

Reflecting on Our Nazarene Heritage

A Roundtable Discussion Featuring

Paul Bassett, Stan Ingersol, Janine Metcalf, and Tom Noble

Moderated by Bob Broadbooks

[INTRODUCTION]

BOB BROADBOOKS: Hello, my name is Bob Broadbooks and as you know, the Church of the Nazarene recently celebrated its centennial. We're here today to have a wonderful conversation about the Nazarene story. The centennial offers us an excellent opportunity to visit about it, and to reflect thoughtfully about the Church of the Nazarene.

Over the past several weeks, many of you have been sending questions to us. We've compiled some of those questions, and we've invited several wonderful guests to be with us today.

We are glad to welcome, on my left, Tom Noble. Tom is a native of Glasgow, Scotland, and he serves as professor of theology at Nazarene Theological Seminary in Kansas City. He's the author of several books, including *Centennial History of the Church of the Nazarene in the British Isles*. Currently, he's working on a book about missionary David Hynd and has also been commissioned to write a three-volume systematic theology.

Next to him is Paul Bassett. Paul is Professor Emeritus of the History of Christianity at Nazarene Theological Seminary. I had the privilege of being his student a long time ago, and I want you to know it was a joy. It's an honor to have Bassett here with us. Paul is the co-author of *Exploring Christian Holiness, Volume 2* and the "Historical Development" portion of that work. He's also authored numerous articles on Nazarene history and theology.

We also welcome, on my right, Janine Metcalf. She presently is the pastor of El Cajon Church of the Nazarene in California. She served as professor on the faculty at Point Loma Nazarene University, also adjunct professor at Nazarene Theological Seminary. She's the author and creator of the documentary, "Ablaze with Love," a living legacy of our Nazarene foremothers. She's also co-author of *The Upward Call* and has written numerous articles on spiritual formation.

We also welcome, on my right, Stan Ingersol. He is the denominational archivist for the Church of the Nazarene. He is the author of a book called *Nazarene Roots*. He also is co-author of a new denominational history, which is tentatively titled *Watchword in Song: A Centennial History of the Church of the Nazarene*.

How important is it for a pastor to know their denominational story, and what are the ways that pastors can help connect their people to our story?

JANINE METCALF: I think one of the ways that we can do that is to not be ashamed of our past. In fact, every congregation needs to see itself framed in the larger story of God. Our Wesleyan-Holiness heritage has such rich marks of Christianity that influence the way we interpret scripture. It influences the way we embody the mission of God. It influences the way we spread the gospel. There is so much as we look back to our Wesleyan-Holiness heritage—the emphasis on the fullness of the Holy Spirit as manifested in perfect love for others. I want to pass that on. That is something to embrace, and it's a distinctive that is a part of our walk with God that I think congregations need to take a closer look at. How are we embodying this? How do we live this out in our communities? It's important to know our past.

PAUL BASSETT: We are ordained to ministry in the church of God, not ministry in the Church of the Nazarene. We are ordained to ministry in the church of God according to the rules and doctrines of the Church of the Nazarene. But we don't separate ourselves from the

rest of the church. I think it's important for congregations and pastors to know that in the rest of the church are our cousins and our brothers and our sisters, our grandparents, our great-uncles and aunts—these are people that we know God has been calling, or, in years past, had called upon. They all had to give some kind of an answer, just as we do. We have to give an answer to the whole church, not just to ourselves.

[BEGIN: The Genesis of the Church.

BROADBOOKS: Let's talk about the "genesis" of the Church of the Nazarene—those beginning days. The founders were dissenters, I suppose you could say. Some people have called them "come-outers" from the established churches of the day. What did they find lacking in those established churches that they wanted to bring to this new organization, to embody in the Church of the Nazarene?

INGERSOL: Well, the primary complaint that the Nazarene founders had with the established churches was that of spiritual decline. They felt that the disciplinary standards of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in particular, were not as strong and not as strongly enforced as they had been before. They understood that the Methodist class meeting, where people were held accountable to one another for a life of holiness, was disappearing from the scene. It was no longer a requirement. This whole idea of decline was one of the complaints that they had, maybe the primary complaint.

Another factor was that in the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church South, there was a controversy over holiness. When the Holiness Movement started in the 1830s, it had no resistance to it at all. However, by the third generation, you had laypeople leading some sectors of the movement. There were camp-meeting grounds that laypeople controlled and that the bishops had no influence over. So, by the third generation of the Holiness Movement, there were fissures. The

controversy developed over the methods in particular of the Holiness Movement—that was one aspect of the controversy.

There were others in the Methodist churches who began questioning the doctrine of entire sanctification. Again, the founders who left really were looking to move beyond the controversies over methods and message and to create congregations that were really rooted in the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition. In a sense, they rejected the developing pluralism over views of holiness and wanted congregations that were very clear in their “rootage” in this Wesleyan-Holiness message. They wanted to be free to use evangelists as they wanted (that was another controversy). Neither the Methodist Episcopal Church nor any other church in the south had a place in their polity for evangelists. Yet evangelists were very important to the Holiness Movement. In the Church of the Nazarene, evangelists became the early heroic figures of the movement. So, there were a number of reasons.

BROADBOOKS: These groups coalesced at the beginning of the Church of the Nazarene.

Obviously, this happened a hundred years ago, approximately in 1908. They came together in Pilot Point, Texas. Why in the world Pilot Point, Texas? It’s not what you would call a mega-center even at that time, I wouldn’t think. Why was it Pilot Point?

INGERSOL: Well, it’s important to realize that the General Assembly at Pilot Point was really the second General Assembly of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene. The first General Assembly was in Chicago in 1907, and that first General Assembly brought together the groups—the churches from the east and the churches from the west. The churches from the east were themselves the product of an earlier merger. At Pilot Point, we don’t have just a birth date, but a series of birth dates. In different parts of the United States, we have a series of mother churches; we have a mother church in Glasgow. We have different mergers.

So, what made the Pilot Point merger different from the ones that went before, and why was 1908 selected by the sixth General Assembly as the anniversary date? If you look at the language that the 1923 General Assembly used about the assembly at Pilot Point, it uses anniversary language. It doesn't use birth language; it uses anniversary language.

It also talks about recognizing the assembly at which “the three rivers of life” flowed together. This phrase was taken straight from Phineas Bresee's address to the 1908 General Assembly. He had talked about it as a great occasion in which the three rivers of life flowed together—one from the Atlantic, one from the Pacific, and one from the Gulf of Mexico. In a sense you can think of 1907 as one bookend and 1908 as the other bookend. There was a small merger with the Pennsylvania group in the middle of this, and there were accessions from another part of Texas (part of the southern group).

These two bookends, 1907 and 1908—really, the second one—were the end of a process where most of the major issues were dealt with (although, there would still be other issues that would come up). Pilot Point was not only the end of that process, but it also helped bring together the north and south. It was easy enough to reconcile east and west; they had a shared culture. However, reconciling north and south was a very heady experience. They realized that what had been accomplished there wasn't *doctrine* of holiness—it was *experienced* holiness. Somehow, the experience of holiness had gotten them past the sectional stereotypes and the legacy of bitterness that had remained as a residue in American religion since the Civil War. It was an experience of holy living; in a sense, that's a good model for the Church of the Nazarene even today, when we have so many cultures and tongues now represented.

BROADBOOKS: One of the pictures that we have in our minds—those of us who've been a part of the Nazarene church for a long time—is the march around the tent at Pilot Point. What was the significance of that march ?

INGERSOL: The march is an iconic image. (Fortunately, there was a photographer there. I wish I knew who it was. I actually suspect it was C. B. Jernigan, but I don't know.) This iconic image is called a "Hallelujah March." Hallelujah Marches were very much a part of the camp-meeting culture out of which the Church of the Nazarene was born. It seemed like a natural response, I think, to the joy that the people felt when the final vote to merge was taken and adopted.

METCALF: In some ways, it reminds us of the march around Jericho: Walls of prejudice and difference began to tumble in the presence of this experience of holiness.

BROADBOOKS: And the word Nazarene, where did we get that name?

BASSETT: It's in the Bible. Joseph Widney was a close friend and associate of P. F. Bresee's in the early days of the church. Widney and Bresee were discussing a name, and Widney, it seems to me, was thinking in the way he usually thought—in terms of groups relating to other groups. He had come to California and noted the social problems of a new place. Having lived in a sort of frontier place, he knew what social problems were and how long-lasting they could become. He thought about Jesus' character as he sought to help people integrate themselves into the larger society. "How do we help integrate the poor of Los Angeles?" Others too—they weren't anxious to leave out anyone. Widney himself was fairly well-to-do. "How do we get these people in and help them to understand the gospel is theirs, too? Let's call ourselves the church of Jesus, Jesus the Nazarene. So, we'll be the Church of the Nazarene." They couldn't call themselves the Church of Christ. There were already a "jillion" of those. And to call [themselves] the Church of Jesus the Nazarene would be too long. The Church of the Nazarene seemed to fit.

There are some problems with the name, especially since a heretical group in the early church was called the “Nazarenes.” My understanding is, there is a group in Hungary, the nation, that still goes by the name “Nazarenes.”

BROADBOOKS: Interesting. How have Nazarenes related to other Wesleyan denominations? Have we ever discussed merging with The Wesleyan Church, the Free Methodists, or other groups? If so, why didn’t we come together, and did any of our leaders push for mergers?

BASSETT: One of the leaders of the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness Camp Meeting, as it was called back in the first or early second decade of the 20th century, went to great lengths to say to those who were thinking about becoming Nazarenes, “Don’t leave us. Stay with us.” There were already Free Methodists in the 1860s, and then there were the Wesleyans, who go back another 10 to 12 years from that. There were already other Holiness denominations: the Southwestern Holiness Association had come together into a group that’s very important in this area (that is, in the Midwest). There was the Church of God, Holiness; the Church of Christ in Christian Union around Circleville, Ohio; and other smaller groups—this was before the Church of the Nazarene even began to form.

When the Church of the Nazarene came together, it was fairly obvious—and I believe Carl Bangs has made this point—that one of the things they wanted to do was to become a national denomination, not a sectional association. That was going to take some doing, and I’m not so sure that we have outlived our sectionalism yet, but at least our intention was to be a national (and now, an international) church. Our relationship to other denominations depends very much upon what we look like in a particular area. In Ohio, we looked too much like the Methodists for the Church of Christ in Christian Union to join with us. Even though they had much the same doctrine as we have, our polity was

too far from their understanding of a democratic polity. In Texas, where it was every man or woman for him or herself, the Nazarenes were too cohesive, so they have been criticized along that line. Every area in which the church met other Wesleyan denominations, it tended to enter into a conversation with them, though not always in a formal way.

In New York state and northern Pennsylvania and Ohio and Indiana, we were in constant discussion with the Wesleyans and the Free Methodists both, but not in formal ways. They would show up at our camp meetings, especially, because we often shared preachers. The camp meeting didn't provide a good platform for any kind of ecumenism beyond the simple preaching of the gospel. So, we didn't move toward any kind of organic union.

Have we ever discussed merger with The Wesleyan Church and the Free Methodists? It depends on what's meant by discussion, I suppose. If we think only in terms of official conversations, yes, we've had official conversations—between the General Superintendents, for instance, of the Church of the Nazarene, and the General Superintendents of The Wesleyan Church. I don't know how involved the Free Methodists were in any of those discussions. I think probably very little to none.

With all of these conversations, the question is raised, "Why haven't we joined together?" Part of the reason is that the Church of the Nazarene would be the 800-pound gorilla in the room. That's not as much a problem for us as it is for the people who don't weigh 800 pounds. We're a little bit self-conscious of that. We stayed out of the National Holiness Association until the early 1970s because—the argument that was used and I'll take it for truth—it is alleged, if we went into the National Holiness Association, we would dominate it. I remember going to Wesleyan Theological Society (WTS) meetings in which

the fear was that if you nominated a Nazarene—because there were more Nazarenes at that meeting than anybody else—surely, the Nazarene would be elected.

Another question is, what do we do with our colleges? What do we do with our missions work? What do we do with the general officers of the church? If I may speak personally, I think those problems solve themselves by people getting older. You can resolve them as time goes by. We have an example in the Methodist-Evangelical United Brethren merger, where they kept all the Bishops in both churches. They just waited for some of them to retire to reduce the numbers.

Did any of our leaders ever push for merger? Yes, we have had leaders who have pushed for merger. I think there are probably less now than before because you can only take so much rebuffing. We've also tended to think of merger from the top down rather than understanding that we are essentially a people movement. Mergers have to begin with the people. The leaders in a church are on the bottom of the pyramid. As Gregory the Great said, "Even the Pope is the servant of the servants of God."

[BEGIN Founders and Shapers]

BROADBOOKS: Well, let's talk a little now about the founders and shapers of the church.

Phineas Bresee: his name has been mentioned already. Then, there was Hiram F. Reynolds. They both contributed to the church as founders of the church. What contribution did these two men make to our beloved church?

BASSETT: Phineas Bresee was the galvanizer of the movement. That is to say, when he walked in the room, everything gravitated toward him. When things needed to happen, you had to have somebody who knew how to organize and how to get things done. This was Reynolds' strength, an administrative strength. Bresee was a splendid "front man." I don't mean to make him sound like P. T. Barnum, but he was a splendid advertiser for the church and a great preacher. Reynolds was much more quiet in his operation,

especially once he had settled down; he'd done a lot of world travel at first. Once he settled down, then he began, bit by bit, to take organizational steps. We owe a great deal of our organizational wisdom to him.

NOBLE: It's also true that the international character of the church probably is due more to Reynolds than anyone else—the travels that Paul was talking about and Reynolds' great interest in world mission. I think we owe the way that we're developing now into an international church to Reynolds. He was a very significant figure preparing the way for that.

BROADBOOKS: As the church began, then, we had to have some sort of polity, some sort of organizational mode, and there were different ways to approach that: for instance, congregational, episcopal. We consider our church to be a connectional church today. How has this "connectionalism" benefited the long-term success of the church? Does it still have value today?

INGERSOL: Sam Young has a very interesting article, from about 1960, entitled "The Dangers of Disconnectionalism." Seems like back then, there were pastors who had the impression that maybe, maybe the denomination didn't have as much value as it had before. In this very short article that was in the *Nazarene Preacher*, Young tried to confront this attitude head on. This whole question, how do you balance the congregational principal with the connectional principal, is basic to the very organization and structure of the Church of the Nazarene. It's reflected in the *Manual*. If you look at the historical statement, you'll see a section very early called "The Basis of Union." The Basis of Union was the agreement that was struck between the congregational-oriented churches of the east coast and the connectional churches of the west coast under Bresee.

Bresee's structure, in the first years of the movement on the west coast, was fairly loose and unorganized because he was planning just for one congregation, maybe a few. By the time of the 1904 annual meeting of Bresee's group, he had basically brought almost all of the Methodist Episcopal structure back into play and at many different levels. In Chicago, with this bargaining between the congregational-oriented church of the east and the connectional churches of the west, Bresee insisted that the Church of the Nazarene should be a connectional church. He insisted on a trust clause—the local church would be trustees of the property, which was actually owned by the district. He insisted that the decisions of the General Assembly had to be binding on the districts and on the local churches.

All these are part of what is involved when we talk about connectionalism. Bresee did give the eastern group a little escape clause. Those 50 congregations of the east were able to leave and take their property with them, but no other churches founded in that area after that point would be able to do so. How does one establish the connectional principal if the congregational principal has been there from the very beginning? When we look through different stages of Nazarene history, we find that sometimes we tilt more strongly toward the connectional principal, and, at other times, maybe even this time, there is a shift, or at least a shift of attitude, toward a more congregational principal. As long as the polity remains intact, we will remain a connectional church.

Another point—last point I want to make on this subject—is when you really think about congregations in the Church of the Nazarene, it is simply a fact of our history that through our world mission program, and through what we used to call our home mission program, all but a very few Nazarene congregations came into existence as an expression of the connectional principal. That is, it was district planning that led to the

planting of this church here and that church there and another church over there—so that almost all of our congregations, again, with very few exceptions, actually came into existence as expressions of the connectional principal.

BROADBOOKS: Well, good. Evangelists played a very important role in the early days of the church. Tom, since you are from the British Isles, I'm assuming that was true even there.

NOBLE: Well, actually it wasn't generally true of the British Isles. Generally, it was the local pastor and the local congregation who "took the spearhead" in evangelism. There is one outstanding figure from the early part of the 20th century—Maynard James, who at that point was not a Nazarene. He was an evangelist with the International Holiness Mission, and, later, broke away to form his own Calvary Holiness Church. He conducted a number of remarkable campaigns in the 1930s. In the years of the Depression, he led a group of students called the Trekkers. They built their own cart and walked across England from place to place establishing congregations. He had meetings with many, many conversions and healings, and he established about a dozen congregations in the 1930s. But that was exceptional.

I can remember other American evangelists coming to Britain. However, the ones I remember more specifically, and as most effective, weren't actually full-time evangelists. I think of Edward Lawlor, who conducted a campaign at the time of the church's 50th anniversary, which I can just remember. I think of Jerry Johnson, who conducted very effective campaigns; Rev. Doris McDowell; and others. Generally, however, it was the local congregation that spearheaded evangelism in Britain.

BROADBOOKS: Interesting. I know that women evangelists played a powerful role in the early days of the church. If it hadn't been for Minnie Ludwig, a woman evangelist, I don't know that I ever would have found Christ, or found the Church of the Nazarene.

METCALF: The role of the evangelist opened the door for women to step forth and use their gift to preach. Congregations found it easier to accept a woman in the pulpit who was a traveling, visiting expositor of the Word, rather than one who remained as the senior shepherd. We do see women shepherds in the early Church of the Nazarene, but, by far, the prominent role of women leaders in the early days of the church seemed to be evangelists who moved from church to church and had effective ministries all over the globe.

INGERSOL: In the first half-century of the church, there were two evangelists who really captured everybody's imagination. One, of course, was Bud Robinson who had an interesting biography and wonderful persona. He endeared himself; he came out of the southern folklore tradition, and people responded to him because of his great warmth and the simplicity with which he preached the gospel and the doctrines of the church.

The other notable evangelist was C. W. Ruth, who actually played a key role in birthing the Church of the Nazarene. Ruth was Bresee's associate pastor for 18 months. After that, he went back into full-time evangelism, which he had been in before and where he would remain for the rest of his life. However, while he was traveling across America as an evangelist with the National Holiness Association, he was burdened with the fact that there were so many independent Holiness groups. He introduced them to the Church of the Nazarene, one after another—the people on the east coast, people in the south, people at Peniel, Texas. Then, Bresee would come in and close the deal. It was out of Ruth's work as an evangelist and the people he came into contact with that Ruth developed a vision of bringing people together into one church.

BROADBOOKS: Who were considered to be the truly great model preachers of the church's first 100 years, and what can we learn from them?

BASSETT: That's a difficult question because it's very complex and everyone has his own Mount Rushmore of great preachers. Let me suggest that preaching should say something about the gospel, or it's not preaching. That's the gospel of Christ, so it's Christian preaching. And it should be an exegesis in some way of scripture and of the congregation and of bringing together the two. If I were to go to models, those would be standards that I would use, I think, in making the assessment. I would suggest that P. F. Bresee was a model in every way. The Christological note did not always come through, but the context would have that—that is, the hymns and the prayers certainly would have Christological content to them.

R. T. Williams was especially good at understanding the people to whom he was preaching. Again, perhaps not as Christological; he tended to deal with problems of the Christian life and not see them as Christian problems, but simply as problems. Yet he was still a good preacher.

J. B. Chapman would not win any prizes for being interesting, but he was a very thoughtful preacher, and people appreciated that. He was faithful to the Word, and he was also faithful to them, and they knew the man's character. He was, in his earlier days, called "Fireball Jimmy," although, his older daughter, Grace Ramquist, would never accept the fact that he had been called that!

H. B. Miller was strong on all of those points. There was a definite command of the English language on his part that was very attractive.

A. M. Hills was very clear on all of these points—a bit on the feisty side, but he could be understood in both the British context and the U.S. context.

If we come up a little closer to contemporary days, G. B. Williamson, before becoming General Superintendent, was a very good preacher. After that, he was too busy, but he was a model preacher.

William Greathouse certainly was a model preacher. Students at the Nazarene Seminary would always come when Greathouse preached. He would preach on Friday if he was there. The house would always be full when Greathouse preached. We loved to listen to him preach.

Sidney Martin, whom I heard a couple of times in person, and then heard reports of his preaching, I think, would rate highly on all of the criteria that I noted. They're my criteria; yours might be slightly different.

Bill McCumber was an excellent preacher; he still is, at the point of being crisp and clear with the Scripture and the congregation.

Reuben Welch is a model preacher, but nobody could imitate him. So, he's not a model in that way, but rather, in getting into the pew and sitting down and talking to the people to whom he's preaching. He understands that this isn't just a conversation; this is a declaration of the Word of God. He does it so winsomely, and the Christo-centricity of his preaching is very clear.

To back up a little bit in time, J. Glen Gould, a long-time pastor in the northeast and teacher at ENC, was a master of both the logic of the sermon and the logic of the text itself and was very effective.

I hesitate on this one because of close bonds of friendship, but I would have to say Alec Deasley is one who is a model preacher in every way .

And one more. Arnold Airhart, Mr. Nazarene for Canada and the Reverend Mr. Nazarene for many of us, was a model whose clarity of character came through in his preaching. It was almost as if Christ or one of the apostles were speaking to you.

BROADBOOKS: Let's talk about women in ministry for a few moments. They had a strong leadership impact on the early Church of the Nazarene. We can talk about the biblical basis for women in ministry. We can talk about how our understanding of women's

ministry has changed in our hundred years. What would it take for women to have an even more influential leadership in ministry in the Church of the Nazarene in our new century?

METCALF: Certainly, there seemed to be a more positive attitude toward women in church leadership in the earliest days of the Church of the Nazarene, at least among our leaders. I'm not sure, as a whole, how everyone felt about it. But Phineas Bresee and others saw the need to allow all people, men and women, to use their gifts to their greatest potential for the body of Christ. They used the Scriptures, going back to Peter's sermon at Pentecost, that the Holy Spirit was poured out on men and women. They used the positive passages of Galatians 3:28, that in Christ, there is neither Greek nor Jew, male nor female, that we are all one in Christ Jesus. At that time, a more positive view of women in ministry opened the door for people to accept women serving in preaching capacities, on the mission field, and as evangelists in a variety of roles. There seemed to be that open door, and women stepped through that door.

At one time in our earliest years, some 20 percent of our credentialed ministers were women. This meant that they were serving in a variety of capacities—probably out in the mission field, as evangelists, as pastors—but they were there. One of the things women in particular have missed out on in the last several decades is that mass of women to look to today. One of the struggles that I have as a leader is finding others to network with, to talk to, to grow together with in this most exciting role.

I think Stan or Paul could talk about this, but something happened after the first three decades in the church as the movement was turning into a denomination. Perhaps there was the concern that having women out there preaching, taking such a prominent role, might not have looked good in evangelical circles. There was the cultural norm that you didn't see women in leadership roles in anything outside of the home, so, to see

these women out there preaching was an odd sight. Some people had real trouble with that. Eventually, as we began formal training of our clergy, these women, who were typically also mothers, could not leave their homes to do formal training. A lot of our women began to pull back from training, and they disappeared from the roles of credentialed ministry in the church.

Praise God we're starting to come back. But it's a long process. We need exposure to those who have done magnificent work for God in our past, but also exposure to those who are serving today in a variety of capacities to open that door, to open the discussion again, to begin this route back to gender mutuality in church leadership.

BASSETT: I wonder if it is partly due to a movement within the church regarding its models of leadership. Up until World War II, the model of leadership within the Church of the Nazarene was the camp meeting and the district assembly (which was connected to the camp meeting). After the war, we began to get the industrial military model, and we fell into that one really hard, and that was an all-male model. I wonder if maybe that doesn't have something to do with the dismissal almost of women in ministry.

METCALF: And we stopped telling their stories. There are so many wonderful stories. When I think of Lucia Carmen de Costa, involved in planting some 17 churches in Argentina. And Mary Cagle involved in planting another 17 churches in four different states—marvelous women of God who stepped out in very difficult days to open the door for others such as myself. We need to hear their voices again; we need to hear from women today who are serving alongside. There is no other agenda but Christ. There is no other banner but the Lord; we are serving here, and there is no other reason to step forth. This isn't about rights. Our rights are on the cross. It's all about stepping forth and following Christ and being true to the calling that God has placed on our hearts.

It's also up to us, men and women, if we are called of Christ, to live to our fullest for Christ. If the Lord is calling you to do this, by all means obey. If the door isn't open, you don't just sit back and fret about it. We're wasting time. What we're called to do is be obedient, so we use our gifts where that door is open, with a positive—I pray—a positive model of Christlikeness wherever we are.

INGERSOL: One of the things I like, Janine, is that when you started out, you talked about Peter's sermon at Pentecost. When I get in arguments with my Baptist relatives who don't believe in ordaining women, I simply ask them, "Do you think when he gave the greatest sermon of his life, Peter got it wrong?"

METCALF: I serve in the shadow of some very large Baptist churches. I was never invited to participate in ministerial association prayer meetings. For many years, as a pastor in the town, I began to wonder. But instead of pounding on the door so much, I just went ahead and did the work that God had called me to do. In time, one of them called up and said, "You know Janine, we miss you." They began to come over to our church, and they now meet me on a weekly basis to pray. It may take time, but if we model the calling that God has placed on our life, and we're not afraid, but we turn and fix our eyes on Jesus, what a great opportunity we have. We can promote this without pounding on doors, but just living the life that Christ has called us to live.

BROADBOOKS: Well, thank you. Let's talk a little bit about the educational institutions in the Church of the Nazarene. We've been serious about forming colleges, universities, [and] seminaries these years. How has that affected the development of our denomination? Would anyone like to jump in on that?

BASSETT: It's a very important question and a complex one. Let me see if I can keep short here. How did we come to emphasize education and to begin these educational institutions that have played such a part in our church? One of the inheritances that we

had from Methodism was the desire to plant colleges. The Methodist model was based upon a social understanding in which one went to college to enter into the professions: teaching, law, medicine, ministry, and, later, business. Our question was, “How do we keep the ministry from being looked at simply as another form of making money, as another profession?” We had a double burden in our schools: learning and spirituality—spirituality, because the question we were asking about ministry also encompassed teachers, lawyers, doctors, and the rest. How do we help these people grow in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ and keep their commitment there and also their commitment to learning? State universities were beginning to show up about the time that the Church of the Nazarene showed up. The state schools gave some attention to religion, but largely as an objective set of data off to the side somewhere.

We wanted to make sure that religion was included in the curriculum of our colleges. However, we didn’t have any good educational models to follow. The Roman Catholics, of course, had been combining spirituality and learning for a long time, but we stayed away from that model. We did insist that our schools first be liberal arts schools and not simply Bible schools. We did have Bible schools, but as soon as possible, they moved toward being degree-granting institutions.

Not only did we want them to be liberal arts schools, we didn’t want them simply to relate to the church. Instead, they belonged to the church. Harold Reed, the long-time president at Olivet, used to make the point incessantly that Olivet is not a church-related school; it is a church-owned school. We had to answer the question: Do we want to follow the state university model, which tends to make religion objective, one more science to study, or can we keep religion a matter of the heart, which affects the whole school?

The sad thing is that today, most of the Ph.D. programs to which our teachers go are concerned primarily with the academic discipline. The spiritual life is left to the

student. Moreover, although the student often feels obligated to go to a Nazarene church, very often, the Nazarene church has not sought to relate itself to the nearby university. That has created some tensions we haven't needed to have.

It also raises questions about whom to call as presidents of our schools. Over the last 50 years, a great deal more care has been taken in the choice of deans. We've had some splendid deans along the way, persons who knew how to meld profound spirituality and profound learning. In one way, one worries a bit. In another way, one is deeply encouraged. When I first went to the seminary, where I'm now in the 40th year (but I've been retired for awhile), there was only one district superintendent who was also a seminary graduate in the whole church. There were no seminary graduates on the Board of the seminary, none. It's vastly changed now. Has that made a difference? Not yet, because it generally takes another generation in order to have both a proper response and to get over some of the negative responses to the previous generation.

BROADBOOKS: Where did early Nazarene pastors draw their self-understanding?

BASSETT: They were very much aware of each other. They took their self-understanding from the great figures in the literature that they read, in school and outside of school, and from—at least in this country—the national politicians, at least what you saw of the national politicians. They also went to the camp meetings to hear other preachers. They enjoyed hearing other preachers. And they enjoyed getting to know these people, what kind of character does this person have, that sort of thing. Integrity—which was critical for living on the frontier—was number one in the formation of their character. Second was an understanding of Scripture. Third was common sense, and fourth was the ability to get along with folks. There were more differences between people than there is now. We've been homogenized by television and other mass-media things. They were as different as

soap and dog food. They were concerned about integrity, and they wanted to come across as ministers of the gospel.

INGERSOL: I'd like to expand on one of the points that Paul made when he talked about self-understanding coming from the things they read. I think it's important to look at the Course of Study for ministers in the early years of the church and see exactly what books were there because there wasn't a Nazarene literature, really, for them to read. The books in the Course of Study came from different sources, but when it came to doctrine and theology, those sources were basically Methodist . John Miley's *Systematic Theology*; Thomas Ralston's *Systematic Theology*; these were both Methodist theologians of the 19th century. And they read Wesley. It's interesting that in the period from roughly 1915 through 1932, if you went through the Course of Study, you read a biography of John Wesley; a 400-page compilation of Wesley's writings from different sources; Wesley's sermons; and *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*—basically all of Wesley's writings on the subject of holiness. These were very important sources informing and shaping Nazarene preachers back then.

When we get to Wiley in 1940 and the publication of his *Christian Theology*, Methodist sources start to disappear from the Course of Study. Before Wiley, non-Methodists wrote books on preaching, how to preach, the techniques of pastoral practice and theology. However, when it came to core doctrine, it was very clear where preachers were to draw from.

[BEGIN: Theological Vision]

BROADBOOKS: We use the term Wesleyan-Holiness to describe our theological tradition. What are the roles of Wesleyan and American Holiness theology in the Church of the Nazarene, and how do they fit together? How would we describe ourselves as Wesleyan-Holiness?

NOBLE: I think in the first place, this has to be understood historically. Wesley formulated his doctrine in 18th-century England. His doctrine of holiness, particularly of Christian perfection, was formulated in that context. The American Holiness Movement was in America, so there you have already a geographical difference, a cultural difference. And a temporal difference because we're now talking about the 19th century. So, you're in a different cultural context, one that is particularly shaped by American revivalism, which is already there, which is a different kind of animal from the British culture. The American Holiness Movement, I think, saw the development of some particular emphases that were not there in Wesley. Two, basically: 1) the entrance of Phoebe Palmer with her altar theology, her shorter way to holiness—consecrate, believe Scripture, testify, profess. That was very controversial in its own day.

The second development was the way in which the Wesleyan tradition was influenced from outside by two particular figures: Asa Mahan and Charles Finney who wanted to identify Wesley's doctrine of entire sanctification with the Pentecostal experience of the apostles in Acts 2. Now that was a new development. Wesley did not make that connection, although some of his colleagues did.

Those two differences mean that you've got two different stages. A lot of people have concentrated on the differences between those two. However, I think it's important for us to see that there are two different stages in the development of the same tradition, and there are deep underlying unities. Just to name a few, one is that both of these stages of development agree on the basic doctrine of Christian perfection—understood as perfect love, loving the Lord your God with all your heart, soul, mind, and strength. That's not in dispute.

Secondly, at both stages, this came about by entire sanctification, an act of grace, an act of God, which took place in an instant. There's no dispute between the two groups about that.

Thirdly, this was by the Holy Spirit and could be called being filled with the Holy Spirit.

Fourthly, it involved the death of the carnal mind, to use the old King James translation—the mind set upon the flesh, the self-centered mindset.

Finally, this could only be experienced by the Christian who had grown in grace: gradual sanctification.

Now, it seems to me on those five underlying points, both the 18th-century formulation of Wesley and 19th-century formulation of the Holiness Movement were in fundamental agreement. I think that's where we need to focus, and that's what we're about.

METCALF: At what point did we move from the emphasis on that one crisis experience, that second blessing, to consider the progression of holiness in a believer's life?

NOBLE: The progression of holiness came first. It was the loss of progression that meant the emphasis was put on the instantaneous experience—it was taken out of context. We've actually recovered an emphasis that was part of the Wesleyan tradition and part of biblical holiness.

METCALF: Where do we stand today?

NOBLE: Well, I think we stand on the five points I've just enunciated. I think we're quite clearly united on those.

INGERSOL: I had a conversation recently with somebody who said, "Well, yes, I believe in Christian holiness as a progression, but it's after entire sanctification." What would you say to that person?

NOBLE: Well, yes, that is also true, and that has also been part of our doctrine, that by no means are we to think that entire sanctification ends the development of Christian holiness. In fact, it has often been emphasized that it is only really from that point on where the greatest development can take place. So I would say that.

INGERSOL: Well, this person denied that there was progression before entire sanctification.

NOBLE: Oh, I see. Well, they're welcome to their opinion, but that's not the Wesleyan tradition.

INGERSOL: I simply told them to go back and read Wyler.

NOBLE: Or, go back and read the Bible.

BASSETT: We were already talking about purity and maturity back at the end of the 19th century, and then the Nazarenes picked it up. In fact, there was a book by that title that came out in the late 1940s, I believe it was, *Purity and Maturity*.

BROADBOOKS: Good. It seems that Nazarene theologians like H. Orton Wiley didn't engage other theologians much, the theologians of their time like Karl Barth. Why didn't they, and should Nazarene pastors be aware of contemporary theologians? If so, who should they be aware of and who should they be reading?

NOBLE: Well, let's start off with Wiley. Paul has already spoken about the fact that he wrote primarily with those in mind who were not necessarily going to be able to go on to college. Although Wiley was published from 1940 onwards, it is said that he actually started writing 20 years before that. In 1920, or a year before, Barth's *Epistle to the Romans* was published. That was in Europe, which, in those days, was a long way from California. Those are both reasons why Wiley did not engage contemporary theologians: that is, those for whom Wiley was writing, and the general tendency to be rather suspicious of any modern theologian. In addition, Wiley, to a large degree, followed in the tradition of William Burt Pope, the British Methodist theologian whose work was published from the 1870s onwards, and who was, already in his day, regarded as somewhat

conservative. Pope did not deal with the German theologians of his day either. If that was Wiley's model, you could see that was also an influence.

Should Nazarene pastors be reading contemporary theologians today? I remember a Nazarene pastor coming into the library once at Nazarene Theological College in Manchester and looking at all the new books and saying, "Ah, you've got to be so careful who you read these days." We rather chuckled at this because our philosophy was you don't agree with everything you read, but you read them in order to sharpen your own understanding of your own position. So, yes, we should be reading people within our own tradition.

I think of those within the Wesleyan-Methodist tradition, historical theologians in Wesley like Maddox and Collins or systematic theologians like Geoffrey Wainwright or Thomas C. Oden or William J. Abraham. There are also plenty within Methodism, within the Wesleyan tradition—biblical scholars like Richard Hays or Ben Witherington.

Moving beyond the Wesleyan tradition, there are theologians like Wolfhart Pannenberg and Jürgen Moltmann; and there's Robert Jensen, a Lutheran, whom some would reckon to be the greatest American theologian today. Two theologians whom I think Nazarene pastors could get into perhaps more easily than some of these are Leslie Newbigin, who came back from having been a missionary to India to his home country, to Britain, and found that it was in a post-Christian era. He has a lot to say to us today. Or someone like Stanley Grenz, a Baptist evangelical theologian who, sadly, died rather young, just a few years ago. Grenz and Newbigin would be a good place to start.

BROADBOOKS: We also have in the church today varying worship styles. In fact, some Nazarene churches are quite liturgical. Some Nazarene churches are quite contemporary, and I'm wondering what we have learned from these different traditions and how that affects the practice of worship in our churches. I'm wondering if these

recent developments reflect or neglect our theological heritage. Would any of you like to weigh in on that?

METCALF: Well, I think one of the things we need to remember is that the method is not as important as the heart from which comes the worship, and the state of the heart and the heart of a congregation and a people offering worship to God. We get all hot and bothered about whether it's contemporary or liturgical or whatever. The fact of the matter is God is more interested in the expression of our praise through undivided hearts. We could learn a lot from our past.

What was sung five years ago might not be considered contemporary today. There are so many different forms of contemporary worship. In my congregation, we have a blended worship service. We have both contemporary worship and liturgy in our church service. At times, we incorporate the reading of a creed; we stand up and acknowledge what we believe as a people of God. We also incorporate communion, the Lord's Supper, more than once a month. We come back to the table and learn something about what it means to approach the table with a pure heart.

We learn from each other using different forms of worship, because it takes grace for generations to come together and to celebrate the presence of God. Rather than getting all upset—"Well, this isn't my form of music. It's not my form of worship." As long as there is proper education as we incorporate our past, we incorporate that which is relevant and biblically grounded in our present. It begins with proper education and the raising up of a congregation to understand what worship really means. It's not so much the method as the motive behind it and that we are truly prepared to enter into worship of our Savior. This is not something that we do just in one particular service on a Sunday morning; this is something that we live. Worship becomes breath; it is who we are as a people of God. As long as there is proper education and what we do is biblically

grounded, led, and infused by the Spirit of God, then, in fact, we're moving in the right direction.

BASSETT: I would go back to the question of Tom and join it to this question about worship, the concern for contemporary theologians. I would suggest that maybe we need to read some of the fathers and mothers of the church and understand that these people have contributed to the shape of our faith. We seem to be asleep with respect to the past; we leap from the New Testament to Luther to Wesley to Buddy Robinson, to 2009. There are great chasms of time in there, and in those chasms of time, there are some very important people who ought to be read and understood.

Try to understand Wesley, for instance, without understanding Calvin, and you're in trouble; or without understanding Richard Hooker, and you're in trouble. Wesley responded to his own context, not to ours.

There's another point, and I saw it made recently, that we have an aesthetic sense to us. That's one of the things that's been missing in our worship—in fact, in our lives in general, in the contemporary American religion, not just the contemporary Wesleyan form of American religion, or the Holiness Movement. We've been missing the sense of the beautiful, that it is Almighty God who comes to us in the Spirit. This is the wonderful phrase that I read: We put ourselves in the position of those people who want to put aluminum siding on Notre Dame cathedral. We have this marvelous relationship to Almighty God, and what do we do? We tack to it poor poetry, poor music, and bad speaking.

METCALF: That poor poetry, however, existed decades ago as well. We're not just talking about contemporary worship. The kind of worship that we offer to God must be biblically grounded, theologically sound, must be motivated....

NOBLE: That's very important, and the point I was going to add was that all worship is by definition liturgical, because liturgy is worship. You either do it in an informed way, in a biblically-informed way, a theologically-informed way, a biblically-structured way, a theologically-structured way, or you do it "any old how." Or by aping the entertainment industry. Those are some of the key issues we haven't even begun to think about, our theology of worship.

BROADBOOKS: Well, let's go on. What does it mean to say that Nazarenes are evangelicals? What does that term mean to us?

BASSETT: Evangelicals fuss over what it is to be evangelical. There is a reformed (or call it Calvinist) hegemony over the term, and they sometimes have difficulty including Wesleyans or Arminians in the discussion as true evangelicals. What's being got at, I think, is loyalty to the Scripture as the Word of God. Some want to say inerrant in some way; others want to say sufficient.

The Word of God is the last word, but the Word of God is three. There is the Living Word, Christ Jesus, to whom the Spirit gives witness; there is the written word, the Holy Scriptures, to which the Spirit gives witness and witnesses to Christ throughout; and there is the preached Word. There's that loyalty to the Word of God; it's all three really.

Then, there's the concern that Christianity not simply be a matter of the head but of the heart as well. Mark Noll writes in *The Scandal of Evangelicalism*, and he's partly right, that evangelical scholarship has let itself be bracketed from time to time because it hasn't talked to the church to which it belongs. It's tried to talk more to academia than it has, in our case, to the Church of the Nazarene. In that sense, the term evangelical has been "fogged over." It has to do fundamentally with loyalty to scripture. It has to do with the desire to be Christian, to be Christlike, to be in a personal relationship with Christ. It also means fidelity to the tradition of the Church—not tradition as an ultimate authority,

but tradition as an authority to which we pay attention. The kind of tradition like our grandparents, our DNA, our spiritual genealogy—we don't ignore that kind of tradition; we appreciate it, both positively and negatively. Critically, I should say.

METCALF: However, does the term “evangelical” carry with it some negative connotations, that we've adopted doctrines that are not necessarily Wesleyan-Holiness but are seen more as a “Baptistification” of the church? That is, when we say we're evangelical, something has happened to us?

BASSETT: That's partly due to this hegemony, the reformed hegemony, which has been very strong, for instance, on “once in grace, always in grace.” That's not a good way to put it nowadays, but that's the way we used to put it, “once in grace, always in grace,” “once saved, always saved.”

Ethics has been limited to personal ethics rather than thinking more broadly in terms of social ethics, and the breadth of our social concerns and the breadth of our social relationships—all of which are to be graced by the presence of Christ.

NOBLE: I think it's probably more problematic in the U.S. than it is in the rest of the world. That's partly because of the particularly American development of fundamentalism, an extreme, hard shell kind of evangelicalism. Very often, the popular press tends to identify the two (fundamentalism and evangelicalism), and that's unfortunate. The root of the word “evangelism” is the “Evangel,” the gospel. Evangelical theology goes back to the Reformation; it's Reformation theology. Wesley and Whitfield, the Arminian and the Calvinist, were allies, though they argued. Yet they were allies in the great evangelical awakening of the 18th century. So, we stand within that tradition. I think it would be true to say that around the world as a whole, there are more Arminian evangelicals than Calvinistic evangelicals.

BROADBOOKS: In light of our history, what is our church's theological task?

NOBLE: Well, the task of the church is to fulfill its mission, so you're asking specifically about the theological task that is within that. I would highlight two things specifically; one is this. We have developed into an international church. That by definition means a multi-cultural church. Yet our theology is all Anglo-Saxon; it's all British-American. I don't think we have yet realized what a big job we have given ourselves in the future. We have to develop our tradition in all of these different cultures; we must indigenize it. That is an enormous task that will take several generations and I don't think it's yet hit us how big that is.

The second thing we need to do is be more persuasive in the presentation of our Wesleyan theology. I think too often we have wanted to differentiate ourselves, and so we've created barriers. We actually have enormous points of agreement with other parts of the Christian church. We need to build on those agreements in such a way as to persuade others that what Wesley had to say about Christian holiness is actually biblical, and not some sectarian distinctive; it belongs to the great mainline tradition of the Christian church. More persuasive, more multi-cultural—those are the two theological tasks for the next century.

METCALF: Not only do we need to feel confident about this theology but about how we communicate it. There needs to be, perhaps, a lot more scholarship, a lot more written, more expressed, so that the story is told.

NOBLE: Yes, absolutely, yes, yes.

BROADBOOKS: One of the pastors wrote in and asked the question about why we have two sacraments: baptism and communion. How often did early Nazarenes celebrate communion?

NOBLE: We share these two sacraments in common with all Protestant theologies, who, from the time of the Reformation, have rejected the idea of the medieval Roman church that there are seven sacraments. For us, the Lord's Supper and baptism are the two

dominical sacraments. They're dominical because they were given by the Dominus, the Lord. The Lord himself instructed us to baptize, to observe the Lord's Supper.

Secondly, they are distinctively sacraments because they are signs, active dramas, of Christ's dying and rising. That's not true of ordination, that's not true of marriage, that's not true of all the other things: that's not true of the other five sacraments the Roman church had before the Reformation. That's why we have two sacraments.

BROADBOOKS: Concerning the celebration of the Lord's Supper, there's a lot of variance as to how Nazarenes practice it, or when they hold it. Is it different all over the world?

NOBLE: There probably always has been that variance. There has been in Protestantism such a reaction against the pre-Reformation Roman church that they wanted to play down the sacraments, particularly the Lord's Supper. Wesley, in his day, reacted against that tendency in the Church of England. He himself went to the sacrament very frequently and said we should go as often as we could. If we think it's merely a ritual, that it's merely high-church liturgy, we react against it. However, if we realize that it is proclaiming the death of the Lord, then that's where our faith needs to be focused. The Lord himself gave us this holy sacrament as a sign of his dying and rising so that through it, we might act out our participation in his dying and rising. So, we need a new vision of how central the sacraments are to the gospel.

BROADBOOKS: The other sacrament is baptism. We have had a tendency to dedicate babies, but also baptize infants. Why is there this difference? We have tended to dedicate more than baptize little ones. I wonder if we're missing the point of baptism or if there is a legitimate place in our tradition for dedicating infants, and you know, there's quite a bit of discussion about this.

METCALF: I understand that we've practiced believer's baptism from the earliest days in the Church of the Nazarene, and that means we acknowledge that a person actually has

understood what has happened in their heart and that they understand they have been saved by grace through faith. We, in our church, make it a point to make a dedication of a baby a very special right. It not only involves that child, but also the family of the child and the family of God. We celebrate that child's "informal" entrance into the body, acknowledging that we all have a role to play in that child's upbringing. In some ways, it reflects baptism, but we still maintain that a person should know what has happened to them before they actually partake of this most important sacrament.

NOBLE: I was baptized as an infant by one of the founders of the Church of the Nazarene, George Shaw from Scotland. That had always been our tradition. So, it depends which part of the denomination you come from. Coming out of Methodism, infant baptism was at one time the norm.

This is an issue that should be talked about more. We tend to be rather confused about this. I think it's rather tragic that many of us end up in membership without being baptized at all either way, and so we're missing out on what the Lord has commanded us to do. I think we need more discussion on this.

INGERSOL: The different founding groups that came together in the Nazarene church included those who believed firmly in believer's baptism and those who believed firmly in infant baptism. One of the reasons why we don't specify one or the other in the *Manual* is because a compromise was reached. Part of the common wisdom of the three groups that merged in 1907 and 1908 was that the experience and doctrine of Christian perfection would be central in the Church of the Nazarene. On a number of other issues—like millennial theories and modes of baptism and even the timing of baptism—we would take a broad view in the church; we kept our focus on what we regarded as central rather than issues that could be divisive.

There were other groups at that time that were part of one or another merger discussions, such as when the two southern groups merged to form the Holiness Church of Christ, which developed its headquarters at Pilot Point. There was another group from Arkansas that was part of that merger discussion, but they believed in baptism by immersion only and would not agree to be part of a church with a broad platform on it. Part of the wisdom of Bresee and his contemporaries was that we would let liberty of conscience prevail. Parents could decide to baptize their infants, or if they believed in a believer's baptism, they could defer that and let their child make the decision on their own someday.

BROADBOOKS: The Second Coming.

INGERSOL: The Second Coming, same thing. We had classical premillennialists and dispensational premillennialists of the Hal Lindsay type. We had amillennialists who didn't believe in a literal millennium at all—they didn't believe that's what the Bible really taught—and we had postmillennialists. It was the very same issue where we would agree to disagree. As long as one would agree to be part of a group where other people had a differing opinion, one was welcome to be a Nazarene. By contrast, when Seth Rees left the Church of the Nazarene and merged his group of "pilgrims," as they were called, with another group out of Cincinnati, the Pilgrim Holiness Church that resulted insisted on premillennialism as an article of faith. I think it can be argued that this kind of restrictive doctrine may have held the Pilgrim Holiness Church back from growing as rapidly as the Church of the Nazarene. I think our founders got it pretty much right.

BASSETT: There is a third party, and those were the Quakers. We had Quakers who didn't believe in sacraments at all, so we have not required baptism as most Protestants do for the reception of communion.

INGERSOL: I was baptized by Oscar Reed in the chapel at Bethany Nazarene College, and I think, Paul, you told me at one point that I probably was baptized by a man who wasn't baptized himself.

BASSETT: I think that's correct, at the time.

BROADBOOKS: Well, here's a good question: What are the most important theological books that have shaped the denomination during its history, and why were they significant?

NOBLE: Head of the list, one has to put Wiley's *Christian Theology*. That is a work which, although it was written between 1920 and 1940, continues to be a standard and was widely read and used within the church. At an earlier point, A. M. Hills was quite influential, although he brought in some other traditions. J. A. Woods' *Perfect Love* was very significant for us. And, once Wesley's books were published and Nazarene Publishing House published *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*, that was very influential. I think that would be a start anyway. There are obviously others one could mention.

INGERSOL: I think another book that I would put on that list is Bresee's 1905 *Manual* for the Churches of the Nazarene in the west before the mergers at Chicago and Pilot Point. Bresee's wing of the church began publishing a *Manual* as early as 1898, and they revised it two or three times. But the 1905 *Manual* became the template for the *Manual* of the united church. It exercised quite a bit of influence on how our book of order was going to be shaped.

NOBLE: Another book that was very stimulating was Wynkoop's *Theology of Love*. That provoked a lot of discussion; discussion and debate are good for any tradition. They keep us mentally alive.

BASSETT: There has been a tendency to put things in question/answer form; J. A. Wood shows that. So also does Wesley in *Plain Account*. It seems that we've been attracted to those

types of books. The problem occurs, of course, when the questions change: we may not recognize that the questions have changed. I would note Harry Jessup's book on *Foundations of Doctrine*, which was quite useful and well-used in the '40s, '50s, '60s, and even beyond in the Nazarene schools, at least, in the general courses in religion.

BROADBOOKS: Who were the important Nazarene theologians of the church, and what made them important?

NOBLE: Well, this question, of course, is closely tied to the last one about significant books on theology. I think Wiley was important because he managed to give a comprehensive, definitive statement. I mentioned Wynkoop; she was different, important, for another reason—she made us think about how the doctrine had to be formulated in a contemporary context and on its biblical basis. Greathouse, I think, has been very important in marrying biblical exegesis with Wesleyan theology, so that's been an important exercise for us. That would be a start anyway.

BROADBOOKS: We have called ourselves Wesleyan-Arminian. What does it mean to call ourselves Arminian? Why was this important, and is it still important to use this designation, Arminian?

NOBLE: Well, yes, I think that's an important point. A lot of people mistake Arminian for Armenian. Armenia is a nation, of course. Arminius was a Reformed theologian of the late 16th century, who died in 1609. He was particularly notable because he objected to the way in which the Reform tradition was developing its doctrine of predestination. Those who have rejected the double predestination of Calvin have been seen as following in the tradition of Arminius; one of those was John Wesley, of course. I think it's important to say that there were Arminians in the intervening period who drifted away from the gospel to some extent. Wesley was very much an evangelical Arminian; he

brought us back to the gospel. To call ourselves Wesleyan-Arminian, therefore, is a very important part of our heritage.

BASSETT: It seems to me it's important, too, to understand that there is a sharp difference between Arminius and Pelagius. If you ask an ordinary group of people, "Are we born with a free will?" the answer will be, "Yes, we're born with a free will." Well, that's not what Arminians say; that is not what Arminius said. We must understand that we are not Pelagian; we don't draw on something apart from grace. Grace is not part of our nature, it's given to us. Prevenient grace itself is a gift of God; it's a divine gift. It's an awesome gift because you can say, "Yes" or you can say, "No" by means of it. That's the tragedy of sin, that some use the grace they have to say, "No." It is important that we understand that Arminius asserted as strongly as any Reformed person, any Lutheran, or even the classical Roman Catholic position, that salvation is by grace alone through faith, and that includes the freedom of the human will.

NOBLE: One point to add to this is that Arminius was not a major theologian in the way that Calvin is reckoned to be. However, Arminius actually represented the vast majority of the church on this point. Calvin did not. We stand with the majority of Christians on what is called an Arminian position, but which is actually the central main tradition of the church.

[BEGIN: Major 20th-Century Challenges to the Church]

BROADBOOKS: Let's go on to some of the challenges that the church has faced. There were major world events in our first 100 years that affected our theology and practice. How did the Great Depression and World War II affect the theology and practice of the church?

BASSETT: The Great Depression helped us to understand that we were part of a family. It helped us to understand that we needed some signals of our unity; it helped us to get together. The camp meeting became more important even than it had been. The district assembly became even more important than it had been. The zone rallies became even

more important than they had been. We needed these centers. The *Herald of Holiness* became more important than it had been as a way of pulling us all together and understanding, we're in this boat together. It also helped us to understand that our first financial obligation is to the Lord. We have had a tendency to not preach tithing, but to preach giving in order to help people who would get legalistic about tithing—do you tithe on the gross or the net and all that sort of thing—to help those people through that. The emphasis on giving came during the Depression. You give what the Lord asks you to give, and we're not going to raise questions about whether you gave enough or too much.

World War II was important to us in two ways. One, it broke down sectionalism. You had people from all over the U.S. in your division. Nazarene met Nazarene, and Nazarene met Wesleyan, and Nazarene chaplains took care of everyone. This helped us to understand that the desire for holiness is not just ours. It's a desire throughout the church. World War II helped us tremendously in that matter. It made the evangelist more important because the evangelist did have some freedom to travel under the restrictions of war, and in traveling, would bring news from one place to another, just as they had done in the 1930s. It brought two things that were bad. It convinced us that we ought to organize like a corporation, or like the military, and that's a bad model really. It didn't prove its badness until maybe the early '60s, but we now see it's a difficult model to work with when you're talking about radical change in human beings, because military institutions try to make everybody the same.

The second thing it did was to take women out of ministry. That was a very serious loss, it seems to me. It gave women a larger place in the lay life of the church, but not in the clerical life.

BROADBOOKS: Here's another one. The Civil Rights Movement, Jim Crow, the segregation of minorities.

INGERSOL: The Jim Crow laws were those laws that prevented social mixing of the black and white races in a number of southern states. The church really issued no challenge against those types of laws. In fact it would be fair to say that up through the '60s, the Nazarenes did not seem to be much different from the rest of their neighbors in terms of how they looked at the issue of race. Those in the northern states tended to have the northern viewpoint. Those in the southern states tended to have the southern viewpoint.

When the Civil Rights movement came along, there's both good news and bad news. Much of the prevailing attitude—and I recall this fairly clearly living in Oklahoma through part of the '60s—one of the prevailing attitudes was a sense that people of color should be patient, that getting out and marching was disturbing. As I listened, it seemed like part of this was rooted in the notion that sin is rebellion and when you get out and march, this is a rebellious kind of act. I think this was the same kind of conservative reaction you saw against those protesting the Vietnam War and the student unrest, which was also a big part of the '60s. There was kind of conservative unease with things that challenged the social order, and it was, at least in my analysis, rooted in this idea that rebellion is somehow identified with sin.

On the other hand, the 1964 General Assembly passed a resolution that talked about the fact that people should not be discriminated against because of their race. There's a clear sense that the General Assembly was responding to changes in American society at that point. We have at least two interesting examples of Nazarene pastors who were personally involved in the Civil Rights movement. One is Charles Johnson in Meridian, Mississippi. You may recall the story of the three Civil Rights workers who were slain there. The motion picture, "Mississippi Burning," was based on

that account. Charles Johnson was a very close friend to two of those Civil Rights workers and worked with them in the movement there in the Meridian area.

The other was Joe Edwards in Oklahoma City, who got very involved with the garbage workers' strike; most of the garbage collectors were black. Joe Edwards was a black pastor of the Providence Church of the Nazarene in Oklahoma City. He was very involved in that.

Ethel Parr at Olivet, back in the '50s, wrote a book called *Perfect Love and Race Hatred*—was that the one?

BASSETT: Yes.

INGERSOL: We had a missionary in South Africa who wrote on the same subject. However, by and large, Nazarenes tended to stick with their sectional feelings; only as attitudes in society changed, did Nazarene attitudes change.

BROADBOOKS: The Women's Movement.

METCALF: I think it had both a positive and a negative effect on women entering leadership ministry. On the positive side, we were exposed in the Women's Movement of the 1970s to more women entering the work force, assuming executive roles, roles of leadership in corporations and industry and different places. In some ways, it prompted us to ask the question, "Where are women today?" As we looked up, we would see men in leadership on the platform of every church, and we'd never see a woman as an ordained elder in that role, very rarely, even in our own Church of the Nazarene. What the Women's Movement may have done is open the door for the conversation to be reintroduced to the church. It caused us to wonder what happened to that 20 percent of credentialed ministers who were women. Where did they go? What happened to them?

It also prompted women such as myself, who probably had a calling very early in life, to consider taking another look, to go back to the biblical passages that would

support this, to go back to our Nazarene heritage to see why these women entered credentialed ministry in the first place, to learn from them. It caused us to go back, and more and more women back in the 1970s and '80s began to re-enter study to become leaders in the Church of the Nazarene. That's the positive side.

The negative side is probably that we were aligned with a radical feminism that does not represent or embody the perfect love of God. At times, there seemed to be this fight for rights that certainly does not reflect the love and the presence of the Holy Spirit working in an individual. Whenever someone mentions the Women's Movement in many evangelical circles, it is blamed as the cause of all wrong in the world today. They go back to the 1970s and that rebellion, and there are good and bad sides to that.

BROADBOOKS: Has the Church of the Nazarene been affected by its encounter with science, and has our understanding of each been shaped by the other?

NOBLE: I am not sure there's much evidence that this has been a big topic or that we have really engaged with science as we might. We have many excellent science professors in our colleges, leading in their field. Perhaps we should be listening to them more than we are.

Of course, when you mention science, the elephant in the room is the Englishman who was born 200 years ago this year, Charles Darwin. And 150 years ago, *The Origin of the Species* was published. In America much more so than in Europe, many sincere Christians think that Darwin's theory is contrary to Scripture. I think we have to respect the way they feel about that. However, if it comes to a choice between what Scripture tells us and what science tells us, where do we go? I think as Christians, we go with revelation. Yet virtually all Nazarene professors of science and theology would not be persuaded that there actually is a conflict. So Perhaps we have some work there to do, to demonstrate that today's post-Einstein cosmology with its talk of the Big Bang 13.5 billion

years ago is actually easier to relate to the Christian doctrine of creation out of nothing than the cosmologies that went before it. We actually have an opportunity to demonstrate the way in which science and Christian theology can relate positively to each other.

[BEGIN: Holiness and Spirituality]

BROADBOOKS: Let's go to a new section; it's called "Holiness and Spirituality." The first question is: What factors led to an interest in Christian holiness in the formative period and were some of these factors culturally motivated?

BASSETT: That's a fascinating question because for me, as a medievalist, the formative period was 500 years earlier than that, or even 1,000, or 1,500 years. But I take it this means the formative period in the history of the Church of the Nazarene. The interesting thing is that Christian holiness has been a common Christian concern all the way through, all the way through the history of the Church, and it's a concern in Scripture itself.

We are never encouraged in Scripture simply to keep on fighting ourselves. We're encouraged to let God have us and love us and to love God and our neighbor. That, I think, was heard very clearly, especially by those in the Methodist tradition in the U.S. Francis Asbury was very clear about the doctrine of entire sanctification. There were other Methodist preachers who picked that up. There were always questions, but the questions also had to do with Christian holiness. How can we in this new land be what God wants us to be in this new land? We want the new land to be what God wants it to be; we want to be what God wants us to be in the new land. There's a sort of manifest destiny idea that's in the culture.

It's difficult to say whether it's the culture that shaped the doctrine of Christian holiness or the doctrine of Christian holiness that shaped the cultural idea of manifest destiny. This was largely because of the various theories of evolution. These theories kept talking about being all that we can be. Our point of reference was not science at that

point; our point of reference for being Christians in the Wesleyan tradition was Scripture and Jesus Christ. Unfortunately, we got it tangled up with being emotionally satisfied. That, I'm afraid, cost us a great deal. We did not take as seriously as we might have Jesus' statement that, "If you hunger and thirst after righteousness, you will be filled." People took filled to mean satisfied, emotionally satisfied, and didn't know how to handle the unsatisfactory aspects of life that all of us meet everyday, including my talkativeness.

BROADBOOKS: If that was true in the formative years, the other side of the question is that perhaps the message of holiness may seem almost irrelevant to some people today.

What changed?

NOBLE: That's a very difficult question, and I've been sort of mulling that one over. In today's post-Christian society, there is a great increase in all kinds of spiritualities. In reaction against the secularism, which was dominant a few decades ago, people are searching for the spiritual. If you have a society that is deeply influenced by evangelical Christianity of all traditions, to talk about Christian sanctification is something that seems relevant. Another dimension to this is that there might be something of a problem with us, that we became very stereotyped in using the language, illustrations, and metaphors of the models that were sanctified somewhere between 1900 and 1930, and we haven't adapted them to talk about sanctification in today's culture. I think that is a big part of the problem.

BASSETT: One of the things that Charles Jones's second edition of his bibliography shows, it seems to me, is how the doctrine of entire sanctification was at first absorbed into revivalism and then revivalism simply soaked up that doctrine. So you had to understand it; you had to experience it in a way given to you by revivalism. But when revivalism is no longer the model for what the church is supposed to do and be, but we have the corporate military model, where do we go? We lose both revival and entire sanctification.

BROADBOOKS: So what metaphors would be appropriate for this day?

BASSETT: I'd say stick with the Scriptures. I heard one sermon where pancake batter was the example. That's probably the worst one I've heard. Yet, the Spirit came to some people; that was a number of years ago, and they're still strong in the faith. They would testify that in spite of that sermon, the Lord got to them, and they have learned to love him with all of their heart, soul, mind, and strength because he loves them.

BROADBOOKS: The foolishness of preaching! Why do we have so many viewpoints about holiness and the church today?

BASSETT: Because holiness is a two- or three-pronged relationship. It's a relationship of myself with God; it's a relationship of myself in the context of other selves called neighbors in relationship to God; and amongst the neighbors are believers and unbelievers. Nobody has that same context; nobody starts in the same place I do; nobody is going to end in the same place that I will, or has the same neighbors. This very personal relationship becomes a highly social relationship. It moves beyond just the believer neighbor and my brothers and sisters; it moves on to my natural brothers and sisters, my neighbors. They all have different settings, too. I pray to the Lord for wisdom that I may not deal with "Richard" as I would deal with "Sam." "Lord help me to deal with Sam, help me to know Sam and not mistake him for Richard." It's so rich, this experience. It's tied to the fact that our redemption comes through one person who became man, the scandal of particularity. There was just that one Jew who was born of the virgin and suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried, and he rose again, and he's coming back. Just one little place in history. You can go stand there; you might not be sure which one it is, but you can stand there. Yet he came for all, and we've seen all kinds.

BROADBOOKS: The variety of it all.

BASSETT: That's right.

BROADBOOKS: Beautiful!

BASSETT: The question is developing the language so that you can work through this; here's where we have to use the Bible.

BROADBOOKS: Ah good! Let's talk about spiritual formation. It's a growing interest in the contemporary church. What practices in the Wesleyan tradition are worth continuing or maybe even recovering today?

METCALF: The practices in the Wesleyan tradition that are worth recovering are those practices that John Wesley used and learned from Christians before him. He practiced what was practiced in centuries before and emphasized the importance of prayer, the role of the sacraments, the role of fasting, the role of community accountability, faith mentoring, and in a search today for authentic community. I think it's a wonderful idea to go back and learn from the Wesleyan-Holiness movement, especially in England, where new believers were encouraged to know each other, to learn together, and to hold each other accountable. The class leaders holding those new believers accountable for their growth in Christ, not like "the big daddy watching," but coming alongside each other, being honest with one another, and confessing to one another where we really are in Christ. These are some of the practices from our past that are worth cherishing and celebrating and passing on.

BROADBOOKS: You were telling me about Estelle Crutcher having a great influence on your life. She would ask you probing questions—

METCALF: Very much!

BROADBOOKS: —as you were beginning to grow. Tell us about that.

METCALF: Grandma Crutcher, an early evangelist in the Church of the Nazarene, held me accountable for my growth in Christ. She came alongside of me, affirmed my progress, but also made very, very sure I understood that this walk with Christ was meant to be a

holy walk, that my life in Christ was meant to be holy, and my heart was meant to be pure before him. When she observed certain things, it's not that she came down on me, but there were moments when she would come alongside and say, "Darling, I'm observing an attitude. Where is this coming from? Could it be pride? Crucify it." I trusted her enough; we had an incredible, loving relationship that enabled her to be honest with me, to help me in this journey, and that's what's required. All of these disciplines are meant to be experienced in love. This is not a rigid formula to be holy but it is because we are following after our Lord that we long to be holy; it's the natural expression of a relationship that is growing.

BROADBOOKS: I think Wesley was good in those class meetings, asking probing questions of the new believers. As we think about preaching the holiness message in the 21st century, what themes would be especially attractive or appealing to the 21st-century listener?

BASSETT: I think one theme would be that God's promises don't fail, and here's a book in Scripture, in holy Scripture that comes accompanied by God, the presence of God himself, the Holy Spirit, and that that being the case, here's where you are really understood. You don't have to go fishing for a self-understanding. There are other books that can help you, but here's the book that really tells you who you are and what you can be, and it doesn't call for you to have to struggle with the question of sin all your life.

NOBLE: One dimension that I think has great resonance today and is very much part of our faith, but something perhaps we have not sufficiently developed, is the corporate dimension of holiness, and in the light of that, the corporate dimension of sin. That has resonance today, and I think that is an area where we need to do a lot of creative thinking. If holiness is about perfect love, then you cannot talk about love without talking about relationships. You cannot talk about holy persons without talking about a holy church. Sadly, Holiness churches are not necessarily holy churches. What makes the

church a holy church? How can this become a matrix of loving relationships? It's only within that context that people can come to perfect love. That's a vital element. What does that mean for our very pragmatic policies, for our financial policies, how we treat people, how we treat employees? There's a whole dimension there; what do we think of power? Every structure has power. How does that relate to holiness? There's a whole field for exploration and development that would help us tremendously to be genuinely a holy people of God in the 21st century.

BASSETT: Responses to all those questions that my brother has raised are found within the Scriptures. They are all part of what atonement means and what atonement does for us, and they're all part of why we sing our hope.

[BEGIN Church Polity and Structures]

BROADBOOKS: Church Polity and Structures. How has the role of General Superintendent changed over the course of our history?

INGERSOL: I would go back to H. F. Reynolds in particular and one of the things that he contributed to the church. The fact that we have General Superintendents goes back to Bresee. Part of his contribution was this Methodist form of government, this connectional system. This was adapted straight from the Methodist churches he had grown up in and labored in for decades. The office of General Superintendent is the office of Bishop in other churches in the Methodist tradition.

Reynolds insisted very early on that General Superintendents could not simply rely on reports from the field. Missionaries had been sent out as early as 1897; they landed in India in 1898. By the middle of the 1910s, Reynolds believed that a missionary visitation was needed. He made a trip around the world; it was the first world visitation by a General Superintendent. A number of things happened on that trip but the bottom line is that he came back absolutely convinced that we could not allow General

Superintendency in the Church of the Nazarene to just be national (the same way it can't be local or just district-wide or regional). It can't be national by default. The General Superintendent in the Church of the Nazarene must go overseas on a regular basis and must be available for the whole church. Some of his colleagues didn't agree with that. It was like pulling teeth to get John Goodwin or R. T. Williams to go overseas. But Reynolds made his point and the church stuck with it. This was very different from the Bishop in the Methodist-Episcopal system because Bishops who went overseas were not necessarily General Superintendents in their structure. At least one key development, then, was this notion that to be a General Superintendent was to be international in scope.

BROADBOOKS: Now we have six General Superintendents and it's been that way for a number of years; we're marching toward two million members. Why hasn't the number of General Superintendents increased even though the membership has dramatically increased?

INGERSOL: That's a mystery. It baffles me. In the early Church of the Nazarene, we periodically increased the Board of General Superintendents as the district responsibilities increased. We started out after Pilot Point with three. There was a brief period around 1915 when we had four General Superintendents but that wasn't intended to be a permanent change on the General Board. They elected four in 1915 because they knew Bresee was going to die. So they really wanted to elect in advance so they would have three. In 1928, we expanded the board to four; in 1952, we expanded it to five; in 1960, we expanded it to six. If you look at the number of districts, each time we expanded the board, we always changed the ratio of General Superintendents to districts from about 1 to 23, 1 to 24, 1 to 25, down to 1 to 16, 1 to 17, 1 to 18. Why haven't we changed it since then is a really good question, and I don't really have a good answer to that. It seems to me that in 1980 when we enshrined the international structure and created six regions, that would have

been a natural opportunity to expand the Board of General Superintendents. Instead, we created the office of Regional Director and imposed a new layer of bureaucracy into the mix. We did this with all of the districts that are outside of the U.S. and Canada. Even the British Isles District, which had been one of the great missionary-sending areas of the church, had to come under the world mission structure at that point.

What is the right number of General Superintendents? At this point in our history, there are some who think we should have less, some think we should just stay where we are, and others think we should have more. I would say we need to ask the question whether the number six hasn't become something fixed in our mind that we've been trying to re-engineer the Church of the Nazarene around.

There have been resolutions from General Assemblies in the past to put the district assembly on an every-other-year basis. The rationale was so it would be easier for the General Superintendents to be there. There are questions, and I have no rationale for why we haven't changed, other than no church commission has really been designated to think about this seriously.

BROADBOOKS: We call them General Superintendents. Why do we do that rather than a more biblical term, such as Bishop or something like that?

INGERSOL: Bishop is the English word in the New Testament that means overseer. The reason Bresee used the term "General Superintendents" seems to have had two antecedents. When John Wesley designated that Francis Asbury and Thomas Cooke would be General Superintendents of the Methodist Societies in America, he sent Thomas Cooke to inform Asbury to set this up for the Methodist Societies after the American Revolution. Instead of Methodist Societies, Asbury created a church. In the early disciplines of the Methodist Episcopal Church, they were called General Superintendents. Within a matter

of years, however, Asbury and Cooke changed arbitrarily to the term “Bishop,” arguing that it was the traditional English word for “overseer.”

The other precedent Bresee had was that when the Free Methodists left the Methodist Episcopal Church around 1860 or '61, they kept the episcopal office but went back to the term “General Superintendent” as Wesley had originally designated. So, when Bresee organized the church in the west, he had both Wesley’s precedent and the Free Methodist precedent to draw on.

BASSETT: In talking about the role of the General Superintendents, it seems to me that one of the ways in which it has changed is that they no longer are understood to be the preachers and teachers to the whole church that they had been. I’ve lived long enough to see a great change. In the past, if a General Superintendent came to town or came within 50 miles, all the Nazarenes went to hear the General Superintendent preach. That doesn’t happen now, and I don’t think it’s altogether a matter of whether they preach well or anything like that. It’s just a different perspective on what a General Superintendent is for. As far as teaching is concerned, very little of instruction in faith comes from the Board of General Superintendents; it usually comes from elsewhere. I don’t offer this as criticism; I simply say this does seem to be a big change in the role. If you’re going to call them Bishops, then teaching and preaching would again be restored as fundamental to their role.

INGERSOL: A Bishop is supposed to be a chief pastor.

BASSETT: That’s correct.

INGERSOL: That’s the basic idea. You raise a point that I’ve thought about a lot, which is in our lifetime, we have seen the decline of district culture. There was a time when we could really talk about district culture. District culture had two pivots: the district camp meeting and the district assembly. At district assembly, which lasted five days, six days, the

presiding General Superintendent was present not only for the District Superintendent but also for the pastors. As we have adjusted the schedule to get business done in one or two days, the General Superintendent is no longer as present to the pastors. In some places overseas, a General Superintendent presides over, preaches, and ordains at one district assembly one day; moves on to another district the next day; and to a third the day after that. In the short assemblies held today, not even the District Superintendents really get access. The Regional Director has the General Superintendents' ear but the District Superintendents don't, and the pastors have hardly any access at all. We've lost in this exchange. People once knew the highest elected officials of the church; if they didn't know everything about them, they felt like they knew them personally. You create bonds of loyalty through this kind of contact. If we are seeing an erosion of loyalty to the denominational idea today, maybe part of the reason is because those kinds of shared experiences are no longer common.

BROADBOOKS: In 1907, when the first General Assembly happened in Chicago, they produced a *Manual*, a Nazarene *Manual*. Where did we get the idea for a Nazarene *Manual*?

BASSETT: I had a friend who would answer that question by saying, "Divine revelation and old Coptic text," but in this case, it came from the Methodists. It was a necessary thing to make clear what the nature of this new body was and to make clear that they agreed. There was the agreed statement of belief in addition to the Articles of Faith. These were clear and brief. They also wanted to make uniform the election of officers across the church and pastoral arrangements across the church so that you wouldn't run into some strange anomalies from time to time. There still were anomalies—for instance, the eastern bodies that Stan mentioned earlier. The eastern bodies were allowed to come in with a lot of their more traditional practices. In the church in Warren, Pennsylvania, for instance, even up into the '70s, which dated clear back to the late 19th century, the

pastor wasn't the chair of the board. The board elected its own chair, and the church owned its own building. But most of those anomalies have disappeared.

BROADBOOKS: Earlier, Paul, I think you referenced inerrancy and Article IV, the *Manual* paragraph on the Holy Scriptures. Can you explain that a little more for us?

BASSET: I hope! It has a genealogy; it goes back to the statements in the 39 Articles of the Church of England and the American Episcopal Church, in which the statements on Scripture are meant to say, "These books alone, these 66 constitute for us the canon." The canon was not officially set until the 16th century. There had been a consensus that it was the 66, but in the 16th century, you had a difference between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, including the Anglicans. The Anglicans said, "It's these 66." So did the other Protestant leaders. These 66 have proven themselves in the life of the Church, said the 39 Articles, to be sufficient for Christian faith and practice. We don't need any more, and we don't need less. So let these 66 be sufficient.

The Methodists, then, when they took it in as the 25 Articles, originally kept the term "sufficient." When we wrote our Article of Faith regarding Scripture—that is, the final revision or near to the final revision in 1928—we were in the middle of the fundamentalist debate, and we felt we needed to state strongly our commitment to Scripture. The language that was used in the 1920s was not the language of sufficiency. It was the language of inspiration. God inspired it; therefore it's authoritative; therefore it's sufficient. However, the mindset of Wiley, who wrote that article, was different. His was, "It's been sufficient. It has been our authority, and it has proven its inspiration." We don't have to declare it inspired; it's proven that. So when you read that article carefully, the inerrancy falls on the Spirit's capacity to tell us what the Scriptures say rather than on the print in the book.

BROADBOOKS: When were the special rules put into the *Manual*, particularly the rule of prohibiting the use of tobacco? Let's talk also about the folklore that we often hear that Phineas Bresee smoked a pipe. Let's discover the truth about that today.

INGERSOL: Let's talk about the folklore, because when I was a student at Bethany Nazarene College around 1970, I was told by a fellow student who declared that he had it on good authority from two old-timers. One of them was his grandmother, so I couldn't argue with it. The fact is, the first, the oldest statement that we have about tobacco is in the 1898 *Manual* of Bresee's church in the west. In that *Manual*, he has a paragraph on tobacco in which he says, "It is injurious to the health and to the Christian witness." So if there were any truth to the folklore, he would be pretty much a hypocrite, I would think. I tend to believe the folklore has a life of its own because it's entertaining; maybe the folklore even gets used to bash those who seem legalistic. Yet, Bresee had a strong statement against the use of tobacco and alcohol in the earliest *Manual* that he played a key role in writing.

The section that this appeared in was called "Advices." Bresee's *Manual* had "Advices" in its various editions in 1903, 1905, and 1905-06. The Holiness Church of Christ in the south had "Rules" in their *Manual*. At the merger at Pilot Point, the southern people were believed their idea of "Rules" had prevailed. There tended to be some confusion after this, so the 1911 General Assembly nailed it down, and we had "Rules" for many years. A simple fact is, of course, that John Wesley had rules—the General Rules. The General Rules have been basic in all Methodist-related denominations from Wesley's time on down to the present. Personally, I think that when we changed the name of the General Rules a few assemblies back, we lost something in the transaction. The term was designed to be user-friendly. In fact, in a sense, we cut ourselves off from the notion of being a church in the Methodist tradition. We've still got the meat there, but there's something about sticking with Wesley.

BROADBOOKS: In light of our Wesleyan-Methodist roots, why did we not keep a public general confession of sin in corporate worship?

NOBLE: I think the basic answer to that is that we tended to oversimplify. We had a simplistic idea. We were, obviously, opposed to any idea of a sinning religion, so confession seemed to be inappropriate. I think what we forgot from the more nuanced doctrine of Wesley was that when he said the born-again Christian does not sin (1 John 3:6 and 9), he defined it as a “voluntary transgression.” He said, “Voluntary transgressions are sins.” He also talked about “involuntary transgressions.” He didn’t call these “sins properly so-called,” but said they still needed confession, and they needed to come under the blood of Christ.

We were very foolish to forget that. Which of us is going to stand up and say, “I have never transgressed involuntarily. I have no faults. I have no failings.” If we’re prepared to accept that we still have some growing to do, that we still have faults and some failings, it would do us enormous spiritual good to confess that to God. We need to revisit that, and it would not be condoning a sinning religion to be prepared to confess that we have fallen short. For our spiritual health, we need to reintroduce that.

METCALF: It’s a step away from our personalization of faith as well and a recapturing of Christianity as community.

NOBLE: Yes, I think that’s a very important dimension. We have tended to be very individualistic in our understanding of what sin is. We need to recapture the idea of corporate human sin and corporate confession of the faults and failings of our society, of our community. This needs to be part of our confession.

BROADBOOKS: We were intentional about building Holiness churches. We said, “Let’s build a Holiness church” throughout much of our history. I’m wondering now if we seem to be creating congregations that are evangelical but not necessarily or specifically Holiness.

NOBLE: I would see the term “evangelical” as more of an umbrella term. We are evangelical; the Lutherans are evangelical; the Calvinists are evangelical. To be evangelical is to put the focus on the gospel, to take your doctrine from the Bible, to make Jesus Christ central. We are all of these things. Within that, our specific commitment has been to emphasizing the life of holiness and the experience of holiness. If that is the case, then it is not being emphasized or clearly taught. I think that’s something we need to address.

[BEGIN The Church and Compassion]

BROADBOOKS: Let’s go to a new section, “The Church and Compassion.” John Wesley used a term, “Social Holiness.” I think Bresee used a term “Social Righteousness.” How have Nazarenes appropriated this idea?

BASSETT: With irritation! “Social Holiness” has been a really bad term as far as many Nazarenes are concerned. We now refer to compassionate ministries, not stopping to think that any ministry is compassionate. Social holiness—we’re beginning to realize that we have to get back to work on the loving of neighbor and that this love is not simply singing hymns to the neighbor. This love is a matter of feeding the hungry, and helping the poor, and visiting the sick and imprisoned, and clothing the naked. Sometimes, we must involve ourselves in society with some pretty strange bedfellows just as Christ himself did. There’s no information in Scripture about the four men who brought the man to the rooftop—what their spiritual condition was, that is—but Christ still healed the one who was let down through the ceiling.

You can shut off a lot of compassion simply by saying, “I don’t want to work with this or that because they’ve got this problem or that problem. We’ve all got those problems. This is where I think the broader understanding of confession and sin comes into play.

METCALF: Social holiness: doesn't it go beyond our care for the poor and the forgotten? Isn't it in the day by day engagement with people, relationship? Holiness is expressed through discipleship, which takes time to nurture. We think beyond the social care for those who are unfortunate and needy, but we're looking at the care of each other, the care of the soul of every believer matters. We seek that relational understanding of what community really is—an honesty, a purity that is lived out in pure love for each other. Sometimes the hardest to love are those within the body.

BASSETT: That, of course, is what Wesley meant by social holiness.

BROADBOOKS: It was more than giving a piece of bread. Evangelism and social concern were wedded in our former, formative period. In our middle period, some say that evangelism and social concern have been alienated from each other. If that's true, what happened?

BASSETT: I'm not so sure that they were alienated. It seems to me that the General Church stepped aside from what we now call compassionate ministries and have now renewed those ministries. In the local churches, there was social ministry—feeding of the poor—going on all the time. There was also an insistence on learning what it is to be a Christian. I'm glad you brought that up; it's one I should have thought of myself. It is the local church's responsibility to see what the needs are rather than waiting for some program from either the district or Kansas City to tell us that—and it's the local church's responsibility to take care of them.

INGERSOL: I think there's another dimension to that. In fact, it's really during this middle period that the first social ministries are actually institutionalized. That's the medical work that the church invested in overseas—in Swaziland and China and later in India and Papua New Guinea. There's a sense in which social ministries in the U.S.—at least the earlier forms like orphanages and maternity homes—decline. Yet overseas, the church is opening hospitals that are the hub of a far-reaching medical ministry. We've tended to

think of Nazarene medicine as part of world mission or the cross-cultural mission story rather than part of the compassionate ministry story, but really it's both.

BROADBOOKS: We have often heard about Phineas Bresee being serious about compassionate ministries. He stepped down from a very prestigious pulpit to go to “the other side of the tracks.” He was involved very much in a social ministry. Was that just confined to the west or did that extend to other parts of the United States? What forms did that compassion take? I know you mentioned hospitals and orphanages; was there anything else?

INGERSOL: In the early years, maternity homes for unwed mothers was a type of ministry that many denominations undertook, and the Nazarenes also undertook this. Bresee is rightly thought of as a “patron saint” of urban ministry, and even multi-cultural ministry because the people he inspired developed the work with the Hispanic community in Los Angeles and the Chinese community and the Japanese community on the west coast. On the east coast, the churches in New England reached out to the Cape Verdean community. Those are different examples of cross-cultural ministry. In terms of honest-to-goodness social ministry, it's very much a mosaic. The eastern churches were involved with social ministries; the churches in the south were involved with social ministries; the churches on the west coast were. In a real sense, this idea that people were in need and we could help them—their bodies not just their spirits—was one of the things that all the merging groups had in common.

BROADBOOKS: In the church's early engagement with the poor, did the church ever emphasize changing public policy as a form of Christian responsibility?

BASSETT: Almost every district assembly had a committee that reported on social action. Now, it tended to narrow itself to bad habits and personal levels of human sinfulness. It tried to stay away from the larger political issues. We do have to remember that much of the

concern of our political parties with social action only arose in the '30s with the presidency of FBefore that time, the political parties were concerned with larger socio-economic problems. They let the social problems take care of themselves. You didn't have to worry about political stances in a social action committee report before 1933. After 1933, you had to worry that you were aligning yourself with Republicans or Democrats. That tended to make it all the more a matter of saving people from these personal things that we were against. Of course, prohibition was public policy for a long time, but then it became very personal thing, alcoholism. I think we're beginning to see that we can't let government try to do all of the solving, that we have to take some responsibility for these broader issues. If it puts us in a particular political bed for awhile, so what? The church needs to learn how to say, "We're saying this as the church, not as party X or party D, Torrey, or labor."

[BEGIN Internationalization]

BROADBOOKS: Let's go on to internationalization. What percentage of Nazarenes presently are Americans, and in what areas worldwide are we experiencing growth?

INGERSOL: That's a really good question because the statistics for the end of the 2008 statistical year, which was finalized in September of 2008, show that 35 percent of Nazarenes are Americans; the year before it was 37 percent. I often say that when it comes to the changing nature of the Church of the Nazarene, for us Americans, everything has changed except the way we think. Some of us certainly go out on work and witness teams to see the international church in action, but many of us don't. Along with 35 percent of Nazarenes being Americans, 23 percent are Africans, and another 22 or 23 percent are Latin Americans, from either Central or South America.

Some people get worried about this. They compare growth rates in different parts of the world with the U.S. growth rate. I don't get pessimistic about this, frankly, because

every once in awhile, I take off my historians' hat and put on my businessman's hat. I think of it in terms of market shares. The fact is, the American market is a hard market to grow in because it's saturated. American society has one of the highest rates of church affiliation of any nation in the world, because church attendance is voluntary. For decades, attendance hovered between 60 and 68 percent. It reached a high point of about 68 percent religious or church affiliation in the '60s, dropped down a little, went back up, dropped down. For a nation in which attendance is voluntary and affiliation is voluntary, this is pretty good. It seems like we have churches on every street corner. Radio and television are saturated with religious messages, Christian messages.

One thing we need to be careful of is not to send a message to our pastors that they are failing, because I don't believe they are. I think they're doing a fine job.

When you think about the growth of the Church of the Nazarene in Africa, you have to think about the context. Context is everything. The great, over-arching theme of African religion in the 20th century was the conversion of Africans from traditional African religions to theism, either to Christianity or to Islam. At this point in history more than 40 percent of Africans are Muslims and more than 40 percent of Africans are Christians. So, all Christian churches have enjoyed tremendous success in Africa in the course of the 20th century, including the Church of the Nazarene. We have exciting stories there—the East African revival, especially in Ethiopia, is one of those exciting stories. When we start comparing American statistics or growth rates with those in Africa, we need to be conscious that the contexts are radically different. Same with Latin America; one theme of 20th-century Christianity in Latin America is sometimes referred to as Protestantization. The Roman Catholic church is declining, and Protestant churches are growing. Our growth story in Latin America is part of that larger story. It's important that we look at these larger stories that our church is a part of.

BROADBOOKS: Was the early Church of the Nazarene open to those of various ethnicities, and how did we do at valuing cultural adversity and allowing it to enrich our understanding of the faith?

BASSETT: In the abstract, we did very well. In the particular, we didn't do so well. If you looked at us from 50 miles up, it would look like we were doing rather well. We had Chinese churches on the west coast, and certainly if somebody was white, it didn't make any difference what country they came from, they were welcome in the church. However, when you got a little closer, you'd find that racism was a serious problem, whatever races were involved.

Did we value cultural diversity? We did seek to learn from each other, but we tended to limit the capacity to believe—the capacity of others to teach us anything was pretty limited. For instance, the African-American could teach us how to get excited in worship, they could teach us some good music. The Bible stories they told were good folk stories even if their exegesis was not to be trusted. It was a strange reaction, the relationship to cultural diversity. I think we wanted to open ourselves; we all sang, “Jesus loves the little children, all the children of the world, red and yellow, black and white, all are precious in his sight.” Yet, we still felt there were geographical places where these people belonged.

Did we allow this to enrich our understanding of the faith? We would have done much better, I think, if we had allowed the missionaries to preach more rather than simply show pictures. The pictures showed us that diversity, but didn't really tell us how to bridge the gaps or what to appreciate in those cultures. So, it's a mixed bag.

BROADBOOKS: That moves right into this question. In 1980, the General Assembly decided the Nazarenes would become an international church. What is the promise of internationalization, and what should that mean?

NOBLE: I think that was a tremendous step of faith. I think it showed the maturity and the generosity of our American brothers and sisters, that they were willing to do that with what was originally a national church. I think there are still adjustments in thinking to be made, and I noticed that Stan made that point. I'm interested in the fact that we differentiate between delegates and international delegates. Well, we're all international delegates; the United States is a nation too. Little things that come through in language sometimes indicate that we haven't yet caught up with what we're trying to do. It's tremendous to have a faith, and enormous enrichment is surely going to come to the churches in this country for being prepared to share themselves in that way.

BROADBOOKS: This brings up sharing decision-making with our brothers and sisters around the world. Will Americans be able to do that? In the past, have we been able to do that? What ideas from the past may help us in this regard?

INGERSOL: I'm not sure what ideas will help us. The question of sharing in decision-making, though, is a key thing. I can say personally that I yearn for the day that the Nazarenes in Africa will contribute something significant to our General Assembly other than just being delegates. I mean, I sat through one General Assembly after another. All the music is American. The styles change. It might be Southern Gospel; it might be contemporary Christian. However, the Nazarenes who live in Africa, Latin America, Asia, and other parts of the world have gifts of music and theology that should be shared with Americans. We don't always elicit that.

In terms of decision-making, I would go back to what I said before. If 35 percent of Nazarenes are Americans and all six of the General Superintendents are Americans, something doesn't seem quite right there. It seems like the rich diversity of experience and types of life stories that we have in the Church of the Nazarene are not being represented at different levels of our general leadership. They should be represented

there. I think the critical question is, “Will Americans be able to share decision-making responsibilities and do it well?”

BROADBOOKS: Since you pastor, Janine, in southern California, the immigration issue is very real—and not just where you are but all around the country. In what ways has immigration impacted our church?

METCALF: Well, especially today, and certainly in the last few decades, we’re seeing so many people coming from all parts of the world to our doorstep. Churches, those that are predominantly Caucasian, have to come to grips with the reality that our neighborhoods are changing. Instead of just creating new churches for different cultures, perhaps the Lord is challenging us to embrace the cultures that are around us and to learn from them. There’s a re-teaching of what it means to be missional or what missions is all about—that we’re not just going out from here, but we allow them to come to us and teach us, and we learn from them and share this experience together. It takes training, love and patience as we mesh cultures.

I happen to live in a community that is the second largest Iraqi refugee community in the United States. Our church began to pray about this. How do we as a church family begin to reach these refugees who are coming in? The first thing we decided to do was to get to know them, one on one, and create ways to intentionally engage in their story so that we learn from each other. We tried to create ways that we’re not just giving to them. We opened up a welcoming place for them to feel safe and for all of us to grow in Christ together. It’s a rethinking of what mission is. It’s not something that we pay for and send missionaries to do. We are all called to express the mission of God. It’s a rethinking of what mission is in the Church of the Nazarene. It’s an exciting time. It’s dangerous; it stretches us in innumerable ways. However, I believe as grace is applied, we’ll all grow together to be more like Christ and reflect the presence of Christ in our congregations.

Yes, there are challenges, but they enable us to understand what it means to be the body of Christ.

[BEGIN Nazarene Identity and Challenges/Opportunities]

BROADBOOKS: Let's talk about Nazarene identity. How do we know that we are being faithful to our tradition, and what do we consider to be the absolute essentials for Nazarene identity, for our tradition?

BASSETT: One way I know I'm being faithful to my tradition is to understand that I am, first of all, a Christian. I do happen to belong to a particular tradition, but "Christian" is my family. For me, it's Christ, it's living in Christ, it's living for Christ, it's living by Christ. It's also understanding that Christ was sent by God the Father and that the Holy Spirit is the Lord and Giver of life. I'm a Trinitarian in that regard and in my roots; I am accountable to all who have come before me in the Christian faith. I seek to be faithful to them and also faithful to the Nazarenes. Nazarenes are the immediate family I must be faithful to.

What do I considered to be the essentials? I think I could put them fairly simply in doctrinal terms, in terms of the Nicene Creed. I not only believe this but this is a way I'm seeking to live so that when I say I believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, I believe that my life is dependent—absolutely dependent—upon the Holy Spirit's presence. Without the Holy Spirit, I don't have that life. The Holy Spirit is the advocate who tells me what Christ has done for me and will do for me. I could go down the articles of the Creed; the essentials of the faith are found there. The holiness message, then, comes through primarily in the fact that I take this very personally and that you're taking it very personally. Your person may take it differently from my person. We're both taking it personally. It's not just that we believe in an intellectual way; we really are committed to this.

BROADBOOKS: Some would say that the Church of the Nazarene is having an identity crisis.

We consider a myriad of theologies as strategies for accomplishing the church's work.

What can we learn from our history that can help us find our way?

METCALF: I think one of the things we can do is learn from our history, not be afraid of it. We have deconstructed the church to be an individual congregation that has no past; It is important to learn from our past, to learn the story, to live the story, to continue the story. There are so many wonderful stories from our past that we need to share, not only with our children but with this new generation of Nazarenes who need to know who we are, why we exist. It's informing our pastors of our history, to not be afraid of the term, to not be afraid of our past, but to understand it and to continue to grow and to learn from others, to keep our ears open, our hearts open, and grow.

BASSETT: The past of the church is not the past of the kingdom of God, so we will find ourselves, sometimes, confessing that it hasn't been right and that our white horse may not be a white horse after all. We're accountable to the future, as well as accountable to the past. The future holds me accountable; my children and my grandchildren will hold me accountable. What do I learn from history? I learn to keep my eye on the great prize and the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and on the path behind me. You shall hear a voice from behind you saying, "This is the way, walk in it" (Isaiah 30:21).

BROADBOOKS: For the final question I'd like to do something a little different from what we've done for the last couple of hours. I'd like for each of us to answer two questions. The first is this: What do you see as our greatest hurdle as a denomination at this time in our existence? Let's start with you, Stan.

INGERSOL: I think I would probably go back to the question that was asked a short while ago about power sharing, because I think the ability to bring others into leadership and to learn from them even when their experiences are very different from ours goes to the

heart of what it is to be a Holiness church. It's important that "holiness" not just be a word. It has to be embodied. When I go back and think about Pilot Point, the great thing there was that it was experienced holiness. People who had been separated by bitterness and the legacy of war came together because their hearts told them they should and their heads told them they should and the experience of holiness made that possible. As we look at where we are today as an international church, if over half of Nazarenes today are people of color, over half of them have a lifestyle that is very different from the American middle-class lifestyle, then being open to their gifts is the next big step we need to take to embody the Holiness church.

BROADBOOKS: Good! Janine, our greatest hurdle.

METCALF: One of the greatest things we've got to admit is that we can learn from others. There are buzz words that set people off, such as "the emergent church," even the term "missional" can set people off because any new phrase has a way of conjuring up different interpretations. I would pray that we would grow and examine what these words mean, to learn even from those we disagree with, and to have the grace to listen, to have the grace to learn, and to explore what it means to be the church of God.

BROADBOOKS: Paul, our greatest hurdle.

BASSETT: I think our greatest hurdle was noted after Vatican II, and that is the problem of confusing structure and content, or form and content. We tend to believe that if we get the structure right, we've got the message right. Maybe the message can tell us something about how the structure should be. Since it's from the Holy Spirit, it will probably be much more free than we're inclined to think. So, it will be a bit scary. On the other hand, the Holy Spirit is speaking to us, and if we're going to talk about loving God with our whole heart, soul, mind, and strength, that's what we're going to run across; burning bushes and seas that fall apart and all kinds of phenomenon. Let's not confuse

getting it right as we think organizationally; let's not say, "OK, now we've got the perfect vessel to carry the doctrine." It's the doctrine and experience that matter, as Stan has continually said this afternoon, the doctrine and the experience. It's Christ's church; it's Christ's body—so let's not confuse form and content.

BROADBOOKS: Tom, our greatest hurdle.

NOBLE: I agree with all of these points. Can I put it this way? I think our greatest hurdle is to learn how to be more persuasive, more attractive in presenting, articulating, and expressing our doctrine, our message, and in embodying it.

BROADBOOKS: What do you see as our greatest opportunity for our new century?

INGERSOL: The greatest opportunity is to pass on what we have been given to another generation.

METCALF: I think diversity can be our greatest challenge, but it can also prompt us to rely more on the grace of God, to get along and to learn together.

BASSETT: I'm not in this alone; we're not in this alone. We are the body of Christ, and the Spirit is the Lord and Giver of life. We aren't. He gives life and does he ever! That gives us more opportunity than we can handle!

NOBLE: I think our greatest opportunity is also our greatest hurdle, and that is expressing, articulating our doctrine persuasively, attractively, and _____; that's our greatest opportunity.

BROADBOOKS: I want to thank all of you for your participation in this. I think you sensed that these four people really love the church, and they're also quite hopeful about the future for the church. I hope you feel the same way. We want to thank you for taking your time to watch this. May the good Lord help us each one to jump these hurdles and discover great opportunities for our new century.