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Contributors

Daniel E. Bassuk is Professor of Religious Studies at the University of South Florida. He also teaches at St. Leo College. His doctoral dissertation was an analysis and critique of the mystical in Rufus Jones and Martin Buber. His major areas of specialization are archetypal psychology, Eastern religions, and sectarian religions. He is a member of Louisville, Ky., Meeting and attends Southeastern Yearly Meeting.

John Yungblut, a graduate of Harvard College, has studied theology at Harvard Divinity School and the Episcopal Divinity School. As an undergraduate at Harvard, he came under the influence of Rufus Jones, who encouraged him in what has become a lifelong study of the mystics. After four years as teachers at Pendle Hill, he and his wife June embarked last summer on self-employment as counselors, teachers, and leaders of Quiet Days. They have taken up residence at Lincoln, Va. John Yungblut is the author of two books: Rediscovering Prayer and Rediscovering the Christ.

J. Floyd Moore has been on the faculty of Guilford College since 1944. His present position there is Professor of Biblical Literature and Religious Studies. He has major teaching responsibilities in the areas of Quakerism, Christian ethics, and non-Western studies. He has served the Society of Friends at Ramallah, Palestine; on an AFSC team in Koblenz, West Germany; and at the Friends Center in Lynn, Mass. Floyd Moore has been very active in the work of the Friends World Committee for Consultation.

Lewis Benson is the author of Prophetic Quakerism and Catholic Quakerism. He is a member and recorded minister of Manasquan, N.J., Monthly Meeting. His concern for the re-establishment of prophetic Christianity, as George Fox understood, preached, and practiced it, has led to the formation of a "New Foundation" movement among Friends in North America and Great Britain. In 1977 Lewis Benson delivered the Nitobe Lecture at Japan Yearly Meeting.

Editor's Page

In this issue QRT returns to a theme which has been a favorite point of discussion within the Quaker Theological Discussion Group from its beginning. I can still remember Douglas Steere, at the first QTDG conference I ever attended, nearly twenty years ago, as he pleaded with the rest of us not to give Rufus Jones too hard a time. He had a point, for most of the founders of QTDG were the Quaker "young Turks" of the day, who had just thrown out Rufus Jones's magisterial interpretation of Quakerism as a mystical movement and were seeking, through mutual support and criticism, to build up a new and alternative understanding of what Quakerism had been all about in its origins and to rekindle a fresh vision of what Quakerism might again become in the second half of the twentieth century.

This controversy with Rufus Jones and his mystical understanding of early Quakerism has cropped up in many articles and comments in QRT through the two decades of its life. Until now, perhaps the fullest development of this theme has taken place in the Autumn 1965 issue (QRT, Volume 7, number 2), which was devoted to the subject, "Historic Quakerism and Mysticism." Not surprisingly, the authors of two comments on Calvin Keene's lead article, in that issue, turn up again today with comments on Daniel Bassuk's article on Rufus Jones. Nor is it any surprise that they remain on opposite sides of the question.

Furthermore, the ongoing discussion in QRT of Rufus Jones's interpretation of Quakerism is one in which the present editor has been most "egregiously" involved. Daniel Bassuk has insured that this involvement would not be forgotten, by his choice of a quotation with which to open his article, and John Yungblut has risen to take the bait. Indeed, I wondered, as I read his comment, whom he was really arguing with. But then, as he noted in an earlier go-round (QRT, Volume 12, number 3, Summer 1970), I had there seemed "bent on total destruction" of his views (honest — all I was trying to do was to impale him on the needle-sharp horns of a dilemma), and so I guess he deserves the opportunity to set matters straight.