

Introduction

“I don’t want to be an anti, against anybody. I simply want to be the builder of a great affirmation: the affirmation of God, who loves us and who wants to save us.”

—OSCAR A. ROMERO, *THE VIOLENCE OF LOVE*

IN 1970, EVERETT CATTELL, Quaker missionary and ecumenicist, made a clarion call to Friends for the renewal of their church. His vision was that the Friends Church find a future not in simply retrieving the past, or accurately predicting the future, but rather as missionaries,

Perhaps the call is now before us for a new seeking: a seeking to find where God’s Spirit is actually at work in today’s world and then a giving of ourselves to work with Him—whether within or without the framework of Friends. The future of Friends may be like the grain of wheat, which must fall to the ground and die. Perhaps this would be the way to a new harvest. (Cattell 1970: 5)

This renewal of the church through mission draws on both past and present, tradition and context. In other words, it is what Quakers have called in recent years: convergent. “Convergent” used in this context is a neologism, naming the interplay between a group being conservative—to the tradition—and emergent—within context.¹

1. Robin Mohr, an unprogrammed Quaker from San Francisco, was the first to use this term in 2006, suggesting that this specialized meaning explained a growing movement within the North American Quaker context (Mohr, “Robinopedia”).

QUAKERISM IN THE FACE OF OBSTACLE AND OPPORTUNITY

At the intersection of these two poles, the socially embodied community discerns the movements of God's Spirit and is renewed. Cattell's "model" is an early reference to what would later be called contextual theology. It is closest to Stephen Bevans' *synthetic model* of contextual theology, which I will develop later. Cattell was no Quaker apologist. He believed that renewal would happen "whether within or without the framework of Friends." While he hoped to see the Friends Church catch the missionary fervency that he believed early Quakers had—and had lost—the possibility included renouncing the institutions of Quakerism.

Following Cattell's cue, I argue that renewal is not only possible for Friends by finding God's Spirit at work in the present, but that it can—and already is—happening "within the framework of Friends." In fact, that framework, or as I prefer, "tradition," is itself the resource that makes this renewal possible. My task is to develop a model of renewal that contains within it Cattell's suggestion—*a la* Jesus—that renewal comes through a grain of wheat falling to the ground, or as I will later suggest, a remix of the tradition that at once pays homage to the original piece of art—the seed—while creating something new out of it—what is born out of the seed's "death." A model of this nature must take seriously all of the components of contextual theology: tradition, culture, dialogue and praxis. Building on these threads, the model developed here will be called a "convergent model of participatory renewal," convergent because the model is a synthesis of tradition and emergence of God's work in today's context, participatory because the model derives insights from culture studies' understanding of "participatory culture," an emerging culture that celebrates production over consumption, grassroots organizing, decentralized authority and collaboration as the means by which people are actively engaged with today's culture.

In hopes of giving some basic background, through this opening chapter I introduce the Friends and some of the internal difficulties they face as a faith tradition: brought on by internal separations in the nineteenth century, shifting demographics and changing contexts. Second, I briefly describe the three theoretical partners whose thought will be the framing of the convergent model. Rooted in the philosophy of Alasdair MacIntyre, Stephen Bevan's understanding of contextual theology and Henry Jenkins work in participatory culture, I develop an understanding

of tradition and mission that has potential to lead to revitalization within Quakerism.

According to Michael Harkin, revitalization theory has become oriented around “deprivation” and the above example is true in this instance. Deprivation in “the typical case involves a group declining in political power, wealth, well-being, population, or, usually, a combination of these that develops a movement out of a bricolage of its own cultural materials, with the explicit purpose being to eliminate or at least exclude the threatening dominant group” (Harkin 2004: xxix).

However, deprivation is not enough to operate as the sole reason or diagnostic category for change within Quakerism because, as Harkin suggests, it is subject to “ethnographic interpretation” (ibid.). Thus, “enrichment” becomes a second category useful from revitalization theory. The “enrichment thesis” is where a movement builds on the richness of the resources (whether wealth, information, technology, and so on) available within ones own culture to produce something that is new within that context. Here “convergent Friends” (see later in this chapter) exemplify both a response to deprivation, as well as the enrichment thesis.

Third, I describe the work of convergent Friends as being both the inspiration and testing ground for the work that follows.

The Beginning of Quakerism

In the 1640s, England saw the beginnings of Quakerism, and by the 1660s there was close to 66,000 Quakers in Britain and Ireland (Dandelion 2007: 43).² The growth of the Quaker movement in Great Britain, into the Continent and the Colonies, was spurred on by an aggressive missionary impulse within the group. These early Quaker ministers and missionaries referred to themselves as “The First Publishers of Truth,” publishing multitudes of pamphlets, tracts, epistles and books. This spread the Quaker message and drew attention to their radical understanding of Christianity (Russell 1979: 166–67).

Over against the control, hierarchy and inequality of the political and religious culture of seventeenth-century England, Quakerism was a fully participative and alternative social community. The history of Quaker origins is the story of a radical Christian movement that emerged

2. Dandelion suggests that during this period almost 1 percent of the British population was Quaker (*An Introduction to Quakerism*, 43).

during a tumultuous time in England in the 1650s. This Christian movement was radical because it was egalitarian, grassroots-oriented, and counter-cultural to the State and established church of the time. William Penn's "Primitive Christianity Revived," suggests that early Friends were self-aware of their attempt to go back to the root of the Christian tradition. Furthermore, early Quakerism was a movement that was inclusive, prophetic and participatory. It not only called the established church back to its roots, but it gathered together the dissenters, disinherited and the rejected of the church of their time and these became the folks who led the movement. Friends were also set apart because they rejected the necessity of clergy, the use of sacramental elements, held to a belief in the Inward Light of Christ in all people and embodied an eschatology that believed in the immediate and full presence of Christ.

Despite the random imprisonments Friends faced for producing or selling Quaker literature, they were very effective in their output (Russell 1942: 79). Elbert Russell acknowledges, "In the seven decades after 1653 there were 440 Quaker writers, who published 2,678 separate publications, varying from a single page tract to folios of nearly a thousand pages" (1942: 79). Adding to this fervor was the "Valiant Sixty," a group of Quaker missionaries went out two-by-two into the South of England and Wales in 1654. This was modeled after Luke 10:1 where Jesus' sent out seventy of his disciples. This mission succeeded in expanding the reach of the early movement all across England, especially in the south such as London (1942: 34).

The expansion of Friends continued with mainly female missionaries embarking westward across the ocean as early as 1656. Russell suggests that, "the first Quakers who came to America were almost wholly missionaries, impelled by the nascent enthusiasm of the Commonwealth period" (1942: 38). Mary Fisher Dyer and Anne Austin began the "Quaker invasion of Massachusetts" (Russell 39); Dyer was one of the first Quakers martyred on Colony soil. This and many other tragic actions against Quakers did little to stop the flood of Quaker missionaries. The concentration of Quaker missionaries increased to the point that after 1656, Barbados Island was referred to by Friends as the "Nursery of Truth." The Nursery of Truth, was a natural landing place after a long journey that served as a community, training ground, and distributing point for early Quaker missionaries (1942: 39).

By 1681, Quaker William Penn began his "Holy Experiment" in Pennsylvania. The goal was to create a moral settlement in the colonies,

based on Quaker principles and practices that offered respite for religious dissenters under the banner of religious freedom and liberty of conscience (Dandelion 2007: 51). Quakers remained in control of the Pennsylvania Assembly until they began voluntarily withdrawing in 1756 over a refusal to participate in the French and Indian War (*ibid.*, 52).³

By 1758, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting “advised any Friend against holding any civil office which might involve compromise with Quaker principles” or marking a larger shift away from overall activity in the world that Quakers had been so successful in up until this point.⁴ This withdrawal mirrored a growing sectarianism and eventual decline of the fervent mission activity that early Friends exhibited.

Nineteenth-Century Fragmentation

In the nineteenth century, the Quaker tradition underwent crisis. This was the outcome of the fragmenting forces of modernity which brought forth great transformations—and separations—within the American Quaker landscape (see Hamm 1992). Over time, Quakerism became three streams all finding their origins in that critical time period: evangelical (Gurneyite), “liberal-Liberal” (Hicksite),⁵ and conservative (Wilburite).

3. See Yoder, Koontz, and Alexis-Baker, “Quakerism in Early American: The Holy Experiment” in *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace, and Revolution*. Where they suggest that the ultimate response of a pacifist run government would be to voluntarily bow out if the only other option was to take up the sword.

4. It would be too much of a caricature to say that there was a blanket withdrawal of all Friends. The charge of “Quietism” has come under scrutiny in Elaine Pryce’s fine work “‘Upon the Quakers and the Quietists’: Quietism, Power and Authority in Late Seventeenth-Century France, and Its Relation to Quaker History and Theology” (Pryce, *Upon the Quakers*, 2010).

5. Dandelion writes: “For liberal-Liberal Friends, theology has become a story, God an option. Key parts of the tradition can be, and have been, questioned as new sets of individual experience/interpretations modify collective popular belief over time. The collective orthodoxy is reframed by each generation in a revised book of discipline. Liberal-Liberal Quakerism is one in which belief is pluralised, privatised, but also marginalised: it is not seen as important. This kind of Quakerism is held together by an adherence to form, by the way the group is religious, not by what it believes. There are Muslim, Hindu, Sikh, and Buddhist Quakers, theist and non-theist, agnostic and atheist” (Dandelion, *An Introduction to Quakerism*, 134). This group was formed by classic tenets of modernity such as the foundations of experience, cultural relevancy, new revelation, and adopted ideas of progressivism (*ibid.*). Interestingly, MacIntyre uses a similar designation: “Liberalism, as I have understood it in this book, does of course appear in contemporary debates in a number of guises and in so doing

There are two other ways these three groups are also identified. The first way is by their style of worship: programmed, unprogrammed and semi-programmed. A programmed Quaker meeting (evangelical) has a pastor and the worship will often, though not always, include silent worship,⁶ along with singing, preaching, and prayers. An unprogrammed Quaker meeting (liberal and conservative Quakerism) has no pastor and participates exclusively in silent worship, waiting upon God to give rise to “vocal” ministry. The category of a semi-programmed meeting has emerged more recently and may or may not have a pastor and will have more emphasis on this silent or “waiting” worship with some level of programming. The second way is by the names of the three men who founded each particular strand of Quakerism, John Joseph Gurney, Elias Hicks and John Wilbur.

As I will suggest later, this crisis and the subsequent transformations parallel the emergence of modernity. Modernity is based on a philosophical system that is anti-tradition, foundationalist, and individualistic. It held deep implications not only for faith traditions but all of Western society. These three characteristics were adopted—mostly unconsciously but in some instances consciously—by the three branches of Quakerism and are still present within these organizations today. Anthony Giddens argues, “Inherent in the idea of modernity is a contrast with tradition” (Giddens 1990: 36). Part of the contrast is in how reflexivity is understood within modernity. Within tradition, interpretation is a “reflexive monitoring of action” rooted in a community (*ibid.*, 37), whereas in modernity

is often successful in preempting the debate by reformulating quarrels and conflicts with liberalism, so that they appear to have become debates within liberalism, putting in question this or that particular set of attitudes or policies, but not the fundamental tenets of liberalism with respect to individuals and expressions of their preferences. The so-called conservatism and so-called radicalism in these contemporary guises are in general mere stalking-horses for liberalism: the contemporary debates within modern political systems are almost exclusively between conservative liberals, liberal liberals, and radical liberals. There is little place in such political systems for the criticism of the system itself, that is for putting liberalism in company” (MacIntyre, *Whose Justice?*, 392).

6. Within the broadly diverse Quaker world there are many names for worship done in silence: open, waiting, expectant or silent worship are a few names. What is at the heart of this practice of waiting worship is that the gathered community listens together in the silence for the Spirit to speak to individuals and prompt them to speak out of the silence to the rest of the group. For a fuller treatment of this subject see John Punshon’s *Encounter with Silence*.

there is a narrowing of this field (social practices are constantly monitored) and a tightening of the feedback loop (based more in individual reason rather than communal interpretation) to the point that “thoughts and actions are constantly refracted back upon one another” (ibid., 38).

Present Day Quakers

What was once characterized as a prophetic and missionary movement has become pluralistic, fragmented and lacking a unified narrative. The “Great Separations” led inevitably to conflict between Quakers of different branches. Each newly formulated branch touts its own rival theories about the origins and core message of the Quaker tradition. Each polarization represents only a piece of the larger tradition. In the twentieth century, local meetings continued down this trajectory of fragmentation leading to a loss of identity, a break with the tradition, and a deepening pluralism among Friends. Dandelion succinctly puts the key differences this way:

Evangelical Friends tend to find their identity in doctrine whereas Liberal Friends define themselves in terms of their ‘behavioral creed,’ the way they operate as a religious group. Liberal Friends will mention their form of worship as a defining characteristic rather than the theology underpinning it.⁷ Experience is primary and sufficient for Liberal Friends as a source of spiritual authority. Conservative Friends require a blend of revelation and Scripture whereas Evangelical Friends emphasis Scripture above revelation. Liberal and Conservative Friends identify primarily as Quaker. For Evangelical Friends, they may see themselves as Christians primarily, who happen to be Quaker. (Dandelion 2007: 242)

In the twenty-first century, Quakers remain in this stagnant place, as witnessed by the decline of Quakers in the West as well as their dwindling social influence.⁸ In a recent issue of *Friends Journal*, Robin Mohr, the executive secretary of Friends World Committee for Consultation-Section of the Americas (FWCC), noted that whereas there is growth among Friends in Asia, Europe and Africa, there is decline among Friends in

7. For a thorough treatment of how silent worship operates as a behavioral creed within liberal-Liberal Quakerism see Dandelion, *Liturgies of Quakerism*.

8. For instance, Quaker sociologist Pink Dandelion has predicted 2037 as the “death date” for Quakers in Britain.

North America. “FWCC has reported a decrease of about 10,000 over the past five years” (Mohr 2013: 28).

In Evangelical Friends churches in the US there is little numerical growth (Dandelion 2007: 248). Some of the largest of these churches have broken their connection to their Quaker past in hopes of competing in the American spiritual marketplace, while other Quakers—such as John Punshon in his *Reasons for Hope*—have issued a call to Evangelical Friends to return to the rich resources of their tradition to find meaningful renewal.

Each Quaker yearly meeting, monthly meeting and local church in the West wrestles with a way forward, hoping that revitalization will come through: (a) clinging to the tradition, (b) rejecting tradition in favor of being “biblical,” “getting people saved,” or other new methods of church growth, or (c) rejecting both Quaker tradition and the Bible in favor of a new pluralistic identity that reflects a growing fragmented cultural context. Often the aspects of tradition that get trimmed from Evangelical Friends are those practices that make Friends unique: silent worship, practice of discernment and consensus-based decision-making, and the “testimonies,” which are practices rooted in nonviolence, equality, simplicity and truth-telling.

I argue, following Punshon and others, that the future of the Friends Church relies on its ability to draw on the distinctives of its tradition while continuing to contextualize those distinctives within today’s participatory culture (Punshon 2001: 357–59). Simply put, if Quakers wish to remain Quaker the way forward includes reaching back; tradition is the only grounds for innovation. Only a revitalization that includes the mission and practices of the Quaker tradition will give reason for hope.

TRADITION, MISSION AND PARTICIPATORY CULTURE

In the previous section, background information was provided to explain the development of Quakerism as it stands today in America. Given the fragmentation and loss of identity, the tradition is in crisis. The way out of this crisis involves apprentices within the tradition retrieving resources within their tradition and reinterpreting them within today’s context.

I argue that this retrieval and reinterpretation is the responsibility of the apprentices, or those who have been steeped in the narrative and practices of their tradition, and are consequently the ones most affected

not only by the demise of their particular movement, but by the problems associated with their context that create the need for reinterpretation. Therefore, the model constructed is convergent in that it builds on the importance of both tradition and context, while recognizing the essential character of renewal is a participative engagement of its apprentices.

The first pole within the convergent model is tradition. The church's relationship to the past is an essential part of what it means to be the church; biblical faith is rooted in a narrative-based tradition. For the church, tradition is something that is alive and passed down to new generations. As Jaroslav Pelikan puts it: "Tradition is the living faith of the dead, traditionalism is the dead faith of the living" (Pelikan 1971: 9). However, the Enlightenment led to anti-tradition sentiments within the Western church that continues to inform Christianity today.

I experienced this anti-tradition influence first-hand as a young college student at a Friends' college. My initial experience of Friends churches and my education at a Friends college began from the perspective of what is known as the Gurneyite branch of Quakerism.⁹ This branch finds its origins in the work of nineteenth-century Friend John Joseph Gurney (1788–1847). Gurney was drawn towards evangelicalism in his theology and understanding of mission. While Gurney was in many ways a traditional Quaker—for instance, he held the traditional Quaker view on the sacraments—his teachings opened the door to newer anti-tradition innovations within the church.

Today, Gurneyite Friends have pastors, sing during worship, and often have little to no silence during their gathered worship time. Some, such as those in Evangelical Friends Church Southwest, allow the use of physical sacraments in their meetings for worship. Others have all but stopped the practice of silence as central to their worship. More importantly, Evangelical "Friends" often differentiate themselves from "Quakers" (or those they see as more socially and theologically liberal, who worship in silence and generally identify more with the Quaker tradition). It is not unusual for these Friends to see "tradition"—and what Pelikan would call traditionalism—as a distraction from how they understand and present the gospel. In many of these colleges and Friends Churches, a connection to their history is seen as a liability to attracting new members, or is simply forgotten due to a devaluing of tradition and history within our

9. Part of the ethos of that school at the time was that any public knowledge of its Quaker tradition would make it less appealing to a broad range of students, so this part was downplayed (Oliver, Cherry, and Cherry, *Founded by Friends*, 203ff).

churches today. Added all together, these elements reveal anti-tradition strands of the Enlightenment within Friends churches.

George Marsden (1991), Nancey Murphy (1996), and Mark Noll (1994, 2002) have all done work to show the connections between the Enlightenment and the historical roots of Evangelicalism. For instance, Mark Noll argues that Commonsense philosophy heavily influenced the Revolutionary generation and helped that generation overcome some of their greatest challenges:

First to justify the break with Great Britain. Second was to establish principles of social order for a new nation that was repudiating autocratic government, hierarchical political assumptions, and automatic deference to tradition. The third task, for evangelicals, was to preserve the hereditary position of Christianity in a culture that denied absolute sovereignty to any authority and that was turning against the structures of traditional religion (like the political episcopate or the establishment of congregation churches in New England) as actively as it was turning against other inherited authorities. (Noll 1994: 87–88)

According to Noll, the best place to look for influences of the Enlightenment on evangelicals is on their use of the Bible (ibid., 96). Prior to 1790, the Bible was something that people had less access to; it was something they would read together while gathered together during their meetings for worship. Leading up to 1790 there were only twenty-two editions of the Bible available in the Western World.

However, in 1790, copyright law changed, allowing for the increase in printing Bibles. From that point on, editions increased dramatically until slowing between 1830–1865 (ibid., 38). This was a remarkable shift and one that allowed for the Bible to become a book read primarily by individuals rather than communities. Noll also remarks that during this period “Trust in the Bible was religious analogue to political trust in the constitution and the analogy was sometimes drawn explicitly” (ibid., 372). These are just some of the examples of the ways in which evangelicalism followed the Enlightenment in being anti-tradition.

Evangelical Friends are not the only ones guilty of distancing themselves from their tradition. In *Liturgies of Quakerism*, Dandelion argues that “Liberal-liberal” Quakerism has become post-Christian and usurped the Bible. Much of the theological language has been lost, and as a result has drifted away from its “realized” eschatological outlook. In Douglas Gwyn’s *Apocalypse of the Word* he argues that the force of George Fox’s

(1650s) earliest message is that he believed that Christ had once again returned, was “in time” and manifest in the Quaker movement. This realized eschatology created an apocalyptic fervor among early Friends (Gwyn 1986).

In these Quaker meetings, Christ’s role is often obscured and the historical figure of Jesus disavowed. Those who find centrality in Christ are often marginalized in their experience and convictions. Many “Christ-centered” Friends in unprogrammed meetings feel they are not safe using more explicitly Christian language. Consequently, the narrative which once held early Quakerism together has eroded and been replaced with a new one:

It is argued that the understanding of liturgy mirrors in part the change in understanding of God. As God has become humanised and internalised in the twentieth century, so this ‘liturgy of silence’ is seen to be an individual event pointing not to an intimate transcendence but to an intimate immanence, or even, in some cases, self-divinity. Quakers in this framework have also moved ‘out of time,’ though not because of the imminent end of historical time, only the present is real or can be trusted. The future is no longer colliding with the present, rather it has ceased to exist. (Dandelion 2005: 6)

Instead, Dandelion argues these groups are held together by a “behavioral creed.” A behavioral creed is the “form” of Quakerism—worshiping in silence or practicing consensus—that holds these individuals together without the need for any deeper sense of the Christian narrative and convictions that formed these practices explain (see Dandelion 2009).

In both instances, evangelical and liberal, these groups fail to grasp the essential nature of tradition. This failure to thrive results from what MacIntyre calls an epistemological crisis within a tradition. A crisis of this nature is one in which certain trusted forms of establishing rationality within a tradition are no longer viable. He suggests that the movement towards a solution follows at least three steps, which I discuss further in chapter 1.

The solution to a genuine epistemological crisis requires the invention or discovery of new concepts and the framing of some new type or types of theory which meet three highly exacting requirements. First, this in some ways radically new and conceptually enriched scheme, if it is to put an end to epistemological

crisis, must furnish a solution to the problems, which had previously proved intractable in a systematic and coherent way. Second, it must also provide an explanation of just what it was which rendered the tradition, before it had acquired these new resources, sterile or incoherent or both. And third, these first two tasks must be carried out in a way which exhibits some fundamental continuity of the new conceptual and theoretical structures with the shared beliefs in terms of which the tradition of enquiry had been defined up to this point. (MacIntyre 1988: 362)

Thus, MacIntyre is an essential dialogue partner when it comes to developing a model of renewal that intends to take tradition seriously. The failings of these groups to renew tradition offers concrete evidence to MacIntyre's argument that modern individualism is "a self that can have no history" (MacIntyre 1984: 221). According to MacIntyre, the modern-self believes: "I am what I myself choose to be. I can always, if I wish to, put in question what are taken to be the merely contingent social features of my existence." This is true at the individual level, but it holds true at the community level as well. Over against this view MacIntyre argues that tradition is an unavoidable reality:

What I am, therefore, is in key part what I inherit, a specific past that is present to some degree in my present. I find myself part of a history and that is generally to say, whether I like it or not, whether I recognize it or not, one of the bearers of tradition. (Ibid.)

In MacIntyre's view, the only way for a tradition to progress is by first having the adherents, or apprentices, develop a self-awareness of the problems within their tradition and begin to discover the resources within their tradition for overcoming the crisis. This self-awareness is essential:

A tradition of enquiry is more than a coherent movement of thought. It is such a movement in the course of which those engaging in that movement become aware of it and of its direction and in self-aware fashion attempt to engage in its debates and to carry its enquiries forward. (Ibid., 326)

For MacIntyre, tradition is the means through which renewal can be brought about within a community, abandoning tradition will not bring about the kind of revitalization called for here.

Following this, the second pole of the convergent model is context. Drawing on a missiological perspective enables one to study the surrounding culture that influences a tradition, the history of that tradition, and provides a sociological look what gave rise to the movements under consideration. In the West, sacred and secular have become a dominant binary that leads the church into an increasingly isolated, inward-focused and stuck place. Too often only focused on what is considered “sacred,” that deemed secular has been treated with suspicion or avoided altogether. Missiology reclaims the reality that the church is a church-in-mission and cannot be separated out from its context. Missiology reminds the church that essential to its very ecclesiology is to be in dialogue with cultural forces, looking for where God is already at work within the world. Second, missiology is ultimately concerned with God’s past, present and future interactions in the world. As Johannes Verkyl puts it:

Missiology is the study of the salvation activities of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit through the world geared toward bringing the kingdom of God into existence. . . . [It is] the study of the world-wide church’s divine mandate to be ready to serve this God who is aiming his saving acts toward this world. Missiology’s task in every age is to investigate scientifically and critically the presuppositions, motives, structures, methods, patterns of cooperation and leadership, which the churches bring to their mandate. (Verkyl 1978: 4)

In the last fifty years contextual theology has spurred on even further developments in missiological study, enabling a corrective to earlier dominate understandings of culture. Contextual theology is the recognition of the subjectivity of experience and theology. All theology is rooted within particular traditions, contexts, and human experiences. As Stephen Bevans puts it “There is not theology as such, only contextual theology,” (Bevans 2002: 3). Quakers have done little to recognize or engage contextual theology today. The majority of writings available on Quakerism are either original texts of Quaker ancestors, histories about the Quaker tradition, or popular Quaker spiritual writings. Therefore, I am convinced that missiology is a necessary dialogue partner when it comes to considering the path forward for the church in this present moment. A number of years ago I had the experience of walking into a Quaker library and seeing the astonishing amount of Quaker history and original texts available, yet this collection led me to wonder if the tradition was

already dead. With so much history, so much looking back, one might think there was nothing left to learn from culture today.

If the first problem we are confronted with in these post-Enlightenment times is a problem of tradition, the second can be classified as contextual inasmuch as the church operates out of a classical understanding of theology, neglecting the subjective turn theology has taken in recent years (Bevans 2002: 4–5). Because missiology is concerned with the interpretation of the Christian tradition within today’s context, contextual theology is an essential component to my convergent model of renewal. For this reason, missiologist Stephen Bevans is the second dialogue partner for the model under development. Where are the adherents who are trying to progress the tradition, carry its enquiries forward, and interpreting the texts of the tradition into new contexts? Is a contextual Quaker theology possible for today, and what might it look like when it is embodied in the community? What resources are already present within the tradition and culture that might bring about a renewed community? These are only a few questions that begin to stimulate missiological reflection in light of one’s tradition and context. As I demonstrate in Chapter 2, Bevans’ Synthetic model provides the contours for how tradition, culture, dialogue and praxis all come together in a way that creates the possibility for a new contextual theology to arise.

This interplay hints at Bevans’ model of contextual theology referred to as the “Synthetic” model which,

tries to preserve the importance of the gospel message and the heritage of traditional doctrinal formulations while at the same time acknowledging the vital role that context has played and can play in theology, even to the setting of the theological agenda. In addition, the synthesis will include the importance of reflective and intelligent action for the development of a theology that does not ignore the complexities of social and culture change. (Ibid., 89)

Finally, the third pole of the convergent model of renewal is participatory culture.¹⁰ If MacIntyre and Bevans are key to developing a deeper

10. There are different methodological approaches to the question of revitalization and problems that plague congregations. As a missiologist, I have chosen to focus strictly on the dialogue between tradition and culture. There are many other areas I could have focused this project, such as: Freidman’s family therapy model (Friedman, *A Failure of Nerve*); appreciative inquiry (Branson, *Memories, Hopes, and Conversations*); social movements theory (Snow, Soule, and Kriesi, *The Blackwell Companion to*

understanding of *convergence*, then Henry Jenkins' work in the area of what is known as "participatory culture" names the specific context in which Quakers now find themselves working. Participatory culture not only names a dominant aspect of today's global context, but it also offers practices that might bring about a renewed tradition. As will become clearer throughout, I believe that Quakerism is aptly suited to thrive within "participatory" culture, because the tradition itself is at its core a participatory movement.

Participatory culture names the space within contemporary society where "older notions of passive media spectatorship" have been challenged by a new culture where participants produce the kind of media they wish to consume (Jenkins 2006: 3). "Convergence" is also a term used within participatory culture to name the intersection where old and new media collide. Henry Jenkins argues that the transition between older and new media often creates conflict, as is the case with remix culture. Complications with copyright infringement have dramatically increased since the advent of the Internet and websites like YouTube.

Another key term that Jenkins draws heavily on is poaching. Poaching—a term first used in this context by philosopher Michel de Certeau—describes an active reading strategy where the "fans" poach texts, appropriating them within their own contexts, for their own needs, and according to their own skills (de Certeau 1984). Often poaching is done in ways that break with bourgeois interpretive strategies. Poaching is an example of using texts in new ways that bring new life and new meaning to those texts. Fans who poach are treated within participatory culture similarly to the way apprentices are within MacIntyre's philosophy, and as insiders or practitioners are within the missiology of Stephen Bevans. They are all active participants who are deeply invested in their texts, practices and community and participate in the "construction and circulation of textual meanings" (Jenkins 1992: 24).

Social Movements), and participative models of change such as world café, open space technology and others (Cady, Steven, Devane, and Holman, *The Change Handbook*). Instead, I have delimited my research to the area of change that takes into account three factors: large scale traditions as it is described by Alasdair MacIntyre, contextual theology that comes out of the field of missiology, and cultural studies rooted in participatory culture. The goal of this project is to create a model that demonstrates how missiology and tradition are not antithetical to one another and how participation is a necessary dialogue partner that can bring these two poles together. The model I have created is flexible enough to work in conjunction with other models mentioned above.

There are five practices that take place within participatory culture that will be explored in more detail in chapter 3: authentic resistance, remix, cultural production, collective intelligence, and decentralized authority. Engaging in these kinds of practices often results in the formation of a sixth element: an alternative social community of resistance. This is what I will later refer to as a *renewed participatory community*. Participatory culture gives insight into how renewal takes place within today's culture through a community of participants working together.

CONVERGENT FRIENDS AND “NEW” QUAKERISM

One Quaker group has already begun this process of wrestling with revitalization within Quakerism today: convergent Friends. Convergent, in the way these Quakers intend to use it, is a hybrid of conservative and emergent.¹¹ They seek to hold together both tradition and mission. Convergent was also meant to name an impulse already happening among some Friends. Robin Mohr, the Quaker who coined the term, writes:

It describes Friends who are seeking a deeper understanding of our Quaker heritage and a more authentic life in the kingdom of God on Earth, radically inclusive of all who seek to live this life. It includes, among others, Friends from the politically liberal end of the evangelical branch, the Christian end of the unprogrammed branch, and the more outgoing end of the Conservative branch. It includes folks who aren't sure what they believe about Jesus and Christ, but who aren't afraid to wrestle with this question. It includes people who think that a lot of Quaker anachronisms are silly but who are willing to experiment to see which are spiritual disciplines that still hold life and power to transform and improve us. . . . Linguistically, it alludes to an affinity for both Conservative Friends and the Emergent Church. (Mohr 2006)

This term has since become very well-known in Quaker circles and synonymous with bringing different Friends together for dialogue, experimentation of worship, and renewal.

Convergent Friends are, in MacIntyrean language, apprentices who have “become aware [of their tradition] and of its direction and in

11. Initially, some of the inspiration and understanding for renewal was drawn from what is called the “emerging church” though the understanding has developed beyond that particular meaning (Gibbs and Bolger, *Emerging Churches*).

self-aware fashion attempt to engage in its debates and to carry its enquiries forward” (MacIntyre 1988: 326). It could be said that convergent Friends signal the emergence of a new Quakerism that transgresses the boundaries of any one Quaker group. Convergent Friends might be better identified as hybrid Quakerism, driven towards a more holistic expression of faith as it is rooted in tradition, while seeking to faithfully live out that tradition in today’s context. Convergent Quakerism rejects the binaries propounded by Evangelical, Conservative and Liberal-liberal Quaker streams of Quakerism (Daniels 2011: 87). Because dialogue with tradition and culture are central, Convergent Friends embodies the features of today’s participatory culture in that it resists the categories available within Quakerism, bypassing institutional hierarchy and bias through grassroots organizing, largely empowered through the internet and social media (ibid.). It is a decentralized group that produces new material through their blogs and local gatherings. They remix Quaker texts by applying them to their lives in new and creative ways. They display collective intelligence through the free sharing of information, ideas, and understandings of the Quaker tradition.

The core features of convergent Friends can be summarized in terms of three impulses: tradition, mission and dialogue. First, they have, as MacIntyre puts it “*an adequate sense of tradition,*” which includes a commitment to the tradition as a whole (MacIntyre 1984: 223). Thus, convergent Friends share an affinity with the “Conservative” branch of Quakers.¹² Second, convergent Friends have a contemporary cultural—or emergent—impulse inasmuch as they seek to translate and contextualize their tradition into new contexts through a variety of means. For instance, many convergent Friends use blogging as a forum for expression and making public their faith. This gives new meaning to the old idea of Friends as “Publishers of Truth.”

There are six practices that I have identified within the convergent Friends community that blend tradition and mission: practice holism rather than adopt a dualistic faith; take seriously the need to have a public presence within society; meet and worship in whatever space is available; seek to incorporate fresh ideas of what it means to be the church in the twenty-first century by offering contextual examples of Quaker practices;

12. “Conservative” here is a self-designation that this group of Quaker use to identify their sense of seeking to conserve tradition. Often these Friends wear plain dress, use plain speech, and worship without pastors in old Quaker meetinghouses, such as the historic one in Barnesville, Ohio.

work within the structures while not being contained or determined by them; place emphasis on friendships and hospitality (Daniels 2010).

There are also many Quakers who were involved with the Occupy movements in the United States and Great Britain. They drew support for this work by collecting financial support, writing minutes, teaching Occupy how to do consensus business models, calling for public silent worship, and by participating in these grassroots communities (Smith 2012). Third, through dialogue they seek an empathetic listening with diverse Quakers. Thus, there is what we might call an ecumenical or “cross-branch” impulse. Dialogue helps convergent Friends become aware of and draw on the resources available within the tradition as a whole. The goal for convergent Friends is to help form, join, and create timely worship, as well as to make their tradition meaningful in the present (Daniels 2010b).

The model or renewal developed here is convergent inasmuch as it participates in a dialogue between tradition and context in ways that are fully engaged with the practices of today’s culture. The goal of the model is to aid in renewal for any faith tradition that seeks to be both convergent and participatory. It is also convergent in that it draws on the language, experience and inspiration of convergent Friends as a participatory renewal movement.

In 1970, a conference of Friends convened in St. Louis for a dialogue on the “Future of Friends.” At that conference twenty-four American Quaker Yearly Meetings were present and 135 people in attendance. Everett Cattell was one of the keynote speakers for the event. In 1971, an edited book by T. Canby Jones was published containing a collection of essays birthed out of the conference.¹³ In that book was this query:

13. Since the time of the great separations in the United States there have been Friends working to bring about change and renewal to the movement. In fact, both the Gurneyite and Wilburite movements can be seen as attempts to progress the Quaker tradition; Gurneyites emphasized innovation, whereas Wilburites emphasized tradition. Beyond this, the Manchester Conference in 1895 was one early attempt to bring leaders and academics together to think about the future of Quakerism. The Manchester conference spurred on the influential career of Rufus Jones who focused much of his work on the task of reinterpreting the Quaker tradition within Modern-Liberalism. Lewis Benson’s “Catholic Quakerism” was an attempt to reclaim the prophetic roots of Quakerism. Out of Benson’s work the New Foundation Fellowship was born. This group believes that seventeenth-century Quakerism is the one true expression of the tradition and every stream since then fails to live up to that original vision (Abbott, *The A to Z of Friends*, 193). Elton Trueblood attempted to bring about spiritual renewal through the work of small groups of people committed to discipline.

What is the purpose of the Faith and Life movement among American Friends? (a) To come into unity through agreeing in a collective statement of our common faith? (b) To reconstruct the theology or find again the spirit of early Quakers? (c) To know the present state of our Society through what might be called “comparative Quakerism”: a study of the various theological types and points of view to be found in our Yearly Meetings and associations? (d) To seek through meeting together and dialogue between the various strands of current Quakerdom new life and light under the leading of the Holy Spirit—something that might be called “convergent” or “emergent” Quakerism? (Jones 1971)

This project stands within these earlier attempts hoping to usher in a new “convergent” Quakerism, which has only in recent years begun to gain momentum. The convergent model of participatory renewal developed here is my contribution to this work.

CONCLUSION

The overall goal of this project is to construct a convergent model of participatory renewal rooted in the insights of Alasdair MacIntyre, Stephen Bevans, and Henry Jenkins. In order to do this, the chapters are structured as such.

In chapter 1, I address the topic of tradition by introducing a number of central features of MacIntyre’s philosophy. MacIntyre is essential for developing a robust understanding of the ongoing nature of tradition and the Enlightenment’s impact on our understanding of tradition today. In fact, the MacIntyrean perspective is that tradition is the only grounds for innovation. Therefore, I explain what it means to think of tradition as a historically extended argument and a socially embodied community. I discuss the role of virtues and practices within that community and their impact on the adherents or apprentices within these communities. Finally, I delve into the process through which traditions overcome what

The Yokefellows, as they were called, became a prison-oriented ministry that is now a national organization (cf. chapter 6 in Trueblood’s, *While it is Day*). There have been many other attempts to bring about revitalization, from the New Meetings Project of Friends General Conference, to Quaker Quest that comes out of Britain Yearly Meeting and is meant to be an outreach program for liberal Quakers. Over the last century there has been much work done, both large and small, to carry the Quaker tradition into the future.

MacIntyre calls an “epistemological crisis,” which is instructive for the model of renewal under development.

In chapter 2, I turn to the subject of contextual theology and the impact of the Enlightenment on the church’s understanding of mission. The Enlightenment initiated a split in the church’s understanding of evangelism and social action. This split, also found within the divisions of Quakerism, is overcome through the emergence of contextual theology. Contextual theology offers a way of understanding not only how to bypass these modern bifurcations, but also the process of how new theology is developed while honoring both tradition and context. In this chapter, I specifically draw on Bevan’s synthetic model, which offers supporting framework for my convergent model. Synthesis is an attractive model to replicate because it contains within the ability to draw on a plethora of sources: tradition, context, dialogue and praxis. If tradition is the grounds for innovation, changing context is the impetus for innovation within a tradition.

In chapter 3, my emphasis turns to participatory culture. Participatory culture is the contextual backdrop and dialogue partner for thinking about how renewal takes place in today’s culture. The first task will be to describe what participatory culture is and some of the key aspects of this new global phenomenon. Then I describe the six key practices within participatory culture: authentic resistance, remix, cultural production, collective intelligence, decentralized authority, and alternative social community. These practices are the final pieces necessary to construct the model.

In chapter 4, I bring the previous three chapters together into a unified model. Building on MacIntyre, Bevans, and Jenkins, I argue that my convergent model of participatory renewal is capable of revealing insights about historical and as well as contemporary renewal movements.

In chapter 5, I test the model historically by turning to the early Quaker movement. In the process what is revealed is that Quakerism as a movement is highly participative and mission-oriented. Early Quakers were creative in the way that they read the Bible, produced new practices and theology within Christianity, and built an open-ended ecclesiology based on communal discernment.

In chapter 6, I test the model out on a contemporary Quaker meeting called Freedom Friends Church. Freedom Friends Church in Salem, Oregon is a new meeting that seeks to be faithful to the tradition of Quakerism while also being a creative expression of something new. Freedom

Friends fits the convergent model well, bringing practices and theology from different Quaker groups together in one meeting. They produce a new space within Quakerism where people who normally would not find themselves in church have found a home. And this space is distilled down into a Faith and Practice, which the community wrote together. Finally, they are open to change and adaptation by their practice of a renewed understanding of Gospel Order.

In the Conclusion, I present the findings of the research and outline questions for further research.

SAMPLE