

La Sierra—To Move or Not To Move?
Letter From the Philippines
Adventist Leads Ugandan Revolution

SPECTRUM

Journal of the Association of Adventist Forums

Volume 17, Number 4

BIBLICAL SAGAS AND SYMBOLS

Samson as Theological Narrative
Jonah as Prophetic Comedy
The Sanctuary in *Paradise Lost*

SPECTRUM

Editor

Roy Branson

Senior Editor

Tom Dybdahl

News Editor

Bonnie Dwyer

Manuscript Editor

Gene Daffern

Book Review Editors

Peggy Corbett

Rennie Schoepflin

Production

Barry Casey

FastForWord

Publication Services

Editorial Board

Roy Benton
Chairman, Mathematics Department
Columbia Union College

Roy Branson
Ethics, Kennedy Institute
Georgetown University

Molleurus Couperus
Physician
Angwin, California

Gene Daffern
Physician
Frederick, Maryland

Bonnie Dwyer
Journalism
Loma Linda, California

Tom Dybdahl
Editor
Allentown, Pennsylvania

Alvin L. Kwiram
Chairman, Chemistry Department
University of Washington

Gary Land
History
Andrews University

Rennie Schoepflin
History
Loma Linda University

Charles Scriven
Senior Pastor
Sligo Church

Consulting Editors

Earl W. Amundson
Church Administration

Karen Bottomley
History
Calgary, Alberta

Bonnie L. Casey
Writer/Editor
Washington, D.C.

Raymond Cottrell
Theology
Loma Linda, California

Geri Fuller
Public Relations
Washington, D.C.

Lawrence Geraty
President
Atlantic Union College

Fritz Guy
Theology
Loma Linda University

F.E.J. Harder
Educational Administration
College Place, Washington

Jorgen Henriksen
Artist
University of California
Walla Walla, Washington

Edward Lugenbeal
Health Care Administration
Kettering, Ohio

Donald R. McAdams
President
Texas Independent College Fund

Margaret McFarland
Asst. Attorney General
Annapolis, Maryland

LaVonne Neff
Publishing
Downers Grove, Illinois

Ronald Numbers
History of Medicine
University of Wisconsin

Edward E. Robinson
Attorney
Chicago, Illinois

Gerhard Svrcek-Seiler
Psychiatrist
Vienna, Austria

Carolyn Stevens Shultz
English
Walla Walla College

Helen Ward Thompson
Vice-President
Loma Linda University

L.E. Trader
Education
Marienhoehe Gymnasium
West Germany

Louis Venden
Senior Pastor
Loma Linda University Church

Association of Adventist Forums

Officers

President
Glenn E. Coe
Attorney
Hartford, Connecticut

Vice President

Verla Kwiram

Business
Seattle, WA

Executive Secretary
Virginia Murray Mendoza
Administration
Takoma Park, Maryland

Treasurer
Richard C. Osborn
Principal
Takoma Academy

Editor
Roy Branson
Ethics, Kennedy Institute
Georgetown University

Directors

Of Chapter Development
Walter Douglas
Church History
Andrews University

Of Harvest '90
Arthur R. Torres
Senior Pastor
Glendale City Church

Of Promotion
Richard B. Lewis, Jr.
Advertising
Weston, Massachusetts

Of Special Projects
Lyndrey A. Niles
Communications
Howard University

Regional Representatives

Atlantic
Lourdes Morales-Gudmundsson
Spanish Literature
University of Connecticut

Central
Darrell J. Huenergardt
Attorney
Kimball, Nebraska

Central Pacific Region
Larry Mitchel
Hospital Administration
Angwin, California

Columbia
E. Theodore Agard
Radiation Physicist
Kettering, Ohio

Eastern Canada
Beverly Connors
Oshawa, Canada

Lake
Donald Gillespie
Health Care Administration
Stevensville, Michigan

Northern Pacific Region
Terrie Aamodt
English
College Place, Washington

Southern Region
Laura Gladson
Psychology
Collegedale, Tennessee

Southern Pacific Region
Jim Kaatz
Education
Lakeside, California

Staff

Legal Consultant
Bradley Litchfield
Attorney
Washington, D.C.

Admin. Secretary
Charla M. Rideout
Takoma Park, Maryland

SPECTRUM is a journal established to encourage Seventh-day Adventist participation in the discussion of contemporary issues from a Christian viewpoint, to look without prejudice at all sides of a subject, to evaluate the merits of diverse views, and to foster Christian intellectual and cultural growth. Although effort is made to ensure accurate scholarship and discriminating judgment, the statements of fact are the responsibility of contributors, and the views individual authors express are not necessarily those of the editorial staff as a whole or as individuals.

The Association of Adventist Forums is a non-subsidized, non-profit organization for which gifts are deductible in the report of income for purposes of taxation. The publishing of SPECTRUM depends on subscriptions, gifts from individuals and the voluntary efforts of the contributors and the staff.

Editorial Correspondence: SPECTRUM is published by the Association of Adventist Forums. Direct all editorial correspondence to SPECTRUM, 7710 Carroll Avenue, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912. Manuscripts should be typewritten, double spaced and in matters of style and documentation, conform to a SPECTRUM style sheet which will be sent, upon request, to prospective authors. Submit the original and two copies, along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Responses from readers may be shortened before publication.

Subscription Information: In order to receive SPECTRUM, send a membership fee (\$20 per 5 issues, except \$25 in Canada and in other foreign countries; \$2 less for students) to Association of Adventist Forums, Box 5330, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912. Phone: (301) 270-0423. Single copies may be purchased for \$4. Pay by check made out to the Association of Adventist Forums. For address changes, send old address label along with the new address.

Articles

Letter from the Philippines	Franny Agdon	2
Adventist Revolutionary Leads Uganda	D. D. N. Nsereko	5
Consolidation and Controversy: La Sierra to Loma Linda?	Rennie B. Schoepflin	13
The Case for Consolidation	Bruce Branson	15
The Struggle in the Lake Region Conference	Norman Miles	19
Where Has the Proctor Case Taken Us?	Lorna Tobler	26

Special Section: Biblical Sagas and Symbols

The Samson Story: Theology as Narrative	Douglas Clark	33
See Jonah Run: Comic Narrative in the Book of Jonah	Beverly Beem	38
The Sanctuary and Sabbath in Milton's <i>Paradise Lost</i>	Andrea Luxton	45
The Bright Wings of God's Grandeur	Judith P. Nembhard	51
Pleasing the Senses: Ellen White Wouldn't Object	Lourdes Morales-Gudmundsson	54

Reviews

Joy of Perfection: An Adventist Theme	Gary Chartier	56
Adventism & The Reformation Redux	William J. Cork	56
Sabbath, Sunday, and the Lord's Day	Neils-Erik Andreasen	58

Responses

60

About This Issue

Enjoying the Bible. That is a pleasure some Adventists have never experienced. What a pity, since the Bible was written not only to inform and inspire, but to delight, amuse, and enchant. Many biblical books were accepted into the canon because, among other things, they were memorably written. Our special section leads you into parts of the Old and New Testament that are superb literature, then explores the poetry of English writers inspired by images from the Bible. Enjoy!

Several reports inform you of major developments in North America. The denomination's largest university has launched a plan

that would unify it in Loma Linda through sale of its present undergraduate campus at La Sierra. One of the all-black regional conferences persists in developing a real-estate venture that the North American Division charges was improperly approved. A court opinion leaves the present Adventist book distribution intact, but with wording that may haunt the church in later cases. From the Philippines we print an Adventist's first-person account of what the recent adoption of a new constitution means at the grass-roots level. From Uganda comes the story of that country's Adventist prime minister—and how he came to power. Finally, we reproduce the largest number of responses *Spectrum* has received on a single topic—the ordination of women.

—The Editors

Letter From the Philippines

by Franny Agdon

Franny Agdon is the Adventist director of operations in the Philippines for Volunteers International, a relief and development agency active in Third World countries.

This is a compilation from letters Agdon sent to Robert Bainum, a member of Sligo Seventh-day Adventist Church, and founder and president of Volunteers International. Earlier excerpts from Agdon's letters appeared in Spectrum (Vol. 17, No. 1).

—Editors

A Victory for the People . . .

The massive vote ratifying the new Philippine constitution means much to me personally because my family and I have suffered so much at the hands of extremists of both the right and the left. The rightists labeled the constitution anti-Filipino, and plotted five military coup attempts just to derail the plebiscite. The leftist National Democratic Front, which includes the Communist Party and the New People's Army, called the constitution antipoor and campaigned for a "principled no" against the constitution. But Filipinos realized that the "principled no" of the left was not different from the no of the right.

In February Filipinos rejected extremism and voted for President Corazon Aquino's leadership and policies—reduced prices for basic commodities, restored freedom of the press, and genuine acceptance of political dissent. Of course, Filipinos also ratified, by a three-to-one margin, a constitution that envisions a society based on justice and the dignity of humans. Practical reforms are also mandated, such as free education through the secondary level, and issuance of arrest warrants by judges only (not simply by government officials, as in Marcos' time).

The ratification of the new constitution was a

victory for generations of Filipinos. But the victory over extremism is also a victory for my family. It was two years ago that we suffered the most from both the left and the right.

At the Cost of Personal Suffering . . .

In December, 1985 I went to Zamboanga Del Sur on the island of Mindanao, where I was raised. What was supposed to be a joyful family reunion was more like a mass funeral. We found many of our relatives and loved ones had been killed—victims of our country's political crisis.

I found many innocent people caught between the various rival political factions. For example, as a farmer in rural areas you could not escape feeding the rebels when they requested food for fear that they would harm you. But by feeding the rebels you ran the risk of being liquidated by soldiers in their anti-insurgency campaign. Conversely, the farmers had to feed the soldiers when they came. The farmers then ran the risk of suffering retaliation from the rebels.

But usually the communists, or their military arm, the New People's Army, did not liquidate civilians for feeding soldiers. They did commit brutalities, but mostly against civilian informers, or so-called enemies of the people. As a consequence, the New People's Army gained sympathy and respect from the civilian population.

Because of the brutal acts of Marcos' anti-insurgency campaign, the communists often gained some measure of respectability and credibility. The people seemed to understand and not condemn the brutality of the rebels.

One glaring example of communist brutality happened three days after our arrival in Mindanao. I was traveling with a photographer to get pictures to document the need for Volunteers International humanitarian work. On our way we were threatened by the military. They confiscated our film and accused us of being communist propagandists out to depict the sorry state of things. Finally, the soldiers let us go.

When I did reach my home I found my wife's

The communists stabbed my grandfather 22 times. This represented the 22 lives they said were lost because of his alleged intelligence work with the military.

sister and husband had been robbed and killed. The murderers were positively identified as members of the Civilian Home Defense Forces, a right-wing paramilitary group ostensibly established to fight insurgents. But they killed more innocent civilians than insurgents. The murder suspects, in turn, were liquidated by another rightist organization, the dreaded Military Intelligence Group, some of whom were friends of the victims' family. Ironically, this government intelligence group was responsible for the murder of a number of my relatives and friends on the mere suspicion that they were rebel supporters. They were not.

I also found that my own 75-year-old grandfather had been investigated by a People's Army kangaroo court. It convicted him of being an informer for the military. They then stabbed my grandfather 22 times. This represented the 22 lives they said were lost because of his alleged intelligence work with the military. During the mourning period hundreds of people cried for him. He had been a leading figure in the community.

The military vehemently denied they had ever recruited my grandfather. They said, "We are not so bankrupt that we must recruit a failing old man." Later incidents and new headlines made it clear that the military had been relying on its

own agents who had penetrated the New People's Army.

On December 27, two days after Christmas, we buried my grandfather, another name on the endless list of victims of my country's political violence.

I firmly believe this violence of the left was largely caused by the oppression and excesses of the right. The rapid growth of communism and its military arm the New People's Army, was not the result of some outside influence as many Americans seem to think. The rise of the communists was primarily caused by internal Philippine political problems under Marcos—inefficiency, massive corruption, manipulation of the three branches of government, human rights violations, favoritism, injustices, military abuses, and above all, the frustration of the true will and sentiments of the people.

There is mounting evidence that Marcos launched his very first political campaign with a deceptive claim to superman exploits during World War II. Marcos openly cheated during his first presidential reelection campaign. I saw communists multiply before my very own eyes. This growth was similar to the rapid growth of rats in a mountain of uncollected garbage. Take away the garbage and the rats will go away. All those years Marcos produced and stockpiled more and more garbage rather than trying to clean it up.

Because of Extremism Right & Left . . .

Most Americans cannot comprehend how much we have suffered both from the right and the left. Just during the latter part of 1985, six members of my family were killed—a grandfather, two aunts, a sister-in-law and her husband, and an uncle who was a major in the military. During those same months 11 of our neighbors were killed, all victims of extremism.

Sometimes in our desperation we blame all this on the Americans. America cannot escape the fact that it supported Marcos for many years,

and during that time the left grew in size and strength. But we are realists. We know that we can not go on blaming America or Marcos forever; we must take responsibility.

Ratifying the new constitution was a responsible act and a triumph for moderation and reason—a blow against extremism. The constitution's preamble expresses the genuine goals of the Filipino people. "Imploring God we shall establish a just and human society, a social order that upholds the dignity of man."

The ratification gives us renewed strength as a

nation. We who have suffered in the turmoil, are now slowly picking up the pieces of our shattered lives, trying to walk proudly amidst the ruins of the past. We still have scars to bear and tears to dry. But smiles are now returning to our faces. Our dignity is back. We go about our business of living inspired by a constitution that, for the first time ever, enshrines the word *love* in the fundamental law of the land.

*Franny Agdon
Palawan, The Philippines*

Adventist Revolutionary Leads Uganda

by D. D. N. Nsereko

Seventh-day Adventists now generally know that Uganda is a country where the prime minister, Dr. Samson Babi Mululu Kisekka, is a fellow believer. He is the first Adventist anywhere in the world to rise to such a high office of state. How did this happen? How does Dr. Kisekka as an Adventist feel about being in politics? What are his government's domestic and foreign policies?

Historical Sketch

To understand its history, basic facts about the country are helpful to know. Adventists know Uganda as the country where their church was proscribed by Idi Amin Dada in 1977 and where fellow believers were persecuted. They also know that in Uganda during the rule of Al-haji Field Marshal Dr. Idi Amin Dada, VC, DSO, CBE (Conqueror of the British Empire), and Milton Obote 1 million innocent people perished. Christendom in general knows Uganda as the home of the African martyrs who were canonized as saints of the Roman Catholic church in 1969.

Before delving into these issues a brief historical sketch of Uganda's recent past is in order. Uganda is a landlocked African state lying astride the equator. It is bounded by Kenya on the east, Zaire on the west, the Sudan on the

north, and Rwanda and Tanzania on the south. It is 93,981 square miles in size and has a population of about 13 million people. Uganda is dotted with snow-capped mountains, strewn with an evergreen vegetation, and watered by a number of lakes, including Lake Victoria, source of the Nile.

Ethnically, Uganda is made up of about 20 groups which, at the time of British colonization, existed side by side as independent entities with various forms of political organization. Some were monarchical with centralized governments, while others were leaderless. The most dominant of these entities was the Kingdom of Buganda from which the name "Uganda" is derived. The king of Buganda, Kabaka Mutesa I, made a treaty of friendship with the Royal British East Africa Company, the precursor to the subsequent subjugation of Uganda.

In 1876 Kabaka Mutesa I invited European missionaries to Buganda "to show me the way of God" and to help "my people know God." In response to this invitation, Church Missionary Society (Anglican) missionaries arrived in the country from Britain in 1877, to be followed in 1879 by the White Fathers (Catholics) from France. The first American-based church to establish itself in Uganda was the Seventh-day Adventist. Their first missionary, named Maxwell, arrived in the country in 1914. He was not able to open up work, however, partly because of the then-ongoing armed conflicts between the Christians and Muslims, and later between the Christians *inter se* (that is, between Catholics and Anglicans), and partly because of the outbreak of World War I. Adventist work

D. D. N. Nsereko is a Seventh-day Adventist, a member of the Ugandan Bar, and head of the law department at the University of Botswana. He holds law degrees from New York University and the Hague Academy.

started in Uganda in 1927, with Pastor Petero Risasi from neighboring Tanganyika spearheading the way. The Muslims had already established themselves at the royal court prior to the arrival of any of the Christian missionaries.

When Kabaka Mutesa I died in 1884, his son Mwanga ascended the throne of Buganda. Kabaka Mwanga feared that the missionaries were out to grab his country under the guise of their religion. Consequently he declared them *persona non grata* and proscribed their faiths. He launched a campaign of persecution against all of his subjects who had embraced foreign faiths and refused to give them up. On October 19, 1885, he ordered the execution of Anglican Bishop James Hannington for having entered his kingdom via Busoga, "a back door." Between 1885-1886 he burned at the stake scores of believers, mainly Christians. As already noted, the Catholics who met their death this way have since been canonized as saints of their church. As is to be expected, these persecutions did not extinguish faith but rather spurred it on. Today Uganda is one of the most religious nations in this region of Africa.

As far as political administration is concerned, Britain formally declared a protectorate over the Kingdom of Buganda in 1894. It then proceeded to use Buganda as a springboard from which it extended the protectorate to the adjacent territories. By 1896 it had succeeded in establishing its control over almost all of present-day Uganda. In 1900 it concluded a treaty, the Uganda Agreement, with the Kingdom of Buganda, under which the kingdom formally became a province of the Uganda Protectorate, but retained some measure of self-government. Similar treaties were made with the kingdoms of Toro, Ankole, and Bunyoro in 1900, 1901, and 1933 respectively. The nonkingdom districts were administered directly by the protectorate government, which was established under an Order-in-Council of 1901 and was headed by a governor.

The protectorate came to an end on October 9, 1962, when Britain granted Uganda independence under a form of government similar to Britain's. The Independence Constitution, as it

is commonly known, spelled out the various branches of government, defined the limits of their respective powers, and provided for an orderly transfer of government from one administration to another. It also preserved the autonomy hitherto enjoyed by Buganda and other kingdom states, by granting them quasifederal status. This constitution was, however, short-lived because the then-prime minister, Milton Obote, abrogated it in a *coup d'etat* in 1966, and assumed full powers as an executive president. He also abolished the kingdoms and declared a unitary system of government. He accomplished these feats with the active military support of Idi Amin Dada whom he had previously promoted to commander of the Ugandan Army.

Milton Obote soon fell out with his protégé Amin, whom he suspected of nursing his own political ambitions. Obote initiated steps to dis-

Amin publicly acclaimed Hitler for what he had done to the Jews and announced plans to erect a monument in honor of the Nazi dictator.

miss Amin from the army. Amin did not wait to be dismissed. Instead, in January 1971, while Obote was away in Singapore attending a Commonwealth Leaders' Conference, Amin toppled Obote from the presidency. As a "devout" Muslim who claimed to have revelations from Allah, Amin broke off diplomatic relations with Israel and expelled all Israeli nationals from Uganda. He publicly acclaimed Hitler for what he had done to the Jews during World War II, and announced plans to erect a monument in honor of the Nazi dictator.

Next, he moved against the Asian community who controlled the country's economy. He gave them only 90 days to leave the country, and they all did—about 70,000 of them. This move resulted in the total collapse of the economy. Once the envy of neighboring countries, the economy—the principal cause of the country's perennial instability—has not yet recovered.

Initially, Amin's coup against Obote was

popular with a large cross-section of the population. Obote had been a dictator, unilaterally abrogating the country's constitution, suspending elections throughout his eight years of rule, abolishing all opposition parties, introducing draconian detention laws, and locking up many of his opponents. Amin promised to right all these wrongs. He never did. In fact, he declared himself president for life. For reneging on his promises for a return to democratic rule and for ruining the economy, opposition to Amin's regime mounted. His brutal response to this opposition has been well documented and will not be repeated here.¹

As is the case with other authoritarian rulers, Amin needed scapegoats to blame for his failures. The first class of scapegoats were church groups, particularly the minority ones. In 1977 he banned 27 denominations, including the Seventh-day Adventist church, claiming that they were "working for the United States Central Intelligence Agency." He ordered the followers of banned faiths to join the four "recognized" churches: Anglican, Catholic, Greek Orthodox, and Muslim. In effect, he outlawed any kind of religious activity outside of the recognized churches. Many Ugandans who persisted in manifesting their faiths were physically assaulted and detained. Church properties were also seized. When Anglican Archbishop Janani Luwum criticized him for his army's excesses Amin ordered his arrest. Within a few hours of his arrest the archbishop died in what the government explained as "a car accident."

Next, Amin directed his wrath against neighboring Tanzania whose leader, Julius Nyerere, he had described as "so handsome that if he were a woman I would marry him." He accused Tanzania of harboring antigovernment dissidents, particularly his archenemy Milton Obote. In 1978 he dispatched his troops to Tanzania's adjoining district of Kagera and annexed it. His troops unleashed so much wanton destruction in the district that Amin himself later gloated that "we did not leave a living thing there except for the dogs and cats." This action turned out to be the halter that killed him politically and removed him from power. Many states, including Britain

and the United States, imposed a trade embargo on Uganda. Tanzania, on her part, with the assistance of her neighboring ideological allies and several exiled Ugandan guerilla groups, launched a full-scale invasion of Uganda, overthrew Idi Amin in April 1979, and for a while occupied the country.

The National Resistance Movement Comes to Power

Before pulling out of Uganda the Tanzanians were anxious to leave behind a government that was ideologically acceptable to them. Of all the Ugandan politicians the one they trusted the most was Milton Obote. He was a long-time personal friend of Tanzania's President Julius Nyerere. He espoused political views akin to those that were being practiced in Tanzania. These included socialism and one-partyism. Since his overthrow in 1971, Obote had lived in Tanzania where he was treated as the Ugandan head of state. So, at the controversial general elections that were held in 1980, under the keen and watchful eye of the Tanzanian occupation forces, Obote's party was declared the winner and Obote the president. So rigged were these elections that during the tally of the results the pro-Obote military authorities promulgated an instantaneous decree vesting all the powers of tallying and of announcing the results in themselves. They did this after the unannounced results by the independent electoral commission indicated victory for the anti-Obote parties.

Yoweri Kaguta Museveni, now the president, was leader of one of the Ugandan exile guerilla groups that fought alongside the Tanzanians in the war against Idi Amin. Prior to the 1980 elections he formed a party, the Uganda Patriotic Movement, to contest the elections. The party lost. So he, along with other factions that felt cheated at the elections, decided to launch a popular armed revolt against Obote under the umbrella of the National Resistance Movement. After four years of bitter fighting, the National

Resistance Movement seized power in January 1986 and Museveni became president. He then named Dr. Samson Babi Mululu Kisekka as his prime minister, the most senior cabinet post next to that of the president.

The National Resistance government considers itself to be an interim administration. It plans to stay in office for a period not exceeding four years. Its most pressing tasks during this period include restoring peace and security, resettling the thousands of refugees and displaced persons who were dislocated during the war, resuscitating the ravaged economy, facilitating the drafting of a new constitution, and arranging for democratic elections.

In its external relations the government pursues a policy of nonalignment toward the two superpowers. This means that while it maintains friendly relations with both, it does not permit either of them, or any other state for that matter, to dictate who its friends or enemies should be. Hence, the fact that it has cordial relations with the United States does not deter it from also

maintaining warm and fraternal relations with Libya. In fact, the National Resistance government maintains that it is ready and willing to establish mutually beneficial relations with any country except the Republic of South Africa.

In terms of economic policies the National Resistance government is for a mixed economy in which both the government and private individuals or companies participate as partners. According to Prime Minister Kisekka *isms* such as capitalism and socialism have very little relevance to the Ugandan situation. He says that there are no capitalists in the country, only poor people. As for socialism, he says that there is no wealth for the state to take over and redistribute. A traditional African practice akin to socialism is sharing food and other commodities between the members of the family—the extended family. Kisekka does not call this sharing socialism because the state is not involved in it. He prefers to call it Christianity.

The National Resistance government, therefore, tries to steer clear of *isms*. Instead, it

Adventist Prime Minister of Uganda Defends His War of Liberation

During March, Prime Minister Kisekka visited the United States at the invitation of the General Conference. He addressed the National Press Club and called on Secretary of State George Schultz, but spent most of his time visiting Adventist institutions, including Andrews and Loma Linda universities, Oakwood College, and several medical centers. While in Washington, D.C., the 74-year-old Kisekka was perhaps most expansive during hour-long interviews on the Columbia Union College radio station and in a Sligo Church Sabbath School class.

Kisekka understands his involvement in politics as a natural extension of religious commitment. A year after his baptism as an Adventist, Kisekka, who was already a physician, wanted to start his own party. Within six years he was elected to his provincial parliament. If you are a person with some education, Kisekka says, and most of your fellow countrymen are illiterate, what are you to do? "I felt I must be of service to my people." That is why "I have been a physician, a farmer, a kind of social worker, and a politician." Not until seven years later, when Milton Obote dissolved the Bugandan

provincial parliament, did Kisekka leave public service.

After 1966, Kisekka threw himself into national Christian organizations. He became treasurer of the Ugandan Bible Society and a member of the board of the YMCA. He frequently preached in churches of all denominations, and he also established a national lay organization called the Seventh-day Adventist Welfare Association.

When Idi Amin closed down all Adventist churches in 1977, the world Adventist church could provide the employees only six months' salary. Kisekka's lay organization took over as the only legally recognized Adventist group. ("Amin's men," said Kisekka, smiling, "could not figure out that the first three letters of SDAWA stood for Seventh-day Adventist.") During the three years they kept Adventism alive under Amin, the laymen collected the tithe and paid ministers without interruption, the membership grew, two clinics were opened, the elementary schools reached 40, and the number of secondary schools increased from one to 10. Property was bought in the capital, near the university, for a church center that would include a hostel to house

pursues pragmatic economic policies that encourage private initiative, both local and foreign. The government steps in when private initiative is not forthcoming, or it wishes to control an economic activity vital to the rest of the economy.

Kisekka and Political Involvement

Son of an Anglican chief, Kisekka was born on June 23, 1912. He attended Anglican missionary schools and Makerere College, now Makerere University, where he studied medicine. As a youth he was an active soccer player, Boy Scout leader, and church choir member. He accepted the Adventist message in 1954 after stumbling into an evangelistic effort that he decided to attend out of curiosity. He became an active and faithful member of the church and an outstanding lay

leader. An ordained local church elder, he has represented his local union at several General Conference sessions. Perhaps the most notable of the many contributions that Kisekka has so far made to the Uganda Adventist community was the establishment in 1955 of the Seventh-day Adventist Welfare Association. The aims of the association are to render material and moral assistance to the destitute and the bereaved, and to provide scholarships to Adventist young people who would otherwise be unable to attend school. The association has also at times been able to supplement the salaries of church workers and thus help sustain them in the work. With its accumulated experience the association has recently formed an insurance company, the Sedawa Mutual Insurance Co. Ltd., to provide inexpensive insurance protection to the members of the Adventist community. Besides maintaining a medical practice, Kisekka has been a very successful dairy cattle farmer, a director of companies in many other areas—fishing, coffee ginning, horticultural farming, printing, general

Adventist students who are enrolled at the university.

Interestingly, when Idi Amin was toppled, this most prominent of Adventist lay leaders reentered politics at the earliest possible opportunity. In 1980 Kisekka stood for election to the national parliament. He and his fellow party members lost, in what they are convinced were grossly rigged elections.

A year later Kisekka fled into exile where he joined the national resistance movement. That year Museveni, who led what Kisekka calls "my military wing," and is now president of Uganda, started the revolution with only 27 soldiers in western Uganda. "I tried," Kisekka says, "to assist my people who were going into the bush to fight against those committing atrocities." From Nairobi, Kenya, Kisekka traveled to other countries, interpreting the resistance movement to Ugandan exiles and foreign governments. When the professor who led the movement died in London, Kisekka became cochairman.

Within five years, the 27 soldiers had become a force of 20,000. "My army," says Kisekka, "had to pick up some very young men and women." The boys and girls who were armed were as young as 10 years of age. "Many were orphans whose parents had been massacred by Amin or Obote's soldiers. One reason my army was so welcome is that the people were grateful when they did not have to take care of the orphans." Another reason was that Museveni, who does not smoke or drink, maintained strict discipline over his young soldiers. Civilians were not pillaged or raped. Captured soldiers

were not killed or tortured. It got to the point, Kisekka says, that "soldiers on the other side wanted to be captured."

When Kisekka was challenged in the Sabbath School class, as to how he could justify leading an army revolution in the light of Romans 13 and its admonition to obey government, he chuckled and said, "provided that it is a government." Uganda had not had governments. "When I elect you to be my leader," explained Kisekka, "I don't expect you to kill me, rape my wives, and kill my workers."

Under Obote and Amin, 1 million of Uganda's population of 14 million had been killed. An equivalent bloodbath in the United States would have meant the slaughter of 18 million people.

Kisekka wondered what American Adventists, troubled by his condoning of violence, would have actually done in Uganda. "My interest is in justice. Are you justified to see rape and killing in your presence? Is it right to say, I don't care?"

Museveni and Kisekka's National Resistance Movement has so far brought relative peace and order to Uganda. A constitution and national elections are promised in three years as well as a mixed public and private economy. Thirty-three years after a missionary discouraged a new convert from political activity in colonial Uganda, the General Conference is honoring an Adventist revolutionary leader and prime minister, for restoring political and economic justice to his country.

trading, pharmaceuticals, and insurance. He was also the administrator and majority shareholder in a 50-bed nursing home that brought together more than 10 highly trained medical specialists and provided specialized services to the community. Kisekka remembers tasting the fruits of industry very early in life:

I was born in what is now called Nakifuma county of Buganda. This area, in the 1920s and 1930s, was a cotton growing area. . . . All of us children were encouraged by our parents to grow cotton. I remember that my first Luganda Bible was bought from my own sweat. So I tasted the sweetness of sweat quite early.²

Kisekka's involvement in politics stems from his belief that among a generally illiterate populace an educated person has a duty to find solutions to common societal ills. He feels that he could not achieve these goals if he were isolated from the people and the organizations. He must therefore be ready to serve the people including, if asked, filling a political role.

In Uganda participation in political activities has been taboo in Seventh-day Adventist circles. Adventists have considered politics intrinsically "dirty" and "worldly." But Prime Minister Kisekka testifies that politics is a mighty avenue for witnessing. At his public rallies Kisekka often cites the Bible and tells the people of his Christian convictions.

Kisekka says that he joined politics back in the colonial days, in reaction to colonial arrogance and injustice.

I became interested in Uganda politics when I had just qualified from Makerere Medical School. My interest was aroused largely because I resented injustice among some of our colonial masters. I resented the unfair domination as well as the attitude of colonial white civil servants. Every white man in those days, whatever his rank or intellectual capacity, considered himself superior to any black person. Every white man's opinion however foolish had to be considered superior to that of an African, however sound and reasonable. I felt my intelligence insulted then as much as I do now, but this time not by colonialists but by fellow Ugandans who have chosen to take Uganda as their personal property and have decided to do whatever they like with the lives of so many Ugandans and to vandalize the economy and the entire social and moral fabric.³

In 1954 he made plans to form a political party but his plans were thwarted by what he

calls "interference" by a "prominent" Adventist missionary. Nevertheless, his political ambitions did materialize in 1959 when he was popularly elected to the Great Lukiiko (then the Parliament of the Kingdom of Buganda within the nation of Uganda). He later became Buganda's minister for health and works. During his tenure in office Buganda's health services underwent tremendous improvement. He again ran for a parliamentary seat in the 1980 elections on the UPM ticket, but lost. A year after the National Resistance Movement launched its armed struggle Kisekka's home and farm were attacked and razed by government troops. He himself narrowly escaped death before fleeing into exile. While there he joined the political wing of the movement. After the death of Professor Yusufu Lule, the movement's first chairman, Kisekka in January 1985 was appointed the external coordinator of the National Resistance Movement.

In the 1950s when he tried to form a political party, Kisekka seemed to be opposed to violence as a means of bringing about political changes. In a letter to the missionary who had disapproved of his plan to establish a political party, Kisekka wrote:

For sometime, I have been thinking about *Moses* of what he *did* to justify his *means*—that he killed an Egyptian to save a Hebrew. The means he used was completely wrong as a Christian. "Thou shall not kill." It is not the means I am concerned with, but the *way* he felt towards his people is the thing which fascinated me immeasurably. It is so difficult to imagine how a subject person, tribe, race could behave in this atmosphere unless you were a subject yourself.⁴

However, 30 years later, in 1986, the National Resistance Movement came to power, not through the ballot but by the bullet. How does Kisekka reconcile this fact with his earlier criticism of Moses? Kisekka does not face this question alone. Peace-loving people, Christians and non-Christians alike, who have lived under tyrannical regimes have throughout history agonized over the same question. Is rebellion, armed rebellion at that, permissible in light of the New Testament injunction to submit to the civil authorities?

It is important to remember that the cause of freedom and justice was advanced by the

English Glorious Revolution of 1666, the American Revolution of 1776, the French Revolution of 1786, the African anticolonial wars of the 1960s and the more recent Uganda wars against Idi Amin (1979) and Milton Obote (1985). The victory over the Amin forces was particularly significant to the Ugandan Seventh-day Adventists. It reestablished their freedom of worship and restored the legality of their church. When the Amin forces were driven out of power Adventists danced for joy and embraced the liberators, among whom were some young Seventh-day Adventists. They were equally jubilant in 1986 on seeing the Obote forces of tyranny ousted. Could these Adventist members simultaneously condemn their liberators for having used force against these regimes? Are all rebellions biblically wrong?

It is a cardinal principle of law, recognized by all reasonably developed legal systems, that every individual has an inherent right to self-defense. This right may be exercised individually or collectively. Most wars of liberation are a reaction to aggression and tyranny by the governments of the day. They are just wars, waged in the exercise of the right of self-defense. Christ himself recognized this right when he instructed his disciples to carry a sword and if necessary to sell their cloaks and buy one.⁵ Why carry swords if they were never to use them? The context clearly shows that the swords were meant to be used in self-defense, because on an earlier occasion Christ had told the disciples to carry mere sticks. Times had changed. More lethal arms were needed.

Does the biblical teaching to turn the other cheek forbid wars of liberation? Prime Minister Kisekka does not think so, and he is right. Wars of liberation are an exercise of the right of self-defense, not revenge. Rulers who tyrannize subjects they are supposed to protect cease to be legitimate and thereby forfeit the allegiance of the subjects. In the democratic era the people are sovereign and have the right to change their governments even by force if force is the only means available. The imperatives of love legitimize the revolt against tyranny. As Kisekka told the missionary, it is well-nigh impossible to

appreciate the ethical dilemma that faces victims of tyrannical regimes unless one has lived under them. Pastor Bekele Heye, president of the Eastern Africa Division, seems to agree. In the presence of this author he praised President Museveni for liberating Uganda and restoring to it peace and human rights. He told President Museveni that Adventists had all along been praying for him and for the success of his Movement.

A Prophetic Duty to Fight Injustice

For most Ugandans the past 20 years or so have been traumatic. Violence, rape, state-inspired murders, insecurity, displacement, want, and moral degeneration have been the order of the day. Hopes of peaceful change were virtually nonexistent. The Christian church, particularly the Catholic church, fearlessly spoke out against this state of affairs. As a result, it often incurred the wrath of the Ugandan regimes. These are the occupational hazards of Christian witnessing!

It is noteworthy that throughout this period the Seventh-day Adventist church never spoke out against the regimes, either by itself or in conjunction with other church groups. The reasons for this reticence were probably these: 1. as a minority, they felt that they lacked power; 2. sheer timorousness; 3. lack of sophistication, and poor public relations; 4. misconception by the leadership and even the laity concerning involvement in "political issues"; 5. nonparticipation in national Christian bodies that voice Christian concerns in corporate form, thus shielding individual church groups; 6. lack of concern for the momentous issues that agitate mankind: peace, justice, and human rights (until Neal Wilson's recent denunciation of apartheid).⁶

In spite of its "safe" apolitical stance the church found itself banned, its missionaries expelled from the country, its church buildings, schools, and clinics desecrated or destroyed, and

its members imprisoned or killed. When the guilty regimes were removed by force Adventist Ugandans, along with the general population, sighed with relief. As this essay has argued, they cannot be faulted.

While it is understandable that the church would avoid exposing itself by publicly criticizing governmental authorities, the Adventist church, as the "light of the world," has a moral obligation to help shape the public ethic and to speak out against injustice and oppressive demonic systems. The Seventh-day Adventist church has a duty to remind rulers, as did the prophet Isaiah, to "Learn to do good; seek

justice; correct oppression; defend the fatherless, plead for the widow" (Isaiah 1:17, RSV).

How should the Seventh-day Adventist church act prophetically? The church should cooperate with other responsible church groups on matters of grave public concern, such as peace, justice, and human rights. In unity there is strength. Additionally, the Adventist church should educate members of their duty as citizens to speak out on moral issues and shape public opinion. Otherwise the denomination will be dismissed as irrelevant. Dr. Kisekka is showing the Adventist church how members can act against injustice and right grievous wrongs.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. For example see Henry Kyemba, *A State of Blood* (London: Corgi, 1977); Joseph Kamau, *Lust to Kill* (London: Transworld, 1979); David Gwyn, *Idi Amin* (Boston: Little, Brown & Company 1977); _____, *Confessions of Idi Amin* (London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1978); Tony Avirgan, *War in Uganda* (Westport, Conn.: L. Hill, 1982); Denis Cecil Hills, *The White Pumpkin* (New York: Grove Press, 1976); Thomas Patrick Melady, *Idi Amin Dada: Hitler in Africa* (Kansas City: Sheed, Andrews & McMeel 1977); Thomas Patrick Melady, *Uganda: The Asian Exiles* (Maryknoll, N. Y.: Orbis

Books, 1976); E. M. S. Semakula Kiwanuka, *Amin and the Tragedy of Uganda* (München: Welfrum Verlag 1979).

2. S. B. M. Kisekka, "A Ugandan in Exile" (pamphlet published by Kisekka in London in 1985), p. 4.

3. Kisekka, p. 7.

4. Kisekka, p. 9.

5. Luke 22:35, 36, *The New English Bible*.

6. For an interesting discussion on the topic see Walter Douglas, "Adventism and Apartheid," *North American Voice* 8:1 (March 1986), p. 5.

Consolidation and Controversy: La Sierra to Loma Linda?

by Rennie B. Schoepflin

"I am opposed to the vote. It pains me, saddens me. [But] I'm not going to let any decision by any board separate me from my Lord."—Steve Gifford, president of the South-eastern California Conference

"I think consolidation will be great for the university 50 years from now."—Norman Woods, president of Loma Linda University

In the late evening of January 12, 1987, the Loma Linda University Board of Trustees voted by the close margin of 22 to 19 (with one abstention) "to approve as the direction for Loma Linda University the consolidation of both campuses at Loma Linda" by moving the La Sierra programs to Loma Linda and selling the La Sierra property. The consolidation is contingent on the fulfillment of the following conditions:

1. "The creation of a Master Plan which details expenditures and the phases of transferring operations from one campus to the other, including projections for construction funds and scheduled completion of each physical facility."

2. "The successful disposition of the La Sierra Campus, i.e., that parcel which contains the campus buildings."

3. "The creation of an endowment fund for students enrolled in entities presently situated on the La Sierra Campus from a portion of the pro-

ceeds derived from the sale or other disposition of La Sierra Campus resources, the amount to be determined by the Board of Trustees at a future date."

4. "Not incurring any major long-term (permanent) debt."

With the stipulation that the action would be reviewed at the May and subsequent meetings of the board, the board approved these conditions by a vote of 26 to 8 but set no time restrictions for them to be met.

Norman Woods, president of Loma Linda University, believes that the sale of La Sierra property, estimated by Coldwell Banker to bring between \$60 and \$65 million, should not be hasty, so that profits can be maximized. He guesses that construction of new buildings, estimated by Neptune & Thomas Associates to cost \$49.85 million, will require a minimum of three to five years. In the meantime, the La Sierra campus will continue to operate its programs as usual, although Woods grants that it will be a "great challenge to continue to attract students" to an institution undergoing such dramatic changes. Interviews of fall quarter 1986 transfer students at sister Seventh-day Adventist institution Pacific Union College suggest that the challenge has already begun. Sixty potential students reported that they chose to attend a more stable institution like Pacific Union College rather than risk Loma Linda University.

This marks the second time in its relatively short history that Loma Linda University, as such, has undergone the trauma of major corporate change. In 1962 the medical school finally consolidated by closing its programs at

Rennie Schoepflin is an assistant professor of history on the La Sierra campus of Loma Linda University and also serves as the book review editor for *Spectrum*. He is writing a dissertation at the University of Wisconsin on Mary Baker Eddy.

the White Memorial Hospital in Los Angeles and bringing the clinical years of training to the Loma Linda campus. When the medical school needed the undergraduate offerings of a liberal-arts college, LLU, rather than start its own college, merged in 1967 with La Sierra College (established 1939) to form the present two-campus structure. With a few exceptions, grad-

Reactions to consolidation run the spectrum from outrage and disgust through sorrow and disappointment to joy and excitement.

uate and professional education (primarily in the health sciences) dominate the Loma Linda campus, while the La Sierra campus shelters the undergraduate and graduate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Education, and most recently the new School of Business and Management.

Reactions to consolidation run the spectrum from outrage and disgust through sorrow and disappointment to joy and excitement. Since the board first made public its August 1986 decision to explore the possibility of joining the two campuses, President Woods, assisted by his vice presidents, has been the key public spokesperson for consolidation. In fact, a well-placed source believes that he and other university officers laid the groundwork for board consideration well before August. When asked whether he regretted having chosen to openly reveal his support for consolidation and to reject the counsel of some who advised him to be more discreet if not coy about his position, Woods replied that "I have thought about this a lot, and in general I do not regret having made the choice I did. I understood that to some extent I would be second-guessed no matter what I did. But I believed and continue to believe that the risks were better than trying to hide my true feelings and then be charged with not being honest and working behind the scenes to influence and manipulate."

Between August 1986 and January 1987,

Woods and his officers called numerous, well-attended, public forums to offer updates on the progress of consolidation studies, to field questions and charges from both irate and inquisitive constituents, and to present a positive case for consolidation. Through it all, Woods has maintained a good humor and a rosy picture of the postconsolidation university. For that future he laid his career on the line.

Not usually noted for public eloquence, Woods at times generated an almost evangelistic fervor as he stumped for consolidation. In his view, changing American and Seventh-day Adventist demographics persuasively demonstrate that there will be at most a few SDA institutions of higher learning in the United States by the year 2000. Although, according to Woods, other Adventist educators seem willing to suffer almost any level of mediocrity so long as the church maintains "equality" among institutions, Woods wants to do what he can to assure that the Loma Linda University that survives into the 21st century is worth saving. To that end, Woods believes that Loma Linda must consolidate its financial and institutional bases and position itself for a successful campaign to market itself as a superior institution.

In an interview, Woods asserted that "ideally a university should be able to examine all the aspects of a culture, but a university also has a body of moral prerogatives that must be studied and passed on to students; we do have something [special] to offer here." When pressed to

A poll of the faculty of the La Sierra campus revealed that 65 percent opposed consolidation, 22 percent had mixed and 13 percent supportive feelings.

suggest a model for Loma Linda University, Woods repeatedly mentioned Brigham Young University, although he granted that Loma Linda would probably never approach its high level of enrollment. "We will always have our critics—the blueprinters and others," Woods continued. "The sectarian roots of Adventism make this

inevitable, but the blueprinters are fragmentary and disorganized." Woods denied the charge that consolidation is just a way to close down one of the liberal-arts colleges in North America, and use a skeleton liberal-arts faculty to create a more humanistic and broadening atmosphere for Loma

Linda's health-professional programs. But his emphasis on the "integration of programs" and his desire to teach "students [who] want to be professionals . . . the advantage of learning for learning's sake" leave many critics unconvinced, particularly among the faculty of La Sierra.

The Case for Consolidation

by Bruce Branson

Conducting the affairs of Loma Linda University sometimes seems like trying to conduct an orchestra with the violin section 20 miles away. Those 20 miles between our splintered, separate campuses and fragmented faculty make a mockery of the university's motto: "To Make Man Whole."

A college should promote collegiality rather than the cocoon of a separate, isolated campus. Sentimental attachment to the past or to stucco and stone cannot bring excellence to education or unity to teachers.

Over a decade ago, faculty members appointed from both campuses served on task forces to study ways to unify policies and procedures and to explore plans for the future. We came to realize how much our unity and perspectives were enriched by sharing our viewpoints as historians or biochemists, as theologians, surgeons, or business professors. We need to recapture that sense of wholeness, that sense of an intellectual community of scholars—to strike sparks and to stimulate creativity.

Consolidation of the two campuses a decade ago could have saved millions of dollars in scarce capital that was spent for duplicate facilities such as library buildings and other expansion. Now, millions more are needed to replace or renovate aging buildings on the La Sierra campus (and some at Loma Linda).

Millions could be saved in operating overhead over the next 20 years by eliminating duplicate administration, intercampus travel, utilities, grounds upkeep, and physical education and recreation facilities. Those millions could be spent much more productively on scholarships for outstanding students and recruitment of the finest faculty.

Loma Linda's rising national and international visibility in research excellence could strengthen and help

support the sciences taught at the undergraduate level. Professional schools would benefit mightily from seminars and study alongside scholars in literature, history, music, and the arts. A first-quality concert hall/fine arts center and auditorium could attract the best talent to bless and inspire the university family and to nurture the cultural and spiritual needs of neighboring communities.

There is hunger for the humanities at Loma Linda. There is also much urgent work to be done in theology, social sciences, business, finance, and Christian ethics—work that demands the finest combined efforts of scholars working harmoniously together and that will attract thoughtful, bright, enthusiastic young people dedicated to excellence in Christian service.

The soul of the university is symbolized by the sculptural group of the Good Samaritan. Set on the Loma Linda campus, but created by Alan Collins, master sculptor from the La Sierra campus, it is a daily inspiration to bring Christ's healing to heart and mind and body.

Current controversies over procedure must not obscure substantive issues and discussion of the fundamental essentials for excellence in a Christian university—a university in fact as well as in name.

We are challenged by an unparalleled opportunity to bring together undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools to secure, with God's help, the destiny of faculty, students, and the leaders of the future.

Update

As this issue of *Spectrum* was in the final stages of production a delay in the consolidation process was announced at the General Conference Committee's annual Spring Meeting, April 1, in Washington, D. C.

Loma Linda University president Norman Woods brought forward several recommendations which were to be presented to the university's board in May. Among them:

- Additional research on rising costs and declining enrollments, and on curricula evaluation and use of space.
- Increased participation of church leaders, faculty members, students, and alumni in the process of research and evaluation.
- In a move apparently designed to reassure such groups as the Concerned Friends of La Sierra, it was also announced that major decisions on the implementation process would be brought before the constituency as well as the board.

—The Editors

Bruce Branson is chairman of the department of surgery at Loma Linda University School of Medicine and chief of surgical services of the University Medical Center on the Loma Linda campus. He has served as a member of the General Conference Board of Higher Education.

A poll conducted in November 1986 by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences revealed that 65 percent of the respondents (more than 70 percent of them responded) opposed consolidation, while 22 percent had mixed and 13 percent supportive feelings. When asked if they would support consolidation even if the university gave no

Administrators also wanted to halt a growing complacency with academic and professional mediocrity.

assurances that their personal concerns would be addressed, 84 percent opposed consolidation while only 10 percent remained ambivalent and six percent supportive. If anything, these percentages widened as the university's administration steadfastly refused to make any but the bare minimum of guarantees to the nervous La Sierra faculty. While expressions of concern varied from person to person, the underlying reasons seemed surprisingly focused.

As one might imagine, some worried about their job security as the threat of consolidation seemed to make more real the winds of academic change that have recently swept Loma Linda University. For the past two years Woods, primarily through his vice president for academic affairs, Helen Evans Thompson, has been paring back some of the growth in programs and personnel that occurred during the rosier 1960s. Although administrators usually defended the cutbacks in financial terms, they also wanted to halt what they believed to be a growing complacency with academic and professional mediocrity among the La Sierra faculty. It was widely rumored that Woods had wondered aloud if there were many faculty at La Sierra who would continue their academic careers if they lost their jobs, or if they would just as soon take a job selling real estate or pumping gas. Consolidation, some feared, offered the administration a perfect excuse to cut unwanted teachers, and fashion a faculty more attuned to research and the administrators' view of academic excellence.

Other faculty expressed dismay at the inconveniences of travel and schedule caused by the Sierra to Loma Linda and emphasized the belief 30-minute commute from their homes in La Sierra to Loma Linda and emphasized the belief that their lower salary scale would ensure second-class citizenship on the other campus. The faculty often voiced opinions on these topics more loudly than they did on more substantive issues of job security and the academic integrity of programs. Undoubtedly such attitudes contributed to a growing belief among some university administrators that the faculty cares more for petty self-interest than for the future of the school.

Many others, however, eagerly awaited the opportunity to participate in the board-mandated process of collecting the data that would accurately reflect the pros and cons of consolidation. But unreasonable report deadlines, heavy-handed administrative editing, or the selective use of reports gave rise to faculty cynicism about the process. From the start university administrators appear to have coordinated a careful plan to manage the flow of information in order to defuse opposition to consolidation and to garner support for the move, while at the same time creating the appearance of openly cooperating with all affected groups. For example, a careful analysis of the various drafts of committee reports that finally resulted in the "Feasibility Study for Consolidating Campuses of Loma Linda University" presented to the board, reveals that points in favor of consolidation were asserted affirmatively ("Consolidation will. . .") while disadvantages were asserted in the conditional ("Consolidation may. . .").

Despite these apparent affronts to the process of participatory governance, however, on balance the faculty took a "wait and see" attitude. They granted the potentially unifying benefits of a single campus, but seriously doubted administrative and board commitment to the maintenance of existing programs, especially in the liberal arts and sciences curriculum. Academic Vice-President Helen Thompson sensed this faculty ambivalence. During her December 18 report to the La Sierra faculty on consolidation,

she conceded that "at this time, given the unknowns, if I were a faculty member on this [La Sierra] campus, I would have reservations about consolidation." Although Woods publicly apologized "for an error of omission in not interfacing with this [La Sierra] faculty more on the issues of consolidation," many of the faculty believed that they would wait in vain for the omission to be corrected. Woods may have underestimated the intensity of the faculty's reaction when they felt that they were being treated like hired help. Loma Linda University's closure of clinical training at White Memorial

Woods may have underestimated the intensity of the faculty's reaction when they felt that they were being treated like hired help.

Hospital clearly influenced Woods. In his view, just as LLU lost the support of some diehard M.D.'s in the 1960s but lived to prove them wrong, so now some disgruntled faculty may be lost, but the university will on balance be stronger.

After the January board decision, reactions of faculty, alumni, students, and church leaders clustered around three major foci. A small minority expressed almost unequivocal support for consolidation, believing either that God's will, expressed at the board meeting, should not be questioned or that in the long run Loma Linda University and its College of Arts and Sciences would be stronger. Another small group called the decision immoral, unjust, and reprehensible. They voiced support for faculty and student strikes or transfers, or lawsuits to reverse the board's decision.

However, the vast majority voiced a qualified willingness to support the decision. This group did, however, express serious doubts about the ability of the university administration to satisfactorily execute consolidation or questioned the procedures used to achieve the board's very slim affirmative vote.

La Sierra alumni have expressed many similar

concerns about consolidation. By the middle of November Walter S. Hamerslough, president of the College of Arts and Sciences Alumni Association, had received more than 60 letters and 50 phone calls or personal contacts. Slightly under 10 percent of the responses favored consolidation while almost 90 percent opposed the move. Among other concerns, alumni doubted the financial wisdom of the sale of La Sierra land, believed that undergraduates would become orphans at Loma Linda, bemoaned the exchange of the beautiful and spacious La Sierra campus for the congested environment at Loma Linda, and believed that Ellen White had counseled against crowding too many Adventists in one location. Some major donors in the alumni organization "Friends of La Sierra" threatened to never give another cent to the university. Students on both campuses, although slow to respond, have registered their opposition to consolidation. Kevin Paulson, student association president on the Loma Linda campus, believes that the students he represents are unanimously opposed to consolidation as a "logistical, spiritual, and financial nightmare."

Students on the La Sierra campus, after overcoming an early period of apathy, voiced serious reservations in their newspaper, the *Criterion*. The student senate at the La Sierra campus expressed concern about "the possible negative consequences of a move to Loma Linda and the apparent lack of genuine interest in participatory decision-making." Ricky Williams, La Sierra campus dean of students, believes that there could be real problems devising uniform rules to govern student life on the Loma Linda campus if it had about equal numbers of graduate and undergraduate students. "There will have to be 'some' liberalization of La Sierra rules when we move." However, in the long run, Williams believes that "we [LLU] would gain more students wanting to come to a prestigious institution [postconsolidation LLU], than we would lose who want a smaller institution with a public image of being rigidly Adventist."

During its January 21 meeting, the Pacific Union Conference executive committee studied the consolidation matter and "concluded that

although the board's action is not within the purview of the union committee, it would advise great caution regarding implementation of such action, and that a broad base of support should be achieved before proceeding with the plan" (*Pacific Union Recorder*, February 16, 1987, p. 14). In public, union and conference officers have generally walked a line between seeking to

After the January board decision, reactions of faculty, alumni, students, and church leaders clustered around three major foci The vast majority voiced a qualified willingness to support the decision.

appear conciliatory and supportive of the decision, while at the same time making it clear that they oppose consolidation. Union President Tom Mostert has reportedly stated that consolidation may be good, but the process used to overcome union and constituent opposition must not be ignored. Administrators of the Southeastern California Conference, encompassing both campuses, worry that the university board may not have followed legal procedures. They believe doubts must be laid to rest if church leaders are to buttress trust among members.

While the university administration works to fulfill the conditions of the board's January vote, a group of 52 citizens (Adventist and non-Adventist), alumni, students, and several faculty from both campuses, calling themselves the Concerned Friends of La Sierra Campus, met on January 30 to organize an effort to halt consolidation. If necessary, they are willing to take the university to court. Numerous faculty members have avoided the group for fear that university administrators will misunderstand their involvement. Already administrators are asserting that if consolidation fails, the faculty's bad attitude will be to blame.

Executive officers of this committee reflect its

wide spectrum of opposition to the closing of the La Sierra campus: Donald W. Hunter (former officer of the General Conference), president; Willard H. Meier (emeritus dean of the university's school of education), executive secretary; Loraine Johanson (Riverside realtor), secretary; Calvin Hanson (Riverside insurance broker), treasurer; Vivian Cushman (former teacher and women's dean, LLU), alumni representative; Gary Chartier (La Sierra senior), student representative. Other members include R. R. Bietz and W. R. Blacker, both past presidents of the Pacific Union. Bietz, as a general vice-president of the General Conference, served as chairman of the board of Loma Linda University, and Blacker was for many years vice-president for financial affairs of the university.

The Concerned Friends have been especially angered by what they believe to be one-sided assessments of consolidation by university administrators. In their view, administrators used La Sierra's financial loss last year to justify its closure, but publicly ignored the importance of habitual deficit spending of the Loma Linda campus. Furthermore, they believe to be true reports leaking from the closed January university board meeting that administrators, in an effort to deemphasize consolidation problems, misled the board by deleting key portions of the "Feasibility Study."

A board member, who insists on anonymity, is ready to file a request for a temporary injunction restraining the university administration from planning or publicizing consolidation. Such an injunction would be sought on the grounds that the university bylaws require that such "non-ordinary business" as the closing of a campus requires a majority vote of the total board membership (23 votes). Past practices of the board suggest that such major decisions affecting the institution would require the approval of the university constituency.

Will the university leaders succeed in their attempt to establish a unified campus that will assure the survival of the school, or will university constituents so doubt the integrity of their leaders that consolidation is doomed to fail?

The Struggle in the Lake Region Conference

by Norman Miles

On March 22, at a conference committee meeting, Dr. Charles Joseph, president of the Lake Region Conference, tendered his resignation effective April 3, 1987. However, the committee asked Dr. Joseph to remain on as president of the Full Life Corporation (the organization created to oversee certain real estate ventures and developments). He is also acting pastor of the Shiloh Church and may continue in that capacity. Such is the outcome of a chain of events that has focused renewed attention on the relationship of regional conferences to the unions and the General Conference.

Two thousand members of the Lake Region Conference gathered in the Kellogg Auditorium in Battle Creek, Michigan, February 8, 1987, for what they hoped would be the resolution of a controversy that had been developing for years and convulsing the conference for months. The meeting left the conference in as much turmoil as before, with implications for the entire church in North America.

The Lake Region Conference, covering the same Midwest states encompassed by the Lake Union, is one of the black conferences in North America. The meeting in Battle Creek was billed as an "informational session" concerning the Continental Plaza, or Racine Street Project. A report by the North American Division had been distributed to all members of the conference in advance of the meeting. Scheduled to answer

serious charges in the division's report was Dr. Charles Joseph, president of the Lake Region Conference.

The Continental Plaza Project, an urban development venture begun by the Lake Region Conference in 1980, has been a source of controversy from its inception. The project was planned as a three-phase development, to include a housing complex for senior and disabled persons, a new complex for the Shiloh School, and a shopping center.

When constituents of the Lake Region conference alleged that the conference leadership had engaged in unlawful practices and benefited personally from the project, the North American Division appointed a committee to investigate the affair. The Lake Region Executive Committee also appointed a subcommittee to investigate, and was scheduled to give a report at the Battle Creek meeting.

The Charges

The division report that constituents had received prior to the meeting covered four basic areas:

1. Personal gain of Lake Region officers from the Continental Plaza Project.
2. Withholding of tithe, and subsequent use of the tithe.
3. Violation of General Conference and Lake Region Conference policies with reference to the Continental Plaza Project.
4. Financial instability of the Lake Region Conference.

Norman Miles, professor of Urban Ministry at the SDA Theological Seminary in Berrien Springs, Michigan, received his B.A. from Oakwood College and his Ph.D. in history from the University of Michigan.

The North American Division Report first addressed the question of personal gain by stating that it was not the purpose of the survey to determine whether Lake Region Officers had diverted funds to personal accounts. The report further stated that the survey commission "did not find evidence of any such diversions nor did we find sufficient evidence to conclude that there was no personal gain by any individuals."¹

On the matter of tithe, the North American Division Report alleged that between 1983 and 1986 the Lake Regional Conference owed \$1,359,231.46 in delinquent tithe remittances, and that Dr. Joseph used about 1 million dollars in tithe funds to pay for obligations incurred by the Racine Street Project.

Concerning violation of policies, the report stated that the Lake Region officers mortgaged Shiloh Church and obtained a series of loans, including one in the amount of \$220,000 from Adventist Health Systems/North, without prior knowledge or consent of the Lake Region Executive Committee.

The North American Division report also accused Dr. Joseph and Conference Secretary R. C. Brown, of fabricating conference committee resolutions approving the amount of bonds issued, and falsely representing to the city of Chicago and the banks issuing letters of credit, that authority to issue the loan guarantees had been obtained from the conference committee.

On the final matter of the conference's financial stability, the report concluded that the "untenable financial state of the Conference is due significantly to the exorbitant and difficult financial burdens placed upon the conference by the Racine Street Project."²

The Defense

At the February meeting the accused conference president gave a spirited defense. In his report Dr. Joseph acknowledged certain policy violations, such as withholding tithe remittances, but insisted that his actions were neither immoral nor illegal, and that they came after a prolonged struggle to

obtain relief through regular church channels. He also denied some of the allegations of the North American Division report, such as misrepresenting conference assets to the banks, and he sought to demonstrate that the risk factor of the venture was relatively low—that any conference liability would expire after 24 months of the project's successful operation.

Following Joseph, the Lake Region Conference Executive Committee's fact-finding subcommittee issued its report. The subcommittee's report covered five basic areas.

1. *Personal gain of the Lake Region Conference.* A review of the documents supplied by the North American Division and Lake Region Conference shows no evidence of personal gain by any Lake Region Conference officer from the Continental Plaza Project.

2. *Present financial condition of the Continental Plaza Project.* Though the project had to be changed after it was launched, the risks are minimal; the Plaza is presently 85 percent Triple A leased and scheduled for completion in March, 1987. The financial projection showed an initial income of \$252,830 in 1987, increasing to \$562,826 per year by 1991.

3. *The financial condition of the Lake Region Conference: tithe remittances and tithe usage.* Lake Region's financial problems were part of the larger problem of regional conferences which operate on a smaller tithe base than comparable nonregional conferences, yet have to send away the same tithe percentages. There are built-in destabilizing factors for regional conferences. "The monies appropriated to regional (Black) conferences by the General Conference change from year to year at the discretion of the General Conference."³

4. *The financial impact of the Continental Plaza Project on the Lake Region Conference.* The Lake Region Conference invested approximately 1.2 million in the Continental Plaza Project. Of these funds, \$795,000 came from the mortgage on the Shiloh Church, \$220,000 from conference revenue (tithe). The conference spent 20 percent of the tithe funds withheld from the Lake Union on the Continental Plaza project. Unlike a local church, a conference's basic

income is in tithe funds, which are used to cover various expenses other than ministerial salaries. The unions and General Conference also invest tithe funds in the stock market.

5. *General and Lake Region Conference policies and the Continental Plaza.* In the main, the conference leadership followed General Conference and conference policy as the project developed, although conference officers failed to communicate with the constituents and the executive committee regarding several key decisions. The committee felt that this situation should end immediately.

After an intense period of questioning, laced with charges and countercharges, Dr. Joseph began a statement that many interpreted to be a resignation speech. Overcome with emotion, he was unable to finish and left the platform. Word came back to the group that Dr. Joseph wanted a vote of confidence from the officers and the executive committee. At this point a number of people rushed to take over the microphones and confusion erupted. A motion for the confidence vote was made and seconded, but as the confusion continued, Elder C. E. Bradford adjourned the meeting without any action on the motion being taken. One observer who characterized the meeting as the "shot heard around the Adventist world," pointed out that although the meeting didn't solve anything it did point up the crisis with regard to the relationship of regional conferences to their respective unions and the North American Division.

For many of the local constituents the issues clustered around a few major points. Those who opposed Dr. Joseph's leadership and were anxious for the North American Division to force a change, charged that his violations of policy and his use of certain tithe funds for non-tithe purposes disqualified him for leadership.

For other constituents this was a moot point. They pointed out that Joseph revealed the policy violations at the conference constituency meeting in March 1986, and that despite the disclosure of irregularities in policy adherence the constituency reelected him by an overwhelming majority (even though the nominating committee brought in another name).

The Project

While the precipitating factor behind the climactic February meeting in Battle Creek was ostensibly the Lake Region Conference's involvement in the Continental Plaza Project, the real roots of the controversy go back to economic issues which have been widely discussed since the late 1970s.

From 1972 until 1979 regional conferences discussed and refined proposals to form two regional (black) unions from the territory of the regional conferences in the North American Division. Proponents of black or regional unions argued that they were necessary to:

1. Channel a large share of the money given by black believers into the regional work;
2. Insure adequate black representation on the policy making levels of the General Conference;
3. Provide a conduit for the upward mobility of black leaders;
4. Enable black workers to plan and develop the black sector of the work in a more unified manner.

Although opinions differed regarding the advisability of creating black unions, even opponents of the plan were convinced that serious economic problems existed in the black conferences. The economic argument pointed out the fact that in the United States the average black income is approximately 55 percent of the average white income. A similar percentage is seen in the incomes of conferences, with regional conferences having a tithe revenue approximately one half of the tithe of comparable nonregional conferences. This innate financial disparity is compounded by the fact that regional conferences send the same percentages of tithe to the unions and General Conference as other conferences, while regional conferences often cover a larger geographical territory than nonregional conferences. In the case of the Lake Region Conference the conference territory is larger than the union territory since Lake Region encompasses churches in every state in the Lake

Union, plus two churches in Minnesota, which is in the Mid-America Union.

Such a reality has historically placed regional conferences in a unique position relative to Seventh-day Adventist church policy. Because regional conferences operate on a much smaller margin than sister conferences, once remittances

Although there was some strong opposition, the majority of constituents approved the plan. It was felt the project would be a new source of revenue which the conference could direct toward Christian education.

are sent off it is often difficult and sometimes impossible for them to comply with North American Division policy in such areas as the funding required for initiating church building projects, or the suggested percentages allocated for educational needs. Regional presidents have pointed out such problems for years. In some cases potential difficulties were solved by the North American Division's writing exceptions to the policy. In other cases division, union, and regional conference administrators were able to come to a "gentleman's agreement" to overlook some policy deviations as unavoidable. The necessity of writing exceptions into the policy was one of the leading arguments propounded by advocates of black unions.

Although black unions were not approved, the knotty financial issues did not go away. In fact, for some regional conferences the economic problems became extremely acute during the financial recession of the early 1980s. Of all the regional conferences Lake Region probably suffered the most during this period; of the 10 urban areas hardest hit by the recession, seven fell in the Lake Region territory (Chicago, Detroit, Pontiac, Flint, Saginaw, Gary, and East St. Louis).

In 1977 the Lake Region Executive Committee voted to form a nonprofit corporation to develop senior citizens' housing complexes

for Chicago and Detroit. Two years later the conference committee voted to proceed with a limited dividend partnership in order to proceed with housing developments. On August 3 1980, nine persons, including three conference officers, two conference workers, and four lay persons, were made members of the Full Life Corporation board by vote of the conference committee. On November 12, 1980, the conference executive committee voted to present a plan to the conference constituency for obtaining a six-acre piece of property from Loyola University to be used to house a new Shiloh Academy, develop a senior citizens' complex, and furnish a building site for a new church.

On March 22, 1981, the Lake Region Conference officials presented a plan to a Lake Region Conference constituency meeting for a three-phase development of a six-acre piece of property in Chicago donated by Loyola University. Phase I involved the renovation of a building into housing units for senior citizens and disabled adults, and townhouses for low-income families. Phase II would renovate another building on the property to serve as the new Shiloh Academy, and Phase III would be the development of a shopping plaza. It was also suggested that a portion of the land be set aside as a future building site for the Beacon of Joy Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Although there was some strong opposition, the majority of constituents approved the plan and authorized the conference to advance \$16,000 in order to gain control of the development of the housing complex and the property. Most of the money for the shopping center was expected to come from the Department of Housing and Urban Development through special funds set aside for urban renovation. It was felt that the project would be a new source of revenue that the conference could direct toward Christian education in various parts of the conference. The very small investment on the part of the conference and the low level of risk made the plan especially inviting. But once the project was underway budget cuts made by the Reagan administration drastically reduced the level of government funding and required a

much higher level of private participation. The Lake Region administration was faced with a painful choice—abandon the project, or go forward, investing a considerably larger amount of money from the conference funds and other private sources than originally planned.

The new conditions also made it necessary to change the order of the project development. While the renovation of the housing units in Phase I was already under way, it was decided to proceed with Phase III—the shopping center—in order to help provide the financing for the Shiloh Academy renovation. It was at this point that the project became a serious issue beyond the Lake Region Conference.

The Controversy

At the same time as the conference administration was busy with the Continental Plaza project the financial position of the conference was becoming more difficult. Due to generally poor economic conditions in the region, tithe income did not rise. At the same time, between 1979 and 1985 medical expenses soared because of severe medical problems among workers' families. Lake Region's medical plan was not designed for catastrophic illness and thus the total medical bill of more than 1 million dollars severely strained conference funds. On several occasions the North American Division and the Lake Union advised the Lake Region administration to make some staff cuts in order to bring the budget into line.

In April 1984 the conference called a meeting of all the pastors and elders to discuss the financial situation. They voted almost unanimously for the conferences to seek to temporarily renegotiate the percentage of tithe to be sent to the union. The union resisted that solution, and the Lake Region Conference began to hold back a portion of the tithe funds due to the Lake Union and North American Division.

Between 1983 and 1986 approximately 1 million dollars in union and General Conference tithe remittances was retained and spent locally. During these three years about \$270,000 was

used to help put together the financial package for the Continental Plaza Project, with the remaining funds used to pay pastors, teachers, and cover other operational expenses. In February 1986 the Lake Region Conference, while keeping current with tithe remittances, repayed \$225,000, or 20 percent of its tithe debt.

In March 1986 the Continental Plaza Project, the withholding of tithe, and the poor financial condition of the conference became key issues in a stormy Lake Region Conference constituency meeting. For more than four hours the conference president was questioned by delegates. Late in the evening the nominating committee submitted to the constituency a name other than the incumbent. After a short discussion the nominating committee's choice was decisively voted down. Dr. Joseph was nominated from the floor and overwhelmingly reelected in a marathon session that finally ended at 2:00 a.m.

Nevertheless, for the rest of 1986 and into 1987 the Lake Region Conference has remained embroiled in controversy. After the constituency meeting delegates opposed to Dr. Joseph's reelection tried to mount a campaign to unseat him. In some larger churches a few members attempted, after Sabbath morning worship services, to secure signatures on recall petitions. A small church threatened to hold back its tithe if

**Between 1983 and 1986 nearly
1 million dollars in union and
General Conference tithe funds
were retained and spent locally.**

additional clarifications of the conference's financial system were not provided. However, these attempts failed to gather much support among the conference constituents.

Charges of mismanagement and personal gain of conference officers did gain the attention of the North American Division. On July 28, 1986, the North American Division Committee voted to arrange for legal and financial professionals to investigate Lake Region's affairs for 60 days. The committee itself promised to issue a report within 30 days of the investigation.

That fall, amid increasing rumors as to what the Lake Region Conference officials had done, Dr. Joseph met with the Shiloh Church, the largest congregation in the conference. He explained it was true that the Shiloh Church property had been mortgaged by conference officials without approval of the church board to launch the Continental Plaza Project. But he argued that the conference holds title to local church properties and is not legally obligated to secure a congregation's permission before mortgaging the land on which a church has been built. However, Dr. Joseph admitted that he should have consulted with the church prior to executing the mortgage on Shiloh.

On October 30, 1986, the survey committee made its report to the North American Division Committee. At that time, the division leadership asked for the resignations of Charles Joseph, president of the conference, and R. C. Brown, secretary. Both declined to comply.

On November 16, 1986, the North American Division leadership met with the Lake Region conference executive committee and requested that the conference committee call a constituency meeting. The conference committee voted to withhold any such action until the North American Division survey committee's report was presented.

Three days later the survey committee presented its report to the Lake Union Committee and about 200 of the administration's supporters. The day-long meeting ended with the union committee voting:

1. To accept the North American Division report and present it to the Lake Region Executive Committee;
2. To recommend that the Lake Region Conference Committee and the Lake Union officers appoint an individual to directly oversee the daily financial operations of Lake Region;
3. That the Lake Region make up its tithe remittances as soon as possible;
4. That the Executive Committee of Lake Region call an open meeting of its members to hear the North American Division report.

On December 10, 1986, the division report was presented to the Lake Region Executive

Committee, which accepted the Lake Union's recommendations, established its own fact-finding probe, and approved the holding of the dramatic February 8, 1987, constituency meeting of Lake Region members.

Construction of the Continental Plaza Project continues. But many issues remain.

The Implications

The question of a conference withholding tithe continues to haunt the North American Division. From the point of view of the unions, the divisions, and the General Conference, a unilateral adjustment by a local conference of the level of tithe remittances to the higher organizations poses the most dangerous of threats. If tolerated, other financially pressed conferences could take the same action and compromise the entire church system of financial distribution.

On the other hand, Dr. Joseph's supporters argue that he has taken a bold, courageous stand to make his regional conference more financially self-sufficient. Many of his constituents continue to consider the conference decision to withhold a higher percentage of tithe than church policy requires a necessary evil.

In addition to tithe withholding, there is the issue of church authority. The General Conference officers told the Lake Union that if conference leadership did not agree to resign, the Lake Union Executive Committee "has no other option" than to

call a special constituency meeting of the Lake Union Conference to present the whole matter, and to determine whether, in light of all that has happened, the Lake Union constituency is willing for the Lake Region Conference to continue as a Seventh-day Adventist conference within that union and within the world sisterhood of conferences.⁴

C. E. Bradford, president of the North American Division, has justified its vigorous action in this situation by affirming the unitary nature of the church organization. He cites recent court opinions that have determined the

Seventh-day Adventist church to be a highly centralized denomination as support for insisting that the Lake Union and Lake Region Conference bow to the direction of the "higher organizations."

The Lake Region leadership, on the other hand, has challenged the North American Division and General Conference's right to force a change in local conference leadership. They point to a January 2, 1987, letter written by Charles E. Dickerson III, special counsel for the General Conference. In a letter to the legal representatives of one of the Chicago banks involved in the Continental Plaza project, Dickerson, speaking for the General Conference, characterizes the structure of the denomination in North America.

While the North American Division, the General Conference and the Lake Region Conference are all part of the "sisterhood of churches" as referred to above, there is no formal tie or connection between these corporations. The "sisterhood" refers only to the concept that the members of each of these religious corporations share the same ecclesiastical beliefs. The term does not intend to imply any other connection between the entities.⁵

The denial of formal connection or ascending liability in the Lake Region case is obviously contradictory to assertions by the General Conference that the Seventh-day Adventist church is hierarchical in structure. The General Conference and North American Division must decide what position it will take. Trying to hold

to both sides of the issue can only result in confusion and possible expensive litigation.

Finally, the struggle in the Lake Region Conference has implications for the future of black leadership in North American Adventism. The fact that Charles Joseph, president of the Lake Region Conference, Robert Carter, president of the Lake Union, and C. E. Bradford, president of the North American Division, are all black, gives the appearance of a civil war among black Adventist leadership. Some may believe this affair calls into question the ability of black leaders on the union and division levels to effect changes benefiting regional conferences. Others may question whether black leaders in North America can discipline black conference leaders.

Whatever the outcome, the era of innocence on the part of the black laity is over. Lay people in the Lake Region Conference have become involved in a power struggle that has to some extent polarized them, but they have also become involved in important issues confronting the church. From now on the laity in black conferences will probably demand more of a share in directing the business interests of their conferences. It is also probable that the influence of the General Conference and the North American Division in the Lake Region and other regional conferences will diminish as the constituents take a more direct role in church business.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Report of the NAD Survey of Lake Region Conference of SDA, p. 1. The language of the statement obviously leaves the issue of personal gain on the part of the conference officers clouded. Moreover, it represents a significant departure from the statement voted by the Lake Union Executive Committee on November 16, 1986, requesting the NAD Survey Committee include in its report that "it was not the purpose of the Survey Committee to determine whether there was any personal gain on the part of the Lake Region Conference officers, as a result of their involvement in the 'Racine Street Project,' and that there was no evidence presented to

support such an allegation." General Conference Officers' Statement to the Lake Union Conference Executive Committee.

2. NAD Survey, p. 13.

3. Response of the Lake Region Conference Executive Committee to the North American Division Survey Committee and Concerned Constituents of the Lake Region Conference, p. 7.

4. General Conference Officers' Statement to the Lake Union Conference Executive Committee.

5. Letter of Charles E. Dickerson, III to James B. Smith, dated January 2, 1987.

Where Has the Proctor Case Taken Us?

by Lorna Tobler

The "Proctor Case" has become increasingly familiar to Adventists all over North America. A federal district court has now rendered a verdict in favor of the General Conference, but its findings, though not a part of the decision, might in the future create difficulties for the denomination. Also, Proctor's continuing activities may yet bring major changes in the way Adventist institutions sell and distribute books.

The court rejected Proctor's complaint that Adventist institutions violated the Sherman antitrust law by conspiring among themselves and with independent publishers to interfere with his book-selling enterprise. The court said that the Sherman Act does not apply to the facts in this case. But even if it did, the court held that these institutions were not guilty of a conspiracy to restrain trade because they are part of a single unified church. As a single entity, it could not "conspire with itself" because, the court said, "all parts of the church are parts of a single entity. Next to the Roman Catholic Church, the Adventist Church is the most centralized of all major Christian denominations in this country." The court's language on this point was taken directly from the General Conference's own "Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law" submitted to the judge. The General Conference has submitted similar proposed findings of fact in a number of other cases, but this is the first case in which they have been accepted by a court.

Lorna Tobler carries out research in a law firm in the San Francisco Bay area. She was employed at Pacific Press when it was involved in sex discrimination cases.

The Story of Derrick Proctor, Colporteur

Derrick Proctor began his bookselling career as a student colporteur. In 1969 he joined the behavioral science faculty at Andrews University. While he taught and completed his doctorate at Purdue University, Andrews gave him permission to sell books in his spare time. Andrews continues with Proctor in this arrangement.

In 1975 he began selling subscription books (sold by colporteurs) primarily to Catholic schools and public libraries. Based on this specialty, he set up a business called Library & Educational Services, which he still maintains.¹

The controversy surrounding Proctor began when he was able to sell books at a much lower price than the recommended retail price for regular colporteurs and Adventist Book Centers. In recent years the price of books sold by colporteurs has soared, due primarily to the expensive credit system maintained by the denominationally managed Home Health Education Service. Additional cost factors are the fringe benefits extended to colporteurs, the salaries and expenses of publishing (sales) directors and their staffs, and Adventist Book Centers.²

Word began to spread that books were less expensive when bought from Proctor. Even colporteurs bought their books from him and sold them for less than the suggested retail price. One colporteur in Ohio sold approximately

\$100,000 worth of books from January 1984 to June 1985 at half the suggested retail price. Even so, the colporteur's markup was from 48 percent to 60 percent.³

It was inevitable that Proctor's merchandising should come into conflict with the book sales system developed piecemeal by Adventist publishers and distributors since they began in 19th century rural America. A number of Adventist Book Centers and publishing directors complained they were losing sales to Proctor, while others kept him supplied, to their apparent mutual benefit.

**This was only the beginning
of a long campaign of subterfuge
and counter-subterfuge in the
escalating book price war.**

From the titles Proctor sells—*The Bible Story* (10 volumes), *My Bible Friends* (five volumes), *Home Reference Library Volumes*, one would assume that if the denominational purpose for this "literature ministry" is religious, charitable, and not-for-profit, publishing directors and Adventist Book Centers would be glad to place as many such books as possible and would try to incorporate, or at least adapt, Proctor's demonstrably successful methods. For his part, Proctor did not attempt to change the denominational distribution system. He simply continued, year after year, selling an ever-larger volume of books.

Frustrated publishing directors and Adventist Book Center managers began to organize to stop Proctor. In the fall of 1979, Adventist Book Center managers in Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin discussed this matter at their regular annual Lake Union Conference Adventist Book Center Council. Following that meeting they began to contact Proctor's suppliers, including Baker Book House, Zondervan, and Concordia, as well as certain Adventist Book Centers. The Adventist Book Center managers threatened to remove their own business from the independent suppliers if they did not stop selling books to Derrick Proctor. Some sup-

pliers yielded to pressure and did stop, at least for a time.⁴

At last, on December 19, 1979, Proctor reached an agreement with then-Lake Union President Lowell Bock and General Conference Publishing Director Bruce Wickwire. The agreement provided that no further attempts would be made by those organizations to interfere with Proctor's book purchases. In consideration for past such interferences Proctor was paid \$4,700. A further provision called for a letter to be sent by Wickwire to all Adventist Book Centers in North America expressing the intention of union and General Conference publishing directors to respect Proctor's right to purchase books from any source. Wickwire never sent the letter. Months later a somewhat different letter was sent out over the name of Clyde Kinder, then General Conference associate publishing director.⁵

This was only the beginning of a long campaign of subterfuge and counter-subterfuge in the escalating book price war. In terms of sales, Proctor seemed to be winning. His total sales grew from \$123,000 in 1978, to \$275,000 in 1980, to \$319,000 in 1982, to \$633,000 in 1984.⁶ But his expenses also grew as a result of the increased effort and cost of finding suppliers.

After many attempts to find a way to give effect to the agreement with publishing directors and Adventist Book Center managers, Proctor contacted the Michigan State Attorney General to investigate possible violations of state and federal antitrust law. This resulted in the attorney general for the state of Michigan issuing a cease-and-desist order on May 12, 1981, warning officials of the Michigan Conference, Lake Union, and General Conference, doing business as Home Health Education Service, to refrain from monopolizing, price-fixing, and interfering with business relationships. Finally, on August 24, 1982, General Conference Attorney Walter E. Carson signed a consent decree agreeing to refrain from those activities.⁷

But the decree was easier signed than followed. Some Adventist Book Center managers apparently did not understand the decree, and others acted as if it did not matter. What

mattered to them was that book buyers went to Proctor for lower prices, and they felt they were losing business because of him. They continued to try to cut off his sources of book purchases, ignoring Proctor's phone calls and letters of entreaty. Letters circulated among Home Health Education Service and Adventist Book Center managers calling for a total boycott of Proctor.⁸

Because of this mounting pressure, and despite the December 1979 agreement and the Michigan attorney general's cease-and-desist order, Proctor filed suit in the U.S. District Court in Chicago. The suit named as defendants a number of conferences (local, union, and General) doing business as Home Health Education Service. It alleged violation of Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act (conspiracy price-fixing and monopoly), Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act (price discrimination), as well as intentionally and tortiously (wrongfully) interfering with his contractual and business relations. A number of other suppliers who had succumbed to pressure were also named in the suit.⁹ A three-week trial took place, ending July 21, 1986.

Arguments Presented in Court

It is customary in federal court cases for the parties on both sides of the issues to submit a statement of their version of the facts and how they think the law applies to them in their case. These documents are called "proposed findings of facts and conclusions of law." The judge then issues the court's findings of facts, conclusions of law, and the order, based on all the testimony, oral and written.

In the Proctor case, Judge William T. Hart adopted 75 uncontested statements of fact. That is, all parties agreed that these were the facts. They were similar to the facts that formed the basis for the issuance of the cease-and-desist order by the attorney general of the State of Michigan. Clearly, then, if the court was expected

to apply the law to these facts, the General Conference, Home Health Education Service, and other institutions named in the suit, would again be found in violation of antitrust laws.

The only way for the General Conference to avoid that result would be to assert a religious immunity to the law itself. This can be attempted by several different approaches. The first and most familiar is the assertion of a specific religious

A third argument states that no inquiry into the conduct of a religious organization can legitimately be made by any agent of government, including the courts, the argument the General Conference used in the Pacific Press employment discrimination case.

belief that would be violated by observance of a particular law. For example, Adventists have successfully asserted a belief against bearing arms in violations of draft laws, and the Amish have successfully asserted a belief against secondary-school education for their children.

In the absence of any *specific* religious belief that would serve to immunize the defendant against the operation of the law, a second argument can be asserted—that the law in question was not intended to apply to the circumstances in a particular case. That argument was successfully raised by the Catholic archbishop of Chicago against the application of the National Labor Relations Act to Catholic schools.

A third argument has recently been used by the General Conference in cases where no specific religious belief is involved, and where the statute was clearly intended to apply to the facts of the case. That argument, based on an interpretation of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, states that no inquiry into the conduct of a religious organization can legitimately be made by any agent of government, including the courts. This was the argument the General Conference used in the Pacific Press

case (employment discrimination based on sex), and states:

The Church claims exemption from all civil laws in all of its religious institutions; it draws a line of its own when dealing with Caesar.¹⁰

When a Christian says "Credo!" the Government whether acting through its judges or its myrmadons must call a halt.¹¹

[W]e insist that in doing its holy work, the church is free to ignore, even to flout, measures which bind all others.¹²

In the Proctor case, no religious belief was available as a defense against the observance of antitrust laws. But the second and third arguments described above were both asserted. The General Conference argued that 1. antitrust laws do not apply to denominational publishing and literature distribution, and that 2. if they do apply, they are, to that extent, unconstitutional. The General Conference asserted that *even adjudication* of a claim brought under antitrust laws would violate the First Amendment rights

guaranteed not only to individuals but also to churches in their collective capacities, which must have "power to decide for themselves, free from state interference, matters of church government as well as those of faith and doctrine." *Kedroff v. St. Nicholas Cathedral*, 344 U.S. 94, 116 (1952) [a case involving a dispute as to who was the true bishop in an Orthodox church].¹³ (Emphasis supplied.)

Similarly, *adjudication of plaintiff's claims, which challenge the right of a Church to control a fundamental aspect of its religious ministry, and to select its own missionaries and representatives, will necessarily entangle the Court in matters relating to the Church's teachings, the nature of its ministry, the internal organization of the denomination, and the motive and intent of Church leaders.*¹⁴ (Emphasis supplied.)

To the argument of the General Conference that antitrust laws do not apply to this case (the "statutory" defense), Proctor responded that they do apply, and cited a case decided by the Federal Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., involving the Roman Catholic church's seeking a boycott of another publisher's book in favor of its own. That Court of Appeals held that

[T]here is no such blanket religious exemption from the antitrust laws. *Costello Publishing Co. v. Rotelle*, 670 F. 2d at 1042.¹⁵

And in answer to the other General Conference argument, the broad claim of immunity to any government regulation by virtue of the First Amendment (the "constitutional" defense), Proctor responded:

[T]he very concept of ordered liberty precludes allowing every person to make his own standards on matters of conduct in which society as a whole has important interest." *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S., 240 (1972). To ask the court to exempt conduct from regulation on the grounds that it constitutes the free exercise of religion, while simultaneously *denying the court the right to inquire into the legitimacy of the claim*, is to assert that the claimant, not the court, is the final arbiter of disputes involving First Amendment religious issues. No court can give cognizance to such an argument.¹⁶ (Emphasis added.)

The Judge's Decision

Federal District Judge William T. Hart did not agree with the General Conference that the court did not have jurisdiction in this case. He rejected their argument that the court lacked jurisdiction to adjudicate a claim involving their commercial activities. Nevertheless, Judge Hart ruled for the General Conference.

Without "reaching" (considering) the denomination's argument that the Constitution exempts the church from government scrutiny, Judge Hart decided in favor of the General Conference. He based his opinion on their "statutory" argument that antitrust laws do not apply to the facts in this case. He gave several reasons:

1. The Sherman Act has never been used by courts to restrain nonprofit or religious antitrust activity.

Neither the statute nor legislative history contains any indication of its application to religious activities or church organizations.¹⁷

2. But even if the Sherman Act did apply to the facts in this case, Judge Hart accepted the assertion of the General Conference that it exercises total control over all denominational organizations, and that they all thus comprise a single entity incapable of "conspiring with itself."

The facts of this case establish that the Seventh-day Adventist church is a single unified body governed by the General Conference. As such it is incapable of conspiring in violation of §1 of the Sherman Act.¹⁸

3. Finally, even if defendants were liable for conspiracy, price-fixing, monopoly, price discrimination and tortious (wrongful), interference, Derrick Proctor did not persuade the court that he had suffered any damages. The court pointed out that, on the contrary, his business has grown substantially through 1984.

Proctor has not proven that he was injured by the defendants. Through 1984 Proctor's business has grown substantially and he has not been able to identify any orders that he was ultimately unable to fill. As testimony indicated, Proctor is a "fighter." Whatever adversity he has met as a result of the defendants' actions he has been able to overcome. He has been able to obtain Adventist Books from other sources and has been able to substitute other products when he has not. In order to show injury a terminated distributor must show an inability to obtain the product.¹⁹

Finding that Proctor had suffered no damages, Judge Hart therefore issued no injunction against the General Conference, Home Health Education Service, or Adventist Book Centers.

Implications of the Proctor Case

Derrick Proctor did not appeal the decision of Judge Hart. The decision itself, involving a fairly narrow application of the Sherman Act, will therefore have limited weight, if any, beyond the northern district of Illinois.

As to the effect on Proctor, the court obviously felt that in terms of business ability, he was not overwhelmed by General Conference opposition. It is not unusual for courts to take a "balancing" point of view in offering shelter to the weaker party. Judge Hart may be right about Proctor's strength. If so, this additional adversity may further enhance his sales creativity.

Similar pressures on the denominational distribution system to excel have been slowed by this decision, at least temporarily. In the long run, however, the "Proctor factor" is bound to have spillover effect. Already renewed efforts are being made by the General Conference Pub-

lishing Department, as well as by denominational publishers (for example, Pacific Press) to utilize independent booksellers, even Proctor himself.²⁰ Proctor has, by his example, excited greater interest in new approaches to literature marketing.

However, the aspect of Judge Hart's decision that has attracted the widest comment among Adventists is his statement that "next to the Roman Catholic Church, the Adventist Church is the most centralized of all major Christian denominations in this country." Although that wording is taken directly from the General Conference's own proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, no reference is made to any documented evidence to support the assertion.

This statement evokes memories of the first wave of such statements in the 1970s during the litigation of employment discrimination at Pacific Press, e.g.:

If the church is a hierarchical one, as the Seventh-day Adventist Church is [again the Kedroff citation on the Orthodox bishop] the resolution of the matter by whatever body in which the church reposes determination of ecclesiastical issues is conclusive.²¹ (Emphasis supplied.)

In the Labor Department's case against Pacific Union Conference (sex discrimination), a General Conference affidavit asserted that church-related organizations are governed by a hierarchy:

All of the institutions, like the *hierarchy of churches* and conferences, come under the ultimate supervision of the General Conference Department, whether they involve Communication, Education, Health, Publishing, or something else. Thus if a problem arises in a school, hospital, or publishing house in North America, it will be *dealt with by the General Conference Department concerned and eventually by me*. The institutions of the church are listed in the Yearbook. They include entities with such apparently disparate names as *The International Insurance Company, Geoscience Research Institute, Home Health Education Service, Castle Memorial Hospital, and Loma Linda Foods. But they are all the church, as truly as is a house of worship*.²² (Emphasis supplied.)

Based on that assertion of fact, the General Conference affidavit offered a legal conclusion:

Matters of church government are *beyond the purview of civil authorities*. . . . one of the teachings of the church is that where differences of opinion exist or where there is a grievance, these should be settled within the church and *not in civil or criminal*

courts.²³ (Emphasis supplied.)

That legal theory—exemption from the court's jurisdiction based on religious immunity—was tested in a recently-decided Supreme Court case to which the General Conference was not a party, but in which it submitted an amicus ("friend of the court") brief in support of the argument. In a 9-0 decision the Court stated:

Dayton contends that the mere exercise of jurisdiction over it by the state administrative body violates its First Amendment rights. But we have repeatedly rejected the argument that a constitutional attack on the state procedures themselves "automatically vitiates the adequacy of those procedures. . . ." Even religious schools cannot claim to be wholly free from some state regulation.²⁴

It appears clear, therefore, that not even the assertion of hierarchical rule over Adventist institutions will exempt the General Conference from the jurisdiction of the courts, an assertion it has made since the 1970s beginning with *Whitney v Greater New York Conference*, *Marshall v Pacific Union Conference*, *EEOC vs. Pacific Press* (all discrimination cases), *Southern*

The General Conference signed a consent decree with the state of Michigan to refrain from the activities which it now asserts it has a right to do. Many people may see a problem with that kind of religion.

California Conference v Burbank Seventh-day Adventist Church (property case), and others since then.

However, in the Proctor case the judge used the concept of a centralized "single entity" to fit the contours of case law in which a "parent corporation" cannot conspire with its "wholly-owned subsidiary." So if all Adventist institutions constitute a "single entity," they are, as he said, "incapable of conspiring." Thus, his finding of a "centralized" church structure defeated the charges of conspiracy price-fixing and monopoly. Since this finding was limited to

this judicial interpretation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, and because trial court decisions are not binding on other courts unless affirmed by a court of appeals, this case will probably have no decisional authority on other cases.

In addition to its impact on literature distribution, its statements on church structure, and the legal posture of the General Conference, there is yet another aspect of the Proctor case that should cause church members concern. That is the matter of good faith and fair dealing in business and legal matters. The General Conference signed a consent decree with the state of Michigan to refrain from engaging in the activities that it now asserts it has a right to do under color of religion. Many people may see a problem with that kind of religion.

This problem appears again, for example, in a case in which General Conference lawyers have described the Seventh-day Adventist denomination very differently than they did in Proctor's case. The Racine Street Project is a real estate development in Chicago in which the Lake Region Conference is financially involved. (see Miles, pp. 19-24 in this issue of *Spectrum*.) When financial problems in that project became known, General Conference Special Counsel Charles E. Dickerson III wrote in a letter dated January 2, 1987, addressed to counsel for one of the other parties in the case:

While the North American Division, the General Conference and the Lake Region Conference are all part of the "sisterhood of churches" as referred to above, *there is no formal tie or connection between these corporations.* The "sisterhood" refers only to the concept that the members of each of these religious corporations share the same ecclesiastical beliefs. *The term does not intend to imply any other connection between the entities. . . .*

Additionally, the North American Division and the General Conference have voted resolutions *denying liability* on the part of the Lake Region Conference, the North American Division or the General Conference *for any sums presently due or which may become due* relative to the bond transaction.²⁵ (Emphasis supplied.)

There is a real possibility that other suits against institutions and entities of the denomination will hold the General Conference and its financial resources liable.

The most serious question that persists in the wake of the Proctor case, is whether there is a "critical mass" of opinion among Adventists in

favor of high moral and business ethics that, sufficiently informed, will lead the church to a more faithful witness.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *Proctor v. General Conference of S.D.A., et al.*, Defendant's Proposed Findings of Fact, pp. 2, 47, et seq.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
3. *Proctor*, Plaintiff's Proposed Findings of Fact, p. 32.
4. *Proctor*, Court's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Judgment Order, p. 10.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 51; Plaintiff's Proposed Findings of Fact, p. 68.
6. *Proctor*, Defendant's Proposed Findings of Fact, p. 68.
7. *Proctor*, Plaintiff's Exhibits Nos. 394 and 396.
8. *Proctor*, Plaintiff's Findings of Fact, p. 22, et seq.; Plaintiff's Exhibits Nos. 308, 154, 306, 153, 228, 229.
9. *Proctor*, Court's Findings of Fact, pp. 1, 2.
10. *EEOC v. PPPA*, 482 F. Supp. (N.D. Cal. 1979), Opening Brief for Defendants dated December 4, 1974, p. 104.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
12. *EEOC v. PPPA*, F. 2d (1982), Brief for Appellants dated July 6, 1975, p. 78.
13. *Proctor*, Defendant's Post-trial Memorandum of Law, p. 13.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
15. *Proctor*, Plaintiff's Post-trial Memorandum of Law, p. 2.
16. *Proctor*, Court's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Judgment Order, p. 54.
17. *Ibid.* p. 46.
18. *Ibid.* p. 49.
19. *Proctor*, Court's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Judgment Order, p. 54.
20. *The Informer*, published by PPPA, January 27, 1987, front page; also in conversation between Clyde Kinder and the author on February 3, 1987.
21. *EEOC v. PPPA*, 482 F. Supp. (N.D. Cal. 1979), Opening Brief for Defendants, December 4, 1974, p. 97.
22. *Marshall v. Pacific Union Conference of SDA*, 14 EPD (C.D. Cal., 1977), Affidavit of Neal C. Wilson, dated February 6, 1976, p. 29.
23. *EEOC v. PPPA*, 482 F. Supp. (N.D. Cal. 1979), Affidavit of Neal C. Wilson, dated November 27, 1974, p. 9.
24. *OCRC v. Dayton Christian Schools, Inc.*, 54 U.S.L.W. (June 27, 1986).
25. Charles E. Dickerson, III, General Conference counsel, letter dated January 2, 1987.

The Samson Story: Theology as Narrative

by Douglas Clark

“Once upon a time...” is one way God has chosen to communicate his word. Stories make up a substantial share of the Bible. I propose that the theology of those stories arises in part from recognizing story as story and treating it according to literary principles governing stories. To unravel the complex relationship between the Bible as a religious book and as literature, I will briefly analyze important aspects of biblical narrative, using the story of Samson in Judges 13-16 as a sample case.

What features of Old Testament stories make them so compelling, so memorable, and so existentially appealing? What is it about them that fosters healing, wholeness, and morality? Robert Alter, a leading scholar of the Bible as literature, provides some answers to these and related questions in his recent book, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. He focuses on what he feels is an essential aim of biblical literary technique. Hebrew writers, he suggests, sought “to produce a certain indeterminacy of meaning, especially in regard to motive, moral character, and psychology.”¹ This indeterminacy on the one hand frees a story from the restrictions of too narrow an interpretation while, on the other hand, it compels readers to respond personally. A biblical story “leads us again and again to ponder complexities of motive and ambiguities of character because these are essential aspects

of its vision of man, created by God, enjoying or suffering all the consequences of human freedom.”²

In addition, stories are to be heard, enjoyed, accepted. To raise *only* questions of historical exactness may well obstruct the path toward appreciation of the narrative’s meaning.

The Book as a Whole

With these considerations in mind, we turn to the Samson cycle of stories in Judges 13-16. It has always struck me as unusual that the Hebrews 11 list of “Who’s Who Among Hebrew Worthies” included Samson. Yet numerous attempts this side of the New Testament have succeeded in sanctifying this mighty warrior whom Kenneth Gros Louis calls “the county fair bell ringer.”³ Certainly Samson as national hero has maintained wide popular appeal for centuries.

What can we know about Samson from the account in Judges? How does the storyteller portray him in what has long been recognized as a masterpiece of Hebrew narrative?⁴ What literary features illumine the delight and disaster of the story and its subtle theological lessons?

The book of Judges provides the immediate backdrop for the Samson story. Although not every Christian’s favorite devotional reading, Judges nevertheless makes deeply significant theological statements. The theology of Judges is borne in part by the consistent pattern devel-

Douglas Clark is chairman of the Theology Department of Southwestern Adventist College in Keene, Texas. He earned his doctorate in Old Testament studies.

See Jonah Run: Comic Narrative in the Book of Jonah

by Beverly Beem

The Bible is a record of literary genius as well as spiritual vision, and often spiritual vision is expressed through literary devices. The Book of Jonah, a jewel of the storyteller's art, runs counter to what we would ordinarily expect in a prophetic work. For one thing, the prophetic message itself is only one sentence long. The author is less interested in the prophecy of Jonah than in the story about the prophet.

The story of Jonah has everything a good story should have. Its cliff-hanger plot is filled with exotic adventures, a storm at sea, merchant ships, long journeys, and prophecies of doom. Its settings include a ship at sea, a great and mysterious capital city, and the belly of a fish. It features a cast of thousands with roles for a wind, a fish, a vine, and a worm. Most important for a good story, it has conflict. And the conflict is not, as the scenario might suggest, between Jonah and Nineveh. It is between Jonah and God.

The narrator creates in Jonah an anti-hero, a prophet who represents everything a prophet should not be, turning upside down our expectations about how a prophet should act. Instead of a powerful and patient ambassador working with God for the salvation of a recalcitrant people, Jonah is a petty little spokesman who sets prophetic tradition on its head. Prophets are expected to follow God's commands. Jonah runs straight in the opposite direction. Most prophets speak God's words to

deaf ears. Not Jonah. Every time he opens his mouth, masses flock to repent. Prophets are an unhappy lot in general. They are accustomed to being ignored, if not worse. They grieve over the sins of their people; they mourn over the fate of their nations. Jonah, too, is unhappy. But he is unhappy for the opposite reason. His message has been received. His listeners have repented. Nineveh is saved. Poor Jonah.

The real prophet of the book is not Jonah at all, but the narrator. He tells the story to express his vision of God's plan for Israel and the greatness of God's universal love. That vision is very different from Jonah's. The master storyteller keeps his reader in suspense while also satirizing this cantankerous prophet and the upside down world-view he professes. He sets up the conflict between Jonah and God and develops it through the four major scenes of the book.

Scene One: After the Dove

A good story begins with action, something intruding into the status quo of an ordinary situation. Here, God sets the story in motion when he tells Jonah, "Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it (Jonah 1:2 RSV). The reader may recognize some familiar echoes from other Old Testament prophets. God often sends his word to a prophet, and we expect the next line to read "And Jonah rose up and went to Nineveh that great city and cried out against it, according to the word of the Lord."

Beverly Beem is chairperson of the Department of English, Walla Walla College. She received her doctorate in Renaissance literature at the University of Nebraska.

But Jonah doesn't know his lines. The narrator sets us up for a surprise as he tells us that Jonah rose not to go, but to flee; not to Nineveh, but to Tarshish; and not according to the word of the Lord, but away from the presence of the Lord (Jonah 1:3).

God's command, too, has some surprises. Other prophets brought God's word directly to Israel, the people of God. His prophets sometimes cried out against the surrounding nations, but they did so from the streets of Jerusalem. To cry out against Nineveh was a respectable thing for a prophet to do—Nahum did it with vigor. But "to put in a personal appearance"—that was a new touch.¹

God is not sending Jonah to just any foreign city, but to the capital of Assyria, the most ferocious and violent nation in the world. Nahum describes it as a "bloody city, all full of lies and booty" with "heaps of corpses, dead bodies without end."² No wonder Jonah heads straight for Tarshish. The narrator seems to catch Jonah's hurry as he tells us in a flurry of verbs that Jonah "rose," and "went," and "found," and "paid," and "went on board," "away from the presence of the Lord."

The scenario is a comic one. Some commentaries point out that Jonah's name means "dove" and his father's name means "faithfulness."³ So, to begin his story, the narrator paints an ironic picture of God's dove, the son of faithfulness, taking wing and flying from the work God has given him to do.

Action and counteraction. The story is underway. It is once again God's turn. Will he let his prophet rest quietly in the hold of a ship while Nineveh waits? Not likely.

But why does Jonah flee? Is he afraid of Nineveh? Or like many other prophets, does he feel unworthy? Might he be worried about his reputation? Maybe he is a gentle dove who does not want to be an instrument of God's wrath. The narrator lets us wonder. Jonah does not explain it until the fourth scene, and by then the narrator has given the reader enough information to see it for the uncharitable reason that it is.

Jonah flees because he fears that the people of Nineveh will hear the word of God and repent.

Then, since God is a gracious and merciful God, he would send mercy rather than justice, love rather than fire. This is not just a question of Jonah's credibility; it is a question of justice. What is going to happen to this vengeful, cruel city with the blood of nations dripping from its hand? Would its people get justice? Would they get what is coming to them? While Israel suffers at the hands of Nineveh, would Nineveh now get off scot-free with just a word of repentance? Would God do that? "Yes," says Jonah. "God would do that. And it just isn't right. It isn't justice."⁴

This is the point of conflict. It is not so much a question of obedience as it is a theological dispute that Jonah has with God. It is not because of unbelief that Jonah flees; it is because he knows God all too well.⁵

Scene Two: Enter the Whale

God does not confront his prophet directly with a theological argument. Rather, like a good dramatist, he works behind the scenes, setting the stage for the salvation of Nineveh and the resolution of the conflict.

While Jonah sleeps, God hurls a great wind upon the sea. Elie Wiesel describes the scene like this:

The wind is howling, the waves are roaring, the ship is about to break up into a thousand pieces; everybody is busy, everybody tries to help, some work, others pray, all efforts, all energies are being mobilized; everybody is trying to be useful except Jonah. What is his contribution to the collective rescue operation? Incredible but true: in that hour of crisis and mortal danger, when the world is upside down, when creation is in turmoil, the prophet—who should, by definition, be more sensitive, more alert, more tense than the common mortal—is asleep! Instead of sounding the alarm and leading the rescue activities, he goes on sleeping!⁶

God's windstorm gets everyone's attention. The sailors want to know what it means and seek their own gods for the answer. The prophet, who knows the answer, is asleep. The pagan captain must wake him to do his duty: "Arise, call upon your god! Perhaps the god

will give a thought to us, that we do not perish" (Jonah 1:6).

Jonah's response to the sailors is a confession of faith. He tells them that he fears the Lord, "the God of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land" (Jonah 1:9). What would his tone of voice be like? Is it the reverent awe of a believer who sees anew the power of God? Or is it the monotone of a creed once meaningful but now routine—the god whom ad the sea and the dry land?

It doesn't really matter. What does matter is that the sailors now know God. Our reluctant prophet is marvelously successful. He recites his creed, and his entire audience turns to worship the Creator. God makes use of the natural world to carry out his purposes in this story. He hurls winds and appoints fish and plants and worms. Yet God needs his prophets

What are Jonah's thoughts as he sinks into the cold black waters? Perhaps he is feeling slightly smug. After all, he is not going to Nineveh.

to interpret the meaning of such actions.

Jonah introduces God to the sailors as the God who made the seas, but his very presence on the ship belies his testimony. In the Psalms, the seas were often a symbol of the world of chaos, the world outside of God's creation.⁷ Maybe Jonah had thought to escape God there. Maybe God won't be able to find him in the deep waters. The sailors know better. They are horrified at Jonah's answer. Who would run to sea to escape the Maker of the ocean?

Jonah has a choice. He could repent. If God would have mercy on Nineveh, he would certainly have mercy on Jonah. But this answer is too simple for Jonah. He chooses rather to be thrown into the sea. Why such a drastic measure? Maybe he thinks of himself as a sacrifice for the sailors. With him out of the way, he explains, "the sea will quiet down for you" (Jonah 1:12). For Jonah, it is a matter of pure and simple justice.

Jonah's situation is just like Nineveh's. He

has been wicked, and he deserves to die. While Jonah is silent, the heathen sailors assume the prophetic role and plead with God to save his life. They pray for him. They intercede for him. They fight to save him. They refuse to take the last drastic step until they are absolutely sure that there is no other way.

What are the sailors thinking as they see Jonah bobbing in the water and finally sinking slowly out of sight? Do they think "This is one tough god. Offend him once and look what happens?" No wonder they offer sacrifices and make vows. Perhaps later they will learn more about this god they met on the high seas. Perhaps they will learn more than Jonah was able to teach them at that moment.

What are Jonah's thoughts as he sinks into the cold black waters? Perhaps he is feeling slightly smug. After all, he is not going to Nineveh. What has happened is what ought to have happened. He may be saying, "See, God, this is justice. The soul that sinneth, it shall die. Take note: This is the way to run the universe."

But God has his own ideas about how to run the universe. He breaks into Jonah's neat and tidy little scheme with the most famous character in the book. Talk about a scene stealer. The big fish swoops in from backstage and gulps down Jonah and practically runs away with the show.

Jonah has had center stage long enough. Now it is God's turn to act. He acts "quite apart from the question of justice" to deliver Jonah from the depths of the sea.⁸

Jonah sings from the belly of the fish a song of praise. He may still argue with God; he may still try to tell God how to run the universe, but he does know how to give thanks. And here, surrounded by fleshy walls and sitting in a semi-digested pool of fishy delights, Jonah praises God for his great grace.

God is the God of all creation, and everything in the natural world works with him for Jonah's salvation. Even in the midst of the sea, this chaotic world supposedly outside of God's created order, even there God works, and the chaos monster himself turns out to be a servant of the Most High.

But has Jonah changed? "Deliverance belongs

Some Good Reading on Jonah

- Ellul, Jacques. *The Judgment of Jonah*. Trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1971.
A theological commentary relating the story to Christian experience.
- Fretheim, Terence E. *The Message of Jonah: A Theological Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977.
An excellent introduction to the literary and theological issues in the Book of Jonah, especially helpful on the question of Jonah's dispute with God and the theme of justice and mercy.
- Good, Edwin M. *Irony in the Old Testament*. 2nd. ed. Bible and Literature Series. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1981.
A pioneering work in the literary study of the Bible. It explores the use of irony in several Old Testament passages: Jonah, Saul, Genesis, Isaiah, Ecclesiastes, and Job.
- Goodhart, Sandor. "Prophecy, Sacrifice, and Repentance in The Story of Jonah." *Semeia* 33 (1985): 43-63.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. *Jonah: Messenger of the Eleventh Hour*. Mt. View, CA: Pacific Press, 1976.
A commentary on the book of Jonah that stresses the parallels to the Christian commission to preach the gospel to all the world.
- Hauser, Alan Jon. "Jonah: In Pursuit of the Dove." *JBL* 104 (1985): 21-37.
Explores the significance of Jonah's name to the action of the story.
- Landes, George M. "The Kerygma of the Book of Jonah: The Contextual Interpretation of the Jonah Psalm." *Interpretation* 28 (1967): 3-31.
- L'Engle, Madeleine. *The Journey with Jonah*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1978.
A warm and comic drama about the prophet Jonah.
- Limburg, James. *Old Stories for a New Time*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983.
Explores the importance of stories and storytelling with particular application to several Old Testament narratives.
- Magonet, Jonathan. *Form and Meaning: Studies in Literary Techniques in the Book of Jonah*. 2nd. ed. Bible and Literature Series. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.
A scholarly analysis of the literary techniques in the Book of Jonah.
- Matheson, George. "Jonah the Narrow." In *Listening to the Giants*, pp. 61-75. Edited by Warren Wiersbe. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1980.
A sermon by a 19th-century preacher best known for his hymn "O Love That Will Not Let Me Go."
- Overduin, Jan. *Adventures of a Deserter*. Trans. by Harry Van Dyke. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1965.
A devotional study of the Book of Jonah.
- Ryken, Leland. *The Literature of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1974.
An excellent textbook for a study of biblical literature.
- Scott, R. B. Y. "The Sign of Jonah: An Interpretation." *Interpretation* 19 (1965): 16-25.
- Warsaw, Thayer S. "The Book of Jonah." In *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, pp. 191-207. Ed. by Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, James S. Ackerman, and Thayer S. Warsaw. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1974.
This collection of essays, all looking at biblical stories from a literary perspective, is an excellent introduction to a study of the Bible as literature. This essay discusses the use of satire and irony in the story.
- Wiesel, Elie. *Five Biblical Portraits*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.
A Jewish writer brings in a rich background of Talmudic and Hasidic sources to a study of five Old Testament characters: Joshua, Elijah, Saul, Jeremiah, and Jonah.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. *Obadiah and Jonah: A Commentary*. Trans. Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.
A scholarly commentary. The author particularly explores the use of narrative techniques to develop the theme of Israel's relationship with the Gentiles.

to the Lord,” he says in his psalm (Jonah 2:9). Now that he has received the great mercy of God, is he willing to extend that same mercy to others? The next scene will tell us.

Scene Three: On the Road Again

It begins with words almost identical to those we heard in the first chapter. “Then the word of the Lord came to Jonah the second time, saying ‘Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and proclaim to it the message that I tell you.’ So Jonah arose and [it’s about time] went to Nineveh, according to the word of the Lord” (Jonah 3:2).

The narrator does not let us forget how great the city of Nineveh is. Repeatedly in the story he refers to Nineveh as a great city. It is a city of three-days’ journey. But Jonah goes no deeper than one-day’s journey. He may be going to Nineveh, but he isn’t going any further than he has to. His message is brief and perfunctory: “Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown” (Jonah 3:4). That is it. Where are the appeals to repent? Where is the presentation of the mercy and justice of God? Where are words of sorrow or of hope? “Just forty days and wham! A graceless message delivered by one living in the shadow of an experience of grace.”⁹

The response is phenomenal. Just as he inadvertently did on the ship, our reluctant prophet meets with total success. On the first day, he converts the entire metropolis. The whole city, from the least to the greatest, falls to its knees in repentance. Repentance becomes a government policy. The king hears the word and proclaims a national fast. The conversion of the Ninevites is so complete that it includes the animals, too. St. Francis may have preached to the animals, but the beasts in the book of Jonah are covered in sackcloth to pray and fast and repent.¹⁰

The response of Nineveh is like the sea captain’s: “Who knows, God may yet repent and turn from his fierce anger, so that we perish not?” (Jonah 3:9). The heathen understand

something that Jonah does not. “God acts as it pleases him, which may or may not conform to human expectations.” God is sovereign, and if he chooses to deliver, he can, and because he is a gracious God, he will.¹¹

Scene Four: I Told You So

God acts with great mercy toward this great city, and Jonah responds with great anger. He is a “man of law and order.” His system of retributive justice has been broken.¹² His world has been invaded by a god who is greater than his neat moral package, a god who steps into the cycle of sin and punishment with mercy and forgiveness. In the final scene of the story, the narrator brings Jonah face to face with the implications of his belief in a remarkable dialogue with God.

Jonah begins with “I told you so—I knew it. I just knew it. That’s why I fled to Tarshish.” His tone is undoubtedly churlish as he describes the character of God as gracious and merciful, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love and repenting of evil (Jonah 4:2). He may be whining or snarling or sneering, but he is not happy. He throws this familiar, confessional description of God’s character into God’s face as if it were a fault.

Jonah is on an emotional roller coaster. He had expressed great joy when he was delivered from the belly of Sheol. When Nineveh experiences this same mercy of God, he is furious. It’s all right for God to be gracious to Jonah and merciful to Israel. Jonah believes in this confession of faith he has just cited; he just wants to limit it to Israel. Mercy is fine, Lord. You’ve just got to be more careful who you give it to. Forgiveness of Jonah, yes, that is good. Forgiveness of the Ninevites, well, God should think twice about that.¹³

So strongly does he believe this that he asks God to take his life. “Let me die,” he says. “I cannot bear the awful sight of Nineveh spared.”

Jonah's anger makes no sense. "Do you do well to be angry?" asks God (Jonah 4:4). But Jonah has no more to say. He stalks away, leaving God's question hanging in the air.

God, though, knows other ways to communicate. When words are no longer effective, he has the whole creation at his service, and now he employs a vine to speak for him. The vine grows overnight, like the magic plant in Jack and the Beanstalk. It grows and it grows in just the right place and shelters Jonah from the hot sun. And Jonah is not just glad for the vine, he is exceedingly glad. After all, it saves him from discomfort. Once again God exercises his grace for Jonah, and Jonah gratefully receives it.

And so he sits in the shade of God's grace. God is no doubt watching his response with great interest and hope: Maybe when Jonah cools down and sees my grace operating for him, maybe then he will be more generous toward the Ninevites. But no. There Jonah sits in a fit of temper, hoping for fire and brimstone to fall from heaven.

So the same God who commissioned the leviathan now brings another creature into the act. He employs a worm to cut down the vine. This is one hungry worm, for the plant dries up within minutes. And then, just to drive the point home, God appoints a sultry east wind to come on stage and gives the sun a featured role, driving the fainting Jonah to wish he were dead.

Once again God asks Jonah, "Do you do well to be angry—for the plant?" Jonah is not silent this time and whines, "I do well to be angry, angry enough to die" (Jonah 4:9).

God is trying hard to communicate with Jonah. The first and last parts of the story are mirror images of each other. In the first part, God has compassion on Jonah, and Jonah approves. In the second, God has compassion on Nineveh, and Jonah disapproves. In the final scene with the plant, God attempts to connect the two incidents in Jonah's mind.

Do you pity the plant? What an odd word. Pity. For a plant. Yes, Jonah pities the plant. He is not without feeling. He pities plants. And though he would like to see an entire city wiped out, he is angry at the destruction of his beloved

plant. Something is out of balance. God is asking Jonah to learn something new. He understands God's justice, but he needs to learn God's mercy.¹⁴

God starts him off with a very easy lesson. You have compassion on the plant, don't you Jonah? That's good, Jonah. Pity the plant. But now, can you take one more step? Can you not understand how I can pity a city filled with thousands of people, with men and women and children and also much cattle? As you pity the plant and want it to live, can you not understand that I pity Nineveh and want it to live?

The story ends too soon. Where is Jonah's answer?

Where Is the Fifth Act?

There is an answer to God's question. The narrator leaves it to the reader. It might not be until this point that we really understand who Jonah is. Of course Jonah is Israel, chosen by God to be a light to all nations. And yes, Jonah is the church. But James Limburg says in *Old Stories for a New Time* that a story really hits home when the application moves from *them* to *us* and finally to *me*.¹⁵

Jonah may have been speaking to Nineveh, but the narrator is writing to us. Jonah's message to Nineveh was bound by time and place, but the message of the narrator is universal.

Jonah is one who can spout pious phrases, but does not pity the people of Nineveh. Jonah is one who knows all the right religious answers, but sleeps while the pagans fight to save the ship and the people in it. Jonah is one who takes offense at God's work among people outside his group.¹⁶

I am Jonah, and God is telling me that his love extends far beyond the borders of my community, that his love embraces his entire creation, from the great cities and cultures of the world to "the cows of Nineveh."¹⁷ God needs me to speak his love outside my community and

he can use me and bless me, even in my most cantankerous moments.

The end of the story makes a lot of people happy. The Ninevites are happy. Destruction has passed them by. God is happy. His word has been heard in Nineveh.¹⁸ Only Jonah is

sulking on a hillside. We can leave him there. But God's question, "Can't you understand that I love Nineveh?" hangs in the air, waiting for an answer. And the narrator, whose account leads us to laugh at the pouting, uncharitable Jonah, has shown us how we must answer.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Terence E. Fretheim, *The Message of Jonah: A Theological Commentary* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1977), p. 76.

2. Nahum 3:1-3 (RSV).

3. Hans Walter Wolff, *Obadiah and Jonah: A Commentary*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986), pp. 98-99. See also Alan Jon Hauser, "Jonah: In Pursuit of the Dove," *JBL* 104 (1985): 21-37.

4. Fretheim, pp. 33, 76-78.

5. Fretheim, pp. 77-78.

6. *Five Biblical Portraits* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981), pp. 144-145.

7. Wolff, pp. 131-137.

8. Fretheim, p. 93.

9. Fretheim, pp. 107-108.

10. Edwin M. Good, *Irony in the Old Testament* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1981), p. 49.

11. Fretheim, pp. 84, 112-113.

12. Thayer S. Warshaw, "The Book of Jonah," in *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, eds. Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, James S. Ackerman, and Thayer S. Warshaw (Nashville: Abingdon, 1974), p. 193.

13. Fretheim, pp. 22-26, 118-119.

14. Warshaw, pp. 193-194.

15. (Atlanta: John Knox, 1983), pp. iv, 114.

16. Limburg, pp. 114-115.

17. Limburg, p. 116.

18. Wiesel, p. 131.

The Sanctuary and Sabbath in Milton's *Paradise Lost*

by Andrea Luxton

More than 350 allusions to Hebrews can be found in *Paradise Lost*; many of these relate to subjects close to Adventism—Sabbath rest, the assurance of the sanctuary, and the “better” priesthood of Christ.¹ Milton does not debate the doctrinal nature of such topics, but as one of the greatest poets in the English language, he explores the dynamic and personal implications of such concepts through his poetic art. In the works of Milton faith and art become combined in a unique fashion. The dynamism of Milton's faith often relies on this art for its expression, and his poetry becomes richer because of his faith. In his poetry, the theologian and the poet meet.

In this essay I examine Milton's imaginative interpretation of holy rest and the sanctuary, looking particularly at Milton's emphasis on the challenges and rewards of individual responsibility and experience.²

Holy Rest

Like the remainder of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Hebrews 3 and 4 concern themselves with the assurance that comes through Christ. The particular promise of these chapters, however, is holy rest, with emphasis on humanity's responsibility and God's reliability. In a complex argument, the author examines the past, present, and future

promises of rest. The promise of rest was given to the Israelites, but their unbelief meant they did not receive it. Rest was also promised in the days of David, but this promise had its own limitations. There is also the rest of God, connected to the Sabbath and Creation (Heb. 4:4). However, all these rests point toward an even more fulfilling rest. As the author of Hebrews expresses it, “There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God” (Heb. 4:9). The author of Hebrews coins a new Greek word to describe this rest—*sabbatismos*. With its root in the word *Sabbath*, this better rest looks backward to the rest of the Sabbath and Creation, but it also looks to the present and future. Most commentators on Hebrews conclude that this is a dynamic rest that can be experienced partially in the present and completely in the future.³ Certainly such a rest depends on a covenant relationship between an individual and God, but God's part of the bargain is assured. Choosing the future remains with humanity.

The richness of Hebrews 3 and 4 largely depends on the tensions that the author introduces into his discussion: the tension between the present and future hope of rest (realized and future eschatology) and the tension between God's promise and humanity's belief. It is these tensions that become central to Milton's use of rest in *Paradise Lost*. He makes no attempts to discuss the issues philosophically. However, he does examine the “experience” of rest. How does rest affect the individual in a practical way? What is the nature of this true rest?

It is interesting that Milton first introduces the idea of rest into his poem by picturing “unrest.”⁴

Andrea Luxton is the chairperson of the English Department at Newbold College. This essay is based on her doctoral dissertation completed at Catholic University in Washington, D.C.

Within a few lines of the beginning of his epic, Milton vividly pictures hell, and among his descriptions he notes that in hell "peace," "rest," and "hope" can never dwell (I. 65-67).⁵ Peace and hope suggest states of mind. Likewise, rest does not mean just physical rest, but spiritual rest as well. Satan and his angels continually search for some rest: a physical place to rest (I. 180-185), and spiritual rest from "restless thoughts" (II. 840-841). However, Satan's trip is doomed to failure. What Milton emphasizes, and Satan does not accept, is that the end of Satan's rest coincided with his first steps of rebellion. For example, when Milton pictures Satan's battle in heaven with the Son, it is in the middle of the night that Satan calls his council together, for he and his followers are "void of rest" (VI. 412-416). In fact, on a number of occasions Milton directly refers to the hardening of both Satan's and the angels' hearts

**Milton's Sabbath of "holy rest"
is not a day of inaction; it is
vibrant, a day of music and
celebration.**

(I. 571-573; VI. 791-792). In Hebrews it is the hard hearts or unbelief of the Israelites that prevents their experiencing rest; in *Paradise Lost* it is the unbelief of Satan and his followers that prevent their reexperiencing the rest that they once knew. Although Satan's rebellion chronologically precedes the rebellions of Israel, Milton establishes Satan and his angels as the antitype of rebellion. They have hardened their hearts and by their choice have separated themselves from the power of the Son and the rest of God.

Adam and Eve's situation is a little more complex, for Milton pictures them experiencing both rest and unrest. In his early descriptions of Adam and Eve, Milton suggests they are only beginning to experience true spiritual rest. Adam speaks of physical rest on a number of occasions (IV. 610-633; V. 368); however, only once does he sense true spiritual satisfaction. On that occasion he listens to an angel and

claims that his "words with Grace Divine/ Imbu'd, bring to their sweetness no satiety" (VIII. 210-216). This concept of spiritual satisfaction approaches the ideal of *sabbatismos* in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Unfortunately the satisfaction is short-lived. Describing the effects of the fall, Milton continually uses words such as *toss't* and *turbulent*. Even before the Fall Satan appears to Eve in a dream and she wakes "As through unquiet rest" (V. 10-11), an oxymoron that vividly suggests the difference between physical and true spiritual rest. Then after the Fall, both Adam and Eve wake "As from unrest" (IX. 1051-1052); recognizing their loss, they both sit down and weep (IX. 1119-1121).

But this picture of unrest is not the end. Adam and Eve's response to separation from God is not the same as Satan's. In these two characters Milton shows the results of hearts that are not hardened. In a series of allusions to passages in Hebrews, Milton shows that repentance will lead to rest; God's promise is still sure. Hebrews 4:11 exhorts, "Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest"; Adam plans to "earn rest from labor won" (XI. 372-375). This rest is not just physical. Adam accepts the consequences of his sin and the responsibility necessary to regain the lost relationship with God and the accompanying rest.

In his presentation of Satan's unrest and Adam and Eve's changing experiences of rest, Milton chiefly concentrates on the tension between God's promises and man's belief. However, he also looks at God's rest and in doing so more clearly defines the nature of rest. The fact that God does not need rest (V. 647) and that the Son does not weary (VII. 552) places the rest of heaven outside the realm of physical rest. The actual term *holy rest* occurs twice. On the first occasion Milton suggests the Creation takes place while the Creator is "in his holy Rest" (VII. 90-93); on the second occasion Satan's rebellion is described as troubling "Holy Rest" (VI. 271-273). The final reference to rest in heaven is the Sabbath rest following Creation (VII. 587-634). This rest takes place in heaven, not on earth, and although the day became a rest

from work in Milton, the rest is certainly not physical, for the day becomes a day of music and a celebration of creativity and lordship. This rest draws very near to the ideal of *sabbatismos* in Hebrews 4. Milton emphasizes that “holy rest” does not mean inaction; it is vibrant—a state of being in which peace and creativity rule.

Milton presents a series of pictures in *Paradise Lost*, each one portraying rest in a different form. We see unrest, physical rest, the possibilities of spiritual rest, and holy rest. Importantly, Milton does not end his discussion of rest with the glory of the future or the timeless and eternal rest in heaven. True, he has presented the glory of “holy rest”—the ideal, eschatological rest of the future, perhaps. However, he ends his epic with one of the most poignant scenes in English literature: Adam and Eve leaving the Garden of Eden

The world was all before them, where to choose
Their place of rest, and Providence their guide:
They hand in hand with wand’ring steps and slow
Through Eden took their solitary way (XII. 646-649).⁶

This moment of pathos owes much to Milton’s artistic skill; it also depends upon his carefully considered discussion of the experience of rest and human responsibility. The covenant of eternal rest lies ahead, but its present and future fulfillment depends on humanity’s acceptance of God’s promise.

The Sanctuary: The Dwelling Place of God

In his consideration of holy rest, the author of Hebrews emphasizes the glory of the rest available to the Christian by contrasting the rests promised in the past to the superior rest of the present and future. Similarly, when he speaks of the sanctuary services, he describes the inadequacies of the past services and priests in order to emphasize the gloriousness of Christ’s priesthood. Time and again earthly objects are considered as “the example and shadow of heavenly things” (Heb. 8:5). The blood of bulls and goats

is contrasted to the blood of Christ; the yearly mediation of the high priest is compared to the eternal mediation of the Son. The Israelites could have assurance of their acceptance, despite the inadequacies of their earthly sanctuary services; how much more assurance Christians can experience with the one sacrifice and heavenly mediation of Christ.

In Hebrews 12:18-24 the author of Hebrews vividly contrasts the Old Covenant and the New Covenant by imagining two mountain scenes. Mount Sinai is the venue of the Old Covenant, but as the author explains, Christians have not come to that covenant:

For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, And the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them anymore.

The experience of Mount Sinai has been superceded by the opportunity of a better experience: “But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem. . . And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.” As with the ideal of holy rest, the Sion experience starts in the present and continues in the future. The sanctuary is not mentioned specifically in these verses; however, coming to Mount Sion includes coming to the sacrifice and mediation of Christ. It is this connection that leads Milton to use Hebrews 12:18-24 in a series of images that finally point to the assurance of the heavenly sanctuary.⁷

Milton refers to Mount Sinai on a number of occasions in *Paradise Lost*. Sometimes he uses it in direct contrast to Mount Sion. Mount Sinai is consistently recognized as the place where judgment is given. On three occasions Milton uses a variety of the images of Hebrews 12—the fire, blackness, darkness, tempest, and trumpet—to picture scenes of judgment. And in each case judgment is given by God from a hill or mountain. The pronouncement of doom on Satan and his troops (VI. 56-60) and the declaration of judgment on Adam and Eve (XI. 72-76) take place from the heavenly mount; the his-

torical scene of the giving of the law to Moses (XII. 227-230) takes place on the earthly Mount Sinai. However, if the trumpet blowing, the fire, darkness, and tempest suggest the giving of judgment, they also indicate what the result of forsaking God's covenant can be.⁸ Just as hell was a place of unrest, so is it also a place of fire and darkness. Right at the beginning of his poem, Milton describes the "utter darkness" of the angels' prison, and how the rebellious troops were "o'erwhelm'd/ With Floods and Whirlwinds of tempestuous fire" (I. 70-78). And only a few lines later he pictures Satan making his way to a hill (God, of course, is always pictured on a hill) "whose grisly top/Belch'd fire and rolling smoke" (I. 670-671). Satan, the antitype of rebellion, cannot escape the consequences of his actions; by his own choice he continually dwells under judgment and, symbolically, at Mount Sinai.

In contrast to Mount Sinai, which represents judgment, Milton suggests that Mount Sion is the place of assurance and acceptance. As mentioned already, the poet very early suggests that the inspiration of Mount Sinai is inadequate and

Judgment does take place on this mountain, but more importantly, this mountain is the place of acceptance and assurance. This is where God experiences his holy rest.

should be replaced by the inspiration of Mount Sion. Yet some of his pictures of the earthly Sion seem less than positive. Although Mount Sion may be the home of the sanctuary, it is also the home of heathen deities.⁹ In fact, in the first of the two references Jehovah is seen "thund'-ring out of Sion, thron'd/ Between the Cherubim" with the heathen shrines placed near the ark of the covenant, even inside the sanctuary. This juxtaposing of the presence of God (with the sanctuary) and the presence of sin (with the other altars) contrasts the ideal of Sion with the reality of the earth. The experience of holy rest was offered to Adam and Eve, but its availability

was limited due to sin. In the same way, the Sion experience is possible on earth, but inevitably, it is not complete. Milton does balance the imperfection of this picture, however, by his third reference to the earthly Mount Sion. On this occasion, he foresees a passage that will link the literal top of Mount Sion to heaven (III. 530).

The presence of the sanctuary in Sion and the passageway from Sion to heaven suggests that the unique nature of the Sion mountain experience encompasses much more than present earthly existence. Milton does not specify where the passageway leads; however, other passages in the epic imply that the passageway probably connects Mount Sion to God's holy hill. Milton presents the holy mount in heaven as the place from which God makes his proclamations, where the angels gather to worship God, and where the Son returns after his exploits, whether he has gained victory in war or completed the act of Creation. By fulfilling these functions this mountain becomes the heavenly antitype of which the earthly Mount Sion is a type. And significantly, on two separate occasions the term *sanctuary* is loosely used in reference to the holy mount or where God dwells. In fact, in one scene Milton specifically pictures the heavenly sanctuary, with Christ mediating on behalf of the repentant Adam and Eve (XI. 1-22), and the scene takes place before the Father's throne, which has previously and consistently been pictured on the "holy mount."

It would seem that in Milton's portrayal of the heavenly Mount Sion, the dwelling place of God, the place of celebration, the sanctuary, and the Son's place of mediation are all in one place. Judgment does take place on this mountain, but more importantly, this mountain is the place of acceptance and assurance. This is where God experiences his holy rest. It is where the angels celebrated Sabbath after Creation, and where the Son, fulfilling his Father's wishes, mediated for Adam and Eve. Sion is the place for forgiveness and assurance. Judgment may be part of the Sion experience, but only within the framework of love and acceptance. Sinai is interested only in justice; Sion is concerned with mercy.

In his imaginative way Milton presents unrest and the ideal of holy rest, putting his final emphasis, however, on human choice. Similarly, in his discussion of Mount Sion and the sanctuary Milton presents the horrors of Sinai and the assurance of Sion, again, however, concluding with humanity's choice. Allusions to Hebrews in *Paradise Lost* appear most often, by far, in the last two books. In a series of brief tableaux, Milton presents the faithful men of Hebrews 11 and the less faithful parallels from the New Testament. However, mingled with this narration of past choices (future to Adam) are a series of complex allusions to the discussion of Hebrews on the Old and New Covenant. Christ is the better sacrifice, the better mediator. There is hope; there is reason for confidence and assurance.¹⁰ But even so, the Sinai experience and the Sion experience still exist side by side for humanity.

The world was all before them, where to choose
 Their place of rest, and Providence thir guide:
 They hand in hand with wand'ring steps and slow,
 Through Eden took thir solitary way.

Adam and Eve must face the unavoidable tension between present reality and future hope; the unrest of Mount Sinai, or the rest of Sion with the assurance of the sanctuary—limited at present as that may be. They have seen what could be; now the future lies in their hands.

When Milton looks at the Epistle to the

Hebrews he sees grand possibilities and glorious visions. He visualizes the dynamic experience of holy rest: celebratory, creative, and rejuvenating. He pictures the unity of Father and Son as the Father's reluctant judgment become tempered by the Son's welcome mediation and love. He imagines the heavenly mount, linked to the earthly Mount Sion, that cannot help but draw men to it.

However, Milton sees not only light, but also the darkness of human struggle. He recognizes the reality of sin and the horror of judgment. He perceives that the Christian often lives with the tension of rest and unrest, or symbolically with the shrines inside the sanctuary. Yet to Milton, this is the essence of Christianity: choice, decision, hope, failure, and dreams.

In *Paradise Lost* Milton explores the experience of the Epistle to the Hebrews and finds it exciting, encouraging, frightening and, at times, disheartening. But most of all he finds its messages provocative and its ideals challenging. Milton the theologian might argue over the detailed interpretation of a text.¹¹ However, Milton the poet and theologian examines the relationship between the human and the divine. He explores possibilities, allows his mind to wander over human predicaments and divine solutions, and finally, leaves the Garden along with Adam, Eve, and his readers—united, alone, questioning, and hopeful.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Before the publication of James Sims' 1962 study, *The Bible in Milton's Epics* from the University of Florida Press, editors had listed allusions to the Bible in Milton's work. However, Sims expands on this limited approach by carefully examining the effect of biblical allusions on Milton's poetry.

The most commonly studied books have been Genesis and Revelation. Other scholars have begun to examine the Pauline epistles, and the Gospel of John. My own study has been in Hebrews.

Milton most frequently refers to Hebrews 1, 3, 4, 11, and 12, although he often conflates texts on the sanctuary from the central chapters of Hebrews. Besides his interest in rest and the sanctuary he also uses allusions to Hebrews in his portrayal of Creation, the nature of true

authority, the relationship between the Father and the Son, covenant relationships, and the power of the Godhead. In every case he authenticates the claims of God and encourages confidence and assurance in Christ.

2. In James Sims and Leland Ryken, eds., *Milton and Scriptural Tradition* (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1984) a selection of authors examine the "interaction between the Bible and Milton's poetry" (p. 3). This consideration of what happens to the Bible in the hands of a poet has become a new and fruitful point of discussion for literary critics.

3. Two helpful commentaries on this point are Donald Hagner, *Hebrews*, Good News Commentaries (San Francisco: Harper, 1983), pp. 51-54, and Leon Morris, "Hebrews," *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, gen. ed.

Frank Gaebelien, Vol. 12 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), pp. 40-44.

4. In *Poetics of the Holy* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1981), pp. 325-327, Michael Lieb discusses Hebrews 3 and 4 and the topics of rest and unrest. Although the focus of his highly allusive study is different from mine, he often makes reference to the same passages as I will use.

5. All references to *Paradise Lost* will be taken from Merritt Hughes, ed., *John Milton: Complete Poetry and Major Prose* (New York: Odyssey, 1957).

6. The last four lines of *Paradise Lost* and their relationship to Hebrews 4 is also discussed in Mary Christopher Pecheux, O.S.U., "Their Place of Rest: *Paradise Lost*, XII. 647," *Milton Quarterly* 6 (1972), 73-75.

7. James Hoyle, "'If Sion Hill Delight Thee More': The Muses's Choice in *Paradise Lost*," *English Language Notes* 12 (1974), 20-24; and Lieb, pp. 140-170, discuss the relationship between Mount Sion and Mount Sinai. However, neither fully devel-

ops the relationship between Hebrews and these passages, and neither looks at the question of the sanctuary.

8. Most 17th century commentators on Hebrews saw the description of Mount Sinai in Hebrews 12 as an allegorical presentation of what would happen to those who denied Christ. In using these same images in his description of hell, Milton is suggesting a similar idea.

9. Three passages in the epic speak of the earthly Mount Sion; yet in two of these cases Mount Sion houses numerous heathen shrines (I. 386, 442).

10. More than 75 allusions to Hebrews can be found in these last two books. Many of these allusions are conflated to emphasize Milton's concern with the assurance of Christ. These references help serve as the finale to Milton's poem, and are vital to an understanding of his epic.

11. Milton also wrote a theological treatise, *De Doctrina Christiana*, where he discusses many of the same passages in Hebrews that he uses in *Paradise Lost*. However, his approach in this work is very different, and his concern lies more with the explication of texts than with faith and experience.

The Bright Wings of God's Grandeur

by Judith P. Nembhard

*The world is charged with the grandeur of God.
It will flame out like shining from shook foil;
It gathers to a greatness like the ooze of oil
Crushed. Why do men then now not reck his rod?
Generations have trod, have trod, have trod;
And all is seared with trade; bleared, smeared with toil;
And wears man's smudge and shares man's smell;
the soil
Is bare now, nor can foot feel, being shod.
And for all this, nature is never spent;
There lives the dearest freshness deep down things;
And though the last lights off the black West went
Oh, morning, at the brown brink eastwards, springs
Because the Holy Ghost over the bent
World broods with warm breast and with ah! bright
wings.*

—Gerard Manley Hopkins¹

In the vast field of English and American letters, the Bible has left a profound imprint on the thoughts and style of a large number of writers. The majority laid no claim to a religious faith, but Gerard Manley Hopkins' writing reveals clear echoes and influences. His deeply religious life led him to write poetry that is thematically Christian, a poetry suffused with biblical imagery.

Acknowledged as one of the finest English nature poets, Hopkins has given us in "God's Grandeur," the first in his series of "bright sonnets,"² a perceptive analysis of the interplay between humans and the natural world. The poem trumpets the biblical theme of God's presence in the earth. Living in the Welsh countryside at St. Bueno College, the poet-priest

trained his vision on his surroundings and came to see nature as God's ambassador, conveying a message of God's presence and concern for all creation. The poem has much in it that is instructive about nature's role as God's ministrant.

From his late 19th-century vantage point, Hopkins had opportunity to observe the environmental impact of urbanization and industrialization. The squalor of the urban centers where he taught distressed him; attacks of any kind upon nature pained him. He reacted strongly whenever any part of nature was threatened with destruction. In one of his journal entries, he speaks of the pain which the felling of an ash inflicted upon him. Using such terms as "maimed" and "pang," he confesses to wanting to die and not "see the inscape of the world destroyed anymore." We today might be prone to consider his reaction overly sensitive, but to Hopkins destruction of nature meant the destruction of the inner being of the world. His poem is a plea for our wise and understanding relationship with nature.

Seventh-day Adventists have the best reasons for being deeply interested in the preservation of nature. True, we are of a theological turn of mind that tends to make this world a stage destined to pass, but we do view nature as God's "second book" where we can detect "the impress of Deity."³ Ellen White assures us that nature "echoes the voice of the Creator."⁴ Moreover, the Sabbath, so central to Adventists beliefs, is bound up with nature: "God designs that the Sabbath shall direct the mind of man to the contemplation of His created works. Nature speaks to their senses, declaring that there is a

Judith P. Nembhard is an assistant professor of English at Howard University in Washington, D.C. She is a graduate of Columbia Union College (B.A.) and holds a doctorate in English from the University of Maryland.

living God, the Creator, the Supreme Ruler of all.”⁵ In our spiritual heritage, then, there is a basis for our considering ourselves as stewards of the earth, not simply setting our minds to enjoy its beauties, but also to protect it against attempts to deplete, despoil, and debase it. In “God’s Grandeur” Hopkins corroborates the Adventist view of nature “as the channel of God’s revelation of Himself.”⁶ The poem’s simplicity of form and theme strengthens our viewpoint regarding our relationship and obligation to nature.

Like a number of Hopkins’ sonnets, this one begins with a strong declarative first line, part of the poem’s disarming simplicity. The poem announces that our world is electrified with the

**To Hopkins, the contemporary
God is blazing power, the kind
of power that should inspire
wonderment and awe.**

presence of God, despite the secularization of our time, when God has suffered near banishment to the periphery of human concern. Indeed, the first quatrain of this tightly knit Italian sonnet introduces the qualities of God which are abroad in nature, qualities powerful enough in themselves to draw us to the Godhead. God’s power, set forth in electrical imagery, with which we can identify today more so than could a 19th-century audience, will flame out in brilliant, attention-getting fashion. Norman Weyand paraphrases the line to read “the world is shot through with the beauty of God as with an electrical charge.”⁷ The reflection given off from shaken sheet foil is the poet’s analogue for lightning, noting in an 1883 letter to his friend Robert Bridges that “gold foil gives off broad glares like sheet lightning.”⁸

Nature, then, is not merely a pale reflection of God, thus allowing for charmed admiration and nothing else; rather, it is a visible manifestation of God’s power. Part of this grandeur that is now on display in the earth is akin to the Old Testament portrayal of God’s might. Hopkins’ language is so strong that it seems almost

violent: “flame out,” “shook,” and “crushed.” These words evoke images reminiscent of that grand power display on Sinai at the time of the giving of the law. But the poet does not dichotomize the Deity into the Old Testament God and the New Testament God. To him, the contemporary God is blazing power, the kind of power that should inspire wonderment and contemplation now as it did then.

Yet nature also shows God’s milder aspects. The grandeur “gathers to a greatness,” not in the dazzlement of lightning now, but in the “ooze of oil crushed.” The smooth assonance in the phrases dramatizes the complementary mild nature of God played off against the preceding power imagery. The antithesis balances the harsh with the tender as part of the quality that permeates nature. Flame and oil are also intertwined; both are light-giving, life-giving forces. The oil here is olive oil, highly appropriate to the context, since in both biblical and classical literature olive oil appears as a source of light, cleansing, and healing. Thus oil is an apt symbol to convey the roles of sin and guilt, and healer of the wounds that sin inflicts. The healing “oil of gladness” (Ps. 45:7) flows through all of nature to bless all God’s creatures.

In light of all this display of God’s majesty and power, it is only logical to assume that we mortals should show utmost respect for Him. We can detect the puzzlement in the Poet’s query: “Why do men then now not reckon his rod?” The “then-now” juxtaposition calls to our attention the longstanding tendency on man’s part to disregard God’s entreaties. Instead of acknowledging God’s supremacy and coming to terms with His evident authority, generation after generation has shown only contempt for Him, demonstrated in their attitude toward “the good earth.” David Jasper has observed: “alone in all creation, man has self-consciousness and freedom, a moral ability to choose to offer or deny glory to God.”⁹

What has been the result of the accumulated abuse of nature? “All” has been tarnished. Everything has been smeared with the soot of global decay. Adam and Eve were commissioned in the beginning to interact with nature as

preservers of the "good" that the Creator had made. But then came the "blight," Hopkins' term for the Fall (see his poem "Spring and Fall"). The blight in the landscape takes on cosmic implications as it hints at consequence of the Fall on the human "inscape." Estranged from nature, humans have become the antagonists, prolonging the curse.

The last line of the octave of the sonnet introduces an ironic note. The earth is bare now, but humans no longer go barefooted; therefore, they are unable to be touched with the consequences of their indiscretions toward nature. In a wider sense, foot cannot feel because physically and spiritually humans are out of harmony with nature.

Nature as God's representative is quietly put in the foreground in the final portion of the poem: "And for all this, nature is never spent." Where we would ordinarily expect a "but" at the beginning of the line, Hopkins presents us with "and." Instead of contrast, we find continuity. The prodigal does not elicit rejection from the father. The "deep down freshness" within nature guarantees that an emblem of renewal exists; "this freshness remains and wells up like a spring. . . from time to time."¹⁰ The Psalmist testifies that God constantly renews "the face of the earth" (Ps. 104:30), and thus He signals a willingness to renew the life of man. Walt Whitman's grass symbol and his "lilac blooming perennial" as a surety of "ever-returning spring" present a corresponding emphasis on the inexhaustible tokens of renewal that nature gives.

The poem sweeps to a close in one gigantic image in which the theme culminates: "The Holy Ghost over the bent world broods." The preservation of the earth is assured by the presence of the Holy Ghost. The sun runs its course and darkness comes, but morning breaks, or as Hopkins' perceives it, morning "springs" eastward with the sun. Morning's light reveals the guardian Spirit resident in the world. The Holy Ghost reaffirms God's presence in the earth.

We can see here also a coalescence of images in bird and Spirit. The Holy Ghost "broods" with "warm breast" and "bright wings." This nesting imagery echoes Matthew 23:37. "As a hen gathers her chicks beneath her wings" (The Living Bible), so the Spirit gathers the world in nurture and protectiveness. In the role as ministrant, the Spirit spreads His wings not only over human beings, but over the entire "bent world."

To Gerard Manley Hopkins, nature is a reflection of that Presence that made and now sustains the world. "God is under the world's splendor and wonder," he tells us in *The Wreck of the Deutschland*. Nature reflects a God who is the supernatural order that governs the world. In the poem he presents the need for God's supremacy in our lives as it is depicted in nature. With an enlightened view such as Hopkins has shown, we can come to see nature as more than the source of our physical sustenance and survival; it will become a means of our perceiving how to live in harmony with the will of God. Our love and care of nature will complement our love and care for God Himself.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. W.H. Gardner and H.H. Mackenzie, ed., *The Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, 4th edition, London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

2. Peter Milward, S.J., *Landscape and Inscape*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975, p. 35.

3. Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 601.

4. *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 572.

5. *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 48.

6. Norman Weyand, *Immortal Diamond: Studies in Gerard Manley Hopkins*, New York: Octagon Books, 1979, p. 229.

7. Weyand, p. 229.

8. Milward, p. 36.

9. David Jaspers, "God's Better Beauty: Landscape and the Poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins," *Christianity and Literature* 34 (Spring 1985), pp. 7-12.

10. Milward, p. 34.

Pleasing the Senses: Ellen White Wouldn't Object

by Lourdes Morales-Gudmundsson

Despite Adventism's fascination with truth and beauty in biblical poetry and prophecy, it has consistently seen as suspect truth and beauty expressed in human art. Always anxious to find unmistakable and clear-cut counsel, Adventists have turned largely to their most contemporary source of spiritual guidance, the writings of Ellen White. A misreading (or perhaps incomplete reading) of Ellen White's writings have made it possible for Adventists to tell their youth and their artists what is wrong with the artistic endeavor, but not what about the arts is right and legitimate. Consequently, Adventist Christians have not been able fully to appreciate and participate in the arts. They have not understood that humans, by developing their imagination, can participate in the artistic dimension of God.

Ellen White, however, never completely closed the door on all sense-pleasing activities. For example, in a chapter of the *Testimonies* entitled "Recreation for Christians" she said "heaven condemns dancing, card-playing, chess and checkers." But she did not leave it there. She also said that "something perfectly harmless should be substituted in their place," thereby acknowledging a legitimate function for that which is pleasing to the senses.¹ When Ellen White quarrels with dancing she does so in a way that implies some form of dance could

promote sacred thoughts and actions. Similarly, her prohibition of linen collars did not mean that she condemned every kind of collar.² What is true of amusement, dance, and apparel surely applies to art forms generally. While there is much harmful trash in them, Adventists should not only appreciate, but create worthy music, dance, film, painting, drama, and literature.

What is needed is a greater cultivation of art in all its manifestations as a function of God's creation. The Genesis account of Creation suggests that God evaluated his work from both an aesthetic and an ethical point of view. "God saw that it was *good*" and God said "It is not *good* that the man should be alone. . . ." Ellen White comments on the original human couple, underlining the marriage of beauty and truth in their creation.

Created to be "the image and glory of God" (I Corinthians 11:7), Adam and Eve had received endowments not unworthy of their high destiny. Graceful and symmetrical in form, regular and beautiful in feature, their countenances glowing with the tint of health and the light of joy and hope, they bore in outward resemblance the likeness of their Maker. Nor was this likeness manifest in the physical nature only. Every faculty of mind and soul reflected the Creator's glory. Endowed with high mental and spiritual gifts, Adam and Eve were made but "little lower than the angels" (Hebrews 2:7), that they might not only discern the wonders of the visible universe, but comprehend moral responsibilities and obligations.³

Ellen White then identifies creation as a work of art by stating that with all its laws and operations and its untainted beauty the whole earth was a "fit emblem of Him who is 'abundant in goodness and truth' (Exodus 34:6), a fit study for those who were made in His image."⁴

But do these words apply to fallen humanity?

Lourdes Morales-Gudmundsson is chairperson of the department of modern languages at the University of Connecticut at Stamford. A graduate of Loma Linda University, she received her Ph.D. from Brown University and has taught at Atlantic Union College and Antillian Adventist College in Puerto Rico.

The answer is that all was not lost at the Fall. Humanity continued to bear the impress of divinity, continued to be endowed with free will and reason. Humanity continued to be responsible for nature. God's command that humanity should wrestle with a rebellious earth until it produced life-giving food suggests that humanity should improve on nature through any effort, including, we may assume, the artistic effort.

This line of thinking runs throughout all biblical writings and into the thought processes of Ellen White. The Adventist church's calls to reform assume that humans can and, in some cases must, improve on the natural. Humanity's lordship over nature is evident in Ellen White's insistence that "every human being, created in the image of God, is endowed with a power akin to that of the Creator—individuality, power to think and to do."⁵ Ellen White believed that these characteristics of lordship were not lost at the Fall, and that fallen humankind can be re-educated and re-created in the image of God. For this reason, Adventists espoused the work of education, medicine, beneficence, and evangelism—all of them means of improving man and woman's lot in life. The arts, too, are a means of improving humanity, of placing our senses in the healing presence of beauty and goodness. We must cultivate our aesthetic selves as assiduously as we do our intellectual, ethical, religious, and physical selves, so that a balanced Christian may emerge. We who bear the image of God can and must participate in creative artistic activities as an expression of our likeness to God the Creator.

The artistic creation, the result of humanity acting in the image of God the Creator, often found its way into Old Testament worship. Sculpture, hymn, dances, and poems were all dedicated to God the Creator. David, in a poem no doubt used in Israel's worship, longs to live forever in the presence of God and "to behold the beauty of the Lord" (Psalm 27: 4). While "beauty" in Exodus refers to beautiful and "useless" ornaments—apparently a legitimate function of the beautiful—the Psalms point to that same kind of "uselessness," suggesting that being continually in God's presence gives that sheer pleasure that is its only reason for being. But the beauty of holiness is a transitive power, not only contemplative, for it leads to the moral and spiritual through an aesthetic experience of wholeness. The garments of the priest conveyed religious doctrine, but they were also part of the sanctuary service in order to please the senses. The biblical objection to idols is not to the sculpted image but to that image as an object of worship, rather than a symbol of truth.

In the Old Testament, then, art is integral to religious worship—it is the believer's attempt to give visual, audible, and tangible form to the infinite. In the art and beauty of worship the believer enters into harmony with his God.

Adventist understanding of creation and worship in Scripture assigns the artistic endeavor a place among those activities that help restore God's image in humankind. Certainly Adventists dedicated to music, sculpture, dance, drama, films, painting, and literature should be encouraged to reflect the affirmations of Scripture and the longings of the Adventist soul.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Ellen G. White, *Testimonies* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1948), Vol. 1, p. 514.

2. *Patriarchs and Prophets* (Mountain View: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1958), pp. 135, 136 (footnote): "The question has often been asked me if I believed it is wrong to wear plain linen collars. My answer has always been No. Some have taken the extreme meaning of what I have written about collars, and have maintained that it is wrong to wear one of any

description. I was shown expensively wrought collars . . . which some Sabbathkeepers have worn, and still wear for the sake of show and fashion. In mentioning collars, I did not design to be understood that nothing like a collar should be worn, or in mentioning ribbons, that no ribbons at all should be worn."

3. *Education* (Mountain View: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1952), p. 20.

4. *Education*, p. 20.

5. *Education*, p. 17.

Joy of Perfection: An Adventist Theme

Lauri Onjukka. *The Sanctuary and Perfection* (Temecula, CA: Lifemark Press, 1982), (paper).

Reviewed by Gary Chartier

Lauri Onjukka is a happy man. You can tell by the smile that beams from the picture on the back cover of *The Sanctuary and Perfection*. And once you have read the book, you can tell why: he loves Jesus, and he is sure that Jesus loves him. Despite the potentially ominous implications of its title, this is a very fine book by a man who has sensed the existential significance of the gospel.

The author's purpose is simple: to respond from traditional Seventh-day Adventist sources, particularly the writings of Ellen G. White, to the views of Adventist perfectionists. Onjukka covers much of the same ground that others have previously trod in their efforts to lay to rest the specter of Adventist perfectionism. He discusses the nature of Christ, original sin, and the nature of justification and sanctification, and he emphasizes the objectivity of a heavenly sanctuary in order to forestall claims that the "cleansing of the sanctuary" has ultimate reference to the supernatural eradication of sin from the hearts and lives of believers. But if his discussion is not breathtakingly original, it is at least a comprehensive analysis of the question of perfection from an Adventist perspective—and one rooted firmly in an Adventist tradition.

Despite what its title might suggest, Onjukka's book is less than perfect. Unfortunately, he uncritically accepts a traditionally formulated doctrine of the sanctuary and depends overly much on the writings of Ellen White to establish

his position. I am not sure that all his quotations from White really mean what he apparently believes they do, although on the whole he has selected well from her writings, calling attention to powerful but obscure passages. Finally, many proponents of the "harvest principle" (who assert that Jesus will return when his people no longer sin) will remain unsatisfied by his discussion of what it means to "reflect the image of Jesus fully." But I recommend this book nonetheless.

What makes this book so powerful and appealing is the personal warmth and Christian love radiating from Onjukka's writing. I was captivated by his personal trust in Jesus and by his joyful understanding and appreciation of the doctrine of salvation by grace. To those who, like me, are sometimes assailed by doubts about God's acceptance, I commend *The Sanctuary and Perfection* as a heartwarming reminder that Jesus Christ is our sin-pardoning Saviour.

Gary Chartier is a senior history and political science major at Loma Linda University.

Adventism & The Reformation Redux

W. L. Emmerson. *The Reformation and the Advent Movement* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1983), 214 pp. \$8.95.

Reviewed by William J. Cork

The *Reformation and the Advent Movement* vividly demonstrates a tendency that historians have long lamented—that of trying to vindicate oneself rather than searching for truth. As Samuel Eliot Morison put it, "Clio is seldom allowed by her foolish votaries to appear in her proper character; she is

clothed in strange disguises, from the whig blue-and-buff to the hammer and sickle" (*The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1960). In this book by W. L. Emmerson, Clio wears the rose-tinted glasses of Seventh-day Adventist apologetics and appears peculiarly uninterested in primary sources.

But the book also seems strangely dated, for Emmerson's unspoken purpose is clearly to respond to Geoffrey J. Paxton's *The Shaking of Adventism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1978) and to continue a debate long passé. Paxton and Robert Brinsmead have gotten off the reformation horse, and most SDA's have gone on to discuss other issues, while Emmerson is still arguing that Seventh-day Adventists are indeed the "heirs of the Reformation." In saying this, however, he does not mean either the Lutheran Reformation in general or justification by faith in particular. Rather, he would have us believe that this phrase means that the Seventh-day Adventist church is a direct descendant of what he calls the "ongoing Reformation" of the Anabaptist movement.

Emmerson devotes much space to contrasting Luther's views with those of the Anabaptists and selects his evidence in order to turn Anabaptists into prototypical Seventh-day Adventists. He says, for example, that a fellow named Oswald Glait "can very proudly be described as the first 'Seventh-day Adventist' of Reformation times, in doctrine and practice if not in name" (p. 74).

Emmerson repeatedly denigrates Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli as "halfway men" (pp. 9, 59, 61), while praising the Anabaptists as "the quiet and truly Biblical evangelicals," active participants in the "ongoing reformatory movement" (pp. 91, 104). Specifically, he says the Anabaptists went beyond the mainline reformers in rejecting Luther's "rather one-sided emphasis on the life of faith," the entire concept of sacraments, immortality of the soul, and infant baptism (pp. 19, 21-22, 24, 59). They further superseded these "halfway men" by embracing footwashing and Sabbatarianism and in studying the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation (pp. 20-21, 29, 51, 61).

It is true that in a number of incidentals, as well as in its approach to the Bible and the Christian life, Adventism does bear a resemblance to Anabaptism, and many Adventists, no doubt, would feel more at home in a Mennonite worship service today than with the Lutheran liturgy. Yet, despite all the similarities that Emmerson draws attention to, his claim that Adventism is thereby a direct historical descendant of Anabaptism remains unproven.

Emmerson damages his own position by referring to Everett Dick's study of Millerite preachers. The figures Emmerson quotes clearly show that while maybe five percent of Millerite preachers were from Anglican, Lutheran, or Reformed churches, *none* can be listed as coming from the Anabaptists. Twenty-seven percent were Baptists, but Emmerson does not even provide a convincing argument for their direct descent from Anabaptism. On the other hand, 44 percent of Millerite preachers were Methodists and 16 percent were from Congregational or Presbyterian churches (p. 200). Despite Emmerson's vehement denial, a more logical inference would be that Adventism arose in 19th-century America as an indigenous religion, the founders of which had been members of distinctly American denominations (p. 7).

In my opinion, Emmerson indicts both Adventism and Anabaptism by failing to appreciate the Reformation concept of *adiaphora*—"things indifferent." For these groups it seems that every theological question and religious practice must be black or white. No space is left for a diversity of practice and belief on those inconsequential matters not directly addressed by the gospel or the ecumenical creeds. Those who want reassurance as to the divine guidance of Adventism will be encouraged by the "humbl[e]" claim that "The Seventh-day Adventist Church . . . is nothing less than God's ecumenical movement of truth" (p. 7). But students of history will not take *The Reformation and the Advent Movement* too seriously, for the author claims too much with too little supporting evidence.

William J. Cork was a student at Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, when he wrote this review.

Sabbath, Sunday, and the Lord's Day

Reviewed by Niels-Erik Andreassen

D. A. Carson, ed. *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical and Theological Investigation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982). 444 pp., (paper).

“**T**o become a seventh-day Sab-
batarian is the only consistent
course of action for anyone who holds that the
whole Decalogue is binding as moral law” (p.
392). This very conclusion was reached by
Seventh-day Adventists well over 100 years ago
and has been the basis for their Sabbath
observance ever since. How can such a remark-
able conclusion be reached again in a study that
defends Sunday observance?

From *Sabbath to Lord's Day* is a symposium
volume consisting of 11 essays treating the Sab-
bath-Sunday theme from the Old Testament
times to the present. The authors and editor
were graduate students in Cambridge Uni-
versity, England, who undertook a research proj-
ect on “Sunday” sponsored by the Tyndale
Fellowship for Biblical Research in 1973. The
present volume is the fruit of their labors. Two
of its essays treat the Sabbath in Old Testament
times, five discuss the subject in the New Test-
ament and the early church, and three cover the
Sabbath in the church. The volume concludes
with a summary chapter and 10 appendices.
Each chapter has extensive notes; there is no
bibliography.

The subject is given fair, if somewhat un-
even, treatment throughout, and the conclusions
are telling, for they reveal as much about the
presuppositions of the authors as about the
materials under study. For example: the Sabbath
(Genesis 2 notwithstanding) is not a universal
ordinance, but a specific institution for Israel (p.
34); Jesus taught that Sabbath rest is intrinsically
bound up with God's eschatological plan of
salvation, but he did not affirm Sabbath observ-
ance as a moral obligation, nor did he introduce
Sunday observance to replace it (p. 85); the

Apostle Paul may have seen Sunday as an
appropriate day for worship and for celebrating
the Eucharist, but no evidence suggests that he
would impose or advocate such a practice.
Indeed, he was content to let Christians observe
Sabbath, but only for reasons of convention or
convenience, not of theology (pp. 184-196);
theologically speaking, the true New Testament
Sabbath is not “a literal, physical rest” but
consists “in the salvation that God has provided”
in Jesus Christ (p. 215); the Lord's Day or
Sunday worship became a commemoration of
the Resurrection early in Christian history (pp.
238-240); the post apostolic church (third and
fourth centuries) did not transform Sunday into a
Christian Sabbath. Rather, the Sabbath com-
mandment was said to enjoin abstention not
from work, but from sin (p. 281); instead, “true
sabbatarianism was a medieval, not a patristic,
development.” The medieval church explained
the Decalogue as a “moral concept” and as
“natural law” with reference to the designation of
time (one day in seven) for rest and worship, but
not with reference to a specifically appointed
time (the seventh day). A similar concept of the
Decalogue and the Sabbath emerged in the
Protestant tradition (p. 287; p. 306; p. 318f).

In short, the book concludes that while early
Christians may well have observed Sabbath for a
time after the Resurrection, that practice was not
considered a Christian ordinance. Sunday wor-
ship, on the other hand, is nowhere enjoined by
the New Testament, but recommends itself
“because it bears the mark of antiquity” and
“lays claim to bearing the mark of canonical
authority” (p. 388). The true New Testament
Sabbath is the Lord's Day, a memorial to the
Resurrection and an anticipation of the kingdom,
but since it involves no rest from work, it does
not constitute a first-day Sabbath. It remains the
day of the Lord, the first day of the week,
which, for the sake of convenience and thanks to
the medieval church, Christians have also set
aside as a day for rest from work.

How shall we respond to this proposal? In
spite of the many helpful insights offered by this
volume, its conclusions fall short of being per-
suasive. If neither Christ nor his apostles en-

joined Sunday worship, how then can it claim canonical authority? Moreover, if Sunday observance (sabbatarianism) is a late medieval development, rejected by the patristic fathers, how can Sunday, as we know it, or even Sunday worship be said to bear the mark of antiquity? The appeal to the antiquity or even presence in the canon of a merely convenient practice can hardly claim the serious attention of the believing community today.

A more persuasive reading of the New Testament will acknowledge the first-century practice of Sabbath observance among Christians while finding no evidence of Sunday observance. It will recognize a relationship among Christian theology of covenant, law and grace, and the Sabbath institution, and will note that the Sabbath emerges in the text as a day of rest, not work, of salvation, not oppression, and as a pointer to the eschaton. Hence, the New Testament affirms the rest day as a Christian ordinance, prominently displayed in the early Christians' Scriptures, designed by God in Creation to benefit humankind, and contributing to his everlasting covenant with all people. That the later Christian church through the so-called transfer theory should establish Sunday as a Christian sabbath seems to confirm that for the New

Testament writers a seventh day of rest remained a natural and inevitable element of the Christian faith. Indeed, it is doubtful that a Lord's Day ordinance could have survived without the weekly day of rest. All the theological insights into true Christian rest could not have survived without observance of the seventh day. Those later Sabbatarians whose strictures are deplored in this volume as being sub-Christian, though perhaps quite valuable, convenient, and socially acceptable, understood one thing clearly: theological insight and spiritual perception must keep company with practical Christian observance. Unhappily, thanks to an early Christian aberration, they attached their sabbatarianism to the wrong day. Fortunately, many seventh-day Sabbathkeepers, both Jews or Christians, have escaped many of the legalistic excesses of some first-day sabbatarians without losing the significance of their day of rest. The rich Biblical heritage of the Sabbath institution has protected them from this harm and has enabled them to overcome the general neglect to which the day of the Lord has become subject in recent years.

Niels-Erik Andreasen is professor of Old Testament and associate dean of the division of religion at Loma Linda University.

Responses

Liberalism: No Match for Apartheid

To the Editors: I salute Roy Branson's courage in addressing the South African crisis and the need for Seventh-day Adventists to come out strongly against apartheid. Unfortunately, the religious liberalism fostered in the pages of *Spectrum*—with the pall of tentativeness it places over the absolutes of God's Word—is hardly an effective moral ground for dealing with world problems. Our pioneers opposed the evil of slavery out of their call to moral rectitude in the closing moments of the great controversy between good and evil. If we are to find moral clarity in the late 20th-century, we must return to these foundations.

Kevin Paulson
Loma Linda, California

Tithing as Membership Dues?

To the Editors: I was astounded to read in Mr. Strayer's article (*Spectrum*, Vol. 17, No. 1) that the church "audits" the tithe records of denominational employees (North American Division tithe policy #D-55-20). I feel that this policy is very short-sighted and could damage the church for the following reasons:

The church has sought to prevent government intervention in its affairs. It has fought for the free expression of conscience in religious matters. Yet it violates the fundamental rights of the individual to privacy and religious liberty. This is ethically inconsistent.

The church has had much to say against coercion as practiced by labor unions, but seems willing to adopt similar policies when dealing with its own employees. Again, this is not ethically consistent.

By making tithing a condition of employment, the church is implying that tithing should be a test of membership. This is wrong. The church cannot demand dues for membership. It is not some sort of exclusive club or organization. We are to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ. There is no place in this proclamation for coercion of this sort.

On what biblical principles does the church base this

policy? The Old Testament tithe was *for* the use of the Levites and priests. It was not taken *from* them. In the New Testament, money was collected *for* the work of the gospel, not *from* its work. In God's word, the operative principle of giving is based on a free, loving relationship between God and the individual, not on a coercive relationship between an organization and an individual.

The image an organization has is to a large degree a reflection of its policies. This policy produces a negative image with two parts. One part effectively states, "We do not trust our employees." The other part says, "What kind of church would put their employees to this sort of test?" As a member of this church, I find this policy to have a look of darkness. To a new member, or to someone outside the church, I can imagine that this policy looks black.

I feel very strongly that this policy should be discarded because it puts the church in a very unfavorable light. We have stood for what is true, right and good. I would hate to see our good reputation in the areas of rights and freedom tarnished by something like this.

Richard D. Ferguson
Calgary, Alberta,
Canada

Ordaining Women

We have received more letters in response to this special section than to any in our history as a journal. We can only begin to publishing the letters in this Spectrum. More will appear in subsequent issues.

—The Editors

God Both Masculine and Feminine

To the Editors: Reading your special issue on the pros and cons for women's ordination, I thought that many of the points made by the various authors merited a response. I would like, however, to contribute toward the clarification of only a *theological* one, since all the participants agree that it is a theological issue that needs to be understood and decide on theological grounds.

In his article, Bryan Ball writes: "God has revealed himself to man (sic) principally in two ways—through Scripture and through Jesus. It is *surely beyond question* that in each of these revelations, there is a *clear and*

unmistakable emphasis on the maleness of God. . . We must avoid the attempt to define God anthropologically. In the interpretation of Genesis 1:26-28, we should not attempt to create God in the image of man. That is not the purpose of the passage, and to use it in such a way is hermeneutically unacceptable. *The fact remains* that God has revealed himself as male, and so long as the *traditional understanding* of the biblical revelation holds, the concept cannot be ignored" (p. 45, italics mine). Several contradictions and falsehoods jump out of these words. In the first place, what the passage makes clear is that both "man" and "woman" were made in the image of God, as Ball himself allows in another paragraph, and I know of not one interpreter in the long tradition of interpretation who has not understood the passage to say that and only that. If anything about God is to be said on account of the fact that humans were made in His image, all that can be said is that God includes the masculine and the feminine. In the second place, Ball is absolutely right: to draw anthropological conclusions about God from the passage is "hermeneutically unacceptable." Why, then, his reactionary insistence, after paying lip service to the dangers of anthropomorphism, that God reveals himself as male? To claim that Scripture reveals God as male is to reduce Scripture to a selection of texts and to interpret those texts without regard for the value of metaphors. In Scripture God is called Father (masculine), mother hen (feminine) and fortress (in English: neuter), among many other such metaphors. The conclusion is: none of these metaphors tells us anything about God's sexual differentiation. Just as to speak of God as Redeemer does not allow us to speculate as to whom received the ransom price. To go beyond the actual metaphor is, *theologically*, to fall into embarrassing anthropomorphisms.

Professor Ball thinks, however, that in the case of Jesus we are on safer ground and wishes to draw theological conclusions from the maleness of Jesus. He writes: "One of the theological arguments offered against women's ordination is the fact that Jesus, as the definitive revelation of God to man [sic], was wholly male, and that his maleness has a direct bearing on the nature of the church and its ministry . . . The fact must be faced that some Christian feminists, in their attempt to justify a theology of female ordination, give the clear impression that they are not fully orthodox in their attitude to the Incarnation" (p. 43). In other words, Jesus was incarnated as a *male*, and theology must take *that* as the starting point for its ecclesiology on the principle that Christology is the basis for ecclesiology. I know of no one who would not agree that anatomically Jesus had male genitalia, but the specificity of his sexual organs was no more significant than his large nose, curly black hair, thin lips, and short stature. To bind Jesus' humanity to his male sexuality is theologically perverse. It has been an "orthodox" theological axiom, recognized by everyone ever since it was postulated by Gregory Nazianzus ("Epistle 101," Migne, P. G., 37:181), that "That which he did not assume, he did not redeem." It was in recognition of this principle that Ellen White insisted that he did not just assume humanity, but that he assumed that humanity which had experienced sin for

4,000 years. Any theological discussion of these issues must be careful to make a distinction between sex (male/female) and gender (masculine/feminine), a distinction recognized by none of the participants in the debate in the last issue of *Spectrum*. The sexual differentiation of Jesus has no theological significance whatsoever. Orthodoxy has insisted that Jesus assumed both the masculine and the feminine; therefore God's revelation of himself in Jesus is like the revelation of himself in Genesis 1:26-28.

Professor Ball allows: "The usual response is that God is neither male nor female, and of course, there is an element of truth here." As far as the orthodox Christian theological tradition has been able to say, the whole truth is that God is neither male nor female and both masculine and feminine.

Harold Weiss
St. Mary's College,
Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana

Are We Looking for a Macho Messiah?

To the Editor: The December issue of *Spectrum* reached this remote corner of the globe just in time for Valentine's Day when once again, relationships between men and women are in the limelight. In the articles on the ordination of women, a major issue seems to have been neglected—the nature of sexuality. Both Ball and Bacchiocchi use the same words, "God has chosen maleness to represent Himself." Neither they nor other writers in this issue go further in defining maleness. "Maleness" it seems, is an immediately recognizable commodity with an unalterable list of ingredients—rather like baked beans. The male body, it is true, is easy to recognize. The maleness of God, however, is not to be defined in purely physical terms; attitudes and behaviour, especially in this context, are the more significant aspects of maleness. The maleness of God demands our scrutiny.

Bacchiocchi refers to the Biblical images of a male God as head, king and judge. As he says, all of these roles are traditionally and unmistakably masculine. They are all too, let us not forget, images of strength, political power, intellectual superiority and dominance.

When we look at the life of Jesus, what ingredients of "maleness" do we find? Authority, kingship, and judgement are there in full measure. Fully integrated with them and equally well-defined are a number of qualities traditionally considered more feminine. The God-Man cares for small children, enjoys unpatronizing non-flirtatious friendship with women, weeps like a mother hen over the unresponsive inhabitants of Jerusalem and cooks breakfast for His followers. He calls himself the Good Shepherd (what more female and nurturing role could a man find?) and symbolizes God as a woman searching for her lost dowry coin. Finally, the King of

Kings and Lord of Lords submitted himself to the unrighteous anger of earthly kings, the taunts of malicious men, and the physical brutality of thoughtless soldiers—all for the sake of His children. Nurturing, tending, weeping and submitting—hardly the traditionally understood ingredients of masculinity, and hardly the qualities for which the Jews were looking in a Messiah.

It was because they were looking for a more macho performance from God that the Jews rejected the crucified Christ as His Son. God, they said, is not like this. He would not submit in this way. "If He be the Christ, let Him come down from the cross." By a manifestation of His power, He could prove His deity. To be a Christian today is to believe that God *is* like that and that in combining in His life and death both strength and submission, Jesus was expressing the best that God could be.

Bacchiocchi's list of Biblical male images also contained the image of the slain Lamb. Indeed the sacrificial lamb was to be a male, and he was to be a slain male, symbolizing both the potential strength and the willing submission of the crucified Lord.

In asserting the maleness of God let us not forget just what that means in everyday terms. Let us not be hoodwinked by the sexual stereotypes of either the ancient or the contemporary world into confining God within the boundaries of our fears and expectations about sexuality. Strength and submission are two sides of the same coin; neither of them is the prerogative of one sex alone.

The women's ordination issue is only the tip of a very large iceberg threatening the church, that of relationships between men and women in the Christian community. Some women, it is true, need to learn to be less strident in their demands. Greed for power is not uniquely a male problem. However, because of traditional cultural expectations, male power hunger has assumed a number of acceptable forms even within the Church. It is a great temptation for men to be deceived into thinking that to seek for maximum power within the Church is to seek to be like God. For many women the temptation has been the opposite. The cultivation of submission to the point of passivity and the neglect of the responsibility which power sharing involves had been an easy route for many. If healing is to take place, we will have to allow the Lord to touch these sore spots, to bring us together in our homes, in our churches, and in our institutions. Until we do so, in a world where sexual alienation, like every other sort of alienation, is on the increase, we shall have little to offer.

Helen Pearson
Newbold College
Bracknell, England

AU White Center Takes Sides

To the Editors: Several years ago, while attending the SDA Theological Seminary, I was a White Estate employee at the Andrews

University Ellen White Research Center. It was during this time that the issue of ordaining women as ministers went before the Annual Council. As the issue became prominent, the director of the Ellen White Research Center began making antiordination materials available on the distribution table, along with all the other White Estate documents.

At that time, I voiced a concern regarding this practice. The Ellen White Research Center receives visitors from all over the world, and only documents prepared or endorsed by the White Estate are sold or distributed. Thus, the placing of antiordination materials on the same table would give to many people the false impression that they were White Estate documents, or at the very least, endorsed by them. However, because both the current director and the former director are opposed to women's ordination, the materials remained.

Although we take opposite positions, they are good personal friends, wonderful Christians, and I respect them greatly. I only wish that the Ellen White Research Center not be used to support personal agendas.

Glen Baker
Bellflower, California

Differences Don't Mean Heresy

To the Editors: A gross misrepresentation by Samuele Bacchiocchi in the recent issue of *Spectrum* (Nov. 2, p. 353) calls for correction. He stated: "... a group of Adventist science teachers requested a meeting with Elder N. C. Wilson, in Portland, Oregon, to explain to him why it is impossible for them to believe the creation story." He cites this as an example to illustrate "... the danger of heresy and apostasy in our Adventist churches today."

As a participant asked to present a paper at that meeting I offer the following observations. Invitations to the meeting (two and a half days) were initiated by Elder Wilson, not by the science teachers. The group consisted of officers of the General Conference, editor of the *Adventist Review*, Bible scholars and scientists (a total of approximately 15). The scientists were present or past members of the Geoscience Research Institute, the board of which I was a member for more than a dozen years. All of us have participated in one or more geology field conferences sponsored by the General Conference. The purpose of the meeting was for dialogue and mutual understanding.

The discussions were free, frank, and not always in agreement (just as Bacchiocchi is not in agreement with many of our finest scholars). However, a spirit of true Christian fellowship prevailed throughout, and differing viewpoints did not call forth charges that those holding them were contributing to the "danger of heresy and

apostasy . . . in the SDA church.”

I have been personally acquainted and professionally associated with most of the scientists over a period of years. I don't know of one who disbelieves the doctrine of Creation or questions the sanctity of the Sabbath as the divinely appointed memorial of God's creative and redemptive acts. All are appreciated leaders in their home churches (where they are best known) and sacrificially committed to service in the mission of the church.

It is always sad to see one who is in reputation for careful scholarship making pronouncements regarding matters on which he is ill-informed or misinformed. Still more regrettable is an arrogant, self-assumed competence to be normative for Seventh-day Adventist orthodoxy and to brand variants held by fellow scholars and colleagues as heresy or as leading to apostasy.

Bacchiocchi's article, "Ministry or Ordination of Women" is more carefully structured and reasoned than are his replies to his critics. If one accepts his assumptions (which I don't), one will probably also accept his conclusions (which I can't). *Spectrum* is to be commended for publishing his views along with the superb presentations by Ivan Blazen and John Brunt, whose hermeneutics demonstrate the meaningful application of Scriptural principles to contemporary life and issues.

F. E. J. Harder
College Place, Washington

Kudos For Trying

To the Editors: I read with much interest your recent coverage of the controversy over the ordination of women (*Spectrum*, Vol. 17, No. 2). You deserve a compliment for a brave attempt to overcome your own bias in the matter, even if not altogether successful.

Although I could find some flaws in *all* the presentations offered, I consider Bacchiocchi's to have been the most balanced.

Bryan Ball's effort, otherwise excellent, suffered from one fundamental error—confining the theological argument to the New Testament.

John Brunt scores a point when he explodes the argument against women's ordination on purely *functional* grounds. He is less successful in other areas. It is not fair to fault the opposition for using a "guilt-by-association" argument, only to adopt it when it suits him by comparing the arguments his opponents use to those "used by proponents of slavery 125 years ago." He is nevertheless correct when he says that "no issue can be decided on the basis of who else takes the same position." From that, however, he must not expect us to assume that such associations are irrelevant.

Any attempt to compare the issues of slavery and ordination falls flat on its face, when we pause to consider that slavery was purely of human origin—whereas ordination to priesthood or pastoral ministry originated

with God Himself. Christ's appointment of twelve apostles, all male, when women were indeed part of the wider circle of disciples, cannot be taken as a mere omission. He was being consistent with His affirmation in Matt. 5:17-19 that He did not come to change the law. The New Testament need not make any further affirmation to justify the silence of either Jesus or the apostles over the question of ordaining women as either elders or pastors. There was no such question. The issue had been resolved by the Creator Himself.

John Brunt's quoting with approval of Krister Stendhal ". . . in Christ the dichotomy is [author's emphasis] overcome through baptism. . ." misses the mark. Nowhere does Scripture back up such statement. In fact, in reply to the Sadducees, Jesus made clear that differences inherent to sex will not be erased till the resurrection (Matt. 22:23-30).

To compare an issue such as the ordination of women with "paying tithe through the local conference" to justify the church's acting "without a specific mandate" is like excusing most of Christendom for going along with the change from Sabbath to Sunday keeping if we concede them the right to say, prescribe a dress code for priests, ministers, or nuns.

The argument for the equality of men and women based on Paul's statement in Galatians 3:26-29, if carried too far, could be used to justify homosexual marriages. As one who is a Jewish Adventist and also a married man, I feel some comfort in the assurance that unity "in Christ" was not meant by Paul to obliterate all differences. My wife, who is a woman, concurs. The misuse of this passage, and a matter of deep interest to me, has been employed by Christians—including SDAs—to rationalize their neglect of the Jews.

Joseph Greig's cheap shot at Bacchiocchi by the use of a double entendre (implicit in his emphasis of the word "Bull") is the kind of emotional reaction one would expect of an adolescent. Such outbursts have no place in scholarly Christian debate.

It is indeed "biblical to speak of the way God, through time and conditions, changes the nature of religious practice and theological discourse" (the latter being less God's direct concern and more of the theologians). It is also true that we cannot limit God in what means He will employ to make His will known. While God has spoken "through the mouth of an ass" (the issue then was a greedy prophet who wanted God to bend to his ambition), I remain skeptical that He will reveal himself through the pressures of a group as vocal as the modern feminist movement.

A. P. Wellington
Interlaken, New York

No Place for Women in Christianity

To the Editors: Bryan Ball and Samuele Bacchiocchi are absolutely correct. Despite their clumsy logic, inept argumentation, and

complete ignorance of Christian feminism, their central thesis is irrefutable: Christianity, specifically as understood by most Seventh-day Adventists, is intrinsically sexist.

Opting for a theological rather than a cultural justification for sexism, Ball and Bacchiocchi demonstrate, however unwittingly, that Christianity is more than just an innocent bystander in a misogynist milieu. Seventh-day Adventist Christianity has not merely reflected culture in its hostility to women, but has gone a long way in the instigation, justification, and perpetuation of gender caste.

Much as I admire the fine efforts of Professors Blazen, Brunt, Grieg, and the rest, their exegetical focus is too shortsighted. No amount of hermeneutical qualification can erase the clear message which the core symbolism of Christianity has imprinted on the Christian mind and unconscious. The only effective response would be to show that the symbols of Father and Son do not have the effect of legitimating male power and female submission. If this cannot be done (and I don't think it can), then Christianity must be transformed at its very core.

Likewise Ball is right in questioning the psychology of women aspiring to the ministry. A woman has to be crazy to want to represent an organization in which anything from her femaleness to her spiritual motivation can be doubted or ridiculed. For a woman to seek ordination in the Seventh-day Adventist church makes as much sense as for a black to aim for Grand Wizard in the Ku Klux Klan. Maybe she could change the system, but I wouldn't count on it.

Carol Richardson
Laguna Hills, California

Called to a Higher Moral Standard

To the Editors: You are to be commended on an excellent issue. Your highly provocative treatment of the issue of ordination of women is something we have needed for a long time.

I felt that the critiques of Dr. Bacchiocchi's position by Stella Grieg, Joseph Grieg, and Dr. Brunt were lucid, to the point, and showed the fallacy of his reasoning. There are some things which I felt were left unsaid which might further clarify the issues.

To begin with, Dr. Bacchiocchi's sophistry is nothing but pure and unadulterated, though slightly disguised, bigotry. Dr. Bacchiocchi's suggested list of functions he feels women should fill in the church encompasses all of the duties of an "ordained" minister, and some additional duties as well. Yet, he doesn't want to ordain women to do this, just men.

Dr. Bacchiocchi's comparison of pastoring with fathering is like comparing apples with oranges. It is impossible to father without male sexual apparatus. I do not know of a single, reputable, pastor who would be so crass as to suggest that this male genitalia contributes

actively to the administration of his office.

Perhaps part of the problem could be resolved by another look at what the word, "ordain," means. According to Oxford's English Dictionary it means: "to organize, to bring into order, to command to occur, to assign a job to someone, or to appoint someone to the Christian ministry." When we ordain someone we are appointing them the job of fulfilling the mission the Holy Spirit has called them to. When the church is functioning as it should, ordination is simply the recognition by the "Body of Christ" that His Spirit has filled some individual, and has called that individual to serve the "Body," or the world outside the "Body." The Holy Spirit must be free to direct as He chooses. Does Dr. Bacchiocchi really want to put himself in the position of saying, "the Holy Spirit cannot call women to the Gospel Ministry?" Christ said that all sins would be forgiven except the sin against the Holy Spirit. I would caution Dr. Bacchiocchi not to get presumptuous.

My final argument is based on a concept the Adventist church has held for as long as I can remember—the teaching that truth is progressive. We believe that God's church has grown in understanding and has expanded its knowledge of truth through the ages. The Bible, if properly understood, is foremost in pointing out that God's people have not lived up to the moral development God would have them reach. Each generation has had its areas of needed moral growth. We, in these last days, are called to a higher standard of moral development than ever before. God calls us to love each other to the extent that "None espouses himself greater than another."

David L. Reynolds
Canby, Oregon

Much Ado About Nothing?

To the Editor: To step in between the two major factions of the 'Ordaining Women' dispute is to welcome being violently verbally slashed from both sides. However, it makes for good letters to the editor, so here goes.

Forty-nine pages were devoted to the two major factions and not one paragraph to the 'Undecided'. As a member of the 'other' almost 20%, please bear with me.

It appears to me too much emphasis is given to the title of "ordained." It certainly did not have such weight during Jesus time. In fact, the NIV simply translates the word as 'appointed.' It was a job that needed to be done. If we don't have authority from Jesus or God in Scripture to create hierarchical 'office' structures then maybe we should be getting on with loving our neighbors.

I am concerned that we are tearing ourselves apart over an issue which is not an issue at all.

Richard Lee McKinney
Ellijay, Georgia

Spectrum Advisory Council

Floyd and Charlene Andersen	Gordon and Nadine Hale	Daniel and Marilyn Patchin
Ted Benedict	F.E.J. Harder	Daniel Paulien
Charles and Julie Bensonhaver	Jon Hardt	Thomas and Sharon Pellow
Doug Bertleson	Milford and Cheryl Harrison	Ernest and Cecelia Plata
Viveca Black	Robert and Sally Hasselbrack	Zane Price
Larry Botimer	John Hodgkin	Winslow and Verna Randall
Joseph and Cynthia Bozovich	Wilfred and Margaret Huse	Alfredo and Martha Rasi
Bernard and Neridah Brandstater	Fil Inocencio	Alvin and Carol Ratzlaff
Bruce and Betty Branson	John and Marjorie Jacobson	Robert Rausch
Roy Branson	Bernarr and Dorothy Johnson	Walter Rea
Floyd and Mary Brauer	Eugene and Liv Joergenson	Merlin and Arlene Reeder
M.L.S. Brown	Elton and Marga Kerr	Barbara Renschler
Morris Brusett	William and Dorane King	Gordon Rick
Robert and Marilyn Burman	Richard and Claire Knierim	William and Anieta Rippey
Harold Campbell	Alice Koelsch	E. Arthur Robertson
B.H. Carson	Edward and Ruth Komarniski	Wayne Rohming
Glenn and Judy Coe	Albert and Elizabeth Koppel	Jan and Patricia Rushing
Douglas Collins	Doreen and Irwin Kuhn	James and Thais Sadoyama
Patricia Cople	Alvin and Verla Kwiram	James Sands
Molleurus and Dos Couperus	Melvin and Karen Lake	Michael Scofield
William and Judy Cowling	Robert and Anita Lang	Donald and Ursula Shasky
John and Anna Mae Crowder	Fred Lee	Gordon and Lovina Short
Eryl Cummings	Andrew Leonie, III	Walter and Lula Ann Stilson
Raymond Damazo	Charles and Rae Lindsay	Dennis and Jodi Swena
James and Mary Dunn	Bradley and Roberta Litchfield	Leonard and Carlene Taylor
Thomas and Bonnie Dwyer	Ewald Lonser	James Thomas
Richard and Juanita Engel	Felix Lorenz	Dort and Nancy Tikker
Rene and Mary Evard	Richard and Heidi Ludders	Lorna Tobler
Walt and Lois Fahlsing	Edward and Marilyn Lugenbeal	Darwin and Faye Tompkins
James and Erika Fallbeck	Robert and Marguerite Marsh	Thorvaldur and Lou Anne Torfason
Joy and Gerald Fuller	Temple G. Matthews, III	Robin and Nancy Vandermolen
G. Elaine Giddings	Donald McAdams	John and Nancy Vogt
Gary Gilbert	Kenneth and Irene McGill	Harold and Ella Mae Wallar
David and Joyce Grauman	W.M. Meek	Kenneth and Karla Walters
Sanford Graves	Mario and Virginia Mendoza	Harry Wang
Octavian Gregorescu	Ken and Mary Moe	James Webster
John Griffen	Robert and Jacqueline Moncrieff	Rodney and Barbara Willard
Paul Gruzensky	Lyla Neumann	William Woods
William Hafner, Jr.	N.W. Northey	Joe Zweig

The *Spectrum* Advisory Council is a group of committed *Spectrum* supporters who provide financial stability and business and editorial advice to ensure the continuation of the journal's open discussion of significant issues.

For more information, contact

Dr. Donald R. McAdams
4501 Holt Street
Bellaire, Texas 77401
(713) 664-9539

Or call the Association of Adventist Forums: (301) 270-0423