Adventist Publishing in North America

The Psychological World of Ellen White

SPECTRUM

A Quarterly Journal of the Association of Adventist Forums

Volume 14, Number 1

THE SANCTUARY REVISITED

Is the Investigative Judgment Relevant?

God's Continuing Initiative

The Moral Significance of the Sanctuary

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, 7710 Carroll Avenue, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912. 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 ($15 per 4 issues, except $18 in Canada and in other foreign countries; $2 less for students) to Association of Adventist Forums, Box 5330, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912. Phone: (301) 270-0423. Single copies may be purchased for $4. Pay by check made out to the Association of Adventist Forums. For address changes, send old address label along with the new address.

Litho USA

In This Issue

Volume Fourteen, Number 1, Published August 1983

About This Issue

The historical understanding of the Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary is in question, increasingly. Though the concept of the heavenly sanctuary was central to the self-understanding of the early Adventist church, today many members find little meaning in it and take no comfort from it. To be believed, a doctrine must, ultimately, make a difference; it must matter, writes Fritz Guy in this issue. Guy finds the Good News in the doctrine. In companion articles in the special section on the sanctuary, Richard Rice and Jon Dybdahl also bring new interpretations and suggest new meanings for the 20th-century Adventist.

Discussion of Ellen White returns in this issue. Venturing into a new area, Ronald and Janet Numbers describe the psychological views of Ellen White and the psychological world in which she lived.

Presented in different form at the Association of Adventist Forums national conference in September 1982, Henry Felder's response to Joe Mesar's vision for income sharing questions its practicality.

While the Davenport story continues, it takes the back stage (and pages) to the Pacific Press debate. George Colvin continues to document the twists and turns, thrusts and counterthrusts, in this latest denominational drama.

—The Editors

From the Editor

Principles for Renewal

by Roy Branson

Seventh-day Adventists in North America give their church more money per person than do members of any denomination of comparably significant size. But the vast pyramid of denominational activities rests on a fragile point: the commitment of the individual member to write a tithe check.

Recently the confidence of Adventists in their leadership has been strained. North American members have learned that 163 denominational employees to whom they entrusted their tithes, legacies, and offerings have had to be investigated for participating in the loss of $22 million. Members have been told that the General Conference has voted to discipline 80 officials at all levels—from local conferences to the General Conference—for their lack of fiduciary responsibility and/or conflict-of-interest.

Now, church members are finding out that although the newly built printing plant of the Review and Herald Publishing Association is not running anywhere near full capacity, and its two high-speed web presses could print everything the Review and the Pacific Press Publishing Association now produces and more, the General Conference has approved constructing a new printing plant for the Pacific Press. It will have its own state-of-the-art, high-speed web presses. After constructing its new plant, the Review has a debt of $13.5 million, which costs approximately $1 million a year in interest. The $8 million debt of the Pacific Press can be retired through sale of its present property, but it still has $12 million of unsold inventory, and it is estimated that over $4 million (and possibly much more) will be required to construct the new Pacific Press printing plant. More importantly, not running either the Review or Pacific Press presses full-time will mean the church will needlessly pay hundreds of thousands of dollars every year to finance and operate underutilized buildings and expensive presses. The result will be higher priced books and, therefore, fewer readers.[1]

Not surprisingly, laymembers are calling for change. They feel this sort of stewardship in North America cannot continue. Committed members around the United States are turning their frustration and outrage at such administrative misadventures into constructive suggestions for altering a church structure that seems to allow such profligacy. As the various commissions and committees established by the General Conference, the Pacific Union, the North Pacific Union, and local conferences examine church structure in North America, it will be crucial for them to distinguish between policy and principle.

Policies can be retained or discarded according to circumstances. Principles express fundamental commitments that endure. Policies can be kept or changed depending on whether they effectively apply principles to present conditions. In the Davenport case denominational policy required a financial statement from Davenport and verification of the collateral provided for local and union conference loans. That

policy should remain. In Adventist publishing long-standing policies may need to be changed. In either case, what should not change are basic principles. We must learn from the confusion of policy and principle that has coursed through two bankruptcies affecting the denomination: Davenport and the Pacific Press.

The Davenport Case

> A conflict of interest arises when a trustee, officer or an employee of the organization has such a substantial personal interest in a transaction or in a party to a transaction that it reasonably might affect the judgment he exercises on behalf of the organization. . . . The following situations are considered to have the potentiality of being in conflict and therefore are to be avoided:
>
> . . . Lending money to or borrowing money from any third person who is a supplier of goods or services or a trustor or who is in any fiduciary relationship with the organization or is otherwise regularly involved in business transaction with the organization.
>
> —"Conflict of Interest," *Seventh-day Adventist Working Policy*. (First voted at Autumn Council, 1969; distributed at Spring Council, 1970; printed in the *Working Policy* ever since 1971.)

For even those of us not directly involved, the Davenport case is our concern—for reasons beyond the loss of money. My father, as a conference and union president, sometimes brushed aside denominational policy to establish new institutions: Middle East College, the New York Center, the first nursing home built by a conference for its elderly members. Some of the denominational administrators who have been accused of involvement in the Davenport case can be admired because, like my father, they have sometimes dared to be innovative.[2] It is possible to imagine that a local or union conference leader might resist denominational policy directing him to place investment funds in a portfolio of stocks supervised by the General Conference that for years had not provided as good returns as did Davenport. In fact, I have to concede that, were he alive, my father might have approved breaking denominational policy in order to put conference funds in Davenport if he thought that the returns would make greater resources available to expand the work of his conference.

But conflict-of-interest is another matter. I can remember lucrative opportunities that would have involved him in conflict-of-interest which he rejected in order to avoid compromising his administrative objectivity. Flouting denominational policy to improve your conference's financial condition is bad enough. It is far worse to break the most widely recognized principle of administrative ethics in order to benefit yourself financially.

In a survey of 211 corporations conducted five years ago by the Southwestern Graduate School of Banking, *A Study of Corporate Ethical Policy Statements*, by far the most frequently cited ethical principle concerned conflict-of-interest—83 percent for businessess of all types, 97.5 percent among financial corporations. The strictest codes had been adopted by corporations like banks (or Adventist conferences) who entered into a fiduciary relationship with customers. An example is the statement of the Republic National Bank of Dallas. It sounds very much like the denomination's statement on the subject. "The most obvious example of a conflict of interest is the officer or employee who lends to a customer, syndicate or corporation in which he or she has a present or prospective financial interest."[3]

Even those corporation codes with less stringent wording would not have allowed their officials to have invested personally in Davenport when he was also the major (sometimes principal) recipient of loans from the local and union conferences the administrators were heading. That would have been true even if the Adventist administrators had received the same rates of interest as the institutions they led.

But Terrence Finney, a superior court judge in California and vice chairperson of the President's Review Commission investigating the Davenport case for the General

Conference, has said that the situation was even worse. Most of the presidents, secretaries, treasurers, and trust officers whose names the commission recommended for publication in the *Adventist Review* received *higher* rates of return on their personal loans to Davenport than did the conferences, unions and institutions they headed. If Judge Finney is right, then not only did many Adventist officials violate the principle of avoiding a conflict-of-interest, they engaged in practices that had they been government officials would have led to their prosecution for bribery.[4] Consider how citizens would regard a governor, treasurer, or secretary of a state if that official received a higher rate of interest from a personal loan to a company than did the state loaning funds to the same corporation.

Church members are justifiably shocked at the cavalier way denominational officials broke sound policy governing loans and investments of tithes and trust funds. Members are even more outraged and saddened that some of the highest officials of this church did not recognize a fundamental moral principle. A staggering number of these powerful denominational administrators did not adhere to the ethical principles proscribing conflict-of-interest prevalent in the corporate and political institutions of our country.

Publishing in North America

> Men in responsible positions should have worked up plans whereby our books could be circulated and not lie on the shelves, falling dead from the press. Our people are behind the times and are not following the opening providence of God.
>
> —Ellen White, 1880, in *Testimonies* Vol. 4, p. 388.

> Never should our publishing houses be so related to one another that one shall have power to dictate as to the management of another.
>
> —Ellen White, 1901, in *Testimonies* Vol. 7, p. 173.

Publishing generates deep feeling among Adventists. A considerable number of us have participated in that rite-of-passage called summer canvassing, or known friends who have. I was rather self-congratulatory about being a student colporteur for nine summers until I met my wife and discovered that she had persisted for 12, and that my mother-in-law for many years had sold more Adventist books in North America than any other woman.

Possible changes in the publishing work elicit strong emotions because publications are at the root of Adventism—Seventh-day Adventist publishing antedated by many years the organized Seventh-day Adventist denomination. Ellen White wrote voluminously and in detail about Adventist publishing houses—she and her family had established all three in North America. Surely all church members would still agree with her fundamental principle concerning publishing: Adventist ideas should be distributed as widely as possible. In her lifetime she suggested many policies to implement that principle. If she were alive today she might well recommend new policies to utilize innovative technologies implementing her basic principle.

It is deeply disturbing that only after the Southern Publishing Association has been closed and Pacific Press has virtually reached bankruptcy that a systematic thoroughgoing review of Adventist publishing policies in North America by the highest levels of the church is now under way. If the commission established by the General Conference, chaired by General Conference Vice President Charles Hirsch, undertakes a comprehensive analysis, it may recommend some revolutionary changes in policy. Perhaps, in addition to Adventist Book Centers, gift shops in the scores of hospitals within the Adventist Health System/U.S.A. would be authorized to sell Adventist books. The commission might even recommend using alternatives to our present system of publishing secretaries, colporteurs, and Home Health Education System. But any such changes would only be alterations of policy. They would be attempts to remain true to the fundamental principle of

distributing Adventist literature to as many people as possible.

A confusion of policy and principle also lies at the heart of recent debates about the future of the Pacific Press. The General Conference Committee seems to have drawn Ellen White's writings into such a confusion:

> "From a purely business standpoint, there is serious question whether more than one printing plant would be required to meet the foreseeable volume of demand for literature in the North American Division. The counsels of the Spirit of Prophecy through Ellen G. White, however, seem to encourage the church to continue operating more than one publishing house with a printing plant in the North American Division."[5]

The committee was understandably attempting to keep faith with Ellen White's counsel, but was not sensitive to the importance of distinguishing policy and principle.

Ellen White repeatedly attacked consolidation of power and authority over Adventist publishing in the hands of a single North American publisher. At times, she had significant differences with editors dominating the Review and Herald Publishing Association. Not surprisingly, a principle to which she was unwaveringly committed was pluralism of authority over Adventist publishing in North America. Because of her principle, books are sold every day at Adventist Book Centers that otherwise would never have been published. Many other Adventist authors have had their manuscripts rejected by one Adventist publisher only to be accepted by another. The wisdom of Ellen White's principle of maintaining checks and balances among Adventist publishers in North America is as sound today as it was in her lifetime.

But translating that principle into the complexities of modern publishing quickly leads to policy considerations about which there can be honest differences of opinion. Publishers in the United States are collections of editors, marketing professionals, circulation experts, and financial analysts. Very few publishers in the United States own their own printing plants. Most publishers have decided that the advent of expensive, high-speed presses makes it prohibitive for them to own their own printing equipment. The same sort of consideration of cost-effectiveness ought to determine whether the Adventist denomination in North America should have three, two, one, or no printing plants. Any of several arrangements concerning printing presses could serve the basic principle of maintaining pluralism of Adventist publishing houses.

"If the Adventist denomination supported two publishers in North America, while limiting itself to no more than one efficient printing facility, it could remain true to Ellen White's principles."

A realization of the difference between publishing and printing would presumably mean adopting the policy of not operating more than one Adventist printing facility with high-speed presses. At the same time, the Pacific Press and Review and Herald could continue as separate publishers, exercising independent judgment about editorial content and marketing strategy. If the Adventist denomination supported two publishers in North America, while limiting itself to no more than one efficient printing facility, it could remain true to Ellen White's principles: distributing inexpensive literature as widely as possible and maintaining pluralism in publishing authority.

Policies, Principles, and Church Structure

The millions of dollars lost in the Davenport affair and the enormous sums wasted in Adventist publishing have stunned Advent-

ist tithe-payers. Some have stopped signing tithe checks. Others are placing their tithe into escrow accounts. The most responsible and significant response has been the unprecedeted groundswell of interest by North American members in the structure of their church. Members of constituencies in the Michigan, Southeastern California, Montana, and Washington conferences have either called for, or organized committees to examine church structure. The Pacific and North Pacific Union conferences have created major commissions studying church organization. The General Conference, in addition to the task force analyzing the publishing work in North America, is continuing to support the President's Review Commission. Laymembers of the commission say that it will recommend structural changes in North America that are needed to avoid another Davenport fiasco.

Before long these commissions and committees will suggest that the membership of the church adopt new policies. Some of their proposals—possibly urging the elimination of entire departments and levels of church bureaucracy—may seem far-reaching and unsettling. (The commissions will no doubt notice that the merging of the Northern and Central Unions into the Mid-America Union together with the subsequent merger of eight into five conferences has saved close to $1 million in operating expenses annually, not counting the one-time saving from the sale of three conference offices and one academy.)[6] The commissions are likely to recommend policies that make employees of the church more accountable to the membership that supports their activities. Accepting or rejecting these policies should depend on their potential effectiveness, while commitment to basic principles remains unwavering.

Probably not since 1901 have Adventists gone through such a turbulent period. Certainly not since then have members devoted so much attention to the nature and structure of our church. Although revision of organizational policies is not a cure-all, crises often force communities to conduct reappraisals they should have carried out long before. The serious and thorough studies now under way into whether administrative policies conform to principles are necessary to reassure members that we can once again have confidence in our church and the way it carries out its mission. We as members of this church must assume responsibility for transforming recent reversals into occasions for renewal.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. George Colvin. "Publishing Sad Tidings: Adventist Publishing in North America," in this issue of *Spectrum*.

2. Jiggs Gallagher. "Merging Unions and Conferences: the Example of Mid-America," *Spectrum*, vol. 13; no. 1, Sept. 1982.

3. "A Study of Corporate Ethical Policy Statements," published by the Foundation of the Southwestern Graduate School of Banking, 1980.

4. Glen Coe. "Letters." *Adventist Review*, June 9, 1983, p. 15.

5. "Publishing Work Task Force—First Session." *Adventist Review*. July 14, 1983, pp. 12–13.

6. Jiggs Gallagher. "Merging Unions and Conferences: the Example of Mid-America." *Spectrum*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 25.

Sad Tidings: Adventist Publishing in North America

by George Colvin

It is not too much to say that North American publishing is facing a crisis. Fundamental changes in both production and distribution of Adventist books and magazines will probably have to be made. The 50 Adventist Book Centers and 931 credentialed literature evangelists in North America sold $75 million in 1982, essentially the same as in 1981. However, only eight literature evangelists in North America earned $20,000 or more in 1982, the Review and Herald Publishing Association is paying almost $1 million a year just to service its debt, and for months the Pacific Press Publishing Association has been on the verge of bankruptcy.

The possible bankruptcy of the Pacific Press—the most immediate of the money problems—sparked an old debate in the North American Division over Ellen White's counsel to maintain more than one publishing house. Exchanges in this debate focused on the production process within Adventist publishing and diverted attention from the church's current legal entanglements with Adventist book wholesaler Derrick Proctor, and distribution problems which also threaten the system.

George Colvin is a doctoral candidate at the Claremont Graduate School.

Pacific Press and Production

Since church presses in the North American Division can print far more literature than the distribution system now handles, the General Conference Committee voted April 7, 1983, to retain Pacific Press as a publishing association at a new location but to delay setting up a new printing plant. Most publishers in the United States edit and promote books and magazines, but do not own their printing facilities. According to the General Conference's recommendation the Pacific Press printing plant would have been sold to pay off current liabilities. Conceivably, printing for Pacific Press reorganized as a publisher would have been done at the new Review facilities in Hagerstown, Md.

Supporters of Pacific Press responded to this decision with a campaign to save Pacific Press as both publisher and printer, even if it were moved to a new location as a cost-saving measure.

Lawrence Maxwell, editor of the *Signs of the Times,* compiled an eight-page mailing for all church pastors in North America, complete with a conversion story and appeal to pastors to write Washington, D.C., in support of Pacific Press.

A professionally printed booklet entitled "Confederation and Consolidation: Seventh-day Adventist History and the Counsels of the Spririt of Prophecy" was widely distributed by the "Friends of the Pacific Press Publishing Association." This booklet carried statements about consolidation of Adventist organizations (especially publishing houses) by Ellen G. White and the General Conference as compiled by the White Estate in 1968. The introduction appealed to readers to help Pacific Press avoid giving up "some of its independence and control" by contacting several General Conference officers and expressing support for the press' continued existence.

Pacific Press employees and their families circulated appeals to continue the press' publishing and printing functions. These appeals often noted that the debt burden of Pacific Press (about $8 million) was substantially less than that of the Review ($13.5 million), reviving the longstanding, if often denied, rivalry between Pacific Press and the Review.

Official sources do confirm that even after the Review obtains the remaining proceeds of about $2.5 million from its merger with Southern Publishing Association and the hoped-for $5–6 million from the sale of the old Review plant in Washington, D.C., it will still be left with a considerable debt because of the costs of erecting a completely new plant. The Review has yet to receive an offer on its old building.

The campaign may have affected the newly formed North American Division Publishing Work Task Force, which was created at the April 7 General Conference Committee meeting. During the task force's first session in May, disagreement emerged over the advisability of adopting a single printing press to solve financial problems. Supporters of Pacific Press pointed to Arthur L. White's 10-page letter in which he discussed Mrs. White's strong encouragement in 1900 to retain a publishing house in Oslo, Norway, that was threatened with bank foreclosure on its physical plant. Arthur White concluded his letter by saying that "Ellen White would give no place to the consideration of abandoning a publishing

A Short History of Adventist Colporteuring

by George Colvin

Like the publishing work as a whole, the delivery system in North America has evolved over time. Colporteurs, or literature evangelists as they are now called, first came into existence in the 1880s near Battle Creek, Mich. They sold John Harvey Kellogg's 1,600-page *Home Hand Book of Domestic Hygiene and Rational Medicine.* Like many books of the time, Kellogg's tome was sold on subscription, with the colporteurs taking orders for later delivery. Gradually the colporteurs' wares expanded to include other health-related and then more directly doctrinal material.

Originally the colporteurs ordered their own books from the publisher, delivered the books themselves, and did their own collections. As the colporteurs went further from Battle Creek, they began to find it convenient to order books through the state Tract and Missionary Society. These societies gradually assumed control of all subscription sales in their territory, and the state agent became a recruiter and trainer of colporteurs.

This system persisted into the first decades of the 20th century, when cash on delivery (c.o.d.) of books was developed. However, because c.o.d. orders had a high non-acceptance rate, installment payment for colporteur books was instituted in the 1940s. This system evolved in the 1950s to become the present literature evangelist program. In this program, the literature evangelist is a licensed or credentialed employee of the local conference, whose program is supervised by the publishing director (the successor to the state agent). Literature evangelists receive their literature from the union Home Health Education Service (HHES), which in turn purchases this literature from the publishing house. The HHES handles credit-related matters (evaluation, billing, payment reception, and collections), and shipping of ordered books to the customer. The literature

house in trouble and just retain the management in issuing literature, but get the printing done some place else than on our presses in our own plants."

After considerable discussion, the task force voted 11 to 2 to recommend that the church "operate two publishing houses with two printing plants in the North American Division."

Despite this conclusion, some General Conference officials maintained that in making a decision the General Conference should consider the principles behind Ellen White's counsel (such as the need for pluralism in editorial voices) rather than the specific applications she made of those principles.

William Johnsson, in his June 9 editorial in the *Adventist Review*, affirmed the need to consider Ellen White's instructions, "But each of us should acknowledge the difficulty involved in trying to understand how counsels out of the past given to specific circumstances should be applied by the church today."

The editorial also spelled out problems in Adventist publishing: decreased number of books sold, despite rising dollar sales; the small number of literature evangelists earning even $17,500 a year (based on average yearly sales of $30,000); struggles for survival by many Adventist Book Centers; the burden imposed on conferences and unions by the distribution system; underutilization of the printing capacity of the expensive high-speed web presses at Pacific Press and the Review and Herald; books priced above many people's ability to pay for them.

This editorial drew an immediate and sharp disagreement on the extent and nature of the problems from J. C. Kinder, director of publishing for North America. He wrote a three-page letter to the *Adventist Review* reinterpretating Johnson's facts point by point. "I was greatly disappointed in the type of journalism displayed in the June 9 editorial, 'Publish or cherish,'" he wrote. "While it is the type of journalism that we have come to expect from *Spectrum* and some other groups, I did expect better from the

---

evangelist is only involved in making sales and filling out orders, which are turned in to the HHES. In this way, the HHES is one of the descendants of the state societies, whose other heirs are the Adventist Book Centers.

A sharp distinction is made between books processed through the HHES (stilled called "subscription literature") and other books (called "trade books") that might be sold by the literature evangelist. One difference is in the books themselves; subscription versions of Adventist books tend to be more impressively printed (and to have correspondingly higher prices) than do other versions. An even more important distinction is in the way the sales are treated. Literature evangelists' sales of non-HHES books or trade books, do not count for minimum sales requirements, are not considered in determining continuing qualifications for credentials, and do not apply to benefits.

Because of various costs associated with credit processing, and perhaps because of the desirability of making sure that the books will stay in the home and not be refused or returned, the literature evangelist also receives a substantially larger commission on books sold for cash (40 percent of the price) than for credit (15 to 33 percent). Nevertheless, the trend in recent decades has been toward sales on credit of large sets of books, such as the 10-volume *Bible Story* set by Arthur S. Maxwell, or a diverse combination of titles called the "Christian Home Library."

A concern among some publishing leaders is the rather sumptuous buildings that have recently been built to house HHES operations. Elder Lowell Bock, a general vice president of the General Conference and chairman of the board of Pacific Press, recently commented to the Pacific Press constituency that the "beautiful facility" built to house the HHES in the Lake Union Conference (where Bock served as president) was felt by "some" to have "increased our overall costs," thereby contributing to what Bock called "a terrible squeeze on the publishing dollar."

Review. While the facts used are correct, they are used in such a way as to give a distorted or false picture of what is happening in the publishing work in North America."

Johnsson and Kinder were not the only General Conference leaders differing about the future of North American publishing during the week of June 9. (The debate concluded at meetings of the General Conference officers and the General Conference Committee, June 7–9).

Comments on the business viewpoint were made June 7. On June 8, the General Conference Committee heard presentations from several conferences and unions advocating relocation of Pacific Press in their area. The sites considered included Central and Northern California, Washington state, and Idaho, but no decision was made. A site recommendation subcommittee was appointed.

That evening the General Conference officers reconvened to discuss the implications of Ellen G. White's publishing statements. After several hours of discussion the leadership drafted a statement describing their dilemma:

- Due to the restrictions imposed on the taskforce due to the immediate situation at the Pacific Press, it has not been able to complete the study requested by the General Conference Officers and union presidents on April 7, 1983.
- From a purely business standpoint there would be a serious question whether more than one printing plant would be required to meet the foreseeable volume of demand for literature in the North American Division.
- The counsels of the Spirit of Prophecy through Ellen G. White, however, would seem to encourage the Church to operate more than one publishing house with a printing plant in the North American Division as has been recognized in previous statements and positions expressed by the GC officers and the GC Committee in recent years.

In light of this conflict the officers reversed the position they had taken just two months before and recommended to the General Conference Committee that the task force's two publishing houses/two printing plants solution be accepted. In presenting this recommendation June 9, General Conference President Neal C. Wilson said that he "yielded" to the implications of the Ellen White counsel, because the Adventist Church is a church rather than a business. Several key General Conference officers who now supported keeping Pacific Press as both publisher and printer said that they would not do so if Pacific Press were their own business, but it was a church institution, not simply a commercial enterprise. Some committee members, including one vice president responded that Ellen White's counsels might not be as clear or applicable as suggested, and that postponing the solving of a problem would only make it worse. But the General Conference Committee approved the recommendation.

On June 12, a much-relieved Pacific Press constituency heard of this action and added their approval. Since then the Pacific Press board has approved selling the Mountain View property to the South Bay Construction and Development Corporation for $10 million.

Derrick Proctor and Distribution

In his June 9 editorial, Johnsson suggested that the traditional methods of distribution (primarily Adventist Book Centers and literature evangelists) were not likely to be entirely sufficient for the future and that "bold, innovative marketing approaches are called for."

What approaches will actually be used will be influenced by the result of a legal case involving an associate professor of psychology at Andrews University, Derrick Proctor. His case has received local newspaper attention, but no coverage by the *Adventist Review*, despite its series of articles on publishing.

Before Proctor went to Andrews in 1969, he had, on occasion, been a colporteur from the university. He obtained an agreement

that he be given one day per week and his vacation periods to sell books. Every year since, this permission has been renewed. In 1976, he established Library and Educational Services, a wholesale book distributorship intended to sell Adventist and non-Adventist books and other materials to Adventist schools at a substantial discount.

The most famous item in his stock was the *Bible Story*. Through arrangements with the Home Health Education Service, Proctor purchased the *Bible Story* for about $50. Proctor offered his sets to wholesale customers, however, at $79.95—a greatly lower price than the ABC and colporteur price ($269.95) and a substantially lower figure than the usual price charged Adventist institutions by the Home Health Education Service (about $135). Since the *Bible Story* is a major profit-maker for Adventist publishing which often subsidizes other, less profitable books, Proctor's discount sales were not taken lightly.

In late 1979, Proctor says he began to hear from his non-Adventist book suppliers that the Adventist Book Centers were threatening to cut off business with them if they continued to sell Proctor while he sold Adventist books at sizeable discounts. Next, he was contacted by various church officials, who told him his sales were hurting church-owned stores. He was asked to raise his prices to the same level charged by denominational stores, even if it meant that he went out of business.

Proctor declined to go out of business; and because he considered the price proposal to be illegal price-fixing, he refused to raise his prices. Lowell Bock, then president of the Lake Union Conference, negotiated an agreement requiring the church to pay Proctor $4,700 and to cease interference with his business. That should have resolved the situation.

However, Proctor says that efforts by the church to cut off his access to Adventist books continued. He considered this interference to be a violation of state and federal anti-trust laws. Proctor wrote to various church officials who responded first with silence, then with what he considered to be attempts to blackmail him into changing his business practices, and finally with a proposal for binding arbitration before a board, the composition of which is still in dispute.

Proctor says that to protect himself he supplied information on the developments to attorneys general of several Midwestern states. May 12, 1981, the Michigan attorney general filed a cease-and-desist order against several church organizations for violations of the 1899 Michigan anti-trust law.

In August 1981, Proctor himself went to court. He filed suit in federal district court naming both Adventist and non-Adventist defendants as having been involved in agreements that illegally restricted trade in Adventist books. He asked for $1.7 million in damages. Proctor alleged that his increasing difficulty in obtaining Adventist books to sell and the decreasing percentage of his sales going to Adventist schools (down from 47 percent in 1977 to 19 percent in 1981) were evidence of such agreements.

"Since the *Bible Story* is a major profit-maker for Adventist publishing, Proctor's discount sales were not taken lightly."

Later that year, Neal Wilson told the Andrews University's *Student Movement* that the church was not the plaintiff and had been "dragged into a legal setting by someone else," and promised that "we are going to go in there with everything we have" to protect the church from malicious attacks on its publishing activities.

Proctor fits a rather bizarre development into the sequence of events. On May 6, 1982, several people broke into the warehouse that stored Proctor's materials. They stole cash, several cases of Bibles, and other items. One of those who later pled guilty to conspiracy to entering the warehouse with-

out permission happened to be John D. Bernet, a part-time student worker at the Lake Union Conference Home Health Education Service and the son of the publishing department director for the Lake Union.

The Michigan state anti-trust complaint was resolved by a consent judgment August 24, 1982, which forbade Adventist organizations from engaging in any efforts to fix the prices that independent resellers charged for Adventist books. It also specifically indicated, however, that church suppliers could "reduce, suspend, or terminate sales or shipments to any independent reseller," provided that they did not do so in order to fix prices.

"Little study has been done on the possibility that Adventist literature is not selling adequately because it is not speaking effectively to Adventists and non-Adventists alike."

Church officials point out that they have never conceded that they were in violation of law and that the consent judgment does not say that the church was violating the law in refusing to sell to Proctor in the first place. They argue that the consent judgment does not now require them to sell to Proctor. Proctor argues that his continuing difficulty in obtaining Adventist books for resale indicates that the church is still attempting to fix the prices at which resellers can sell Adventist literature. Though church officials disclaim any knowledge of this development, Proctor claims that the attorneys general of several states are dissatisfied with the church's compliance with the law and the consent judgment and may file suit within a few months.

Proctor's personal suit has not been resolved. Church officials, on advice of anti-trust counsel, are reluctant to make comments outside of court proceedings on the case. However, the principal argument of the church is that the church as a single entity cannot conspire with itself to restrain trade, and did not, in fact, do so. Therefore, it has not violated the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. The church also claims that the First Amendment exempts the church from the application of the Sherman Act to Adventist publishing. The First Amendment argument was presented unsuccessfully in previous cases involving the Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Some church entities other than the General Conference are also presenting jurisdictional arguments.

In the first stages of the case, Proctor's request for a preliminary injunction has been denied. On June 24, 1983, Zondervan Books (one of the non-Adventist defendants) won a motion for summary judgment that removes it as a defendant. The church anti-trust counsel believes these actions and the judicial conclusions involved in them bode well for the church's position.

Proctor feels that the principal issue in his case is the price that the church charges for its books, particularly the "subscription books" sold by colporteurs. Proctor cites Ellen White's direction that the books should be distributed "like the leaves of autumn" and denies that can be done when the *Bible Story* costs $269.96 per set. He also wonders how his for-profit business can manage to sell Adventist books so much more cheaply than the non-profit Adventist Book Centers. Kinder points out that church distributors have many expenses (advertising, retirement funds, commission for sales people, and supervisors' salaries) that Proctor does not have. Kinder claims, too, that Adventist books are priced similarly to, or lower than, comparable non-Adventist books.

But other problems besides the Proctor case also face the distribution system. Because of the cost of capitalizing the sales system (which relies extensively on credit sales), many conferences and unions have

placed a limit on the extent to which book sales may increase from year to year. Cancellation and delinquency rates on books sold are substantially higher than in secular business, partly because the church's interest in having the books in non-Adventist homes leads to lenient collection practices. Colporteur sales figures recently have been disappointing, with a 1.3 percent decrease in sales for 1982 as compared with 1981.

Also, some think that the publishing houses (which are General Conference institutions), the Home Health Education Services (which are union institutions), and the literature evangelists and Adventist Book Centers (employed and owned respectively by local conferences) should be more integrated in their policies.

Though the best solutions to these and other problems may not be known, recent experiences have shown some methods that are unlikely to work. In the February 10 *Review*, Kinder said that efforts to place Adventist books on news racks and in non-Adventist Christian bookstores failed resoundingly, with losses to the church running into hundreds of thousands of dollars. Attempts to put Adventist Book Centers into shopping malls mainly serving the non-Adventist public have also been "financial disasters," Kinder stated.

Current publishing problems, according to Kinder, should be blamed on "spiritual lethargy" and lack of missionary activity in the church, and unpopularity of literature promotion within local congregations, and the growing tendency to use non-Adventist sources for sermon, study, and guidance material. He also maintains that the printing plants at Pacific Press and the Review are more economical than the publishing offices, which he says are overstaffed and whose workers often get called away for other church activities. So when the suggestions for two publishing offices and one printing plant circulated at the General Conference, Kinder countered with the solution of one publishing office and two printing plants.

The most workable solution for the publishing industry in the church, he says, would be increased emphasis on outreach by pastors, thereby motivating members to use Adventist literature. The Adventist Book Centers would then function as "arsenals" for the members to use.

Among the questions left open by this proposal are whether the laity can be so easily motivated to do in the future what they could already be doing and whether this would be sufficient to meet industry needs.

Other proposals rely more on structural changes. The Pacific Union Conference Church Structure Committee suggested that literature distribution be integrated and serve Adventist and non-Adventist customers through stores, van services, and field representatives. In this system, the literature evangelists and Adventist Book Centers would become publishing house representatives. The committee's report also suggested that literature evangelists should sell both trade and subscription books and should always leave some Adventist literature at each call, whether or not a sale is made.

J. C. Kinder called these suggestions "the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard." He said the publishing work exists solely for an evangelistic purpose and not to make money for the church. From this viewpoint, he faulted the proposal for separating the literature evangelists from the local conferences and local churches, the primary evangelistic agencies of the church in general. Kinder also saw no role in the distribution system for the publishing houses, which he characterized as producers only without the expertise or resources to manage distribution. Kinder also claimed that non-Adventists do not feel an immediate need for Adventist religious literature. Literature evangelists' through private conversations with prospective non-Adventist customers are necessary to create this need.

Sales to Non-Adventists and Writing

In the recent discussions about North American Division publishing, one element has received scant attention: the product itself. Relatively little study seems to have been done on the possibility that Adventist literature is not selling adequately because it is not speaking effectively to Adventists and non-Adventists alike. Such marketing research would seem to be essential in today's competitive publishing industry.

Many standard Adventist books were written in a time when religious belief was more widespread, and literary style more flowery than today. Recent efforts to alter the appearance of some Adventist books written in the 19th century, whether by changing book titles and bringing them out in cheap paperback editions or by putting them on parchment paper in expensive leather-bound sets, do not alter their content. Whatever the level and nature of the truth in Adventist books, if they are to sell widely they must speak clearly to the people's present needs. Recent comments, such as Kinder's concern that Adventists are increasingly using non-Adventist religious works suggest this is a significant problem.

The Adventist publishing system also has no "escalator clauses" to provide additional royalties to authors of best-sellers, leaving writers with proven talents who might write appealingly for non-Adventists without incentives. Reports from publishing workers that a rather high proportion of church-published books come from unsolicited manuscripts (the "slush pile") also suggest an overreliance on unproved writers.

What sort of message might be more appealing? It may be that the emphasis on doctrines in Adventist publications needs reconsideration. When ephemeral romance novels make up such a high proportion of book sales, writing for the general American reader might seem a depressing task. But the need to speak to people in ways they understand seems to have been endorsed by Paul's comment that he had "become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some." (1 Corinthians 9:22)

If not only structural changes in production and distribution (however desirable) were accomplished, but Adventist writers were stimulated to address questions people are actually asking, Adventist publishing in North America could more effectively "publish glad tidings" of itself and its Lord.

Giving Yes; Income Sharing No

by Henry E. Felder

In a recent article ("Income-Sharing: A Plan for Economic Justice in the Local Church" *Spectrum*, vol. 13, no. 3), Joe Mesar justifies an ideal of economic equality among Christians by citing Judaic and early Christian precedents presented in Scripture. He proposes that local Christian congregations today translate that ideal into an income-sharing plan. The more affluent members would assist the poor in the congregation through a systematic system of cash payments. A major result of this proposal would be a redistribution of income such that extremes of great wealth and extreme poverty would not exist among Christian families.

The plan is based on three major premises:

1. That the economic systems of the early Hebrew era and the early Christian church are ideals for present economic functioning.
2. That economic equality is the biblical ideal, thus income and wealth inequality are unnatural and must be avoided.
3. That the church has an income maintenance responsibility for its poorer members.

Henry E. Felder is an associate deputy assistant secretary for Policy Development and Research with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. He graduated from Oakwood College and received his Ph.D. in economics from Stanford University.

There are many attractive features of this plan. I believe most Christians of good will are interested in lessening burdens on the poor while providing the affluent with a new avenue for sharing their wealth. However, it is my position that the social and cultural context in which biblical metaphors, stories, and illustrations are presented must be taken into account when they are used to define present Christian behavior. Hence, the realities of modern social and economic life in the United States must also be taken into account if Adventists structure an economic-sharing plan. The major weakness of the Mesar proposal is a failure to take these realities into account. In addition, I contend that the three premises on which the income-sharing plan is based makes questionable use of the biblical record. I examine each of the premises, then assess the economic structure in which this plan would operate.

Hebrew and Early Christian Precedents

Mesar's extensive examination of the Judaic economic system and his call that "it is time for us to join Jesus and the prophets,"

sets up the early Hebrew system as an ideal that can be recreated in the present. I suggest instead, that the major principles to be derived from these examples are that God requires a spirit of generosity to the less fortunate and that the tithes and offerings belong to him. The specific concepts of the Jubilee and the Sabbath year were part of the Hebrew approach to a particular economic need. They provide us with possible manifestation of the basic principles but tell us little about how we can ration scarce resources now.

"The specific concepts of the Jubilee and the Sabbath year provide us with the basic principles but tell us little about how we can ration scarce resources now."

The Hebrew economy was overwhelmingly agrarian, in which an early means of caring for the poor was to leave portions of the agricultural produce for gleanings—a practical way to assure minimum subsistence to all (Deuteronomy 24:19, Leviticus 19:9,10). The Hebrew political system was a closed system, in that both religious and civil customs were incorporated under a single set of rulers—the priest and the judges/kings. Thus, the pronouncements made by the prophets regarding social justice and economic distribution were given as much to national leaders who had the power to tax and redistribute as to wealthy individuals. The various offerings of money and goods, including animals, were a means of providing for both civil and ecclesiastical needs until the later kings set up more formal taxing procedures.* Therefore, in contemplating how best to employ the Hebrew examples, we must consider the institutional structures within which they operated, extract the appropriate principles, and then convert them into present practices.

In examining the evidence from the New Testament, several factors must be kept in mind. First, many of Jesus' parables were spoken to illustrate eternal truths, not economic principles. For example, the parable of the ruler and the workmen, in which each received equal pay for unequal work, was not a prescription for ideal labor-management relationships! Once again, it is necessary to extract the underlying principle, rather than seeking means of literally transferring that metaphor to contemporary life.

Next, it is certainly not clear that the New Testament teaches the complete relinquishment of all wealth. As an insightful observer of the human psyche, Jesus asked of each person he encountered to surrender any impediment that would separate the sinner from reconciliation with God. Thus, to the rich young ruler, and only to him, did Jesus say, "If you want to be perfect, go, sell your possessions and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me." (Matthew 19:21, NIV) However, to Nicodemus, a wealthy Pharisee, Jesus said that he had to be born again; his wealth was never mentioned. Also, no income disbursal was required of Zacchaeus, a rich tax collector who readily acknowledged his ill-gotten gain. To Zacchaeus, Jesus said, "Today, salvation has come to this house, since he also is a son of Abraham. For the Son of man came to seek and save the lost." (Luke 19:9 KJV). This was hardly an indication that the rich could not be saved, nor was it an endorsement of wealth disposal. The clearest message that comes from these stories is spiritual, not economic.

The experiences of the early Christian church in income maintenance and income redistribution are often cited as the ideal for contemporary Christians. There is little doubt that the early church was attempting to carry out in its time the ideals of the Beatitudes. At issue, however, is whether

*(See the SDA Commentary on 1 Samuel 8:7)

the Bible specifically enjoins Christians to adopt today the economic system adopted by the early church. Once again, we must examine the social and economic context that prompted that system. The small band of Jerusalem-based Christians were responding to the immediate temporal needs of the newly emergent church—many members of whom were no longer part of the temple system. As the early church expanded outside of Jerusalem, the system of common holding of goods became one of individual giving (1 Corinthians 16:2;2 Corinthians 8:2). The underlying concept of Christian liberality was maintained, but the structure of the giving system changed to meet the changing environment.

Economic Equality as an Ideal

In the Mesar paper, economic equality is spoken of as a biblical ideal. At the onset, we must recognize that economic equality may describe wealth equality, income equality, or some combination of the two. Wealth derives from the ownership of capital, both physical and financial; and from possessing items of value, such as land, goods and animals. Income derives from the returns from wealth, the increases from a natural process (such as farming), the value of the labor services provided by the worker, and gifts from individuals or institutions. Only in the most simple society can these factors interact to produce anything resembling economic equality. Contrary to the Mesar hypothesis, I suggest that the notion of the equality of these two aspects of economic value is not part of the biblical record—either as an actual or an ideal.

Beginning with the biblical record of Genesis 4, men and women have been endowed with unique gifts. Among these gifts is the God-given ability to acquire wealth (Deuteronomy 8:19). Throughout the Old Testament, the leading characters were overwhelmingly men of wealth. As an indication of God's blessing, Job once again became a man of great wealth once his ordeal was over. In the instance of Solomon, God granted extraordinary wealth even when it was not specifically requested (2 Chronicles 1:12). In the latter history of the Jewish people, after they had established civil and religious bureaucracies, the wrath of the prophets was not directed towards wealth inequality, per se, but the inordinate disparity between the rich and the poor. The prophets railed against a disparity that left the poor without even a subsistence.

Economic inequality is also a reality in the New Testament, and there is no clear indication that Christians were to move towards absolute or relative economic equality. Instead, the New Testament writers tried to turn Christians away from accumulation of excessive wealth and towards the biblical ideal of sharing, liberality, and the avoidance of excesses. Most importantly the writers of the New Testament did not want Christians to allow any form of wealth to interfere with their relationship with God.

Income Maintenance Responsibility

Mesar is right that the Bible calls the Christian to respond differently from non-Christians to the needs of the poor. However, the essential question is, what should be the means of that response? Before answering that question, the social and economic environment in which the Seventh-day Adventist operates must be considered. Of necessity, my analysis focuses exclusively on the United States. Once other countries are included, the nature of the response must differ.

To begin with, an enormous income maintenance system is in place in this country—one to which all Christians have access. In fiscal year 1983, the federal government will spend almost $300 billion dollars for a variety of income maintenance

and support programs that annually assist millions of the poor and the not so poor. (see the information in the box, taken from the Budget of the United States Government, fiscal year 1984, U.S. Government Printing Office, pages 5–113). The major programs assist the elderly, the widowed, the orphaned, the unemployed, the poor, and the infirm. For example, over 36 million Americans are helped by the Social Security system at a cost of over $162 billion annually. More than 22 million Americans receive food stamps or other nutrition assistance (compare this with Old Testament gleaning.) Additional millions are helped with medical bills through Medicare (those over 65 years of age) and Medicaid (those under 65 years of age).

These programs do not alleviate all aspects of want and deprivation, and are not to be viewed as absolving the Christian of the need for compassion. But any system of Christian charity in the United States must be developed with an awareness of the context of that which already exists.

Within the context of the U.S. social and economic system, there would be many difficulties in implementing the Mesar plan. Indeed, it is not clear that such an income-sharing plan is really warranted—either on ethical or efficiency grounds. From an ethical perspective, the Christian response need not seek to duplicate the proper role played by the federal system. Instead, an ethical response requires complementing that system where needs continue to be unmet. And many needs remain unmet. It is estimated that about 30 percent of all American families have income that is less than the poverty standard. (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level, 1980, Table 1.)

THE INCOME MAINTENANCE ENVIRONMENT

PROGRAM	COSTS (MILLIONS)	PERSONS (THOUS)
Social Security	$ 162,000	36,000
Widows and widowers		
Retirees		
Disabled		
Orphans		
Unemployment Insurance	30,000	10,000
Housing Assistance	5,000	2,500
Food and Nutrition Assistance	17,000	22,000
Other Welfare	20,000	
Medicare (65 and older)	47,000	
Medicaid	14,000	
TOTAL	295,000	

A church system of the sort suggested by Mesar would encounter enormous problems in terms of efficiency: defining needs, establishing the ability-to-pay, and diverting funds from other church activities. The Mesar plan implicitly assumes that each church contains affluent as well as poor members. Yet, it is clear that most churches contain few, if any, who are truly affluent. Equity considerations would require equalization of benefits across churches—a dubious proposition at best. Even with complete income sharing, it is not clear that church members would indeed be better off, since many of the poorest members are presently part of the existing government income maintenance structure and would see some benefits reduced as additional income were received. (For example, food stamps, housing, and medical assistance are based on the amount of income received. These benefits would decline as income from the local church increased.)

If the income-sharing plan is not practical, how should the Christian respond to poverty in its midst? The responses can come from three levels: the individual, the local church, and the corporate church.

The individual response is at once the most important and includes all the ethical prescriptives of Scripture. Fundamental to this is the view that as individuals we are

stewards of the gifts God has entrusted to us. It also means that we are our brother's keeper. As Christians, we cannot be comfortable with our wealth, knowing that there are people we can help, but are not because of our selfishness. In practical terms, that means that the tithe and liberal offerings are returned to the Lord, and that we actively seek those we can help by sharing. This help can take the form of gifts, labor, or other forms of assistance. In addition, we must be sensitive to local and corporate efforts to assist the needy.

The local church also has an identifiable role to play, given the existing income maintenance structure. First, church officials must know what economic benefits are available from the appropriate government authorities, so this information can be conveyed to those in need. Most local churches have an emergency fund to provide special assistance to the needy, but in most instances, this amount should be systematically expanded. The church could provide immediate help when circumstances warranted, rather than forcing poor members to wait until government agencies had completed their protracted eligibility processes. Next, the local church can, in conjunction with other churches, establish a financial management plan to assist families in managing their resources more prudently. (This is not to suggest that the only reason for a person's financial straits is an inability to manage money.) Finally, the local church can establish special programs, like education scholarships, for those who need cash assistance to attend to an Adventist school. The key notion is that the local church can become much more sensitized to the needs of the poor.

In summary, the Mesar plan addresses the need for a Christian response that exceeds that which non-Christians would be expected to make. There is a need for Christians, through their financial gifts to become involved in the needs of the poor. However, Mesar's plan relies far too much on a mechanism that is not warranted by biblical precedents. It is also subject to equity and efficiency problems, and fails to take into account the support system that is already in place. Instead, a less formal response may be needed.

Joe Mesar's Reply

Although I disagree with much of Henry Felder's response to my article on income sharing in the local church (*Spectrum*, vol. 13, no. 4), I appreciate the thoughtful nature of his approach to the issue. Hopefully, his critique of my position will stimulate further serious discussion of how to deal with problems of wealth and poverty in the church.

Felder's initial point seems to be that I am improperly using the Year of Jubilee and the example of the early church as models for our economic behavior as Christians in the 20th century. He advises that we should extract principles from the biblical material rather than urging adoption of actual policies designed for simpler economic times. This is what I have tried to do, although I suspect Felder is unhappy because I see the biblical principles as more radical and far-reaching than he does. I have not

recommended Year of Jubilee or the common purse as solutions for the contemporary church. (I must say, however, that periodic redistribution of wealth among church members along the lines of Jubilee would be a dramatic demonstration of our commitment to the principle of justice.) I would simply caution Felder that the economic system that actually exists provides less of a model for humane economic behavior than the biblical methods.

Felder next argues that the Bible does not support economic equality as an ideal. He reasons that God gives us the ability to acquire wealth, therefore its accumulation furthers his will. While I agree with the first part of this statement, the conclusion does not necessarily follow. I believe the Bible says that God gives us the ability to obtain wealth, therefore we have a responsibility to distribute it fairly, to assist the poor. Jesus and the prophets do not mention economic equality in each encounter with well-to-do individuals, but the concern for justice and equality animates every discussion of Christian economic principle.

Felder urges that any plea for care of the poor must take into account existing government programs. I agree. But these programs are far less generous than Felder implies with his use of aggregate statistics. For example, in Pennsylvania a single adult without other income receives $172 per month in welfare. If the recipient is "able-bodied," he or she can only receive this amount for three months out of the year. The other nine months the state provides nothing at all—despite 15 percent unemployment in the major urban areas. I challenge Felder or any other church member convinced of the generosity of the government to live on $516 per year. Moreover, I find it ironic that Adventists have traditionally opposed the expansion of the income maintenance programs on which Felder says the poor should primarily rely.

Finally, I find Felder's own recommendations for assistance to the poor distressing, albeit well intentioned. He advocates that churches maintain a fund to care for the poor as emergencies arise, that they advise low-income members about government programs and that congregations teach better management of financial resources. The first two suggestions are already commonly utilized in local churches and have proven wholly inadequate to meet the need since poverty and drastic inequality of wealth persists within Adventism. As for lessons in financial planning, I could support this idea only if it applied to more affluent members. It is my experience that the poor know how to ration their scarce resources, but that the wealthy pay little attention to biblical counsel on the use of their income and property.

My main problem with Felder's response is his skillful evasion of my central point that the Bible requires the prosperous believer to make regular and serious sacrifices to eliminate poverty in the church. My plan doubtless has numerous flaws, as any attempt to implement it would probably reveal. But the present inequality of wealth in the church is shameful and sinful. I believe that the only serious efforts to solve this problem must focus on the Bible's call for economic justice, not on the occasional good will of the affluent member.

Joe Mesar, a graduate of Atlantic Union College, is a staff attorney for Neighborhood Legal Services in Pittsburgh, Penn.

The Psychological World of Ellen White

by Ronald L. Numbers and Janet S. Numbers

Ellen G. White, the founding prophetess of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, died in 1915. Her views on subjects ranging from science to theology have continued to influence Adventist beliefs and practices up to the present. As recently as 1977 the trustees of the Ellen G. White Estate published a two-volume compilation of her writings on mental health, not as a historical monument, but as a practical, reliable guide for the late 20th century. The compilers, believing that "Ellen G. White wrote under the influence of the Spirit of God," expressed confidence that "as research in psychology and mental health progresses, her reputation for setting forth sound psychological principles will be still more firmly established."[1] They made little effort to place White's statements in their historical context—the only way, in our opinion, that her views can be properly understood. In this article we attempt not only to outline what she taught about the causes and cures of mental illness, but to identify the ways in which the Bible, contemporary medical ideas, and especially her own experience may have influenced her opinions. Our study is far from definitive, but it does suggest, we think, some of the ways in which a knowledge of historical context can clarify the meaning and significance of Ellen White's various comments on mental health.

Diseases of the Brain and Diseases of the Soul

In harmony with the prevailing psychiatric opinion of her time, Ellen White tended to regard mental illness as a somatic condition: a diseased brain. According to her understanding of human physiology, there was a two-way street between the brain and the rest of the body. The nervous system, like a telegraph network, transmitted "vital force" or "electrical energy" from the brain to other organs, while the vascular system

Ronald L. Numbers, professor of the history of medicine and history of science at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, is spending 1983–85 in Topeka, Kansas, is a fellow in Interdisciplinary Studies at the Menninger Foundation. Janet S. Numbers, who recently completed her Ph.D. in clinical psychology at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, is a postdoctoral fellow at the Menninger Foundation.

This paper was originally presented at a conference on "Seventh-day Adventists and Psychiatry: An Uneasy Alliance." Organized by Ronald Geraty, M.D., the conference was sponsored by Fuller Memorial Hospital and New England Memorial Hospital and held in Toronto, May 21–22, 1982.

carried blood to the brain. A healthy brain needed to be constantly supplied with pure blood. "If by correct habits of eating and drinking the blood is kept pure," she wrote, "the brain will be properly nourished."[2] A "mysterious and wonderful relation" thus existed between mind and body. In fact, White estimated that nine-tenths of all physical diseases originated in the mind.[3]

Because God at the creation had endowed Adam with so plentiful a supply of vital force that it took about 2,000 years of "indulgence of appetite and lustful passion" for disease to gain a foothold, White surmised that there had been no imbecility among the antediluvians.[4] However, as humans continued to squander their reservoir of vital force, the incidence of mental and physical disease had risen correspondingly. The race's only hope for maintaining health lay in carefully preserving the remaining vital force, and all persons—except idiots—had a moral responsibility to do so.[5]

Although Ellen White generally regarded mental illness as somatic rather than spiritual, she did give a religious interpretation to the apparently hysterical behavior of some of her contemporaries. Mid-19th century America abounded with visionaries, trance mediums, and religious enthusiasts of all descriptions. They could be found among Shakers and spiritualists as well as Methodists and Millerites.[6] For example, during the winter of 1842–43 John Starkweather and other Boston Millerites began to display various "cataleptic and epileptic" phenomena, and a few years later a veritable epidemic of what Joshua V. Himes called "visionary nonsense" broke out among the Millerites of Portland, Ma. By 1845 fanaticism among Millerites had reached such proportions that Himes declared the movement to be "seven feet deep" in mesmerism.[7]

Ellen White viewed such deviant behavior not as a manifestation of an unbalanced mind, but as spiritual pathology or, in a few instances, as a genuine outpouring of the Holy Spirit. William E. Foy's visions in 1842 fell into the latter category. As he described his experience, he was on one occasion "seized as in the agonies of death, and my breath left me; and it appeared to me that I was a spirit separate from this body." On another occasion he heard a strange voice, then "immediately fell to the floor, and knew nothing about this body, until twelve hours and a half had passed away, as I was afterwards informed." A physician who examined him during one of his visions testified that he "could not find any appearance of life, except around the heart."[8] Later in the 1840s, when Ellen White encountered some ministers manifesting similar behavior, which they believed to be caused by the Holy Ghost, she attributed it to the "power of Satan."[9] In both instances, her own experience rather than the external phenomena seems to have determined her response: Foy's visions corresponded remarkably with her own, while the ministers taught doctrines contrary to hers.

Repeatedly throughout her life White struggled to preserve or regain her physical and mental health. When she was a child of about 10, a thrown stone hit her on the nose, knocking her unconscious for several weeks, temporarily disfiguring her face, and prostrating her nervous system to the extent that she could not resume her schooling. In 1840 she and her family accepted William Miller's prediction that the world would soon end, and the anticipation of this event, especially the prospect of being lost, caused her intense agony. She "frequently remained bowed in prayer nearly all night, groaning and trembling with inexpressible anguish, and a hopelessness that passes all description."[10] Although religious anxiety was not uncommon among pious New England children, Ellen's experience seems to have been unusually intense. By 1842 she was having ecstatic religious experiences in

which the "Spirit of God" would render her unconscious, causing her to fall to the floor. Such episodes occurred less frequently as she grew older, but they continued at least into the 1870s.[11]

From her youth onward White, like many Victorian women, felt a need to share the details of her medical history—from nosebleeds to rheumatic pains—with others. Sprinkled liberally throughout her testimonies, letters, and autobiographical writings are complaints of lung, heart, and stomach ailments,[12] frequent "fainting fits" (sometimes as often as once or twice a day),[13] paralytic attacks (at least five by her mid-40s),[14] pressure on the brain,[15] and breathing difficulties.[16] At least once a decade from her teens through her 50s she expected imminent death from disease.[17] She frequently suffered from anxiety and depression.[18] On one occasion her "mind wandered" for two weeks, and on another it became "strangely confused." At times she did not want to live.[19] Although she commonly ascribed the illnesses of others to violations of the laws of health, she was inclined—especially during her early ministry—to attribute her own mental and physical ailments to the machinations of Satan and his evil angels, who had made her and her husband "the special objects" of their attention and who had gone so far as to cause several near-fatal accidents.[20]

In December, 1844, shortly after the great Millerite disappointment, she began going into trances, during which she experienced visions. These episodes, modeled in part after the visions of the biblical prophets, were unpredictable; she might be praying, addressing a large audience, or lying sick in bed, when suddenly she would be off on "a deep plunge in the glory." Often she would first shout "Glory! G—l-o-r-y! G—l—o—r—y!"—which, as Ron Graybill, an associate secretary of the White Estate, has recently shown, was a favorite exclamation among the Methodists of her day.[21] Then, unless caught by some alert brother nearby, she slowly sank to the floor. After a short time in this deathlike state, new power flowed through her body, and she rose to her feet. On occasion she possesed extraordinary strength, once reportedly holding an 18-pound Bible in her outstretched hand for a half hour.

During these trances, which came five or 10 times a year and lasted from a few minutes to several hours, she frequently described the scenes she was seeing. Sometimes she would also hear voices and music, smell a "sweet fragrance," or feel an angel's hand on her head. Occasionally she would be transported to far away places, usually guided by an unnamed male angel. According to the testimony of numerous witnesses, including some physicians, her vital functions slowed alarmingly, with her heart beating sluggishly and respiration becoming imperceptible. Although she was able to move about freely, others could not forcibly budge her limbs. Many visions left her in total darkness for short periods, but usually her sight returned to normal after a few days.[22]

"The world as seen by Ellen White consisted of two spheres: the material one and an invisible one. Electric or magnetic forces permitted interaction between the spheres."

The pattern of her visionary experiences suggests a strong need for reinforcement from persons who believed her trances to be supernatural. Even before her first vision, relatives and friends had interpreted her dreams and faintings as evidence of divine power, and her early visions brought similar assurances from those closest to her.[23] During the 1850s, when for a period fellow believers ignored her testimony, the visions became "less and less frequent" and White sank into depression.[24] Later, when they expressed appreciation of her gift, the visions returned. They remained fairly

common into the 1860s, but disappeared by the late 1870s, when dreams gradually replaced the trances.[25] There were, according to Ellen White, three categories of dreams: those arising "from the common things of life, with which the Spirit of God has nothing to do," "false dreams, as well as false visions, which are inspired by the spirit of Satan," and "dreams from the Lord," such as hers, which "are classed in the word of God with visions, and are as truly the fruits of the spirit of prophecy as visions."[26]

Skeptics who rejected her claim to inspiration tended to regard her as a hysteric or, more commonly, especially during her early ministry, as "a wonderful fanatic and trance medium."[27] This reaction is understandable in view of the great number of mesmerists, spiritualists, and miscellaneous other clairvoyants whose experiences paralleled Ellen White's. Although mesmerism or animal magnetism, as it was also called, originated in Europe in the 1770s, it did not attract much attention in the United States until the 1830s, when a French mesmerist named Charles Poyen came to America. Before long hypnotic displays became a favorite American entertainment. "Animal Magnetism soon became the fashion, in the principal towns and villages of the Eastern and Middle States," recalled one observer. "Old men and women, young men and maidens, boys and girls, of all classes and sizes, were engaged in studying the mesmeric phenomena, and mesmerizing or being mesmerized."[28] Through mesmerism americans gained a familiarity with trances and, in some instances, with spirit communication during these states. Thus when the Fox sisters touched off the spirit-rapping craze of the 1850s, they found a well-prepared audience. Many mesmerists embraced spiritualism, and it became virtually impossible for the uninitiated to differentiate between the two movements. As one historian has recently noted, "Mesmerized persons, especially those who attributed their powers to the inspiration of guardian spirits, were indistinguishable in their actions from many of the later trance mediums of the spiritualist movement."[29]

From outward appearances, there was also nothing to identify Ellen White's trances as being distinctive. In fact, Seventh-day Adventists were "often branded as Spiritualists" precisely because, as Ellen White explained, they believed "in the restoration of the gifts."[30] During her early ministry she frequently encountered allegations that her visions were simply mesmeric trances. Indeed, the phenomena were so similar that even she at times wondered whether or not she was being mesmerized. The discovery that she could have visions in private, away from the magnetizing influence of others, provided some comfort, but nagging questions remained in her mind until a peculiar episode, similar to that experienced by the father of John the Baptist, erased all doubt:

> While at family prayers one morning, the power of God began to rest upon me, and the thought rushed into my mind that it was mesmerism, and I resisted it. Immediately I was struck dumb, and for a few moments was lost to everything around me. I then saw my sin in doubting the power of God, and that for so doing I was struck dumb, but that my tongue should be loosed in less than twenty-four hours.

During her enforced silence she communicated with others by means of a slate and pencil, and for the first time since her childhood accident her writing hand did not tremble. The following day her speech returned, and from then on she knew that mesmerism had nothing to do with her visions.[31] Others, however, remained doubtful, and for years she and her apologists continued to insist that she was not a mesmerist.

White did not question the genuineness of phenomena associated with mesmerism and spiritualism, but she believed that they were Satanic in nature and that practitioners of these arts were "channels for Satan's electric currents."[33] Like Mary Baker Eddy, the founder of Christian Science, White greatly feared being influenced by what

Eddy called malicious animal magnetism. White described how on one occasion the Lord protected her from a mesmeric attack:

> . . . I felt a human influence being exerted against me. I looked at J[oseph] T[urner]. He had his hand up to his face, and was looking through his fingers, his eyes intently fixed upon me. His lips were compressed, and a low groan now and then escaped him. In a moment I remembered the promise which the Lord . . . had shown me in Portland; that if I was in danger of being affected by a human influence, to ask for another angel, who would be sent to protect me. I then raised my hands to heaven and earnestly cried, Another angel, Father! another angel! I knew that my request was granted. I felt shielded by the strong Spirit of the Lord, and was borne above every earthly influence, and with freedom finished my testimony.[34]

As this and other evidence suggest, the world as seen by Ellen White consisted of two spheres: the material one revealed by our senses, and an invisible one inhabited by good and evil angels. Electric or magnetic forces permitted interaction between the spheres.

In 1862 White published a condemnation of mesmerism and related sciences that has subsequently elicited much discussion. She wrote:

> The sciences of phrenology, psychology, and mesmerism are the channels through which he [Satan] comes more directly to this generation. . . . Phrenology and mesmerism are very much exalted. They are good in their place, but they are seized upon by Satan as his most powerful agents to deceive and destroy souls. . . . Thousands are conversing with, and receiving instructions from, this demon-god, and acting according to his teachings. The world, which is supposed to be benefited so much by phrenology and animal magnetism, never was so corrupt. Satan used these very things to destroy virtue and lay the foundation of Spiritualism.[35]

These strictures, we believe, can only be understood within the context of White's own visionary experiences and her need to distinguish between her trances and those of her contemporaries.

Phrenology was the science of the mind developed by two German physicians, Franz Joseph Gall, and his student Johann Gaspar Spurzheim, and brought to the United States in the 1830s by Spurzheim and a Scottish convert, George Combe. According to phrenological theory, the human brain is made up of a number of different "organs," each corresponding to a mental "faculty" such as amativeness, acquisitiveness, or philoprogenitiveness. Since the relative strength of any propensity could be determined by measuring the size of its corresponding organ, it was not difficult for a skilled phrenologist to "read" a person's character by carefully examining the skull.[36] White herself often used phrenological language, and in 1864 she took her sons to a physician for a physicial examination and phrenological reading.[37]

Although many orthodox Christians criticized phrenology for its implied materialism, which seemed to diminish individual moral responsibility, White condemned it primarily because of its sometimes close connection with mesmerism and spiritualism. (She seems to have included psychology in her list merely because of its frequent association with these other evils.)[38] In the early 1840s mesmerists discovered that they could elicit distinctive responses in hypnotized subjects by stimulating particular phrenological organs. This gave rise to a hybrid movement known as phrenomagnetism. With this development, says one historian, phrenology appeared to veer away from materialism and "toward spiritualism and the occult"—the worst possible direction from White's point of view.[39]

The Causes and Cures of Mental Illness

By the 19th century the idea of insanity as demonic possession had largely disappeared from both medical and theological literature. Although some religious writers continued to invoke the power of Satan, it was more common, says Norman Dain, for orthodox ministers to admit "the theoretical possibility of demonological possession

but [deny] its actual presence in the mentally ill. This position enabled clergymen to accept the concept of somatic pathology and to sanction medical treatment of insanity."[40] Such was the stance of Ellen White. She knew from the Bible that demonic possession could cause insanity; but whenever she discussed mental illness in her own time, she appealed to natural rather than supernatural causes. Even in relating the story of how Jesus cured the "maniac of Capernaum" by rebuking the "demon" that possessed him, she suggests that the maniac lost his mind because of intemperance and frivolity.[41]

Mid-century American psychiatrists commonly separated the causes of insanity into two categories: predisposing and exciting. Predisposing causes included such factors as inherited tendencies and neglect of personal health, which, though not directly the cause of insanity, could make a person vulnerable to the disease. Exciting causes allegedly precipitated abnormal behavior. Asylum superintendents in the annual reports listed among exciting causes everything from excessive study or labor, disappointed ambition, and physical abuse to Mormonism, Millerism, mesmerism, and spirit rappings. Some superintendents distinguished between "physical" and "moral" causes, but it was never clear which label to apply to a condition like masturbation. The admitting physician customarily relied on accounts of relatives and friends to assign the exciting cause, though they were well aware of the hazards of such an approach, including the possibility that they might be confusing cause with effect.[42]

Although Ellen White never wrote systematically on the etiology of mental illness, her scattered comments on the subject generally reflected the prevailing opinions of her time. Like many psychiatrists, especially those writing after the Civil War, she believed that a large percentage of mental illness was attributable to inheritance. Typical of her many statements was one written shortly after having a major vision on health reform in 1863. "As the result of wrong habits in parents," she said, "disease and imbecility have been transmitted to their offspring."[43] In her opinion, no habits had a more insidious effect than those that violated the laws of health:

> Our ancestors have bequeathed to us customs and appetites which are filling the world with disease. The sins of the parents, through perverted appetite, are with fearful power visited upon the children to the third and fourth generations. The bad eating of many generations, the gluttonous and self-indulgent habits of the people, are filling our poorhouses, our prisons, and our insane asylums. Intemperance, in drinking tea and coffee, wine, beer, rum, and brandy, and the use of tobacco, opium, and other narcotics, has resulted in great mental and physical degeneracy, and this degeneracy is constantly increasing.[44]

Fortunately for the great majority of humans—and the doctrine of free will—right living could overcome a predisposition to insanity inherited from one's parents. But persons so predisposed had a "duty to ascertain wherein their parents violated the laws of their being" and to make sure that they did not continue in the same course. White thus agreed with the mental hygienists of the late 19th century that insanity was a preventable disease.[45]

A person's own intemperance could also contribute to insanity. In fact, White assigned the "main cause" of the disease to "improper diet, irregular meals, a lack of physical exercise, and careless inattention in other respects to the laws of health."[46] Her enthusiasm for health reform following her 1863 vision no doubt encouraged her in this belief, but her own experience confirmed it. "When my brain is confused," she wrote in 1900, "I know that I have been making some mistake in my diet."[47]

Much of the world's "deformity, disease and imbecility" she believed could be "traced directly back to the drug-poisons administered by the hand of a doctor as a remedy for some of life's ills." Strychnine was particularly dangerous, in part because it overheated the spinal column.[48] In an 1871 column explaining how the wearing of wigs

could affect one's mental health, she described the physiological relationship between insanity and overheating the brain:

> The artificial hair and pads covering the base of the brain, heat and excite the spinal nerves centering in the brain. The head should ever be kept cool. The heat caused by these artificials induce the blood to the brain. The action of blood upon the lower or animal organs of the brain, causes unnatural activity, tends to recklessness in morals, and the mind and heart is in danger of being corrupted. . . .
>
> In consequence of the brain being congested its nerves lose their healthy action, and take on morbid conditions. . . .
>
> Many have lost their reason, and become hopelessly insane, by following this deforming fashion. . . .[49]

White did not acknowledge it, but this view was virtually identical to that previously expressed by Dr. James Caleb Jackson, with whom she had become acquainted in the 1860s.[50]

To the 19th-century mind, a connection between masturbation and insanity seemed self-evident. Thus it probably surprised no one when White reported after her 1863 vision that God had identified imbecility as resulting from self abuse. "Everywhere I looked," she recalled, "I saw imbecility, dwarfed forms, crippled limbs, misshapen heads, and deformity of every description."[51] Some readers may have been surprised, however, by her description of the physical effects of masturbation on the brain. Among girls who masturbate, she wrote in *An Appeal to Mothers,* "the head often decays inwardly. Cancerous humor, which would lay dormant in the system their life-time, is inflamed, and commences its eating, destructive work. The mind is often utterly ruined, and insanity takes place."[52]

In addition to the various physical causes of insanity, White at one time or another identified a host of what her contemporaries called moral causes: frustrated ambition, excessive grief, guilt, gossip, and novel reading, the excitement of which weakened the "delicate machinery of the brain." "Thousands are today in the insane asylum," she observed, "whose minds became unbalanced by novel reading."[53] White was not alone in seeing this activity as a threat to mental health. In his annual report for 1846, the superintendent of the Mount Hope Institution in Baltimore warned parents to "guard their young daughters" against the pernicious practice of reading works of fiction. "We have had several cases of moral insanity, for which no other cause could be assigned than excessive novel reading."[54]

During times of religious enthusiasm and revivalism, asylum superintendents often listed religious anxiety or excitement among the leading causes of insanity. Shortly after the Millerite disappointment in 1844, for example, Amariah Brigham, superintendent of the New York State Lunatic Asylum in Utica, noted that 32 Millerites had been committed during the past year alone. "The nervous system of many of those who have been kept in a state of excitement and alarm for months," he explained, "has received a shock that will predispose them to all the various and distressing forms of nervous disease and to insanity, and will also render their offspring born hereafter, liable to the same."[55]

The nature of the relationship between religion and insanity generated considerable debate in the 19th century, and Ellen White resented the "infidels" who attributed insanity to religion. "The religion of Christ," she argued, "so far from being the cause of insanity, is one of its most effectual remedies; for it is a potent soother of the nerves." Nevertheless, she conceded that under certain conditions remorse for sin could unbalance the mind and that "erroneous doctrines," such as "an eternally burning hell," could have the same effect.[56] Her own experiences in the 1840s made these connections seem plausible; in fact, she sometimes suspected that "many inmates of insane asylums were brought there by experiences similar to my own." As a teenager she had suffered intense anxiety about her chances for salvation, and while listening to sermons

describing hell, her "imagination would be so wrought upon that the perspiration would start, and it was difficult to suppress a cry of anguish." Sometimes she spent entire nights agonizing about her spiritual condition, and once she slipped into "a melancholy state" for several weeks, during which "not one ray of light pierced the thick clouds of darkness around me."[57]

White also possessed first-hand knowledge of Millerites who had lost their minds during the turmoil following the disappointment:

> . . . after the passing of the time in 1844, fanaticism in various forms arose. . . . I went into their meetings. There was much excitement, with noise and confusion. . . . Some appeared to be in vision, and fell to the floor. . . . As the result of fanatical movements such as I have described, persons in no way responsible for them have in some cases lost their reason. They could not harmonize the scenes of excitement and tumult with their own past precious experience; they were pressed beyond measure to receive the message of error; it was represented to them that unless they did this they would be lost; and as the result their mind was unbalanced, and some became insane.[58]

How much of this account paralleled her own experience we cannot determine. However, we do know that during this same time *she* experienced visions and fell to the floor and became so mentally distraught that "for two weeks my mind wandered," an episode she later referred to as her "extreme sickness."[59]

During White's formative years, American psychiatrists expressed great optimism about curing the mentally ill with what they termed moral therapy. This form of treatment involved removing patients from the environments that had caused their illnesses and placing them in an asylum, where their lives would be restructured. Asylum superintendents reported remarkable cure rates, sometimes as high as 90 percent. However, during the latter decades of the century, as mental institutions filled up with intractable cases of insanity and increasingly assumed a custodial function, optimism gave way to pessimism.[60]

Although White gives no evidence of being aware of these trends, she did express herself from time to time on the best—and worst—means of treating mental illness. Unlike her writing on etiology, which rarely went beyond natural causes, her discussions of therapy often referred to the supernatural. The physician who treats mental illness, she said in a typical statement, can be efficacious only if he is aware of "the power of divine grace. . . . [I]f he has a firm hold upon God, he will be able to help the diseased, distracted mind."[61] White was not recommending that religious healing supplant medical therapy, only that one should always supplement the other.

At least once in her career, however, she attempted to use prayer alone to cure what she probably regarded as a mental illness. Upon encountering an Adventist sister in Massachusetts suffering from "fit," White "In the name and strength of Jesus . . . put my arms around her, and lifted her up from the bed, and rebuked the power of Satan, and bid her, 'Go free.' She was instantly brought out of the fit, and praised the Lord with us."[62] It is significant that this incident occurred during White's early ministry, in 1846, when she for a few years rejected medicine and relied solely on spiritual healing. By the mid-1850s she had resumed going to physicians and taking medicines.

For theological more than therapeutic reasons White strongly condemned using the so-called mind cure—"the most awful science which has ever been advocated"[64]—to treat physical or mental problems. The strength of her feeling stemmed from the fact that she associated the mind cure with the much-feared activities of spiritualists and mesmerists. "At the beginning of my work," she wrote in 1901,

> I had the mind-cure science to contend with. I was sent from place to place to declare the falseness of this science, into which many were entering. The mind cure was entered upon very innocently—to relieve the tension upon the

> minds of nervous invalids. But, oh, how sad were the results! God sent me from place to place to rebuke everything pertaining to this science.[65]

She does not say whether the dire consequences of using the mind cure were physical or spiritual, but it seems likely that she had less concern about the efficacy of the mind cure than about the propriety of exposing oneself to Satan's "electric currents."[66]

"Although Ellen White's theological views may have enduring values, we have no reason to expect that current research on the human mind will corroborate her scientific views."

White's most common prescriptions for preventing and curing mental disorders, especially depression, called for will power and physical exercise. "The power of the will is not valued as it should be," she wrote. "Exercised in the right direction, it would control the imagination and be a potent means of resisting and overcoming diseases of both mind and body."[67] Although she did not elaborate on the physiological processes involved, she once asserted that exercising the will would give "tone and strength" to the mind and nerves.[68]

She also attached considerable therapeutic value to physical exercise, especially after the mental breakdown of her husband, James, in the mid-1860s.[69] On 31 October 1865, the *Review and Herald* carried the following announcement: "The arduous and unremitting labors of Bro. White for several years in the past, and especially for the past summer, imposing heavy taxations upon his mind and nervous system, finally culminated in a shock of paralysis, leaving his nervous system, as a matter of course, in a shattered condition, and his brain somewhat disturbed."[70] According to his wife's account, her overworked husband broke down on the morning of August 16, while walking with her through a vegetable garden. At first they called in a physician to shock him with an electric battery, but they soon terminated this therapy because, for reasons not given, it undermined their faith in God. After five weeks of little progress, Ellen took her ailing husband to a water cure in Dansville, N.Y., where they remained until early December. But even with daily hydrotherapy, James improved little. "He suffered with the most extreme nervousness. Ellen later recalled. "I could not sew or knit in his room, or converse but very little, as he was easily agitated, and his brain confused almost beyond endurance."[71]

Shortly after removing her husband from Dansville, Ellen went into vision and learned about the importance of physical activity:

> I was shown that the position of Dr. [Jackson] in regard to amusements was all wrong, and that his views of physical exercise were not all correct. . . . He has to a great degree condemned physical labor for the sick, and his teaching in many cases has proved a great injury to them. Such mental exercise as playing cards, chess, and checkers, excites and wearies the brain and hinders recovery, while light and pleasant physical labor will occupy the time, improve the circulation, relieve and restore the brain, and prove a decided benefit to the health. But take from the invalid all such employment, and he becomes restless, and, with a diseased imagination, views his case as much worse than it really is, which tends to imbecility.[72]

Back home in Michigan, Ellen applied her therapeutic regimen in a personal effort "to save [her] husband's brain." She constantly kept him "working at . . . little things" and "would not allow him to remain quiet." After 18 months of this therapy James showed signs of returning to normal—although as late as 1871 Ellen in a letter to her children compared his condition with that of a man "near insanity." Her success in treating James convinced Ellen that she had found the best method for treating the mentally disturbed, and she recommended

that the physicians at the Western Health Reform Institute follow her example. "Lead the patients along step by step, step by step," she advised, "keeping their minds so busily occupied that they have no time to brood over their own condition."[73]

******

Our intention in this essay has not been to evaluate the validity of Ellen White's psychological advice or to diagnose her psychological condition, but rather to explore her psychological world, relying to a greater extent than we would like on her published statements and recollections. Not surprisingly, our historical review shows that her opinions on mental health were deeply rooted in her own experience and in the culture of 19th century America. Thus. although Ellen White's theological insights may have enduring value, we have no reason to expect that current research on the human mind will corroborate her scientific views.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Unpaginated Foreword to EGW, *Mind, Character, and Personality: Guidelines to Mental and Spiritual Health*, 2 vols. (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Pub. Assn., 1977).

2. Ibid., II, 60; EGW, *Testimonies*, III, 69.

3. EGW, *Testimonies*, III, 485; V, 444.

4. EGW, *Testimonies*, III, 138–139; IV, 29.

5. EGW, *The Ministry of Healing* (Washington: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1905), pp. 324–325; EGW, *Testimonies*, III, 161. On EGW and vital force, see also Ronald L. Numbers, *Prophetess of Health: A Study of Ellen G. White* (New York, N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1976), pp. 154–156.

6. Numbers, *Prophetess of Health*, pp. 15–17. For a recent study of a nineteenth-century American visionary, see Jean McMahon Humez (ed.), *Gifts of Power: The Writings of Rebecca Jackson, Black Visionary, Shaker Eldress* (n.p.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981).

7. Numbers, *Prophetess of Health*, pp. 16–17.

8. William E. Foy, *The Christian Experience of William E. Foy, Together with the Two Visions He Received in the Months of January and February, 1842* (Portland: J. and C. H. Pearson, 1845): "William Foy: A Statement by E. G. White," from an interview with D. E. Robinson, *ca.* 1912 (White Estate, DF 231).

9. *Early Writings of Ellen G. White* (Washington: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1945), pp. 44–45.

10. *Life Sketches of Ellen G. White* (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Pub. Assn., 1915), pp. 29–31.

11. Ibid., p. 38; EGW to Edson and Willie White, Dec. 7, 1872 (White Estate, W-20-1872).

12. Regarding her heart, see, e.g., EGW, *Spiritual Gifts: My Christian Experience, Views and Labors in Connection with the Rise and Progress of the Third Angel's Message* (Battle Creek, Mich.: James White, 1860), pp. 184–186; EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 185; II, 271–301, 371; IX, 65–66. Regarding her lungs, see, e.g., EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 30, 206–207; EGW; *Testimonies*, I, 604–605. Regarding her stomach, see, e.g., EGW, "Our Late Experience," *Review and Herald* 27 (Feb. 27, 1866), 98.

13. EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 184–186; EGW, *Testimonies*, II, 10; EGW to Edson White, June 10, 1869 (White Estate, W-6-1869); EGW, Sermon at Berrien Springs, May 21, 1904 (White Estate, MS-50-1904).

14. EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 271–272; EGW, *Testimonies*, II, 371.

15. EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 576–81; II, 271–301.

16. EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 184–186; EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 185.

17. *Life Sketches*, p. 69; EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 206–207; EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 185; EGW to Edson White, June 10, 1869; EGW, *The Writing and Sending Out of the Testimonies to the Church* (n.d.), p. 19.

18. *Life Sketches*, pp. 29–31, 323–324; EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 16–18; EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 576–81; EGW; "Communication from Sister White," *Review and Herald* 7 (Jan. 10, 1856), 118.

19. EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 51, 69; EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 185, 604–605.

20. EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 185, 346–347; EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 271–272.

21. Ron Graybill, "Glory! Glory! Glory!" (unpublished MS, March, 1983).

22. Much of the material in this and the previous paragraph is extracted from Numbers, *Prophetess of Health*, pp. 18–19. Regarding hallucinations, see, e.g., *Life Sketches*, p. 310; EGW, *Testimonies*, IX, 65–66; *Selected Messages from the Writings of Ellen G. White* (Washington: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1958), I, 207; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White: The Early Elmshaven Years, 1900–1905* (Washington: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1981), pp. 23–24, 53–54.

23. Numbers, *Prophetess of Health*, p. 10.

24. EGW, "Communication from Sister White," *Review and Herald* 7 (Jan. 10, 1856), 118.

25. Numbers, *Prophetess of Health*, p. 181.

26. EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 569.

27. Numbers, *Prophetess of Health*, pp. 19–20; Isaac C. Wellcome, *History of the Second Advent Message and Mission, Doctrine and People* (Yarmouth, Maine: I. C. Wellcome, 1874), p. 402.

28. John D. Davies, *Phrenology, Fad and Science: A 19th-Century American Crusade* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1955), pp. 126–127; Eric T. Carlson, "Charles Poyen Brings Mesmerism to America," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 15 (1960), 121–132.

29. R. Laurence Moore, *In Search of White Cows: Spiritualism, Parapsychology, and American Culture* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 9; Frank Podmore, *Mediums of the 19th Century*, 2 vols. (New Hyde Park, N.Y.: University Books, 1963), I, 202–204.

30. EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 421. On the similarity between White and spirit mediums, see also J. N. Loughborough, *The Great Second Advent Movement: Its Rise and Progress* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1909), p. 210.

31. *Life Sketches*, pp. 88–90.

32. James White, *Life Incidents, in Connection with the Great Advent Movement* (Battle Creek: SDA Pub. Assn., 1868), pp. 272–273; [Uriah Smith], *The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White* (Battle Creek, Mich.: SDA Pub. Assn., 1868), pp. 5–6.

33. EGW, *Testimonies*, V, 193; *Early Writings*, p. 21.

34. EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 62–63. On Mary Baker Eddy, see Edwin Franden Dakin, *Mrs. Eddy: The Biography of a Virginal Mind* (New York, N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929), pp. 131–132, 159–160.

35. EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 290–297.

36. Numbers, *Prophetess of Health*, p. 67.

37. Ibid., pp. 90–91.

38. See, e.g., Davies, *Phrenology*, p. 130.

39. Ibid., pp. 126–134.

40. Norman Dain, *Concepts of Insanity in the United States, 1789–1865* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1964), p. 187.

41. EGW, *The Desire of Ages: The Conflict of the Ages Illustrated in the Life of Christ* (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Pub. Assn., 1940), pp. 255–256.

42. See, e.g., Amariah Brigham, *First Annual Report of the Superintendent of the New York State Lunatic Asylum at Utica* (1843), pp. 20–22. A common system of classification divided insanity into mania, melancholia, dementia, and idiocy; but, as Brigham noted (p. 25), no system of classification seemed to be "of much practical utility."

43. *Selected Messages*, II, 465. See also Dain, *Concepts of Insanity*, p. 109.

44. EGW, *Mind, Character, and Personality*, I, 144.

45. EGW, "Duty to Know Ourselves," *Health Reformer* 1 (Aug., 1866), 2. On the prevention of insanity, see Barbara Sicherman, *The Quest for Mental Health in America, 1880–1917* (New York, N.Y.: Arno Press, 1980), pp. 79–152.

46. EGW, *Mind, Character, and Personality*, II, 382.

47. *Guidelines to Mental Health: Materials Assembled from the Writings of Ellen G. White* (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1966), p. 217.

48. *Selected Messages*, II, 442; EGW, *Spiritual Gifts: Important Facts of Faith, Laws of Health, and Testimonies Nos. 1–10* (Battle Creek, Mich.: SDA Pub. Assn., 1864), p. 138.

49. EGW, "Words to Christian Mothers on the Subject of Life, Health, and Happiness.—2," *Health Reformer* 6 (Oct., 1871), 121.

50. "The Hair," *Health Reformer* 5 (May, 1871), 266.

51. EGW, *An Appeal to Mothers: The Great Cause of the Physical, Mental, and Moral Ruin of Many of the Children of Our Time* (Battle Creek, Mich.: SDA Pub. Assn., 1864), p. 17. Writing to the parents of a boy who indulged in "secret vice," White warned that he would "eventually become idiotic" if he continued his wicked ways; EGW, *Testimonies*, II, 402. On masturbation, see H. Tristram Engelhardt, Jr., "The Disease of Masturbation: Values and the Concept of Disease," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 48 (1974), 234–248.

52. EGW, *Appeal to Mothers*, pp. 17, 27.

53. EGW, *Mind, Character, and Personality*, II, 399, 674; *Guidelines to Mental Health*, pp. 72, 159; EGW, *Selected Messages*, II, 64; EGW, *Testimonies*, V, 443–444; EGW, *Ministry of Healing*, p. 446.

54. William H. Stokes, *Fourth Annual Report of the Mount Hope Institution for the Year 1846*, p. 34.

55. [Amariah Brigham], "Millerism," *American Journal of Insanity* 1 (Jan., 1845), 250.

56. *Guidelines to Mental Health*, p. 16.

57. EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 25; *Life Sketches*, pp. 29–31; EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 16–18.

58. *Selected Messages*, II, 34–35.

59. EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 51, 69.

60. Dain, *Concepts of Insanity*, p. 113. See also Gerald N. Grob, *Mental Institutions in America: Social Policy to 1875* (New York, N.Y.: Free Press, 1973); and David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown, 1971).

61. *Guidelines to Mental Health*, p. 485.

62. EGW, *Spiritual Gifts* (1860), pp. 71–72.

63. Numbers, *Prophetess of Health*, pp. 32–36.

64. EGW, *Medical Ministry: A Treatise on Medical Missionary Work in the Gospel* (Pacific Press, Pub. Assn., 1932), p. 116.

65. Ibid., p. 113.

66. EGW, *Testimonies*, V, 193–198.

67. EGW, *Ministry of Healing*, p. 246.

68. EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 387.

69. See, e.g., EGW, *Testimonies*, II, 325; *Guidelines to Mental Health*, p. 78.

70. H. S. Lay, "Eld. White and Wife, and Eld. Loughborough," *Review and Herald* 26 (Oct. 31, 1865), 172.

71. EGW, "Our Late Experience," ibid., 27 (Feb. 20, 1866), 89–91.

72. EGW, *Testimonies*, I, 554–555.

73. *Selected Messages*, II, 306–308; EGW to Edson and Emma White, Nov. 15, 1871 (White Estate, W-15-1871).

Special Section

The Relevance of the Investigative Judgment

by Richard Rice

Seventh-day Adventists often describe the doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary as their distinctive contribution to Christian theology. It played a central role in the church's early development (see box). And in recent years, Adventists have turned to the doctrine with greatly renewed interest.

This essay explores the contemporary significance of the sanctuary doctrine. Its thesis is that Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary concludes with a review of the ultimate impact of God's saving activity in human history. This review is comprehensive because it occurs at the end of history. Its effect is to demonstrate the true character of God's sovereignty. And because it surveys the whole sweep of history, this endtime judgment discloses with utter and unprecedented finality that God's deeds are great and wonderful, that his ways are just and true (cf. Revelation 15:3).[1]

We can support this interpretation of the heavenly sanctuary by reflecting carefully on three important ideas: (1) there are larger issues involved in the work of salvation than the redemption of individual human beings; (2) the meaning of history is apparent only in light of its end; and (3) the course of human history is genuinely open, undetermined in advance. We will develop each of these themes.

But first it will be helpful to review another, more familiar, interpretation of the investigative judgment. As Seventh-day Adventists understand it, the investigative judgment involves an endtime review of heaven's records. It focuses specifically on human beings who at some point in their lives have accepted God's offer of salvation.

It is commonplace to say that the investigative judgment establishes the identity of the redeemed. The endtime review of each life's record determines whether a person's sins have been entirely repented of. And when the review is complete, Christ will know whom to save when he returns.[2]

This interpretation of the investigative judgment raises some important questions. For one thing, it does not explain why this review is conducted immediately before Christ's return. Seventh-day Adventists believe that probation closes at death; there is no further opportunity to repent. But if a person's eternal destiny is fixed at death, it is not clear why an endtime review is needed to establish the identity of the redeemed. This is something that could be determined throughout human history as individuals die.

In addition, this explanation of the inves-

Richard Rice is a professor of theology in the Division of Religion at Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, Calif.

FORUM

Newsletter of the Association of Adventist Forums **August 1983**

Committee decides outline for Second AAF Conference

By Dana Lauren West

The second conference of the Association of Adventist Forums will be held in Loma Linda, Calif., March 15–18, 1984. The title of the conference "The Search for a Usable Future" symbolizes a commitment to working towards the future within the church.

Views of the past shape our perceptions of what we can and ought to do in the present. The conference will explore how views of the future shape Adventist understandings of what the church ought to do now.

"We hope that a look into the future at the conference will suggest ways the church can be an exciting place for its members," said Glen Coe, chairperson of the Committee on Conferences. "We are not engaging in triumphalism. We want to take a hard, pragmatic look at how we all can participate in shaping the church's future."

While speakers and specific topics are still being discussed, AAF's Committee on Conferences has come up with a tentative outline for the second national conference. According to Coe and Susan Jacobsen, chairperson of the planning committee for the 1984 conference, the committee is inviting speakers within the Seventh-day Adventist Church as well as those without.

The schedule includes a banquet Thursday night where "What the Biblical Past can Teach Us About the Future" will be discussed. "The Growth Stages of a Church" and "Lay Participation Within the Church Structure" will also be investigated. Several sessions are still in the planning stages.

On Friday, under the heading of "Personal Relationships with the Church," the subjects are:

continued on page 4

AAF and the SDA Church

Occasionally questions are asked about the relationship of the Association of Adventist Forums to the Seventh-day Adventist Church organization. The Association of Adventist Forums is an independent organization that fosters a fellowship of ideas and an exchange of information within the Seventh-day Adventist community. According to its constitution the officers of the association must be members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Church employees have always served with laypersons on the board of the association and on the editorial board of its journal, *Spectrum*. Consultation with denominational leaders preceded the creation of the association in 1968, and since then various denominational officials—three at any given time—are designated as consultants to the association.

However, no denominational official serves *ex officio* on the board of the Association of Adventist Forums. Decisions of the association board are made independently of actions by denominational committees or officials. From its inception the association, its chapters, and its journal have been supported solely through dues/subscriptions and gifts. At no time has the denomination appropriated funds to the association.

The views expressed by speakers in meetings of chapters of the association and of authors in its journal may or may not coincide with the outlook of the association or the leadership of the church. The Association of Adventist Forums and *Spectrum* were established and have been sustained by church members who believe that their denomination can only be strong and vibrant if it considers the rich diversity of its members' points of view.

AAF tape library under consideration for use by remote chapters

By Ramira Jobe

The establishment of a videocassette library is under consideration by the AAFs Executive Committee. The library would be used as a method of utilizing Forum speakers to their fullest, and to provide remote chapters with programs equivalent to those held in large Adventist centers.

The Andrews University's communications department can prepare a 58-minute color videocassettes by using simple graphics and student labor for approximately $300. The cost of production would be covered if 12 chapters rented the tape at $25 each. Also, the speakers involved in this project would be presenting their message to more than one group or chapter, and the cassettes would be available in a central library for further rental.

Production would not only be limited to the taping of individual speakers. Discussions of religious art or music, with visual illustrations, would bring forth new dimensions in chapter program planning. The taping of new liturgies would also be possible. Single tapes, and different series of tapes on various topics are under consideration.

Discussion groups could use the tapes as a basis for study. Prior to viewing the tapes, chapter members would receive a brief synopsis of the scheduled presentation, as well as a list of suggested readings. Then, following the presentation, a discussion could be held regarding the contents of the tape. Videocassettes would be helpful as guides for the formation of chapters, and to use at large gatherings, such as conventions or seminars.

The AAF would copyright all taped material after obtaining releases from the authors and creators.

Panel members address investigative judgment question at chapter meeting

by Molleurus Couperus and Bonnie Wilson

Seventh-day Adventist lay people has the opportunity of hearing scholarly dialogue on the investigative judgment sponsored by the San Joaquin Valley Chapter of the Association of Adventist Forums. A panel of four speakers presented their understandings before some 400 people. The panel included Desmond Ford and Smuts van Rooyen of Good News Unlimited, William Shea, chairperson of the Old Testament department of the SDA Theological Seminary of Andrews University, and Alex Ortega, a pastor who is on leave from the Hawaiian Mission.

Panel members addressed the investigative judgment from the traditional and non-traditional points of view, and discussed three predetermined questions. Each had 15 minutes to present their ideas, with five minutes for the response. Grant Mitchell, an attorney practicing in the Fresno area, moderated.

"What is the investigative judgment?" was the first question. Ortega answered that the salvation of man was the ultimate issue—that this is the most important thing going on in God's universe. We've become the center stage of the universe to resolve this question and to vindicate the character of God. God is on trial before the universe and sin will not (be able to) happen again. During 1844, there were vigorous expressions and changes in science, philosophy, and religion as evidenced by Darwin, Karl Marx, the Fox sisters, and Adventism. Ministers of that time believed Jesus wouldn't come for another 1,000 years and that the Golden Era was just beginning. Adventism entered at this point in time and preached, "Fear God and give glory to Him for the hour of His judgment is come" (Revelation 14:7). It is God's judgment and not our judgment—judgment of the character of God. The vindication of God is the theme of the Holy Writ.

In response, van Rooyen noted that the concept of the investigative judgment as a means of vindicating God's character has been recently developed. The traditional Seventh-day Adventist view of the investigative judgment, is found in *Great Controversy*. According to this view, the issue is the sin of individual humans, not God's character. The investigative judgment is to determine who is saved or lost. According to *Great Controversy* our sins may be forgiven at the cross,

but they are not blotted out until the investigative judgment is concluded. Thus, believers in Christ are never certain of salvation.

The second question was "What is the biblical evidence of the investigative judgment?" Shea stated that in the Scriptures the prophetic time line has been taken from the horizontal dimension of human history into the vertical apocalyptic of the heavenly court where the prophet sees not the continuation of the judgment, but the commencement of the judgment (Daniel 7:9–14). The "Ancient of Days" (vs. 9) enters the courtroom and takes his place. The heavenly angels are there ministering to him. The books of the judgment are opened for the first time at this point (vs. 10). At the commencement of the judgment the prophet's eye is brought back to earth to witness the results of the working of this judgment. He sees the destruction around him. In scene A the prophet is then taken back to the heavenly court for the conclusion of this judgment. Scene B (vs. 13, 14) shows that the Son of Man is given everlasting dominion over the people and all the earth.

"According to Ford, the New Testament denies that a believer's destiny is ever in doubt."

Shea then asked several questions concerning the investigative judgment and followed each with his answers: (1) Is it an investigation? Yes, by definition. (2) When does this judgment take place? Not in 165 B.C. as modern critical scholars say or 31 A.D. as evangelicals claim. (3) Who is judged? The professed people of God. (4) Is there a sanctuary judgment? Yes, so therefore the professed people of God will come under judgment also. (5) Is there biblical reference to the use of the idea of heavenly books? Yes, there are 14 references to judgment, half in the Old Testament, and half in the New Testament. (6) Is there a result of this judgment? Yes, the judgment has results in terms of the Son of Man, the wicked, and the righteous. (7) Are there investigative judgment parallels elsewhere in the book of Daniel? Yes, Daniel 8:14 refers to the judgment of scene A. Scene B is described by the angel, Gabriel, in Daniel 12:1–2.

Ford thought the reasons for rejecting the investigative judgment could be summarized as follows: (1) The 'evenings-mornings' of Daniel 8 as being equal to a year in prophetic time is never referred to in Scripture when interpreting prophecy. (2) The date of 457 B.C. as a starting point for the 70 weeks prophecy is debated by most scholars, as is the date of 31 A.D. for Christ's death. (3) Daniel 8:14 has to do with the work of a wicked power and the need for divine judgment upon this antichrist, not upon the saints (compare Daniel 7:9–13, 26). (4) Daniel 8:14 is not discussing a work of cleansing but of justification. The Hebrew term translated "cleansed" by the King James Version has no connection with the cleansing of Leviticus 16 and should be translated "justified", "vindicated", or "restored". (5) The one chapter (Hebrews 9) in the New Testament which discusses the meaning of the sanctuary apartments and the "cleansing" ceremony of the day of atonement covenant while the first apartment pointed to the Jewish era. (6) The New Testament teaches that the believer in Christ already has the verdict of the last judgment because of justification by faith. This does not deny the doctrine of the last judgment, but it does deny that a believer's destiny is ever in doubt.

The participants' answers and responses to the final question "How does the investigative judgment affect the doctrine of salvation?" and responses to other questions from the audience can be heard on tapes available for $15 per set. Orders can be sent to San Joaquin Valley Chapter of AAF, 1702 N. Temperance Avenue, Fresno, CA 93726.

Molleurus Couperus is director of international affairs for the AAF.

Bonnie Wilson is president of an engineering firm in the Monterey Bay area

Paragraph five of Bonnie Wilson's article in the Spring 1983 Forum *should read". . . eyewitness testimony that is reliable, such as that given in the Bible, turning to present day scientific research to fill in the gaps that are missing in the eyewitness testimony . . . 6700 ± 800 years."*

Atlantic Region

The ***Philadelphia Chapter*** has featured a professional group addressing the topic of "Euthanasia: Is it Ever Acceptable?" And William Loveless, president of Columbia Union College and marriage counselor spoke on "'Til Divorce Do Us Part".

The ***New York Chapter*** sponsored "Epilepsy, Inspiration and the Bible." A presentation given by Douglas Will, a neurosurgeon. "Adventist Colleges under Attack" was introduced by Robert Reynolds, executive secretary of the Board of Higher Education at the G.C.

Central Pacific Region

The chapters in the ***Monterey Bay Area*** and ***San Francisco*** presented Ernest Ching, Jr., in May. Ching investigated the dealings of Davenport and was selected as an attorney for the plaintiffs in the Northern Pacific Union class action suit.

Also, "Re-organization of Conference Constitutions" was introduced by Ray Cottrell on June 4.

Northern Pacific Region

The ***Seattle Chapter*** featured Ray Cottrell in its spring lecture series on "The Current State of the Church." The program included titles such as: "Assets and Liabilities: What's Right and Wrong with the Church?"; "How to Keep Our Balance in a Time of Change"; and "Forecast: What the Future Holds in Store for the Church."

Hamer is Atlantic Region's Representative

John Hamer, of Hudson, Mass., has been elected regional representative of the Atlantic Region of AAF.

Hamer is a senior manufacturing instructor at Digital Equipment Corporation in Hudson, Mass. He has also written for *Spectrum*.

Communicating ideas from local chapters to the international AAF is critical, says Hamer. The regional representative is the one who manages the life blood of the Adventist Forum, and he plans to foster that flow of ideas and information within the Atlantic Region.

Columbia Region

The ***Treasure Valley Chapter*** has sponsored several programs in its first year as an organized chapter. John Brunt, a theology professor from Walla Walla, presented a brief seminar on Christian decision-making. Duane St. Clair, M.D., conducted a discussion of abortion during an AAF weekend retreat. And Helen Thompson, the executive director of the Walla Walla College Alumni Association, conducted a meeting on the future of Adventist education.

Southern Region

The ***Collegedale Chapter*** recently elected new officers for the 1983–84 school year. Jerry Gladson and Wilma McClarty will serve as president and president-elect, respectively. David Smith is secretary-treasurer and Lorella Howard is secretary, Barbara Ruf is publicity secretary and Wayne Thurber is publicity secretary-elect.

Recent programs included Charles Hirsch, vice president of the GC, who spoke on "The Administration and Operation of the General Conference," and Ron Graybill, of the E.G. White Estate, presented "The Visions of Hazen Foss and William Foy."

continued from page 1.

"Coming to Personal Terms with Mrs. White"; "A Perspective on the Church in Our Daily Lives"; "Growth Through Crisis"; and "The Evolution of a Born Adventist."

On Saturday, "The Apocalypse as Liturgy" organized by Charles Teel, associate professor in Loma Linda University's theology department, will comprise the worship service. On Saturday afternoon speakers will draw lessons from the third world concerning the relation of the church to care programs, and liberation movements.

On Sunday, the conference will examine economic trends affecting Adventist institutions such as publishing, health care, higher education, and elementary and secondary education.

The 1984 conference will differ slightly from the one in 1982. "After the first conference most of the attendants felt that more time was needed for question and answer periods," said Bonnie Dwyer, program committee chairperson. "We have tried to schedule more time for group discussion."

Forum will print schedule updates and changes as they are approved, as well as location and accommodation information.

Dana Lauren West is the editorial assistant Forum *and* Spectrum.

tigative judgment does not indicate just who needs this review. The picture of God having to pore over books of record in order to find out who really belongs to him is unacceptable. It contradicts the attribute of perfect knowledge, the idea that God knows all there is to know immediately and intuitively. God doesn't need records to find out anything. And perhaps more important, it conflicts with the belief that God enjoys a deep personal relationship with his human children. He knows who belongs to him. So we cannot explain this review as something God needs to discover who his loyal followers are.

We also have to rule out human beings as the beneficiaries of the investigative judgment, even though it concerns their lives, because the investigative judgment does not take place in their presence. We have no way of knowing just who will be saved or lost until Christ actually returns.

This leaves the unfallen inhabitants of the universe. And many Seventh-day Adventists account for the investigative judgment with reference to this group. To Graham Maxwell, professor at Loma Linda University, for example, the investigative judgment demonstrates to unfallen beings that those who have accepted salvation are really "safe to save". They can be trusted not to reintroduce rebellion into the universe if they are admitted to the society of perfect, immortal beings.[3]

But this explanation, too, fails to account for a distinctly eschatological examination. There seems to be no good reason why unfallen beings must wait until just before Christ returns to find out who is safe to save. This could be determined throughout the course of history with the passing of each human life.

So there are difficulties with the idea that the investigative judgment establishes the identity of the redeemed. For this concept to be intelligible, we need to look for other explanations. We can find one, I believe, by reflecting carefully on the three concepts mentioned above. Taken together, they provide us with a rationale for the investigative judgment that is faithful to traditional Adventist concerns and relevant to contemporary Christian experience.

Salvation Larger Than Individual Redemption

The presence of issues in the plan of salvation larger than individual human redemption is a familiar theme in Seventh-day Adventist theology. Its most famous and influential expression appears in the great controversy motif which plays a prominent role in the writings of Ellen G. White. This is the idea that the opposition of sin and salvation in human history is part of a cosmic conflict between superhuman forces of good and evil. And in the outcome of this larger controversy, the destiny of the entire universe is at stake.

The focal issue of the great controversy is the sovereignty of God. Properly understood, it pertains not to God's power, but to his character. The question is not whether God has sufficient power to dominate his creatures. It is whether he is the kind of person who deserves their allegiance. If power were the issue, the great controversy could easily be settled with a display of superior force. But since the issue is God's right to rule, rather than his ability to rule, it takes considerable time to resolve the matter.

The issue before the universe, therefore, is this: Does God deserve to be God? Does his character inspire his creatures to respond with love and devotion, or must they merely acquiesce to superior power?

E. G. White's writings locate the saving work of God in human history within the context of the great controversy.[4] Christ's death speaks to the fundamental question of God's right to rule by demonstrating decisively God's true disposition toward his creatures. It provides irrefutable proof that

God places the highest priority on the welfare of his creatures. He is willing to make any sacrifice on their behalf.

The concept of the great controversy provides a similar perspective on the investigative judgment. The lives of certain human beings contribute to a resolution of the great controversy by demonstrating the effectiveness of God's saving activity. A comprehensive review of the lives of those who have accepted salvation supports the conviction that God deserves to be God.

There are several ways in which this view of the investigative judgment moves beyond the idea that it establishes the individual identity of the saved. As we just saw, it suggests that the primary object of concern in the judgment is God's activity rather than the performance of individual human beings. Second, the investigative judgment is something God does for his people. It is his judgment on their behalf. This provides a helpful corrective to the all too prevalent feeling that we have something to fear from the judgment. People are often disturbed by the specter that one forgotten sin, unconfessed and unforgiven, will stain their record in the heavenly data bank and seal their eternal doom. Moreover, this concept fits nicely with the characteristic apocalyptic motif in which God acts to rescue his people and reverse their negative fortunes in this

The Emergence of the Sanctuary Doctrine

Development of the Doctrine

Seventh-day Adventists developed their unique concept of the heavenly sanctuary over a period of 13 years following the Great Disappointment.[1] They left intact the time calculations of William Miller and the Seventh Month Movement, which held that the 2,300 evening-mornings of Daniel 8:14 ended on October 22, 1844. But they reinterpreted the cleansing of the sanctuary as a reference to something that happened in heaven, rather than the return of Christ to this earth.

According to this concept, Christ's work in the heavenly sanctuary comprises two distinct activities which began at different times. Since his ascension to heaven, Christ has mediated the benefits of his atoning sacrifice for human beings. His work as our high priest consists of forgiving sins, providing human beings with direct access to God, and directing the work of the church on earth. In 1844, Christ began the "investigative judgment." In this phase of his high priestly ministry, Christ examines the life records of his professed followers throughout human history. At its conclusion, he blots out the sins of those whose lives were/are consistent with their profession. By bringing the work of salvation to a conclusion, the investigative judgment prepares for the return of Christ to deliver his people from the earth.

Discussion of the Doctrine

Over the years, people both inside and outside the Seventh-day Adventist Church have raised questions about this interpretation of Daniel 8:14: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days: then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" (KJV).[2]

On the level of biblical exegesis, the precise meaning of *nitsdaq* is debatable. It occurs only once in the Bible, and its translation as "cleansed" is problematic. Questions also surround the use of Leviticus 16, which describes the day of atonement services, to interpret Daniel 8, which describes the judgment of God against the little horn. In the one case, the sins of God's people are removed from the sanctuary. In the other, God removes from the sanctuay the defilement caused by his enemies. Third, Hebrews 8 and 9 pose problems for the view that Christ did not enter the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary until 1844. These chapters seem to indicate that the day of atonement services, in which the high priest enters the most holy place of the Hebrew sanctuary, were fulfilled at Jesus' ascension.

On a broader level of biblical interpretation, the year-day relationship raises questions when it is used as a principle of prophetic interpretation. Extending the 2,300 days of Daniel 8:14 to the mid-nineteenth century seems to confilct with many New Testament passages which proclaim the nearness of Christ's return to those who lived in the first century. There are further questions concerning the whole character of biblical prophecy. Is there, as some maintain, a basic difference between so-called classical prophecy and apocalyptic prophecy? Furthermore, what is the nature of prophetic fulfillment? Do biblical prophecies apply

world. His people are threatened, and he saves them. The world condemns them, and he vindicates them.

The investigative judgment also concerns the people of God as a whole, not merely as individuals. We often overlook this aspect of the day of atonement services, which played an important role in the development of the sanctuary doctrine among Seventh-day Adventists. The day of atonement involved the entire people of Israel. It represented a renewal of God's covenant with the nation as a whole. Similarly, we can view the investigative judgment as involving the people of God in the most comprehensive sense. It includes those throughout history who have responded to God's gracious offer of salvation. But it views them as a cohesive group, as one people. They are not merely a collection of individuals.

Finally, the investigative judgment concerns God's saving activity during the entire course of human history. And this is something more than its total effect on individual human lives. The investigative judgment is not just a final tally of who deserves to be saved. It assesses the cumulative impact of salvation in human history. And for this reason, it must be eschatological. This brings us to the second of the three elements in our interpretation of the investigative judgment.

---

to the distant past (preterism), to the future (futurism), or to the historical process as a whole (historicism)? Or, do they somehow apply to all three (cf. Desmond Ford's apotelesmatic principle)?

The concept of an investigative judgment also raises questions of a predominantly theological nature. For some people, it detracts from the sufficiency of Christ's atoning sacrifice as the basis of human salvation. If, during his earthly ministry, Jesus accomplished everything necessary to save us from sin, what is the point of an investigative judgment?

Moreover, the idea that our sins are not blotted out until an end-time judgment seems to deprive us of the assurance of salvation. We may accept Christ and believe that we are forgiven, but our sins stand against us in the heavenly record until some indeterminate future time when they are finally removed.

Because of its importance to our sense of denominational identity, Seventh-day Adventists have devoted considerable attention to the doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary. Matters of biblical interpretation have attracted most of the attention. Adventist scholars have developed lengthy word studies and examined various biblical concepts related to the sanctuary. This trend is evident in most of the contributions to the recent publication entitled, *The Sanctuary and the Atonement.*[3]

To a lesser extent, we have also discussed theological questions arising from the doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary. Portions of the book *Questions on Doctrine,* published 25 years ago, attempted to show that this concept is compatible with the affirmation that Christ's sacrificial atoning work was complete at the cross.[4] And some recent papers and articles on the topic of the sanctuary emphasize assurance as the essential theme in the doctrine.[5]

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Donald F. Neufeld traces this development in a nine-part series of articles entitled, "How SDA's Adopted the Sanctuary Doctrine (*Adventist Review,* January 3-February 28, 1980).

2. Most of these questions areas are mentioned in the Consensus Document, "Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary," accepted by the Glacier View Sanctuary Review Committee in August 1980. This and other documents from this conference have been published in several places, including *Adventist Review* (September 4, 1980), *Ministry* (October 1980), and *Spectrum* (Vol. 11, No. 2).

3. *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies,* ed. Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Lesher (Washington D. C.: Review & Herald Publishing Association, 1981).

4. See the answers to questions 29–31 in *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine: An Explanation of Certain Major Aspects of Seventh-day Adventist Belief* (Washington, D. C.: Review & Herald Publishing Association, 1957), pp. 341–364.

5. William G. Johnsson, "What the Sanctuary Doctrine Means Today," parts 1–6, *Adventist Review,* May 14-July 23, 1981, especially part 3; and Fritz Guy "Confidence in Salvation: The Meaning of the Sanctuary," *Spectrum* (Vol. 11, No. 2), pp. 44–53.

Judgment Must be Eschatological

No contemporary theologian has done more than Wolfhart Pannenberg to emphasize the importance of eschatology, or the study of last day events, to an adequate understanding of Christian faith. An important element in Pannenberg's eschatology is the concept of a final future, which he derives from the writings of the German philosopher, Wilhelm Dilthey.

The question of the end of history arises as Dilthey reflects on the possibility of meaning in life. He argues that something is meaningful as part of a larger pattern or whole which includes it. Conversely, a whole is meaningful in light of the various parts it comprises. We understand a sentence, for example, through the meanings of the individual words which make it up. And we perceive the meaning of the individual words in light of the sentence as a whole. Similarly, the individual events of a human life have meaning in connection with that life in its totality. This relation between part and whole is not complete in the case of an individual until the end of his life. So it is only in light of the end of a person's life that the individual events acquire their final meaning.[5]

Does history as a whole have meaning? Dilthey seems to think not, because it never becomes a totality. "One would have to wait for the end of history," he writes, "to have all the material necessary to determine its meaning."[6]

Pannenberg agrees that history must come to an end in order to be meaningful. But, he argues, this is precisely what Christian eschatology affirms. Christian hope anticipates the coming of a final future. With it, reality will at last become a totality, and the meaning of the entire course of history will become evident.[7] In light of this comprehensive whole, the meaning of history's individual events finally emerges.

The idea that individual events acquire their meaning only in relation to the whole of history makes an important contribution to our understanding of the investigative judgment. For one thing, it explains why this judgment must be eschatological. Because every event exerts an influence as long as time lasts, its ultimate meaning is apparent only in light of the end of history.

The ultimate effect, and consequently the final meaning, of a person's life is never realized at the time of his death. It continues long into the future. This is especially noticeable in the case of outstanding figures such as Martin Luther whose work and writings affect us today, hundreds of years since he died. But it is also true of less conspicuous individuals. In fact, it is true of every one of us. The events of our lives, our actions and decisions, exert an influence on other people that is largely imperceptible. And this influence continues not just as long as we live, but clear to the end of time. Consequently, a final assessment of individual lives must take into account the course of history as a whole.

This concept clarifies the central focus of the investigative judgment in another respect. The specific concern of the investigative judgment is the cumulative impact of God's saving activity in history. The effectiveness of salvation is evident as history reaches its conclusion to a degree never discernible before. With the entire course of history in view, it is clear to every observer that God is the source of all that is good in human life and that the plan of salvation has succeeded in counteracting the destructive consequences of sin. The investigative judgment thus removes all doubt about the nature and desirability of God's sovereignty.

With this in mind, we can describe the investigative judgment as a comprehensive review of the total impact on human history of God's activity in the lives of human beings who have accepted salvation. It provides a climactic demonstration of the

effectiveness of salvation and helps to resolve the question of God's right to complete creaturely allegiance.

History is Open

We have argued that the investigative judgment must be eschatological because events acquire their meaning only in relation to the whole of history and history becomes a totality only because it comes to an end. This explains why everything must be evaluated in light of the end of history. But it does not explain why nothing can be fully evaluated *until* the end of history. For this, we need to take a closer look at the nature of history itself. An open view of history helps us to understand the importance of a judgment at the very end of time.

In a publication entitled, *The Openness of God,* I argue that reality itself, and God's experience of reality, are open rather than closed.[8] An open reality is one whose contents are dynamic rather than static. Events come into being, rather than existing from all eternity. And creaturely decisions and actions make a real difference in the scheme of things.

Such a view of reality requires a similarly dynamic view of God's relation to the creaturely world. God does not encompass past, present, and future in one exhaustive experience. Instead, he experiences the events of this world as they happen moment by moment.

The open view of reality makes possible a coherent concept of creaturely freedom. By definition, a free choice makes definite something previously indefinite. Freedom involves the presence of genuine alternatives and the capacity to make an uncoerced choice between them. And the choice is something brought about by the agent himself. In principle, therefore, a genuinely free decision does not exist until its author makes it. This is why freedom is incompatible with a static view of reality. On a static view, everything is definite from all eternity. Our deliberations contribute nothing to the scheme of things. So we are not really free.

The open view of reality also makes possible a coherent concept of divine love. Love involves sensitivity to the experiences of its objects. If you love someone, your feelings will reflect the experiences of the one you love. You will feel joy and disappointment, happiness and distress, as the one you love experiences these things. The basic affirmation that God loves the world makes sense if God experiences the events of our lives as they occur. It is incoherent if we think of him as enjoying the total content of our lives all at once.

On the view that reality is open, the concept of an endtime review of history makes more sense than it ever could with the idea that reality is closed. If the entire course of history were definite from the outset, then God would perceive the ultimate impact of each person's life from all eternity. The actual end of history would contribute nothing new to his perspective. And the endtime judgment would have no real significance for him.

"On the view that reality is open, the concept of an endtime review of history makes more sense than it ever could with the idea that reality is closed."

But if reality is genuinely open, then the ultimate impact of creaturely decisions and experiences is imperceptible, even to God, until the course of history actually concludes. Only then is the final meaning of each event and each life completely clear. This is because the ultimate impact of a person's life is determined to a significant degree by the way in which others respond to him. And their response is largely a matter of their own decision. My father's influence on me, for example, is partly determined by the way I choose to respond to him. Consequently, the ultimate effec-

tiveness of God's saving activity in this world is perceptible only at the end of time. And a comprehensive assessment of God's efforts to save human beings cannot take place before history has run its course.

Contemporary Relevance

We have interpreted the investigative judgment as a review of the ultimate impact of God's saving activity in human history. This understanding makes a positive contribution to the outlook of contemporary Christians in several different ways.

First, it presents us with a theocentric concept of salvation. It directs our attention to what God is doing in human affairs to accomplish his purposes.

This view of the judgment also encourages us to look beyond the confines of personal concerns to the destiny of God's people as a whole. It reminds us of our solidarity with others in the experience of salvation.

This notion of a pre-advent judgment heightens the sense that our actions and decisions are significant. It reminds us that the things we do day by day have a real impact on the course of events. It is true, for example, that sins forgiven pose no obstacle to our relationships with God. But their effect on subsequent events cannot be undone. Salvation does not simply cancel the results of sin, although it mitigates its consequences over the long haul. So, the concept of the investigative judgment reminds us that everything counts, for good or ill, until the end of time.

Finally, this interpretation underlines the importance of eschatology. It indicates that the course of history does not merely terminate, or run out. It concludes. It reaches a culmination with its final events. The concept of the investigative judgment thus reinforces the conviction that history will reach a meaningful climax.

These considerations give a positive answer to the question posed in our title. Properly understood, the concept of the investigative judgment is indeed relevant for Christians in the 20th century.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The present effort represents an exercise in "systematic theology," as distinct from two other aspects of the theological task—"biblical theology" and "philosophical theology." Unlike biblical theology, which examines the different concepts and ideas employed by the writers of the Bible, and philosophical theology, which assesses the meaning and validity of fundamental religious beliefs, systematic theology explores the inner vitality of the various symbols and ideas with which a religious community expresses its faith and seeks to integrate these contents within a coherent, cohesive framework of thought. Accordingly, the primary purpose of this essay is not to examine the biblical basis of the investigative judgment, nor to establish the validity of the idea by an appeal to common human experience. Instead, it analyzes the inner meaning of this idea and attempts to situate it within the large context of Christian faith.

2. Ellen G. White often explained the investigative judgment along such lines: "There must be an examination of the books of record to determine who, through repentance of sin and faith in Christ, are entitled to the benefits of his atonement. The cleansing of the sanctuary therefore involves a work of investigation—a work of judgment. This work must be performed prior to the coming of Christ to redeem His people; for when He comes, His reward is with Him to give to every many according to his works" (GC 422).

3. See A. Graham Maxwell, *Can God Be Trusted?* (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1977), p. 134.

4. See, for example, Ellen G. White, *The Desire of Ages*, (Washington, D.C., Review and Herald Publishing Association), pp. 19, 26, 758–59, 761, 763–64. 763–64.

5. Wilhelm Dilthey, *Pattern and Meaning in History: Thoughts on History and Society,* edited with an introduction by H. P. Rickman (New York, N.Y.: Harper Torchbooks, 1962), pp. 106, 108.)

6. Ibid., p. 106

7. *Basic Questions in Theology: Collected Essays,* trans. George H. Kehm (Philadelphia, Penn.: Fortress Press, 1971), 2:62.

8. Richard Rice, *The Openness of God: The Relationship of Divine Foreknowledge and Human Free Will* (Nashville, Tenn.: Review & Herald Publishing Association, 1980).

Good News from the Sanctuary in Heaven: God's Continuing Initiative

by Fritz Guy

If a religious idea is going to be persuasive—to people within the community of faith as well as to others outside it—that idea needs to carry contemporary meaning. Not only does it need to be intellectually credible (by having sufficient reason for being regarded as true), but it must also be experientially significant (by making a difference for one's concrete existence here and now). In other words, in order to be taken seriously enough to be actually *believed*, an idea needs to *matter*. Without this kind of significance, a religious idea is simply uninteresting. At best it is a kind of holy puzzle or word game. Then it is not really believed, not because it is thought to be "untrue" or "wrong," but because people do not care enough about it to incorporate it into the thinking that guides their daily lives. The idea is just ignored.

In this regard the doctrine of Christ, the high priest, in the sanctuary in heaven (which is usually called the doctrine of the sanctuary") is especially a problem, because its major elements seem utterly unrelated to modern existence. Firstly, even if our experience of going to church enables us to grasp the meaning of a "holy place," that is nothing like the meaning of the "Holy of Holies" or "most holy place" of the biblical world. Secondly, there is nothing in Christianity that makes any direct contact with a "high priesthood." (The Catholic tradition, to be sure, has an ordained priesthood and a clerical hierarchy, but nothing that corresponds to the ancient Hebrew role of the sanctuary's high priest.) And, thirdly, the Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary is about a "high priest" who functions in a "most holy place" that is in *heaven*, which is a reality that is radically different from anything that we have personally encountered. So the experiential significance of this particular doctrine is not immediately obvious.

Yet the doctrine of the sanctuary belongs to the biblical revelation (especially the Old Testament books of Leviticus and Daniel, and the New Testament books of Hebrews and Revelation), and it is a prominent element in the heritage and definition of Adventism. Part of the theological task of the church, therefore, is to uncover and communicate the significance of this doctrine for contemporary life. Thanks to some questions raised a few years ago, Adventist theology has become more interested in this

Fritz Guy is a professor of systematic theology at the SDA Theological Seminary in Berrien Springs, Mich.

subject, and this essay is intended to be a small further contribution to the discussion.[1]

My thesis is that, among other things, the doctrine of the sanctuary affirms the good news of God's continuing initiative for the salvation of humanity; and I would like to suggest what this involves.

Reconciling

Christ the High priest is Christ, the incarnate Servant, the crucified Messiah, the risen and ascended Lord. His heavenly, high-priestly ministry is an extension and implementation of his earthly, sacrificial ministry. So Hebrews 7:25 (RSV), "He is able for all time to save those who draw near to God through him, since he always lives to make intercession for them," is an elaboration of John 3:16 (RSV), "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life." The sacrificial ministry of Christ on earth was atonement and reconciliation as a unique historical event; the high-priestly ministry of Christ in the sanctuary in heaven is atonement and reconciliation as an ongoing process.

The sanctuaries in the life of the Hebrews were a revelation of the activity of God in addressing the fact of human sin—that is, the continuing initiative of God in atonement and reconciliation. Revelation is not to be identified with atonement, for there is more to atonement than revelation. But neither is revelation merely a report of atonement. Rather, revelation is an essential dimension of the whole process of atonement, just as expression is an essential dimension of love.[2] Atonement no more

Change and Continuity in the Theology of a Church

In the change that is the consequence of history, a particular idea sometimes loses its apparent relevance to contemporary existence. Such an idea then tends to disappear from the thought as well as the discourse of the community: because it is no longer experientially meaningful, there is little reason to think or talk about it. Thus there develops a disparity between what the community once believed and what it now actually and actively (as opposed to merely nominally and superficially) believes. To this situation there may be three kinds of response.

On the one hand, some who feel uncomfortable about the disparity may suggest that the now-ignored idea ought *not* to be ignored because it is in fact essential to the identity of the community. That is, the idea in question is regarded as part of the definition of the community, so that to *be* this community *means* actively to believe this idea. If the community no longer believes as it once did, it has thereby ceased to be what it was (and what it still claims to be) and has become something else; and to that extent it has betrayed its heritage and lost its original, authentic identity. What the "defenders of the faith" are in fact doing with this line of reasoning (although they do not think of it in this way) is making the idea experientially relevant again. In so doing, however, they are giving it a new (and different) relevance; for in place of its original experiential significance (whatever it was), it now has the significance of being a means of continuity with the past.

On the other hand, some others who also feel uncomfortable about the disparity between the past and the present belief of the community may suggest that the idea is not merely irrelevant to contemporary experience but indeed conceptually *untrue* (because it lacks adequate support of one kind or another). Therefore it should not have been believed in the first place, and the community was mistaken (if not deluded) to have ever believed it. This second kind of response is of course likely to elicit strong opposition from those who have made (or are inclined to make) the first kind of response. Indeed, this latter kind seems all the more threatening if the disparity between past and present belief is widely felt within the community of faith, and if there is a widespread (though generally vague) feelings of theological insecurity. Thus, ironically, the magnitude and prominence of the second kind of response (by the critics of the tradition) may well contribute to the extent and intensity of the

than love can keep itself secret; it includes the communication of itself.

There is, of course, an important sense in which the salvation of humanity is an accomplished, irrevocable fact. This is the heart of the Christian gospel. But it is not the whole of the gospel. For the gospel also includes the fact that salvation is an extended process in which God continues to take the initiative. This continuing initiative is symbolized by the ministry of Christ as high priest in heaven.

When Jesus said on the cross, "It is finished" (John 19:30), he declared that the crucified God had done what needed to be done: he had totally identified himself with humanity by voluntarily suffering the consequences of human sin. But he did not declare that he was "finished" with his divine ministry to human need, and thus with the activity of atonement and reconciliation. He did not announce that henceforth he would be a retired Savior with nothing to do but wait for the ultimate outcome of his previous work.

And it is not merely divine activity that continues; it is the divine initiative. This is what makes the ministry of the High Priest in the sanctuary in heaven truly good news. For it is not merely a matter of God's interested observation and moral support, nor even just a matter of divine response to our decisions and assistance in our efforts. If that were all, we would have no assurance, and hope would be impossible (or at best irrational). The ministry of Christ as high priest means that God does not say to us, "I have now done my thing. The rest is up to you." Rather, the High Priest who "has suffered and been tempted" is "able to help those who are tempted" (Hebrews 2:18), and the help is offered even before we know

---

first kind of response (by the defenders of the faith).

Yet a third kind of response is also possible—one that like the first proposes a new experiential significance for an old idea, but like the second does not find in the need for theological continuity with the past a sufficient reason for actively believing and proclaiming an otherwise irrelevant idea. Thus there may be those who suggest that the idea in question does have important experiential significance, even though this is not exactly the same meaning it had originally. Therefore, the idea ought to be maintained for the good of the community, and its contemporary meaning should be clarified and developed. Like all hybrid responses, however, this one tends to be regarded with suspicion by those who make either of the other two kinds of response. To the defenders of the faith, this response seems to be an illegitimate revisionism, a deliberately camouflaged renunciation of the community's heritage; and to the critics of the tradition it seems to be a futile rearguard action by those who recognize that the doctrine is not in fact true but who do not have the moral courage to say so.

It may be noted here that in spite of the differences among the three responses, they all carry the same complementary temptations to self-righteousness and paranoia: the proponents of each response tend to feel that they alone are on the side of the angels, and that they are unfairly criticized by their opponents and unappredicted by the community as a whole.

It is evident that this brief sketch of ways of responding to a disparity between past and present belief is directly applicable to the current discussion within Adventism regarding the doctrine of the sanctuary. When this doctrine was originally formulated in the middle of the 19th century, it "mattered" profoundly, for it explained the Adventist experience of 1844, including both the joy of expectation and the trauma of disappointment. But as that experience became increasingly distant in time, its importance diminished; eventually it came to be largely ignored in the actual life of the church, because it seemed to have little pastoral or evangelistic function. At that point it was perhaps inevitable that (1) some members of the community would suspect that the doctrine was not only irrelevant but also untrue, (2) this criticism of the community's theological heritage would evoke a vigorous reaction, and (3) there would be an attempt to show that the doctrine of the sanctuary has had an important contemporary significance. In any case, this essay is an example of the third kind of response.

we need it. If we need forgiveness, it is already available. If we need strength to resist evil, to confront tragedy, to understand truth, to live generously, it is immediately available, because God continues to take the initiative for our salvation. This good news is revealed (among other ways) by the fact that Christ is our high priest in heaven.

The fact that Christ is high priest thus shows that he is still Immanuel, "God with us" (Matthew 1:23). The self-giving of God in Christ was a singular event as far as human history is concerned, but the incarnation was not the beginning and the ascension was not the end of a temporary attitude toward human beings as far as God is concerned. God is revealed in Christ—both as suffering servant and as high priest—as eternally "with us." This is the way God is in relation to his moral universe.[3] When God announces "I the Lord know not change" (Malachi 3:6) he is affirming his moral consistency, his covenant responsibility, his faithfulness to his promise.[4] Hence the conclusion that immediately follows: "Therefore you, O sons of Jacob, are not consumed." The revelation of Christ as high priest means that we need not be consumed, either, in spite of the destructiveness of our world and our own self-destructiveness, for God's initiative for our salvation continues.

Sustaining

It is significant that God's continuing initiative on our behalf originates in heaven. This fact draws our attention to a transcendent kind of reality. Heaven, as "the 'place' of God's presence,"[5] is a reality that is not only "above" (that is, other than and superior to) the reality we know "here below"; it is also "ahead" as the qualitative goal (that is, the present actualization of the future fulfillment) of the reality we now experience.

The transcendent "location" of Christ as high priest is thus a reminder of the fact that the "here and now" is not the ultimate created reality. The present reality is not even the ultimate *human* reality. There is something *else* that is something *better*—a reality different from the present, "above" it and "ahead of" it, yet now related to the present as its goal and fulfillment. A consciousness of Christ ministering for our benefit in the transcendent reality of heaven helps us avoid two major and opposite temptations of our present reality: remembering the superior reality of the "place" where Christ ministers keeps us from arrogance; and remembering that Christ's ministry in that reality is a ministry *for us* keeps us from despair.

The ministry of Christ in a heavenly sanctuary also reveals the transcendent and eternal reality of holiness. As transcendent and eternal, holiness is transcultural. In spite of its apparent strangeness, therefore, holiness is as relevant to the modern mind as it was to the biblical mind.

"The modern mind needs precisely what it finds so alien to its immediate inclination—a sense of transcendent and absolute holiness."

The modern mind is distinguished first of all by its scientific consciousness—its sense of the vast amount of knowledge available about the natural world and the way it works. This sense is by no means limited to professional scientists; it is shared by all informed people in our time. The modern mind is also distinguished by what might be called its anthropological consciousness—its sense of the enormous variety of human experience (individual and collective, past and present, Western and Oriental, and primal). The behavioral and social sciences have enlarged the modern mind with at least a general awareness of the way human being

functions and some of the reasons why. The combination of scientific and anthropological consciousness has led the modern mind into a kind of ambivalent humanism that is relativistic and realistic, liberated and tolerant, skeptical and uncertain.

So the modern mind needs precisely what it finds so alien to its immediate inclinations—a sense of transcendent and absolute holiness. In another time and place and culture this holiness was encountered in the Hebrew sanctuaries; for us it is symbolized by the sanctuary in heaven. Such an ultimate "locus" of holiness is essential to human beings; for only a trandcendent holiness can function adequately as a source and criterion of value and goodness, and thus as a ground of meaning for humanity as a whole and for individual people.

Reassuring

At the same time that the continuing initiative of Christ as high priest symbolizes the transcendent reality of heaven and the ultimate locus of holiness, it also symbolizes the nearness of heaven and holiness to human being. For the mediatorial role of the High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary is intended, not to maintain the distance between God and humanity, but to overcome it. That is, Christ functions as high priest, not because God wants to keep us away from himself, but because he wants us to come close to himself. Indeed, if God wanted to keep us at a distance, Christ would not serve well as our high priest. For he does not merely represent God; he is God.

The ancient Hebrew sanctuaries—the tent in the wilderness, and the temples of Solomon, Zerubabbel, and Herod—were first of all a revelation of the presence of God. "Let them make me a sanctuary," Yahweh had said, "that I may dwell in their midst" (Exodus 25:8). These sanctuaries were the focal point of the divine presence, not its totality, as if the rest of the world were off-limits to God, but the primary place where God appeared, and the place where holiness could be most readily experienced. Having encountered God's presence vividly and dramatically here, and having thus been "sensitized" to it, one could more easily detect it elsewhere. Thus the revelation of the divine in and through the historical sanctuaries was to be the means of illuminating the whole of human experience with the light of the presence of God.

The sanctuary in heaven has the same kind of function. It, too, is a revelation of the presence of God—the nearness of transcendence and holiness in the concrete existence of human being.

Thus it is clear that as high priest, Christ is a "mediator" in a very special, revelatory sense. Just as on the cross he was not a "third party" who was being punished by God for our sins, but rather God identifying himself with humanity and taking on himself the consequences of sin,[6] so in the sanctuary in heaven there is no "middle-man" between God and humanity, but rather God making himself accessible to us in a way that will encourage our positive response. If we speak of Christ as "our Man in heaven,"[7] we must remember that he is that only because he is first "God with us."

So it was God who was in Christ, "Himself the priest, Himself the victim."[8] The high priesthood of Christ in heaven is significantly like that of the Hebrew high priests because it too involved a sacrifice, yet it is radically different from theirs not only because Christ sacrificed himself, but also because his self-sacrifice was God's own self-sacrifice. The death of Christ is actually a statement that God makes about himself[9] and therefore about the ultimate nature of the reality which he has created: namely, that greatness is disclosed in humiliation, power in vulnerability, sovereignty in self-surrender.[10] The High Priest in heaven, who is both sacrifice and God, reminds us that the continuing initiative in our behalf is the initiative of an omnipotence that identifies

itself with our humanness. This extraordinary mediator is no neutral "go-between"; he is God wholly and eternally "on our side."

None of this, of course, is new. But it has profound experiential significance. It is no easier now than it ever was to be satisfied with the glib assurance that "God's in his heaven, all's right with the world."[11] We know too well that all is not right with the world, with human beings, or with our own existence. We know that life is not fair. We know that as strategies for personal or professional success, integrity and generosity do not work as well as shrewdness and self-interest. We know that achievement and satisfaction are not the inevitable results of unselfish motives or diligent efforts. In this setting, it is good to know that in the transcendent reality of heaven is a sanctuary symbolizing ultimate holiness, and that its high priest is the God who is on our side.

Culminating

Whatever one may think about the temporality of God (that is, whether the divine eternity is understood as timelessness or as everlasting time),[12] it is evident that in relation to human time the ministry of Christ as high priest in heaven is not unending. It is the continuing initiative of God for the salvation of human beings, but it does not continue indefinitely. It is an ongoing process of atonement and reconciliation, but it does not go on forever. As a divine activity that is going on now, it is "above" the "present" in which we live, but it also points "ahead" to a future in which this particular activity has been completed:

> Christ has entered not into a sanctuary made with hands, a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf . . . And just as it is appointed for men to die once, and after that comes judgment, so Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time, not to deal with sin but to save those who are eagerly waiting for him. (Hebrews 9:24, 27–29, RSV)

Thus the ministry of Christ as high priest in heaven has an unmistable association with eschatological events. It anticipates its own consummation, its own end. And its end is related to the end, the Eschaton.

For the continuing divine initiative for the salvation of human being lasts only as long as the tragic reality of sin, and sin is not everlasting. Thus the fact that the ministry of the High Priest comes to an end is good news. Indeed, in terms of experiential significance, it is as important for this ministry to be limited in time as to be located in the transcendent reality of heaven. Both of these characteristics are related to the ultimate overcoming and elimination of sin (which is what both the Hebrew and the heavenly sanctuaries and high priesthoods are all about).

So it is not at all surprising that the letter to the Hebrews associates the ministry of Christ as high priest with his second coming. Each of the other biblical documents that provide the primary data for a doctrine of the sanctuary (Leviticus, Daniel, and Revelation) does the same in one way or another.[13] The consummation of Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary is the final victory over sin. This ultimate victory of God is at the same time a victory for his people, and it inaugurates the final future which they share with God.

"Christ functions as high priest, not because God wants to keep us away from himself, but because he wants us to come close to himself."

In Christian theology generally and in Adventist theology particularly, this triumphant consummation of God's activity of atonement and reconciliation is described in terms of eschatological judgment, and it is

important that we never separate our thinking about judgment from our understanding of atonement and reconciliation.[14] For on the one hand, the initiative and activity of God in atonement and reconciliation in Christ (in his historical, sacrificial ministry and in his heavenly, high-priestly ministry) constitute the basis and crucial issue of the final judgment. In the language of the fourth Gospel: "This is the judgment, that the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light" (John 3:19, RSV). Thus we understand why the one who atones and reconciles is the one who is our judge. It could not be otherwise. And we also know that the judge is not our adversary (for that is the role of the Enemy, the Accuser, the Satan), not a neutral, disinterested observer. He is the God who is eternally with us, the God who is forever on our side.

And on the other hand, the consummation of atonement and reconciliation that is described as "judgment" is the confirmation of salvation. It is the final recognition and revelation of our acceptance of God's ultimate gift. At that point, God's continuing initiative on behalf of humanity has reached its objective.

As it was the function of the Hebrew sanctuaries, so now it is the function of the sanctuary in heaven to reveal the continuing initiative of God in reconciling, sustaining and reassuring humanity that the God who saved continues to be present with us until the glorious consummation of history. This is the supreme experiential significance of the doctrine of Christ as high priest.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. An earlier consideration of this subject, presupposed by this present essay, appeared in a paper presented to the Glacier View meeting of the Sanctuary Review Committee in August 1980 and was published under the title "Confidence in Salvation: The Meaning of the Sanctuary" in *Spectrum,* vol. 11, no. 2 (November 1980), pp 44–53.

2. Jack Provonsha, *You CAN Go Home Again,* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1982), especially pp. 85–128, gives a powerful presentation of the revelatory dimension of atonement.

3. Cf. Provonsha, *You CAN Go Home Again,* p. 92: "At Calvary's point in time and place the curtains pulled back so that our dim souls could behold what was always so since there was separation between God and His creation. God's heart was laid bare at the cross. The cross did not *make* anything so, but revealed what *was* so."

4. Cf. Robert W. Jenson, *The Triune Identity: God According to the Gospel* (Philadelphia, Penn.: Fortress, 1982), p. 40: "Yahweh does not transcend time by immunity to it. The continuity of his being is not that of a defined entity, some of whose defining characteristics persist from beginning to end. It is rather the sort of continuity we have come to call 'personal'; it is established in his words and commitments, by the faithfulness of his later acts to the promises made in his earlier acts. The continuity of his being transcends time, to be *eternal,* in that he keeps all his promises, in that time cannot take any of his commitments from him."

5. Aelred Cody, *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in The Epistle to the Hebrews* (St. Meinrad, Ind.: Grail Publications, 1960), p. 81.

6. Cf. Jurgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God* (New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1974), p. 276: "God does not become a religion, so that man participates in him by corresponding religious thoughts and feelings. God does not become a law, so that man achieves community with him through constant striving. He humbles himself and takes upon himself the eternal death of the godless and the godforsaken, so that all the godless and the godforsaken can experience communion with him."

7. Cf. Edward Fudge, *Our Man in Heaven: An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1973).

8. Ellen G. White, *The Desire of Ages* (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1898), p. 25. Cf. Charles Beecher, *Redeemer and Redeemed* (Boston, Mass.: Lee and Shepard, 1864), p. 65, cited by Ron Graybill, "E. G. White's Literary Work: An Update" (photocopied typescript, 1981), p. 15 and Appendix F.

9. Karl Rahner, ed., *Sacramentum Mundi,* six vols. (New York, NY: Herder and Herder, 1968–70), 3:207–8.

10. Cf. Moltmann, *The Crucified God,* p. 205. While the idea of a suffering God is not dependent

on an understanding of the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, a question may be raised regarding a possible connection between the traditional Christian insistence on the idea of an impassible God (who by definition could not suffer) and the traditional neglect of the Christ's high priesthood. For the logical incompatibility of the ideas of impassibility and Trinity, cf. Jenson, *The Triune Identity*, especially pp. 21–55; for the principal references to the ministry of Christ as high priest in the mainstream of historical and contemporary theology, cf. the appendix to my earlier essay, "Confidence in Salvation: The Meaning of the Sanctuary," *Spectrum*, vol. 11, no. 2, (November 1980), p. 51

11. Robert Browning, "Pippa Passes," I, 228–29.

12. Cf. Schubert M. Ogden, *The Reality of God and Other Essays* (New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1966), pp. 144–63; Nicholas Wolterstorff, "God Everlasting," in Cliften J. Orlebeke and Lewis B. Smedes, eds., *God and the Good: Essays in Honor of Henry Stob* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1975), pp. 181–204; Richard Rice, *The Openness of God* (Nashville, Tenn.: Review and Herald, 1980); Jenson, *The Triune Identity*, pp. 1–5, 21–40, 57–68, 161–84. On the tension between futurity and (timeless) eternity, cf. Cody, *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy*, pp. 117–44.

13. The distinctive role of the Hebrew high priest was part of the ceremony of the day of atonement—a ceremony that included the symbolic removal of sin as the goat designated "for Azazel" was sent out to perish in the wilderness (Leviticus 16:5–10, 21–22). This ceremony obviously carried strong eschatological overtones.

The prophecy of Daniel concerning the desecration of the sanctuary (and the concomitant oppression of God's people) by demonic forces comes to a climax with a promise of a "cleansing" (that is, a restoration) of the sanctuary (Daniel 8:9–14). Although it does not explicitly involve the figure of the high priest, this climax is surely an eschatological event.

In the apocalyptic visions of John, Christ appears in the heavenly sanctuary in the figure of a triumphant lamb who still bears the marks of scarifice (Revelation 5:6), but whose victory is complete and who is the object of worship (5:13, 14:1–5). Here the eschatological context is both explicit and predominant. And in John's final vision there is no more sanctuary at all (21:22), for its function has been consummated and ended along with that of the High Priest.

14. Some of the recent theological discussion and debate within Adventism has been defective at just this point. It is particularly ironic that the doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary should be misunderstood here, since the relationship between reconciliation and judgment is one of its most important theological elements.

The Sanctuary as a Call to Moral Seriousness

by Jon Dybdahl

Seventh-day Adventists interpret the doctrine of the sanctuary in two main ways. Some say the doctrine is mainly about last day events, or eschatology; others say it is mainly about the assurance of salvation, or soteriology. These interpretations are not mutually exclusive, but they do represent different emphases which alter the function of the doctrine in the light of the church. I propose a third possible emphasis, arguing that, among other things, the doctrine of the sanctuary is an ethical appeal, a call to repentance and moral seriousness. I also claim that the two dominant interpretations are, by themselves, inadequate. After laying out all three interpretations I am going to assess the first two in light of the third.

The first option I shall call the *eschatological* view. This has become the traditional understanding of the sanctuary in Adventism. A good example of it is found in the well-known Adventist book, *Bible Readings for the Home.*[1] This book considers the doctrine in a section entitled, "The Sure Word of Prophecy," along with other prophecies from the books of Daniel and Revelation. The presentation begins by examining the prophecies of Daniel 8 and 9 showing the dates for the 2,300-day prophecy. The author elucidates the prophecy of Daniel by going back to Old Testament passages on the sanctuary and ahead to the book of Hebrews. He concludes this section on prophecy with a discussion of judgment and Babylon.

What this means is that here the doctrine of the sanctuary fits into that major category of doctrines called eschatology, or the doctrine of the last things. For many of us raised as Adventists the doctrine basically was the 2,300-day prophecy and its accompanying chart. Everything else simply explained and buttressed the prophecy. On this view the doctrine of the sanctuary functioned as an explanation of the origin of our church and told us we are living in the period after all time prophecies have been fulfilled.

The second option is what I shall call the *soteriological* view. It developed later partly, I suspect, due to an uneasiness with the emphasis of the first view on time and judgment. An early indication of shifting emphasis is the treatment of the doctrine by T. H. Jemison in the Bible doctrines textbook *Christian Beliefs.*[2] Jemison places the doctrine in the section of his book called "The Ministry of Reconciliation." This section begins with a chapter on the plan of salvation and moves on to a discussion of the covenants and the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries. Consequently the emphasis shifts. While Jemison discusses Daniel 8, the

Jon Dybdahl is an associate professor of theology at Walla Walla College, Walla Walla, Wash.

sanctuary is no longer simply another way to understand last day time prophecies, Jemison places the sanctuary primarily within the doctrine of salvation or soteriology. How God saves us, not the 2,300 days, is the emphasis of the sanctuary symbols.

The same emphasis comes out in the material published following the Glacier View meeting in 1980.[3] The headline on the cover of *Ministry* magazine, "Christ and His High Priestly Ministry," as well as the name given the now famous consensus document, "Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary " indicate the direction taken. The main thrust is that the doctrine of the sanctuary concerns the high priestly ministry of Christ who gives the believer assurance before God. The biblical starting place is the book of Hebrews. A section (IV) of the consensus statement does discuss time, but the shift of emphasis away from chronology and Daniel is clear. The sanctuary doctrine functions mainly as a metaphorical affirmation of the believer's assurance of salvation made possible through Christ's high priestly ministry.

I propose a third approach which I call the *ethical* view.[4] This view interprets the doctrine of the sanctuary as an appeal to God's people to be morally serious in view of the horror of sin and the impending judgment of God upon it. Rather than Daniel or Hebrews, the biblical starting point is the prophets, but it reaches back to even earlier Old Testament voices and forward to the New Testament as well. According to this view the sanctuary fits more directly under the heading of theological ethics than under eschatology or soteriology.

In developing this third view, I will later deal with traditional sanctuary passages in Leviticus 16 and Daniel. However, my exposition begins with other passages, particularly passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Indeed these two writers are essential to understanding this view of the sanctuary. Consider first Jeremiah. In chapter 7:3–15 this prophet gives a powerful sermon at the gate of the temple. He calls for Israel to repent of her sins—her murder, idolatry, and oppression of the poor. If she will not repent, the temple will be destroyed. Mere ritual observance at the temple, says the prophet, does not save; a change of life is necessary. As historical precedent Jeremiah cites the destruction of the Shiloh sanctuary, a tent of meeting presided over by Eli and Samuel and apparently destroyed by the Philistines. The parallel is clear. The sin of an earlier Israel led to the destruction of their sanctuary. Jews of Jeremiah's day are by their sin "defiling" God's house, as verse 30 specifically states, and they, too, face judgment and the loss of their sanctuary/temple.

The second prophet to be considered is Ezekiel. His book makes the theme of temple defilement and judgment even more prominent. An example of this is Ezekiel 5:7–11.[5] Here Ezekiel makes the clear statement that because of Israel's sinfulness God must execute judgment. In verse 11 Ezekiel says specifically that Israel has defiled the sanctuary and that God's judgment will follow. (As a matter of fact, the temple was desolated by the Babylonians shortly thereafter.) Ezekiel also prophesies a future when a repentent people will return again to their land. In the picture of a restored Israel in Ezekiel chapters 40–48, the prophet, among other things, describes and considers at some length a new sanctuary where God dwells in Israel's midst. A restored and cleansed temple becomes the center of a repentent Israelite remnant restored to her land and her God.

In summary, Ezekiel and Jeremiah use the motif of the sanctuary polluted by Israel's continued sin as a means of appeal for repentence. The mere form of religion is not enough; only if their lives change can Israel avert judgment and God return to his people. The sanctuary doctrine emphasis then is a call to moral reformation in an age of impending doom.

It should also be remembered that these

prophets do not see this cycle as happening only once. Jeremiah, as we have seen, points to Shiloh during the period of the judges as well as to his own late seventh-century world. Interestingly, the gospel writers themselves—see Matthew 21:13, Mark 11:17, and Luke 19:46—do not miss the theme. They all invoke the Jeremiah passage in describing Jesus' cleansing of the temple. Jesus' acted parable is clear—Israel is again deep in sin and polluting the temple. Unless the country changes, serious consequences will follow. All three of these passages are examples of a proclamation of impending judgment and a call to repentance and reformation based on the sanctuary pollution/cleansing motif.

One question remains. How are Jeremiah and Ezekiel related to traditional passages in Leviticus and Daniel? Are the messages of these prophets really connected with the day of atonement motif in Leviticus 16, and Daniel 8 and 9? The answer is yes, as the following evidence suggests.

First, the prophetic passages are related linguistically to Leviticus 16. Both Jeremiah 7 and Ezekiel 5 use the word "defile" to describe what Israel's sins do to the sanctuary. The same Hebrew root word is used in Leviticus 16:16 to describe the uncleanness that necessitates the cleansing of the sanctuary in the day of atonement rites.

Further, the prophetic passages are conceptually and functionally related to the day of atonement. This is especially true for Ezekiel. He repeatedly mentions the pollution of the temple and its subsequent cleansing and restoration. The fact that he conceives of this in terms of the day of atonement would seem to be symbolically indicated by the date on which he receives his vision of a cleansed temple—according to Ezekiel 40:1, the 10th day of the new year. If the new year referred to is the one beginning in the fall, then the day of the vision is none other than Yom Kippur, the day of atonement. On the very day that Leviticus says the first sanctuary was to be cleansed, Ezekiel saw in vision a cleansed and purified temple.[6]

There is an even broader sense in which the message of these prophets is related to the day of atonement. Remember that Leviticus 16 describes only the ritual connected with the day of atonement. It is much like the description of the marriage rite found in a minister's manual. The description of the rite does not describe entirely the institution solemnized by it. As the marriage rite doesn't tell us what happens if no marriage title occurs or if it is performed incorrectly, so the day of atonement rites of Leviticus 16 do not tell us the consequences of not performing the ceremony or of performing it incorrectly. It is not, however, hard to find implied answers. Consider Leviticus 15:31, just before the description of the day of atonement begins. Unless Israel is kept separate from its uncleanness, the people will die by defiling the tabernacle. I think we can safely connect this with the day of atonement. If the rite is not performed or performed incorrectly, judgment comes.

"The *ethical* view interprets the doctrine of the sanctuary as an appeal to God's people to be morally serious in view of the horror of sin and the impending judgment of God upon it."

Remember here that the day of atonement rites was not simply magical. Forgiveness and cleansing could occur only if there were confession of guilt and change of life.[7] This is similar to the message of the prophets, who say that the repentence is not evident and, therefore the sanctuary is *not* being cleansed. Unless the sinning stops, God will perform the cleansing himself through judgment, for he cannot abide where sin is not properly cared for. The prophets' message does, therefore, reflect

the day of atonement rites found in Leviticus 16.

We need not belabor the connection between Jeremiah and Ezekiel, on the one hand, and Daniel on the other. Seventh-day Adventist theology has always connected Daniel 8:14 to Leviticus. And we have seen now that Jeremiah and Ezekiel themselves take up the theme in Leviticus. Daniel was a contemporary of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and so it is not surprising that he has a similar concern over the sanctuary.

"The ministry of Christ as High Priest in heaven anticipates its own consummation, its own end. And its end is related to the end, the Eschaton."

I suggest that we find an emphasis akin to that of Ezekiel and Jeremiah in Ellen White's presentation of the doctrine of the sanctuary. In *Great Controversy*, Ellen White devotes 23 pages of chapters 23 and 24 entitled "What is the Sanctuary?" and "In the Holy of Holies" to an explanation of the doctrine's historical role in Adventism: accounting for the non-occurrence in 1844 of the second advent. It should be noted that the sanctuary motif thus functioned at the beginning of Adventism not so much as a motif important in itself, but as something that validated the key doctrinal tenet of the believers—the literal, imminent second coming of Jesus.

Ellen White, however, does not stop here, for in the next six chapters, she develops the ethical and theological implications of the sanctuary. This 77-page section centers around the idea of the law and the Sabbath and is a plea for careful obedience to God's law rather than easy belief devoid of life-changing commitment. The key to all this is Ellen White's transition from the sanctuary to the law which comes at the beginning of chapter 25. "When the temple of God was opened in heaven, the ark of His testament was seen. Within the holy of holies, in the sanctuary in heaven, the divine law is sacredly enshrined . . ."[8] Building on the theme of the law, Mrs. White attacks easy religion which does not divorce itself from the follies of the world and practices a faith without works. This ethical appeal in light of impending judgment is the same emphasis found in Ezekiel and Jeremiah.

In summary then, I am suggesting that both the Bible and Ellen White use the theme of the defilement/pollution and subsequent cleansing/restoration of the sanctuary as a means of appealing for moral reformation. The theme is the basis for a call in light of impending crisis to forsake evil and live the life of obedience. For Ellen White, the earlier pollutions and cleansings in the time of the prophets and Jesus are precursors of the great final cleansing and restoration at the end of time.

How then does the ethical view assess the other two options in Adventism? Consider first the time prophecy view. I claim that it must take into account a broader range of biblical passages. It must look beyond Daniel and acknowledge that the Bible applies the theme of pollution/cleansing of the sanctuary to many different occasions. It should note, too, that Ellen White spends more time, as do the prophets, spelling out ethical demands based on the sanctuary than she does in expounding the specific historical and chronological details. The sanctuary must somehow be communicated as more than a time chart. In order to be genuinely "traditional," this view must embrace the emphasis of the Bible and Ellen White.

Of the soteriological view, we may say that the emphasis on Christ as high priest and on the assurance of salvation are indeed commendable. These are vital elements in Christian theology too often neglected by

Adventists. On the other hand, it should be recognized that the priestly-assurance position is basically a theology of Hebrews, and that pollution/cleansing of the sanctuary portrayed in the Old Testament makes a different, equally important point. Just as the time prophecy view reads Hebrews in the light of Daniel, the priestly view tends to read all the Old Testament in the light of Hebrews, or else ignore the Old Testament altogether. It speaks to people who are not assured of their salvation. We must remember, however, that the Old Testament prophets and the early Adventists were speaking to people too assured of their salvation and in need of moral reformation. Although many undoubtedly need the assuring message, it should not be portrayed as the historic Adventist emphasis. In an increasingly secular world, many in the church today may need to hear not only words of comfort and assurance, but also a warning to judgment and a call to obedience and reform.

We may expect a call to reformation that employs the ideas of pollution, judgment and cleansing to be understandable and thus proclaimable in our world. We speak often today of "cleaning up" a long-standing "mess" in some government agency or school administration. We are coming to recognize that we cannot go on dumping toxic wastes into rivers and streams and fouling our air forever without one day coming to an ecological day of judgment. Even secular writers speak of our past mistakes as accumulating "pollution," leading us to impending nuclear and ecological judgments. Modern men and women recognize the need for cleansing all this "pollution," and many have made this need the basis for a call to changed behavior.

In the Old Testament it is God, of course, who cleanses the sanctuary. Seeing the doctrine of the sanctuary as a call to *us* to engage in acts of cleansing might at first seem odd, but to press this point would be to misunderstand the deeper significance of the whole sanctuary motif. For the cleansing of the sanctuary and the rescue from judgment depend upon the willingness of the people to repent—to cease committing the sins that pollute. It does not stretch the matter overmuch to say that the positive significance of this is that God's people must themselves be cleansing agents in a world polluted by sin. This accords, after all, with the bibilical theme of human beings as instruments of salvation for the nation.[9]

A community steeped in the sanctuary doctrine may well consider this ethical motif. Indeed, it may be that the world is ready to listen to the message that continued flagrant.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. My Review and Herald paperback edition lists copyrights in 1914, 1935, 1942, 1949, 1958, and 1963. Page one says "revised" but gives no date for the revision. See page 218ff.

2. T. H. Jemison. *Christian Beliefs* (Mt. View, CA: Pacific Press, 1954), pp. 181–224. See esp. 214ff.

3. *Ministry*, October, 1980. I think the high priestly-assurance view is also the emphasis of Dr. Desmond Ford.

4. My reading of the prophets, in particular Jeremiah and Ezekiel, have influenced me as has Ellen White's *Great Controversy* presentation. My teaching colleague, Glen Greenwalt, has also enhanced my understanding of this issue.

5. See also Ezekiel 7:20–23, 9:3–7, 23:26–39, 24:15–24, 28:18–19, 36:16–18, and 43:6–9.

6. Wm. H. Shea. "The Investigative Judgment of Judah, Ezekiel 1–10," in *The Sanctuary and Atonement* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981), p. 291.

7. Gerhard Hasel. "Studies in Biblical Atonement II: the Day of Atonement," in *The Sanctuary and Atonement* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981), p. 120. See also Jacob Milgrom, "The Day of Atonement," in *Encyclopedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1971), p. 1386.

8. Ellen G. White. *Great Controversy* (Mt. View, California Pacific Press, 1951), pp. 433–34.

9. See, e.g., Genesis 12:1–3 and Isaiah 42:1–6. Cf. also the New Testament motif of the church as the body of Christ.

The Impact of Religion in Adventist Marriages

Charles C. Crider; Robert C. Kistler. *The Seventh-day Adventist Family: An Empirical Study.* xii + 284 pp., bibl. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1979.

reviewed by Herbert L. Smith

Seventh-day Adventists view themselves as a very religious people, particularly in terms of corporate worship and other highly visible religous activities, but only about one-third of American Adventist families regularly conduct family devotions in their homes, and many more feel dissatisfaction with their spiritual lives. Such indications of tensions in the spiritual life of Adventist families illustrate the substantial contribution *The Seventh-day Adventist Family* brings to our understanding of the impact of religious beliefs on marital interaction and family systems.

I recommend a careful reading of this book with particular attention to the implications that the findings have for church programming for marriage and family enrichment, and dating and premarriage counseling

Marriage and families in the United States have been undergoing severe strain recently, and although the various dimensions of this strain are well documented statistically, they are not so well understood on the human level. Since the Seventh-day Adventist Church exists in the larger society, and its members interact with people in that society, Charles Crider and Robert Kistler, professors of sociology at Andrews University, believed that the factors contributing to the problems and stresses of contemporary American homelife might also be felt by Adventists. Although the church encourages stable, well-regulated family life, sound child-rearing practices, and no divorce, no information existed to establish how these basic principles actually worked out in the homes of its members. While conducting a series of Family Enrichment Seminars, Dr. Crider became aware that effective programs to strengthen family life in the church could not be developed without an adequate assessment of the real nature and extent of the problems involved. To create a religious and marital profile of the Adventist family, Crider and Kistler questioned American Adventists about their homes, spouses, and religion. Among other questions they asked: Do you view your home as a happy place in which to live? Do you rate your spouse high on such personal traits as kindness, courtesy, and poise under stress? Do you give your partner high marks for those traits that are important to successful marriages such as affection, cooperation, communication? How do you evaluate the spiritual atmosphere in your home?

Based upon the information provided by 2,004 respondents, the "typical" American Adventist in this study was a forty-six-year old female who belonged to a congregation located near an Adventist institution. She met her spouse at school, was married by an Adventist minister in a church, and described herself as a professional in terms of occupational status. She and her husband had two, three, or four children, and she believed their family organization was "democratic." The "typical" male (46 percent of respondents) paralleled the female in socio-economic characteristics,

and the average couple experienced freedom from economic pressures, was attached to its material possessions, and felt that what it possessed was in line with its neighbors. Due to certain sampling restrictions, the authors did not claim the respondents to be a "representative sample" of Seventh-day Adventists, but the respondents did represent a sample of Adventist marriages and families.

The survey revealed that couples tended to see themselves and each other in a favorable light as individuals, but were likely to have an unfavorable view of their marriages. Such perceptions provide important indicators of the nature of the marital relationship, shed light upon the functioning of the family system, and can highlight possible marital and family problem areas for later support and development. The authors appropriately pointed out the need to develop specific programs of enrichment and growth to help Adventist couples create more meaningful marital relationships.

In contrast to the patterns of American society, the authors discovered a direct relationship between occupational status and marital happiness and religiosity, and noted that non-mobile couples have a slightly higher divorce rate than do mobile ones. The authors explored the reasons for this somewhat unusual finding in terms of motivation for mobility, for example, to pursue higher education or to work at an Adventist institution. The majority of the respondents reported that they were "married once and living with that spouse." However, the authors pointed to the possibility that the rate of family disorganization and divorce might be as high as 15 to 17 percent for the overall church membership.

The authors concluded their book with comments from their respondents concerning family life. One-third commented on factors contributing to success or failure. Factors leading to a successful family life included adherence to counsels of the Bible and the writings of Ellen G. White, a happy childhood, consistency and firm discipline for children, warmth, and deep companionship with one's mate. Included among the 10 factors that contribute to failure are lack of family worship, not living up to the standards of the church, living in a religiously divided home, unfaithfulness to one's companion, and sexual incompatibility.

My favorable reaction to this study carries with it several reservations about its sampling procedures and measurement devices, but these are in part recognized by the authors and in no way detract from its significant contribution to literature on the family. The volume deserves reading not only by Adventists but also by students of marriage and the family who wish to better understand the dynamics of marital and family relationships within the North American Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

Herbert L. Smith is an assistant professor of sociology at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Mich.

The Influence of Beliefs about Truth and Reality on Educational Goals

George R. Knight. *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective.* 244 pp., bibl., index. Berrin Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1980. $9.95 (paper).

reviewed by F. E. J. Harder

The conjunction "and" in the title of George R. Knight's *Philosophy and Education* makes the title descriptive of the book's contents; the preposition "of" in its place would have been inappropriate. However, since the author did not develop a philosophy within the Christian perspective, the subtitle can mislead until one reads the preface. What Knight intended, and achieved with considerable success, was to show the relevance

to educational practice of beliefs about reality, truth, values, and goals. He wrote the book as an introductory textbook to supplement readings in philosophy and educational theory, and to provide the essentials for developing a Christian philosophical perspective.

Knight began by defining philosophy as an activity, a set of attitudes, and a body of content, differentiated among education, learning, schooling, and training, and followed with concise and lucid discussions of metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology. He attempted to show how one's beliefs will determine one's basic educational goals and also how the dynamics of a particular society will modify both goals and practice. It is especially important, Knight concluded, that "Christian educators who have sought to develop an alternative system based on supernatural assumptions in the context of a society that is largely operating on naturalistic premises" establish practices within an environment in harmony with their basic beliefs.

Building upon this foundation, Knight followed a procedure quite standard in introductory texts by presenting abstracts and brief critiques of 14 schools of philosophy, occasionally noting their implications for education, and reminding us that although each may have some contribution to make toward a Christian philosophy, none is adequate, and eclecticism is unsatisfactory. "The better way is for each educator and each educational system to examine its own basic beliefs in terms of reality, truth, and then consciously to build a personal educational philosophy upon that platform." True, and the reader will wish that Knight had revealed his own.

Although anyone seeking such a concise survey is unlikely to find a better one, Knight devoted three times more pages to recent, splintered theories than to idealism realism, and neo-scholasticism—traditions of much greater importance to the development of Christian philosophy. Of the 14, only these three have a primary concern with metaphysics—a concern that is basic to Christian belief and is determinative for the development of Christian answers to the questions: What is real? What is true? What is good? What is the nature of the learner? What are the aims of education? and What should be taught?

"Although Knight did not develop a philosophy of Christian education, he outlined instructive principles to aid anyone endeavoring to build his own."

In chapters eight and nine Knight discussed a Christian approach to philosophy and education, but he failed to outline a structure for such an approach. Rather, he offered suggestions, raised questions, indicated issues, and stated principles that can heighten an educator's "sensitivity to the challenges of professional responsibility." Knight then reflected on Christian views of metaphysics, epistemology, axiology, the nature of a student, the role of a teacher, curriculum, methodology, and the social function of Christian education. Although Knight did not develop a philosophy of Christian education, he outlined instructive principles to aid anyone endeavoring to build his own, and made it clear that a Christian philosophy of education and a theology of education find common ground in their biblical bases.

I was disappointed that although the credits given for frequent (perhaps too frequent) quotations and idea sources required a bibliography of nine pages, not one reference appeared in either the text or the bibliograpy to the Ellen G. White literature, which obviously had been highly influential in the author's thinking. Since such a major omission could not have been unintentional, one wonders what considerations prompted it.

The author demonstrated a broad understanding of philosophical thought, an ability to make precise conceptual distinctions, and a firm grasp of theoretical implications for educational practice. I encourage him to produce a second volume in which he constructs an integrated Seventh-day Adventist educational philosophy in harmony with the principles he enunciated. This could be a significant contribution to teachers, students, trustees, and patrons who, for over a century, have operated denominational schools without such a guide.

F.E.J. Harder is a retired executive secretary of the North American Division Board of Higher Education, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C. He received a bachelors degree from Andrews University and a Ph.D. from New York University.

A Psychological Test for Christians?

Peter Blitchington; Robert J. Cruise. *Understanding Your Temperament: A Self-Analysis with a Christian Viewpoint.* 38pp., with tables. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1979.

reviewed by Ronald Geraty

Based on Peter Blitchington and Robert J. Cruise's *Understanding Your Temperament,* I am a phlegmatic, sanguine, choleric who is bold, insensitive, and scatterbrained. In the first part of my discussion of this newly developed psychological test, I will hope to live up to those descriptors. In the second part, I will hope to make up for it by being sociable, cheerful and carefree, tactful, diplomatic, and even flexible without being bland and unorganized.

Blitchington and Cruise describe their psychological test as having a Christian viewpoint, but I wonder what makes it Christian. The authors are Christians, the validation studies appear to have been done on Christians, and the authors discuss how various temperamental traits may impact on moral and spiritual development, but none of these characteristics make the test "Christian." Andrews University Press even published the test, but I doubt that makes it Christian, and none of the test questions, analyses, or findings have anything to do with Christianity or spirituality. I conclude that the test does not have a Christian viewpoint, though some of the authors' discussions of the test do. I further suggest that a Christian psychological test is probably no better than a non-Christian one. Would a Christian microscope be better than a non-Christian microscope? It might be interesting to develop a moral and spiritual development scale and have it standardized to measure the maturity of Christians, but even then it may be difficult to find agreement on what characteristics constitute Christian maturity.

Leaving the Christian issue aside, I do not understand why the authors use Hippocratic terms such as sanguine, melancholic, choleric, and phlegmatic. Though they do try to equate them with adjectives in current usage, their attempt fails and merely evokes images of an ancient human physiology with its "evil humours" lurking in body cavities and pulsing through tubes with blood and other liquids. Equally problematical are technical difficulties with the temperament inventory. It took me two tries to fill out the questionnaire due to its length and confusing repetitive questions. On the important issues of validity and reliability, which are dealt with elsewhere in a more scientific presentation of the inventory, it appears that the test has been well validated and has been shown to be reliable except for one important issue. The authors do not adequately describe the population they used to standardize the test.

I differ with the authors' implication, in their discussion of the inventory, that since temperament is due to heredity, it is unchangeable. Recent developmental studies

seem to support the discontinuous theories of development and place more emphasis on the "fit" between the styles of the child and the parent. In other words, an easily excitable child with an easily excitable adult stimulate each other; a calm adult with an excitable child complement each other. Hence, parent-child difficulties are often due to a poor fit rather than "poor parenting." Temperament can be shaped, and little evidence (if any) exists to show that a phlegmatic-choleric child stays that way, becoming a phlegmatic-choleric adult.

It is important, however, for parents to look at each of their children and recognize their *inborn* characteristics. After all, the difficulty the child is having may have been inherited from the parent. Each child is an individual with God-given characteristics that must be nurtured, influenced, and sometimes punished. Children do not come from the same molds and must not all be pushed into the same mold. Some adults who take this test and analyze their temperament may be relieved to find that some of their troubles are less available to change than others (if indeed that is true). Each temperamental characteristic has both positive and negative attributes, and a person may be able to find settings in which a certain strong characteristic is important. For example, introverts may make excellent writers or successful Bible workers but poor salesmen or evangelists.

In support of what I believe is the partial intent of this booklet, I applaud Cruise and Blitchington for trying to make psychology germane and palatable to Seventh-day Adventists. Too often the ambivalence between psychology and Christianity prevents either from turning to the other for help. Christians, and especially Seventh-day Adventists, look distrustfully at psychology and suspect psychologists of influencing the mind, while psychologists often see devout Christians as unsophisticated and naive. But the authors have attempted to turn what may be a reasonable psychological self-analysis into a Christian mold where the test does not seem to fit. The goal is laudable but the attempt falls short.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. R. J. Cruise, W. P. Blitchington, W. G. A. Futcher, "Temperament Inventory: An Instrument to Empirically Verify the Four-Factor Hypothesis," *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40* (1980): 943–954.

Ronald Geraty, M.D., is chief of psychiatry at New England Memorial Hospital in Stoneham, Massachusetts, and clinical instructor of psychiatry at Harvard University.

Medi-Cal Forces Changes at Adventist Hospitals

by Terri Dopp Aamodt

When the California legislature in the summer of 1982 enacted a new law requiring hospitals to re-negotiate contracts to receive state funds to treat low-income patients, Loma Linda University (LLU) Medical Center and other teaching hospitals in California were faced with a dilemma. The Medical Center needed the state medical funds. But the new law specified that all hospitals must have an open staff policy: any physician meeting hospital requirements could admit patients. Loma Linda and other California teaching hospitals had wanted staff qualified to teach and had always restricted admitting privileges to physicians with faculty appointments.

The financial dependency was significant. If the Medical Center did not get a state medical contract, it would lose about 25 percent of its patients and $25–30 million annually,. according to Ron Anderson, financial vice president. The pediatrics department would lose 50 percent of its patients and would probably have to close its residency program. The neonatal intensive care unit, serving four counties, would no longer be available to many critically ill infants.

Administrators pursued "what if" scenarios, department heads prepared contingency budgets, and Medical Center employees tried to calculate whether or not they would be among the 800 to 1,000 workers who would lose their jobs if a contract were not signed.

Within the Adventist Health System/West, Ron Nelson was appointed to help member hospitals in the delicate negotiating process. Early in 1983, White Memorial Medical Center and Glendale Adventist Medical Center were among the first Los Angeles-area hospitals to receive contracts.

On May 2, 1983, LLU was also offered a Medi-Cal contract. The Medical Center Board of Trustees finally had to decide whether to accept it and its requirement that the hospital abandon its closed staff policy. "We knew that if we accepted a Medi-Cal contract we had to insure the quality of our teaching potential," said John Ruffcorn, president of the University Medical Center. "We had to give the Medical Center sufficient protection both as a church organization and a university medical center."

The Medical Center has maintained a closed staff because it wanted to ensure adherence to the academic goals of LLUs School of Medicine. (All other Adventist hospitals in North America have open staffs.) The Medical Center Board of Trustees asked for assurance that these goals would be spelled out to physicians who wanted to join the medical staff when the new policy was implemented.

As a result the medical staff amended its bylaws to accommodate a new category of medical staff who were not faculty members at LLUs School of Medicine. Requirements for all applicants now include board certification or its equivalent, provisional status for one to three years, and proctoring of at least 25 patients within the first year. For the first time, bylaws include specific references

to Adventist philosophy and standards. Rule 14 of the "General Conduct of Care" section states that medical staff members "should not be in conflict with" denominational and hospital "ethics, principles, and philosophy." It then spells out hospital emphasis on the Judeo-Christian tradition, Sabbath observance, vegetarianism, and the prohibitions against alcohol and tobacco. "We want to indicate to anyone who wants to apply that we have a unique philosophy," says Charles H. Brinegar, Jr., M.D., president of the medical staff.

For now, LLU Medical Center anticipates business as usual. Other agencies, including the federal government and private insurance companies, are expected to follow Medi-Cal's example. Teaching hospitals throughout the United States may soon face similar decisions.

Terri Dopp Aamodt teaches in the English Department at Walla Walla College, Walla Walla, Wash.

More Davenport Repercussions

by Bonnie Dwyer

Insurance negotiations, organizational studies, and membership considerations have kept the name of Donald J. Davenport before Adventist committees from the local church to the General Conference in 1983, two years after the doctor filed for bankruptcy.

Here is a roundup of significant actions taken by those committees:

Insurance Negotiations

Although the Seventh-day Adventist Church advocates that members settle disputes in the church without litigation in secular courts, the North Pacific Union, the Oregon Conference, and the Georgia-Cumberland Conference Association Boards voted in May to pursue insurance negotiations to the point of filing lawsuits against former officers. The three union and local conferences are trying to recoup—partially through their officers liability insurance—for the losses they suffered by making loans to Davenport.

But the Arbitration Steering Committee, which was established to settle disputes among church entities over Davenport loans, and the General Conference Officers Committee quickly voted actions disagreeing with the three entities over the advisability of such lawsuits.

Within insurance circles it is not often that an organization paying the premiums files action against its own former officers, as the three Adventist entities are considering doing. Officers liability insurance usually protects the organization from third party actions. But to collect on the policy, the entities have to say their officers were negligent in their duties and be willing to sue their former employees. Potentially approximately $5 million might be recovered from the insurance policy, which is why negotiations continue, despite the actions of the General Conference and the Arbitration Steering Committee.

All entities that suffered Davenport losses send representatives to the meetings of the Arbitration Committee. There were 28 people at the meeting held May 16 in Riverside, Calif., where employee lawsuits were discussed. At the close of the meeting a vote was taken and the motion to allow suits against former employees was defeated 21 to 6 with one person abstaining.

Discussion of the suits continued, however. On May 19, the General Conference Officers Committee took up the subject. In a unanimously approved statement, the officers said, "Though an argument can be made that litigation seeking recovery through other insurance coverage is not violative of the (church's) historic position on litigation, it is the counsel of the General

Conference that litigation against former agents and employees not be pursued by church entities."

In explanation, the officers first noted that financial advantage, purchased at a price of serious erosion of spiritual growth, is not a viable option for a church committed to a world mission of love and unity. Also, no assurance could be given that such litigation would result in recovery of a substantial portion of the losses sustained. Thirdly, targeting specific defendants, given the large number of people selected for discipline, would be a delicate task. The officers suggested litigation could generate a ripple effect, and undercut the central values and mission of the church.

This General Conference action, however, went out simply as a recommendation to local church entities. In the Georgia-Cumberland Conference, President Gary Patterson said a few members threatened litigation against the conference if it did not seek to recover the losses on the loan for the building to which former President Des Cummings holds the title and the conference holds a worthless first trust deed. Another vote of the conference committee will be taken, and consideration given to the General Conference action, Patterson says.

The National Union Insurance Company of New York City carries the denomination's single policy on officers. The fact that a single policy covers the entire denomination helps to explain why the Arbitration Steering Committee and the General Conference are concerned that suits by one or two conferences will lead to suits by all. Nevertheless, it is possible that some local conferences will attempt to collect on their own.

Organizational Studies

When the President's Review Commission convened in Takoma Park, Md., May 30, even its vice chairman Judge Terrence Finney thought that, because of previous disagreements with the General Conference officers, the commission members might vote themselves out of existence. The commission had not approved the decision of the General Conference officers to withhold from publication the names of church officials recommended by the commission for substantial discipline.

Nine members of the commission had voted in March to tell General Conference President Neal Wilson that for the commission to continue it needed to: broaden its investigation to include church reorganization; draw on experts for staffing data; and make its recommendations available to the whole church.

Wilson responded to this request with a letter saying expansion of the commission's task to the world-wide church was inappropriate and that the commission, which was called into existence by him, should report directly to him and let its report be released to the church members through the General Conference officers.

A major share of the commission's time on May 30 went to discussion of the issues in Wilson's letter, because the commission felt he misunderstood their request.

In the end, the commission voted to continue. Finney said that members felt that Wilson, in essence, understood what they wanted. So the commission will look at church structure, but only within the North American Division, which is what they had intended from the start. Its report will be given to the church after it has gone to President Wilson and the General Conference officers.

The commission will not hold hearings on discipline, or deal further with reprimanding individuals, although the Southeastern California Conference and the Adventist Lawyers Association had requested that the commission do so. "We want nothing more to do with Phase I," Finney said. The commission heard a report from General Conference Secretary William Bothe on disciplinary actions, Finney said of the May

30 meeting, but there was no discussion on those measures. The commission meets again in September.

Davenport's Church Membership

Another important action took place at a business meeting of Davenport's local congregation in May, when the Loma Linda University Church voted to discontinue Davenport's membership. Pastor Louis Venden said his congregation did not come to the decision easily or quickly. "We had been considering this matter since last July, and felt that we had to act based on the materials at hand. Davenport was very much the Christian gentleman throughout the process. It was a difficult situation for him, because the church at large is his adversary in court. As a church family, we needed more help from him which he could not give. The meeting was not a hatchet job. We did not presume to make a legal judgment. We acted as a church family."

Davenport was invited to speak at the meeting, or to have someone talk on his behalf, but he declined the invitation. He told Pastor Venden that he did want to remain a member, but legal concerns prevented him appearing at the meeting, even though his membership was at stake. At the business session, a motion to censure, rather than to disfellowship received a second, but was easily defeated. The moral implications of some of Davenport's actions and the disrepute he brought to the church were cited as grounds for discontinuing his membership.

In making the motion to disfellowship Davenport, Gordon Thompson, M.D., referred to Paul's experience in the early church where such an action was intended to be a call to the church to give the individual supporting care.

Mrs. Davenport sent a request to the University Church in June requesting that her name also be dropped from the membership list.

Commission Proposes Genuine Full-Fledged North American Division

by Bonnie Dwyer

Saying that the Adventist organization has too many levels, a lengthy and dramatic study on church structure commissioned by the Pacific Union Conference recommends adoption of new organizational models for the local church and local conference, and a substantially different role for the union conference within an organized, full-fledged North American Division.

The six-member committee which prepared the report said there is no reason to have a union conference as it is now constituted. It suggested that the function of union conferences be changed to purely administration, eliminating the need for departmental work. Under this proposal, the unions would exist as regional offices of the North American Division and the number of unions would be reduced. The local church and local conferences would become the key operational organizations.

After hearing a two-hour presentation on the committee report June 1, 1983, the Pacific Union Executive Committee voted to accept the 300-page document, and created a second, 39-person committee to suggest by November 1984 how to implement the report's six recommendations.

Adoption of new organizational models came first on the list. The report suggested working with the General Conference and North American Division in establishing a new role for the unions. "Develop a sound organizational transition plan," it said, "communicate it and implement it in increments. Do not attempt to patch present structures—more drastic change is needed."

Secondly, the report urged decentralizing decisions, plans, and programs to the local

church and administration support to the local conference.

Maintaining unity of beliefs, mission, priorities, and direction through the local conference was the third recommendation. It specified that the local conference should have approval of strategic plans, operating plans, budgets and performance standards, selection and removal of key conference personnel, and major policies and methods.

Fourthly, it was suggested that existing resources at the union conference level be redeployed through vigorous streamlining efforts, with a specific goal of eliminating in the short run the top-heavy department functional structure. "Combine every feasible functional department at the local conference, too," it said, "with those people and resources to be used on an approved budget basis at the local churches primarily for outreach activities, but also available for additional pastoral staff, a business administrator, educational assistance, and the great training needs."

According to the report, pastors and others need training in management and finance, program and project management, team and task force organization, and the utilization of volunteers. Thus, the fifth suggestion was that local conferences design and provide education development and training programs as soon as possible.

Lastly, the report recommended communicating its findings and recommendations to the General Conference and North American Division, so the Pacific Union can join them and appropriate laymember representatives in pursuing further studies. A list of 12 areas needing attention were given: mission and priorities, new resources (re-examination of tithe and other fund formulas), constitutional changes, compensation and reward systems, representation of laymembers and election system, a communication network, new roles for publications and media, foundations and trusts direction, performance evaluation system, integrated strategic planning, as well as integrated conference and institutional systems, time schedules and bench marks.

To prepare the report, the committee went through five procedures. Loma Linda University statistician David Abbey surveyed pastors, lay church members, Association of Self-Supporting Institutions members, local conference employees, and union workers. He passed out 2,500 questionnaires to use in compiling information. Secondly, over 450 in-depth interviews were conducted at eight select churches, three local conferences, and the union. One committee member compiled all the relevant information on organization structure from the writings of Ellen G. White. Business consultant Paul Cone contributed organizational theories from the financial world. Finally, committee members read materials currently in print by Adventist leaders on organizational structure.

Summarizing the findings of approximately 450 interviews in churches, conferences, and the union office, the report said, "Most agree that the church organization structure needs to be cut back. Except for its feet, the elephant is too big. What part of the elephant you personally believe is too big depends on your perspective, but all groups surveyed concur that more funds and effort need to go where the mission is accomplished—the local church."

Former Loma Linda University President David J. Bieber chaired the six-member committee. He will also chair the new 39-member group appointed to implement the report. Composition of this large second committee will be: nine people from the local conference offices, one (non-administrative) union conference representative, one retired worker, and the balance divided among the various conference constituencies, with lay members to outnumber by one the pastors selected within the conference constituencies.

According to one Pacific Union Conference official the report cost approximately $50,000, which the union considered a bargain because much of the consultant's services were donated.

Responses

Prisoners and Capital Punishment

To the Editors: The March issue of the *Spectrum,* vol. 13, no. 3), contains a stimulating article "I Was in Prison" by Tom Dybdahl, and I would like to share with you some comments in this respect.

I sincerely appreciate his compassion for the people behind bars, and I commend him for his efforts to alleviate their plight. Nevertheless, we must not lose sight of the fact that we are dealing here with very complex issues, and that society at large is not necessarily the villain, or the only villain in this case, as some people like to contend.

When reading the article under discussion, one has to keep in mind that actually the author is bringing up two distinct subjects. On one hand he talks about the judicial process and the administration of justice. On the other hand, the author discusses the death penalty; in this article, this distinction became blurred.

The author emphasized that he is opposed to the death penalty, and I fully respect his convictions. However, his statement that "opponents have most of the logical arguments on their side" is a sweeping generalization. I think it would be helpful, if the author, just for the sake of discussion, listed a few of those logical arguments. He also stated, "Jesus accepted execution to save us all from that fate." What fate? Did Christ get the repentant thief off the cross? We should not confuse freedom from damnation with freedom from penalty for our misdeeds.

Since the author is making references to the Scripture, I feel at liberty to do the same, and will begin with a statement of the Lord: "Who so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man" (Genesis 9:6). This was declared by the Lord centuries before the promulgation of the Mosaic code.

One frequent argument in discussions of this subject is that the Decalogue states, "Thou shalt not kill." A scholar of the Hebrew language explained to me that in Hebrew, like in English, there are two verbs concerning homicide. One verb is equivalent to the English "to kill," that pertains among others to accidental death and to killing in war, and the other verb means to commit premeditated murder, which would be equivalent to our judicial term "with malice aforethought." This scholar emphasized also that this commandment reads in the original Hebrew "Thou shalt not commit murder."

This concept is further amplified in chapter 35 of the book of Numbers, but for the sake of brevity I quote here just the salient points: ". . . for blood it defileth the land: and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it. Defile not therefore the land . . . for I the Lord dwell among the children of Israel" (vs. 33–34).

I can hear now loud objections that these were provisions of the old covenant, and that we are now under the covenant of grace, as also the author has pointed out in his article. Well, did the Lord have a change of mind? Did He adopt now the "situation ethics" philosophy? In Malachi 3:6 the Lord declared unmistakably, ". . . I am the Lord, I change not."

Tom Dybdahl stated also "There is no evidence that capital punishment deters anyone else from killing." This is a rather specious argument. While it is true that not everybody will be deterred by the threat of punishment, we do not know on the other side how many lives were saved in actuality when the potential killer got some second thoughts.

I assume that St. Paul, the great apostle of grace, wrote under inspiration when he said in his letter to the Romans—issued under the reign of Nero—"For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil . . . For he (the power, the ruler) is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil" Romans 13:3–4).

Here Paul with one bold master stroke of his pen irrefutably linked together deterrence with service to God, and it is only to be hoped that the sword will remain sharp and swift to protect the innocent.

During the war I saw some of my buddies felled by quick bullets, and I heard the screams of agony of another whose foot was blown off by a shell. When a country has the right to demand that some of its best men yield their lives on the battlefield, that country should not be denied the right to claim the life of a person who willfully terminated the life of another human being.

Erwin Krueger
Redlands, CA

To the Editors: I greatly appreciated Tom Dybdahl's sensitive presentation in *Spectrum,* (vol. 13, no. 3). However, as a physician outside the prison system, I have a different perspective than does Mr. Dybdahl. I deal with the victims—victims whose needs or rights are also largely unaddressed.

Regardless of what other considerations there may be, it appears obvious that imposition of the death penalty will have no measurable deterrent effect given our present system of "justice" with its interminable delays and endless appeals—appeals which often have nothing to do with either guilt or appropriate punishment.

As a church we should have a multifaceted approach to crime:

- Crime prevention education especially directed to meet the needs of children, the elderly, and the poor—the latter are often the worst victims of crime.
- Assistance for victims in two ways:
  1. Direct community-church support, emotional, spiritual, and financial.
  2. Promotion of a state run, financially self-sustaining, pooled (from increased fines, legally mandated seizures) program of restitution to victims.
- Direct, personal evangelism (financed by some other mechanism than a computerized mail campaign).
- A non-sectarian organization that could work with similar groups, of whatever origin, for criminal law and prison reform, and modification of the entire judicial system. This organization should focus on attainable goals, a few of which might be:
  1. Alternatives to prisons as they now exist with special emphasis on rehabilitation of younger prisoners and separation of these and properly selected "first-timers" from "street-wise," hardened criminals.
  2. Fostering productive work and education programs within the prison system.
  3. Monitoring judicial review to ensure promptness and due process and to work toward elimination of reversals on merely technical grounds where justice is not served.
  4. Equal penalties among the states for similar crimes.
  5. Equal justice. This would largely eliminate the death penalty except in cases of the killing of law - enforcement officers and special circumstance killings. A move in this direction would be a less controversial, more likely successful, start against capital punishment.
  6. Establishment of an advisory council outside the legal system to:
     a) Provide resource information to any person accused of a capital crime, or at risk of long term imprisonment should he plead guilty or be convicted, and, on request, to any prisoner accused of a felony.
     b) Investigate charges of abuse or abrogation of human rights.
     c) Establish basic criteria of experience and competency for defense counsel.
     d) Ensure regular inspection of prison facilities for proper sanitation, humane supervision, adequate food, and adequate medical care.
     e) Monitor the above for compliance and systematically report derelictions for appropriate action to grand juries, attorneys general (local or state), legislative representatives and/or the media.
  7. An effectively empowered state board of legal quality assurance to:
     a) Establish criteria for specialization.
     b) Enforce continuing education in the legal profession.
     c) Suspend or disbar those guilty of incompetence, negligence, criminal misconduct or impairment due to diminished capacity from any cause (substance abuse, disease, senility, etc.).
  8. Educational and personal rehabilitation for lawyers and judges who have been disciplined.

Such a program tries to encompass some of the other needs expressed in Matthew 25:35, 36. Can we really be at God's right hand if we are content just to visit those in prison?

Gordon W. Thompson, M.D.
Loma Linda, CA

Dybdahl Responds

Mr. Krueger notes correctly that my *Spectrum* article on "Prisons" makes some broad generalizations about the death penalty. I would like to briefly defend my claims.

The deterrence theory is used by almost all supporters of capital punishment, but the facts do not support it. The best evidence against this theory is that states with the death penalty do not have lower homicide rates than states without the death penalty, even when they are neighboring states with relatively similar demographics. When states without the death penalty have reinstated it, there has been no significant change in the murder rate. Similarly, abolishing the death penalty in particular states has not seemed to affect the number of homicides in those states.

I also take issue with Mr. Krueger's understanding of scripture. The death penalty is clearly supported in the Old Testament for a variety of crimes, including blasphemy and sabbathbreaking. But the eye for eye formula did not establish the death penalty. Rather, there was an attempt to limit the vengeance to something roughly equal to the crime.

Jesus spoke directly to this point in the sermon on the mount. "You have heard that it was said: an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. But I say to you . . . " Matthew 5: 38, 39. Instead of vengeance, Jesus prescribed mercy.

When confronted with the woman taken in adultery—a capital crime according to the Old Testament—Jesus did not support her execution. Whoever is without sin can throw the first stone, he said. The point seems clear: None of us is good enough to decide whether someone else should live or die.

Finally, I cannot agree with Mr. Krueger's interpretation of Romans 13:3, 4. Governments are often a terror to good people. At this moment, in various places around the world, people are being imprisoned and tortured for crimes like sabbathkeeping, concern for human rights, or refusal to kill or betray their countrymen. Government support for capital punishment in no way makes it a legitimate or proper activity for Christians.

Tom Dybdahl
New Orleans, LA

On Pacific Press

To the Editors: A statement by Martin Kemmerer, Tom Miller, and Otho Eusey to the Pacific Press board, quoted by George Colvin in *Spectrum* vol. 13, no. 3, cries out for reply. The statement—"the press . . . in the past only rarely made commercially viable operating gains"—is obviously false. No organization, certainly not the unsubsidized Pacific Press, could have attained the position of financial independence, even preeminence, among Adventist institutions enjoyed by Pacific Press by the early 1970s without quite substantial and long sustained "commercially viable operating gains." This statement also contradicts one by Pacific Press board chairman L. L. Bock, also quoted by Colvin in the same article, indicating that "in the early 1970s . . . the press was financially secure."

As a Pacific Press trade book editor for nearly 14 years I observed—particularly and increasingly toward the latter part of that period—either lack of management decision or disastrous decision, each occurrance unintentionally designed to dismantle that venerable establishment as rapidly as is humanly possible. Colvin, as an outside observer, was only able to list some (e.g., Montemorelos, the two web presses and their utilization, continued subsidy without reform of such unviable publications as *Listen* magazine, unrealistic or nonexistant job estimates, Quixote-like legal jousting with the United States government, etc.). He omitted others (e.g., gullible purchase of astronomically expensive and quickly outmoded computer equipment, installation of paranoidally grandoise security systems, unnecessary wholesale remodeling and refurbishing, unjustifiable and unproductively oriented travel itineraries and budgets, etc.).

My own experience begs me to elaborate yet another crucial factor Colvin only touched. "Books," he wrote, "were producing losses which some former editors suggest were brought on by management's uncritical approach to the books' potential salability." While nearly all of the above listed factors involved only unfortunate expenditures (hemorrhages), this one involved choking off of vital income as well.

Manuscript acquisitions consisted primarily of inspecting the mail for unsolicited proposals and manuscripts, and of basing acceptances on the amount of production needed to keep the "factory" operating at an accustomed level. Trade books were considered "filler" for the prevention of machinery becoming idle from lack of work. Spoken justification for accepting manuscripts which would produce losses was that the press needed to provide enough of these projects to carry the share of overhead that other projects would otherwise have to bear, to keep the overhead "spread around."

Exacerbating this problem was the press penchant for accepting manuscripts submitted by people in positions of influence over it (General Conference presidents, union conference presidents, publishing leaders, etc.) with little or no regard to salability or even to the intrinsic value or lack of same in the materials submitted.

Further exacerbation involved the affinity for manuscripts biased toward the right-wing-legalistic-perfectionistic end of the SDA theological-philosophical spectrum. That one does not stack all his load on the right side of his canoe is, I fear, a truism the Pacific Press book publishing committee has even at this late hour to learn. It may surprise even some in the middle or on the left that such books *do not sell, not even among Adventists* (Walton's *Omega* notwithstanding, due to its essential sensationalism, which still does sell, even among Adventists).

No genius is required to extricate a publishing house from such a predicament. Well-established rules of the trade suffice: (1) serious market research, (2) intelligent development of books that meet known marketplace criteria, (3) polite but firm refusal to every manuscript or proposal that fails those criteria regardless of politics, and (4) perceptive targeting of an appropriate market for each title. But with considerable pain I state categorically that press management was profoundly disinterested in applying such corrective measures despite repeated appeals through the years by myself and others.

To be a bit more personal, let me say that for years, knowing that the press would lose money (often in large amounts) on every copy of nearly every trade title published, I was, nevertheless, compelled to edit them and see them through the production process. Although I continually read and reported negatively on submitted manuscripts which failed the "salability" test, my recommendations were so routinely ignored or overridden that I was made continually aware of my near total lack of influence at Pacific Press.

General economic conditions cannot explain the plight of Pacific Press. After all, the press weathered the Great Depression without laying off the head of a single household. Wrong and mistaken actions or inaction on the part of management go a long way toward explaining it—action or inaction on the part of men rather ignorant in the main of the publishing business, careless of blunt economic signs and signals all around them, and unwilling and/or unable to adapt to changing conditions within the SDA Church and without—men in nowhere near the same entrepreneurial league as such earlier management representatives as James White, to cite but one.

The fact that the self-indulgent blunders took so long—a decade—to show up so glaringly and so painfully is but another *tribute* to the press' financial *health* during my first few years there. How long does it take a rider to weaken and destroy a strong and magnificent steed through careless ignorance of the creature's true needs and abilities?

Max Gordon Phillips
Sunnyvale, CA

Spectrum Advisory Council

Charlene and Floyd Anderson
Lucille and Alan Anderson
Julie and Charles Bensonhaver
Ramona and Len Bierlein
Ben R. Boice
LeJean and Allen Botimer
Neridah and Bernard Brandstater
Betty and Bruce Branson
Mary and Floyd Brauer
Merrilyn and Ray Brown
Marilyn and Robert Burman
Harold S. Campbell
Dos and Molleurus Couperus
Eryl Cummings
Walter Cummings
Elsie and Raymond Damazo
Thelma and Lloyd Dayes
Mary and James Dunn
Mary and Wilfred Eastman
Juanita and Richard Engel
Nancy Engeset
Janine and Wilmer Engevik
Mary and Rene Evard
Lois and Walt Fahlsing
Erika and Jim Fallbeck
Marjorie and Albert Farver
Karen and Ronald Fasano
Beth and Jack Fleming
Joy and Gerry Fuller
G. Elaine Giddings
Joyce and David Grauman
Nadine and Gordon Hale
Deanne and David Hanscom
Cheryl and Milford Harrison
Sally and Robert Hasselbrack
Donald Hawley
Hanna and Hjaltar Helmerson
Claudette and Jack Hennemann
Margaret and Wilfred Huse
Marjorie and John Jacobson
Liv and Eugene Joergenson
Dorothy and Bernarr Johnson
Genevieve and Paul Johnson
Katie and Richard Johnson
Marga and Elton Kerr
Dorane and William King
Claire and Richard Knierim
Ruth and Edward Komarniski
Albert and Elizabeth Koppel
Doreen and Irwin Kuhn
Verla and Alvin Kwiram
Karen and Mel Lake
Anita and Robert Lang
Roberta and Bradley Litchfield
Ewald Lonser
Heidi and Richard Ludders
Thelma McAdoo
Irene and Kenneth McGill
Marguerite and Robert Marsh
Iola and Julius Martin
Neva and Bill Meek
Ken and Mary Moe
Jacqueline and Robert Moncrieff
Lyla Neumann
Valerie and Glenn Patchen
Marilyn and Daniel Patchin
Sharon and Thomas Pello
Cecilia and Ernest Plata
Verna and Winslow B. Randall
Martha and Alfredo Rasi
Arlene and Merlin Reeder
Carole and Gordon Rick
Anieta and William Rippey
Thais and James Sadoyama
Ursula and Donald Shasky
Gordon and Lovina Short
Grace and Walter Stilson
Carlene and Leonard Taylor
Dort and Nancy Tikker
Dorwin and Faye Tompkins
Lou Anne and Thorvaldur Torfason
Maredith and Rudy Torres
Ken Tucker
Nancy and Robin Vandermolen
Nancy and John Vogt
Ella Mae and Harold Wallar
Carol and Bruce Walter
Karla and Kenneth Walters
Janice and Harry Wang
Barbara and Rodney Willard
Vicki and Chuck Woofter
Morton Woolley

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:

Raymond S. Damazo, Chairman
855 106th Avenue N.E.
Bellevue, WA 98004
(206) 454-2722 Office
(206) 455-4522 Residence

For other information about the Association of Adventist Forums call: (301) 270-0423