

# 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.”

**I**n 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.

**O**nce 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.

**I**n 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 Zytoskee