

# The Utrecht Session

PART ONE OF FIVE

**Throughout the world field, there were leaders and workers in our church who had anxious forbodings about the forthcoming 1995 General Conference Session, which was slated to be held in Utrecht, Holland on June 29 to July 9.**

**This brief report will provide you with the key issues which were discussed, and the decisions made regarding them.**

**It will provide you with an overview of the entire business part of the Session. Key points will be highlighted.**

## THURSDAY - JUNE 29

As discussed in earlier studies, the Utrecht Session would be crucially important: Would the delegates protect our church against a major revamping of church structure, which would effectually wipe out the changes made—at Ellen White's direction—in the 1901 Session, or would the 1995 delegates yield to pressure and approve all or most of what was placed before them? This would be the question.

In this present study, you will learn the answer. Please understand that this present, five-part report only deals with the business meetings, not with the other activities at the Session. In a later report (*Journey to Utrecht*) we will provide you with insights on such matters.

Actually, it is the business sessions which are the most important!

"The Utrecht session's business agenda is full! Not since 1901 have so many substantial changes in how we govern ourselves come to a session. In 1901 the session devised critical changes in the church's structure to decentralize authority and

create a structure better suited to direct the rapidly expanding church." (*Bulletin #1, p. 8; Myron Widmer*)

Thus, you can see that the crisis we are here discussing is very real.

"All the proposed governing changes come from the work of a commission appointed by the General Conference in 1991 to see how we might better govern our church." (*Ibid.*)

Unfortunately, Widmer was misinformed. According to Susan Stickler, a member of that Governance Commission, the commission was presented with those recommendations, which were devised in the topmost levels of the General Conference building in Maryland. The commission could not accept the ones which would transfer immense power to the General Conference and division presidents,—so the commission never approved them.

But those items were then falsely presented by Folkenberg to the 1994 Annual Council for their approval, as having been "approved" by that commission!

The total number of changes which will be presented to the 1995 Session for their approval is somewhat astounding: 50 Church Manual changes (#1, p. 8), and 72 Constitution and Bylaws changes (#6, p. 28).

Here is a brief overview of some other important changes:

### "Elections at the GC Session.

Under this proposal, elections at the GC session would be limited to GC officers, departmental and association directors, the Auditing Service director, and the three executive officers of the 11 divisions. All associates and a few others traditionally

elected at the session would be appointed by the respective executive committees within several months. This would reduce the number elected at the sessions from about 200 to about 70—three for each division and about 35 to the GC.

"[**Reorganization of GC Committee.**] . . . The proposal would also downsize the [GC] Committee from about 362 to 240 members, plus invitees . . .

"**Church Manual Changes.** More than 50 proposed changes range from counsels on courtship to discipline." (*Ibid.*)

Let us now turn our attention to the first of these business meetings.

On Thursday afternoon, June 29, at 3 p.m., the 56th General Conference Session began. About 12,000 people were in attendance at the second meeting, that evening. Since a number of visitors were present, the low count indicates that many of the delegates had not yet arrived. According to the Constitution, 2,650 might be attending this Session. Actually, only 1,609 delegates were present that first night. (A complete list of delegates is printed in *GC Bulletin, #1, pp. 21-31.*)

In an earlier study (*The Ominous Utrecht Agenda, Part 1, pp. 2-3*), we discussed the complexities of attendance at this Session, and in a companion study (*Journey to Utrecht*, to be released soon) we will provide you with eye-witness reports by historic believers who did attend.

It is now time to discuss the important business discussion and actions which occurred at this memorable Session in the Nether-

lands. In doing so, we will pass over the great mass of lesser items.

After approving the daily program, the agenda was approved. With this done, the pathway the Session would take had been determined.

Generally, voice votes were used. In this way, the officers could tell how each of their workers voted, since all delegates were required to sit in their own special areas. Standing committees were then approved.

As usual, Bert Beverly Beach, introduced several non-Adventist dignitaries. He it was who brought, among other religious leaders, a Catholic bishop to Indianapolis five years ago, who then uttered his blessing upon the congregation.

Robert Folkenberg spoke next, and, well-aware of the fears of many delegates that, unfortunately, it was his intention to push constitutional changes through at this Session which would give him immense control at world headquarters, he said,

"We come as more than 2,600 delegates. We have no king. We have no small group of men who rule over us." (*Bulletin #2, p. 27*)

That statement ran contrary to the objectives of certain of those constitutional changes.

"I pledge to you tonight that this session will be open and fair." (*Ibid.*)

At this point, Folkenberg, who relies heavily on constitutional changes, computers, and videos to help him maintain controls, launched into his sermon. But it was no traditional preaching, such as a president traditionally delivers on the first Thursday of each Session. Instead, it was a dramatic video presentation, with overvoice narration by him. Scenes of suffering children and happy faces of new Christians tugged at the hearts of the viewing delegates. The next day those delegates would be deciding whether to retain Robert Folkenberg in office or look for a different president.

There were those present, that evening, who feared his inordinate desire to grasp for power and his determination to enact changes in the church's basic constitution in order to obtain his objectives.

#### FRIDAY - JUNE 30

The next morning, June 30, the next business meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. It primarily consisted of several lengthy reports read to the delegates: one by the secretary, another by the treasurer, and a third by an outside auditor.

That same morning, the nominating committee met for the first time. As was its custom, the first item of business was slated to be the election of the General Conference president. Five years earlier, that decision was not made until 5 p.m.

After lunch, the business meeting again convened at 12 noon. Immediately the chairman of the nominating committee, Benjamin Reaves (president of Oakwood College) told the delegates that the secretary of the nominating committee, B. Lyn Behrens (president of Loma Linda University) had a report to present.

She said that the nominating committee recommended the name of Robert Folkenberg. The motion was seconded and approved by the delegates.

**Item One of the crucial issues had been settled: Folkenberg was back in for another five-year term; his second.**

In view of the fact that he is trying to gain so much control over the world headquarters through constitutional changes (read *The Ominous Utrecht Agenda—Part 1-3* [WM-620-622]), it is surprising that, in the acceptance speech which followed, Folkenberg said this:

"During these past five years, I learned that nobody is smart enough to lead this church. Nobody is wise enough to reach out and grasp the incredibly complex and diverse pressures that tend to fragment.

"This is truly God's church, and it can be led successfully only by our Lord Jesus Christ. All I can do is confess that I don't have infallibility, and pledge that these feet of clay will walk that best if they can work with a group of wise, dedicated leaders." (#2, p. 31)

On at least two occasions earlier, Folkenberg had admitted that he frequently made mistakes. In two written letters he had apologized for serious blunders (see our book, *Collision Course*). He has made errors which a man of maturer years would not make, yet he came to Utrecht, determined to curtail the authority of other church leaders, in order to enhance his own. Our tract set, *The Ominous Utrecht Agenda—Part 1-3*, explains this in detail.

At 2 p.m. on Friday, June 30, the next business meeting was called into session. It was at this meeting that the subject of constitutional and bylaw changes was first introduced.

It should be noted that Calvin Rock, chairman of that meeting, mentioned, in passing, **the name of the man who wrote the actual changes in the Constitutional and Bylaws:**

**"Athol Tolhurst is the man who has crafted most of this language."** (#3, p. 12)

Keep that name in mind, for we have been hearing more and more about Tolhurst lately. Apparently, he works closely with Folkenberg in preparing written materials for him. As some of you may know, the Tolhursts come from Australia, and can be expected to be solidly new theology.

"A.H. Tolhurst: There are two kinds of recommended changes to the constitution and bylaws. The first type of change or recommended change are those changes that clarify the meaning but do not change substantively the intent of the constitution or the bylaws. Second, there are those changes that do make a substantive change to the meaning of the

constitution or the bylaws.” (#3, p. 12)

**In addition to 50 Church Manual changes (#1, p. 8), an astounding number of constitutional changes would be presented to this General Conference Session! One delegate later made the following astonishing comment about the immense number of those changes: changes in the basic constitution and bylaws of the denomination!**

**“Alvin Kibble: There are some 72 amendments to our present constitution. I cannot imagine a constitutional revision of some 72 items being suggested to the Constitution of the United States of America! That would represent a rewriting of the Constitution!” (#6, p. 28)**

In order to simplify the work (and perhaps keep visitors from understanding what was taking place), the following motion was recommended to the delegates, and then passed:

“Voted, To waive the reading of items presented to the floor, excluding Constitution and Bylaw items, unless determined as being necessary.” (#3, p. 30)

It is an interesting fact that, each time a crucial point in the proposed changes had to be definitely defended, the chairman insisted on waiting until Folkenberg was called in from running the nominating committee—to make that defense to the delegates!

It is clear that this whole mass of modifications was Folkenberg’s affair, and that he alone was in charge of pushing them through.

**At this point in this Friday afternoon business meeting, Folkenberg steps forward and introduces a key point: eliminating all authority from many of his associates at the General Conference:**

*[Folkenberg:]* There is another strange dynamic. For many years the General Conference committee met every Thursday morning. It was fairly common for the General Conference officers who were presenting the

agenda to feel themselves on trial before the other members, who were almost entirely departmental staff within the General Conference. There was a dynamic that was really unhealthy. It certainly was not accountability to the world church. So a series of motivational issues needed to be addressed.” (#3, p. 13)

**That was a dynamite statement! In it, Folkenberg stated the underlying problem, revealed his enmities, and disclosed his objectives.**

For the context of this, please understand that Folkenberg has come to the podium to introduce his plan, changes in the denomination’s Constitution, **to strip all General Conference (GC) departmental staff members of their voting rights on the GC Committee, and also strip those same workers of any protection from his domination and control—by henceforth making their employment subject to his hiring and firing whims**, instead of being elected at quinquennial (five-year) General Conference Sessions.

**But here, near the beginning of his introduction to this aspect of his proposed changes, he is unable to hide his intense dislike of anyone horning in when he is trying to get the GC Committee to do as he wishes. The delegates heard it and remembered it until Monday morning.**

Here is an additional analysis of the above-quoted statement: The GC Committee is composed of approximately 360 men. (Folkenberg’s plan is to have that number reduced to about 260, later in the Utrecht Session.) The total membership—the 360—only meets once a year at the Annual Council. A smaller number of them normally meet at the yearly Spring Council. The members of the committee are the top GC, division, union, and institutional leaders around the world field.

However, there is a built-in flaw: **When the Annual and Spring**

**Councils are not in session, which is the remainder of the 50 weeks of the year, a small group of men at world headquarters runs the show—and makes the major decisions affecting the entire world church! Only a few men make those decisions. But, constitutional rules permit the departmental staff within the world headquarters to also come to those meetings, deliberate, and vote. This, of course, increases somewhat the number of minds dealing with the problems and recommendations.**

Folkenberg clearly does not like that arrangement. He wants to deeply cut the number of people who will attend those committee meetings. In fact, he is utterly disgusted that some men in the GC dare to openly resist his railroading, and suggest his ideas might not be the best.

**The man who, at 12 noon on Friday, told the delegates he had feet of clay and made many mistakes, on Sunday at about 2:30 p.m., tells those same delegates that he will be more accountable to the world field if he has less men around him to help him the right decisions!**

In the above quotation, he said that the “GC officers” felt themselves “on trial” before the departmental associates. This must mean that someone there is not agreeing with everything the officers want to do! Wonderful; some people there still think for themselves! It is unlikely that anyone there feels “on trial” except Folkenberg. People who value the counsel of many thoughtful minds do not express their enmity against counsel. But Folkenberg’s feelings are so deep that he expressed it before more than 20,000 people.

And the *Review* printed it. But they will not be doing that much more, since henceforth he will appoint the magazine’s leadership, instead of their being elected at the

Session.

But, in the above quotation, a mystery is presented, something about “*accountability*.” This is one of Folkenberg’s magic words. The other two are “*linkage*” and “*fairness*.” Just above, Folkenberg says that, if those other men were permitted to be voting counselors on that committee—it would somehow not be as accountable to the church for its actions! **According to his words, the GC Committee would mysteriously be more accountable with only a little clique of president, treasure, and secretary, and field secretaries—and almost no one else—on it!**

So, Folkenberg concluded that paragraph by saying, it was an “unhealthy” “dynamic,” and that “a series of motivational issues needed to be addressed.”

With this background, you can better see through one of the paragraphs Folkenberg next stated:

“We came back to the fundamental philosophy that was driving the [governance] commission—fairness and accountability. These were the two principles. We came to the conclusion that we needed to restructure the General Conference Committee so that there was a significant increase of accountability of those doing the serving to those being served.” (#3, p. 14)

(That which Folkenberg does not mention is that the Governance Committee refused to okay his constitutional changes. So he later presented them to the 1994 Annual Council with the statement that the Governance Committee had approved them! More on that in our earlier study, *The Ominous Utrecht Agenda*.)

It is clear that, in Folkenberg’s thinking, his little group is all that is serving the church—and the departmental associates are not “serving”; they are just hirelings, paid to do what they are told and keep their recommendations to themselves. Does that sound like too strong an interpretation of his thinking? Lis-

ten to this!

“Now there is another element, and I am going to be compassionate but clear. It is really not accountability when you are accountable to yourself. When a large proportion of those at the meeting are employees of the General Conference, you really don’t have accountability. It is accountability only when those doing the serving are accountable to those being served.” (*Ibid*)

This is obvious gobbledygook! Folkenberg takes the English language and *changes the meaning of words!* Read the above paragraph again, and see if you can figure it out.

In the subsequent four paragraphs, he specifically states what he wants: to oust departmental workers from the meetings which, week by week, determine major decisions throughout the world field—and to reduce them to hired flunkies, instead of elected officials who can hold their heads up and oppose wrongdoing. If you think we are out of context here, read it for yourself (#3, p. 14).

Tolhurst then made the motion, it was seconded, and, after N.C. Wilson said he liked the idea but noted that it was a subtle negative thrust against fellow workers, the delegates arose and began to speak. They wanted to know why on earth the departmental workers could not be on the committee, have voting rights, and be elected by the Session instead of appointed by Folkenberg’s little clique?

Finally, it was time for that meeting to adjourn for supper, so Kloosterhuis asked that someone table the motion till later. This was done.

“After a very lengthy discussion, it was

“Voted, To table this item until the next business session.” (#3, p. 30)

With sunset, came the sacred hours of the Bible Sabbath. In a companion study, *Journey to Utrecht*, to be released soon, we will describe some of what happened on the two Sabbaths at that Session.

To our knowledge every one of Friday’s items was approved.

## SUNDAY - JULY 2

The next business meeting began at 8:30 a.m. on Sunday, July 2. Within a short time, the question of appointing or electing departmental workers was again brought to the floor for discussion. The ensuing discussion continued throughout the morning until it came time for lunch break! People were upset! (#4, 23-28) Here are some insights into what occurred that morning:

The discussion on this began when a ruse was attempted—and immediately exposed. Instead of taking up the tabled motion, an apparently new one was presented—which would eliminate the tabled one!

“P.S. Follett: Now we have a constitutional item concerning departmental directors and their associates that we would like to place on the floor for your discussion.

“Dr. Harold Butler: If we vote this, the departmental associates will be appointed and not elected any longer. If we come back to the other agenda item and vote that down, it says just the opposite of this. So how can we vote on this particular item when it is in direct contradiction to the other that we have tabled?

“A.H. Tolhurst: There are two or three actions here that are so interlinked with each other that it’s difficult to deal with one without impacting the others . . .” (#4, p. 23)

**The plan had been to sidestep the elect/appoint issue of GC departmental workers, which the delegates increasingly opposed. In its place a different motion was introduced, which would affect all departmental workers in the church—including those in the General Conference.** Clever, but it did not succeed.

At this point, Calvin Rock stood up and agreed with Butler’s point.

Continued on the next tract

More WAYMARKS - from —  
**PILGRIMS REST**

HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305

# The Utrecht Session

PART TWO OF FIVE

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

Throughout the Session, people were impressed that Rock frequently appeared to be fair and not dissembling.

“C.B. Rock: I think Dr. Butler, as Elder Tolhurst has commented, has a very valid point. If someone moves to table this item, we can go right at the appointment versus election principle.” (*Ibid.*)

“Voted: To table the proposed amendments to Bylaws Article X, Departments—Directors/Secretaries, Associates and Assistants, so the issue of appointment versus election can be decided first.” (#4, p. 30)

So the tabled item—which had so embarrassed Folkenberg—was quickly resurrected instead of being bypassed.

**During the discussion, Max Mitchell, a church auditor, stood up and objected to trying to make auditors appointed by those they audit, instead of elected by the Session.**

“Our world church has on a number of occasions had problems with large financial matters. These could have been addressed [solved before a crisis occurred] if people had taken notice of the auditors, or even if the auditors had been involved [instead of refusing to permit them to audit those particular books; see *Collision Course* for details]. Once auditors are appointed, rather than elected, they become tame. They become auditors who will not stand up and tell administrators what to do, because they fear for their jobs. You cannot do this. Industry as a whole does not do this. Shareholders elect auditors; administration does not appoint them.” (#4, p. 24)

Then Don Crane stood up and noted that the proposed changes would, in reality, be reversing the

changes made at the 1901 Session.

“Some of these recommendations, I feel, may bring weakness to the departmental structure. We remember that in 1901 the General Conference in session brought in the auxiliary departments, the independent organizations, the institutions, and the organizations that became the departments of the church. This [present] session has an opportunity to reaffirm this historic stand and support the departments of the church .

“I believe that appointing the associates at the Annual Council would lead to a weakening of the departments of the church.” (#4, p. 24)

Ellen White returned from Australia in the year 1900, with a special assignment, by the Lord, to change the structure of the denomination. That was done at her urging in 1901; the organization was decentralized. Folkenberg wants to centralize it again.

**To our knowledge, not one time throughout this \$15 million Session was a Spirit of Prophecy quotation cited in one of its business meetings.**

That is what we have come to. The wisdom of man is thought to be greater than the wisdom of God.

Then Ronald Appenzeller stood and told the delegates that only 12 departmental heads were involved. Why should they be eliminated from the GC Committee? Then he went on to make this valid point:

**“[Voting this recommendation] will weaken the departments. General Conference associates travel the world field, and they’re supposed to be familiar with what’s happening in the field and at the General Conference headquarters. And that informa-**

**tion cannot be given fully and completely through minutes or through a briefing by someone.”** (#4, p. 24)

**How very true! If at the GC, and elsewhere in the world field, departmental leaders are barred from the executive meetings, how can the leaders know what is going on? Are departmental men only to take orders and never give information or think for themselves?**

We obtain here an insight into the mind of Robert Folkenberg. He is not an ignorant man (even though some of his comments seem that way). He apparently wants a church full of robots who obey orders, and do not think or devise ways to improve or correct situations. Why not just put in a bunch of chimpanzees into subordinate positions; they cost a lot less to feed than do departmental leaders?

For that matter, why have General Conference Sessions, since all certain leaders want is rubber-stamping?

Rudi Henning next asked why such a foolish proposal was being requested. But Chairman Rock replied: “I would prefer waiting until Elder Folkenberg arrives.” (#4, p. 24)

This happened on other days also, and each time the delegates were told that they would have to wait till Folkenberg arrived back from the nominating committee so he could explain the proposed constitutional changes. **One gets the idea that either these changes were solely his, or that no one else could explain what good they were, or both.**

Later, Folkenberg arrived and

once again summarized why he wanted it passed. You can read it in *Bulletin #4*, pp. 26-27. Once again the delegates are told about the importance of “fairness” and “accountability.”

“The two points are fairness and accountability . . . It is the desire to see the ratio of accountability dramatically increased.” (#4, p. 26)

Eventually, it would be ruled that no delegate could speak more than two minutes. Since most of the delegates who arose were protesting the high-handed objectives, that limitation helped ease the situation. But when Folkenberg stood up, he went on for nearly two pages of the *Bulletin*. **Eventually he admitted, in passing, that only three men will really be running the General Conference—if he gets his way:**

**“When the three officers in this proposal are elected, they are elected as officers with backing of the entire world church. Those officers—the president, the secretary, and the treasurer—sit together and develop world church policy.”** (#4, p. 27)

**Folkenberg applies this triad leadership thinking to all divisions as well: Three men are to run every division, and no one else is to give a peep nor a mutter.**

“Therefore, it stands to reason, the commission and Annual Council concurred, that whether it is the president or the secretary or the treasurer, all of those officers from all the world divisions should stand accountable, not just to the delegation of their division, but in fact to the whole world church . . . [but] the division departmental directors are accountable primarily to the unions within the divisions that they serve, not to the world church.” (*Ibid.*)

**Can a man with such strange reasoning be trusted with such power? Yet he is the man who will manage the General Conference for the next five years, and he will do it, having won a bagful of rule changes.**

**Folkenberg claims that he is**

**only expressing the views held by the three-year governance committee and the 1994 Annual Council. The truth is (as we recently disclosed) that the committee never approved most of Folkenberg’s wild ideas!** Susan Sickler, who was on the commission and also attended and spoke at the 1994 Annual Council, let the cat out of the bag on this. From start to finish, this power-grabbing attempt is the work of Robert Folkenberg.

**He then goes on to extend this hands-off attitude toward every other GC worker, even those who are not in the departments. They are hired merely to be told what to do:**

“The others who are affected under this proposal are the associates of the General Conference. In order to be consistent, both levels—that is to say, the division department directors and the General Conference associate directors—needed to be dealt with in the same fashion. It is critical that we distinguish between ‘informed’ and ‘decided.’ what do I mean? [Yes, what do you mean?] The steps are in place and have been in use for some time, and these can all be improved, in which the General Conference associate departmental directors are informed.” (#4, p. 27)

The underlings “need to be dealt with,” that is, put in their place. They are to be informed as to their duties. It is reserved alone for the three leaders to do the deciding as to what is to be done.

So there. Put the whip in my hand, Robert says, and I will take care of the rest. This is what I mean by fairness and accountability.

**Ron Mataya rises, and the inference of what he says is a question as to why it is the president who is urging that this be done, since he is the one who will get the added power if it passes.** (#4, p. 27)

**Then Tom Miller, one of the GC associate auditors stands.**

“It is our unhappy lot to write unpleasant reports sometimes. Some

of our administrators adopt the custom of the Roman emperors of killing the messenger, killing off those who bring bad news. **At the moment, we have a degree of protection in that we are elected. I believe the action before us will strip us of that protection, and the Auditing Service will be gutted.** It will be emasculated.” (#4, pp. 27-28)

To that shocking statement, Follett, who was chairing at the time, said that the plan was to set up an “auditing board” which would appoint the auditors, and only the chief auditor would be elected at Sessions. (#4, p. 28)

Well, with only thirty men in charge of the entire church, guess who will be in charge of the auditing board?

**Oh, you do not think that thirty men will run the church—if the constitutional changes are made? Well, the GC and each of the divisions will primarily be managed by three men each. According to #4, p. 31, there currently are nine divisions. According to the new Folkenberg math, we will have  $9 \times 3 + 3 = 30$ ; thirty men running the denomination.**

When it was time for lunch break, a motion was made, seconded, and voted to send the item back to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (C&B Committee).

Although it was not mentioned on page 28 of *Bulletin #4*, there were so many delegates upset about the matter, that the announcement was made that some could speak to a back-room committee about it.

“Voted: To refer the proposed amendments to Constitution Article VI, Election to the standing Constitution and Bylaws Committee for further study, with the request that all of those now standing to address this item refer their concerns directly to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee which will meet immediately.” (#4, p. 31)

**The delegates had spent most of Friday afternoon and all of Sunday morning objecting to one**

little aspect of what, many were coming to believe, was a takeover plan by Folkenberg. —Yet that was only one of the 72 proposed Constitution and Bylaw changes!

But the problem was that nearly all the delegates (about 92 percent) were church employees. How far could they go in resisting the president's demands?

That same Sunday afternoon, at 2 p.m., when the business session reconvened, several items were discussed. (#4, p. 28) Not only were changes planned for the Constitution and bylaws of the church, but also for the *Church Manual* as well.

(Sometimes in this study, we call it "bylaw" and sometimes "by-laws;" which is right? The set of rules of an organization, supplementary to its constitution, is called its *bylaw*. So we here speak of the GC bylaw. But Folkenberg's plan is to change the bylaws of each division as well. That is why we sometimes use the word in the plural, when referring to all of those *by-laws*.)

**One Church Manual change was intended to weaken the authority of leaders of organized companies. (#4, p. 29) It was approved.**

**Another change which would help the liberals succeed in the church, would permit local churches to elect their church officers for two years, instead of only one. This would enable to officers to have less accountability (yes, that special word, but here used in its true sense) to the church members. In spite of a number of clear-cut objections, the change was voted (approved). (#4, pp. 29-30)** Here was one of the delegates' pleas:

"Charles Ferguson: I am pleading with you folks. If ever an extremely liberal or extremely conservative, imbalanced element gets hold of your board of elders, you'll have to live with that a year longer than you will right now. I plead with you not to vote for this motion." (#4, p. 30).

The problem was that, after having fought the battle over one item (the election vs. appointment of departmental leaders), and still not having defeated it, the delegates were beginning to grow weary. We find that, with two exceptions (the Monday vote on that issue, and the Wednesday vote on women's ordination), the delegates were wearing down. We find that, more and more, they were just passing whatever was offered them.

**Indeed it gradually became obvious to delegates and visitors that, when efforts were made to eliminate a problem item, the chair generally had deft ways of ignoring or sidestepping it, so the proposed change was kept on track until it was approved. In a few instances, items were sent back to committee to work over, but that generally only postponed the fateful final vote.**

If you want to see changes in the General Conference Sessions, require that 50 percent of the delegates be laymen or laywomen. Then the rubberstamping will cease.

By Tuesday, the delegates had become so tame and lifeless in resisting constitutional changes, that the present writer suspects that division officers were told to speak with them in the hotels at night—and warn them to be more cooperative.

The Sunday afternoon business meeting finally concluded.

The controversy over appointments vs. election was still unsettled. It was to carry over to Monday morning.

According to one person's count, there were 72 changes which top leadership wanted changed in the Constitution, Bylaws, and *Church Manual*.

Yet there were only five days left in which to make them. What the delegates should have done was to reject many of those changes as out-

of-hand. But, as is also frequently done at local conference constituency meetings, the delegates were pressured into feeling that "time is short, and we must hurry alone or we won't get through the agenda." So decisions were made which should never have been made. Large chunks of power were handed over to a relatively young General Conference president.

"On the gates of houses and in public places, placards were posted . . . On one of these were written merely the significant words of the wise man: 'Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child.' " (*Great Controversy*, 165)

But, just now, let us turn our attention to what happened in that back room, where the C&B Committee was meeting with those objecting to the appoint/elect ruling:

"After hours of spirited debate on this matter Friday and Sunday, with departmental personnel voicing strong opposition, the item was tabled yesterday [Sunday, July 2]. Those with concerns were invited to make their case before the Constitution and Bylaws standing committee. More than 50 people appeared, and the committee sat for seven hours late into Sunday night." (#4, p. 5, later comment by W.G. Johnsson)

**We learn from other sources that 75 delegates went to the back room, and that 70 were opposed to the proposed amendment. That special meeting not only lasted well into the night, but continued on the next morning after breakfast!** However, although that tally was made, not all of them spoke that day, some spoke the next morning. The following sentence probably applies this Sunday afternoon in that committee:

"One day the committee heard 56 delegates speak after items were sent back from the floor for more consideration." (#7, p. 4)

In another statement, elsewhere in the *Bulletins*, we are told this:

"For seven hours we listened to

those who came on Sunday. We listened for another two hours yesterday [Monday morning]." (#6, p. 25)

In still another statement, which is probably a summary statement of Friday to Tuesday, we are told:

"That [C&B] committee has met for 20 hours and heard from 75 individuals." (#7, p. 19)

*To our knowledge, every one of Sunday's items was approved, with one exception, which was not concluded until Monday.*

### MONDAY - JULY 3

We will now continue with Johnsson's statement:

"This morning (Monday), the committee has been meeting to consider how it should respond to the various suggestions it heard on Sunday." (#4, p. 5; Johnsson)

How should the committee respond? The answer was obvious. **The problem of the committee was to try and make the delegates satisfied enough to approve the amendment, while retaining as much as possible of the president's objective in recommending it.** His objective was to gather as much power as possible into his own hands.

Finally, the committee came up with a compromise that might work: give both sides part of what they wanted. The plan worked. Here is the compromise which was approved by the delegates:

"The recommendation is a compromise: General Conference associate department leaders will be elected at GC sessions, but will not be members of the General Conference Committee." (#4, p. 5; Johnsson)

What did the compromise give to the church worldwide? It meant that, henceforth, GC departmental leaders would continue to be elected, not appointed.

What did the compromise give to Folkenberg personally? (1) **It gave him control of the GC Committee. He could now make decisions affecting the entire church from headquarters in Maryland,**

**without any opposition from departmental men.** Remember that, in his opening remarks on the subject Friday, he said that it was the departmental men who were opposing him; apparently no one else dared do so. They had already been silenced.

(2) **The compromise only affected GC departmental leaders; it did not include division leaders. No vote had yet been taken on Folkenberg's plan to also strip them of election and committee participation rights.**

The compromise was not presented to the delegates for their vote until after lunch on Monday, July 4. It took the C&B committee half the night and all morning the next day to be willing to accede to half the demands of the delegates.

At 2 p.m. the compromise was presented, but the delegates were upset when they learned the election of departmental leaders only included GC personnel, and it did not include departmental membership on the GC Committee. It was disheartening to protest that much and accomplish so little.

"C.B. Rock: . . . We ran into elections versus appointments. **We became aware of the fact that this principle is one that needs to be settled** before we can move into a number of the vital recommendations coming from Annual Council by way of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee." (#6, p. 20)

**After two days of withering objections from the floor, the committee finally decided it would have to give the delegates something they were asking for.**

Ultimately, this compromised position was approved by the delegates:

"A.H. Tolhurst: The main motion is that the Constitution and Bylaws Committee be empowered to modify the constitution in harmony with the following recommendation: that associate directors of General Conference departments be elected at General Conference sessions but that

they not be members *ex officio* [official, voting members] of the General Conference Executive Committee." (#6, p. 20)

At this point a highly significant request was made. It was becoming quite obvious that massive changes were being placed before the delegates to enact—which would dramatically change the way the church was governed! What would all these cumulative changes produce? some kind of monster kingship? Surely, the delegates needed to know what the end-product would look like.

**Alvin Kibble now stood to his feet and stated an underlying problem: The delegates were being asked to enact dozens of changes, but what would be the overall effect of them all?**

"There is a concern that the body have the opportunity to address the larger issues in the total scope as they are coming to us. It is possible for us to take action on individual recommendations without seeing the large picture . . . Some have looked at the proposals carefully, and it has been observed that many of those recommendations have to do with the diminishing of the authority of this body to make decisions that are the proper and appropriate. **I would hope at some point that we could even get an opinion from the legal counsel of our church in regard to the impact that these revisions might make upon the integrity of this session of the world church.**" (#6, p. 20)

No time could have been better for Kibble to arise with such a request. **Sizeable portions of Friday, Sunday, and Monday had been preoccupied with discussion of one unfair constitutional proposal; literally dozens more were standing in the wings, waiting to be brought on stage. What kind of gargantuan monster was all this going to produce?**

Continued on the next tract

More WAYMARKS - from —

**PILGRIMS REST**

HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305

# The Utrecht Session

PART THREE OF FIVE

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

No agenda item or other business was on the floor. Now was the time for the legal statement. But leadership recognized that such a statement would be the death knell of the railroad company in the back rooms. Folkenberg had issued the orders: Get those proposals passed! And no one dared oppose him. While he was off in the nominating committee, determining who would be reelected, his trusted subordinates were standing before the delegates, stonewalling opposition, and the Constitution Committee was behind them, fending off efforts by faithful delegates to protect the balanced Constitution bequeathed us at the 1901 Session.

**M.A. Bediako was chair at the time that Kibble made that request, and he carefully ignored it. Although it was a valid request, made at the proper time, it was sidestepped.**

“M.A. Bediako: Thank you for your comments. I would like to say that we decided that those who were interested should meet with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. We referred several issues to Constitution and Bylaws for consideration. Right now we would like to continue with the *Church Manual* issues until such time as the Constitution and Bylaws Committee reports to us.” (#6, p. 20)

**As we will later note, this request was repeated later in Session, and similar ones were made. Each time, the request was snubbed.** Leadership was determined to ramrod through its objectives. —And why? All those men were doing was forging their own fetters. Changes were being made

which would provide Folkenberg with far greater power to hire and fire, than any Adventist president before him had ever had!

But there is another issue implicit in the above quoted statement. Many of our readers will recall our in-depth analysis of General Conference Sessions (*Captive Sessions—Part 1-3 [WM-114-116]*). In that study (now in section two of our *Organization Tractbook*), we discussed a variety of factors which need improvement.

Yet there are always new discoveries to be made. One of them is to be found in the minutes of this present Utrecht Session.

When Kibble requested legal advice on the whole picture, **he made the request at the right time for such a legal opinion to be given! There was no business of any kind on the floor, and the delegates had a right to make such a request.**

**But there is more, because the delegates were becoming concerned about one set of rule changes, their attention was diverted to something else.**

Instead, Bediako said that the C&B committee was not yet ready to send more constitutional changes to the delegates to discuss (#6, p. 20). This is ridiculous. There was no need to wait for the committee to finish discussing current items referred back to it; the delegates could deal with others. The changes had all been in hand over a year before Utrecht began. As we reported earlier, the changes were given to the governance committee to approve, but they refused to do so. So the changes were then presented to the 1994 Annual Council as

changes approved by the governance committee! But that was an untrue representation.

From the Annual Council, the changes were sent to Utrecht for final approval by its delegates

With over two dozen constitutional changes yet to be made over the next two-and-a-half days, Bediako said the C&B committee did not have any more changes ready.

**The plan was to divert the attention of the delegates to a totally different matter, and thus confuse minds, at that moment prepared to seriously object to the constitutional railroad.**

**It is something like viewers at a tennis match: Look here and look there. Keep the mind mixed up and then, as the end of the Session nears, get everyone in a frenzy of concern to get the rest of the agenda passed, for the time is nearly gone.**

At this point, we ourselves will do some diverting. We thought it best to carry on through to the end of the GC departmental elect/appoint debate. But, now that that has been completed, we should return to the Monday morning business session, which we skipped over. Then we will return to the Monday afternoon business meeting.

At 8:30 a.m. on July 3, the meeting began. You can read the condensed text of the meeting on #5, 12-15. One point stood out:

**Previously, members could be disciplined by the local church body, sitting in a constituency meeting. Henceforth, the church board must first review the case, and then a meeting where the pastor or conference president**

**presides must be held.** (#5, p. 14)

In this way, the pastor or conference president can help guide the direction of every disciplining session.

Let us now return to where we left off at the Monday afternoon meeting. (#6, p. 21)

Several *Church Manual* issues were discussed.

**First a change was presented which would make it easier to reinstate church members who had been disfellowshipped. If you will look at the comments made by delegates, they were generally ignored.** The chair would, instead, immediately turn to the next delegate who wished to speak and listen to him. You will find that pattern in local conference constituency meetings also. **The idea is to let everyone talk and “get it out of their system,” then when they are becoming wearied with it all, vote through most or all of the original leadership recommendations.**

After that item was approved, an even more serious matter was discussed: **disbanding or expelling churches. The objective was to strengthen ways in which local churches, which were considered doctrinally deviant, or classified as in rebellion against duly authorized authority—could be disciplined or expelled more easily.**

The problem here is that, **if a local congregation puts up too much argument about not liking the new theology pastor sent by the conference, the changed constitution will permit the conference to more easily expel that local group.**

Here is the proposed new position:

*“Mario Veloso: . . . ‘Churches may be dissolved or expelled from the sisterhood of churches’ for reasons that are classified into two groups. The first is loss of membership [not enough members in that congregation]. In that case the church is dissolved. There is no discipline in-*

*involved. The second is discipline. A church could be expelled for apostasy, refusal to operate in harmony with the *Church Manual*, or rebellion against the conference/mission. If that is the case, then expulsion could be initiated.” (#6, p. 21)*

The complete text of the change is lengthy, and is printed on #6, pp. 22-23).

Lorena Bidwell then spoke up and said:

**“All that needs to happen is a suitable recording about an act [perceived wrong by the conference]; there is no apparent time to explain what is going on, and it is completely within the hands of the executive committee.” (#6, p. 21)**

The proposed change was approved by the delegates.

Not mentioned in the *Bulletin* minutes of that business meeting is another action pushed through, which is noted only in the “*Actions*” section for that meeting:

**If a church member is censured by his local church (perhaps because he is defending historic Adventism), he will not be able to go to another local congregation—but will carry the stigma of that censure with him! Henceforth, he will be a marked man.** This was an entirely new section added to the Constitution. It was approved. (#6, p. 22)

*Except for partial modifications, to our knowledge every one of Monday’s items was approved.*

#### TUESDAY - JULY 4

At 8:30 a.m. on Tuesday morning, July 4, the business meeting reconvened.

During the Friday to Monday debate over GC departmental election/appointment, a question had arisen as to exactly what leadership had in mind for the departmental structure of the church, and, second, who would have membership on GC committee.

Athol Tolhurst told the delegates that the plan, regarding departmental identity was as follows:

“Adventist chaplaincy, Commun-

ication, Education, Family Ministries, Health and Temperance, Ministerial Association, Personal Ministries and Sabbath School (incorporating Community Services), Public Affairs and Religious Liberty, Publishing, Stewardship, Trust Services, Women’s Ministries, and Youth.” (#6, p. 23)

Regarding the second point, the plan was to have 260 members on the GC Committee, composed of certain leaders (their offices were listed on #6, p. 23).

If you take time to read that list, you will find that nearly everyone is outside of Maryland! **Therefore, from day to day—for 50 out of the 52 weeks of the year—only a very small group of men will decide world church interrelations and activities.** These men would be the GC president, treasurer, secretary; GC field secretaries, and a few others of lesser importance (the head of Adventist World Relief, Adventist Development and Relief Association, and Adventist Risk Management, Archives and Statistics, and past GC presidents, when in town. **The very much-needed counsel of the departmental personnel would be barred.**

**(Essentially the same personnel reduction will occur on the division level.)**

So the triad—the president, treasurer, and secretary—would primarily operate the church. **Yet, in point of fact, the present writer was assured by a high-placed worker that only the president—Robert Folkenberg—actually makes the decisions.** He has done a remarkable job of gaining the ascendancy over everyone else at General Conference headquarters.

**The chair next directed the attention of the delegates to the agenda item of reducing the approximately 360 members of the General Conference Committee to about 260 members.**

The plan would save money in Annual Council attendance, but require increase costs for the Spring

Councils, since an included requirement would be for the General Conference to pay the entire 260 to attend Spring Councils as well.

Folkenberg urgently wanted this GC Committee reduction passed, and we are not exactly certain why. We suspect that, in some way, the reshuffling and reductions in committee membership aided his overall rise to greater power in the world church. That seemed to be the pattern most everything else fitted into.

The action was approved. (#6, p. 25)

That afternoon, at 2 p.m., the next business meeting convened.

Interestingly enough, N.C. Wilson arose to speak. He noted that he had been hearing from many delegates a strong sense of pessimism. Many felt that the Session was, frankly, useless. They were recognizing the fact that it was merely a rubberstamp operation. Wilson caught this, and decided to try to encourage the delegates that the situation was far different.

**That which he said was remarkable—and very correct. He told them that, legally, they were the most powerful body in the denomination—and that all other committees were subservient to their jurisdiction.** Thank you, Elder Wilson.

*Neal C. Wilson:* I think that is something that needs to be clear to this delegation. There are some people who are taking a very pessimistic view, feeling that this body is [un]important and can't really make a decision. And I think they are misunderstanding at times the process that is being used to try to do this the best possible way. All these committees, including the General Conference Committee, are the servants of this body. All the subcommittees that we have that are operating here are servants of this body. And it is merely a matter of trying to channel things in a proper and correct way to get the happiest results. Because if this body really wants to have a commission, they don't have to ask the General Conference [head-

quarters in Maryland]. They can say to the General Conference. Set up a commission that will deal with such and such a matter." (#6, p. 28)

At this juncture, one might ask what really is the problem here? **Why is it that the Session delegates seem to just wander along in a lockstep pattern; a pattern from which they seem totally unable to break loose from? Why are they, the all-powerful ones, so powerless—when, indeed, there are urgent reforms which they need to set in operation.**

Here are some suggestions:

Throughout the Session, when a delegate wishes to initiate something new or different, he must do it as a motion. It is not sufficient to merely step to the microphone and say, "I think we should do this," or "I recommend that we do that." As soon as he is done speaking, the chair will immediately call on the next person to speak,—and that which the previous person said will be quickly forgotten.

The speaker must say, "I move that we do this or that."

Now, as soon as he says that, the chair will tell him, "You are out of order." And he is. The problem is that a motion is already on the floor and being discussed, and another one cannot be initiated at the same time. So what to do?

The delegate must make his new motion between agenda items. But that does not seem to happen; why? Well, **it is all part of the sewing up process which occurred many months before the Session convened. It is the little word, "agenda."**

You may recall that this was written on page one of the report you now have in hand:

**"After approving the daily program, the agenda was approved. With this done, the pathway the Session would take had been determined."** (*The Utrecht Session—Part One, page 1 [WM-634]*)

At that moment, on the opening Thursday afternoon, halfway

through the first business meeting of the Session, the sewing up was completed.

Here is the procedure at that first business meeting:

"The next item on the agenda is for us to vote the daily program. [The motion to approve the daily program was made, seconded, and voted.]

"The next item of business is to approve the agenda. [The motion to approve the agenda was made, seconded, and voted.]

"The next item of business is the election of the standing committees. [The motion to approve the standing committees was made, seconded, and voted.]" (#2, p. 26)

**First, when the preplanned daily program was approved, that set in rock the number of hours the delegates would meet for business.** In *Captive Sessions [WM-114-116]*, the present writer counted up the number of hours allocated to business meetings for a typical Session (the 1985 New Orleans Session), and discovered that **only about 20 hours was used for church business!** Yet that Session was said to have cost the church \$12 million, and the visitors another \$10 million.

**Second, when the preplanned agenda was approved, that set in cement nearly everything the delegates would do!**

Third, when the preplanned standing committee members were approved, that determined some other things we will not discuss here.

Back to that agenda: When the agenda was cast into concrete at the first business meeting, the mold of coming events was pretty much decided. Only predetermined items would be discussed and voted on.

**Now, with that background, let us return to the delegate on the floor who would like to introduce a new item of business.**

**He cannot do it when a motion is already on the floor.** Okay, then he will try again as soon as that motion has been voted up, down,

tabled, or returned to committee “for further study.”

**But as soon as that item of business is completed,—the chairman immediately opens his mouth and either presents another preplanned item or quickly gives the floor to someone who introduces that next preplanned item.**

**Am I telling the truth? How many NEW items of business were in this Utrecht Session? Go through the ten bulletins and count them. There are hardly any.**

Well, that person can stand up, while an item is on the floor, and make a motion about that preplanned agenda item: He can make a motion adding, subtracting, modifying, tabling, referring back to committee, or closing debate and calling for the vote on that motion before the house.

But he will have a difficult time getting any other item introduced.

Notice that we said that any other item had to be introduced between preplanned agenda items. But where is the delegate at that time? He probably has been standing in line—and is in the wrong place in line at the right time. He must be right at the microphone.

Now are you able to see why the most powerful committee in the church—the General Conference Session delegates in a business meeting—are nearly toothless? **The teeth were nearly all pulled when they approved the preplanned agenda that leadership handed them at about 4:15 p.m. on that first Thursday afternoon.** Incidentally, less than half the full quota of delegates are present at that first business meeting. (You may recall the statistic, gleaned from *Bulletin #1 or 2*, which we cited in the first tract in this report: Only 1,609 of the 2,650 delegates were present at the *second* business meeting, which met on Thursday evening.)

Let us now return to the Tuesday, July 4, afternoon business

meeting:

Alvin Kibble made a landmark statement. We quoted part of it earlier. Read this, and think about it:

“There are a number of delegates who have expressed rather extensive concern over the weightiness of many of the new items, not those that have been referred back for further review and discussion by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. **I noted yesterday that there are some 72 amendments to our present constitution. I cannot imagine a constitutional revision of some 72 items being suggested to the Constitution of the United States of America! That would represent a rewriting of the Constitution! I believe that if [legal] counsel were offered to this body, the conclusion would be the same.**” (#6, p. 28)

Well, that takes one’s breath away. Thank the Lord for Brother Kibble, whoever he is.

**But there is more: In the next paragraph, Brother Kibble makes a motion.** Now, you will recall that we said the delegate has to be in the right place at the right time—at that microphone just when a motion has been eliminated, one way or the other. Well, that has just happened. A motion about the North American Division edition of the *Church Manual* has just been completed, with these words:

“*R.J. Kloosterhuis*: . . . Now let’s go immediately to the motion before us. [Motion was voted.]” (#6, p. 28)

Then it was that Brother Kibble spoke, and, immediately after the above-quoted statement by him, made this motion:

“In the interest of time, given the fact that the chair is now most concerned about the time allowed to delete many of these items, **I like to move that legal counsel provide for this body a summation of the total effect of these actions** upon the historical privileges and powers of the session when it is seated, as it is on this occasion.” (#6, p. 28)

**Kibble had made a valid motion, requesting legal counsel as to the vast implications of all**

**these amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws. That was not only a reasonable request; it was vitally important, in view of the massive number of preplanned changes which leadership was urging enactment of.**

**Yet, in response, Mittleider replied that Kibble was “out of order.” It was Mittleider who was out of order!**

“K.J. Mittleider: I believe that your motion would be out of order. I think the delegation needs to see those items presented from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, and we must take the time to have it clearly understood. We’ve not prepared anyone to give a legal summation. Let me explain what I think will help us through. **As with the assembly of an automobile, it comes together one piece at a time. That is what I would hope we could do with the constitution and bylaws.** If we just take bite-sized pieces and go through it, we should vote our position on every item.” (#6, pp. 28-29)

*Interpretation:* Your motion that the delegates be given an overview is out of order, not for any parliamentary reason, but because we think so. First, because the C&B committee should send the pieces out to us one at a time, so we can see each piece, without knowing how it will all fit together. Second, because we have not prepared anyone to give a slick response. Anyone unprepared might give you the facts in the case. Third, it is better to see the trees than the forest. For example, if you are going to make an automobile, you do not design the overall car first. Without knowing what you will end up with, you make one piece and then you make another piece; hoping that, in the end, it will all look good and run right.

To Mittleider’s put-down, that brave man Kibble said this:

Continued on the next tract

More WAYMARKS - from —  
**PILGRIMS REST**

HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305

# The Utrecht Session

PART FOUR OF FIVE

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

"In an effort to move an item, many of these delegates may find themselves voting things that they do not clearly understand. **I believe it would be fair to ask for a legal opinion.**" (#6, p. 29)

**For the second time, Kibble presented the motion; this time pleading that Mittleider could find it in his good graces to accept it.**

**But now, Mittleider, ever faithful to the cause of his master, resolutely set his face to refuse to accept a proper motion from the floor!** But he was kind enough to thank Kibble for having tried.

"K.J. Mittleider: Thank you very much. We're going to proceed. We do have the Constitution and Bylaws Committee chair here." (#6, p. 29)

**At this juncture, another delegate, Edward Reid tried to present a motion requesting that the facts about the dangers in all these amendments be presented to the delegates. But he was cut short by Calvin Rock, who called on Athal Tolhurst to start presenting more bits and pieces of the 72 changes.** (#6, p. 29)

At this point, one of our readers may be thinking: "Poor souls, those leaders were not at fault; they did not themselves know much about these matters, and they surely would not know who else might know."

The truth is each of the leaders know the facts *and* the implications quite well. Items discussed at the Session are their life; they live and breathe those topics all day, all year. In addition, in their private conversations in committee, over lunch together, and on the planes, they dis-

cuss the implications and latest developments among themselves. They well-know every facet and detail, and they know what it all is leading to.

The present writer was particularly astonished at how some of the detailed, and even irrelevant, questions from the audience were, without consulting anyone, instantly answered by the chairman. Read the ten *bulletins* through for yourself, and you will see this. Those men are experts in their field—which is managing every aspect of the church. Only lifetime experts in church business arise to conference, division, and General Conference leadership positions.

**No, it cannot be said that no one was able to tell the delegates what the forest of the church would look like, after the 1901 trees had been cut down, and 1995 trees had been hauled in and put in their place. Leadership knew.**

At 4 p.m. the meeting was interrupted for a prescheduled event, which had been planned for 3 p.m.: the calling into session of the General Conference Corporation. You might wonder what that was. Like many organizations, the General Conference controls two corporations: The first is the one we all know about (its legal name is the *General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists*). The second is the *General Conference Corporation*, a holding company. By that I mean it has no activity, other than to maintain ownership of the fixed assets of the General Conference (primarily land and buildings). The purpose is that, if anything happens to the General Conference, a sister

organization can hopefully protect many of the assets from being seized. You will find it listed in the *Yearbook*. It has a board and little else. But, in order to remain legal and valid, it must hold a brief meeting at each General Conference Session, and that meeting must be announced several months earlier in the *Review*.

At 4:45 p.m. on Tuesday, July 4, the ongoing business meetings resumed with an eloquent tribute by leadership to Bert Beverly Beach, who was retiring from the General Conference. As our readers will recall, it was Beach who gave the gold medal to the pope in 1977.

He was given a vote of appreciation by the delegation.

*Except for slight modifications, to our knowledge every one of Tuesday's items was approved.*

## WEDNESDAY - JULY 5

Now we proceed to that memorable day, Wednesday, July 5, 1995. It will long be remembered by liberals in the church with cries of heart-broken sadness, rending of garments, and gnashing of teeth.

The delegation decided to remain with the Bible.

Some of our readers will wonder why, since they were so willing to compromise in regard to the Constitution and Bylaws. But those issues concerned leadership and subservience. And opposition in such matters might affect later employment and promotions.

In contrast, women's ordination was strictly a doctrinal issue. All sides recognized it as such. Therefore everyone felt free to vote their views—and they did.

At 8:30 a.m., the long-awaited day began as the business meeting

was called to order.

But it began with varied routine business, having nothing to do with that momentous topic.

One key item occurred immediately after McClure's morning welcome, so it was likely planned. A motion was made which was voted:

**"Voted, To provide reasonable time for discussion of items that were previously referred to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, and then to vote on the issues without referring them back to the committee."** (#8, pp. 27-28; cf. #7, p. 19)

Here it is again, in different words:

"Once the item is presented by the chair and the secretary of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, there will be reasonable time provided for discussion without the opportunity to amend or refer. The body will then vote the proposal up or down." (#7, p. 19)

This was something of a gag rule, affecting as it did the freedom to which delegates could object to constitutional amendments. Such matters were too important to hurriedly examine, consider only once, and return for modification to the C&B Committee only once.

**Why did the delegates approve such limitations? Why did they regularly approve nearly everything on an agenda written out months earlier?**

There are reasons, and you will find them discussed in detail in this writer's *Captive Sessions*.

Here are a few:

**1 - Nearly all the delegates are church** employees on one level or another. Employees have to be careful what they do in the presence of their bosses. They had better not be found disagreeing very much with them.

**2 - An average of eight percent of the delegates are laymen.** That means only about a couple hundred out of 2,650 are not church employees. Perhaps the Utrecht Session

had a little higher lay representation, but that would not change the picture much.

**3 - During business meetings, the delegates must sit in their respective blocks,** just as do delegates to a Republican or Democratic convention. At the right or left rear of each block, sits the leader, or a worker appointed by him, to keep track of who is present and how they are voting.

**4 - Nearly all voting is done by a show of hands.** By thus raising hands, all the no votes can easily be noted, and jotted down. The standard procedure was for the delegates to raise their "voting card" as an indication of their vote. "Please signify by raising the voting card. Opposed, the same sign." (#7, p. 22) Pictures of the voting card will be found on #7, pp. 16-17, and a photo of delegates raising their voting cards will be found on #7, p. 16. The bright red of the voting card really stood out, and made the no votes easy to locate.

**5 - The delegates are selected by the leaders,** who know who best to choose to attend the Session.

Additional factors could be mentioned, but the above five are enough. **The result is locked-in delegates carrying on a rubber-stamping operation for ten days, at a current cost of US\$15 million.** It would be far less expensive for the divisions, after having selected their delegates, to then mail the names and addresses of the delegates to the General Conference,—and let the GC mail printed copies of the complete agenda to the delegates, so they can fill in a yes or no vote by each item, and sign their names at the bottom. In addition, for that added touch of realism which they would experience at an actual Session (when leaders look over their shoulders as they raise their hands); a cover letter should be included with the mailed agenda, stating that the union and division presidents will look over each bal-

lot sheet, to see how they voted.

Just think how much money would be saved, as the same results were accomplished!

Well, back to the Wednesday morning business session.

**By the way, in addition to the Wednesday morning gag rule (which was renewed on Thursday and Friday), do not forget the earlier two-minute gag rule, approved earlier in the week.**

**Later that same Wednesday morning, C.B. Rock instructed the delegates that they should not discuss any problems—other than those related to the preplanned agenda.**

"But if we're going to start picking up things that we don't like but that the committee hasn't even talked about, we have an insurmountable problem." (#7, p. 22)

At one point, a delegate noted that the proposed amendment permitted division committees to have a quorum as low as five members, whereas no other church committees are that low. **So he made a motion** to refer it back for modification.

**It was voted and approved by the delegates, but then the chair told him that all that meant was that it would be considered five years later in A.D. 2000 at the next Session.** (#7, p. 22)

#### WOMEN'S ORDINATION

After the lunch break, the delegates gathered for the afternoon business meeting at 2 p.m.

**The chairman, Calvin Rock, presented the schedule for that afternoon's momentous business meeting.**

He told them there would be several introductions, and then the floor would be open to comments. Recognizing that there could be large numbers of comments, each one would be limited to two minutes (or three if translation was required).

There would be two microphones in one of the aisles. Viewed

from the rear of the auditorium, the one on the right would be for those opposed to women's ordination, and would be labeled "Against." The other one would be for the pro-ordinationists, and would bear the label, "For." Delegates at each mike would speak alternately.

(For your information, Utrecht was the first Session at which there were routinely three live aisle mikes: one for pro, one for con, and one for technical points and parliamentary questions. That was a definite improvement. But it would also give opportunity to more closely examine those in line at the con mike.)

**According to the afternoon schedule, one person would give an introduction, another give the con, a third give the pro, and then the floor would be open for delegate comments, which would end at 5 p.m. Then, after final remarks by Folkenberg, a secret ballot would be taken.**

In view of the fact that most everyone already had their minds made up before Wednesday afternoon, the above schedule had several outstanding qualities: the time limit, the alternating microphone comments, the predetermined closing time, and the secret ballots. Those were good and fair points, especially since everyone already knew the issues and had made up their own minds.

Keep in mind that the General conference and North American Division had sunk in the opinion of the world field—after the little trick that was played five years ago. You will recall when the women's ordination was voted down in 1990 (on Tuesday), a surprise vote was taken later (on Thursday)—when most of the delegates were out sightseeing. That surprise vote permitted local elders to perform the functions of ministers—which effectually gave women pastors everything except ordination.

So the secret ballot was very

much needed to reassure the rest of the world field that there was still some integrity left in leadership. (The delegates took them at their word that that Wednesday afternoon would settle the issue, for Thursday morning the chair noted that a lot of delegates were absent. (#8, p. 18)

**However, that Wednesday afternoon, efforts were still made to tilt the vote toward approval of women's ordination. Consider the following:**

The NAD president, Al McClure was assigned the task of giving the introduction. But, in his 20-minute speech, he obviously favored women's ordination, and appealed to the world church to accept North America's great need for it.

Then, contrary to the schedule, just before Damsteegt, Rock slipped in his uncle, Charles Bradford for a quick two-paragraph statement on Bradford's acceptance of women's ordination. Recognizing that the African divisions were strongly opposed to women's ordination, Bradford's statement was slipped in.

Then Gerard Damsteegt (Andrews University Church History professor) presented the "against" side for 20 minutes.

Following this, Raoul Dederen (Andrews emeritus theology professor), spoke and presented the "for" side.

So, before the delegates spoke, two major and one minor speech for and one against women's ordination were given.

Then, after the floor discussions by delegates, Folkenberg was to say a few words. Well, they were more than a few words, and he also gave a major statement, leaning toward women's ordination.

**Final tally: three major and one minor speech for, and one against. Then the vote was taken.**

A clear effort was made to obtain a vote favorable to a certain class of members in North America.

What is all this about?

**The Bible is clear enough. The problem is a small, powerful clique of liberals in the United States. They have intellect, they have money, they have influence, and they are liberal. Because women's ordination is the current fad in the other churches, they are determined to force it on our church also.**

You will find the *Bulletin* report on this Wednesday afternoon business meeting in #7, pp. 23-31, and #8, p. 30.

Now, let us proceed through the afternoon:

Calvin Rock's opening remarks, which began with a brief history of women's ordination in our denomination, are given on #7, p. 23.

Then L.C. Cooper read the motion:

"The General Conference vests in each division the right to authorize the ordination of individuals within its territory in harmony with established policies. In addition, where circumstances do not render it inadvisable, **a division may authorize the ordination of qualified individuals without regard to gender. In divisions where the division executive committees take specific actions approving the ordination of women to the gospel ministry, women may be ordained to serve in those divisions.**" (#7, p. 23; #8, p. 30)

Al McClure spoke to "make a 20-minute presentation giving the background and rationale of the North American Division's request" (#8, p. 30). This he did. If you will read the text of his presentation (#7, pp. 23-25), you will find that it is totally an appeal for a yes vote for women's ordination. **His theme was that the Bible does not say it cannot be done.**

"I too was unclear on this matter for some time. But after much study and reading, praying and listening, I must tell you that I am a convert to this position . . . Scripture makes no such gender distinction, how can the church, takes its commitment from Scripture, continue to make that dis-

tion?" (#7, p. 24)

Then, after Bradford's brief recommendation for women's ordination, and sandwiched between two 20-minute pro-speeches, came **Gerard Damsteegt's con-speech. It was refreshing, wonderful! Thank the Lord for His faithful ones! His theme was that the Bible repeatedly, in a variety of ways, reveals we should not do it,—and that we must stay with the Bible or we will destroy ourselves!**

If there is space elsewhere in this study, we will provide you with some quotations from his speech, but for those who have the *Bulletins*, you will find it on #7, pp. 25-26.

Then Raoul Dederen presented reasons for accepting women's ordination. **His theme was that the Bible does not say it cannot be done.**

"There is not a single statement in the Scripture that addresses this issue . . . As you noticed, neither Dr. Damsteegt nor Elder McClure was able to quote a statement in the Scriptures saying that women should not be ordained to the gospel ministry . . . How can we reconcile the views of those who stick to certain biblical passages—which, by the way, do not exist—and those who look at the overall principles of Scripture?" (#7, p. 27)

"The Bible does not explicitly address the issue of ordination of women to the ministry. I would like to see the statement. I think there is no conclusive statement in the Scriptures." (#7, p. 28)

—Can you see the basic issue here? It is clear enough. **The women's ordination activists base their case on the fact that the Bible does not say women cannot be ordained to the ministry. But they omit mentioning that the Bible does not say they should be ordained.**

The classic statement on such matters is to be found in *Great Controversy*, 289-290, which by the way, Damsteegt quoted:

"The very beginning of the great apostasy was in **seeking to supplement the authority of God by that of the church. Rome began by enjoining what God had not forbidden**, and she ended by forbidding what He had explicitly enjoined."

There you have it; the principle is clear enough.

After those three speeches, Rock opened the floor to the alternating pro and con comments by the delegates. Only a very small number are quoted in *Bulletin* #7 (pp. 28-30). Most of the names are unknown to us, but two well-known people were included: Noelene Johnsson (wife of the Review editor) and Benjamin Reaves (president of Oakwood College), both of whom spoke in favor of women's ordination. **Actually, in the North American Division, it is quite politically popular among leadership to be favorable to that innovation.**

Next, as prearranged, Robert Folkenberg came to the podium and spoke for about 10 minutes—and he leaned toward women's ordination also.

He also said:

"It was with fear and forboding that some of us foresaw the approach of this debate this afternoon." (#7, p. 30)

Folkenberg had good reason to say that, for **the leaders were well-aware that, whichever way the outcome, there will be those who will be extremely upset; some may wish to bolt from the church.**

After he concluded with prayer, the secret ballot cards were distributed. J.H. Zachary asked whether it would be a two-thirds or 51 percent vote. Rock said 51 percent.

Then the schedule called for a few songs to be sung while the votes were collected and counted. But then, to pass some time, to B.B. Beach's surprise, Rock requested that he step forward and tell the audience who were the guests sitting beside him (Beach had a reserved section of seats, in a front row for

himself and his guests.)

Beach stepped to the podium.

"One of the blessings of a General Conference session is to have a number of guests in our midst, leaders of other denominations, or other world organizations, or Christian world communions. We've had about 20 special guests from different communions. Some of them have come and already gone. A few have not arrived yet, so they kind of come in relays. I would just like to take the opportunity of asking these special guests that are here in front right now to stand so that you can take notice of where they come from." (#7, p. 31)

**We are not told who all the guests were, but the three there, right then, were spectacular. There can be little doubt that Beach would have preferred that they not be displayed publicly. They would not have been, but Rock needed to fill time:**

"**The three that are here are from the Netherlands representing the old Catholic Church, the World Baptist Alliance, and also the World Council of Churches.** We're very happy that these gentlemen are here with us, and we ask them to stand. [Applause.] [In addition to the "20 special guests," mentioned in the above-quoted paragraph] We also have about 20 observer **delegates** or observer guests from a great variety of Christian communities. And we're honored that they have come and spent time witnessing and communing with us." (#7, p. 31)

**Since these three guests—Catholic, Baptist, and WCC leaders—were so amazing, one cannot help wondering who the other guests were, that Beach brought to the Session!**

After more singing, the ballot results came back:

"Total number voting: 2,154. Of that number, 673 voting YES [for women's ordination], and 1,481 voting NO." (#7, p. 31)

Continued on the next tract

More WAYMARKS - from —  
**PILGRIMS REST**

HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305

# The Utrecht Session

PART FIVE OF FIVE

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

**Another major decision: The women's ordination issue was voted down.**

A friend who attended the Utrecht Session told us that he spoke with many people before and after that Wednesday afternoon meeting, and by far the majority were against women's ordination. He told me that one high-placed official personally told him that North American leaders knew this would be the last opportunity for America to get women's ordination voted in at a Session—because church membership outside of North America was steadily increasing every year, and it was the overseas vote which kept it from being approved.

What is ahead?

I predict that, within a few months, Southeastern California Conference will bolt, and begin ordaining women ministers—in spite of the Utrecht decision!

Watch for it. It is coming. What will the General Conference do about it? I predict they will fuss a little, but will, essentially, do nothing. Other areas, such as Potomac Conference, may follow their lead and also bolt.

"I have the distinct impression that very few people changed their minds during the course of the afternoon: most delegates already had decided how they would vote.

"And, of course, the result was identical with 1990—thumbs down. Support for women's ordination perhaps increased from about 25 percent in Indianapolis to 31 percent." (William Johnsson, #7, p. 3)

A few paragraphs ago, we stated that the underlying problem was whether or not we should stay by

Scripture. But the liberals declare they are remaining with Scripture. **While the conservatives take the words of Scripture, the liberals interpret it. Their view is not what we read in Scripture, but what we read into it that counts.** This is clearly seen in the two speeches—Damsteegt's and Dederen's. **How should we interpret the Bible? Should we take the literal words for what they say, or should we strive to adapt the overall message to conform with modern fads?**

**The modernist view is that, when the Bible does not say not to do something, therefore we should consider doing it. Conservatives maintain we must remain with what is taught in Scripture. But liberals want to interweave their own ideas, by finding passages which could possibly mean this or could be stretched to include that.**

William Johnsson presents his (somewhat slanted) view of the controversy:

"The crux is how Adventists interpret the Bible. The Bible doesn't directly speak to the issue. If it did, we could have resolved women's ordination long ago, because both sides want to submit to the authority of the Word of God.

"Out of this silence one side says—'Go forward under the leading of the Spirit.' The other side says—'We dare not without direct counsel from the Lord!'

"And there is more. Yesterday [Wednesday afternoon] we saw two respected Adventist scholars approach the Scriptures in different ways. One [Damsteegt] based his case on specific verses and statements of Ellen White, arguing from a *literalistic* basis. The other

[Dederen] also appealed to Scripture and Ellen White, but in terms of [what he called] the *principles* behind the statements.

"The differences are striking and important. They impact not only the women's issue but many others. We have not heard the last of this matter. Adventists will have to wrestle with this most basic concern: How shall we interpret Scripture?" (Johnsson, #7, p. 3; italics his)

*Except for slight modifications, to our knowledge every one of Wednesday's items was approved—except one, the ordination issue, which was rejected outright.*

**THURSDAY - JULY 6**

On Thursday, July 6, 8:30 a.m., the next business meeting convened. It was time to get back to rewriting the Constitution.

**Did the delegates know, in advance, that they would be attending a Con-Con? That is the abbreviation for a Constitutional Convention. The delegates were sent there to change, not the U.S. Constitution, but the basic framework and governing paper of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination! What have we come to when one man can decide to radically do that—and no one dares oppose him!**

**Significantly enough, there was one man who had been opposing Folkenberg: David Dennis, the head auditor at world headquarters for over a decade. But he had been ousted just a few months before the Utrecht Session.** (You can read all the details in our new book, *Collision Course*, which is now available in our book store or by phone, on credit card orders: 615-692-2777.

At this Thursday morning meet-

ing, the expelling churches item was approved.

The item entitled "Disbanding or Expelling Churches" was approved. (#8, p. 19)

**It would not be simple for the delegates to easily recognize the significance of all these changes.** The delegates were presented with printed material which had little relationship to their everyday lives, and they were asked to approve it all. Yet **only an expert could be certain of the significance of the proposed changes—and twice they were denied information by such an expert.**

Who but an expert would be able to identify the significant changes? This is the way it went throughout most of the Session; **a mass of material was set before them, and, after a few comments, a hurried vote was needed so the next of the 72 changes could be voted on.**

As mentioned in an earlier tract study, **some of the changes approved by the 1994 Annual Council—were not sent on to Utrecht for approval. Why are not all constitutional and bylaws changes sent on to the Session for their approval?** At any rate, this fact was briefly mentioned on #8, p. 20.

The chair next directed the attention of the delegates to a major item on the agenda: **should the total number of delegates attending each Session be capped** (limited to a certain maximum amount), or left uncapped? (#8, p. 21) At the 1980 Session this point was presented, and the delegates voted down capping. Once again it is brought up, and it is a valid issue. The more delegates which attend, the greater the cost. **Since, to a great degree, a rubberstamping pattern is adhered to during each ten-day Session, the church might as well reduce the number who attend.**

It is of interest that, in response, one delegate arose and said this:

"*M.A. Fargo*: . . . I feel that if we are interested in solving the problem and addressing the issue we should cut the expenses and the size by sending and paying for only delegates, not spouses as well." (#8, p. 22)

Well, that is a discovery new to some of us! **Why are spouses paid to attend General Conference Sessions?**

Shortly afterward, in spite of many who wanted to speak about the capping, discussion was closed because it was time for the meeting to adjourn for lunch.

At 2 p.m. on Thursday afternoon, the business meeting should have convened. There was urgent business before the delegates, and they needed time to discuss the remaining items of proposed amendments (72 of them), and the many *Church Manual* changes (a total of 30).

The situation was made more urgent by the fact that Friday was the last day that business meetings would be held, and so many items were yet unfinished!

—So what do you think was done? In order to hurry up the "get the motion approved quick" pattern, the delegates were told that Thursday afternoon was assigned to "breakout discussion groups"! (#7, p. 3)

The delegates, when they approved the agenda and schedule that first Thursday afternoon (#2, p. 26), had little idea that they were greatly limiting the amount of time they would have for business, and okaying a vast amount of agenda changes which would be presented to them.

There was also another useful reason for skipping the Thursday afternoon business meeting: Lacking it, the delegates would have even less time to bring up new items of business on the floor.

Please know that they fully had the power and authority to do this. But, unfortunately, many of them did not know that fact. Consider the

plight of delegate Morten Thomsen, who, in the Friday afternoon meeting, said this at the microphone:

"How does a delegate get an item on the agenda? There is no plans committee as such." (#9, p. 19)

Consider the picture: Morten Thomsen, as a bonifide delegate to the 1995 General Conference Session, at a business meeting of that Session, had the authority to make a motion, *right then*, to bring a new item of business to the floor for discussion and vote—in this meeting of this Session!

Or if he preferred, *right then*, he could make a motion to place an item on the next Session's agenda (with approval, of course, from the delegates).

Yet, instead of telling Brother Thomsen that fact, he was given a five-year roundaround, during which the conference, the union, and all the division presidents would have to decide if they wanted to bother presenting his agenda item to the A.D. 2000 Session!

"*G. Ralph Thompson*: Agenda items generally follow the route of going through the organizations from the conference committee to the union committee, then to the division committee, and finally to the General Conference. If, after discussion, all the divisions think the matter is of general interest for a session, then it will be brought through the channels to the General Conference Annual Council, and that's the body that recommends items for the GC session agenda." (#9, p. 19)

That which Thompson forgot to mention to the Thomsen (and the other listening delegates)—was that that was the pattern used by a church member, NOT A DELEGATE SITTING IN A BUSINESS MEETING OF THE SESSION!

*Except for slight modifications, to our knowledge every one of Thursday's items was approved.*

#### FRIDAY - JULY 7

At 8:30 a.m., Friday, the business meetings resumed. One item

brought before the delegates included the point that the treasurer and secretary of the GC could not bring anything to the GC committee—until they had first counseled with the president regarding the matter!

Several delegates, observing this effort to further tighten controls in the hand of Folkenberg, objected.

*“Susan Sickler: . . . If the difference in terms means that the president can kill a report of fellow officers before it goes to the Executive Committee, we are in deep trouble. One of the major checks and balances that we have is that these people have free access to the Executive Committee. I have personally been in a conference in which, if the treasurer had not gone directly to the Executive Committee despite what the president wanted, we would have become bankrupt.” (#9, p. 10)*

In response, it was stated by Tolhurst (the one who under Folkenberg’s direction had written all the changes) that everything would work out all right, so the item was approved by the delegates. But not before Joyce Hopp expressed her concerns:

*“I also wish to speak to the same words, ‘in consultation with.’ I am very concerned lest the treasurer and the secretary be unable to go directly to the Executive Committees if there is a problem. It’s when there is a problem that you need all the safeguards you can get. I am very concerned with this language.” (#9, p. 10)*

Another item was to appoint a special board to recommend who should be elected onto the next auditing staff. When it was suggested that those on the board ought to be decided right then (instead of waiting five years to do so), the chair said there was not enough

time to pick names. Yet this item of business had been known months ahead of time. There had been lots of time to select names for the delegates to choose from. Instead, it will not be selected till half a decade later (#9, p. 10). In connection with this, associate division auditors would not be elected at Sessions. (#9, p. 11)

At one point, it was noted that some church entities are not audited by church auditors (#9, p. 11), even though it was stated that church auditors do a better job than outside auditors (#9, p. 12). In connection with this discussion, the fact came out that our most notorious church entity for running up big bills and going heavily into debt—Adventist Health Systems—is exempt from having church auditors check on what they do! (#9, p. 11)

No wonder the church does not know what is happening in AHS finances!

Eventually, the item of whether to cap the delegates at 2,650 or 2,000 was brought back from the table and presented to the delegates for their vote. After discussion, it was voted to table the item until that afternoon.

After lunch, the delegates reassembled for the final business meeting, which convened at 1:30 p.m.

A major part of the meeting was allocated by the chair to honoring retired and retiring workers with words of appreciation. Several speeches were given.

Partway through the afternoon, the final report of the nominating committee was presented to the delegates. It included many, many names which were approved in a single vote. It is of surprising interest that Wintley Phipps, the well-

known Black singer, was included: According to the *Bulletin*, he is now associate director of the GC Public Affairs and Religious Liberty Department (#9, p. 18)! Yet he has probably never had a day of training in legal affairs, courtrooms, or legislative lobbying in his life.

Eventually, the tabled item of capping was again taken up and discussed further. It was voted to limit the number of delegates sent to future Sessions to 2,000.

The concluding portion of this meeting consisted of statements by former leaders, now retired, who spoke of how well the business meetings had gone, and the progress that had been made.

*Except for slight modifications, to our knowledge every one of Friday’s items was approved.*

So the 1995 General Conference Session is past. But it is well to consider one point on which it, and every other Session could have been improved. There was absolutely no mention—not one—of Bible or Spirit of Prophecy principles throughout the entire Session, except in those two women’s ordination sermons (Damsteeg’s and Dederen’s). One would think that the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy has nothing to say about church business matters, but God’s Word has much to say about such matters.

How can we have success in carrying on God’s work, when we do not put God’s Inspired Writings first when we discuss that work?

For your information, the next General Conference Session is slated to be held in Toronto, Canada in the summer of A.D. 2000.

If you will count the total number of hours allocated for business meetings at this Session, you will find they are about average for General Conference Sessions.

Looking through the schedules

and text of the business meetings, and subtracting the extraneous speeches, honorariums, etc., we find that there was only about 41 hours and 47 minutes actual hours of business. With eight business days, this averaged a little over 5

hours per day.

Yet that is what the delegates were brought to Utrecht to do—initiate and transact five years’ worth of business!

See the chart on the next page. Pray for our people.

## GUIDE TO THE BULLETINS

Frankly, General Conference Sessions are somewhat difficult to figure out. The following guide to the ten General Conference *Bulletins* may help you in your personal analysis.

### LISTS

List of delegates #1, pp. 21-31  
 List of radio stations #1, p. 19  
 Session agenda #1, p. 8  
 Highlights from past Sessions #1, p. 4  
 Nominating Committee members #3, p. 31

### NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORTS:

1st Report: #2, p. 31  
 2nd Report: #2, p. 31  
 3rd Report: #3, p. 31  
 4th Report: #4, p. 31  
 5th Report: #5, p. 31  
 6th Report: #5, p. 31  
 7th Report: Not printed in the Bulletin  
 8th Report: #6, p. 31  
 9th Report: #  
 10th Report: #

### THURSDAY

DAY ONE: Thursday, June 29 #2, pp. 2-3  
 FIRST BUSINESS MEETING [Part One]: 3 p.m. #2,  
 pp. 24-26  
 ACTIONS: Not printed in the Bulletin  
 FIRST BUSINESS MEETING [Part Two]: 7 p.m. #2,  
 pp. 27-28  
 ACTIONS: Not printed in the Bulletin  
 SCHEDULE: Thursday, June 29 #2, p. 6

### FRIDAY

DAY TWO: Friday, June 30 #2, pp. 2-3  
 SECOND BUSINESS MEETING: 8:30 a.m. pp. 28, 30  
 ACTIONS: Not printed in the Bulletin  
 THIRD BUSINESS MEETING: 12 noon pp. #2, pp.  
 30-31  
 ACTIONS: Not printed in the Bulletin  
 FOURTH BUSINESS MEETING: 2 p.m. #3, pp. 12-15  
 ACTIONS: #3, p. 30  
 SCHEDULE: Friday, June 30 #2, p. 6

### SABBATH

DAY THREE: Sabbath, July 1 #2, pp. 7-8  
 SCHEDULE: Sabbath, July 1 #2, p. 6

### SUNDAY

DAY FOUR: Sunday, July 2 #3, pp. 2-4  
 FIFTH BUSINESS MEETING: 8:30 a.m. #4, pp. 23-  
 24, 26-28  
 ACTIONS: #4, pp. 30-31  
 SIXTH BUSINESS MEETING: 2 p.m. #4, pp. 28-30

ACTIONS: #5, pp. 20-21  
 SCHEDULE: Sunday, July 2 #3, p. 4

### MONDAY

DAY FIVE: Monday, July 3 #4, pp. 2-4  
 SEVENTH BUSINESS MEETING: 8:30 a.m. #5, pp.  
 12-15  
 ACTIONS: #5, pp. 21-23  
 EIGHTH BUSINESS MEETING: 2 p.m. #6, pp. 20-21  
 ACTIONS: #6, pp. 21-23  
 SCHEDULE: Monday, July 3 #4, p. 4

### TUESDAY

DAY SIX: Tuesday, July 4 #5, pp. 2-4  
 NINTH BUSINESS MEETING: 8:30 a.m. #6, pp. 23-  
 27  
 ACTIONS: #7, p. 13  
 TENTH BUSINESS MEETING: 2 p.m. #6, pp. 28-31  
 ACTIONS: #7, pp. 13-14 and #8, 26-27  
 ELEVENTH BUSINESS MEETING: 4:45 p.m. #6, pp.  
 31  
 ACTIONS: #8, p. 27  
 SCHEDULE: Tuesday, July 4 #5, p. 4

### WEDNESDAY

DAY SEVEN: Wednesday, July 5 #6, pp. 2-4  
 TWELFTH BUSINESS MEETING: #7, pp. 19-22  
 ACTIONS: #8, pp. 27-30  
 THIRTEENTH BUSINESS MEETING: #7, pp. 23-31  
 ACTIONS: #8, pp. 30  
 SCHEDULE: Wednesday, July 5 #6, p. 4

### THURSDAY

DAY EIGHT: Thursday, July 6 #7, pp. 2-3  
 FOURTEENTH BUSINESS MEETING: #8, pp. 18-22  
 ACTIONS: #9, pp. 22-23, 25-27  
 Afternoon BUSINESS MEETING: None held, instead  
 small discussion groups met [#7, p. 3]  
 SCHEDULE: Thursday, July 6 #7, p. 3

### FRIDAY

DAY NINE: Friday, July 7 #8, pp. 2-3  
 FIFTEENTH BUSINESS MEETING: #9, pp. 10-14  
 ACTIONS: #9, pp. 27-30  
 SIXTEENTH BUSINESS MEETING: #9, pp. 14-15,  
 18-19  
 ACTIONS: #9, pp. 30-31  
 SCHEDULE: Friday, July 7 #8, p. 3

### SABBATH

DAY TEN: Sabbath, July 8 #9, pp. 2-3  
 SCHEDULE: Sabbath, July 8 #9, pp. 3

# GUIDE TO THE BULLETINS

Frankly, General Conference Sessions are somewhat difficult to figure out. The following guide to the ten General Conference *Bulletins* may help you in your personal analysis.

## LISTS

List of delegates #1, pp. 21-31  
List of radio stations #1, p. 19  
Session agenda #1, p. 8  
Highlights from past Sessions #1, p. 4  
Nominating Committee members #3, p. 31

## NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORTS:

1st Report: #2, p. 31  
2nd Report: #2, p. 31  
3rd Report: #3, p. 31  
4th Report: #4, p. 31  
5th Report: #5, p. 31  
6th Report: #5, p. 31  
7th Report: Not printed in the Bulletin  
8th Report: #6, p. 31  
9th Report: #  
10th Report: #

## THURSDAY

DAY ONE: Thursday, June 29 #2, pp. 2-3  
FIRST BUSINESS MEETING [Part One]: 3 p.m. #2, pp. 24-26 [c. 2 actual hours of business]  
ACTIONS: Not printed in the Bulletin  
FIRST BUSINESS MEETING [Part Two]: 7 p.m. #2, pp. 27-28 [0 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: Not printed in the Bulletin  
SCHEDULE: Thursday, June 29 #2, p. 6

## FRIDAY

DAY TWO: Friday, June 30 #2, pp. 2-3  
SECOND BUSINESS MEETING: 8:30 a.m. pp. 28, 30 [c. 20 minutes actual business]  
ACTIONS: Not printed in the Bulletin  
THIRD BUSINESS MEETING: 12 noon pp. #2, pp. 30-31 [c. 15 minutes actual business]  
ACTIONS: Not printed in the Bulletin  
FOURTH BUSINESS MEETING: 2 p.m. #3, pp. 12-15 [c. 3-1/2 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: #3, p. 30  
SCHEDULE: Friday, June 30 #2, p. 6

## SABBATH

DAY THREE: Sabbath, July 1 #2, pp. 7-8  
SCHEDULE: Sabbath, July 1 #2, p. 6

## SUNDAY

DAY FOUR: Sunday, July 2 #3, pp. 2-4  
FIFTH BUSINESS MEETING: 8:30 a.m. #4, pp. 23-24, 26-28 [c. 3-1/2 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: #4, pp. 30-31  
SIXTH BUSINESS MEETING: 2 p.m. #4, pp. 28-30 [c. 3-1/2 hours actual business]

ACTIONS: #5, pp. 20-21  
SCHEDULE: Sunday, July 2 #3, p. 4

## MONDAY

DAY FIVE: Monday, July 3 #4, pp. 2-4  
SEVENTH BUSINESS MEETING: 8:30 a.m. #5, pp. 12-15 [c. 3-1/2 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: #5, pp. 21-23  
EIGHTH BUSINESS MEETING: 2 p.m. #6, pp. 20-21 [c. 3-1/2 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: #6, pp. 21-23  
SCHEDULE: Monday, July 3 #4, p. 4

## TUESDAY

DAY SIX: Tuesday, July 4 #5, pp. 2-4  
NINTH BUSINESS MEETING: 8:30 a.m. #6, pp. 23-27 [c. 3-1/2 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: #7, p. 13  
TENTH BUSINESS MEETING: 2 p.m. #6, pp. 28-31 [c. 2 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: #7, pp. 13-14 and #8, 26-27  
ELEVENTH BUSINESS MEETING: 4:45 p.m. #6, pp. 31 [c. 1 hour actual business]  
ACTIONS: #8, p. 27  
SCHEDULE: Tuesday, July 4 #5, p. 4

## WEDNESDAY

DAY SEVEN: Wednesday, July 5 #6, pp. 2-4  
TWELFTH BUSINESS MEETING: #7, pp. 19-22 [c. 3-1/2 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: #8, pp. 27-30  
THIRTEENTH BUSINESS MEETING: #7, pp. 23-31 [c. 3-1/2 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: #8, pp. 30  
SCHEDULE: Wednesday, July 5 #6, p. 4

## THURSDAY

DAY EIGHT: Thursday, July 6 #7, pp. 2-3  
FOURTEENTH BUSINESS MEETING: #8, pp. 18-22 [c. 3-1/2 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: #9, pp. 22-23, 25-27  
Afternoon BUSINESS MEETING: None held, instead small discussion groups met [#7, p. 3]  
SCHEDULE: Thursday, July 6 #7, p. 3

## FRIDAY

DAY NINE: Friday, July 7 #8, pp. 2-3  
FIFTEENTH BUSINESS MEETING: #9, pp. 10-14 [c. 3-1/2 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: #9, pp. 27-30  
SIXTEENTH BUSINESS MEETING: #9, pp. 14-15, 18-19 [c. 3-1/2 hours actual business]  
ACTIONS: #9, pp. 30-31  
SCHEDULE: Friday, July 7 #8, p. 3

## SABBATH

DAY TEN: Sabbath, July 8 #9, pp. 2-3  
SCHEDULE: Sabbath, July 8 #9, pp. 3