

NEWS • ANALYSIS • OPINION

SEPTEMBER - OCTOBER 1994

Volume 2 Number 5

\$3.75



ADVENTIST TODAY



ADVENTIST CREATIONISM

FOUNDATION BOARD

Keith Colburn
 Raymond Cottrell
 Donna Evans
 Gary Fraser, Advisory Council
 Chairperson
 John Jones
 Jim Kaatz
 Ervin Taylor, Sec./Treasurer
 James Walters, Chair

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Jo & Ken Abbott
 Gary & Jeanne Bogle
 Antonius & Lilia Brandon
 Todd Burley
 Charlotte & John Cassell
 Judy & Keith Colburn
 James & Kathryn Dexter
 Donna Evans
 Douglas Ewing
 Beverly & Donald Farley
 Gary & Sharon Fraser
 Annette & Gary Frykman
 Richard Green
 Kathi & Richard Guth
 Jackie & Jim Henneberg
 Dennis & Jolene Hilliard
 Susan & Wayne Jacobsen
 John & Judy Jacobson
 Elton & Marga Kerr
 Janis and Richard Larsen
 Florence & Ken Lorenz
 Don & Penny Miller
 Rick Murray
 Thaine & Wanda Price
 Gary & Ruthe-Marina Raines
 Judith Rausch
 Joyce & Phil Reisweig
 Gordon & Judy Rick
 Missy & Richard Rouhe
 Cherie & Glenn Rouse
 Don & Ursula Shasky
 James & Maryan Stirling
 Ervin & Marilyn Taylor
 Bob & Karen Torrey
 John & Nancy Vogt
 David Van Putten
 James & Priscilla Walters
 Betty & James Webster
 Stephanie & Tim Welebir

INSIDE ADVENTIST TODAY

On April 2 *Adventist Today* sponsored a panel discussion in Loma Linda on Adventist creationism. In this issue we present four of the six prepared papers read by the panelists. Two others will appear in our next issue.

The corporate endeavor of the church regarding creationism has been conducted by the Geoscience Research Institute (GRI). The first two articles in this issue are by Dr. Ariel Roth, currently director of GRI, and Dr. Robert Brown, past director. They explore what the church has done and is doing at the interface between science and religion. The third article is by Dr. Richard Hammill who, for the General Conference, presided over the founding of GRI in 1957. He recounts the circumstances that culminated in its founding, and the concerns that motivated him and other church leaders. The fourth article is by Dr. Edgar Hare, one of the two original GRI staff members and for the past 30 years senior scientist at the Geophysical Laboratory of the Carnegie Institution of Washington (D.C.). His article highlights some of the problems currently at issue between the observed phenomena of the natural world and the Bible account of creation.

At the request of *Adventist Today* Dr. David Ekkens of the Biology Department at Southern College of Seventh-day Adventists in Collegedale, Tennessee, critiques these four papers. The editor concludes the series on creation with comment on the relationship between faith and reason in exploring questions at issue between science and religion.

Subsequent to the April 2 panel discussion *Adventist Today* conducted a survey of biology, physics and chemistry teachers in Adventist colleges and universities in North America, with respect to their understanding of the biblical account of creation, the Flood, the fossil record, and the time during which life has existed on Earth. Incomplete returns indicate that approximately 44 percent opt for a short chronology of less than 10,000 years, and others for varying lengths of a longer chronology. Complete returns of the survey will appear in our November-December issue.

One focus of interest at the Year End Meeting of the North American Division on October 3 and the Annual Council of the General Conference immediately following is the question of ordaining women to the gospel ministry, as requested by the South-eastern California Conference, where 10 women are currently serving as ministers, and the Pacific Union Conference. Our March-April 1994 issue presented a cluster of six articles favoring ordination. Earlier this year Dr. C. Raymond Holmes, recently retired director of the Doctor of Ministry Program at the Theological Seminary of Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, authored an excellent book opposing ordination—the most effective presentation we have read. A condensation of its main points, in the author's own words, appears on page 17.

But that is not all. We hope you find the other literary "goodies" enjoyable and informative as well.

Raymond F. Cottrell, Editor

ADVENTIST TODAY

Vol. 2, No. 5
September/October 1994

Editor: Raymond Cottrell

Associate Editor: James W. Walters

Managing Editor: Delwin Finch

Assistant Editor: Cherie Rouse

Copy Editor: James H. Stirling

Director of Development: Dean Kinsey

Office Manager: Hanan Sadek

Editorial Consultants:

Antonius Brandon
Loma Linda University
Barry Casey
Columbia Union College
Glenn Coe
South Windsor, Connecticut
Donna Evans
Cascade Christian Academy
Frank Knittel
La Sierra University
Andy Nash
Andrews University
Beatrice Neall
Union College
Joel Sandefur
La Sierra University
Lynn Sauls
Southern College

Copyright ©1994 by **Adventist Today Foundation**, a nonprofit organization dedicated to fostering open dialogue in the Adventist community.

Published bimonthly, *Adventist Today* reports on contemporary issues of importance to Adventist church members. Following basic principles of ethics and canons of journalism, this publication strives for fairness, candor, and good taste.

Unsolicited submissions are encouraged. Payment is competitive. Send a self-addressed stamped envelope for writers' guidelines.

Annual subscriptions: \$18 for individuals, \$12 for students, \$29 for institutions. Add \$10 for addresses outside North America.

POSTMASTER--Send address changes to:
Adventist Today
P.O. Box 1220
Loma Linda, CA 92354-1220
Telephone--(909) 824-2780
Fax--(909) 824-3880



Adventist Today is printed on 50% recycled paper stock with soybased inks.

—by Wendy Hunt, of Orchard Hill

Inside *Adventist Today*.....2

SHORT AND LONG TERM CREATIONISM

Creation According to Genesis.....4
Ariel A. Roth

Science Through the Eyes of Biblical Writers.....5
Robert H. Brown

The Church and Earth Science.....7
Richard Hammill

How Creationists Live.....8
Dave Larson

Geological and Geochemical Clocks.....9
P. Edgar Hare

Bits of the Creationist Mirror.....11
David Ekkens

Faith and Reason: Two Eyes.....12
Raymond Cottrell

CHALLENGES AND OPTIONS

Humble New Mission for Adventist Health Care.....14
Adele Waller and Winton Beaven

Moving God's Church: A New Proposal.....15
James H. Stirling

Beyond Structure: A Look at the New District Plan.....16
Harold Phillips

The Tip of an Iceberg: Excerpts From the Book.....17
the Editors

Adventist Colleges: An Enrollment Snapshot.....18
Albert Dittes

Hinshaw's Era to End at Loma Linda.....19
the Editors

NEWS AND VIEWS

Letters to the Editor.....21

Perspective: Bad News, Good News.....23
Cheri Lynn Gregory

As We Go To Press.....Back Cover

Coming in the Next Issue...

1844—1994: 150 Years of Disappointment or Celebration?

Creation According to Genesis

by Ariel A. Roth

4

THE QUESTION OF THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE BIBLICAL account of creation is one over which many have serious concern. In this age of science, many wonder if the Bible is correct or if current scientific interpretations should not be given preference. This question has been the subject of major debate since the middle of the 19th century. At that time Charles Darwin proposed a theory of the gradual evolution of life forms over at least hundreds of millions of years. The secularism of the 18th century and the gradual rejection of the concept of God by science in the 19th century contributed to the rapid acceptance of Darwin's views of evolution.

Not only did science embrace evolution, but most major Christian bodies gradually accepted a variety of views intermediate between the purely naturalistic evolution of science and the biblical creation account. Commonly accepted views include; (1) deistic evolution: God started life many millions of years ago and evolution proceeded by itself thereafter; (2) theistic evolution: God used and guided the process of evolution; and (3) progressive creation: God gradually created more advanced forms of life in stages during many creation events over many millions of years. Some suggest that the devil may have been creating organisms on earth over long periods of time before creation week.

All of these views contrast rather sharply with the biblical model of God creating in six literal days a few thousand years ago. One needs to keep in mind that there are very different kinds of organisms represented by fossils in the various rock layers of the earth. If one puts extended periods of time into these layers, as is commonly done, this precludes God having created these life forms in six days. One cannot have it both ways. The biblical model describes a recent creation by God with subsequent destruction by a flood. Fossils result largely from that flood.

The intermediate views between evolution and creation presented above all suffer somewhat from a lack of authentication. They stand without direct support from either science or revelation. Secular science does not propose that God created life, and the Bible does not entertain the

concept that organisms developed gradually over an extended period of time. If, in a theistic context, one is going to challenge the biblical creation model, one needs to come up with a better and more defensible substitute. Thus far, I do not know of any.

The Bible seems to propose an empty, dark, wet earth before creation (Gen 1:2; Job 38:9; 2 Pet 3:5) which would preclude plants that need light and that are necessary to feed animals. The devil is not suggested as a creator. God and Christ are the creators of all (Gen 1 and 2; Exod 20:11; 31:17; Neh 9:6; Ps 146:6; Is 40:26, 238; John 1:3; Acts 4:24; Col 1:16).

The biblical model of creation by one God in six days is unique and is a strong antithesis to the polytheism prevalent in ancient times. It is not a repetition of ancient views. One can find apparent contradictions in the Bible, and expressions that suggest inaccuracies, such as an earth that does not move (Ps 93:1) and an earth with four corners (Rev 7:1). However, we still use such expressions now, such as "a square meal" and "on solid ground." Such figures of speech in the Bible need to be considered within their contextual meaning. In contrast to this, the creation account of the Bible is clearly represented as factual, and not as metaphor, parable, or allegory.

When considering the scientific evidence related to beginnings, one needs to differentiate between a very successful experimental science that deals with nature as we now see it and the more subjective historical science which deals with the past. Historical science suffers from a greater degree of interpretation and necessarily less validation by experimentation because the past is often difficult to repeat experimentally.

Evolution is in the category of historical science. It now finds itself in some serious trouble as acknowledged even by a number of prominent scientists who do not believe in creation. Nevertheless, the idea that life developed over millions of years is rather firmly ingrained in contemporary scientific interpretation, and many believe that life has been here on Earth for many millions of years. But here also there are scientific challenges and inconsistencies. The Genesis flood would alter many of the assumptions of dating techniques. The recent trend in geology towards interpreting many past events as occurring catastrophically fits nicely with the biblical model of a recent creation that was later destroyed rapidly by the flood. While creation is difficult to test scientifically because it is a unique past event, science has great difficulty in providing a workable model of its own.

The view that life may have developed gradually with

Ariel A. Roth is director of the Geoscience Research Institute, a Seventh-day Adventist Church department in Loma Linda, California.



God's help over many millions of years raises other questions that also need to be addressed. It would be a strange God who would create varied forms of life over billions of years and then ask us (in the Ten Commandments) to keep the Sabbath because he created all in six days (Exod 20:11; 31:17). It would also seem peculiar that God would allow his prophets to be deceived for millennia on the very important question of beginnings and wait for James Hutton and Charles Darwin to come up with the supposedly more correct account of life developing over millions of years.

Why do we see in the early fossil record of past life evidence of evil, such as disease and even cannibalism (for instance, a crocodile-like reptile eating its own kind)? According to accepted long-age models of development, this would have occurred before the creation or evolution of humans, and the effects of sin would occur long before the fall of humankind. This challenges the story of the fall and its consequences on nature (Gen 3:1-19; Rom 5:12; 8:22). This also challenges the goodness of God as a creator (Gen 1:31) in his assumed earlier creations. Is God that imperfect a creator?

God, Christ, and the apostles Paul and Peter (Exod 20:11; Matt 19:4; 1 Cor 15:22; and 2 Pet 3:3-6) all authenticate or treat the Genesis creation account as if it were factual. It turns out that Peter, Paul, Christ and God all seem to be creationists—not bad company to be in. Can one deny the beliefs of all these leading personalities in the Bible regarding creation and still have confidence in whatever else they tell us? Rejecting creation challenges belief in the Bible as a whole. On the other hand, belief in creation solves the four inconsistencies listed above.

Traditionally churches have drifted towards evolution while still leaving the door open for some kind of God. Drifting in the religious realm is an all-too-common phenomenon. The children of Israel repeatedly drifted into the

commonly accepted idolatry of their times. Religious educational institutions have repeatedly drifted towards secularism, as can be seen by the examples of Auburn University, Boston University, Brown, Dartmouth, Harvard, Princeton, Rutgers, Tufts, University of Southern California, Wesleyan University, Wichita State and Yale. All these began as church-related institutions, but that is no longer the case. I do not know of any educational institution that started with a secular basis and then became religious. Adventist educational institutions face the same pressures towards secularization and need to be careful to avoid this.

There are many reasons why the Seventh-day Adventist Church should not abandon its belief in creation. Among them is the simple fact that creation is the biblical model of origins. Also important are indications that abandoning our faith in creation would weaken our faith in God's word and effectively reduce our commitment to bringing the news of personal forgiveness and salvation to others. Loss of faith in the integrity of the Bible can result in loss of faith in personal salvation. The mainline churches of the United States which have generally veered away from belief in the authenticity of the Bible have been losing members, some by the millions. We may want to avoid moves in that direction, especially when Christ enjoins us to go teach and baptize all nations (Matt 28:19). We should avoid that which would interfere with that all-important goal. While evaluation of beliefs is useful, a church should not dissipate undue energy in internal disputations. According to data gathered by D. M. Kelly, the rapidly growing churches in the United States are those with firm beliefs. We should do all possible to fulfill our commission to bring salvation to as many as we can.

Personally, I am very grateful for the Bible and its creation account. It gives confidence in the power of God and Christ to help us, to save us, and to *recreate* us.

Science Through the Eyes of Biblical Writers

by Robert H. Brown

MAINSTREAM SCIENTIFIC ENTERPRISE IS CONDUCTED ON the premise that humans, through reason and observation of present phenomena, are capable of

understanding the past, all past, even to the ultimate beginning. A contrasting perspective places the Bible as the ultimate means for understanding the past, and presumes that the testimony of the Bible can be validated by scientific enterprise, if conducted correctly. This perspective produces what is known as scientific creationism.

I wish to state outright that in my opinion both of these perspectives concerning the role of science are inadequate for arriving at truth regarding the Creator and his creation. My viewpoint is oriented from Revelation 14:7. This text delineates a world-wide challenge to recognize God's role as Creator: "Worship Him who made..." Recognition of

Robert H. Brown has been an Adventist educator, administrator, and past director of the Geoscience Research Institute.



God's creatorship carries recognition of the record of his creative activities in the past. I am convinced that the Adventist church is uniquely and specifically designated for the mission portrayed in Revelation 14:7.

For hundreds of years the Bible has been recognized as a collection of writings that contain valid records of God's interaction with humanity, interaction in events which display his creatorship and cannot be explained by logical analysis of previous and subsequent events in the normal course of the universe.

Prime examples of such interaction are the conversion of about 150 gallons of water into choice grape juice at a wedding banquet (John 2) and the multiplication of five small loaves of bread and two little fish into sufficient food to satisfy over 10,000 hungry people and fill 12 baskets with leftover garbage (Luke 9). The worldwide call to "worship him who made" is a challenge to recognize the records of God's interventions into the normal course of events and place the scientifically unexplainable into proper perspective. Noteworthy examples of such intervention are recorded in the Old Testament as well as in the New Testament.

God could get two million people across the Red Sea in one night (Exod 14), just as easily as he miraculously transported Philip the evangelist to the town of Azotus, 10 miles or more from an unspecified location on the desert highway between Jerusalem and Egypt (Acts 8). Actually, simple calculation shows that with an opening as wide as a modern city block, all experienced military leaders such as Moses could have moved two million people across the bed of the Red Sea within the time specified in Exodus 14. The challenge before us today is not to explain these events but to accept the divinely-attested historical records of their occurrence.

There is no need to prove that a man might survive three days in the stomach of a whale. The need is to recognize the account in the book of Jonah (as endorsed by Jesus, according to Matt 12:40), and to recognize that God could create an animal, or miniature submarine, specifically designed to preserve Jonah's life on a three-day trip back to the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea.

The object of whatever might be called creation science is not to establish biblical testimony as correct. Its legitimate function is to seek, wherever possible, a reasonable and scientifically sound interpretation from the viewpoints of biblical writers. Practitioners of what I am bold enough to designate as legitimate creation science accept the historic reality of these events on the same basis of faith in the Bible record as do individuals who do not have scientific skills.

The revealed character of God assures me that when a sufficient body of data is available, interpretation of that data from the perspective of historical-grammatical exegesis of the Bible will be logically superior to interpretation from the currently popular approach which makes no allowance, or only a "scientifically" limited allowance, for supernatural activity in God's maintenance of planet Earth over human history. With present limitations on the availability of pertinent data, and on our understanding of cause-and-effect

relationships, we must expect some data sets to defy explanation, and some to appear better explained by a long-age, uniform-process model than by a biblical creation and universal flood model.

Let me, however, briefly allude to some examples in which scientifically superior interpretation is obtained from the perspective of the biblical record.

It is now widely recognized that a major catastrophic event involving rapid burial in sufficient depth to exclude oxygen is necessary for the formation of soft-bodied organism fossils. A uniform-process modeling from the present to the past does not satisfactorily account for either individual fossils or fossil beds. The specifications in Genesis 7 and 8, together with reasonable consequences over a several-hundred-year readjustment period following the Flood, meet stringent scientific requirements for formation of Earth's fossil record; extrapolation from present conditions into the past does not.

A world-wide, or at least continent-wide, catastrophic crustal restructuring associated with flooding to great depth is similarly demanded for formation of earth's geological features. The principal differences between explanatory models derived from a grammatical-historical biblical perspective, and those which represent unrestricted uniformitarian science, have to do with time—time between stages of geological development, and time since the initiation of this development.

Time is the nemesis of attempts to model earth history within the constraints imposed by biblical chronological data. Biblical creationism has incurred its greatest disrespect from attempts to deal with the evidence regarding time—time on astronomical, molecular, and atomic levels.

Confidence in the validity of the historical detail in the first 11 chapters of Genesis leads to the insight that radioisotope mineral age may be a characteristic of the mineral, without being associated with the time when that mineral was placed in a geological formation, or the time when a microfossil was buried in association with it. This perception is supported by abundant scientific evidence. For example, sediments presently forming on the floor of Ross Sea in Antarctica have a rubidium-strontium age of 250 million years, and historically-dated lava flows in the Hawaiian islands have potassium-argon ages up to as great as 1.1 million.

Mineral ages that exceed the time frame indicated by the chronological data in the Pentateuch may be classed as consequences of design features expressed by God in a recent creation of inorganic material, and without significance in real time. (This is the most commonly held view among proponents of biblical creationism.) Mineral ages exceeding 10,000 years may also be considered as consequences of the normal operation of the universe between a primordial creation not explicitly treated in the Bible and the subsequent creation of organic life on planet Earth. Note that planet Earth is a concept distinct from the concept of earth as defined in Moses' creation account (Gen 1:8-10).

Radiocarbon ages for material that was once part of a living organism appear to directly disallow use of data
~~continued on page 10~~

The Church and Earth Science

by Richard Hammill

7

PLANS FOR WHAT EVENTUALLY BECAME THE GEOSCIENCE Research Institute (GRI) began to take shape at a meeting of Seventh-day Adventist college science teachers at Union College in the summer of 1956. Every summer the General Conference Department of Education sponsored such meetings at which teachers could explore ways by which to improve instruction. As a member of the Education staff it was my responsibility to organize these conventions.

Again and again the science teachers expressed concern over the fact that they did not have adequate training to deal with the problem of a long time scale of earth's history and life on earth that kept coming up in their classes. These discussions led to a formal request to the General Conference to provide for some science teachers to take further study in the areas of geology and geochronology. These persons could then serve as guest lecturers at the various colleges and conduct seminars for science teachers.

This recommendation impressed me because I had encountered similar problems when I studied under George McCready Price at Walla Walla College in 1936, and 10 years later at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary where Frank Marsh was a guest lecturer. In 1948 at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago I was working toward a doctoral degree in ancient civilizations in relation to Hebrew thought and history, with special attention to ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian history.

At Chicago I encountered undebatable evidence that pharaohs of the first Egyptian dynasties lived 600 or 700 years before the time Ussher assigned to the flood, and for human settlements in the Nile Valley at least 4,000 or 5,000 years before that. The same was true in Mesopotamia, where the earliest city states came into being around 3,500 BC, with evidence of long periods of human habitation at least 5,000 years before that. I discovered, also, that there was very clear evidence for long periods of human habitation in Europe and Asia.

At the University of Chicago a young chemistry professor by the name of Willard Libby had developed a method of dating ancient artifacts by the use of radiocarbon. He

came to the Oriental institute for ancient objects whose dates were already accurately known by which he could calibrate his new method of dating. I heard him report his findings in graduate seminars. At about the same time an Adventist archeology teacher—Dr. Lynn Wood—established and published 1,992 BC as the beginning of the 12th Egyptian dynasty, the earliest authenticated date in human history.

Also at the Oriental Institute was an anthropologist named Robert Braidwood who, while excavating very ancient human sites in northern Iraq and Iran, had found clear evidence that the people were just beginning to domesticate animals around 8,000 or 9,000 years BC. They were also domesticating native wild emmer wheat before its use spread to other areas where it was not native.

Thus I was intensely interested in the science teachers' request for the General Conference to finance further education for some science teachers to help their fellow teachers deal adequately with the problem, and I recommended to Elder Cossentine, director of the Department of Education, that we implement this recommendation. He in turn conferred with R. R. Figuhr, president of the General Conference, who proposed that we take it up with the college presidents at their next meeting, at Canadian Union College in the summer of 1957. Upon their approval Figuhr took the proposal to the 1957 Annual Council, which likewise approved it.

Arrangements were made to finance advanced study for a minimum of two teachers to serve as guest lecturers at our colleges and to conduct seminars and field trips for them. This plan, at first administered by a General Conference Committee on Geology and Paleontology, of which I was a member, eventually developed into the Geoscience Research Institute.

Frank Marsh, author of several books on creation, was hired to lead out, and Edgar Hare, a young chemistry teacher at Pacific Union College, was assigned to earn a doctoral degree at the California Institute of Technology in an area related to geochronology. Richard Ritland, who had already earned a degree in paleontology and comparative anatomy at Harvard University, was soon added to the staff, as were Harold Coffin for research in invertebrate biology and Harold James to specialize in stratigraphy and petrology. Later, Edward Lugenbeal was sent to the University of Wisconsin for a degree in prehistoric archeology. In the meantime the original committee had become the Geoscience Research Institute, with Dr. Ritland as its director.

In 1965 the Geoscience staff arranged a geology field trip for college science teachers, and another in 1968 for

During a lifetime of church service, Richard Hammill has served as president of Andrews University and general vice president of the General Conference. In retirement he continues his scholarly interest in early humans.



church administrators. Robert Pierson, recently elected General Conference president, participated in the 1968 trip. Neal C. Wilson, then president of the North American Division, required all union conference presidents to go as well. There were also college teachers and editors of denominational journals along. On an intense schedule, the group studied the geology of the Rocky Mountain and Grand Canyon areas, and each night listened to lectures and discussions.

At one evening meeting Dr. Eric Magnuson—then president of Avondale College—explained how chemical geochronometers prove that fossil life forms have existed for very, very long periods of time. This troubled Elder Pierson greatly, and after the trip he began planning a major reorientation of the Geoscience Research Institute. At the Annual Council that fall he arranged for Willis J. Hackett, who had been on the field trip, to become a vice president of the General Conference and take over guidance of the Institute as chairman of the GRI Board. Henceforth its primary role was defined as more apologetic in nature—that is, to support the position of the church relative to a short chronology. This led some staff members who were more interested in research to leave the group, and they were replaced by persons willing to participate in GRI's new apologetic role.

There is, to be sure, a legitimate role for apologetics in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. I have read the reports of research conducted by the GRI staff and enjoy their publication, *Origins*, from which I learn much, and I appreciate all of the staff members and what they have done. At the same time I believe there is a need for scientists to engage in research designed to help us understand what actually happened.

I do not believe that science can tell us anything about how God created the universe, the earth, and life, which I do believe he did by his own power. This is beyond the role of science. However, after the earth and life forms were brought into existence they left evidence of their existence in the rocks as fossils and artifacts of various kinds. It is a legitimate role for science to try to figure out what was happening while these life forms were alive, and how long ago they lived.

I think God left the evidence of fossils and geochronometers on purpose because he wants us to study the natural history of the earth and find out how much time has actually elapsed. Genesis tells us something about natural history, but not everything. It is primarily a book of theology like the rest of the Bible, designed to make us wise unto salvation—how we can be born again and enter into life that will never end. Nothing in the Bible suggests that its role is to teach about science or about the length of time that has elapsed since creation.

I firmly believe that all things came into existence by God's creative power, but he did not instruct the writer of the book of Genesis as to the time that has elapsed since he created the heavens and the earth and life upon it. The author of Genesis did not say anything about the long period of history in which humans were hunter-gatherers and during which they were slowly learning to domesticate animals

and plants. He began at the time when people had domesticated animals and plants, saying that Adam and his sons were agriculturists and practiced animal husbandry.

Genesis says that the second generation of human beings built the first city, but archeology shows that the first cities were not built until human beings had existed on the earth for thousands of years. Genesis also says that the seventh generation learned to make bronze and iron implements. It is clear from archeological evidence that human beings used stone implements for thousands of years before they learned to mix soft copper with tin to make bronze, which is hard enough to make agricultural tools and implements of warfare. The earliest bronze dates around 2,900 BC, and the earliest smelted iron about 1,800 BC. The Israelites who invaded Canaan under Joshua did not have iron tools. The book of Joshua specifically mentions the flint knives they were using, and that the Philistines had iron implements.

The book of Genesis correctly describes events in the development of human culture but telescopes or foreshortens the time factor. God led these inspired writers to understand creation *ex nihilo* (from nothing) but their complete silence regarding the time of creation implies that it is not vital. Accordingly, it is legitimate for us to investigate the many evidences of the long period of time that has elapsed since creation that God has seen fit to leave in the earth. However, I believe also that there are other, far more important things that demand a higher priority—such as Global Mission, strengthening our families, and making ours a truly caring church.

How Creationists Live

by David R. Larsen

Whether or not we are short-chronology creationists, long-chronology creationists or chronologically uncertain creationists, we Christians agree with Jews and Moslems that we ought to live as though our world is:

Not necessary	but	contingent
Not eternal	but	temporal
Not self-sustaining	but	dependent
Not illusory	but	actual
Not chaotic	but	orderly
Not evil	but	good
Not accidental	but	purposeful
Not pristine	but	corrupted
Not unpredictable	but	reliable
Not worthless	but	valuable
Not cyclical	but	linear
Not divine	but	creaturely

Geological and Geochemical Clocks: Time for a Reasonable Explanation

by P. Edgar Hare

THE GEOLOGIC COLUMN REPRESENTS THE SEQUENCE OF rock layers in the outer crust of planet Earth. Rock sequences from different geographic areas are correlated and arranged by means of fossil contents, radioactive isotope time clocks, magnetic records, and the oxygen-isotope record in ocean sediments.

Based on evidence of lead isotopes from the radioactive decay of uranium, the age of the earth is calculated to be around 4.5 billion years. The oldest rocks are at the bottom of the geologic column, and the youngest at the top. Older rocks are sometimes thrust over younger rocks, giving an out-of-order appearance.

The first fossils in the geologic column occur in layers about 3 billion years old and remain rather rare up to layers around 600 million years old, where fossils are found in relative abundance worldwide. These layers represent the Cambrian period, characterized by a wide diversity of animal life. Trilobites are common, but different fossil assemblages are found in successively younger rocks. Dinosaurs dominated the Mesozoic era and disappeared at the end of the Cretaceous period about 65 million years ago.

At the very top of the column, the Pleistocene Epoch, fossil assemblages show a close similarity with living plants and animals. Here are found fossil humans and creatures associated with them throughout their history: sheep, goats and cattle. Fossils further down the column generally show a greater divergence from modern plants and animals. Nearly all scientists agree with these observations.

It is the explanations for why fossils are found as they are in the geologic column that are controversial. The young-earth creationist believes that most of the fossil animals and plants lived at the same time and were destroyed in the Flood, but this concept does not match the geologic record. The geologic column reveals a pageant of life: groups of animals and plants have come at different times, had their day, and then been replaced by other groups. Human fossils are not found with the dinosaurs or trilobites.

Harold Clark attempted to show that the geologic column represents deposits made by the Flood. When the *SDA Bible Commentary* came out in 1953, it represented the views

of George McCready Price and made fun of the geologic column—saying there was no order—it was just a mistake geologists had made. Harold Clark saw the geologic column as essentially the ecology of the Flood: animals were buried near where they had lived and consequently formed an artificial order.

It is important to consider both science and Scripture as avenues to knowledge of God. *The Ministry of Healing* (pg. 462) assures us that science (the book of nature) is in harmony with the written word. They have the same author and testify to the same great truths. They shed light on each other. Whether we believe in an old earth or a young earth, neither science nor the Bible is at fault, but the interpretation or explanation of either or both is controversial.

One of the primary discoveries in the 20th century was the radiocarbon method of dating organic material. This discovery had an important role in starting the Geoscience Research Institute (GRI). Many radiocarbon dates of artifacts and fossils showed ages much greater than 6,000-10,000 years and raised questions on our college campuses. These questions led to the idea of starting a geoscience group that would help to answer some of them.

I was interested in disproving radiocarbon methods when I started work at GRI. I researched another dating method—protein analysis. Proteins play an important part in all living organisms and are present in biominerals like shell, bones and teeth. Proteins disintegrate with time, and these reactions are varied and can be studied in the laboratory at different temperatures. When amino acids in a recent shell are compared with amino acids in fossil shells of different ages, the fossil shells are found to contain altered amounts and structures. Many of these reactions can be duplicated in the laboratory, and reaction rates can be established for various temperatures. I found that the results of protein analyses agree with radiocarbon dates and, in many cases, indicate ages far beyond the dates capable by the radiocarbon method.

An exciting discovery of the 20th century is that the crust of the earth is made up of a dozen or so moving plates. As these plates move they cause earthquakes, volcanoes and certain kinds of mountain formation. At the Strait of Gibraltar, Spain and Africa are very close together. From deep sea drilling, scientists have concluded that the African plate once actually closed off the water gap at Gibraltar, so that no water from the Atlantic flowed into the Mediterranean. The two major rivers that feed the Mediterranean were not enough to sustain the water level, and as a result the whole Mediterranean evaporated, leaving a basin like the Dead Sea with water in depressions here and there 8,000

P. Edgar Hare was a founding staff member of the Geoscience Research Institute. For 30 years he has been a senior scientist in the Geophysical Laboratory of the Carnegie Institution in Washington, D.C.



or 9,000 feet below sea level. The Nile and Rhone cut deep canyons because of the lowered sea level. The Alps and the volcanoes of Italy and Sicily are all similarly related to the movements of the African and European plates.

On the other side of the earth, the Hawaiian Islands are the end of a chain of islands that extends to Midway and then changes direction and continues as a series of seamounts (submerged volcanoes). A stationary hot spot in the mantle below the moving Pacific plate has generated volcanic activity and created the seamounts and islands. Toward the north and west along the chain the volcanism is older. Haleakala, on the island of Maui, last erupted about 200 years ago. Farther along the path is Oahu, which last erupted about 10,000 years ago, forming Diamond Head and the Punch Bowl. To the northwest, on Kauai and the other islands, volcanic activity is progressively older. The northernmost seamounts are estimated at 70 million years BC. They have fossil corals around them, although they are now at too high a latitude for coral growth.

This interpretation of the island geology seems convincing to many. This plate has been moving for millions of years causing volcanic activity at different times. Islands have been built, coral reefs have grown around them, and as the plate has moved northwest, these islands have sunk below the ocean's surface forming a chain of seamounts. In time, could it be aloha to the present Hawaiian Islands?

Many deep sea cores show a series of sediments made up of tiny shells showing differing past temperature conditions. The oxygen isotopes in the shells tell us the temperature of the seawater in which these animals were growing. Sediment cores separated by some distance generally show the same isotopic pattern: the warm and cold pattern of interglacials and glacials alternating down the core.

Another recent discovery comes from the Greenland ice core. Again, the oxygen isotopes show the results of past

temperatures in a pattern similar to the deep sea cores. For the last 10,000 years it has been relatively warm. Farther down, the core shows the colder area of glacial times with the coldest showing at about 70,000 years ago.

This is exactly the same pattern shown in the deep sea cores with sediments brought up from the ocean floor, only instead of going back 100,000 or so years as they do in the ice core, the patterns keep going for millions of years in the deep sea sediment cores.

Thus, if we were to take the geologic data seriously—and I have only scratched the surface—the conclusions would be:

1. We are dealing with a very old earth; 4.5 billion years is the accepted radiometric age.

2. Life is not as old as earth itself. Abundant fossils appear only in the top 15 percent of the column at about 600 million years BC.

3. All life forms did not exist at the same time. We do not find everything from humans to trilobites living on earth at the same time.

4. Anatomically, modern humans are a very recent life form on earth (upper one-half of one percent of the geologic column).

5. Most fossils and geologic activity are not the result of a single event.

Serious work in geology began in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Conclusions essentially like the present views were accepted by the middle of the 19th century. In the last 150 years, there has been little or no change in the broad outlines of earth science. In spite of the unprecedented new scientific discoveries of recent years, the conclusions agree with views that go back a century and a half. We must ask: Is it not time to work on forming reasonable explanations of the geologic record instead of continuing to argue over the observations?

~~Creation Science, continued from page 6~~

from the first 11 chapters of Genesis in the development of a time frame for the biological history of our planet. However, when radiocarbon ages are interpreted within the constraints of biblical chronological specifications, rather than on a uniformitarian, present-is-the-key-to-the-past basis, many critical anomalies are resolved. For the purposes of the present discussion it is adequate to cite only two.

If radiocarbon years are approximately equivalent to real-time years, a musk ox that was frozen in an Alaskan muck deposit died about 17,000 years ago and had a minimal life-span on the unrealistic order of 7,000 years, as required by the difference between radiocarbon ages of hair (17,210) and scalp muscle tissue (24,140). A mathematical conversion of radiocarbon age into real-time age within the bounds set by biblical chronological data places the animal's death about 4,900 years ago, and indicates a minimal age

within the range between 50 and 100 years.

The same mathematical conversion places ground sloth dung accumulation in Rampart Cave, Grand Canyon, Arizona, at a rate greater than one dung pellet per day over a 77-year time span around 5,300 years ago. If the radiocarbon ages of this dung directly represent real time, the accumulation averaged less than two pellets per year over 20,000 years. Two dung pellets per real-time year does not reasonably correlate with a viable population of sloths in the vicinity of the cave.

I cite these examples of rubidium-strontium, potassium-argon, and radiocarbon ages, not as "proof" for accuracy of the biblical record, but as evidence that interpretation of radioisotope age data from a historical-grammatical biblical perspective does give a respectable, often scientifically superior, analysis of data.

Bits of the Creationist Mirror

by David Ekkens

*Truth is the shattered mirror strewn
In myriad bits;
While each believes his little bit the whole to own.* Burton

*The truth is mighty and will prevail,
But it is mighty hard to find it.* Anonymous

EACH OF US SEEKS TRUTH, BUT IT OFTEN PROVES elusive—as wise old Anonymous says. Several of the authors of the four papers under review mention the difference between fact and interpretation. Facts are true; our interpretations of facts may be (but are not necessarily) part of the truth. This distinction between fact and interpretation is a very vital difference that we must keep in mind. In these papers, different scientists look at the same data (results of age-dating experiments) and draw vastly different conclusions (young earth versus very old earth).

As Brown points out, interpretation of time has been one of the biggest challenges faced by short-chronology creationists. Hammill says that the Geoscience Research Institute was formed originally to deal with the time problem. Hare makes a strong case for long ages as determined by many different age-dating methods. But all age-dating techniques depend on certain assumptions about past events. We do not know if these assumptions are correct or not.

Roth believes that a catastrophic flood could be expected to change assumptions of dating techniques, and Brown mentions cases where radioisotope dating methods give erroneous or highly questionable dates. He also suggests that the age of a sample based on radioisotope data may represent something other than when it was placed in the rock where we find it today. Anomalous dates cast doubt on some dating methods and suggest that we might need to put age-dating on hold for the present time.

Hammill notes that Egyptian and other civilizations are far older than a short chronology allows, but this too is an interpretation. He also seems to suggest (without giving evidence) that people lived for a long time on the earth before Adam was created. I find this very hard to accept from a Biblical perspective.

Some problems of long ages may not bother a long-chronology creationist who believes that God could have created the world millions or billions of years before he put life on it a few thousand years ago. Other alternative explanations exist and have been discussed elsewhere.

When Hammill says that Genesis (and the rest of the Bible as well) is a theology book, he reminds us of an important point: we should not expect the Bible to answer all our questions on science (nor try to read more into it than is there). However, if we are going to investigate origins, time is a central issue. We need to study the problem and realize that we do not have all the information we need on time.

I agree with Roth when he says that abandoning a literal Genesis creation would lead to a weakening of our faith in the Bible and God. However, we should be willing to examine our interpretations and change any that are not based on the best evidence available. Truth never needs to fear investigation.

Two different interpretations of the geologic column appear in these papers: Hare suggests that the geologic column represents a pageant of life (more advanced forms replacing more primitive forms over time) whereas Roth attributes it to a catastrophic world-wide flood that buried animals and plants and produced the entire column in a short time. Brown concludes that a flood would provide for rapid burial of organisms much better than a theory based on uniform processes. Local floods could have buried organisms rapidly. (A problem with the local flood theory is that it doesn't explain the extensive layers of rock that cover large areas of earth's surface today.)

We should note that the conclusions that Hare says have been accepted for 150 years are interpretations based on factual data. Other scientists have made different interpretations based on the same data. Over and above all interpretations, we would do well to remind ourselves that God cannot be placed in a human box—as Brown says, events which show his work as a Creator cannot be explained by humans.

Perhaps it is time to work on forming reasonable explanations of the geological record and stop arguing over the observations. However, based on these four papers, it does not appear that we can agree on what are facts and what are interpretations. Without that, it is unlikely that we will be able to agree on reasonable explanations for earth's history. Possibly the most important contribution we as Christians can make to the debate on origins may be to point out that understanding of the unseen is always based more on faith than on interpretation of the seen.

David Ekkens has taught at several Adventist colleges, including those in Nigeria and Kenya. He now serves on the science council of the Biblical Research Institute and on the biology faculty at Southern College, where he teaches the course "Issues in Natural Science and Religion."



Faith and Reason: Two Eyes

by Raymond F. Cottrell

12

THE CREATOR ENDOWED HUMAN BEINGS WITH TWIN CAPACITIES for reason and faith. Reason and sensory perception give a person access to phenomena of the natural world. Faith gives a person access to realities not perceptible to sensory and rational investigation. Faith is indispensable for created, finite beings if they are to relate meaningfully and wisely to an infinite Creator and to a universe that would otherwise be too big and too complex for them to cope with. So much is unknown that no one, creationist or evolutionist, can function responsibly without faith in something.

The Creator did not intend faith as a substitute for reason, nor reason as a substitute for faith. Each has its proper sphere of operation, and neither should invade the sphere in which he designed the other to operate. Faith and reason are two eyes of the mind. They provide intellectual perspective the human mind cannot otherwise have for in-depth perception of reality—where we came from, why we are here, and where we are going. Only the ultimate past and the ultimate future can explain and give ultimate meaning to the present, which is always relative to these two absolutes.

Faith needs reason to make it practical and to prevent it from deteriorating into credulity, superstition, and obscurantism. Conversely, reason needs faith in order to keep it from being blind to ultimate realities and to enable it to rise above its finite limitations. The question is not one of choosing between faith and reason, but of coordinating faith with reason. Perhaps we could call this a symbiotic relationship inasmuch as neither is truly viable without the other.

We should not be surprised, at times, to find faith and reason in tension with each other. Without tension between the centrifugal and centripetal forces that keep the earth in orbit about the sun, the former would pull us into the sun and incinerate us, or the latter would project us out into the deep freeze of outer space. Under control, tension between faith and reason need not be a traumatic experience, either for an individual or for a church that aspires to be in harmony with reality and is willing to be patient. There is harmony between faith and reason despite sometimes seeming

evidence to the contrary, and under the aegis of the Holy Spirit the two are wholly compatible. There is no dichotomy between science and revelation, for we assume that God is author of both sets of data.

Problems at the interface between science and religion are not exclusively either scientific or religious, but with our mistaken understanding of one or the other or perhaps both. There is no conflict between true religion and true science, but only between either religion or science falsely so called. Tension between the two is friction caused by the drag of our finite limitations as we try to understand.

Faith and reason are like the pair of terrestrial coordinates—latitude and longitude—both of which are essential in order to pinpoint any spot on earth. They may appear to be at cross purposes with each other, but that is the very fact that makes navigation possible. When truth and reason appear to be at cross purposes with each other, truth and reality always lie at the intersection where the two meet. Faith and reason are complementary, not contradictory. Granted our assumption that God is the creator of the natural world and author of the revealed word, the real difficulty lies not in the facts, whether of science or revelation, but in our finite comprehension of the facts and our finite attempts to coordinate, or interpret them. We need not relinquish faith in order to be intellectually respectable, nor surrender our intellect in order to be faithful. Faith can be reasonable and reason can be faithful.

Maturity of mind as well as of faith is essential to participation in a meaningful dialogue between science and religion—a mind that understands itself, its thought processes and its own finite and personal limitations. Anchored by faith to ultimate realities, a mature mind will be disposed to examine any and all evidence objectively, and to modify preconcepts to comport with the weight of evidence. An adamant, dogmatic attitude is one route immature minds take in their quest for security. A well-informed person does not need to be dogmatic in order to feel secure. A tendency to speak dogmatically is characteristic of intellectual immaturity and an immature faith.

Sometimes we hear a well-intentioned eulogy of “blind faith.” But is blind faith a secure basis on which to build one’s intellectual life? Such faith is probably better than no faith at all, but it can trip and fall when it stumbles onto evidence it is unable to explain away or controvert. It is inherently weak and defenseless. Blind faith is just as much a handicap as physical blindness. There is no virtue in ignoring or denying observed and verified facts, whether of paleontology, geology, or theology.

Raymond Cottrell has served the Adventist Church for more than 50 years, including terms as associate editor of the *Adventist Review* and the *SDA Bible Commentary*. In so-called retirement, Dr. Cottrell continues to study, teach, and write.



Misconceptions as to what the Bible actually says may become as serious roadblocks in a dialogue between science and religion as misconceptions as to the observed phenomena of the natural world. There is as much danger in misreading the Bible, and thereby being diverted from the strait and narrow pathway to truth, as there is in misreading the fossil record in the rocks. Remember the supposedly Bible-based, earth-centered attitude of the church toward Galileo? Remember Darwin's mistaken understanding of the phrase "after his kind" in Genesis 1 when he encountered the finches and turtles of the Galapagos Islands? As a result he abandoned the Bible account of the origin of species. A misinterpretation of the data of revelation, like a misinterpretation of scientific data, can be just as fatal both to faith in the revealed Word and to truth about the natural world.

The scientist may not have all of the facts, nor an accurate understanding of what is perceived as fact; it is equally possible for the theologian to have an incomplete or inaccurate understanding of the revealed Word. All will agree that reason can go astray without faith. We must also acknowledge that faith will go astray without reason, and that our present understanding of Scripture and the writings of Ellen White may have flaws.

In the cooperative quest for a right concept of the phenomena of the natural world, scientists and theologians should each be content to limit their primary contribution to their own area of competence and to respect each others' value judgments in their respective areas of competence. The church is not well served by theologians presuming to make value judgments in the area of science, or by scientists presuming to make theological value judgments. Those whose area of professional competence does not include either science or biblical studies should respect the responsible consensus judgment of their brethren whose training and experience have made them competent in one or the other of these areas, and who are as dedicated to Christ and to the church as they themselves are. We need a higher degree of toleration for diverse points of view held by persons just as dedicated and sincere as we are, in addition to being competent in their respective fields of expertise. We are all on the same side of the fence looking for answers.

Let us be honest with ourselves and fair with all of the evidence. Let us admit that we do not yet have all of the an-

swers, either in the area of faith or that of reason. To acknowledge that there are very real problems to which we have not yet found a solution, or to exercise suspended judgment, is not a denial of faith. We have tended to assume that our present interpretation of the data of faith is necessarily without error, and that our only important unknowns lie within the data of reason, or their interpretation. As a result we have attempted to solve our faith-and-reason problems as if they were simple equations with only one unknown—and to feel puzzled and frustrated when this method does not produce the answers we want.

We must not, *a priori*, postulate one particular interpretation—either on the basis of an inspired statement or some natural phenomenon—as a norm to which all the other data must conform, *ipso facto*, before we have carefully examined and evaluated all of our options in both areas. Nothing will be lost by facing up to problems and to reality; much may be lost by refusing to do so.

Only an immature mind supposes that it is either necessary or possible to obtain a definitive answer to every question at once, or even soon. Suspended judgment may sometimes be our only viable option. The less we know on a given subject, the more dogmatic we tend to be about it. The more we know the more cautious we will be about forming dogmatic conclusions, or of questioning the intellectual integrity and loyalty to the church of those who may not see things exactly as we do.

We need a higher degree of respect, confidence, and cooperation than now exists between experts in science and religion, and on the part of those who may not be quite so expert in these areas. Let us listen to one another with respect for, and confidence in, each other's personal integrity and good will. Let us recognize our personal limitations and the professional competence with which others are equipped in their respective areas of special training and expertise. This applies to both scientists and theologians.

The master key to the whole problem of faith and reason in relating to the written word and the natural world lies in our attitude toward truth and its author, toward ourselves, and toward the integrity and sincerity of purpose of other dedicated Seventh-day Adventists investigating truth about the revealed word and the natural world.



Humble New Mission for Adventist Health Care

by Adele Waller and Winton Beaven

14

CONVERSATIONS ABOUT THE FUTURE OF ADVENTIST health care are difficult and speculative because of the rapid pace of change in both Adventism and health care. This change is fueled by the application of information and communications technology to health care and by rapid developments in biotechnology and scientific knowledge. However, Adventists can extend the spirit of our quarterly "ordinance of humility" to a health care mission that provides humble service in the name of Christ. Let me show how this might play out in light of current trends.

- **The trend toward providing less and less health care in institutional settings.** If health care is less institutionally based, there will be fewer Adventist health care institutions, fewer monuments to the Adventist ecclesiastical ego. Yet this will not limit opportunities for Christian service. For example the growth of home health care provides tremendous opportunities for ongoing contact with people in their own homes. In these settings, sustained relationships with patients and their families are common and there will be new opportunities for Christian caring.

- **The trend to integrate very divergent entities into health care delivery systems.** The resulting systems are "virtual entities" linked together by communications technology and by contracts, but often without centralized control. To be effective in this environment, Adventists will need to carry out their mission within systems over which they have little or no legal control.

Jesus said, "You are the salt of the earth." In the future, Adventists will have the opportunity to blend into networks and integrated delivery systems. We can thus give the flavor of Christian service to the whole, rather than keep ourselves separate. Thus, we might paraphrase the words of Jesus: "You are the salt of the network or community."

- **The trend to provide too little health care because of powerful economic incentives.** Adventist health care must discover creative ways to stay afloat financially while delivering the right care and the right amount of care. This may mean providing some care without counting the cost in advance.

We have an opportunity to add an important ingredient to health care—our loving care in the name of Christ. In so doing, we can move purposefully into an uncertain future and give new shape to our health care ministry.

HERE AT THE KETTERING MEDICAL CENTER IN Kettering, Ohio, we are in the midst of radical changes, the outcomes of which are yet unclear.

During the past calendar year, bed occupancy has steadily declined until it has reached 50 percent. Various ways to deliver health care have sprung up. Networking is beginning and advancing at a rapid pace, posing severe problems for the Adventist system and equally severe problems for the Adventist philosophy of health and health care.

Health gurus tell us that in the future we should look at the four C's: close, consolidate, compete, or collaborate. Hospitals are closing all over the country. Consolidation is moving on apace. There is going to be competition, and as a result of this competition, there will be either closure or collaboration. These developments pose severe philosophic questions for the Seventh-day Adventist health care system and for the church as a whole. We have perceived our mission to include the delivery of health care. Such efforts have flourished in many parts of the world, but in particular in the United States. Adventist health care has not flourished in those countries that have some form of socialized medicine. It is extremely unlikely that the traditional health care mission of the church can continue to be carried out under the restrictions, consolidations, and networking that are already in the offing. We will be faced with the necessity of joining private and/or public health care delivery entities in order to fulfill the health care mission as perceived by the state. Under those conditions, we will have to determine intelligently whether we can or cannot create a revised mission that merits our continuation in the delivery of health care.

The old days are gone, the new challenges are already monumental. In our planning for the future we need the guidance of God as never before.

Adele Waller is a partner in a large Chicago law firm where she practices health law. She confesses she is a mission junkie, always interested in ways to carry out Adventist mission in contemporary and future settings.



Winton Beaven, Ph. D., veteran Adventist health leader and educator, is assistant to the president of Kettering Medical Center in Kettering, Ohio.



Moving God's Church

A New Proposal

by James H. Stirling

15

IT IS NOT OFTEN THAT SERIOUS PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE in Adventist church structures appear in official church publications. When a recent issue of the *Pacific Union Recorder* (April 18, 1994) carried an article titled "Moving God's Church Into the Future: an Organizational Restructuring Plan for the Pacific Union Conference," it seemed like an opportunity for readers to hear something new that they could compare with previous proposals. This latest report has been prepared by a 15-member Pacific Union Conference Governance Commission.

The main problem addressed in the proposal is support for local church pastors, who are said to need more opportunities to "participate in relationships with colleagues that are nurturing, provide for professional growth, and encourage evaluation." An additional problem is church members who feel they do not really participate in important organizational decision-making. And a third problem is inefficiencies in "technical services," computerized handling of accounting, payroll, membership records, etc., for conference workers and the constituencies of the conferences. Consolidating what is now done in seven conferences into one centralized location would result, the committee estimated, in a saving of over \$2 million a year. The proposed solution for the first problem is a new kind of organizational unit, a "district." Twenty to thirty of these districts would be organized within the union conference, for some purposes replacing activities now carried on by the local conferences. Each district would be headed by a district leader chosen by a district committee. Such a committee would include 11 to 26 people, mostly lay persons. Each district would be responsible for the duties now carried on by conference ministerial departments—nurturing and supporting pastors and working closely with congregations. Thus "the unmanageable 'spans of control' in large conferences" would be "replaced by smaller 'spans of connectedness' in districts." In addition, the districts would be encouraged to make use of "professional ministry organizations," of which several are named. The cost of operating this new kind of structure would presumably be met by the savings effected in the consolidation of the technical ser-

vices and the salaries not paid to local conference church ministries offices.

Pacific Union Special Commission

In the past 11 years at least three task forces have taken long looks at the structure of the Adventist Church and come up with recommendations for changes. Few of these have been implemented yet. For instance, a comprehensive report commissioned by the Pacific Union Conference was completed June 1, 1983, by a blue-ribbon Special Commission.

This report noted that while the way an organization is set up may not guarantee success in accomplishing its mission, an inappropriate or inflexible structure may indeed get in the way. The recommendations were far-reaching—like clarifying mission statements and training pastors and others in management, finance, and team and task force organization, and the management, use and training of volunteers. It also recommended better coordination of the activities of people at all levels of the church.

A major finding of the 1983 report was that the church as presently structured is very "top heavy." The duplication of departmental functions such as religious liberty, Sabbath School, education and all the others at the levels of the General Conference, North American Division, union conferences, and local conferences is not only a waste of resources and money but actually a hindrance to the conduct of the work. It noted that in management theory the optimum levels an organization should have are three—and the Adventist church has five. The most dispensable level as perceived by Adventists throughout the opinion survey was the union conference. The Commission members concurred that if the union conference were to be retained at all it should be reduced in scope and number to a kind of regional branch of the North American Division. And the writers of the report cautioned the church against any idea of adding new levels.

Whatever happened to the recommendations in this 1983 report? The major proposal—reduction or elimination of the union conferences—was never discussed in any public forum. It was essentially buried.

Adventist Forums Task Force on Church Structure

Also in the early 80s, the Association of Adventist Forums created and funded another task force to study church

~~continued on page 20~~

James H. Stirling has taught anthropology at La Sierra and Loma Linda Universities since 1964. As a scholar and church member, he has been interested in cultural and organizational change. He recently wrote on the fear of change in the *Pacific Union Recorder*.



Beyond Structure

A Look at the New District Plan

by Harold Phillips

16

BEFORE 1900 THE ADVENTIST CHURCH WAS ORGANIZED on the basis of its various kinds of activities, or functions, all stemming from the church's headquarters. But it was reorganized in 1901 to have a territorial, or geographic, organizational structure, and this has served it well until now. There are other possible ways to organize large institutions—some focus on products, others on customers, for example. A company will choose from among the kinds of possible structures one that will help it operate best in some particular set of circumstances.

An organization with a territorial structure will replicate its functions in each territory in which it operates. In the church, this results in all the local conferences having essentially the same leadership positions and the same institutions and services—academies, elementary schools, hospitals, Adventist Book Centers, and church congregations. At a different level, union conferences also mirror each other with respect to positions and institutional elements. This type of arrangement works well if local conditions vary from one territory to another and if, because of difficulties of travel or communications, local attention is required. The church faced such conditions for many years, and a territorial organizational arrangement enabled it to face them reasonably well.

One major exception in North America has been the development of a "customer" or participant basis for serving the Black population through regional conferences. Because in parts of the country the traditional local conferences could not encompass the needs of the Black members, the union conferences developed a separate local unit, the regional conference. It may be that now other segments of society—Hispanic and Asian—have similar special needs that should be addressed as well.

The motivation for the district proposal in the Pacific Union Conference, however, seems to involve two issues—

first, administrative difficulties related to the number of churches and members, and second, the costs of operating the conference. The proposal would certainly create a new layer of organization within the local conference, and this could lead to delays of communication between churches and conference officers. Administrators might find their work easier, but not necessarily. Moreover, the district offices would cost money to operate. Assuming salary costs of about \$55,000 for a district leader and secretary and \$15,000 for rent and utilities, the annual cost of 20 districts in a conference would be \$1.4 million. In addition, medical and educational benefits would likely run aggregate annual costs to well over \$1.5 million.

Perhaps structural changes may be needed. But well-thought-out procedures and functions might do as much or

Would it not be possible that the efficiency and cost saving claimed for the district structure could be achieved by simply arranging for the services that are proposed in the restructuring?

even more to make the organization effective. Would it not be possible that the efficiency and cost saving claimed for the district structure could be achieved by simply arranging for the

services that are proposed in the restructuring? Moreover, conference leaders might obtain closer relationships with local congregations by reassigning the conference headquarters ministerial staff to serve as assistants to the president for given territorial areas within the conference.

This is to suggest that structure is only a tool to help an organization achieve its mission. The structure should be modified if circumstances and needs change. Generally speaking, an organization's structure alone neither causes nor solves its administrative problems. The leaders should also give attention to:

1. The mission—is it clear, understood, and relevant?
2. The procedures—are they all necessary? Do they help achieve the mission at minimum cost?
3. The structure—does it permit the necessary procedures to be conducted?

If there is any uncertainty about the district proposal in the light of these questions, the church should be slow to initiate another level of administration.

Harold Phillips, dean of the business school at Andrews University, has studied and taught organization and management for 30 years. He has also served the Adventist Church on the finance taskforce of Project Affirmation, on the board of Adventist Health Systems/North, and as a constituent assisting with a reorganization plan for Hinsdale Health System in Chicago.



The Tip of an Iceberg

Biblical Authority, Biblical Interpretation, and the Ordination of Women in Ministry

Excerpts from the book by that title by C. Raymond Holmes

[Dr. Holmes has recently authored the most insightful and convincing book opposing the ordination of women to the gospel ministry. The author recognizes the fact that differences of opinion regarding ordination are the result of different principles of biblical interpretation. He correctly points out that these differences affect other doctrinal matters as well and have the potential of leading to schism in the Adventist Church. The following is an abstract of the book in author's own words. These excerpts are taken from throughout the book and rearranged in a way we believe faithfully represents his point of view. Holmes has approved this arrangement. For a copy of the book, postage paid, send \$9.95 to Pointer Publications, 611 Niemela Road, Wakefield, MI 49968. —Eds.]

THE QUESTION CONCERNING THE PROPER ROLE OF WOMEN in ministry is just the tip of an iceberg, beneath which lurks the far more serious issue of the inspiration of Scripture (page 67). Does such an iceberg threaten the Seventh-day Adventist church today? (21) It is crucial because what the church finally decides will reveal a great deal about the nature of its commitment to biblical authority and its approach to the interpretation of Scripture (12). This is the fault line along which any possible schism could occur within Adventism (27). The Seventh-day Adventist church has reached another major crossroad in its doctrinal history. Which way will it go? Will it go the way of full or limited biblical authority? (45). That...is what this book is all about (13).

The issue of biblical authority [is] the most crucial issue of all (63). For me the Bible [is a] revelation from God in all its parts (18). It seems that we are more interested in defending the human side of the Bible today than the divine side (44). Since Paul's counsel is part of God's revelation, it would be dangerous and irresponsible to ignore his prohibition of women as overseers, rejecting his counsel on the supposed basis that it was culturally conditioned (151). Is this a way of saying that the Bible is not the Word of God but simply *contains* the Word of God? (111). Seventh-day Adventists need to be careful that with nonacceptance of dictation/verbal inspiration they do not also reject the infallibility of the Bible (42).

Interpreters of the Bible are guided in their interpretation by what they believe about the Bible itself. Presuppositions concerning the nature and authority of the Bible are keys to interpretation and understanding (33). That which shatters unity of spirit and core beliefs is change in the presuppositions concerning the nature of the Bible (35). Have our pre-

suppositions been changing, even without our knowing it? (70).

Aspects of the historical-critical method or its conclusions and cultural conditioning are used by some proponents of women's ordination in the Seventh-day Adventist church; there are other proponents who do not employ them (15). The Seventh-day Adventist church has adopted the historical-grammatical method of Bible interpretation (39). This, the position I represent, is the majority view in North America as well as throughout the world church (14).

Theological pluralism...is essential if the interpretation of the Bible allowing for the ordination of women is to be accepted by the church (121). Hermeneutical unity and pluralism cannot exist side-by-side; they are divergent tracks moving off in different directions (35). Theological pluralism means the acceptance of a plurality of views, a diversity of Bible interpretation...It means that *divergent* views on an issue involving Bible interpretation can exist side by side in the church without threatening its unity of doctrine and mission (220). Pluralistic hermeneutics would result in radically reconceptualizing Adventist identity. Seventh-day Adventist believers might well disappear into the grayness of contemporary society (44).

There are already advocates of women's ordination proposing that world divisions of the church, or even local conferences, be permitted to go their own way in this matter. This, of course, would shatter the historic unity of Adventism as a world church, contributing to fragmentation into national or regional churches (27).

Those who oppose the ordination of women in the Seventh-day Adventist church on biblical grounds must not allow proponents to control the terms of the debate (75). The ordination issue is not a peripheral matter that can be resolved regionally. By affecting principles of Bible interpretation, it can be expected to impact other fundamental doctrines of Adventism, and it would strongly influence how the church responds to other issues that may appear on the horizon. Thus the Seventh-day Adventist church may very well be facing one of the most critical periods in its history.

As painful as it may be, perhaps we should be grateful that the women's ordination question has served to call our attention to the foundational issues of biblical authority and interpretation (178).

The terms "watershed" and "crossroads" are appropriate, because in order for the Seventh-day Adventist church to ordain women in ministry, a departure from full biblical authority would be necessary. Such a departure would have serious consequences for the future of Adventism.

C. Raymond Holmes recently retired from the faculty of the Theological Seminary at Andrews University. He is a past president of the Adventist Theological Society. For a change from teaching and writing, Dr. Holmes is building a home on the Upper Peninsula of northern Michigan.



Adventist Colleges:

An Enrollment Snapshot

by Albert Dittes

18

SINCE THE LAST ISSUE OF *ADVENTIST TODAY*, THE LEADING candidate for the presidency of Walla Walla College has accepted that position, reversing his original refusal. The new president, W.G. Nelson, 46, formerly vice president for academic administration at Southwestern Adventist College, Keene, Texas, reconsidered and has assumed his new responsibility at Walla Walla. Edwin Schwisow, North Pacific Union director of communication explains, "When he returned from a vacation, Bruce Johnston and Jere Patzer flew to Dallas and met with him at the airport. This meeting caused him to reconsider, and he accepted." Jere Patzer, president of the Upper Columbia Conference, served as chairperson of the search committee. Bruce Johnston is president of the North Pacific Union and chairperson of the Walla Walla College board of directors.

"It was a difficult decision," Nelson said from his new Walla Walla office. "Both my wife and I were happy where we were. And when I came here for the first visit, I didn't feel impressed I should come. Elder Patzer called me and told me some of the rumors about why I had declined to go to Walla Walla. None of them were true. My conversation with him and Elder Johnston at the Dallas airport helped me change my mind, and I found some of the people who had advised me against taking this position had changed their minds. After much prayer, I decided this is what the Lord wants for me, so I am at peace and happy to be here." Nelson feels no mandate for change at Walla Walla, seeing it as financially stable and having good morale. He plans to carry on the good work of his predecessor.

Walla Walla College expects to have about 1,750 students this fall, 1,600 in college and 150 in graduate programs, mostly in social work. The other Adventist colleges expect their enrollments to stay about the same this year as last year according to a survey of admissions officers. A repeat of last year would give Andrews the largest college enrollment—1,809. Canadian Union College expects the smallest—384, more than last year's 367.

Southern College will start the year with 1,550 students, similar to Walla Walla's 1,600. Pacific Union College and Oakwood College each expect 1,500, Atlantic Union College—760 and Southwestern Adventist College—875.

Of the specialty colleges affiliated with major medical centers, Florida Hospital expects 304 students, the same as last year, and Kettering College anticipates 635, 15 fewer than last year.

As in the past few years, La Sierra University expects a five percent increase, meaning 1,384 college students, plus 150 graduate students.

Union and Columbia Union Colleges are having trouble attracting students from within their respective fields. Union College expects 550 full-time-equivalent students, according to President John G. Kerbs, while it had 1,000 students 15 years ago. "We lose some local students to other Adventist colleges outside our field, and our academy enrollment is down," Kerbs says. "But we are working hard to attract Adventist high school students."

A check with the Mid-America Union education department showed that some feeder academies have gone through slumps. And the upgrading of Southwestern Adventist College from a junior to a senior college eliminated a rich student base, according to Ron Russell, associate education secretary for the Mid-America Union. In addition to that, the Mid-America Union membership declined from 55,555 to 52,771 during 1984 to 1993, according to the latest General Conference Summary of Progress report.

Columbia Union College expects a total of 950 students, including 350 in adult evening and external degree classes, and 600 in traditional classes. Columbia's recruitment efforts emphasize music and sports. "The New England Youth Ensemble is based here and is already making an impact," says Charlotte Conway, assistant to the president. The college has also become an independent member of the National Athletic Intercollegiate Association (NAIA). "This attracts Adventist athletically-minded students who would otherwise be in public universities playing on Sabbath," Conway says. "Our policy is to limit the number of non-Adventist team players. A winning team of ours has gone to the national tournament."

These enrollment figures and trends raise several important questions. Is maintaining a status-quo enrollment enough to insure the survival and continuing progress of these schools? How many additional students would they need to keep their programs progressive? Does the same enrollment mean conference membership and student base are fixed in a nation increasing in population? Would closing the weaker colleges strengthen the more solidly established ones or leave many Adventist young people in their territories without an Adventist college education?

Will the traditions of these schools continue into the next century if the Lord doesn't come?

Albert Dittes, a journalist, attended Adventist schools from second grade through graduate school and sent his children to Adventist schools as well. He believes we need to fine tune, not reform, our educational system.



Hinshaw's Era To End at Loma Linda

by the editors

19

ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 23, DAVID MOORHEAD, MD, WAS elected president of Loma Linda University Medical Center. He succeeds David B. Hinshaw, Sr., MD, who has been the chief executive officer of LLUMC since 1988. Moorhead, age 46, is a pediatric urologist and has been at Loma Linda since 1981. In recent years he has combined administrative responsibility with his medical practice by giving leadership to the newly established children's hospital on the LLUMC campus.

The actual transition is scheduled for January 1, 1995, and it will mark what some call "the end of an era." Hinshaw, 70, has carried major responsibilities at Loma Linda since 1961, except for a two-year period as dean of the medical school at Oral Roberts University. His positions have included chair of the surgery department, dean of the medical school, vice president of the university, president of Adventist Health Systems/Loma Linda and chief executive officer of the medical center. Hinshaw was an influential part of a group of physicians and church leaders who in the 1960s organized and implemented the building of the current medical center and the consolidation of the full four years of medical education on the Loma Linda campus.

During the Hinshaw era, LLUMC has developed a world reputation for infant heart transplants, become the home of the first proton accelerator designed for medical use, and built a new children's hospital, which is one of the largest in the state. At the same time, LLUMC, under Hinshaw's leadership, has assumed a dominant position in the health-care delivery system in Southern California, a system which is increasingly driven by managed care in contrast with the typical patterns and habits of a research-oriented medical center.

Hinshaw's supporters see him as a visionary leader who has almost single-handedly brought LLUMC to its current position of renown. His detractors accuse him of high-handed and autocratic methods which have resulted in the loss of capable physicians from the medical school faculty and have created an atmosphere of distrust and low morale. Furthermore, top church leadership, reportedly including the General Conference president, have viewed Hinshaw as too often operating independently of the board—by all accounts a large and unwieldy organization and thus challenging active church control of the institution.

Hinshaw, who many believe was planning to retire at the next constituency meeting, scheduled for late 1995, was

pressured toward an earlier retirement, and a search committee was established to recommend his successor. The committee was chaired by Calvin Rock, a General Conference vice president who chairs the LLU and LLUMC board. The committee, meeting over several months, faced several areas of fundamental conflict.

On one side were those who believed Hinshaw's successor should be a physician, a position formally advanced by many leading physicians on campus. In opposition were those who argued that an experienced lay administrator was essential, an argument reportedly supported by the General Conference leadership.

A second conflict involved differing views of the future of LLUMC. Some believed that LLUMC is essentially a research-oriented, teaching institution and should do everything possible to be true to that identity. Others maintained

that LLUMC must function successfully in the managed care environment of Southern California, developing and

participating in an integrated, risk-assuming delivery system in order to maintain the financial success necessary to support the academic and research functions.

A third and related dilemma was posed by some who viewed Loma Linda as the crown jewel of the church's world medical mission. They were uneasy with the assertion that LLUMC should be given the flexibility to make business decisions primarily as a linchpin in successful Southern California systems for delivering care. Such decisions will inevitably involve relationships with non-church-controlled entities.

The search committee, after interviewing at least five potential candidates, decided to recommend two names to the LLUMC board. Besides Moorhead, the committee recommended Fred Pritchard, a longtime hospital administrator whose last administrative post was as chief executive officer of Queen's Medical Center in Honolulu. After discussion which continued until late in the evening, the board voted overwhelmingly to invite Moorhead to the post.

One observer remarked that "the election of Dr. Moorhead means that an entire generation has been skipped." However, this is a discontinuity more of age than of vision. By most accounts, David Moorhead shares the vision which has marked the leadership of David Hinshaw. While administrative styles may change, in all likelihood the legacy of David Hinshaw will continue.

Hinshaw's supporters see him as a visionary leader, his detractors accuse him of high-handed and autocratic methods.

structure from the perspective of church government. Reporting in *Spectrum* (March 1984), James W. Walters, task force chair, urged the establishment of a "genuine North American Division" and the elimination of union conferences. The task force proposed that a few regional offices staffed by division appointees would aid conference coordination. The Forum's task force also proposed more involvement by lay people in various levels of church governance, freer flow of information, and reforms in agenda-setting and the election of officers at constituency meetings, as well as a new constitution for the North American Division.

Although the task force report was titled, "A Call for an Open Church," there was little evidence in succeeding years that any in positions of power were listening. To be sure, the North American Division was voted autonomous status at the 1990 session of the General Conference. But the casual observer could see no apparent consideration given to changing the status of union conferences. Until now.

Conference Presidents

The local conference presidents in the North Ameri-

can Division, at their annual meeting in February of 1994, heard a proposal to reduce the number of union conferences to three—serving the regions of Canada, the eastern region of the United States (to the Mississippi River), and the west. (See *Spectrum*, April 1994.)

The proposal sparked interest because it claimed that savings in operating expenses of the new arrangement would come close to \$100 million in the first four years. Staffing for each region would involve only a regional vice-president of the North American Division, a chief financial officer, two education officials, a trust officer, a communications officer, an ethnic representative for any group reaching 10 percent of the membership, a legal/public affairs and religious liberty officer, and essential support staff.

At the moment it looks as if the work of commissions and task forces may have attracted attention after all, though pastors and conference officials I have talked to say that the district proposal stands little chance of acceptance. In the light of current efforts to reduce entire unions, the district proposal seems like a very minor question.

By the time of the next General Conference meeting in 1995, conference leaders may have mustered enough concern about the church's finances and mission to make serious proposals for change. Such a move would strengthen the confidence of many members in their leadership.

Sub-scrip-tion—noun

1. The act of subscribing, 2. To promise to contribute or give, 3. To agree to receive and pay for a periodical or journal, for a fixed period of time, for a fixed sum.

Adventist Today is alive and well because you are a subscriber. The converse is also true. You are a subscriber because *Adventist Today* is alive and well. We certainly need each other.

The truth is we need more than each other. *Adventist Today* needs 500 new subscriptions in order to grow. Why grow? So we can cover the next General Conference Session and give you the most unbiased reporting that any GC has ever had. To give you 7 instead of 6 issues in 1995. To set the stage for further growth so we can offer 12 issues by 1996. Reasons enough?

You can help. We'll even pay you (almost) to help us grow. If you send us the names and the money to cover eight new subscriptions, we'll extend your subscription by one year. Now, that's almost like paying you, isn't it?

Or, if you can only find four new subscribers, we'll give you one-half year free. Find two subscribers and we'll tack another issue onto your subscription.

We're not desperate to get 500 new subscriptions, but we are anxious to see this publication expand. We hope you will help.

Letters to the Editor

Response to Sandefur on Folkenberg

I am grateful for the recent issues of *Adventist Today*. You are doing a great favor in presenting clearly the various views of Adventists in a fairly even-handed way. [Jan/Feb 94] The exception is, perhaps, the obvious lack of articulating both sides of such issues as the ordination of women. [Mar/April 94]

It seems to me rather unfortunate that such an emotionally charged issue should continue for years, even after having been soundly defeated in a properly constituted General Conference session, and after long and heated discussions of the matter. The world field voted not to ordain women, and the world is watching to see how God's Remnant Church respects its decisions. We are well aware of the adroit, sneaky move that brought jeers from our enemies as the vote was, in many respects, reversed the following day.

My purpose at this time is to comment on the lead article in the May/June 94 issue: "Folkenberg: A Kinder, Gentler Conservative."

This article, in my opinion, would be more appropriate if placed elsewhere in the issue, and not as a lead article. While the author, Joel Sandefur, is no doubt a loyal Adventist, and has done a superb job in presenting his article clearly and in excellent language, indicating the youthfulness and immaturity of its author, the piece could be well accepted and perfectly harmless. I feel that this may not be the case, however. I have no desire to discourage or offend this fine young man. I admire his spunk in writing the article. My only concern is that some folks may be misled or ill informed to the point of losing faith in Adventism in general or Adventist education in particular.

He questions the direction of Adventist education by stating that to reach our goal of creating a highly spiritual atmosphere, and extending salvation to as many people as possible before it is too late, we end up discovering that "practical details (to accomplish this) remain in doubt." Answer? We have access to volumes of Spirit of Prophecy counsel giving precise details to this very end. He later states that "the ambiguity of Folkenberg's speech suggests a lack of clearly defined ideology." This—about our General Conference President—by a mere neophyte?

While Sandefur states that he doesn't fear for the future, he states that he is "quite uncomfortable." Uncomfortable about what? Is it that our world leader is so close to being on target that this youth fears that his "academic freedom" or "private personal opinions" will be challenged?

This article, written by an obviously very young and inexperienced youth, while it may indeed be well intentioned and contain valid propositions at times, may be taken at full value by unsuspecting, naive readers. I believe the young man is obviously in no position to set himself up in judgment over the General Conference President. To take all that he

says could lead to weakening the faith of otherwise loyal Adventist youth.

Earl Meyer
Oakhurst, California

I want to respond to Joel Sandefur's excellent commentary on the Folkenberg speech. [May/June 94] I was impressed with the discerning and articulate way it was written. I have pondered this piece for several weeks, which tells me that it must have hit a nerve.

Joel's statement that caught my attention: "More accurately, the ambiguity of Folkenberg's speech suggests a lack of clearly defined ideology. His perspective is more naively conservative than rabidly doctrinaire."

Joel, you are naively liberal. Folkenberg's "ambiguity" reflects the concerns of a seasoned statesman who is determined to avert a church civil war. His attempt to articulate a middle ground is commendable.

Market forces have a lot to do with SDA education even though there is no place for them. Mr. Folkenberg realizes that education must challenge, question and train. He values academic freedom. He also knows that most students who attend SDA colleges are SDAs. If

SDAs stop attending SDA colleges, the enrollment drops. When enrollment drops there will be no place for young Adventists to find mates, which will mean fewer well indoctrinated Adventists, which will result in a drop in revenue. In order for mainline SDA colleges to survive, they will have to produce the kind of Adventists that will continue to support them.

DeWitt Boyd
Lynchburg, Missouri

Adventists Need More Information

Raymond Cottrell's summary of "The Future of Adventist Health Care" conference in the May/June 94 issue includes a summary of Adele Waller's talk in which she "referred to the recent crisis involving Hinsdale Hospital in which the issue of control has done incalculable damage that leaves the hospital's future uncertain." These details may have been obvious to the attendees of the conference but they are not well known to the SDA members at large, even in the local area of the hospital, which is five miles down the road from the church I attend.

Were it not for an article in the *Chicago Tribune* we would not have known that the previous president of Hinsdale Hospital was fired. The local union paper only presented veiled calls for prayer for the crisis at the hospital, and reported the appointment of the new president. If hospital administrators are to remain accountable to the membership, much more information needs to be available to the members so that we can provide informed input. Hopefully

Letters to the Editor

Adventist Today
PO Box 1220
Loma Linda, CA
92354-1220

Letters to the Editor (continued)

22

Adventist Today will help to fill the communication void with more information on this specific instance and on the larger issues of church governance that are currently raging here and elsewhere.

Steve Timm
Batavia, Illinois

Ordination Needs More Balanced Perspective

The purpose of this letter is to ask for a clarification of your editorial policy. In your very first issue, you promised to print both sides of the issues facing our church. In the May/June issue you reiterate this policy by stating that your purpose is to "discuss important issues from multiple viewpoints."

However, in your March/April 94 issue, it appears that you have betrayed your trust. I counted 9 articles having to do with women's ordination, and all of them strongly, and I mean strongly, favor it; these articles also very effectively scold anyone who does not support it.

Furthermore, there are no articles on the other side of the issue. The writings of such well-known intellectual giants as Samuele Bacchicchi and C. Raymond Holmes were totally ignored.

Lloyd Nedley
Troy, Michigan

—Your point is well taken. Please see excerpts from Dr. C. Raymond Holmes' new book, *The Tip of an Iceberg*, on page 17. —Eds.

A Pacific Union Regional Conference

I was an eyewitness to the organization of the first Black conference in the Shiloh Church where my father was pastor in Chicago about five decades ago, and I was present to be one of the two who cast minority votes for a Black conference in the Wadsworth SDA Church in Los Angeles about four decades ago.

Even a casual glance at the latest statistical report of the North American Division confirms the numerical growth of the Black conferences during the past half century as compared to the previous half century. The church has experienced greater growth under Black administration.

1. Could a Black conference function in the Pacific Union? The answer is "Yes it could."

2. Why? Because regional conferences have proved that with great struggles it can work.

3. Does organizational policy provide for such? Yes!

4. Would the remnant Black constituents be willing to

start from scratch where their counterparts started and learn to use the church political system and work together? This remains to be seen. The present Black conferences have a 50-year experience of trial and error that a beginning conference does not have. I have doubts that Black Californians would have the patience and motivation required to go through this long process.

5. Would I vote for one today? No!

6. Why not? Because I would let the present constituency decide for themselves. The reasons I argued for one four decades ago are no longer valid. We have in the Pacific Union

Black presidents, vice-presidents, treasurers, departmental leaders, secretaries, ABC employees, teachers, and educators. These have been selected in existing conferences where blacks are a minority.

Now, alas, I fear blacks, by choosing to have our own conference, are in effect saying, "You Whites can go to heaven or the other place—if you will—but not with us." That is the hidden message we would be sending to the

other churches and communities at a time when hate groups are again on the rise. I say to White and Black churches, "Implied openness is not good enough." Black conferences, White conferences, should be very explicit on this. We want everybody! We must be **inclusive** in our membership appeal. I believe we have encamped around this (race) issue long enough. It's time to hear God's voice saying, "If you have the faith of a mustard seed, you can say to this mountain be removed and be cast into the sea and it shall be so. Race mountain, it's time to get out of our way!"

Chaplain Herman Kibble
Loma Linda, California

Church + Creation = Truth

Your account of the response of the Hierarchy to your hosting a seminar on creationism was most interesting. [July/August 94]

It seems to me that you have missed certain facts. These facts are: (1) The Church has all Truth. (2) Only Truth has the right to exist. Error has no rights. (3) When you present all sides of an issue you are giving error equal status with Truth. (4) A "search for truth" implies that the Church does not have all truth and is therefore an act of treason toward the Church.

These facts are well established in religious history, especially in many encyclicals since the time of the Council of Trent. They were often enforced by the Inquisition.

Please keep up the good work. We need a breath of fresh air.

Alvin J. Ratzlaff
Spartanburg, South Carolina

Bad News, Good News

PERSPECTIVE

by Cheri Lynn Gregory

23

I SHOULD HAVE FELT ECSTATIC. INSTEAD, I LAY AWAKE, steeping in self-loathing and guilt, wondering what was wrong with me. I was 16, and the boy I'd been dating for several months had kissed me for the first time that evening. We'd spent half an hour steaming up the car windows, and now I felt awful. I tossed and turned, wondering why I had, once again, willingly opened myself to physical intimacy that I neither desired nor enjoyed. I spent most of that night in self-condemnation, wondering what was wrong with me.

Two years later, as a hospital inpatient, I should have felt grateful for the support I received from my therapist and fellow "inmates." Instead I was in a daze, the words, "Why are you doing this to me?" re-echoing through my head. I had been in the Eating Disorder Unit of Brea Neuropsychiatric Hospital for three weeks, and had just weathered a difficult parent-patient group session. My mother believed my incessant dieting, bingeing and purging were my ungrateful methods of taking vengeance for imagined wrongs. I had no answers. I didn't know why I was doing this to her; more importantly, I didn't know why I was doing it to myself.

I was strong, self-disciplined, and upright in so many areas of my life. My friends, Sabbath School leaders, Pathfinder counselors, teachers, and parents would never have picked me as the girl "Most Likely to Make Out" or "Best Bet to Become Bulimic." And yet, as I approached my twenties with high honors, commendable ACT scores, and a college scholarship, I felt awful—stupid, guilty, and ashamed. I could control myself in all but two crucial areas. Obviously, there was something very wrong with me if I did things I didn't want to do with such destructive results.

It took four more years for me to discover the truth. And although the bad news that I learned was difficult to handle, the good news that came along was incredibly freeing. I saw a segment of the video series "Bradshaw: On The Family," in which John Bradshaw discusses the growing evidence that many eating disorder patients were sexual abuse victims as children. I began to read everything I could get my hands on regarding childhood sexual abuse and its effects, and the

pieces began to fall into place. The memories I carried plus details given by family members all pointed to several incidents of "mild" but real instances of inappropriate sexual contact by a non-family member—or, less euphemistically, sexual abuse—when I was about five years old. This both terrified and relieved me; terror because I did not want to face the truth and the associated pain, and yet greater relief, because now I knew I wasn't crazy after all.

The good news was that I had finally found answers to questions that had nagged me for so long. After years of wondering "What's wrong with me?" I found I simply had a destructive coping mechanism. At an early age, in traumatic and threatening circumstances, I had learned that saying "no" to physical advances from a male was not an option. Silent compliance had helped me survive as a child; as a teenager and young adult, it was my instinctive response.

And in answer to, "Why am I doing this?" I realized that anorexia is a subconsciously ingenious way to deal with the fears and guilt associated with sexual abuse. My eating disorder developed as I was entering puberty, as my body was becoming more womanly, and as I was becoming more consciously aware of my sexuality. Because sexuality carried such negative associations for me, I kept my weight low enough to eliminate feminine curves, and my menstrual periods stopped. Although I was 18, I had the body of a child. Had I not received medical intervention, I might have continued to reject my sexual self—pound by pound—until I died.

Before I became consciously aware of my sexual abuse and its consequences, I blamed myself for my inappropriate physical relationships with boyfriends and my inability to stop dieting, bingeing, and purging. I believed I was a bad person and a terrible Christian. Knowledge and acceptance of my sexual abuse has freed me from guilt, shame, and self-condemnation and empowered me to take personal responsibility and consciously act differently in the future.

Sexual abuse is neither pleasant nor easy to discuss. But there are thousands of teenage girls and women who, because of childhood secrets and suppressed memories, are in bondage to habits that destroy their bodies and hearts. They need family, friends, and a courageous community to help them face the truth about their abuse, painful as it may be. It is too costly to avoid the truth about sexual abuse in our own lives and families, or in our church. There are too many in bondage, and they need the truth to help set them free.

Cheri Lynn Gregory teaches in a junior high school, writes, and raises kids in southern California.



As We Go To Press

Adventists in Rwanda

ADVENTISTS COMPRISE THE LARGEST PROTESTANT CHURCH group (recently over 300,000) in Rwanda and were involved in the recent fatal turmoil. Both ethnic conflict within the church and tribal identity played a role in the Adventist complicity. "I think that Adventists were probably less involved than the general population in the killings, and more involved in trying to save threatened individuals. But given the significant percentage of the Adventist membership, there were a number of Adventists involved on both fronts," says Ronald Vyhmeister, a business professor at Andrews University, who has closely followed events in Rwanda. The church pastor of Rwanda's Adventist University of Central Africa told of seeing one of his church elders (supposedly a Hutu) involved in the killings that took place on the campus this spring, states Vyhmeister, who received this information from missionary relatives who earlier left Rwanda.

For centuries in Rwandan government, the more educated, minority Tutsi group dominated the majority Hutus. Similarly in Adventist church leadership, the Rwandans who were racially or socially identified with the Tutsis ran the church. Recently one extended Adventist family simultaneously gained leadership in each of the local missions, provoking a group of church members to blockade the union conference building, forcing leadership to become more ethnically diverse. In the last few years more equality in church leadership and general lay involvement has come through greater college education of Hutu Adventists.

Many second and third generation Adventists in America cannot comprehend Adventists killing Adventists in Rwanda. But rapid growth in third world countries does not allow for the socialization many American Adventists take for granted. For many Rwanda converts, "first comes family, second tribe and then church or God," states Vyhmeister.

Transitions in Adventist Leadership

GERHARD HASSEL, 59, JOHN NEVINS ANDREWS PROFESSOR OF Biblical Theology and Old Testament at Andrews Univer-

sity, died in an automobile crash in Utah in mid-August. Hasel served as dean of the Adventist Theological Seminary, 1981-1988, until forced to resign due to his controversial leadership. Hasel was widely published and a first-rank biblical scholar. As a conservative theologian he was very influential in Adventism. Hasel pastored in New England and taught at Southern College before coming to Andrews University in 1967. Hasel is often viewed as the religious force behind the Adventist Theological Society.

David B. Hinshaw, Sr., 70, president of Loma Linda University Medical Center, was asked by his board to take an early retirement, effective January 1, 1995. J. David Moorhead, 46, an associate professor of urology, was selected by the LLUMC board as a replacement. Hinshaw is also vice president for medical affairs—LLU, president of Adventist Health System/Loma Linda, and administrator of the Faculty Medical Offices. Moorhead will not assume all of Hinshaw's roles. Hinshaw has been called "the most significant Adventist physician-administrator since John Harvey Kellogg." See page 19 for more complete coverage.

David Taylor, 60, president of Atlantic Union Conference, will join the Faculty of Religion at Loma Linda University as a professor. Taylor taught religion at Pacific Union and Oakwood Colleges and served as an administrator in the Pacific Union Conference before going to Massachusetts. Taylor's health and his enjoyment of teaching are reasons for the change. "I am enthusiastic," states Gerald Winslow, dean of LLU's Faculty of Religion. "Taylor brings ethnic diversity and immense experience in church leadership and academia." Taylor holds a Doctor of Ministry degree from Vanderbilt University.

William G. Nelson is Walla Walla College's new president, after all. See story on page 18.

Brian Bull, 57, professor of pathology and human anatomy, School of Medicine, Loma Linda University, is the next dean of his school. Bull is a medical scientist, having published 165 professional articles and gained seven patents for his research. He edits the journal *Blood Cells*. Bull replaces B. Lyn Behrens, who was serving as acting dean after the premature departure of Douglas Will. Bull has chaired a pathology department of 39 members and has diverse administrative experience.

Adventist Today

P.O. Box 1220

Loma Linda, CA 92354-1220

Forwarding and Address
Correction Requested

BULK RATE U.S. POSTAGE PAID SAN BERNARDINO, CA PERMIT NO.1553
--