the last day of this toilsome life, the day on which I am to rest (*sabbatizo*), after all my labors and troubles, for on this coming sacred night of the Lord (*Dominica nocte*) at the midnight hour, I shall, as the Scriptures speak, go the way of my fathers."

Even should one accept this century-later source, filled as it is with legendary material, as accurately reflecting Columba's words, it appears fairly clear that even this isolated account is speaking of "sabbatizing" in a figurative sense, i.e., the rest from earthly labors that his approaching death is bringing about. Moreover, the phrase the "venerated Lord's night" (*venerabili dominica nocte*) reveals a reverence for Sunday, and the entire context of the book makes his veneration of the first day of the week even clearer. In it are at least four references to the mass's being celebrated on the Lord's Day.¹⁶ In fact, the last such reference is contained in the same story about Columba's approaching death only four paragraphs before the citation used by Andrews. Here it mentions "the rites of the Mass . . . being celebrated on a Lord's day according to the custom (*ex more*)."

The next inaccuracy that will be dealt with here falls outside of the chapter on the Waldenses. However, because it fits into a broad pattern showing how Mrs. White described the history of the Sabbath, it is vital that this passage be discussed. In the third chapter of *The Great Controversy*, Mrs. White states: "In the first centuries the true Sabbath had been

kept by *all* Christians" (emphasis added). That this was not the case has now virtually been conceded by C. M. Maxwell in a recent *Ministry* magazine article. Justin Martyr, for example, is cited as one who willingly "gave his life for Christ's sake and was beheaded by Roman authorities." Yet, Justin Martyr lived circa A.D. 150 and kept Sunday. Maxwell even states that "as a whole, the second- and third-century Christians whose writings have come down to us provided Christ-centered reasons for preferring the first day of the week to the seventh."¹⁷ Thus, we find that from her comments on the first centuries, through the British Christianity of the sixth century, down to the Waldenses of the twelfth through sixteenth centuries, Mrs. White has consistently mistaken the historicity of Sabbathkeeping groups. This does not prove that Sabbath is the incorrect day for worship, nor even that there were not small scattered groups somewhere that kept Sabbath. Historically, however, we know of no such groups, and it is clear that Mrs. White mistakenly identified certain groups as Sabbathkeepers when they were not, just as she mistook the Albigenses for preservers of the "true faith."

These and other errors in *The Great Controversy* must lead one to question the traditional Adventist position concerning Mrs. White's use of the historians. According to W. W. White, the Holy Spirit directed Mrs. White to "the most helpful books and to the most helpful passages contained in those books." This statement suggests that through such a selection process any significant errors in historical fact would have been eliminated. However, it has just been demonstrated that such was not the case. Furthermore, the long-standing assertion by Mrs. White and the White Estate that whatever material may have been borrowed was drawn from "conscientious historians" suggests that the historians Mrs. White used were more careful or honest in dealing with their material than was the average historian. Here the obvious inference is that any material which Mrs. White borrowed from them must be more reliable than would otherwise

be the case. Naturally, any measurement of the conscientiousness of a particular historian is a somewhat subjective judgment. Nevertheless, there is evidence that Léger and Perrin, important sources for the historians on whom Ellen White depended, distorted evidence from the Waldenses' own documents regarding their beliefs concerning transubstantiation, confession to a priest and the seven Catholic sacraments, when these documents indicated that the Waldenses were not very different from the Catholics in some of their beliefs.¹⁸ Also illustrative of how poor historical research has affected both Wylie and White is Samuel Maitland's indication in the early nineteenth century of how one source on the Waldenses was twisted to prove that the Waldenses originated in antiquity.¹⁹ Nor can it be said that more accurate histories of the Waldenses did not exist to which the Holy Spirit might have directed Mrs. White's attention. Maitland's book was published in 1832—well before Mrs. White wrote on the Waldenses. Thus, while her mind may have been directed to the “most helpful books,” these

“Mrs. White has paraphrased historians for pages and chapters at a time and included many inaccuracies which have become, thereby, ‘facts’ to many Adventists.”

books were not the most accurate ones. Finally, the analysis of yet another chapter of *The Great Controversy* which again proves to be almost a total paraphrase of other historians raises the question of how to interpret W. C. White's statement that Mrs. White's borrowing was *not* done “in a wholesale way.” Her use of such books as William Hanna's *Life of Christ* for outlining and detailing her own *Desire of Ages* also brings this question to the fore. Certainly, however one wishes to use the word “wholesale,” it can no longer be denied that in the historical sections

of her writings, Mrs. White has paraphrased historians for pages and chapters at a time and included many inaccuracies which have become, thereby, “facts” to many Adventists.

Thus, two basic principles may be enunciated: 1) In the historical portions of her writings Mrs. White exhibits a strong literary indebtedness to various Adventist and Protestant historians. 2) Her own accuracy in describing events is in direct proportion to the degree of accuracy achieved by her sources. Whatever type of discrepancy appears in her sources—whether minor questions of date and place, or more fundamental inaccuracies concerning the overall significance of a religious movement and its fundamental beliefs—also appears in her writings. Where her sources have distorted historical reality in presenting Reformation precursors, their conclusions are generally accepted without correction or comment. Indeed, in the process of condensing their descriptions, Mrs. White has, on occasion, eliminated their more tentative and careful presentation of conflicting or inconclusive evidence.

It is, therefore, imperative that a different methodological approach be taken when evaluating the informational value of Mrs. White's writings on history or other areas where a literary dependency can be demonstrated. Previously, official church bodies have attempted to build models of how inspiration has functioned (and, therefore, also of how one ought to utilize the results of inspiration) almost solely by compiling all of Mrs. White's and W. C. White's statements relating to revelation, and then interpreting them anecdotically in accordance with certain presuppositions about how inspiration must have functioned. The conclusions of such studies have almost inevitably been identical with these preconceptions. In the future, it is clear that investigators must first acquaint themselves with the data which a literary and contextual analysis can provide *before* attempting an interpretation of these statements. This procedure will keep Adventist scholars from misconstruing actual historical documentation in attempting to reinterpret various events on the basis of what they thought was the more correct *Great Con-*

troverson information when that information originated not from Mrs. White but only from her sources. Finally, a recognition of these principles and an adoption of this methodology, long since applied to biblical studies, would save the church the embarrassment of having to assimilate each newly

discovered bit of information piecemeal into a theoretical framework which has proven inadequate. For the few examples presented in these pages are not the only ones of their kind, and the the church will, undoubtedly, have similar cases brought to its attention in the future.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Arthur White asserted that Mrs. White corroborated with "indisputable historical evidence that which had been revealed to her." A. White, "Ellen G. White as an Historian," p. 7.

2. Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy* (Mountain View: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1911), p. 97.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 271.

4. For an excellent and well-documented history of the Waldenses until 1218, see Kurt-Victor Selge, *Die Ersten Waldenser* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1967), vol. 1. Volume 2 contains an excellent bibliography as well as the *Liber Antiheresis*, which includes the anti-Albigensian material.

5. George Schmitz-Valckenberg, *Grundlehren katharischer Sekten des 13. Jahrhunderts* (München: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1971), pp. 1-338. See also Jacques Madaule, *The Albigensian Crusade*, trans. Barbara Wall (London: Burns & Oates, 1967), pp. 32-38.

6. Andrews, *History of the Sabbath*, 2nd ed. (Battle Creek: SDA Publishing Assoc., 1873), pp. 398-403, 427, 430; Wylie, *History of Protestantism*, 3 vols. (London: Cassell, Peter & Dalpin, 1874-77), I, 23-32 and II, 431, 435.

7. Emilo Comba, *History of the Waldenses of Italy*, trans. Teofilo E. Comba (London: Truslove & Shirley, 1889), pp. 231-233. See note 826 in particular.

8. Antoine Dondaine, "Aux origines du Valdésisme: Une profession de foi de Valdes," *Archivum Fratrum Praedictorum*, 16 (1946), 202-203.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 194-201.

10. Comba, *History of the Waldenses*, p. 295.

11. White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 72.

12. Comba, *History of the Waldenses*, p. 295.

13. Earle Hilgert, "The Religious Practices of the Waldenses and Their Doctrinal Implications to A.D. 1530," an unpublished M.A. Thesis presented to the SDA Theological Seminary in 1946, pp. 49-50. See also Pius Melia, *The Origin, Persecutions and Doctrines*

of the Waldenses (London: James Toovey, 1870).

14. For example, in 1535 the following heading appeared in the preface of one of the Brethren's Confessions of Faith: "Preface of the Elders of the Brethren of Christ's Law, whose enemies out of hate in order to abuse call Picards, and whom many out of ignorance call Waldenses." According to Joseph Theodor Müller, the first time we find the appellation "Picards" in the mouth of their enemies is in 1461. *Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder*, 2 vols. (Herrnhut: Verlag der Missionsbuchhandlung, 1922-31), I:34, 109-112. Much of the confusion between the Bohemian Brethren and the Waldenses/Picards has an early origin. Evidently, Flacius Illyricus tried to equate the two, but Alexander Patschovsky has shown by applying text-critical methods to recently discovered manuscripts, that Waldensian manuscripts which Flacius believed to have originated from Bohemia actually came from France. See *Die Anfänge einer Standigen Inquisition in Böhmen*, (New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1975), p. 4; and Edmund de Schweinitz, *The History of the Unitas Fratrum* (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1885), p. 17.

15. See Adomnan's *Life of Columba*, ed. and trans. Alan A. and Marjorie O. Anderson (London: Thomas Nelson, 1961).

16. *Ibid.*, pp. 293, 305, 501 and 519. See also p. 489 for a celebration of a mass which may imply that ordinary work was usually not done on Sunday.

17. C. Mervyn Maxwell, "Sabbath and Sunday Observance in the Early Church," *Ministry*, 50 (January 1977), p. 9.

18. Hilgert, "The Religious Practices," p. 13-21.

19. Samuel Roffery Maitland, *Facts and Documents Illustrative of the History, Doctrine, and Rites of the Ancient Albigenses & Waldenses* (London: C. J. G and F. Rivington, 1832), pp. 32-36.

Must the Crisis Continue?

Critics of the Seventh-day Adventist Church have prematurely heralded a “shaking of Adventism” several times in recent years, while church leaders have glibly denied any significant tremors. But six months after Glacier View (an innocent piece of real estate which, like Yalta or Teapot Dome, has become shorthand for a complicated crisis), a major schism in the denomination seems possible for the first time since the early twentieth century.

Following the dismissal of Australian theologian Desmond Ford last September, church authorities at several levels have moved decisively against “variant views.” Refusing to concede any weaknesses in traditional positions, *The Adventist Review*, *The Ministry* and other church publications have mounted a strong campaign against Ford, insisting that the church’s scholars overwhelmingly reject his views. Eighteen pastors (at last count) have been forced from their pulpits by one means or another, most of them in the areas where Ford’s influence is strongest — California and the Antipodes. The best known of these pastors, 59-year-old

Walter Rea of Long Beach, California, a controversial figure in his own right before Glacier View, was defrocked after the *Los Angeles Times* reported his research into Ellen G. White’s sources under the headline “Plagiarism Found in Prophet Books.” The action against Rea bears a relation to other developments in that the nature of Ellen White’s authority has become one of the key issues in the crisis.

In a further development, when a group of seminary students began publishing *Evangelica*, a journal dedicated to promoting “a gospel revival” in Adventism, the Mountain View Conference and Oregon Conference moved to cut off support for two staff members, and school officials considered expelling the editors.

Not surprisingly, Ford and his supporters have been just as energetic as the editors of church publications in promoting the controverted points. Though Ford himself has had very little public comment on the sanctuary since Glacier View, his massive study has received wide circulation via \$15 xerox copies. Now an employee of a lay-sponsored foundation, Ford travels widely,

preaching in public meetings and on a radio program. Ford's supporters are rumored to have helped bring the church crisis to the attention of *Christianity Today* and *Newsweek*. *Evangelica's* editors sent out 20,000 copies of the first issue, in another attempt to reach the hearts and minds of ordinary Adventists.

Though both dissidents and traditionalists found evidence of malicious coordination in the other group's actions, there was, in truth, no conspiracy by either side. The firings, the outside publicity, the independent manifestoes, all made sense as part of an understandable defensive reaction to the aggression of *somebody else*. Ford was not in control of his numerous admirers, nor could the ministerial casualties be blamed on witch-hunting fever among administrators. To speak of Ford (or the "evangelicals" or Ford/Brinsmead) versus the General Conference (or the conservatives) would be to overlook a complicated spectrum which includes "liberals" who strongly support freedom of expression and who are both sympathetic with and critical of Ford's views; reactionaries who desire even more aggressive leadership; and the large tribe of the ignorant, apathetic, and neutral.

Still, certain clear patterns are emerging, and Glacier View, Ford, *Evangelica*, Walter Rea, ministerial resignations, and scattered "congregational Adventists" are, like the dry bones in the song, *connected*. In spite of the wishes of most of the people involved, the Adventist church appears to be moving toward division.

Critics of denominational leadership and traditional beliefs ("reformers" they would call themselves) entered 1981 with a growing corps of professionals available to them, with a clear, non-denominational legal organization and significant financial resources, and a loyalty-inspiring rhetorical system which provided their supporters positive commitment and a mission to the wider non-Adventist public. To some observers, these things added up to the skeleton of a new church, awaiting only harsher and bolder actions against Ford and the other "friends of the gospel" to spring to life.

SPECTRUM writers have filed reports on three aspects of this growing crisis: the firings and resignations of "gospel-oriented" pastors; the attack on Walter Rea and his work; and the precarious status of the new journal *Evangelica*.

Yesterday I was an ordained minister of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in good and regular standing," wrote John Zapara in an open letter to the members of the Woodside (Sacramento) church, January 6, 1981. "Today I am not."

Zapara told his former parishioners that he could no longer accept the Adventist practice of giving Ellen G. White doctrinal authority equal to the Bible and allowing "a hierarchy" to supplant "the priesthood of all believers." He also repudiated traditional Adventist positions on the investigative judgment and the "remnant." Though he said that he continues to cherish the Sabbath and many other Adventist doctrines, he insisted that "Jesus Christ and Him crucified" should be "the topic of every presentation we give." "I realize the gospel brings with it a sword and not peace," Zapara said, "but woe is me if I do not preach the gospel."

The dismissal of Zapara was not an isolated event in the Northern California Conference. Three other pastors have recently left the ministry for related reasons. Pastors Nordon Winger (Fort Bragg) and Don Kellar (Healdsburg) resigned, and Pastor Robert Palmer (Colfax/Meadow Vista) was fired outright. Several other pastors remain under close scrutiny, and according to some sources, as many as 10 more may ultimately lose their credentials.

Northern California's prominence in the pastoral losses is surprising. The conference is led by Elder Philip Follett, a gifted man who prides himself on his ability to steer a pragmatic, "reasonable" course between pro-Ford enthusiasts and blind reactionaries clinging to a verbal inspiration view of Ellen White. "It's the most wrenching experience in my career," he says of the resignations and firings. He tells his friends that he is uneasy with the church's handling of the Ford affair, particularly the disastrous coverage given the

crisis by the *Review* and *Ministry*, but at the same time believes that Ford's "solutions" to genuine doctrinal problems would do away with the need for the Adventist church. Follett appears to be profoundly concerned about the increasing polarization in his conference. None of the departing pastors has criticized Follett's patience or fairness.

The most disturbing feature of the events in the Northern California Conference is the credal authority Follett and other leaders have conferred (perhaps unwittingly) on the 27-point "Statement of Fundamental Beliefs" voted at the last General Conference. There is "no litmus test" for pastors, according to one conference official, but the fact remains that if a pastor comes under fire from conservative parishioners, his orthodoxy is measured by the Dallas statements. Church spokesmen, however, usually insist that though the denomination has "a set of fundamental beliefs," it does not have a creed.

In effect, both sides in Northern California — Follett and his advisors on one hand, and the dissident pastors on the other — are bearing the burdens of the church as a whole. Issues that remain unsettled (despite the bluster of *Adventist Review*) are being pushed to conclusions by sensitive, well-intentioned administrators and earnest, courageous pastors — with each group wondering why a crisis must come now, and praying to know their duty.

According to John Zapara, the conference personnel committee told him they would judge his case on the basis "of where the church is now, not where it was 20 years ago or where it may be five years in the future." If the "Statement of Fundamental Beliefs" is used prescriptively (rather than descriptively) such subtle distinctions may lose all meaning, and the church could turn its back on the idea of "progressive revelation." Conference officials insist, on the other hand, that any reasonable definition of "Adventist" — even the personal definitions of the pastors in question — cannot include a minister who feels called to witness against the "anti-gospel doctrines" of Seventh-day Adventism.

The Good News Unlimited Foundation,

established by Adventist physician Zane Kime, has committed itself "to support any minister defrocked over the gospel," according to Kime. Already employing Desmond Ford and a part-time researcher, Good News Unlimited is now willing to take on Zapara and Winger.

The two men are considering organizing a Sacramento Gospel Fellowship to serve both Adventists and non-Adventists each Sabbath in their area. Kime holds gospel meetings in his Sacramento home on a weekly basis for another group of 120. (So far, he is far more interested in promoting separate church organization than his friend Ford is.)

Other "gospel fellowships" are cropping up in California and throughout the United States. Though these groups pattern themselves after New Testament house churches, the South Bay Gospel Fellowship in San Diego provides a more immediate model. John Toews, formerly a pastor in the Southeastern California Conference, withdrew 160 church members from the conference (or about 90 percent of the "active" Adventist membership of his own church) to form the South Bay Gospel Fellowship and a smaller Escondido Christian Fellowship.

"We didn't go out simply because of Glacier View or Ford," Toews stated, "but that was definitely a catalyst." Although Toews has not abandoned his belief in the Sabbath or the Second Coming, he left Seventh-day Adventism because "its witness to the gospel has been negative and confused." Moreover, "Ellen White has superseded Scripture as an authority for Adventists."

The two San Diego area congregations are legally incorporated as the Xaris Gospel Fellowships and Toews reports numerous requests from all over the United States for copies of their bylaws, legal advice on incorporating other gospel fellowships, as well as taped and written "gospel" materials.

A sampling of fellowships with anywhere from 20 to 60 members, under the leadership of laymen or former Adventist pastors, includes congregations in the Newport-Richey area of Florida; Peoria, Illinois; Colville and Seattle, Washington; Aurora, Granby, Pagosa Springs and Longmont, Colorado;

Farmington and Albuquerque, New Mexico; and Tucson, Arizona.

In Madera, California, physician and former minister Herschel Lamp meets with more than 30 people in his home one Sabbath afternoon a month. After working for the church for 25 years, 13 of those as an ordained minister, Lamp left Adventism because, as he says, he was “not being informed and not being fed.” He has rejected the authority of Ellen White because “her unbiblical position on the investigative judgment destroys assurance, and her ‘blueprint’ for

“Eighteen pastors (at last count) have been forced from their pulpits by one means or another, most of them in the areas where Ford’s influence is strongest. . . .”

every aspect of the Adventist lifestyle destroys individuality, Christian liberty, and results in Adventist isolationism.” Like other fellowship leaders, Lamp wants “only the gospel at the heart of worship.”

In Australia, controversy over Ford and the doctrine of righteousness by faith has raged for years, with opponents of the charismatic scholar rallying under the banner G.R.O.F. (Get Rid Of Ford) and his supporters countering with the jocular battlecry F.I.S.H. (Ford Is Staying Here). Since Glacier View, at least seven pastors have lost their jobs for sympathy with Ford’s theological positions. The largest group of clerical casualties was in the Western Australia Conference, where Lorin Jenner, Wayne Pobke, and Heinz Suessenbach were sacked. Conference leadership precipitated the crisis by announcing in November that all ministerial credentials would be issued on the understanding that pastors intended to conduct their ministry in harmony with the 27-point Dallas statement.

“I am glad there is so much controversy surrounding various cherished church doctrines,” wrote Pobke in a letter to conference

officials four days before he was fired. “This is a healthy sign,” he commented, urging mutual tolerance. He offered a list of changes he believes necessary in contemporary Adventism, including a new emphasis on the gospel, recognition of the Bible’s supreme authority, and a more democratic form of church organization. Pobke repudiated the traditional Adventist view of prophecy, informing his employers that Uriah Smith needs to be completely discarded. “I am no radical, but see myself standing in the long line of the best apostolic and reformation tradition,” concluded Pobke, expecting, perhaps that the letter could lead to his dismissal. “I am generally in harmony with the church’s beliefs, but take exception to any beliefs that are . . . out of harmony with Scripture and conscience.”

Although the situation in Australia is complex — one administrator at Avondale College emphasized that it is simplistic to lay the blame entirely at the feet of conference leaders — the firing of the three men did provide a strong negative reaction among some church members. Conference president Gordon A. Lee said in an open letter to the entire conference membership that he had received “numerous phone calls” and that some people were “very emotionally upset and strongly exercised by the matter.” “I can only advise every honest Adventist to get back to his Bible and prayerfully . . . seek direction from the Lord.” He added, “We have not been led by ‘cunningly devised fables.’”

Lee urged church members “to have confidence in those God has appointed as leaders. Should any of these misuse the trust God has placed in them, He will remove them.”

“It is truly a time of shaking for many,” Lee observed. In Australia, in New Zealand, in California, at church headquarters, in many places scattered around the world, Seventh-day Adventists were echoing the thought.

Once upon a time Walter Rea was an Ellen White fundamentalist. In the earlier years of his ministry, he published three compilations of statements by Ellen G.

White, entitled *Bible Biographies*, which were sold and distributed by all denominational Book and Bible Houses, and employed by nearly all Seventh-day Adventist schools. Ironically, this work of compiling quotations from Ellen White's writings gave Rea an unusually accurate recall of what she had written, laying the groundwork for later research.

In 1955, while pastoring in Florida, Rea became acquainted with Drs. Daniel and Lauretta Kress, pioneer Adventist medical workers who called his attention to Mrs. White's *Sketches from the Life of Paul* (1883), a book which borrowed large sections of a contemporary work on Paul. Rea read carefully Francis D. Nichol's apologetic work *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*, noting his explanation of her literary indebtedness.

A few years later, another veteran Adventist worker, Dr. Lillian Magan, introduced Rea to Alfred Edersheim's book, *Elisha the Prophet*, as a work which Ellen White had used. After studying this and other books by Edersheim, he wrote an article for *Claremont Dialogue* in 1965 entitled "E. G. White and Contemporary Authors," in which he discussed her literary indebtedness, particularly to Edersheim, and suggested several possible attitudes one might take on this. Two years later he became acquainted with the writings of William Hanna and Ellen White's dependence on them. He followed closely the lively discussion produced by the scholarship of William S. Peterson, Ronald Numbers, Donald R. McAdams, and others, particularly as they examined the prophet's sources.

Correspondence between members of the White Estate and Walter Rea started as early as June 15, 1978, but it was not until early 1979 that Robert Olson, secretary of the White Estate, met with Rea to discuss the question of the relationship of other authors to Ellen G. White's *Desire of Ages*, and the possibility of Rea's coming to the White Estate to present his findings. A few days later, Olson wrote to Rea: "I want to reiterate in this letter, Walt, what I said personally while we were together last Sunday. And that is, the White Estate has no desire whatsoever to control your activities or your movements or your public meetings in even the slightest

possible way. . . . You surely have a right to be heard, and if you are extended an invitation to address a certain group at Loma Linda, it is your prerogative to make the decision as to what you will do about it."

At the same time, White Estate officers disagreed with Rea's work, insisting, as Ronald Graybill put it, that his work was "misleading and ill conceived." In the summer of 1979, Olson asked Rea not to publish anything until the White Estate had checked his work. Rea declined to keep his work secret. In an open meeting, September 15, 1979, at the Long Beach Seventh-day Adventist Church, with Olson present on the platform, Rea presented evidence of Ellen White's widespread copying to a packed house. The entire program, including Olson's reaction and audience questions, was taped and thus became available to thousands in North America and Europe.

As the issues presented by Rea began to be widely discussed, General Conference president Neal Wilson appointed a special committee to meet with Rea in Glendale on January 28 and 29, 1980, to evaluate his work. This meeting has been reported in detail by Douglas Hackleman in a previous issue of SPECTRUM (Vol. 10, No. 4). At the close of that meeting, a number of recommendations were made by the committee, including the following: "That we recognize Ellen White in her writings used various sources more extensively than we had previously believed." The committee also voted "To express our appreciation to Elder Rea for the enormous amount of work he has done in his research over the past several years, and also for the preparation of the material presented to the committee."

The tapes of this important meeting also became available soon, and the worldwide discussion of Ellen White's literary debt became even more intensified, with increasing activity on the part of the representatives of the White Estate to minimize the extent and importance of Walter Rea's findings.

The first non-Adventist notice of Rea's research came on October 23, 1980, when the *Los Angeles Times* published a long article,

starting on the front page, by John Dart, *Times* religion writer. In this article Dart stated: "Seventh-day Adventists regard Ellen G. White as a prophet and messenger of God who left their worldwide church with an inspired legacy of 25 million words, including 53 books, when she died in 1915. A big reason for her prodigious output is now being discovered by researchers in the denomination . . . 'She was a plagiarist,' asserts Elder Walter Rea. . . . The precise extent of borrowed writing in White's works is probably incalculable because of paraphrasing, Rea said. But in White's book on Jesus, *The Desire of Ages*, Rea has found repeated parallels from six different non-Adventist sources. Rea's findings have startled Adventists who were taught to believe that White's writings were entirely inspired by God."

Dart's article was picked up by the Associated Press wire service and became the

"Dart's article was picked up by the Associated Press wire service. . . . Adventism had probably never received so much free coverage in the world press before!"

core of similar articles in numerous newspapers in North America, Europe, and Australia. Adventism had probably never received so much free coverage in the world press before! Religious periodicals, including *Christianity Today*, also reacted.

Some embarrassed Adventists accused Walter Rea of approaching the *Times* for an interview and thus initiating the publication of this long article on Ellen White's plagiarism. Rea firmly denies this, and Dart told SPECTRUM that the interview was not initiated or suggested by Rea. Dart said that he had been a reader of SPECTRUM, was acquainted with the work of Ronald Numbers, and that someone had called him to suggest that Walter Rea had new material bearing on plagiarism by Ellen White. Dart then called Rea, who suggested that he call Pacific Union College theologian Fred Velt-

man, the church's officially selected researcher into the topic. Dart states that he was unable to reach Veltman at Pacific Union College and that he then called Walter Rea again to make an appointment for an interview, on October 13. In addition to this interview with Rea, Dart's article was based on SPECTRUM, Ronald Numbers' *Prophetess of Health*, and telephone conversations with Robert Olson of the White Estate and Marilyn Thomsen, communication secretary for the Southern California Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. He later also discussed the article with Veltman.

The end of Rea's ministry in the Seventh-day Adventist Church came late Thursday evening, November 13, 1980, when he was informed by the executive committee of the Southern California Conference that his ministerial credentials had been removed and his employment by the Seventh-day Adventist Church immediately cancelled, though he would receive six months' severance pay. According to Harold Calkins, president of the Southern California Conference, "The executive committee has no objection to Elder Rea's conducting research into how Mrs. White's books were prepared, nor has the church denied that she used other sources. . . . The action was based on the negative influence of Elder Rea's conclusions circulated worldwide." Calkins asserted that "the fact that Mrs. White creatively used Protestant historians in preparing her works does not negate her inspiration."

Rea's firing produced another *Los Angeles Times* report, which in turn resulted in a new spate of newspaper reports all over the land. After his dismissal, on December 10, Walter Rea gave SPECTRUM the following information:

"After the [first] article appeared in the *Los Angeles Times* on October 23, 1980, I was asked to meet with the Conference Committee on November 3, which I did for approximately six hours. I also met with the pastoral staff of the local conference for approximately four hours on November 9. At both meetings, I was assured that no decisions had been made as to

my firing, and the president of the conference stated to me that he was working on a compromise. He maintained this posture to me personally up to Wednesday, November 12, in spite of all the rumors to the contrary we had received that we had already been fired on a higher church level.

“At both meetings, I assured both groups that I had not initiated the interview and that I had not supplied all the material that was made available in the interview. . . . I further agreed to work with any committee that was formed or had been formed to study the matter of Mrs. White’s borrowing. I had already accepted the conditions that I was not to speak publicly on the subject or to talk to anyone in the ‘peanut gallery’ as Elder Calkins put it. I also agreed not to grant any more interviews and to direct all reporters, even of our own school papers, to the conference office.

“I agreed not to publish my book on Mrs. White and her copying as long as I was employed. This last condition upset both committees, inasmuch as they expressed their desire that the book never be printed. This was unacceptable to me. At no time in either meeting was I given any options to accept or reject and no compromise was ever suggested. It is now evident to both Mrs. Rea and myself that my firing was settled before the two meetings were held.”

What are Rea’s plans and hopes for the future? He is still willing to work and communicate with the leadership of his church, and he believes that a compromise and two-sided cooperation is not only possible but also desirable for the welfare of his church. Rea is completing his book-manuscript of some 500 pages on the literary dependence of Ellen White. Freed from his day-to-day pastoral work, he plans to devote more time to lecturing.

In October of 1980, shortly after the Glacier View meeting, a new journal called *Evangelica* appeared on the Adventist scene. Published by a group consisting primarily of seminary students from Andrews Universi-

ty, the journal was designed to promote what its editors called a “gospel revival” within the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

In the introduction to the opening issue, the editors boldly asserted that *Evangelica* was “the most positive and dynamic paper published in and about Adventism today” and claimed to be speaking to and for “evangelical Adventists,” who were identified as those who give primacy to the New Testament good news of justification by faith.

Some observers saw the journal as a reaction to the events at Glacier View and to the way these events, particularly the defrocking of Desmond Ford, were reported in official denominational publications. Still others, including officials at Andrews University and editors of some other denominational publications, viewed the *Evangelica* publishers as muckraking troublemakers whose actions seemed designed to divide the church and embarrass the university.

“The university administrators had hoped to keep Andrews in a snug harbor, safe from the stormy post-Glacier View seas.”

Alan Crandall, the soft-spoken editor of *Evangelica*, denies the charges that his journal is negative or sensational. An ordained Adventist minister and a doctor of theology candidate at Andrews, he acknowledges that the first issue included a heavy emphasis on the Ford firing but maintains that *Evangelica* is not, primarily, a response to Glacier View but, rather, a presentation of a theological emphasis that is lacking in most other denominational publications. He admits that Glacier View furnished the impetus — because the “joy and expectation” he and many of his fellow seminarians felt when the Colorado convocation was called turned into subsequent shock and disappointment when they learned that Desmond Ford had been fired.

He describes a “gloomy atmosphere which settled over the Andrews campus” and he says that out of this gloom came the idea for a new magazine. Crandall and his associates solicited articles, sought advice from sympathetic faculty (early in the organizational process there was a plan to give an editorial post to a faculty member, but this plan was discarded), and raised money from “around the world.” Verdict Publications (the Robert Brinsmead organization) offered to finance the venture, but this offer was turned down because it was believed that such close ties with the controversial Brinsmead would jeopardize the support for *Evangelica* among many church members.

Within four weeks from the time the initial plans were laid, the first issue was off the press and *Evangelica* turned out to be most unwelcome news to the Andrews University administrators. Highly sensitive to the role of the university as a General Conference institution serving the world field, the university administrators had hoped to keep Andrews in a snug harbor, safe from the stormy post-Glacier View seas. They were embarrassed and chagrined to find a magazine suddenly appearing on campus, edited by their own students, which put the university in the middle of the church’s theological and political crisis.

When *Evangelica* first appeared, Joseph G. Smoot, president of the university, viewed it as a student publication which had not gone through policy channels for such publications and banned its public distribution on campus. This action made the paper “forbidden fruit,” in the words of one seminary professor, and seemed to increase its impact. There was some talk among administrators of expelling the students involved, but a number of teachers encouraged the administration not to act “precipitously,” and a meeting was set up for November 3 with the major administrators involved, the *Evangelica* staff, and about two dozen interested faculty and students.

The administrators seemed surprised at the depth of the anguish expressed by the students over theological problems within the

church. It also became clear for the first time to many present that *Evangelica* was not simply an underground campus newspaper. President Smoot was described by one observer as “amazed” when he learned that 20,000 copies of the first issue had been printed.

Smoot told SPECTRUM that he suspects *Evangelica* is primarily operated and funded by off-campus organizations who are using the student editors to further their own ends. He cited the fact that Verdict had taken a substantial portion of the first press run of *Evangelica*, sending copies to names on the Verdict mailing list with an accompanying letter which identified Verdict as being in alliance with the group at Andrews. Crandall vigorously denies the allegation that *Evangelica* is anything but independent, although he admits that the Verdict letter contained some unfortunate implications.

A second, smaller meeting was held on November 18 under the direction of Roy Graham, university provost. At this meeting, he urged the *Evangelica* staff to make their magazine a university publication under existing university policies. Such a plan was unacceptable to the editors, and one of them asked Graham what the other options were. Graham responded by stating that one option was for the students to withdraw from school if they continued publishing, and another was for the school to ask them to withdraw. When asked if that were a “threat,” he responded, “No, not at all.”

One of the teachers present suggested a fourth option, which was to acknowledge to the constituency that *Evangelica* was not a seminary publication. The faculty would attempt to influence the students involved with the journal to adopt a less confrontational style. The meeting adjourned with no decision, but subsequent publicity caused relations between the administrators and the *Evangelica* staff to deteriorate further.

One member of the staff made comments to a reporter for radio station WSJN in Benton Harbor, which hinted at the possibility that students at Andrews were about to be expelled for publishing a journal. The reporter contacted Crandall seeking confirmation, but Crandall refused to give him further

information. The reporter eventually got the information he desired from other sources on the Andrews campus and, combining the Desmond Ford issue with *Evangelica*, broadcast several rather sensational reports regarding an alleged repressive atmosphere at Andrews. These reports were picked up by UPI and published in the *Detroit Free Press* and the *South Bend Tribune*, creating consternation among the university officials preparing to launch a 30-million dollar fund-raising campaign in the area surrounding the school. The *Evangelica* staff later sent a letter of apology to the administration for their part in these events.

The second issue of *Evangelica* was published in December. For the first time, it included articles by Andrews faculty. Other efforts are being made to appeal to a broader constituency and to be conciliatory in a time of confrontation. For example, at the suggestion of some sympathetic faculty members, the staff made several changes in the second issue for the purpose of lessening tension. Among other things, the staff did not include a news article on congregational churches within the Adventist church, postponed a review of Brinsmead's *Judged by the Gospel* and postponed an article by Ford. Crandall has indicated that this is the last issue that will be sent to other mailing lists, such as Verdict Publication's list, for example. The third issue contains articles by Adventist teachers from colleges other than Andrews.

The situation is still tense, and the students' status is precarious. In interviews with SPECTRUM neither Dr. Smoot nor Dr. Graham would rule out the possibility that the university may have to take some kind of action to protect its interests. Graham called the students "naive" for believing that *Evangelica* could be perceived in people's minds as independent of Andrews. Smoot labeled *Evangelica* as a "fringe" publication and saw its role, to date, as primarily "divisive." He argued that *Evangelica* is not living up to its own objective of presenting the gospel. Instead, he said, the editors are concentrating on issues that divide, and he cited the Ellen White articles in the second issue as

an example. He maintained that the second issue, with the exception of the two articles by faculty members, was "worse than the first." When asked to describe any positive contributions *Evangelica* has made, he said he could think of "no positive contribution at all."

Despite these negative comments, the university administrators seem to be adopting a wait-and-see attitude, one, as Graham put it, of "monitoring" the publication and holding various options open.

In any case, the *Evangelica* editors claim they have received 30 to 40 letters a day for the past two months, 99 percent of which were favorable. They insist that, come what may, they plan to continue publishing.

All the issues of the growing crisis in Seventh-day Adventism were highlighted in a private meeting between General Conference president Neal Wilson and the faculty of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary (along with selected administrators and college faculty) on December 17, 1980. In a session marked by startling candor, the scholars told Wilson that church media must change their reporting of the theological issues represented at Glacier View. Professor Robert Johnston specifically questioned the policies of *Review* editor Kenneth Wood, and he was seconded by several others, including President Smoot. Professor Fritz Guy pleaded for freedom to reinterpret the sanctuary and judgment doctrines for our own generation. The point was emphatically made that "the scholars" — as a group — did not defend all traditional views. Other speakers assured the General Conference president of the "pastoral concern" of scholars and their desire for gradual change rather than disruption. Professor Elden Chalmers called for a less authoritarian style of church leadership.

How Wilson took these views remains to be seen. There is no question, however, that without a dramatic gesture to break the logic of factionalism, Seventh-day Adventism will continue skidding toward schism.

— Eric Anderson, Jonathan Butler, Mollerus Couperus, Adrian Zytkoskee

Why the Review Voted to Leave Washington

by Richard C. Osborn

The General Conference appears to be a step closer to moving its headquarters out of the nation's capital into the suburbs. Consolidation of all three North American Adventist printing plants into a single, more cost-efficient operation appears to be dead for the foreseeable future. These are consequences of an action taken by the Review and Herald Publishing Association Constituency on October 16, 1980. The following tells the story of, and poses questions about, that action.

At their meeting last October, the Review constituency voted overwhelmingly to sell its Nashville plant (formerly operated as the Southern Publishing Association) and move all factory functions from the Washington, D.C., plant to a site one to one-and-a-half hours from Washington. At some time in the future, the editorial and marketing offices will also move to the new site, and the Washington, D.C. plant will be sold to pay for expansion and support of the new factory.

The constituency also voted to recom-

mend to the Review Board that a Hagerstown, Maryland, site recommended by a site location committee be seriously considered as the new location. According to committee estimates, this move will cost approximately \$5½ million more over a five-year period than combining all Review operations in the Washington plant. An additional \$1 million will be needed to purchase land.

A question of key importance in constituency deliberations was how best to effect the merger, already decided upon, of the Southern and Review and Herald Publishing Associations. As early as 1977, the General Conference ad hoc committees were studying the possibility of merger in order to save money. At the 1979 Annual Council the North American Division Committee on Administration (NADCA) voted that the number of publishing houses in North America be reduced to two, one on the West Coast and one in the East, saying that "it is highly desirable to have the plant for the East located in an area other than Washington, D.C., because of the large number of major church institutions and the resultant congregating of large numbers of Seventh-day Adventists in this area."

Richard Osborn, principal of Takoma Academy, holds his master's degree in history from the University of Maryland.

Within a week after the 1979 Autumn Council Vote, General Conference leaders met with the Southern Publishing Association Board and appointed committees to study an institution which was fighting for its life.

On January 8, 1980, the Southern constituency heard from these committees detailed recommendations for saving the publishing house, including the recommendation of a 20 percent reduction in staff within three months. The constituency declined to approve merger with the Review, voting instead to request that the General Conference representatives "convey to the General Conference Committee the deep conviction of this body in regard to maintaining the Southern Publishing Association as an independent and self-standing institution." If, despite this appeal, the General Conference insisted on studying the possibility of a merger, the constituency would concur. But in the meantime, Southern's management should immediately implement the economies and other policies recommended to save the institution.

Less than two months later, on March 5, a General Conference subcommittee recommended merger of assets, liabilities and management under the name Review and Herald Publishing Association. Operations would continue at Nashville and Washington until a suitable new location for the merged institutions could be found. Within two weeks a meeting of the Southern constituency was convened in Nashville.

After long, passionate debates, the constituency reversed its January action and agreed on March 18 to merge. Southern's workers were *not* guaranteed that they would not have to move to Washington, D.C., and many had the impression that there was a commitment to move to a completely new site. The next day the Review constituency meeting in Washington agreed to the merger. The succeeding day, March 20, the Southern constituency was flown to Washington for a joint meeting of both constituencies, where the merger was officially approved. It was also voted to conduct a study into the feasibility of operating one plant in a new location.

The newly merged Review Board appointed a 14 member Feasibility Study Committee chaired by Lowell Bock, General Conference vice president, to study all the options. Under the commission of the committee, Alan A. Anderson, Jr., a retired federal government information systems scientist, and two Review departmental managers, Robert Ellis, Jr., and Russell Wetherell, prepared a detailed 81-page analysis of the options, utilizing modern survey techniques, computer studies of marketing centers, distribution, and membership, and studies of modern factory operations. The study also suggested proposals for addressing the broader issue of publishing practices in the church. Only the Review Board members, however, saw the complete study with the delegates to the October constituency receiving a brief, nine-page summary.

Neal Wilson reported to the October constituency meeting that the feasibility study committee had analyzed seven possible options. The Review Board recommended the option calling for a two-stage move out of Washington. In the first stage, all property in Nashville would be sold. Land would be purchased an hour to an hour-and-a-half driving time outside Washington, and buildings constructed to house all printing operations. In the second stage, at some unspecified time in the future, the editorial and marketing offices would be moved from their present quarters to the new location. Harold F. Otis, Jr., general manager of the Review, with the help of professionally prepared charts placed across the front of the church, explained that a number of variables had been studied, including concentration of Adventists living in the states east of the Mississippi, proximity of paper mills, access to a bulk mailing center, and the wishes of workers in Nashville and Washington.

In the subsequent discussion of the motion to move the Review, Robert Osborn, assistant treasurer of the General Conference in charge of investments, spoke first. Acknowledging that a General Conference treasurer did not lightly oppose the General Conference president in public, he nevertheless felt duty-bound, he said, to speak out against the

proposed move for two principal reasons.

First, the General Conference had loaned the Review \$5½ million at greatly reduced interest rates in recent years for long-term capital expenditures, \$4.2 million of which was still outstanding, although being paid off regularly. At the time the loans were made, assurances were given that the resultant expansion would enable the Review to function for many years. Furthermore, when the merger occurred, the General Conference was told that by running an extra shift the entire workload could be handled in the Washington plant.

Second, he reminded delegates that each Adventist institution in the Washington, D.C., area is dependent on the others. He predicted that if the Review moved, a domino effect would first hit the General Conference followed by Home Study Institute, the Takoma Park Church, and the John Nevins Andrews School. He asserted that if the Review facilities were turned over to the General Conference, it was questionable whether they could be leased or sold because of special zoning variances allowed by the District of Columbia government just for the Review. The most cost-effective use of church funds would be for the Review to combine into one operation in Washington.

Roy Branson, senior research scholar at the Kennedy Institute of Ethics in Washington, D.C., and a delegate from the Potomac Conference, presented a paper prepared by him and the other lay delegate from Potomac, Robert Coy, the assistant general counsel of the Veteran's Administration. The paper, which Neal Wilson agreed to distribute to the delegates, argued that the proposed move to a newly built plant did not best serve the fundamental mission of Adventist publishing — to print and distribute literature at the lowest possible price to the largest number of people, particularly non-Adventists. Assuming such a mission, Adventist publishing should be as cost-effective as possible. The feasibility study had not provided grounds for thinking the Review sales would grow to the point that dramatic expansion was needed. Even if sales increased marked-

ly, the Washington site could furnish the increased production. Unlike most commercially viable printers that run their presses on three shifts 20-24 hours a day, the Review operates only one shift a day. What is needed is increased productivity from present facilities and equipment, not larger grounds.

Since the General Conference's President's Executive Advisory Committee (PREXAD) voted that it had neither the funds nor the interest to purchase the Review's Washington property, and since, because of its prox-

“If the church were indeed committed to producing literature as inexpensively as possible . . . logic would dictate that the constituency vote that the Review remain in Washington.”

imity to the General Conference, it could not be sold, the feasibility study itself, argued Branson and Coy, shows that selling the Nashville plant and concentrating all printing in Washington is by far the most economical option. Over the five years projected by the feasibility study, even allowing for the costs of improving the present plant, concentrating printing in Washington would save \$5½ million more than the two-stage move out of the city, and some \$5 million more than any other option. If the church were indeed committed to producing literature as inexpensively as possible, to achieve the widest distribution possible, and if a final decision had to be made at this constituency meeting, logic would dictate that the constituency vote that the Review remain in Washington.

Rather than urging such a vote, however, Branson proposed that the denomination conduct a thorough study, with a specified reporting date, into the possibility — what some leaders had suggested at the time of the 1979 Autumn Council — of maintaining several editorial and marketing centers, but consolidating all three North American printing

plants into one. The moment for achieving true consolidation of printing (while preserving editorial diversity) was now, when not only Southern had been merged with the Review, but reports indicated non-Adventist interest in purchasing the Pacific Press. Many members of the constituency, Branson pointed out, were workers at the Nashville plant who had suffered great trauma from the merger decision, and who were faced now with expensive moves that would uproot their lives. But the goal their sacrifices were to achieve — producing less expensive literature — would not be realized unless the constituents asked the General Conference to

“Moving the Review out of Washington would drastically weaken the church’s ability to influence the leadership of the the nation.”

devise plans for a thorough consolidation of printing plants in North America.

After lunch, several speakers took the opposite view and supported the building of a new plant outside Washington. Workers at the Nashville plant stressed that selling houses in Tennessee and purchasing them in the Washington metropolitan area would impose a heavy, virtually insupportable financial burden. Furthermore, as one worker said, they did not want to live in an urban environment, but where they and their children could raise gardens. Economically and otherwise, homes an hour away from Washington seemed more reasonable. The president of the Southwestern Union, Ben Leach, said that a commitment had been made at previous constituency meetings that the Southern Publishing Association would not simply disappear in Washington, but be moved with the Review to a new, third location. General Manager Otis and Glenn Beagles, treasurer of the Review, stressed the difficulty of working with the government

of the District of Columbia to gain zoning and other variances because of community opposition to a factory in a residential community. Otis spoke of the Review’s need for a new adhesive binding unit; this would take away current storage space and necessitate further building expansion.

While the dominant trend of the discussion in the afternoon was in favor of the proposed move out of Washington, some speakers expressed reservations. Robert Coy said that after carefully analyzing the figures in the feasibility study, it seemed clear to him that the proposed move was not the most cost-efficient one, and he knew laymen who, while loyal to the church, were becoming increasingly disenchanted with unwise decisions by the denomination’s leadership. Furthermore, Coy said, as an official in the executive branch of the federal government he could assure church leaders that moving the Review, and inevitably in its wake, the General Conference, out of Washington would dramatically weaken the church’s ability to influence the leadership of the nation. From the point of view of influence, two hours outside downtown Washington might as well be the Midwest.

The president of Potomac Conference, Ronald Wisbey, urged a postponement of a vote until a comprehensive study had determined the most cost-effective organization of Adventist publishing, and the ideal location of a printing press serving the entire country. Wherever that place proved to be, he would support the move. During the months necessary for such a study, Washington was the most economical place for locating operations of the Review.

Without question, the most persuasive speech of the day was Neal Wilson’s comprehensive response late in the afternoon to opponents of a two-stage move. He acknowledged that the Review was working only one shift, and that in its present location it could increase production by working large, web presses through three shifts. He also agreed that several denominational publishers, using a single printing plant, or even non-Adventist presses, would be the most

cost-effective method of producing Adventist literature.

But, many were concerned, he said, that not having our own press would endanger the freedom of Adventist publishing. As for having a single plant, it was his judgment that achieving such a consolidation was simply not feasible, given present attitudes. The leadership of the church could not put all its time into an attempt to consolidate all operations into one plant for North America. Other projects and policies also demanded attention.

As for the location of the merged Review, Wilson said that the existing Nashville and Washington plants, while theoretically surrounded with enough land for expansion, were badly located in built-up urban locations. The Washington plant, for example, was bordered by residential streets sometimes clogged by supply trucks. Neighbors became annoyed. While more might be done to enhance contact with the community, there would likely always be disagreements and disputes over requests for necessary adjustments of city regulations. Furthermore, urban plants were potentially vulnerable to union pressure and boycotts. The Review would have to move out of Washington eventually, anyway. Inflation meant that the sooner the move, the better.

Wilson recognized that the refusal of the General Conference to buy the Review building when operations move to a new site, and its simultaneous insistence that it not be sold until the General Conference sold its property meant that the Review would not be realizing any income from the use of the property or from its sale unless the General Conference moved. He noted the resulting conjectures, before and during the constituency meeting, that the General Conference must be planning to sell not only the Review building, but also the entire complex of office buildings it owns along Eastern Avenue. He said that it might happen, although the leadership of the church was not spending all its waking moments devising ways to accomplish it. In any case, commitments had been made when the high-rise "North Building" was erected that would make sale without community approval extremely difficult.

He did think that it might be better for the General Conference if it were located on one of two properties it already owns in the Maryland suburbs north of Washington. Even if the General Conference were to move to one of these locations, it could retain the important Washington, D.C., mailing address.

Branson in a final appeal argued that Wilson had not refuted any of the facts cited by those opposed to the two-stage move, and had in fact conceded the validity of much of their analysis. He warned that if the constituency voted for the motion to move, true consolidation of Adventist publishing in North America would be postponed and Adventist books would remain high-priced and limited in circulation. Before the final vote, several members of the General Conference leadership made strong speeches in favor of the recommendation made by the Review Board.

When the secret ballot was counted and announced as 305 in favor of the move and 114 against, spontaneous applause broke out. Wilson quickly stopped it. No one had won today, he said. It had been a very difficult decision. Had he been sitting where many others had been, he could well have articulated their arguments in favor of a different decision.

At the October 16 meeting the constituency also received the report of a site committee appointed by the Review Board. The membership of the committee had been kept secret to prevent Adventists from buying land around the favored site as a real estate investment. The committee reported on several sites, the most favorable being in Hagerstown, Maryland, a medium-sized town located 80 miles north from Washington. The delegates concluded their principal business by bypassing the offer of the Potomac Conference president to provide free of charge land two hours driving time from Washington next to Shenandoah Valley Academy in Virginia. Instead, they voted to recommend to the Review Board the Hagerstown site costing an estimated \$1 million.

In a later interview with SPECTRUM, General Manager Otis said that the Review's

Nashville property has been sold to a non-Adventist Bible record business and will be turned over to the purchaser on May 15, 1981. By the end of January 1981 all the editors in Nashville will have moved to Washington, followed by a carefully prepared phasing-out process of plant employees who will also move to Washington. Several are retiring rather than moving and others are taking employment in the Nashville area. A double shift will be run at the Review's Washington plant to handle the extra work load.

Otis further said that the Review has options on property in both Frederick and Hagerstown, Maryland. A site engineering company has been hired to make a recommendation on January 15, with final action by the Review Board expected in February. An informal vote taken among local Board members after a tour of both sites indicates a strong majority in favor of the Hagerstown property pending further professional analysis. A spring 1981 ground-breaking is anticipated with plant construction expected to take 12 to 15 months. Otis has no projection on when the Washington plant will be closed or when the editorial offices will be moved to the new site.

Three key questions arise in connection with the proposed move of the Review.

1) *Why is the option of consolidating all publishing in the North American Division into one plant with separate editorial boards not being seriously considered at the present time?* In the larger, undistributed feasibility study document, Alan Anderson, Jr., wrote, "It would be possible for one publishing plant, properly equipped and running two or more shifts per day, to most economically provide the printing needs of the North American Division" (p. 77). Otis told SPECTRUM that this option was rejected for four basic reasons:

First, the Adventist philosophy promulgated by Ellen White of avoiding centralization.

Second, paper suppliers divide at the Mississippi River, meaning that if a West Coast strike of paper mills occurs, as happened re-

cently, the East Coast plant could supply paper through its mills.

Third, the United States is founded on the principle of "competition in the market place." Otis feels the church receives better service by having two competitive publishing houses.

Fourth, a complete consolidation is politically unrealistic and would result in the loss

“ ‘What effect would such a move have on Adventists themselves and their sense of mission to the great metropolises where most Americans live. . . ?’ ”

of money for the Review because of time taken to study something that probably will not happen. Wilson, who knows the difficulty of consolidation efforts through such experiences as the recent attempt to unify the Southern and Southwestern unions, alluded to this argument in the constituency meeting.

2) *Is Takoma Park another Battle Creek?* The only argument used for moving the Review out of the Takoma Park area in the 1979 Annual Council action was the "large number of major church institutions and the resultant congregating of large numbers of Seventh-day Adventists in this area." What light do facts throw on this assertion? According to 1979 figures, the 13,108 members in the 35 churches within a 25-mile radius of Takoma Park (from Columbia, Maryland to Vienna, Virginia) comprise 0.39 percent of Adventism's worldwide membership and 2.2 percent of the North American Division membership. The Adventist work force in the entire Washington area amounts to 4.3 percent of the worldwide total. Excluding employees of Washington Adventist Hospital, many of whom do not belong to the church, Adventist workers in the Takoma Park area make up 1.2 percent of the worldwide total.

How do these figures compare to Battle Creek when Ellen White was concerned

about too many members being in one area? In 1902, close to 20 percent of the total work force of the church worked in Battle Creek. Not only did many workers reside in Battle Creek, but 40 percent of the entire church's membership lived in the northern area between Ohio and Nebraska.

In actual fact, moreover, when Ellen White addressed the centralization issue at the 1903 General Conference Session, she urged Adventists to "make centers in many places." Unlike Battle Creek in 1902, Takoma Park today represents one of many Adventist centers around the world.

3) *Does moving the Review out of an urban environment, along with a probable General Conference headquarters move, represent a retreat from a commitment to urban ministries?* The Washington area is an urban community in which Adventists can make a substantial impact on the broader non-Adventist community. Here the church has four strategically located hospitals, a college, a high school, several elementary schools, one of the country's best and largest correspondence schools, 35 churches, a large publishing operation, the church's world headquarters, and a powerful Adventist radio station. The church's impact here can be all the more significant because Washington is the nation's capital and the residence of many overseas diplomats. Moving to the Washington suburbs would result in a less identifiable Adventist presence than is possible with a Takoma Park-based headquarters. It could result in the same kind of

weak Adventist presence that exists in other major American cities such as Chicago, Boston, New York City and San Francisco.

The report prepared by Branson and Coy for the constituency meeting states the issue well:

The spectacle of Adventist institutions, domino-like, removing themselves from sharing the problems faced by the overwhelming majority of Americans who are city dwellers, would make a statement that would be sadly noted. Finally, what effect would such a move have on Adventists themselves and their sense of mission to the great metropolises where most Americans live . . . ?

These thoughts run counter to current efforts to implement Ellen White's counsel on working cities from country outposts, notably those of Metro Ministries in New York City under its director, Ted Wilson. Some persons, however, among them Gottfried Oosterwal, professor of mission at Andrews University, argue that conditions have so changed from when Ellen White wrote as to necessitate a reassessment of the most effective approach to urban areas.

Such questions as these remain, then, and seem no less important after the October 16 vote than they did before. All Seventh-day Adventists should consider the implications and the effects of the proposed move of the Review and Herald from its present Washington, D.C., location.

Responses From Readers

Dallas Statement

To the Editors: It has been suggested that I add a little further information concerning the evolution of the new Statement of Fundamental Beliefs. In the following paragraphs, I accede to that suggestion. For brevity's sake, I number the successive points.

1) In 1965, I wrote from Berne to the General Conference administration and expressed my conviction that our Statement of Fundamental Beliefs needed revision both from a theological and a literary point of view. The administration's reply revealed that no such need was felt at the GC, so the matter was dropped.

2) In 1970, I became an associate secretary of the General Conference, and found that one of my duties was to serve as secretary of the *Church Manual* Committee. It became clear that the *Manual* needed revision. It had grown like Topsy, with additions being made in random fashion as individuals and groups became aware of deficiencies in the original Statement. The 1967 edition revealed the patchwork nature of the volume, and cried out for editorial attention. But, as page 22 recorded: " 'All changes or revisions of policy that are to be made in the *Manual* shall be authorized by a General Conference session.' " —*Review and Herald Bulletin*, June 14, 1946." This quotation proved to be a roadblock in every effort to revise any part of the *Manual*. It took several months of interpretative endeavor to convince the committee that editorial/literary revisions in the interest of clarity and consistency were not covered by the above declaration. When that light dawned, many pages of editorial emendations were accepted and eventually presented to the 1975 Session of the GC in Vienna.

3) Because of the official reluctance to

change a jot or tittle of the *Manual*, I had refrained from including the Statement of Fundamental Beliefs in the initial editorial suggestions. After the 1975 Session, however, the time seemed ripe for attention to the Fundamentals. They seemed surrounded with an aura of untouchability, and the secretary of the committee seemed to be the only one convinced of the need for revision. He therefore produced a complete but cautious revision for presentation to the chairman of the committee and, at an early date, to a subcommittee that was appointed on the chairman's initiative. With the initial one-man revision as its base, that subcommittee spent many hours producing a revision for presentation to the full *Church Manual* Committee. At every step, however, it was dogged by the tradition of untouchability concerning the Fundamentals: indeed, there appeared to be an aura of "inspiration" that hamstrung most suggestions for refinement and improvement of each Statement of Belief. This greatly hampered the work of the committee. If that aura could have been laid to rest, the way would have been open for a much more effective revision. Under that weighty handicap the subcommittee revised the original Statement and presented it to the full committee for its reaction. An *ad hoc* committee was then appointed, early 1978, with the specific task of preparing a document that, via the *Church Manual* Committee, would prepare a Statement for presentation to the 1980 Session.

4) That *ad hoc* committee was commissioned to work within the framework of minimal revisions in deference to the generally held idea of the sacrosanct nature of the *Manual* and the sensitivities of the church membership respecting any change that

might appear to touch the doctrinal beliefs of the Church. Once again, the brakes were on, and revision had to be carried out on a very limited basis.

5) When that further limited revision was completed in mid-1979, I ventured to suggest that it would be wise to submit the document to our professional theologians, on the basis that it would be better to have their reactions before the document went further rather than await their strictures on the Session floor. There was some hesitation, but eventually the suggestion was accepted, and the document went to Andrews University, with the request that it be studied, that comments and emendations be referred back to the *ad hoc* committee. Those terms of reference did not register, for the University prepared its own set of fundamentals, which were presented to the 1979 Annual Council for eventual presentation to the 1980 Session.

6) The University's action accomplished what a timorous interpretation of *Church Manual* procedure had failed to effect. Hindsight suggests that it would have been wiser if the *Church Manual* Committee had worked closely with Andrews' theologians from an early date — but the traditional reticence to touch the *Manual* would probably have made that a too-revolutionary suggestion!

The above paragraphs are intended to supplement the very acceptable account given by Larry Geraty in Volume 11, Number 1. This addendum may serve to complete the historical record.

Bernard E. Seton
Etowah, North Carolina

To the Editors: It is difficult to conceive how anyone who heard the discussion in Dallas on the statement of fundamental beliefs could conclude that I advocated consideration of the Bible as “*all-sufficient* in matters of history” (Vol. 11, No. 1, p. 10).

I proposed, and the General Conference session delegates affirmed, that our Statement of Fundamental Beliefs include an explicit expression of confidence that the Bible is a reliable and authoritative witness to God's acts in human history, as well as an

authoritative revelation with respect to faith and morals. Before reading the last issue of SPECTRUM, it never occurred to me that anyone would propose that every activity of God related to the history of man or Planet Earth is referenced in the Bible, or propose that the historical testimony in the Bible is all sufficient. My only intention at Dallas was to secure a formal recognition that the Bible does contain historical data (e.g., Creation Week, Fall of Adam, Noachian Flood, Exodus of the Hebrews), and that such testimony is trustworthy and authoritative.

R. H. Brown
Geoscience Research Institute

Sanctuary Issue

To the Editors: I've just concluded a profitable Friday evening by reading at one sitting the special “Sanctuary Issue” of SPECTRUM. Kudos to both authors and editors. What many of us earnestly desire to see in denominationally published periodicals — a balanced presentation of news and views that includes a spectrum of responsible opinion — we have come to rely on in SPECTRUM. Once again we were not disappointed. From my point of view as a member of the Sanctuary Review Committee, I would say that Cottrell's account of what happened at Glacier View is by far the most authoritative report that has yet appeared in print. Not only was it accurate and fair, but his analysis of the event and its aftermath was perceptive and constructive. Ford's article was the only condensation of his own (1,000 page) views in context that I have read and thus provided your readers with a genuine service. Shea's critique contained some important biblical/historical insights and suggestions that might be otherwise unavailable to readers who felt they could not take time to read his original (430 page) manuscript. Guy's presentation at Glacier View was the most creative attempt by an Adventist theologian in years to make the sanctuary truth “present truth” for our generation and your publication of it is a real “coup.” It is also useful to have the relevant documents and letters under one cover. So

thanks again for providing meat in due season.

Lawrence T. Geraty
Professor
Archaeology and History of Antiquity
Andrews University

On Chronology

To the Editors: The discussion on chronology (Vol. 10, No. 3) alludes to the widely held impression that the fifth and eleventh chapters of Genesis present a list of firstborn sons. The second individual in this list, Seth, is easily identified as at least the third male descendant of Adam.

The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary* (p. 997 of the 1960 edition) points out that Shem was the secondborn of the three sons of Noah who are mentioned in Genesis 5:32. With the virility the human race possessed less than 2,000 years after Creation and when individual life spans typically approached 1,000 years, it would be most unexpected for a man not to have children until the 500th year of his life. Therefore, it is reasonable to presume that the Bible names only the three youngest male children in Noah's family, those who accompanied their parents in the Ark. (We might suggest that Shem, Ham and Japheth were saved as a consequence of identifying with their father in witness to the impending destruction and in construction of the Ark. Also, we might speculate on the sadness with which Noah and his wife left their many sons and daughters who refused to join them in the Ark.)

From Genesis 11:32 and 12:4, it is evident that Abram was not the oldest of the three sons of Terah named in Genesis 11:26. Either Nahor or Haran, most probably Haran, was 60 years older than Abram.

In view of these insights from Scripture, I must conclude that the fifth and eleventh chapters of Genesis list out of the Adam-Noah-Abraham lineage only the most prominent individuals who maintained integrity to God. There is no way to be certain as to what proportion of these individuals were firstborn sons. We are only given the age of

one at the time the next-named was born.

It is also widely held that Abraham moved into Palestine 430 years before the Exodus. This view is based on priority of the interpretation given by an inspired New Testament writer. There appears to be a problem in finding the correct interpretation of the interpretation given by Paul. Many Bible students are aware of the apparent inconsistency between Galatians 3:17 and Acts 7:6, Exodus 12:40, 41 and Genesis 15:13. These four passages are in perfect harmony if the "ratification" spoken of by Paul is understood to be the final confirmation given to Jacob immediately before he relocated in Egypt (Genesis 46:1-7), 215 years after Abraham took up residence in Palestine.

A hasty review of the changes that have occurred in human society over the past 215 years will readily point out the value of an additional 215 years in an effort to find a harmonious interpretation of archaeological data and the stipulations of Scripture.

R. H. Brown
Berrien Springs, Michigan

To the Editors: Siegfried H. Horn's "Can the Bible Establish the Age of the Earth?" (Vol. 10 No. 3) is a valuable contribution on the discussion on biblical chronology.

It is a pity, however, that Horn, who recognizes the difficulties of the New Testament's use of the Septuagint, should base the date of the covenant with Abraham on Paul's statement in Galatians. (Incidentally, Paul's interest was not chronological). There is much archaeological and secular historical evidence that supports a long chronology for the Israelite Egyptian bondage (cf. Gen. 15:13). This, then, would place Abraham's covenant event somewhere between his entry into Canaan in 2095 B.C. when he was 75 (Gen. 12:4) and the birth of Ishmael in 2085 B.C. when he was 86 (Gen. 16:16).

Let me also note briefly that William Shea in an unpublished syllabus has demonstrated fairly convincingly a March 15, 1450 B.C., date for the Exodus. Using Sothic agete dating technique, new moon dates, as well as biblical, historical and archaeological data, he has been able to correlate the biblical event

with the actual secular occurrence. In this case, of course, we take into consideration the four-year coregency of Solomon in our evaluation of I Kings 6:1; and thus instead of counting back from 966 (which date is questionable even without taking cognizance of the coregency), we count back from 971 and arrive at 1450 (on the basis of inclusive reckoning).

P. U. Maynard-Reid
West Indies College
Mandeville, Jamaica

Against Reason

To the Editors: The varied articles in the commemorative edition of the SPECTRUM do a good job of summing up the work and purpose of the AAF since its inception.

During these years, I found myself moving along with what was, with but few exceptions, the steady advance of reason. It is impossible to read each issue without sensing the conviction of most of the writers that truth will yield to honest and painstaking research. Indeed, one is easily borne along this current by the certainty of the contributors that intellectual might will prove right and prevail in the end.

It has been easy to sympathize with the staff as it tirelessly worked in what was not always encouraging circumstances. They appear to have borne up well under an atmosphere of continued misunderstanding. However, with the emergence of the work of Desmond Ford, Walter Rea, and others, I am overwhelmed with second thoughts. At first, I attributed this to a normal aversion to abrupt change. After all, the movement of the earth beneath one's feet is always disquieting.

Now, however, an attitude among some of my colleagues and fellow Adventists is sounding an alarm that grows louder with each issue of SPECTRUM. There is among them an unmistakable satisfaction with the exacting investigation of our traditional values. There is an increasing tendency for some to confess that they have harbored similar suspicions concerning the Spirit of

Prophecy and traditional biblical supports for the "message."

The current agitation and increased attitudes of questioning are well launched. No end of controversy is in sight. However heated the discussions concerning our basic belief become, and regardless of how near some may feel we are to a solution, I find myself backing away from what yawns increasingly as a fearsome black hole. Countless billions have been pulled into such an abyss of no return by the delicious and siren call of reason. The misuse of intellect felled the "light-bearer" so that at the present time the ether is filled with countless individual reasoning personalities who out-thought God. To me the present course seems far too pell-mell and hell-bent. The "end" of present historical research and scientific method looms as a certainty.

I do not believe that the Gift of Prophecy or the book of Genesis can stand this exposure. These two witnesses are being done to death and will soon lie in our streets. Even pure gold can be vaporized. It is not that the present efforts toward truth are careless; on the contrary, the ongoing work will become more and more precise and irrefragable. The evidence against the supernatural origin of the Spirit of Prophecy and the accuracy of the book of Genesis will become conclusive. Every intellectual will have enough unassailable proof to make a rational decision.

Surely, within five years every thoughtful Adventist scientist or historian can say with certainty, "It can never rain." It is not the intention of this letter to list the warning from Scripture concerning the pitiful inadequacy of human thought, or to show that the thoughts and actions of God are mega light years apart from man's brief and tumultuous achievements. However, the work of the Forum in the past dozen years would seem to indicate that there are those who would deny that we are all blind, pitiful and helpless.

In mercy to human nature, the entrance into salvation has been made to appear simple. All are invited and all may receive eternal life. However, the ways and works of God and His creation should warn us that His work of salvation is in most particulars beyond the understanding of His creatures. In-

tellectual achievement by any creature or the most sincere reasoning of any human being must stand outside the door, head down and shamefaced.

Your heavy tread upon, or near, sacred thresholds and hallowed ground frightens me. I wish you well, brethren, but I take my leave of you to seek with all my resolve, purpose and strength a way of utter surrender, self-abnegation, childlike humility and simplicity. I will work, pray, sing and strive to trust, to believe, and to hate every second of doubt. Should my senses and my mind be shown absolute proof against some segment of the Scripture or the Spirit of Prophecy, I will beg God for the strength to disbelieve my own eyes and trust the Word. Any other course I take will place me in peril of my soul.

H. N. Sheffield, M.D.
Madera, California

Forum Newspaper

To the Editors: I am mystified by Richard Osborn's hostile and inaccurate remarks

about *Forum*, the AAF newspaper (Vol. 10, No. 4). What does he mean by his statement "Anderson's background as editor of Andrews University's *Student Movement* . . . brought problems to Lawrence Geraty"? The only two specific remarks about *Forum* picture Geraty as restraining unwise journalism. Is Osborn trying to suggest recklessness on my part led to an adversary relationship between Geraty and me? That my background somehow led to Geraty's unfortunate resignation?

Osborn's comments might have been more accurate if he had taken the time to talk to me about the newspaper. Geraty and I worked well together and neither of the incidents described is entirely correct. Osborn could have mentioned some of the positive contributions of *Forum*. We were the first Adventist publication to cover the Merikay case — and our coverage was successful in stirring up wide interest in the matter. Also, *Forum* published the first independent, behind-the-scenes report of an Annual Council meeting.

Eric Anderson
Pacific Union College

SPECTRUM

is pleased to announce that the following back issues are still available:

Prophetess of Health Vol. 8, No. 2

Church and Politics Vol. 8, No. 3

Church and the Courts Vol. 9, No. 2

Commemorating the First Decade Vol. 10, No. 4

Sanctuary Debate Vol. 11, No. 2

Charge per each issue, \$3.50

10 or more copies of a single issue, \$3.00 each

Make checks payable to: Association of Adventist Forums
Box 4330
Takoma Park, MD 20012

SPECTRUM ADVISORY COUNCIL

Lucille and Alan Anderson	Genevieve and Paul Johnson
Ben R. Boice	Katie and Richard Johnson
LaJean and Allen Botimer	Dorane and William King
Neridah and Bernard Brandstater	Claire and Richard Knierim
Betty and Bruce Branson	Ruth and Edward Komarniski
Mary and Floyd Brauer	Verla and Alvin Kwiram
Merrilyn and Ray Brown	Karen and Mel Lake
Marilyn and Robert Burman	Ewald Lonser
Dos and Molleurus Couperus	Heidi and Richard Ludders
Eryl Cummings	Thelma and Benjamin McAdoo
Walter Cummings	Irene and Kenneth McGill
Noreen and Paul Damazo	Iola and Julius Martin
Elsie and Raymond Damazc	Jacqueline and Robert Moncrieff
Thelma and Lloyd Dayes	Lyla Neumann
Mary and James Dunn	Valerie and Glenn Patchen
Mary and Wilfred Eastman	Cecilia and Ernest Plata
Juanita and Richard Engel	Verna and Winslow B. Randall
Janine and Wilmer Engevik	Martha and Alfredo Rasi
Nancy Engeset	Carole and Gordon Rick
Karen and Ronald Fasano	Thais and James Sadoyama
Beth and Jack Fleming	Marjorie Scrivner
Joy and Gerry Fuller	Ursula and Donald Shasky
Joyce and David Grauman	Janet and Naor Stoehr
Nadine and Gordon Hale	Carlene and Leonard Taylor
Deanne and David Hanscom	Meredith and Rudy Torres
Cheryl and Milford Harrison	Nancy and Robir Vandermolen
Sally and Robert Hasselbrack	Nancy and John Vogt
Donald Hawley	Carol and Bruce Walter
Hanna and Hjaltar Helmersen	Karla and Kenneth Walters
Liv and Eugene Joergenson	Vicki and Chuck Woofter

The SPECTRUM Advisory Council is a group of committed SPECTRUM supporters who provide financial stability and business and editorial advice to insure the continuation of the journal's open discussion of significant issues. For more information, contact:

Dr. Raymond S. Damazo, Chairman
855 106th Avenue N.E.
Bellevue, WA 98004

(206) 454-2722 Office
(206) 455-4522 Residence

