

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Christian Brethren Research Fellowship Journal* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_cbrfj.php

CONTENTS

Diminished—or Enlarged?	<i>Sosthenes</i>	1
-------------------------------	------------------	---

Topic of the Issue:—

Aspects of the Christian's Social Responsibility

Introduction, and the Implications of Divorce Law	<i>K. N. S. Counter</i>	2
Marriage Guidance Counselling	<i>Verna Argent</i>	7
Old Age	<i>Joyce K. Stunt</i>	10
After-Care of Offenders	<i>Joan F. S. King</i>	16

Members' Section:—

The Pentecostalism Debate:—

A critique of CBRFJ ix	<i>David G. Lillie</i>	20
Further Correspondence	<i>Don Tinder and others</i>	24
Other correspondence received		29
From the Monitors: notes on <i>Humanist</i>	<i>Chas G. Martin</i>	30
Book Review	<i>K. G. Hyland</i>	31

For Private Circulation Only

Copyright © 1966

The Christian Brethren Research Fellowship

DIMINISHED—OR ENLARGED?

Does Christianity enlarge us—or diminish us? The question is posed by Teilhard de Chardin in *Le Milieu Divin*: and his comments serve as a demonstration of how much, on the level of personal piety, there is in common between evangelical and catholic. Is Christ for us the Consummator of all things: the One whose glory enters into and transforms the lowliest and least of common created things, until:—

Something shines in every hue
Christless eyes have never seen?

Or is our religion something which diminishes us, shrinking our minds and (worse) our souls: setting us at odds with our fellow men and with ourselves, narrowing our understanding and our compassion? Narrow religion produces tragically narrow men. Yet there is a diminishment which is of God: straits through which a soul passes before it is launched on the broad sea of the over-flowing knowledge of God. Which is our experience?

Perhaps it would help us if in all our Christian activities we kept in the front of our minds those terrible words of our Lord Jesus:—

‘Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves’.

SOSTHENES

There is little to add concerning the progress of the Fellowship at present, except for the following notes:—

Council members. There have been so many reminders to members that further nominations would be welcomed, that it came as something of a shock to hear that a critic had recently complained of a ‘self-propagating leadership’ of the Fellowship. (We are possibly the sole organisation within Brethren which requires an annual re-election of its governing body.) New blood and new ideas are always needed. A word to the wise!

Future Issues. We were particularly sorry for the slow arrival of Issue 10. Several further issues are already in hand, and we hope to increase the output substantially during the next few months.

Subscriptions. Members are asked to check whether they have submitted their current subscription. If they have not, the treasurer would be glad to hear from them.

Proposed School of Theology. Details of a proposed graduate school of theology, under assembly auspices, possibly to be sited in the Vancouver area, are given in the autumn (fall) 1965 issue of *Calling* magazine. This is a vitally important project. (*Calling* is a journal which deserves a wider circulation in this country, and is obtainable from 1620 West 6th Avenue, Vancouver 9, Canada. Subscription 40c. per copy, \$1.50 annually.) Members interested should write to Mr. Ward Gasque, 29a Moorfield Road, Manchester, 20.

ASPECTS OF THE CHRISTIAN'S SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Introduction, and the Implications of Divorce Law

Introduction

It might be supposed that the theme of the Christian's Social Responsibility—at least in the form of some account of its fulfilment in individual cases—would be a welcome one, and that the books written about it would be best sellers. Yet it is not so. It might also be supposed that the importance of facing responsibilities in social life would be recognised as part of that relevance of Christianity to modern times, which is so frequently taken for granted by those who proclaim its doctrinal content. Yet this is not so, either.

Books which are badly written do not deserve to sell well, while well-written Christian books of recent date have achieved enormous sales; but this may nevertheless not be the answer. No one at any rate could claim that *Evangelicals in Action*, *Time for Action* or even *Within a Yard of Hell* were as well known among Christians as if they were prescribed reading; yet any one of these might well be required of anyone intending to undertake Christian work and seeking a reading list. Of course, he would find himself not agreeing with everything he read, and this would no doubt be disconcerting if his former reading had been limited to Holy Scripture and commentaries thereon whose authors were elevated by tradition above being disagreed with. Readers of Professor Torrance will recall his abhorrence of any approach to the Church's ministry or witness to Scripture which, being introvert in nature, forms an echo chamber where 'the Gospel rebounds, as from a brick wall'.

To change the metaphor, we have seen all we need to see of that professed Christianity which stands beneath the arched dome of its glass case, indistinguishable because of the grime that collects upon the glass, and proudly proclaims that the *inside* gets a regular clean!

The current significance of their topics has brought to the fore two books which *have* been really widely read: *The Cross and the Switchblade* and Lunn and Lean's *New Morality*. In this issue of the *Journal*, we are considering the social responsibility of the Christian in relation to the rapidly rising rate of divorce and the social consequences of some recent attitudes to divorce generally; Marriage Guidance; the problems of Old Age; and the Rehabilitation of Prisoners.

Before we pass to the consideration of some recent problems in relation to divorce, there are a few matters which should be mentioned. Some doubt has been expressed whether Christian social responsibility (in an institutional sense) should be regarded as synonymous with the social responsibility of the Christian. Perhaps there is a duty to influence society in a Christian direction? In the International Reformed Bulletin issued in December, 1965 under the title *The Church's Mission Today*, Mr. Hebden Taylor argues for a growth of Christian organisations—and makes it clear that here is no isolationist attitude, but rather a call to concentrated action by Christians through organisations which 'devote themselves in word and action to the cause of social justice'. There are of course problems about all this, but clearly we can no longer stand aloof, anti-union, anti-vote, anti-politics and still hope to help, on anything but a personal level, broken homes, broken lives, broken marriages and broken hearts.

Yet nothing could be more clear from the articles which follow than that much of the work which is being done, and which could be still more widely done, *will* be personal work in the most literal sense. Indeed, it is surely useless to contemplate successful Marriage Guidance work unless one is personally fitted by experience as well as training. But this has a corollary. If it is true that one cannot discuss deeply personal problems unless one has a personal concern and some personal acquaintance with the nature of the problems to be solved, it is also true that the experience called for involves some integration into the life of the community. A husband whose dutiful wife has always done as she is told, is not fitted by the submissiveness he has secured, nor by the marital 'harmony' which has resulted from it, to be a Marriage Guidance Counsellor.

How individual are the needs of the aged (yet how dangerous it may be to let them become obsessed by self-pity), and how individual are the circumstances of ex-prisoners, will likewise sufficiently appear from the pages which follow. But what of the problem of the increased and increasing divorce rate?

The implications of divorce law

The very recent decision to pass to the County Courts the decision of many divorce cases will not, I think, in itself represent a very great change in the climate, though its practical and legal implications are considerable in the sphere of administration. The areas which seem rather to call for some specific comment are three:

- The increasing rate at which dissolutions are taking place;
- The effect of this increase on moral standards;
- The significance of recent suggestions for changes in the law.

(a) The rate of divorce

Something in the region of 30,000 divorces now take place in each year. This figure, with some variation, has been the rough average for some fifteen years.

The effect of the *Matrimonial Causes Act*, 1950 (re-enacted in this respect this year) is to enable a woman to obtain a divorce in this country provided that (her husband not being resident in any other part of the United Kingdom, the Channel Islands or the Isle of Man) *she is resident in England and has been ordinarily resident there for three years*. This means that the English Courts have jurisdiction even if the *husband* is not *domiciled* in England, and so the Act widens greatly their jurisdiction. Similarly, the extent to which foreign divorces are recognised as valid has been greatly widened in scope during the past fifteen years. This is not to say that these moves have been wrong or unfortunate; in some cases, the decisions have done no more than to break to some extent the ancient shackle by which the personal law of the wife is regarded as that of her husband, so that only the Courts in the country to which he had gone could, in many cases, grant what we regarded as a valid divorce at all. It is the *effect* of the changes that is a matter for concern.

In a case decided in 1906, it had been decided that the English Courts would *recognise* a divorce, wherever granted, provided the divorce was recognised by the Courts of the husband's domicile; it must be granted however that in 1959 the Courts declined to say that a further suggested extension could be recognised. Equally, it must be admitted that recognition was refused to a decree obtained after a residence in Florida of the required period of ninety days!

If a projected change were made, the separated wife would be able to acquire a domicile independent of her husband's (as she can in most American States) and the residence basis for divorce would be rendered unnecessary.

Here again, however, if we accept that an unsatisfactory marriage is, in practical terms, as well dissolved, it is difficult also to argue that increases in the ease with which marriages may be dissolved are intrinsically bad. It is not usually people who stand a good chance of 'making a go of it yet' who petition for divorce from a husband now out of the country.

(b) The effect on moral standards

Much doubt has been expressed whether broken homes are a real cause of juvenile crime, and perhaps too much attention has been paid to this particular aspect of the situation. Time might have been more profitably spent demonstrating what the dissolution of marriages on a large scale does to a society which is family-based, and in which the control of the lives of their children in every respect rests to so great an extent with parents. What could be more easy than a succession from one generation which regards marriage as a terminable contract, to a next generation which regards any relationship as freely assumed, freely doffed, and experimental in between the two? If God cares, He cares enough not to let men do what they like; if God is left out, the moral climate will not stay at relaxed divorce rules, because 'what I like' will eventually become the only criterion.

(c) **Suggested changes**

Many suggestions have been put forward, many criticisms levelled at those who have been bold enough to suggest one change or another. Can we get to one or two fundamental principles? Do we still think that the retention of collusion as an absolute bar to divorce is right at the expense of reconciliation? Should such emphasis be placed on whether the parties have 'got together' collusively on the matter, or is it more important to *try* to get them together in order to reconcile them before finally dissolving their marriage—irrespective of the origin of the proceedings? As the emphasis swings (it has done so) to reconciliation if possible, and to the consideration of the welfare of children above all else, does the importance of collusion diminish?

Certainly this can become very clear from a different angle. Some time ago, I was asked for advice by a student who had committed adultery with another man's wife. He was himself single, and anxious only to discuss the ease with which he could marry the woman, since (he said) her husband did not care whether the marriage continued or not. Surely it was more important to tell him to get out and stay out than to discuss the niceties of collusion?

The value of opportunities for reconciliation is recognised also by an Act of 1963, as the result of which condoned adultery cannot be revived; formerly, condoned adultery would revive if, for example, the guilty spouse deserted the other for a period of three years. The result was that condonation was treated as conditional forgiveness, and the period of re-association was regarded as probationary. Now, a continuance or resuming of co-habitation after a matrimonial offence, for a period of not more than three months, will not amount to condonation at all *provided the co-habitation is with a view to reconciliation*.

As far as collusion is concerned, the effect of the Act of 1963 is said to be to render it a discretionary rather than an absolute bar. The Act says that the Court may in its discretion grant a decree despite collusion; it is clear, however, that the intention is not to enable spouses to part by legal divorce on a concocted petition.

Is not such an emphasis on reconciliation, difficult to work out in practice though it may be, more satisfactory than the reduction of marriage to a simple contract (instead of legally a matter of status)—a reduction which characterises the approach in *Law Reform Now?* There, the writers of the Family Law section, under the general editorship of the now Lord Chancellor, expressed the view that marriage should be regarded as a contract, imposing certain obligations, breach of which should (broadly) entitle the other party to set it on one side; all talk of guilt, innocence and matrimonial offences was, they thought, out of place. Matrimonial offences, they agreed with some members of the Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce, 'are in many cases merely symptomatic of the breakdown of marriage, . . . there should also be provision for divorce in cases where, quite apart from the commission of such offences, the marriage has broken down completely'.

This emphasis on reconciliation is of course repeatedly emphasised in Mrs. Argent's paper on Marriage Guidance, to which is appended a copy of the General Principles and Aims of the National Marriage Guidance Council. Perhaps, indeed, the whole theme of this issue should be reconciliation: the reconciliation of the spouses to a marriage, of ex-prisoners to a hostile society, of youth to age. Those who are theologically inclined will see from their New Testament Word Books that we are not far from the New Testament concept of reconciliation in so regarding it. In this way, men may be helped to find themselves.

'And when he had come to himself, he . . . came to his Father'.
(the first century prodigal);

'And suddenly, nothing seemed more natural in the world than to come home'. (a twentieth century prodigal: Richard Feverell)

K. N. S. COUNTER

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

K. N. S. Counter, B.A., LL.B., an honours law graduate of London, is a senior lecturer in law.

Mrs. C. W. M. Argent, wife of a magistrate of many years' experience in matrimonial and juvenile courts, has been for ten years secretary of a marriage guidance group, and for fifteen years appointments secretary in marriage guidance work. She has considerable other practical experience in sociological work.

Miss J. K. Stunt has been a geriatric social worker for fourteen years. Trained in Social Science at London School of Economics.

Miss J. F. S. King, M.B.E., M.A., Senior Assistant in Research at the Cambridge Institute of Criminology, was previously for 12 years a Probation Officer.

Marriage Guidance Counselling

Mrs. C. W. M. Argent

There are many areas of human suffering not relieved by the Welfare State. In no area is the need for help as great as in that of human relationships, and especially the marriage relationship. Stable marriages, and homes in which children can be reared in love and security, are the basis of a good social structure in any community. Many couples find themselves in difficulties—in some cases brought upon themselves, and in others right 'out of the blue'—and do not know where to turn for help. It was the recognition of this need for 'somewhere to turn' that brought to birth the National Marriage Guidance Council, who seek to provide centres in various cities and towns where skilled, kindly, and highly-trained men and women are available to offer the needed help.

The choosing of candidates for marriage counselling is most carefully done. The candidate is first interviewed locally and if the interviewing committee think him suitable, the local Marriage Guidance Council sponsors him to the National Council, which calls him to a residential Selection Conference. Here, in company with some fifteen or so other candidates, he will live for two or three days. He will be interviewed separately by each of the five or six selectors, one of whom will be a psychiatrist, and all the others will be people experienced in counselling methods. Discussion groups are held, with the selectors observing those taking part. After the candidates have departed, the selectors get together and come to a unanimous decision about each one. Successful candidates, about 40-50% of those sponsored, are told they have been selected for training. Four residential periods of training are spread over a year or so, and after each period of training, written papers must be submitted. Then follows a year's probationary work under the guidance of more experienced counsellors, and then an assessment is made by a representative from Headquarters.

Marriage counselling is not giving direct advice. This is perhaps not easy to understand for those whose evangelistic efforts often sound like 'Do this—or else!' Counsellors are selected, not particularly for academic qualifications, but rather for qualities of personality and character. They are people of strong convictions, but with sufficient humility not to impose them on others. They must be able to listen, without interruption, without showing any sign of shock, without judging, or offering ready-made solutions. Over a period of time, and during several interviews, the counsellor is able to help the troubled person to come to a better understanding of himself, his partner, and thus the marriage. Counsellors must recognise their own limitations, and know when it is necessary to pass people on to consultants for specialised help.

Some years of counselling experience showed that many difficulties could have been avoided if people had had a better understanding of marriage before they began. This led to questioning as to whether something could be done to help young people in their formative years to understand the responsibility that goes with adulthood. Many young people in the top forms of our schools have a good deal of factual knowledge, but need someone to help them to relate that knowledge to the emotional upsurgings of adolescence. Many parents cannot help, willing though they may be, and it became more and more apparent that valuable work could be done in this field by people of the right personal quality. Today, 'education counsellors', carefully selected and trained, are welcomed by some Local Education Authorities into grammar and secondary modern schools, to talk with small groups of girls and boys in the top forms. These are not occasions for preaching, or for laying down laws, but for frank and open discussion, in which girls and boys can air their views and opinions about personal relationships, about marriage, about the whole perplexing business of becoming adult. The great need is for communication. This need is evident at all levels, but particularly with young people, who by this means can learn much from each other, as under skilled leadership they are able to discover for themselves their own moral standards. Today, at a very early age, pre-marital sexual experience is taken for granted by many young people, and most of the mass media, for which the adult world is responsible, seem to endorse this view. It is surely a healthy thing that mature, informed, happily married and highly trained men and women should have the opportunity of guiding the thoughts of such young people. By means of these frank and informal discussions characters are being steadied, and values established in the minds of young people which will stand by them as they move into the adult world of business, or factory, or university.

Many of our own Assembly young people, brought up in happy, sheltered Christian homes—surely the best background—could well profit by such discussion groups. Just as one's faith becomes valid only when one appropriates it for oneself, instead of giving a mental assent to what someone else teaches, so one's convictions about morals and behaviour, marriage and family life, must be hammered out for oneself. It has been a disturbing experience for many to leave home, and go out into college or university life, to find that values accepted at home are here questioned or even openly scorned, and the surest armour is *knowledge*. There are trained workers in most Marriage Guidance Councils who would be happy to give help in such groups, particularly in the atmosphere of our Youth Clubs and Young People's Fellowships.

Marriage Guidance is not a field for evangelism, but it is a way of expressing one's faith in terms of service to disturbed and perplexed people. Many Councils need all kinds of help. As well as counsellors and educational workers, many centres need part-time secretaries, appointments secretaries, receptionists and money-raisers.

I read somewhere recently: 'Compassion alone is reason enough to

become involved in relieving human suffering, and we may not excuse ourselves from involvement because we cannot see much advantage to be gained for the Kingdom'.

APPENDIX

The General Principles and Aims of the National Marriage Guidance Council, reworded in 1952, are accepted by every Marriage Guidance Council in England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Principles

- 1 Successful marriage, the foundation of happy family life, is vital to the well-being of society.
- 2 Marriage should be entered upon as a partnership for life, with reverence and a sense of responsibility.
- 3 Spiritual, emotional and physical harmony in marriage is only achieved by unselfish love and self-discipline.
- 4 Children are the natural fulfilment of marriage and enrich the relationship between husband and wife; nevertheless, scientific contraception, when used according to conscience within marriage, can contribute to the health and happiness of the whole family.
- 5 The right basis for personal and social life is that sexual intercourse should take place only within marriage.

Aims

- 6 To enlist, through a national system of selection and training, the services of men and women qualified for the work of reconciliation and education in marriage and family life.
- 7 To help parents and others to give children an appreciation of family life; and to make available to young men and women before marriage such guidance as may promote right relationships in friendship, courtship, marriage and parenthood.
- 8 To assist those who are about to marry to understand the nature, responsibilities and rewards of the married state.
- 9 To offer counsel to those who encounter difficulties in the way of married happiness, if possible before these difficulties become serious.
- 10 To work towards a state of society in which the welfare of the family shall receive primary consideration, and parenthood shall nowhere involve unreasonable social and economic disabilities.

Old Age :

HELP TO THOSE FACING ITS PROBLEMS

Miss Joyce K. Stunt

Long life was one of the blessings promised to the righteous in the Old Testament, and all through the ages the recipe for long life has been earnestly sought. Yet Moses who lived to be one hundred and twenty years old stated that if by reason of strength one lived to eighty years, that strength brought labour and sorrow. Let us not be sentimental: labour and sorrow it is! There are happy old people, many of them, and rather than seeking a recipe for longevity perhaps it would be better to discover what makes a happy old person. There is no one answer: but, if we may generalise, their past lives have contributed greatly. If they have been outward-looking, useful, interested in the world around them, in youth, their neighbours, the sick and the afflicted, the probability is that these attributes will continue to the end. In fact, 'pure religion and undefiled', as St. James puts it, is the very greatest help to the practitioner at all stages of life. We may as well recognise that, if all our past history has been self-centred, it is no easy matter—perhaps it is impossible—to re-educate ourselves in old age.

What is old age? It is not necessarily a matter of years. An eighty-year-old can be younger than one of sixty, and it is not only an attitude of mind which determines the matter. The ageing process brings about the decline in activity of various glands, the weakening of muscles and the hardening of arteries. There are special enemies of the ageing, such as arthritis and strokes. All who study old age are only too familiar with the frightful hardships bodily infirmities inflict, not only on the sufferers but on those who are responsible for their care.

'To know how to grow old is the master work of wisdom and one of the most difficult chapters in the great art of living', wrote Amiel in his *Journal*, and it is the purpose of this article to consider in detail some of the difficulties besetting ordinary old people of the present day. (Not, let it be emphatically stated, that any old person is 'ordinary' in the strict sense of the word. With an individual life-story behind him, and his own particular temperament and personality, each is unique.)

Retirement

Let us suppose you are coming up to retirement. You are not there yet but you see its shadow distinctly on the horizon and you feel compelled to plan for it. You must not let it overtake you when you are unprepared. Is your ideal a cottage in the country, to sit back and relax and let the world roll on without you? Will this satisfy you? Even supposing you are a passionate gardener, can get around in a car, and have congenial neigh-

bours, will this be enough once the novelty of relaxing has worn off? Lack of interest and the realization that one is no longer contributing to life is a certain way of ensuring premature old age. The country (or a quiet backwater) may be the answer for you, but for many it has proved disastrous. *It is far easier to get out of life than to get back into it again.* One of the greatest tragedies of old age is not the loss of physical strength but dragging out one's days in idleness, enjoying the benefits of life but contributing nothing in return.

The age of retirement is a great challenge. You know your resources, your interests, your gifts. Only you, with the wisdom of God, can decide how best to bring forth fruit in old age. But do not at this stage think of yourself as 'old'. You are still laying up for the future. But face the future. Don't just drift!

Housing

Sooner or later a time will come when you begin to think: 'I am not as young as I was, I can't do as much as I did, and I had that nasty attack of bronchitis last winter. Everyone says I should be "getting my name down on a list".' Yes, perhaps you should. But this is another very complex matter and must be studied from all angles. To begin with, do you like being where you are? Is the place too big for your present needs? Are you finding there are too many stairs? Can you afford it? And is the rent likely to go up when your lease runs out?

If you decide that a move is indicated in the not so distant future you should consider the following points. You may be able to 'get your name down' on the local housing authority's list for elderly people's flats, if you are in reasonably good health and want to stay in the district. In fact, you would be well advised to see to this soon after your retirement, as it usually takes years to get to the top of the list. But in these flats you will have to reckon on looking after yourself, doing your own shopping etc. and this may necessitate another move at a later date. Very often there are wardens or caretakers living on the premises, but they cannot nurse or fetch and carry for you.

There are other flats, or flatlets, run by borough councils and benevolent societies and religious bodies, but the same applies and you must make arrangements in good time.

Various benevolent societies run excellent houses where you can furnish your own bed-sitter and do some of your own cooking, but these again will have long waiting lists and many rules governing eligibility: e.g. your age, sex, profession or trade. As they are subsidised your income will have to be below a certain level. In most of these places you are not likely to be accepted for the waiting list if you are over eighty years of age, and usually you will have to be able to manage stairs and stand firmly on your own two feet. If you decide that this is the sort of place where you would like to be then you should apply well before you need to get settled.

Rooms

'I'll find myself a room and cater for myself'. This is the cry of many desperate elderly people forced to make a change. It sounds like the

answer but it rarely is. In the South of England, at any rate, and certainly in London, landlords are a dying race even for businessmen and students. They go out to work instead and don't want to be bothered with house-keeping; and, to put it bluntly, they don't want to be bothered either with people who are at home all day. (More than one elderly person has gone out systematically after breakfast five days a week to sit in the park or library so that his landlady should think he was still at work.) There is something to be said for the landlords' attitude, unkind though it may seem. If a landlady takes in elderly people she may well find she is left 'holding the baby', having to give care and attention, knowing very well that she is unlikely to get them into hospital and that there are long waiting lists for local authority Homes.

Hotels

If you are in good health, do not want to be 'mothered', nor feel the need for constant companionship, why not consider a hotel? It is true that many hotels, besides being very expensive, will not take elderly people permanently, for the same reasons as the landlords. But some do, and there are comfortable reasonably priced hotels on the South Coast, for instance, where many old and elderly people have lived happily for years, some well on into their nineties. But this point must be made clear, in quite a few hotels it is necessary to move out for the summer months to make room for the holiday crowds. Is this such a hardship? It is possible to be looking round during the winter for some pleasant little hotel in a less popular area where holiday visitors are not catered for. And a change once a year is not such a bad thing.

Homes

Now supposing you are not able to get a flatlet of any kind and do not feel you would like the impersonal atmosphere of a hotel, perhaps you would consider a Home. There are virtually three kinds of Home:

- (a) those run by the County Councils or local authorities,
- (b) voluntary Homes run by benevolent societies, and subsidised,
- (c) private Homes.

For the County Council Homes you would have to apply to the local Welfare Officer who would assess whether you would be suitable for one of the large 'Institutions', or one of the smaller (and usually very nice) up-to-date Homes, having maybe forty to sixty residents. But you would have to face up to the probability of sharing a room with perhaps two or three. In the large Homes, which are founded on the old workhouses, there is dormitory accommodation.

It may be necessary to share a room in the Voluntary Homes, though you might graduate to a single room in time, and in these Voluntary Homes, which are subsidised by benevolent societies or religious bodies, your income will be taken into consideration and you may well be refused if it is too high. Unfortunately there are comparatively few which cater for men.

For the people who have money to spend, there are the private Rest Homes. These are business concerns run for profit, but if properly run (which admittedly is a large IF) are none the worse for that—provided you can afford them over a long period. At the time of writing they are *from* about 9 gns. to 20 or 25 guineas per week and you would not be likely to find a single room for less than 12 to 14 guineas per week. It is not usually possible to furnish your own room in a private Rest Home. These prices seem high and indeed it is a great deal to pay over a long period, but when you consider the present cost of living—rent, food, heating, staff wages, repairs—they are not as ‘wicked’ as people like to think; especially as, unlike hotels, they expect to provide a certain amount of care and attention. Some private Homes give a very great deal of care to the elderly and infirm but they are not supposed to *nurse*.

Be careful about a private Home. When you are trying to assess it take a long, long look at the Matron and as far as you are able sniff out the atmosphere of the place. Be more concerned with whether there is a happy ‘feel’ about it, rather than whether it looks smart and there is no fluff under the bed.

Living with relatives

Well—don’t! *Unless you are absolutely sure you can make a success of it!* It may work. But it may not. And it is far better to be friends apart than enemies together. How many marriages have been broken or strained to breaking point by friction brought about by the incompatible temperaments of in-laws, even where there is the best will in the world to get on together. Bear in mind too that you will have to live under the same roof with (in your view) uncontrolled small children or pop-loving teenagers. Having stressed the difficulties, however, there are occasions when it is the happiest arrangement; when, for instance, there is a ‘granny house’, or a room large enough, in which you can live to some extent apart and have a measure of independence. Experience has proved that it is rarely wise to attempt to live for three months with each member of the family in turn.

If you have a single or widowed daughter, it is more than likely that, accommodation permitting, she will want to have you living with her. In many instances this arrangement has worked happily on both sides, but today the daughter will no doubt have to work, and if so you cannot expect to have her undivided attention when she is at home. She must have some life of her own, friends in, evenings out, holidays, and leisure for her own pursuits.

It will have been noticed that so far nothing has been said about elderly married couples, the reason being that usually, though by no means always, while there are two together life is more easily coped with. The difficulty comes when one of the two becomes either ill or infirm or mentally confused, and then domiciliary helps come in useful. Sad to say, if the time comes when it seems necessary to give up the home where the

two of you have lived for years, there are comparatively few places, apart from flats, where a couple can live together. Sometimes, after long waiting, a double room can be found in a County Council Home—and then only if no nursing is required and there is no mental confusion. Some benevolent societies and private Rest Homes do take married couples, but the difficulty is finding two vacancies at once.

Illness and infirmity (advice to relatives)

Illness and infirmity are without doubt a problem to the sufferers themselves, but in the majority of cases the chief burden falls on the relatives.

Old people often say (and honestly think they have settled their future satisfactorily), 'I shall go on as I am and when I am ill I shall go to hospital. I was very happy in Bart's . . . (or Thomas's—or the Westminster—)'. That is all very well, but the fact must be faced that even if the elderly patient is lucky enough to get into one of the big teaching hospitals he or she will not be able to stay there indefinitely, 'blocking a bed'. Directly the acute stage of the illness is over, in any general hospital, the doctors will be on to the medical social workers, and the m.s.w.'s will be on to you, the relatives, to make arrangements for the future. If more care and attention is needed than can be given at home or undertaken by the relatives then a geriatric unit may be the solution—if there is a vacant bed. If the patient is up and about but needs general care and help with dressing etc. his name may be put on the waiting list for a County Council Home. There are private Nursing Homes but we will consider these in a minute.

(a) Domiciliary care

If the patient goes home, or to your home, arrangements can be made, either through the doctor or the medical social worker, for the district nurse to attend regularly, and/or a home help. Or, of course, you yourself can arrange for a trained nurse through one of the nursing agencies. But trained nurses are vastly expensive. You might be fortunate enough to obtain the services of an unqualified kindly person to help you, but you would be one of the favoured few if you did so. People do not want that kind of job these days, and, sad to say, if they do they are rarely the kind of person you are looking for! Some districts are running a Good Neighbour service and you could enquire about this at your local Town Hall or Citizens' Advice Bureau. A good neighbour, even if not from an agency, who has already proved helpful, and will accept payment to pop in and out, can wonderfully ease a difficult situation. But a *business arrangement* is a good idea. People cannot keep up voluntary help indefinitely.

(b) Private nursing homes

A good private nursing home is not likely to have an immediate vacancy, and it is a long arduous job finding the right one at the time you want it. They are also very expensive owing to the cost of adequate nursing staff. You cannot judge a nursing home by its charges, however. It is only too

easy to pay high prices for loneliness, neglect and sheer misery. A simple, clean, warm little place, even with four or five in a room, may give better nursing care than a stylish expensive place. As with a Rest Home, look hard at the Matron! And try to judge, not only her attitude to the patients, but the patients' attitude to her and the nurses: the Matron and staff may play up to you when you call, but the patients certainly will not! It is only fair to bear in mind, though, that nursing homes for the chronic sick cannot in the nature of things always be very happy or cheerful places.

As to fees, the Ministry of Health definitely will not contribute a penny, even though the patient needs nursing and should be in hospital. The National Assistance Board can only contribute towards *maintenance*, not to the cost of nursing, and then only if the patient's income is below a certain level. But, mercifully, there are Benevolent Funds (often related to a particular profession or trade) which are able to help financially in certain circumstances. Some benevolent societies have their own nursing homes, but they will certainly have long waiting lists.

You find this depressing . . . it is, and it is no use disguising the fact. The National Health Service leaves much to be desired in the care of the chronic sick and elderly infirm.

. . . .

Helpful advice on the varied and acute problems facing the elderly can very often be obtained from the following sources: Your local Welfare Officer, the local Old People's Welfare Committee, the Citizens' Advice Bureau. The Elderly Invalids' Fund (don't be misled by its name) can give you specialised advice about Homes and Nursing Homes of all kinds and will advise about possible financial help. Their address is: 34 King Street, London, E.C.2. Tel. MONarch 1778.

From your local reference library you should be able to obtain *The Annual Charities Digest*, published by the Family Welfare Association. The sections on Old People (Welfare and Homes) and Professional and Trade Benevolent Funds will be specially relevant.

After-Care of Offenders

Miss J. F. S. King

'For most people, crime is something they read about in the newspapers. The prisons they have never seen are frightening places of punishment for wicked criminals they have never known . . . Crimes of violence, and certain offences against the person, inflicting as they sometimes do grievous injury on innocent members of society, create a response that stamps the criminal as the enemy of all that is good, and clean, and civilised. He cannot possibly be anybody's neighbour'.

The quotation is from *Safe Lodging*, in which Mervyn Turner describes how, as 'a simple interpretation of the Christian injunction to love one's neighbour', he and his wife lived for five years on a family basis with persistent offenders just out of prison. It may be objected that the neighbour in the parable was not a thief but the victim of thieves. But Christ found a neighbour in a criminal on a cross. The identifying mark of the neighbour is surely not his deserts but his needs.

Who are these needy neighbours? Most will have committed property offences rather than crimes against the person (which constitute a very small proportion of all crime). Most are boys or men, since proportionately far fewer women commit offences and fewer still are sent to institutions. But beyond this they vary widely, from those leaving approved schools to continue their education or perhaps start work, to young men who have undergone the 'short, sharp shock' of three to six months at a detention centre, or have been thought in need of the longer training given at borstal, and older men who may have spent many years in preventive detention. Some may be first offenders, unlikely to return to prison but facing grave difficulties in re-entering normal life. Others may be youths who already have considerable criminal records behind them, and are still in the full flush of self-assertion and defiance, linked up with criminal companions, and very likely to offend again even if it can be hoped they will grow beyond this attitude with time. Others may be those classed as aggressive or inadequate 'psychopaths', with a long history of petty thieving and occasional violence, unsatisfactory in all their relationships, friendless, homeless, incapable of settling down to a normal life at all without the closest and most continuous support.

The sort of situation that faces people on discharge will also vary. A fortunate few will be able to return to families, employers, friends or churches who will combine wholehearted acceptance with a real determination to help in their restoration. Others will go back to families, neighbourhoods or companions who will indeed accept them, but only because they accept law-breaking itself as normal and permissible if you can get away with it: in the absence of powerful influences in the other direction these

are very likely indeed to drift into further crime. Others again will return to highly respectable families and neighbourhoods, only to be met with rejection and with little hope of re-establishing themselves in professional work or positions of trust. The majority will encounter the distrust of the law-abiding and the temptation to accept moral support from those less scrupulous.

For it is here that the central need of those coming out of prisons, borstals, detention centres or even approved schools, shows itself. Certainly many need help with money, with employment, with finding somewhere to live. It is the need of these things that may lead them to accept after-care in the first place. Of late years, however, the State, through the penal institutions themselves, and also through the employment exchanges and National Assistance, has accepted responsibility for meeting the basic material necessities. But beyond them lie other necessities, common to all of us; but particularly acute in the case of those who have been, in the popular phrase, 'put away' as offenders. Such are the needs for acceptance, companionship, support, some sense of purpose in life.

The fact of having been judicially segregated cuts across all these. A man will have been sent to prison or to some other institutions as having deserved such punishment: perhaps he was also sent as being a danger to the rest of the community, perhaps as being incapable of responding to training except in captivity. Any or all of these reasons inevitably produce a sense of rejection. This is likely to be emphasised on release by the stigma attached to the very fact of having been in prison (or even, for that matter, in an approved school), a stigma additional to that of having committed an offence, and a stigma which cuts a person off in a special way from the law-abiding and respectable. Alongside this is the fact that during his detention he has been cut off from all his normal human relationships—family, jobs, friends. Some can never go back, and for all the way back is difficult.

This is not to pretend that all will welcome or accept help. The response to a sense of rejection may be withdrawal, a strong resentment against 'do-gooders'. It may be a drawing closer to others similarly humiliated in hostility to society. Some element of these attitudes is likely to be present even in those who are anxious for help. Many, too, are very ill-equipped, in intelligence or temperament, to settle easily or happily to work, or to maintain very rewarding relationships with other people.

After-care can be very exacting work, demanding infinite patience and producing few spectacular results in any worldly terms. What a prison governor has called the 'one-more-chance' type of helper is unlikely to get far: there is need rather of those who remember Christ's answer to Peter about forgiveness 'unto seventy times seven'. Forgiveness does not mean that a man may not have to be punished, even segregated again, but it does mean that, so long as he himself genuinely is willing to go on, we cannot reject him.

Christians have an honourable record of such tenacity of love and concern in many fields. They are sometimes accused of an exceptionally

retributive and punitive attitude to offenders, of siding too much with the respectable in rejecting the 'publicans and sinners' to whom Christ came so close. But in after-care, as in many other social services, it was Christians as individuals or groups who first offered help to those leaving prison in the nineteenth century. It was from their efforts that the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Societies grew up, societies later recognised and subsidised by the government and right up until the present the main source of help, however inadequate for the great majority of adult prisoners.

Like other movements for voluntary service, however, these societies have latterly fallen upon lean times. Fewer people have been free to work on a purely voluntary basis, funds have been too low to employ adequate numbers of well-qualified paid staff; the sheer rise in the numbers of offenders imprisoned has increased the pressure, and too often the societies have been unable to do much beyond providing a little material aid on release.

Meanwhile, since the inception of borstals in 1908, the State has progressively introduced compulsory after-care for those who seemed in the greatest need of it—the young who leave approved schools, borstals, prisons, and now detention centres; and older men whose records had been such as to incur the longer sentences of corrective training and preventive detention. These compulsory categories are to be extended still further in future. The Central After-Care Association (an official body appointed by the Home Secretary) and the managers of approved schools have in the past appointed a number of specialist officers to supervise some of these offenders, but the great majority have come under the care of the probation officers in the areas in which they live.

Surveying the whole question of after-care in 1962, the Advisory Council on the Treatment of Offenders concluded that the distinction between those entitled to voluntary and compulsory after-care had no relevance to the real needs of those coming out of prisons and other institutions. The same quality of personal help and support should be available to any who were willing to accept it on a voluntary basis as much as to those obliged to accept supervision by statute. Accordingly it was recommended that the whole responsibility should be passed to an enlarged probation and after-care service. This recommendation is in process of being put into effect and has already been carried out in many areas.

That does not mean, however, that the contribution of voluntary service is no longer needed. On the contrary, if more adequate help is to be given a much more lively and responsible participation by the community is going to be essential. Even before the Committee reported, individuals like Mervyn Turner, organisations like the W.V.S., had already taken the initiative in testing ways to give more effective support to former prisoners, as well as to their families, who may be in at least equal need. More recently a maximum-security prison, dealing with men undergoing preventive detention, has encouraged voluntary associates to visit and correspond with selected prisoners for at least a year before their release, and to continue to befriend them afterwards in collaboration with the

official after-care authorities. There have been schemes for finding employment and providing centres where men or their families can bring problems and feel welcome.

In the specifically Christian sphere, the Langley House Trust already has six special hostels, with another four in the planning stage, designed to 'provide a family life on a Christian basis' for inadequate recidivists of various ages, so as to pave their way to independent life in the community in due course. In Bristol a parish church has bought a house, where three ex-prisoners at a time can live for an average of six months, 'mothered' by a rota of church members. The Salvation Army has opened special hostels for prisoners' families and for alcoholics. The West London Mission has both a hostel and a non-residential centre for alcoholics. Christian Teamwork is engaged on a tentative scheme to provide 'associates' for short-term prisoners, comparatively neglected in the past: it hopes to work, as does the W.V.S., by making initial contacts through probation officers at the time of sentence so that friendship can be continued throughout. These are only a few of the projects afoot (anyone interested can find full particulars, with addresses, in the *Directory of Prison After-Care Projects* recently published by the National Association of Discharged Prisoners' Aid Societies, 289/299 Borough High Street, London, S.E.1.).

Alongside such centres as these are plans for enlisting voluntary 'auxiliaries' to work with probation officers in connection with particular cases. The idea is that volunteers, if accepted, would attend some preliminary briefings (in evenings or at weekends) to give them an idea of the kinds of people and problems they would be likely to encounter, and would thenceforth work in fairly close contact with the probation officer ultimately responsible, being able to rely upon him for advice and support as necessary, but making their own direct and personal contributions in interest, friendship and encouragement. Here, as in all the other attempts to reach out to former offenders in after-care, we come back to the needs for acceptance, companionship, a sense of being cared about, a sense of purpose.

Perhaps I should finish with a comment on this word 'acceptance', which slides rather glibly off the tongues of those of us who have been trained or deeply immersed in modern social casework, but which may well give rise to much misunderstanding. I have sometimes heard Christian people suggest that all these attempts to help offenders, whether on probation, in institutions or through after-care, somehow imply a softness towards sin, a slurring over of the harm done to their victims, a denial of their responsibility. But acceptance, and the attempt to help, involve none of these. On the contrary they involve facing reality, including the realities of distorted personalities, of evil behaviour and its evil effects on others. We have to accept people as they are if we are to help them to move beyond that. Is not this what God does for us? Can we hope that they will believe God can accept them if we cannot?

This, surely, must be the Christian attitude to after-care, whether expressed in general attitudes to the way offenders should be treated in the community, or in any specific service to which we may be called.

MEMBERS' SECTION

THE PENTECOSTALISM DEBATE

In the last issue of the *Journal*, Mr. Somerville-Meikle complained of a familiar lethargy in relation to the special issue on *Pentecostalism*. Happily, after he had written those words, the correspondence began to arrive. It has been almost without exception stimulating and helpful. We are grateful to all our correspondents, including those whose letters we have not been able to publish.

Mr. David G. Lillie has engaged us in a considerable correspondence, and we are grateful to him for the time and trouble which he has spent in producing the critique with which this selection opens. His comments are directed largely at the article in No. 9 by the present editor of the *Journal*, who endeavours, in a comment on the critique, to wear the hat of a contributor.

A CRITIQUE OF THE ISSUE ON PENTECOSTALISM

by David G. Lillie

Some observations on *The Divine Encounter* (F. R. Coad)
(CBRFJ ix, pages 5-15)

Mr. Coad's thesis is concerned with 'the problem of pentecostalism', and is an attempt to provide an effective answer to that 'problem'. This is evidently necessary because, to quote the writer's own words, 'traditional arguments advanced against pentecostal teachings have been completely inadequate for the purpose'.

It should be noted, in passing, that the writer assumes the existence of an identifiable *genus* called 'Pentecostalism' with standardized doctrines and characteristics, and in which all holding certain convictions regarding the ministry of the Holy Spirit are involved without need of further discrimination.

It is gratifying to note the uncompromising rejection of such traditional arguments as the familiar one that 1 Cor. 13: 8 proves the withdrawal of tongues, etc., before the end of 'the apostolic age'. It is asserted that the continued propagation of these arguments has become 'an act of pastoral irresponsibility'. However, the validity of current charismatic testimony is not recognized: hence the need to formulate a convincing answer to this new 'movement' which is challenging individual believers, and assemblies of 'Christian Brethren' and indeed all sections of the Christian Church.

This formidable task is tackled with considerable courage. The opening paragraph poses the question: 'At what part of human experience may

we expect that God will most strongly and intimately encounter the individual?" and there follows an attempt to prove that although 'where it occurs most powerfully will differ for each individual . . . the encounter at *some* level of intensity should take place for us all, at *every* part of *normal* life'. By 'normal' is evidently meant 'natural' for the demonstrably supernatural is definitely ruled out, such features as 'tongues' being regarded as deviations into the realms of the 'abnormal' and the 'grotesque'. Although there is the admission that the Christian life begins with a supernatural experience, thereafter it shall continue without any further manifestation of the supernatural apart from that which may be evidenced through steady growth in grace.

We are in the fullest possible agreement as to the supreme importance and excellence of those basic characteristics of the Christian life which are emphasized. What is questioned, and that most strongly, is the assumption that we are offered two irreconcilable alternatives; i.e.: that we choose to know God within the limits of 'normal human experience' as for example 'in the quiet immensity of silent worship . . . in moments of intense need . . . in a fellow man or woman . . . at some advance in intellectual understanding, etc.,' or, turning our backs upon such experiences, plunge headlong into this 'highly emotional and subjective by-way of experience' known as pentecostalism.

This proposition arises from what we believe to be a distorted concept of one particular yet important part of the Holy Spirit's gracious activity. Thus the thesis rides uncertainly from the start upon a heaving sea of misconception. This seriously prejudices its chances of reaching its intended destination of providing a solid Biblical answer to help perplexed enquirers.

Tongues are seen as 'the problem of pentecostalism in its most acute form', and it is therefore to this gift, understandably enough, that most attention is given. Throughout the article tongues is presented as a 'sign gift'. This is a somewhat misleading term. It focuses attention on what is a secondary and special feature, a sign to the unbeliever, and away from its primary feature as a gift to the Body of Christ for its edification and particularly as a means of expression in private worship (1 Cor. 12: 4-11; 14: 2, 4, 14 etc.), which is Paul's primary emphasis. Moreover it is assumed that the exercise of tongues must involve excitement and emotional excess, and the gift itself is bluntly stated to be 'essentially abnormal and unnatural'. It is an easy step from here to the final dictum that 'tongues are an irrelevancy, tokens of immaturity' which is only one stage removed from the daring assertion (attributed to a certain author whose book is favourably reviewed elsewhere in the *Journal*) that 'tongues speaking is a useless gift . . . inimical to true religion', and that, concerning tongues at Corinth, it was 'gibberish' of which Paul's 'faint praise amounts to damnation'.

Let us apply the writer's own excellent principle of 'appeal to Scripture' to some of these assertions. Paul says: 'he that speaketh in a tongue edifieth himself' (1 Cor. 14: 4):—is this a mark of 'irrelevancy'? And does

Paul's own unashamed testimony: 'I speak with tongues more than ye all' provide evidence as to his spiritual immaturity? In 1 Cor. 12: 4-11 Paul gives us a list of gifts, including tongues, bestowed and worked by 'the one and the same Spirit', Are not those who assert that any gift of the Risen Lord is 'useless . . . gibberish', or that the practice of speaking in tongues was virtually 'damned' by the Apostle Paul laying themselves open to the charge of profanity?

In their (doubtless sincere) desire to withstand the incursions of the merely emotional and superficial it seems that some of these brethren have gone beyond the realm of honest doubt to a point where their attitude and words casts a very grave reflection (to say the least) on the God Who gave this gift to men.

Again, upon what Scriptural foundation rests the concept of spiritual *normality* set forth in this thesis? It is true there is plentiful use of Scripture references, but it would seem that this concept represents the residual deposit which remains when the N.T. has been drained of its 'supernaturalism'. The writer would presumably acknowledge that supernatural elements form an integral part of the whole of the N.T. history, which is mainly concerned with the life and ministry of our Lord and His disciples (including Paul)—not to mention the frequent incursions of the supernatural into O.T. history. Nor, presumably, would he question the eventual reappearance of the supernatural in the fulfilment of Bible prophecy at the end of this age.

We are asked, however, to accept the proposition that in this present age only, the ultimate in spiritual experience of the individual believer and of the church as a whole *must* be contained within the limits of the 'normal' (or natural), and in the preservation of 'the true wealth of our heritage' we must reject any and all those 'supernaturalistic' features which are deemed abnormal, irrelevant and trivial, in spite of their being a 'normal' concomitant of Christianity in New Testament times.

One has only to consider the implications of the prophecy of Joel 2: 28-32, to realize how dangerous is this reaction. Pentecost was clearly not the complete fulfilment of that prophecy for that belongs to the days immediately preceding 'the great and terrible day of the Lord'. Are there as yet NO portents in the world scene suggesting the approach of that cataclysmic era? If there ARE, then at what stage are we permitted to expect a re-appearance of those 'pentecostal' manifestations which Joel clearly indicates will be a feature of the closing days of the age?

It is this strange lack of awareness of certain practical implications of the Word which they so dearly love which is one of the most disturbing features of contemporary Brethrenism. In face of the fiercest onslaughts of materialism and secularism, and against a background of apostasy, we are asked to accept, without a shred of solid scriptural evidence, a Christianity drained of its vital supernatural content. At a time when we need, as never before, the whole armoury of God provided to fight the powers of darkness, we are forbidden access to some of the very weapons which the Risen Lord placed into the hands of His commissioned men.

There are an increasingly large number of us, both in and outside of Brethrenism who are unable to accept this traditional viewpoint. When we hear clearly the Head imposing these limitations upon His Body we will readily submit. Until then, in keeping with what we find in the N.T. and see God is doing all around us, we feel compelled to pray and work towards a full recovery of those features which marked His church at the beginning. We are persuaded that it is only such a church which is capable of fulfilling His original commission to preach the gospel to every creature, to set the captives free, and whose bindings and loosings on earth will be ratified in heaven. And only such a church will be ready to arise without shame to meet her Lord at His coming.

To impugn this contemporary, worldwide, spontaneous resurgence of charismatic ministry by use of the ready-made epithet of 'Pentecostalism'—with all its prejudiced overtones—simply will not meet the case for a growing number of thinking people. And it may not be long before those who use it become embarrassingly aware of this fact.

If this present spontaneous, world-wide movement is a work of the Holy Spirit poured out at Pentecost, then it is 'Pentecostal' in the true Biblical sense, and God will vindicate it.

Brethren, we ask you to take a second look at this movement, with an open Bible and an unprejudiced mind, 'lest haply ye be found even to be fighting against God'.

Mr. F. R. Coad comments:—

I am a little sorry that the reactions to CBRFJ ix of those who favour the current resurgence of pentecostal manifestations, have shown little appreciation of the fact that their own case has much to gain from exposure to ideas such were contained in the articles therein.

The two sides in the debate have long been settled in a sort of trench warfare: opponents of the practices behind a bulwark of dogmatic assertion, and the advocates behind a breastwork of proof texts. By casting down the bulwark of the former, and by showing the inadequacy of the latter's breastwork, we had thought to have persuaded them to talk with us on the broad plain of the total Biblical witness to the Spirit of God. It is therefore disappointing to find that Mr. Lillie should decline the discussion on that ground, and entrench himself yet more firmly behind his breastwork. He rightly rejects an *either-or* of irreconcilable alternatives (which no one offered him): the logic of his rejection should have brought him out to the open ground.

Two matters in this debate cause me a real concern, and Mr. Lillie's observations only intensify that concern.

The first is doctrinal. It is odd that a very commonplace statement of the classic doctrine of the Holy Spirit should be regarded as a sort of Bultmann-like exercise in 'demythologizing' the Faith. Something is amiss somewhere! Much pentecostal writing reminds one of a man looking through a wrongly set pair of binoculars. He sees two distinct circles of

light, touching at no point, and labels one 'supernatural' and the other 'natural'. It is only a short step before the labels become 'spirit' and 'flesh'—and then 'good' and 'evil'. That way lies the most persistent heresy of the Church. Is it flippant to suggest that this is a very cross-eyed view of reality? The Biblical doctrine will not only superimpose the circles one upon the other—it will produce a truly focussed and three-dimensional view of reality.

The second matter is one of Christian apologetics. There is something so unnecessary in this desperate attempt to resist any suggestion that 'tongues' may not be 'supernatural' (in their limited sense) at all: after all, no one fears it in respect of the equally charismatic gift of the teacher or helper. Are not Mr. Lillie and his colleagues running themselves into a classic 'God-of-the-gaps' trap, which may one day snap tight, with devastating effect upon their faith?

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Donald Tinder (409 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn. 06511, U.S.A.) writes:—

Your statement of the fundamental issue (p. 5) is good, but I wonder if there is not another of equal importance, namely whether or not there are two distinct classes of Christians, just as surely as there is a distinction between the saved and lost. Most Pentecostals as well as many from other traditions seem to believe that there are two kinds (almost always identifying themselves with the superior kind, or else being in despair because they feel left out). A superficial reading of Paul with his 'carnal' and 'spiritual' might support much of this tradition, of which Pentecostalism is but one manifestation (others include those who stress loyalty to the Pope or to the 'historic episcopacy' or to a certain mode of baptism, even by a historic succession of Baptists, or 'gathered out ones' or the 'holiness' crowd and so forth).

Pp. 5 and 23 should be combined in my judgment to list three distinct kinds of 'tongues': (1) ones exercised in private; (2) the sign of tongues which all Christians are supposed to have (and thereafter, perhaps, exercise private tongues); (3) the gift of tongues, which is definitely limited. In practice, many Pentecostals have a fourth kind, 'private' tongues exercised in a small group, and with such there is no interpretation, clearly contrary to the requirements for the gift. I have been to such a meeting.

In Acts, I observed four features common to the three explicit instances and the one I will accept on implicit grounds (Samaria). (1) It was not sought after—came solely by the Spirit's impetus. (2) It came with or shortly after conversion or enlightenment about the new age—there was no significant time lapse. (3) Everyone, not just a few, in the group concerned had the experience. (4) The tongues were real languages, unknown to the speakers but known by the hearers. Ordinarily none of these four is true in contemporary pentecostalism. Pentecostals must

turn to Corinthians to find justification for their practice, but Cor. just as clearly limits tongues to a few; the result is they hop back and forth between Acts and Cor., using the former to say that all must do it, but the latter for most other aspects.

I am almost certain that the two Chilean Pentecostal denominations are very tiny splinter groups, and not at all among the larger Pentecostal denoms. in that country—the two that are in WCC. I heard that their interest was awakened after financial and other aid had been sent to the country by WCC after an earthquake.

I take the filling of the Spirit to mean the control of the Spirit. The command Paul gives to be filled is put by me in the same category as Peter's to be holy and John's to be sinless. It represents goal not achievement.

The various denoms. and groups on pp. 25, 26 that are said to be new tongues speakers may give a distorted picture. I have seen the notice about PB's elsewhere, but I have serious doubts that it is at all widespread. I also question the documentation for the 600 in Hollywood First Presbyterian though I have seen it in print elsewhere. I have found the neo-pentecostal leaders notoriously given to exaggeration, I think sinfully so. I know something about the situation at Yale and I don't think the IVF has been strengthened by this 'encounter' at all. I believe that Navigators has taken a definite stand against it and the other evangelical groups mentioned at the top of p. 26 are not in their leadership or in the greater part of their numbers with the new movement. It would be unfortunate if your readers got the impression that they were.

Healings prove nothing. I have recently been exposed to a lot of Christian Science and that is of course their big pitch. I take it that the British Assemblies of God are not related to the American, which is by far the largest pentecostal group over here with a large missionary force.

I like the thoughts on p. 27—we should not 'prohibit without providing'. I should think that the chief reason pentecostalism has made inroads into other groups is because Christians who are looking for genuine fellowship and vitality, etc., are not finding it elsewhere. Of course, as your introduction points out, it is not just a matter of becoming more lively, but of understanding God at work in the everyday activities of life.

I think many interesting parallels exist between the new-pentecostalism (whose members call it the Charismatic Renewal or some such) and the early Brethren. A few that come to mind: (1) Anglican influence, even predominance (2) a call to cease fettering the Holy Spirit in old forms (3) continuing within existing churches, or at least not seeking to form simply another denomination (4) opposition from others because of its 'divisiveness' (5) the two categories of Christians—those who have been baptized with Spirit—those who are gathered out waiting for the Lord. That Brethren oppose charismatics with much the same arguments that we were once facing ourselves (and doubtless still do in lands where we are vigorous and gaining converts or proselytes from other groups) indicates how far we've evolved! (See footnote—*Ed.*)

I don't believe in clergy, yet I fully believe that God uses clergymen to accomplish His purposes; I don't believe in most of what goes under 'tongues', but I believe God uses the ecstatic speaking nevertheless to accomplish His purposes. Our main concern should not be to oppose tongues, but to so live and teach that those who come into contact with us will not have legitimate occasion to seek after such experiences. Moreover, we must always keep open to God changing our minds, but surely we cannot but be commended for copying the Bereans and searching the Scriptures, waiting for the Spirit to show us from them that what is going on today is also His will for us.

(*Ed.* Readers will be interested to compare Mr. Tinder's remarks on the early Brethren with Mr. Stunt's article in CBRFJ x.)

Mr. Eric G. Fisk (5 Rue Dante, Tangier, Morocco) writes:—

I feel I must comment on Mr. Cotterill's masterly article on Pentecostalism. The writer seems to have had experiences similar to mine.

I was saved in 1913 and found my first home amongst the Pentecostals due largely to the fact that my Aunt who led me to Christ was a personal friend of the Boddys of Sunderland, and the church I attended was modernistic. However, I was soon unhappy amongst them, partly because in 1914 I received a commission in the army and met with very intelligent fellow officers whose views upset me in my ignorance of the Scriptures and Christian life generally, and partly because I felt that those exercising what they called the gifts of the Spirit, failed, so often, to exhibit the fruits of the Spirit, and those who could not honestly claim to have spoken in tongues, and consequently—in their judgment—had not received the Holy Spirit, were so often the better people. This fact very much upset me. However, one point I feel very strongly about, and which I am glad Mr. Cotterill mentioned was the way they deprecate ordinary scholarship, and persuade their followers to look to the Holy Spirit to meet whatever emergencies that may arrive. In my case, I offered myself for missionary service in 1913 soon after I was converted. I was accepted, in principle, but told I would need further instruction, and so I commenced to prepare myself to sit for the entrance examination into Cambridge University in June 1915. When I joined up in 1914, I dropped my studies, of course, but, when wounded and convalescing, I resumed them. It was then when I was making progress in N.T. Greek and logic that these people found me and pooh-poohed the whole idea, and pressed me to 'allow the Holy Spirit' to teach me and make me wise above anything I could learn. In my weak state physically, I gave in and many precious years went by before I realised that to learn N.T. Greek, I needed to study it and I was only being fooled. In consequence of this error on their part by suggesting it, and mine by accepting it, much of what I might have learned over a number of years had to be grasped in a short period of time, and I feel this is something that young people should know. Many times when I was asked to take meetings, preach the Gospel &c., I stood up before people and should never have done so for I was totally unprepared, and always ashamed to produce any notes, or assume any knowledge that might be construed, by my Pentecostal friends, as 'fleshy wisdom'.

Mr. W. J. Pethybridge (5 Wazir Hasan Rd., Lucknow, U.P., India) writes:

As I read the *Journal* on 'Pentecostalism' I was led to think again on this subject, and it came to me in a new way. During the last thirty years or so I have had various contacts with Pentecostal friends, some very close and intimate, and have studied many works both for and against. During this time, I have met so many very good things and so many very bad, that it has been impossible to come to a place of rest in my mind where I felt I had discovered the right attitude. I wanted an attitude of heart which I felt was pleasing to the Lord, and in which I could feel at peace with God on the subject as well as having a right spirit towards these dear friends many of whom have a real fruitful ministry for Christ.

Just after reading the *Journal* it suddenly came to me. I saw this is too vast a subject to expect a simple clear-cut answer to it. We cannot truthfully say either, 'We should be for it' or 'We should be against it'. Neither can we say 'It is perfectly good' or 'It is definitely bad'.

What we can say is that this is a definite 'dimension' of spiritual life. It is a realm with a vast series of experiences, some of which can be definitely of God, and some definitely of the devil, and a great many that are inexplicable.

It has helped me to think of two analogies; 1, *Radio* and 2, *Marriage*. It is clear that Radio has brought another dimension into the lives of almost everybody alive today, which was unknown to our worthy ancestors. But it is impossible to say squarely if radio is either good or bad. We have to say that some aspects of its use are very good, especially in the shipping realm, SOS etc., some aspects are very bad (Pop music? and dirty plays etc.) and some aspects like news reports are good when true, and bad when used for wicked propaganda. Wise use of the Radio can help even the best Christian in some ways, but unwise use will hinder him.

Marriage is a 'dimension' of life which most of us enter into, but some abstain for various reasons. If a single young fellow came to us and said, 'Tell me, is marriage good or bad?' we should have to answer, 'It all depends . . .' There are many people who have remained single, and have yet served God and man in an outstanding way, far beyond the average married couple. But marriage is God's loving gift and His usual order for His children, and many married couples have served God and man far better than the average single person. To marry in the will of God and live according to the Bible rules is very blessed, but to use it in a selfish lustful way can spell disaster.

In the same way there is this charismatic realm with healings, tongues, etc. which seems to have been a fairly normal thing in N.T. times. But in 1 Cor. 12-14 it is shown that though these gifts are of the Holy Spirit, yet they become a hindrance if they are not used according to divine instructions, and love. There is no doubt that the spiritual life of many has been enriched and made far more useful after the so-called 'Baptism with Tongues', but there are also many others who have used this gift in a proud and selfish or unwise way and have brought much sorrow into their own life and the lives of those around them.

If we spent most of our life in the divorce court, we would no doubt conclude that marriage was the biggest curse on earth. If we read books on Christian marriage we learn that when lived correctly it is the best in life. If we only listen to those who seek to run down the charismatic gifts by repeating only those stories against it, we shall be convinced it is 'all of the devil'. but if we take an unbiased view we shall have to admit two things:—1, The most outstanding Christians of 18th and 19th centuries did not appear to use tongues, yet were beyond the average pentecostal today. 2, The average believer in Pentecostal (good) circles, is more loving and effective for Christ than the average evangelical.

Mr. H. L. Ellison (Moorlands Bible College, Holcombe, Dawlish, Devon) writes:—

The excellent issue of CBRFJ on *Pentecostalism* (No. 9) seems to suffer from one outstanding weakness. Though the point is hinted at, it is not developed.

In brief, 1 Cor. 12: 28 to 13: 1 gives a list of the more important gifts of the Spirit, of which love is greatest. The not unknown feature of one who speaks in tongues yet does not show Christian love must be judged in the light of this passage. What concerns me is that any company of Christians giving due place to the gifts of the Spirit might be expected to display examples of the greater gifts, but do they?

Of apostles I say nothing for brevity's sake. Prophets—that prophets exist among Pentecostals I know: I have personally met a prophetic, and the lack of interest shown in her by her church showed clearly that they did not consider she had one of the greater gifts, nor have I heard of one so regarded, though they probably exist. Teachers—those who accept invitations for 'ministry' to Pentecostal churches will soon learn from the gratitude with which it is received how few teachers the movement has produced.

Undoubtedly some speaking in tongues has been from God: undoubtedly some has not. It is a foolish church that rules out the possibility of its taking place in its midst. But we may be allowed to query the claim of any group that claims to be Spirit-ruled and yet does not display a true cross-section of the Spirit's gifts. Just as the individual's claims to a Spirit-filled life may be fairly judged by how much of the fruit of the Spirit he shows, so the claim of the church may equally be judged by the measure of the gifts of the Spirit.

Points from other letters

Two correspondents protest at Mr. Patterson's reference to Romans 10: 9 (CBRFJ ix 36): one considers it 'almost a denial of one of the clearest promises of God's Word'.

We have also received a most interesting paper from Mr. John Kennedy, entitled *The Modern Resurgence of Pentecostalism in North America*, and dated May 1960.

Mr. Kennedy relates much of the phenomenon in North America to the social and religious conditions of that country. He sees in the hyper-Calvinist 'fundamentalist' reaction to liberal theology, a tendency to 'a defining of positions which has circumscribed the faith of believers within narrowly defined limits'. This has led to an excessive emphasis on doctrinal orthodoxy—'spiritual life has been reduced to a mental assent to a correct theological position. Thus we are being more and more confronted with a church which is evangelical in outlook and doctrinal position, yet which does not possess the corresponding life in the Spirit'. Pentecostals, largely Arminian in theology, have correctly diagnosed this lack of personal experience, and in their correction have tended to replace the Word by subjective experience.

It is an interesting and provocative thesis. Readers of current discussions will not have failed to notice the almost naive acceptance by some advocates of the ecstatic gifts, of any report of their occurrence, without regard to the doctrinal background. In extreme cases, speaking in tongues takes the place which was occupied in a certain type of evangelism by the more emotional class of 'conversion' experience.

Other Correspondence Received

Mr. Bernard C. Martin makes the following points in reply to Dr. Stanley Hoyte's criticism of his contribution on audible prayer by women (CBRFJ viii, 26):—

(a) Dr. Hoyte challenged his contention that the subjection of woman to man is inherent in nature, by creation; and in place of this view suggested that it was the result of the fall rather than God's ideal. Mr. Martin quotes in explanation of his view I Cor. 11 (esp. v. 9) and I Tim. 2: 13-14.—while conceding that the authority has been 'terribly abused'.

(b) Mr. Martin denies that he made no reference to the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ, and draws attention to his reference to Christ's emancipation of women from a vassalage brought about by man in departure from God. He points out that his article was concerned with the limited subject of department in the church, on which the epistles alone can give guidance.

Mr. Martin re-emphasises the importance of his main conclusions on women's freedom for exercise 'of their Spirit-given gifts and privilege of prayer'.

(*Note:* This subject is now taken up into the wider matters to be dealt with in the competition announced in the last issue, and it is requested that further correspondence should be held over.—*Ed.*)

From the Monitors

Notes on Humanist, December 1965 issue

Hector Hawton—General approval of Prof. Ayer and other Humanists in recent BBC series, ‘but I hope we shall not overplay our respectability and tolerant comprehensiveness’.

Jan Szrednicki ‘Is religion really necessary?’ disposes, to author’s satisfaction of commonly quoted ‘needs’ for religion—logical need (though I think he underestimates the ontological argument), needed to understand universe, needed to understand morality, social need, psychological need. His analysis of some of these is worth taking to heart, to make sure we are not offering the Faith merely as an addition to human happiness. Christians are primarily declaring truth about God and His right to worship and obedience, irrespective of what we get out of it.

Kit Mouat ‘Jesus, Christians and Humanists’ is interesting for its assertion that it is not only argument about God but ‘our attitude to Jesus determines whether or not we become Humanists’. Christians would do well to realise that Kit Mouat finds *relief* in her Humanism. ‘As we become committed to the Humanist attitude we should feel comfort in realising that the strange Christian superman, man-god, no longer dominates or distorts our view of the history of mankind’. Another evidence of the need to declare truth about God rather than sell ‘satisfaction’?

R.I. in Schools gives most of the usual arguments. It appears to take no account of recent Christian-Humanist paper on the subject. Christians should realise that by no means all Humanists wish Christian instruction to be abolished—this is declared policy of the Secular Society, but not of British Humanist Association. Many want ‘ethics’ taught separately from ‘Christian facts’. The ‘rationalist view of ethics’ is raised in a review in this issue of Prof. Ginsberg’s *On Justice in Society*.

Quotes of the month

(In obituary reference to Tillich) ‘To speak of the Ground or ‘ultimate concern’ instead of God seems exciting to those who want to enjoy the adventure of doubt without losing the consolations of faith’.

‘Humanism in this country has no poetry, which arises at the point where reason glimpses the emotional life and comes to terms with it. To this extent Humanists are incomplete, immature people: they cannot tolerate their subjective selves’. (Bet Cherrington)

The Correspondence columns show sharply divided Humanist opinion on voluntary Euthanasia.

Charles G. Martin

Book Review

TWO BIBLICAL FAITHS, Protestant and Catholic

by F. J. LEENHARDT, Professor of New Testament, University of Geneva-Lutterworth. 120 pp. 9/6

This book is set in the context of Protestant-Roman dialogue. The author believes that a basic mis-understanding exists by reason of the confessional presuppositions of both sides. We are both formed and deformed by our ecclesiastical backgrounds, to such an extent that we both read the same word of God, but do not hear the same message; and indeed do not seem to be worshipping the same God. Even in the matter of words, we use the same words but their content is not the same.

The writer has therefore 'frequented quite perseveringly the circles in which both protestant and catholic exegesis was taught', in the endeavour to think himself into the underlying bases of each system. For any therefore who are really concerned to understand the deep reasons for Roman thought and practice this book is invaluable.

He has come to believe that most of the controversies surrounding doctrines and practices are therefore treated by both parties merely on the surface, and that the deep sources are not really understood. 'The common mistake was not to keep sight of all the texts, with the result that each warped the conclusions he drew'.

Briefly, he concludes that each tradition has proceeded upon two parallel Biblical lines without achieving a Biblical synthesis. The one line stems from Abraham, the other from Moses. The one produces the individualistic breaking in of the sovereign word of God to the experience of one man; hence the individualism and divisiveness of protestantism. The other stems from the superimposition of a further divine revelation to a constituted society at the exodus; hence law, liturgy, ritual, mediatorship, sacrifice and priesthood; in short the Old Testament ecclesia. This naturally predisposes toward the monolithic authority of the church.

He sees in the New Testament days the extension of the former in Romans and Galatians, where Abraham looms large; while he sees in the developed church authority of the Corinthian and Ephesian letters the extension of the latter. He suggests that Paul embodies the former, and Peter the latter. This last of course is a much over-simplified generalisation! After all Paul did write all the epistles mentioned. He sees in the former the naked word of God to the human spirit; but in the latter the sacramental use of material things in sanctuary, sacrifice and human mediatorship.

He does hold however, that in the total revelation of the Old and New Testaments the desired synthesis is clearly present, and obviously hopes that such a result may be achieved in the life of the Church.

We would, I feel, part company with him in his belief on the sacramental use of the material creation, in the water meaning baptism in John 3, and the flesh and blood of John 6 meaning the eucharist.

One wonders if the translation—'humanism', p. 22 line¹, really conveys what was intended. Perhaps the simple term 'men' would have served. It would be difficult to commend adequately the deep and spiritual insight into the Old Testament passages dealt with.

K. G. Hyland

THE CHRISTIAN BRETHREN RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP



Secretary:

Philip Handley Stunt

71 Duke Street, Chelmsford, Essex

Treasurer:

D. H. Thompson

80 Northumberland Road, New Barnet, Herts.

Editor of Journal:

F. Roy Coad

29 Crossways, Sutton, Surrey

Members of Council:

K. N. S. Counter

D. J. Ellis

Ward Gasque

Dr. G. Higgins

Dr. J. M. Houston

Dr. S. H. S. Love

A. R. Millard

Dr. J. P. Redfern

J. M. Somerville-Meikle

Publications Office:

34 Tewkesbury Avenue, Pinner, Middlesex