

NEWS • ANALYSIS • OPINION

JULY - AUGUST 1994

Volume 2 Number 4

\$3.75



ADVENTIST TODAY

Where
is
Adventist
Higher Education
Headed?

FOUNDATION BOARD

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

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Jo & Ken Abbott
 Gary & Jeanne Bogle
 Antonius & Lilla 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
 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
 Judith Rausch
 Joyce & Phil Reisweig
 M. William Reves
 Gordon M. Rick
 Missy & Richard Rouhe
 Cherie & Glenn Rouse
 Don & Ursula Shasky
 James & Maryan Stirling
 Ervin & Marilyn Taylor
 Bob & Karen Torrey
 John & Nancy Vogt
 David Van Puffen
 James & Priscilla Walters
 Betty & James Webster
 Stephanie & Tim Welebir

Adventism and education are synonymous, or so it seems to many of us children of the church. Because our lay church movement of 150 years ago so emphasized education—and later accredited higher education—today in North America one-half of Adventist men under 50 years of age and one-third of all Adventist women hold college degrees.

Today Adventist higher education faces unprecedented problems. Today's challenge is primarily two-dimensional:

—Scope. One thing is certain in our maturing denomination: the 800,000 members of the North American Division cannot adequately support all our colleges and universities (imagine a city the size of San Jose having 3 universities and 11 colleges to serve 14,000 students). Our lead story paints the challenges in broad brush strokes. On page 13 Fritz Guy states that the church subsidizes each student to the tune of \$2,400 per year, and lays out options for change. Ervin Taylor chooses one of those options, consolidation, and contends that the church should operate only one comprehensive university—on the Loma Linda campus.

—Mission. In the days when our institutions adopted names like College of Medical Evangelists and Southern Missionary College the question of mission was simple: convert the world. Today, our goals are much more modest: provide a quality Christian education and hopefully retain a significant number as church members.

The three articles that comprise the core of our focus on higher education deal with how Notre Dame University, Baylor University and Andrews University relate to their Christian mission and specifically to their mother churches. The Catholic Church is the largest Christian organization (59 million members) and the Southern Baptist Convention (15 million) the largest Protestant church in the U.S., and both of their renowned universities are independent of official church control. Whether this is a strength or weakness is worthy of contemplation as one reads Gary Land's article on Andrews University and its very close denominational ties.

Brian Harper's piece on Baylor calls for a Christian university that is rooted in the institution's religious tradition, but open to modern knowledge. Perhaps Larry Geraty has found this balance, for he is committed to Adventist education's pursuit of truth "wherever it leads." While president of Atlantic Union College he placed a Bible and *Adventist Review* on every student's desk.

It is fortuitous that our major news article, on creationism, occurs in this issue of *Adventist Today*. Should candid discussion of the pro's and con's of Adventism's traditional belief in a short 6,000 year chronology take place on a church university campus? The recent creationism panel discussion and its aftermath starkly poses the issue facing Adventist higher education: the need for university inquiry versus the importance of fidelity to historic positions.

Regardless of how questions of scope and mission are answered, interesting and perhaps tumultuous times are ahead for Adventist higher education.

Jim Walters

P.S. We regret that some of you received a subscription renewal notice when, in fact, you already had renewed. Our error! We have had some problems with our mailing list service that are now being remedied. Again we apologize. Please call or write us any time you have any concern about your subscription.

ADVENTIST TODAY

Vol. 2, No. 4
July/August 1994

Editor: Raymond Cottrell

Associate Editor: James W. Walters

Managing Editor: Delwin Finch

Assistant Editors: Gayle Saxby & Cherie Rouse

Copy Editor: James H. Stirling

Director of Development: Dean Kinsey

Administrative Assistant: 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.

Cover by Wendy Hunt, of Orchard Hill Communications, Riverside, California.

Inside *Adventist Today*.....2

WHERE IS ADVENTIST HIGHER EDUCATION HEADED?

The State of Adventist Higher Education.....4
The Editors

HOW CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITIES RELATE TO THEIR DENOMINATIONS

Where the Catholic Church Does Its Thinking.....5
Herold Weiss

Is Baylor University Really Christian?.....7
Brian Harper

Andrews University: Educating for Christian Service.....10
Gary Land

The Future of Adventist Higher Education: A Look at the Options.....13
Fritz Guy

Following Truth Wherever It Leads.....14
Larry Geraty

Can Adventist Education See the Big Picture?.....15
Jack Cassell

The Church Can Afford Only One University.....17
Ervin Taylor

THE LOMA LINDA CREATIONISM PANEL

Setting the Story Straight—The Loma Linda Creationism Panel.....18
The Editors

NEWS AND VIEWS

Letters to the Editor.....21

Perspective: Culture Clash.....23
Bonnie L. Casey

As We Go To Press.....24

AND IN THE NEXT ISSUE...

Short-term Creationists and Long-Term Creationists
—Transcriptions of the April 2 discussion.

WATCH FOR THESE COMING TOPICS...

- Russian Evangelism: A Russian's Critique
- Is 1994 the 150th Anniversary or the 150th Disappointment?
- Adventist Lifestyle: Why All the Jewelry?

The State of Adventist Higher Education

by the editors

4

THE PICTURE OF ADVENTIST HIGHER EDUCATION ACROSS North America is mixed. Traditionally small liberal arts Adventist colleges are facing severe problems. Generally, professional programs are thriving, but the institutions that are offering such programs face other problems.

The Atlantic Union College faculty recently voted to ask their president, James Londis, to speak to the president of Columbia Union College about a possible corporate union of the no relatively small colleges. Norman Wendth, a professor of English at AUC and a leader in urging such planning, says "I am not too concerned about AUC's survival." The college has made cutbacks, and next year's budget is based on a 500 student enrollment—less than that of 1993-94.

The primary idea that Wendth and some—but not all—faculty at AUC have in mind is a corporate union into what could be called Atlantic University, with two campuses—what is now AUC and CUC. The one institution would have the same requirements on each campus, but each campus could specialize. For example, nursing could be taught at the Takoma Park campus, and the humanities at South Lancaster.

Londis has not discussed this subject with Charles Scriven, CUC's president, so Scriven had no comment to make on the idea. He is, however, optimistic about the future of CUC. "Our finances are better off than they have been in two decades, our summer enrollment was much higher than we expected, our enrollment looks promising for the fall and we will be starting the fall with ten new faculty members on campus," Scriven says.

Lyn Bartlett, who has just joined CUC as its vice president for academic administration, is putting priority on a new program called Washington Experience that will take advantage of the Washington, D.C. area—the political and communications hub of the Western world.

Union College is the third Adventist college in the 500-700 student enrollment category. "Enrollment is a problem, and we've tried to do all kinds of things to bring it up," stated Beatrice Neal, a recently retired professor of religion at UC. Recruiting has been beefed up, and a \$250,000 gift made possible a "UCareer Center" to give UC students a head start in career development.

Two years ago the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges granted UC a 10 year accreditation, with the stipulation that it would make a return visit because of its concerns about enrollment and financial stability. In April the accrediting body returned. The Mid-America Union Conference had given UC officials a letter stating its willingness to underwrite any deficit, and "a lot of weight was put

on that" in retaining the accrediting body's favor, reported Neal. UC has full accreditation.

Universities Must Adjust, Too

All Adventist college administrators are "nervous wrecks," in the words of one Adventist college president. Not only do the small Adventist colleges face great problems, but so do the three denominational universities. For example, as the health care economy changes in the country and fewer specialists are needed, it is not assured that all medical schools will survive. Loma Linda University's School of Medicine is the most academically recognized school within Adventism, yet it is far from possessing the financial resources and the academic research of top-tier medical schools. Great efforts are now being taken to strengthen the medical school's research productivity.

Because health care comprises one-eighth of the country's economy, there is a continuing need for ancillary personnel. Accordingly, the School of Allied Health at LLU has added several new programs and hundreds of students. This single school at LLU, essentially housed in Nichol Hall, had 682 students in 1993-94—significantly larger than about half of the 14 Adventist colleges.

Andrews University is welcoming Neils-Erik Andreassen who is "extremely popular with the university community," states Robert Johnston, a seminary professor at AU. But the gift for fund raising Andreassen displayed at Walla Walla College will be severely tested at AU. Andrews suffered a 150 drop in enrollment last year and has a large debt from its industries. Faculty have had to be cut. The seminary is still plagued with church politics. "Seasoned scholars with notable academic standing and reputation run afoul of ideological or personal enemies to the right, left, or middle," reports Johnston.

The relatively new La Sierra University has just completed its first year under the leadership of Lawrence Geraty, and enrollment continues to slowly grow, although it still has only some 1350 students. Again, the related issues of finances and enrollment are an issue—a particular issue at LSU if faculty are to have time to perform the research and writing expected of genuine university professors. Because of a lack of research opportunities several LSU faculty have recently left.

Recognizing the challenges facing Adventist colleges, Gordon Madgwick, director of the church's Board of Higher Education, editorialized in the last issue of *The Journal of Adventist Education*, "the future is ours to create."

(A more complete report on Adventist colleges will appear in the September/October issue of *Adventist Today*.)

Where the Catholic Church Does Its Thinking

by Herold Weiss

5

EDWARD SORIN CAME TO THE WILDS OF INDIANA FROM Le Mans, France, in the winter of 1841-2 as an adventurous young priest of the newly formed order of The Congregation of Holy Cross. He founded a school for young men that was the beginning of "L'universite de Notre Dame du Lac."

The nineteenth century Catholic system of parochial education flourished within a church which in America saw itself as a besieged minority. By 1940, there were almost 200 Catholic colleges, with about 162,000 students. The University of Notre Dame was at the time not among the best.

Just before World War II, Catholic colleges in the United States enjoyed unparalleled optimism about their future and had developed a self-congratulatory attitude. Communism, Fascism, American Protestant Liberalism, intellectual and moral relativism and the economic collapse of the 30's were taking history into a terrible morass, showing more than ever the superiority of Catholicism. Protestants reacted in alarm.

The Catholic Renaissance and a Thomist revival swelled within the church at the turn of the century. Thomas Aquinas was a thirteenth century Dominican priest who discovered Aristotle and used his philosophical structure to exhibit Christian theology. Catholic theologians discovered his genius in the nineteenth century. They saw in his magnificent theological work the instrument with which the rational integrity of the Catholic faith could be defended against the inroads of modern philosophy and science. The New Thomism became the intellectual core of a revitalized Christian culture which self-consciously took a counter-cultural attitude toward what it saw as a declining Western Civilization.

Neo-Thomism gave Catholic colleges the key to a well defined Catholic identity in terms of the curriculum. Until the early 60's a degree from Notre Dame meant a rather substantial dose of scholastic philosophy and theology. Core requirements for all degrees included 16-20 hours of Thomistic philosophy and 18-24 hours of Thomistic theology. A Catholic education was identified by its content.

Catholic faculties saw their universities as the seedbeds for the flowering of a Catholic culture that would know its

roots in the Catholic tradition and yet would be open to doctrinal developments, thus being able to play a major force in civilization.

The complacent triumphalism of the 40's and 50's was brought to a halt by the criticisms of Monsignor John Tracy Ellis, who exposed what he described as "the self-imposed ghetto mentality" that prevailed in Catholic colleges. His criticism plus the new opportunities for expansion into graduate education provided by the G.I. Bill gave Notre Dame the opportunity to search for excellence in the academic arena which the "Ivies" considered their home turf.

An Independent Catholic University

Under the leadership of Father Theodore Hesburgh the University also restructured itself, reflecting the new status enjoyed by the laity after Vatican II. In 1967 the Congregation of Holy Cross divested itself of sole control and ownership of the university. The majority of the board of trustees, and its chairperson, became lay people, and the board, rather than the congregation, became sole owner of the corporation. The new by-laws, however, stated that the president of the university must be a priest of the Congregation of Holy Cross. Thus when Hesburgh retired, the applicant pool was rather small.

This move was taken in order to avoid the embrace with which the Vatican was eager to regale Notre Dame. It wished to make Notre Dame its pontifical university in the United States. As Notre Dame skillfully dodged it, the dubious honor was conferred to the Catholic University of America, at the nation's capital. Ever since, conservatives on the faculty, while benefiting from being kept at arm's length from the Vatican, have lamented what they view as the disdain the university has for the Vatican.

The 1960's were the decade of The Council. No one could have foreseen what Vatican II accomplished. The Roman Curia, who thought itself in control of what was to happen, found itself watching in disbelief when the council got away from them and brought about a radical transformation in the Catholic vision of the church. One of the Council's unintended results was that brothers, nuns and priests left their "religious habits" for a life as faithful Catholic laypersons. As a consequence, the staffing of Catholic educational institutions went through a dramatic transition. Priest and Religious had been a majority in the faculty until the 30's. Many had earned their doctorates at the best universities of Europe and America. At the beginning of the century, Notre Dame counted in its faculty priests who distinguished themselves as chemists, astrono-

Herold Weiss is professor of Religious Studies at Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana. He previously taught at the Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University.



mers, and professors of literature and political science. Little by little, Catholic laypersons also became faculty members. In the 60's, however, the expansion of graduate programs and the shortage of new blood within the order drastically reduced the percentage of clerics in the faculty, and brought in a significant number of non-Catholics as well, even into the department of theology. This was one of the most tangible results of the new ecumenical outlook of Vatican II. Today the overall faculty is about 60 percent Catholic, and the administration is exercising some pressure in order to ensure that this percentage does not fall below the half-way mark.

In the early 70's Notre Dame decided that its Catholicity was not going to be identified ideologically. The department of theology in particular made clear that it was a department of theology at a Catholic University, not a department of Catholic theology. As such it embraced the ecumenical spirit that had been exhibited at Vatican II. The recently published Mission Statement begins, saying,

The University of Notre Dame is a Catholic academic community of higher learning, animated from its origins by the Congregation of Holy Cross. The University is dedicated to the pursuit and sharing of truth for its own sake. As a Catholic university one of its distinctive goals is to provide a forum where through free inquiry and open discussion the various lines of Catholic thought may intersect with all the forms of knowledge found in the arts, sciences, professions, and every other area of human scholarship and creativity [emphasis mine].

Nowhere in these lines is it even implied that the Catholic Church is the fountainhead of one monolithic truth. The administrative link with the Church is gone, even if the soul (*anima*) of the University is the Congregation of Holy Cross.

Vatican II also gave the Catholic Church a new vision of itself as an instrument for peace in the world. This took shape in the slogan, "If you desire peace, work for justice." During World War II, Notre Dame had been the training ground for 15,000 men for the Armed Services. Ever since, ROTC has been a significant presence on campus. The Notre Dame of the 70's, however, became known for its program of Peace Studies, begun by a Catholic monk but soon identified with the work of John H. Yoder, a prominent pacifist who for some time was both president of the Mennonite Biblical Seminary in Elkhart, IN, and professor of theology at Notre Dame. Peace Studies soon found a colleague in the Center for Social Concerns, where issues of justice and peace are studied by sociologists, economists and political scientists. These academic enterprises find themselves reflected in the large number of volunteer programs sponsored by the University, in which more than half the student body participates, like Urban Plunge and Christmas in April, besides volunteer work in local schools, homes for the retarded, hospices for the elderly, etc.

Where the Catholic Church Can Do Its Thinking

Notre Dame also has become a renowned center for the study of the philosophy of science and the relationship of science and faith. The annual conferences on these topics attract the best minds from around the globe. They are the best exhibits of the seriousness with which the university attempts to be a bridge between the culture of science and the culture of faith. Besides, it also hosts a number of institutes whose purpose is to serve the Catholic Church. They are centered on the liturgy, ministerial formation, pastoral concerns, etc.

Father Hesburgh liked to say that Notre Dame was a place where the Catholic Church can do its thinking. Catholic professors at Notre Dame are quite conscious that they are transmitters of a tradition. Most of them, however, make clear that the tradition got into trouble at the time of the Reformation. They consider the time from the Council of Trent (1540's) to Vatican II (1960's) as less than the defining moment for Catholic identity. Rather, this period marks a better-forgotten historical parenthesis where polemics got the better part of wisdom and the ghetto mentality decreed by Ellis set in. The infallibility of the Pope, the immaculate conception and the ascension of Mary, the Syllabus of Errors, the Index of Proscribed Books, etc., are not what the tradition is about. Catholicism is not to be defined denominationally, but etymologically. In Greek *katholike* means "according to the whole." The task of those who are involved in the transmission (not just the preservation) of the tradition is to have a vision of the whole of what Christianity is about. That is why the mission statement refers to the "various lines of Catholic thought." It is because the university has committed itself to this definition that prominent Protestant historians and philosophers find themselves now comfortably teaching at Notre Dame. Among them immediately come to mind the names of Nathan Hatch, George Marsden and Alvin Plantinga.

In the early 70's, when aspirations to become a major research university were beginning to take shape, Notre Dame decided that it would remain primarily an undergraduate residential university and made a concerted effort to give residential life a Catholic tone. Every residence hall has a chapel and a Religious as rector. She or he is a spiritual mentor and religious leader whose major task is to make a dorm a home. Although participation in religious services is voluntary, statistics show that 87 percent of the students attend mass at least once a week. There are no fraternities or sororities at Notre Dame. Dorm loyalties are so strong, however, that no one seems to miss either of them.

Most observers believe that the Catholic identity of Notre Dame is most visible in the amazing amount of volunteering being done by its students, and in the cohesiveness of residential life.

There is no question that Notre Dame has a widely recognized Catholic image which the university has marketed most successfully, as evidenced by its

~~continued on page 22~~

Is Baylor University Really Christian?

by Brian Harper

7

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, KNOWN TO SOME AS THEE UNIVERSITY, is the pride and joy of Southern Baptists around the world. Over the past fifteen years, however, Baylor has been the site for a contemporary showdown between two antagonistic groups, popularly known as moderates and fundamentalists. At the center of the controversy lie two opposing views of what a Southern Baptist Christian university should be. Fundamentalists want to take control of the university from the moderates in order to enforce their own model of education, replacing the classical 'liberal' model of education that exists at Baylor. But do either of these groups provide the best Baptist or Christian model of education? Is there an alternative model?

The most recent battle for Thee University occurred during the September 1990 meeting of the board of trustees. Sensing that fundamentalists in the Baptist General Convention of Texas (BGCT) were preparing to interfere with Baylor's curriculum and campus life, Baylor president Herbert Reynolds decided to surprise the fundamentalist trustees with a proposal to insulate the university from the BGCT, making the trustees into a self-perpetuating board of regents, independent of the convention's control. The fundamentalist trustees couldn't stop the moderate trustees from passing the resolution. As an added precaution, Reynolds cut the power to all the fax machines in the administration building so that fundamentalists couldn't obtain a restraining order. Once the vote was in, the fax machines were turned on and the new charter was faxed to the state clerk's office for immediate recording.

Fundamentalists in the BGCT objected to the resolution, arguing that the convention's constitution states that any changes in the charter of a convention institution must be first approved by the convention. Reynolds and other Baylor officials responded that the university's charter has never included any reference to convention ownership. Furthermore, to suggest that the convention controls any Southern Baptist church or institution runs contrary to Baptist ecclesial polity, which is based on the idea of the "priesthood of the believers." According to this idea, all Baptist churches and institutions exist as independent organizations who govern

themselves on a local level. In order for the denomination to work more effectively, each Baptist organization has the option of associating itself with a state and/or national convention. A Baptist organization can choose to remain independent, or it can join the state convention and not the national convention, or vice versa, or it can belong to both. In 1886, Baylor chose to associate itself with the BGCT, allowing the state convention to appoint 100 percent of the university's trustees. This relationship continued until 1990, when Reynolds and other moderates felt that the fundamentalist faction in the BGCT could no longer be trusted. Since the historical relationship between Baylor and the BGCT has been established on trust rather than on legal grounds, university officials argue that its charter and Texas law give it the right to act unilaterally without the consent of the convention. Since 1991, however, Baylor has proceeded to rebuild its relationship with the BGCT, allowing the convention to elect 25 percent of the university's trustees.

Since there exists no uniform set of fundamental beliefs within the fundamentalist regime, it's difficult to clearly define what fundamentalism is. However, the ideas of Biblical literalism and the "inerrancy" of Scripture have remained two constant elements that characterize the fundamentalist movement. At least, these two issues have been the primary justifications for firing moderate faculty members at schools where fundamentalists have assumed control.

To avoid losing their jobs, moderates at two other Southern Baptist universities have followed in Baylor's path—Wake Forest in North Carolina and Furman in South Carolina, severing ties with their state conventions. For moderate Southern Baptists this seems to be the only option they have to protect their schools from the onslaught of fundamentalists, who have won a reputation for destroying the academic standing of Southern Baptist schools in the broader academic world.

Two Conflicting Views of Education

The battle over Baylor revolves around two conflicting views of what a Southern Baptist Christian university should believe and practice. The moderates have made Baylor an institution of higher learning where education may be gained under generally Christian influences and ideals. According to the university's 1993-1994 statement of purpose, Baylor assumes responsibilities traditionally associated with institutions of higher learning: "dissemination of knowledge, transmission of culture, search for new

Brian Harper is a Ph.D. candidate in theology and ethics at Baylor University. Originally from Minnesota, he got his BA in religious studies from Southwestern Adventist College in Keene, Texas.



knowledge, and application of knowledge." Furthermore, "It strives to stimulate students to think clearly and creatively; to develop in students a sense of civic virtue and responsibility; to foster in students an appreciation of the role of the arts, sciences, and humanities in the development of culture; and to prepare students to use their knowledge in productive careers." In short, Baylor operates on a model of education that has its roots in the Enlightenment. Consequently, Baylor knows itself first as a university, not as a religious institution or extension of the church. Baylor governs itself in deciding what it should be and do, both academically and religiously. The university couches its "liberal" education in a conservative atmosphere, which consists of a conglomeration of moral and political views commonly shared by Southern Baptists. This allows Baylor to appear on the outside as a conservative, Southern Baptist university, while on the inside it offers a classical liberal education. Baylor likes its conservative reputation and takes great care in fostering this aspect of its relationship to the denomination. What remains unclear is to what degree Baylor's conservative values, morals, and political views are Christian.

There is no sense that the university on the whole has thought very hard about what intellectual difference Christian convictions might make for what is considered "non-religious" subjects, such as physics, biology, literature, history, political science, etc. According to Abner McCall, a past Baylor president, "We teach religion in the religion department and science in the science department." As a result, the "liberal arts" curriculum at Baylor looks like any liberal arts college's curriculum. When asked what makes Baylor a Christian university, the faculty usually appeal to campus environment or the convictions of some of those teaching. But what's unclear is how those convictions really make a difference in the lives of students. Unlike other schools, however, Baylor doesn't prevent teachers from teaching their subject from a Christian perspective as long as they touch on alternative views, nor does Baylor discourage a teacher from helping students with spiritual matters. Unfortunately, most teachers at Baylor consider this sort of activity as irresponsible behavior for academicians.

On the other hand, fundamentalists in the BGCT think the best educational model for Baylor, if they had control, would be something like a Bible college. Baylor's rejection of the Bible college model has led fundamentalists to interpret the actions of president Reynolds and the moderate trustees as a signal that the university is about to follow in the paths of Harvard, Princeton, and Yale, who lost their church-related mission. They think that the moderates who control Baylor sacrifice central elements of the Christian faith, such as the "inerrancy" of Scripture, in order to maintain academic respectability. Since the Baylor faculty wouldn't mind having the reputation of being the "Harvard of the South," there is some merit to the accusations of the fundamentalists. It's clear, however, that the real discomfort

the fundamentalists experience with Baylor's unique blend of a "liberal" model of education with conservative "Christian" values is in the fact that Baylor, as a representative of the Southern Baptist denomination, doesn't advocate a fundamentalist view of life.

Baylor as a Southern Baptist Christian University?

How is Baylor, a Southern Baptist Christian university, given its current mission to become a modern university? First of all, while most of the faculty embrace modern academic attitudes and a secular model of education, there are a few who are open about their dedication to the Southern Baptist denomination and eager to share their Christian faith. However, these faculty are few in number.

A second way Baylor maintains its Baptist Christian reputation is through emphasizing Texas and Southern Baptist traditions. It's important for non-Texans to realize that Southern Baptist traditions are woven into the very fabric of Texas tradition, so much so that it's often difficult to distinguish the two. In most of Texas, Southern Baptists virtually

constitute a state religion. Not only are there millions of them, but they control almost every city hall, school council, and government office in Texas. As a result, most people in Texas, whether Southern Baptist or not, have been shaped by Southern

Baptist values. The average Texan tends to have traditional Protestant morals and a conservative political outlook, strangely tempered by a "Lone Ranger" type mentality which emphasizes the importance of being a "rough-n-rugged" individual. In the last two decades, however, these traditional values have become less apparent as Baylor actively recruits non-Southern Baptists and students from outside Texas. Currently, only 45 percent of the student body comes from the Southern Baptist denomination, and 73 percent comes from Texas.

Baylor's homogeneous student body represents the main reason it can keep up the university's conservative Baptist Christian reputation. Nearly 90 percent of the students are Christian. It's probably one of the few American campuses where student T-shirt slogans read: "Our God Is Awesome," and "The Lord's Gym—No Pain, No Gain." Furthermore, most of these students take church attendance and spiritual life seriously. Despite the variety of Christians on campus, the Baptist code of behavior remains intact to help preserve a Christian environment. At Baylor drinking and dancing are not allowed on campus, which means students who want to do these things go off campus. Baylor doesn't actively monitor students to enforce its standards; it simply asks that students not disobey the rules on campus. Men's and women's dormitories remain separate. Two semesters of chapel are required for every student, and attendance is taken. Parents think of Baylor as a safe place, a "bubble of protection" that will shield students from the nasty pains of sin and the real world. Even most fundamen-

The president cut the power to all the fax machines in the administration building so that fundamentalists couldn't obtain a restraining order.

talist parents are still relatively convinced their kids won't come home pregnant, gay, perverted, un-Christian, un-American, anti-Bible, or stoned. Parents feel these problems are more likely to be acquired while attending a school like the University of Texas.

However, Baylor's conservative Texas, Southern Baptist, and generally Christian reputation is only skin deep. When fundamentalists attack Baylor for being too liberal in their curriculum or student life, the administration usually responds by making mere cosmetic changes. For example, the latest cosmetic change occurred when fundamentalists complained about models posing nude in figure-drawing classes. To the chagrin of many faculty and students, the administration's response was to have the models put on bathing suits. From the administration's perspective, it's better to give an inch on a relatively minor principle of academic freedom than to lose a mile with a significant number of powerful alumni. One wonders how long Baylor will be able to keep up its "conservative," Baptist Christian charade.

Make no mistake, underneath Baylor's conservative values, traditions, and general Christian atmosphere rests a modern, almost secular university based on a liberal (Enlightenment) model of education. Ironically, the education that Baylor provides might be more liberal than at state universities, due to the recent wave of political correctness (PC) that has swept across most state schools. If there's one thing that fundamentalists and PCers have revealed to liberal universities, it is that all education is indoctrination. Baylor, however, continues to think of itself as a "free" university, where knowledge can be explored openly without interference from religious groups or personal religious convictions. They are blind to the fact that this idea itself is a form of indoctrination.

An Alternative Model of Education

Baylor seems to have escaped the clutches of the fundamentalists for good. But it's unclear that the secular model of education that Baylor is moving towards—even though tempered by old-fashioned traditions, a conservative atmosphere, good kids, and a few committed Christian faculty—will take the university to the top of the academic hierarchy. This observation comes at a time when the liberal model of education may be coming to an end.

The liberal, modern or Enlightenment model of education, call it what you will, trusts in reason, progress and universal truth. Liberal education is being attacked by postmodernism—a pervasive understanding in higher education which says that liberals don't realize how their own reasoning and prized ideas are conditioned by time, place and historical accident. Postmodernism contends that none of us are free from the bonds of tradition, community and history. Postmodern writers, particularly those who focus on political issues, have forced many of us in the classical "liberal" tradition to ask some difficult questions: Is the liberal (Enlightenment) notion of the university coming to a close in light of today's postmodern mood? What kind of

students do liberal universities produce? Can Christians build their universities on liberal models of education without forfeiting what it means to be Christian?

Though fundamentalists aren't postmodernists, they voice similar concerns about the state of liberal education in America. Therefore, Baylor should at least listen to the concern fundamentalists are expressing about the university's church-related status and direction of education, rethinking the benefits a distinctively Christian education can provide. Baylor should try to go beyond being Christian in outside appearances only, and actively pursue an alternative Christian model of education that embraces both the Christian faith and high academic standards. This doesn't mean Baylor must become a Bible college, but it does mean finding an alternative model of education that falls somewhere between a fundamentalist model and a liberal model; between academic freedom and the Christian faith; and between closed-mindedness and irresponsible open-mindedness.

Finding an alternative model of education that falls between the Bible college model and the liberal arts model may very well be the most important issue facing church-related schools today. Describing what this alternative model should be is extremely difficult. For a university that desires to remain close to its mother church, the most valuable resource it has for constructing an alternative model of education comes from within the church's theological tradition.

For example, one option for Baylor would be to build a model around the idea of discipleship, a key theological motif in the Baptist faith. The primary goal would be to produce students who follow the gospel ethic of Jesus Christ and who evaluate academic fields from a Christian perspective. In addition, discipleship education would provide a great deal of academic freedom. It would provide the freedom to pursue knowledge in the world as it's reflected through the lens of the Christian faith. All thinking must be done within a tradition, and, given the rich tradition of Christianity, this type of academic freedom shouldn't be seen as restrictive but simply a fact of good scholarship for those faculty who call themselves Christian. After all, the chains of academic freedom in the liberal tradition are no lighter than any other tradition. In fact, the repercussions for breaking faith with the rules of liberal scholarship may be even more damaging to a scholar at a secular school than at a Christian school. For no secular university can claim that its faculty are bound by the practices of love, forgiveness, kindness, understanding, prayer, and patience—the stuff of Christian faith. Discipleship education requires that Christian scholars tolerate a diverse number of opinions in the church, due to the mystery of understanding how God's Spirit continually works in the world. No single mind can articulate this mystery nor the complexity of the church and its mission. For this reason, Christian scholars trust that God will establish a unity of Christian spirit among faculty, rather than a unity of thought and belief, so that the church might better fulfill its divine mission, especially where education is concerned.

Andrews University: Educating for Christian Service

by Gary Land

10

ON A COLD JANUARY MORNING IN 1875, A CROWD OF Seventh-day Adventist denominational employees entered the chapel of the newly-constructed Battle Creek College to hear James White preach the dedicatory sermon. About a year previously, the denomination had organized the Seventh-day Adventist Educational Society to oversee the development of this school. Its bylaws stated that the new institution was to give instruction in "sciences, languages, and Holy Scriptures." James White, president of the General Conference, now told the congregation that they were engaged in an important enterprise intimately connected with "the work of present truth."

Through the remainder of the century, Battle Creek College endured a tumultuous experience, including battles over finances, administrative control, curriculum, and student conduct. Finally, in 1901, a "reform" president, Edward A. Sutherland, convinced the trustees to move the school to the more rural location of Berrien Springs, some eighty miles southwest of Battle Creek.

The early years at Berrien Springs were difficult ones, as the school struggled to define itself, moving from an experimental, practically oriented missionary training institution to an accredited liberal arts college in 1939. Twenty years later, the school had more than a thousand students.

Major changes were in store, however. In 1958 the General Conference voted to move its theological seminary and graduate school from Takoma Park, Maryland to Berrien Springs.

In the 1970's Andrews began its first doctoral programs. At present, the University is divided into several schools: College of Arts and Sciences, College of Technology, School of Education, School of Business, and SDA Theological Seminary. Its 3,000 students, about two-thirds of whom are undergraduates, come from more than eighty different countries.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church has from the beginning been intimately involved with the development of Andrews University. The relationship continues in both formal and informal ways today. The governance structure of the University is closely tied to the church. The legal base of

the institution lies in the Association which consists of 225 individuals, all Seventh-day Adventists, selected in equal numbers from three groups: (1) the officers and general faculty of the University, (2) other employees of the church representing the General Conference, North American Division, and Lake Union Conference, and (3) various lay persons.

This Association meets at least once every five years, having as its major function the election of a Board of Trustees for the University. As with the Association, the Board is linked tightly with the church, particularly the church administration. The twenty-eight board members, who must all be Seventh-day Adventists, include six members of the General Conference Executive Committee, the president of the Lake Union Conference and up to four other union conference presidents, and the presidents of the local conferences in the Lake Union. Clearly, the University is controlled by the church and will not easily slip away.

In addition to maintaining strong legal control of the institution, the Seventh-day Adventist Church provides significant financial support. In 1993 denominational funds provided approximately 21 percent of the University budget plus significant special appropriations (see page 13 for further financial data). Not surprisingly, the close governance and financial ties with the church also find expression in the University's formal statements of purpose. Its Articles of Incorporation state that the institution is to "further the educational and spiritual ministries of the Seventh-day Adventist Church" and that it is "part of the system of educational institutions established and operated by the Seventh-day Adventist Church." The Statement of Mission adds that the University is committed to "providing high-quality Christian education in the context of the Adventist faith." It speaks further of encouraging "Christ-centered service to humanity" and providing "a campus environment supportive of Christian character development."

The "Strategic Plan" adopted two years ago further explains this sense of religious purpose. In "Vision Statement I," the plan states that the University seeks to transmit Christian "moral and religious values," as understood by Seventh-day Adventists, and develop "faith, idealism, and inner conviction."

Perhaps the first step in accomplishing this purpose is to provide an adequate faculty. In contrast to many church-related schools, Andrews University requires that its full-time, regular faculty be members of the sponsoring denomination. It is expected that these faculty be active, tithe-paying participants in their congregations. Faculty are told

Gary Land, professor of history at Andrews University, is particularly interested in American religious history. This widely published author's diverse interests are indicated by his membership in the Society for American Baseball Research.



these conditions when they are hired and, whether under annual contract or continuous appointment, receive annual reminders of their Seventh-day Adventist church responsibilities.

A second level in fulfilling the University's mission is through its curriculum. All undergraduate students who attend the University for four years must take four or five religion courses. One of these must be a course in Christian beliefs or "Issues in the Great Controversy." In addition, some departments require their majors to take a class relating their discipline to Christianity. Biology majors, for instance, take "Philosophical Biology," which concentrates on issues of earth history. While graduate students have no equivalent to the general education courses, many programs require theological or philosophical courses.

Recognizing that a Christian university involves more than the academic element, Andrews also encourages students to integrate religion into their daily lives. Although students of all creeds are accepted at the university, they are expected to adhere to traditional Adventist standards, such as avoidance of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs, as well as dancing and "improper associations," all of which is spelled out in detail in a student handbook.

Required chapels for undergraduates take place weekly and the dormitories hold daily worship. Sabbath School and church services, while not required, are strongly promoted. The university also sponsors a Campus Ministries Center staffed by pastors of the university's church. Another program, "Positive Choices," promotes a drug-free lifestyle.

While the formal church relationship provides the structure within which the university pursues its mission, it does not take much time on campus to discover that there is also a strong informal relationship with Christianity, often initiated by students. The campus newspaper, *The Student Movement*, regularly reviews Christian music albums and interviews the artists, while also including a religion page. The last issue of the 1993-94 school year, for example, printed a poem titled "What Would Jesus Do?" and a few paragraphs "On His plan for your mate...." Posters regularly announce Friday night and Sabbath programs such as "Fireside Fellowship" and "Sing 'n Share" which bring together students, and frequently faculty.

More than fifty students participate annually in the student missionary program. Task Force attracts others to give a year in service to the church, usually at an academy, in the United States. Some students spend Christmas vacation building churches in Mexico or a Caribbean island under the coordination of Maranatha Volunteers International. Although not directly serving the denomination, the Community Service Assistance Program provides opportunity for students to become involved throughout the year in working with the local community.

In the classroom, many faculty begin their classes with prayer. As frequently happens, if students raise religious questions in class teachers willingly engage in dialogue. Outside of the classroom, teachers frequently counsel with students and sometimes pray with them individually. Such

actions are generally assumed to be part of the calling of a Christian teacher, although they do not appear on a course syllabus or a faculty job description.

It would be easy to paint too rosy a picture of campus life. While Andrews University is readily identifiable as a Christian university, its mission is a demanding one whose ideal is always beyond present accomplishments.

All Is Not Roses

The same denomination which provides extensive support for the institution is occasionally also a source of tension. Faculty sometimes complain that their salaries are set by ministers who have little understanding of higher education. Often they wish that the university were not so visible to the General Conference, which because of the seminary takes a special interest in it.

Occasionally church officials or conservative forces in the church bring pressure on internal campus affairs. A textbook used in the freshman seminar was publicized in an independent paper as reflecting a "new age" philosophy; after administrative review the book was abandoned. The same publication also attacked the *Cast*, a directory published by the Student Association, for being too Catholic because of its use of renaissance art. This prompted the university president to issue an "apology." Most recently, a local conference president criticized the language appearing in a book used in psychology classes and ultimately met with the Behavioral Science department. Although in this case the department continued using the book, incidents such as these suggest that both church administrators and church members, particularly those representing the conservative wing of the denomination, maintain a sense of ownership of the university, desiring that it respond to their concerns and suspecting that the institution is on the verge of departing the faith.

Despite such pressures, considerable religious diversity exists at the university among both students and faculty. Lifestyle and values changes taking place among Adventists at large appear also at Andrews. Probably the most visible is the wearing of jewelry, which appears among a significant minority of both female and male students. Students are also free to express in *The Student Movement* their frustrations with required chapels and worships, usually referred to as a kind of "forced religion." With widespread availability of automobiles, the *in loco parentis* that has traditionally characterized Adventist higher education has lost much of its strength. Weekend life, in particular, no longer revolves around campus activities. Students can and often do go elsewhere on Friday nights and Saturdays; as a result Sabbath is not observed so uniformly as in the past and the temptations of "worldly" entertainment are strong. Movies are no longer an issue; now the concern is with drinking and dancing.

Diversity among the faculty is neither so visible nor so wide. While virtually no faculty member publicly departs in significant ways from the expected Adventist lifestyle, religious viewpoints cover a wide spectrum. They range from

the members—mostly in the Seminary—of the Adventist Theological Society, who defend what they regard as historic SDA beliefs, to those who are willing to consider a variety of positions on such issues as inspiration, earth history, and the nature of essential Adventism. There is an unspoken sense that there are limits to what may be said in the classroom, but elsewhere—faculty offices, hallway discussions, the Faculty Lounge Sabbath School, among others—one can be more direct. A religion teacher in recent years was nearly fired because of his theological views, but the committee of full professors who reviewed his case was able to establish an accommodation between him and the administration. In part because no such case has forced the issue, the limits of academic freedom remain vague. It is clearly not absolute, and considerable flexibility exists in defining acceptable Adventist belief.

Recognition that the institutional mission is not being fully met has appeared in several recent reports. The Strategic Planning Committee called for a restructuring of the general education religion requirements to emphasize "practical Christian living and fulfillment through Christian work and service in a secular society." It also stated that the religion department should focus on "value transmission" rather than pre-seminary training.

A survey of alumni for the period from 1989 to 1993 suggested that graduates rated their relationship to the Seventh-day Adventist Church relatively low [a mean of 2.90],

although they regarded more favorably their spiritual growth while at Andrews [3.56]. Based on this survey and other information, the Self-Study Committee for the 1994 North Central accreditation visit concluded, "Despite the opportunities for spiritual growth..., indications are that much remains to be done to make the University a powerful influence in the value structures of students." Not surprisingly, religion requirements and value expectations are high in the consciousness of the general education committee as it works on a new or revised program.

Although "integration of faith and learning" is frequently mentioned, the university does little to pursue this goal in a systematic fashion. Several evangelical institutions, such as Wheaton College, require their faculty to participate in a seminar addressing the relationship between religious faith and scholarship; but there is nothing like this on the Andrews University campus. The General Conference Department of Education sponsors such a seminar during the summers, but the university does little to promote it among its faculty and only a few have attended.

Service Orientation or Intellectual Values?

There are several related reasons for the lack of emphasis on distinctive Christian scholarship. First of all, many faculty are skeptical of such an endeavor. Campus
~~continued on page 20~~

JUST A COINCIDENCE

by Berto



The Future of Adventist Higher Education—A Look at the Options

by Fritz Guy

13

The following was excerpted by permission from the **Journal of Adventist Education**, April/May 1994. Call (301) 680-5075 for the full article.

LOOKING TOWARD THE 21ST CENTURY, ADVENTIST higher education in the United States faces major challenges as a result of three converging realities:

- One, the continually rising cost of Adventist higher education. Tuition and fees for undergraduate students at Andrews University, for example, rose from \$1,101 in 1967-1968 to \$9,645 in 1992-1993—an increase of 776 percent. This increase is typical of Adventist colleges and universities although it is somewhat greater than the average of other United States private colleges (679 percent) and private universities (750 percent).

- Two, the attractive and accessible educational alternatives for Adventist students. Across the United States, there are more than 3,500 colleges and universities. Many of these institutions offer good (sometimes excellent) education that is conveniently located and relatively inexpensive. Some are genuinely religious in commitment.

- Three, the limits of church resources. In 1992, the tithe income from the eight union conferences in the United States totaled \$421.7 million, and their direct appropriations for colleges and universities in the United States came to \$36.3 million, or the equivalent of 8.6 percent of the tithe. This was an average subsidy of \$2,431 for each of the 14,897 students enrolled in the 11 institutions in the fall of 1992.

In shaping the future of Adventist higher education, the church has a variety of options—some disturbing, some difficult, but all deserving of thoughtful, creative attention.

Option 1—Liquidation

The most radical, and almost unthinkable option is for the Adventist Church in the United States to get out of the business of operating colleges and universities, and settle for a seminary (or two?) to educate pastors and chaplains. This option would save the church something like \$34 million a year in operating subsidies. The present college and university property could be sold and provide a massive perma-

nent endowment of perhaps a half-billion dollars or more. From this endowment an income of \$25-\$30 million a year could be used to establish and support Adventist residential and study centers adjacent to secular or church-related colleges and universities. These centers could provide an Adventist social environment, spiritual nurture, and courses in religion and ethics.

Option 2—Consolidation

Certainly less radical than liquidation—but still a drastic choice—would be to reduce the number of institutions the church supports in order to fund the remaining ones more adequately. This option assumes that having fewer large institutions would be more efficient and viable economically and educationally than having many small ones (for example, Brigham Young University). There would be a smaller number of colleges and universities, which could therefore receive more financial support per institution; but there is no evidence that they would have correspondingly larger enrollments.

Option 3—Simplification

Just as radical as consolidation, but in a quite different way, would be the twofold option of focusing either on undergraduate education or on graduate and professional education, and phasing out the other level.

Option 4—Privatization

The church could choose to turn some or all of its existing colleges and universities (with the exception of the theological seminary) into private institutions. If it can be done at Weimar, the reasoning goes, why not in Lincoln, South Lancaster, and Collegedale? Privatization does carry the danger that the religious character of a college or university could be diluted or lost—the examples, beginning with Harvard and Yale, are legion. However, there may be ways of counteracting this danger, as suggested at the University of Notre Dame, which is actually private but intentionally and unmistakably Catholic.

Option 5—Specialization

A much less radical option—but still a change from the present—would be to encourage each existing college or university to chart its own course, emphasizing what it can do best. This would mean the elimination of both the “franchise” mentality, which expects Adventist education to be as standardized as fast food, and putting limits on the “student recruitment turf” for each institution.

~~Continued on page 19~~

Dr. Fritz Guy is University Professor of Theology and Philosophy at La Sierra University, Riverside, California. He formerly served as president of the university.



Following Truth Wherever It Leads

by Lawrence Geraty

14

ADVENTIST COLLEGES INCULCATE WITHIN THE LEARNER AN urge to roll back the frontiers of human knowledge, following truth wherever it leads. Although the involvement of our scholars in such creative and critical pursuits may disturb the complacency of some within the church, the scholars' obligation to pursue knowledge must be upheld by trustees true to our mission. This is one of the most important ways for the church to renew itself, to come to grips with "present truth." As Ellen White said, "Those who sincerely desire truth will not be reluctant to lay open their positions for investigation and criticism, and will not be annoyed if their opinions and ideas are crossed." (*Counsels to Writers and Editors*, p. 37)

The wise administrator understands that the development of understanding means reappropriating reality at increasingly more complex levels, as one's thinking expands to envelop the increasing richness and intricacy of experience. For example, the biblical injunction "Thou shalt not kill" says more to us as educated adults than just "murder is forbidden." The Adventist student goes beyond his or her secular colleagues when these learning processes become avenues to contact with the work and will of the Creator.

Seventh-day Adventist higher education takes place in the setting of a world view that long undergirded all higher education. Roots of the university idea may be found in the belief that a superior education occurs when the program fosters intellectual growth and the acquisition of knowledge within an atmosphere of Christian faith and commitment.

Thus an essential characteristic of Adventist higher education is the introduction of particular views about the nature of the universe, of humanity, knowledge, and values, including a belief in God's creating, sustaining, enlightening, and redeeming activities through His Son, Jesus. For that reason, one of higher education's most important goals is helping students to develop a relationship with God.

In a practical sense, this means that all disciplines are placed under the scrutiny of faith. For example, what does it mean to be an Adventist Christian in business? The ethics of honesty means more than fairness in remuneration and hiring; it means one cannot be involved in exploitation of any-

one anywhere. What does it mean to be an Adventist Christian in science? It means earth-preserving, and destruction-avoiding. In art it means communicating nonverbally. In literature it means examining premises and challenging assumptions—all of which are scrutinized by Christian values.

Spiritual Life

Adventist colleges particularly need to be known for what they offer in the spiritual realm. They must develop Christian character, nurture spiritual sensitivity and awareness, encourage the internalization of Christian doctrine and practice as understood by Adventists, foster understanding and respect for other persuasions, and make religion—worship, faith, and participation—an integrating and unifying force in learning and thereby inspire commitment to Christian mission.

Traditionally, this has been approached through required worships and chapels, certain Sabbath prohibitions, required religion courses that covered mostly propositional truth, weeks of prayer, and emphasis on correct behavior. Most of these things are still de rigueur to some extent. There are signs of change, not because these things are wrong or bad, but because in today's world, at least, they don't seem to be producing vibrant, growing, committed Christians in the numbers we would like to see.

What we need is a renewed emphasis on the relational, spiritual life. For instance, Atlantic Union College has worked hard on a spiritual master plan for the campus that attempts to harness the spiritual resources at the college on behalf of the students' spiritual development. To assist students in their prayer life, the student services office has put out a weekly prayer resource guide and sponsored a "dial-a-prayer" service. Each student has been given the One Year Bible and encouraged to make daily Bible study a part of his or her experience. All students receive the weekly *Adventist Review* to get them into the habit of staying updated with the progress and issues of their church. The general education committee has encouraged all departments to find ways to integrate faith into disciplinary agendas. The religion department has begun some very popular spiritual growth courses, while approaching propositional truth in a way that encourages loyalty and devotion to the personal God who inspired those propositions.

(Excerpted by permission from the *Journal of Adventist Higher Education*, April/May 1994. Call (301) 680-5075 for the full article.)

Lawrence Geraty, president, La Sierra University in Riverside, California, was the president of Atlantic Union College, South Lancaster, Massachusetts, at the time he prepared this piece.



Can Adventist Education See The Big Picture?

by Jack Cassell

15

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER education in the United States from their inception in the late 1800s adopted a traditional liberal arts curriculum similar to that of other church-sponsored colleges of the day. Courses in religion were offered and included as part of the general education or core requirement for graduation, along with offerings in the arts and sciences. The curriculum was classical in content, with courses in Greek, philosophy, science, mathematics, literature and music. Rather than merely prepare students for church careers, the object was to provide a broadly based curriculum patterned after the traditional liberal arts concept. Inherent in this educational philosophy, which originated in the Middle Ages, was the idea that the liberal arts were intended for "Liberi" (free men) and that the purpose and objective of liberal education was to give men and women that knowledge and background which would make it possible for them to act in contemporary society with freedom based on knowledge and right motives. It was believed that when individuals were freed from ignorance and prejudice and encouraged to think critically, they could best function as leaders in society.

Adventist pioneers, including Ellen White, espoused this educational model while adding a strong Biblical studies component to the curriculum of early Adventist colleges. Ellen White supported this concept when she wrote, "Divorce God from the acquisition of knowledge, and you have a lame, one-sided education, dead to all the many qualities that give true power to man." She also seemed to recognize the importance of an education that produced graduates with the skills to think critically as best evidenced by her statement that "Every human being, created in the image of God, is endowed with a power akin to that of the Creator—individuality, power to think and to do....It is the work of true education to develop this power, to train the youth to be thinkers, and not mere reflectors of other men's thoughts." (*Education*, p. 17)

Pioneer Adventist educators believed that moral and spiritual values could best be taught as well as caught within an academic environment where these principles were included within a traditional liberal arts curriculum taught by

Adventist teachers. Such an educational experience, it was believed, could best address the spiritual, educational, and physical needs of the student. Although this holistic concept of education was not unique to Adventists, who established their first college in Battle Creek, Michigan, in 1875, it has endured and remains to this day a vital part of Adventist higher educational philosophy. Other American institutions of higher education launched over one hundred years before Battle Creek and Healdsburg, including such famous institutions as Harvard, Yale and Princeton, abandoned this concept, even though this had been a fundamental purpose in their founding. For example, the stated purpose for the establishment of Yale in 1701 was to provide a school "wherein youth may be instructed in the arts and sciences who through the blessing of almighty God may be fitted for public employment both in church and in civil life."

Bible Colleges

Other church groups developed institutions of higher education for the express purpose of preparing graduates for employment by the parent denomination. The primary objective was merely to indoctrinate students by providing a narrow, single-purpose curriculum, with only cursory exposure to the liberal arts. Institutions of this type, usually referred to as Bible colleges, remain today with a specialized and limited curriculum. However, the majority of church-related colleges have severed their close ties to the parent denomination, secularized their general education requirements, and abolished theology departments and majors. Adventist colleges and universities in North America remain committed to a comprehensive curriculum, close ties to the parent church, the holistic philosophy of education, and a general education component based on the liberal arts model. Some recent trends, however, could trigger the same evolutionary process within Adventist higher education that has affected other church-related colleges and universities in America.

Even though the system retains many positive aspects, there are certain factors that demand serious consideration and study as the church approaches the twenty-first century. For example:

1. A failure to fully recognize the devastating effect of declining church financial support upon the quality of higher education. Church subsidies comprise less than 10 percent of operating expenses in most Adventist colleges and universities.

Jack Cassell is a former president of Pacific Union College and a former academic dean at Southern College and PUC. He is now a funeral director in Loma Linda, California.



2. Pressure from conservative elements to promote the Bible college model as the ideal system of higher education for the church.

3. The counterproductive influences of open student recruitment as a means of maintaining a tuition-driven system.

4. The subtly erosive consequences of employing non-church members as adjunct professors and contract instructors. This practice can quickly erode the role model influence of faculty as well as the integration of faith and learning.

5. A seemingly naive belief that a particular academic discipline, such as religion, best prepares one for higher educational leadership.

6. The refusal of church leaders to engage in a serious study of the negative effects of current church organizational structure upon the efficiency and effectiveness of Adventist higher education in North America.

7. The essential need for a coherent policy and master plan for Adventist higher education within the North American Division.

8. The establishment of an organizational structure that better protects institutions from vocal radical groups who seek to promote their own particular agenda.

Failure to address these and other issues will only perpetuate a system of higher education that is increasingly costly, provincial, competitive, and inefficient. While none of these trends in and of themselves may be inherently destructive of Adventist higher education, they do indicate the need for some careful consideration and planning as the church looks to the future. Pressure to move toward a limited, non-accredited Bible college curriculum or the historical trend of many institutions to become independent of the parent denomination must be resisted. Crisis management has too often resulted in piecemeal, stopgap solutions, and complacency with the status quo has caused Adventist higher education in America to lack focus and direction.

Adventist higher education today is plagued by provincialism which results from an archaic church organizational structure. Because the North American Division has traditionally been merely an extension of the General Conference, the Union Conferences have exerted total control over the higher educational institutions within their region, with the exception of the two GC institutions, Andrews and Loma Linda Universities. This arrangement has resulted in an inability to visualize the bigger picture of what may be best for the college-age youth of the church and has thus perpetuated a system that has produced competition rather than cooperation, and proliferation instead of consolidation.

Although significant changes have taken place in church growth worldwide, the degree of financial support and the availability of low-cost transportation, organizational control of higher education in North America has remained virtually unchanged since its inception. Adventist colleges and universities continue to struggle to survive financially even as they underpay their faculty, raise tuition out of the reach of many,

and defer maintenance on their physical plants. The fact of the matter is that the church has perpetuated an organizational structure in North America that not only prohibits much-needed changes in many areas but has also inhibited the master planning that is necessary to bring about a more efficient and effective system of higher education. The establishment of the North American Board of Higher Education in the 60's constituted an attempt to coordinate higher education in the United States and Canada. Although the Board has made some valuable contributions to this effort, it has only been able to exert pressure through persuasion and has lacked any real power to bring about needed organizational change.

It is essential that the control, funding and availability of higher education in North America be seriously addressed as soon as possible. A blue-ribbon committee comprised of individuals knowledgeable about higher education should be convened and commissioned to study those factors presently affecting the system and begin the work of

charting a course for needed change. Issues that must be considered include:

- the level of church organization best able to coordinate and control higher education;
- the feasibility of reducing the present number of nine senior

college and three university campuses to a more efficient system;

- maximizing the available financial resources from the church for higher education;
- the value of retaining regional and professional accreditation;
- more effective ways to control costly course and program proliferation.

A blueprint for Adventist higher education in North America for the twenty-first century must be developed. For over 100 years Adventist higher education in North America has provided a highly educated workforce and laity for the church. Graduates have contributed greatly to the message and mission of the denomination around the world. They have brought moral and financial strength to the church in North America as professionals in the fields of law, medicine, and education. It should be obvious to even the casual observer that continuation of a quality higher educational program is essential to the future growth of the church.

The church-related college and university can best provide an academic environment that will assist in the attainment of knowledge as well as a commitment to the highest moral and spiritual values. What better place for teacher and student to freely and openly consider the great issues facing the church and society? Although positive aspects of the present system should be retained and protected, the church must not fail to quickly seek solutions to vexing problems that could weaken and even destroy one of its most important institutions for evangelism.

Adventist schools continue to struggle to survive financially even as they underpay their faculty, raise tuition, and defer maintenance.

The Church Can Afford Only One University

by Ervin Taylor

17

THE SIMPLE THESIS OF THIS COMMENTARY IS THAT—ON both academic and intellectual grounds—the Seventh-day Adventist Church in North America can afford only one university institution. With careful planning and good administration, the intellectual and financial capital of the church could be marshaled to sustain, at a credible level, one university that has a good chance of supporting a faculty undertaking distinguished scholarship, nationally-ranked professional education and offering intellectually rigorous undergraduate and graduate-level instruction.

In the current academic world of the United States and Canada, the combined enrollment of all 14 SDA institutions is below the average enrollment of one comprehensive research-oriented North American university. Regrettably, the SDA Church did not follow the approach of the Church of Jesus Christ of Later-day Saints (Mormons) in organizing their system of higher education in North America—one church-owned university with a vast support network for college-age students at public institutions.

Unfortunately, our liberal arts colleges do not exist primarily for academic reasons. They exist, as do many other church-affiliated colleges, in large part for cultural and social reasons—as a means of maintaining a religious sub-culture and encouraging endogamous marriage patterns with respect to that religious sub-culture. One might conceivably justify such a purpose for a secondary school system. However, by the time that one matriculates at the college level, one would expect that values and the basis for making choices are essentially fixed for life.

It needs to be emphasized that there are many highly capable faculty members and a few, quite good academic departments at several Adventist colleges. However, most faculty are working under difficult circumstances and are not receiving adequate compensation. In addition, it does not help faculty morale to have two Adventist institutions of higher education under the sanction of the American Association of University Professors for violations of due process in the handling of academic personnel decisions.

A serious sociological and economic problem that will increasingly haunt the church's ability to maintain the current number of its post-secondary institutions is that many mem-

bers—primarily upper middle class Anglo but also other upper-mobile middle and working class members of U.S. ethnic minority groups—no longer see the point of paying four years of tuition, now at about 80% of Stanford and Harvard, for a B.A. or B.S. degree from an Adventist college. They can pay much less and go to a campus of a state university that has nationally and internationally ranked academic programs.

What should be done? If our criteria would be only, or even primarily, academic, the most obvious solution would be to consolidate all educational resources at one university. However, we are confronted with a present reality—a “present truth”—that we have 14 institutions—each with its alumni and highly active and vocal constituencies. Most importantly, our regional liberal arts colleges are part of the political domain of union conference presidents—the equivalent of cardinals in the Roman Catholic Church. They are not about to relinquish any symbol of their power and prestige. Given the realities, the question is not what should be done but what is possible.

One scenario would be to make all of our post-secondary institutions in North America part of a single Adventist university system. The model for this would be multi-campus systems such as the umbrella University of Wisconsin. In this system, there is a prestigious research university campus, a series of liberal arts colleges of varying size and academic standing, and a number of community/junior colleges.

Does a suggestion to reconstitute SDA higher education have any chance of being implemented? The short answer is no. Strong forces, driven by conservative, even reactionary, ideological considerations, are currently very powerful. However, current proposals to reduce the number of local and union conferences may curtail the power of the local conference and union conference presidents to influence decision-making in the academic arena. If the number of union conferences in North America can be reduced to three, this would make consolidation—perhaps at the regional level—much more feasible. Our hospitals can do it, why not our colleges?

However, perhaps all of this will be essentially irrelevant, if the diversion of upper middle class students and upper-mobile ethnic middle and working class students from our colleges into non-Adventist institutions continues to accelerate. If this occurs, SDA educational and ecclesiastical leaders might have to downsize by consolidation the Adventist higher education system simply to keep one or more of its colleges from going broke.

Ervin Taylor is professor of anthropology and chair of the Department of Anthropology at the University of California, Riverside and a member of the Adventist Today Foundation Board.



Setting The Story Straight—The Loma Linda Creationism Panel

by the editors

18

ON SABBATH AFTERNOON, APRIL 2, *ADVENTIST TODAY* sponsored a four-hour panel discussion on Adventist Creationism, with a crowded standing-room-only audience of more than three hundred, in the Campus Chapel of the Loma Linda University Church. Written questions from the audience prolonged the meeting more than an hour beyond the planned closing time.

Two days later a misleading report of the meeting was circulated worldwide. According to the report, which appeared in the April 4 edition of *From the G. C. President*, a weekly newsletter distributed to Adventist leaders around the world:

Historicity of Scripture and the Genesis account of creation came under attack last Sabbath afternoon, not by secular forces but by two retired church workers, Raymond Cottrell [sic] (retired associate editor of the Adventist Review) and Richard Hammill (retired vice-president of the General Conference and former president of Andrews University), during a panel debate in California.

As a matter of fact, none of the panelists attacked the historicity of Scripture and the Genesis account of creation. All are members of the church in good and regular standing; all are creationists. In no sense was there a "debate"; it was strictly a formal panel discussion. Furthermore, Raymond Cottrell, editor of *Adventist Today*, functioned exclusively as moderator of the panel and never, at any point, commented on the historicity of Scripture and the Genesis account of creation, much less attacked them.

In harmony with its mission, from time to time *Adventist Today* sponsors public events devoted to major issues and concerns within the church. In these public events its role is that of coordinator, not advocate for any particular point of view. The assumption is that its readers and those who attend these events are mature enough to listen with open minds, to form their own opinions, and to accord differing points of view, competently and responsibly expressed, the same respect they wish their own. The April 2 panel discussion of Adventist Creationism was the second of such public events. The panelists all spoke as dedicated Seventh-day Adventists, constructively, and with respect for one another.

The purpose of the April 2 creationism meeting was to pinpoint some of the problem areas at the interface between science and religion and to present what the church has done and is doing to correlate confirmed phenomena of the natural world with the biblical account of creation. Identification of some of the problems logically precedes a report of what

the church is doing about them. An objective statement of the problems does not imply an attack on the biblical account of creation any more than affirmation of the biblical account implies a rejection of confirmed data of the natural world.

The first three panelists were asked to present the problems, and the last three, what the church has done and is doing about them. The first three were: Richard Hammill, retired president of Andrews University and former vice-president of the General Conference; Edgar Hare, senior staff scientist of the Geophysical Laboratory, Carnegie Institution of Washington; and Ervin Taylor, director of the Radiocarbon Laboratory and professor of anthropology, University of California, Riverside. The last three were: Ariel Roth, director, Geoscience Research Institute; Robert Brown, retired director of the Institute; and Clyde Webster, a staff scientist of the Institute. No panel more competent to address the topic could be assembled anywhere.

Hammill's key role thirty-seven years ago in establishing the Geoscience Research Institute (GRI) as a permanent agency of the church dedicated to dealing with problems at the interface between science and the Bible, and his subsequent participation as a member of the Geoscience board made his role as a panelist particularly important. His assignment on the panel was to recount the circumstances that led to its founding, and to describe the problems as he and church leaders of that time perceived them, and the mission they mapped out for Geoscience. The other panelists were asked to limit their remarks to ten minutes each, but no time limit was actually imposed.

A Misleading Response to the April 2 Panel Discussion

Someone in the audience mistook a discussion of issues in creationism as an attack on the historicity of Scripture and the Genesis account of creation, and sent a distorted account of the meeting to Elder Robert S. Folkenberg, president of the General Conference. On April 4, two days after the meeting, this report appeared in his weekly newsletter to Adventist leaders around the world, with his unqualified approval but evidently without any attempt to verify it.

On Thursday, April 7, copies of this edition of the newsletter came to the attention of Hammill and Cottrell. On Friday morning, April 8, Cottrell called Folkenberg to protest this fictitious report of the April 2 meeting. Folkenberg was away from the office, and his administrative assistant, Jerry Karst, received the protest.

Also on Friday, Cottrell and Hammill each addressed a letter of protest to Folkenberg. On Sunday, April 10, Folkenberg called Cottrell from British Columbia requesting a brief statement from *Adventist Today* about the April 2 meeting, for insertion in his April 18 newsletter. At his request this was faxed to him on April 12, together with a copy of Cottrell's April 8 letter and a joint letter from Cottrell and Hammill that made four requests:

1. That in his next newsletter he run a retraction of his April 4 newsletter version of the April 2 meeting together with an apology to Cottrell and Hammill, and to recipients of his newsletter.

2. That he arrange a face-to-face meeting with Cottrell and Hammill in Loma Linda at his early convenience to clarify the facts.

3. That he explain his precipitous April 4 newsletter comment without checking the misinformation and without contacting Hammill and Cottrell before releasing it (in harmony with Christ's admonition in Matthew 18:15-17 to go first to one's brother).

4. That he arrange a face-to-face meeting with their anonymous accuser, in harmony with the axiomatic right of an accused person to meet his accuser and in order to clarify the facts. In a democratic society the accused has an inalienable right to meet his accuser face to face.

The statement submitted in response to Folkenberg's request read:

The April 4 edition of this weekly newsletter mistakenly reported Drs. Raymond Cottrell and Richard Hammill as attacking the historicity of Scripture and the Genesis account of creation. Like the other five panelists we believe there is full and complete harmony between the Bible and confirmed data of the natural world when both are rightly understood. The April 2 panel was designed to clarify this relationship in a way faithful to the Bible record.

On April 14 Folkenberg confirmed receipt of this statement and asked a series of questions having to do with what Hammill and Cottrell thought regarding the Genesis account of creation. "These questions," according to Cottrell, "would have been appropriate prior to Folkenberg's April 4 indictment but were altogether inappropriate afterward until he had corrected his inaccurate report of the April 2 meeting. Folkenberg misrepresented what Hammill and I said at the meeting, and it was essential to correct that error before asking questions about what we think," he explained. Absent at Pacific Union College for the annual Alumni Homecoming, Cottrell was unable to respond to this request until April 19, at which time he repeated the four requests. Hammill likewise wrote Folkenberg again.

Elder Folkenberg devoted his entire April 18 newsletter to the "one topic, CREATION/EVOLUTION" (emphasis his). In it he set forth his personal view of the Bible-science relationship at length, reproduced the Cottrell-Hammill statement cited above and one from Ariel Roth, director of GRI, and implicitly reaffirmed his April 4 version of the April 2 panel. Apparently he intended that to conclude his response to the joint protest.

As if to underscore the irony of Folkenberg's attack on Hammill and Cottrell, both are recent recipients of the prestigious Pacific Union College Alumni Association's annual "Charles Elliott Weniger Award for Excellence" in service to the church, Hammill in 1992 and Cottrell in 1994. Both have served the church exclusively and with distinction throughout their entire lives, Cottrell for 47 years prior to retirement and 17 years since, and Hammill for 44 and 14 years, respectively. They are both for the church and the integrity of Scripture.

Folkenberg is being invited to reply to this report for publication in Adventist Today. Tapes of the Creationism panel are available for ten dollars from Audio Cassette Duplicating Service, 1556 Gould Street, San Bernardino, CA 92408-2978, a service of the Loma Linda University Church. The six panel presentations will appear in our September-October issue.

~~A Look at Options, continued from page 13~~

Option 6—Centralization

Moving in the opposite direction from specialization would be merging all Adventist higher education in the United States into a single organizational structure, perhaps like the University of California. A case could be made for developing a true "system" of Adventist higher education in the United States that would allow limited autonomy to the individual campuses—an Adventist University of America, with campuses in Massachusetts, Maryland, Alabama, Tennessee, Michigan, Nebraska, Texas, California, and Washington. The obvious questions here are, as usual, both political and economic.

Option 7—Continuation

Adventist higher education can reject all of the other

options and keep on doing what it is now doing. But this option carries the possibility of leading to the worst of all possible worlds for Adventist higher education, with decreasing quality at increasing cost. And it might encourage the best and brightest of both faculty and students to go elsewhere—a development from which Adventist higher education might never recover.

In one way or another, intentionally or by default, the church will decide how much and what kind of higher education it believes in enough to pay for. But the future will be better if it is shaped by deliberate, informed decision making after considering the various options. The costs of Adventist higher education demand this kind of attention; the benefits deserve it.

discussions of what it means to be a Christian teacher usually revolve around the personal influence of the teacher as an exemplary Christian rather than the nature of scholarship.

Secondly, the Adventist tradition lacks a strong commitment to intellectual values. It appears that few faculty members have taken philosophy courses, and all discussion regarding the role of presuppositions and values in relationship to scholarship are necessarily philosophical. There is little sense that Christian educational institutions have as a major function the development of an integrated intellectual framework within which to understand the individual disciplines. Such questions as the elements and function of a Christian world view and the nature of truth within such a context play a small role in public discourse.

Finally, the Adventist understanding of Christianity is primarily service oriented, a position well reflected at Andrews. The strategic planning committee called for religion courses that emphasize "practical Christian living" and "Christian work and service." The 1994 self-study report urged integration of the theme of "Christian values and service" throughout the university. A service orientation is not necessarily in conflict with intellectual values, but at Andrews it constitutes the dominant understanding of the nature of a Christian institution.

Being a self-consciously Seventh-day Adventist institution in contemporary society is not an easy task. As the percentage of the budget provided by the denomination decreases, the institution must look elsewhere for funds. In the

long run, nondenominational finance may change the character of the school. As distinctions between church members and the surrounding society decline, the students coming to Seventh-day Adventist colleges are often less committed to traditional beliefs and lifestyle than previous generations. The characteristics that its students bring to the campus challenge the institution to continually redefine the manner in which it is Adventist, an effort that runs the risk of, on the one hand, alienating the conservative sector of the church, and, on the other, of the university's losing its distinctive identity. As American higher education becomes more career oriented, the curriculum emphasis is shifting from liberal arts to pre-professional and professional education. Such a shift fits the service orientation of Andrews University, but at the same time it forces the institution to discover how to educate Christianly professionals ranging from ministers to architects, teachers to businessmen.

Still in its youth as a Seventh-day Adventist Christian university, Andrews reflects the tensions between a church that seeks to preserve older beliefs and practice and a society increasingly secularized and dynamic. Its formal ties with the Seventh-day Adventist Church almost guarantee that it will long remain closely tied to the denomination. Only time will give Andrews University the opportunity to develop the particular traditions that define its Christian identity, determining how the "present truth" discovered by the Adventist pioneers relates to the truth needed by the "present" generation.

UNDERWRITE

n. 1. to write under something, subscribe. 2. to agree to pay for or finance something.

UNDERWRITER n. a person who agrees to finance something of value.

Adventist Today exists because nearly fifty people are underwriters. If you are interested in knowing who they are, you can look on page one under the column entitled "Advisory Council."

This group of people have committed time, energy and funds to make certain that this journal will succeed. They are advisors. They do not dictate policy; the board does that.

What they do is underwrite. Uphold. Donate. Give. They could use some help. Would you like to become a member of the Advisory Board?

Become an underwriter. Call or write to *Adventist Today's* Advisory Council chair, Gary Fraser, and ask for details. He'll be glad to share them with you. And you'll be glad you became an underwriter. Write to *Adventist Today*, Communication 2000, PO Box 1220, Loma Linda, CA 92354, (909) 824-2780.

Response to "A Gathering of Adventisms"

I am finding my subscription to *Adventist Today* stimulating and useful as a source of information about our church which is not otherwise available. As I read in the current issue (Jan/Feb 94) the articles by spokespersons for four categories of Adventists, I realized that, as a member of the 1888 Message Study Committee, I represent a growing number of Adventists who do not fit any of these categories.

I am writing to enquire whether your editorial policy would make room for a statement which would explain our position. If so, we would be glad to submit such an article for your consideration.

Helen Cate
Weimar, CA

The articles on four different Adventisms (Jan/Feb 94) are probably more the personal views of the authors than the united thinking of clearly defined groups. I, for one, do not fit neatly into any of them. Each of them expresses some of my own concerns, but none of them my most important concern, which is: How do I treat other Adventists, other Christians, other human beings? If I am to be a Christian and identify with Christ, this must be my great concern—not doctrinal statements.

Historian George Knight correctly identifies, as the most important issue in 1888, the manner in which the brethren were treating one another. It is so in every crisis. Anyone familiar with the original documents of that period knows that this was Ellen White's chief concern. She knew, and all of us should remember, that none of us has or ever will have a full and complete view of truth.

We must not foster a community that can rest with easy conscience while some are in want, lacking even the necessities of life, while others must possess every latest electronic gadget, spend lavishly on luxuries and amusements, and travel to the ends of the earth for any purpose except to feed starving children or give hope to the heathen. If this condition exists, then we are not in a Christian fellowship and should set about to change it and ourselves at once.

David Entz
Madison, TN

And Now for Women and The Church

I am a 19 year old student in the senior class at Mesa Grande Academy. My English teacher gave me a copy of your magazine. When she handed it to me, I wasn't really sure why we were looking at this in English class. A few minutes later I found out why. The reason was, she wanted us to read some of the articles and hear our opinions.

I'm glad that she gave me your magazine because it was something I have never read before. Your magazine gave me a lot of things to think about, and I also learned some new facts. I really enjoyed your March/April 1994 issue. It's good to know there is finally an Adventist magazine a young adult like myself can enjoy. Thank you.

Cathie Little
Calimesa, CA

Thank you very much for your supportive and thought-provoking issue on women (March/April 94) in the SDA church. The church that I attend is very supportive of women's issues.

I, along with 5 other women, have been involved in a grueling 4-year struggle with an Adventist college over allegations of sexual discrimination and sexual harrasment. It was reassuring to discover that we might enlist the support of other women to encourage the college to solve their problems.

I do not believe that the men in our church realize the various methods they utilize to give to women the idea that we are somehow incompetent and inferior, simply due to our gender. I minored in religion and often sat in classes full of male theology majors. My exam scores were so high that the professors excluded me from the grading curve so that the theology majors could have a chance at passing. I often asked myself why I could never be "called" to the ministry, even though I demonstrated a far better grasp of the issues than many of my male classmates.

Jaydine Munsey
New Meadow, ID

Adventist Creationism

I attended the seminar in Loma Linda on Adventist Creationism and found it very interesting.

The questions raised by the first speakers were not reassuringly answered by the last three. The last three all basically appealed to our previous belief system as the reason to continue our present interpretation, and not look to any possibility there might be something new to incorporate. Their apology at the end, that they did not include a "scientific" rebuttal, sounded more like an excuse that there is none, rather than that they didn't include it because what they had to say was more important.

The church has frequently expressed concern about members leaving its fellowship. I think it is this lack of intellectual honesty, an unwillingness to face the issues, that is very damaging to the church. Unfortunately, I don't see any real change in sight.

Tom Denmark
Seal Beach, CA

Letters to the Editor

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

Letters to the Editor (continued)

Nixon Is Being Unfair to Whites

Since Folkenberg argued against "political correctness" in the May/June issue of *Adventist Today*, I will risk not being P.C. by responding to Timothy Nixon's "Why We Need a Regional Conference." I agree with many of Nixon's conclusions and recommendations. However, his opening arguments dumped on whites unfairly. He misused statistics on white migration. It is wrong to argue that whites, not blacks, are responsible for racial separation. Until both whites and blacks admit their responsibility for racial separation, racial integration won't be achieved.

Nixon argues that "white flight" to the suburbs shows that it is whites that are pulling away, not blacks. What he fails to show are any data proving that "white flight" is primarily race-based rather than caused by crime and economic concerns. The plight of young black men is widely discussed even in the African-American community. Drugs, alcohol and guns create a fatal combination that has decimated the inner cities. That people of any race who can afford to leave would do so is hardly surprising. High police costs and high cost social programs result in big city tax rates. These drive middle-class citizens to the suburbs. "White flight" could be described as "middle class flight."

Nixon accuses whites of being the separatists. His memories of Andrews University must be fainter than my own. I recall "blacks only" tables at the cafeteria where white students sat only at the risk of angering black regulars.

That white church members might refer visiting blacks to the "black church" can't reasonably be cited by Nixon as

evidence of white separatism when those black churches wouldn't exist if blacks didn't want to worship together in their own way. That whites would expect blacks to prefer such churches can hardly be considered surprising in light of Nixon's plea for a separate conference. In any case, I suspect that the incidence of referrals is much smaller than implied by Nixon. I have visited many happily multiracial congregations in North America. I have also enjoyed visits to black churches.

Living in Texas where the church has considered but never formed a Hispanic conference, I find it particularly interesting to note that it would make just as much sense numerically to form Asian and Hispanic conferences in the Southeastern California Conference, but *AT* only reported activity by African-Americans. This is consistent with the view that African-Americans bear at least some of the responsibility for separatist trends in American society and in the church.

Robert T. Johnston
Lake Jackson, Texas

Letters to the Editor

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

AT Graduates

I am school board chairperson at Pine Tree Academy in Freeport, Maine. I wish to give copies of the "Collegiates" issue (April/May 94) to our graduating seniors. I need these rushed to me as graduation is June 3-5. Please send me 20 copies.

Ron Davis
Yarmouth, Maine

~~Notre Dame, continued from page 6~~

astounding success at fund raising in the last twenty years (over \$700 million).

There are some Catholics, however, who deny Notre Dame its Catholic definition of itself. A priest colleague of mine (not a Holy Cross priest) who has been associated with five different Catholic universities thinks that without a doubt Notre Dame is the most Catholic among them, even though some of the others defend some "Catholic" doctrines more staunchly. On the other hand, many Catholic colleges and universities, in an effort to survive under trying circumstances, have become campuses with an invisible Catholic presence.

The consciousness of a religious identity is a shared experience, a group feeling. Among universities Notre Dame is known for leaving an indelible imprint in its students. It is called the "spirit," the "mystique" of Notre Dame. It is plainly noticeable on campus, especially on football weekends, but not only on those occasions. No other university has more "school spirit." The alumni are among

the most loyal anywhere, and to an amazing degree they are Catholic. On these grounds, which are where the university has purposely chosen to identify itself, there is no doubt that Notre Dame is doing its best, in a free and open way, to remain Catholic. Throughout the past academic year Catholic and non-Catholic faculty members were engaged in a conversation concerned with the Catholic character of the institution. Some of the best efforts from this series of evening panels have just been published under the editorship of Father Hesburgh. The book is must reading for anyone interested in these issues.

There was a time when Catholics and Protestants defined each other against the other. Today it is recognized that the reason why the other is feared is because it mirrors us too much. Those who have a conspiracy theory of history may have a vested interest in defining Catholicism in pre-Vatican II terms and very much the other, but history has left such behind. It would seem that today, observing postmodern Notre Dame, George B. Shaw would be less likely to come up with the witticism that a Catholic university is a contradiction in terms.

by Bonnie L. Casey

ONE RECENT AFTERNOON I STOOD ON A WASHINGTON, D.C., sidewalk quite pleased with myself. I had just snagged that most coveted urban commodity—a legal parking space—and was plugging coins into the meter, when I noticed a foreign-looking man next to me. He was also feeding his meter, but without any apparent self-satisfaction. In fact, he was muttering darkly. When he saw me watching him, he launched into a truculent explanation.

"I don't understand to pay money to park car! Where I come from, we have much better system. All things like this are free. Much better system!"

Thinking this gentleman must be from some socially engineered welfare state like Sweden or Switzerland, I asked, "So, where are you from?"

"Beirut," he replied.

I knew immediately, of course, why this answer was so hilarious. I had long ago dismissed Beirut as a disaster, a place where parking would be the least of one's problems. Where the only people who drove cars had first loaded the trunk with plastic explosives.

It took me longer to figure out why free parking in a free-fire zone was this man's idea of a "much better system." Obviously, he had filed Beirut in a different mental category than I had. To him, it was not a disaster, it was home and all things familiar, a standard against which all else was judged. And in this, he was only doing what comes naturally to everyone.

We all approach new situations conservatively, afraid to give ourselves up to the present reality, let alone an unnerving future. We cling to what we know, because it's all we've got.

This tendency is most pronounced when we confront a new culture, which can be any unfamiliar territory or system: a foreign country, a new work environment, a racially diverse neighborhood, or even a different congregation. We try to ease our way into the new environment by finding points of similarity, small things that reassure us we'll probably function just fine on this new turf. If we can't find a sufficient number of these points, we tend to judge the new culture

harshly. We cling so fearfully to what was, that we are unable to see clearly what is or what could be, even though it might be better for us.

My paternal grandfather had one very simple rule of life. He judged a thing acceptable or unacceptable depending on whether or not "we had it in Cornwall." He grew up amid the tin mines of southwestern England and had little experience of the world. In young adulthood, something inspired him to muster the courage and the boatfare to emigrate to America, but it wasn't American cuisine. I can recall Thanksgiving dinner conversations between my father and grandfather that had a sort of "Twilight Zone" quality.

"Pop, you want some pumpkin pie?"

"No."

"How come?"

"Don't like it."

"Have you ever tried pumpkin pie?"

"No."

"Then how do you know you don't like it?"

"We didn't have it in Cornwall."

Perhaps we just need to maintain enough personal identity to appreciate new situations without feeling threatened by them. I think my six-year-old son intuited this on a recent trip away from home.

Don't they have nature in Delaware?

My husband was preaching in a small church in Delaware, and Conor and I went along. Delaware is pretty exotic territory to Conor, and he was excited about going. But as we neared our destination, I could tell he was nervous about visiting a new Sabbath School.

"Will they give me a name tag?"

"I don't know."

"Will they have a nature story?"

"I'm not sure."

"How come? Don't they have nature in Delaware?"

I assured him that though the program might have some surprises, he would probably enjoy himself if he didn't expect it to be just like his own Sabbath School. He pondered this advice for a moment, then hit on a plan. "Well, Mom, if I get confused, I'll just say to myself, 'It's okay. We just do things a little differently in Maryland.'"

Modern life seems to be a continual clash of warring cultures: Jews and Muslims, blacks and whites, teenagers and everybody else. Is it simplistic to think we could foster a little understanding by reminding ourselves that "it's okay; we just do things a little differently"?

I hope my Lebanese acquaintance has found that kind of equilibrium. I hope he's left me his parking space.

Bonnie L. Casey lives in Takoma Park, Maryland, and is an editor at a Washington, D. C., law firm, as well as a freelance writer and editor.



As We Go To Press

Collegiates Push for Women's Ordination

THE ADVENTIST INTERCOLLEGIATE ASSOCIATION, STUDENT leaders from Adventist colleges in North America, meeting at Union College this spring, voted to bring the issue of women's ordination to their respective campuses. Student senates at the various colleges are discussing the issue, with the intent that a representative of AIA will present the student response to the year-end meeting of the North American Division in October.

A student-initiated national drive to get students to sign a petition is under way. The petition reads, in part:

We, the concerned youth of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, request that the Church and its leadership fully recognize the spiritual gifts of the women pastors in the North American Division by ordaining them to the gospel ministry. We join with the Ministerial Council...[and eight other Adventist groups are named]...in asking the church to enable the North American Division to ordain its women pastors. We pray for continued unity of belief in the gospel of Jesus Christ and the fundamental doctrines of the Church.

Sallye Pershall, editor of last year's *The Collegian* at Walla Walla College, initiated the petition drive. "We (Adventist students) have a strong voice, and we should use it," stated Pershall.

Confusion at Walla Walla College Over President

CHURCH LEADERS IN THE NORTH PACIFIC WERE SPEAKING OF the "blessing of the Lord," because the process was going so well. Then the candidate said no. William G. Nelson, 46, academic vice president of Southwestern Union College, Keene, Texas, announced as the unanimous choice of both the Walla Walla College search committee and the board, declined the offer on June 7. Nelson, with his wife, visited the campus for two days in early June, speaking with administrators, faculty and students.

Before his visit, all indications were that Nelson would take the offer. Nelson was "all but saying 'yes,'" stated Jere

Patzer, president of Upper Columbia Conference and chair of the presidential search committee.

Following Neils-Erik Andreasen's departure for Andrews University's top spot this summer, a search committee comprised of some 15 individuals (including all North Pacific Union officers and conference presidents) was appointed by the WWC Board. The committee did most of its rapid work in May, selecting three finalists: Peter Bath, the provost at Kettering College of Medical Arts (who had just declined to be chief academic officer at Andrews University); John Brunt, academic vice-president at WWC; and Nelson. Bath withdrew his name. After interviewing Brunt and Nelson, the committee voted to recommend Nelson, and the Board accepted the recommendation.

Although Nelson's negative reply was not expected and has caused turmoil on campus, it was not a total surprise to some faculty members, for Nelson's meeting with the faculty went poorly. Nelson's presentation to the faculty was essentially a biographical sketch. Some faculty were disappointed that no vision for WWC or Adventist education was articulated. When asked by faculty about such issues as academic freedom, theological pluralism and the role of liberal arts, Nelson's responses were not satisfying to most faculty in attendance. Also, certain faculty members questioned Nelson's acceptability because of his lack of college teaching experience and his possession of a doctorate in education—not a Ph. D.

Regarding Nelson's decision to reject WWC's offer of the presidency, Patzer stated: "He said it was an intuitive decision. He saw challenges on campus, but said specifically that he wasn't intimidated by those challenges."

Brunt, a faculty member and administrator at WWC for 23 years, is widely respected as a churchman, an administrator and an academic. In light of the widespread anticipation among faculty that Brunt would be picked from the two finalists, for the Board to now reject front-runner Brunt, would be seen as "an intentional affront to the majority of the faculty," said Ron Jolliffe, a religion professor at the college. "I can't imagine the Board not asking Brunt."

Other faculty believe the Board to be more imaginative. Beyond looking back at the list of 60 candidates already reviewed, they could appoint an interim president. "We are very disappointed at this point; we are regrouping," said Patzer, as reported in the *Walla Walla Union Bulletin*.

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