

Homosexuality

To the editors: I read with some interest your April 1982 issue (Vol. 12, No. 3) on homosexuality. It was mostly of high quality. I think, however, that it did not really get a grip on the basic issues.

I am troubled by the statement found on pages 35 and 36 that "while there is mention of certain homosexual *acts* unacceptable in the Christian community, none is defined (in the new Testament) with sufficient specificity for us to know exactly what is being described". Isn't this a form of legalism? Do we *need* to know "exactly what is being described?" Are we looking for a line to see how close we can come to what is forbidden without crossing the line?

Homosexuality is more a symptom than it is a disease. The disease is our separation from God, our rebellion against Him, our choosing our own way. Homosexuality (as well as adultery, fornication, and most other sins) are the natural result of the basic disease, and its symptoms as well.

I think that the church should have a ministry to homosexuals. But it must not excuse this sin any more than any other. Paul says, in I Corinthians 6:9 and 10, that no homosexual shall enter the kingdom of Heaven. A part of the ministry to the homosexual must include facing that fact.

Kenneth Harvey Hopp
Attorney at Law
Redlands, California

To the Editors: In considering three articles printed in the Vol. 12, No. 3, issue of SPECTRUM, I have to wonder what the official position of Seventh-day Adventism is on homosexuality. Really, does something of this nature need individual treatment via special organizations such as Seventh-day Adventist Kinship International, Inc., or the Quest Learning Center in Reading, Pennsylvania? Since it is Scripturally classified as an evil, must we give it any more attention than to the evils of indulgence in heterosexual lusts involving adultery or incest that are also present within our ranks?

Some of the personal testimonies of the unfortunate victims of this unnatural lust seemed to be a cry for others to understand and accept them as they are, rather than a plea for prayerful support in attempting to overcome and be spiritually healed of this evil.

"Christ was in all points tempted like as we are . . ." (Heb. 4:15).

To look down the nose on homosexuals any more than any one else is not Christ-like. The way some of the experiences were related to be handled [sic] by even clergy is embarrassing and not Scripturally acceptable. On the other hand, setting homosexuality apart for "special understanding" gives it a dignity that it does not deserve. To defend or understand sin would justify it so that it would then no longer be sin.

If other denominations recognize homosexuality for what it is—a sin and not a physical condition—it seems that we too should be able to call sin by its right name and deal with it accordingly—not to condemn but to encourage the struggling sinner. How *can* we condemn when Christ Himself came not to condemn (John 3:17).

Frederick E. Kent, M.D.
Lancaster, California

To the Editors: Your three articles on "Adventism and Homosexuality" in the last issue of SPECTRUM (Vol. 12, No. 3) were read by me with great interest even though I too am "hopelessly heterosexual."

It should be obvious to everyone reading "Growing Up Gay Adventist" that many of our homosexually oriented members have been hurt deeply and alienated by SDA Christians and church leaders. The church has much to learn and change so that more gays and lesbians will not be adversely affected.

The approval church administrators gave to Benton, Cook, Cox, Geraty, Guy, and Londis to attend the first Kinship "camp meeting" should be applauded as should the clergy's nine proposals. It is unfortunate that the General Conference officers could only give "qualified" approval to the first seven and that they rejected the last two. I think that Kinship should be related to the church in a similar way to that of the Association of Adventist Forums. I would also hope that the subcommittee suggested in proposal 1 would have representatives from the gay and lesbian community as well as from the field of sexology and sex therapy.

PREXAD extending a three-year grant to Quest Learning Center was apparently done in haste and without consultation with experts in the field of human sexuality and homosexuality in particular. Quest's

premise that they can help people find freedom from homosexuality and be "healed" is contrary to all research on the subject. We have learned in the field of sex therapy that a person can only change one or two points and no more on Kinsey's Heterosexual-Homosexual rating scale. This scale is a continuum from zero to six (zero being totally heterosexual and six totally homosexual). Masters and Johnson claimed in their recent book *Homosexuality In Perspective* that they could convert homosexuals to heterosexuals; however, they have bowed to criticisms of their research and now state that all their successes were ambisexuals not homosexuals. An ambisexual is equally satisfied with and oriented to the same and opposite sex.

Therapy for sexual orientation problems is valuable for Kinsey's "2"s, "3"s, and "4"s who happen to be trapped at either end of the scale in their own minds. These bisexuals quite possibly could be helped out of their confused state by some of Quest's methods. Other persons with ego-dystonic homosexuality can be helped by therapy, but only to be comfortable in their homosexual orientation.

You can see from the above that I feel rather uncomfortable with the message of "healing" that the Quest Learning Center gives to homosexuals and their loved ones. Many will be given false hopes and will suffer from guilt feelings.

Lastly, I must give my support to SDA Kinship International and plead for the recognition it deserves from the church. Its address should be published in all church papers as well as in SPECTRUM.

Roy G. Gravesen, M.D.
Associate Clinical Professor
Director, Sex Therapy Clinic
University of California, Irvine

To the Editors: I wish to congratulate you, on behalf of the officers of SDA Kinship International, for your fair coverage of "Adventism and Homosexuality" in Vol. 12, No. 3 of SPECTRUM. I hope that your discussion will help Adventists recognize that they have many gay sons and daughters. The church has ignored, and indeed contributed to, our problems for too long. Meanwhile, most gay Adventists have either left the church, having failed to find love there, or have tried to live double lives within the church, hiding their homosexuality, a course which exacts a great cost from them.

It is a pity that SPECTRUM failed to publish a means of contacting Kinship. Kinship was formed to minister to gay Adventists, to encourage them when necessary, to assure them of the love and acceptance of Jesus. We have been credited with preventing several suicides. Our Kampmeetings have been especially exhilarating experiences. Adventist lesbians and gays, previously isolated, have found joy and acceptance with each other and with the remarkable clergy who have ministered to us. Finding acceptance here, many have felt strengthened to return to church. Meanwhile, the acceptance we found at Kampmeetings allowed us then to explore the ethics of being gay Christian Adventists. We invite potential members and friends (gay and non-gay alike) to join us, to support us, and to come and share with us our third Kampmeeting, which is to be held near San Diego from August 15 through 22. Write to SDA Kinship International, P.O. Box 1233, Los Angeles, CA 90028, or call us at (213) 876-2076, (212) 662-8656, (212) 729-1698, or (415) 921-1662.

I would like to comment on the decision of the General

Conference and the Columbia Union to fund the Quest Learning Center, Colin Cook's program to "deliver" homosexuals, which was reported in the same issue of SPECTRUM. While Kinship has serious misgivings about this program, the decision to fund it does have positive as well as negative aspects:

Positive. (1) The General Conference (GC) has now recognized that there are large numbers of homosexuals within the Adventist church. Cook's plans for 1,000 chapters of "Homosexuals Anonymous" in the U.S. in ten years, for eight regional Quest centers processing say 160 persons with homosexual orientations at one time, suggest a considerable potential constituency. It will be more difficult for church leaders to ignore Adventist homosexuals and their issues in the future.

(2) The GC wants to do something for its homosexual members—we are not by definition beyond the pale, but are at least potential members of the community of faith. Moreover, church leaders are willing to finance a program (however ill-advised it is specifically) to serve such people.

(3) It is legitimate that maladjusted homosexuals should be offered help to change their orientation if possible if there is some chance that this will bring them happiness.

(4) To the extent that Cook's plans are realized, the presence of groups of Quest "counselees" in churches near the Quest centers will both test the acceptance of local churches and make them used to having known homosexuals in their midst.

Negative. (1) The scholars and pastors whom the GC sent to the Kinship Kampmeeting in 1980 brought back a series of recommendations to PREXAD. First among these was that the church "study thoroughly the whole question of homosexuality and the church." It is unfortunate that the GC has now rushed into funding one kind of program without first conducting a study which would consider what should be done.

(2) It is distressing that this initiative has been taken without any attempt to consult with Kinship, the organization of gay Adventists, in spite of several offers from us. Would the GC make decisions effecting, for example, the women of the church after consulting only one woman, and that one who had undergone a sex change? Colin Cook seems to have become the GC's token gay who is listened to attentively because he says what they want him to say.

(3) Most distressing of all is the fact that both the experience of Kinship members and the vast bulk of serious research indicate that Quest's slogans offer a hope that will prove false to most of those who try them, so that their pain will be heightened and lengthened. Kinship members have generally responded to meetings presented by Colin Cook with deep depression, sometimes to the point of considering suicide. He insists dogmatically that we resume struggles we have long found to be bitter and fruitless, and allows no alternative. Cook rejects the conclusions that the few Adventist scholars who have seriously studied the issue are reaching on what the Bible says about homosexuality, and attempts to impose rigid rules of celibacy and to uphold the chimera of "deliverance" to heterosexuality. Yet the bulk of the evidence suggests that most of the "counselees" will find disillusionment, that at best they will live lives where every effort has to focus on controlling one narrow area, and that those who marry are likely to wreak havoc with the lives of their spouses. What will the church do with those who do everything to find "deliverance", as so many of us have, but do not find it? While there may be a place for an organization with the aims of Quest, it is

dishonest to present Quest as the only option, or as a viable option for many. When Colin was a delegate to Kampmeeting 1980, he promised us that he would send those for whom Quest failed to Kinship where they could learn the gay Christian alternative. However, he told me recently that although a number of counselees had already pulled out of his program, he felt he could not direct them to us. I fear that he prefers to let such "failures" fend for themselves. Until the GC backs other alternatives also it too is endorsing this situation.

Should Quest succeed to any notable extent, it will be making history in the area of homosexuality. Any results need to be documented carefully and independently, and followed up for ten years. Since Cook is choosing his own board, any results he issues will be suspect, even if received with enthusiasm by church leaders. I urged Colin to give an independent social scientist with recognised expertise in the area of homosexuality access over time to the first enrollees. But he replied nervously that he did not trust social science. I would suggest that unless objective monitoring of the program is allowed that any homosexuals thinking of trusting their lives to Quest should give pause, and any church officials providing funds do likewise. If Colin believes his own propaganda, surely he must be willing to open his program to systematic, objective monitoring and analysis.

Meanwhile, it is essential that Kinship do all that it can to inform the thousands of Adventists who are in despair because they realise that their sexual orientation is homosexual, and those who minister to them, that there is a "gay Christian" alternative to the official choice of either an elusive "deliverance" or giving up on Christ and their church. I would urge the GC to help us reach those who need us by at least publishing our mailing address in *Insight*, the *Review*, and *Ministry*. And I invite SPECTRUM readers to help pass the word.

Ronald Lawson
General Conference Liaison
SDA Kinship International
New York City

Cook Responds

To the Editors: I should like to correct certain distortions that arise out of Dr. Ron Lawson's letter. He says I changed my mind about referring counselees to Kinship. Kinship members assured me at the 1980 campmeeting that they did not advocate committed gay relationships. Since then Kinship has adopted a statement of beliefs, one of which states that same-sex intimate love can be to the glory of God. Although I always encourage counselees to act according to their own convictions, I cannot recommend people to Kinship when it holds a view that I believe is contrary to Scripture and inimical to personality development.

Ron says I reject the conclusions of the few Adventist scholars who have "seriously studied the issue." It would be no disrespect to the scholars who attended the 1980 campmeeting to say that they themselves stressed the tentativeness of their positions and the fact that their study reflected the pressure of having to study several thousand pages of material for the Glacier View meetings which convened the week following the Kinship campmeeting.

Ron speaks of the "vast bulk of serious research" and "the bulk of the evidence" that suggests that Quest counselees will find disillusionment. I can only take this to be a polemical statement rather than an objective one. In the last decade and a half, greater credence has been given to statistical and biochemical research, and many assume that this is the only "serious" kind. But there is another "vast bulk" of clinical research which, of late, is almost totally ignored because it assumes a value system. This latter kind of research still carries great weight among experts. Rather than hormonal or early developmental causes, it points to interpersonal relationships and intra-personal distortions. Furthermore, the research to which Ron probably refers in no way allows us to draw from it the conclusion that change is impossible, nor is there any research in existence that examines the effects on homosexuality of the vast resources of grace opened up to us by reformation theology and received by a trained faith in the context of a supportive Christian community.

Ron states that I nervously replied that I do not trust social science. Ron and Kinship make disproportionately frequent appeals to science and infrequent appeals to the power of the Christian gospel. As a Christian I cannot accept the non-value systems upon which the social sciences operate. Entirely different meanings are given to words like "normal" and "natural" by these disciplines, meanings which ignore the Christian values of reason, freewill, and choice, simply because these are not subject to empirical observation. Bio-psychosocial determinism pervades the social scientific interpretation of man. This kind of non-value secular presupposition influences the interpretation of scientific data. Values can never be determined from the results of scientific investigation. This is the role of Scripture.

Quest has never been averse to opening its program to systematic, objective monitoring as long as the research group is prepared to place proper value on the full range of Christian influences, namely, the cognitive, spiritual, psychic, and social effects upon behavioral change and intra-psychic resolution. In fact, plans are presently being worked out for the Department of Psychiatry at Hershey Medical Center (Hershey, Penn.) to do a ten-year study on Quest counselees with careful observation of the Christian influence on psychic and behavioral change.

According to Ron, Quest counseling will only "heighten and lengthen the pain" and lead to "the resumption of bitter and fruitless struggles." Neither Ron nor Kinship give evidence of perceiving the real issue behind Quest, that of righteousness by faith. Counselees are urged to see that God does not charge any of their homosexual responses against them because of His acceptance of them through the atoning work of Christ.

Through this atonement, applied in counseling, both cognitive and affective, people develop motivations stemming from gratitude towards the kindness of God, instead of motivation from guilt and fear. It is expected that Ron and Kinship misunderstood the purpose of Quest precisely because they perceive its message of deliverance as a call to return to the guilt-producing perfectionism from which they have just escaped. The message of Quest is just the opposite.

I hope that continued dialogue will lead to better understanding of how the gospel brings healing to homosexuals.

Colin Cook
Quest Learning Center
Reading, Pennsylvania

SAWS

To the Editors: Some of your readers may be interested in further information about Seventh-day Adventist World Service (SAWS) which became available after the publication of an article on the subject in the last issue of SPECTRUM. The following table produced in 1980 by the U.S. government's Agency for International Development (AID) provides a picture of the

size and source of funds of various voluntary organizations. Only the best known organizations in the table have been selected as a means of comparison. As you will notice in the accompanying table, SAWS compares very favorably with other organizations receiving aid from the U.S. Government.

More detailed information in the table concerning the kind of governmental and private support SAWS and the other organizations receive can be obtained by writing to the Agency for International Development and asking for the booklet cited below.

Harrison John

Agency	US Government Support	Private Support	Grand Total
Catholic Relief Services	298,666,000	50,614,000	349,280,000
CARE	154,624,250	40,790,821	195,415,071
Agricultural Missions Foundation	185,029,533	598,577	185,628,110
American Jewish Joint Distribution Comm.	22,627,652	40,270,255	62,897,907
Church World Service	20,370,000	25,250,000	45,620,000
HADASSAH	1,111,715	32,368,792	33,480,507
Domestic & Foreign Society for Protestant Episcopal Church in the USA	1,080,000	27,825,000	28,905,000
Seventh-day Adventist World Service	11,291,115	4,663,314	15,954,429
Internal Rescue Committee	9,925,984	5,410,140	15,336,124
Save the Children	4,885,425	9,586,536	14,471,561
The Population Council	5,045,989	8,595,855	13,641,844
Mennonite Central Committee	2,200,261	11,132,499	13,332,760
Girl Scouts of the USA	238,246	13,013,861	13,252,107
Lutheran World Relief	2,859,162	9,031,801	11,890,963
Note: These data taken from <i>Voluntary Foreign Aid Programs, 1980: Reports of American Voluntary Agencies Engaged in Overseas Relief and Development Registered with the Agency for International Development</i> , Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., pp. 21-27.			

Guy Favors Theological Elite?

To the editors: I read Fritz Guy's article on the future of Adventist theology (Vol. 12, No. 1) with a great deal of interest since I am presently a theology student. I appreciated Dr. Guy's evenhanded analysis of the current situation and his presentation of theological options for the church to pursue.

I was, however, shocked that he would advocate the idea that without theologians and biblical scholars, the Adventist community "would have lost the possibility of discovering 'present truth.'" Since when have theologians and biblical scholars been the only ones with access to present truth? This certainly was not the case during the early development of the Adventist church, with no apparent disastrous consequences. Why has the truth been suddenly concentrated in the hands of an elite group of scholars?

Perhaps my interpretation of Dr. Guy's words is

incorrect. But when Dr. Guy defined the role of the theologians (in encouraging openness within the church) as *initiating* "responsible theological discussion," while describing the role of the "great majority" of believers as merely to *participate* (however nebulous that may be) in these discussions, Dr. Guy effectively relegated most Adventists to the backwoods of theological inquiry.

Of course, Dr. Guy's article focused on theologians and not on the complete church body. It was thus fair and understandable for him to be biased in his treatment of these scholars. We *do* need a group of men and women to—in some sense—control the potential for damaging theological "eruptions" while providing the church with ongoing theological education.

Also, Dr. Guy nicely defined openness as the opposite of insecurity, obscurantism, and dogmatism. But elitism contains all three elements: it is the result of insecurity, the cause of obscurantism, and the bulwark of dogmatism. Openness is the opposite of elitism. The subtle drift towards an elitist attitude within the church must be stopped.

Ross Winkle
Student Missionary
Tokyo, Japan

Guy Responds

Although Mr. Winkle does misinterpret the article, he is surely correct in insisting that theology is the task of the whole church. This task must not be confined to "an elite group" of professional theologians, or to administrators, or to ordained ministers. Every member of the church has a contribution to make to its total understanding and experience of truth. It is the continuing *activity* of theology, not a special category of persons, that is essential to the possibility of discovering "present truth."

Fritz Guy
Professor of Theology
SDA Theological Seminary
Andrews University

Volunteers International

To the Editors: Thank you for the fine article on Volunteers International and Robert Bainum in the last issue of SPECTRUM. It was one of the most comprehensive and informative articles on the subject of Indochinese refugees that I have read. Mr. Bainum is now in Thailand evaluating the projects of Volunteers International and the needs of the refugees. If you wish further information on the work of Volunteers International, please write us at 10701 Main Street, Fairfax, Virginia 22030, or call (703) 385-1435.

Glenn Rounsevell
Vice-president
Volunteers International

British Union Crisis

To the Editors: Please allow me to comment with reference to the article, "Crisis in the British Union," which appeared in the June issue of SPECTRUM. As a founder member of the London Layman's Forum, as well as its first secretary, I believe I can offer insights that may, to some degree, reflect what was the thinking among some of the "articulate immigrants" which resulted in the formation of the Forum at that time.

No problem can be adequately understood apart from its history, and Mr. Porter has attempted to show that what resulted in a crisis for the British Union had its origins in a hurricane in Jamaica, the passing of a U.S. Immigration Act and the economic situation in the West Indies. He suggests that the root causes of this crisis are socio-economic in nature. Large scale emigration from the West Indies to the United Kingdom in particular being suggested as a major factor.

I submit that Mr. Porter has not gone back far enough in history to seek reasons for the crisis. I believe we need to be reminded that black/white relationships have had a much larger and long-lasting effect on the history of Great Britain than some may care to admit, or remember. I am not only referring to the trade in blacks in which Britain eventually had the largest slice of this "human cake," and finally relinquished with an acute feeling of

racial guilt. I speak also of the fact that emerging societies in North America and the Caribbean at this period in history were, to a large extent, influenced by the political norms and cultural mores of 17th-century Britain. Deeply implanted in their racial consciousness was the belief that God appointed white to rule black. The British slave trade was one result of this theory of race, and the political and economic life of the American and Caribbean colonies further entrenched these attitudes.

While some other European powers participated in the slave trade, there was a difference between their treatment of slaves and their attitude on race and that of Great Britain. It is a matter of record that the humanity of the black man was in serious doubt by Christian Britain right up to the end of the 18th-century. He was not even considered a suitable receptacle for the Christian religion.

Generally speaking, the British Adventist was not very different from the rest of British society in his acceptance of certain assumptions and attitudes concerning Britain's black colonies and their inhabitants. These assumptions equated technological superiority with moral excellence. In addition, a cultural nationalism, carefully cultivated by the popular media, as well as by church paper articles and even returning missionaries, served to reinforce these patterns of thinking regarding non-whites. The fundamental conviction that whites always ruled was transferred to relationships between the indigenous and the immigrant within the denomination. The British, it was felt, was enlightened, and the black colonial not so. Consequently, the British Adventists continued to set the parameters for everything that concerned the churches because they claimed they knew best how things should be done. Religious ethnocentricity and arrogant racial attitudes went hand in hand.

I strongly believe that it was black reaction to the above that made the indigenous Adventist feel threatened. An examination of the attitudes of most whites in the larger British society at this time would have turned up striking parallels among the indigenous Adventists. One would have heard the same prejudiced references and generalizations about blacks, and one would have been measured against the same black stereotypes. The British Adventist saw the denomination as national, rather than international, and this, perhaps, was contributory to their denial of any meaningful role to their West Indian brethren in the political life of the churches. It was the reaction of black Adventists who were no longer prepared to accept second-class membership that brought things to a head. The London Layman's Forum was one result of black reaction to the prejudice they knew to exist within the denomination.

Perhaps some British Adventists will need to accept the West Indians as "people" first, before they can accept them as brothers in Christ. It is not consistent with the Gospel to say, "We are all one in Christ," when by their attitude and behaviour they say to the same persons, "You do not belong here." Perhaps it might be worth considering that West Indian Adventists can be equally qualified to know how to put things right racially. Could it be that they possess a better judgement and perspective on this issue because of their past colonial experience?

As I see it, hope for a lasting solution to the crisis lies only in a return to the ethics of the Gospel. It will then mean both sides going forward as new creatures in Christ, members of a forgiven and a forgiving community. It will mean incorporating this new unity in Christ into church community life: worshipping together, listening to each other, and accepting and encouraging each other's leadership at all levels of church life. It will require an understanding of, and a sensitivity to, the history of the

colonial West Indian. It will mean that the men in leadership strive to produce a framework in which both sides can understand one another. It will mean a Gospel-centered reappraisal of the factors that brought the crisis into being.

It will be only by this material expression of His kind of love and of His new community, that the world will truly know that we are His followers and are serious about spreading His Truth.

L. M. Kellawan
London, England

Adventists in the USSR

To the Editors: Amnesty International, an organization concerned with the plight of prisoners of conscience in countries known for their frequent violation of human rights, has tried for the past year to free Maria Mikhailovha Zinets from imprisonment in the Soviet Union. She and her step-sister were arrested when they distributed leaflets which contained a rebuttal to articles that had appeared in the Soviet press which attacked their spiritual leader, a member of the True and Free Seventh-day Adventist Church, who was then on trial for his religious activities. Amnesty International learned that Maria M. Zinets was sentenced to three years imprisonment in a labor colony, and that her health has badly deteriorated since her arrest. In consequence, Amnesty International in the United States has been appealing for her release on the grounds that her imprisonment constitutes a violation of her right to freedom of expression, guaranteed under Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which the Soviet Union is a signatory.

Sincerely,

Werner T. Angress
Amnesty International
Group 129
20 Hartwell Drive
Mt. Sinai, New York 11766

To the Editors: In his letter in SPECTRUM (Vol. 12, No. 3), Mr. Dabrowski says that Vladimir Shelkov, the very famous leader of The True and Free Seventh-day Adventists in the Soviet Union, was *not* a Seventh-day Adventist nor a Christian. This is very surprising.

Let me tell you an experience Swedish Adventists had with Soviet embassy authorities concerning Shelkov. Some months after the confinement of Shelkov, the

Swedish Union of Seventh-day Adventists had its annual meeting. During the Union meeting many members got printed cards, and sent 2000 to Premier Brezhnev in Moscow, asking him to liberate Shelkov. A year later, but before Shelkov died in prison, the Soviet embassy in Stockholm responded by sending an article written by Pastor Kulakov to the Seventy-day Adventist Swedish Union office. The embassy asked that the article be printed in the church paper, and it was.

In the Soviet response, Pastor Kulakov described the situation of the officially recognized Seventh-day Adventists in very favorable terms. This clearly shows that while the Soviet government classified V. Shelkov as an "illegal Seventh-day Adventist," they nevertheless regarded him as a Seventh-day Adventist. Furthermore, such notable authors as Solzhenitsyn, Ginsburg, and Orlov; General Grigorenko; Nobel prize winner Sacharov and many other persons know that Shelkov was not only a Seventh-day Adventist but also a very sincere Christian. A few years ago, I also had an interview with Pastor Kulakov. He did not say that Shelkov was not a Christian believer.

It is very remarkable that it was not Pastor Kulakov from the Soviet Union, but a Czech SDA leader who is quoted as saying Shelkov was not an Adventist or a Christian. I regret that Mr. Dabrowski and other people have been misled. He and others would do well to read accounts of the actions of the Soviet government against Shelkov that were sent to the Madrid Peace Conference, and which are available for study.

Rune Blomdhal, Ph.D.
Professor at Blackeberg College
Stockholm, Sweden.

Correction

In SPECTRUM, Vol. 12, No. 3, the story titled "The Davenport Bankruptcy and Recent Litigation" reported that Gertrude Daniels, one of the plaintiffs in a suit against the North Pacific Union Conference (NPUC) and other Adventist organizations, had met with attorney John Spencer Stewart about funds she had placed in irrevocable trust with the NPUC that may have been lost in the Davenport bankruptcy. The report stated that Mr. Stewart told Mrs. Daniels her money was gone and she had no claim on the NPUC.

Since publication of the article, one of Mrs. Daniels' advisors has stated to the author that the meeting was not between Mrs. Daniels and Mr. Stewart, but between the advisor and James Hopps, the in-house attorney for the NPUC. According to the advisor, Mr. Hopps said he could do nothing about the problem and that Mrs. Daniels would have to contact Mr. Stewart, who was and is the NPUC's attorney for all legal matters related to the Davenport case. Mr. Hopps has refused to confirm or deny that the meeting took place.

Davenport

Three plaintiffs are continuing action against the church over handling of funds in the Davenport case despite the refusal of Portland, Oregon, Judge Clifford B. Olfen to certify a class action lawsuit against the denomination last April. On June 15, Judge Olfen ordered the church to produce records of the minutes of the North Pacific Union Conference committee from 1968 to the present and the report of the General Conference audit of the North Pacific Union for the same time period.

So the suit which many thought had ended in April proceeds in the "discovery" stage. Sources close to the case indicate that the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation also are studying the case.

Documents from the Davenport estate are providing the press with an abundance of material. The *San Bernardino Sun* published a four-part series in June which said that 13 church officials at local conference, union, and General Conference levels loaned Davenport money while sitting on governing boards of church entities that made loans to him. The personal deals those officials negotiated with Davenport not only violate the church's conflict of interest guidelines, but were made at substantially higher interest rates (up to 80 percent interest) than the church entity received.

In the meantime the elders at Davenport's local congregation, the Loma Linda University Church, chose a committee on May 29 to study the matter and make a recommendation to the church membership committee on whether action should be taken on his membership.

Pacific Press Case

The old Pacific Press cases also saw action in California court recently. In the case brought by the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission involving Lorna Tobler (Merikay Silver having settled out of court), the U.S. District 9th Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment of the district court that the Pacific Press Publishing Association violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by denying Lorna Tobler monetary allowances paid to similarly situated male employees. The press was held in violation for terminating Tobler's employment in retaliation for her filing charges against them. The Pacific Press is considering whether to take the case to the Supreme Court, the only remaining avenue of appeal.

In its ruling the Appeals Court said the legislative history shows that "although Congress permitted religious organizations to discriminate in favor of members of their faith, religious employers are not immune from liability for discriminatory action against employees who exercise their rights under the statute." It also noted that discharging Tobler from her position at the Pacific Press does not constitute one of the recognized forms of church discipline.

In the separate class action suit also filed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in the federal district court for Northern California, the judge has not yet rendered a final opinion, although the magistrate, a lower court official to which the case was referred, has reported his finding to the court. The Pacific Press totally objected to his findings, and oral arguments were presented to the court in early June. The Equal Employment Op-

portunity Commission says the interest due as of February 1, 1982, on the aggregate monetary relief for head of household under payment is not less than \$291,315. That is a point of contention as is the method suggested for distributing the money to the entitled party. The Pacific Press lays its basic objection to all of the magistrate's determination on the ground that the burdens imposed on the Pacific Press entangles the government in religious affairs in violation of the first amendment and impermissibly inhibits the free exercise of religion. That argument failed in the Tobler case. If the Press loses on this level, it may appeal to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals.

EGW Project Extended

July 1 of this year the General Conference Committee officially voted to approve the recommendation of the General Conference Officers that Professor Fred Veltman's E. G. White Life of Christ Research Project, be extended a third year until June 30, 1983. Neal Wilson, president of the General Conference, notified John Cassell, Jr., president of Pacific Union College, at the May meeting of the school's Board of Trustees, that Veltman would not be returning to the college's theology department for the 1982-83 school year. The General Conference Officers had changed their earlier decision to terminate the project this summer at the end of the two years initially approved for the study.

Veltman, chairman of the theology department before undertaking this project, randomly chose 15 chapters in *Desire of Ages* to study in detail, in order to analyze how Ellen White used the writings of others to produce her own works. Because of the latest action of the officers, his final report will be submitted by June 30, 1983, to an 18-person committee appointed by the General Conference and chaired by Gordon Madgwick, dean of Pacific Union College.

The study had been approved July 1, 1980,

on the recommendation of the White Estate, particularly its executive secretary, Robert Olson. When James Cox, originally selected to head the project, accepted the presidency of Avondale College in Australia, the General Conference invited Veltman to undertake the study, providing him with a budget of \$40,000 each year, that includes his own salary, funds for assistants, scholarly materials, and office supplies. At first, Veltman planned to investigate how Ellen White used sources in the entire *Desire of Ages*, as well as several other volumes. He soon discovered his study would have to be illustrative, not exhaustive. Even with the study limited to fifteen chapters in *Desire of Ages*, Veltman had to tell the president of the General Conference in January, 1982, that the research could not be completed by the end of the two years approved. Veltman submitted a request for a one-year extension of the project and an increase of his budget to \$55,000.

However, the officers of the General Conference had questions about the adequacy of Veltman's scholarly methodology, recurring doubts about the basic necessity of such a project (since, among other things, borrowing by Ellen White had already been acknowledged in denominational publications), and a few raised eyebrows at Veltman's frequent speaking engagements describing his research well before it had been completed. In the spring of this year the officers decided Veltman should submit whatever research he had by August, 1982.

Nevertheless, the President of the General Conference was instrumental in extending the project another year. After the officers' decision, Wilson, during an April visit to Pacific Union College campus, reviewed more closely Veltman's work in progress. Also, in a subsequent research trip to Washington, D.C., Veltman provided further information about his work to Kenneth Wood, chairman of the board of the White Estate, to Robert Olson, and to others. Within a month, Veltman's college president had received word from the General Conference president announcing the extension of the E. G. White Life of Christ Research Project.

—Bonnie Dwyer