10-1986

Update - October 1986

Loma Linda University Center for Christian Bioethics

LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY
ETHICS CENTER
Volume 2, Number 4 (October, 1986)

Update

CENTER PRESENTS FAITH AND PEACE CONFERENCE

A comparison of three Christian perspectives on nuclear arms will be the focus of the Christian Faith and Nuclear Peace Conference to be held at Loma Linda University during the first two weeks of November. The conference will be comprised of eight sessions culminating in a day-long discussion of Christian pacificism, the just war theory, and Christian political conservativism on Friday and Saturday, November 14 and 15. "The threat of nuclear arms to God's creation is unprecedented," comments Jim Walters, an LLU professor of Christian ethics and conference co-ordinator. "I am gratified that several organizations are together sponsoring a serious discussion of this issue."

To provide an enlightened context for discussion of the religious options, two prior Friday evening sessions are planned: the first dealing with scientific and moral aspects of the Strategic Defense Initiative and the second with a discussion of the political moralities of the superpowers. Dr. Marvin Goldberger, President of the California Institute of Technology, will discuss "Star Wars: Is It Possible, Is It Right?" on October 31. Professor Nathaniel Davis, Professor of Humanities, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, and a former U. S. ambassador, will lecture on "The Contrasting Moralities of the Superpowers," November 7. Both presentations will be followed by formal respondents and panel discussions.

Further discussion of the nuclear arms issue will be held in two other forums. "Boris Edvardovich Illovka," as personified by James Hill, history lecturer, will speak on "A Soviet View of the Arms Race" at the LLU student assembly on November 5.

Also, the Ethics Center's monthly Medicine and Society Conference session on November 12 will be devoted to a discussion of "Nuclear Peace and Medical Responsibility."

The conference will culminate on the weekend of November 15, with the University Church worship service focusing on the theme of Christian peace. In addition to Pastor Louis Venden's sermon on Adventism and peacekeeping, three other Christian thinkers will develop distinctive viewpoints.

continued on page 8

SENATOR GORE ADDRESSES TRANSPLANT ETHICS AT LLU
November 17

Senator Albert Gore, Jr., a Democrat from Tennessee who is recognized as one of the nation's most effective legislators, will speak at the Loma Linda University Church on Monday evening, November 17, at 7:30 p.m. His speech will address the moral and governmental challenges evoked by recent developments in organ transplantation, a topic about which LLU's School of Medicine and Ethics Center are sponsoring a working conference for surgeons, ethicists, lawyers, and media experts. The public, as well as LLU's students and faculty, are invited to attend Senator Gore's address. Admission is free.

Senator Gore was reared in Carthage, Tennessee and Washington, D.C. He graduated from Harvard University in 1969 and spent an additional year at Vanderbilt Divinity School and another year at Vanderbilt Law School. He enlisted in the U.S. Army and went to Vietnam, worked as an investigative reporter and as a businessman, and served in the House of Representatives from 1976-1984. He is in his first term at the Senate.

Senator Gore's energies in Congress have focused upon legislation that influences the health and healing of American citizens. He has been especially active regarding genetic engineering, organ transplantation, medical fraud, computer technology, robotics, and cigarette advertising. He has also worked toward the formulation of a mutual and verifiable arms control agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

AAW Features "Women of Courage" November 28-30

The Association of Adventist Women will conduct a national conference on "Women of Courage" at Loma Linda University November 28-30. Adventists from all parts of North America will convene to honor women of exemplary fortitude and resourcefulness. They will also explore ways and means of increasing opportunities for women and men to serve on an equal basis within the Seventh-day Adventist Church. All interested persons are invited.

Mary Elizabeth Moore, a professor at the School of Theology at Claremont, will lecture on "Woman — Story in History, Bible, and Church" on Friday, November 28. That day's activities will also include a report by Helen Thompson, Vice President for Academic Affairs at LLU, regarding the United Nations conference on women in society that was held in Nairobi. Several workshops will be conducted that will explore methods by which women and men can fulfill their professional and domestic opportunities. Audray Johnson, an Adventist

A Critique

IS GOD "DEAD" IN BIOMEDICAL ETHICS?

Theology and Bioethics: Exploring the Foundations and Frontiers. *Earl E. Shelp, editor (Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Co., 1985. xxxiv+ 315 pages, $39.50).*

Do a theologian's convictions regarding God's reality and character make a difference when he or she addresses bioethical issues? Should they? If so, why? If not, why not? The almost twenty renowned scholars whose essays appear in this excellent anthology probe these questions with insight and originality.

Although they are all stimulating, I think the chapters by Georgetown University's LeRoy Walters and Duke University's Stanley Hauerwas establish the discussion's context and contours. Walters demonstrates that theologians have contributed to biomedical ethics in every generation. Roman Catholic moralists wrote the primary texts for decades. A new era began in 1954 when Joseph Fletcher, then a young Anglican theologian, published his challenges to Catholic views in *Morals and Medicine*. And in the so-called "renaissance" of medical ethics that flowered between 1965 and 1975, Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians published a host of significant articles and books, as did their Jewish and secular colleagues.

But Hauerwas claims that many theologians rarely indicate how their theological convictions relate to the form and substance of their bioethical arguments. Sometimes this happens because the theologian does not want to alienate a secular audience. Sometimes it occurs because the theologian has lost certainty or clarity about the convictions regarding God that initially prompted him or her to become a theologian. In any case, though appreciative of their work in other respects, Hauerwas faults theologians for functioning as though God is now "dead" in biomedical ethics.

Hauerwas has a point, a sobering one! If theologians do not relate their understandings of God to contemporary bioethical challenges, who will?

"Hauerwas has a point, a sobering one! If theologians do not relate their understandings of God to contemporary bioethical challenges, who will?"

And yet, it is also true that theology's success in infusing so many of its themes into secular discourse heightens the difficulty. Hauerwas rightly indicates that some theological disputes in medical ethics actually reflect competing philosophies. But sometimes these competing philosophies are secular expressions of more ancient competing theologies. Should we leap-frog backwards through the entire history of Western thought in a futile attempt to land on intellectual terrain the theologian can truly "own"? No! Hauerwas "simply" asks himself and other theologians to be candid about their own understandings of God, their own bioethical conclusions, and the conceptual bridges or chasms between them.

This volume includes at least two essays that attempt to meet Hauerwas' expectations. The chapter by Margaret Farley, a professor at Yale Divinity School, describes the distinctive concerns of feminist theology and relates them to various reproductive technologies including *in vitro* fertilization. Farley contends that portraits of God as an authoritarian sovereign who relishes human submission provide the paradigms that justify many forms of oppression, including man's subjection of woman. She describes, albeit briefly, a relational understanding of God that fosters egalitarian relationships among all humans, women and men, wherein reproductive technologies such as *in vitro* fertilization may or may not merit moral approval depending upon whether they enhance equality and mutuality in any particular context.

The chapter by Charles Hartshorne, who taught for many years at the University of Chicago and then at the University of Texas at Austin, defends the morality of abortion from the perspective of process theology. Hartshorne outlines his understanding of God's attributes and insists that the difference between potentiality and actuality is genuine in God's own experience even as it should be in human deliberation. The human fetus, he contends, does not deserve the protection we provide actual persons because its personhood is merely potential.

Although I am enthusiastic about several features of process theology, and although I support the 1973 Supreme Court ruling on abortion laws in *Roe vs. Wade*, I believe that healthy human fetuses deserve a presumption of protection such that we do not destroy them for trivial reasons (e.g., gender selection or mild parental inconvenience), though we legally could. Precisely because it is a potential person, I think it more serious to terminate a human conceptus than to swat a mosquito that can never become a person, a judgment Hartshorne virtually denies. And I think my attitude toward abortion is more coherent with Hartshorne's view of God than is his!

Some who notice that people with similar views of God sometimes disagree regarding issues as basic as abortion may prefer agnosticism. Others will see such outcomes as exciting opportunities for continuing thought and conversation. This book is a must for all those in the second camp.

David R. Larson

Update

Volume 2, Number 4
October, 1986

EDITORS
David R. Larson
James W. Walters

CONSULTANTS
Katherine Ching
Richard Utt

DESIGN AND LAYOUT
Judy D. Larson

TYPESETTING
Mary Khalaf

ETHICS CENTER STAFF
David R. Larson
Director
Charles Teel, Jr.
James W. Walters
Gwen Utt
Office Manager

BOARD OF COUNCILORS
Jack W. Provonsha
Chairman
Niels-Erik Andreasen
Dalton Baldwin
Bruce Branson
Brian Bull
Michael Jackson
Miroslav Kis
David R. Larson
Jack W. Provonsha
George Reid
Charles Teel Jr.
Carolyn Thompson
Kenneth Vine
James W. Walters
Norman J. Woods
Danielle Wuchenich

WHY DOES GOD LET US SUFFER?

On May 9, David Larson moderated a discussion regarding God and suffering at LLU's Randall Visitors Center. The featured speaker was Richard Rice, Professor of Theology at Loma Linda and author of When Bad Things Happen to God's People *(Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1984). The responders were Steven T. Davis, Professor of Philosophy at Claremont McKenna College, and Irvin Kuhn, Professor of Medical Oncology at LLU. The panelists from Loma Linda included Marion Poos (Public Health), Paul Heubach (Applied Theology), Jack Provonsha (Philosophy of Religion and Ethics), and Dalton Baldwin (Theology). The following excerpts are representative of the entire conversation. Video and audio cassettes of the 90-minute program are available for $25 and $5 respectively from Media Services, LLU Libraries, Loma Linda CA 92350.*

THE MYSTERY OF SUFFERING

Richard Rice

"There is only one question which really matters," writes Harold Kushner in *Why Do Bad Things Happen to Good People?* "All other theological conversation is intellectually diverting."

Kushner has put his finger on the source of greatest perplexity to anyone who believes in God, and the greatest obstacle to religious faith. If God is who he is supposed to be, how can so much go wrong? Why does God let us suffer?

"No matter how devastating our circumstances or how deep our anguish, God can still bring about something good."

Richard Rice

A Christian approach to the problem of suffering must pursue three objectives: (1) it must affirm the perfect goodness and perfect power of God. A God who is less than perfect in goodness is not worthy of worship, and a God less than perfect in power leaves us without hope. (2) Our response must acknowledge the reality of evil. It is counterintuitive to deny that evil exists, and the view that all suffering is either needed or deserved removes the negative character of evil. For if every instance of evil can be accounted for in terms of past misdeeds or of benefits that eventually come to us, then everything balances out nicely and evil is not negative after all. This contradicts the Christian belief that evil is fundamentally opposed to God's will. Evil represents an intrusion into God's creation. It is the ultimate absurdity. (3) An adequate response must also provide a basis for meeting it courageously on the level of practical experience.

The "freewill defense" attributes the entrance of evil into the universe to the misuse of creaturely freedom. God created beings in the world who could serve him out of choice, not because they had been programmed to do so. Beings capable of voluntary loyalty could also use their freedom to reject God's authority.

If we ask why God didn't create morally free beings who would always use their freedom to do good, the answer is he couldn't. He couldn't give creatures freedom and guarantee what they would do with it. An action cannot be free and determined at the same time.

If we ask why God created a world in which suffering was even possible, the answer is, Because the highest values we know of, such as love, loyalty, and compassion, presuppose personal freedom. God cannot create a world where personal values are possible without giving its inhabitants the freedom which such values presuppose.

All this means there was a risk in creating beings morally free. There was the genuine possibility that they would fall, and this is where evil began. God's creatures, then, are responsible for evil and its consequences, while God is blameless. Because it began in an act of personal freedom, there is no explanation for evil. Indeed, evil makes no sense at all.

"Evil is permanent not in the sense that it cannot be mitigated, and not in the sense that it will not ultimately be eliminated, but in the sense that it will never be either good or inconsequential that evil occurred."

Richard Rice

The absurdity of evil on the cosmic level has its counterpart on the personal level. In most cases there is no answer to the question, Why did this misfortune happen? The sad fact is that we live in a world where things have gone wrong. Bad things happen, and they often happen to good people. Ordinarily there is no rational explanation for suffering, and it only makes matters worse to try to find one.

The second element in our response to suffering concerns the condition of the world here and now. Evil and suffering give the present world a tragic character. There is a profound discrepancy between what is and what was

meant to be. But God has not abandoned the world to its sorry fate. Though his creatures have rejected him, God still loves and cares for them. Indeed, he takes their sufferings upon himself.

The third element in an adequate response to suffering looks to the disposition of evil. Evil and suffering are incompatible with the sovereignty of God; they cannot go on indefinitely. The Christian hope anticipates no suffering in the future.

The most striking aspect of divine providence is the way God uses evil and suffering to bring about something good. "In everything God works for good" (Romans 8:28). No matter how devastating our circumstances or how deep our anguish, God can still bring about something good.

This threefold response to the problem of suffering satisfies the objectives we mentioned. It acknowledges the reality and negativity of evil; it affirms both the goodness and power of God; and it provides a basis for meeting personal suffering with courage and hope.

Why does God let us suffer? There is no final answer that neatly ties everything together and permits us to forget about it. Suffering is less a problem than a mystery. When reason has done all it can, the question of suffering remains. Responding to it will always be a matter of faith.

WILL SUFFERING EVER REALLY END?

Steven T. Davis

I am in substantial agreement with the five major themes of Rice's book. First, God is not the direct cause of our suffering; as Rice says, suffering is a consequence not of God's will but of sin. Second, God is with us when we suffer and suffers with us. Third, God is capable of bringing good out of even terribly evil situations; we must trust in God when we suffer. Fourth, the attitude of Christians ought to be one of perpetual thanksgiving even when we suffer; when we look beyond suffering rather than back toward its cause we can grow as persons and come closer to God. And fifth, Christians ought to forgive those who cause them to suffer.

With so much agreement between Rice and me, it will not surprise you to learn that except for one major point my criticisms of *When Bad Things Happen to God's People* are relatively minor.

The point I aim to discuss — Rice's denial that God has complete knowledge of future events — is only hinted at in his latest book. It is developed fully in the author's previous book *The Openness of God*. I wish to consider this item because it may have an impact on the problem of evil. I am not sure Rice can consistently hold everything he wants to hold in the second book if what he says in the first book is true.

Rice's position is not that God is totally ignorant of the future. He holds that God knows what God is going to do, as well as what will occur as a causal result of what is occurring now. But what God does not know, according to Rice, is the future result of human free choices. These decisions are undetermined or indefinite till they occur, and so there is literally nothing yet for God to know. My own view is quite different from this. I hold that God has complete and exhaustive knowledge of the future. I also hold that at least some human decisions are free, and I have argued in print that divine foreknowledge and human freedom are compatible. Rice is correct that on some views of God they are not compatible, but I do not embrace the static concept of divine perfection, the notion of absolute immutability, or the claim that God is timeless. I think the distinction among past, present, and future is a genuine distinction, real for God as well as for us. When these mistaken views are denied, I claim, you can consistently hold to divine foreknowledge of a genuinely open future because it makes sense to say that what God now knows about our future decisions is logically contingent upon what we will then freely decide to do.

"Rice owes us an explanation: How can he be so sure of what he tells us in his later book, given what he claims in his earlier book?"

Steven Davis

I see two dangers in Rice's position, both of which might have an impact on the problem of evil. The first is the possibility that future free decisions of human beings (which, Rice says, are at present unknown to God) might interfere with God's future plans.

The second danger can be raised by asking the question whether God has free will. One presumes Rice wants to say yes — he stresses that we are made in the image of God and that our facility for free choice is one of the crucial aspects of that image. But he also thinks that foreknowledge rules out freedom.

Rice insists in both books that God can handle any eventualities, and that the coming of the kingdom of God is certain. As a Christian, I fully agree. But I think the upshot of Rice's position is that virtually nothing can be foreknown about the future. Almost nothing will be foreknowable through a knowledge of its causes because free human beings might interfere with the natural operation of those causes. And not even God can foreknow what God is going to do in the future (assuming God has freedom of choice). Of course, as noted, God can formulate intentions about what to do in the future, and (given that God is omnipotent) God has good reason to believe those intentions will be realized. But it is still the case that no one, not even God, now knows that the problem of evil will be solved because of what will occur in the eschaton, because no one, not even God, now knows what will occur in the eschaton. Rice owes us an explanation: How can he be so sure of what he tells us in his later book, given what he claims in his earlier book?

Despite the critical points I have made let me note my profound sense of appreciation for *When Bad Things Happen to God's People*. The combination of theological acumen and spiritual wisdom that we find in Rice is rare indeed. I hope his book will be widely read.

RELIGION AND SUFFERING AMONG MY PATIENTS

Irvin Kuhn

Is it fair that a 30-year-old father with a young family should be dying of lung cancer? He has only a 20-pack-year smoking history, but in the room across the hall is a 90-year-old with a 150-pack-year history of smoking and no family, who has only a bit of emphysema. These are actual clinical cases.

Professor Rice describes his conversations with three physicians, two Adventist and one atheist. Rice was told that "Christians often found it more difficult to face the consequences of a serious illness than patients with no religious commitment. The non-Christians were better able to accept their condition and willing to make the best of what time they had left." The atheist physician understood the differences clearly, but the Adventist physicians and Professor Rice, he admits, found that troubling.

I would like to add my observations based on 20 years of practice as a cancer-treating doctor, most of the time dealing with incurable disease and working with nurses, medical students, resident physicians and chaplains, most at least Christian, but a few without commitment to any organized religion — all these assigned by schedule or by choice to Unit 9200, the Medical Oncology Ward of the Medical Center. I have been impressed that nurses, students and residents who take their religion more seriously seem to have more difficulty with the younger dying patient than other health-care workers who take their religion less seriously. Does this latter class have less empathy? Not that I've noticed. Further, I'm aware that several Adventist chaplains have in the past requested a transfer of duty station from 9200 to another Unit because I presume they had not yet worked through adequate explanations for why bad things happen to God's people. So even those of us whose business it is to make "bad things" bearable have difficulty addressing the question this book addresses.

Let me hasten to add that it was an Adventist physician in his early 60s who, while dying of colon cancer, went into and stayed in "the valley of the shadow of death" in a manner that I have determined is for me whenever my time comes. His trust in God was remarkable and the resultant equanimity was beautiful.

"I have been impressed that nurses, students and residents who take their religion more seriously seem to have more difficulty with the younger dying patient than other health-care workers who take their religion less seriously."

Irvin Kuhn

If my salvation is because I trust that God is fair even though I don't yet know all the details — a lá Job, fine! However, if I take the traditional view that salvation depends on whether my slate is clean or because I've asked it to be cleaned item by item, I may, under the pressure of suffering, become unsure that some smudges, some blotches might not have been forgiven. Undeserved pain or uncontrollable deprivation can spawn guilt and self-incrimination.

I think some Christians suffer hard and die hard because they are not confident they can face the judgment without knowing for sure that their slate is clean. The non-believer who tried to do right because it was the right thing to do and has no further expectations, who has observed the imperfections in the system of things, often suffers and dies having no guilt. I've seen that. The Christian — particularly the one with the long list of do's and don't's — runs the highest risk of no firm explanation of "why bad things happen to God's people."

GOD AND SUFFERING: A DISCUSSION

David Larson: Paul Heubach is the one here at Loma Linda who began the course entitled, "God and Human Suffering." He has come to know in a more personal way what it means to be a sufferer as well as a thinker about suffering since his "encounter" with an automobile at the La Sierra Campus of our University.

Dr. Heubach, have you noticed that some religious people have even more difficulty coping with suffering than some nonreligious people? If so, why?

Paul Heubach: The religious person who thinks of God in terms of judgment, as described by Dr. Kuhn, obviously will have trouble. A person who has learned to know God as he is revealed in Jesus Christ and who sees him in the light of the issues in the great controversy and the principles involved in dealing with free moral agents — that Christian can face trials better than anyone else.

My faith now does not rest in the answer to all questions. My faith rests in a Person who has given me enough evidence that he cares and that he is trustworthy so that I can still trust him even though I'm going to ask him a lot of questions some day.

David Larson: Jack, as a physician who is also a philosopher, you are the one person who wears both hats this evening. What's going through your mind?

Jack Provonsha: I was a little surprised that Rick didn't make use of a more traditional Adventist answer to this question. At Harvard I once heard Krister Stendahl, dean of the Divinity School, observe that you could never solve the problem of evil without introducing a personal devil some place in it. He said, "Now, I want you to understand I have as much difficulty defining the devil as I do defining God."

It's a complicated notion, but the role of the demonic is one kind of solution that could be added to the fine work Rick has done. This would be a more traditional solution,

in which we recognize we are dealing with a cosmic problem with warring or contrasting orderings of reality. If God does not allow the full truth about those two warring factors to become revealed, he doesn't eternally solve the problem. So he has to let the full consequences of the demonic also express itself, and those demonic consequences involve nature as well as the moral issue.

"At Harvard I once heard Krister Stendahl observe that you could never solve the problem of evil without introducing a personal devil."

Jack Provonsha

The "great controversy" is an expression of two orderings of reality that are in conflict. The resolution of that conflict has to do with the final disclosure of the nature of each. So we are experiencing the consequences, even the domino effect of consequences, far away and down the road from the time when choices were made. But it seems to me the demonic has to be somewhere in this if we're going to understand the conflict we're facing.

David Larson: Marion, you have not been well for some time. What can you tell this group of friendly strangers about the nature of your illnesses?

Marion Poos: When I was five months old I had cancer for the first time and that recurred five times. Then I was okay until I was twenty-four. My mother had taken a drug called DES which was prescribed to women to prevent miscarriages. The drug sometimes causes cancer in the daughter's reproductive organs; so I went through a hysterectomy about 4 years ago and then 2 years ago I was diagnosed with systemic lupus erythematosis, an autoimmune disease that I've been dealing with heavily over the past couple of years. I've been in the hospital 17 times in the last 15 months.

David Larson: As you listen to what's going on here tonight, what thoughts do you have?

Marion Poos: A lot of personal thoughts about the way I viewed God earlier in my life. I had always, until a few years ago, thought that illness came as a punishment. I

"I felt like the illness was something due me because of something I had done in the past or something that happened to me in the past even if I had no control over it."

Marion Poos

felt like the illness was something due me because of something I had done in the past or something that happened to me in the past even if I had no control over it. It's been a revelation to me that God did not cause my suffering and that he suffers with me and that if I'm sad about it, he's even sadder. If I'm crying over it, he's crying with me. That has helped a lot.

David Larson: What was the most helpful kind of material or experience in revising your view of God?

Marion Poos: Learning to ask questions of the right people. Also there are books that have helped me — people's stories. For my doctoral dissertation I decided that one of the most helpful things would be to read the biographies of people who'd gone through different types of suffering and how they dealt with them. I read between 40 and 50 books like that, and they've helped me quite a bit.

David Larson: Dalton, would you like to say anything about the thinking of process theologians about suffering?

Dalton Baldwin: It is true that most process theologians are inclined to diminish God's omnipotence in order to solve the problem. I do not think it is necessarily so that a person who takes a process perspective must give up omnipotence. One of the very attractive things about process theology is that it recognizes that "becoming" is real. It seems to me that change or "becoming" is essential for the expression of voluntary love, fellowship, friendship, *koinonia*. In the dominant Christian theology for hundreds of years, the "really real" cannot change. In contrast to that, one of the main points of process theology is that growing, "becoming" is "real." It's part of God's program. So I think the process theology approach which says that "becoming is real and good" is very helpful.

David Larson: Rick, this question concerns the distinction between moral evil and natural evil: the holocaust being a moral evil brought about by humans and the Lisbon earthquake a natural evil. In what sense is the "free-will" defense of God effective when we're speaking not merely of moral evil, but also of natural evil?

Richard Rice: That question invites more comment than I gave it in the book. I think a traditional Christian response would assimilate ultimately natural evil to moral evil. It's quite obvious that some of the suffering we experience is caused by other human beings — that would be moral evil. Other suffering, such as disease and accidents, is caused by just the way things are. Ultimately, traditional Christianity attributes even natural evil to sin, to moral agency in the universe. My guess is that the way to establish such a connection is what Steven Davis calls "the luciferous defense." The idea is that the natural evils of this world are brought about by the workings of supernatural moral agents of whom Satan or Lucifer is the chief one. Most writers on this topic agree that the values available in a world where freedom exists outweigh the values of a world without creaturely freedom. At the same time most philosophers take the position that evil is virtually inevitable in a world where there is genuine freedom. Sooner or later some moral agent is bound to experiment with rebellion against God. But I think this is an example of arguing from *what is* to *what must have been*. The fact that evil exists does not mean that its existence was a certainty. What I'm proposing is, first, that the risk of evil was conceivably relatively small; second, that the values of freedom are enormous, which makes taking the risk worthwhile; and third, that the consequences of evil are permanent. Evil is permanent not in the sense that it cannot be mitigated, and not in the sense that it will not ultimately be eliminated, but in the sense that it will never be either good or inconsequential that evil occurred.

CONTRIBUTORS

$50,000+

Ronald and Anita Cafferky
Ralph and Carolyn Thompson, Jr.

$20,000+

Bruce and Elizabeth Branson
Brian and Maureen Bull
General Conference of SDAs
Loma Linda University Medical Center
Tom and Vi Zapara

$10,000+

Merle Collins
The Wuchenich Foundation

$5,000+

AHS/Sunbelt Health Care Corp.
Floyd and Mary Brauer
Gerrit and Mae Brouwer
Michael and Marlena Ehlers
Elton and Marga Kerr
J. David and Jeanne Killeen
Loma Linda GYN/OB Medical Group
Loma Linda Neurosurgery Group
Loma Linda Surgery Group
Robert Norwood Smith
Danielle E. Wuchenich

$2,500+

Anesthesiology/FMO Group
Daniel Leslie Engeberg
Glendale Adventist Hospital
Richard and Kathleen Guth
David and Judy Larson
Daniel and Carol Lewis
Kenneth and Irene McGill
Jack and Margaret Provonsha
John Stanton Webster

$1,000+

Delmar and Cherie Aitken
Donald and Sharon Ammon
Geneva Beatty
Ken and Diana Bauer
Frank T. Buchanan
Duane L. Camp
George and Nannette Chonkich
Raymond and Elizabeth Crawford
Dale E. Creech, Jr.
George A. Deloney
Elwin and Beth Dunn
Frank and Norma Dupper
Walter and Lois Fahlsing
Gary and Annette Frykman
John and Sylvia Griffin
Ronald and Judy Guth
Bonnie Rae Hadley
Richard Katsumi Hamamura
Franklyn and Frances Hankins
David Lee Holland
Michael and Melanie Jackson
Carl Jansen
Christopher and Melanie Jobe
Frank W. Jobe
Gerald W. King
Robert and Louise Knighton
Brian and Mary Pat Koos
Edwin and Beverly Krick
Irvin and Doreen Kuhn
Caleb and Doreen Liem
Roland and Priscilla Lonser
M. C. Theodore and Linda Mackett
Julie Mann
Temple G. Matthews, III
Robert and Gladys Mitchell
Robert and Jacqueline Moncrieff
George B. Nelson
Donald and Lynn Nicolay
Glen and Glenna Owens
George and Beatrice Petti
Karen Radke
Alfredo and Marta Rasi
Robert and Judy Rausch
Clifton Reeves
Philip H. Reiswig
E. Arthur and Nilde Robertson
Jim and Susan Sands
Gene and Miriam Schroeder
Louise Schumacher
Neils Michael Scofield
Richard and Judy Sheldon
Donald and Susan Sickler
James and Nancy Simpson
Louis L. Smith
Timothy and Wainett Smith
Ernest and May Stanton
Walter Leslie Stilson
John and Lyle Marie Stockdale
Kennard O. Stoll
Marcia and Kenneth Stone
David and Frances Stout
Charles and Marta Teel
James and Charlene Thomas
Ralph Thompson, Sr.
Clifford Eugene Vance
Edwin and Nidia Vyhmeister
James and Priscilla Walters
Leslie G. Werner
Robert L. Willett
William and Jan Willis
Verchele and Esther Wood

$500+

Dalton and Barbara Baldwin
Almon and Dorothy Balkins
Ted and Ruth Benedict
Robert James Berecz
Allan and Rose Nell Brandt
George and Elaine Burton
Norman J. Clark
Harold and Dorothy Cotton
James J. Couperus
Frank Damazo
Russell L. Dounies
H. Walter and Rosemarie Emori
Fekede and Azeb Gemechu
Gary and Sandra Gilbert
Ted M. Glendrange
Donald and Rolene Hanson
Lynn and Margaret Heath
Ernest and Viola Herr
H. C. A. Foundation
Alf Karstein Jacobson
Varner and Dorothy Johns
Mark and Diane Johnson
Charles Norman Kendall
Donald and Phyllis Knepel
Fred and Aura Lee
Robert and Ulrike Marsa
Bernard and Shirley Marsh
Robert Lee and Marguerite Marsh
Charles and Janet McMillan
James and Laurel Munson
Milton and Virginia Murray
James and Adele Nelson
Benjamin and Barbara Ninan
Jere and Patti Sandefur
James and Joann Slater
David G. Small
Leonard Joel Soloniuk
Walter C. Thompson
Harold Utt
Richard and Gwen Utt
Donald and Vivian Wahlen
Jack Pierce Ward
Rodney and Barbara Willard
Kenneth and Carolyn Wilson
William and Reba Winsor, III
Morton M. Woolley

$250+

Bruce and Audrey Anderson
Jerome L. Bray
David and Peggy Bryson
Clarence and Barbara Carnahan
Robert and Merilyn Christenson
Keith and Judy Colburn
Michael and Marilyn Crane
Paul and Dolores Gruzensky
Guy and Iona Hunt
Mrs. S. W. Jones
Roy Jutzy
Raymond and Lo Rita Larsen
Ralph and Jeanne Larson
James W. Malin
Arnold and Flaudia Michals
Craig R. Miller
Robert and Marilyn Nelson
Elmar and Darilee Sakala
Charles and Sharon Stewart
Barry and Desmyrna Taylor
Gerald H. Wade
Harry and Janice Wang
Linda I. Wat
David and Constance Wilbur
Lester and Dolores Wright

$100+

Earl and Gail Selby Aagaard
American Cassette Ministries
Dennis and Joyce Ashley
Mina Marie Ashley
Mihran Mickey and Ladan Ask
James and Corinne Bainer
Linbrook Barker
Robert L. Barker
Thornton and Barbara Beckner
Randy and Sharon Beem
Kevin F. Benfield
Charles and Julia Bensonhaver
Hazel Berglund
Douglas E. Bertleson
Winona Harding Bevins
Daniel and Jeannette Bish
Mardian and Joan Blair
Reiner and Karin Bonnet
Christopher and Connie Boskind
Philip and Mary Boyne
Stanley and Carol Brauer
James L. Bray
Philip G. Broeckel
A. Kendall and Leona Brown
Albert Franklin Brown
Merrilynn L. S. Brown
Stanley and Marjorie Bungard
Glenn and Jacquelyn Bylsma
Ronald and Patti Carroll
Douglas G. Clark
Ramona R. Clark
Tracy and Pearl Comstock
John and Anna Mae Crowder
Joseph S. Cruise
Willaim and Donna Lee Dassenko
Clyde and Janice Davis
Linda Elaine De Ramonett
Frank and Doris Domijan
John Frederick Duge, III
Velma and Harold H. Dupper
Hertha and Darleen Ehlers
Florence L. Elder
Harvey and Eleanor Elder
Rene and Mary Evard
Jack and Elsie Facundus
Fairfax Nursing Center
Harold and Eleanor Fanselau
Keith and Betty Farley
Joel and Sharyn Feree
Galen M. Fillmore
Vernon and Elizabeth Foster
Helmuth and Sue Fritz
Daniel W. Giang
Richard Allen Gingrich
Gary A. Glenesk
Wilbert Gonzalez-Angulo
Beverly June Gregorius
Eric C. Griffey
Willaim and Trish Gruzensky
Willaim and Margaret Hafner
Kenneth and Karen Hallock
Elmer A. Hankins, III
G. Herschel and L. Ouida Harding
Dell and Irene Haughey
Elvin C. Hedrick
Douglas R. Hegstad
Helgi Heidar
Bruce Sigurd Heischober
Marilyn Joyce Herber
John and Jeanie Hodgkin
Theodore Warren Hoehn
William and Cheryl Hopkins
Gary and Suha Huffaker
James and Cathie Jetton, Jr.
D. Robert Johnson
J. Arthur and Lois Johnson
Michael Williams Jones
George I. Kafrouni
Eldyn L. Karr
Donald R. Kellogg
Arthur L. Koehler
Louis Koenig, Jr.
Ronald Eugene Krum
Melvin H. Lake
Harold and Betty Lawson
Sze and Villy Lee
David and Vonnie Lounsberry
James C. Low
Beverly Ludders
Carl and Evangeline Lundstrom
Horst and Galina Maerzke
Vance J. Maloney, Jr.
Brenda and Warren McGuire
Roger McNeily
Art Mendoza and Sharon Longway
Clifford and Jaydine Merkel
Lillian V. Miller
Robert G. Myers
Roland Nakata
Else L. Nelson
Richard and Carol Nelson
Albert and Mable Olson
Barbara J. Orr-Willey
John E. Peterson
Mickey and Eugenia Rabuka
Reuben A. Ramkissoon
Evert Stanley and Florence Ray
Akram and Sinka Razzouk
Douglas and Barbara Rebok
Nile and Mildred Reeves
Robert and Donna Reeves
George and Julia Reid
Richard and Lynnet Reiner
G. Robert and Joyce Rigsby
John Christian Roos
Roger and Kathy Rosenquist
Walter and Ella Rydzewski
Donald Schafer
William A. Scharffenberg
J. Mark Schultz
Dorothy Ann Schumacher
Frederick and DeVona Schumann
Eric and Pamela Shadle
Reggie and Margaret Sherrill
J. Barry and Joan Siebenlist
Bill Simmons
Ernest Simmons
Gordon Daniel Skeoch
Warren and Elouise Smith
Wayne Elmer Smith
Gail and Virginia Stevens
Mildred Stilson
Eric and Cathy Stirling
O. Ward and Julia Swarner
Robert and Harriet Taylor
John Tilstra
Bernard E. Tilton
Peter and Marcia Triolo
Ada L. Turner
Miriam O. Vinnard
Clifford and Peggy Wagner
M. C. Waldron
Chester H. Walters
Donald and Sheri Weber
Gordon and Elle Wheeler
Warren and Jean Wheeler
Margo Willey
William and Cheryl Williamson
George W. Wilson
Joanne H. Wong
John and Alice Wong
Ernest and Dorothy Zane
Harold and Marjorie Ziprick

CONFERENCE *continued from page 1*

John Howard Yoder, a Mennonite and leading pacificist theologian teaching at Notre Dame, will present the case for nuclear pacificism on Friday evening.

Two other religious options will be developed by speakers on Saturday afternoon. Dr. William Spohn, S.J., a professor at the Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley, will argue from the just war tradition. Dr. Paul Seabury will advance a Christian rationale for a position similar to that of the current U.S. government. A round table conference involving the principal speakers will conclude the afternoon discussion.

The conference will end with the film "Testament," to be shown Saturday night in the Randall Visitors Center.

AWW *continued from page 1*

church administrator from Riverside, California, will convene a special "Agape Celebration" Friday evening.

The activities for Saturday, November 29, will begin with interviews of experienced clergywomen at the University Church's Sanctuary Sabbath School. Pam Dietrich, an English and speech teacher at Loma Linda Academy, will present a chancel reading entitled "When God Calls" at the worship services. The afternoon's events will include an awards ceremony that will honor "women of courage who have made a difference" as well as a vespers featuring Rosalie Branigan in "Miriam's Song, Mary's Magnificat, Martha's Story."

In addition to a business session, the schedule for Sunday, November 30, will include a discussion on "Why the Seventh-day Adventist Church Should Ordain Its Women Pastors" by Alberta Mazat, Professor of Marriage and Family Therapy at Loma Linda University. Lindy Chamberlain, an Adventist woman from Australia who was mistakenly imprisoned because of an atmosphere of religious prejudice following the death of her child, will report on her ordeal. All are invited.

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND NUCLEAR PEACE

October 31: Friday

7:30 p.m. "Star Wars: Is It Possible, Is It Right?"
Speaker: *Marvin Goldberger, President, California Institute of Technology.* University Church

November 1: Saturday

3:00 p.m. "Where Is Christian Higher Education Going?"*
Speaker: *Warren Bryan Martin, Senior Fellow, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.* University Church

November 5: Wednesday

8:10 p.m. "A Soviet View of the Arms Race"
Speaker: *Boris Edvardovich Illovka.* University Church

November 7: Friday

7:30 p.m. "The Contrasting Moralities of the Superpowers"
Speaker: *Nathaniel Davis, Professor of Humanities, Harvey Mudd College.* University Church

November 12: Wednesday

12 noon-1:00 p.m. "Nuclear Peace and Medical Responsibility"
Panel Discussion. A-Level Amphitheater, LLU Medical Center

November 14: Friday

7:30 p.m. "No More War"
Speaker: *John Howard Yoder, Professor of Theology, University of Notre Dame.* University Church

November 15: Saturday

11:15 a.m. "The Adventist Hope in a Nuclear Age"
Speaker: *Louis Venden, Pastor, University Church.*
University Church

2:30 p.m. "Christian Realism and Nuclear War"
Speaker: *William Spohn, S.J., Associate Professor of Theological Ethics, Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley.* University Church

3:15 p.m. "Protection of Christian Values"
Speaker: *Paul Seabury, Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley.* University Church

4:00 p.m. Round Table Discussion
The Principal Presenters. University Church

7:30 p.m. "Testament" (a film)
Randall Visitors Center

**This discussion explores the theme of faith and academic responsibility and is particularly for University faculty.*

For a brochure listing respondents, panelists and the full conference, call or write Gwen Utt, Office Manager, Ethics Center.

ETHICS CENTER
Division of Religion
Loma Linda University
Loma Linda, California 92350

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 6
Loma Linda, CA