

1961

The Concern of Evangelical Friends for the Fellowship of the Gospel Among All Friends, July 1961

Arthur O. Roberts Editor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/concern>

Recommended Citation

Roberts, Arthur O. Editor, "The Concern of Evangelical Friends for the Fellowship of the Gospel Among All Friends, July 1961" (1961). *The Concern*. 9.
<https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/concern/9>

This Journal Issue is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives and Museum at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Concern by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

CONCERN

THE CONCERN OF EVANGELICAL FRIENDS

p. 17

for the fellowship
of the Gospel
among all Friends

"Ye are my friends,
if ye do whatsoever
I command you."

John 15:14

expressing the CONCERN of evangelical Friends in the areas of theology, Biblical study, outreach, and devotional life.

dedicated to a Christ-centered renewal of spiritual life among all Friends.

praying for an enlarged Quaker witness to the Gospel throughout the world.

Editor: Arthur O. Roberts, Professor of Religion and Philosophy,
George Fox College

Contributing Editors: Everett Cattell, superintendent, Ohio Yearly Meeting, Damascus, Ohio. Eugene Coffin, pastor Alamos Friends Church, Garden Grove, Calif. Lowell Roberts, president, Friends University, Wichita, Kansas. Jack Willcuts, editor, The Northwest Friend, Newberg, Oregon. Walter R. Williams, minister, Ohio Yearly Meeting.

CONCERN is published quarterly by the Association of Evangelical Friends. Subscription price, \$2.00 for one year, \$5.00 for three.

Address all editorial correspondence to the Editor, George Fox College, Newberg, Oregon

Make all checks for subscriptions and gifts payable to:
The Association of Evangelical Friends, and mail to the treasurer,
Lloyd Hinshaw, 4995 Newton, Denver 21, Colorado.

Second-class mail privileges authorized at Portland, Oregon.

Evangelical Unity Among Friends

I propose that Friends take the following steps in an effort to discover unity and recapture the spirit of united vision which will make our message more largely heard:

1. Strengthen such bonds of unity as we now have.
2. Define our doctrines and write them into a common Discipline.
3. Work toward the establishment of a Friends Church as a body through which the various yearly meetings may take actions of extension and concerns which are coherent with evangelical beliefs.

To this end I suggest a series of conferences called by one or more yearly meetings to effect these steps.

In elaborating the proposal I would first like to discuss the question why we should seek to close ranks and then consider ways by which these steps may be taken.

Pressure Toward Church Unity

There are two reactions to the numerous current proposals for church mergers, one to imitate, the other to reject; if rational attitudes, both express a portion of truth. The first recognizes the goal of unity in the Church which is consistent with Biblical teaching. The second understands that political joining of church bodies may not necessarily be an act of Christian unity, to the contrary it may render more difficult the fellowship which properly belongs to all who own Christ as Savior and Lord.

In various ways during the past few years Friends have begun to draw together. Philadelphia and New England have concluded that doctrines need no longer separate, and have each in its own way bridged the Hicksite-Orthodox

gulf. Through the AFSC Friends have ignored theological differences and tried to find in its place a common field of action. The Five Years Meeting has sought to find unity both on the consultative level and by a deepening of doctrinal study and formulation. It now plans to meet every three years. The Association of Evangelical Friends has made vocal the growing concern among Friends from several yearly meetings that our fellowship in Christ be based on sound Biblical doctrines.

The pressure toward church unity comes in part from the general perils posed by a rapidly expanding irreligion. Under pressure of the cold war and the ascendancy of communism as a particularly virile form of irreligion, those of us within Western culture are being forced to support our public philosophy as well as our personal convictions either upon Biblical orthodoxy or some sort of humanism. Because the threat of communism is so often pointed out in chiefly materialistic terms—e.g. comparing the military strengths of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.—we tend to forget that the greater need is to assess the strengths of the ideologies. One of the reasons for ecumenical soul-searching by churches is the desire to make the Christian ideological attack as vigorous as possible with little wasted effort. Some leaders feel that the Church cannot now afford the luxuries of its denominational differences. I am not convinced that the super-church is the answer, for bureaucracy and totalitarianism in the Church would in the long run doubtless destroy the very message which is assayed to proclaim more efficiently. But there is nevertheless a challenge to make our witness as effective as possible within the limits of the convictions which give each denomination its reason to be. Whether a political combination of the Methodist, Episcopal, Presbyterian, and United churches, will increase or decrease strength is debatable. Organization which is effective flows along the lines carved out by the streams of compelling convictions. If Friends are to have a place in the Christian witness under increasingly materialistic skies, we had better have a denomination which has compelling convictions clearly defined.

The irreligion from outside is only more conspicuous than

the irreligion within the West itself. Many a "decent American" who takes his cues for life from the ideologies of John Dewey or Aldous Huxley does not realize that communism is only a more refined and ruthlessly logical form of his own materialism. If we would effectively stop communism without we had better stem the tide of materialism within. Every Friends family is confronted by such pressures. Mass media of communication—radio, TV, movies—public education, cultural patterns, these shout "no" to God and "yes" to materialism. Against this tide it is difficult for our little denomination to stand, divided as it is into small and sometimes isolated yearly meetings, often encrusted with tradition and cumbersome church machinery, and worse, holding widely differing beliefs. A bigger organization is not the whole answer, surely, but the vision has to be larger, and this requires certain modes whereby it may be manifest, some sort of effective communication and fellowship.

Another peril facing us is the resurgence of a vocal liberalism, signalized in recent months by leading churchmen whose bold denials of certain fundamentals of Christian orthodoxy have been hailed in the secular press. Let us face it, the post-war revival mood is over and while there has emerged a vigorous and vocal evangelicalism (Christianity Today has a far wider circulation than the old Liberal Christian Century) the pressures of the new modernism are upon us. The attempt on the part of theologians such as Bultmann to have faith without fact, and thus avoid the revelatory, supernatural claims of orthodox Christianity are flimsy reeds which cannot give support. The polarity is rapidly becoming evangelicalism or a new liberalism which shades off quickly into universalism or humanism.

There is a special peril which faces the Friend in the independent, evangelical yearly meetings, that of narrowness of vision. Independency in the case of Kansas, Oregon, Central, Rocky Mountain, and to some extent, Ohio, has come about as an attempt to take an evangelical stand against liberal leadership and policies in the past. What have been the results? Obviously, there have been certain beneficent

results. These yearly meetings were enabled to develop actions consonant with beliefs in such a measure that schools, missions, and church extension have been strengthened. Strongly evangelical mission programs are certainly salutary (and in this case, California Yearly Meeting must be included), and the liberal-conservative struggle which has been lessened from that within the Five Years Meeting.

But withdrawal has its price; we should recognize it and see whether it should continue to be paid. We have cost our brethren in the Five Years the support which we might have given them. The conflict between those who want to redeem a situation and those who wish to protest it is a difficult one, but in any case both options were taken in the past decades and we should not forget that the independents do not have a corner on evangelical Christianity. The independent has had to substitute in measure the picture of a section of a movement for the larger vision of a more encompassing church body. It may well be true that loyalty has practical limits which make feasible the operation of yearly meetings with their separate colleges, boards, extension programs and mission fields. But we lack and sorely need tangible objectification of the Friends movement in the world. One reason for the great loyalty which many people feel to the AFSC, even though they often criticize its ideology and methods severely is that it has at least seemed to represent Friends on a larger level. I suspect that the AFSC, the Young Friends Committee of North America, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, yes, and the Association of Evangelical Friends are all somewhat symptomatic of the weakness of our movement organizationally, a weakness especially felt by the independent yearly meetings.

For the independent there is no vision of the Friends church beyond the yearly meeting. This makes a low ceiling for our young people and has perhaps been a reason why some of them have worked especially hard (and often effectively) in inter-church organizations, such as Youth for Christ, Young Life, World Vision, or World Gospel Mission. We have enriched the other Christian movements to the impoverishment of our own by a whole stream of young lead-

ership. I am not as much inclined as once I was to blame these young people as to reveal their perplexity in identifying themselves with the Friends movement. Even with a hike up Pendle Hill can the Friends World Committee for Consultation challenge them? Its functions are too limited whatever its theology might be.

As a result of protesting against liberalism we have cultivated a cushioning insularity so that our youth are not made aware of other Friends and of their responsibility to their heritage as a whole. We restrict the range of their vision to manageable proportions and then watch them drift off into other organizations or become purely congregational—or at best regional—in their church interests. A hundred years ago the youth of Indiana had the vision for revival among Friends; let us pray that our youth today will lend their strength to the emergence of a vigorous, evangelical Friends Church.

Another price for independency or perhaps we should say, for the evangelical protest against liberalism, has been the disproportionate influence of non-Quaker movements and institutions upon us. If the Quaker liberal of a couple decades ago bore the Hartford stamp, the Quaker evangelical bore the Asbury stamp. Our doctrines and our methods have been colored by such influences, however necessary. We have used non-Quaker literature. Some meetings rather automatically order Gospel Light or David C. Cook literature—have for years—without giving much thought to Quaker literature available. Even among the independents the George Fox Press has had a rough time of it. Local congregations and individual Friends have been supporting independent missionary work such as World Gospel Mission for years, have often shown more interest in Holiness Camp meetings than in yearly meeting, and in some cases, I am afraid, are scarcely to be distinguished from shattered Methodists.

With such pressures it is difficult to enable Friends and their families to be captivated by the unique message of Friends. Efforts sporadically to preach Friends principles and doctrines appear to be "tacked on", gestures of respect for a heritage which no longer has living power. Again,

we should seek to understand rather than to blame, for there has been no strong vision of the Friends Church to elicit a corresponding support. It is difficult for a Friends minister to preach the Biblical nature of pacifism when much of the peace talk and activity is humanistic and contradictory to evangelical principles. The April issue of Friends World News carried an article by Norman J. Whitney, until recently director of Peace Education for the AFSC, which exemplifies the sort of thing which poses for the evangelical the dilemma of isolation or compromise. Whitney writes:

If traditional evangelical Protestantism no longer speaks adequately to the condition of our time, as I believe it does not, what is the meaning for historic and essential Quakerism? Simply this: a non-creedal, open-ended type of religion whose "authority" lies in experience, which has no institution to support, is uniquely free to restate its eternal Truth in language that can reach the scientifically, experimentally trained mind of the twentieth century. It need not be bound by any ancient orthodoxy of word or phrase; it fears no new revelations that may appear from this or outer space; it can create the living silence in which participants are not merely spectators. . . but themselves become responsible ministers of Truth in the eternal Quest for the Holy One.

Regardless of the flowery words or even the intentions of the writer of this piece, it is essentially pragmatic and empirical, and his latter plea for an affirmation of the Seed of God in every man is just so much noise. Just as well go the whole way and join Huxley's religion without God, the apex of man's pride in himself.

Robert Barclay, in a treatise on church government called by the name of the danger then threatening the Quaker movement, Anarchy of the Ranters, wrote that God "hath not gathered us to be as sheep scattered without a shepherd, that every one may run his own way, and every one follow his own will, and so be a confused mass or

chaos, without any order; but He, even the LORD hath also gathered, and is gathering into the good Order, Discipline, and Government of his own Son, the Lord Jesus Christ: he hath laid care upon some beyond others, who watch for the Souls of their Brethren, as they that must give account."

If we are to avoid the chaos which will surely spell death to the Quaker movement we must be gathered by Christ into His good order and make our bonds of unity real. The words of Paul to the Galatians haunt me, "Having begun in the spirit are you ending in the flesh?" There is danger that even those who have preserved orthodoxy are seeking fleshly means in church life. Where is the deep prayer for the true spiritual unity of our church? Do local Ministry and Oversight bodies yearn over the loss of our united vision? Or have we just given up? Do Representative bodies or Executive Councils concern themselves with the fact that the sheep are scattered? Or are the elders busy appointing nominating committees to bring forward names for new elders and are the Executive Councils busy deciding whether to cut the funds from the Board of Evangelism more than those from the Board of Missions?

Steps Toward Unity

"Why" close ranks is easier to answer than "how". But I would like to elaborate the points outlined at the beginning of the paper as steps through which the Holy Spirit may work among us for evangelical unity. The Discipline of the Yearly Meeting to which I belong has this statement about Friends as a denomination:

A Christian denomination is an organization composed of those who hold similar views of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures, who maintain certain practices based upon these teachings, and who voluntarily associate themselves for joint participation in worship, for fellowship and mutual help, and for united effort in the promotion of truth and righteousness. The denomination known as the Friends Church is such a Christian body.

Regardless of how the church organization is drawn, we can now take the first step, to strengthen our present bonds of union. One way is through intervisitation. Unity is achieved through the discovery of like purposes, beliefs, and efforts. I am convinced that we really do not know ourselves across the several yearly meetings. We are apt to be misled by minor cultural differences or modes of expression. Ways must be found for greater intervisitation, and I should think that funds could be appropriated by the various yearly meetings to release some who otherwise could not go. Some Friends have been released by retirement from their professions and may be able to finance their own way. Youth camp intervisitation, begun this year, provides another means and should be increased. Care needs to be exercised in preparing those who visit, that they go with real understanding and concern and not just from curiosity or to visit relatives.

Another way to strengthen our present ties is through interchange of ministry, both pastoral and evangelistic. The Summer Seminary, now postponed for two years, was designed to provide a fellowship in serious study for ministers from across America. It is a good plan and I hope that the yearly meetings will find ways to encourage ministers to participate in it.

Let local meetings be concerned to seek out and use Friends literature wherever possible and to supplement it with literature which is similar. Some of our vacation Bible schools would do well to investigate Mennonite literature from Herald Press. One Quaker press exists, the Barclay Press, which can be utilized more effectively for Friends literature as yearly meetings cooperate to avoid duplication and to exchange useful pamphlets and other publications. The whole area of publication needs to be explored for ways by which we can use what resources we have, within the present organizational framework, for more effective circulating of literature. The George Fox Press provides Sunday school literature, as does the Publication Board of the Five Years Meeting. All this requires writers, and thus an opportunity to demonstrate the evan-

gelical nature of our Quaker teachings. There are a number of Friends magazines, including yearly meeting papers. Evangelicals are wont to complain about the liberal slant of Quaker Life. Well, why don't they write, write, write, and write? If the AFSC has a dozen news items each issue it is because they have people who write. I am sure Earl Conn would be happy to receive news and features which reflect in a more balanced way the activities and thoughts of Friends.

Would it not help inform our people in local meetings about Friends in general if some of the yearly meeting papers carried the same editorials or feature articles? It would save time and energy and extend the range of effectiveness.

Organize Young Friends

Another way to strengthen present bonds is through our youth. We have large numbers in our summer camps, and some very active Christian groups in local churches. But there is a startling lack of vision among them for the whole of the Quaker movement and for their responsibility as Friends. I propose that the several yearly meetings which now have Christian Endeavor societies give serious consideration to naming these organizations "Young Friends". This would at least unify the name and be a prelude to more significant unity. The tie with international Christian Endeavor is nebulous and it is no longer fair to keep the name. There is some concern for a newsheet to tie the young people together across the yearly meetings. The intervisitation among the camps is good and must be extended. Why not a joint leadership camp some time at mid-winter?

The association of Evangelical Friends, organized on an individual basis, has sought to encourage the bonds of the Church through the five conferences held since World War 2, and the forthcoming conference at Canton, Ohio, promises continued fellowship and encouragement. This magazine, The Concern, seeks to convey that vision through the printed page. These conferences, and this magazine, will succeed as they encourage Friends to work through their monthly and yearly meetings to effect ways by which the

Holy Spirit will enable the Friends Church to witness the gospel message with boldness and clarity. But if there is to be revival among us it will need to come through a volume of prayer and concern on the local level. I fear that some of our Friends ministers do not keep their people informed about the problems and needs of our movement as a whole. I think it is time for the elders and mature members of our churches to become deeply concerned about our needs and to join in prayer for revival. They, too, need to know the issues and understand the problems; they, too, need to join in intervisitation and share in reading and writing of Quaker periodicals.

Defining Our Doctrines

Our second step toward evangelical unity is to define our doctrinal beliefs so that we may be able more effectively to share our experience of Jesus Christ with others. These doctrines need to be written into a common discipline. At three times during the history of our church special attention has been given to the formulation of the beliefs which Friends hold. The first was at the beginning of the movement, the second during and after the Hicksite separations, the third during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Each had its precipitating reasons which space prohibits detailing. Out of the last came the series of uniting conferences, the Richmond Declaration of Faith, and the organization of the Five Years Meeting. The pressures of religious liberalism and its reactions gradually dissipated unity on the basis of common doctrines. Evidences of this are the withdrawals of Oregon and Kansas (later Rocky Mountain) dissolution of the doctrinal unity of the discipline, dual Five Years Meeting and Friends General Conference memberships, and theological division within the Five Years Meeting.

Although a quarterly does not lend itself to letters to the editor, on this particular issue comments are welcomed and space provided for them in the fall issue of Concern.

A fourth effort to define our doctrinal basis is now upon us, and no attempt to ignore theology, or to excoriate it as a disruptive villain, serves to remove the fact that belief is central and must be regulative in the life of a church body. In an editorial in the current issue of Quaker Religious Thought, Calvin Keene notes this danger from an implicit theology which came to characterize liberal Friends, that it is present without being recognized and hence not examined nor related logically to other understandings. He shows the result to be one of "vast weakness, for we are weak not only in thought but also in experience, and more to the point, perhaps, as we look to the future, there can be no great outbreak of experience in years to come without a foundation of thought sufficient to bear it."

Since World War 2 a rising voice has called for theological discussion and it is becoming difficult for liberal Friends to foster the illusion that unity can be had only on the basis of name and heritage. The Five Years Meeting adopted a statement of faith, in its 1960 sessions, which was Christocentric and indicative of a stronger position. This, coupled with addresses by Seth Hinshaw and others, made this meeting a sober move in the direction of a more evangelical church (see evaluations by Eugene Coffin and Orlando Dick, who had a part in the formulations, in the Fall, 1960 Concern).

Among scholars the trends toward clearer doctrinal formulations are unmistakable, with a widespread recognition of and appreciation for the orthodoxy of early Friends. The Quaker Theological Discussion Group, composed of Friends representing a wide range of theological opinion, has stimulated a serious study of theology again. Its magazine, Quaker Religious Thought, carried your editor's article on "Early Friends and the Work of Christ." Significant to me were the comments by British Friend, Joseph Pickvance, of the staff of the University of Birmingham, "I should like to endorse fully the stress that he lays . . . on the Christ-centeredness of early Quaker Christianity," and his agreement with my general conclusion that "the unity of Jesus Christ in history and in experience is the foundation of Quaker doctrine of their evangelistic outreach."

This theological upheaval is eliminating the fuzzy romanticism which limited its theology to a single phase, "that of God in every man." It is beginning to clear away some thoughtless fundamentalism which assumes that certain terms are sacrosanct because we use them and certain mores because we practice them. It is challenging the shelter of neo-orthodoxy in which many Friends have found temporary shelter, pushing them to the truer option of Biblical orthodoxy or humanism. We have had our practical rebuke of modernism and its claim to the early Friends heritage has been discounted. What we need now is a deep examination—a prayerful examination—of the Bible in order to define to ourselves and to our public what are the convictions of Friends. This needed discipline restatement, whether a modified Richmond Declaration or whatever, will help us to quit apologizing for being Quakers and will enable us to take actions in evangelism, missions, and service with greater clarity and coherence.

Three issues especially need to be spelled out: the authority and place of Scripture, the meaning of holiness, and the nature of our Christian worship. After these matters are clarified against the Biblical teachings we may then move toward working out a church policy which may help us be more effective as Quakers in the world.

Development of the Friends Church

On the third step, the development of an organized body known as the Friends Church, it is too early to know into what forms of organization the Lord may lead us. But I will suggest a few thoughts which have come to me. Some will ask why it would not be simpler for the independents just to join or return to the Five Years Meeting and lend it their support. Although the invitation has been open, I do not think that this is a realistic answer. The Five Years Meeting is itself in transition, and furthermore the issues of liberalism and conservatism are not yet resolved to the satisfaction of many. Another option would be for the evangelical independents to unite and form what would become almost a separate denomination, perhaps the Evangelical

Friends Church. But this has its liabilities. It would be unfair to the great majority of Five Years Meeting Friends across America and Africa and elsewhere who share a conservative theology and who long for the strengthening of the Five Years Meeting in that direction. It would be unfair thus to limit the vision of those whose membership it would encompass, although it might at least increase to some extent the breadth of vision of the separate yearly meetings.

Either one of these options may be the course history will take, but I think that a third course, the emergence of a Friends church on an evangelical foundation along the steps which I have outlined is a better solution. The purposes and organization of the Five Years Meeting must be honored, as also the evangelical stand of the independents. Accordingly it would be more respectful to the conscience and Christian concern of both to have the initiative taken by several yearly meetings, preferably both within and outside the Five Years Meeting, to call these conferences. The latter organization is a body with powers delegated by the several yearly meetings, anyway, so this approach is a valid one.

There are many questions, some of which may be noted briefly. Whether the Friends Church should be more or less centralized than the present Five Years Meeting is a question to ponder. I think the whole matter of our polity, including the nature and size of our monthly, quarterly and yearly meetings and their boards need to be reviewed. So does the nature of our ministry. The relationship of tangent organizations which have sprung up, quasi-official, would need to be resolved.

On the question of the name, I have used the "Friends Church" which is simple, practical, and much to be preferred to the obsolete "Society of Friends"—a term not used among earliest Friends and one which should now be retired from the scene.

What would this proposal mean for liberal Friends who would not wish a common, evangelical doctrinal base, Friends with whom rapport has been established along non-theological lines. Well, certainly we can continue to re-

gard one another on the level of consultation so long as theological division remains. That is the fair and honorable thing to do. On this point I would like to share the insights of a very perceptive little Pendle Hill pamphlet, "Two Trends in Modern Quaker Thought", in which Albert Fowler shows how modern Quakerism is proclaiming two quite different beliefs at the same time, the universalist and the particularist, with a third group seeking to draw them together in various ways. Fowler, member of Radner meeting, Philadelphia, who espouses the particularist, or orthodox view, calls for these things to be brought out into the open—and in this I heartily agree—declaring, "thus one of the most important problems facing modern Quakerism is left to the mercy of personal debate instead of being considered soberly in public with concern for the sense of the Meeting and a Minute to record it."

It strikes me that the kindest action Friends could take is to define their positions clearly and in love. I dare say that many Friends in what are sometimes labeled liberal yearly meetings would be emboldened to give clearer witness to their own experience of Christ and their concern for the evangelical nature of the church were these steps toward a Friends Church to be taken. What we strive for is the greatest possible effective unity, seeking so to act in love that the ragged edges created by misunderstandings may be finally straightened. There is a bond of love and there is a bond of truth: at the highest reaches they are one. To act out the lie of superficial harmony, to smother belief under wholly unChristian religious generalities and thus to deceive our posterity as well as to confuse the world about us—such are not the ways of love. Far better to proclaim that the Friends Church accepts the word of John in his first epistle, "every spirit which confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God," and again, "whoever confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, God abides in him, and he in God," and "we have seen and testify that the Father has sent his Son as the Savior of the world." We may let the chips fall where they may.

To Conclude

I hope that Friends will consider these matters in their local and yearly meetings. Out of such consideration will come, I trust, some yearly meeting invitations for a series of conferences aimed at unifying the church, first to strengthen such bonds of unity as we now have, second, to define our doctrines and write them into a common Discipline, and finally, to work toward the establishment of a Friends Church as an organized body through which our actions may flow from an evangelical basis. If these who are selected by the yearly meetings to represent them as a series of such conferences are guided by the Holy Spirit and supported by the prayers of Friends at home, God may bring us into a unity beyond our present hopes. This cannot come about overnight, and may not come about at all, but if we catch the vision, tarry for it, and put our faith in God, exercising great patience, our prayers will be answered.

In His last hours before the crucifixion, Jesus upbraided the disciples gently because in their distress none of them asked Jesus where He was going. They could not see Jesus' purposes nor look for His promised Holy Spirit because they were distressed by the apparent chaos of the present. As I read that passage in John 16 recently, the Lord laid it on me that in our concern for the needs of Friends we had not asked of the Lord where He is leading us through His redemption, what is our place in the Kingdom, and that we had not caught the assurance of the promised Holy Spirit who will take the things of Christ and reveal them unto us. It is my prayer that Friends who read this will be led past the imperfect understanding which I have of the issues and their solutions and will seek earnestly to let the Holy Spirit lead us as a church once more with a great vision of a people to be gathered unto the Lord.

In order to cover the next two issues of Concern, extra money is needed. Why not send a contribution, or gift subscriptions to Lloyd Hinshaw, 4995 Newton, Denver 21, Colorado.

Book Reviews

There is greater challenge in this little "Focal Pamphlet", As You Go, Preach, by John Howard Yoder (Scottsdale, Pa., Herald Press, \$.35) than in many a full length religious treatise on missions. The challenge is for the church to engage in what he terms "migration evangelism" at this time in church history when the forces of nationalism and the rising cultural level of many "receiving" countries make difficult the continuance of the type of missionary service which proved so effective during the past one hundred seventy years.

I recommend that every pastor and every member of a mission board read this. I am going to suggest its inclusion in the reading list for the missions class at George Fox. Perhaps the church has been slow to realize the potential for missionary activity which it has in its fund of committed, technically qualified young people whose professional services are needed elsewhere than in the United States. Whether at Philippi or at Corinth, Paul preached the Gospel. This may be the time for the tentmakers!

Northwest Friend Book Review

A worthwhile new work on the Sermon on the Mount is that prepared by D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, minister, Westminster Chapel, London. Studies in the Sermon on the Mount (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2 vols., 1959-60; 276 and 334 pp., \$4.50 each) comprise sermons drawn from actual ministry. Excellently written, and provocative of deep thought, they are also presented in such a way as to minister the Scriptural truths to us experientially.

I think the author has hedged somewhat from the social implication of the sermon on the mount, especially as it relates to the translation of personal ethics into social ethics. Even so on such matters as the precepts to love one's enemies, to go the second mile and to be peacemakers, he has reminded us of the dangers of legalism which come if one were

to forget the primary spiritual, personal application.

The author has shown the necessary link between the sermon on the mount and the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ. These volumes will rank as classics in this area of Biblical study. I recommend them to all serious students of the Scriptures.

In a very provocative little Pendle Hill Pamphlet (Wallingford, Pennsylvania, January, 1961), Albert Fowler writes concerning "Two Trends in Modern Quaker Thought;" one he call the universal, the other the particular. The universal variety considers Christianity as one religion among many. Fowler shows that some Friends, e.g. Arthur Morgan of Illinois and Horace Alexander, of India, look upon Quakerism as a means of gathering men of good will into an interfaith fellowship. The particular, which is Fowler's position, "is supported by those whose lives are rooted in a common Christian experience and in the doctrines of Christianity which interpret the fundamental facts of that experience."

Fowler finds a resurgence of interest in the particular variety, and quotes from papers by Paul Lacey and John McCandless in support of this view. Working within the rather narrow confines of the non-pastoral tradition Fowler fails to recognize a larger body of orthodox Quakerdom. He is, nevertheless, right when he shows modern Quakerdom "proclaiming two quite different beliefs at the same time, with a third group trying to draw them together."

Fowler considers the pull toward the universal variety to be part of the anti-Christian attitude so evident in western civilization today. He writes:

The most persuasive and most misleading form this anti-Christian attack is taking today is the claim that the Christian gospel must be tailored to fit the modern mind, to suit the modern temper, to cover the needs and demands of today. The great revelations recorded in the gospel accounts of the life of Jesus, his birth, his temptations, his ministry of healing, his crucifixion and resurrection, are one by one argued out of existence for the sake of cutting the Christian garment to clothe twentieth century man. Once the shears start snipping at the seamless robe they do not stop till it is reduced to rags.

Revival and the Holy Spirit

By EVERETT L. CATTELL
President of Malone College

What can we do to have a revival? That is a typically American question for in our mode of thinking there must be a technique or method by which we can do anything. Indeed, amongst Evangelicals, this thought has been furthered by the writings of Charles G. Finney who pretty much claimed that revivals were controlled by spiritual laws and that wherever the conditions were met revival would be almost automatic. He would not overlook the place of the Holy Spirit in revival but he did feel that the Holy Spirit confined Himself to work through definite laws or patterns which could be used like an instrument in our hands.

This has an element of truth in it, but is not the whole truth. For one thing, the laws or patterns of the Spirit's work are far more complex and include many more items than Finney realized. To use just one illustration, it should be noted that the Holy Spirit holds in His sovereignty the tides of human affairs and the degrees of ripeness for response at different stages of history. In John Wesley's day there seemed to be a very general question agitating the minds of thousands of common people expressed thus: How can we escape the wrath to come? Obviously very few people are worried about that today. Similarly in Finney's day there was a theological climate and a ripeness amongst people which the Holy Spirit used. There are many other factors also which the Holy Spirit knows when we do not.

If we want revival one of the first steps is to give up the notion that we can arrange, precipitate, manipulate or manage it, and look directly to the sovereign Spirit of God in prayer that He will pour it out upon us. It must come from God rather than from man.

Dr. Cattell's article appeared first in June, 1961, issue of the Evangelical Friend. Permission to reprint has been requested.

When we sincerely look to the Holy Spirit for revival, it is implied that we get ourselves out of the way. It may sometimes be that someone else or a group in the church is holding up revival, but a searching for such on our part will not help. The very looking for others to blame may effectually take our minds off the thing or attitude in our own lives about which the Holy Spirit is trying to talk to us. Some of the attitudes in us which may hinder the Holy Spirit are as follows:

1. The tendency to trust in our past experience of sanctification instead of searching our hearts for present victory.

2. The notion that because we feel no condemnation at the moment, heart searching is unnecessary.

3. Being too busy to meditate and give the Lord a chance to search our hearts. It might be well for a church to declare a moratorium on all activities for a week, and let the members only come together nightly for a "Quaker" style meeting—just waiting on God with hearts open in obedience to Him, and in prayer for revival, but let there be more listening to God than talking to Him. A variation of this is to have a small group (or groups) listen to God by reading together a passage of Scripture of some length, one reading while the others follow in their Bibles, and anyone interrupting anytime to share a thought where the Word has spoken to one's own heart.

4. The idea that where we have had strained relations with another person there is nothing we can do about it until the other person makes a move. Christ's command is for the innocent party to take the initiative in reconciliation.

5. Likewise the false idea that revival can come in spite of bad relationships and without them being cleansed and renewed.

6. Preconceived ideas about what a revival is or what it would be like if it came, such as assuming it will be accompanied with great emotional outbursts (the greatest I ever saw was far too deep for that—it was quiet) or that certain people would act in the way we think they ought to act.

7. The confusing of revival with evangelism, supposing that a great ingathering of souls would be the equivalent of revival. Ingathering may be the fruit of revival, but it is

not revival per se. Revival is a renewal of life amongst the saints. One reason why revival does not come is because we look for it amongst the sinners. Actually revival is for the church and evangelism for the world. Let us stop using the words revival meeting and evangelistic services interchangeably. They are not at all the same thing. And let us be honest in what we are after when we announce meetings of any sort.

8. The confusion of revival with its fruits in conduct. For instance, we may judge that certain signs of worldliness creeping into the church indicate need for revival and conversely that if people put off these things it would be a sign that we had had revival. This misses the point that real revival starts with an attitude to God—an attitude of utter openness, brokenness, tenderness, and obedience. Looking at the worldliness of others may harden our own hearts into critical attitudes and into self complacency. The hardness of our opinions and coldness of our hearts may be more reprehensible in God's sight than some degrees of worldliness. Indeed, it is a form of worldliness!

There are many other attitudes which can hinder the Spirit in His work. These will suffice, however, to illustrate what is meant when we say that we must get ourselves out of the way before the Holy Spirit can pour out revival. It is a work of God we want. We cannot produce it. But we can get ourselves out of the way, and give the Holy Spirit a free channel.

Moving? Be sure to send your change of address card for CONCERN to Barclay Press, Newberg, Oregon.

Our apologies to those subscribers whom we disturbed through incorrect information on subscription dates. We appreciate your help in getting us straightened out! Thank you for your patience.

Rockcleft Postponed

Sufficient numbers of ministers could not clear their schedules or raise the funds to allow them to attend the proposed three-week Friends Summer Seminary at Green Mountain Falls, Colorado, this July. Gerald Dillon, president of the Association of Evangelical Friends, and director of the program, expressed keen disappointment at the necessity for cancelling this year's plans, but at the same time reiterated his conviction as well as other members of the Administrative council that this is a project in the life of the Friends church. Gerald wondered whether or not the motive to secure additional theological training is as strong as it should be among pastors and people.

Whatever the reasons, whether of a practical or psychological nature, the vision for the school remains in the hearts of those who had planned this year's session. Because of the conference of evangelical Friends, at Malone College, Canton, Ohio, the summer of 1962 the summer school will be slated for two years hence. In the meantime the board will seek to overcome the problems and make available a session which will meet the needs.

Off to Camp

By LONNY FENDALL, president
Oregon Yearly Meeting Christian Endeavor

"Sure, I'd love to go to camp in California; when do we leave?" This was the reaction among those who were chosen to represent the C.E. young people of the area served by Twin Rocks camp, on the Oregon coast. They had little hesitancy about being "guinea pigs" in the new program of camp exchanges (see editorial in CONCERN, summer, 1960).

The camp and the C.E. organization are sharing in the opportunity of representation as well as in the expenses involved. Three high school teenagers are ready to join two college young people in attending one of the Quaker Mea-

dow camps sponsored by California Yearly Meeting. Each of the high schoolers has been chosen as an outstanding youth leader: Dwight Kimberly, of Camas, Washington, also president of Southwest Washington Quarterly Meeting C.E., Cherly Morse from First Friends in Portland, Oregon, and David Bishop, Tigard, Oregon, who is also treasurer of Newberg Quarter C.E. College age youth are represented by Marilyn Winters, Yearly Meeting C.E. program chairman, and Lonny Fendall, C.E. president.

Almost before the final benediction has been given at Oregon Yearly Meeting sessions in August, the carload of good-will ambassadors will be motoring their way to Quaker Meadow, the first contingent of what we hope will become a larger exchange plan.

... Among Friends

The Quaker devotional quarterly, FRUIT OF THE VINE, has found good reception. A number of churches are ordering them, as well as individuals. Published by Barclay Press, Newberg, Oregon, they sell for \$.35 each. Eugene Coffin and Arthur Roberts provide the devotional material, with photographs by J. Emel Swanson.

Beginning in 1962, the Bulletin of the Friends Historical Association will be known more simply as Quaker History.

The Friends World Committee for Consultation begins its sessions August 26, in Kaimosi, Kenya. Because of the liberal leadership of this group, some conservatives have been rather apprehensive regarding the effect such might have upon the members of East Africa Yearly Meeting. The church there is for the most part strongly evangelical and we pray that the fervor and witness of the Africans be exemplary.

STATISTICS OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS 1959-60 (Latest available figures)	
Africa (38,232)	
East Africa	30,397
Madagascar	7,575
Pemba	46
Southern Africa	214
Asia (888)	
China (no figures)	217
Formosa	240
India (Bundelkhand)	230
India (Mid-India)	201
Japan	
Australasia (1,399)	
Australia	824
New Zealand	575
Europe and Middle East (24,929)	
Austria	14
Denmark	60
Finland	15
France	127
Germany	534
Great Britain	21,745
Ireland (North and South)	1,933
Lebanon and Jordan	100
Netherlands	92
Norway	85
Sweden	118
Switzerland	106
North America (123,206)	
Canada	623
United States	122,583
South and Central America (14,106)	
Bolivia	3,000
Costa Rica	76
Cuba	375
El Salvador	400
Guatemala	7,895
Honduras	1,298
Jamaica	865
Mexico	197
Grand Total	202,760
Estimated Totals Over a Period of Years	
1935	159,506
1950	174,022
1955	188,460
1959	193,991
1960	202,760
(Taken from <u>Friends World News</u> , April, 1961)	

Barclay Press, after several years in the Portland location, is moving to Newberg, Oregon, as part of the general relocation of Oregon Yearly Meeting headquarters. A new building is in process now, with one wing to house the superintendent and other Yearly Meeting offices, and the other wing to provide much needed space for Barclay Press. Hereafter communications should be addressed Barclay Press, Newberg, Oregon.

The move to Newberg was precipitated by several factors, including the general awkwardness of using an old apartment building in a residential zone for offices and press, a desire to utilize Yearly Meeting property on which is located the Yearly Meeting house, and the advantages of being located in the same city as the college.

SEED THOUGHTS

"It is not preaching things that are true which makes a true minister; but receiving of his ministry from the Lord. The Gospel is the Lord's, which is to be preached, and is to be preached in his power; and the ministers which preach it are to be endued with his power and to be sent by him."

—Isaac Penington, minister among Friends, 1658-79

"The passion of Christ is the victory of divine love over the powers of evil and therefore it is the only supportable basis for Christian obedience. Once again, Jesus calls those who follow him to share his passion. How can we convince the world by our preaching of the passion when we shrink from that passion in our own lives? On the cross Jesus fulfilled the law he himself established and thus graciously keeps his disciples in the fellowship of his suffering. The cross is the only power in the world which proves that suffering love can avenge and vanquish evil. But it was just this participation in the cross which the disciples were granted when Jesus called them to him. They are called blessed because of their visible participation in his cross."

—Dietrich Bonhoeffer, in the Cost of Discipleship