

Who Watches? Who Cares?

Misadventures in Stewardship

Douglas Hackleman

with concluding essays by

**Frank Knittle
Arden Clarke
Stewart Shankel**

**Members for Church Accountability, Inc.
Morrison, Colorado**

Who Watches? Who Cares?

© 2008 Members for Church Accountability

This book is a publication of

Members for Church Accountability, Inc.

P.O. Box 1072

Morrison, Colorado 80465

<http://www.advmca.org>

Telephone orders 909-793-9430

Fax orders 909-335-9887

Orders by email advmca@aol.com

© 2008 by Members for Church Accountability

All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Manufactured in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hackleman, Douglas

Who watches ; who cares : misadventures in stewardship / Douglas Hackleman.

– [1st ed.] Morrison, CO : Members for Church Accountability , Inc . , ©2008

p.

Includes bibliographical references and name index.

ISBN-13: 978-0-9814520-0-5 (acid-free paper)

ISBN-10: 0-9814520-0-0 (acid-free paper)

1. Seventh-day Adventists–United States . 2 . Adventists–United States .

3. Seventh-day Adventists–Finance . 4 . Adventists–Finance . II . Title .

BX6154 . 3 . H23 2008

Introduction

The Flat Tire

Since the late 1970s, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination has been buffeted by a concatenation of corporate church financial scandals that have resulted in the unnecessary loss of hundreds of millions of dollars. Ours are lesser losses, in absolute terms, than those of the United Nations food-for-oil fraud, or than the betrayals of stockholders by Enron, WorldCom or Arthur Anderson. But the church losses may be considered more serious because they continue in waves, one after another, and because we believe each instance not only betrays the institution and the members that comprise it but the Higher Source whose selected stewards we claim to be.

If the pronouncements of church leaders and their legal representatives since the Pacific Press cases are correct (about the Adventist denomination being hierarchically structured), it is not surprising that members begin to think of the church as a major international corporation with many far-flung branch offices (divisions, unions, conferences) that have been responsible for numerous multi-million-dollar failures over the past thirty years.

Unfortunately, our faith-based behemoth has not responded to its failing and fraudulent fiduciaries like a corporation that must regain the respect of clients and stockholders; rather it responds like the United Nations that (no matter how crippled and corrupt) remains supported by its country constituents (or their citizens' taxes) and the superstition that the world cannot survive without it.¹

In like manner, the corporate church eschews investigation, covers for cavalier clerics, claims religious exemptions from legal responsibility and winks at Ellen White's insistence that the work of God should be "as transparent as sunlight."²

The seven following stories of shameful SDA stewardship were chosen from a larger list. Some that were left on the cutting room floor included the divestiture of Loma Linda Foods, the Loma Linda University Medical Center Learjet lapse, the collapse in early 1992 of Sködsborg Sanitarium and the Nutana health food business with which it was affiliated, the recent loss of Paradise Valley Hospital and the scandalous implosion of the Lake Region Conference. Unfortunately, should a second volume be required, there will be no shortage of cold cases to review.

Norm Smith represents Members for Church Accountability (MCA) when he expresses the hope that this book will motivate readers to labor kindly but relentlessly with church leaders to make the adjustments that are necessary to minimize the accountability shortcomings that hamper the church in its mission.

Mourning a "pattern of misadventures in our church," Smith believes that flaws in the accepted ways of doing business facilitated the shirking of accountability that made possible these and other unreported misadventures.

Drawing attention to problems without appearing vindictive or destructive is a delicate task. MCA has no choice but to trust readers to understand that the purpose of this volume is to strengthen the Seventh-day Adventist Church by instigating practical procedural reforms. In this effort to speak truth with love, Smith uses a modern parable to illustrate the difficulty in overcoming resistance to even the most obviously needed change:

Imagine the church is a van, he says, its members the passengers and its leaders in the driver's seat. As the van trundles down the highway toward its destination, some riders notice that a tire has gone flat. Despite their

expressions of concern, the driver continues on as though nothing has happened. Most passengers ignore the odd way in which the bus is riding, and even express irritation at the riders who continue to voice concern about the potential hazard of continuing on a deflated tire. Why, they ask, would anyone want to stop and impede the van's progress. The vehicle belongs to the Lord, they point out, and He will fix the flat tire if it needs to be repaired.³

The concerned passengers reply that at the very best the flat tire is slowing the van's progress, and at the worst may cause it to leave the road and crash. They observe other vehicles stranded along the road and point to history's witness that the Lord expects His drivers to fix flat tires on His vans. But the majority of riders align with the driver by leaving the tire (and their safety) in the hands of the Lord.

As the parable concludes, Smith comments on those other vans stranded at various mileposts. While many of their passengers have not abandoned their vehicles, he writes, they are using them as shelters rather than as methods of transportation.

MCA is made up of loyal members of the SDA Church who take no joy in voicing accountability concerns. But they cannot set aside the overwhelming conviction that our church has an accountability problem that is a great impediment to its mission and even possibly a threat to its future.

It is the prayer of MCA's leaders that these stories of unnecessary loss will encourage others of the need to change the tire, to realize that it is presumption to expect God to do for us things that we are compelled by commandment to do for ourselves and to join with us in the effort to correct the church's accountability problems in the most constructive manner possible.

To research, write and publish these examples of painful and pointless misadventures, MCA risks the misapprehension by some loyal church members that we are merely accusers of the brethren. But we are more concerned about the flat tire than about our image, and take some comfort in Jesus' assertion, "Woe are ye when all men think well of you."

It is understandable that those who care for the church will read these stories of cavalier stewardship with indignation. It was not easy for the primary author of this volume to expand these exposés in a measured voice; and the initial draft was less irenic.

After reading earlier versions of several of these misadventures, an Adventist friend vented: “I don’t know why we don’t just get together a tithe of the tithe in a pile of cash—you know, \$15 or \$20 million—and have an annual bonfire of the disappointed! It would be less frustrating, and less destructive, than the losses that come from the bankrupting hospitals, churches and schools with all the damaged lives and diminished faith that often accompany such institutional failure.”

We should fete rather than fire our whistleblowers, and fix the flattened tires that impede and endanger the journey to our appointed destination.

Notes

1. Malcolm Muggeridge once referred to the UN’s predecessor, the League of Nations, as “another Tower of Babel, climbing inanely into the sky.”
2. Ellen G. White, “A Peculiar People,” *Review and Herald* (November 18, 1890), p. 2.
3. The logic of this seems to conflate the roles of church leaders, the driver, and the Lord.

A Tale of Two Institutions

Why are those who are set apart for the work of the ministry on committees and boards? Why are they called upon to attend so many business meetings, many times at great distance from their fields of labor? Why are not business matters placed in the hands of business men? The finances of the cause are to be properly managed by men of ability, but ministers are set apart for another line of work. Let the management of financial matters rest on others than those ordained to the ministry. —Ellen G. White¹

Fuller Memorial Hospital's misadventure began at its address in Attleboro, Massachusetts, during the spring of 1977, when its administrator, Gerald Shampo, involved the 82-bed Seventh-day Adventist psychiatric hospital² in a limited partnership of his own devising that was created to finance, build and manage a 160-bed nursing home facility in nearby Pawtucket, Rhode Island.³ The nursing home was funded by the Fuller Memorial Hospital, built by the limited partnership headed by the hospital's administrator and then sold to the very hospital that underwrote its erection.⁴

Nearly five years later (February 1982) an unofficial comment during a Southern New England Conference constituency session at the Worcester Seventh-day Adventist Church prompted an Adventist layman to investigate the nature of the relationship between the two institutions.⁵ During that constituency session Cliff Turner, an elder of the Foxboro Seventh-day Adventist Church, overheard someone say that the Adventist Church did not own the Pawtucket Nursing Villa. Turner

was puzzled by what he heard because the remark was at variance with articles that had appeared in the Atlantic Union *Gleaner* in 1979 and 1980 written by Fuller Memorial chaplain Alton Johnson⁶ and Atlantic Union president Earl W. Amundson.⁷ In his article, Amundson listed the Pawtucket Institute for Health Services (Pawtucket Nursing Villa) as one of the nine health-care institutions owned by the Atlantic Union via Adventist Health System/North, adding that “in 1972 the General Conference Annual Council voted to make possible the reorganization of Adventist hospitals into management corporations within the church organizational lines in order to retain complete and ultimate control in an age of rapid change.”⁸

Sleuthing church elders

Seeking to resolve the contradiction between what he had heard and what he had read, Turner went on an independent fact-finding visit to the Rhode Island State House and the Pawtucket City Hall. As he examined an amended limited partnership agreement, Turner discovered that at the inception of the Pawtucket project four years earlier, Fuller Memorial Hospital—as a subordinate, limited partner—had owned only 24 percent of the nursing villa.⁹

The controlling general partner in this limited partnership was comprised of three individuals: Gerald Shampo (the Fuller Memorial Hospital administrator) and two Rhode Island developers, Eugene Sirois and Anthony Lawrence—with addresses, respectively, in Pawtucket and Cumberland. The general partners were teamed up on other questionable and much publicized ventures unrelated to the Adventist Church.¹⁰

Fuller Memorial Hospital, as limited partner, had invested \$145,000 to acquire a 24 percent interest in the Pawtucket Nursing Villa. Inexplicable to this day, the general partners—Shampo, Sirois and Lawrence—were designated 76 percent (controlling) interest in the venture . . . *for an investment of \$1.00 each.*¹¹

“Neither trifle nor tragedy”¹

In Matthew 25:14-30 Jesus relates the parable of three servants entrusted by their master with various sums of money while he was away on extended travel. When the master returned he rewarded two of his servants for their stewardship—for doubling the money he left in their care. The third servant simply safeguarded his master’s principle. Because he had not invested the money in an interest-bearing account, the master ordered that “the unprofitable servant” be cast “into outer darkness.”

Imagine what would have befallen the unprofitable servant had he lost part of his master’s principle while making a profit on his own money invested with the same speculator.

IN THE THIRD WEEK OF APRIL 1977, General Conference president Robert H. Pierson received an unusual letter. As the Seventh-day Adventist denomination’s chief executive, Pierson regularly received copious correspondence; but this letter was different. It was sent from Long Beach, California, by certified, return-receipt-requested mail. It was seven-pages long, and the letterhead announced:

**DONALD J. DAVENPORT M.D.
GENERAL CONTRACTOR REAL ESTATE
INVESTMENTS**

The correspondent was familiar to Elder Pierson, if for no other reason than that the General Conference president was the most powerfully positioned of the many Adventist Church regional administrators on the doctor’s roster of creditors.² In his letter Davenport reviewed facts and repeated complaints with which Pierson was, to varying degrees, familiar. Two sentences in the doctor’s letter described quite clearly financial arrangements that created an ethical dilemma to which both men seemed oblivious.

. . . . I have managed the Church's money for the different Conferences for a period of approximately twenty-one or twenty-two years, going back to 1956.

I have been . . . handling and investing millions of dollars for the Seventh-day Adventist Church as a corporate entity *as well as for many officers and individuals of the Seventh-day Adventist Church on an individual basis.*³

The "officers and individuals" included quite a few who were also making decisions to loan Davenport money from the union and local conference trusts funds.⁴

Davenport spent most of a page specifying church institutions he had helped financially through building projects that included "the shopping center for Pacific Union College," "a post office in Angwin" and "a post office at La Sierra College"; as well as contributions (totaling more than \$250,000) to the Georgia-Cumberland Conference, the Carolina Conference and the Garden Grove Seventh-day Adventist Church.⁵

The doctor wasn't so much boasting as he was preparing Pierson for his complaint about a problem that he believed could put the "millions of dollars" various church entities had invested with him in jeopardy, not to mention the roughly \$7,000 Pierson had sitting in Davenport's "Capital Loan Account."

For the last several years a short statured Napoleonic complexed individual in your office has seen fit to run hither and thither in the United States . . . demeaning me and casting doubt and bringing disreputable thoughts into the various Church organizations that have invested with me.

. . . . Elder Pierson, I am tired of this back handed, character assassination, low dealing tactics of this employee in your organization.

Davenport surmised that "one of the reasons that I am suspect is because I don't give out a balance sheet." A reason he offered for that refusal might have seemed understandable, but it also provided an excuse (if he needed one) to maintain the

confidentiality of individual investors, including some who should not have had a dual financial relationship with the doctor.

I have several Ministers and workers and Conference officers, including yourself, who have invested with me on my Capital Loan Account and my Current Income Account and I have been asked by all of these Ministers at one time or another not to divulge the amount of money that they had with me and for that reason . . . I would never give a balance sheet because a balance sheet would have to represent the names of the people and the amounts that they had.

It troubled Davenport that the “Napoleonic complexed individual” was expressing concern that the money many North American Division entities and their administrators had entrusted to the doctor did not conform to the investment guidelines in the *General Conference Policy Manual*. Listing the Bible, the writings of Ellen White and the “Policy book,” Davenport wrote that of the three, he found it “very hard to see which one the Church puts the most emphasis on”; and he felt that its strictures were applied inconsistently at best. Referring to local conference officer elections at constituency sessions, he wrote:

a nominating committee is set up to bring in a name or names to be elected and according to the constitution those names are to be voted upon. There are instances which you and I know very well in which the nominating committee did not bring in the name of the [incumbent] president and then by some maneuvering [in] . . . sessions that ran clear up until midnight [the incumbent was reelected.]

He wanted to know then “why is this short statured, Napoleonic complexed individual running around and talking about me and the way the different Conferences are out of policy investing with me?”⁸

As he drove home more deeply the inconsistency point, Davenport appeared to be subtly threatening Pierson with the possibility that the revelation of so many improper church investments (including Pierson’s) could undermine confidence in church leaders.

Now Elder Pierson, let’s get down to some specifics. I know very

Knotty Boards at Harris Pine

I had been kept up-to-date in recent months and knew that something was terribly wrong. It is not believable that the Board did not know. They did know, but did not give management the direction they so much needed. . . . The most severe step possible was taken, the filing of Chapter 7. The question has to be asked, "How could so few be permitted to affect the lives of so many?"

—Mary V. Harris, "Wife of HPM Founder Shares Feelings,"
Atlantic Union Gleaner (February 16, 1987), p. 8.

RESTORED TO THE LORD is the title of a 1953 *Life Magazine* photo that featured the gift by Clyde and Mary Harris of their then \$5 million outdoor furniture manufacturing business to the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.¹

Fortune and *Time* magazines covered the event as well.² At Harris Pine's Pendleton, Oregon, headquarters, General Conference president W. H. Branson and North Pacific Union secretary-treasurer Charles Nagele, presided over the transfer of stock to the General Conference Corporation. *Time* quoted Branson's pithy transition prayer: "We know, dear Lord, that all the silver and gold is thine; we pray to thee to bless this plant, the people who work in it, the brother and sister who have given it back to thee, and to bless its profits. Amen."³

Harris Pine Mills was an integrated industry that operated tree farms, built and maintained roads, cut timber, hauled logs with its own fleet of trucks and operated saw mills that seasoned, surfaced and produced lumber from which it manufactured finished and unfinished furniture.⁴ Beginning in 1952, 75 percent of its profits would accrue to the General

Conference, 15 percent to the North Pacific Union Conference and 10 percent to Washington's Upper Columbia Conference.⁵

The Mill also began to provide mostly Adventist young people an opportunity to work their way through academy and college. This student labor farmed out to Adventist academies across the United States—such as Mt. Pisgah Academy,⁶ Cedar Lake Academy,⁷ Rio Lindo Academy⁸ Adelpian Academy⁹ Indiana Academy,¹⁰ Wisconsin Academy,¹¹ Monterey Bay Academy,¹² Thunderbird Academy¹³—provided Harris with low-rent plants, sometimes at no cost. On the other side of the ledger, the work force was constantly revolving with new workers needing training and all with class schedules to accommodate.

The American dream

The eighth of nine children (six of them sons) belonging to James and Bertha Harris, Clyde Harris was born March 9, 1890, in newly incorporated Milton, Oregon—part of the Walla Walla River Valley, where his parents had moved from Waupun, Wisconsin, four years earlier.¹⁴

As poor as the Harris family was, Clyde's entrepreneurial nature became obvious in grade school when he began selling the trout he regularly caught in the Walla Walla River to Milton locals. He also picked fruit and sold it to passengers riding trains that passed through the area, and a little later began raising flowers that he boxed and marketed. By his middle teens, Clyde had saved enough money to purchase, improve and resell small plots of orchard property.¹⁵

While on a fishing trip with a friend, Clyde made the acquaintance of a man in Cove who explained to him how much money he was making in the manufacture and sale of fruit boxes. Clyde convinced an older brother, Clarence, to join him, and in 1912 the two started the Milton Box Company.¹⁶

In 1914 as the startup limped along suffering from a dearth of capital, Clyde met and married a local seventeen-year-old named Mary Coe. The couple spent their first year of married life living in a 10-by-12-foot tent between the box company and the river. They also began attending the local church of Clyde's mother's conviction—the only Seventh-day Adventist church in Washington State.¹⁷

By 1929, diligence and thrift had paid off; and the Milton Box

Risk for God

\$18 million of non-Adventist money has been dedicated to developing and marketing this series of 15 videos. The Animated Bible Story will be seen on infomercials across the country. When literature evangelists knock on the doors of homes anywhere in North America, families will be familiar with The Animated Bible Story—our story.

—Harold F. Otis, Jr., “Risk for God,” *Columbia Union Visitor*
(March 1, 1996), p. 2.

Twas the day after Christmas 1995, and all through the North American Division pastors and leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church were about to be stirred by their weekly newsletter from General Conference president Robert Folkenberg.

Touting spectacularly good news about the continent’s literature evangelism, Folkenberg wrote: “In 1991, the North American Division suspended its policies governing the sales of ‘subscription literature’ (books sold by literature evangelists [LEs]) to facilitate innovative methods to expand sales . . . more cost effectively.”¹ As a result of this deregulation, the world church leader explained, “in January 1992 . . . all but two conferences in the Atlantic Union, all but two conferences in the Columbia Union, and all of the conferences in the Pacific Union formed a consolidated distribution system for the three unions called Family Enrichment Resources (FER).”²

Taking advantage of the permissive new division policies, the Pacific Union Conference Executive Committee voted in October of

1991 to reorganize its publishing department. “When the Columbia and Atlantic Unions heard of this progressive step,” FER’s president, Harold F. (Bud) Otis wrote in the *Pacific Union Recorder*, “they asked to join in the venture.”³ But it was the General Conference president’s leadership newsletter that four years later specified the awesome results: “The percentage of tithe funds used to underwrite some support services of LEs,” Folkenberg wrote, “was reduced: in the Atlantic Union conferences from 4.07 percent to 1 percent;⁴ in the Columbia Union from 2.86 percent to 1 percent; and in the Pacific Union from 2.2 percent to 1 percent. As a result,” Folkenberg continued,

during the last four years the three unions . . . saved a total of \$6,695,199 in addition to not paying for publishing directors, secretaries, office expenses, and related programs!

During the same period, combined annual sales increased from \$4.4 million to \$7.3 million.

At the close of 1991, there were 69 LEs of which 12 qualified for benefits [compared with] 269 LEs [in 1995] . . . with between 220 to 269 qualifying for benefits.

The ratio of leadership staff to LEs in 1991 was 1 to 1; but in 1995 it is 1 to 8.⁵

“I am so thankful,” Folkenberg enthused as the New Year of 1996 approached, “that this process . . . has so effectively increased the number of literature evangelists, their total sales, as well as their average income while reducing the total dependence on each conference and union’s tithe.”⁶ Between the \$7 million saved and the \$3 million sales increase, the General Conference president seemed to be celebrating a \$10 million victory.

Animating the Bible stories

But the most exciting prospect for Family Enrichment Resources, Folkenberg announced, was just three months away. “[T]he first [of] three videos are expected to be launched across North America in March

Evergreens at Shady Grove

If we should adopt the policy of allowing workers to set their own wages, we would soon be in a strange condition. We cannot consent to any such proposition, because it is not in harmony with God's plan for the conduct of His work. . . . God would be greatly displeased, if we were to permit men to set their own wages. And if men threaten to go elsewhere to labor, unless we yield to their requests for special consideration and wages above others, let us allow them to go. . . . Our brethren in positions of responsibility must come into harmony on this matter, and not regard any man as so indispensable that he must be allowed whatever he thinks his services are worth. —Ellen G. White¹

A series of fourteen investigative reports published by the *Washington Post* in the last three months of the second millennium questioned clinical competence at Shady Grove Adventist Hospital and the executive compensation of those who administered its parent corporation, Adventist HealthCare, Inc. The *Post* pieces attracted considerable interest from the Seventh-day Adventist members of the Columbia Union Conference and from Adventist Church leaders at the nearby headquarters of the denomination's General Conference world (and North American Division) headquarters.²

Shady Grove and Adventist HealthCare

Shady Grove Adventist Hospital is one of about 60 hospitals throughout North America that during the 1990s were owned and operated by Seventh-day Adventist (SDA)-affiliated organizations. With few exceptions, Adventist healthcare institutions are owned and operated by several regional, nonprofithospital-management corporations that were created in the mid-1970s ostensibly to provide more efficient management and

economies of scale through the purchase of equipment and supplies.³

When the *Post* stories broke in late 1999, there were eight such regional corporate entities, with confusingly similar names: Adventist Health Mid-America, Inc; Adventist Health System Sunbelt Healthcare Corporation; Adventist Health System/West or Adventist Health; Adventist HealthCare, Inc.; Atlantic Adventist Healthcare Corporation; Kettering Adventist HealthCare; Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center and PorterCare Adventist Health System.

Despite the fact that senior level Adventist Church administrators dominate their boards, with the exception of Loma Linda, each of the nonprofit corporations is financially independent of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, and of each other.⁴ These regional healthcare management corporations are usually referred to by their even more difficult to distinguish acronyms: AHSMA, AHS, AHS/W, AHC, AAHC, KAHC, LLUASC, PCAHS.

At the very close of the twentieth century, Adventist HealthCare Inc. (AHC), headquartered in Rockville, Maryland, owned and operated Shady Grove Adventist Hospital, Washington Adventist Hospital and Hackettstown (New Jersey) Community Hospital; as well as a large home healthcare agency and seven nursing centers.⁵

Adventist HealthCare, in turn, was “owned” by the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists—owned in the sense that the Columbia Union included a legal entity called the Columbia Union HealthCare Corporation that (according to its bylaws and the bylaws of AHC) shared a specified and substantial number of officers and members with the AHC board of directors (see below “Who owns Adventist healthcare?”).⁶

Clinical lapses

Shady Grove Adventist Hospital, Adventist HealthCare’s 263-bed acute-care facility, also located in Rockville, Maryland, made headlines in late 1999 when a *Washington Post* article alleged unprofessional lapses in patient care at the hospital.⁷ The story triggered a next-day investigation by Maryland State Health Department inspectors and an October 22 site visit by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO).⁸ The article that set the inquiries in motion was based on complaints by Shady Grove physicians, nurses and

Filthy Lucre¹

For the assertions of so many facts in this chapter that are not referenced by an endnote, the author is indebted to the very professional journalism contained in the team report, “A Kanaka Valley Tragedy,” that appeared in Spectrum 27:2 (Spring 1999), pages 58-67. I am particularly grateful to the journal’s editor, Bonnie Dwyer, for the access I was given to stacks of Folkenberg-related business, legal and miscellaneous documents that the Spectrum team gathered for its report. Material from several of those documents significantly enhanced this chapter.

EARLY IN THE SIXTH AND PIVOTAL DECADE of the twentieth century, the comparatively clean-cut young graduate students attending C. Mervyn Maxwell’s church history classes at Andrews University Theological Seminary heard their professor ask the then-startling question: “What do we Adventists do if we should find ourselves with a *bad* General Conference president?”² Three decades later, the election of Robert Stanley Folkenberg to the General Conference presidency seemed to some an act of faith rewarded and to others the unintended consequence of reckless presumption.

Except as the very tall, baby-faced man with the good baritone voice so ably chairing the nominating committee of the 55th General Conference Session at Indianapolis in the summer of 1990, very few of the committee’s 226 members were familiar with the middle-aged Carolina Conference president. He was the first local conference president in the twentieth century to vault over union conference and division heads, as well as General Conference vice presidents, to become

chief executive officer of the world-wide Seventh-day Adventist Church.³ The leap was tantamount to a North Carolina state assemblyman being elected president of the United States; or, to keep the analogy sectarian, as if a diocesan bishop had hurdled archbishops, cardinals and major archbishops to become pope. But it was even more interesting than that.

In the process of skipping levels of administrative hierarchy, Folkenberg found himself in a position of authority over the two men who had most recently been his immediate superior officers. During the quinquennium ending in 1985, Folkenberg was field secretary⁴ under George Brown,⁵ the man who became president of the Inter-American Division at the 1980 General Conference session in Dallas—winning by one vote over . . . Robert Folkenberg.⁶ And just an hour or so before Folkenberg's heady shock, he was presiding over the committee that nominated the same George Brown (130 to Neal Wilson's 81)⁷ to be General Conference president—a man whose nomination went unreported in the *Adventist Review's* blanket coverage of the session.⁸

Another reversal of fortune occurred when Southern Union Conference president Al McClure, Folkenberg's immediate administrative up-line for the previous five years, was elevated to North American Division president, only to find himself looking up—now figuratively as well as literally—at his former Carolina Conference subordinate.

Nothing more than innocent curiosity is required to wonder how the first-term, Carolina Conference president came to be chairing such a crucial GC session committee. A reasonable deduction from what is known suggests that he was an unusually capable and well-connected insider. When as a fledgling singing evangelist Folkenberg served in the Columbia Union (1964–1966),⁹ Neal C. Wilson was his union president. His parents were overseas workers; his uncle, Elman J. Folkenberg, was co-developer in 1960 (with Wayne J. McFarland) of The Five-Day Plan to Stop Smoking.¹⁰ Perhaps just as important, his wife, Anita Emmerson Folkenberg, was the daughter of retired General Conference treasurer Kenneth H. Emmerson, who had worked closely with Neal Wilson during all of Wilson's dozen years (1966 through 1978) as General Conference vice president for North America.¹¹

Periodically during his twenty-five years in “the work,” Folkenberg had sought Wilson's counsel about taking various calls he had been offered to other denominational positions.¹² When he left Central America

Reserved for Us

This place is the most nearly perfect location for a sanitarium that I have ever seen. This place, and several other places, were presented to me some time ago. This place was pointed out as a most desirable site for the sanitarium work that should be carried on near Boston. It has the attractiveness that will bring to it wealthy people from Boston. It has been reserved for us, that we may reach the people of that city. It is in the providence of God that the Sanitarium is here, and we should appreciate the advantages thus placed within our reach.

—Ellen G. White, “The New England Sanitarium,” MS-86-04
(written at Melrose, MA, August 21, 1904).

What was born April 28, 1899, as the New England Sanitarium and Benevolent Association died February 4, 1999,¹ as Boston Regional Medical Center—just three months short of its 100th birthday.

For no doubt altruistic reasons, in 1895 eight Seventh-day Adventists² arranged to convert a dormitory of South Lancaster Academy into a “health center to serve all races, creeds and nationalities, regardless of ability to pay, and give health restoring treatment and wise instruction from Christian nurses and physicians.”³

Four years later (April 28, 1899) the four-story renovation was chartered as the eastern branch of Michigan’s famous Battle Creek Sanitarium.⁴ It was such a success from the outset that in 1901 the New England Sanitarium served 501 patients from twenty-two states and graduated its first two-year class of seven nursing students.⁵ Seated front and center in the graduating class picture is Dr. John Harvey Kellogg

who most likely gave the late November commencement address.⁶

Recently returned from nearly a decade of Australian quasi exile, Ellen White “groaned in spirit when” she “saw the [initial] sanitarium site in South Lancaster. I knew,” she wrote later, “that the work ought to be carried on in a more favorable place.”⁷

Also groaning about the Sanitarium’s location was its wealthy neighbor, Ruth Thayer.⁸ Whenever she looked out the front window of her mansion, she saw patients in wheelchairs and on blankets decorating the Sanitarium lawn. Her chivalrous husband, Bayard Thayer, approached Dr. C. C. Nicola, sanitarium superintendent, and “offered to buy the sanitarium property.”⁹

Mr. Thayer’s offer created an alignment of interest between the esthetic concerns of the institution’s neighbors and a timely Ellen White admonition that “[o]ur sanitariums should not be situated near the residences of rich men, where they will be looked upon as . . . an eyesore, and unfavorably commented upon, because they receive suffering humanity of all classes.”¹⁰

Mrs. White believed “the providence of God was guiding,” when Thayer not only “gave our people a good price for it,” but then gave them the sanitarium building “if they would move it off the land.”¹¹

Another congenial confluence of concerns enabled the sanitarium to relocate in Stoneham, Massachusetts, approximately thirty miles due east of South Lancaster and nine miles north of Boston, to what Ellen White regarded as “the most nearly perfect location for a sanitarium that I have ever seen.”¹² For \$39,000 the Sanitarium acquired the only private (not to mention commercial) property within the several thousand acre Middlesex Fells state reservation—forty-five (of 3,500) wooded acres with considerable shoreline on picturesque, 340-acre Spot Pond.¹³ “There are medicinal properties in the fragrance of these trees,” wrote Mrs. White after touring the property.¹⁴

The Stoneham acreage came with a 150-room, four-story hotel—an 1850s stone chateau built by William Lang for his personal residence. Thirty years later a new owner added a wing and opened the Langwood Hotel. It became a center for illegal gambling, cockfights and illicit boxing matches staged on one of Spot Pond’s several islands from which shoreline lookouts could warn of approaching authorities. By the time the Adventists took an interest in the location, the property was under more respectable ownership.¹⁵

Heir to major holdings in Boston financial institutions and several railroad companies,¹⁶ the generous Mr. Thayer transported the deconstructed four-story South Lancaster Sanitarium building by rail (at no charge to the Adventists) to the village of Melrose—so close to Stoneham and Spot Pond that the conveyance was completed by oxcart.¹⁷

In August 1904 Ellen White urged that work on a new building at the Langwood property begin “soon, so that patients of the wealthy class may be accommodated.” And she suggested that the salvaged lumber from the South Lancaster site “now lying in the barn can be utilized. Remember,” she added, “this material was a gift.”¹⁸ Specifying “the barns and stables” associated with the Langwood Hotel building, Mrs. White cautioned: “[T]here must be no laxness or looseness in the care of the premises.”¹⁹ Three months later, New Year’s day 1905, a fire destroyed “the stables and many horses,” and damaged the engine room and more than twenty patient rooms in the north wing.²⁰

When the Adventists moved their sanitarium to Stoneham, they were preceded there by the Baptists, Congregationalists, Unitarians, Methodists and Roman Catholics—who by the turn of the nineteenth century each had a church edifice in the 3,441-acre town of 1,138 dwellings.²¹ Nevertheless, Ellen White’s preference for the salubrious location was not difficult to understand—especially since she had been “instructed that [nearby] Boston must be worked,” and “that it was in the providence of God that our people obtained this place.”²²

Continual expansion

Repairs to the fire damage and the addition of an east wing from the South Lancaster dismantling, along with the erection of a new building in 1906, brought the institution’s capacity to 65 beds.²³ It most likely was Ellen White’s firm directive to C. C. Nicola (May 1906) that brought about the transfer in 1907 of legal responsibility from the Benevolent Association to the New England Conference of Seventh-day Adventists—a constituent of the nascent Atlantic Union Conference:²⁴ “I now say to you, in the name of the Lord, Cut loose from Battle Creek. Sever every connection.”²⁵

Under conference leadership in 1909, the sanitarium advertised its facility in a local newspaper as having its “own dairy, bakery and farm.” “Our great lawns, wooded with grand oaks, stately elms, graceful maples,