

## In This Issue

**The good, the not so good, and the perplexing**  
Inside glances at the sometimes contentious 55th  
General Conference Session.....1

**An agenda for Folkenberg**  
Currents offers a twenty-one point wish list of policy  
changes and additions that would make the church a  
happier place.....3

**Separate ways – LLU meiosis**  
One SDA university is becoming two, and the entire  
constituency comes together on the 26th of August to  
make it legal .....5

**Administration hegemony**  
An informative box documents the troubling  
centralization of power at LLU, its medical center,  
and related entities.....6

## Clippings

### Did you know that . . .

Six independent trustees of Kettering Medical Center (KMC) filed suit (including a class action) on 21 June 1990 against Adventist Health System – North East and Middle America (AHS–NEMA) and the Columbia Union Conference Association, asking a U.S. District Court to determine who owns and controls KMC and its assets – the SDA Church, by way of the Columbia Union, or the community that its original charter indicates it was founded to serve.

The suit arises out of concerns by the plaintiff/trustees over attempts by AHS – NEMA to extract \$8 million from KMC to help keep at bay creditors of AHS – NEMA who are threatening lawsuits to recover more than \$216 million worth of loans that are in default. (Most of the \$216 million was lost by AHS--NEMA through diversification ventures into diagnostic imaging centers and nursing homes.)

On 26 June 1990, Mrs. Virginia Kettering, who has con-

*Continued on page 16*

# The Good, the Not So Good, and the Perplexing

## The 55th General Conference Session

*Note: The sources for this article – nominating committee members and regular delegates in both public and private debriefings – are not credited in order to protect both the guilty and the innocent and to multiply the joy of speculation.*

**A**fter twelve years of self-imposed (or at least tolerated) paternalism, Adventism appears to have reached a fork in the road – a fork drawn first by circumstance (we've run out of money) and, second, by political will (a sitting president was refused reelection for the first time since A.G. Daniells was turned out in 1922).

From the opening night it was clear that this Session was different. The delegates to this quinquennium seemed fully aware that politics play a major role in denominational deliberations. And many delegates were restive under their belief that so much of what would take place had already been determined by a few men in Silver Spring, Maryland.

This restiveness became apparent when late in the evening the platform chairman, Enoch Oliveira, general vice-president of the General Conference, distributed the 226-name Nominating Committee list to the delegates. With hardly time provided to read much less to consider the names, the chair asked for a voice vote on the entire slate. The “nays” were considerably louder than the “yeas” and the subsequent show of hands appeared ambiguous. But Oliveira declared that the “ayes” had it and gavelled the meeting to a close to not quite a storm of boos and hisses.

## The Good

### The replacement of Neal Wilson

The replacement of Neal Wilson as General Conference president was greeted not so much with joy as with relief by a preponderance of the delegates. It was not an easy thing

for the Nominating Committee to do. The individuals who comprised it are by and large quite conservative in makeup; and they did not recommend change to the delegates on a whim.

It would be very interesting to know how a man with Wilson's ego strength absorbs the kind of rejection he received at Indianapolis. He had made it so clear that it was his duty to keep his hands on the plow that, as one Nominating Committee member told a reporter to the session, "we would have to pry each finger from the plow."

From remarks made by both Neal and Elinor Wilson to various people before the Session, it was clear that they just couldn't think of anyone else who could handle the task. And they were correct, if it is assumed that the General Conference president should personally administer the world field, and simultaneously serve as chief executive officer of the North American Division.

But no tears should be shed for Wilson or the church. He will continue to serve in a capacity to which he is very well suited – roving goodwill ambassador to the world.

### **Robert Folkenberg's election**

Robert Folkenberg's election came as a shock. Many delegates assumed, as *Currents* had predicted, that Wilson would make it to a third term. But as surprising as Wilson's exit was, the entry of an individual from three rungs down the administrative ladder was even more out of the ordinary. And not since A.G. Daniells was replaced by W.A. Spicer in 1922 has a sitting General Conference president been refused his desire to return to the post.

It is not clear whether Folkenberg would have been nominated had he not been chairing the Nominating Committee, and chairing it effectively. His name was included in a second slate of names that was placed for consideration after George Brown turned down the nomination following his third-ballot win (130 to 81) over Wilson.

The assumption of most delegates and Nominating Committee members was that Wilson's only serious opposition would come from the North American Division – a division

in which the delegate total continues to dwindle as a percentage of the world church delegation. North American Nominating Committee members and delegates – at least the majority of them – were deeply concerned about Wilson's abuse of political power and his financially costly mistakes in judgment (see past two issues of this newsletter). But most North American delegates were unaware that the representatives from the Inter- and South American Divisions were unhappy with Wilson for reasons that overlapped the concerns of their brethren to the north very little.

A pre-Session swing through Central and South America by Wilson was interpreted by those populous divisions as little more than a campaign trip. Wilson's tolerance of North America's push toward the ordination of its women pastors did not sit well in those divisions. After all, they reasoned (as does the Italian-born Samuel Bacchiocchi), wasn't Adam created before Eve? And wasn't Eve derived from Adam?

Also Wilson's affidavit in the Pacific Press lawsuits consigning Adventist anti-Catholicism to the historical trash heap had only recently been distributed by an independent Adventist ministry to those Latin American constituencies. Wilson's sworn statement was not easily understood by Seventh-day Adventists who find themselves continually out of step in a Catholic-monopolized culture.

Despite their unhappiness with Wilson, the Nominating

## **A sitting president was refused reelection for the first time since A.G. Daniells was turned out of office in 1922.**

Committee members from the Latin countries waited for some North American delegation member to make the first move. After nearly two hours of speeches lauding Wilson's service to the church, Pacific Union president Tom Mostert told the committee that the North American

Division had been under the strong influence of one man for twenty-four years – twelve as NAD president and twelve more as General Conference president – and that twenty-four years was enough.

Steve Gifford, Southeastern California Conference president had called Mostert before going to Indianapolis to tell him that he was going to make a speech in the nominating committee arguing the importance of a change. Gifford said

*Continued on page 10*

## **Adventist Currents — the Newsletter**

*Adventist Currents* is published 24 times a year by Mars Hill Publications, Inc., a California-based not-for-profit corporation. Douglas Hackleman, Editor; Sydney Allen, and Dennis Hokama, Contributing Editors. Subscription price (24 issues), \$29 per year in U.S., \$45 (U.S.) per year foreign. Please Address all subscription inquiries to *Adventist Currents*, P.O. Box 362, Loma Linda, California 92354.

Copyright Mars Hill Publications, Inc., 1990. All rights reserved. Third class postage paid at Loma Linda, California.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Adventist Currents*, P.O. Box 362, Loma Linda, California 92354.

*Adventist Currents* is an unauthorized, free-press adjunct to official Seventh-day Adventist publications, published by, for, and about Seventh-day Adventists.

# Separate Ways – LLU Meiosis

## Finalizing the Divorce and Starting Over

---

“It shall be the function of the constituent members of the Corporation . . . to inform themselves on the business of the Corporation to be transacted . . . .”

—Loma Linda University Bylaws Article 4, SECTION 4

---

### The LLU Constituency Session

**W**hen the Loma Linda University constituency last met (12 January 1986), it was disenfranchised by a patently incorrect ruling received made by a misinformed parliamentarian who was drafted from the floor during a lively discussion regarding proposed changes to the Loma Linda University bylaws (see “Birth of a Two-Headed Frog,” *Adventist Currents*, 2:2).

At that 1986 constituency meeting, arts and sciences campus student leaders attempted to introduce changes to the LLU Bylaws that would have helped to reduce the size of its board, reduce the potential among the trustees for conflict of interest, and require a more representative makeup to the constituency.

Attorney Kent Hansen, drafted mid-meeting for the job of parliamentarian, mistakenly ruled that however “arcane” the point, proposals for bylaw changes had to be made in advance of a constituency meeting, by a committee chosen by the board from constituents, through the notices calling the constituents together.

If he was correct, when the constituency assembles again on Saturday night, 25 August 1990, it may as well hear the apology of those who called the meeting and return home. Because one of the most important tasks of this constituency session is to vote changes to the LLU Bylaws that will be required to accommodate the separation of LLU’s two campuses into legally independent entities.

Fortunately the parliamentarian was incorrect five years ago, and it will be possible for the constituents who attend this meeting to do business legally. Actually, no article or section of the current LLU Bylaws suggests that bylaw amendments, changes, or revisions cannot be made by constituents from the floor of any constituency meeting – regular or special. Article 12 states:

These Bylaws may be amended by a vote of two-thirds of the con-

stituency of Loma Linda University, a corporation, present at any regular meeting of said Corporation, when the proposed amendment does not conflict with federal or state laws or with the Articles of Incorporation. **When it is proposed to change the Bylaws at any special meeting of the Corporation, notice shall be given to that effect in the call for the meeting.** (See also Article 5, SECTION 4, f.)

Notice that the second, emboldened sentence refers to a “special” meeting. However momentous, this will be a “regular” quinquennial meeting. Even if this were a special meeting, the wording of the article does not require the notice to specify the nature of the change to the bylaws, much less to mail out in advance a motion. Article 5, SECTION 4, f, referred to in Article 12 above, merely states that one function of the Board of Trustees is

To appoint from constituent members, at least thirty days prior to a regular constituency meeting, a committee to review the Articles of Incorporation and the Bylaws; said committee to report to the constituency.

Nothing there penalizes the constituents by proscribing them from initiating discussion, making motions, or taking votes regarding additions to, deletions from, or changes to the LLU Bylaws – should the board fail to appoint such a committee.

The constituents have a rare opportunity at their 25 and 26 August 1990 meeting to make a significant contribution to the future of Loma Linda University. The composition of the board has to be addressed and changed if for no other reason than because of the divorce of the Loma Linda and Riverside campuses.

**Why has LLU been without a vice president for financial affairs or for academic administration for more than a year?**

*Continued on page 4*

## Whose constituency is meeting?

There are very interesting procedural questions that arise because of the LLU board's vote to sever the relationship between the two campuses. Legally speaking, the divorce is not final until the constituency ratifies the decision of the board of trustees to end the marriage. When this constituency assembles, it will be, initially, still the constituency of both the campuses that are/were Loma Linda University.

Once that ratifying vote is taken, there will remain a host of both ex-officio and appointed constituents whose constituent status was appropriate only so long as the schools on the Riverside campus were part of Loma Linda University. To remove these constituents will require changes to the bylaws. Does the entire assembly of constituents vote those changes, after which the no-longer-applicable constituents leave the proceedings? Or have the bylaw adjustments been anticipated (a very questionable procedure) in the invitations to this constituency meeting?

It would be of further advantage to LLU if its constituency would move and vote changes to the bylaws that would reduce greatly the constituency's size and radically alter its makeup.

As it has been constituted, more than half of the constituency's 550-odd members are either General Conference Executive Committee members from North America, Pacific Union Conference Executive Committee members, or members of the executive committees of the member conferences of the Pacific Union.

The constituency needs to be reduced to under 100 members, constituted mostly of individuals who have an immediate interest in LLU; and who are geographically close enough to attend annual, rather than quinquennial, constituency meetings.

Section 4 of the bylaws lists as one of the functions of the constituents "to inform themselves on the business of the Corporation to be transacted." The constituency needs to figure out a way to make that happen and add it to the bylaws. (A step in fulfillment of that bylaw injunction would be to add to the list of functions required of the board of trustees under Article 5, SECTION 4, that quarterly reports of the activities and actions of the board be mailed to the constituents.

## Problems

For a number of years, unfortunate administrative situations have existed and decisions have been made at LLU that the board of trustees, for various reasons, has not been able to address effectively. Some of the difficulties summarized below seem at first look to be Medical Center rather than University problems. But the fortunes of the University are inextricably comingled with the success of the Medical Center, especially now that the University is to become exclusively a health sciences university.

Some of these problems could be rectified by changes in the bylaws that dictate the size and makeup of the board. Other bylaw changes might address at least one or two difficulties directly.

## An impotent board

As the three-year history of the campus consolidation effort indicates, the LLU board has a difficult time making decisions that are conclusive. Part of the fault for that difficulty lies with LLU administration for not providing the board with information from which it could make valid decisions. But ultimately it is the board's responsibility to replace an administration that is incompetent. It is hard to explain why LLU has been without a vice president for financial affairs or for academic administration for more than a year.

The forty-five member LLU board suffers from all of the problems that newly-elected General Conference president Robert Folkenberg has described in the June 1989 *Ministry* (see page 13 box entitled, "Folkenberg on church structure").

For more than ten years the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accrediting body has been expressing concern about the size and makeup of the LLU board, stating that "the

Board of Trustees should function . . . more clearly as the advocate of the interest of Loma Linda University within the organizational structure of the Seventh-day Adventist Church."

This constituency could see to it that the new LLU board is limited to something like the fifteen trustees that the Pacific Union Conference Executive Committee

(acting as Loma Linda University Riverside's interim Board of Trustees) will appoint for Loma Linda University Riverside, sometime in September.

## Administrative hegemony

While the LLU constituency has no direct say over policies pertaining to Loma Linda University Medical Center or the faculty medical practice groups, LLU constituents can write into University bylaws certain healthy restrictions on the responsibilities of LLU administrative officers. For example, Article 7, SECTION 7, of the bylaws specifies that "the Vice President for Medical Affairs, who shall be responsible to the President, shall be . . . subject to the reserve of powers of the President . . . and shall perform such other duties as the President may delegate . . ."

As is well known, Dr. David Hinshaw has been LLU vice president for medical affairs since 1986. Some other positions he occupies include president of the Loma Linda University Medical Center, president of LLU Medical Faculty Practice Groups, and president of Adventist Health Systems - Loma Linda (see box entitled, "Administrative Hegemony"). This is widely considered to be too much responsibility for one individual, no matter how talented; and it is too much power for one individual to wield, no matter how resistant to its abuse he may be.

The practical effect of the vice president for medical affairs occupying these other presidencies has been to void the intention of Article 7, SECTION 7. Rather, for the past several years the LLU president has been responsible to the vice president for medical affairs and subject to the reserve of powers of the vice president and has performed such other duties as the vice president has delegated to him.

**"The Board of Trustees should function . . . more clearly as the advocate of the interest of Loma Linda University . . ." - WASC**

### A Simple solution

A simple and very reasonable step toward undoing this administrative hegemony would be to amend Article 7, Sections 2 - 9, of the bylaws specifying the responsibilities of LLU officers. Article 7 easily could be amended to limit each LLU officer (those positions addressed in Article 7) to one full-time administrative appointment.

### Financial postscript

Many people wonder how many salaries Hinshaw draws from among his various positions. For the present the answer is incomplete; but based on IRS records, sources inform *Currents* that he makes \$140,000 as president of AHS-Loma Linda, and

\$38,000 as vice president for medical affairs at LLU. He apparently draws no salary for his presidency of the LLU Medical Center. *Currents* does not know how much, if anything, he draws for his presidency of the Faculty Medical Practice Group, or for his membership in the surgery group (normally a salary and bonuses).

### Unfinished business

Documents floating among constituents and the LLU constituent community suggest that the LLU board has allowed a \$916,180 misappropriation of LLU funds to go unrectified for more than twelve years.

*Continued on page 6*

## Administrative Hegemony

David Hinshaw, M.D.

- Adventist Health System – Loma Linda.....**President**
- Loma Linda University Medical Center .....**President**
- Loma Linda Faculty Medical Group, Inc. ....**President**
- Loma Linda Mercantile .....**President**
- Medical Properties of Loma Linda .....**President**
- Loma Linda University .....**VP for Med. Affairs**
- LLU Behavioral Medicine Center .....**Board Chairman**
- LLU Ambulatory Services.....**Board Chairman**
- Medical Personnel Services .....**Board Chairman**
- Barstow Community Hospital .....**Board Chairman**

### Notes:

Adventist Health System – Loma Linda is the administrative coordinator of those entities affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventist church to provide health care-related services in the Loma Linda area.

Lyn Beherens, MD, Loma Linda University president-elect, will be David Hinshaw's administrative superior at the University. But Behrens will be administratively subordinate to Hinshaw in her Department of Pediatrics Faculty Medical Group position and at the Medical Center where she teaches and affiliates. In reality, the vice president for medical affairs and the dean of the medical school have more power than the University president, if for no other reason than the size of the budget they control.

In the early 1970s, members of the radiology faculty practice group sued the radiology department and its chairman, Melvin Judkins, on suspicion of financial improprieties. An audit conducted in the discovery part of the suit eventually revealed, rather serendipitously, that then-LLU Hospital administrator C. Victor Way had misappropriated more than \$916,000.

Most or all of the \$900,000 was diverted, it has been claimed, from University accounts through checks co-signed by Victor Way and David Hinshaw, then LLU medical school dean and surgery department chairman.

Way, who became LLU Hospital administrator in 1967, resigned that position under pressure from the board over unrelated issues in mid-1974. He remained for about a year after that as manager of an outpatient practice program.

On 3 April 1975, Way and Hinshaw became the joint owners of a 2,073-acre ranch, divided by Interstate 5, in Lake County, Oregon, near the California border. The purchase price was \$525,000; and the new owners put \$52,000 down. Not long after the purchase, Way moved to the ranch to oversee its development.

It was in 1975, sources tell *Currents*, that then General Conference president Robert Pierson, General Conference general vice president, Willis Hackett, and General Conference vice president for North America Neal Wilson fought repeatedly among themselves in secret meetings over what to do about evidence of the \$900,000 misappropriation and other alleged evidence of financial improprieties that had been presented to them.

It was not until May of 1977, according to attorney Robert Warren of Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher, that the board of trustees became aware of the problem. In January of 1978 Hinshaw resigned his position under pressure from the LLU Hospital board. Hinshaw denied any involvement in or knowledge of the misappropriation of funds and said that he had paid for his portion of the ranch with his own money.

On 24 February 1978, Way signed an Agreement of Restitution in which he agreed to repay to the University \$916,180. Shortly thereafter he paid the University \$53,978.35 – leaving a balance due and owing of \$862,201.65.

The ranch became a focus of LLU efforts, in March and April of 1978, to recover its loss. Way and Hinshaw had very little equity in the property, but they proposed a plan that would allow Way to make it profitable and pay his debt to the University with the proceeds. The University had attached a \$200,000 second mortgage on the property (security interest on a \$200,000 promissory note from Way) that it agreed to lift so that Way could refinance the property and pay for more than \$100,000 worth of improvements (including an irrigation system) that were needed to make the ranch profitable.

Hinshaw and his wife signed an agreement with LLU on 4 March 1980 in which Hinshaw agreed “to assist Way in fulfilling his obligations to University, and to settle all disputes between Hinshaw and University.”

Hinshaw further agreed “to do whatever is necessary to assist Way in attempting to secure new financing sufficient to repay and discharge all security interests on the Oregon ranch and to

install an irrigation system costing not less than \$100,000 . . . .”

Hinshaw also agreed that if, when LLU directed the sale of the ranch, he wanted to keep it he would “be relieved of obligations under this agreement by paying forthwith to University the full principal sum then due under the Agreement of Restitution plus interest at the rate of ten (10%) percent per annum from April 24, 1978.”

Way and Hinshaw were unsuccessful in whatever efforts they made to refinance the property.

Nine months later (9 December 1980), the University “release[d] and forever discharge[d] . . . Hinshaw’s liability for the actions of Way,” in exchange for his agreement to “execute any and all documents” that would enable the University to sell the Way/Hinshaw ranch to a third party.

On 4 February 1981, the property was sold to J. R. Ferguson & Associates, Inc., who also assumed the \$200,000 promissory note obligation to LLU. Shortly after the sale, Ferguson paid the University \$18,000 in interest that was owed on the promissory note. One year later (4 February 1982) he paid \$2,000 toward the principal on the same note.

By August of 1983 Ferguson was delinquent on the \$200,000 second trust deed/promissory note, and the \$500,000 first deed of trust was in default to Downey Savings & Loan. Downey Savings & Loan subsequently named LLU as a defendant in a suit over the ranch default.

On 10 November 1987, the LLU Investment Management Committee

**VOTED** that the Way Lakeview property be “sold” for \$25,000 cash provided that Loma Linda University is dismissed as a defendant from Downey’s suit, with prejudice.

From what evidence *Currents* has been able to compile, it appears that of the original \$916,180 misappropriation, LLU recovered \$98,978 – \$53,978 from Way in 1978, \$18,000 in interest from Ferguson in 1981, \$2,000 in principal from Ferguson in 1982, and \$25,000 from the lawsuit sale of the property settlement in 1987. If the question of interest is simply ignored, LLU is still out \$835,202.

Why the board did not deal more definitively with this issue is not clear. Individuals who were on the board during the events just related say that both Way and Hinshaw would appear before the board defending themselves and each other. There were no confessions. Sometimes when the issue would come up the board would be called into executive session by the chairman.

After being expelled from LLU in 1978, Hinshaw became dean of the medical school at Oral Roberts University. By the time LLU was looking for a new School of Medicine dean, in late 1985, to replace Gordon Hadley, ORU had let Hinshaw go. (Hinshaw’s immediate superior at ORU, vice president for medical affairs James Winslow, indicated to a member of the LLU search committee that shortly after Dr. Hinshaw arrived at Oral Roberts he began to function more like a vice president for medical affairs than like a dean, and Oral Roberts needed someone who could concentrate on the day-to-day details of running a medical school.) Eight years after his ignominious departure from LLU, Hinshaw returned to the University, replacing Harri-

**Article 7 easily could be amended to limit the LLU officers to one full-time administrative appointment each.**

# LLU Roller Coaster

<b>12 January 1987</b>	Board votes (22 - 19) for campus consolidation. Action was one short of simple majority required in LLU Bylaws.	arate chancellors and operating boards to effect separate accrediting of the two campuses.
<b>11 January 1988</b>	Board votes (23 - 14) for consolidation. This action was illegitimate because one pro-consolidation vote was given by proxy which is specifically prohibited in LLU Bylaw Article 5, SECTION 13.	<b>4 October 1989</b> Board appoints R. Dale McCune, provost of the Riverside campus, to serve as its chancellor for the 1989-1990 school year. It was not an open-ended appointment.
<b>13 February 1989</b>	Board votes (23 - 1) to "terminate consideration of consolidation as a viable option for Loma Linda University."	<b>9 November 1989</b> R. Dale McCune resigns his Riverside campus chancellorship, effective June 30. McCune did not wish to become a candidate for a position he had in effect occupied for the previous nine years.
<b>7 March 1989</b>	Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), citing eight sources of concern, places LLU accreditation on two-year probationary status.	<b>12 February 1990</b> Norman Woods resigns his LLU presidency, effective June 30, citing unworkability of two-campus, independent governance model.
<b>April 1989</b>	Helen Thompson resigns position as vice president for academic affairs (effective June 30), following the report of a three-member committee appointed by Norman Woods at the request of the board to investigate numerous allegations regarding her conduct of her office.	<b>13 February 1990</b> Board votes (29 - 0) to divide two campuses into separate universities, effective July 1.
<b>21 April 1989</b>	Board votes in principle to provide campuses with independent governance.	<b>28 March 1990</b> Pacific Union Conference Executive Committee (acting as interim board) appoints Fritz Guy acting president of newly formed LLU Riverside.
<b>29 August 1989</b>	Board votes (33-3) for independent governance of two campuses; including sep-	<b>5 June 1990</b> Board appoints Lyn Behrens president of LLU.

son Evans as vice-president for medical affairs, and named Lyn Behrens dean of the School of Medicine.

## School of Public Health closure

The LLU constituency might want to ask the new board to consider reversing the board's 13 February 1990 vote to close the School of Public Health. Dr. Edwin Krick, dean when the University administration announced its closure, was asked to resign by then-president Norman Woods shortly after Krick's letter of 8 March 1990 to the school's alumni, answering questions they had been asking, was printed in the School of Public Health's alumni association newsletter. Krick told Woods he had done nothing for which to resign; and Woods told Krick then he would have the board fire him, and did.

The School of Public Health was closed ostensibly for financial reasons. In 1967 the LLU board voted an annual subsidy of \$200,000 - \$250,000 to the school. Rather than increase the sub-

sidy in the ensuing years to match inflation, two years ago the University officers persuaded the board to approve their recommendation to eliminate the subsidy.

Along with the loss of the General Conference subsidy, National Institute of Health funding for the Adventist Health Study ran out. Simultaneously, the school had just staffed a department of development to raise endowments, a full-time recruitment team to swell enrollment (and, thereby, tuition income), and had added new faculty to meet accreditation standards. All of this resulted, Krick says, in the first red ink (\$676,000 worth) in two years. But the school was not given a chance to see what the development and recruitment teams could accomplish.

There is within Adventism a significant group of people who are strongly committed to the philosophy of wellness that the School of Public Health represented, and who might be happy - given the opportunity - to endow it. The very sudden decision to

close the school can only reinforce the belief of many of its friends and supporters that Loma Linda really is the halfway house to the secular city that they always thought it was.

### The proton accelerator

The development of the first clinical application proton accelerator, located in the underground levels of the south wing of the LLU Medical Center, has attracted a record number of rumors. Some of the reasons for that are inevitable; others are not.

In the inevitable category are the facts that it is a first, it is technologically sophisticated, it is massive, it is expensive. Then there are professional jealousies. The proton accelerator and the infant heart transplant team receive far more publicity than any other LLU programs.

Other reasons for the rumors seem more legitimate. The initial estimate by the Department of Radiological Sciences submitted in 1985 was \$12 to \$20 million. Since then no accounting of the costs of the project have been made available to the faculty. However, a Loma Linda Hospital Revenue Refunding Bond prospectus, Series 1989-B offering of \$121,870,000, states:

The Medical Center estimates the total cost of the proton accelerator to be in the vicinity of \$40 million, although the figure could increase as the technology is developed. The Medical Center has received a \$20 million grant from the United States Department of Energy to help finance the acquisition of the accelerator and intends to finance the remaining costs through a fund-raising campaign.

During a guided tour of the accelerator construction site this August, LLU Medical Center public relations director Dick Shaeffer told *Currents* that his understanding was that between \$5 and \$10 million has been raised so far to match the DOE grant.

A single sheet draft document prepared by unnamed members of the LLU faculty for submission to the board alludes to "informal estimates by outside experts in accelerator design . . . as high as \$80 million." The document's authors "respectfully request that the Board . . . request the appointment of an expert panel composed of leading national and international figures in nuclear physics" to estimate "the capital cost of developing the Proton Accelerator to the point of reliable, regular use in patient therapy." Six candidates for an accelerator review panel from the United States and Canada are listed.

"In the strongest terms," the document's authors "respectfully urge the Board"

to initiate a full inquiry by external auditors into all circumstances relating to financial commitments existing or planned for construction, testing and operation of the Proton Accelerator; and that the auditors prepare a comprehensive report based on sworn testimony and submitted in its entirety to the Board and to the Faculty Council.

Only a misanthrope would wish anything but success for a project that has so much potential for good. Proton beam cancer therapy at LLU has the potential to destroy localized growths in any part of the body while causing minimal damage to surrounding tissue. In many cases it should be able to replace surgical

procedures. The expectation is that surgical and recovery expenses will be minimized, not to mention the side effects of either surgery or traditional radiation therapies.

LLU medical center, or some entity within it, is supposed to have the patent rights to all aspects of the accelerator's design and application technology. It is expected that a significant portion of construction and operating costs will be offset by the leasing of these patent rights to institutions desiring to develop their own proton accelerators for clinical use in other parts of this country and the world.

But because highly respected faculty throughout the University fear that the accelerator development, construction, and operational costs may exceed the income it can generate, this constituency may wish to instruct the new LLU board to initiate the external audit that faculty members have requested.

### Lawsuits

In the past three or four years, a number of lawsuits have been brought against the University for wrongful termination, breach of contract, and other disputes relating to employment.

More recently two researchers at the Medical Center have become involved separately in serious disputes with the University and the Medical Center over their relationship to Loma Linda institutions and especially over agreements regarding their patented or patentable discoveries. Both research scientists were affiliated previously with the University of California Los Angeles, and one has been nominated for a Nobel Prize.

One of the two, Ronald Billing, filed a suit for \$10 million against LLU, the Medical Center, and the Loma Linda Surgery Medical

Group; the other is still trying to get the appropriate administrative personnel to complete the in-house grievance process.

Several highly-respected LLU clinical and research faculty have substantiated for *Currents* the validity of the complaints of both researchers. Also, *Currents* has had the opportunity to evaluate considerable evidence in wrongful termination suits that have been filed. It appears that LLU administrators have given financial exigency or departmental retrenchment as the reason for terminating certain faculty when that clearly was not the case.

*Currents* recommends that this constituency instruct the reorganized LLU board to retain legal counsel (that is independent of LLU legal counsel) to provide the board with an disinterested opinion of the merits of these and other troubling cases. This will enable the board to see to it that LLU administrators act justly as well as expediently in disputes with employees and subcontractors. A responsible board will recognize that in the long run it is most expedient to act justly.

### Nepotism

Nepotism is another reality at LLU that some of the faculty find demoralizing. The constituents may wish to advise the LLU board to instruct the administration of the University to draft guidelines for the avoidance of nepotism within the faculty and administration of the University.

**Only a misanthrope would wish anything but success for a project that has so much potential for good.**



## Church membership


Over the past several years the proportion of non-Adventist to Adventist medical faculty at LLU – a reputedly Seventh-day Adventist organization – has grown steadily. (For example, the chairman and preponderance of section chiefs in the department of pediatrics are not Adventists.) This constituency may wish to instruct the board of trustees to require the University's administration to at least target some proportion of the faculty that must be members of the Seventh-day Adventist church in good and regular standing.

## In Conclusion

Because *Adventist Currents* is part of the constituent com-

munity of Loma Linda University, and because the LLU bylaws command that

"It shall be the function of the constituent members of the Corporation . . . to inform themselves on the business of the Corporation to be transacted . . ."

And because the invitation to attend the constituency session contained no information regarding the "business of the Corporation to be transacted, Mars Hill Publications, Inc., through its publication, *Adventist Currents* – the newsletter, offers all of the above in the hope that it might be helpful to the LLU constituents, many of whom have been of kind assistance over the years to the cause of fairness and candor in SDA institutions and publications. 

## Suggested Motions

1. that it be a function of the board of trustees to provide permanent constituents with quarterly reports of the board's activities and actions; and to provide appointed constituent members with an annual summary of the board's activities and actions, within twenty-one days of each annual constituency meeting.
2. that the LLU constituency be reduced to 100 members, of which 75 are comprised of individuals (faculty, alumni, students, community leaders) who have an immediate interest in the University, and who are geographically close enough to attend annual, rather than quinquennial, constituency meetings. The remaining twenty-five constituents are to be comprised of General Conference-appointed members, who may not be constituent members of any other Seventh-day Adventist institution of higher education.
3. that the LLU board of trustees be limited to nineteen members, of which no more than five may be members of the General Conference Executive Committee, and of which none may be constituent members or trustees of any other Seventh-day Adventist institution of higher education.
4. that the bylaws specifically limit the officers of the corporation to one full-time administrative position.
5. that it is the LLU Constituency's desire that the LLU Board reinstate the School of Public Health, reversing the 13 February 1990 vote to close that School.
6. that it is the LLU Constituency's desire that the LLU Board initiate the external audit that University faculty members have requested concerning the proton accelerator project.
7. that the LLU Board be required in the bylaws to retain legal counsel (that is independent of LLU legal counsel) to provide the board with an independent opinion on any legal matters about which it may want counsel.
8. that it is the LLU Constituency's desire that the LLU Board instruct the officers of the University to draft guidelines to be added to the *Policy Manual* that would define and proscribe nepotism within the faculty and administration of the University.
9. that it is the LLU Constituency's desire that the board of trustees instruct the officers of the University to at least target some proportion of the faculty that must be members of the Seventh-day Adventist church in good and regular standing.

## The Good, the Not So Good. . .

*Continued from page 2*

that Mostert concurred with his assessment. As it turned out, Gifford made the second speech in favor of change and provided some of the reasons that Mostert did not elaborate. Gifford said that his constituency wanted the change; that while they were a diverse group the General Conference leadership was not. The youth of his constituency, he said, felt disenfranchised. And Gifford argued that Wilson's considerable talents could best serve the church at this time as a goodwill ambassador.

And then there was a run on the microphone of individuals calling for change.

Eventually it was Folkenberg, the man Wilson suggested for chair of the Nominating Committee, and who many believe Wilson had intended to have as his third-term assistant, who returned to the room to see himself voted General Conference president by a vote of 111 to 69 over Jan Paulson, president of the Trans-European Division.

Folkenberg is a multi-talented, can-do person who understands administration, who is intimately acquainted with a major third-world culture, and who has indicated specifically that he does not intend to micro-manage the work or serve as North American Division president. He has come out for a less judgmental and bridge-building church. (Read in the *Adventist Review* the text of Folkenberg's Sabbath sermon – a sermon that was ghosted by Collegedale Church pastor Gordon Bietz, with some assistance from Loma Linda University – Riverside history department chairman, Ron Graybill.)

If anyone doubts that Folkenberg will bring a change in approach to the General Conference president's office, that person should read Folkenberg's six-page assessment of Adventist Church structure in the June 1989 Ministry. (See page 13 box entitled, "Folkenberg on church structure.")

It is encouraging to know that Folkenberg knows how to read financial statements, because he comes to his new post at a time when the church faces grave financial crisis.

Folkenberg inherits a world church budget in which the North American Division workers retirement fund (what little there is of it) has been used (certainly unethically, and very possibly illegally) to capitalize all kinds of projects.

He inherits an Adventist Health System that is in a shambles of debt. (See front page "Clippings" on the bankruptcy of AHS-NEMA and Kettering Medical Center lawsuit.)

He inherits a legal battle between a conference (Arizona) and the AHS-West that could disprove the legitimacy of his

predecessor's Federal Court depositions claiming that all segments of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination are one entity.

He inherits a Loma Linda University Medical Center that, along with its receivables, is collateralizing a \$125 million bond issue. It is a medical center that many clinical faculty and other observers feel could collapse under the weight of growing debt to one particular capital project (the development of a proton accelerator for the treatment of any localized cancers) that appears to be far exceeding its \$40 million projected cost and (some observers believe) to have been optimistically projected for revenue-generating potential. And it is an LLU Medical Center that appears on the verge of being embarrassed as the defendant in several significant lawsuits by research faculty.

Folkenberg is in a position, however (he doesn't owe a fist full of political IOUs), to objectively and hard-headedly address the reality that confronts him. But he takes his new post with the disadvantage of having no power base. And all the General Conference officers who did not retire at this session were returned to their positions. In other words,

Folkenberg does not get to pick a cabinet or appoint any Supreme Court justices.

Because he comes to the mound at a time when the bases are loaded, Folkenberg must throw strikes; and he must realize that even if a run or two crosses the plate, those runs will

be charged to the previous pitcher.

Over the years General Conference and Third-World church leaders have helped to maintain, and in some cases to deepen, theological and ecclesiastical differences between Third World and Western Adventists. (Just-retired General Conference general vice-president from the Inter-American Division, Enoch Oliveira, has actively perpetuated such differences.) These fields have been isolated largely from even those articles in the *Adventist Review* that have provided somewhat of a re-understanding of Adventism's roots and the evolution of its theology that have taken place particularly in the last dozen years. Keeping those fields in ignorance of the historical and doctrinal discussions that have taken place in North America will come back – if it hasn't already – to haunt us. Those in the North American church who know more about Adventist history and theology than some others in North America, already come under the suspicion of those on this continent who know less. And the same dynamic operates between Third World Adventism and Western Adventism. Folkenberg has several years to encourage the establishment of a new and better relationship between the North American Division and the burgeoning but poor Third World fields.

**All the General Conference officers who did not retire at this session were returned to their positions.**

### Floor overrules Nominating Committee

There was resentment among a significant number of Nominating Committee members over a letter that General Conference chief auditor David Dennis had written to Neal Wilson following the 1989 Spring Meeting vote by the General Conference Committee to dramatically increase the salaries of Adventist Health System administrators. Dennis was very concerned not only about the outcome but also

about what he felt were Wilson's manipulative tactics in getting the vote he wanted; and he sent approximately twenty copies of his letter to colleagues and church leaders.

When another name was sent to a business session to replace Dennis as chief auditor, Biblical Research Institute associate secretary William Shea asked that the nomination be returned to the Nominating Committee for reconsideration.

## Presidential Nominees

NAME	OFFICE	AGE
Neal Wilson *	Pres., General Conference	70
George Brown *	Pres., Inter-American Division	66
Walter Scragg	Pres., South Pacific Division	64
Cyril Miller	Pres., Southwestern Union	62
Ralph Thompson	Sec., General Conference	61
Ken Mittleider	V.P., General Conference	61
Ottis Edwards	Pres., Far Eastern Division	61
Calvin Rock	V.P., General Conference	60
Joao Wolff *	Pres., South American Division	60
Jan Paulsen	Pres., Trans-European Division	55
Robt. Kloosterhuis *	V.P., General Conference	57
Bekele Heye	Pres., Eastern Africa Division	53
Fred Thomas	Under Sec., General Conference	
Leo Ranzolin	Assoc. Sec., General Conference	
Ralph Watts	Director, ADRA	
Robt. Folkenberg	Pres., Carolina Conference	

The mean (average) age of the initial slate of twelve candidates placed for discussion by the nominating committee was 60.83 years – nearly identical to the mode and median ages, which were both 61 years. (At 49 years of age, Folkenberg is twelve years younger than the average nominee.)

After George Brown turned down the nomination for GC president, four names were removed from the list (those followed by asterisks) and replaced by those four whose ages are not provided, before the balloting resumed.

Later, when the Nominating Committee relented and sent Dennis' name to the floor for confirmation, the chairman of the business session insisted that there be no applause and no demonstration following the introduction of the next name. He was not obeyed entirely.

### **Sabbath-keeping guidelines skirted**

A document detailing how the Sabbath might best be observed was debated strenuously and at length in business sessions at the Quinquennium. The delegation's general ignorance of the medical profession can be seen in its willingness to add to the document a recommendation that physicians not schedule elective surgical procedures on Friday to avoid the necessity of postoperative care on Sabbath. (A patient whose hernia is repaired on Thursday will still require hospitalization on Sabbath.)

The evidence of the Adventist temptation to codify can be seen by tracing the history of this church that once rejected any creed as evidence of popery, to a church that now has perhaps the most elaborate creed in Christendom. J.N. Loughborough's words to an 1861 conference suggest how far we have come:

The first step of apostasy is to get up a creed, telling us what we shall believe. The second is, to make that creed a test of fellowship. The third is to try members by that creed. The fourth, to denounce as heretics those who do not believe that creed. And, fifth, to commence persecution against such.

Although it was a disappointment to the document's Biblical Research Institute architects, the majority of the delegates recognized our legalistic tendencies and refused to affirm the document as a formal guide for the world church's Sabbath observance. Almost as if they saw the humor in it, the delegates voted a motion indicating that they had received the document.

### **More good**

An action was tabled that would have forbidden Adventist pastors to marry an Adventist to a non-Adventist.

### **The Not So Good**

#### **Adventist women given the bum's rush**

Delegates to the 55th General Conference Session voted overwhelmingly (1173 to 377) that Adventist women should not be ordained to the Gospel ministry.

The debate over this issue lasted a day and a half.

Approximately the same number of delegates spoke for as spoke against the issue. And the same Bible texts were used to argue opposite positions on the question. No minds were changed.

Oddly enough, in a later discussion of changes to the *Church Manual*, the delegates voted to give licensed and commissioned (but unordained) ministers who are ordained as local church elders (male or female) the right to perform marriages and conduct baptisms. Welcome as this outcome may be, it defies any kind of logic. The many who voted yes on the first motion and no on the other seem to be saying that we are faithful to Scripture if we ordain unsalaried, local church elders; but that we are at odds with the Bible if we ordain salaried, credentialed ministers. But the New Testament makes no distinction between ministers and elders. In fact, there was no such category as minister in the New Testament church — only elders.

According to Loma Linda University Church senior pastor William Loveless it appears as though a deal was made on the floor of the session, in front of everybody, when Ministerial Association secretary Floyd Bresee and Neal Wilson and others appealed to the assembly. We voted with you (the world church) yesterday against the ordination of women pastors; now don't take away our right to let licensed ministers baptize and perform weddings. Bresee reminded the overseas divisions that the North American

church for decades had sent them its sons, its daughters, and its dollars. It worked.

Many delegates returned from the session convinced that the General Conference will never vote women's ordination. However, the Southeastern California Conference constituency could provide the new General Conference

and North American Division presidents an interesting dilemma to deal with in October when that constituency meets in special session to decide whether to independently ordain its women pastors. Southeastern president, Steve Gifford, says publicly that the conference constituents will face squarely what many believe is a moral issue.

Listening to Gifford's speech on the question of women's ordination from the floor of the General Conference session, one would have to believe that he saw it as a moral issue. Appealing to those who had "suffered racial inequality and injustice," "political repression," and "religious persecution," Gifford asked

How can we, in the name of a Heavenly Father who stands for justice, equality and love, speak of justice and equality while hiding behind the arrogance of faith and "so called" Biblical authority? The same

**McClure demanded that he fire black religion teacher Lonrenzo Grant "and a white faculty member of your choice."**

*Continued on page 14*

# Folkenberg on church structure

"An organization operating under this law [German sociologist Robert Michels' iron law of oligarchy] tends to resist change. And when it does change, too often it is in reaction to a crisis rather than from a desire to accomplish its mission more effectively."

"We must never come to the point where we redefine the mission of the church as the preservation of the structure."

## Lay member confidence

"The members' trust in their leadership is an indispensable commodity. . . . There is evidence that this trust is in decreasing supply. We must take aggressive steps to counteract this trend. Some options here include increasing to more than token levels lay membership on governing boards and key committees, and creating an atmosphere in these bodies that encourages free discussion of difficult issues."

"Too many meetings. . . . give the impression to our constituency that we do not have adequate control of our spending. . . . Two steps we can take. . . . First, we can require the organization calling a meeting to pay all travel expenses for those expected to attend. . . .

"Second, . . . increase to more than token levels the proportion of laity serving as members of the committees. . . .

"Sunset clauses. . . . These clauses set a definite life span on the programs to which they are attached, . . . Every program . . . our church offers should submit to periodic review by those whom they are intended to serve."

"Could . . . some programs or institutions that were established to meet very real needs have developed special interest groups that are more concerned with self-preservation than mission?"

"The closer each organization operates to its lay constituency, the more effectively it holds the foliage' in check."

## Adventist book distribution

"In several unions, conference subsidies to the [Adventist books and literature] sales system are so large that the conferences involved could actually afford to distribute more books if, instead of using the present sales system, they used their appropriations to purchase the books directly from the publishers and gave them away!"

## Education

"Perhaps we should amend our appropriations policies to include incentives for efficient operations. We need to establish clear target ratios relating, for example, infrastructure to revenue and faculty to students."

## Worker/member ratios

"Twenty years ago there was almost one office worker for

every field worker in the North American Division. By 1987 there were 1.6 field workers for every one in the office. The world divisions have seen hardly any change in the ratio. They have been adding office staff at almost the same rate at which they have added field workers."

## The Adventist health system

"Logic dictates that liability should rest with the same group that exercises control. When the same group does not carry both risk and control, responsibility declines and frequently disaster follows.

"The fact that in our present health system control and risk are not firmly linked poses great dangers to us. . . . we must have effective governance.

". . . the fear of ascending liability has led the General Conference to take a significant role in the governance of the health system.

"The size and composition of the various AHS division boards makes this extremely complex situation even more difficult. With few exceptions, these boards have 35-50 members. The dynamics of a group this size more closely parallel those of a congregation than those of a board! Growth beyond optimum size reduces the members' participation, and more important, their sense of individual responsibility.

". . . many of the directors have not been placed on these governing boards because of their knowledge or because they have medical or financial skills. Rather they have been placed there to represent various church constituencies. Such directors may face conflicts of interest that require them to choose between protecting the interests of their constituencies and those of the corporation. . . . Many of the governing boards of the church's other organizations and institutions give evidence of the same problems."

## Motivation

"If we are truly mission-driven rather than tradition-driven, we will resist the pressures of the special-interest groups and make the structural and policy changes necessary to rectify these situations."

## Candor

"I believe that we build credibility when we are candid about problems the church faces.

"No one should necessarily equate questioning the status quo with rebelling against the church, its institutions, or its leadership."

**Credit:** All quotations for this box are taken from Robert S. Folkenberg, "Church structure -- servant or master?" *Ministry*, June 1989, pp. 4-9.

## The Good, the Not So Good. . .

*Continued from page 12*

type of rationalization that imprisoned your ancestral parents and continues to imprison many behind the bars of bigoted minds.

After reminding the delegates of how "there was plenty of alleged 'Bible' that was quoted" in support of segregation, and of the mentality that allows Lyn Behrens to serve as president of Loma Linda University but that says "she is not qualified to pastor the smallest of my churches," Gifford reached his peroration:

As for me and my house, we wish to no longer halt between responses to the issue. God or Baal, equality and inequality. It is time that we bring God's community into acknowledging mankind's wrong and our lateness in righting the wrong, and then get on with proclaiming the "unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of Man."

### A.C. McClure voted NAD president

At a time when the changing of the guard at the General Conference presidency provides hope for the possibility of denominational glasnost, and, there is reason to hope, some perestroika too, the North America Division nominating committee elected Southern Union president Al McClure to succeed Charles Bradford as North American Division president.

McClure, with his history of theological obscurantism, contrasts sharply with Bradford. Bradford read widely outside of Seventh-day Adventist literature, and despite his "awesome power" gaffe, was an intelligent man with kindly instincts and an articulate wit who strongly supported women's ordination.

McClure for the past two quinquennia has ruled the Southern Union – a doctrinally inbred and religiously red-neck territory where theological hemophiliacs abound. (It has been nearly sixty years since a Southern Union president has been elected from outside the territory, and the replacement of McClure with Florida Conference president Malcolm Gordon continued the tradition.)

In an early *Adventist Currents* interview (Volume 1, Number 4), *SDA Press Release* editor John Adam described McClure's refusal to deal with the Davenport offenders in his union and his consistent secretiveness about financial dealings in the Adventist Health System – Sunbelt.

McClure not only looked the other way during the witch hunts of pastors following Glacier View; but Ken Coonley,

the pastor who presided over the late Saturday night business meeting/ "lynching" of his predecessor, Phil Wilson, at the Orlando Central Church (see *Adventist Currents* 1:5) was made to pay for his sins by being banished to the position of Carolina Conference Secretary.

McClure distinguished himself as chairman of the board of Southern College by bringing former Biblical Research Institute director Gordon Hyde out of retirement to chair and to purge the "Fordites" from the religion department of that school. In 1981 McClure approached then Southern College president Frank Knittel and told him he had to get rid of eight teachers, five from the religion department. Knittel refused. Later McClure approached him again and demanded that he fire black religion teacher Lorenzo Grant "and a white faculty member of your choice."

Knittel was outraged by McClure's demands and told the Union president exactly what he believed him to be. McClure then told Knittel he was fired. Knittel responded that the college board would have to do that, and so McClure tried to call a special session of the board to get rid of the school's president. Board members talked him out it after he had called about half of the trustees. Later, according to Knittel, McClure denied ever trying to call a board meeting to fire Knittel.

Eventually Hyde managed to get rid of three of the religion faculty and force one into the languages department. McClure was able to pressure Knittel from his college presidency in 1983.

McClure also approved the establishment (using money from the McKee family, owners of Little Debbie's) of an endowed religion department chair that could be occupied only by a person who would sign a very specific delineation of Adventist beliefs. The \$500,000 endowment included the budget for a theologically reactionary publication put out by the Southern College religion department entitled *Adventist Perspective*.

McClure was voted at Indianapolis to the North American Division presidency by the Division's 26-member nominating committee, by a vote of 14 to 10 over Pacific Union president, Tom Mostert, with two abstaining. And here is where the perplexing comes in.

### The perplexing

#### North American Division caucus

It was early on the first Sunday of the Session that the North American Division delegates caucused in a meeting chaired by Joan Tonge of Modesto, California. Charles Bradford tried to scuttle the meeting. The day before, he

*Continued on page 16*

**It is safe to say that eight or nine of McClure's fourteen votes came from regional conference presidents.**

# An Agenda for President Folkenberg

In the effort to be constructive as well as critical, *Currents* provides the following suggestions for changes that would increase the number of advantages to being a Seventh-day Adventist church member and employee. In his June, 1989 *Ministry* article, the new General Conference president has suggested the importance of two or three of the following recommendations.

1. General Conference president should not serve on the editorial board of the *Adventist Review*.
  - a. *Review* should be accorded legal independence from the General Conference.
  - b. Core, nonregional articles should appear in all language versions of the *Review*.
2. Totally revamp and elaborate grievance procedures for workers and members versus each other and any church entity. Reconciliation panels must be **totally** disinterested.
3. Rational guidelines for board makeup/size for all denominational entities.
  - a. Limits on number of boards on which church administrators may serve.
  - b. Limit the boards on which church administrators may serve to avoid conflicting interest.
  - c. Specify a proportion (50 percent or more) of each board's directors that must be lay members.
4. Dispense with trademark lawsuits, or sue all infringers (such as the Reformed Seventh-day Adventist church).
5. Establish guidelines for ministerial counseling sessions.
6. Establish uniform methods for assessing moral accusation against pastors.
7. Make independently audited financial statements of all SDA entities available to each entity's constituents.
8. Create a plan, and make it public, to responsibly fund SDA worker retirement funds; and make those funds off-limits to any other purposes.
9. Greatly reduce or disband union conferences.
10. Limit the role and functions of the General Conference to those of a coordinating broker or clearinghouse for human, financial, and information resources, rather than a governing body.
11. Establish uniformity of wage scale. Denominational wages in all areas of work would be a published percentage of the national average for similar positions, with provisions for regional cost-of-living variations.
12. Place the "right arm of the message" at arm's length. Health-care institutions might be managed by Adventists, but the resources of each entity so managed would benefit primarily the institution's community and would serve the purpose for which the institution was established.
13. Decide openly whether the 27 Fundamental Beliefs are a creed, or whether --
  - a. the baptismal vow is a creed, or whether
  - b. some SDA variation of the Nicene Creed might not suffice for formal fellowship.
14. Give formal permission for Adventist writers and writer-historians to produce and publish candid Adventist history.
15. Require the White Estate to make available for sale to the public Ellen G. White's unpublished writings in the same CD ROM format that her published writings are now available.
16. Vote and implement as denominational policy the new General Conference president's statement, "We need total openness." (Robert Folkenberg, *Adventist Review* interview excerpt, 8 July 1990, p. 3.)
17. Democratize General Conference quinquennial sessions by having the Nominating Committee send a minimum of two names per position to be voted by delegates in business session.
18. Expedite General Conference quinquennial business sessions by assembling the Nominating Committee a week before each session.
19. Bring meaning to the votes of the delegates in business sessions of the General Conference quinquennium by requiring that standardized vitae accompany each pair of names sent to the floor by the nominating committee, as well as specified-length responses from each nominee to questions on issues germane to each position under consideration. With the Nominating Committee meeting a week in advance, such a process would be quite feasible.
20. Provide the North American Division additional delegates to compensate for its disproportionate contribution to the world church budget.
21. Enhance the whole proceedings by choosing devotional speakers based on their ability to speak, not according to their administrative rank.

## The Good, the Not So Good . . .

*Continued from page 14*

had insisted that it was not legal to hold such a meeting and that he would have no part of it.

The North American Division union presidents had agreed that their delegates should caucus to discuss names they might like to see nominated for their division presidency. Columbia Union president Ron Wisbey invited Ms. Tonge to chair the caucus. Charles Bradford's assistant, Gary Patterson, was to introduce her. Tonge had no idea what a hornets' nest awaited her.

When she met with Patterson early Sunday morning to review procedure, she met a frightened man who would have liked to cancel the meeting. Shortly after the caucus began, South Central (regional) Conference president of twenty-eight years, C.E. Dudley, said that the meeting should not be taking place. Paul Monk, president of the Central States (regional) Conference began shouting questions at Tonge from the back of the room. Who had authorized her to chair the meeting, he asked. The union presidents, she answered. And who had authorized them to authorize her to chair the meeting, he demanded. Monk continued with such a harangue that Tonge threatened to have him removed from the room. Monk then said he would leave. Tonge responded that she did not want him to leave but wanted order.

The blacks had come to believe that Mostert had initiated the Sunday morning caucus, a caucus the regional conference presidents feared would become an ad hoc nominating committee likely to nominate Mostert. Their fear of this possibility is explained partly by the fact that the North American Division nominating committee of twenty-six members contained eight or nine blacks – approximately one third; while the North American Division delegation to the session was not nearly so substantially black.

Eventually it became clear – at least to some – that before the session, another union president had been spreading the word that Mostert was a liberal and telling regional conference presidents that he was their enemy because there were no regional conferences in the Pacific Union. From what *Currents* has been able to learn, it is probably unfair to infer anything about Mostert's attitude toward black Adventists in leadership positions from the absence of regional conferences in the Pacific Union.

The caucus did not become a nominating committee, and when the North American Division nominating committee of twenty-six members did meet, the black members went in openly stating that Mostert was unacceptable as a candidate


and that they would be voting as a bloc against him.

When General Conference general vice president Calvin Rock refused the nomination to be North American Division president, the outcome turned on a run-off ballot between Mostert and Southern Union president Al McClure. McClure won by the vote of 14 to 10, with two abstentions. It is safe to say that eight or nine of McClure's fourteen votes came from regional conference presidents – which makes it an open question how broad McClure's base of support will be.

### Down the road

The future is murkier even than it needs to be. Because of the way quinquennial elections of General Conference presidents are conducted, very little was known by most members of the Nominating Committee (or by the delegation-at-large) about the man they nominated and voted to lead the world church for the next five years.

No search committee met in advance of the session to place his name on a list of potential candidates. No curriculum vitae describing his work and educational experience was passed around. No letters of recommendation or even oral testimony was required from a cross section of those who had worked closely with him over the years. The Nominating Committee did not ask him even one question about his views on Adventist doctrine, organization, or polity.

In fact, there are many Adventists who believe this almost planned ignorance about the candidates is a way of making room for the Holy Spirit to act. But however he got there, *Currents* hopes that Robert Folkenberg is a large-hearted man who sees the church more as a hospital than an exclusive club, who is more concerned with doing justly and loving mercy than with preserving and protecting the 27 Fundamental Beliefs. 

**The Nominating Committee did not ask even one question about his views on Adventist doctrine, organization, or polity.**

### Clippings

*Continued from page 1*

tributed more than \$17 million to KMC since its founding in 1959, requested that the court allow her to joint the suit as a plaintiff. The class action portion of the suit endeavors to establish that KMC's benefactors have contributed to KMC, not to the SDA church.

Worried that it may prove ascendingly liable for AHS debts, the General Conference recently has taken steps to distance the church from the hospital system. However, to prevail in this suit, the Columbia Union will have to prove that it is indeed the owner of KMC. But to win that battle may be tantamount to losing the ascending liability war.