

British Union at the Crossroads
SDA Hospitals Become Big Business

SPECTRUM

A Quarterly Journal of the Association of Adventist Forums

Volume 11, Number 4

ADVENTISTS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Adventists and Human Rights Activists
Interview with Alexander Ginzburg
Conversation with *Liberty* Editor

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

Sandra Clayton-Emmerson
College Place, Washington

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 Henriksen
Artist
Boston, Massachusetts

Edward Lugenbeal
Anthropology
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Eric A. Magnusson
Biology
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
Marienhoehe 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

DIRECTORS

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

REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

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

Central
Erwin Sicher
History
Southwestern Adventist College
Keene, Texas

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

*Graduate Student

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.

Editorial Correspondence: SPECTRUM is published quarterly by the Association of Adventist Forums. Direct all editorial correspondence to SPECTRUM, Box 431, College Place, WA 99324. Manuscripts should be typewritten, double spaced and in matters of style and documentation, conform to *A Manual of Style* (University of Chicago Press). Submit the original and two copies, along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Responses from readers may be shortened before publication.

Subscription Information: In order to receive SPECTRUM, send a membership fee (\$12 per volume, except \$14 in Canada and other foreign countries; \$2 less for students) to Association of Adventist Forums, Box 4330, Takoma Park, MD 20012. Single copies may be purchased for \$3.50. Pay by check made out to the Association of Adventist Forums. For address changes, send old address label along with the new address.

In This Issue

ARTICLES

Volume Eleven, Number Four, Published June 1981

Crisis in the British Union	Dennis Porter	2
The British Union: Some Comments on the Issues	Jean Picart	13
The New Adventist Health Care Corporations	Geri Ann Fuller	16

SPECIAL SECTION: ADVENTISTS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Shelkov and the True and Free Adventists	Marite Sapiets	24
Adventists and the Madrid Conference		28
Shelkov's Daughter Protests: An Open Letter to Brezhnev		33
Amnesty International and Adventists		34
An Interview with Alexander Ginzburg	Tom Dybdahl	37
The Church in the USSR: A Conversation with Hegstad	Gene Daffern	42
A Letter to Soviet Adventists	Neal Wilson and Alf Lohne	45

REPORTS

Lay Representation in Union Constituency Meetings	Janice Eiseman Daffern	47
AAF News and Roster	Claire Hosten	50

RESPONSES

Glacier View Reports	D. Ford, W. Shea, K. Strand R. Cottrell, H. D. Baumbach	54
----------------------	--	----

About This Issue

Although Adventists in America in discussions of Glacier View and subsequent events sometimes speak of a crisis in the church, elsewhere the church faces a variety of challenges which, in many ways, should help us keep our quibbling over doctrinal subtleties in perspective. Within the Soviet Union, Adventists are harassed daily for their beliefs and their commitment to traditional doctrine. As the articles in this issue's special section make clear, many Adventists have suffered loss of liberty and even death for their faith. It is perhaps time for the worldwide church to focus on the courage of these fellow believers to learn more about their lives within a nation dedicated to atheism.

The opening articles deal with the church in Great Britain. Clearly emotions run high, for the British Union faces complex issues involving conflicts between the traditionally white membership and leadership and the racial minorities whose growing numbers have resulted in demands for a greater role in

church administration. SPECTRUM, in an attempt to present two sides of the issue, publishes two articles, but the editors realize that the issue may have more than two sides.

Recent developments in the organization of Adventist hospital systems and in lay representation at church constituency meetings are the subjects of two shorter articles. We also publish a roster of the regional representatives and chapters of the Association of Adventist Forums to help those readers interested in joining local chapters or perhaps beginning new chapters. This issue concludes with a series of responses to our Glacier View reports, including four responses by participants.

The next issue, which will begin SPECTRUM's twelfth volume, will include several articles outlining positive and constructive suggestions for the Adventist church to pursue in the 1980s. We hope that in this way SPECTRUM may contribute to the church as it forms its vision for the future.

The Editors

Crisis in the British Union

by Dennis Porter

At the end of 1953, the membership of the British Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists was 7,257. The average annual membership increase from 1889 onwards had been approximately 100 a year after allowing for transfers out, deaths and apostasies. By 1978 (the last year for which complete figures are available at the time of writing) the membership stood at 13,229, an increase over 1953 of almost 6,000, or an average annual growth of 240.

Given the Adventist predilection for measuring success by statistics, one may well wonder whether the title of this article is justified. Where is the evidence of “crisis”? For that we must cite some other figures. In 1953 the population of Great Britain was almost 100 percent indigenous. In 1976, according to government statistics, it was approximately 97 percent so and 3 percent immigrant, the 3 percent being divided almost exactly into three equal parts: West Indian, Indian and Pakistani and the rest of the “New Commonwealth.” In 1953 the membership

of the Seventh-day Adventist Church was almost 100 percent indigenous. In 1978 it was stated to be 54 percent indigenous and 46 percent immigrant, with these immigrants being mostly West Indians. Actually, the figure was much more likely to have been about 60 percent immigrant, if one considers attending members rather than simply names on the books. As early as 1972 a census of attendance on one Sabbath in the North British Conference gave a return of 1,528 nonindigenous adults and 368 children. A year later a similar census in the South England Conference showed 2,942 non-indigenous adults and 1,467 children, 2,352 indigenous adults and 841 children.

Put in the simplest terms, then, the problem in the British Union Conference is that a population overwhelmingly white has to be evangelized by a church with a membership almost two-thirds black. Even those figures do not show the whole extent of the problem. Adventist evangelism had traditionally been carried on in the larger cities to the almost total exclusion of the small-town and rural areas. It is precisely in those larger cities that most of the immigrants have settled — as early as 1966 over 4 percent of the population of London was immigrant — and have there-

Dennis Porter, a graduate of Newbold College and the University of London, is the curator of ancient manuscripts at the Bodleian Library, Oxford University.

fore had the greatest impact upon the Adventist Church. At the end of 1953 there were 1,215 members in London, almost all indigenous to Britain. Twenty-four years later there were 3,674 members in London, of whom it is doubtful if many more than 200 were indigenous.

An unlikely combination of a hurricane and an act of the United States Congress was the precipitate cause of the current situation. Behind these lay the deeper, long-term cause of the economic situation in the British West Indies, particularly the largest island, Jamaica. That situation, precarious before the Second World War, grew steadily worse after 1945. The traditional remedy was migration, usually to the United States. In 1952, however, after a major hurricane had worsened economic conditions, the US Congress passed the McCarran-Walter Act, which had the effect of drastically reducing the quota of West Indians who could enter the US. But if Uncle Sam's door was shut, John Bull's was open. West Indians, like all other citizens of the Commonwealth, had the right of unlimited entry into Britain. From 1952 until the passage by Parliament of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act of 1962 (which reduced but did not end immigration), between 250,000 and 300,000 West Indians, primarily Jamaicans, settled in Britain. In 1976 the government estimated that some 604,000 persons of West Indian origin or parentage were living there.

Many of these West Indians were Christians when they left their home islands. Their rejection of the forms of Christianity dominant in Britain is one of the most remarkable themes in the story of the migration and serves to throw into sharp relief the impact that that movement has had upon the Adventist Church in Britain.¹

West Indians came to a Britain that was not, in fact, a church-going country. Not only did they find their British workmates and neighbors given to the ridicule of religious practice; they often had to take employment where the working hours made religious observance difficult. Faced with such pressures, many ceased to practice their religion.

Those made of sterner stuff found yet other difficulties when they entered the portals of British churches. Many West Indians are outgoing, while many English people are reserved to a fault. It was not therefore difficult for the West Indian churchgoer to feel that he was not wanted in British churches. On the other hand, some clergymen, anxious to do their part in the cause of integration, singled out the newcomers in a way that embarrassed them. Sheila Patterson in her *Dark Strangers* (University of Indiana, 1964) quotes one immigrant as saying, "The minister ask everyone to welcome our black brother as if I some wild man from the jungle. I never go back there." Moreover, the church in England simply is different from the community in the West Indies with the same name. In the literature on the subject, this comes out repeatedly; the churches in Britain are "cold," the music is not inspiring, the sermons are not sufficiently spirit-filled, and so on. Later, the development of West Indian sects in Britain was to fill the vacuum and to provide a sense of community in an alien environment, but in the early days of the migration the response was simply to stay away. A sociologist, Robin H. Ward, found evidence of this in the sample he interviewed in Manchester in the late 1960s: "Whereas 116 of the 275 interviewed claimed to have been frequent church attenders at home (a minority even then), only 20 claimed this now; and while 27 said that their church attendance was infrequent at home, 110 gave this reply when speaking of the present."² An earlier investigator, the Congregationalist clergyman and sociologist Clifford Hill, who worked much among West Indians in the earlier days of the immigration, came to much the same conclusion. In his *West Indian Migrants and the London Churches* (Oxford, 1963), he says that whereas 69 percent of the West Indians then in London had regularly attended church in their home islands, only 4 percent (2,563) still did so at the time of his investigation, and only 3 percent (1,813) held actual church membership. Even these low percentages, Hill claims, are unrealistically high inasmuch as they are based on the 1961

census figure of 70,488 West Indians in London. Hill maintains that the 1961 figure was nearer 100,000 and that for 1962, 120,000. Hill's picture, however, is not complete, for he takes into consideration only the six major denominations in London. He has nothing to say about Seventh-day Adventism, and it is to this that we must now turn.

Extrapolating from Hill's London figures to arrive at an approximate figure for West Indian church attendance all over Britain in the early 1960s, one comes up with about 7,000, the West Indian population in Britain as a whole being then about 2½ times that in London. This figure of 7,000 excludes Adventists and so, to arrive at the total church-going population among the immigrants, one must add about 3,000 more who were attending Seventh-day Adventist churches. This latter figure is an approximation as no detailed statistics were kept, but a little later than Hill's date, 1,843 West Indians were attending churches in the South England Conference alone, so it is probably not far wide of the mark. Thus, one is led to the startling conclusion that in the early 1960s, some 30 percent of West Indian churchgoers

“It was not until 1962 that church officials began to hint that disproportionately large membership increases since 1953 were due in any part to immigration.”

in Britain were attending Adventist churches. Allowing for some distortion, it is probably safe to say that one in every four West Indians in Britain who wished to worship God in public meetings passed by the imposing edifices of the Anglican, Methodist, Baptist and other churches and sought out the often humble meeting-places of the small Seventh-day Adventist movement. Not without justification, then, did Roswith Gerloff, a Lutheran pastor and authority on race relations and religion, call the

Adventist Church “the only functioning multiracial community in a well-established church body.”³

It is surely remarkable that Adventist immigrants remained faithful to their church in such large numbers. They, too, no doubt, came into the country at the bottom of the economic pyramid; the types of work they could get probably made Sabbath observance difficult. Part of the explanation for their loyalty in spite of difficulty may be that they were better equipped spiritually to withstand the prevailing atmosphere of irreligion in Britain. After all, they had been taught to regard themselves as part of a “remnant” in an apostate world and to expect persecution considerably more severe than the sneers of workmates at the factory bench when they produced a Bible to read in the tea-break or whistled a hymn as they worked. Moreover, the Seventh-day Adventist Church has always stressed the importance of correct beliefs, in contrast to Christian bodies which emphasize certain ritual observances while allowing a wide latitude in doctrine. When the West Indian Adventists came to Britain, they found the same doctrines being taught and the same Sabbath school lessons being studied in Manchester (England) as in Manchester (Jamaica). John Rex and Robert Moore, in their *Race, Community and Conflict: A Study of Sparkbrook* (Oxford, 1967), point out that in the south Birmingham area they investigated only the Adventists and Jehovah's Witnesses among the existing religious groups that had large immigrant memberships (60 percent and 30 percent, respectively). On this they comment that both of these are movements in which “a sense of the rightness of their beliefs binds people together.”

Thus the Adventist immigrants did not come into a totally strange environment when they entered Adventist churches in Britain. They came, too, among an indigenous membership not entirely unacquainted with them, thanks to the weekly missions appeal and to appearances in British Adventist churches of furloughing missionaries with slides. The global and closely integrated na-

ture of the Adventist Church thus ensured a welcome for the earliest newcomers. They were given more than a welcome, however; they were given office. It had never been easy to persuade many English Adventists to accept church office, although, of course, as in all movements, there were some who were avid for it. To local churches which had difficulty in filling their quota of offices, the immigrants were a godsend. On the immigrants' part, church office was welcome because it helped to offset the feeling of rejection by the wider community, a rejection experienced by all, whatever their abilities, on the grounds of color. Non-Adventist writers of the 60s noted this. Malcom Calley, in *God's People* (Oxford, 1964), says, "Seventh-day Adventist congregations strive to make the stranger, whether white or colored, feel at home and the welcome they extend goes far beyond the conventional clerical handshake at the door." Sheila Patterson mentions "the warm welcome extended to newcomers not only by the pastor but by the members of the congregation." Both writers also refer to the practice of giving the immigrants work to do, both in proselytizing activities and in church office.

Although many immigrants intended one day to return to the West Indies, various factors, often economic, tended to convert a planned temporary residence into a permanent one. As a result, the church membership in Britain — in particular its racial makeup — has been vastly transformed, and it is to that transformation and its effects that we now turn.

Even according to official figures, there were in 1978 only 7,144 white members in the British Union, a slight decline from the figure of 25 years earlier. Had the historic net average growth of 100 a year during the years prior to the immigration been maintained, there would have been 9,700 members in addition to immigrants. At best, then, only a static white membership can be claimed for the labor of over a quarter of a century.

It has been argued that there has been a general decline in church membership in most denominations in Britain since 1945 and that Adventism has shared in this. If that is so, it is purely coincidental that the decline

in white membership has proceeded parallel to the immigration of West Indians. This may be true and it is given some substance by the relatively slow growth of the membership in the 1940s. However, another denomination, the Mormons — until recently a racially-discriminatory body that attracted few blacks, and also a movement whose American origin might suggest to the public a closer kinship to Adventism than to the declining denominations — has increased its membership in Britain phenomenally.

Such little relevant research as has been done also seems to point in the direction of some causal connection. Investigation shows that in two all-white areas of the South England Conference the growth rate between 1953 and 1978 continued at the former national average of around two percent, and this without any special evangelistic thrust there. During this same period the white membership in London (also part of the South England Conference) fell by over 80 percent. This may have nothing to do with the fact that in one case there was no black immigration while in London large numbers of immigrant Adventists settled during the period, but it does indicate that the decline in London cannot be attributed only to a general decline in religion in England.

Scholars have noted a connection between the increase in the number of black worshippers in British Adventist churches and the decline in their white counterparts. Rex and Moore, in the work already cited, say (page 188) that in the Birmingham church they studied, West Indians "have come to predominate in the organization and the English have become a minority group. . . . We suspect that the beliefs of this sect and its predominant membership are so alien to the ordinary Englishman that it will not attract any more English members." An immigrant author, Dilip Hiro in *Black British, White British* (revised edition, 1973), after detailing the large percentages of black members in several big-city Adventist churches, goes on to remark (p. 32) that "one of the reasons for this was the white members' propensity to leave as West Indians joined in numbers." He

also quotes the *Birmingham Post* of 4 October 1964, which said, "A study of churches by Robert Moore showed . . . the Seventh-day Adventist church loses white membership where blacks come in."

Such a relationship has indeed been observed by the journal of the most articulate black Adventists themselves. We shall recur to the London Laymen's Forum and its journal *Comment* in due course, but suffice it to say here that the former is an organization of black laity in London which has played an important part in the events yet to be narrated. In an article entitled "Which Way Now?" in *Comment*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (January 1977), G. S. Escoffery notes that "in the 1940s Holloway Church had over 300 members, 99 percent of whom were indigenous. Today there are over 500 members, 99 percent of whom are immigrants. This applies," he continues, "to dozens of other churches around Britain; this is known as the 'white flight.'"

All this leads one to ask why an integrated church was so hard to establish in the big cities. Little research has been done, however, though writers who have addressed the issue have pointed to differences of outlook, custom and mores to which the indigenous English have had difficulty adjusting.⁴

Whatever the reasons were for white withdrawal from city churches in the fifties and sixties, there were a few cases in which white members who had ceased attendance at their original churches when black membership there had become substantial were reclaimed for the movement when white companies were established in predominantly white areas not too far away. This was the case at Bromley, just outside London, to which members who had ceased to attend the Lewisham church, a few miles away within the metropolitan area, were eventually attracted.

It was not until 1962 that church officials began to hint that disproportionately large membership increases since 1953 were due in any part to immigration. At the Union session of that year, J. H. Bayliss, the South England Conference president, said, "While a large proportion of our membership net

increase has resulted from public and sundry other forms of evangelism, we cannot overlook the fact of immigrants from parts of the Commonwealth, particularly the West Indies, accounting for a fair section of the balance." Thereafter, the true situation began to be acknowledged publicly. At the end of 1965, according to Bayliss' successor, E. H. Foster, the membership of the South England Conference was 5,869, of whom 75 percent were white and 25 percent black. By 1968 the black membership in South England had edged ahead of the white, and two years later the percentages were given officially as 53 percent black and 47 percent white. In 1972 there were 3,988 black members in South England and 3,099 white, with approximately 3,000 black and 840 white children attending. For several years subsequently, accessions to the membership were to average two blacks to one white. And all the while white attendance — in contrast to the situation among blacks — was considerably lower than the figure for white membership. Exactly comparable figures for the North England (later North British) Conference are not available, but the trend seems to have been parallel although the numbers are lower.

In this new situation discontent gradually arose. Among blacks, this centered initially upon the English ministry. As Gerloff remarks, ". . . in Jamaica the pastor still serves as the real social worker."⁵ Most British ministers did not see themselves in such a role, having not been trained for it or called upon to exercise it before.

Before long, requests for black ministers began to be heard and they grew in volume as church after church in the cities became black until in some cases only the minister was white. The answer given to such requests was always that the British field could not afford to call black ministers with the accompanying expenses of furlough rights and so on. With hindsight it is easy to say that this was a mistake which was to have far-reaching consequences. It is possible that had black ministers been placed in certain churches in the fifties and early sixties, a polarization

would have taken place — each community going to where it found the style of worship and service to which it was accustomed — which would have resulted in a *de facto* regional system on American lines. That course was not taken and the penalties for not taking it became apparent as early as 1959 in an incident which was to become a sort of touchstone in racial relationships in the Adventist Church in Britain.

In 1953 an evangelistic center had been opened in the former New Gallery Cinema on Regent Street in the most fashionable part of London's West End. By 1959 large num-

“Indeed, what some of the more articulate immigrants saw as racial discrimination was simply the normal Adventist discrimination against the laity.”

bers of immigrants were attending evangelistic services there, and the church which met there on Sabbaths was largely black. As blacks came in, white attendance declined, though it cannot be proved, of course, that the former movement caused the latter. The important fact, however, is that the church administrators of the time believed that it did and acted upon that belief.

In 1959 a circular was sent to black members asking them not to frequent the New Gallery on Sundays. At the same time plans were set in motion to find a new home for the church which met there on Sabbaths. That action has been looked upon as a gratuitous piece of blatant racial discrimination and, as such, has figured in various articles in *Comment* and in letters from the London Laymen's Forum to the General Conference. It would perhaps be nearer to the truth to say that it was a course of desperation which might never have been necessary had there been even a small corps of black ministers in London at the time who could have handled the problem. A problem there undoubtedly was. The reading-room, for example, fur-

nished rather luxuriously and equipped with Adventist literature to attract the general public, was being used on Sabbath afternoons as a place to eat sandwiches and attend to babies. There had also been complaints from the police about the blocking of the footway outside the building after services. Black pastors would probably have been able to impose a discipline which would have been accepted without rancor. The white administration could do so only at the cost of still-existing bitterness.

During the 1960s the steady increase in the black membership and stagnation in the white went on. Successive administrators tried to convince themselves that there was no problem and, given two traditional Adventist attitudes, this appeared to be true. One was the denominational obsession with numbers. The numbers kept on going up. The other was the traditional dominance of the clergy in the Adventist Church. The laity have never been allowed to play any really significant part in the government of the church, and as almost all the blacks in that period were lay people, they had no more influence upon administration than the white laity had. Indeed, what some of the more articulate immigrants saw as racial discrimination was simply the normal Adventist discrimination against the laity. Many of the demands they voiced, unavailingly, at conference sessions (for example, for church schools) had been voiced — equally unavailingly — for many years before by white lay members.

On November 23, 1973, a group of blacks in the London area founded the London Laymen's Forum, whose stated aim was “to encourage the progress of the church in Great Britain.” According to the forum, this would be achieved by the appointment of more colored ministers (“because cultural differences make it difficult for many ministers to understand our colored members”); by “proportional representation on the executive committees of conferences and union”; and by “more expenditure in immigrant areas.” Other goals were “a regional representative at the conference office”; “colored office staff”; and “immigrant-

orientated articles in church papers” (*Comment*, Vol. 1, No. 1).

In June 1974 the London Laymen’s Forum began to publish a duplicated paper entitled *Comment*. The third issue of this paper (September/October 1974) summarized a document recently sent to the General Conference. Beginning with the exclusion of West Indians from the New Gallery, it further made specific complaints of discrimination concerning the locating of evangelistic campaigns, the small number of black ministers in Britain, the lack of black representation on various committees, and the alleged encouragement by the administration of the “hiving off of white members into strictly white enclaves,” etc. It further charged that large numbers of black young people were leaving the church because they were denied church school education and black leadership.

The same issue of *Comment* (p. 2) urged that “our administrators must sit up soon and take notice of the stream of justifiable discontent in the mainly immigrant churches. They must not let it become a raging torrent which could tear apart the unity in our beloved church.” Ironically, at about the time these remarks were being published, E. H. Foster, now union president, was in Washington, D.C., with an extremely detailed memorandum on the situation in the British Union, what could be done to improve it, and an appeal for the money to do just that. The General Conference, with a fine sense of impartiality, turned a deaf ear to both pleas.

In May 1975 *Comment* devoted itself to the forthcoming conference sessions, urging “full and complete integration, unity and growth.” At the South England session, held at Plymouth, two London Laymen’s Forum leaders were put on the conference executive committee, and the plans committee produced a resolution entitled “Integration and Growth.” Most of what has happened in the British Union since then has flowed in some sense from this resolution.

The South England executive committee appointed a subcommittee to consider the resolution. According to *Comment* (Vol. 4, No. 1, p. 3), the subcommittee rejected both the resolution’s suggestion of black represen-

tation at departmental and administrative levels and the suggestion of a separate London conference which would, of course, have been almost completely black. Instead, the idea of a regional conference on American lines was then taken up and recommended to the full executive committee which passed the suggestion to the British Union. The Union, in turn, set up a study committee under the chairmanship of the secretary of the Northern Europe-West Africa Division. This committee recommended that a regional conference was feasible, suggesting an entity embracing nine churches in the South England Conference with a total membership of well under 2,000 (97 percent black and 3 percent white), while leaving in the remainder of the South England Conference nearly 6,000 members (42 percent black and 58 percent white).

“As far as the British Union Conference administration was concerned, Adventists in Britain had rejected the idea of a regional conference, and that was the end of the matter. No other possibilities were to be explored.”

The study committee recommended that the entire British Union hold a referendum on the matter, though it, in fact, concerned only the South England Conference. The October 15, 1976, issue of the union paper, *Messenger*, carried an article by E. H. Foster explaining the referendum together with voting papers which had to be returned within one week.

Comment, Vol. 4, No. 1 (January 1977) complained about “the rejection of the forum’s suggestion for an Integrated London Conference and the administration’s imposition of a referendum about a regional conference,” although in fact the forum had now come to support the idea of a regional conference itself. *Comment’s* objection to the referendum was that white members had been allowed to vote. Although the racial makeup

of the vote has never been revealed, it is believed that most of the white voters cast their ballots in favor of a regional conference. However, there must have been a very large black vote against a regional conference, for the figures published on December 10, 1976, showed 4,629 members opposed to such an innovation and only 849 in favor of it. As far as the British Union Conference administration was concerned, Adventists in Britain had rejected the idea of a regional conference, and that was the end of the matter. No other possibilities were to be explored. The status quo would be maintained.

The forum, however, had new ideas. The January 1977 issue of *Comment* gave a hint of its intentions. It said clearly that it could not “in all honesty accept a “no” vote as binding,” and another article in the same issue referred to a “powerful weapon” in the hands of the black members to achieve a regional conference.

In its next issue (Vol. 4, No. 2, March/April 1977), *Comment* allowed at least the hilt of the weapon to show by saying that the feasibility committee had been doubtful whether the remainder of the British Union could operate without the money which would henceforth be confined to a regional conference. In a memorandum to the General Conference, sent in May, the forum urged the establishment of a regional conference by September 1, 1978, “under the direction of the General Conference.” In its last issue of that year (Vol. 4, No. 4, September/October 1977), *Comment* reported that so far five churches with a combined membership of 1,118, including one with 295 members in the North British Conference, had voted in favor of a regional conference in soundings it had taken. In addition, it said, there were hundreds of other members in favor of such a reorganization. “The desire for regional conference overwhelmingly exists,” it concluded.

The campaign for a regional conference was furthered by other Laymen’s Forum publications. The most significant document was a well-produced pamphlet entitled *Towards Regional Conference*, in which the

“powerful weapon,” referred to earlier in *Comment*, was starkly revealed. “Have our brethren suddenly learned to love us as equals? Their refusal to share responsibility in the church with us suggests, not love of us, but love of something we have which is necessary for their well-being.”

As early as June 1976, one of the Laymen’s Forum leaders, Michael Kellawan, had been interviewed by *The Observer*, a national Sunday newspaper, and in the resultant article on June 27 appeared the words: “Most of the 23 churches in London, for example, are now predominantly black and there is resentment that their sacrificial tithe payments go into largely [sic] white hands . . . Mr. Kellawan is withholding his tithe and paying the money into a special bank account.” In 1977 three London churches withheld tithe completely and were estimated to have kept back some £18,000 (\$36,000). This was for only the latter part of the year and did not take into account tithe withheld by individuals in other churches.

The weapon (or perhaps the two weapons, for it may be that the implied threat of adverse publicity had an even more telling effect than the withholding of tithe) speedily proved effective. On March 8, 1978, the president of the General Conference with three senior General Conference officers and the officers of the Northern Europe-West Africa Division and the British Union Conference stood before a gathering in the New Gallery Center to unveil peace proposals to end the “tithe war.”

Although the meeting was to propound a policy for the whole union, almost all those present were from London (apart from the officers and committee members) and so most of the laity at least were black. Much of the day was spent in speech-making, from which it soon became apparent that there was considerable — although by no means unanimous — support for a regional conference on the part of the London laity. It was equally apparent that the General Conference representatives wished for no such thing. The reason for this, although publicly couched in spiritual terms, is perhaps not far to seek. The tide of agitation for black unions in the United States had for some time been

lapping ominously around the feet of the General Conference. The advocates of black unions were arguing that their establishment was a logical continuation of the policy begun in the 1940s with the creation of black conferences. The retort to this was that what had been appropriate in the 1940s was no longer so in the vastly changed climate of opinion of the 1970s. That argument would have been stultified by the creation of a black conference in Britain in 1978-79. Thus, not only did the General Conference misread the British situation by reading it in terms of that prevailing in America (from which, in fact, it differs enormously), but it was also willing to use the plight of the British Union as a pawn in a larger game of denominational power politics.

At about 4 p.m., the General Conference president arose to unveil what came to be known as the "Pierson Package." The "Package," as subsequently printed in the

"Some British Adventists now believe that in a short time a London-type situation will prevail over the whole union with only a few dying pockets of white membership remaining."

Messenger, began with a preface consisting largely of quotations from Mrs. White about the relationships between Americans and Europeans, used here to apply to those between blacks and whites. It then went on to set forth a series of proposals for "more meaningful racial representation" in the church, ranging from black typists in offices to black officers and departmental directors in the union and conferences. All committees and boards were to have greater black representation. Human relations workshops, a black youth center in London, better educational facilities for blacks and so on — all were to flow forth from a bountiful General Conference. The meeting was urged to accept this and to persuade the churches it represented to do likewise. Then at the ensuing

local conference sessions (1978) and the union session (1981) the proposals would be voted and implemented.

The earlier of those local sessions was little more than two months away, so there was not much time for opposition to crystallize. The London Laymen's Forum apparently decided to accept the "Package" and drop its campaign for a regional conference. Certainly by the time the South England and North British sessions convened (in that order) in May, there was no manifest black opposition to the proposals. Opposition, however, came from another quarter.

There neither was nor is a white organization comparable to the London Laymen's Forum. Indeed, the whole controversy so far had been between the white administration supported by the white ministers and the black laity supported by the few black ministers. It seemed to be forgotten that there was a third group to be considered, the white laity. Among some of those signs of dissent began to appear. Eventually white lay opposition in the South England Conference (there seems to have been none — at least articulate — in the North) came to concentrate upon two points: the election to union and conference offices of men with no experience of work in Britain and the increased representation of blacks on conference committees which (if not modified) could have eliminated white lay representation altogether.

In these circumstances a group of white lay members took a leaf from the forum's book and resorted to the duplicating machine. A circular was sent to a number of delegates outlining the background to the "Package" proposals, giving support to the demand for black ministers for black churches, but protesting against the two proposals mentioned.

The first debate on the proposals took place on the last day of the South England session at Bournemouth, May 18-21, 1978. On the Saturday evening before the debate, a group of white laity met the division officers. What happened at that meeting is a matter of some controversy, but the lay members present came away with the impression that a

promise had been made that no specific names would be brought forward by the South England Conference nominating committee for certain conference posts. Rather, a number of black ministers would be brought into the country and then be assigned to specific conference offices.

The Sunday morning debate was opened by the division president who promoted the "Package" in a lengthy speech with only a hint of the Saturday evening agreement. The chairman then announced that no speaker would be allowed more than two minutes. White lay delegates who had been at the Saturday night meeting supported the "Package" because they believed that the arrangement made then was the best they could secure. Others were divided and disconcerted by the suddenly announced gag-rule. Although a card ballot had been promised, as had separate votes on the various parts of the "Package," neither was implemented when it came to voting. As a result the proposals were carried easily although the objection about lay representation on the executive was met by a constitutional amendment increasing the committee's size.

The nominating committee then met. Under the terms of the "Package," it was assumed that the conference secretaryship would be reserved for a black. Those who had been present at the Saturday night meeting expected that this post would be left vacant until the arrival of the black ministers from overseas from whom a choice would be made. However, in direct contradiction to the agreement, the name of someone unknown to almost all members in Britain was forced through. The lay activities directorship was left vacant, but this made no real difference as the man eventually appointed received a direct call to the post. To emphasize the administration's rout of the white protestants, all the lay members who had signed the circular against certain aspects of the "Package" were *ipso facto* excluded from consideration for membership of the conference executive committee on division advice, while a member of the London Laymen's Forum was elected to it. Thus was inaugurated the new era of integration, racial harmony, brotherly love and mutual trust in

the South England Conference. Inasmuch as there was a black candidate for the secretaryship already working in the North British Conference, things went more smoothly at that session the following week.

In the nearly three years that have passed since the adoption of the "Package," there has been a curious shift of roles. The London Laymen's Forum appears to have accepted the prevailing situation, perhaps secure in the belief that weight of numbers will soon deliver the denomination in Britain over to black control. That some blacks so believe was evidenced in the winter of 1979-80 by an anonymous document sent to a number of overseas divisions and unions listing the white administrators in the British Union who would be free in 1981 to accept appointments elsewhere after their places had been filled by blacks at the conference and union sessions.

On the other hand, a group of white ministers in South England has voiced a demand for a regional system. This has resulted in a series of meetings culminating in a unionwide ministerial gathering at Coventry in September 1980. Here it was decided to set up a committee to look into the matter. Nothing further has been made public.

The conference sessions of 1981 are likely to prove crucial, for beyond the mere struggle for power, lie two irreconcilable concepts of the church. If it exists primarily for the spiritual succour of its membership, then the race that predominates in the membership should have the principal voice in its government and be given the opportunity to remake the organization in its own image with, it is to be hoped, some safeguards for the minority. If, however, the church's chief function is evangelistic, then primacy must be given to maintaining an organization which will appeal to the vast bulk of the population with, again, suitable provision for attracting the minority also.

The former case means black administrators spending the bulk of the funds available on projects appealing to blacks within the church (such as the very costly school recently established in London). The latter

implies a mainly white administration spending the bulk of the funds on evangelism aimed at the 97 percent white population (a suggestion for black and white budget advisory committees was rejected by the present union administration). In either case, however, whites or blacks, respectively, must be served by an organization catering for their particular tastes and needs.

It may be that the last opportunity to set up such a system was lost in 1978 when the "Pierson Package" prevented the establishment of a regional system. At that time a regional conference arrangement could not have been damned as "apartheid" since the most articulate blacks were demanding it. Some British Adventists now believe that in a short time a London-type situation will prevail over the whole union with only a few dying pockets of white membership remaining. When Adventism in Britain has thus become a black sect, the only remnants of a small, but spiritually thriving, white denomination will be back where their forebears started a century ago, meeting in

small groups in private homes, but owing no allegiance (or money) to an organization, whether at Watford or Washington, which has long since abandoned them.

Whether this ultra-pessimistic prophecy proves to be well-founded or not will depend very largely upon what — if anything — is done in the next two or three years. Adventism in Britain will not be helped by blacks accusing of racism anyone who wants to see an Adventist witness to whites survive in Britain. Neither will it be aided by whites hurling the charge of "black power" at blacks who honestly feel that their weight of numbers in the membership gives them the right to rule. The only hope for Britain would seem to be the overriding power of the Holy Spirit. Only through divine guidance can goodwill and a willingness to experiment (notably lacking thus far) make possible a *modus vivendi* whereby both communities co-exist peacefully in the same organized body. Meanwhile, in Britain, the body of Christ lies wounded, perhaps unto death.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The earlier part of this article is a precis of the treatment of the same subject in the author's *A Century of Adventism in the British Isles*, published in 1974 as a special edition of the union paper, *Messenger*. See pp. 40-44.

2. Robin H. Ward, "Some Aspects of Religious Life in an Immigrant Area in Manchester," *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, 3 (1970), 18.

3. Roswith Gerloff, "Black Christian Communities in Birmingham: The Problem of Basic Rec-

ognition," *Religion in the Birmingham Area: Essays in the Sociology of Religion*, ed. Alan Bryman, n.d. (?1975), p. 70.

4. See Cynthia Handysides, "West Indian Integration in the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Britain" (BEd thesis, University of Reading, 1968), pp. 20, 21; and Clifford S. Hill, "Some Aspects of Race and Religion in Britain," *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, 3 (1970), 35-6.

5. Gerloff, p. 74.

The British Union: Some Comments on the Issues

by Jeanie Picart

I shall attempt to reply specifically to certain portions of Mr. Porter's article which I believe warrant definite answers, but I see the article as the tip of the iceberg, with the real issues lying below the surface; it is to these that I primarily wish to devote myself.

Mr. Porter is to be commended for the amount of research he has obviously done, and for his attempt to walk the middle line on a very emotional and highly charged topic. If the points raised are the personal views of the author only, they are important. If, as I sense, he is the articulate voice for a larger white constituency in the British Adventist Church, then they become highly significant.

Britain has during the past half-century edged its way toward being what the popular press likes to term "a multiracial society." This trend has been even more pronounced among Adventists, putting the British Adventist Church in a unique position to set the world an example of true Christianity and racial harmony. Whether we have

achieved this goal is a different matter. As Porter implies, initially, when there were only a few black Adventists in England, they were welcomed, but when it became clear that these people were no longer passing through, and that the racial makeup of the church was changing, the welcome began to cool. If we ask "Why?" part of the answer, surely, will be the feelings of fear and hurt and loss that often attend our human attempts to love all our brothers and sisters.

However we explain this matter, Porter, as I interpret him, is now concerned 1) with what he sees as the problem of a church two-thirds black evangelizing a predominantly white community, and 2) with the diminishing numbers of the whites who make up one-third of the British Adventist Church. Mr. Porter implies that black immigration has negatively affected white membership numbers, and also that it has deterred other whites from joining the church. But this begs the question of the type of "Christian" one is hoping to attract and to keep in the church, and that surely is an important consideration.

Suppose we accept Porter's claim that black immigration drove out white members, some of whom were "subsequently reclaimed for the movement when white com-

Jeanie Picart has spent most of her life in England, although she was born in Jamaica. At present she is a doctoral student in plant physiology at Cambridge University.

panies were established in predominantly white areas.” Was this caused by mere apprehension of two different cultures facing each other in a common worship hall, or is the real question “Who wants to attend a black church?” Is there some form of stigma attached to this strange venture? There seems to be the unspoken implication that blacks somehow lower the standards of “white Adventism,” as though the concern is with the difference between first and second-class citizens — one definitely does not mix the two because the first-class person runs the risk of being categorized as second class!

If so, what type of person will we be hoping to attract to the church? The white academia? The doctors, lawyers, dentists? People from all walks of life? Will the drunk, the drug addict, find room in the church? Will a “soul rating” be assigned to each person, based on financial status, academic excellence? What happens if only the souls rated “zero,” the “sinners,” the down-and-outs of society, are attracted? Will we leave to form new, *exclusive* churches? Once we start classifying people, we lose sight of the individuality of a human soul, upon which Christ placed such store that he said, “If only one . . . I would still have come!”

Concerning Britain’s lack of regional conferences on American lines, all that can be said is that such a setup is an indictment of American Adventism. The fact that the London Laymen’s Forum seems to have campaigned for a regional conference appears, on the face of it, rather strange; but it should be borne in mind that the suggestion for a regional conference came from administrative levels, and that the original aim of the London Laymen’s Forum was for “full and complete integration, unity and growth.” That the regional conference was suggested, and the London Laymen’s Forum came to subscribe to the idea, is past history. The outcome so far has been a failure to establish a regional conference; perhaps God has merely been saying to all concerned, “I am still in command.”

At one point Porter addresses the question why an integrated church has been so hard to

establish. It no doubt has to do with racial bigotry and insularity, and these raise the question, “Why have these crept into the church, and on what do they feed in our ‘enlightened’ society?” The answer is partly historical. To justify slavery, whites had to convince themselves that the slave was sub-human; once convinced, they were hard to unconvince. The church, by not raising a

“There seems to be the unspoken implication that blacks somehow lower the standards of ‘white Adventism,’ as though the concern is with the difference between first- and second-class citizens.”

loud enough voice — and in this I implicate all the churches, helped to maintain the status quo, and never set out wholeheartedly to restore to the black race the humanity and dignity with which God endowed all men at creation. Consider, too, the picture we have — and here I specifically implicate Adventist literature — of the origin of the races. Before the differentiation of the races, there was one race . . . and it was white! To see this, ask yourself what picture comes to mind when I say, “God, Adam and Eve, angels.”

Turning now to Porter’s hope for a church that will appeal, as he says, to “the vast bulk of the population” — this would involve, he believes, “mainly white administration” of a church now mainly black — we may simply note a warning sounded by Martin Luther King:

Nowhere is the tendency to conform more evident than in the church which has served to crystallize, conserve and even bless the patterns of majority opinion. The erstwhile sanction by the church of slavery, racial segregation, war and economic exploitation is testimony to the fact that the church harkened more to the authority of the world than to the authority of God. Called to be the moral guardian of the community, the church at times has pre-

served that which is immoral and unethical. Called to lead men on the highway of brotherhood and to summon them to rise above the narrow confines of race and class, it has enunciated and practiced racial exclusiveness (*The Strength to Love*).

Jonathan Butler, in his *Insight* articles (January 1979) on church relations, points out that church leaders have not always been apathetic on the subject of race relations. He recorded the words of former General Conference President William Branson:

“Perhaps no religious group in the US or the world claims so loudly that it is international in its attitudes and services as do Seventh-day Adventists, and yet in this matter of Negro segregation we are trailing behind. Shall we wait till our hands are forced on this matter, or shall we move forward carefully but surely as men who believe that all ye are brethren? It seems that we have come full circle; the question is, do we now move forward or backwards?”

This, perhaps, is a word for us today.

The Bible’s account of man’s creation makes it quite clear there can be no such thing as a superior race in God’s sight. The whole of mankind was created in God’s image, without racial and cultural distinction. As David Field, in his *Taking Sides*, has written: “The dignity and equality which creation in the divine image gives each human being brands every attempt to discriminate between men on racial grounds abhorrent to God. . . . As a result of Christ’s reconciling death, therefore, all divisive racial partitions between Christians are smashed.” There is neither Jew nor Greek, as Paul declares, for we are all one in Christ. In light of this, how can we justify regionalism and separation as a matter of social expedience? What are we going to make of John’s vision, in the book of Revelation, of the heavenly congregation standing before the throne and before the Lamb, its members coming “from every nation, from all tribes and peoples and tongues”? (Revelation 7:9).

Every day we pray “Our Father.” When will we realize the universality of the God whom we worship, and how lightly we use words? Says Martin Luther King in *Strength to Love*:

A spiritual myopia limits our visions to external accidents. We see men as Jews, Gentiles, Catholics or Protestants, Chinese or Americans, Blacks or Whites. We fail to think of them as fellow human beings, made from the same basic stuff as we, moulded in the same divine image. When the church is true to its nature (the nature of God), it knows neither division nor disunity.

I accept this view, and agree with David Field that the Christian “is to insist on nothing less than full integration, especially in the church, where any kind of spiritual apartheid is ruled out altogether by New Testament teaching” (*Taking Sides*).

In conclusion let me say that my first reading of Porter’s article left me numb. It was the type of attitude I had heard for well over a decade, but this time it came from within the church of which I am a member, and with a religious slant to it! All of us, of course, are prejudiced to a greater or lesser degree. Once we can admit we are prejudiced, we are on the road to recovery — not by might or power, but by the spirit of the Lord. I may have taken what sounds like a hard and emotional line on a seemingly insignificant problem, but for too long, racial bigotry has been cherished and nurtured and called by every other name except by its God-given one — sin!

I hope that in the light of all that has been said, we can now examine our lives, acknowledge our sin, and together with the poet Langston Hughes dream a dream of a world, by God’s grace to become a reality, where “love will bless the earth and peace its paths adorn,” a world where “black or white, Whatever race you be, Will share the bounties of the earth, And everyman is free.”

The New Adventist Health Care Corporations

by Geri Ann Fuller

Pat Horning left her post as associate editor of *Listen* magazine late in 1980 to become public relations director of Florida Hospital. The year before, Fred Hauck resigned his job as academic dean of Columbia Union College to accept a position as personnel director at New England Memorial Hospital. Don Prior, who was vice president for public relations and fund development at Andrews University and held a similar vice presidency at Loma Linda University, left in 1979 to assume a post with the same title at Glendale Adventist Medical Center.

Don McAdams, president of Southwestern Adventist College, reports that "Since I've been here, we've lost three nursing instructors, two maintenance people, and one computer person to Adventist hospitals, all for increases in pay. Colleges and hospitals are in direct competition in areas like public relations and development, maintenance, nursing, computer science, and business administration."

Geri Ann Fuller, community relations director of the Washington Adventist Hospital, graduated from Columbia Union College and received a master's in journalism and public affairs from American University.

The intensified lure of medical institutions — in part due to their higher pay scales — for employees in other denominational institutions is only one of several issues raised by Adventists forming large health care organizations. With a total of 65 hospitals, 9,300 beds and combined assets of more than \$661 million, the four Adventist health care corporations are big business. According to an October 1980 article in *Modern Health Care*, one of the major hospital management journals, "A merger of the four corporations would make the consolidated Adventist system the nation's seventh largest operator of acute care hospital beds behind the five large investor-owned chains and New York City's municipal Health and Hospitals Corporation. (The regional) Adventist health systems (already) rank first, second and fourth among all Protestant multihospital systems." Adventist health care corporations were organized in the 1970s as a response to the need for greater expertise and control in dealing with government regulations, third-party payers and increasingly sophisticated technology.

Adventist health systems are part of a national trend. According to a recent American Hospital Association survey, such multihos-

pital systems already operate 1,400 of the 5,805 community hospitals in the United States. It has been estimated that as many as 80 percent of eligible community hospitals, if not already members, are at least negotiating involvement with a multihospital system. Adventist hospital administrators make strong arguments in favor of Adventist hospitals being organized into such corporations. But the support of the Adventist health care corporations for salaries higher than those paid in some other Adventist institutions fuels strong feelings.

Dr. McAdams sees the church's wage and benefit policies as a source of widespread and deeply rooted bitterness among those in the higher education field. "I think we should be either fish or fowl," said McAdams. "Either we all sacrifice or we all get community rates. . . . Almost everybody, including ministers, elementary and high school teachers and hospital people, are already getting community rates, and some are getting even more."

The \$45,000 to \$50,000 salary an administrator earns in the top echelons of the Adventist health care work in North America may appear to be a sacrificial wage when compared to the \$125,000 or more he could earn in the same job outside the church, but next to a salary in the low \$20,000's earned by his counterpart in the Adventist educational work, it seems generous indeed. Although neither church leaders nor educational administrators seem individually to resent the large salaries commanded by those in the health care work, most admit that the disparity between hospital corporation salaries and denominational wages is one of the most sensitive problems raised by the formation of Adventist health care corporations.

A crucial factor in the decision to approve the higher wage scales was that, unlike in other areas of church work, hospital employees are not paid out of church funds. As North American Division President C. E. Bradford put it, "The church is not going to benefit if we pay these people less — only Blue Cross and Blue Shield."

Also, many believe it would be impossible to attract competent management personnel capable of running a financially sound in-

stitution at wages at or below those being paid to rank and file employees. And with nursing shortages which have reached crisis proportions in some areas in recent years, hospitals have had no reasonable choice but to offer competitive wages to the rank and file employees. Thus, the present guidelines for administrative salaries are based on a formula which takes into account the size of the hospital and the community rates for floor-duty registered nurses. When the General Conference blessed the large wage scales for administrators, it was with the understanding that other benefits, except those specifically approved by the General Conference (such as medical and educational benefits) would be dropped. Previously, some medical institutions were quietly recruiting personnel by offering perquisites ranging from luxury cars to low-cost housing.

Of course, hospital administrators defending the creation of the health care corporations believe it is unfortunate that attention has focused on salaries. They say that they organized the corporations to lower purchasing costs, increase efficiency and facilitate expansion of the Adventist health work into new geographical areas. The concept of such corporations was formally introduced to the Adventist Church in 1972 at General Conference-sponsored meetings in Mexico City. A committee was appointed at that time to study setting up health care corporations along union lines in response to difficulties experienced by many of the smaller hospitals in coping with complexities like Medicaid. The committee, chaired by R. R. Beitz, then a vice president of the General Conference, included such veteran Adventist hospital administrators as George Nelson, Harley Rice, and Irwin Remboldt, as well as other administrators from large and small hospitals. The committee agreed on a concept whereby corporations would be supported by dues from the member hospitals and would provide centralized services in areas where cost savings could be achieved or effectiveness maximized by centralization.

From that stepping-off point, however, the individual unions developed at their own

pace and according to their own structures. Hospitals in the Southern Union were probably the earliest to develop a strong corporation, followed by those in the Pacific Union. Other corporations, like Eastern States Adventist Health Service, in the Columbia Union, remained for several years little more than loose federations of hospitals.

Because of their additional power and therefore ability to deal with outside agencies, union-based corporations in the late 1970s began to form across union lines. The corporations in the Southern and Southwestern Union conferences formed Adventist Health Systems/Sunbelt; Pacific and Northern Pacific Union Conference corporations became Adventist Health Systems-West, and the Columbia and Central Union corporations merged into Adventist Health Systems/Eastern and Middle-America. As recently as early 1981, the health care corporations in the Great Lakes region and New England formally merged into Adventist Health Systems-North.

Why the rush of Adventists and others to form such corporations? They can provide financial and management expertise, added power to deal with regulators, and financial assistance to allow some hospitals to survive. Corporate offices can also provide assistance in dealing in capital markets, data processing, credit collections, accounting and auditing, insurance programs, purchasing, recruitment, and a whole host of other areas of skills that most institutions could not afford to buy on their own. Although funds have been spent by the Adventist health corporations on such unlikely items as bailing out an ailing medical school in Mexico and the purchase of corporate jets, corporate executives justify the expenses as either furthering the aims of the church at large or producing long-range savings.

The services available and degree of centralization varies from one Adventist hospital corporation to another. In Sunbelt the hospitals have pooled their cash resources to institute a cash management system which has enabled the hospitals to reduce borrowing from outside sources and to automatically

invest cash balances on a daily basis. Eastern and Middle America, which only merged formally in January 1980, already has made available centralized data processing. Adventist Health Systems-West, in addition to pioneering the group purchasing and

“The crossing of union lines to form hospital corporations has raised some questions about who is in control. But union presidents seem satisfied that the church is maintaining its authority”

group malpractice insurance programs, was the first system to have a consolidated financial statement for all member hospitals, and it has also standardized the articles of incorporation and the bylaws for all its hospitals. Adventist Health Systems-West also has a more centralized structure than the other corporations. The corporate office staffs a collection center for hospital accounts, a department specializing in maximizing third-party reimbursements, a foundation for fund-raising activities, and several marketing corporations, among other things.

The crossing of union lines to form hospital corporations has raised some questions about who is in control (since formerly the unions were in lines of authority). But union presidents seem satisfied that the church is maintaining its authority, even in the new, larger structures. Not only do the corporation presidents report to union leadership, which makes up a large portion of both the corporate board and membership, but the North American Services Board adds another layer of official church influence. The board was set up at the 1976 Annual Council to set guidelines and provide an oversight function. Board representation is made up of the presidents of the health care corporations, union presidents, and General Conference representatives. The board sets

goals, objectives, and standards for the operation of Adventist hospitals; oversees group purchasing for all Adventist hospitals; determines group malpractice insurance policies; and sets administrative salary scales.

Even though most hospital administrators indicated support for the corporations, all are not necessarily convinced that they are yet getting their dollar's worth of value from the corporations, especially when part of that dollar value can look very much like a loss of autonomy. However, Herb Shiroma, president of Washington Adventist Hospital in Takoma Park, Maryland, defends the cost of corporations on the basis of "intangibles" received. "I think every administrator has pet areas where he questions the money being spent by the corporation," he said. "But what price do you put on having a financially sound hospital? When you have somebody looking over your shoulder to doublecheck and it happens to save you \$50 to \$100 thousand, how much is that worth? I also feel that the corporate dues are part of the price I pay to help my church," he adds, referring to the fact that in many situations, larger hospitals pay a disproportionately high share of dues to help make available the services of the corporation to smaller hospitals that can less well afford them.

One of the intangible benefits that comes from the corporations is a new sense of cooperation and teamwork among member hospitals. More than one hospital executive indicated that before the corporations were established, about the only time Adventist hospitals had anything to do with one another was when they were trying to steal each other's best people.

Under the management agreement by which Adventist health care corporations operate their hospitals, administrative staff draw their salaries from the corporations and are responsible to it. The corporation appoints the administrator, although corporate executives are quick to point out that they would not put an administrator in a hospital where he was unacceptable to the board. The corporations also set standards for management and provide expertise where it is

needed to assist in running the hospital. The local board retains responsibility for quality of care, making sure the hospital meets standards for accreditation and state licensure, medical staff relationships and operating according to the budget. Each hospital in the corporation is still self-contained in terms of legal ownership and has its own bylaws and articles of incorporation. But at least one corporation has already standardized the bylaws and articles of incorporation for all its hospitals, and with other corporations considering a similar move, hospitals may be in for tighter, more direct control by the corporations.

Adventist involvement in developing health care corporations was not motivated simply to improve efficiency. Besides preventing Adventist hospitals from joining other health care consortiums (and thus jeopardizing the peculiarly "Adventist" character of the institutions), developing the corporations was an aggressive move to strengthen Adventist influence through acquisition of hospitals in communities where Adventist presence had been minimal or nonexistent. "Within five years," says Russell Shawver, president of Adventist Health Systems/Eastern and Middle America, "The potential for expansion of the Adventist Health System by acquisition will be past — and it is now impossible, except in most unusual situations," he says.

Already, acquisition is really the only route left by which the Adventist health care work can expand, because health planning agencies have nearly put an end to the construction of brand-new hospitals. In the Washington, D.C. area, for example, Shady Grove Adventist Hospital opened in 1979 amid widespread public debate over whether Montgomery County actually needed 225 more hospital beds.

Corporate executives point to thriving Adventist communities — such as those in Tillamook, Oregon; Moberly, Missouri; Durand, Wisconsin; and Hackettstown, New Jersey — where there was no Adventist presence until an Adventist hospital was established, as evidence that this expansion of the health care work is helping the church to accomplish its mission.

What happened in Moberly, Missouri, may in fact be a prime example of what the corporations can accomplish. The 18,000-member community had two hospitals, one proprietary and one nonprofit, but both had inadequate facilities and were failing financially. Tensions between the two hospitals were creating such a divisive atmosphere in the community that both hospitals were having trouble holding on to their medical staffs and more than half the residents of the town were going outside the area for their health care. When executives from what was then Mid-America Adventist Health System heard of the problems, they went to the local health planning agency and learned that even the regulators were baffled by the problems. So they approached the nonprofit hospital and proposed to rebuild the hospital in exchange for taking over the management of the hospital. "They were a little startled by our approach," admits Shawver now. "I think they felt at first that it was like giving away city hall. But then they realized that our goal was to run a good hospital, which was what their goal was."

Mid-America then offered to buy up the stock of the ailing proprietary hospital. When the corporation was able to show the health planners that both hospitals were willing to cooperate, it obtained permission to dispose of both hospitals and rebuild a single new facility. And when they presented the approved Certificate of Need for rebuilding to the first hospital, the board of trustees resigned and Mid-America took over.

At the time the negotiations were going on, says Shawver, "the Adventist Church in Moberly was a tiny little clapboard facility that was just off the campus of one of the two hospitals. There were about 15 regular members. It was astounding that we were able to convince them that we could do all these things for them when they looked out their window and saw that kind of representation of the church." Today, however, Moberly has a new Adventist church school, a new 120-bed hospital scheduled to open in May and land has been purchased for a new Adventist church. To be sure, most of the increased Adventist population is due to im-

ports rather than converts, but even so the influence is there today.

Hospital executives and church leaders disagree on just how many Adventist employees in a hospital there needs to be to provide an effective witness; hospital people usually believe the needed proportion is smaller than estimates given by church leaders.

C. E. Bradford, president of the North American Division and chairman of the North American Health Services Board, an advisory board overseeing the affairs of the hospital corporations, believes that at least 50 percent of rank and file employees in an Adventist institution should be Adventist,

"In spite of all the complications that must first be solved, many hospital executives anticipate that sooner or later a single Adventist health care corporation in North America will be formed."

not to mention administration and department heads. "The greatest challenge the hospitals face is in maintaining their Adventist character. Our greatest contact with non-Adventists is through our hospitals. How do we reach these people — how do we develop programs that will be a benefit without offending people?"

Others, like Francis Wernick, a general vice president of the General Conference and vice chairman of the North American Hospital Services Board, says the church should set guidelines based on articles of incorporation, procedures with regard to distribution of assets on dissolution, structure of the board, constituency, and similar criteria to determine whether an institution is Adventist or merely Adventist-managed or operated. Church and hospital leaders alike, however, seem to agree that top management — administration and in most cases, department heads — should provide a nucleus of Adventist support and identity for any Adventist hospital.

The four corporations have different mechanisms for exerting an Adventist presence on the board of trustees. In some communities, the local Adventist community must be supplemented with church members from surrounding areas to come up with enough individuals experienced in leadership to fill a board.

While some church members fret over the difficulties of fostering an Adventist philosophy within an institution, local communities also demand representation in determining the direction of their hospitals. In Ellijay, Georgia, because of difficulties with Adventist philosophy, Adventist Health Systems/Sunbelt recently lost its management contract with the 50-bed Watkins Memorial Hospital which the church had controlled at the request of county government for more than 20 years.

Russell Shawver acknowledges that the local community does have a right to demand representation on the board. "Hospitals are being viewed more and more like public utilities. In effect, we are being given a franchise to operate our facilities by the local community."

Interestingly, excessive centralization is a danger raised by experts in hospital management themselves. Robert Cunningham warns in an article in the August 1980 issue of *Trustee* that "when decisions . . . are in some part removed from the local institution to a more remote authority, . . . local vigilance and local concern may also be diminished accordingly. If there is a risk, it is mostly to the caring component of quality. . . ." And that caring component is an element that most hospital executives agree is fundamental to what makes an Adventist hospital.

Nevertheless, as Adventist hospital corporation leaders look for greater opportunities to both save money and expand the denomination's health work, it seems likely Adventist health care will be further centralized. Although the four regional corporations have no formal linkage, a recent public relations publication on "The Adventist Health Systems" referred to "the four regional divisions of the Adventist Health System" and described the system as "the largest nonprofit

Protestant health care system in North America."

Such a merger has already been recommended. Mardian Blair, president of the 800-plus bed Florida Hospital in Orlando, formally proposed the formation of a single corporation called Adventist Health System/North America to the NAHSB in June of 1980. But at this point, the only action taken has been for the President's Executive Advisory Committee to approve a committee to make a formal study of the proposal.

Several problems would have to be solved before a single large corporation could succeed. "My concern," said Herbert Shiroma, president of Washington Adventist Hospital, "is that we not set up a structure with so many checks and balances that by the time an administrator gets past all the checkpoints the crisis is gone and so is the hospital."

A national merger would also create an additional bureaucratic layer which would mean three of the regional corporate presidents would suddenly find themselves reporting to a superior. As Charley Eldridge, a regional vice president with Adventist Health Systems/Eastern and Middle America, pointed out, "The biggest stumbling block to a national merger is personal feelings. You're talking about people's careers." Also, many in church leadership share Francis Wernick's apprehension: "We've always been reluctant to place large numbers of institutions under a single head."

The church has never forgotten the specter of Battle Creek. It probably should be noted, however, that John Harvey Kellogg wrested the Battle Creek Sanitarium away from the hands of the church by buying up the stock in what was then a proprietary corporation. Adventist hospitals today are nonprofit corporations with no stock. The membership of the church is equivalent to stockholders, and indirectly it elects the boards of the hospital corporations.

Some believe that a national corporation is not needed since questions such as whether or not to further standardize wage and benefit packages can be handled by the present

North American Health Services Board. The board is now, for example, working on a national retirement program.

However, most corporation executives think that a national corporation could provide further cost savings for the hospital and the church. Adventist Health Systems/West president Frank Dupper has proposed, for example, that some of the costs of the General Conference Health Department activities on behalf of the hospitals would be eligible for reimbursement by government funds if the health department were under a national corporation.

In fact, elements of a national organization are already in place, such as group purchasing and insurance plans, through the General Conference. These elements are described in the recent article in *Modern Health Care*:

The Adventist's medical malpractice and general liability insurance program . . . provides coverage for all Adventist hospitals in the U.S. at premiums roughly 75 percent of what individual hospitals would pay to local shared insurance pro-

grams for similar coverage. The program . . . covers up to \$5 million per occurrence and \$25 million aggregate through the National Union Fire Insurance Company of New York. . . . The Adventist national group purchasing program . . . is expected to buy some \$200 million worth of equipment and supplies this year. . . . Chief financial officers of Adventist hospitals have agreed to use uniform financial statements and 27 key financial ratios. . . . The chief financial officers of the systems will meet this month [October 1980] to discuss pros and cons of merging their data processing systems . . . and Adventists systems hospitals and the church's Health-Temperance Department are discussing consolidating their human resource departments.

In spite of all the complications that must first be solved, many hospital executives anticipate that sooner or later a single Adventist health care corporation in North America will be formed.

Adventists in the Soviet Union

The following cluster of articles further acquaints our readers with the unfolding drama of Adventism in the Soviet Union. In March of 1977, in connection with an article by Joe Mesar entitled, "Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn: Dialogue on the Good Society," we published the same author's interview with M. P. Kulakov, an Adventist pastor from Russia who had come to the United States for the 1976 Annual Council. In November of 1979, under the heading, "Soviet Views of Adventism: A Communist Analysis," we published a series of articles about Russian Adventism translated from a highly unsympathetic Soviet Journal. One of these spoke of a "split" within Adventism between a group called "moderate" and inclined to "patriotism" and another group called "reactionary" and "anti-social," led by P. Matsanov. In what follows we learn of still another group, also by Communist standards anti-social, calling themselves True and Free Seventh-day Adventists and led until his death in 1980 by Vladimir Shelkov.

The relationships among these groups appear complex — recent reports, for example, suggest that Matsanov's attitude, both to the Soviet government and to the "moderate"

branch of Adventism, may be in flux — and the editors are fully aware that the picture now available of Adventist life in the Soviet Union remains distressingly incomplete. We are confident, nevertheless, that what follows contributes substantially to the clarification of that picture. The article by Marite Sapiets, along with the letter by Shelkov's daughter, is reprinted by permission from *Religion in Communist Lands*; this journal is published by England's Keston College, a research institute whose widely-regarded work focuses on religious life behind the Iron Curtain.

The cluster also includes two interviews, one with Alexander Ginzburg, the expatriate Russian dissident and journalist whose lectures on several Adventist campuses have stirred special interest due in part to his friendship with Shelkov, forged while both were in prison together in Russia. The other interview is with Roland Hegstad, editor of *Liberty* and himself a close follower of the developments here being reported.

Two boxed reports, contributed by the editor of SPECTRUM, briefly describe, on the one hand, Amnesty International's interest in the True and Free Seventh-day Adventists, and, on the other, materials sent to this

magazine from Keston College summarizing that institution's most recent information about Adventists in Russia. The final item in the cluster is a letter by General Conference President Neal Wilson (Oct. 31, 1979) communicating the position of denominational leadership regarding the divided Adventist community in the Soviet Union.

The central figure in the story here being told is, of course, Vladimir Shelkov. His recent death at 84 in a Soviet concentration camp attracted the outraged notice of numerous publications, among them, for example, the evangelical weekly, *Christianity Today*, and the Catholic journal *Commonweal*, whose biting editorial (Sept. 26, 1980) expressed as much admiration for Shelkov as disdain for his persecutors. From what we now know, it appears that Shelkov was a figure of compelling authority, stubborn conviction

and resolute, even defiant, courage. More remains, of course, to be learned about him — not least of all about the degree of his doctrinal orthodoxy — but for the present it seems clear that his was a special kind of Adventist life, special even in a nation where other Adventist leaders, among them M. P. Kulakov, have also suffered imprisonment for their faith. Shelkov's ways — though no doubt of ambiguous merit, as are the ways of every mortal — nonetheless afford our community an opportunity to assess itself against the exceptional standard of one who, through all his days of trial and adventure, remained, in some sense at least, a sharer of the Adventist way. It is with this theological point in mind, as well as a concern for historical clarity, that we now publish these materials.

—The Editors

Shelkov and the True and Free Adventists

by Marite Sapiets

The recent death in a Soviet labour camp of 84-year-old Vladimir Shelkov, leader of the All-Union Church of True and Free Seventh-Day Adventists, has highlighted the activities of this small Christian sect in the USSR. Although it was known in the West that it existed as a body separated from the officially recognized Adventist Church — it is periodically attacked in the Soviet anti-religious press — it was only in the 1970s that True and Free Adventist *samizdat* documents began to reach the West. Certain facts soon became clear from a study of these documents: there was an unofficial press, *True*

Witness, run by the True and Free Seventh-Day Adventists as a centrally-organized group; and a large number of documents, pamphlets and articles, even books, were being produced by this “publishing house” and distributed all over the USSR (as proved by the lists of material confiscated by the KGB during searches of Adventist homes as far apart as Riga and Samarkand). In fact, owing to the information provided in these documents about the history and doctrines of the True and Free Adventists, more is now known about them than about the “official” Adventists, who have no publication of their own. Even Soviet press articles tend to con-

centrate on attacking the “reformist” Adventist sect and largely ignore the registered Adventists, apart from pointing out that they have “realistically assessed their position.”¹

The split between the official Adventists and the True and Free Remnant took place as far back as 1924–28. The Adventist Church developed in the USA after 1844 and was officially founded in 1863, as a result of the apocalyptic visions and prophecies of Ellen White.² It has existed in the territories of the Russian Empire since the 1880s. Under the Tsars, as later under the Soviet regime, certain key Adventist doctrines led to conflict with the State: strict observance of the Sabbath day (Saturday), on which no work could be done, and refusal to bear arms or swear a military oath. The loyal greeting sent to Emperor Nicholas II by the All-Russian Council of Seventh-Day Adventists in 1905, after its legalization as a non-Orthodox denomination, is a carefully worded document (though always quoted by Soviet sources as an example of Adventist reactionary attitudes): it promises to render to the Tsar whatever is “Caesar’s” — taxes, tributes, fear and honour — while giving God “what is God’s”.³ The pre-revolutionary period is seen by True and Free Adventists, especially by V. A. Shelkov himself, as one of persecution by “state Orthodoxy” (“*gospravoslaviye*”) — a parallel to the later Soviet “state atheism” (“*gosateizm*”). Such persecution abated after 1905 but came to a head again after the declaration of war in 1914, when the first split occurred between Adventists who were prepared to swear the military oath and thus declare their loyalty to the Russian State, and those who refused. Shelkov refers to the former group with disapproval in his article *A Recurrence of Misanthropy*, quoting loyal statements issued by “false Adventists” in both Russia and Germany in 1914 and drawing a parallel with the 1924 declaration of loyalty to the Soviet government by the “official” Adventists.⁴ The central issue in all cases is not the legitimacy of the government in question, but the infringement of the commandment “Thou shalt not kill” by Adventists who were prepared to take up arms in defence of the State.

The All-Russian Council of Adventists left the problem to individual conscience, while encouraging Adventists to serve in medical and construction units, as they were allowed to do in many cases.

The period looked on most favourably by all Adventists is that between 1918 and 1924, when the Soviet government was still allowing evangelization by non-Orthodox sects and in some cases encouraging the concept of “Christian socialism”. The Adventists doubled their numbers, rising from 6,085 in 1916 to 12,697 in 1926,⁵ and were allowed to publish two newspapers, *Voice of Truth* (*Golos istiny*) and *Good News* (*Blagovestnik*). During this period both the Constitution of 1918 and the Decree on the Separation of Church and State were still in force. These allowed “religious propaganda” (as well as “anti-religious propaganda”) and “private” religious education. In 1929, the clause on “religious propaganda” was deleted and the Law on Religious Associations was passed, forbidding the teaching of religion by anyone except parents. The Decree issued by Lenin on 4 January 1919, allowing exemptions from military service on religious grounds, remained in force until 1926, and is the main reason for the special place given to Lenin in modern Adventist *samizdat*. Shelkov, for example, quotes approvingly Lenin’s words, “let us adopt this decree to calm down and satisfy those who have already borne dreadful torments and persecution from the Tsarist government”.⁶ The Adventist leader justified his own practice of living “underground” on a false passport by reference to Lenin’s example under the Tsarist regime. Lenin’s actual view of the Protestant sects as “a new, purified, refined poison for the oppressed masses” is not referred to.

It is doubtful whether the 1924–28 schism between the two groups of Adventists took place only over the issue of declaring loyalty to the Soviet State, as is often implied by Soviet atheist authors such as F. Fedorenko and A. Belov. “Gratitude and sincere support” was indeed expressed to V. I. Lenin, his close associates and “the only progressive government in the world” by the Fifth All-

Union Congress of Seventh-Day Adventists in 1924; but limited loyalty to “Caesar” and the authorities “instituted by God” (as in Tsarist times) had never been denied by Adventists. The official argument put forward by A. Demidov, editor of *Voice of Truth* (see *RCL* Vol. 5, No. 2, 1977, pp. 88-93), was that the Adventists must stress the things that united them with the “builders of the new social order”, not those that divide them from the new society. Adventism could still win toleration from the atheist regime by joining with communism to reorganize society and condemning the injustices of capitalism, imperialism and the established Churches of the West. Demidov’s article “The Voice of the Protestant West” is almost the only substantial account of the “official” Adventist viewpoint in 1924, but it is available only in the form of extracts in books by

“The True and Free Adventists have been savagely persecuted since the 1920s, . . . partly because of their pacifism and their stubborn insistence on refusing to work or attend school on Saturdays.”

atheist authors⁸ who quote only those passages which confirm the points they themselves wish to make and who avoid specifying the precise points of conflict between the “official” Adventists and the “reformist” groups. The real disagreements, as outlined by V. A. Shelkov in *A Recurrence of Misanthropy* and in *The Struggle of the All-Union Church of Time and Free Seventh-Day Adventists for Freedom of Conscience in the USSR*, were apparently over basic Adventist doctrines (strict Sabbath observance and military service) and registration of Adventist communities by the State. It seems clear, from both V. A. Shelkov and the atheist writer A. Belov, that the official Adventist All-Union Council, fearing to lose its limited state recognition and its journals, agreed to compromises over the question of military serv-

ice: Adventists were at first (1924) encouraged by the All-Union Council to serve in the army according to individual conscience, then (1928) declared subject to conscription on the same terms as other citizens. Shelkov states that the more complete 1928 surrender of principle was then back-dated for *post-factum* inclusion in the 1924 statement, after which those Adventists who had expressed their opposition all along (led by G. Ostvald) were expelled from the Congress.

This “remnant” are the “True and Free” Adventists, as they describe themselves: “True”, because they are true to God’s fourth and sixth Commandments, thus following the example of the early Christians (Shelkov even quotes the Church Fathers Origen and Tertullian in support of Christian refusal to bear arms); “Free”, because they are free from what they see as slavish subservience to the state atheist dictatorship imposed by registration of their communities (which thus bear “the mark of the beast”, as in Revelation 14:16). The “Beast” is identified by V. A. Shelkov in his writings with the principle of state religion or state atheism as such, wrongly made use of in the past by the Catholic and Orthodox Churches and now incarnate in the materialist atheist “religion” of the Soviet State. Shelkov contrasts this “impure State” with his ideal of the “pure State”, in which faith and religious expression are left to individuals and voluntary religious organizations, while state power is confined to maintaining peace and law and order.

The official Adventists gained little from their compromise: by the end of the 1920s their journals were closed down and evangelization became illegal; in the 1930s the Leningrad congregation and almost all Adventist communities were dissolved and most Adventist leaders were arrested, although the central All-Union Council remained officially in existence. After a revival during the religious “thaw” of the Second World War and the post-war period, the All-Union Council was abolished by Khrushchev during the anti-religious campaign of the 1960s. Some official Adventist leaders, such as A. Demidov, have spent as many as 20 years in prison.

By 1964 the “official” Adventists had increased their numbers significantly since the 1920s⁹ and were successfully conducting evangelization among younger people. Children were being taught in groups and Adventist services were often extended to include a period of Bible study. Pamphlets explaining Adventist doctrines and using scientific facts to support Biblical texts were circulated unofficially and passed on to non-Adventists. Similar activities were going on in most of the Protestant churches and were resented by the Soviet authorities as an infringement of the law against religious propaganda. Khrushchev’s campaign against the churches was in part an attempt to end such “violations”. Instead, as among the Baptists and Pentecostals, it gave rise to a split between Adventists who were willing to submit to government demands to keep their registration permit and Adventists who preferred to form “unregistered” congregations and continue their church activities without official sanction. In January 1965, at a conference held in Kiev, 180 Adventist leaders (led by P. Matsanov) founded a new central body, the Council of Elder Brethren, which rejected the “official” Adventist leadership (led by A. F. Parasei) and began to ordain its own evangelists.¹⁰ This “reformist” group seems to have merged with the True and Free Adventists of the 1920s, advocating “separation from the world” (i.e. the Soviet State) and organizing its church life — services, children’s groups, charitable activities and Bible classes — without seeking registration. The “unofficial” Adventists also seem to have established links with unregistered congregations of Pentecostals and Baptists.

The state-registered Adventists exist as individual communities but often have to share a “prayer-house” with a registered Baptist congregation. It is grudgingly conceded by the Soviet press that they have even increased the number of their young people — for example, from 25.2 per cent (1967) to 32.7 per cent (1977) in parts of Moldavia.¹¹ Occasional defectors from the True and Free Adventists returning to the “official” flock are given publicity by the press — for example, T. I. Chertkov, who wrote a letter to his

brothers and sisters urging them to return to “official” Adventism.¹²

The True and Free Adventists have been savagely persecuted since the 1920s, partly because of their success in maintaining their own central All-Union Council and an independent press (established on organized lines by V. A. Shelkov in 1968), partly because of their pacifism and their stubborn insistence on refusing to work or attend school on Saturdays. About half of the known Adventist prisoners of conscience have been imprisoned for refusing to bear arms or swear the military oath, although many have declared their readiness to serve in medical and construction units (not on Saturdays however).

Like other banned religious groups (the True Orthodox and Uniates, for example), the True and Free Adventists were arrested *en masse* during the 1930s and 1940s as members of an “anti-Soviet organization”. Two of their leaders, G. Ostvald and P. I. Manzhura, died in prison, “cheerful and unbowed in spirit”, though “exhausted and tormented”. V. A. Shelkov himself, ordained as a preacher in 1929, served three sentences (totalling 23 years) in camps and prisons: 1931-34 in the Urals, 1945-54 in Karaganda and 1957-67 in the camps of the Far East, Siberia and Mordovia, “in conditions of violence, barbarity and horror, which cannot be described in words”.¹³ Avraam Shifrin, a Jewish fellow-prisoner, wrote of the impression made on him by Shelkov in Siberia: the guards pushed into their cell “a tall, thin man about 60 years old, with an intense, expressive face, framed by a long, white beard. The beard was so white that it looked unreal in the middle of our filthy cell. But even more striking than his beard were the gentle old man’s eyes: they were dark and peaceful and literally radiated tenderness.” He goes on to describe Shelkov’s method of argument: quiet and tolerant, but knowledgeable and insisting on the final victory of good over evil.

Shelkov’s entire guilt lay in his rejection of war. Because of this the Soviet authorities feared his influence on young people: as he had deep faith and education he was able to persuade people he was right.¹⁴

Shelkov was elected leader (chairman) of the All-Union Church of True and Free Seventh-Day Adventists in 1954. After his return from prison in 1967, he was instrumental in organizing the Adventist *samizdat* activities which have annoyed the Soviet authorities ever since. The success of the *True Witness* press and the photocopying and reproduction of Adventist works are tacitly

acknowledged in Soviet newspapers, which accuse the Adventists of “educating children and young people in an anti-Soviet spirit” by “producing and disseminating handwritten and typed pamphlets” and “spreading literature slandering our social system”.¹⁵ This last charge refers to the publicity given by Shelkov and the Adventist press to violations of citizens’ rights by the officials of *gosateizm*

Adventists and the Madrid Conference

Currently, in Madrid, Spain, 35 governments are participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, reviewing their compliance with the Final Act they signed in Helsinki in 1975. Section VII of that Helsinki agreement demands that each signatory nation, including the United States and the Soviet Union, manifest “respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief.”

The Council of the All Union Church of the True and Free Seventh-day Adventists has smuggled out of the Soviet Union a 863-page report charging that the Soviet Union is systematically violating the human rights provision of the Helsinki Accords by persecuting Adventists. The report lists 55 True and Free Seventh-day Adventists who are currently prisoners of conscience in Soviet jails. The names are accompanied by biographical details, photographs, length of prison sentences and in most cases addresses of prisons. Sometimes it is clearly stated that the offense is conscientious objection to military service or the offense of producing, storing or distributing unofficially published literature. Other times, the document reports that prisoners have been arrested for “purely religious life and activity,” which probably refers to the holding of religious services in homes or the organization of religious teaching of children.

The report also lists 257 Adventists whose homes have been subjected to searches by the KGB for religious literature. Four hundred pages of the document are a transcript of the 1979 trial in Tashkent of five leading True and Free Seventh-day Adventists, including their charismatic leader, the 84-year-old Vladimir Shelkov.

A copy of the document has been translated by scholars at Keston College, not an undergraduate school, but a research institute in Britain devoted to analyzing the state of religious faith and practice in Marxist countries, particularly in Europe. Regarded by academic authorities as one of the most respected such centers, the institute’s patrons include the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is the head of the Anglican world community; the cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, the senior bishop of the Roman Catholic Church in Britain; the chief patriarch of the Orthodox Church in Britain and the Chief Rabbi of England. The director of the institute is a clergyman, Michael Bourdeaux, who also edits the institute’s journal, *Religion in Communist Lands*.

Keston College indicates that in addition to the massive new document submitted to the Madrid Conference, it has in its possession about 120 other documents that began to reach the West in the 1970s from the True and Free Seventh-day Adventists. The subject matter of this material is largely factual descriptions of government mistreatment of Adventists. Many of the

(state atheism): Adventist parents, such as Mariya Vlasyuk,¹⁶ deprived of parental rights; Adventist home-owners, such as N. Mikhel,¹⁷ fined for holding religious meetings or storing Adventist literature; and young men, such as Alexander Mikhel,¹⁸ imprisoned for refusing to join the army. Shelkov's vast output of articles and books (110 works were listed at his 1979 trial),

which made him a leading *samizdat* author, were largely produced while he was in hiding from the authorities (like other leading "unofficial" Adventists) between 1969 and 1978. If he had not evaded arrest in this way, he would certainly have been imprisoned earlier on the same charges as those he faced after his arrest at his daughter's flat on 14 March 1978. His works, although theological in content,

experiences parallel that of other religious groups unrecognized by the government. The most common specifically Adventist grievance is the government's refusal to allow True and Free Adventists exemption from work or school on Saturdays. The few theoretical articles by V. A. Shelkov among the papers are largely discussions of the relation between the state and religion.

Miss Marie Sapiets, a specialist at Keston College on religion in the Soviet Union, states that "this material is in Russian and at present we do not have the financial resources to translate it all into English. We are hoping to obtain financial backing for a book on Soviet Adventists, but this has not yet been forthcoming."

Researchers at Keston College recognize that differences of belief and practice exist among Seventh-day Adventists within the Soviet Union. However, the material they have from the True and Free Seventh-day Adventists persistently claims that their failure to obtain recognition from the government as a religious community stems from their consistent adherence to conscientious objection to military service and to such typically strict Seventh-day Adventist standards of Sabbath observance as refusal to send children to school for Saturday classes. The following passages in the recent "Appeal" from the Council of the All-Union Church of True and Free Seventh-day Adventists to the Madrid Conference are typically uncompromising expressions of their views:

Adventists form a voluntary Christian organization based on the Ten Commandments and the Law of God, which for them is the source of all rights and

freedoms. Freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief are divine gifts to mankind. No one has the right to dictate to other people in this respect or to force others to conform with his own thoughts and beliefs. . . .

State atheism grants "freedom of conscience" on its own terms to believers who compromise their consciences by breaking the commandments "Do not kill" and "Keep holy the Sabbath Day." This the True and Free Seventh-day Adventists cannot do. They are for true freedom of conscience and are not willing to lie about state atheist persecution. Instead they publicize state atheist acts of violence and repression against believers and for this they are prosecuted as slanderers. Nevertheless, publicity in such cases is both right and useful in obtaining concessions from the authorities. Their open, peaceful struggle for human rights against state atheist repression may yet lead to true freedom of conscience in the USSR. To this end the Church of True and Free Seventh-day Adventists is presenting this collection of factual evidence to the delegates at Madrid, so that the Soviet Union may be called upon to fulfill its obligations according to the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference: observance of true freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief.

Further information concerning True and Free Seventh-day Adventist documents may be obtained by directly contacting Keston College, Heathfield Road, Keston, Kent BR2 6BA, England.

constantly reaffirm the True and Free Adventist commitment to pacifism, Saturday observance and evangelization of young people. In his analyses of Soviet legislation, he rejects all state interference in religious organizations and proclaims freedom of conscience as a divinely given right. On the basis of the Soviet Constitution and laws of 1918-24, he rejects later anti-religious legislation as unlawful and supports evasion of such legislation, even issuing instructions for those in danger of arrest under the title "How to Behave before Ill-intentioned Blasphemers who Unjustly Persecute Innocent Believers". A "holy silence" is recommended in reply to threats and unlawful questions.

The 1978-79 KGB campaign against the True and Free Adventists involved searches and confiscation of religious literature, and arrests and trials of Adventists found transporting or storing such literature. It culminated in the trial in March 1979 of V. A. Shelkov, his son-in-law I. S. Lepshin, and his close associates A. A. Spalin, S. I. Maslov and S. P. Furlet. The abandonment of any pretence of legality or justice during the trial was excessive even for a Soviet court and seems to have shocked the officially-appointed defence counsel, G. Spodik, who defied Judge N. S. Artemov in insisting that the defendant's words should be fully and correctly recorded instead of being deleted on the judge's orders. Shelkov and the others were charged with "inciting citizens to refuse to participate in public life and fulfil their civil obligations", running a "conspiratorial organization", living on the means of believers and "disseminating knowingly false fabrications slandering the Soviet State."¹⁹ No fewer than 155 Adventists had stated in writing that they were prepared to testify in court that Shelkov had given a true account of their persecution by the state organs for "purely religious convictions", but they were wholly ignored by the judges and were physically prevented from travelling to Tashkent or entering the courtroom. Instead, the main prosecution witness was V. V. Illarionov, son of a well-known True and Free Adventist, and now an atheist. Before his appearance in court he had been serving an 11-year sentence (imposed in 1976) for theft, fraud and

forgery. Even he made no statement that constituted proof of the charges against the accused, merely agreeing with the court in describing Adventist *samizdat* literature as "libellous" and stating that other Adventists would condemn a sect member who joined the armed forces (although they would do him no physical injury).²⁰ No attempt was made in court to prove Shelkov's works libellous — it was merely stated that they were reactionary and anti-Soviet and that they accused the authorities of being non-Leninist.

Perhaps the most revealing section of the indictment was that accusing Shelkov and the others of "joining with the illegal Baptist sect and the so-called 'dissidents' — such as Sakharov, Solzhenitsyn, Orlov, Ginzburg, Khodorovich, Grigorenko and others . . ." Shelkov was accused of storing works by these persons for "slandering purposes". Works by Solzhenitsyn, documents by Orlov and Ginzburg, copies of the *Chronicle of Current Events* and the *Bulletin of the Council of Evangelical Christian and Baptist Prisoners' Relatives* were given as examples of slanders that Shelkov had distributed, sending them abroad to "mislead world public opinion". It is indeed an interesting fact that the True and Free Adventists had established close links with the Soviet human rights movement as a whole, sending reports to the *Chronicle of Current Events* and making contact with secular "dissidents" such as Academician Sakharov. V. A. Shelkov himself had written to President Carter appealing for help in releasing Yuri Orlov and Alexander Ginzburg, who had defended "true justice and morality" as enshrined in the Ten Commandments. He described them as "self-sacrificing, selfless men, with no thought for their own profit", who had fought for the suffering families of prisoners and had defended true spiritual values against the "cult of the God of Prisons".²¹ Nevertheless, although he obviously respected such men as fellow-fighters for universal rights and freedoms, Shelkov had criticized the dissidents for having no "united ideal": "they know what they don't want, but not what they do want".²² Some

were still attached to the idea of “impure government” by the imposition of some ideology, national or religious, by the State. Shelkov affirmed the True and Free Adventist position in proclaiming the necessity of the “pure” religion, unattached to nationality or State. His views were respected, as he was himself, by people as far removed from his position as Andrei Sakharov, who came to “attend” his trial from outside the closed courtroom. Sakharov’s appeal to the Pope, heads of States which were party to the Helsinki agreements and world public opinion on Shelkov’s behalf condemned the sentence eventually passed on 23 March (five years in a strict regime camp) as “cruelty surpassing all norms of decency”.²³ His intervention brought Shelkov’s plight to the eyes of the world, but too late to save the 84-year-old man’s life. Like his predecessors, Ostvald and Manzhura, V. A. Shelkov died “in chains” on 27 January 1980.

It is possible that the Soviet authorities had intended this: Shelkov had defied them too

“It is indeed an interesting fact that the True and Free Adventists had established close links with the Soviet human rights movement as a whole.”

long and too successfully. The KGB officials who arrested him told the old man “Now you’re going to pay for everything, grandad”.²⁴ His daughter-in-law Dina described in a letter to Amnesty International how the prison authorities had refused to take warm clothing she had brought for Shelkov. The leader of the True and Free Adventists would not have found his end inappropriate, however. He himself had constantly emphasized the necessity of self-sacrifice in the “bloodless fight” against evil, in the name of divinely-given human rights.

It is impossible to predict who his successor might be. The True and Free Adventists

are continuing their activities, producing long accounts of the March trial and its after-effects. It was clear from the evidence presented at Shelkov’s trial that they are organized in three groups — Caucasian, Western (Baltic and Ukraine) and Central (Urals and Russia) — united by a central All-Union Council. The total number of True and Free Adventists is almost impossible to estimate: it may even surpass the “official” Adventist figure (21,500 in 1964). Their deputy chairman at the moment is Mikhail Ivanovich Illarionov from Tashkent, whose nephew gave evidence in court against Shelkov (see above). The new chairman may be his brother, another Illarionov, or one of those imprisoned with Shelkov, such as I. S. Lepshin or A. A. Spalin (both serving five-year sentences); or the choice may fall upon someone like Rostislav Galetsky, now living “in hiding” as Shelkov once did. Galetsky, now 32 years old, is the author of a number of *samizdat* documents on the situation of believers in the USSR. He has also publicly supported Yuri Orlov. In May 1978 he founded the Group for Legal Struggle and Investigation of Facts concerning the Persecution of the All-Union Church of True and Free Seventh-Day Adventists in the USSR. This Group is similar in its aims to the Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers’ Rights, although it concentrates on monitoring the persecution of fellow-Adventists. It has already published more than 50 documents about searches and bugging of Adventist homes and arrests of True and Free Adventists. At the age of 13, Galetsky was already an Adventist evangelist and was expelled from a corrective school for this reason. He now travels round Adventist communities in the USSR, distributing literature and collecting new complaints about religious persecution. Like other “unofficial” Adventist leaders living such a life, he does not see his family for months on end.²⁵

Western Adventist leaders have visited the Soviet Union, participating in “official” Adventist services in Odessa, Tallinn and other towns, but have not attempted to establish contacts with the True and Free Advent-

ists. They are largely of the opinion that the True and Free Adventists in the USSR are an offshoot of a German reformist group that split away from the central Adventist Church during the First World War, mainly over the issue of military service. Shelkov did indeed condemn military service with reference to the 1914-18 war (see above) but he also emphasized that his objection is to bearing arms, not to military service as such (which is the same as the normal Adventist position). It is difficult for western Adventists to form a clear view of the True and Free Remnant as they have not in general studied the documents by the latter which have reached the West, but have relied instead for their information on official Adventist spokesmen.

The recent decision by the Soviet government to allow two representatives of the officially recognized Adventist Church to attend a meeting of the International Council of the

Seventh-Day Adventist Executive Committee in the USA may be an attempt to counter the publicity achieved by the True and Free Adventists for their accounts of anti-religious repression in the USSR. M. P. Kulakov, one of the Soviet Adventist delegates, told American Adventists that V. A. Shelkov and the True and Free Remnant held unorthodox views and were not really Adventists, that Shelkov had represented himself as a new "prophet", and that he had rejected contact with the official Adventist body. Similar attempts were made in the 1960s to cast doubts on the credentials of "unofficial" Baptist spokesmen by means of "official" Baptist statements. It is to be hoped that international Adventist opinion will suspend judgement on the True and Free Seventh-Day Adventists of the USSR until more of the facts are known.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. A. Belov, "Adventisty i adventizm", *Nauka i religiya*, No. 3, 1978, p. 32.
2. Works by E. White, e.g. *Patriarchs and Prophets* and *Life of Paul*, are circulated in Russian translation in *Samizdat* issued by the *True Witness* press.
3. A. Belov, *Adventizm*, Moscow, 1968, p. 49.
4. V. A. Shelkov, *Retsidiv chelovekonenavistnichestva*, n.d. (late 1977), pp. 44-7. *Samizdat* available from Keston College. Excerpts on pp. 213-7 of this issue of *RCL*.
5. A. Belov, *Adventizm*, pp. 54, 58.
6. V. A. Shelkov, *Retsidiv chelovekonenavistnichestva*, p. 22.
7. Lenin's phrase has recently been quoted in: A. Belov, "Adventisty i adventizm", *Nauka i religiya*, No. 3, 1978, p. 31.
8. Quoted in: F. Fedorenko, *Sekty, ikh vera i dela*, Moscow, 1965, and V. N. Lentin, *Adventisty sedmogo dnya*, Moscow, 1966.
9. There were 21,500 in 1964. See "Novye tendentsii v adventizme", *Voprosy nauchnogo ateizma*, No. 24, 1979, p. 121; A. Belov, *Adventizm*, p. 60.
10. S. Orlov, "V poiskakh vykhoda", *Nauka i religiya*, No. 3, 1978, p. 34; "Novye tendentsii v adventizme", *Voprosy nauchnogo ateizma*, No. 24, 1979, pp. 120-34.
11. Novye tendentsii v adventizme", *Voprosy nauchnogo ateizma*, No. 24, 1979, p. 122.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
13. *Borba vsesoyuznoi tserkvi vernykh i svobodnykh ASD za svobody sovesti v SSSR*, 27 October 1977, p. 3. *Samizdat* available from Keston College.
14. A Shifrin, *Oblako molitvy nad lagerem*, 11 April 1972. *Samizdat* available from Keston College.
15. V. Kassis and M. Mikhailov, "Chto tvorilos v bunkere 'apostola'", *Izvestiya*, 13 May 1979, p. 5.
16. M. I. Vlasyuk, *Zhaloba v Verkhovny Sud Ukrainskoi SSR goroda Kiyeva*, 1975. *Samizdat* available from Keston College. Also in *Vestnik RKhD*, No. 117, 1976, pp. 265-84.
17. *Khronika: Nina Fyodorovna Mikhel*, 20 March 1978. *Samizdat* available from Keston College. Also in English in *Documents of the Christian Committee for the Defense of Believers' Rights in the USSR*, Washington Street Research Center, San Francisco, Vol. 3, pp. 336-8.
18. *Soobshcheniye: presledovaniya za religioznye ubezhdeniya v SSSR*, December 1978. *Samizdat* available from Keston College.
19. *Chronicle of Current Events* (Russian edition), No. 53, pp. 15-17.
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 23-4.
21. V. A. Shelkov, *Prosha Prezidentu SShA Dzhimmi Karteru*, 23 February 1977, pp. 2-4. *Samizdat* available from Keston College.
22. V. A. Shelkov, *Ediny ideal*, October 1975, p. 6. *Samizdat* available from Keston College. Also in *Arkhiv Samizdata*, a collection of *samizdat* documents produced by Radio Liberty, AS 2349.
23. See: *Chronicle of Current Events* (Russian edition), No. 53, p. 25.
24. *Presledovaniya adventistov*, 10-16 April 1978, Helsinki Monitoring Group Document No. 45, p. 3. *Samizdat* available from Keston College. Also AS 3311.
25. *New York Times*, 16 October 1977.

Shelkov's Daughter Protests: An Open Letter to Brezhnev

Vladimir Shelkov, the late leader of the True and Free Adventists, was arrested in Tashkent on 14 March 1978. Various of his relatives were in the flat at the time, including his son-in-law I. S. Lepshin, who was also arrested. In an Open Letter to Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, Shelkov's daughter Dina gives a description of the KGB search which accompanied the arrests. She protests at the callous behaviour of the KGB officer who supervised the search and at the confiscation of purely religious literature and objects of material value.

In this letter we are making it known that on 14 March this year a violent, despotic and cruel reprisal, a crying injustice, took place in our home. Vladimir Andreyevich Shelkov (83 years old), Chairman of the All-Union Church of True and Free Seventh-day Adventists, and Ilya Sergeyevich Lepshin were seized and arrested.

Having broken into the house by means of deception, sending an unidentified mob of more than 20 so-called "official representatives", men from the KGB, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Prosecutor's Office stated that they would be carrying out a search. With insults and threats, they pushed us all into one room (those of us at home were my very aged 83-year-old father, my seriously ill husband, my two sisters-in-law, niece and aunt, and my two children). We were forbidden to make the least move into the rest of the house and, after an armed guard had been set over us, they proceeded to carry out the search.

The shame and horror of it! The things that went on then!

They brought in crow-bars, spades, tongs, axes, pincers, saws, mine-detectors, metal hoists, probes, powerful lights, cameras, firearms, walkie-talkie radios, motors and so on. They broke through the ceilings, demolished the chimneys, breached and took up the floors, hollowed out and pulled down walls, tearing down the plaster; they dug huge, deep holes under the floors (up to 2 metres in depth), broke up the asphalt paving, dug up the whole courtyard and breached ceilings, walls and floors in neighbouring buildings. They investigated all cesspools and toilet bowls, in a word, it was as if a bomb had gone off. This act of plunder was presided over by German Vasilevich Ponomaryov, criminal procurator and junior counsellor of justice at the Tashkent Procurator's Office. All the others taking part in the pogrom categorically refused to give their names or official positions, though we asked them more than once to show us their identity cards. G. V. Ponomaryov, as the person in charge of the search, also refused to name the others, saying "What do you need their names for? So that you can write about us afterwards?" My father said "Yes, we shall write about you, as all your actions are unjust and illegal".

The procurator would not allow any of the residents to be present in the rooms being searched. Even the "witnesses" were deprived of this legal right and only looked on from afar. Such an unceremonious, unjust

ban harshly tramples underfoot the right to be present at all the investigator's activities during the search. When this illegality was pointed out to Ponomaryov, he rudely told us to mind our own business, as he was a lawyer and knew what he was doing.

Ponomaryov behaved insolently and despotically, bragging and blustering, saying "I just have to say the word and the world will turn upside down". And he kept showing he was boss. For him, no laws or limits existed — he was going to do what he wanted by force because he was in charge.

We protest against this illegal search, as the warrant was made out for only one person, but the search was carried out contrary to law and justice by other persons, in violation of Art. 55 of the Soviet Constitution, concerning the inviolability of the home.

Our seriously ill mother, in whose name the search warrant was made out, was in hospital at the time, in a hopeless condition. We had been taking turns to watch at her bedside around the clock, but during the four-day search we were categorically forbidden to go to her by procurator Ponomaryov.

When the hospital authorities sent a mes-

sage saying that our mother was dying and that we should come at once, heartless, cruel Ponomaryov remained deaf to all our requests and pleas to be allowed to visit our mother. Only after prolonged and insistent demands was I taken to the hospital, accompanied by two procurators and two officials (whose names were not given), but I was not allowed in to see my mother: Ponomaryov himself went in and obtained the required improved report on mother's satisfactory condition from the surgeon in charge. I was forcibly pushed back into the car; no one paid the slightest attention to my pleas and prayers to see my mother and I was taken back to the house, which was still being searched.

My husband, I. S. Lepshin, is seriously ill; he has to stay in bed and suffers from severe heart attacks and migraine every day. He has two or three attacks a day, migraine and heart pain at the same time. During the search his state of health took a sharp turn for the worse, medical help was vitally necessary, but the inhuman, cruel criminal-procurator Ponomaryov showed the icy coldness of his soul in this case as well, not allowing emergency medical aid to be called. How-

Amnesty International and Adventists

Amnesty International, an organization which won the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1977, has many times spoken out on behalf of Adventists imprisoned in the Soviet Union. Amnesty has made one of its principal objectives the unconditional release of "prisoners of conscience," persons who have not used or advocated violence and are detained for their beliefs, color, sex, ethnic origin, language or religion. One way Amnesty's 250,000 members in 134 countries work for their release is to form groups that adopt specific prisoners, whose cases the group documents and publicizes.

In 1978, Amnesty produced a booklet,

USSR: Protestants in Prison, which gave details concerning 12 prisoners of conscience. Three of them were described as Seventh-day Adventists, adopted by Amnesty groups in Belmont and Somerville, Massachusetts, and Tarrytown, New York. During 1980, in both its *Annual Report* and a volume devoted to *Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR: Their Treatment and Conditions*, Amnesty refers to specific Seventh-day Adventists imprisoned for refusing to perform military service or operating unofficial printing presses. Details often indicate that True and Free Seventh-day Adventists are involved, but Amnesty's reports do not always make clear to which Adventist group the prison-

ever, when he saw that the matter might end badly, he summoned his *own* medical workers. After they had given him an injection, the sick man felt even worse. I was no longer capable of watching this kind of mockery and asked to see the ampoule from which the injection had been given, but the nurse and her gang rudely pushed me back.

After this my husband was put in an ambulance and driven off to an unknown destination. I only know that a KGB man got into the ambulance with him and began to try to persuade him to co-operate with them, promising him freedom. What cynicism!

We are extremely perturbed at the hard-hearted, inhuman behaviour of the KGB officials, their amorality and sadism. Who taught them to behave like this? After all this, how are we to understand your words, Leonid Ilyich?: "Respect for right and law must be each man's personal conviction. This applies especially to the actions of state officials. Attempts to get round the law or ignore it, no matter why, cannot be tolerated. Nor can we tolerate violations of individual rights or damage to citizens' self-respect. For us as communists, upholders of the highest human ideals, this is a matter of

principle." (*XXIV Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1971, p. 81.*)

Very eloquently said! But in practice, what you have so often condemned still goes on. Is this not just play-acting?

You, comrade Brezhnev, said in your speech to the Central Committee of the CPSU on 24 May 1977: "We know, comrades, that certain years after the adoption of the present Constitution were clouded by unlawful acts of repression, violations of the principles of socialist democracy, of the Leninist norms of Party and state life. This was contrary to the provisions of the Constitution. The Party decisively condemns those practices and they must never be repeated."

One of the victims of that unlawful Stalinist repression was our father, who was sentenced three times for his purely religious life and his just and legal struggle against the atheist dictatorship, and who spent 23 years of his life in camps and prisons.

And now our father has been arrested again. My husband has also been arrested.

Is it turning out, then, that "certain" dis-

ers belong. Amnesty does not discriminate among Seventh-day Adventists when it adopts prisoners of conscience.

The Amnesty group in Lanarkshire, in the western part of Scotland, adopted Mariya Zinets, a True and Free Seventh-day Adventist serving a three-year term in a labor camp for distributing a brochure answering charges made by the Soviet press against Vladimir Shelkov. The Lanarkshire chapter drafted a petition asking for the release of this prisoner of conscience and expressed particular concern for Mrs. Zinets' health; she was suffering in the labor camp from swollen legs, bronchial asthma and continual heart pains.

On March 2, 1981, a delegation composed of Mrs. Margaret Conway, a Catholic member of the Lanarkshire Amnesty chapter who organized the protest, the Reverend E. G. Towson, representing the

Congregational Union of Scotland, and the Reverend James Boyle, Secretary of the Justice and Peace Commission of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Glasgow, traveled to London and called at the Soviet Embassy to the United Kingdom. At first, a spokesman refused to pass on any request for information. Finally, however, he agreed to initiate inquiries about the case with higher authorities. He accepted from the delegation a petition to Leonid Brezhnev on behalf of this Adventist, supported by virtually all denominations in Lanarkshire and Glasgow, and signed by 4,000 Scotsmen.

Chapters of Amnesty International throughout the world continue to be active on behalf of Seventh-day Adventist prisoners of conscience. Ten chapters in the United States alone have adopted as many Adventist prisoners.

tant years in the past, which were clouded by illegal acts of repression contrary to the provisions of the Constitution, have today once again become acceptable after the adoption of the new Constitution?

In addition, during the search Ponomaryov threatened my father with *special* punishments, tortures and *new experimental methods of interrogation*, saying, "When he's there, with us, he'll tell us everything and pay for everything in full", "Now he'll start talking in a different style".

How long will those empty but profuse declarations continue — proclaiming that "tomorrow" will be better than "yesterday"? "Yesterday", all right, some comrades in some places were still "acting contrary to the provisions of the Constitution", but today, fortunately, the Party has condemned this and tomorrow it must not be repeated! Have faith, honest people, wait in hope, but meanwhile . . . the usual godless carousal continues — state atheist robbery in broad daylight, arrests and bloodshed. And is this arbitrary violence not more than a merely local affair?

All this has convinced us yet again that religion is a crime in our country and that believers are arch-criminals. Owning religious literature is forbidden by state godlessness. So Ponomaryov, looking at a pile of religious books, said "I'm very hard on criminals, I hate them". This was while he was still in our house, long before the preliminary investigation — but we were already criminals! Is this not just arbitrary power?

We firmly protest against such violent acts of terrorism and demand full observance of justice and the laws, as expressed in the teaching of Lenin, the Constitution of the USSR, international agreements, the Declaration of Human Rights and the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference. Are all these humane and equitable international legal norms now being proclaimed and published abroad just so much empty air? We don't want to believe that.

This whole act of banditry, carried out by insolently shameless KGB men, went on for four days.

The search warrant stated that "the residence of V. F. Shelkova may contain stores

of manuscripts, libellous literature, machinery designed to print or reproduce such literature, and objects and documents which may be relevant to the case".

As a result of the search, all purely religious literature was confiscated: Bibles, psalms, books dealing with moral and spiritual subjects, religious poetry and tape-recordings, tape-recordings of sermons and psalms, and all our savings down to the last penny. As for libellous literature, for confiscation of which the warrant was made out, we have never had any. The confiscated literature was purely religious in content and was not directed against Soviet power.

We firmly protest against the unjust and baseless accusations that purely religious literature is libellous in content, as it does not attack Soviet power but is directed only against the dictatorship of state atheism, which is in its own way the state religion of the godless class. State atheism now artificially broadens the category of crimes and makes criminals out of innocent religious citizens. State atheism initiates illegal repression of the freedoms of all freely believing Soviet citizens belonging to purely religious denominations: the freedoms of conscience and belief, with their indivisible attributes — freedom of speech, of the press and of assembly.

We firmly protest against the illegal, baseless arrest of the very old Vladimir Andreyevich Shelkov and the seriously ill Ilya Sergeyevich Lepshin.

We protest against the illegal search.

We protest against the barbarous and criminal actions of those who carried out the search (or robbery).

We firmly protest against the illegal confiscation during the search of:

- 1) purely religious literature;
- 2) literature dealing with law and rights;
- 3) objects of material value;
- 4) savings;
- 5) other objects of material and cultural value (photographs, slides, tape-recordings, etc.).

We firmly protest at the cruel repression and violence directed against all dissent in thought and religion by the dictatorship of state atheism in our country.

Let us put an end to shameless state

atheism in the USSR!

We decisively protest against the enslaved, weak position of the True and Free Christians of our land.

Down with the criminal Legislation on Religious Cults of 1929-75, which enslaves religious people!

We demand:

- 1) that the executioners threatening their chosen victims, the honest, innocent believers of our country, should be made to stay their hand;
- 2) that the unfortunate victims of the militant violence of state godlessness, V. A. Shelkov and I. S. Lepshin, should be released immediately. Criminal charges against them must be dropped;
- 3) that everything confiscated during the illegal, baseless search-robbery should be returned;
- 4) that we should be compensated and reimbursed for all the material damage done during the search;

5) that such harassment by force of religion and believers in the USSR should cease.

We are seriously concerned at the state of health of the very old V. A. Shelkov and the seriously ill I. S. Lepshin and we fear for their lives and safety. If either of them comes to an untimely end (as Ponomaryov threatened during the search), the whole responsibility will be yours and we are informing you of this.

If our legal protests and rightful demands are not taken into consideration, we shall be forced to inform all socialist countries and world public opinion as a whole about this arbitrary act of violence.

With respect,
Dina Vladimirovna Lepshina
Vladimir Vladimirovich Shelkov
(and all relatives of those arrested)
Tashkent, Soyuznaya 56
19 March 1978

An Interview with Alexander Ginzburg

by Tom Dybdahl

Alexander Ginzburg was interviewed for SPECTRUM by Tom Dybdahl on October 30, 1980, at the home of Dr. Hans Wuerth, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Ginzburg, long active in the human rights movement in the Soviet Union, along with four other political prisoners, was exchanged on April 27, 1979, for two convicted spies. One of the founding members of the Moscow Helsinki Watch Group and the editor of

the first samizdat literary journal, Ginzburg has been arrested, tried and imprisoned for his human rights activities in 1960, 1967 and 1977.

Spectrum: How did you meet Shelkov?

Ginzburg: In 1968, I was taken to the labor camp where he was. He had only a week left to serve in that camp; we spent a week together. After that I only saw him once for a very short time.

Spectrum: Did you correspond?

Tom Dybdahl, a member of SPECTRUM's Editorial Board, is a full-time book editor living in Allentown, Pennsylvania.

Ginzburg: We had extensive correspondence, and when I was put in prison, Shelkov wrote a very wonderful open letter in support of me. A copy was sent to President Carter.

Spectrum: Prior to your meeting, did you know anything about him, or about Adventists?

Ginzburg: Very little. This camp where we met was unique in that in it there were quite a few religious leaders of different churches. In the prison slang, this particular camp was known as a “snake pit.” The people who were in this camp were those they were afraid of in other camps. A lot of religious leaders were there.

Spectrum: Where was this camp?

Ginzburg: It was between Moscow and Volga, close to the Volga River.

Spectrum: What was the camp like?

Ginzburg: It was a very small camp. The only people there were those who had been in camps three times. There were only about 40. And in a year and a half, six people died — from tuberculosis and ulcers.

Spectrum: How did life there compare with what is described in Solzhenitsyn’s *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*?

Ginzburg: Today things are both better and worse. There is a scene in *Ivan Denisovich* where the convicts are fighting over the packages which some of them received. Today this could never happen. None of these appear in camp. During the time when the book was written, a convict could receive as many packages as he would be sent. But these days, you can only receive one package a year, after having served half your term. And before that you can’t receive any packages. [Ginzburg was in camps for 9½ years.]

Spectrum: Describe your cell.

Ginzburg: It held four people; there were four army cots. There was one wooden stove which served two cells. They brought wood to it in camp, but it was a very small amount. The normal temperature in the cell was 12 to 13 degrees C. [54 to 55 degrees F.]

Spectrum: Were you a religious person at the time?

Ginzburg: Yes, I am a Russian Orthodox Christian and was confirmed when I was 13 years old.

Spectrum: What did Shelkov look like?

Ginzburg: He was very tall. He had a large bald spot on his head and a huge beard. He was 82 when I last saw him, and his hair was totally gray.

Spectrum: Do you know anything about his background?

Ginzburg: Not much. He became a preacher in 1924. He spent 23 years in prison before 1968. He also wrote many books.

Spectrum: What kind of books were they?

Ginzburg: There are three categories: religious books, books dealing with human

“There is a very, very important commandment which Seventh-day Adventists believe in, Thou shalt not kill. This is a very big threat to the Soviet authorities. This and the fact that Adventists proselytize.”

rights, and also the books dealing with the persecution of the church. I have 70 of his books.

Spectrum: Why was Shelkov in prison?

Ginzburg: For his religious work. There is a very, very important commandment which Seventh-day Adventists believe in, Thou shalt not kill. This is a very big threat to the Soviet authorities. This and the fact that Adventists proselytize.

The authorities also wanted to get hold of Shelkov’s publishing facilities. But, so far, they have been unsuccessful in finding these publishing facilities in spite of the fact that I receive work all the time that they do here in the West. Another thing that they didn’t like at all was that this publishing house helped other dissidents as well. For instance, it was in this typographical facility that the brochure on Solzhenitsyn’s Russian Social Fund was created. And they made blanks — applications — for the Helsinki monitoring groups.

Spectrum: So they published much more than religious material?

Ginzburg: Yes. And the government is trying to find them, where they are, how they do it.

Spectrum: You mentioned that Shelkov's press helped other dissidents, and the article about Shelkov mentions that Andrei Sakharov came to one of the trials of Shelkov. Did Shelkov know Sakharov?

Ginzburg: They didn't know each other. While Sakharov was doing his human rights activities, Shelkov was in prison, or he was underground. In that whole time, Shelkov only spent one year not hiding. They put out a complete national search on him, and they were trying to locate him as a common criminal all across the Soviet Union.

Spectrum: But because of his actions in helping dissidents, others came to help him?

Ginzburg: Of course.

Spectrum: Did he know Solzhenitsyn?

Ginzburg: No. But he read him very carefully. He's the one that published all of Solzhenitsyn's activities.

Spectrum: What kind of influence did Shelkov have on you?

Ginzburg: In the camp, I immediately saw that he was a very brilliant personality. He was always surrounded by other people, no matter what religion they were. And every night in the barracks he would speak to at least 15 to 18 people about the history of the church.

Spectrum: Did Shelkov ever try to convert you?

Ginzburg: No. That problem does not exist in the camps. Everybody respects everybody's religion, and proselytizing only goes towards the people who are nonbelievers. That's just a basic rule of camp.

Spectrum: Do you know where he is buried?

Ginzburg: He is buried close to the camp where he was. The excuse the authorities give is that they will not return the body until his time in jail is expired.

Spectrum: Do you know the cause of his death? Was he mistreated?

Ginzburg: He didn't work in the camp. He was too old to work. And he had spent years in prison.

Spectrum: Shelkov's daughter had said warm clothes were taken to him and he could not receive them. Why couldn't he receive them?

Ginzburg: He didn't receive them because this is prohibited by the government. The basic form of punishment in Soviet prisons is starvation and freezing.

Spectrum: Will anybody take Shelkov's place?

Ginzburg: Of course, someone will take his place. But his closest associate, a very talented young man, was arrested recently, in July of this year [1980].

Spectrum: Did Shelkov talk about why there was a split in the Adventist church?

Ginzburg: The split occurred when the government tried to subject congregations to certain legal statutes, and Shelkov objected. If the church had accepted these limitations, then it could have been registered officially in the Soviet Union.

Spectrum: So the official Adventist Church accepted those and Shelkov did not?

Ginzburg: That's correct. For instance, it is very hard for people not to try to educate their children in a religious way. Yet doing this is forbidden under the Soviet system. Bowing to this was not acceptable to Shelkov's group.

Spectrum: Are parents allowed to teach their children religion?

Ginzburg: Only the parents are allowed by law to teach their children religion. And the reason that's a very painful situation is that this generation of parents is one that's not religiously educated. If the grandparents were religiously educated, they're not allowed to teach their grandchildren. For instance, I myself don't have the capacity to teach religion to my children. I have a right, but since I wasn't educated religiously, I don't know what to teach.

Spectrum: One of the official Adventist leaders recently reported that there had been some reconciliation between the two groups. Have you heard anything like that?

Ginzburg: There is cooperation as far as the believers are concerned. But as far as the

hierarchies, the upper leaders of the church, there's not much cooperation.

Spectrum: Do you know anything about the relative size of the two groups?

Ginzburg: The unofficial church is really in the majority. Almost two-thirds of the Adventists are in the unofficial church. But what the rate of growth is, that's hard to say. The Soviets today are making a strong effort to register these different parishes. And they often have been successful by giving some concessions. For instance, they allow the Adventist children not to go to school on Saturday, as a way of getting them to register. In general, they are persecuted for this.

Spectrum: Given this concession, are the unofficial Adventists willing to register?

Ginzburg: In general, and as a group, they do not register, but certain parishes have done so.

Spectrum: Do you think that the Shelkov group is becoming more conciliatory toward the government?

Ginzburg: No. It couldn't even if it wanted to, because most of its leaders are in the underground. And the authorities really dislike them.

Spectrum: Are most of the Adventists in a particular area of the country?

Ginzburg: The largest concentration of Adventist parishes is in the northern Caucasian Mountains, and quite a number are in the Baltic regions.

Spectrum: Are there many in Asia?

Ginzburg: A lot fewer. But there are some in Central Asia.

Spectrum: In spite of all the constraints, you mentioned that the church is growing. Where do the converts come from?

Ginzburg: They usually come from people who don't believe, who haven't believed in anything before, not from other churches. The only church which actually gets members from other churches is the Russian Orthodox Church. All other religions are really filled up by people who were former nonbelievers. I never saw any person converted from Baptist to Adventist, or the other way around.

Spectrum: Are individual Adventists

sometimes persecuted?

Ginzburg: To give you an idea of the situation, let me say that one statute in the criminal code had to do with "violations" of the rights of citizens under the guise of religious customs. For instance, when a young boy of a religious family refuses to be a member of the Communist youth group, the Pioneers, his parents could be subject to criminal penalties because they abridge his right to be a member of the Pioneers. And there have been trials where parents were convicted for not allowing the child to become a Pioneer.

Spectrum: What happens to a child who doesn't want to go to school on Saturday, or doesn't want to join the Pioneers?

Ginzburg: The authorities force the teachers to try to humiliate him. And besides that, the state can remove parental rights.

“ . . . he was a very brilliant personality. He was always surrounded by other people, no matter what religion they were. And every night in the barracks he would speak to at least 15 to 18 about the history of the church.”

Spectrum: Do they take children away from their parents?

Ginzburg: This has happened. The children are sent to a children's home.

Spectrum: What happens if a member refuses to join the Army?

Ginzburg: If a member of the unofficial church refuses to join the army, he may spend three or four years in prison for it.

Spectrum: So they even refuse to join construction brigades?

Ginzburg: They refuse to join the army at all.

Spectrum: Is this common?

Ginzburg: More and more it is happening.

Spectrum: With all this persecution, are there many who remain faithful?

Ginzburg: As a matter of fact, today there

are even more people in the church. For a long time, people believed in the ideas of socialism. But today, nobody believes in them any more, so as a result, more people are turning to the church. This is why I try to encourage all churches to do some kind of missionary work in the Soviet Union. The movement toward religion, and the desire for religion, is really great.

Spectrum: Is there anything that Adventists in America could do to help improve the life of unofficial members?

Ginzburg: Yes, definitely. If they were recognized and supported, they would be in a much stronger position. And if they simply, for instance, just brought the works of Ellen White to the Soviet Union, in Russian, this would be a great help to those people. Because they are forced to spend a lot of time and energy in publishing these works there.

Spectrum: One reason the General Conference has given to explain why it doesn't recognize the unofficial Adventist Church is that it would hurt the official members.

Ginzburg: That's false.

Spectrum: Nothing we write here will cause them trouble?

Ginzburg: As a general rule, these days, a person is in much less danger in the Soviet Union if he is written about in the West. If I wasn't known in the West, I wouldn't be here today.

Spectrum: Is there any way that the church here could be doing evangelistic work? Could I go and preach?

Ginzburg: If you knew Russian, you could. And there could be radio programs.

Spectrum: So the church could be doing much more from outside than it is doing?

Ginzburg: Absolutely. Today, unfortunately, the Baptist station and the Pentecostal stations have very poor programming. There was an article written about Shelkov when he was arrested which stated that during the search of his house they found many many tapes of religious radio programs from the West. But the major portion of this religious programming was from Voice of America, which transmits basically Russian Orthodox religious programs. And he probably did it simply because there was no other form of religious broadcast.

Spectrum: Would there be any problem with jamming?

Ginzburg: No. The only time they jammed Voice of America was during the Polish strikes.

Spectrum: If the Adventists in Western Europe wanted to have a radio station, could they build a transmitter and start programming.

Ginzburg: Yes, absolutely. And if someone would make good programs and put them on tape, I have the ability to get them to other radio stations. I could talk to Voice of America, German Radio, Radio Korea, the BBC.

Spectrum: Is there anything else you'd like to say?

Ginzburg: Basically, I can say that it is a sin for American Adventists to try to forget two-thirds of the church in the Soviet Union.

The Church in the USSR: A Conversation with Hegstad

edited by Gene Daffern

Roland R. Hegstad, editor of Liberty and associate director of the public affairs department of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, made the following comments during conversations with the editor of SPECTRUM in March and April 1981.

To generalize about “Adventists” in the Soviet Union is almost surely to misinform in some respects. For example, many Adventists in the United States think of two classifications of church members — “underground” and “official.” Even this generalization is wrong on two counts. First, the proper term for Adventists and other groups refusing to register with government is “unregistered churches.” (And, on the other hand, “registered.”) Second, among unregistered Seventh-day Adventists there are at least two groups (three if one includes the Shelkov faction), each with their own long-standing theological and personality differences.

It is hoped that leaders of all factions, registered and unregistered, will soon be able to elect a leader for a unified Adventist Church within the Soviet Union. Some signs of willingness to talk and to pray about issues are encouraging, but it would be premature to rejoice in the resolution of issues that go back many decades.

Gene Daffern, a graduate of Walla Walla College, where he edited the student paper, took his M.D. from Loma Linda University School of Medicine. He practices in Washington, D. C.

Is the Shelkov Faction One of the Unregistered Adventist Groups?

By most standards it would seem to warrant that designation. However, here too, several qualifications must be entertained. For one thing, what is today called the church of the “True and Free Seventh-day Adventists” broke from the Adventist Church in 1924 over such issues as serving in the armed forces, bearing arms and registering with the government. Shelkov became leader of the group in 1954.

From information I have received both from registered and unregistered Adventists, the “True and Free Seventh-day Adventists” may be more analagous to the Shepherd’s Rod in the United States than to other unregistered Soviet Adventist factions — not in belief, but in the degree to which belief divides from the main body of Adventism. The registered Adventist congregations and the two unregistered factions recognize each other as *bone fide* SDAs, though disagreeing emphatically on some issues; but they are united in regarding the Shelkov faction as something other. However, Michael Bourdeaux, editor of the widely respected journal, *Religion in Communist Lands*, believes some of our information concerning Shelkov’s theology may be incorrect.

The “True and Free” Adventists have suffered fragmentation among themselves. Shelkov’s son-in-law, Orleg Litkov, was one who broke away, accusing Shelkov of creating a “cult of the person.” A number of ex-Shelkov people are among our registered

and unregistered orthodox Seventh-day Adventist churches. Estimates of Shelkov's followers range from 1,000 to 100,000 — the latter estimate probably influenced by the "noise" they make. A former member of the "True and Free" group told me 9,000 would be close. Others think that number, too, is exaggerated. Take your pick. There are some 30,000 registered and unregistered Adventists who, as I have indicated, regard each other with some qualifications, but nevertheless as members of the Adventist world family. Only the Lord Himself could tell us who are truly His, and I'm sure He has followers in each group.

Issues Separating the Groups

Registration with government is a basic issue. Some choose not to register as a matter of conviction, others to avoid harrassment. To become a registered church, 20 Adventists must sign a petition and, ultimately, may receive permission to meet as a congregation. Free assembly is not a right in the Soviet Union, as it is in the United States.

Sabbath observance, particularly in the matter of sending children to school on Sabbath, is a genuinely important issue. Some here in the States have assumed that registered congregations follow this practice, while the "genuine" Adventists of the unregistered congregations do not. But again, the issue is not clear-cut. Among the registered churches are Adventists who will not do so. Those in both groups who do explain that they feel children must make their own decision. Some children, they explain, have had nervous breakdowns because of the peer pressure and scorn from teachers this course may bring. When a child understands the Sabbath truth and is willing to face the consequences, I was told, parents will back his decision.

If this reasoning sounds less than satisfying, consider the consequences: A child may be taken from the parents (though not so frequently now as a few years ago) and placed in an atheist home — perhaps hundreds or even thousands of miles away. Two years ago, I met a young lady who had just been returned to her parents because she had become 18. She cried as she told me of two

younger sisters still separated from their parents. Of course, in some cases, gracious teachers and other officials honor the child's religious commitment, and things go well. But such is not the usual. When asked for counsel on this matter, I have replied: We have no pope in Washington to dictate what you must do. The same Bible I carry, you also carry; it contains God's instructions. And you have access to the Holy Spirit. Get on the line to God and seek His will.

We must keep in mind that our Soviet brethren were separated from the worldwide Adventist family for many years. The visit to the Soviet Union of R. R. Figuhr and Jean Nussbaum in 1960 marked the first contact between Adventist world leaders and our Soviet believers since at least World War II. In 1966, as I recall, I was the second member of the General Conference to visit our Soviet believers. In 1967, W. Duncan Eva and Alf Lohne were in Moscow.

Our believers had few Bibles and even fewer Adventist books. It is not surprising that the years of attrition and conflict with authorities on behalf of conscience has produced a people who sometimes elevate policy to the level of principle and then battle each other on issues quite as enthusiastically as they battle the authorities.

For example, when I was in Moscow in 1966, one of the great issues was whether the congregation should use a common cup for communion or provide a cup for each communicant. "You are now using five goblets instead of one," I pointed out, "and if five, why not 500?"

Shelkov and the Human Rights Movement

Shelkov has been the most publicized Adventist in the Soviet Union because he linked his ministry with that of Soviet dissidents and publicized abuses of religious rights in the context of the Helsinki Accords. He also had an extensive *samizdat* publishing operation. He and his group were probably as effective as the much larger unregistered Baptist publishing enterprise.

My colleagues and I in the department of public affairs and religious liberty are interested in securing a number of Shelkov's books and papers — we know of 40 or so — and having them translated into English. It would take about \$10,000 to handle those now available. I think this project should be of tremendous interest both to the Adventist Church and world leaders of the human rights movement. Until we have access to

“I have long urged that after trying quiet diplomacy unsuccessfully we give more publicity within our own papers and elsewhere to instances of mistreatment of Seventh-day Adventists in the Soviet Union.”

these materials, it would seem well to reserve judgment on some aspects of Shelkov's teaching. Most information we have now comes from those who disagree with Shelkov's positions. Only when we have opportunity to study his work will we know to what degree his theology and other views can be described as aberrant, when compared to traditional Adventist positions.

And, whatever we find, he must be admired for standing up to 22 years or so of imprisonment and a death sentence.

Whether Shelkov acted wisely in linking the cause of the “True and Free Seventh-day Adventists” with the political aspirations of Soviet dissidents may be a judgment dependent both on principle and perspective. Certainly by so doing he incurred the acute displeasure of the Soviet state — but the practice of Christian principle may do that. Perhaps I must leave it to each SPECTRUM reader to determine for himself whether one honors the counsel of Paul in Romans 13 by linking religious issues with political and publicizing violations of a political document such as the Helsinki Accords.

One additional perspective: I was told bluntly by Dr. Mixa, a former minister of religious affairs in Czechoslovakia, that the

reason our church has gotten along as well as it has since 1968 is that Adventist leaders during the Dubcek era did not sign manifestos and other political documents, as several other churches did. I won't extrapolate too broadly from this incident; circumstances differ from country to country. But in the main, Adventists do well to stick to their gospel knitting and eschew political controversies. Certainly the Adventist-sponsored International Religious Liberty Association has achieved results through its “Quiet Diplomacy” that likely would not have been achieved through foot-stomping.

When news came to the General Conference that Shelkov had been arrested, we did not simply write him off by taking the line that this man was not a Seventh-day Adventist. I drafted a statement on behalf of the church that said in part:

We regret that the Soviet government has found it necessary to imprison an 83-year-old man because he has stated his conscience on various issues. And while Shelkov at some time in the past diverged from the Adventist Church and has a group which he calls the True and Free Seventh-day Adventists, nevertheless, we regret the circumstances that surround his arrest.

The Wisdom of Reporting Soviet Treatment of Adventists

No one has documented one incident of retaliation toward a Seventh-day Adventist in the Soviet Union, or, indeed, to any Christian, as the consequence of international publicity concerning his mistreatment. To the contrary, one can document a relaxation of government pressures, in some cases, because of international publicity. Experts on Soviet affairs, such as Michael Bourdeaux with whom I have talked, agree with these statements.

I have long urged that after trying quiet diplomacy unsuccessfully we give more publicity within our own papers and elsewhere to instances of mistreatment of Seventh-day Adventists in the Soviet Union.

Religious Toleration in the Soviet Union

I support the policy of those Soviet Adventists who seek to register congregations with the government. While the con-

stitution of the Soviet Union does not permit the promulgation of religion as it does protect the promulgation of atheism, freedom of worship by citizens, singly and corporately, is upheld — and indeed was strengthened in a recent (1978) revision. In practice, this means such freedom is guaranteed to registered congregations.

Soviet Adventists who are members of registered congregations are far from spineless acquiescers in injustice. By working with officials assured of their loyalty to the Soviet state, they have achieved some long-desired objectives. For example, two young men are now training for the ministry at Newbold College, in England. Recently, our churches have been permitted to publish a small paper, Sabbath school lessons, and week of prayer materials. During a recent meeting in Moscow with the deputy minister of religious affairs, I was impressed with his knowledge of Adventist affairs — theological and other. I found he knew every Adventist minister in

the Soviet Union by name, and a number of elders as well.

Of course, not even the deputy minister or the minister of religious affairs himself controls how laws are applied to Christians in the Soviet Union. But good relations on every level can be helpful. Recently a high official was instrumental in securing the release of one of our ministers from prison.

Members of our recognized churches in the Soviet Union believe it to be not only wise policy but the imperative of Scripture itself that Adventists be good citizens. Certainly they should not be stigmatized as compromisers by those in this country and elsewhere who are far removed from the realities of their witness and its consequences.

Many have themselves spent years in prison camps. Many are prepared to spend more before compromising the essentials of the gospel.

A Letter to Soviet Adventists

October 31, 1979
Dear Brothers and Sisters in Christ: From the depths of our hearts we greet each one of you with the wishes expressed by John, the apostle of love: “My prayer for you, my very dear friend, is that you may be as healthy and prosperous in every way as you are in soul. I was delighted when the brothers arrived and spoke so highly of the sincerity of your life — obviously you are living in the truth. Nothing brings me greater joy than hearing that

my children are living in the truth” (3 John 2-4, Phillips).

We are not only thinking about the life to come but we wish you physical and spiritual blessings in this present life. The personal acquaintance we have with some of you and the good testimonies we hear from others regarding your faithfulness give us cause to rejoice. When we think of you, dear brothers and sisters in Christ, we have a warm feeling of Christian fellowship. We often mention you in our prayers as we talk to our heavenly

Father. We trust that you likewise include us in your prayers, so that we can join together in a blessed fellowship before the throne of Grace each day.

As the year 1979 hastens toward its close, we look back with gratitude for what God has done for His people. We also look forward with great anticipation to what He has prepared for us in the future. With confidence we place ourselves in His hands and trust His guidance. It is very fitting that the Week of Prayer comes to the church toward the end of the year. It gives us all a special opportunity to seek the Lord for spiritual strength and personal dedication.

Here in Washington, D.C., we have just concluded the annual meetings of the worldwide Seventh-day Adventist Church. Representatives from many parts of the world were here for spiritual fellowship and counsel on matters pertaining to the church. This year, for the first time, two representatives from the USSR were with us: Pastor M. Kulakov, from Tula in the Federated Republic, and Pastor N. Zhukaluk, from Lvov in the Ukraine. They brought us greetings from believers in the USSR and studied with us the great fundamental beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists. Their presence was greatly appreciated as we counseled together. They, in a very fine way, represented the USSR and Adventist believers there. God blessed their testimonies and their influence.

We are happy to hear that in most of the Soviet republics, our churches now have the opportunity of electing district senior pastors and also senior pastors for the entire republics. We trust these organizational steps will serve to unify Seventh-day Adventists in fellowship and faith, and will strengthen their witness.

From time to time questions are raised as to the attitude of the General Conference toward believers and their church organizations in countries where it has not been possible to follow in detail the organizational procedures Seventh-day Adventists have outlined in their *Church Manual* and *Working*

Policy. To this we answer that the following principles should be practiced and serve as a guide in such situations:

1) The General Conference can recognize only one Seventh-day Adventist organization in any country. This would normally be the one recognized by the authorities. We conduct our work in harmony with biblical principles expressed in texts such as Romans 13:1-8 and Acts 5:29. On this basis we encourage all who consider themselves to be Seventh-day Adventists to identify with the recognized body of believers. We are convinced that this is in harmony with biblical and Spirit of Prophecy counsel to the church.

2) The General Conference recognizes that in some countries there are divisions of opinion among those who profess to be good and faithful Seventh-day Adventists. Usually, these differences of opinion do not relate to fundamental doctrinal matters, but rather, as to how individuals understand and practice Bible instruction such as "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's" (Matt. 22:21). We honor the conscience of each believer in this respect and reach out with brotherly love and pastoral concern to all who want to obey God's commandments and be considered members of the spiritual body of Seventh-day Adventist believers.

3) The General Conference appeals to those who hold differing opinions to talk to and fellowship with each other in love and with mutual respect. Fellow believers should avoid attitudes, actions and words that misrepresent the church and tend to create unholy strife among believers.

In all this we aim for unity in Christ, oneness in faith and practice, and, hopefully, eventual union in one church organization.

We send you our Christian greetings and brotherly love. Both the present and the future are cared for by the promises of God. We are all admonished: "Wait for the Lord; be strong, and let your heart take courage; yea, wait for the Lord!" (Psalm 27:14, RSV).

Your brethren in Christ,
Neal C. Wilson, President
Alf Lohne, Vice President

Lay Representation in Union Constituency Meetings

by Janice Eiseman Daffern

Lay representation became a prominent issue at some of the meetings of the nine North American union conference constituencies held early in 1981. Several unions significantly increased the number of lay persons on their executive committees. More dramatically, one, the Columbia Union, revised its constitution and bylaws to insure greater lay representation in the union constituency, constitutionally the highest authority within a union. The Columbia Union now requires that a minimum of 35 percent of the delegates to constituency sessions must be lay persons, that is, individuals not employed by church organizations or institutions.

Union constituencies are important because they select the officers of the union, including, of course, the president. The presidents of the unions in North America have traditionally been regarded as some of the most powerful and influential leaders within the Adventist Church. They not only

chair the boards of North American senior colleges and conference constituency meetings selecting local conference officers, but also are assumed to have influence beyond their numbers at General Conference sessions electing General Conference presidents. It is constitutionally the case that the union executive committees (chaired by the presidents) are the administrative units in North America that select delegates to General Conference sessions. On more than one occasion, the chairman of the nominating committee at a General Conference session has been a union conference president.

In preparation for the round of union constituency meetings held the year after the General Conference session, the secretariat of the General Conference presented to union administrators attending the 1980 Annual Council a "model" constitution and bylaws. As their constituency meetings approached, the unions adapted the model to their specific needs and sent it out this spring to delegates.

The Columbia Union constituency meeting, March 8-9, 1981, revealed how lay representation has emerged as an important concern. Delegates immediately noted that while the constitution, reflecting the model, proposed by the Columbia Union men-

Janice Eiseman Daffern, a member of the pastoral staff of Sligo Church in Takoma Park, received her B.A. in Theology from Walla Walla College and is completing an M.Div. from the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.

tioned the possibility of electing lay persons to the executive committee, it did not recommend a percentage. Nor did it propose levels of lay representation at the quinquennial meetings of the union constituency. The proposal from the Columbia Union did suggest that the number of delegates for the General Conference be limited to 10 percent of the union constituency.

Although the 1976 Columbia Union constituency delegates had voted to have at least 20 percent lay representation to the session, the new proposed constitution from the Columbia Union passed over the issue. A separate sheet was included in the packets sent to the delegates, that said:

The local conference is directly responsible to the laity within that conference. The union conference is directly responsible to the local conferences within the union. In other words, the union conference staff primarily services the local conference leadership and clergy.

While it is true that the laity predominate at a local session, in a union session, normally, pastors have a larger representation in a business meeting which covers the wider area of the union.

Local congregations choose delegates to a local conference session. The local conference executive committee is the body which names delegates to the union wide session.

Several delegates wrote to the Columbia Union in advance of the constituency meeting questioning the de-emphasis of lay responsibility. The discussion continued on the floor of the session where it was referred to the constitution and bylaws committee for further study.

The chairman of the committee was a lay person, Allan Buller, vice president of Worthington Foods. He especially invited two of the pastors advocating greater lay involvement to sit in on the meeting. When the group gathered, the two pastors were joined by more than 30 observers, a majority of whom were young pastors from the constituent conferences. General Conference associate secretary Don Christman was also present. Although Christman warned that

they were not following the General Conference approved model, the committee, in its three hours of work, recommended two major revisions to the full constituency. First, no more than 65 percent of the delegates to union sessions could be denominational employees. Second, one-third of the executive committee would consist of lay members, with a specific number of pastors and representatives of the educational work selected as well. The committee, in its recommendations, expressly excluded directors of the union departments from serving on the union executive committee. (Most local conference executive committees do not include departmental directors.) The committee's proposal never reached the floor.

That afternoon, the committee was recalled to meet with W. O. Coe, the union conference president, and C. E. Bradford, vice president of the General Conference for

“It may just be that this year’s sessions will come to be regarded as the loudest cry for lay participation in the church’s recent history.”

North America. Coe expressed fear of a morale problem in his administration if departmental directors were not made members of the executive committee in the Columbia Union when their counterparts in all other North American unions are members. He went further to say he did not want the Columbia Union to be the first to make such a move.

Bradford, in a strongly worded statement, said the idea that union session and executive committees were the place for sizable lay representation was widely held, but a misconception. He warned that such a practice would cause confusion because lay people are not initiated in the working of unions and that this work should be “left to pros.”

After hearing from Coe and Bradford, the constitution and bylaws committee reworked its proposal regarding the composition of the executive committee to reinstate

departmental directors. The committee's final proposal adopted by the full constituency created a large executive committee: 23 *ex officio* members—union administrators, pastors (one from each conference) and four other persons, two of whom must represent the interests of K-12 education. As for the important issue of lay representation in the union constituency, the session adopted the committee's suggested figure of 35 percent.

Although no specific percentage of lay delegates of a constituency meeting was written into the constitution and bylaws of the Southwestern Union, the makeup of its executive committee was changed to include 10 lay persons and five pastors. Although W. R. May, secretary of the union, does not recall who was the author, he says that the union leadership received a letter from the General Conference suggesting that 30 percent of the delegates to the 1981 session of the union constituency be lay persons. The leadership of the union passed that request on to the local conference executive committees choosing the union constituency. May says that the Southwestern Union would cheerfully increase lay representation in the union constituency to 50 percent if there were a desire on the part of the membership to do so.

Major White, secretary of the Pacific Union Conference, said that the union constituency meeting this spring accented not only lay participation, but also representation from ethnic and racial groups. The bylaws only read that two-thirds of the delegates to the quinquennial session of the constituency be pastors and lay persons and that there be a "fair representation" of lay people and ethnic groups. White conceded that interpreting "fair representation" was left to the conference committees making up the delegate list. As for the makeup of the executive committee, 10 of the 50 members are lay persons and another 10 are local pastors.

H. F. Roll, secretary of the Southern Union, indicates that at its constituency meeting this spring the number of lay persons on the executive committee rose from

five to 14. However, the bylaws of the union gives no specific percentage for selecting lay members of the union constituency. The trend to specify the number of lay members of the executive committee but not of the union constituency was shared by the North Pacific Union as well.

That leaves the Columbia Union as the only one in North America to adopt in its constitution and bylaws minimum levels of lay representation on both the executive committee and union constituency. When asked to comment on why this meeting of the Columbia Union constituency was so active in changing patterns of representation, Monte Sahlin, a pastor in the Pennsylvania conference, listed four factors. First, the delegates were able to study the proposed constitution and bylaws before they came to the constituency session and were prepared to discuss the issues. Second, the constitution and bylaws committee invited observers to make suggestions. Third, though W. O. Coe resisted the removal of departmental directors from the executive committee, he expressed support for increased lay involvement and suggested accomplishing that by enlarging the committee. Fourth, a significant number of local pastors united to speak forcefully in favor of equitable representation in the decision-making processes of the church.

Sahlin also noted that a new generation of Adventist pastors is emerging in the church. Whereas in the past they often understood their pastoral role as a steppingstone to administrative positions, these pastors are developing a high degree of identification with the congregations they serve. With recognition of the gifts given to all in the body of Christ, the pastors are developing a heightened sense of responsibility to make certain those gifts are used in the work of the church at all levels.

Certainly those who construct models for North American Division organization in the future must consider the meaning of the actions taken by North American union constituencies in the spring of 1981. It may just be that this year's sessions will come to be regarded as the loudest cry for lay participation in the church's recent history.

AAF News and Roster

by Claire Hosten

The Association of Adventist Forums has grown to more than 5,500 members. Membership in the association includes four issues of SPECTRUM. During the last six years, 17 out of the last 18 SPECTRUMS have been mailed to more members than received the previous issue. Professionals in periodical circulation inform us that readership is always several times paid circulation.

The association emerged from groups of students and professionals, both lay persons and those employed by the church. There are now 40 chapters of the association, one-quarter of them overseas. The latest groups to form are in the United States: Atlanta, Orlando, Jacksonville and Philadelphia. Some of the chapters are small, with average attendance of approximately 20. Others have a membership of over 300, and some meetings have exceeded 2,000 people.

In Australia and New Zealand, the Association of Adventist Forums is becoming as well-known as the koala bear. Nine chapters

have now formed. In Australia there are chapters in Adelaide, Brisbane, Canberra, Lake Macquarie, Melbourne, Sydney and Western Australia. In New Zealand, chapters have sprung up in Auckland and Christchurch. Membership in these groups ranges from 40 to 200. Each chapter has its own newsletter, publishing both local and overseas news. Some also include articles. Memberships, of course, have increased in Australia, and with greater exposure to SPECTRUM, single copies and back issues are now in great demand down under.

SPECTRUM is not only read in Australia, but all over the world, including several countries in each of the following: Africa, Europe, the Far East, Southern Asia, the Middle East, South America and the islands of the West Indies. We even have members receiving SPECTRUM in the Seychelles Islands, Fiji and Katmandu.

Glacier View has dominated discussions into 1981. In Toronto, Canada, with only two days notice, information was passed by word of mouth, and more than 100 people attended a meeting on the subject. More than 2,000 also attended a meeting of the Loma Linda chapter on Glacier View. Clearly, this indicates a sustained interest by church

Claire Hosten, executive secretary of the Association of Adventist Forums, is an attorney in Washington, D.C. She graduated from Caribbean Union College and Howard University Law School.

members in theological topics.

But other subjects also elicit interest. The chapter at Pacific Union College had to change the location of one of its meetings when around 1,500 people appeared for a showing of the cinematic adaptation of C. S. Lewis' "The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe." After the showing of the film, a panel discussed Lewis' allegory and the role of this type of literature in the development of healthy children. Other topics discussed during the last 12 months at various chapter meetings in the United States and overseas include: "The Church: Its Agenda in the Eighties," "God and Time: Foreknowledge

and Providence," "Divine Foreknowledge and Human Free Will," "Dilemmas in the Institutionalization of Adventism," "The Role of the Pastor When Every Member Is a Minister," "How Can the Concept of the Individual's Ministry Be Realized Within Adventist Institutions?"

Why not let us hear from your group? Write to us, c/o Association of Adventist Forums, PO Box 4330, Takoma Park, MD 20012. And encourage those three or four people who keep insisting on reading your copy of SPECTRUM to get their own copies by becoming members of AAF!

ASSOCIATION OF ADVENTIST FORUMS ROSTER

REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Regional Representatives coordinate Association of Adventist Forums activities in areas — usually equivalent to those within the denomination's union confer-

ences. The representatives serve on the national AAF Board.

Atlantic Region

Richard B. Lewis, Jr.
Advertising Assts., Inc.
436 Boston Post Rd.
Weston, MA 02193
Tel. (O) (617) 899-3250

Central Region

Erwin Sicher
212 Woodlawn
Keene, TX 76059
Tel. (O) (817) 645-3921 x269
(817) 645-7246

Central Pacific Region

(vacant)

Columbia Region

Charles Bensonhaver
326 Southbridge Lane
Dayton, OH 45459
Tel. (O) (513) 299-4832
(H) (513) 435-2180

Lake Region

Walter B. T. Douglas
712 Bluffview Dr.
Berrien Springs, MI 49103
Tel. (O) (616) 471-3543
(H) (616) 471-7107

Northern Pacific Region

John Brunt
Walla Walla College
College Place, WA 99324
Tel. (O) (509) 527-2193
(H) (509) 529-8114

Southern Region

David Steen
Biology Dept.
Southern Missionary College
Collegedale, TN 37315
Tel. (O) (615) 396-4369
(H) (615) 236-4636

Southern Pacific Region

Mike Scofield
1465 Rockview St.
Monterey Park, CA 91754
Tel. (H) (213) 244-9625

AAF CHAPTERS

Angwin, Calif.

Pacific Union College
Eric Anderson or
Kent Seltman
English Dept.
Pacific Union College
Angwin, CA 94508
Tel. (O) (707) 965-7559

Atlanta, Ga.

T. Grace Emori
2502 Asbury Court
Decatur, GA 30033
Tel. (404) 325-0360

Berrien Springs, Mich.

Andrews University
R. Edward Turner
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, MI 49104
Tel. (O) (616) 471-3408
(H) (616) 473-4369

Boston, Mass.*New England Adventist Forum*

David Mee Lee
 New England Memorial Hospital
 5 Woodland Rd.
 Stoneham, MA 02180

Tel. (O) (617) 665-1740
 (H) (617) 965-3785

Collegedale, Tenn.*Southern Missionary College*

Jerome Clark
 McKee Library
 Southern Missionary College
 Collegedale, TN 37315

Tel. (O) (615) 396-4289

College Place, Wash.*Walla Walla College*

Gerald Winslow
 Walla Walla College
 College Place, WA 99324

Tel. (O) (509) 527-2456
 (H) (509) 525-3113

Dayton, Ohio

Tom Robbins
 617 Dell Ridge Dr.
 Kettering, OH 45429

Tel. (O) (513) 296-7201 x656
 (H) (513) 294-8635

Flagstaff, Ariz.

Bill D. King, Jr.
 2615 N. 4th St., Rt. 4
 Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Tel. (O) (602) 779-0381
 (H) (602) 526-9190

Fort Worth, Texas

Harold Brendel
 2401 Oakland Blvd.
 Fort Worth, TX 76103

Tel. (817) 429-0521

Jacksonville, Fla.

Ben L. Walker
 PO Box 37378
 Jacksonville, FL 32236

Tel. (904) 781-2535

Keene, Texas*Southwestern Adventist College*

Doug Clark or
 Andy Woolley
 Southwestern Adventist College
 Keene, TX 76059

Tel. (O) (817) 645-3921

Lincoln, Neb.*Union College*

AAF Chapter
 Union College
 Lincoln, NE 68506

Loma Linda, Calif.*Loma Linda University*

Doug Hackleman
 22757 Fairburn Dr.
 Colton, CA 92324
 or Box 251
 Bryn Mawr, CA 92318

Tel. (714) 824-1908

Los Angeles, Calif.

Robin Van Der Molen
 1414 N. Louise
 Glendale, CA 91207

Tel. (213) 246-0077

Memphis, Tenn.

George Foust
 5420 Knight-Arnold Rd.
 Memphis, TN 38104

Tel. (O) (901) 272-2650
 (901) 527-4651

Miami, Fla.

Duane McBride
 15825 SW 99th Ct.
 Miami, FL 33157

Tel. (305) 238-3220

Mid-Columbia, Wash.

Charles Woofter
 814 N. Quillan
 Kennewick, WA 99336

Modesto, Calif.

Mary Jean Coeur Barron
 415 Bonita Ave.
 Modesto, CA 95354

Tel. (O) (209) 529-3552
 (H) (209) 577-0615

New York, NY

Ron Larson
 3928 45th St.
 Sunnyside, NY 11104
 Tel. (212) 729-1698

Orange County, Calif.

Kenneth Moe
 Lyon Moving and Storage Co.
 3416 S. La Cienega Blvd.
 Los Angeles, CA 90016

Tel. (213) 937-6500

Orlando, Fla.

Albert Thompson
 163 Duncan Terrace
 Longwood, FL 32750
 Tel. (305) 869-6524

Philadelphia, Pa.

William A. Niles
 2412 N. 53rd St.
 Philadelphia, PA 19131

Portland, Ore.

Bruce Moyer
 18604 NE 109th Ave.
 Battle Ground, WA 98604

Pomona Valley, Calif.

Barry Casey
 750 W. San Jose Ave. #W4
 Claremont, CA 91711
 Tel. (714) 624-9355

San Francisco, Calif.

William Baker
 1900 Jackson St.
 San Francisco, CA 94109
 Tel. (415) 771-2053

San Diego, Calif.

Walter Fahlsing
 5114 Mt. Helix Drive
 La Mesa, CA 92041
 Tel. (714) 465-6938

Seattle, Wash.

Ray Damazo
 Box 9
 Medina, WA 98039
 Tel. (206) 455-4522

Washington, D.C.

Roy Benton
 806 Maplewood Ave.
 Takoma Park, MD 20012
 Tel. (301) 587-8861

Worthington, Ohio

George Harding
 Harding Hospital
 Worthington, OH 43085

CANADA**College Heights**

Canadian Union College
 Warren Trenchard
 Canadian Union College
 College Heights, Alberta
 Canada T0C 0Z0

Tel. (O) (403) 782-3970
 (H) (403) 782-6287

Toronto and Oshawa

Henry Poutiainen
98 Mortimer Ave.
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M4K 2A1
Tel. (416) 422-4741

AUSTRALIA

Adelaide

Peter Drewer
34 Tallarook Rd.
Hawthorndene, So. Australia 5051
Tel. 278-5716

Brisbane

John Knight
3 Winston St.
Rosedale, Queensland 4123

Canberra

Lynette Carlsen
4 Douglas Place
Spence A.C.T. 2615

Lake Macquarie

Ken Meyers
PO Box 40
Cooranbong, N.S.W. 2265

Melbourne

James Judd
8/705 Park Street
Brunswick, Victoria 3056

Sydney

John Pye
2 Colin Place
Westleigh, N.S.W. 2120

Western Australia

Rao Karvinen
12 Casino Rd.
Glen Forrest
Western Australia 6071

NEW ZEALAND

Auckland

Rhonda Pitt
2/21 Gowing Drive
Meadowbox
Auckland

Christchurch

c/o PO Box 5135
Papanui
Christchurch

TRINIDAD, WEST INDIES

Letnie English
Caribbean Union College
Box 175
Port of Spain
Trinidad, West Indies

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
Festival of the Sabbath Vol. 9, No. 1
Church and the Courts Vol. 9, No. 2
Commemorative Issue Vol. 10, No. 4
Sanctuary Debate Vol. 11, No. 2
Food Vol. 11, No. 3

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

Glacier View Reports

Ford Responds to Shea

To the Editors: I agree wholeheartedly with Dr. Shea's opening statement in his SPECTRUM article (Vol. 11, No. 2) that the real issue at Glacier View was "whether or not the past teaching of the SDA Church that an investigative judgment began in heaven in 1844 was soundly based in Scripture." Since writing that statement, Dr. Shea has been informed by fellow seminary professors at Andrews University, in their meeting of December 16, that their judgment is in the negative on this issue, and that they are not in sympathy with his position as reflected in the October *Ministry*.

Dr. Shea rebukes me for not directly addressing the issue of Old Testament parallels for the investigative judgment. But there are really no such parallels. His discursive analyses of certain Old Testament passages, such as in Ezekiel 1-10, and Psalms, are more homiletic than exegetical, for such instances are anthropomorphic and symbolic, rather than literal and didactic. Inasmuch as they are all found in the era before the atonement of the cross, they cannot be said to parallel God's dealings with His people since. The New Testament (Eph. 3: 9, 10; Rom. 16:25, 26; 2 Cor. 3:5-18; Gal. 4:22-31; Heb. 8:13; 9:1-15)

is clear that the divine dealings since the cross transcend everything in the Old Testament era. In the dispensation of the new covenant, the believer has been judged already at the moment of faith and eternal life given to him, so that condemnation in judgment is no longer possible, provided he abides in Christ (See John 5:24; Rom. 8:1, 11).

The Old Testament citations offered by Dr. Shea might have some value if the New Testament applied them as he does, or if the New Testament gave a clear didactic presentation of the doctrine of the investigative judgment. The question must be asked, "Why does Dr. Shea refrain from using the usual New Testament proof texts such as Acts 3:19; 1 Peter 4:17; and 1 Timothy 5:24?" Could it be that he suspects that the New Testament knows nothing whatever of an investigative judgment, and that therefore there is nothing in this regard for the Old Testament to parallel? For a discussion of this, see chapter five of my sanctuary manuscript.

Dr. Shea's next point concerns Antiochus Epiphanes. He says "many" modern scholars so apply the little horn of Daniel 8. He should have said "most" scholars, both past and present, have so applied it. Those scholars who limit the little horn to Rome have ever been a very insignificant number comparatively.

Dr. Shea's main argument in rebuttal of the Antiochus position is that Daniel 11:22 obviously applies to Christ, and therefore inasmuch as 11:31 parallels 8:11-13, the power in verse 22 must be identical with the prince of 9:26 — Rome. In answer, I would point out that verses 14-35 (at least) are closely knit and that, therefore, whatever chronological view is taken of verse 22 must fit in with the entire prophetic picture. I would challenge Dr. Shea or anyone else to make exegetical sense of the passage by using any other power than Antiochus Epiphanes as central to verses 21-35. Uriah Smith's interpretation has long seemed forced and invalid to many scholars. Dr. Shea puts much stress on the sequence of the verses, but even Smith recognized that it is impossible from the Rome viewpoint to contend for sequence. Thus Smith took verse 23 back to 160 years before Christ, and made the following verses to verse 28 apply to pre-Christian times.

There seems to me to be only one way to make exegetical sense of the Daniel passage:

Verse 22 should be specially noted. As Antiochus is "credited" with betraying princes to whom he professed friendship, and in his day, according to Jewish tradition, the deposed high priest Onias III was murdered, so Rome broke the "prince of the covenant" in AD 31. The latter term is reminiscent of "the Prince of the host" (8:11), "the Prince of princes" (8:25), and "an anointed one, a prince" (9:25). Just as in Matthew 24 and all Old Testament descriptions of "the day of the Lord," the perspective can abruptly change by the introduction of a feature that transcends the immediate historical occasion, so it is here."¹

Verses 29 and 30 speak of the same "he" as the previous 10 verses and distinguish him from the "Kittim" who come against him. "Kittim" (originally Cyprus) came to signify all those regions which, from a Palestinian viewpoint, lay directly to the west. Both the LXX and the Dead Sea Scrolls apply Kittim to Rome. Thus the primary meaning of the power opposed by Kittim cannot also be Rome, but rather fits Antiochus perfectly.

Dr. Shea declares that I have "specifically rejected the interpretation which applies 9:26, 27 to the second century B.C." (39:2). He has not noticed that I have applied the apotelesmatic principle here as well. I quote the lines Dr. Shea has apparently missed.

The situation here is similar to that of chapter 8, the prophecies in each chapter covering the same ground. Both speak of an attack upon the sanctuary by a wicked leader. One speaks of a temporary taking away of the "daily" and the other of the permanent cessation of "sacrifice and offering." Most commentators who have given the prophecy study in depth affirm that God in His mercy intended the faithful before the Christian era to see even in this prophecy shades of Antiochus. See the commentaries of Zöckler, Auberlen, Bosanquet, Fausset, Hofmann, Delitzsch, and a host of others from very ancient times to the present.²

Auberlen writes, "It was therefore necessary that special prophetic announcement should prepare the people for Antiochus." Bosanquet and others have listed the parallels to their own day that the Maccabees would have recognized in Daniel 9:24-27. Here they are:

1. A command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem
2. The appearance of an anointed prince
3. His death
4. Damage to the city and the sanctuary
5. The ceasing of sacrifice
6. The overspreading of abominations in the temple, making it desolate
7. The anointing of a holy of holies at the end
8. Fulfillment in sabbatical cycles of years

Thus, "who could fail in Maccabean days, notwithstanding many obvious difficulties in the application, to couple vaguely these events of Antiochus Epiphanes with Daniel's words in chapter 9? They were so applied."³

Thus in chapters 8, 9 and 11, I have consistently applied each prophecy first to Antiochus, and then spoken of the larger later applications.

In this next section (pp. 40–41), Dr. Shea points out the differences between my denominational commentary on *Daniel* (written in 1973) and my later study manuscript for Glacier View written seven years later. (Shea speaks of a two-year gap by using the year of SPA publication, rather than the date when SPA received the manuscript). The chief difference, however, is that in general I have given most stress in the former volume to the meaning now seen as most pertinent after the delay of Christ's return for so many centuries. In my Glacier View manuscript, I have clearly affirmed "the validity of the year-day principle as a providential provision rather than a biblical datum and its application to the prophecies of Daniel, though without punctiliar precision. . . ." (See my discussion on this in chapter three of the Glacier View manuscript and particularly pp. 344ff.) Thus I have also stressed my confidence in 8:14 as eschatological and on no account to be limited to the second century B.C.

Even my *Daniel* commentary warns against punctiliar precision by precise dates. There, the decree of Cyrus is named as the starting point in the process of the rebuilding of the city (p. 230) and an earlier page quotes as follows: ". . . all sharp divisions in history are obviously artificial. Nothing ends and nothing begins absolutely. There is something absurd in setting hard and fast limits to a period by dates."⁴ The same volume denies the validity of A.D. 34 as a terminal date for the 70 weeks,⁵ and emphasizes that even the end of all things should have transpired within a few short years after the cross, had the church taken the gospel to the world.⁶ All the major interpretations of the Glacier View manuscript are either implicit or explicit in the *Daniel* commentary. The main difference between the two has to do with the literal or metaphorical meaning of *chathak*.

Dr. Shea's attempt to prove that the year-day principle is a biblical rather than a providential datum is based on the use of "years" in a chapter paralleling chapter 8. But the only three usages of this term are found in verses 6, 8, 13 — all within the days of the Greek divided empire and *all prior to the work of the desolating Antichrist who pollutes the*

sanctuary. The 2,300 "days" are specifically linked with the latter defilement — so much so that the numeral itself does not actually qualify "days" but "evening-mornings" — a reference to sanctuary *tamid* units.

This same section from Dr. Shea accuses me repeatedly of "shifting" "from one school of prophetic interpretation into another" (p. 41). This is not true. Both my *Daniel* commentary and the Glacier View manuscript insist on the validity of the apotelesmatic principle which means that the schools (and *not* the vagaries of each individual interpreter, as Dr. Shea insists I teach) of interpretation applying prophecy to the past, continuing history, and the future, may each be correct in what they affirm *in principle*.

Dr. Shea may well be right in affirming 457 B.C. as a settled date for the seventh year of Artaxerxes. I gave little space to that, only alluding to the more commonly used 458 B.C., inasmuch as my chief point was that the seventh year of Artaxerxes yielded a temple decree, not one to rebuild the city. See Ezra 6:14. There is absolutely no biblical evidence that the decree of Ezra 7 had to do with the rebuilding of the city mentioned in Daniel 9:25.

The last section of Dr. Shea's article suggests that "the ultimate irony in the controversy" is Ford's own refusal to employ his own principle" to Mark 14 and to Daniel 8:14 (in the sense of traditional Adventism). I would point out:

1) I do not refuse to apply the apotelesmatic principle to Mark 13. Both the *Daniel* commentary and my Glacier View sanctuary manuscript do so apply. (See pp. 49 and 293 of *Daniel*, and pp. 482ff. of the recent *Sanctuary* manuscript.) My Manchester thesis makes no references to the apotelesmatic principle at any point, for, as all know who have done exegetical work for non-Christian universities, examiners there are only interested in the initial meaning of a passage in biblical literature — what it meant for contemporaries. All other discussion is therefore out of place. My recent manuscript strongly links the apotelesmatic principle

with another principle — that of conditionality. The latter is clearly affirmed in the Manchester thesis, and repeatedly so.

2) When I do apply the apotelesmatic principle, I endeavor to do so with consistency. That is to say, a prophecy by means of the apotelesmatic principle is not to be applied to anything and everything, but to events of similar shape and context in separate ages. See Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 373. I do not see an attenuated investigative judgment as intended by *any* legitimate application of 8:14. The latter verse fortells *restoration* and must always be applied accordingly. Its meaning is certainly eschatological applying both to inaugurated and consummated eschatology as set forth in the *Daniel* commentary (see pp. 176-77).

Contrary to the allegation in Dr. Shea's last lines, I have never taught that all individual interpreters were "right in what they affirm and wrong in what they deny."

Desmond Ford

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *Daniel*, p. 267.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 200.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*, p. 158.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 212, 213.
6. See pp. 211, 212, 219.

Shea Replies to Ford

To the Editors: In reply to Desmond Ford's response to my critique of his Glacier View manuscript, I would submit the following observations:

1) I find it curious how inaccurately Ford reports on a meeting which I attended and he did not. My recollection of the meeting of the graduate and undergraduate religion faculties of Andrews University with Neal Wilson is that since Wilson's remarks were rather lengthy, there was only opportunity for half a dozen or so of the faculty to make remarks or raise questions. Of these, only one voiced anything that I would consider lending some support to Ford's views. If this is the kind of support he expects to find in the academic community, it is meager indeed.

2) That some of the judgments in the Old Testament were investigative in nature is quite clear from the cases I have cited from Numbers, in which the matter was presented before Yahweh at the door of the tabernacle to which he had come down in the pillar of cloud in the sight of all Israel. How one can call the visions of Ezekiel "homiletic" escapes me. For details the reader is referred to my study on this subject in *Studies in the Sanctuary and Atonement, Vol. 1*, available from the Biblical Research Institute at the General Conference.

3) Ford's remarks on the Old Testament era versus the New Testament era sound surprisingly like Scofield-style Dispensationalism. I personally believe that there is no difference between the way in which those who lived before the cross were saved and the way in which those who have lived after the cross are saved. All are saved by the atoning death of Christ on the cross. There naturally has been a difference in the way that atonement has been perceived by those before and after the cross, and the vehicle through which God has communicated His word to the world has differed, Israel being employed for that purpose before the cross and the church after it. These distinctions do not provide adequate reason for God not to judge through the era of the church when he did judge through the era of Israel, as the seals, trumpets, and plagues of Revelation indicate. Regardless how one applies these historically, their common denominator is that of judgment. To completely exclude the Christian world from these judgments is to skew the book of Revelation out of focus from a prominent center of its attention.

4) Implicit in Ford's appeal to the New Testament only here is a denigration of the Old Testament on its own merits. That the greatest revelation of God's love is found in the person and work of Jesus Christ is unquestioned. The debate over creation and evolution, however, has largely to do with Genesis 1-11. The greatest body of literature on the praise of God is found in the Old Testament Psalms. By far the largest body of predictive prophecy is found in the Old Testament. The greatest biblical statement on theodicy is found in the Old Testament book

of Job. The ten commandments and the Sabbath rest, by and large, on the authority of the Old Testament. If the Old Testament is of so little importance in Ford's scheme of things, then he appears to have wasted his time in writing a commentary on the Old Testament book of Daniel.

5) Since the pre-Advent judgment is found in the major apocalyptic book of the Old Testament, it is appropriate to look for it especially in the major apocalyptic book of the New Testament rather than in its letters and historical books. I find the same pattern of judgment in Revelation 14 that I find in Daniel 7, as the box on this page indicates.

Daniel 7:14 proceeds directly to its explanation in verse 27. Revelation 14:1-5 is not really out of order, it is just another case of the common Old Testament type of description which proceeds from result back to cause. Note that dead die in the Lord while the next two messages after that which announces the judgment are being given. Given these two parallel patterns through salvation history, and given the various other themes, terms and prophetic images that are common to Daniel and Revelation, it is reasonable to interpret Revelation 14:6-7 as announcing the judgment described in Daniel 7:9-14 and take both as resulting in the same outcome, the establishment of the final kingdom of God. Note also in this connection the parallels between Daniel 7:9-10 and Revelation 4 and between Daniel 7:13, 14 and Revelation 5.

6) My understanding of the enterprise of biblical scholarship today is that theology starts with exegesis and exegesis starts with linguistics. The very first place to start with the interpretation of Daniel 11:22 and 31 is, therefore, intra-Danielic linguistics. Before proposing historical interpretations for these passages, therefore, one must make a value judgment upon the significance of the lin-

guistic relationship of the *naḡîd* of the *be'it* in Daniel 9:26-27 and the *naḡîd* of the *be'it* in Daniel 11:22. As far as I can see, they should be the same person. Ford holds that they are not. He has not yet addressed himself to the problem posed by these relations.

In this connection I would point out that Jesus Himself reinforces the relationship that I have proposed here. He, as the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27, locates the fulfillment of Daniel 11:31 future to his own time according to Mark 13:14. This poses a major problem for Ford's 1972 thesis. His answer to this problem is to assume that Jesus accepted Antiochus Epiphanes as a fulfillment of Daniel 11:31, for which there is no biblical evidence whatsoever, because Ford thinks that it was fulfilled by Antiochus Epiphanes. For Ford's circular reasoning here, see *The Abomination of Desolation*, pp. 163-165.

7) Ford says that he accepts the second century B.C. application of Daniel 9:24-27 apotelesmatically, which simply contradicts what he has written on p. 297 of *Daniel*:

The evidence is overwhelming that the New Testament teaches that 9:24-27 was *not* [italics Ford's] accomplished in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. Christ saw in the prophecy an allusion to the fate of the city (Jerusalem) and the world which would reject Him. He applied the "abomination of desolation" in 9:27 *first* [my italics] to pagan Rome's attack on Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and second to antichrist's attack on the church just before the end of time. *Christian expositors can do no other than follow their Master's exegesis* [my italics].

8) If one does not think that there has been a major shift in Ford's presentation of prophecy between his commentary and the Glacier View manuscript, then I simply invite the interested reader to lay the two texts side by side and compare them carefully. The Glacier View conference would never have been convened to examine his commentary

Present world history	Commencement of judgment	Temporal interval for judgment	Conclusion of judgment	God's future kingdom
Dan. 7:1-8 Rev. 13:1-18	Dan. 7:9-10 Rev. 14:6, 7	Dan. 7:11, 12 Rev. 14:8-13	Dan. 7:13, 14 Rev. 14:14-20	Dan. 7:27 Rev. 14:1-5

on Daniel and he would be teaching at PUC or Avondale today if that was all he had ever written on this subject.

9) Since the purpose of written communication is to clarify, I do not see why Ford bothers to maintain a pretense of appearing to adhere to some kind of quasi year-day principle when it is obvious from his Glacier View manuscript and his SPECTRUM article (pp. 32, 34 and 36) that he rejects any legitimate use of it in valid biblical exegesis. I would simply have said, "The year-day principle which I advocated in my *Ministry* articles of 1964 and in Appendix F of my commentary *Daniel* I now reject for the following reasons. . . ." There is not one place in the entire Glacier View manuscript where Ford ever applies the year-day principle to any time prophecy in Daniel or Revelation. In this, he was out of harmony with the reports of seven out of seven of the small groups at Glacier View.

10) Ford states that the 2,300 days (=6 yrs. + 4 mos. literal time) should be linked specifically with the defiling of the temple, but Antiochus Epiphanes' defilement of the temple lasted but three years to the day (1 Macc. 1:59, 4:52).

11) Ford continues to refuse to acknowledge that the question of dating the seventh year of Artaxerxes I is just a difference between the Persian-Babylonian spring-to-spring year and the Jewish fall-to-fall year (cf. Neh. 1:1, 2:1).

12) That Ezra began, for one reason or another, to build the city of Jerusalem as a consequence of the decree given to him by Artaxerxes is indicated historically by Ezra 4:11-16.

13) The issue of applying the apotelesmatic principle to Mark 13 is far greater than just deleting mention of it in his thesis because it was written for a non-Adventist professor at Manchester University. The point is that any application of the apotelesmatic principle to Mark 13 would have destroyed the very heart of his thesis. This can be seen from an examination of the alternate interpretations of this passage and the one he finally selected on page 62 of the *Abomination of Desolation*:

3. Application to both events (though understood in the gospel as distant in ful-

fillment from each other) on the basis that either Christ or the Evangelist blended the themes.

4. Application to both events, regarding such as promised by Christ to the generation contemporary with Him. This view makes the fall of Jerusalem a part of the predicted end of the age.

The third interpretation of Mark 13 is the one to which Adventists have traditionally held, and the fourth is the one that Ford came down in favor of in his thesis. If one looks carefully at these two alternatives, one can see that the third is the apotelesmatic solution, which he rejected, and the fourth is the non-apotelesmatic solution, upon which the rest of Ford's entire thesis is based.

14) Ford says that he applies the apotelesmatic principle with consistency, whereas I say that he has applied it with inconsistency and arbitrariness. I will point out but one example here. As Ford and I both agreed when we met at the small committee on the Andrews campus in May, he did not apply the apotelesmatic principle to Daniel 2 or Daniel 7 in his commentary. He did apply it to Daniel 8, 9 and 11. He has still not applied it to Daniel 2 or 7 in the Glacier View manuscript. Since Daniel 2, 7, 8 and 11 are all outline prophecies that extend through history from the sixth century B.C. to the time of God's final kingdom, the apotelesmatic principle should either be applied to all of them or to none of them. By applying it to only half of them, Ford has not done "so with consistency."

15) Finally, Ford states that "I have never taught that all individual interpreters were 'right in what they affirm and wrong in what they deny.'" Maybe not, if he is hedging about his use of the phrase "all interpreters," but he certainly has applied this phrase, his philosophical justification for the apotelesmatic principle, to all the major schools of interpretation of apocalyptic prophecy. To document this, I would note that on *Daniel*, page 68, Ford wrote:

Having now viewed the respective systems as wholes (preterism, historicism,

and futurism), what counsel can be given to one who comes to the task of exegesis with the sole intent of discovering truth regardless of whether it supports or wrecks systems?

It must be said that each of the systems is right in what it affirms and wrong in what it denies [italics Ford's].

In order to avoid an apotelesmatic acceptance of Daniel 8:14 as applying to an investigative judgment that began in heaven in 1844, Ford is forced here to delete all previous Adventist interpreters of Daniel from the ranks of the historicist school of interpretation. Consistency, thou art a jewel!

William H. Shea
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Inaccurate Report?

To the Editors: I have read your Glacier View issue of SPECTRUM with mixed emotions. Though I wish to express appreciation for your effort to provide a balanced portrayal as evidenced by your inclusion of both Desmond Ford's and Bill Shea's materials on Daniel, I must also take strong exception to certain things "reported" in this issue — in particular, the account of the Monday morning discussion session of Study Group 2.

It is somewhat painful for me to do this, inasmuch as the author of your SPECTRUM article is a long-time friend whose scholarship and concern for accuracy I have greatly admired. However, as secretary of Study Group 2, I cannot agree that his "considerably condensed report" is also a "virtually complete" one (p. 5). In fact, the gaps he has left and his oversimplified summaries leave the reader with a grossly distorted — if not completely baffling and confused — description of what this discussion session was really like.

For illustration, I will comment on the four remarks attributed to me in this section of the article. None of these gives the reader an accurate portrayal.

1) Except for the incorrect Hebrew trans-

literation, perhaps the most accurate summary of something I said is the statement, "I am with Jim Cox on *shabu'ah*" (the author goes on to explain the Hebrew term as "'weeks' or 'sevens' of years"). The term is *shabua*^c (sing.) or *shabu'im* (pl.). Irrespective of this, however, the author's statement (given on p. 7) is meaningless, since what Jim Cox said about *shabua*^c has been omitted, as has also the discussion leading up to Jim's comment. In fact, the reader is given *no background whatever* regarding *shabua*^c.

2) Another rather straightforward statement attributed to me concerns our consensus on the year-day principle: "Our consensus, then, is 'yes,' but that we need to base it on better reasons than we have in the past" (p. 7). The reader gets the impression that I made a declaration, when in fact, as secretary for the group, I was raising a question to ascertain whether this was what the group wished me to put into the minutes.

3) I am quoted as saying, "There are two types of prophetic literature — classical and apocalyptic — and this makes a difference. It is not proper to attribute multiple fulfillment to apocalyptic prophecies, as Dr. Ford does" (p. 6). The last sentence contains distortion, for my publications going back over a decade will reveal that I have never denied the possibility of "multiple fulfillment" in apocalyptic prophecy. In fact, in the first edition of my *Open Gates of Heaven* (1970), I call attention to this sort of fulfillment as portrayed in Ellen White's *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 585-589. I believe Desmond Ford recognizes this sort of application too. What I do reject is Ford's approach as represented in his particular use of the "apotelesmatic principle." Along hermeneutical lines, I very seriously question the propriety of utilizing the dual-fulfillment modality of general or classical prophecy as an interpretational schema for apocalyptic when apocalyptic itself gives no warrant for such. (What is this sort of transposition but a heightened form of "proof-textism" that ignores context?) I also deny the legitimacy of breaking an apocalyptic historical-continuum sequence by giving multiple fulfillment to one item of it, such as the Little Horn of Daniel 8. Why should *it* have multiple fulfillment when the four horns of the

goat, the goat itself, and the ram should not have such multiple fulfillment?

4) Regarding the year-day principle, I am quoted as saying, “The crucial issue is how Ellen White used these texts (Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6). God always communicates with His people in terms of their own time” (p. 7). Once again, my comment is very poorly represented — especially inasmuch as it follows immediately after Elder Duffy’s statement that “We should not use negative expressions in our report” (a statement to which my comment was not at all related). Moreover, the question I raised was not “how” but *why* Ellen White used these texts — because earlier discussion had made reference both to her use of the texts and to present-day inadequacy of these texts as “proof texts.” A full transcript of my comments would show that I referred to Matthew’s “typological” (or special kind of “Old Testament-proof-text”) hermeneutic as useful for his day, even though we do not tend to use it today. Such a transcript would also reveal my mention of the fact that if time should last, later generations would undoubtedly look back at our 20th-century approaches as being outmoded and very inadequate. Does all this mean that God has been unable to communicate truth at these various times — including our own time? Obviously not. Rather it means that He has indeed communicated truth — through the avenues of understanding that are appropriate to the various times. If I gathered the consensus of our group aright, we did concur that Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6 were not genuinely appropriate from the standpoint of “proof-text” use *today*, but we did so without denying the legitimacy of this sort of use of them in the past. However, we also concluded that the texts do *illustrate* the year-day principle, and therefore as such they can be used as *supporting* evidence for the validity of that principle.

Though inadequacies in the reporting of other speeches may in some instances be even more drastic than with regard to mine, it is not my intent to elaborate further, except

that I feel obliged to mention that one of the most crucial and significant items in Dr. Zurcher’s reference to the year-day principle has been omitted. Reference is made (p. 7) to his believing that “the year-day principle is based on the sabbatical year and the jubilee system.” What is not said is that that pertains to Daniel 9. Dr. Zurcher then proceeded to give support that the 1,260 days of Daniel 7 and the 2,300 days of Daniel 8 should be considered year-days on the basis of ancient numerological concepts related to lunar and solar astronomical principles, respectively — concepts existing at the very time when the book of Daniel was written.

I have mentioned the foregoing simply to illustrate how inadequate is the sort of reporting represented in your article. It may be useful in jogging the memories of those of us who were there in Study Group 2, but it can hardly do anything but confuse the situation for general readers. I would admit that in our Study Group we did jump around a bit in our discussion at times as we dealt with various facets of the different questions, but our discussion was by no means so disjointed and incoherent as this report would indicate. I can assure you that our dialogue in Study Group 2 was strikingly more intelligent, coherent, stimulating, and enlightening than what this truncated version in SPECTRUM portrays.

Kenneth A. Strand
Secretary

Glacier View Study Group 2

Cottrell Responds

To the Editors: The section of the Glacier View report in SPECTRUM (Vol 11, pp. 2-26, November 1980) to which my esteemed friend Dr. Kenneth Strand takes exception — the Monday morning discussion in Study Group 2 — and the following section covering the Monday afternoon proceedings of the full assembly, were specifically requested by the editors after they read my original draft of the article, which was already several pages longer than the space assigned it. Abbreviation was inevitable;

hence the “considerably condensed report” he describes as “oversimplified,” “grossly distorted,” “baffling,” “confused” and “meaningless.” So be it. These heated adjectives reflect two qualities that might more calmly and accurately be described as brevity and a lack of coherence. I, too, was troubled by these defects as I sought to comply with the editors’ request. In Strand’s lament, he acknowledges that “we did jump around a bit in our discussion at times as we dealt with various facets of the different questions.” How could the abbreviated report requested by the editors avoid seeming even more “disjointed and incoherent”? He laments, also, a lack of “background” — the addition of which would have lengthened the report still further, rather than abbreviate it. I would like to invite him to try his hand at an equally brief report of the Monday morning proceedings, in the same format, that would be more coherent and that would more adequately capture the essence of the discussion.

Dr. Strand’s own consensus report of our Monday morning session to the full assembly that afternoon also omitted relevant material that several of us would like to have seen included. His report was, to be sure, more coherent and logical than mine. He had the privilege of editing the comments and was not under constraint as to its length. As a matter of fact, his report was eminently logical and coherent, in contrast with the blow-by-blow account the SPECTRUM editors requested of me. His report, however, very inadequately reflected comments by one-third or so of the members of Group 2 Monday morning, to the effect that all Old Testament prophecy, including that of Daniel, is conditional, that it is an expression of God’s *purpose* for His people and not of His *foreknowledge*, that it had meaning for the originally applied to people of the time in which it was given, and would have been fulfilled to ancient Israel under the covenant, that the Old Testament does not present two advents separated by 2,000 years, and that Christ, the disciples and the New Testament writers all envision His return and the fulfillment of the prophecies within their lifetime. Dr. Strand’s report very inadequately reflected this minority point of view, yet none of us

thought of faulting him inasmuch as it did reflect the opinion of the majority.

I suppose every speaker could wish that more of his remarks had been included. To have included everything each speaker said might well have filled that entire issue of SPECTRUM. Another point not to be forgotten is that no two writers would be likely to select precisely the same parts of the various speeches, or to agree completely on what was most important. However imperfect my report of the Monday morning session of Group 2 was — and I could point to a number of inadequacies he does not mention — it was an honest attempt to be equally fair to all and to give the gist of each speaker’s remarks *in his own words* as recorded in my somewhat voluminous shorthand notes. Where I may have failed in this attempt I accept full responsibility.

Perhaps an author under fire may be permitted a moment of solace with the kudos that tend to balance the brickbats. A seminary colleague whom Dr. Strand esteems highly wrote the editors of SPECTRUM: “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.”

Regarding the substance of Dr. Strand’s comments:

1) He is, of course, correct as to the transliteration of *shabua*^c. I, too, noticed the error once the article was in print. My shorthand notes have it spelled correctly (in Hebrew). Veteran editor Francis Nichol used to comment that doctors are fortunate; they can bury their mistakes. But authors and editors publish theirs for the whole world to see. Alas and alack! I regret also the careless omission of what Jim Cox said about *shabua*^c.

2) Having already introduced Dr. Strand as secretary of Group 2, I assumed — perhaps naively — it would be obvious that his comment about a consensus on the year-day principle was spoken in his role as secretary for the group. Was it necessary to state the obvious?

3) I am puzzled as to the point Dr. Strand attempts to make here, because his Glacier View remark as I reproduced it is precisely what he now affirms in the remainder of the paragraph as his own position on the subject. SPECTRUM has him saying that he does not consider it correct to attribute multiple (apotelesmatic) fulfillment to apocalyptic prophecies, as Dr. Ford does; he now protests that he rejects Ford's particular use of the apotelesmatic principle. To my dull mind, these are simply two different ways of saying the same thing. I concur with Dr. Strand's evaluation of the apotelesmatic principle.

4) Dr. Strand laments that his comment about Ellen White's use of Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6 is "very poorly represented" inasmuch as, in my report, it follows an entirely unrelated statement by Elder Duffy. Yet in the same sentence, Dr. Strand goes on to explain that his own Group 2 remark was "not at all related" to Duffy's comment. SPECTRUM reports the two statements as they occurred, in the order in which they occurred. Strand also notes that his Group 2 remark refers back to earlier discussion of the subject, which SPECTRUM likewise reports — also as it occurred. Strand's further observation that Group 2 saw these two passages of Scripture as illustrating the year-day principle and as supporting evidence for its validity is true as a majority consensus, though a third of the group saw matters otherwise. Strand regrets that Dr. Zurcher's comments were not reported at more length — which regret I share with respect to his remarks and to those of a number of the other participants as well.

I accept Dr. Strand's criticisms as those of a friend and trust that he will accept my comments in the same spirit. All said and done, I deeply regret that what I wrote embarrassed or hurt Dr. Strand, or perhaps others. It was certainly not intended to do so.

Raymond F. Cottrell
Calimesa, California

Ford Dismissal

To the Editors: I would like to commend the editors for the recent issue of SPECTRUM in which the events and issues of the Glacier View Conference were presented with such welcome clarity and forthrightness. It is an issue which is certain to stand as a landmark of integrity and a signpost of emerging credibility in Adventist literature. I sincerely hope, however, that the progress towards clarification and insight into the issues leading to and addressed at the Glacier View Conference will not end with this issue. Nor, I hope, will it end with the recent defensive expulsion of the individual on whom the issues were focused. I see many parallels between the collective response to the Adventist Church administration in these events and the typical response of individuals and social systems suffering from an acute sense of insecurity and a confusion of identity.

Insecure individuals, when faced with a problem which highlights their insecurity, instinctively respond by attempting to destroy that which addresses their insecurity or to banish it to the recesses of the mind (or, sociologically, to the mountains). Psychologically, this is done in the presumed interest of "defending the ego" or self. In actuality, however, such behavior is maladaptive and only confounds the initial insecurity and confusion of identity. At each attempt at banishment, additional energy is needed to continually justify and maintain the banished idea (or individual) from again emerging into the mainstream of consciousness. This depletes energy available for normal and creative problem solving and daily pursuits. The only way in which such diverted energy can again be reclaimed and made available for constructive pursuits is to openly and honestly examine, experience and discuss the source of the insecurity and thereby "work through" and come to terms with it. To accomplish this of necessity entails more than a little emotional turmoil and anguish. And in the process it is incumbent upon the individual to utilize all the resources and faculties

at his disposal, even and especially those that might most aggravate and provoke his sense of insecurity. To banish, expel or neglect even one of these subjects the individual or social system to a life of mental anguish and darkness. Finally, and most importantly, the process of self discovery must take place in a milieu of complete trust, acceptance and honesty.

In examining the events surrounding the Glacier View Conference and subsequent actions of PREXAD which led to the expulsion of Dr. Ford, I am left with the inevitable impression that had the administrators involved in these actions been entirely secure in their theological positions and beliefs, they surely would not have responded in such an obviously defensive manner. Such action will invariably lead to a siphoning of energy within the church from creative and essential pursuits and divert it toward a divisive conflict over the specific action of the church administrators. The real peril in this process is that the key issues will be decided, not on careful and systematic examination and thought, but upon defensive emotional reactions. And there will be little energy for a unified approach to the real issues and problems.

When dealing with an individual in mental anguish, it is incumbent upon the therapist to skillfully direct and assist that individual in understanding the source of his anguish and to ensure that he does not neglect or banish any resources available to him in dealing with it. And if he does, it is incumbent upon the therapist to tactfully, but directly, make him aware of his errancy. Likewise, I submit that, as earnest and dedicated students of truth, it is incumbent upon all scholars and concerned individuals within the church skillfully, but without ambiguity, to inform the church and its administrators of the errancy in their actions and of the theological and doctrinal insecurities and ambiguities and to ensure that these are openly and vigorously pursued and clarified. Not to do so and to allow the defensive pathology of a few transiently powerful individuals to destroy the work of

so many who have traversed this path before us in building our faith would entail awesome responsibility many times greater than the actual deed of destruction itself.

The intellectual pursuit, study and discussion of theological and doctrinal matters is not a "pardonable activity" as Neal Wilson contends in his letter published in SPECTRUM (Vol. 11, No. 2). Rather, I submit that it is a sacred responsibility of all those who enter into the endeavor and search for truth. I disagree with the attitude implicit in the church administrators' admonition against public discussion of controversial issues on the grounds that the church laity is not sufficiently capable of dealing with theological or doctrinal disputes or ambiguities. I have much more faith and trust in the general intellectual capacity and faith of Adventist church members. On the contrary, the overriding problem is one of a lack of faith and trust in the church administrators' ability accurately and openly to present information to the church at large and likewise to deal with emerging problems and conflicts. It is this lack of administrative credibility, not doctrinal controversy, that is the gravest threat to the church unity. And this can only be resolved by vigorous, open and forthright discussion and study of doctrinal insecurities that lead to such drastic and divisive action as the expulsion from the ministry of men of obvious integrity and dedication who attempt to fulfill their inherent responsibility of ensuring truth and validity in theological doctrine.

If the Adventist Church is to continue to carry out its sacredly mandated responsibility, it must openly search and study the issues, not simply to verify preexisting concepts, but to discover new accommodations to existing knowledge. And if this is done with intellectual honesty and integrity, I suggest that the perceived threats to our institutional integrity will, in the end, not loom as darkly as our current state of institutional insecurity and instinctive emotional responsibility may lead us to fear.

H. Dale Baumbach, Ph.D.
Lewiston, Idaho

SPECTRUM ADVISORY COUNCIL

Lucille and Alan Anderson	Genevieve and Paul Johnson
Ben R. Boice	Katie and Richard Johnson
LeJean 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 Damazo	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
Marjorie and Albert Farver	Thais and James Sadoyama
Karen and Ronald Fasano	Marjorie Scrivner
Beth and Jack Fleming	Ursula and Donald Shasky
Joy and Gerry Fuller	Grace and Walter Stilson
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 Robin Vandermolen
Sally and Robert Hasselbrack	Nancy and John Vogt
Donald Hawley	Carol and Bruce Walter
Hanna and Hjalmar Helmerson	Karla and Kenneth Walters
Marjorie and John Jacobson	Barbara and Rodney Willard
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	(206) 454-2722 Office
855 106th Avenue N.E.	(206) 455-4522 Residence
Bellevue, WA 98004	

