

# BACKHOUSE LECTURE: 1980

QUAKERS and SACRAMENTAL HISTORY: Reflections on Quaker Saints by a Quaker Sinner

Hector Kinloch  
January 1980

## PRELIMINARY NOTE

In due course it is hoped that this lecture will be published as the Backhouse Lecture for 1980. Hector Kinloch plans, however, to continue 'working on' his theme of 'Quakers and Sacramental History' up to the day of the lecture. This is not merely the result of an un-Quakerly habit of putting off until tomorrow what should have been done yesterday. This was agreed in mid-1979 for two reasons, partly because there are doubts about the continued good sense of reading out loud a lecture which has been completed months before.

Much more important is *the author's request that Friends will respond in person and/or in writing to the themes of this lecture so that the final version may properly represent both the views of the author and of Friends who will gather in a 'meeting to hear a lecture' on Monday, 14 January 1980.* \* Could it be that the giving and amending and re-writing of a lecture in the same way that we deal with an issue in a meeting for business, is yet another Quaker sacrament?

\*\*\*\*\*

RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS (QUAKERS) IN AUSTRALIA, INCORPORATED. Amendments to Handbook of Practice and Procedure of 1967 approved by Yearly Meeting, January, 1979.

10. Testimonies regarding Deceased Friends. While a record of the death of a Friend, including some biographical notes, should always be made, a Regional Meeting may feel that the life of the Society will be enriched by remembrance of the grace of God in the life of that Friend .....

The purpose of such testimonies is not eulogy or history, but to preserve a record of the power of divine grace in the lives of men and women.

What is a Quaker?

What is at the heart of being a Quaker?

What is the irreplaceable core of a Quaker way of life? What is the immovable centre of Quaker belief?

Is the heart of Quakerism a commitment to God? Is the core a commitment to Jesus? Is the centre a commitment to the golden rule of loving one's neighbour as oneself?

\* \* \* \* \*

It would be both bold and un-Quakerly to give inflexible answers to these questions. One reply is that Quakers agree to disagree about all matters which lie between Genesis and Revelation, between our understanding of the genesis of the universe and each person's understanding of God's revelation or lack of it.

Such a reply is, however, inadequate and unsatisfactory. A Quaker seen in that way is little more than someone with vague, ill-defined, half-formed beliefs which may be interchanged with any other set of equally insecure beliefs.

Yet within the Society of Friends there are many with firm, orthodox trinitarian beliefs about God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. Similarly there are Quakers convinced that such hardline theology is not for them. They may have joined the Society in order to escape from and even to deny traditional theology. These two varieties among many varieties of Quakers do not agree about the nature of God and creation, yet they coexist. What then can they possibly have in common?

We necessarily return to our opening questions. What is the heart, the irreplaceable core and the immovable centre of the Quaker way of life? If it is not a shared creed and doctrine, what can it possibly be?

What binds Quakers of differing beliefs together is not mere tolerance, the kind of tolerance many Christians and non-Christians have for each other. It is not merely that Quakers welcome varied beliefs, even contradictory systems of belief. The centre, core and heart of Quakerism is simply this, that each Quaker recognizes that personal experience, not received dogma, is the final test of faith, belief and 'truth'.

For some this personal experience is a 'direct encounter with God as revealed in Jesus Christ.' (From the introduction to Christian faith and practice in the experience of the Society of Friends, London, 1966). For others this personal experience may be a shadowy and uncertain process of seeking for the light.

It may even be a painful personal experience of coping with doubt and unbelief. Yet the confident believer, the seeker, the doubter and the searching unbeliever sit in the same circle of worshippers or would-be worshippers of a clearly known or relatively unknown God. The centre, core and heart of their common life is that each Friend has an obligation to sustain every other Friend in his or her personal experience of God or the search for God. Each Friend accepts the validity of personal experience as the testing ground of the religious life.

The Christian Quaker may wish that a non-Christian Quaker could have a Christian personal experience. A universalist or deist or humanist or agnostic Quaker may wish that a Christian Quaker could have a wider personal experience. Both know that such experiences cannot be imposed by one upon the other.

It is possible that Quaker Brand X may believe in the superiority of his variety of religious experience over that of Quaker Brand Z; and vice-versa; but Brands X and Z respect the shared process of personal *experience* which enabled them to reach their respective positions. One hopes that X and Z also recognize that their beliefs may develop given new revelation through continuing personal religious experience.

In such a religious way of life there are obvious dangers. The personal religious experience of one Friend may be deep, profound, exalting and overwhelming. In a way, such a personal experience might properly be described as 'superior'. The personal religious experience of another Friend may be shallow, insubstantial, depressing and unmoving. In a way this might properly be described as 'inferior'. Whether 'superior' or 'inferior', if such categories of religious experience may be used, we recognize that we are all at different stages of development of a religious life, and that no one of us could properly judge what is or what is not a 'superior' or 'inferior' religious experience. Theoretically, all religious experiences are created equal! In both cases the quality of the experience may vary and change. In both cases there may be elements of self-aggrandizement and/or self-flagellation. Personal religious experiences may be distortions or misperceptions of 'reality', whatever that is. It is also difficult to know what line, if any, can be drawn between what might be called day-to-day personal experiences and so-called religious experiences. Perhaps the term 'religious' should be expendable if all life, all experience is seen as 'religious'.

Despite these real and recurring dangers of personal experience as the ground of faith we accept personal experiences over the centuries as basic to the nature of Quakerism. Understandably therefore, we place high value on spiritual autobiographies and journals whether Christian or non-Christian. The place of honour given to George Fox or John Woolman or James Backhouse is not only for their inspirational and organizational Skills, but because they have revealed to us in their journals a way of life, based on personal religious experience.

Quaker handbooks of faith, belief and behaviour include many examples of spiritual autobiography. The one most familiar to British and Australasian Friends is not called 'What Quakers believe.' It is not a gathering of prayers and patterns of worship. It is most certainly not a codified creed. It is, as its title suggests, a record of experience. My own London edition of 1966 is entitled Christian faith and practice in the experience of the Society of Friends. An equivalent North American publication of 1955 avoids the terms 'Christian' and 'experience' in its title; Faith and Practice of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends. In both books, however, personal religious experience is an essential common factor. In the London book the North American Quaker Rufus Jones reminds us of our historical beginnings: 'The original message of George Fox which gathered the Society of Friends was never systematically formulated by him. It was essentially the faith, based on personal experience, that God and man have direct relationship and mutual correspondence. This was not, in the first instance a doctrine, but a live and throbbing experience.' (Christian Faith and Practice, London, 1966, extract 206).

In the Philadelphia book, that same Rufus Jones deals not with the historical record of personal experience but with a personal experience of his own.

I was walking alone in a forest, trying to map out my plan of life ... Suddenly I felt the walls between the visible and the invisible grow thin and the eternal seemed to break through into the world where I was. I saw no flood of light, I heard no voice, but I felt as though I were face to face with a higher order of reality ... A sense of mission broke in on me and I felt that I was being called to a well-defined task of life to which I then and there dedicated myself ... I was brought to a new level of life and have never quite lost the transforming effect of the experience. (from 'Why I Enroll with the Mystics', reprinted in Vergilius Ferm, ed., *Contemporary American Theology*, 1932, p.206, in *Faith and Practice of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting*, Philadelphia, 1955, p.139).

Many Friends can and have testified about such powerful 'experiences which have changed their lives, but such experiences are not necessarily the norm, whatever that is. Equally there are many Friends whose backgrounds, personalities and personal experiences are such that no such one moment or one event can be identified as 'transforming.' Quietly, simply, silently over many years, slower processes of personal religious experience have had comparable effects. Both kinds of Friends recognize the legitimacy and centrality of both kinds of experiences. The flamboyant and dramatic breakthrough of God to person; and the drop-by-drop accretion of God-consciousness may both be seen as equally valid.

Furthermore each one may lead to and strengthen the other. There is also no suggestion here that religious experience may be planned like a course of study. Truth and light break in at the strangest and even most unlikely times, provided that the heart is receptive.

It is also necessary to say that one's personal religious life may go through times of dreadful deterioration and seeming decay. It is a comfort to learn from the religious experiences of others, Quakers and non-Quakers, Christians and non-Christians, that such deterioration and decay is reversible. I would like to go further and assert that such periods of doubt, aridity, insecurity and hopelessness may be a necessary part of personal religious experience.

\*\*\*\*\*

## SACRAMENTAL HISTORY

I now want to put the point of view that although Quakers do not formally have or accept sacraments, we do in fact have sacraments of our own. These sacraments take the form of rituals, sacred rites, religious ceremonies concerned with recording the history of personal religious experience.

Many Quakers are ill at ease with the concept of sacraments; that is religious ceremonies or acts which may be seen as 'outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace.' If one believes that all life is 'religious', then all of life may be seen as sacramental. From that point of view there is no one special place or special time at which our spiritual perceptions are or should be extraordinarily

enhanced. My own personal experience, however, is that within the Quaker way of life there are times and occasions when 'inward and **spiritual grace**' may be encouraged to break through by '**outward and visible**' acts and signs.

Such aids to faith may not be necessary for those Friends who have already reached saintly perfection; but most of us still need religious ceremonies and acts, familiar outward and visible signs.

Because we have turned our backs on contentious creeds and divisive doctrines we have avoided 'orthodox' sacraments associated with traditional Christianity. We do not baptise infants or adults. We do not join together in a Last Supper, Holy Communion or Eucharist. We do not define the moment of membership of our Society by a laying on of hands. We do not recognize a supreme sanctifying and sacramental moment in 'the solemnization of matrimony'. We do not anoint the sick with oil. Yet we have our workable and sacramental substitutes for each of those sacraments.

Outward and visible signs abound of our commitment to equality, especially to the equality of personal religious experiences. Our silences are outward and inward, visible and invisible. Our silences are sacramental. Our shunning of altars and vestments, our insistence on plain names, our absence of titles and our mannered simplicities are all sacramental. We do things in the way we do them, outwardly and visibly, because the very way of doing them has religious meaning, no less powerful than the set patterns of all the groups we lump together under the heading of 'orthodox churches.'

*How for example, do we deal with death?* We are sacramental when we gather formally for a 'meeting for worship on the occasion of the death of a Friend.' Our silences, our breaking of those silences, our rhetorical and ritual assertions of equality of the living and dead are deliberately - I would say sacramentally - the same as in any other meeting for worship.

But I now want to focus on one very special Quaker phenomenon related to death. We become even more sacramental in the way in which we remember Friends who have died, as we move towards the preparation, the giving and the accepting of 'a testimony to the grace of God in the life of a Quaker. Often such a testimony comes months after the death of a Friend. In such a testimony we see the heart, core and centre of the Quaker way, because what we try to stress is the truthful record of the personal experience of each Friend. The testimony to the grace of God in the life of a Friend is not primarily an obituary or a formal record of a person's life from birth to death, but a loving, faithful and sacramental assessment of the personal experience of a Friend. That testimony, after being received, amended and approved in an appropriate Quaker meeting, is then added to the total deposit of faith and truth. That testimony to 'grace' may then itself become an occasion for 'grace'. At its final reading it may be a sacramental starting point for the grace of God in the personal experience of those still living and remembering.

As an historian I am sharply aware of these Quaker testimonies. In their hundreds of thousands over three centuries, they form an extraordinary historical record, not just of an incredible range of personal religious experiences, but, in essence, the corporate history of the Religious Society of Friends throughout the world. These testimonies, singly and as a whole, tell us and the world what a Quaker is,

what a Quaker believes, what a Quaker does and the myriad ways in which the grace of God may be expressed on earth.

However, as an historian and as a member of the Society of Friends, I need to express from my own personal experience some caution about that impressive historical record. I do so from my awareness that the recording and writing of history is rarely objective, even when the recorder and writer aim for objectivity. Furthermore, I believe that the reason for the recording and writing of history is not primarily to preserve the essence of the past, although that is essential and should be done; but to provide those living in the present with a sense of identity and continuity and even purpose on into the future. I also believe that there are many dangers in our particular method of recording and reflecting on the past. One danger is so great that I believe it could be a crippling influence on the ongoing life of the Society of Friends.

But first of all let us remind ourselves of the process of participating in that unique Quaker sacrament, 'the testimony to the grace of God in the life of a Friend'.

Each one of us here who is a member of the Society of Friends knows that sooner or later he or she will become part of the vast repository of Quaker history. After each one of us dies, two or more Friends will be chosen to meet as a committee to reflect on the life which has ended. What are the responsibilities of such a committee? A first responsibility is to get some of the basic facts right. When was he born? How many children did she have? What meetings did he attend when he was transferred from Sydney to Brisbane? When was she clerk of the meeting? What prison was he in as a conscientious objector during the war? What were the details of her teaching career? What offices did he hold in his government department? What was her final illness? A second responsibility is to do straightforward justice to the many observable activities in the life of a Friend. Was she effective in carrying out her 'concern' about capital punishment or peace or race or refugees? What was his contribution to maintaining the life and vitality of the meeting during a time of dissension and aridity? The committee can usefully tell us about busy or backwater careers at home and abroad, of achievements and strivings, of hobbies and interests which became fruitful and creative and touched many lives. The testimony can also help us maintain historical continuity as we see how a Friend from one generation grew in the faith thanks to particular influences in the generation which went before. Children and grandchildren may discover how the rest of the Society of Friends perceived their peculiar parents. Thirdly, however, is the prime responsibility of the committee truly and honestly to witness to the qualities of grace which really mattered in the life of a Friend. After a recitation of jobs held and committee assignments faithfully carried out, the testimony may stress a private and shocking personal tragedy nobly borne, or the sense of welcoming love always shared by a Friend who in other worldly ways might have been counted a failure.

I'm very much impressed by the testimony of Ratcliff and Barking Monthly Meeting concerning the grace of God in the life of Mary Ann Stokeley (1869-1941). The extract (no.96) in Christian Faith and Practice reminds us of Mary Stokeley's physical frailty, educational handicaps and very confined experience. She was not a success in life. The testimony notes, however: 'Very conscious of her own limitations, her part was a silent one, but she was amazingly faithful to the tiny meeting to which she belonged. ... Faithfulness was indeed the keynote of her life, and an example to us all.'

The weightiest of Friends might, on this score, be found full of busy-ness rather than full of grace.

\*\*\*\*\*

So far our discussion of the heart, core and centre of Quakerism has been mainly self-congratulatory. We are not as Other groups, sects, churches and religions. We do not need a creed or doctrine. We base our lives, individually and corporately, on the truth to be found in personal religious experience. We are all equal in the sight of God and of each other. Each person's religious experience is as valid as that of any other person. Amen.

After hearing those assertions, some critics would say that we are guilty of spiritual pride. Others might claim that we have made 'a form of our very rejection of forms'. (See the section of 'Sacraments' in *Christian Faith and Practice*, op.cit., extracts 208-215, especially the remarks of A. Barratt Brown.) It might be said of many of us individually and of the Society of Friends corporately that our religious ideals and principles - we must not call them creeds and doctrines - are splendid but that too often our practices are even more silent than our silences. Do we any more make a mark in the world? Are we in danger of living on past testimonies?

Specifically I am concerned about the 'testimonies to the grace of God' in the lives of Friends, past and present. I worry about these for two reasons. The first is that we may be in danger of producing as frozen a form as the orthodox sacraments which we once rejected. The second, on which I wish to dwell, is that we are in danger of endless hagiography, of worshipping Saints, of relying on Saints of the past, rather than facing up to the reality of Sinners which we, in the present, truly are.

The first worry is in some ways a relatively minor one. Testimonies to the grace of God in the lives of seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth century Friends assumed the existence of a particular kind of God, with specific qualities of 'grace'.

Friends before the twentieth century were split into several sub-groupings but they tended to share similar views of Quakers as various kinds of Christians with various Christian graces, about which testimonies could be clearly given. Quakers then were biblically literate, aware of standard versions of Christian theology and much closer to various forms of orthodoxy than we are today.

Now, as one by one, we die, we may not be easy to classify as inheritors of and participators in God's grace. Might a fully truthful testimony to some of us read as follows:-

He had great questionings about the existence of God and the relationship, if any, between God and man. His life was one of searching for meaning, which he tried to do as honestly as possible. His doubts, carefully and rarely expressed in

meetings for worship, often helped other Friends by revealing a common experience of doubt.

We must surely recognize as we try to maintain continuity with the past through Quaker sacraments received from the past, that their personal experience of God is not necessarily compatible to our personal experience of God; their ways not necessarily our ways. Even the very word 'testimony' has a tinge of formal sacramentalism about it. Perhaps we need to refer to 'testimonies', in future, as 'reflections on the search for God in the life of ...'!

My second worry is much greater. Much of this discussion so far has been about the heart, core and centre of Quakerism in the power of personal experience.

Without wishing to turn a lecture into the sacrament of penitential confession, I need to say that my personal experience is mainly one of commandments disobeyed, promises not kept, personal relationships destroyed or damaged, and resolutions made and soon broken. I was not a Saint when I first came into contact with Friends. Joining Friends did not make me a Saint. And I am not a Saint now, and do not expect to be one. Many of the testimonies of Friends in the past I find impossible to keep, and I am not sympathetic to them. I do not think I am unusual in this respect.

As I consider the Quakers I have met in the U.S.A., in Britain and in Australasia I recognize several truly saintly Friends, but they are exceptional. Within our supposed equality of personal experience, they are elitist in their saintliness, not by intent but by the quality of their lives. In due time they will deserve a saintly 'testimony to the grace of God in the life of ...'. And we shall be grateful. But most of us are not Saints and, if pressed, would shudder at the thought of being one. Perhaps it is the Devil at our elbow putting in his claim to part of our personal experience!

Yet we try to exist in a Society of Friends in which we are confronted with three hundred years of recorded perfection. We are surrounded by the testimonies to the grace of God in the lives of Saint George, Saint John, Saint Joseph, Saint Mary, Saint Elizabeth and Saint Thomas. Occasionally in the testimonies are efforts to be fully honest about the failings and iniquities of Friends; but, understandably, Quaker reticence, Quaker silence, Quaker propriety and even Quaker saintliness have resulted in unspotted reputations. The testimonies, after all, are to the grace of God, not to the fallibilities of man, in the lives of Friends. BUT - ARE THEY HONEST.

#### LIFE-ENHANCING TESTIMONIES FOR SINNERS?

I am not here advocating fully-fledged historical biographies of each dead Friend, warts-and-all. That is not the point. What I am concerned about it is that through our history we have produced an elitist sect of Saints with an enviable and amazing international reputation. We all, I'm sure, are humbly proud of that reputation as we try with the help of God, to maintain it in the 1980's. But is that history almost an albatross around our neck?



We cannot survive on that reputation. As the personal experience of the God of previous generations is not necessarily our personal experience of God, so their hard-won reputation is not transferable to us. Nor should we be dominated by the concerns and testimonies of other times and circumstances.

Here we sit, a band of sinners, in Hobart in mid-summer 1980. Behind us is a history of martyrdom in Massachusetts; of religious persecution in England; of social and economic reform in the new cities of the industrial revolution; of distinguished contributions to science and literature; of a battle against slavery; of educational experimentation, innovation and achievement; of resistance to war and tyranny; of a powerful commitment to equality in theory and practice. We truly give thanks for the grace of God in the creative lives of many generations of Friends for that history.

But we must not live in the saintly past, nor by the methods and testimonies of the past or we are in terrible danger of becoming a small sect of hand-me-down and badly tarnished, ageing, substitute Saints, waiting for our turn to be memorialized in a frozen Quaker sacrament.

\*\*\*\*\*

I cannot leave the matter there, however. Having spurned the Quaker past and its Saints, I want now to ask that we do not reject either their personal religious experiences or their saintly lives and concerns.

If they were here today, what would they tell us?

First of all they would deny that they ever were or intended to be or should now be regarded as Saints and Martyrs. They would be the first to insist that they were like us. Their lives were full of temptations to which they succumbed. They would implore us not to listen to this expert or that specialist on the spiritual or religious life, but to look prayerfully within ourselves to discover our own condition. Where are we? What canst thou say?

Fox, Woolman, Fry, Backhouse and the many generations of distinguished Quaker birthright families such as the Cadburys and Hodgkins were present where they were, whether in prison, or confronting slave-holders, or on the mission field, or speaking "truth to power" about international affairs.

They were at the frontier point of the crises and challenges of their day. Each effective saintly sinner in his or her own generation sought the power and light of the Spirit in contemporary terms, often by rejecting the frozen orthodoxies of his or her own immediate predecessors. Effective saintly sinners took on the worldly evils which were central in their own time and experience.

So then, if we genuinely wish to be true, within our own experience to the insights of the saintly Quaker past we must be prepared to start again, each in his or her own time, in his or her own way, just as George Fox did. He is our Friend and equal and exemplar.

Let us take this to a logical extreme. How can we both reject the past and be true to the best of the past? Here are some considerations'.

Should we now be prepared to tear down and restructure our modes of programmed and so-called unprogrammed silent worship? Have our one-hour chunks of busy "silence" become a mockery of our claim to be worshipping and communicating directly with God in "living silence"? Have our Sunday morning forms of meditation and response become a kind of ritualized tyranny over truth?

Fox believed to the core that the Lord's power was over all. He acted on that belief. Is it still true for us? As we hear about the strength of present-day evangelical revival and the charismatic movement, can we any longer be comfortable with our quiet, punctuated suburban niceties?

Could it be that our formidable saintly reputation combines with the formal rigidities of Quaker propriety to put up the barriers to so many young people? Are we any more a burning spiritual light? Or are we perhaps stubby votive candles fluttering in devotion to saints who, in their own day, were never made of plaster?

My last question concerning the kind of religious establishment we seem to have become is this: do we any more deserve to be a separate denomination vaguely within but not quite within Christendom? As we seek the light, should we be asking whether our Quaker commitment to the centrality of individual religious experience could now find equal or even better expression within other bodies or churches? Might our function be to pass on our saintly heritage to those who can make more effective use of it than we seem to be able to do?

Turning from worship to worldly concerns, are we fully facing the kind of world which is being revolutionized by technological innovation? Are we adequately coping with either racism or sexism? How shall we deal with the reawakening of the deep anti-materialist spirituality of Islam which also provides a huge arena for personal religious experience? What role would Quakers play as we watch super-powers crush small states whose ideologies and regimes displease them? As the electronic media revolution outstrips the invention of printing as an influence for good or evil, where will Quakers be standing? Faced with the possibilities of, even the necessity of, ever-enlarging nuclear power and nuclear technology, will Quakers be spiritual Luddites pleading for an earlier, simpler and more saintly age?

I believe there is at least one positive note. We do seem to be continuing our saintly peace testimony in the context of the world of the 1980's. That testimony may soon be put severely to the test. Are we full of grace to meet that test?

Finally, I return full circle. What was a Quaker? What is a Quaker now? What will a Quaker be? In our revolutionary times what will remain of Quakerism? Is there any element which is so worthwhile, so unshakeable, so in need of repetition that, no matter what happens in the dangerous secular world, that element will continue to feed and inspire us; and, by extension, our world?

In my personal experience, I believe there is, although I do not wish to impose this view on others.

It is not the personal experience of well-meaning tolerance, of careful and conscientious doubt, of accepting non-belief as a form of belief, although as a corporate body we cheerfully welcome all those who are in such a state of mind, in which many of us have been. It is not the personal experience of utter dogmatic rectitude about "the truth, our truth and nothing but our truth". All Quakers should surely be reverently willing to be doubtful about man's certainties about God.

But in terms of historical continuity, of generation upon generation of saintly sinners, we need to say to each other that Christ of the Gospels, Christ of the Epistles, Christ of the early Church of saints and martyrs, the Christ who spoke to George Fox's condition, the Christ known in personal experience by many varieties of Quakers over three hundred years, is still with us. To some he is a loving and familiar friend, day by day. To others he may die a stumbling block, a figure who defines too narrowly the limits of religious experience. But --- we do share him still.

Hesitantly I ask that we not make this personal assertion a matter of doctrinal debate. Rather I hope that whatever stumbling there may be will be towards rather than away from him, however we might perceive him. I pray that if there is any chance for any of us to lead redeemed rather than degraded lives, even lives committed to the saintly notion of perfection, that his continuing influence will sustain us.

He is the constant of our saintly past, of our insecure present, and of our imperfect future.

\*\*\*\*\*

That difficult and saintly sinner (Saint) Paul spoke as follows to the Corinthians. (Corinthians 2:13, vv.11-14)

And now, my friends, farewell. Mend your ways; take our appeal to heart; agree with one another; live in peace; and the God of love and peace will be with you.

Greet one another with the kiss of peace. All God's people send you greetings.

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and fellowship in the Holy Spirit, be with you all.

\* As explained in the Preliminary Note, Hector Kinloch hoped to receive comments and criticisms from Friends and others so that the final lecture might be the result of corporate seeking. Standing Committee of 4 January 1981 agreed that the lecture be published (but not as part of the Backhouse Lecture series) with financial assistance from the author. However,

the lecture never appeared in booklet form. The lecture above was scanned by Ian Hughes from two separate documents held at the Wahroonga Meeting House Library.