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About This Issue

Persons are as important as ideas or institutions. A single life provides the foundation for Christianity. We wish to honor one person who was a model Adventist Christian. Gillis Erenius, professor of jurisprudence at the University of Stockholm and administrator of the Supreme Court of Sweden, was formerly one of the judges on Sweden's second highest court, the Court of Appeals. He also actively served as a consulting editor of Spectrum. Although he grew up in an Adventist home, Gillis did not meet another Adventist lawyer—let alone an Adventist judge—until he visited the United States in early middle-age. Gillis Erenius, in mid-career, died earlier this year in Stockholm. We join his family and friends—in the church and in Swedish public life—in expressing our gratitude for having known a person whose life was both diverse and whole, the embodiment of a Christian gentleman.

This issue of Spectrum celebrates the lives of some other Adventists who have remained faithful to their principles in the most unusual, even dangerous circumstances. Humberto Noble Alexander reviews 22 years of witnessing in a Cuban jail. John Kelley gives his reasons for ignoring death threats while helping to ensure fair elections in El Salvador. Lowell Tarling describes the response of a young Adventist couple to the workings of the Australian judicial system.

In addition, Spectrum continues to report on one of the most significant developments in the life of Adventists in North America: the increasing awareness that women deserve to be treated and recognized by the institutional church on an equal footing with men.

—The Editors
Women and the Church

1. Potomac Conference Yields: Baptisms by Women Halted

by Roy Branson with Diane Gainer

The General Conference officers have rejected the proposal by the Potomac Conference that baptisms by women pastors be at least discussed—if not approved—by the Annual Council, and that a committee be established to discuss at greater length the distinct issue of granting ministerial licenses to women. September 18 the officers decided not to take such a step-by-step approach to the role of women in ministry, and insisted that these topics be addressed only within the larger question of whether the world church approves of ordaining women. The officers voted to recommend that the Annual Council establish a special committee, with representatives from each world division and the Biblical Research Institute, to re-study the policy and theological ramifications of ordaining women. This special committee is to report to Spring Council, which will presumably make recommendations to the 1985 General Conference Session. The question of whether women pastors in the Potomac Conference can baptize will have been escalated to the issue of whether the world church agrees to ordain women throughout the denomination.

A month earlier, in a meeting with the same General Conference officers, the Potomac Conference Executive Committee agreed to “table” its earlier action authorizing the licensing of the women pastors in their conference. Members of the Potomac Conference Committee understood that the General Conference officers would not find it difficult to at least recommend approval of baptizing by women pastors. Now, the committee must decide which is more important: cooperating with the world church, or affirming the ministry of its women pastors by holding to its May 16 action to grant them ministerial licenses. Since the beginning of 1984, the three women, trained at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary who have several years of pastoral experience each, have baptized 12 people in six different baptismal services.

On Aug. 16, Neal Wilson and the officers of the General Conference (vice presidents, treasurers, secretaries) summoned the executive committee of the Potomac Conference to come to the General Conference building for a five-hour meeting. The discussion revolved around the action of the Potomac Conference in May authorizing ministerial licenses for three trained and experienced female pastors: Jan Daffern, Marsha Frost, and Frances Wiegand. (The May 16 action of the conference stated that implementation of the authorization was to take place
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after the 1984 Annual Council; see Spectrum, Vol. 15, No. 2.) Neal Wilson, in an hour-long presentation, repeated in public what for weeks he and other officers had been saying forcefully in private. The issue was no longer simply one of women in pastoral ministry, but one of church authority. The local conference must rescind its interpretation of church policy, acknowledging that the status of women pastors must be determined by the General Conference and the North American Division.

Three-quarters of the way through the afternoon, the Potomac Conference president, Ronald Wisbey, volunteered on behalf of the committee to table the May 16 action to license women pastors in the Potomac Conference. The conference also "respectfully recommended" that church leaders:

- consider authorizing participation in the ceremony of baptism by ordained church elders (even in the presence of an ordained minister) when that ordained elder has received prescribed theological training from church institutions and is serving in a pastoral role in the church where the baptism takes place;
- establish a study group, including representatives from conferences with women in ministry, to explore the feasibility of granting ministerial licenses to women pastors, either on a world-wide or local basis. The conference added that if, following the recommendations of a study group, pilot programs were established, "the Potomac Conference would appreciate being involved;"
- accept the fact that there are those, including the Potomac Conference Committee, who believe the time should come when women in the Seventh-day Adventist Church will be accepted as fully equal to men without being viewed as a threat to church authority.

In response, Wilson promised that if the conference approved tabling its May 16 action to license its women pastors, he would take up with the General Conference officers the possibility of changing the Church Manual in the manner suggested by the Potomac Conference. Earlier in the discussions, the president had acknowledged that over several years the General Conference had adopted official actions encouraging women to enter pastoral ministry, including providing financial assistance for women to study at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. Wilson also noted that many letters had been received from church members on this subject—almost all supporting women in ministry. It was time, he said, that the church either admit it had made mistakes in encouraging women to enter the pastorate or make positive moves to make women equal in the Adventist ministry.

In effect, the Potomac Conference Committee on Aug. 16 dropped its insistence that denominational working policy does not prohibit local conferences from granting licenses to women pastors. (A subject of differing interpretations is an Annual Council action regarding women in ministry not written into the actual Working Policy. In its Oct. 17, 1977, form the action reads: 1. "Adoption of 'Associates in Pastoral Care' to identify persons who are employed on pastoral staffs but who are not in line for ordination. 2. To agree that persons employed in this type of work should initially receive a missionary license and eventually missionary credentials.") While committee members like Robert Coy, deputy general counsel of the Veteran's Administration, do not believe denominational policy specifically prohibits conferences granting ministerial licenses to women, Ronald Wisbey and the Potomac Conference Executive Committee acquiesced to the postponement of granting licenses to women until the highest levels of the church agree—sometime. At the meeting, Neal Wilson predicted that it would
take at least two years for such a consensus to form.

However, many conference committee members are adamant that they have not removed themselves permanently from the decision about what they now describe as a distinct issue: whether the women pastors in their conference will be able to baptize—their Aug. 16 action says, “by the end of the current calendar year.” Coy understands the language of “tabling” an action already adopted as a “step sideways, not backwards.” The committee, he says, is cooperating “in good faith” with the General Conference to see that women pastors can baptize “until that faith is destroyed.”

Nancy Marter, a member of not only the Potomac Conference Committee but also the General Conference Committee on the Role and Function of Denominational Organizations, agrees that the conference committee took its latest action in good faith; she also says that ultimately, members of “the conference committee must follow our consciences.” Londis insists that “the sine qua non for many—if not all—members of the conference committee is their deep conviction that this is a moral issue: God is calling the Adventist church, as he did the early Christian church, to bring all members into full equality in Christ. This cannot occur without the SDA ministry acting as a model. That is why for the committee the moral and spiritual demands of this issue take precedence over details of policy.”

Meanwhile, the conference committee members stress the positive statements made to them by Neal Wilson and church leaders. Ron Halvorsen, who recently moved from the Mid-America Union, where he was director of the Ministerial Department, to become senior pastor of the Takoma Park Church, says that “Elder Wilson asked the conference committee to trust denominational leadership. I would be very surprised if church leadership didn’t approve women pastors in North America baptizing soon—certainly before the General Conference Session. If that doesn’t happen I will be surprised and shocked.”
2. National Conference Petitions Church Leaders on Role of Women

by Judith P. Nembhard

At a time when, for the first time, a woman is running for the office of vice president of the United States, several developments within the denomination have focused attention on the role of women in the North American Adventist Church: the General Conference has established an ad hoc commission on women; Dr. Helen Ward Evans was appointed the vice president of academic affairs at Loma Linda University—the first woman to hold such a position at an Adventist college or university; and women pastors are beginning to baptize new members into the church (see Spectrum, Vol. 15, No. 2).

But one of the most important of recent events was the conference organized this summer by the Association of Adventist Women, July 11 to 15, on the campus of Andrews University. The National Conference of the association brought together 120 registered participants from places as diverse as California, Washington, Kentucky, and Canada. From these meetings, three topics or actions emerged as particularly significant: the progress of women in ministry 11 years after the Biblical Research Institute held its own conference on the subject; the resolutions adopted by the conference concerning major issues facing Adventist women; and the recognition by the association, in its Women of the Year awards, of the often-overlooked achievements of Adventist women.

The principal organizers of the conference were Kit Watts, of the James White Library of Andrews University, and Iris Yob, on leave from Avondale College in Australia. They, with other women of the Michiana Chapter of the association, planned and executed the two-part conference: a two-day pre-session concentrating on a review of the 1973 Biblical Research Conference at Camp Mohaven ("Council on the Role of Women in the Seventh-day Adventist Church"), and the regular national conference of the association. The national conference began with a banquet on Thursday evening and ended with an awards luncheon on Sunday.

Women In Ministry

The pre-session reviewed the scholarly papers presented at the Camp Mohaven symposium. That 1973 conference was significant as the first official step taken by the Seventh-day Adventist Church to study the role of women in church ministry. In giving the historical background to Mohaven, Gordon Hyde, then the director of the Biblical Research Institute, pointed out that in 1973 other denominations were already moving vigorously ahead on the question of ordaining women. At Camp Mohaven, scholars and administrators deliberated for five days, presenting 27 scholarly papers on the role of women in the church. Ten years later, at
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the pre-session, the Biblical Research Institute made a bound, mimeographed volume of some of the papers available for the first time.

Participants in the pre-session raised the question of how far the church has come since 1973. Gordon Hyde, now chairperson of the religion faculty at Southern College, responded, "My cynical reaction is—not very far," and he suggested that research be done to determine the extent of progress. However, at the pre-session, some developments that have favored women were noted.

First, in response to resolutions made at Mohaven, the General Conference gave limited approval to ordaining women as local elders. A growing number of women now serve the church in this capacity; in some churches women hold head elderships.

Second, the category of "Women in Pastoral Care" has been introduced into the ministry of the church. The Potomac, Southeastern California, and Upper Columbia conferences have each employed several women pastors. In addition, all three women in pastoral ministry in the Potomac Conference have been baptizing. On May 16, the Potomac conference executive committee voted to grant these pastors ministerial licenses (see Spectrum, Vol. 15, No. 2).

A third development is the ad hoc committee on women, appointed by the General Conference Office of Human Relations. The nine-woman panel met on March 17. After electing Alice Smith, a former associate director of the department of health and temperance, as its chairperson, the group recommended that the committee be extended, rather than disbanding after a second meeting, as was orginally intended by the General Conference.

Finally, the ordination of women, the issue which brought the Mohaven participants together 11 years ago, is still being discussed. According to Gordon Hyde, it is "the most emotionally-laden cause in the church," but he can see "no justification for the attitude." The consensus of the scholars at Mohaven 11 years ago, as well as the consensus of many of the church’s scholars and administrators in North America today, is that there is no theological basis for refusing to ordain women.

## Resolutions on Women

Among the resolutions adopted by the 1984 national conference of the Association of Adventist Women were the following resolutions concerning women in the Adventist ministry.

—The Editors

**WE RESOLVE** that the Office of Human Relations be asked to request the Biblical Research Institute to make available copies of The Mohaven Papers and the BRI papers on women to leaders of the church, such as pastors, administrators, and teachers.

**WHEREAS** the 1973 and 1974 Annual Councils, and the 1975 Spring Meeting prepared the way for women to become local church elders, and to become associates in pastoral care, and WHEREAS various church bodies—local, conference, and union—and particularly the Southern California, Southeastern California, Upper Columbia, Potomac, and Oregon Conferences and the Lake Union have responded to these actions.

**WE THEREFORE RESOLVE** to request the Association of Adventist Women to express appreciation to those conferences who have recommended the ordination of women as local church elders and those local churches who have elected them, and **WE FURTHER RESOLVE** to request the Association of Adventist Women to express appreciation to these conferences and their respective unions, as well as other churches as they come to the attention of the Association of Adventist Women: 1) for their recognition of women as capable of serving the church in the pastoral ministry, 2) for encouraging and fostering the role of women in this capacity, and 3) for continuing to support these women who have responded to the call of God to serve the body of Christ.

**WHEREAS** the 1973 and 1974 Annual Councils, and the 1975 Spring Meeting prepared the way for women to become local church elders and to become Associates in Pastoral Care, and...
Resolutions for Action

The Association of Adventist Women, officially organized June 13, 1982, has as one of its goals that of acquainting the Adventist community with the potential and achievements of women in the church. The resolutions adopted by the conference (not by the executive committee or by the membership of the association) lead to this goal. The various resolutions call for women to participate more fully in the official affairs of the denomination, to recommend ways that the laity can be informed of the role of women in the church, and to propose actions to counteract the erosion of the Seventh-day Adventist family.

Reflecting the concerns of the pre-session, the conference adopted a resolution requesting the executive committee of the Association of Adventist Women to appoint a special "nationwide task force of articulate persons, astute in church structures, to serve as a liaison and source of information between the church and the association, on issues relating to ordination." Participants also resolved to express their appreciation of local church conferences that have encouraged the ordination of local women elders and of licenses for women pastors (see box).

Citing the conflict between lay members and church employees who still believe that there are theological and biblical reasons for barring women from participating in ministry and those who are convinced that there are no such barriers, the group called for the Office of Human Relations to communicate with the editors of the Adventist Review, Ministry, and the union conference papers, encouraging them to feature articles on the role of women in the Adventist Church. Another resolution calls for the Association of Adventist Women to commission a series of monographs on women and to set up a lending library on women, which will operate through the mail. The association is also request that the North American Division include a workshop on women in its 1985 "Compleat Administrators Seminar" and make the workshop available to workers' meetings and to campmeetings.

As Pat Habada, from the General Conference department of education, and Nancy Vyhmeister, assistant professor of Missions...
at Andrews University, noted during the pre-session, women are not adequately represented on any level of Adventist church administration. The conference also noted that many positions not requiring ordination exist in the church, and it adopted a resolution requesting that the North American Division officers widely publish the openings for these positions. A related resolution requests that C.E. Bradford, vice president for North America, and the office of the North American Division both encourage organizations and institutions to increase the number of women on appointed committees and boards to a minimum of 10 to 15 percent within the next two years.

These resolutions seem to be in tune with current thinking at church headquarters. Gary Ross, Neal Wilson's official representative to the conference, in his address Thursday evening, spoke of Wilson's personal commitment to a "decisive and radical increase in the number of women in the decision-making process in the Seventh-day Adventist Church—local conference, union conference, and General Conference."

To help women become more fully acquainted with the administrative structure of the church and to acquaint church leaders with women's leadership capabilities, one resolution calls for the North American Division Board of Higher Education to establish a center or centers for women's studies on selected campuses within the next quinquennium. Further, the conference resolved to request that the Board of Higher education establish a Commission on Women on each college and university campus; one of the functions of the commissions will be to develop courses in women's studies.

Another resolution for which the participants voiced strong support was one which requested the North American Division Curriculum Committee of the General Conference department of education to include family management skills as part of the education of Seventh-day Adventist youths. These skills include building strong family relationships and learning sound financial management.

**Women of the Year Awards**

The third area of the conference that has generated enthusiasm was the efforts of the association to identify and commend women in the Adventist Church for their contributions to home and community life, work life, and church life. Under the direction of Peggy Harris, a business person from Maryland, a panel of General Conference and Association of Adventist Women leaders selected the 1984 Women of the Year Awards: Lenora McDowell, Avon Park, Fla., was cited for her many accomplishments as home and school leader of Walker Memorial Junior Academy; Anita Mackey, Santa Barbara, Calif., was selected for her career contributions as a social worker and civic leader; and Mary Walsh, Glendale, Calif., was honored for her many contributions as a Bible worker, church pastor, camp meeting speaker, and author.

An awards booklet, edited by Viveca Black, director of development for the Boys and Girls Clubs of Greater Washington, lists brief biographical sketches of not only the three women who received awards, but also of each of the other 65 women who were nominated. The awards booklet reveals a pool of Adventist women with divers skills and occupations. One has written seven books and has served as vacation bible school director; another is co-founder of a city-wide, inter-church, sharing organization; a head elder conducts Five-day Plans and stress control clinics, and is active in the Dorcas Society; a retired physician uses her time to conduct blood pressure tests in shopping centers. Others include retired missionaries, teachers, nurses, homemakers, ministers' wives, Bible workers—all serving the church in some way.
The second national conference of the Association of Adventist Women—unlike the first—has led to increased communication between Adventist women and the General Conference leadership. President Neal Wilson sent a representative, Warren S. Banfield, director of the Office of Human relations; Jocelyn Fay, managing editor of the *Adventist Review*; Elizabeth Sterndale and Iris Hayden, associate directors of the General Conference department of health and temperance; and Edward Zinke, associate director of the Biblical Research Institute, attended as well. These General Conference representatives presented a half-hour report on the conference to the General Conference Executive Committee.

On July 23, after the conference, some of the conference organizers and participants exchanged views with J.R. Spangler, editor of *Ministry*, and Neal Wilson, president of the General Conference, on several subjects which included the licensing and ordination of women. During his 45 minute statement on a variety of topics, Neal Wilson made it plain that he thought no conference in North America should license women as pastors until the world church approved. No doubt, Adventist women in subsequent meetings will continue to discuss and seek action on this and on other vital issues.


The 23-person Council on the Role of Women in the Seventh-day Adventist Church was chaired by W.J. Hackett, then a General Conference vice president and chairman of the Biblical Research Institute. The secretary was Gordon M. Hyde, then the director of the Biblical Research Institute. The council met September 16-19 at Camp Mohaven in Ohio. Within days, the report printed below was submitted to Annual Council. The 1973 Annual Council voted to receive the report and send it to the world divisions for their study. Because of objections from the world divisions the 1974 Annual Council refused to move towards ordination of women as ministers, but acknowledged that women were being ordained as local church elders.

In April, 1976 the Biblical Research Institute General Council voted that "it sees no serious theological objection to the ordination of women to various offices, including the ministry."

—The Editors

In recognition of the growing evidence of the imminence of return of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of the consequent demand for the utilization of every personal resource available to the Church in fulfilling her commission, the Council was led to the following positions:

1. With due recognition of evident individual differences, the equality of all believers was established by creation and is being restored through redemption in Jesus Christ (Gen. 1, 2; Gal. 3:28; 3T 484).

2. Redemption of believers in Jesus Christ is shared by them with others through the
proclamation of the gospel, in which all believers participate. To aid in this sharing role the Holy Spirit has seen fit to pour gifts upon all (Joel 2:28, 29).

3. As a further aid in carrying out its mission, the Church by divine appointment bestows on certain members specific functions and recognizes the divine calling by ordination.

4. In harmony with the following statement, we see no significant theological objection to the ordination of women to Church ministries:

"Women who are willing to consecrate some of their time to the service of the Lord should be appointed to visit the sick, look after the young, and minister to the necessities of the poor. They should be set apart to this work by prayer and laying on of hands. In some cases they will need to counsel with the church officers or the minister; but if they are devoted women, maintaining a vital connection with God, they will be a power for good in the church. This is another means of strengthening and building up the church. We need to branch out more in other methods of labor. Not a hand should be bound, not a soul discouraged, not a voice should be hushed; let every individual labor, privately or publicly, to help forward this grand work. Place the burdens upon men and women of the church, that they may grow by reason of the exercise, and thus become effective agents in the hand of the Lord for the enlightenment of those who sit in darkness." (Review and Herald, July 9, 1895, p. 271.)

On the basis of the above positions, it is Recommended,

1. Ordination Roles

a. That qualifications for church offices which require ordination (example, church elders and deacons) be listed without reference to sex. (The ordination of women to such offices does not seem contrary to the spirit of

the gospel nor to the specific counsel of Ellen G. White given above.)

b. That, while Inspiration provides no explicit directive in this matter, yet in view of the principles and the recommendation above, and the fact that the authority for selecting ordinands to the gospel ministry has been vested by God in his Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit,

(1) A pilot plan be formulated by the General Conference in Annual Council, enlisting qualified women to pastoral and evangelistic ministry in selected areas;

(2) Ministerial licenses be granted to the participants with the possibility of later ordination as the pilot plan may evidence its growing acceptance by the members of the church;

(3) As evidence is provided by the pilot program, the ordination of women to the gospel ministry be considered, if possible, by the 1975 General Conference session.

2. General Church Roles

That, since the function of the church involves the utilization of all its resources for the completion of its task, the eligibility of qualified women, representative of the women of the church, to participate with men in leadership and administrative roles at all levels, be recognized by the church.

3. Home and Family Roles

a. That, while we are advocating some wider roles for women in the church, we reaffirm the primacy of the home and family in the upbuilding of the church and as a soul-winning agency, and the significant roles of mothers and fathers in their responsibility of main-
taining the sanctity of the home in fulfilling its purpose and high calling, be fully appreciated;

b. That, in the family context, the husband-and-wife team called to the gospel ministry be recognized as an effective agency in the ministry of the church on the terms of the counsel contained in MS 43a, 1898 (GW 452, 453):

"The Minister's Wife. The minister is paid for his work, and this is well. And if the Lord gives the wife as well as the husband the burden of labor, and she devotes her time and strength to visiting from family to family and opening the Scriptures to them, although the hands of ordination have not been laid upon her, she is accomplishing a work that is in the line of ministry. Then should her labors be counted as naught?

"Injustice has sometimes been done to women who labor just as devotedly as their husbands, and who are recognized by God as being necessary to the work of the ministry. The method of paying men-laborers, and not paying their wives who share their labors with them, is a plan not according to the Lord's order, and if carried out in our conferences, is liable to discourage our sisters from qualifying themselves for the work they should engage in. God is a God of justice, and if the ministers receive a salary for their work, their wives, who devote themselves just as disinterestedly to the work, should be paid in addition to the wages their husbands receive, even though they may not ask for this.

"Seventh-day Adventists are not in any way to belittle woman's work. If a woman puts her housework in the hands of a faithful, prudent helper, and leaves her children in good care, while she engages in the work, the conference should have the wisdom to understand the justice of her receiving wages."

4. A Program of Education
That the General Conference initiate a program of education of the church, which will provide a wider understanding of the principles and recommendations of this Report.

5. Areas of Further Study
That, as a result of the council's work, a number of areas calling for further study be recognized, such as:

a. A fuller theology of the entire concept of ordination.

b. A fuller study of the lay ministries of the church.

c. A fuller study of the professional ministries of the church.
During 1984, the regular turnover of personnel at Adventist colleges took a new twist. Rather than simply switching from one school to another, a number of administrators and teachers moved out of Adventist higher education altogether. Two of the Adventist system's youngest college presidents have left to head non-Adventist institutions in American higher education. The Adventist Health Systems took at least seven administrators and faculty this year, including a vice president and a department chairperson from Andrews University, two department chairpeople from Pacific Union College, and faculty from Pacific Union, Southwestern, and Union Colleges. In addition, two senior members of the faculty of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary left for ministerial posts, and two theology teachers at Southern College were forced out of their positions. While these changes may mark advances in the careers of individuals, the changes also raise questions about the present state of Adventist higher education in North America, particularly about the qualifications currently necessary for career growth within the system and the diminishing pool of talented college administrators.

Presidents Dean Hubbard of Union College and Donald McAdams of Southwestern Adventist College have taken over the direction of non-Adventist institutions. Hubbard has become the president of Northwestern Missouri State College and McAdams has assumed the post of executive director of the Texas Independent College Fund. Joining the Adventist Health Systems/USA from Pacific Union College are Adrian Zytkoskee, chairperson of the behavioral science department; Kent Seltman, chairperson of the English Department; and Wayne Judd, a popular teacher in the history department. From Andrews University, the Adventist health system is gaining Donald Bauer, vice president for development; and Desmond Cummings, Jr., chairperson of the department of church and ministry in the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. Union College is contributing Jiggs Gallagher, director of college relations; and Southwestern Adventist College contributes John Anderson, a member of the division of business, consumer, and vocational services.

After years in teaching and administration, two distinguished members of the Seminary are returning to the ministry. Fritz Guy, professor of systematic theology, is joining the pastoral staff of the Loma Linda University Church, and James Cox, a professor of New Testament and president of Avondale College, is assuming the directorship of an urban ministry program for the Potomac Conference in the Washington,
D.C., metropolitan area. Ed Zackrison and Lorenzo Grant left Southern College's Division of Theology.

This drain of present and future administrative talent has taken place at a time when over the last two years, two-thirds of the Adventist colleges in North America have had to find new presidents. In addition, an unprecedented situation occurred when Andrews and Loma Linda Universities were looking for presidents at the same time.

**Andrews and Loma Linda Universities**

Andrews and Loma Linda Universities did break new ground, however, in the processes they followed to select their new presidents. Faculty were included in search/screening committees at both schools and minority candidates and Adventists working at secular institutions were included on at least the initial lists of possible presidential candidates.

At Andrews, tragedy prompted the search for a new president. On Oct. 13, 1983, Joseph Grady Smoot, the president for seven years, was arrested in Maryland and charged with fourth-degree sexual assault, a misdemeanor under Maryland law. He had allegedly solicited a plain clothes policeman that evening, after attending the General Conference Annual Council. Two-and-a-half weeks after his arrest, he announced his resignation. Meanwhile, after plea bargaining, the judge agreed to cancel the impending trial and place Smoot on limited probation. The board of trustees of Andrews voted to accept his resignation Nov. 9. Smoot is now at Pittsburgh State University where he is the vice president in charge of public relations, communications, and development.

At Loma Linda University, the need to find a new president arose in August 1983, when V. Norskov Olsen announced that at the close of the 1984 school year he would retire after a decade in the presidency. That gave the trustees a whole year to search for a new president, but when Andrews began its search, Loma Linda decided to speed up its process.

**While changes may mark advances in the careers of individuals, the changes raise questions about the present state of higher education in North America.**

Among the names considered by Loma Linda University were church members holding responsible positions in non-Adventist institutions. These include Benjamin Wygal, president of the 30,000 student Florida Junior College in Jacksonville, Fla.; Frank Hale, vice president of student affairs at Ohio State University; and Alvin Kwiram, chairman of the chemistry department at the University of Washington. In the end, the board of trustees promoted Norman J. Woods, vice president for academic affairs, to the Loma Linda University presidency. His academic background is in educational administration.

At Andrews University, a list of 10 candidates was published: James Cox, president of Avondale College; Fritz Guy, a seminary professor and former acting dean of the seminary; Dean Hubbard, president of Union College; William Johnson, editor of the *Adventist Review*; Sakae Kubo, president of Newbold College; Merlene Ogden, dean of the Andrews College of Arts and Sciences; Humberto Rasi, Pacific Press Editor and former dean of the Andrews Graduate School; Robert Reynolds, of the General Conference Board of Higher Education; Clifford Sorensen, president of Walla Walla College; and Richard Schwarz, Andrews' vice president for academic affairs. The search committee of the board narrowed that list to four by the time of the board meeting of Dec. 22. Clifford Sorensen, the
president of Walla Walla, was then chosen. He declined the post, to the amazement of the board. Charles Hirsch, the chairperson of the board, had already announced his name in the Adventist Review as the new president.

Subsequently, the board received three names from the search committee, with no preference listed. W. Richard Lesher, a general conference vice president, was selected. His selection was surprising since his name had not emerged in the search committees, earlier selections.

Union and Southwestern Colleges

The college presidents who have left denominational employ were two of the youngest in the North American Adventist college system and headed two schools whose enrollment increased during a period when other Adventist colleges were struggling for students. During the four years Dean Hubbard was president of Union College, the enrollment climbed from 888 to 1,040.

Not only did enrollment rise during the nine years Don McAdams was president of Southwestern Adventist College, but with the help of his vice president for finance, Marvin Anderson, the worth of the college assets tripled. The development office he opened raised $1 million in 1983. McAdams also selected the first woman as academic dean of an Adventist college, Helen Evans, and increased the number of faculty with doctorates from nine to 25. The Texas Independent College Fund, which he now directs, helps raise funds for all private colleges and universities in Texas, including Southern Methodist, Texas Christian, and Baylor Universities. The board of trustees unanimously selected Marvin Anderson, who has a doctorate in business, as McAdams' successor as president of Southwestern.

Southern College

Southern College did not lose its president, but over the summer, two prominent members of its theology department left as a result of continued problems between members of the board of trustees and individuals in the theology department. A call came for Lorenzo Grant from the Columbia Union to serve as chaplain to the Adventist students attending non-Adventist universities in Washington, D.C. (The North American Division shares in the cost of supporting such chaplaincies and the Southern Union agreed to pay for part of his salary, too.) The Lake Union made a similar call to Ed Zackrison, but he declined it. Southern College then initiated proceedings to terminate him.
He began grievance proceedings within the school’s guidelines and a faculty committee of five prepared to hear testimony. Over 30 faculty members were ready to testify in his defense. Then, on July 11, attorneys for the school and for Zackrison worked out a compromise in which Zackrison and his wife received a settlement offer reported to be worth over $200,000. The Zackrisons have moved to Southern California, where he plans to begin postdoctoral studies in marriage and family counseling.

CORRECTION

A line of type was inadvertently omitted from the essay by Roy Branson, "A Church Of, By, and For the People," appearing in the last issue (Vol. 15 No. 2). As a result, the meaning of two sentences on page six were confused. The sentences should have read: "Improving the structure of the church will not by itself bring a resurgence of the Adventist movement—anymore than repairing a house creates a home. More important than institutional frameworks is the quality of life the family of faith embodies—its sacrificial service to others, powerful preaching, and moving theology."
Eight days after his release from the Cuban prison where he had been held for 22 years, Humberto Noble Alexander, an Adventist ordained as a local elder, agreed to be interviewed by Ronald Geraty, M.D., a graduate of Loma Linda University School of Medicine and now the medical director of Fuller Memorial Hospital in Massachusetts.

One of 48 prisoners whose release Jesse Jackson obtained, Alexander had arrived in Boston on June 30 to be greeted by his older sister Paulina and his mother Berle. Two pastors sent by the local conference were also on hand to welcome Alexander.

Alexander was released following Jesse Jackson's negotiations with Castro. The significance of the release has been debated in the public press. Some have seen it as the result of skillful negotiating by the Reverend Jesse Jackson and evidence of Fidel Castro's willingness to open a dialogue with the U.S. On the other hand, some (including many of the prisoners themselves) see Fidel Castro as having used Jackson to demonstrate his magnanimity and to influence world public opinion.

Of the prisoners released, Alexander has been the most quoted and the most interviewed. He had just completed six hours of interviews by local, national, and international press when Spectrum interviewed him. In spite of this tiring schedule, he walked into the room with outstretched arms saying, "Finally, I am with brothers."

Inexplicably, though there had been an outpouring of interest and support from the world, national, and local press since his release, he had been visited by only four Seventh-day Adventists: the pastor from the Spanish church in Dorchester had brought him a Spanish Bible and a new Sabbath School quarterly, and three "sisters" from the local Seventh-day Adventist church had come to greet him.

As he spoke, there was a radiance in Alexander's face and excitement in his hoarse voice. His elderly mother sat in the room listening proudly and his sister often chimed in with information. Neither his sister nor his mother are Seventh-day Adventists. Both described his religion as "his own thing and he can do what he wants with that." He described how messages, letters, and news were smuggled in and out of jail and how the Bible used for worship services was hidden and retrieved. Some of his answers to Geraty's questions were "off the record" at his request.

According to his fellow prisoners, Alexander was a spiritual leader and counselor to them. The Wall Street Journal reported that when his prisonmates were depressed, they went to Alexander and he consoled them, letting them know that there was meaning to their suffering. The Boston Globe reported that Alexander was an organizer and leader of the underground church in jail.

In 1959, the revolution lead by Fidel Castro overthrew the government. In 1961, Fidel Castro declared himself a communist and in the
same year repelled an attack of Cubans and Americans in the Bay of Pigs. Less than a year later, President John F. Kennedy blockaded Cuba and forced the Russians to keep Cuba free of nuclear weapons.

—The Editors

Geraty: You must be glad to be free. How does it feel?

Alexander: Surely, I am. I feel like I was in a long sleep and have just awakened after 22 years. I am 50 years old now. Worn out as you can see.

Geraty: It has been reported in the newspapers that you served as a minister of the Seventh-day Adventist church in Cuba. When did you become a pastor?

Alexander: I was ordained an elder while I was in jail in 1980. I was in the Combinado del Este Jail. I was ordained by Pastor Pedro d’Arma. He was president of the Seventh-day Adventists in Havana. He ordained me just before he left the jail so that I could minister to my fellow prisoners. Before that time I was a deacon in the church in Marianao. Marianao is a section of Havana. There I was an assistant to Pastor Bascus.

Geraty: What kind of work were you doing before you went to jail?

Alexander: I owned my own workshop in Havana. I was a mechanic, a welder, and a rigger.

Geraty: When and how did you become a Seventh-day Adventist?

Alexander: I’ll tell you, that’s a long time ago. I was around 18 or 19 years old. I was living in the city of Guantanamo. There I met a Seventh-day Adventist family and became a Seventh-day Adventist.

Geraty: Wasn’t there an American armed forces base in Guantanamo?

Alexander: Yes. Once I worked there, long before Castro’s government. It was in 1950 when I became acquainted with the captain of the base. He was the base commander and he said he would get a job for me. I worked first as a caddy at the golf course and then later as a mechanic. About 1953, I stopped working there.

Geraty: Then what did you do?

Alexander: Well, I went to Havana and found a family, the Lamberts, who were contractors in steel buildings. I began working with them and Mr. Lambert formed a small company of steel work contractors. He taught me how to be an entrepreneur and I prepared my own workshop. It was at that time that I began to work with Pastor Bascus in the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Havana.

As quickly as the revolution came, we began to see many changes that weren’t right, but we were told to remember to preach the Gospel and not to meddle in political affairs.

Geraty: How did the Seventh-day Adventist Church view the government of Batista at that time?

Alexander: I didn’t think much about politics, but at that time the Seventh-day Adventist Church had no problem with the government. Of course, there were some people who had personal problems. I would visit a home and a parent would tell me, “Look, my son is having this problem with the government.” I would say, “Well, I will speak to your son and see what I can do to give him an aiding hand and keep him apart from that problem.” No. I would say that we had no feelings about the government at that time. I would try to help people with their problems, but they were just routine problems with the government, I think.

Geraty: What about the Castro government, beginning with the revolution? What impact did the revolution have on the Seventh-day Adventist Church and your work in Cuba?

Alexander: I’ll tell you. There was direct persecution from the very beginning; we knew that our church was being visited by
members of G2, the security and intelligence service. We knew that they were there checking everything. Well my church, I'm going to tell you the truth, was appalled from political fear. I used to speak with Pastor Bascus and we would say we didn't like this new government. As quickly as the revolution came we began to see many different changes that weren't right, but Pastor Bascus would say, "Remember we are here to preach the gospel and give the gospel to the people and not meddle in political affairs in the government." After Castro, I began to see churches being used as warehouses and then I knew what was coming. It was not everything at first, but little-by-little.

Geraty: Who was in charge of the Seventh-day Adventist churches in Cuba before the revolution?
Alexander: Let's see, I am not certain. It was either a Pastor Riffle or a Pastor Jacobs.

Geraty: Were they Americans?
Alexander: Yes.

Geraty: How did the church leadership change after the revolution?
Alexander: Well, I believe it was Pastor Bascus from Havana who was in charge of the church.

Geraty: How were these changes viewed by the Cuban Seventh-day Adventists?
Alexander: More or less the same. These changes were not part of our problems.

Geraty: Tell me, how were you jailed?
Alexander: Remember, I was living in Marianao, and I had family friends in Guantanamo. I used to travel sometimes to other places, for instance, campmeetings. I sang with a quartet, and we used to travel all over Cuba. I was returning from a campmeeting by myself. I was coming to look for a member of the quartet. On my way I saw two cars, one ahead and one behind, but I continued. The one ahead slowed down, and I stopped. As soon as I stopped, he backed up and said, "Are you Noble?" I said, "Yes. My name is Humberto Noble." He said, "Would you mind accompanying me to headquarters for five minutes?" I said, "O.K. why not?" We went to headquarters, and the five minutes extended until one week ago. That is a long five minutes.

Geraty: What did they charge you with?
Alexander: They said they were charging me with several different things. They said that I was going to Guantanamo to go to the base to see a guy they called McDonald. The other charge was that I was taking out counter-revolutionaries and smuggling them out of the country. The counter-revolutionaries were people the government was seeking, and I was charged with smuggling them out of the country by the base. The third charge was that I was going to Guantanamo to get a bomb to kill Castro. To this day, I do not know which one of the three charges was the final charge.

They put me in the dungeon, a small room with an iron plate door; no light was allowed inside; there was only room to lie down.

Geraty: So the reasons they gave for putting you in jail really had nothing to do with religion?
Alexander: That's it. Any time they were going to, they never charged you directly. All the charges they brought up were for something else. For example, I have seen persons charged for crimes they didn't know anything about.

Geraty: Who was this man McDonald?
Alexander: I don't know McDonald and never knew a McDonald.

Geraty: Did you have the impression that the real reason they were putting you in jail had something to do with your religion?
Alexander: I am certain of it. Once I was delivering a message; I was preaching about the origin of sin. I told how Lucifer taught the other angels that they were equal because they were all celestial beings and all had the same rights in heaven. For that, he rebelled with the other angels, and he was thrown to earth, and when he came to earth,
he tried to do the same thing as he did in
heaven, saying that all are equal. They said
that by this, I was referring to Castro. They
asked me, “What do you mean by this?” I
explained to them that I was preaching
strictly from the Bible. You can say that the
Bible was referring to Castro, but you can­
not say that Noble Alexander was referring
to Castro. But it made no difference. Once
they see something from their point of view,
it’s unchangeable, they don’t need proof.
They said they wanted my conviction.

Geraty: Was there a trial?

Alexander: The court case was made up
by the G2. The G2 told me that I was going
to be in jail for 20 years for this. Of course,
there was a trial, but I was not allowed to
talk.

Geraty: But you’ve been in jail for more
than 22 years.

Alexander: Yes. But I was condemned
according to their papers for 20 years only.
After 20 years, they just left me there. I’m
not the only one; there are a lot. Among
those of us just released, 26 served more
than 21 years, but all 26 were sentenced to
20 years. All 26 of us served more years than
that.

Geraty: Were there other religious people
in jail with you?

Alexander: Yes, there were.

Geraty: What other religions did they
represent, and why were they put in jail?

Alexander: Well, for example, there were
Pentecostals, Baptists, Jehovah’s Witnesses,
Catholics, and more. There was a Pastor
David Fite from Georgia. He was released
and deported from the country.

Geraty: Why were they released and you
kept?

Alexander: They were strangers to the
country, and I was Cuban. There used to be
Americans there, but a lot of them were
released in 1980.

Geraty: Are there other Seventh-day
Adventists in jail now?

Alexander: Where I was before being
released there were none. But they were in
different places, in other prisons. Some of
the others have been released.

Geraty: Why were they released and you
kept?

Alexander: Well, they used to do general
work, but I was considered a Plantado. Plant­
ados are rebels.

Geraty: Why were you labelled a
Plantado?

Alexander: I prepared a small pulpit for
my religious services, which is not permit­
ted. As quickly as the guards were out of our
section we would prepare another pulpit and
would have more services. When the cells
were opened for lunch, we would stay
behind and have our religious services.
When the others came back we would have
finished our services and nobody would
know the difference.

Geraty: Were you able to have Bibles in
prison?

Alexander: Well, I had a Bible given to
me by Melvin Bailey. I had another small
Bible that I call my Bible of Testimonies that
has been with me for over 30 years. We hid
the Bible in several sections of the prison.
I sent the Bible to another section because
they didn’t have one. We tied the Bible to
a small string and would pull the string
between the different sections to get the
Bible. One time a guard saw it, and he tried
to get the Bible. I told him, ‘‘This is my Bible
and I’m not going to give it to you.’’ They
searched for the Bible, and when they
couldn’t find it (we had hidden it behind the
sewer), they put me in the dungeon.

Geraty: What was the dungeon?

Alexander: The dungeon is a small cell
with an iron plate door; no light is allowed
inside; there is only room to lie down. There
is just a small slit in the door that is cut out
Geraty: How long were you in the dungeon?

Alexander: For not giving them the Bible? Two years.

Geraty: Two years, for having a Bible? So while you were being rebellious you were put in this cell for two years, and all this time the Bible was behind the sewer.

Alexander: No. Others were using the Bible. Everybody knew how to find it. Evening services continued at sunset every evening. We used the Bible at prayer meetings every evening at sunset.

Geraty: Did you worship only with other Seventh-day Adventists or with people from other religions?

Alexander: The only ones who didn’t worship together were the Jehovah’s Witnesses. They kept completely apart. Even the Catholics worshipped with us. We would have our services with them, and they would have their masses with us. Then we began an arrangement where I would have a service one day and they would take the service the next day. Somebody would always be responsible for watching for the guards and making sure that the guards were not coming.

Geraty: Were there ever any problems worshipping with people of different religions?

Alexander: No. I don’t care what church you visit. I don’t care what religion you practice, if your heart is like mine and Jesus is your saviour. Then we are brothers. That is the theme we used in our general services. But then there were other studies too. These we called our Sabbath School quarterlies.

Geraty: You had Sabbath School quarterlies in jail?

Alexander: Yes, we had them in jail. Of course, they were smuggled in, and our Sabbath School quarterlies were not like the ones you have here. They were typed pages we would tear up and you keep one, I keep one, and somebody else would keep the other, and then we would study them like that. When I finished one page, I would pass it to someone and then he would pass it on to somebody else and we would pass them all around.

Geraty: What do you think is the experience of the others, now that you have left?

Alexander: Their experiences are the same. We have all seen many leavings. When I left, they told me, ‘Noble, we want you to speak without being afraid. We don’t care what you say about this. Don’t mind the revenge that they take on us, you just try to make everyone know what is happening here.’

Geraty: Tell me what your jail was like, food, room, visitors, and other things.

Alexander: I shared my room with five others. The rooms were all prepared for eight people, and were approximately nine feet by 12 feet. Some of the rooms were even smaller than that. I was one of the lucky guys. The beds were on top of each other and around the room. It was in the middle of the room that we would hold our evening services and worships. We called them the ‘setting sun prayers.’

Geraty: Was everyone in your room religious?

Alexander: Yes. In my section, everybody in the whole section, about 60 people, were Plantados.

My food was wheat and fish. But the fish
they gave us was caught sometimes seven, eight, or 10 years ago. It looked very strange. It was frozen fresh and when it became unfrozen it rotted. They would try to fry it to the utmost, but as quick as you opened it, the meat inside was like sand. I wouldn’t touch it and still I cannot eat it yet. We were given Russian meat. When the meat became outdated and the Cuban armed forces could no longer eat it, then they gave it to us. Sometimes we were given pork, but I refused to eat it. My brothers would say they didn’t know how I was going to manage not eating without getting sick, but I told them, “I don’t know what is making me live, but I am living and I am not sick, so you mind yourself and leave me alone.” They gave us something white that they called milk. It was white, but it was not milk. They gave us bread at every meal. The rice they gave us always had worms and was military supplies that had gotten too old.

You also asked about visitors. In 22 years in jail I had no visitors for 17 years, including the last four years. The time when we had visitors regularly was during what they called the Carter Dialogue. During the dialogue, things got smoother. We got two hour visits every 45 days. They kept thinking that we were going to have a visit from the Carter people or from the Red Cross.

Geraty: Who would visit you?
Alexander: A lady from the Adventist church who calls herself Alexander also. She came as my mother. Another Adventist, another good friend came; her name was Gonzales. They both came to visit me.

Geraty: What type of news were you given from the outside world?
Alexander: The Americans were on the other side of the jail and they received generally two visits every 45 days: one of the visits was from the embassy and one was from family or friends. We had a code for speaking. We could speak from nearly a block away. When the doors were open for lunch, they would stand at one end of the jail, and we would stand at the other end and watch. From there they would give us news through hand signals and sign language.

Geraty: I’d like to return to the subject of your refusing work. It has been reported in the press that prisoners are allowed to work; and that the government pays them for their work.

Alexander: Yes. That is partly true. The trouble is how do you get to the point where you can get paid? They would take you to a plant and put you to work. You were told that you wouldn’t get any pay until you worked six months. After six months you began to get paid, but 90 percent of the political prisoners would work for five months and then be released for bad behavior and another group would come in and not get paid. Why work?

Geraty: Did you ever work?
Alexander: No. I was a Plantado. I was described as rebellious and Plantados had no opportunity to work. Even if I had had the opportunity to work and they had wanted me to work, I wouldn’t work, because I knew what was going on.

Geraty: I still don’t exactly understand why you refused.
Alexander: They used work for money as a means of indoctrination. I was glad to work for free and I did work. For example, I taught others English and I helped them with their French and so forth. I helped them with mathematics. Some of us were able to sew, others to write, and so forth. We exchanged knowledge with one another, and we helped each other. When I say we didn’t work, that just means that we didn’t work for the government, because we did work very hard for each other.

Geraty: I understand that according to the Cuban Constitution of 1975, everyone is free to practice his or her own religion within the framework of the law. What is your understanding of that?
**Alexander:** I had a Russian constitution once. I was called in because they wanted to search my parcel post. We used to lose a lot of things during those searches and so I said, "I'm not signing my card permitting you to search my parcels." I showed the guard my Russian constitution saying that no one can search prisoners' letters and parcels. He took the book and hit me on the head and said, "This is Cuba and we do what we want to do." With this I show you that what is written in the book is only written there; people do what they want to do. It is one thing if the verse is written, but another if it is followed and carried out.

**Geraty:** You said that at various points during your time in jail you were visited by some Seventh-day Adventists. Did they do anything to try to help you get out of jail?

Smuggled letters were pieces of paper approximately 3 inches by 5 inches, written with a fine point pen in writing so small that it could not be read without a magnifying glass.

**Alexander:** They knew if they tried to help me, they would get themselves in trouble also. I knew a communist who was living right in front of my workshop in Havana; before the present government came into power, I had helped him a lot. At that time, I did not know that he was a member of the Communist Party. After I went to prison he went to the government and said, "This man, Noble Alexander, who is in jail, this is one of the mistakes that the revolution is committing. I know Alexander for a long time, and I can see him working in his workshop. All he does is go from work to church to home." You know what they told this good man? "Keep yourself quiet if you don't want to get yourself in trouble." Now, he was a member of the Communist Party and even he had to keep himself quiet. Members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church would definitely have gotten into trouble if they helped me. Of course, they did help me, they gave me strength with their prayers. This was all the help that I needed.

**Geraty:** But you said that sometimes some of your friends smuggled you Sabbath School quarterlies or literature.

**Alexander:** Yes. But I cannot tell you how that was done, because it continues to this day. We would smuggle things in and we would smuggle things out. I used to write my family. I would think that letters had been lost because I hardly ever got an answer. As I said, it was easier to get them out than it was to get them in. So I would always write three times and send them out different ways (At this point Mr. Alexander produced a packet of many letters, that he had written while he was in jail, that had been smuggled out. Each letter was on a small piece of paper approximately 3 inches by 5 inches, written with a fine point pen with letters so small that they obviously could not be read without the aid of a magnifying glass. These letters have been saved by his sister through the years and provide him with a chronology of his experiences.).

**Geraty:** Last year, a Jehovah's Witness reported that there was an American Seventh-day Adventist minister in jail. Could that have been you?

**Alexander:** Yes. It's possible. Sometimes I jumped over to the American section when there was no guard around and I would hold services with them. Some of the Cubans would listen to me speaking English and they believed that I was an American, and so some people confused me with being American. However, I am not American and I did not present myself as American.

**Geraty:** What do you see as the mission of the Seventh-day Adventists in Cuba?

**Alexander:** They are having a very hard time now. One of the pastors there sent me a message that he is having troubles morning, noon, and night. He wants to leave the country. He told me that if I could ever get myself a visa to any country other than Cuba, that I should get the visa as soon as possible. The Seventh-day Adventists who are left behind are having a very difficult
time. I cannot say what the mission of the church is in Cuba other than to preach the gospel.

---

**I am just waiting for God to lead me. I have no plans for myself. God will lead.**

---

**Geraty:** Are you aware of what happened to Seventh-day Adventists in Cuba in 1980 and that many of them left at that time?

**Alexander:** Yes. They fled the country seeking religious freedom, yet the church now needs pastors and workers. There is work to do; we need to work now.

**Geraty:** What are your first impressions of the United States?

**Alexander:** I cannot say. This has been a complete change for me. It's like being asleep for 23 years and suddenly waking. I tell you, I cannot describe my impressions.

**Geraty:** How was it, yesterday, to be in the United States on the Fourth of July?

**Alexander:** It is unbelievable, just unbelievable.

**Geraty:** Will you be celebrating on Castro's Cuban Independence Day, July 26?

**Alexander:** Don't speak about this. This is not a holiday, it is a day of mourning. Believe me this is a tragedy, there is nothing to celebrate.

**Geraty:** What are you going to do now that you are a free man?

**Alexander:** I am just waiting for God to lead me. I have no plans for myself. God will lead.
Castro and the Churches

by Caleb Rosado

The Seventh-day Adventist message first came to Cuba in 1903, shortly after the Spanish-American War (1898), which brought Cuba under U.S. domination. The first efforts at spreading the gospel were the results of self-supportive work of American missionaries, who accepted the challenge of W.A. Spicer for work to be started on the island.1

From 1904, when the Cuban Mission was established, to 1959, when the Cuban Revolution took place, Adventist work grew to a membership of 5,464, with a yearly increase of 347. Though the church’s institutional presence was substantial, with 74 churches and a senior college, the leadership of the church was primarily in the hands of Americans and foreigners. Very little effort was made to train Cubans for leadership roles.

Thus, when the Revolution came and all the American and foreign missionaries fled the country, the Cuban church was left without properly trained Cuban leaders to assume the leadership of the church. The result was that the Adventist church in Cuba stagnated, so that the church of 1984 is basically the church of 1959—same religious thinking, same values in behavior, same world view, same religio-centric perspective, same values in dress, same understanding of the church’s mission, etc.; in other words, the church ceased to progress, due to the lack of qualified leadership, and, as a result, failed to change with the times.

After the Revolution, there were no Cuban theologians at the seminary in Cuba to readdress and redefine the mission of the church in a changing situation. Then too, many Cuban leaders left the country along with the Americans. The new leadership therefore resorted to addressing the church’s mission in terms of the past, in terms of what they had known. The question of whether a changing situation might alter the mission of the church, or at least force the church to rethink its role in a revolutionary society, was never asked, nor has it been asked since.

It must be kept in mind that even though most Cubans prefer the situation of the church under Batista to being under Castro, many Adventists were opposed to Fulgencio Batista for his cruelty and political corruption. Thus, when Castro began the Revolution in the autumn of 1956, a number of Adventists, especially the laity in the province of Oriente, where Castro was located, sympathized with the revolutionaries and provided clandestine assistance. The help was such that the only religious
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group Che Guevara mentions in his *Reminiscences of the Cuban Revolutionary War*, are Seventh-day Adventists. Speaking of one Adventist family (which he mentions by name) Guevara declares:

They were Adventists who, even though they were against violence of any kind because of their beliefs, gave us their full support at that time and for the duration of the war. We ate heartily and rested there.

When the final battle of the Revolution was fought at Santa Clara, Castro used the Adventist Antillian College as his headquarters, where he and his soldiers were housed, fed, and entertained, due to his distrust of students at the University of Santa Clara, located across the road from Antillian College.

On May 1, 1961, shortly after the Bay of Pigs and his announcement of going socialist, Castro nationalized all the schools. The last school to be nationalized, however, was our college in Santa Clara, due to the model school that it was with its work/study program, and the high esteem in which Castro held Adventists.

**Church and State Relations**

There were three factors that led to a rift in relations between the Cuban government and the Seventh-day Adventist Church:

- The acceptance by the government in April 1961 of Marxist/Leninist ideology as the official ideology of the state.
- The nationalization of all private schools in May 1961.
- The refusal to grant Adventists Sabbath privileges, whether in school, work, or the military, resulting in imprisonment for many.

The establishment, in September 1960, of the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution proved to have some devastating results for Adventists. Since these committees were primarily set up for vigilance purposes, anyone who espoused an ideology different from that of the state came under severe repression: no job advancement, loss of employment (especially for women), no academic scholarships, and constant surveillance.

**The government does not mind religious practices, but actively seeking to convert others is punishable by law.**

As part of the official policy of the state, religion was relegated to the private sphere, and though officially allowed, unofficially, religious adherence was discouraged by means of subtle repressions, constant vigilance, and loss of privileges.

The result was a difference of attitude between sectarian religious groups and mainstream Protestants about the state. (One must keep in mind that in an atheistic, Marxist/Leninist state, all religious groups take on a sectarian status, as they all find themselves in tension in an environment hostile towards religion. Still, some religions remain more accommodating to government.)

More than other groups, sectarian Christians like Jehovah’s Witnesses, Evangelical Gideon’s Band, and Seventh-day Adventists find themselves at odds with the state in a socialist society such as Cuba. There is a reason for this: like the Communist government itself, these three sectarian groups share one common element—they are all total systems. They are systems that attempt to control both the behavior and beliefs of their constituents. Because the basic ideologies of these groups are different, they end up competing. This is not to imply that the systems have equal power. Adventists relate to the Cuban government like David related to Goliath.

Because of the totality of control necessary to Adventism or Communism, it is virtually impossible for one system to be sympathetic and accommodating to the other. Mainstream Protestant groups like Presbyterians,
Methodists, and Baptists do not adhere to a similarly regimented system of belief which governs all the actions of the group. These other groups, for example, have no restrictions on the Sabbath as an exclusive day of worship, on diet, on dress, on entertainment. Since they are not competing total systems, mainstream Protestant denominations are not regarded as threatening to the Communist system, a system which demands complete loyalty and integration into the system.

The church in Cuba needs to define its mission in terms of faithfulness to the Gospel and its demands—not in terms of the church’s institutions.

For these reasons, at the First National Congress on Education and Culture, held in April 1971, Seventh-day Adventists, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and the Evangelical Gideon’s Band were singled out “because of their activities in opposition to the Revolution.” The “most outstanding peculiarity” the declaration brought out against Seventh-day Adventists was that, “they do not engage in any activities on Saturday (do not work or send their children to school, etc.).” The Cuban government has made it quite clear that:

The Revolution respects religious beliefs and cults as an individual right. The Revolution does not impose nor persecute nor repress anyone for religious beliefs.

This statement, written in 1971, was made into Article 54 of the Constitution of the Republic of Cuba, adopted in 1975 at the First Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba, and reads:

The socialist state, which bases its activity and educates the people in the scientific materialist concept of the universe, recognizes and guarantees freedom of conscience and the right of everyone to profess any religion and to practice, within the framework of respect for the law, the belief of his preference.

The law regulates the activities of religious institutions. It is illegal and punished by law to oppose one’s faith or religious belief to the Revolution, to education, or to the fulfillment of one’s duty to work, defend the country with arms, show reverence for its symbols and fulfill other duties established by the Constitution.

The key phrase in the above law is, "within the framework of respect for the law." Within this "framework" there is freedom of religion, outside this framework there is none. This "framework" defines religion as a "private" matter, meaning that one is free to worship in the church or faith of one’s choosing. Evangelistic campaigns are even allowed with the proper permit, to be held inside church buildings. One is free to carry a Bible in public, even read it in public, as long as it is done for one’s personal and private devotions. Literature can be published by the conference, as long as its use is strictly for members and not for evangelizing members. However, speaking in public, going house-to-house to distribute literature or to gain interests for Bible studies, is regarded as proselyting. That activity is considered counter-revolutionary and punishable by imprisonment.

The government claims that it does not persecute for religious practice. If a person, like Humberto Noble Alexander, finds himself giving Bible studies from home to home, then the government will arrest him or her, as Alexander was arrested. But it will not be for religious infraction, but for failure to practice religion "within the framework of respect for the law." In other words, the government says, "We don’t mind you practicing your faith, but you cannot go around actively seeking to make others adherents.
of your faith. That is proselytism, and is punishable by law." Since this often can be misunderstood as religious persecution, what usually happens is that other charges are trumped up, such as, in the case of Alexander, of transporting counter-revolutionaries or of being part of a plot to assassinate Fidel Castro.

Though the government claims not to persecute religion, even this declaration from the First National Congress on Education and Culture is contradicted by a statement that the declaration makes after stating that no one is repressed for religious beliefs. The declaration says: "The obscurantist and counter-revolutionary sects must be unmasked and fought." If such a statement does not mean persecution, then I don’t know what does.

**The Mission of the Church in a Socialist Society**

The biggest challenge facing the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Cuba is how to redefine the church’s mission in terms of the society wherein it finds itself. The alternative of escape as seen in the mass boat exodus from Mariol, including some 1,500 Adventists (and 50 pastors), is actually a negation of mission. Not that the individual Adventists who left for personal reasons should be judged, but that the church as a whole should be judged if the entire Adventist community fled, as was once contemplated.

The church must redefine the Gospel in terms of the needs of humanity. The government has now taken over the tasks that the church once considered to be part of its mission: education, medical and social service ministry. Since the church is no longer needed in these areas (except for the Christian education of its children), many feel that the church no longer has a mission in Cuba. That thinking defines mission entirely in terms of institutions. The church in Cuba needs to redefine its mission in terms of faithfulness to the Gospel and its demands.

Even though the Seventh-day Adventist Church is the largest Protestant denomination in Cuba, with 9,358 members as of December 1983, numbers alone do not spell success in mission. Success in proclaiming the Gospel in a socialist land is determined not by the numbers that are added to the church, nor by its institutional presence but by its faithfulness to Christ.

Perhaps the experience of Humberto Noble Alexander in prison best exemplifies what the mission of the church ought to be. The common experience of being imprisoned for proclaiming the Gospel led Christians of various faiths to band together as one body in Christ, irrespective of their differences. One of the prisoners composed a short chorus which became the theme song of the clandestine prison church, the lyrics embodying the mission of the church:

*It makes no difference to what church you belong,*

*If behind Calvary you stand.*

*If your heart is like mine,*

*Then you are my brother, so give me your hand.*

**NOTES AND REFERENCES**

2. This Gideon’s Band must not be confused with the Gideons in the United States who are best known for placing Gideon Bibles in motels and hotels.
El Salvador: A High-Risk Mission For Political Reform
by Eric Anderson

In the spring of 1984, at the time of the March and May Presidential elections in El Salvador, the name of John Kelley appeared in front-page stories in the New York Times, Washington Post, and other newspapers, as well as on the ABC and NBC television networks. Kelley had gained notice because he was the representative of the U.S. State Department to the El Salvador Election Council.

John Kelley is a Seventh-day Adventist who grew up in Mexico as the son of Adventist missionaries. He did not leave Mexico until he was 15. Andrews University was his first English-speaking school. There he became president of the student association and in 1967 earned a B.A. in biology and religion. After attending the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary for a year, Kelley was youth pastor for a year at the Broadway Seventh-day Adventist Church, a Spanish-speaking congregation in Manhattan. He then enrolled at Columbia University, earning a doctorate, summa cum laude, in anthropology. His dissertation topic studied the politics of agrarian reform in Mexico. After teaching for three years at Columbia University and the City University of New York, he joined the Agency for International Development (AID), became a foreign service officer in the State Department, and worked for six years in Honduras as an expert in land reform. In 1982 he and his family had to leave the country within 24 hours because of a threat against their lives.

Kelley was interviewed by Eric Anderson, a professor of history at Pacific Union College, and a frequent contributor to Spectrum. (See "The Bishops and Peace, Or is it Necessarily a Sin to Build Nuclear Weapons?" Vol. 14, No. 2.)

Anderson: John, you were a member of the Big Chill generation. You were a student activist at Andrews University (at least in a mild Adventist sense). What are you doing working at the State Department in 1984?

Kelley: I was one of those who organized the teach-ins at Andrews against the Vietnam War in 1967. People who see some parallel between Vietnam and Central America would say that I have done an about-face. In fact, I don't think I have.

Anderson: Why?

Kelley: We had no interest in Southeast Asia which justified our massive involvement. At that time, and still now, I believe that we do have a legitimate interest in the Western Hemisphere, specifically in Central and South America.

Anderson: What is your current assignment?

Kelley: Well, for the last year I have been working on elections in El Salvador. I may be working on elections in Honduras and Guatemala. I provide technical advice on the organizing of clean, honest, and fair elections.

Anderson: How did you become an elections expert?

Kelley: Sort of by accident. I was involved in the agrarian reform program in El Salvador on and off between 1980 and 1983. That happens to be my professional spe-
cialty—I did my dissertation on agrarian reform.

Anderson: So you came into the foreign service from academic life?

Kelley: Yes. After pastoring an Adventist Spanish church and teaching anthropology at the City University of New York, I became an anthropologist for the Agency for International Development (AID) in 1976. AID is a branch of the State Department. As an anthropologist, I analyzed the social impact of our aid programs in Honduras. In 1982, I began working in the computer division of AID, pursuing my hobby rather than my profession, and in 1983, I was the only Spanish-speaking computer expert in AID.

When I say I got the elections assignment by accident, I mean that I was asked to go to El Salvador because I knew computers, I knew AID, and I knew Central America. The last chapter of my dissertation (“Political Structure and Political Conflict in Mexico”) was entitled “How to Win an Election.” I was looking at the whole relationship between agrarian reform politics and electoral politics in Mexico at the local level—how the Mexican one-party system maintains its stability by managing elections, by continuing agrarian reform, and continuing other reform programs that were started years ago.

Anderson: The Washington Post reported that you were the target of a personal death threat in the recent Salvadoran presidential election. Is that accurate?

Kelley: Yes. Keep in mind, however, that the elections were organized in two rounds. The first round was a qualifying round. In the absence of a clear majority, there would be a run-off between the two parties getting the highest vote in the first round. My whole involvement in the election process was not really questioned by any of the parties before the first round of elections. I was viewed as a neutral person involved in the voter registration system making sure that U.S. assistance for voter registration was carried out effectively and efficiently. The first round was won with a plurality of 44 percent by the Christian Democratic Party, on a platform that called for continued reforms, improvement in human rights, and social justice.

After the first round, the voter registration system came under heavy attack from the party that came in second place—ARENA, the right wing party headed by Roberto D’Aubisson and widely viewed as a defender of the landed elite. They blamed the low percentage of the vote that ARENA received (29 percent) on the registration system and they insisted from day one after the first round of elections that the voter registration system should be removed. The Election Council held a meeting with the two parties and asked me to participate and talk about the voter registration system that I had worked on for a year. They wanted me to spell out the weaknesses of this system and how we were going to correct them for the second round. When it became clear to ARENA that I was going to vociferously (at least in private) defend the registry system, it also became clear to them that they would probably have to get me out of the country if they were going to get rid of the system. The reason for that is that my co-workers at the U.S. Embassy were always very lukewarm about the voter registration.

Anderson: Why?

Kelley: They believed that the voter turnout might be reduced by the extra effort involved in a registration system. In the view of the embassy the important thing was size of the turnout—not really who won but how many people turned out.

Anderson: But it did make a difference to the Embassy who won, didn’t it?
Kelley: To most people in the Embassy it did not. There were people in the Embassy who privately favored ARENA and others who personally favored the Christian Democrats.

Anderson: Back to the death threat—
Kelley: Yes. The chain of events that led up to this threat against me was very clear. Within two days after ARENA decided to condemn the voter registry, a phone threat came to the house where I was staying—the caller identified himself as a member of the Maximiliano Hernandez Martinez Brigade. This group, named after a Salvadoran leader of the 1930s, is probably the best-known and most violent of the "death squads." You don't mess around with them.

It's hard to tell when you get a phone threat whether the caller is really who he says he is; but in any case you take it seriously, since there is no way of knowing. I was expecting a threat because two members of the Election Council had already been threatened, and—given the circumstances—I could predict there was going to be a threat against me. So I had already thought through what I would do.

Anderson: You ignored the threat?
Kelley: I was committed to the election. I didn't just want to turn around and run. I knew that most of the assassinations usually take place without a warning. Threats are usually a way to coerce or frighten you—if there is a group that is serious about killing you they usually shoot and take credit for it later.

I had decided that the best strategy for dealing with a threat was to go into hiding—seclusion, basically—and work, sleep, and eat at the same place. Ninety percent of the political killings take place on the street when you are getting into or out of your car, or as you are driving along. So I went into seclusion. I stayed on the sixth floor of the Sheraton Hotel with some other people who were also handling elections—those who also felt the general pressure of threats. We stayed in seclusion for a month between the first and second round of elections. I worked with some of the technical experts who were working on the elections, living on the sixth floor of a hotel that was sealed off—only one entrance, guards at the entrance. I left for America three weeks before the second round of elections. A day later the local security officer of the Embassy, who was the supervisor of our bodyguards was shot and killed. Two weeks later, I was called on Saturday night and asked to return to El Salvador because preparations for the election were coming unglued.

People who see some parallel between Vietnam and Central America would say that I have done an about-face. In fact, I don't think I have.

I left Washington, D.C. within 10 hours and spent the week before the elections in El Salvador writing, again in seclusion, on the logistical preparations for election day. While I was meeting in my hotel room with members of the Election Council, ARENA's vice presidential candidate called a press conference and accused the American ambassador of rigging the election for the Christian Democrats and accused me of threatening the life of his party's representative on the Election Council. That really took chutzpah!

Anderson: Who were the guards?
Kelley: Salvadoran guards from the Embassy. Not the best in the country, but probably as good as you could get. The best in the country are with the ambassador. There's one factor: as a reporter friend in Salvador pointed out, the cost of shooting an American far exceeds the benefit derived from it.

The real intent of the threats and accusations was to make me leave the country again because I was working day and night to eliminate the logistics problems from the final round of elections. I wanted to stay
because, at this point, I thought I knew more about the election process than anybody else. I was able to talk in my hotel room or over the phone to all the actors involved—people who weren’t talking to each other would talk to me.

Disorder in the second round could lead to accusations of fraud—more importantly open up the possibility of actual fraud. And real fraud is what I still believe ARENA had in mind in their attacks on the voter registration system.

So, despite ARENA’s accusations—and the heightened risk to my staying in El Salvador—I decided to stay on. A good clean, orderly second round could decide the whole future of El Salvador.

**Anderson:** I’d like to ask you about the broader implications of that election. Historian Barbara Tuchman recently declared that she longed for the day when the United States would somewhere be on the popular side. Are we on the popular side in El Salvador?

**Kelley:** I think we very clearly are. We are on the popular side because we have supported the main populist—and popular—issue: land reform. We are on the side not only of land reform but also a number of other reforms that have already taken place—banking reform, for example. We are doing the things that the majority of Salvadorans want to do. And there has been a consistency in our policy since 1979, when the Carter administration supported the group of young reformist military officers.

**Anderson:** Are you saying the Carter and Reagan administrations have had the same basic policy in El Salvador?

**Kelley:** In El Salvador, yes. The Carter administration started the military build-up. There was a strong linkage under the Carter administration between military strategy and economic reform strategy and that’s what has happened under Reagan.

**Anderson:** It’s a fascinating situation, isn’t it? A conservative administration supporting measures like the nationalization of banks and expropriation of agricultural property. How many guerrillas are we talking about?

**Kelley:** There are between 8,000 and 12,000 belonging to an umbrella organization with five different groups ranging from Maoist to Marxist-Leninist.

**Anderson:** How much of the population sympathizes with them?

---

**Liberation theology in its purest theoretical form is valid; unfortunately, when implemented it becomes watered-down, baptized Marxism of the most naive sort.**

---

**Kelley:** If you look at the results of the vote—and take the ballots that were crossed out, where the voter put a big X through the whole ballot, you get 4 percent. Let’s assume that all of those who abstained from voting (12 percent) were for the guerrillas. You have a maximum of 16 percent of the voting population who support the guerrillas.

**Anderson:** Why is the impression so widespread in the United States that our government is “fighting against history” in El Salvador, that the ordinary folk of El Salvador favor some sort of Marxist revolution?

**Kelley:** I think most people who believe that way are people who do not understand Latin America and its history. Foremost, they don’t understand that the United States government by supporting agrarian reform, by supporting banking reform, by supporting a number of other reforms, has in essence pulled the platform out from under any revolutionary movement. You don’t need a revolution to have reform.

**Anderson:** One of the most influential religious critics of American policy in Central America is the magazine Sojourners, published by evangelical Protestants. How do you respond to their view of Central America?

**Kelley:** Viscerally!

**Anderson:** Can you give us a cerebral response as well?

**Kelley:** Their reporting is shoddy, sloppy
reporting of the worst kind—they wear cultural blinders. When we see those cultural blinders on somebody who is right-wing, then we criticize the biases of the writer. When a vaguely leftish person writes articles with these great cultural blinders on he is still an ugly American, writing on Central America without understanding it.

I will give you a case in point. In a recent *Sojourners* article about refugee camps in Honduras the entire tone of the article was that all these refugees were people fleeing from the Salvadoran army. In fact, everybody who has worked in the refugee camps knows that the refugees are simply tired of being caught in the middle. That’s why they flee El Salvador—why they go to Honduras and into refugee camps. If you read *Sojourners*, you get the idea that all these refugees are refugees from the bloodthirsty army.

**Anderson:** Do you see any validity to “liberation theology” which emphasizes the church’s responsibility to fight oppression?

**Kelley:** It’s our responsibility as Christians to help people who are oppressed. I don’t have any quibble with that. Where I differ from liberation theology is in the implementation of its goals and objectives. In most cases, unfortunately, liberation theology becomes watered-down, baptized Marxism—and Marxism of the most naive sort.

The Christian Democrats are engaged in reforming Salvadoran society, in a day-to-day living out of Christian principles in the transformation of Salvadoran society into a more just society. And yet these are precisely the people who are most criticized by the liberation theologians, who accuse them of having sold out to “imperialism.”

**Anderson:** But isn’t there some value to a Marxist analysis—a class-conflict analysis—of the turmoil in Central America?

**Kelley:** Back in graduate school days, when I was becoming a Marxist anthropologist, the one thing I did learn was that Marx never understood peasants. He wrote that the peasants are like a sack of potatoes—they can’t organize, they can’t get together. The transition from an agrarian feudal soci-

*The only way the guerilla problem has impinged on the consciousness of the Adventist educators was that they were glad the violence had not disrupted school operations and programs.*

**Kelley:** Yes, as a disillusioned disciple. (Marxian, by the way, is a term that was used when I was in graduate school to distinguish Marxist analysis from Marxist political dogma.)

Let me say one more thing about *Sojourners*. The frame of mind of the typical *Sojourner* writer is no different from the frame of mind of all missionaries that I grew up with who were conservative politically—except that the *Sojourners* people are not conservative. They vary from liberal to radical. The frame of mind is that everything is black and white—there are good guys and bad guys. The good guys are the guerrillas and the bad guys are the government and the army, and anybody who works with the government and the army.

**Anderson:** Does President Reagan just reverse that?

**Kelley:** Reagan does a very good job of dividing the world into good guys and bad guys and appearing to sharply define things like that. Yet he has an administration that is very good at strategically maneuvering between various shades of gray. The Reagan administration, I think, did a very good job in Salvador in distinguishing between the various gradations of black and white.

**Anderson:** You’ve talked about the Chris-
tian Democrats, who are Catholics involved in democratic reform. What are Seventh-day Adventists doing in El Salvador?

Kelley: I tried to find out by talking at length with an educational administrator and with a couple of union conference officials. In essence, they aren’t doing anything because they don’t even understand the problem. The only way in which the guerilla problem has impinged on the consciousness of the Adventist educator was that he was glad that guerilla violence had not disrupted the school’s operations, the school’s program.

Anderson: So Adventists are politically apathetic?

Kelley: I tried to set up an interview with members of the union conference, but ended up only talking to them over the phone. I wanted to find out what their position was in relation to all the social upheaval. I learned that it is very much that “those are the concerns of the world.”

Anderson: Could you say that both liberation theology on one side and Adventist practice on the other are irresponsible extremes?

Kelley: I wouldn’t say that it is an extreme on the Seventh-day Adventist part because there are a lot of other fundamentalists that are similarly removed from reality. At least Seventh-day Adventists are not preaching magic political solutions in the name of Christ. That’s my problem with liberation theology—its advocates are using Christ’s name to preach what I consider an irresponsible political solution.

Anderson: What about individual Adventists? Are individual Adventist laypeople involved in politics? They vote, don’t they? Are you required to vote in El Salvador?

Kelley: Citizens are required to vote, but if you don’t vote there is only a symbolic $1 fine. It has never been imposed on anyone. So in effect you’re not required to vote.

Anderson: We’ve talked mostly about El Salvador. What’s going to happen in Nicaragua? Will it become a police state, a Soviet client like Cuba?

Kelley: It’s going in that direction. But Nicaraguan exiles—former Sandinistas—have told me that Nicaragua could never go the way Cuba did because the “fun-loving” Nicaraguans would never stand the kind of repression that goes on in Cuba. Also there are many natural escape routes from Nicaragua. These exiles feel that Cuba can be a prison only because it is an island.

I used every ounce of knowledge that I have ever gained to bring a democratic process to successful completion. I felt that was a mission worth risking everything for.

On the other hand, you see the Sandinista minister of the interior getting lots of advice from Bulgarians and East Germans. For example, the Ministry brought an Eastern European who is an expert in subverting the church from within. We have seen the results over the last two years—a religious opposition to the institutional Catholic Church, always out there on the street demonstrating, harassing the bishops, demonstrating against the pope, and so on. They are “religious” shock troops.

Anderson: Some people suggest that Costa Rica and Nicaragua are the contrasting developmental models for the rest of Central America: democratic capitalism or militarized socialism.

Kelley: If you know Costa Rican history—in 1947 Figueres took over the country and he disbanded the army. The country has had uninterrupted democracy since the standing army was abolished.

To me that is the model. As long as you have a strong military in any country then you are going to have the same problem you have now. The Costa Rican model of democracy presupposes the muzzling of the military.

Anderson: Will they be able to maintain that posture in the face of the Nicaraguan build-up?
Kelley: Yes, they are doing a good job. They are also resisting the hawks within our government who are trying to get them to change their minds.

Anderson: What will they do if—

Kelley: It only works because they know that the United States will intervene if the Nicaraguans invade. You can afford to be a Switzerland if you know there are strong allies.

Anderson: Would it be fair to describe what you are doing as a kind of secularized missionary work? You are willing to put up with a lot of discomfort and trouble—risk your life even—because you believe in a cause. Can I take your cause to be democracy? How is all this related to your Adventist background?

Kelley: Yes, I approach my work with a sense of mission, a strong sense of commitment. Several reporters have seen an Adventist connection, writing that I was committed to democracy in a very personal way and relating this to my background as a Seventh-day Adventist missionary. It was evident to them that I was not working in this whole process as a typical government bureaucrat.

You might understand why I felt so committed if you met Rosario, a 23-year old telephone repair technician in San Salvador. In 1979, she left El Salvador to “El Norte” with a legitimate work visa. On her way to San Diego she was called off the bus and assaulted by Mexican border guards. In Los Angeles she worked as a maid for slave wages in the home of a wealthy businessman. She went back to El Salvador in 1980 after she learned that her younger brother and his girl-friend were gunned down in the crossfire as they waited for a school bus. A year later her father was robbed and killed as he was carrying a payroll to the rural school district where he taught. She told me in El Salvador that she was going to vote because she wanted peace more than anything else.

I felt that the election assignment in Salvador was probably my culminating mission—when I used every ounce of knowledge that I ever gained to bring a democratic process to successful completion, and tried to stop the killing. As a person trying to be moral—as an Adventist Christian—I felt that was a mission worth risking everything for.
Greece: The Gospel to Macedonia and Beyond

by Leland Yialelis

"For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to every one who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek."

—Paul, Epistle to the Romans

The Seventh-day Adventist Church has designated evangelism to be more important than any other church program for the three years preceding the 1985 General Conference Session in New Orleans, La. We want "one thousand days of reaping" from our "unprecedented worldwide soulwinning thrust, placing unquestioned priority on evangelism in all forms."* We hope to convert and baptize 1,000 souls a day for 1,000 days. I see this as an affirmation by my church that we are not ashamed of the gospel.

Evangelism has special meaning for me as I serve the people of Greece as a member, pastor, and administrator of the church. I believe that the church, by proper planning, will see the power of the gospel work among the Greeks. But factors in the society and in the church combine simultaneously to make this a moment of great opportunity and of frustrating stagnation. I have suggestions to seize the first and overcome the latter, suggestions that are based on factors unique to Greece, and on a realistic use of the church's resources, which will allow us to grasp the special opportunity now opening.

Greece In Transition

Recent history has changed the fabric of Greek life and thought. Traditionally, Greece has been a bridge between East and West. Though it is the source of Western culture, Greece itself has always stood in the middle, neither Western nor Eastern. But since the war for independence from the Turks began in 1821, modern Greece has been oriented toward the West.

As a result, Greece developed a Western tilt that has increased in this century. In the late 1970s and 1980s, that affinity has become the avowed program of the government. Greece's entry into the European Common Market strengthened its ties to

* voted at Annual Council, 1981.
Europe and placed pressure on the Greek government to grant the personal and religious freedoms found in other Common Market nations. It has served to hasten the development of Greece as a modern secular state.

In 1975, Greece overthrew its dictators and adopted a constitution granting religious freedom. A socialist government was elected in 1981 and continued the trend away from an Orthodox to a secular, religiously nonaligned, Greece. For the first time, a prime minister and a party have as their goal the further separation of church and state. This has already been demonstrated by the institution of civil marriage. Though bitterly opposed by the Orthodox church, secular marriage is now a legal and practical reality.

It is now legal to hold lectures about religious matters (but not worship) in public halls without obtaining a permit for such gatherings. There are still statutes against proselyting, but these are rarely if ever enforced, and we now expect the socialist government to further separate state and church interests. I have seen Pentecostals preaching and passing out pamphlets in public squares unmolested, even by priests passing by.

This secularization reflects changes in popular thought. Very few people under 50, and virtually no young people, are more than nominally Orthodox. It is understood that most Greeks consider themselves to be Orthodox, yet this is a cultural definition, not one of private belief. Few Greeks are well-versed in the theology and beliefs of Orthodoxy. They are familiar with its traditions and saints but with little else. They respect the Gospels and Scripture, though Bibles are not owned by many and are read by few. In thought, lifestyle, and attitudes, most Greeks more closely reflect the modern, materialistic ways of thought of the West than those of the Orthodox religion or church.

Greeks realize that their culture is in transition. They speak about the changes which are coming in their lives and in their country with a sense of anticipation. The socialist party, PASOK, ran on the slogan, "The people want—PASOK can bring—the change." Change is the popular word, concept, and desire. I sense this on all levels, among people in the government and in business, from laborers and the young. Greece is emerging into 20th century Western thought.

The rapid growth of other Protestant churches testifies to the Greek's response to Western religious appeals. By far the most active and the largest of these groups is the Jehovah's Witnesses, who now number more than 30,000 members in Greece. The government has even granted them noncombatant status. The Pentecostal movement is a relatively new movement, but already they number several thousand members and are rapidly increasing. They have active groups in Athens (one church has more than 1,000 members) and in Thessalonica, and they are spreading. There are also active Evangelical church groups throughout Greece.

It is clear that, officially, there now exists a great degree of religious freedom in Greece, that people are changing their cultural attitudes and lifestyles, and that this change makes them responsive to Protestant evangelistic efforts such as those of the Jehovah's Witnesses and Pentecostals. This suggests that Adventists, too, face an era of unparalleled opportunity in bringing the message of the three angels to the Greek people.

---

The Greek Adventist Church structure is weak and struggling to survive. Failure to assess the church's needs and problems will lead to failure for Greece's evangelistic purpose.
Adventists in Greece—Yesterday and Today

There are, however, factors in the church which affect our ability to respond to this popular responsiveness to aggressive evangelism. In Greece our problems lie not outside the church, but within. The problems we must overcome lie both in our local field and in the church's administrative structure.

Though the first Greek Seventh-day Adventists were baptized before the turn of the century, and though the organized work in Greece is more than 50 years old, the present church numbers less than 250 members. If we are realistic, it is closer to 200 in the entire nation. This membership is divided into eight congregations. About 50 percent of the members are in the Athens area in three church groups; 40 percent are near Macedonia and Thessalonica in four churches; and 10 percent are scattered through the rest of the country.

In the 1950s, average annual baptisms were slightly fewer than a dozen, and the average membership gain was 10. During the 1960s, average annual baptisms were about the same, but the average gain in membership slipped to 6.8. In the 1970s, average annual baptisms dropped to just under nine people, while the average gain in membership was .9 members!

These numbers indicate why the church is composed primarily of adults and older people with very few young members. Approximately 30 percent of the membership is older than 60. About 58 percent is between 30 and 60 years old. Only 12 percent is under 30. The membership is approximately 70 percent women and 30 percent men. Though accurate statistics are hard to obtain, it's fair to say that most of the members are poor.

Of the eight full-time employees of the Greek mission, four are engaged in full-time pastoral-evangelistic work. The other four are engaged in the office or the school. For 250 members nationwide, there are seven church buildings (in addition, there is one which is rented, for which the mission pays), one office building of five floors, and a camp site with improvements. Of these eight churches, not one is fully self-supporting, in the sense of being able to operate and maintain the local church. For five of the churches, the mission must subsidize the operating budget as well. These few numbers reveal that the Adventist church in Greece is small and has few resources.

Beyond the numbers, I find members who are passive when it comes to church life and witness. My analysis is that for years, all church authority has been in the hands of a very few. Congregations have not had regular church boards, or, when they have had boards, they weren't operated according to principles in the church manual, especially in regard to lay participation and authority. Lay initiative has been discouraged, in fact. No local constituency meetings were held before 1980.

Thirty years ago, a rift developed in the Greek membership. This division still affects the small church, making it prey to gossip and innuendo. Such an unhappy climate is the significant factor in the annual average membership gain of less than one person a year during the 1970s.

Evidently, leadership in upper organizations of the church has failed to understand the crisis in the Greek Mission. When the local leadership explained that the work went slowly because it was difficult to work among the Greek Orthodox, the upper organization accepted this explanation, even though our work was declining as measured against its own previous effectiveness. We must wonder why, in the light of this situation, there were no changes made as year after year the church slowly slid downward into decay.

The top level leadership was ignorant of specific local problems and failed to communicate with the Greek laity so that when new workers were brought to the field, and failed to work in, the situation was not appreciated
A few basic elements characterize the historical model. Members are active in personal witness, and the pastor/evangelist leads Bible study and makes direct evangelistic outreach through public meetings. A heavy emphasis is placed on developing and nurturing groups of believers as they develop. Members are committed to spreading their faith. Their sense of identity and responsibility to the movement is fundamental. Pamphlets and periodicals are used for personal evangelism. A circular is used to communicate between the groups of believers and further develop a sense of participation in a larger movement.

Aside from these basic essentials there is very little structure. There are no complicated programs requiring special skills or special materials. Administrative procedures and details are few and require a small percentage of time, money, and energy. Thus the members and pastors can dedicate themselves to their primary goal: sharing their faith. It is true that, as the groups grow in size and number, there is corresponding development of structure and organization. But in this model the structure develops as the groups develop needs which an organization can meet. There is always a balance between the structure and local ability to sustain that structure.

The institutional model, on the other hand, depends for its evangelistic success not so much on the voluntary and volitional contributions of the membership, assisted by the activities of a pastor/evangelist, as on various programs to accomplish its work. The focus is on the complex interaction and the smooth functioning of a series of projects coordinated to produce results.

It is clear that there now exists a great deal of religious freedom in Greece, that people are changing their cultural attitudes, and that this change makes them responsive to Protestant evangelism.

Adventist Greeks Tomorrow

If we look at our church, I believe we see two models of church growth, both of which are intended to be evangelistic. I call these two models the historical and the institutional. By "historical," I refer to the way in which our church first grew and developed in North America. By "institutional," I refer to the modern, highly structured, departmentalized approach to church organization and evangelism which is common in North America and Europe, the two areas where I have personal experience.

for what it was, nor was any thorough study made to ascertain the causes. Likewise, an answer for worker training was sought in a Greek seminary in Athens, without first making a careful study of all the relevant factors, such as local resources or support for such a project. Several hundred thousand dollars were spent building the facilities in an area of legalized prostitution, and the church was further divided about the seminary before the plan was abandoned.

Now, as it has in the past, failure to assess the church's needs and problems will lead to failure for our evangelistic purpose. The church in Greece is extremely limited in its ability to witness, both in pastoral leadership and in members' participation. The church structure in Greece is weak and struggling to survive.

However, there is an increasing sense of expectancy in the Greek church. There is hope here—a sense that something good will happen. We must capitalize on this desire and provide the leadership to create changes and foster a living, evangelistic church in Greece. Without the members' hope, it would be sad to contemplate "One Thousand Days of Reaping," even in a field so full of opportunity as modern Greece.
The church’s summer camp program is an example of the institutional model. Generally we have chosen to own and operate our own campsites, providing facilities, improvements, equipment, and maintenance. The camp program requires a diverse staff, making the program, time, money, and energy intensive.

Yet the results, in terms of church growth, may not depend on the success of the program. In an area where we wish to begin new work, it is possible to create a “successful” summer camp program. Children will be found to attend and for two weeks they will be exposed to the ideals and spiritual guidance of the church, but what then? Unless there are local, active church groups capable of providing a continuing program geared to the young people who attend, the results in terms of church growth will be minimal.

This same scene represents our schools, colporteur work, medical work, and media. All of these programs, which are useful and successful in church work, are heavily dependent on relatively complex and costly support structures to operate effectively. Above all, they all depend on strong local churches for their ultimate success.

These programs grew out of a church which had already reached a level of sophistication capable of using these complex tools for its evangelistic purpose. Our church grew and developed for some years before we founded our first institution. It was a church which had reached a certain level of membership, organizational stability, and financial resources, and which then began to institutionalize. It was then that the church was able to capitalize on the interests which this institutional activity produced. Institutions are most effective when they fill the needs of and are supported by the local membership and organization.

Which of these two models fits the Greek work best? The unfortunate history of 30 years of church activity in Greece provides the answer. Our greatest need is to focus on the basics of the historical model. It should also be noted that this is what is being followed, essentially, by the two fastest growing Protestant groups in Greece.

Based on the historical model, at this stage of our work among Greek-speaking people, we need to develop pastor/evangelists to support the growth of local groups. But we don’t need to build an institution to train the pastoral workers we need. There aren’t enough young Adventists in Greece to establish a seminary here. I believe there is an efficient alternative to the institutional approach. The habits of Greek migration can provide a source of pastors and evangelists.

A significant pattern of Greek emigration is the common occurrence of immigration, or repatriation. The practice of leaving Greece for a time and then returning is not at all unusual. Emigrants maintain a strong sense of ethnic identity and often look forward to returning to the land which they or their parents left. Thus, the Greek population worldwide forms a single community. This is recognized and encouraged by the Greek government, as it allows Greeks to carry dual citizenship—living and traveling with two passports.

The church can yet act in Greece. If the evangelic imperative is believed, the Gospel still has the power to save the Greek.

There is absolutely no prejudice on the part of Greeks in Greece towards Greeks returning from abroad. As evidence of this, they just elected as prime minister such a man, Andreas Papandreou. It is well known that Mr. Papandreou lived in the U.S. for many years.

From 1970 to 1976 (the last year for which complete statistics are available), approximately 290,000 Greeks emigrated. In those same years, approximately 190,000 Greeks repatriated. The three primary countries of emigration during this time were the United States, Italy, and France. It is in these three countries that the Greek government has focused its efforts to recruit and train pastors and evangelists.
States, Australia, and Germany.

The statistics further reveal that emigration to Germany is probably more temporary than emigration to the other two countries. There is about an equal flow between those Greeks going to Germany (often for work) and those returning. The statistics suggest that emigration to Germany is undertaken temporarily.

In this six year period, approximately 26,000 Greeks emigrated to the U.S. and approximately 10,000 repatriated. In the same period, approximately 25,000 emigrated to Australia and approximately 16,000 repatriated.

These patterns of emigration and repatriation have meaning to the church and our evangelistic program. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, some Greek immigrants converted to Adventism in the U.S. They worked among their countrymen there and for a short time there existed a Greek church with a Greek pastor in Oakland, Calif. Also for a short time, a Greek layperson was employed by the church to work among Greeks in the Chicago area. But unfortunately, although there were conversions, these opportunities were not developed.

But from those few Greeks who did join our church came a significant part of the workers who have since carried on the church’s work at home in Greece. The impact is greater in that Greek lay members from America have carried the gospel back to their homeland and have influenced friends and families to join the church. A similar pattern is developing in Australia today, where a Greek worker has started a Greek church in Melbourne. When people leave their homeland it is often easier to approach them with the Gospel. The patterns of Greek emigration and repatriation, and our own history as a church, together suggest that evangelizing Greek immigrants worldwide may and should be tied together with our evangelistic outreach in Greece.

**Greeks of the World Unite**

Greek people at home and abroad give us an opportunity to view the worldwide Greek work as a single unit which can be coordinated, planned, and developed as a whole. Comprehensive planning would prevent the territorial and hierarchical fragmentation that currently exits. Now, potential Greek workers can be blocked from leaving another division. Greece and Cyprus, the two largest areas of Greek population, are not even in the same division, in spite of their cultural, linguistic, historical, and geographic proximity.

Beyond this obvious management efficiency, a unified Greek work could have an impact on Greek people everywhere, allow us to use available Greek workers immediately, increase the potential field from which to draw future workers, and provide greater efficiency in developing Greek-language materials.

I suggest the General Conference organize a central committee to develop the Greek work worldwide as a single administrative unit. Such a committee would include representatives from Greece and Cyprus, Australia, North America, and Germany, who could meet at the times of regularly scheduled committees to minimize travel and time expense. Such a body would be responsible for placing and transferring Greek-speaking workers worldwide, and would serve as a clearinghouse for Greek evangelistic literature and media programming.

As a church, we should make an assessment of Greek personnel currently
employed by the church who would be capable and willing to transfer to Greek work. Then we can transfer them as quickly as possible into active work for their fellow Greeks—at home or abroad. If we wait for new workers to develop in or out of Greece, we will wait four or five years, at the very least, before such workers are ready to serve. I don’t think we can afford to wait in the face of our current opportunities.

When a unified program for Greek evangelism is in place, we can recruit men and women who are fluent in Greek to train as workers. Their training should be supervised by the central Greek committee so they can receive assistance for their training and so they don’t develop conflicting commitments. This could be extended to people training in medical fields.

The Adventist church also needs a study/research program to help us understand Greek Orthodox faith, its similarity to and divergence from Western Christianity. We need a much clearer understanding of the Orthodox mind. This is absolutely critical if we are to expand our evangelistic thrust among the Greeks.

As planning and budgeting begin for a Greek work, I think the planners should emphasize personnel resources rather than physical resources. People will have the most direct effect on outreach, and a pastor/evangelist has the potential of generating income, whereas a building is a continuing expense.

Other groups of Christians, who do not have the message we have to share, are experiencing growth in Greece. They are reaping a harvest we could and should be reaping. This is the time to cast aside those things which hinder us, allowing us to approach the question of our commitment to proclaim the gospel without the impediments of unproductive traditions, practices, and antagonisms.

The church can yet act in Greece. We have a duty to act if we believe in our evangelistic imperative. We face a challenge to create a new approach to evangelism, for the Gospel still has the power to save the Greek.
What follows is the second and concluding installment of an article which began in Spectrum, Vol. 15, No. 2. Written by Lowell Tarling, a writer and ex-Seventh-day Adventist who attended Avondale College, the article originally appeared in the Australian edition of Rolling Stone (April, 1984). It is the story of the Chamberlain case, the most publicized criminal case in the history of Australia, and of Michael and Lindy Chamberlain, Australian Seventh-day Adventists convicted of murdering their two-month-old daughter, Azaria.

Australian Adventists, in the face of what they consider a flagrant miscarriage of justice, have united to support the Chamberlains, although many of the same people had previously been fighting both the Adventist Church and each other. In the meantime, Lindy Chamberlain is behind bars and sentenced to hard labor for the rest of her life.

—The Editors

Seventh-day Adventism

One of the reasons why the public tended to favor the dingo above Lindy was because the dingo wasn’t a Seventh-day Adventist. Lindy and Michael weren’t even ordinary Seventh-day Adventists, they were ideal. Lindy was the daughter of an Adventist pastor, Clifford Murchison, and she married another pastor, Michael. He was well-known to his Mount Isa parish, having a radio program aimed at encouraging people to quit smoking, give up the bottle, and improve their diet. The Chamberlain family are a living example for the healthy life. They all have good looks, composure, and physical fitness. The day before Azaria’s disappearance, Michael climbed to the top of Ayers Rock three times (the first time, running all the way). It takes most people an hour or so to do the climb, and some take three. Michael took only twelve minutes, unofficially equalling the record to the summit.

Everybody loves a hero—their hero—someone who represents their cause and wins. However, Michael Chamberlain was running for the other team. Says author James Simmonds, “The average red-blooded townsman knew you couldn’t trust a bloke who spoke out against good honest booze.”

The classic piece of misinformation about the Chamberlain’s church was the rumor that the name Azaria meant “sacrifice in the wilderness.” This was scotched by the first inquest, yet the media lost no credibility for printing such a howler. If the Australian press misrepresented politics, as they do
many religious minorities, there’d be all hell to pay plus legal costs.

Says sociologist Dr. Stanley Cohen, author of *Folk Devils & Moral Panics*, "The repetition of obviously false stories, despite known confirmation of this, is a familiar finding in studies of the role of the press in spreading mass hysteria. These stories are important because they enter into the consciousness and shape the societal reaction at later stages." He takes his examples from the Mods and Rockers "wars" at English seaside resorts in the early and mid 1960s. Using press exaggerations of the incidents, he asks how a town can be "beseiged?" Or how many shop windows have to be broken to constitute an "orgy" of destruction? Likewise, Geoff de Luka from Adelaide, writing for Sydney's *Daily Mirror*, headlined with "Azaria, Police Seize 'Blade'" How was this blade "seized" by police, who were permitted by the Chamberlains to freely search their premises? Six months before the trial, the Illawarra *Mercury* used the misleading headline "Mother Killed Azaria." In smaller letters were the words, "QC tells inquest." In December 1981, the *Daily Telegraph* led out with "How Azaria Died" in large lettering, but in the opening paragraph explained that this was how Azaria "probably" died. The list could go on. It is tiring and disillusioning.

There are two reasons why "sacrifice in the wilderness" seemed to offer a neat solution. The first is that it put the whole problem back into the religious world where it somehow seemed to fit best—shades of the spirit dingo and the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The religious angle may have been so overpowering that the public might not have been ready for a secular explanation which denied them a rare glimpse into the world of the gods.

The second, more fundamental reason, is that Australians frequently make the same mistake themselves. The average Australian probably couldn’t verbalize the difference between a Seventh-day Adventist and a Jehovah’s Witness, and yet, to the members of these groups, their eternal salvation rests on those very points. Australians don’t consider this to be essential information. Wrong facts about Mormonism, the Hare Krishnas, the Children of God, the Church of Scientology, and Seventh-day Adventism are not usually considered to be mistakes of the same caliber as whether or not Greg Chappell (a famous cricket player) was really out.

In 1973, market researcher Dr. Peter Kenny surveyed community attitudes towards Seventh-day Adventism. He concluded that Australians had a complete lack of understanding as to the nature of the church. When asked what the church taught, responses wrongly included "They don’t believe in blood transfusion," "They don’t wear underclothes," "They don’t vote," and "They don’t believe in doctors." Considering the extent of the church’s health ministry, the last point is striking, and not at all flattering for their public relations department. The truth is that the Seventh-day Adventist community is similar to the most conservative Baptist communities, and far from slaughtering their infants, they are among the most staid and boring people in Christendom.

Seventh-day Adventists are doubly alienated from the secular world. Not only must they avoid eating and drinking like the rest, but they are locked away for one day a week.

A 1977 sociological study published a survey on Seventh-day Adventist attitudes towards the outside world, and the world’s attitudes to the church. Not including the new so-called "cult" religions, Seventh-day Adventists indicated the strongest feelings of hostility to the outside world. The world reciprocated; whereas 25 percent of the sample group disliked Mormons, 27 percent disliked Seventh-day Adventists. Methodists, Baptists, Anglicans were disliked by 4 percent to 8 percent, and Jews, Southern Bap-
tists and Quakers scored 12 percent to 15 percent. If this is true, what can one conclude about the mild-mannered Seventh-day Adventist who lives down the street? Perhaps he feels the most rejected of all.

I hazard this explanation. Seventh-day Adventists are doubly alienated from the secular world. Not only must they avoid eating and drinking like the rest, but they are locked away for one day a week. They call this "the Sabbath" and their keeping of it is based on a literal interpretation of Exodus 20:8-11. Seventh-day Adventist school children at state schools have a hard time because of this Sabbath. They must not play sports on Saturday, nor can they watch sports on television or at any sportground. They can't be disciplined by Saturday morning detentions, and if the school fete or carnival is on the Sabbath, they don't participate or watch. Only lax Seventh-day Adventists would allow their children to attend the school dance on any night, but Friday night is always impossible because, like the Jews, the Adventists take their Sabbath from sunset to sunset.

To the papers, and all their readers, Seventh-day Adventism was never a church in its own right, but always "The Chamberlain's Church."

Seventh-day Adventists go through the rest of their lives as outsiders. They drink tomato juice in pubs. For 24 hours each week they miss all the news and sports results. They're not allowed to eat bacon and eggs, nor garlic prawns. They'd prefer it if you didn't light a cigarette in their lounge rooms. Most Seventh-day Adventists in Australia are educated and socialized in Adventist institutions. They can go to a Seventh-day Adventist primary school, high school, college, then they can come back and work for the church. This all helps to take the sting out of their contact with the rest of the world.

The writer of the Australian feature films Newsfront and Fatty Finn, Bob Ellis, says that he was raised in Adventism. He described the faith in the introduction to his play, The Legend of King O'Malley: "As Seventh-day Adventists, we children believed in the last great Persecution, when the Catholics would take over the earth, would fight on Armageddon Hill; and the astral descent on a cloud of 10,000 angels of Jesus Christ himself, in time to save the faithful from the knife-points of the ungodly; and our coming millennium in heaven, standing on the sea of glass and singing before the throne the song that only the chosen of the Most High Lord could know; and the final triumphant return to earth, with Jerusalem the Golden floating down the corridors of Orion, like a bride adorned for her husband, to touch down on the Mount of Olives itself, to be attacked by the hordes of Satan in their last great kamikaze throw, to be saved by the invincible cavalry of heaven, again in the nick of time; and to watch the ungodly burn up in the Last Great Holocaust; and to live forever and kneel in adoration at the feet of the Almighty."

The point not often seen is, the Chamberlain's are thought to believe that. Is it any wonder that they were immediately considered suspect?

Seventh-day Adventists see God's hand in the universe as all-powerful, yet he may be challenged by demonic forces who urge him not to protect His own, but to "test" them. Like Job, their reward will come later, despite the difficulties of their present situation. Without a doubt Lindy Chamberlain believes that any indignities suffered by her and her family, in this present life, will be rectified in the after-life. This gives her the strength to continue without breaking down. The media effect of this is Lindy's apparent lack of concern for Azaria, her son Reagan who suffered a serious eye-accident, and her own imprisonment.

This convinces many that she is guilty and "hard." One often-heard remark is, "I knew they were guilty when I saw them so com-
posed on television, after Azaria’s death.” Agnostic Australians counted the Chamberlain’s tears, and when they cast their final verdict, they reckoned it wasn’t enough. However, what most people don’t realize is that Channel 10 and other media do have adequate footage of Lindy and Michael Chamberlain broken-hearted over the death of their daughter. These have yet to be screened, but they will be shown—and even now there is a slow release of material keeping pace with changing public opinion.

Shortly after the “sacrifice in the wilderness” publicity, the church released a four-page tract entitled “What do Seventh-day Adventists Believe? The cover photograph featured Chamberlain look-alikes, the message being to portray Seventh-day Adventists as a relatively normal bunch. It suited middle-class Australia to a tee. Shortly afterwards the major papers ran lengthy articles on what the church “really” stood for, and most of these were reasonably accurate although far from incisive. They tended to run when there was little else one could write about the case.

To the papers, and all their readers, Seventh-day Adventism was never a church in its own right, but always “the Chamberlain’s church,” hence those very words headlined a Sun-Herald article, by Debra Jopson, on the church itself. An even more pointed example was a published story on Seventh-day Adventist “heretic,” Dr. Desmond Ford. While it ran in Newsweek, January 1981, without any mention of the Chamberlains, Sydney’s Sun entitled their piece, “The Chamberlain Teacher Who Split the Church.” The link with the Chamberlain issue was a no-news story, with the journalists admitting the only connection between Ford and Chamberlain was the fact that Michael once sat in Dr. Ford’s classes. The piece was embellished by a photograph of Lindy Chamberlain’s back, a mention that she now had a new hairstyle, and wore a red cardigan on that particular day. One could be forgiven for thinking that Seventh-day Adventism only had a membership of two, plus kids.

The Ford issue was nevertheless an important story, and although not directly relevant to the Azaria case, it was an underlying feature of Seventh-day Adventist consciousness of the time. Seventh-day Adventism was clearly a church in crisis. Not only had they sacked Ford, their most popular theologian, but others followed suit, resulting in more than 100 sackings and resignations from teachers, lecturers, and ministers. To compound problems, United States leaders were accused of “influence peddling” and the authority of the prophetess was under serious question. As a result, many of the laity also resigned. The Daily Telegraph ran a two-part series on the church’s difficulties, based on a recent master’s thesis by a Melbourne sociologist, Robert Wolfgramm. His statistics reveal the high level of dissatisfaction among church members: 27 percent stopped paying tithes (one-tenth of earnings normally given to the church), 15 percent gave less, 65 percent believed the leaders to have mishandled current crises, and 70 percent believed the leaders were holding out on information.

Now, the members were divided as to whether or not Lindy was guilty of murder. Could the wife of one of their ministers commit such a crime? If not, to what extent should the church openly support the Chamberlains—over and above the judicial system of Australia? If the church backed the Chamberlains, could future Seventh-day Adventist “murderers” look to the church for the same kind of support? Ministers of the church were asked these kinds of questions on talkback radio, and they answered with great difficulty.

One feels that, had the Chamberlains been members of some other orthodox faith, they would not have been treated so harshly.
At first, the church was cautious in their dealings with Michael and Lindy, but by mid-1983 they were openly lending them money totalling $143,000 of which $120,000 is not considered to be repayable. The rest has been raised as donations from friends, church members, and members of the public. A great deal of support for the Chamberlains comes from their church; however, this support is certainly not exclusively, nor even mostly, from Seventh-day Adventists. Many others feel threatened by the guilty verdict.

One aspect which is extremely troubling is that the testimonies of the witnesses at Ayers Rock on the fateful night corroborated the explanations offered by Michael and Lindy. This was all overridden by circumstantial evidence, put together by “leading experts” who were not present at the Rock, and who have made mistakes before. Says investigator Don McNicol, “I can’t find any case that has set a precedent in respect to this sort of circumstantial evidence. And this is a dangerous precedent to set. It can affect you and I [sic], our children, and everybody else in Australia.”

Nevertheless, for the Chamberlains, the support of their church was well-deserved. As far as Seventh-day Adventism is concerned, they have shown exemplary behavior, trusting in God through hard times, and smiling at the prosecutor when others might have been tempted to throw a brick at him. Furthermore, the church owes the Chamberlains something for being “persecuted” on the church’s behalf. One feels had they been Baptists, Methodists, or members of some orthodox faith they would not have been treated so harshly by the press, the public, or the courts. For a start, when a minister of religion swears an oath on the Bible, that minister is usually thought to be telling the truth.

One curious aspect of the Azaria case has been the high profile given to the Chamberlain’s church, which as an institution had nothing to do with the case. Interestingly, Adventists other than the Chamberlains have been involved. The first and second inquests involved two other practicing Seventh-day Adventists, Stewart Tipple, the Chamberlain’s friend and solicitor, and Dr. Kenneth Brown, a dentist who heads a forensic laboratory at the University of Adelaide whose forensic investigations prompted the reopening of the case. Of course, Phil Ward, an Adventist publisher, has involved himself by paying for his own investigation of the case.

To the horror of many Seventh-day Adventists and sympathizers, Brown took the stained jumpsuit—which was not his to take—to London, where he consulted with world-class forensic experts. They concluded that there was a small adult handprint on the garment, and a blood-flow pattern which indicated that Azaria may have been decapitated. Although Brown obviously went above and beyond the call of duty in ensnaring the Chamberlains, his findings and those of Professor Cameron do not necessarily lead beyond Barritt’s conclusions of “human intervention.” Brown’s evidence may be essentially correct, and a dingo may still have been involved. It is the blood tests done in the Chamberlain’s car—not Brown and Cameron’s contribution—which are currently being held to ridicule by scientists and newspapermen.

However, with the onset of the trial, the church became visibly involved on an administrative level. Initially there was nothing more in it than the fact that one of their employees and his wife were facing a murder charge. But then came the feeling that Seventh-day Adventism, perhaps even Christianity, was on trial with the Chamberlains. Members were brought face-to-face with the realization that after almost 100 years of having an Adventist presence in the country, secular Australians saw nothing inherently trustworthy or respectable about the Seventh-day Adventist Church, thus ending, once and for all, the myth that Adventist wowserism is a thing respected by the rest of the world.

The trial saw much behind-the-scenes
work done by church folk. Money was raised, much of it negotiated at Union Conference level. Further backstage activities included the finding of a non-Seventh-day Adventist spokesperson who could refute the fetal blood tests made by Mrs. Joy Kuhl. This was quietly organized by science lecturers at Avondale College. The person chosen to speak on their behalf was Professor Barry Boettcher, Professor of Biological Science at the Newcastle University. Religious prejudice was such that Dr. Eric Magnusson, a former president of Avondale College, and lecturer at the Australian National University, would not count as an objective witness. The defense strategy was quite correct in making certain that all practicing members of the church remain well away from the firing line.

On closer questioning, Chamberlain admitted that he has changed his mind repeatedly on the question of human intervention and cover-up.

Once the "guilty" verdict was heard, all that changed. Radio announcers, journalists, ordinary Australians, wept alongside members of the church. Seventh-day Adventists became increasingly militant. An interview with Lindy's brother, Alex, appeared on the front page of the *Daily Telegraph*. Lindy's parents, Pastor and Mrs. Cliff Murchison, appeared on television, in the dailies, even in nonnews publications like *TV Week*. Michael and Lindy's sons, Reagan and Aidan, could likewise command prime media space, and after two years of silence, Michael Chamberlain allowed himself to be interviewed.

Perhaps provoked by Steve Brien's *Azaria*, *The Trial of the Century*, a sensationalized account of the case, Michael Chamberlain demolished Steve Brien's strange accusations. Continuing the theme that there was something sinister about the Seventh-day Adventist religion, Brien concentrates on the bizarre. He says that the Chamberlains had a tiny white coffin in their house, "reserved for Azaria." Brien also claimed that the murder of Sisera, underlined in the family Bible, formed the blueprint for the alleged murder of Azaria. Chamberlain denied these charges. However, for once, he had the media on his side. The *National Times* denounced Brien's book as a "most tawdry account of the Azaria Chamberlain saga."

Days later Michael Chamberlain appeared on Channel 7's Willessee program. The interview won him much public sympathy.

Another Seventh-day Adventist loyalist is Phil Ward, a former pastor who now publishes leading Australian newsletters on business and health. Another of his publications, the independent *Adventist News*, has given a blow-by-blow description of the Chamberlain case since its inception. He says that he has spent $100,000 of his own money to pay for his investigations. Time after time Ward has scooped the news on the case, leaving major media to steal stories from *Adventist News*. More recently he and a fellow Adventist lawyer, Don McNicol, have investigated the case for themselves. Many think that theirs is the best explanation for what happened to baby Azaria. Despite this, Ward's relationship with Michael Chamberlain has sometimes been strained. Commenting on this, Chamberlain says this is so "because of the legal ramifications of a private prosecution, which I never wanted, because I personally do not think that anyone was involved in the disposal of the body. However that does not mean that I don't think there's been a cover-up of some kind." On closer questioning, Chamberlain admitted to me that he has changed his mind repeatedly on the question of human intervention.

Church representatives have been interviewed on the media, including Australian division officers Ron Taylor, secretary, and Russell Kranz, director of communications, to name just two. Others, like Avondale lecturer Dr. Noel Clapham, have contributed
to the public debate through writing letters to the editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald*. Still others have published or circulated private publications. Pastor George Rollo's *The Azaria Mystery* considered the psychological aspects of the case. Peter Hodgson and Dr. Glen Rosendahl have prepared manuscripts dealing with the inaccuracies of Joy Kuhl's evidence. The list of Seventh-day Adventists goes on and on. Many have been involved in Chamberlain lobby groups, the gathering of signatures for the petition given to the Governor-General, and, almost an evangelistic "effort" under another name, the Azaria rallies, frequently held during Sabbath hours.

Strangest of all is the involvement of former members of the church, some of whom are quite hostile to the church on other issues. They include investment advisor A. James Ward, who served for a little time as media advisor to Michael Chamberlain; Dr. Genna Levitch, chairperson for the pro-Chamberlain lobby groups in the Newcastle area; Dr. Weston Allen, who works in a similar capacity in the Brisbane area; and, yes, Dr. Robert Brinsmead, who used his *Verdict* mailing list to gather support for the Chamberlains. In the words of Dr. Levitch, "I didn’t do it for the church. I only did it for Mike." All the same, welcome home, boys.

I fall into this same category of supporters. This article first appeared in *Rolling Stone*, a rock 'n' roll tabloid that frequently runs articles on political and social issues. This list of supportive church members and former church members is by no means exhaustive, nor is it intended to highlight people who are of pre-eminent importance to the case. I have listed only a few examples of Adventist support; in terms of importance, perhaps two non-Adventists are most prominent. They are a Member of Parliament, Mrs. Betty Hocking, and Guy Boyd, a Melbourne sculptor. They have channeled much pro-Lindy support into audible and coherent social protest groups.

---

**Alice Springs**

Alice Springs is where the Chamberlains were committed for trial after the second inquest into the disappearance of their daughter, Azaria. Although the actual Chamberlain trial was held in Darwin, most of the law which saw the case through was from Alice. In Alice Springs, the dingo is subconsciously treated like it is guilty, even though the blame overtly rests on Lindy. The dingo image is seldom seen. Souvenir shops sell scores of felt koalas, wooden wombats, "I Climbed Ayers Rock" T-shirts, and various toy snakes. Kangaroos and kookaburras aplenty, but by November 1983, the dingo image was down to four: two spoons, a keyring, and a postcard. Even the hippopotamus does better than that.

Likewise, aboriginal artists tend to avoid the "dingo dreaming" theme, whereas butterfly and witchetty grub dreamings aren't a problem. The whites are no more forthright. Popular subjects by artists at the Alice Prize 1983 included Pine Gap and Ayers Rock. Dave Stagg seemed to sum up the mood of the place by painting an owl-like visage entitled, "I’ll Paint a Dingo Next Time." More to the point was Graham Sorrelle's painting of the Rock: it dripped blood and got my vote.

Alice Springs is the town closest to the center of the continent. It has a population of 20,000 and also supports 200,000 tourists per year. The area around Alice Springs and Ayers Rock is largely defined by the drivers of the tourist buses. They are the authorities when it comes to telling tourists what goes on about the place, what should be seen, and what is best avoided. Says aboriginal community advisor Jeannie Scollay, "The bus driver is a very powerful person in this part of the world. People just accept the word of the driver, who is usually ill-informed, from the city, knows nothing about the blacks and imparts this gung ho attitude of knowing it all." The obvious
exceptions, according to Jeannie, are those who were born and bred in the Territory.

The effect of the bus driver syndrome is that certain scenes are seldom or never witnessed by the tourists, who may include royalty, international celebrities, or courtiers to a royal bed. Sooner or later most of these will find themselves in the care of the bus driver, who may then impart the attitudes picked up from a limited experience in the locality. I saw this effect at Ayers Rock, where I was surprised to learn that two Swiss tourists had no idea of the appalling living conditions of the aborigines half a mile away. This aspect of the outback is something the tourist industry seems anxious to avoid.

Wherever possible, the aboriginal presence is minimized. There is an unspoken apartheid in which aborigines know their places and there they remain. For example, they don’t bother trying to catch the free tourist bus. They know that they won’t be welcomed, even though no law forbids them. While I was in Alice, in November 1983, a carload of West Australians harassed three aborigines who were drinking a flagon of moselle in the dry Todd River. Aboriginal Willy Young tried to take down their car number, but was too drunk to get it together. Nor would he have known how to register an official complaint at the local police station.

It’s easier for a white person to break the Alice Springs law than it is for a black to stay on the right side of it. That’s because many laws are specifically framed to modify the behavior of aborigines. The best example is the two kilometer drinking law, where one must drink alcohol within two kilometers of the place of purchase, but not in public places. Locals are candid in saying that the only reason for such a law is to keep the “coons” from drinking in the dry Todd River. As this is what Willy Young was doing, the West Australian lads probably felt that they could attack him with a clear conscience.

Aboriginal advisor and filmmaker, Clive Scollay, had this to say about the two kilometer law: "It’s to stop blackfellas sitting in circles in the riverbed. Whitefellas think in squares—hence square paddocks, square buildings, town squares. But blackfellas sit in circles. They think in much more organic shapes."

Despite the fact that many aborigines live in conditions that would shock many whites, if they ever saw them, aboriginal culture is gradually showing signs of growth and acceptance. The aboriginal population is far from resented: apart from anything else, it accounts for almost one-third of the Northern Territory’s economy. It also gives the whites something to draw on tea-towels. The aborigines have a quiet acceptance of their lot. In Alice, you probably won’t get into a fight unless that’s what you’re after. Like drugs, if you’re looking for a fight, you’ve got to go to the right places.

The Central Australian Aboriginal Media Association has a cassette service which offers only aboriginal music, talks, stories, and ideology. This is one of several creative outlets available to aborigines. Another is the Aboriginal Arts and Crafts Centre, which encourages local artists. In the main, it is difficult for whites to differentiate between the best and the mediocre in the aboriginal arts. The works are not usually approachable by European methods. It is probably easier for a creative aborigine to make a name than for a whitefella. Furthermore the Warumpi Band is a strong point of identification. A surprising amount of passing aborigines reckon they play guitar in that band. Among the very young, the hope of attaining such heights is a slight deterrent against petrol sniffing, a habit which is common from the age of seven.

In Alice, the whites talk as if aborigines are perpetually drunk. This has never been tested. Clive Scollay suggests that it could be that—like the shearers—Alice has become a service town, with blackfellas coming in for a regular binge from any of the 14 outlying camps. Or it could be that the same crowd is always drunk. We just don’t
know... Furthermore, whites have a strong sense of "shame," tending not to burp, strip, have sex, or get outrageously out of it in public. The aborigines understand very little of this. So, whereas the drunken behaviour of the whites is done behind closed doors, the blacks do it in the road. Again, we just don't know...

These things may explain a little of the feeling of Alice Springs. However the most influential factor, behind what appears to be the most fascist legal system in Australia, is the existence of Pine Gap, only 20 km south west of Alice. Recently, 600 women, representing Women's Action Against Global Violence, converged on Pine Gap. Jenny Brown, of Brogo, New South Wales, was one. She described Pine Gap like this:

"It's a top secret spy installation sitting in the middle of Australia, but Australians are not entitled to know anything about it. It seems that it's going to play a really key part in any nuclear exchange, either offensive or defensive."

Rosemary Beaumont, of Cobargo, New South Wales, also among the 600, had this to say: "It's like a trigger to World War III sitting just outside Alice Springs. Anything that happens to set off a nuclear exchange anywhere in the world has to involve Pine Gap. It's the key link with all the spy satellites going around the globe, and they're an integral part of the whole American defense and offense system. The satellites are equipped with sophisticated electronic equipment which goes beyond imagination." Even though Jenny and Rosemary were among the 111 women who broke into Pine Gap during the 1983 Women's Anti-Nuke Demonstrations, and even though they have both read extensively on the subject, their main fear with Pine Gap is the unknown. Australia is pro-American by default, meaning that the people have never really been asked. Australians see Pine Gap as just another example of American imperialism. If Seventh-day Adventism became a force, it would be another. So we have Australia identifying with Pine Gap, a headache to Russia, certainly implicating Australia in any nuclear attacks leading to war. This is much resented, as Australians do not know what Pine Gap is. What is known is that it would cost the United States $1 billion to replace it. The lease is renewable every 10 years. Former Prime Minister Gough Whitlam was sacked shortly before his signature was required. The lease is up for renewal in 1986. And under the Defense (Special Undertakings) Act, which is Commonwealth Law, one can be locked up for up to 10 years without a proper trial, with respect to Pine Gap.

Alice Springs is the meeting place of the most sophisticated and the most primitive cultures in Australia. The geography speaks as much about an atomic age as about the Dreaming. While driving through the desert near Docker River, Wayne Howard and five aborigines actually found the Blue Streak Rocket, which came crashing down near the aboriginal camps in 1964, dashing the high hopes of the joint Australian and British venture which was to transform Woomera to the rival of Cape Kennedy in the space race. Wayne Howard found that rocket, told me about it, even showed me the pieces lying around his yard. He reported it to the army who asked him not to talk about it on the media. On the level of co-existence, Pine Gap meets the Dreaming with great difficulty. Both have their secrets.
Wile the searchers were still looking for the body of Azaria, Michael and Lindy were both sure that their daughter was dead. Michael told me that he asked ranger Derek Roff how long Roff expected Azaria to have lived. Roff said, "It'd be all over in a minute mate. She won't have felt a thing." For that small mercy, Michael was relieved. Yet the public thought that Michael and Lindy accepted Azaria's death too quickly. Michael was accused of having been indifferent to all but the early stages of the search. For him, it was more important to pray. Hearing the sounds of Christian music coming from a tent, he burst in, and in a shocked voice told the couple, "If you have a torch, please come out and search. If you haven't, please pray."

He had always been a man of prayer. At the Seventh-day Adventist College, Avondale, he would sit quietly during the chapel service, listening intently and constantly flicking back and forth through his Bible. He was also neat, his Bible color-coded to assist him in finding texts on such subjects as justification, the Sabbath, the Sanctuary, and the Mark of the Beast. At the college he was well-liked. He met Lindy when she was dating another blond ministerial trainee, Sandor Gazsik. Gazsik was Chamberlain's roommate but seemed to take his loss of Lindy sportingly.

From the moment Azaria was missing, Michael seemed to be in a state of despair. The incident had so confused him that he searched with a "pathetically inadequate" torch, instead of a 100-watt spotlight rendered unusable because he could not find the key to turn on the accessory switch in the Torana. He was a man in a trance. Not having passed through such an experience themselves, the public imagined what they would have done. Many judged Chamberlain harshly for not continuing with the search-party and for "wasting time" in prayer.

They were again mystified by the grizzly prospect of a father returning to the fated site and taking black and white photographs for the Adelaide News. That Michael should be so co-operative must have puzzled that newspaper's reporter, Geoff de Luka, the first journalist onto the case. He didn't accept that the Chamberlains were anxious for others to learn from their experience. He could not believe that a couple could lose their baby without also losing their dignity. Unless the Chamberlain's were implicated, how else could they be so certain as to their daughter's fate?

In this way, the Adelaide News started a campaign which the other media followed. Circulation figures showed that when a Chamberlain story was splashed across the first page, sales would rise dramatically. For this reason, every development, no matter how speculative, was usually the lead story. Some accounts not written by the Chamberlains were wrongly accredited to them, and the public strove to make sense of what may be considered an absurd accident.

In describing the Kennedy killing, Standley Cohen, author of Folk Devils & Moral Panics, describes the media's response, which may just as easily fit the Azaria case or any incident which evokes a strong public reaction. He says, "They wanted an explanation of the causes of the murder, a positive meaning to be given to the situation, and a reassurance that the nation would come through the crisis without harm. All these things the mass media provides by reducing the ambiguity created by cultural strain and uncertainty. In the case of mass delusions, a significant stage in the diffusion of the hysterical belief is the attempt by commentators to restructure and make sense of an ambiguous situation. In such situations, theories arise to explain what cannot be seen as random events." Strangely, public reaction to Jackie Kennedy was exactly the opposite to that of Lindy Chamberlain. For exhibiting the same
response to a tragedy, Jackie Kennedy was described as "stoical" while Lindy Chamberlain was "heartless."

Azaria's death was just as meaningless to Australians as the Blue Streak Rocket must have seemed to the aborigines of Docker River. People just had to know why, and so began this "trial by media," but not a trial in the sense of a vendetta against the "much-hated" Chamberlains. They were not hated as much as misunderstood. Working on the premise that dingo attacks were rare, and that the Chamberlains ought to be bursting into tears every time a camera was pointed at them, reporters threw indiscriminate baits at the public, perhaps hoping that someone out there could stand up and explain what it all meant. This was a problem peculiar to the whites. The aborigines understood that wild things sometimes behave wildly, whereas whites tended to suppose that the wildlife around Ayers Rock would behave as if they were in zoo conditions.

Some may feel that there is nothing new about a "trial by media." What was different about this was that the Chamberlains found themselves quite unexpectedly subjected to the sort of treatment reserved only for the very famous. The Chamberlains were seriously disadvantaged by not having developed a means of protecting themselves. To them, the media was something new. At first, getting onto national television might have been a thrill, had it not been marred by bizarre circumstances. It was certainly an opportunity to share their faith, which they dared not pass up. Here, the church showed its complete failure to communicate with the ordinary member. It wasn't the Chamberlain's fault that they accepted so many T.V. interviews. Their message to Australia was the very thing their church had taught them to say. But few understood it; it was esoteric, unbelievable and almost irresponsible.

They never developed an adequate strategy for handling the press. When following their own inclinations, the Chamberlains have usually been over-friendly, and when acting under advice, they've been inaccessible. They've paid a high price for both.

As far as the Chamberlains were concerned, the most damaging aspect of the first inquest was not what was said about them (they were vindicated) but what was said about the forensic science section of the Northern Territory police. Constable Myra Fogarty, of this branch of the Territory's police force, admitted at the second inquest that she had received no formal training in forensic criminology and she failed to observe important blood stains. She agreed that the blood stains she had failed to notice on the tent was likely to be the strongest evidence to support the Chamberlain's story. Although Coroner Denis Barritt chastised Constable Fogarty, he went on to lay the real blame on her supervisor, Detective Sergeant Sandry, who erred in expecting the most junior person in the force to handle what some have called "the case of the century."

Barritt went on to say, "No meaningful liaison appears to exist between members of the forensic science section and the police in the field. From my observations of the operation of this section in this inquiry and other cases in the past, I recommend that consideration be given to it being re-established on a proper forensic basis." He said they had been "negligent in the extreme." Three-and-a-half months later, Constable Fogarty resigned from the force. After this she told the press that she had been made the scapegoat in the Azaria case. Twice, she had asked a senior police officer if she could attend a six-week forensic course run by the South Australian police. Both times she had been told it would be too expensive to have her properly trained.

Barritt did not close the case. His inquest simply summarized what was known to
One statement which virtually ensured the re-opening of the case was his admission of human intervention. He accepted that the sprays on the tent were fetal blood, that dingoes were seen in the area, that Lindy Chamberlain was not a homicidal maniac, that the Chamberlains were accountable for their movements, that Nipper Winmatti's tracking ability was sound, and that a dingo took and killed Azaria Chamberlain on Aug. 17, 1980. But Barritt went on to say that "some intervention occurred before an opportunity arose for the dingo to otherwise maul the body of the child."

Commenting on this point, author James Simmonds says, "For those who could cut through the officialese in which his findings were couched, it was evident that he really did believe a dingo had taken Azaria and that someone knew exactly which dingo it was. The implication was that the dingo in question was well-known to someone living in the vicinity and that person had taken steps to protect the animal." Was Barritt inferring that this could be Cawood's dog, "Ding?" Nipper Winmatti said it was. He followed Ding's tracks to Cawood's house.

Flashing in and out of the action were several physicians, experts, and a couple of professors. Having spent a month arguing about obscure topics, even the judge found the going tough.

Barritt also stated, "It is not unreasonable to infer that the inclination of many at Ayers Rock to protect dingoes could provide a motive to conceal Azaria's body."

Not surprisingly, the suggestion of "human intervention" was unsatisfactory to those who wanted the mystery to come to an end. Why was the jumpsuit, found and photographed first "in a ravaged condition," later folded, and reported by the press as having always been folded? Anyway, whose was the handprint on the jumpsuit, if indeed it was a handprint? Who cut the jumpsuit with the "scissors?" In an attempt to affirm the dingo theory, might even a policeman cut the jumpsuit, thereby hoping to compensate for the failure of their three-week trained forensic department?

Lindy Chamberlain would have none of this, and perhaps this was why people wondered what it was that she wasn't prepared to face? She felt that there had been no human intervention, and that the "scissor cuts" could have been caused by birds pecking at the clothing. Others were not so easily satisfied. Sensing this, the Territory's Chief Minister, Mr. Paul Everingham, instructed the Solicitor-General, Mr. Brian Martin, to re-open the case.

This was a black day for the Chamberlains. Everingham was putting his career on the line by ordering a second inquest. It was just that important that he show progress.

Politically, he could not afford to spend another $500,000 of public money and come back with the same verdict. Michael Chamberlain told me, "We haven't won a round since that second inquest." He might well bemoan his plight; all the stakes had been raised. Responsibility had shifted from Head Ranger of the Ayers Rock National Park to the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory.

Everingham appointed Mr. Jerry Galvin to head the second inquest. Galvin was said to be a "no-nonsense coroner." No more televising of the findings—from now on, the front stage and the back stage were to be kept separate. The forensic department was not to be again disgraced. Furthermore, Mr. Jerry Galvin had a sound record as a "hanging judge." While the findings were not for television, Galvin more than compensated by giving the press every opportunity to photograph and publicize the Chamberlain's car. He was also quite prepared to break convention in order to squeeze them all into the crowded courtroom. For a while, the press were invited to occupy the seats normally filled by the jury. The Chamberlain lawyers protested, claiming that this gesture, at least visually, turned the second inquest into a courtroom. Galvin conceded
the point. The forensic criminologists made their memorable comeback, proving beyond doubt that the Australian public has faith in the unseen if it is packaged as science and not religion. The result was a clear-cut finding of fetal blood all through the family Torana. It hadn’t even flaked off from under the dash.

Obviously the Chamberlains are finding it difficult to account for the blood. Only a brave man would step into the witness box and suggest that it may have been a set-up. Yet when I suggested to Michael Chamberlain that it might have been a plant, he genuinely didn’t think it was. He believed that it must have been the blood of car accident victim, Keyth Lenehan. I have yet to ask Michael to explain the syringe plunger, the fact that the blood was sticky, and why the car was not impounded until it was out of his care. Here’s a body, a motive and an opportunity. Mr. Jerry Galvin committed the matter to court and on Oct. 29, 1982, Lindy Chamberlain was convicted of murder, and Michael Chamberlain as an accessory to it.

Court was held in Darwin, the capital of the Northern Territory. Justice Muirhead was Judge. For the prosecution, Ian Barker; Des Sturgess, Queen’s Council; and Tom Pauling. In the other corner, John Phillips, Queen’s Council; Andrew Kirkham; Peter Dean; and Stewart Tipple. Flashing in and out of the action we then had several physicians, many experts, and a couple of professors. Having spent a month arguing about obscure topics, such as the pH content of the soil, even the judge found the going tough. So the whole matter was handed over to three housewives, two clerks, three public servants, a builder, plumber, mechanic, and a surveyor, who unanimously found Lindy Chamberlain guilty. She’s virtually been in jail ever since.

Her only respite was when she was released to give birth to Kahlia. Again the Chamberlains were heavily criticised. When Lindy told the press that she had toyed with the idea of calling her daughter Azaria II, the movie industry started to get excited. Many were openly revolted by the idea, and the Chamberlains settled for Kahlia. After “sacrifice in the wilderness,” Michael and Lindy were sick of the meaning-behind-the-name. They picked Kahlia, which means nothing at all. “She’s only doing it for the sympathy,” was a frequent comment on Lindy’s pregnancy, and, “She thinks they won’t send a pregnant woman to jail.” Around the time of the first inquest, Lindy had told the press that all her pregnancies had been planned—Kahlia too?

Yet the point that was missed is that, in making his wife pregnant with “Azaria II,” Michael Chamberlain was telling Australia that Lindy had been OK with Azaria I. It’s almost unthinkable that a normal, clean-living, clergyman and justice of the peace of the peace could not only cover up for a wife who had massacred his daughter, but then give her more to carve up. Just the opposite, here Michael Chamberlain was trusting his wife with more of the same. This was his strongest testimony and something that could not register even one point in the judicial system of the nation. Furthermore, you might suppose that after three years a man might tire of covering-up for his daughter’s murderer, but Michael Chamberlain has done the very opposite, appealing to higher and higher courts, asking for more—not less—investigation. He just doesn’t seem ashamed.

Writer of The Dingo Didn’t Do It, Jim Oram, neatly summarized public feeling after the verdict: “It was as though people had had their sport, their excitement during the trial, but were appalled at the ver-
dict . . . It wasn’t Jack the Ripper who had been sentenced. It wasn’t a sexual pervert or a mass murderer or a multilator who had been sent to Berrimah Jail on the outskirts of Darwin, but an attractive, dark-haired woman with far-away eyes, a 34-year-old mother of two living children."

Then, flying in the face of all sensitivity, along comes Dave Hansen and cartoonist Mark Trounce. Their production *Dingo Lingo* was a kind of instruction book on 101 ways for a dingo to kill a baby: you can toast it, mince it, turn it into hamburgers or shish kebab. There was also a tea-towel, and a few T-shirt manufacturers, all trying to earn a living to tide them through the recession and into an age when the print medium can afford to be more scrupulous.

**The Defense**

During the Chamberlain trial, the defense was always tame. They seemed to adopt a "we’ll go quietly" attitude, almost hoping that their clients would be let off if the defense adopted a sufficiently low profile. They had their problems: a main one was credibility. There were two points on which the Chamberlains and Stewart Tipple were all alone. Even friends and supporters couldn’t go along with them.

As previously mentioned, the idea that "a person or persons, name unknown" was involved in the disposal of Azaria’s body has been virtually accepted by the Australian public as FACT. The prosecution believe these "persons" to be the Chamberlains, but in their defense the Chamberlains have shied away from theories of human intervention. They’re virtually all alone in that thinking, the involvement of the third party being the heart of the mystery. It explains anomalies such as the "scissor" cuts, the missing matinee jacket (perhaps removed because it contained key evidence). It also explains the sudden appearance of Azaria’s clothes 15 meters from a dingo lair, and it makes sense out of Brown’s and Cameron’s evidence.

A second defense-backed improbability is the identity of the dingo that took Azaria. Perhaps deceived by those involved in the cover-up, Tipple’s defense team has consistently blamed the wrong dingo. They claimed the dingo carrying Azaria went south, whereas it is becoming increasingly obvious that it moved in a westerly direction. True, a second dingo went south, but it was not carrying Azaria.

The defense was fraught with problems, not the least being a curious reversal: instead of the thrust of the case being a prosecution attempting to establish guilt “beyond reasonable doubt,” it was the defense who found themselves with the unexpected task of having to prove the absolute innocence of the Chamberlains. How did things get so about-faced? Simply, the prosecution had a comprehensive explanation for the events of Aug. 17, while the defense could only offer a jig-saw puzzle explanation, with many key pieces missing.

Furthermore, the prosecution latched onto a major flaw in the Australian legal system: a jury will usually vote in favor of a speaker who is interesting and charming, in preference to one who may be right. The prosecution had this area all sewn up, leaving the defense to resort to dissertations from highly-qualified intellectuals. Enter prosecution witness Joy Kuhl—entertaining, not what you’d call good-looking in Sydney, but worth six out of 10 in the outback.

For the Northern Territory Police Force, Joy Kuhl was a real pleasure to deal with. She went out on dates with key prosecution witnesses Constable James Metcalfe and Detective Sergeant Graeme Charlwood. In fact, she was so popular with the force that they offered her a permanent position in the Territory which she accepted in 1984. She was an instructress in court, simplifying where the defense was intent on doing the opposite. One observer described Kuhl as a "theatrical actress." Jill Bottrell, of the *Centralian Advocate*, summarized Kuhl’s court
performance like this: "Joy Kuhl had the court wrapped around her little finger. How could they misunderstand? She was going out of her way to prove to them that what she was saying was completely and utterly correct. There were no two ways about it, and she kept on asking, 'Now do you understand?' 'You understand this, don't you?' and they're all going 'Yeah'.'

Attorney McHugh argued that it was highly unlikely that a woman who had just murdered her baby would be involved in playful frolic right after committing the murder.

In February 1983, the Chamberlains launched their first appeal. Mr. Michael McHugh for the Chamberlains told the court that the case in favor of innocence was overpowering. His vital points included the "extraordinary" fact that Lindy Chamberlain had asked someone to have her tracksuit pants drycleaned. These were the pants said to have been splattered with blood. McHugh also presented evidence to show that children had also bled in the car. He added that there was tremendous significance that not one of the loops of material in the car were bloodstained, that the bloodstained chamois found in the car had been used to clean up blood from accident victims, and that it was "hardly consistent" that a woman who had just murdered her baby would be involved in a race with her son Aidan, right after committing murder. Judges Sir Lionel Bowen and Sir William Forster concluded that, "We are quite unable to say that the jury was wrong." And the first appeal failed.

Shortly beforehand, publisher Phil Ward handed a lengthy dossier to one of the Chamberlain legal team. In this brief was indeed some material which may prove to be of tremendous significance. Ward and lawyer Don McNicol, along with another Seventh-day Adventist, Arthur Hawken, turned into super-sleuths and succeeded in producing an alternative explanation to the Azaria story.

The Ward-McNicol Private Prosecution

Phil Ward arrived on the scene too late to make anyone feel comfortable. He’s got all the bad habits of Colombo, with an erratic temperament which may only lead to genius or total failure. He’s unconventional, petulant, and he’ll go broke if he has to, just to prove a point. That’s why he can’t be shaken off the path. He’s thrown away the rulebook. Although he’s a Seventh-day Adventist, it’s not the church that he’s trying to vindicate, but the Chamberlains.

He and Michael were in the same theology classes at Avondale College, but whereas Michael went on to become a minister, Ward has pursued a successful career in publishing. He is the owner of the Business Newsletters Group, and his mini-empire includes ownership of The Small Business Letter, The Investment Advisor, Health ’84, Time Talk, and Adventist News. The latter is exactly what it sounds like—a newsletter for Seventh-day Adventists. In many ways this publication is the most representative of the real Phil Ward.

Ward is capable of carrying superlative workloads. Rather like the idealized American businessman, Ward bursts into his office and writes all his editorials, plus a string of other pieces, plus correspondence, and then he may devote the afternoon to the Azaria case. Work accompanies him wherever he goes.

Don McNicol is getting paid for it. He doesn’t make any bones about that. Ward initiated McNicol’s involvement, he didn’t. Initially he feared that Lindy Chamberlain might be guilty, but after going through the
evidence accumulated by Ward and Arthur Hawken, McNicol was convinced. Although very different in temperament from Phil Ward, both seem to attract audiences from out of nowhere; each will make himself known to a roomful of strangers, and each is seldom anonymous, even when trying to be. In the course of their investigations they have had their luggage searched, snooping equipment and cassette tapes stolen, and have received two death threats.

Arthur Hawken is an older Seventh-day Adventist living in Cooranbong, the village which surrounds Avondale College. He began his own independent investigations but teamed up with Ward and McNicol. Hawken specializes in communicating with the aborigines. After working with Ward and McNicol for three months or so he left the team after “constant harassment by rangers and police.”

Ward and McNicol plan to have their evidence tested in a private prosecution of certain people who, they claim, “covered the thing up.” Their only other alternative is a Judicial Enquiry, which is unlikely because Paul Everingham would not want it. What follows is their explanation for the events surrounding the disappearance of Azaria Chamberlain. This is how Don McNicol explained it to me:

Azaria Chamberlain’s predator was the dingo named “Ding,” “Scarface,” “ Kulpunya.” His photograph appeared in the front cover of Sydney’s Daily Mirror July 20, 1983, with the headline, “This Dingo Took Azaria.” In favor of this argument is the fact that Nipper Winmatti and wife Barbara which identified the tracks as Ding’s because Ding had a limp in his left foreleg. These tracks moved away from the camp, to a place where the trackers claimed they saw marks which indicated that the bundle was temporarily put down. The tracks then doubled back and led to the Cawood’s house, where they became too obscure for tracking. The next day, a second tracker independently returned the same findings.

On the other hand, park ranger Ian Cawood claims to have shot Ding eight weeks beforehand, after Ding had gone for the throat of another small child. Don McNicol and Phil Ward believe that Ding wasn’t shot. He was re-located. Says McNicol, “The unusual thing is that Ian Cawood said he shot this dingo, but never before in the history of this park had troublesome dingoes ever been shot, ever. They had been taken away and were re-located. That was standard procedure. There was no need, with such a vast country, to kill healthy animals. They could be taken away and be expected never to return. They shot dingoes that had mange and that were sick, or got down near the sewer pits and couldn’t walk any further. They never shot a good dingo, but here, Ian Cawood said he shot this one.

“Three days after Azaria disappeared, the aborigines saw Ding near the British Petroleum station and Ininti Store, and they knew it was Ding that took the baby. They ran and got Cawood to come and shoot the dingo. The reason they went and got Cawood was because three men were appointed to shoot all dingoes for stomach analysis; Frank Morris, John Beasey, and Ian Cawood. The aborigines told me that Cawood then shot a bullet past his nose, and missed. Now Derek Roff told us that Cawood was a crack shot with a gun. Besides, if he’d wanted to shoot Ding, Ding was so much of a pet that Cawood would just go up and put the gun in his ear and pull the trigger, which is exactly how Ding died later on, two or three days later when Ding turns up in front of the police station, just along the road between Cawood’s corner and the police station. Morris saw him, raced out, put the gun in his ear, pulled

Despite assurances from the Seventh-day Adventist clergy, the laity can plainly see that people do not respect them for their faith.
the trigger—bang. Dead. It was in the middle of the day, and fortunately there were two witnesses, white people who saw this happen and were very upset because Ding was a pet, and they didn’t understand why he had to be shot. 

“So we asked Constable Frank Morris if he knew what Ding looked like. He did, it was the big red one with the white collar. No problem. But when we asked him ‘Did you shoot him?’ He said ‘No. You’ve got your facts wrong there.’ Anyway, we had a look at the Conservation Commission reports, the police reports where all the dingoes that were shot were supposed to be recorded, the time they were shot, where they were shot, by whom, etc., and how many bullets were expended. But this particular shooting incident, I couldn’t find at all. So he shot a dingo in a National Park and he did not record it.”

There are also many inconsistencies in the Cawood’s story of their movements on the night when Azaria became missing, and as no rangers ever searched the yards, this part of the case is still a mystery. McNicol feels that the many footprints which obliterated Ding’s tracks around the Cawood house are unusual. They alone show a lot of movement in an area where the searchers had not yet come. Says McNicol: “We have a witness who puts Val Cawood, daughter Debbie, and another lady by the name of Lynne Beasey—wife of the mechanic for the Conservation Commission—in the yard at 11:30 p.m., in the backyard with torches. They thought it unusual. We have another witness who actually went over and spoke to them in the yard, and the three women were in the yard at 2:30 in the morning, still with torches. As this fellow said, ‘I had a very strange feeling that I wasn’t wanted there.’ Val said that she was looking underneath buildings because aboriginal dogs often have their puppies under houses, but the interesting thing is that there is no ‘underneath’ to the Cawood’s house. It’s built on a concrete slab.” After this, McNicol claims that all three ladies gave variant accounts of their movements, including “having a cup of coffee outside,” which McNicol felt was strange around 2:00 a.m. in a temperature of minus 2 degrees. McNicol claims that Val Cawood burned the slacks she wore that night. 

Motive? Coroner Denis Barritt suggested one in the first inquest, words not often resurrected! “It is not unreasonable to infer that the inclination of many at Ayers Rock to protect dingoes could provide a motive to conceal Azaria’s body.”

**Conclusion**

The Azaria case has proved to be an embarrassing one for Australians. Whether or not the Chamberlains are innocent, there are those who now fear that Lindy’s innocence would make such a farce of the whole judicial system, that it would be best to let things stand. The status quo is at stake, with the question no longer one of innocence, but of disruption. Says one, “Personally I’ve had a gut full of this Chamberlain travelling circus. Let them accept the decision of the referee no matter how painful.” That’s almost like saying, “If you let us scapegoat the Chamberlains, we’ll promise never to use that reagent again.”

The disquieting feature of the Chamberlain case is that it somehow keeps putting the finger on the pulse of Australian prejudices. The first is racial. Nipper Winmatti, who should have been a key witness for the defense, has never been used to his fullest potential. He stated, perhaps a dozen times in the first inquest, that the dingo that took Azaria went west. This was ignored—not challenged—ignored! The inquest proceeded as if he was in agreement with white witnesses who’d said the dingo moved south. An interpreter was not enough to make Winmatti understood.
Another strange characteristic of the case is the willingness on the part of Australians to believe a woman killed her baby. On one hand some feminists are reckoning that there is something normal about a mother wanting to murder her baby, and Lindy, religion aside, is normal in Australian terms. But others are piqued that Lindy should be seen as a murderer, whereas Michael appears as a mere accomplice. In the finish, Australia identified the person they wanted to punish for murder. It was a woman, not a man, much less a dingo.

Finally, the Azaria case has highlighted the issue of religious prejudice. The results have been so harsh that no one stands to gain by talking about it. Despite the assurances from the Seventh-day Adventist clergy, the laity can plainly see that people do not respect them for their faith. But in bringing this out, the secular world also stands accused for misunderstanding Seventh-day Adventism just as surely as they misunderstood the blacktracker. In Australian legal history, the closest parallel case is that of the bombing of the Sydney Hilton. A religious group, the Ananda Marga, were blamed for the terrorism, but many who have closely examined the case believe that they, like the Chamberlains, were falsely blamed.

In Australia, the Chamberlain situation is becoming more and more obviously a case of victimization. Apart from the racial, religious, and sexist overtones, the death of Azaria Chamberlain is what the people laugh about. Azaria jokes are a national obsession, alongside Irish jokes, Wog jokes, elephant jokes, and jokes about the physically handicapped. How do Australians cope with this? Easy. The secular press assures the people that Lindy is coping well in jail, even though privately Michael says she's not. Every so often the Seventh-day Adventist Church circulates a morsel from Lindy, likewise giving an assurance that her religious faith is sacrosanct.

Perhaps the last word belongs to Michael Chamberlain, who this year resigned as a pastor of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Three months before the official resignation, I asked him whether he would continue with pastoral work. His answer was simply, “Who’ll let me?” Summing up his current situation, he said this: “The last four years have certainly changed my approach to life. As a minister looking back, I see myself as being quite naive about certain aspects of life. A realism in the horror of our situation has caused me to become a great deal more pragmatic, and at times even cynical. However, I remain a spiritual person, and while I am perfectly willing to be judged and criticized, it will only be by God and history.”
Notes On Books By And About Adventists

by Rennie Schoepflin

Dewey M. Beegle. Prophecy and Prediction. 274pp., bibl., index. Ann Arbor, MI: Pryor Pettengill, 1978. $5.95 (paper).

With an eye to the predictive aspects of biblical prophecy, this professor of Old Testament at Wesley Theological Seminary seeks to clarify the confusing and contradictory prophetic claims of Christian denominations by developing an understanding of the Bible’s teaching. In the first half of the book, Beegle describes biblical predictions and discusses their accuracy, and outlines and characterizes biblical apocalyptic literature, focusing particularly on Daniel and Revelation. The concluding half of the book describes and critiques popularly influential prophetic schemes that have tried to find contemporary events foreshadowed in biblical prophecy—a task that he finds fruitless. He devotes one chapter to a discussion of Seventh-day Adventism, concluding that E.G. White’s efforts to authenticate her prophetic claims and religious dogmas were “built on sand” and “simply not biblical.” Beegle asks: “What kind of mentality is it that can keep psyched up enough to continue making proclamations when years of history witness that previous pronouncements are wrong?”

Gregory G. P. Hunt, M.D. Beware This Cult! An Insider Exposes Seventh-Day Adventism and Their False Prophet Ellen G. White. 152pp. Belleville, Ontario, Canada: The Author, 1981. $7.00 (paper).

In this angry diatribe against the “cult” of Seventh Day Adventism [sic], a Canadian physician prays that a record of his experiences will shield others from the misery inflicted by Adventism and prompt them to read the Bible. But Hunt’s real purpose “is to discredit Ellen G. White as a prophet and to encourage some thinking amongst the members of the Seventh Day Adventist Church [sic].” A former member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church for three years, Hunt invites his readers to skip ahead to the “sensational material” of Chapter 6, “The Meat of the Adventist Health Message,” to discover that “one would have to be an idiot to follow her [E.G. White’s] counsel.” Reciting a litany of White’s “destructive philosophies” and “perversions,” he discusses diet, medicine, Catholicism, the Sabbath, and witchcraft among many other prophetic “errors.” Hunt concludes his private little exorcism with the invitation to accept Jesus Christ as your personal Saviour and hopes that the reading of this book will “protect” you from joining the Adventist Church.


In a popular, accessible style, Paul Bork, professor of religion at Pacific Union College, continues a tradition of apologetics that uses the discoveries of archaeology to confirm faith in the historicity and accuracy of the Bible. Focusing on the patriarchal age, Bork reconstructs the ancient worlds of Mesopotamia, Palestine, and Egypt—the
lands inhabited or visited by Abraham. Tentatively, Bork ventures to assign dates to key events in Abraham's life and provides a larger context for the patriarchal stories by describing the geography, politics, culture, religion, and laws of an important cradle of modern civilization. In welcome contrast to most books published by Adventist presses, this book contains a useful, though somewhat dated, bibliography and enough footnotes to convey the air of scholarship necessary to reinforce most Adventists' faith "that God's Word is accurate and dependable."

Arnold Valentin Wallenkampf. Salvation Comes From the Lord. 128pp. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1983. $3.45 (paper).

Wallenkampf believes that the dangers of an unbalanced confidence in faith or works "lurk still in today's church" and argues that a true understanding of biblical salvation always portrays faith and works as "good neighbors." In this brief discussion of salvation, based primarily on the New Testament books of Galatians and James, the author describes how men and women "can be made spiritually alive and fit for heavenly society." He sensitively attends to the historical and theological contexts surrounding these two books, concluding that the authors' seemingly contradictory attitudes toward the value of works in salvation only represent the different needs of their audiences. A brief glance at the footnotes reveals the author's dependence on the authority of Ellen G. White, but he also regularly and conspicuously cites Martin Luther and occasionally acknowledges contemporary commentators. For the reader confused by the apparent conflicts of Scripture, this book illustrates the power of a moderate historical-criticism to create a richer understanding of the Bible by acknowledging its diversities.

News Updates

Singer of The Rainbow

The following article is reprinted in part from a longer feature, written by Washington Post staff writer Edward D. Sargent, that appeared July 21 in The Washington Post. Wintley Phipps is an ordained Seventh-day Adventist minister who is an assistant to the president of Oakwood College. Phipps and Jesse Jackson met in Huntsville, Ala. and have been friends for over a decade. Phipps defends his involvement in Jackson's political campaign by saying, "Jesse is at heart a minister in the prophetic tradition. He represents just causes—feeding hungry children and caring for the aged." Phipps points out that the presence of a black Christian Sabbath-keeper in Jackson's campaign was noted appreciatively by many Jews, who had been angered by other aspects of the campaign. Phipps has said that he would be equally pleased to sing at gatherings to help the needy which featured Republican political figures, such as one of Mrs. Reagan's meetings to prevent drug abuse by the young.

—The Editors

SAN FRANCISCO—He was the mystery singer at the Democratic National Convention. But at his song's end, he had a rainbow of blacks, whites, Hispanics and Native Americans holding hands and swaying back and forth like a forest caught up in a forceful but calm tropical storm. Tears flowed freely. Many of those in the crowd were disarmed and numbed by the moment.
The singer, Wintley Phipps of Columbia, Md., walked out of obscurity and into the spotlight Tuesday night when he took center stage. Phipps, whose bass-baritone sounds like rumbling cannon-fire, sang a moving, meditative song called "Ordinary People" that capped off the Rev. Jesse Jackson's 50-minute electrifying appeal to the convention.

The combination was a one-two punch that dazzled the thousands of Democrats crammed into Moscone Center. "God uses ordinary people... put your faith in the Master's hands," sang Phipps, a 29-year old Seventh-day Adventist minister who actually lifted more conventioneers and guests to their feet than did Jackson.

To those unmoved, it was a sideshow, emotional hogwash. "Ordinary people, huh?" scoffed one lukewarm delegate who declined to be identified after Mondale received the nomination Wednesday. "We're going to have to be extraordinary in order to beat the Republicans. But it was a beautiful song."

At a jam-packed reception in his honor Wednesday night, Jackson said he was glad to "share the stage" with Phipps. "I wanted the nation to hear him, too." And the response, Jackson indicated, was what he expected. "People have been calling [Jackson campaign headquarters] from all over the world asking us, 'Who is this brother, Wintley Phipps?' "

On several occasions during Jackson's campaign, Phipps sang gospel songs before the candidate spoke. "This was the first time I sang after he spoke," Phipps said. "He requested that I sing after him this time because he wanted to leave the people in a spiritual mood.

"We had some discussions about the kind of song we were going to do because they wanted to be careful that everything fit just right. We chose the song from a list of three," Phipps said. The two others, both gospels, were "Remember Me" and "I Choose You Again." he said.

Jackson and Phipps met 10 years ago while the singer was a student at Oakwood College, a Seventh-day Adventist school in Huntsville, Ala. Their relationship grew through Phipps' participation in annual "black expo" conventions held by Jackson's activist organization, PUSH.

Phipps is president of a small recording company called Serenity and has produced three moderately successful albums that feature his singing. He has never had a runaway hit, but his music is played on gospel radio stations across the country and he has appeared on several religious television programs. He was one of the first gospel artists to perform on the black music show "Soul Train" when he sang a tribute to Minnie Ripperton in 1979.

He is currently assistant to the president of Oakwood College, handling public relations and recruitment, he said.

At noon Wednesday, Phipps visited Jackson's headquarters at the Hyatt Union Square Hotel and encountered the robust former mayor of Atlanta, Maynard Jackson. "Young man, you were tremendous. Do you have a [business] card?" Maynard asked, smiling. "No," Phipps said, also smiling. "Then take mine and call me. I want to talk to you about coming to Atlanta. You were tremendous."

Rae Lewis, 22, a youth coordinator for the Jackson campaign, screamed when she saw him. "Tears were already in my eyes before you started to sing. When you opened your mouth, your voice just shook me. The tears flowed."

Phipps said he is not sure how to keep his momentary star shining. "I wouldn't know how to maximize on this moment in terms of advancing my career as a singer," Phipps said before leaving here for Washington and a reunion with his wife Linda, a nurse, and their 3-year old son, Wintley II.

But perhaps Arthur Pinkney, Jackson's campaign manager, has the next step in mind. He asked Phipps: "You released an album recently? We're going to have to do some marketing."
GC Commission Plans Minor Changes
by George Colvin

The report of the Commission on the Role and Function of Denominational Organizations to the 1984 Annual Council basically endorses the present system, recommends few changes, and does not build rationales for the changes it does recommend. Francis W. Wernick, a General Conference vice president, chaired the commission which included officers and laypeople from the world divisions.

Absent are any recommendations about the church’s electoral processes. Instead, the commission affirms management by committee, rejecting business, government, and academic models. While the report suggests some ways to separate the functions of the North American Division from those of the General Conference, it firmly rejects the view that North America should become a full-fledged and separate division. The report also reaffirms unions as the foundation of the General Conference, and it strongly emphasizes the control of the General Conference by saying that its authority comes from God. Although the commission was established in the aftermath of Davenport, issues of communication and accountability are totally ignored.

The recommendations will be discussed at the 1984 Annual Council and then submitted to the 1985 General Conference Session in New Orleans. If accepted, changes will be made by the unions and local conferences before the 1986 Annual Council.

The Role and Function Commission’s recommendations are notable for what they leave out. The report deals with seemingly minute matters—for instance, it recommends that the name the ‘‘North American Division Committee on Administration’’ be changed to the ‘‘North American Division Committee’’—but what changes like this imply in terms of actual operation is not spelled out. The commission’s recommendations that lay participation should increase and administrative personnel should decrease might substantially change the way the church’s affairs are conducted, but how this might come about is also not explained. The commission supports lay involvement increasing, but suggests that it still be less at the General Conference level, where policy is formed, than on lower levels. The roles of the local church and local conference are barely mentioned.

The commission argues for more centralized authority and specifically recommends that the constitutions of church organizations below the General Conference level conform closely to General Conference Working Policy models (at present, they differ widely). The commission also states that all changes to constitutions of local conferences and union should require the approval of the next higher level of organization, which they do not now do.

Two pages of the 24-page report are devoted to explaining the North American Division’s role and function. While asserting the ‘‘special relationship which has existed historically between the General Conference and the North American Division,’’ the commission proposes several changes to improve the division’s visibility: separate division quarters (but in the new General Conference complex), separate annual estimates of the division’s operating costs (possibly a step toward a separate budget), a division administrative committee with the authority to appoint study groups, and increased responsibility for the division officers and directors (complete with new titles).

In the end, by not supplying any supporting evidence or rationale for its recommendations, the commission has missed an important opportunity to build the church unity which it says is of utmost importance.
Authors Respond to Geraty's Criticisms

To the Editors: In his Spectrum (Vol. 14, No. 1) review of our book Understanding Your Temperament: A Self-Analysis with a Christian Viewpoint, Ronald Geraty mentions three psychometric aspects of the Temperament Inventory to which we would like to respond. First, he states that "it took me two tries to fill out the questionnaire due to its length and confusing repetitive questions." The length of the Inventory is in line with other well-known personality and temperament tests. In fact, in reviewing 18 of the most widely-used tests recently, none were shorter, and some were three to five times longer.

With regard to "repetitiveness" of the Temperament Inventory, in calculating the factor analysis, each item was unique in its factor loading for each of the four temperaments. So though they may seem to be repetitive, each item is measuring a unique aspect of each temperament. Finally, he comments that "the authors do not adequately describe the population they need to standardize the test." The description of the population in our Educational and Psychological Measurement is quite detailed and includes: number of subjects, type of sampling methodology, socioeconomic status, vocational categories, geographical regions, gender, and age.

W. Peter Blitchington, Ph.D.
Asst. Director of Family Practice Residency for Behavioral Medicine Florida Hospital

Robert J. Cruise, Ph.D.
Prof. of Research and Statistical Methodology Andrews University

In Defense of Weimar

To the Editors: After having spent three years at Weimar Institute as a student—graduating in 1984—I was shocked and dismayed at the misinterpretation of the principles and philosophy of Weimar Institute as portrayed in your article, (Spectrum, Vol. 15, No. 1).

Weimar Institute is made up of individuals, each growing in his or her personal understanding of and relationship with God at different levels of growth. Some who have a concept of God as being harsh, arbitrary, demanding, judgmental, and unbalanced, have been on the staff in previous years. Some have been disillusioned and left because the philosophy of Weimar Institute is to present God as he really is... forgiving, healing, restoring, loving, and non-condemning. The primary focus of the theology here is not on the gifts, but rather on the giver. We can never base our classification of what Weimar is on one or two individuals.

It hurts me to see the bitterness that Van Cleave, Wohlfiel, and the Chens are expressing. What I have seen as I have been close to several faculty members and students is that those who lean toward an unbalanced view of God do get disgruntled and leave. I have seen the administrators treat people only with the utmost respect, sensitivity, love, and concern.

The atmosphere of Weimar Institute, especially this past year, is one that elicits openness, change, growth, and genuine love for one another. I just cannot keep from sharing the beauty of the truths that I learned.

One thing that is important to remember is that Weimar is progressive—as the understanding of God and his methods of relating to people deepens in the hearts and minds of those whom God uses to run the institute—the institute grows in its understanding of God and his methods. I'm excited about the picture of God that I have seen and experienced at Weimar Institute and am thankful that the emphasis is not in me concentrating on my weaknesses, but in concentrating on Jesus Christ.

Sonja Phillips, Youth Pastor Paradise, CA

My Favorite Uncle

To the Editors: In thanking Fred Hoyt for his perceptive review of Arthur White's biography of Ellen White, I hasten to point out that Francis White, not Arthur, is Ellen White's "youngest grandson."

Francis, a favorite uncle of mine, was on the staff of the Pacific Press Publishing Association until the mid-1970s where, for many years before offset printing, he was in charge of the photoengraving department. He recently moved to Oregon.

Oliver Jacques
Franklin, OH
Spectrum Advisory Council

Charlene and Floyd Anderson
Lucille and Alan Anderson
Julie and Charles Bensonhaver
Ramona and Len Bjerle
Ben R. Boice
LeJean and Allen Botimer
Netidah and Bernard Brandstater
Betty and Bruce Branson
Mary and Floyd Brauer
Merrilyn and Ray Brown
Melvin and Robert Butman
Harold S. Campbell
Dor and Moleurous Couperus
Eryl Cummings
Walter Cummings
Elise 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 Faltings
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 Hjalmar Helmersen
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
Robert 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
Anita and William Rippey
Thais and James Sadoyma
Ursula and Donald Shaysky
Gordon and Lovina Short
Grace and Walter Stimson
Carlene and Leonard Taylor
Dort and Nancy Tikker
Dorwin and Faye Tompkins
Lou Anne and Thorvaldur Torfason
Meredith 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 Wooster
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