

LETTERS

I greatly appreciated and profited by Allan W. Anderson's philosophical-theological survey of Genesis 1-3 [summer 1970]. And Gary Land is so right in affirming that we must not confuse Adventist apologetics with history [summer 1970].

WILLIAM G. WIRTH
Pasadena, California

78

Although our church colleges and universities do not subscribe to the publish or perish dictum, with a growing number of Adventist scholars we should be more productive in our respective fields than we have been in the past. One deterrent is the lack of a press similar to the university presses which have served the cause of scholarship so well for so long. An "Adventist University Press" might be established with minimal costs by contractual arrangements with a high quality independent printing firm to publish selected volumes in this manner.

A few years ago the Alumni Association of the School of Medicine of the College of Medical Evangelists operated in some such fashion the San Lucas Press. At that time faculty productivity had not assumed the proportions it has now, and in time the project was abandoned. The basic idea, however, still has much to recommend it.

A recent penetrating and perceptive review by Gary Land [History from an Adventist Perspective, summer 1970] points up the importance of having history that is good history and not apologetics. Church publishing houses are rightly designed to carry forward the evangelistic function of the church. Their resources are not necessarily such as can be devoted to the critical evaluation, production, promotion, and sale of purely scholarly monographs.

The organization and sponsoring of some type of Adventist University Press would render a great service to the productive Adventist scholar in that it would assist in enabling him to produce sound work that would be taken seriously by the academic community in general. The normal course of university press activities in promotion would also regularly bring these works to the attention of libraries, scholars, and teachers everywhere. Such a definite arrangement would likely attract endowment funds from a variety of sources to assist in publishing worthwhile studies that might have only a limited sales potential.

GODFREY T. ANDERSON
Loma Linda, California

Congratulations to you and to Martin Turner for *Project White Coat* [summer 1970]. It appeared to be well researched, and I appreciated its forthrightness, not only in revealing the nature of the CBW research and its applications carried on at Fort Dietrich, but in raising the question of the church's present posture toward the military. I wonder if Saul, holding the coats of the men who stoned Stephen, would

qualify as a noncombatant. In its eagerness to show loyalty to civil government, the 1934 General Conference may have placed the church in a morally compromised position.

MARSHALL BREWER
Riverside, California

A slant on separation of church and state: "*As to religion, I hold it to be the indispensable duty of government to protect all conscientious professors thereof, and I know of no other business which government hath to do therewith.*"

Who said it?

Suppose it were the devil. Would that make it suspect? Or Isaiah. Now is it true? The fact is — it was Tom Paine. *Now what is it?*

Does it strengthen or does it weaken the First Amendment proscription of church and state intermingling and intermeddling? That is to say, what does it do, if anything, to the long and jealously guarded wall of separation between church and state which many Americans seem to think of as totally inviolate. Never mind here the many attacks against it waged by those in both church and state.

If the separation concept is false, then we have nothing to fear but fear itself. If it is true, and American, and freedomly, why don't we confess our sins against it and square our practice of freedom with our long and loud — sometimes even giganic — protestations?

Also, if it is true, how come we can seem so smug in criticizing endlessly our Catholic friends for violating the wall when we also seem so willing and ready to join them in [so doing]?

No, this is not a salvation concept, or an appeal to make it into one. Just a plea for us to be true in word *and* in deed to that which we have said long since and which we believe with historical pride — and also with such decibellic and holocaustic gusto.

DONALD F. HAYNES
Glendale, California