



## Addressing Apostasy

In regard to Mark Finley, apostasy, and Monte Sahlin's "Dropouts: Missional Challenge for a Maturing Church" (summer 2005), I have discussed these issues with some former church members. Some of the major reasons they told me for their "apostasy" include:

1. Lack of fiscal responsibility—only one example being *Spectrum's* report on the Lake Region Conference.
2. Continued employment of those responsible for the fiscal mess or other manifestations of irresponsibility.
3. Extreme judgmentalism and intolerance of those who continue to grow in Christ.

I am disturbed that the reasons for "apostasy" are not seriously addressed. I believe we will continue to lose members if they are not.

*Elvin Feltman  
Howard, Ohio*

## The Time That is Not Yet

Signe Tonstad's focus on hope deferred, affirmed, and reconstituted (fall 2005) was helpful for those of us who search for meaning as we wait for the "time that is not yet."

*Edwin Hill  
via the Internet*

## American Ways of Thinking

Reading the article of Julius Nam, "A Conversation with Myself" (fall 2005), I am a little surprised to see that he has some misgivings as to the orthodoxy of his thoughts. It seems to be a quite new idea for him that Christ is also acting among all faiths and denominations and cultures in the world.

I believe that European Adventists have had these thoughts for many years, perhaps even from the start of the Advent message in the 1800s.

To a European, American ways of thinking seem to be strictly tied to the late 1800s way of interpreting the Bible, and the church members seem to be copying their forebears generation after generation.

*Kristen Falch Jakobsen  
Ringstad, Norway*

## Adventist Education

Regarding the General Conference Commission on Education report (fall 2006):

There seems to be grief over a lack of control over our schools, and consequent inability to stop movement down the famous slippery slope that leads to secularism. The levers they've lost—or never had—are the ones usually listed, and include an ability to influence budgetary resource allocation, power to

require acceptance and compliance with central policy, mandated loyalty to a nonexistent philosophy of education, and avoidance of interference with General Conference authority by incompetent campus trustees.

If these perceptions were founded in fact, I, too, would tremble, but they are not, and so their remedies are specious.

My own reaction is that, although the commission is obviously alarmed, its concerns are largely unfounded. Its proposed remedies for imagined problems reflect an unacceptable dictatorial style of management ill-suited to the college culture. Protections from its feared fates are already available and can work; though they would, properly, place responsibility and power securely with the campuses instead of with central administrators.

I'm very familiar with these protections, because they have been established at La Sierra University. They are derived from the American Association of University Professors 1940 *Statement of Principles*, and where they are understood, they work.

The Pawluk/Williams article is carefully worded, but too cautiously states the case against the commission report, and it does not spell out solutions already in our toolkit.

This is brief, but the evidence and argument behind it are not. Perhaps a basic question is whether the commission is willing to listen.

*Ted Benedict  
Monterey, Calif.*