

Columbia Union College Declared to be a Secular School

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE: Was Ellen White Black? / Bachiocchi's #98: Christians Should be Ready to Kill

Columbia Union College is now officially a secular educational institution. The fact has been established by a federal court of law and is so registered with the State of Maryland. Here is the story:

Many years ago, the State of Maryland initiated the *Sellinger Program*. Its objective was to provide yearly grant money to all private colleges and universities in the state which were willing to submit to certain requirements. The program involved grants of money each year, to help cover some of the expenses at those schools.

Hungry to get its hands on some of that money, the administration of Columbia Union College set out to obtain its share of that grant money.

As you may recall, the Colony of Maryland was originally founded by Roman Catholics, and it is still heavily Catholic to this day. Several years ago, the Maryland legislature enacted this grant program (named after a Catholic priest by the name of *Sellinger*). A lot of money is involved; and three of the colleges receiving it are owned by the Roman Catholic Church.

Recognizing that, if it could be accepted by the *Sellinger Program*, Columbia Union College (CUC) could receive more than \$800,000 a year, plus substantial financial assistance with capital projects. So, in 1990, CUC first applied for its share of those funds. If successful, it would receive more than \$1,000 per eligible student, per year, that Maryland provides.

But officials in the Maryland State Department of Education repeatedly rejected CUC's request for the *Sellinger* money, because of the school's "Adventist perspective and practice." Its request was ruled ineligible.

Initially, CUC's objection was that it should receive the money in spite of the fact that it was a "sectarian (religious) school." It pointed out that Catholic universities in Maryland were receiving the grant money and they had not stopped teaching Catholicism to their students.

Catholic colleges in the state routinely received the *Sellinger* grant money, because the attorney general, who is a Roman Catholic, had ruled that under current case law, they are religious to a permissible degree.

In 1996, determined to obtain those funds, CUC

initiated a lawsuit against the State of Maryland, demanding that it too receive that government aid, in spite of the fact that it was religious. For this purpose, it hired expensive constitutional attorneys. Its lead attorney had earlier clerked for two Supreme Court justices and one Circuit Court judge.

When news of this lawsuit reached them, many of our church members in the Columbia Union (which heavily funds CUC) were understandably horrified. CUC's aggressive efforts to sue the government, demanding that it be paid government money, seemed to be the height of a new species of church apostasy. They worried that CUC was taking the church into a new low and undermining Adventist principles, its message, and mission to the world. In order to help dispel those fears, the CUC administration issued an official statement on October 8, 1999, assuring church members that all was well.

When U.S. District Judge Marvin J. Garbis in Baltimore eventually heard the case, he ruled that CUC was not eligible for state funds because it was "pervasively sectarian," or too religiously focused, the key test under a 1976 U.S. Supreme Court decision.

Undaunted, CUC appealed the Garbis ruling to the fourth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled, however, that Maryland had, so far, failed to prove that CUC should be disqualified and sent the case back to the District Court for further review. In that ruling, **the fourth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals said that the burden of proof lay with Garbis. He was ordered to reconsider the case—by doing an actual analysis of CUC's program content.**

In other words, was CUC really teaching much religion, if any, on its campus? And if so, how much? Now those are questions that many would be interested in obtaining answers to.

In the midst of Garbis' investigation, prior to the giving of his decision in the case, in June 2000 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled, in a 6 to 3 vote, that parochial schools in Louisiana were eligible for federal education funds for the purchase of computers.

In that decision, four justices advocated scrapping the 1976 "sectarian" test and instituting a new test: A school could receive aid as long as it had non-religious content; and the same aid was also avail-

able to non-religious schools. But Sandra Day O'Connor and Stephen G. Breyer, who made up the rest of the majority, did not go that far. They also said they would view direct payments differently than in-kind aid.

Legally, the CUC case broke new ground, because it involved direct payments to a church-owned college rather than funds for equipment. If appealed, it might provide a special test case in the Supreme Court. The ramifications are significant; for many other religious schools are seeking government aid, school vouchers, etc. Oddly enough, it is the Adventists who are leading the way in asking for government handouts!

But unexpectedly, in his second and final decision, Garbis ruled that CUC could have the money—**because it was essentially not a religious school! He based his decision on the careful investigation he did of the college and what it was actually teaching in its classrooms!**

In his decision, Garbis said he decided to abide by the “pervasively sectarian” test because there were not five votes to overrule it, but interpreted it in a way that was favorable to CUC.

In a 40-page opinion issued on Thursday, August 17, 2000, U.S. District Judge Marvin J. Garbis, in Baltimore, declared Columbia Union College eligible to receive state funds. This reversed the first decision he had made earlier. **The second decision required Maryland to begin providing direct subsidies to CUC over the objections of state officials. Maryland had argued that such an action would violate the Constitution’s ban against state-established religion.** An article about the decision appeared in the August 19, 2000, issue of the *Washington Post*.

Maryland’s Sellinger Program provides \$40 million a year to more than a dozen private colleges and universities in the state. CUC is now eligible for about \$800,000 annually, equivalent to about 5 percent of its budget.

Although several Catholic institutions have participated, **state officials had earlier ruled that CUC’s program was much more “pervasively sectarian” and therefore did not qualify.** The “pervasively sectarian” test is based on that 1976 Supreme Court decision. **But when Judge Garbis actually investigated the situation, he found the facts to be far different.**

In his official decision, the judge noted that only 90 of the 535 courses outside of religion had explicit religious statements in their syllabuses; and, despite many religious references, he concluded that they “do not, in context, show that religious inculcation is the primary goal.”

While conceding that CUC “is controlled by the Seventh-day Adventist Church, with a faculty and student body selected so as to give preferences to church members,” Garbis wrote, **“the evidence does not . . .**

establish that it is pervasively sectarian. The primary goal and function of Columbia Union College is to provide a secular education.”

Immediately, the new CUC President, Randal R. Wisbey, tried to do damage control. **He was very anxious to assure Seventh-day Adventist Church members throughout the Columbia Union that what Garbis said was not really true: CUC was not really a secular school that taught almost no religion anywhere on campus. Anxious that church funds keep coming in, Wisbey said the college had not compromised its mission. But the careful investigation done by Garbis revealed something different.**

According to assistant Attorney General Pace McCokie, the State of Maryland was considering an appeal.

We, and many others in our denomination, are asking **how could it be that our college in Maryland could be adjudged as being a secular college which teaches essentially no religion of any kind, much less Adventist?**

Was Columbia Union College willing to abandon its Adventist teachings in the classroom or had it already done so years earlier? Or did it perjure itself in legal documents, during the Judge Garbis’ investigation, to give the appearance of having abandoned them, when it had not done so?

In the early 1990s, the State of Maryland had rule that CUC was a religious school. How then could it be that, when Judge Garbis actually checked into the matter, he was led to believe, accurately or not, that it wasn’t?

And why is it that Seventh-day Adventists should take the lead in seeking to obtain government funds, when *Great Controversy* so earnestly warned us against seeking the support of the government?

These are questions to which we may never receive answers.

“It was apostasy that led the early church to seek the aid of the civil government, and this prepared the way for the development of the papacy—the beast.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 443. “The papacy . . . [was] a church that controlled the power of the state and employed it to further her own ends.”—p. 443. “When the leading churches of the United States . . . shall influence the state to enforce their decrees and to sustain their institutions . . .”—p. 445. “. . . apostate Protestantism, which will be developed when the Protestant churches shall seek the aid of the civil power for the enforcement of their dogmas.”—p. 445. The context is talking about how the image of the beast will be set up and the mark of the beast imposed.

Why is our denomination in America taking the lead in demanding that the State support our institutions?

Was Ellen White Black?

In 1999 the book, *The Genealogy of Ellen Gould Harmon White*, was published. Charles Edward Dudley, Sr., for many years a regional conference president, is the author.

The book claims that Ellen White had African-American ancestry. If that were true, it would not really matter; for Advent believers, whether black or white, are fine folk.

Indeed, when a person is truly converted, regardless of national or racial origin, he or she becomes a changed person. But, apart from Christ, all of us are sunken in sin and in desperate need of help. Race is not the problem in this world; it is sin and mankind's need of a Saviour.

But, briefly, it would be well to turn our attention to Dudley's claim. Was Ellen White of black descent? If so, we have right to expect that Dudley's book will contain the evidence. Yet the evidence is lacking.

Dudley bases his argument on the fact that some blacks who lived in New Jersey, over a century ago, were surnamed Gould. But he provides no evidence that there is any direct connection between those Goulds and the Eunice Gould who was Ellen's mother.

Dudley claims that his theory must be right, since no research has ever been made as to the ancestry of Ellen's mother. That is an intriguing argument. If there is no evidence that Ellen's ancestry is not black, then it must be black.

However, on this point Dudley is wrong. A careful, in-depth research study of the genealogy of Ellen's mother has been done. The research was done over twenty years before Dudley wrote his book; so the results were surely available to him.

In the 1970s, the Ellen G. White Estate went to a qualified, experienced, licensed genealogical researcher and asked her to conduct such a research study. I have noticed that, on a number of occasions, Mormons are glad to cause trouble for us. So, because she was a Mormon, it would be expected that she would not be likely to provide favorable data, unless that was all that was available.

This researcher had, at her disposal, the vast genealogical resources of the Mormon Church. Because it is one of their strange doctrines, Mormons are anxious to baptize for their dead relatives; so they can be saved and taken to heaven. The primary center in America where this genealogical research is conducted is in Washington, D.C. This is because the Library of Congress has the largest database. Over the years, the Mormons have used it extensively and compiled an immense collection of genealogical records.

The assignment was to trace Ellen White's ancestry back through all lines, as far as the records extend. The research made use of a complete collection of both whites and blacks, and extend all the way back to Europe, Africa, and elsewhere.

The researcher not only traced Ellen White's ancestry, but she provided photocopies of original documents to support her work. A chart that shows the result of this research has been on sale at all E.G. White Estate offices for over

twenty years.

Charles Dudley claims that he made use of E.G. White Estate records. If so, he surely had opportunity to learn about that genealogical research.

At any rate, that Mormon researcher clearly established that Ellen White had no black ancestors. It would have been fine if it had been true, but there was no connection.

Dudley says that, because of her flattened nose, Ellen White had to be black. But you will recall that Ellen was not born with a flattened nose, and her parents and siblings did not have flattened noses.

When Ellen was still a child, her parents moved from their home north of Gorham, Maine, into Portland to a home they purchased at 44 Clark Street, where Robert Harmon engaged in hatmaking. Ellen was a cheerful, buoyant, active child. At the age of 9, while returning home one afternoon from the public school on Brackett Street, an angry girl behind her threw a stone. Just as Ellen turned around to look, it struck her squarely on her nose, shattering the bone that held it extended. For two years, she was unable to breathe through her nose.

So the only evidence that Ellen may have had African-American ancestors was the existence of a family with that name, living 250 miles away (as the crow flies) in New Jersey. There is no evidence that any of Ellen's forebears ever lived in New Jersey.

Other problems with Dudley's book indicate a broad lack of careful research on his part. Regarding Ellen's grandchildren, Dudley says that Grace married John Gawks. But his name was Jacques. I personally met them both, and he was French (Gawks is not a French name). Dudley says that Arthur married Fried Swingle. But her actual name was Frieda.

Arthur's brother was named Francis—but Dudley assumed that Francis was a girl and said she married someone named Richard Rub! Such errors are astounding for a book which is supposed to be an accurate record of genealogical relationships! If Dudley did not get Ellen's descendants right, how can we expect that he got her ancestors right?

In addition, some of the works cited in the text are not listed in the references at the back of the book. "Records of the Ellen G. White Estate" is often cited as the source for data. But, checking with those records reveals that frequently no such data exists.

In the book, Dudley thanks the E.G. White Estate for their help; yet there is no evidence that anyone with genealogical or historical training—white or black—ever read or approved the final manuscript.

Dudley says that Ellen's mother "was a mulatto." If that is so, then the evidence for Ellen's black ancestry would be only two generations earlier. Yet the evidence does not exist. The *SDA Encyclopedia* says, "Her parents, Robert Harmon and Eunice Gould Harmon, were of sturdy New England stock with British ancestry" (1976 ed., Vol. 10, p. 1584; 1996 ed., Vol. 11, p. 873).

Bacchiocchi's #98 / Christians Should be Ready to Kill

It is a remarkable fact that Samuele Bacchiocchi was permitted to teach at Andrews University for over twenty years, when that which he taught contained so much error.

We said nothing until he openly, and quite brazenly, declared the Spirit of Prophecy and our prophetic teachings to be in error. Since his retirement, the General Conference has permitted him to spend much of his time holding seminars in our churches throughout the world. Therefore, his errors need to be exposed, in the hope that the permission will be revoked.

In earlier studies, we found that, by his own words, Bacchiocchi does not believe that the book, *Great Controversy*, is accurate. He declares that the 1260 years did not begin in A.D. 538 nor end in 1798. He says that the time span is actually a symbolic number. At the same time, he maintains that time period applies to Islamic ascendancy more than to the time of papal power. For some reason, he likes to protect Rome. (*Endtime Issues #86-92; cf. WM-1120-1129*)

Now Bacchiocchi's latest *Endtime Issues* study has been released (#98). In it he declares that warfare and killing is justified and that, down through history, it has been the non-Christians who oppose warfare. He says Christians should like warfare, and that true Christians do.

In order to explain away Christ's statement to Peter not to use the sword, Bacchiocchi claims that the comment only applied to Christ's arrest. Normally, he says, we should have weapons for self-defense, and we should use them (#98, p. 11).

However, Christ spoke about not *living* by the sword, and that would apply to Peter's lifetime, not merely to an incident in the Garden of Gethsemane (*Matthew 26:52*). Bacchiocchi says the "radical" statement of Christ in that verse was merely "hyperbole" and not a command we should obey (#98, p. 12). Bacchiocchi claims that another evidence that the statement cannot be true is the fact that Paul verbally defended himself in court!

"He resisted his accusers by going out of his way to defend himself before the Jewish and Roman authorities" (#98, p. 12). This verbal defense, Bacchiocchi maintains, provides clear proof that Christians should arm themselves with weapons and be ready to use them at a moment's notice.

Bacchiocchi is teaching Jesuit concepts; for Rome has always upheld its right to persecute, punish, and even slay those who do not agree with its dogmas.

But we would expect this, since Bacchiocchi received a five-year education in the oldest Jesuit spy-training institution in the world, the Gregorian University in Rome, located in the shadow of the Vatican.

On #98, p. 15, he says it is "charity" to kill those who threaten us personally.

Here are several statements from the Roman Catholic Church which mirror the sentiments of Samuele Bacchiocchi (quoted from our 1884 Great Controversy, p. 167; also in our 1888 edition, pp. 256-257):

"That the church of Rome has shed more innocent blood than any other institution that has ever existed among mankind, will be questioned by no Protestant who has a competent knowledge of history . . . It is impossible to form a complete conception of the multitude of her victims, and it quite certain that no powers of imagination can adequately realize their sufferings." *W.E.H. Lecky, History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe, Vol. 2, p. 32, 1910 ed. [An excellent, though lengthy, article, describing in detail the right of the Roman Catholic Church to do this, will be found in The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 12, p. 266.]*

"For professing faith contrary to the teachings of the Church of Rome, history records the martyrdom of more than one hundred million people. A million Waldenses and Albigenses [Swiss and French Protestants] perished during a crusade proclaimed by Pope Innocent III in 1208. Beginning from the establishment of the Jesuits in 1540 to 1580, nine hundred thousand were destroyed. One hundred and fifty thousand perished by the Inquisition in thirty years. Within the space of thirty-eight years after the edict of Charles V against the Protestants, fifty thousand persons were hanged, beheaded, or burned alive for heresy. Eighteen thousand more perished during the administration of the Duke of Alva in five and a half years." *Brief Bible Readings, p. 16.*

"The Catholic has some reason on his side when he calls for the temporal punishment of heretics, for he claims the true title of Christian for himself exclusively, and professes to be taught by the never-failing presence of the Spirit of God . . . It is not more 'morally' wrong to put a man to death for heresy than for murder . . . [and] in many cases persecution for religious opinions is not only permissible, but highly advisable and necessary." *"The Lawfulness of Persecution," in The Rambler, 4, June 1849, pp. 119, 126 [English R.C. journal published from 1848 to 1862].*

"The church," said [Martin] Luther . . . 'has never burned a heretic' . . . I reply that this argument proves not the opinion, but the ignorance or impudence of Luther. Since almost infinite numbers were either burned or otherwise killed, Luther either did not know it, and was therefore ignorant, or if he was not ignorant, he is convicted of impudence and falsehood; for that heretics were often burned by the church may be proved if we adduce a few examples." *Robert Bellarmine, Disputationes de Controversis Christianae Fidei ("Disputations Concerning Controversies of the Christian Faith"), Tom. II, cap. XXII [Bellarmine, later canonized, was a leading Jesuit leader and writer.]*

"The orthodox doctrine, as formulated by St. Thomas Aquinas and confirmed and elaborated by later Dominicans and by Jesuits like the Blessed Robert Bellarmine Suarez, runs as follows:

"Heresy [as defined by Rome] is the willful holding by a baptized person of doctrines, which contradict an article of faith defined by the Catholic Church." *P. Hinschius, "Heresy," The New Schaff Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. 5, pp. 234-235 (1909).*