
Rewriting the 1960s: Is Dr McGrath Right?

Stephen Clark

Some people write history, while others rewrite it. Alister McGrath is certainly in the latter category when, in two recent and important publications,¹ he deals with the division in the 1960s between the late Dr Lloyd-Jones and other evangelicals, notably John Stott and Jim Packer. The importance of that division lies in the legacy which was thereby bequeathed to, and inherited by, today's evangelicals. Evidently Dr McGrath believes that the pathway pursued by Lloyd-Jones led into something of an evangelical wilderness, whereas the path which Packer and others followed has led into a large place full of promise. Nor is Dr McGrath alone: not a few men who supported Lloyd-Jones' stance have, in more recent years, appeared to argue that a different situation calls for a fresh appraisal and a departure from the path which Lloyd-Jones pursued. In one sense, they are right. Who in his right mind wants to be forever locked into the disputes of the 1960s? The situation has changed beyond all recognition, and men can hardly be surprised at being accused of living in the past if they fail to address the situation as it is today. But it does not follow that because a situation has changed that the principles to be applied have changed. And it is at that point that Dr McGrath's revisionism comes through: for although he has evidently studied the issue, it seems that he has failed to understand what it was with which Lloyd-Jones was really concerned. Before discarding principles, it is surely the path of wisdom to be crystal clear in our understanding of what those principles were.

The purpose of this article is to attempt to remove misconceptions and misunderstandings and to go on to consider the relevance of Lloyd-Jones' concern to an understanding of the present situation and the way in which the principles he articulated *then* might be applied *today*. Before I am accused of harking back to a bygone era and being imprisoned in a past dispute in which nobody is any longer interested, it may be worth pondering the fact that evidently Dr McGrath thinks the issue to be important, else he would not devote so much space to it. Dr McGrath can hardly be accused of living in a time warp, yet he considers this matter to merit consideration. If a strong case is not to go by default, it is important to challenge those areas in which Dr McGrath is *demonstrably* inaccurate. Only then might the relevance of Lloyd-Jones' case be properly considered.

It may be as well to stress what Lloyd-Jones was not doing. First, it needs to be said that he was *not* arguing for a gathered view of the church as over against a territorial or national view of the church. Dr McGrath, like a host of others, seems to think that Lloyd-Jones' radical Welsh nonconformity got the better of him and led him to make a particular view of the church a hallmark of evangelicalism. This inevitably made him view the Anglicans as the fly in the evangelical ointment. Dr McGrath evidently thinks that this is the nub of the issue when he writes: "Yet separatism still has its appeal: as Packer remarks, there are still those who claim that 'all true evangelicals are committed to Baptist or Congregationalist church principles'."² But this was not the issue. Certainly, Lloyd-Jones was a nonconformist who held a gathered view of the church and who thought that the territorial view was mistaken. But he had,

for years, worked with and alongside Anglican evangelicals *and continued to do so after 1966, and after his parting of the ways from Jim Packer over "Growing Into Union"*. His letters to David Samuel towards the end of 1966 and in 1970³ – the first in the aftermath of his address at the National Association of Evangelicals in October 1966, and the second after the publication of *Growing Into Union* – demonstrate very clearly that nonconformity was not the issue. As we shall see, there were – and still are – evangelical Anglicans in basic agreement with much that Lloyd-Jones had to say in the controversy that became public in 1966. In the 1940s Lloyd-Jones wrote to Leslie Land in terms which indicated that Land might find a greater sphere of usefulness in the Anglican ministry than in the nonconformist churches.⁴ At the very time when Lloyd-Jones was maintaining links with some evangelical Anglicans, he was expressing his unease with parts of evangelical nonconformity and, as his letter of October 1973 to Alan Francis⁵ indicates, there were evangelical nonconformist chapels – within Wales! – where he was declining to preach. The controversy was manifestly not nonconformist v. Anglican, still less Celt v. Anglo Saxon, and it is a pity that those who should know better continue to misrepresent it thus.⁶

A superficially more plausible analysis is that Lloyd-Jones was campaigning for separation or secession from mainline denominations. But this is a simplistic misinterpretation. Lloyd-Jones continued to chair the discussion at the Bala Ministers' Conference of the Evangelical Movement of Wales until illness made this impossible. Members of that Conference include(d) highly esteemed ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Wales. Moreover, in the late seventies Lloyd-Jones chaired discussions and spoke at the Conference when it was addressed by a minister of the Church of Scotland.⁷ Indeed, Lloyd-Jones' letter of March 1969 to Eric Alexander,⁸ in which he urged Alexander to give serious consideration to filling the pastorate at Westminster Chapel, should put beyond all dispute the fact that the issue was not a simple question of one's denominational affiliation. As Iain Murray comments on this letter: "... Lloyd-Jones ... was to maintain fellowship with ministers in the Church of England and the Church of Scotland provided they did not support ecumenism".⁹ It may be thought that the letter to Alan Francis and other public statements made by Lloyd-Jones about secession reveal an inconsistency of practice. We shall return to this point; suffice it to say at this point that it may not have been inconsistency but a refusal to allow a simplistic reduction of everything to the sole categories of black and white.

Still less was Lloyd-Jones calling for a "pure church" of the kind beloved by ecclesiastical perfectionists. His stance has regularly been ridiculed by erecting such an idea and then demolishing it by an appeal to the obvious imperfections of the New Testament churches. But such criticism is really a sleight of hand. Even the Savoy Declaration, which sets out the "gathered church" view as well as it has ever been set out, states: "The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error ..."¹⁰ Has Dr McGrath forgotten that Article 19 of the 39 Articles states: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached ..."? Article 26 agrees with the Westminster Confession and the Savoy Declaration when it states, "Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good ..." Admittedly, it goes on to state that while the wicked may gain the

chief authority in the ministry, their ministry may still be used because it is in Christ's name. However, this was to allay the scruples of faithful believers rather than to countenance some kind of ecclesiastical free-for-all, for this Article concludes: "Nevertheless it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences: and finally being found guilty, by just judgement be deposed." And let it be noted that this Article is not countenancing the preaching of heresy, for that cannot be done in Christ's name and is hardly consistent with Article 19's insistence that "the pure Word of God [be] preached". Rather, it may be dealing with a Judas type figure, who is sound in teaching but vicious in life. Perhaps critics of Lloyd-Jones' stance – Dr McGrath included – should have reserved their fire power for the real target which Lloyd-Jones erected. Such a target might prove a little too close for comfort and would certainly be far more resilient than the man of straw which has been put up for target practice. There is a world of difference between the way the New Testament treats believers who are living below their profession and the way it deals with teachers who systematically undermine the faith of God's elect. A reading of the following verses establishes this point beyond dispute: Matt. 15:14; Rom. 16:17-19; 2 Cor. 11:1-15; Gal. 1:8,9; 1 Tim. 1:6,7,19,20; 3:1-7; 2 Tim. 3:1-9; Titus 1:10,11; 2 John 7-11.

This last observation leads to the final misconception which requires clarification. Lloyd-Jones was not calling for a repeat of the isolationism and bitterness which had characterised the split in early twentieth century, American fundamentalism. Dr McGrath thus represents the position. But, firstly, Lloyd-Jones was no isolationist, and was involved in lengthy discussions with liberals and Roman Catholics over theological issues.¹¹ This extended dialogue confirmed his initial views which were gathered from extensive study of the issues. Secondly, whereas fundamentalism was a somewhat eccentric, stunted, and historically short-sighted phenomenon, Lloyd-Jones was, as Dr McGrath himself acknowledges, instrumental in re-opening deeper spiritual wells by going back to the Reformers, the Puritans, and the Methodists. Dr McGrath quotes an incident where he claims that Lloyd-Jones was too set in his own thinking to reconsider Calvin's teaching in the Institutes which, Professor Basil Hall alleged – and presumably Dr McGrath agrees – presented a very different view of the Church from that of Lloyd-Jones.¹² While there were significant differences between Lloyd-Jones' ecclesiology and that of Calvin, the impression conveyed by Dr McGrath is that Lloyd-Jones was prejudiced, rather than informed, with respect to the implications of Calvin's understanding of the doctrine of the Church. However, the following quotations from Calvin indicate that Lloyd-Jones' teaching was significantly nearer to that of Calvin than was Hall's:

... as soon as falsehood has forced its way into the citadel of religion, as soon as the sum of necessary doctrine is inverted, and the use of the sacraments is destroyed, the death of the Church undoubtedly ensues ... if the Church is founded on the doctrine of the apostles and prophets, by which believers are enjoined to place their salvation in Christ alone, then if that doctrine is destroyed, how can the Church continue to stand? The Church must necessarily fall whenever that sum of religion which alone can sustain it has given way ... it is certain that there is no Church where lying and falsehood have usurped the ascendancy."¹³

When Calvin states that there is no salvation out of the Church,¹⁴ we must balance that with his observation that we must not submit to a false Church.¹⁵ His strictures against seceding from the Church are in the context of splinter groups not separating over fundamental doctrines but over lesser things. Though the Roman Catholic Church was trinitarian, Calvin states that it was not a true Church¹⁶ and explains that there is no Church where the Word of God does not appear.¹⁷ Not every church which claims to be one is such and, as Lloyd-Jones pointed out in a letter to Philip Hughes,¹⁸ that Calvin himself was not in the Roman Catholic Church meant that his negative comments on separation must not be interpreted out of context so as to suggest that Calvin would always disapprove of secession. Dr McGrath ought to ponder whether Lloyd-Jones and those who agree with him stand more in line with Calvin, some of the Puritans, the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, and CH Spurgeon, than with American fundamentalists. It may be that what Lloyd-Jones was contending for will not then be viewed as such an eccentric blip.

What then was his concern? I shall advance the thesis that while the *formal* area of concern was the doctrine of the Church, the issue of *substance* which lay behind it was the primacy and uniqueness of the gospel. The doctrine of the Church came to the fore because, for practical purposes, it was at this point that evangelicals were in danger of succumbing to theological latitudinarianism and pluralism within the professing church. Although Dr McGrath accuses Lloyd-Jones of changing the tacit understanding by which evangelicals had hitherto co-operated, the truth of the matter is that changes in the wider church scene had led some evangelicals to change their attitude to those who were not evangelicals, and this inevitably entailed a change in their attitude to evangelicalism itself. It was because other evangelicals were changing in this respect that Lloyd-Jones changed in his attitude and behaviour towards them. The evidence for this is overwhelming. For example, as Dr McGrath observes, the 1967 Keele Conference was not an evangelical Anglican response to Lloyd-Jones' call of 1966, but had been planned for some time and set out a coherent policy or programme of evangelical action. Central to that programme was the fact that there Anglican evangelicals publicly repented of their tendency to withdraw from the wider church and committed themselves to conscientious involvement in the wider church. Keele represented not only a different approach from that advocated by Lloyd-Jones but also from a tendency which had characterised earlier Anglican evangelicals. What was the change and what brought it about? The answer to this question brings us to the heart of Lloyd-Jones' concern.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth century, Protestants in England were divided over their vision of what the church in this country should be. 1662 was a defining year, in that many who had stayed within the National Church were ejected because of their refusal to conform to the Prayer Book. Some stayed within the National Church. In the eighteenth century evangelical life in England and Wales was undoubtedly most vigorous amongst those in the Anglican fold who experienced God's reviving power rather than in the nonconformist bodies. The evangelical leaders within the Church of England were *committed* to the 39 Articles of the Church's belief, and this was certainly the case in the nineteenth century as well. Thus, although Anglicanism was a broad church which accommodated many non-evangelical clergy – as many Puritans had warned that it would – the evangelical leaders claimed that they were the true Anglicans

by holding to the Church's belief. Men like Simeon epitomised this attitude and when, in the nineteenth century, Tractarianism started to make advances, evangelicals in the Church of England raised their voices in protest. By the earlier part of this century, liberalism had made huge inroads into most of the Protestant denominations of this country, the Church of England included. This led to an increasing tendency amongst evangelicals to think in terms of movements, associations, and extra-church groupings, and to neglect the doctrine of the Church. From an early date, Lloyd-Jones's diagnosis of the situation differed radically from this "para church" approach. Thus, in 1935, the Welsh Representative on the IVF Executive Committee indicated the likely difficulty of getting Lloyd-Jones to speak for IVF because he "was a 'high-churchman' in the Presbyterian sense".¹⁹ What this meant was that while Lloyd-Jones was committed to the gospel and fellowship based upon it, he did not believe that it was right to adopt a cavalier attitude to ecclesiology, as many evangelicals of that period tended to do. He most certainly was not guilty of the kind of pietism which had, as the leaders at Keele acknowledged, characterised many evangelicals of that time.

In the 1960s, all this was to change. Evangelicals who had not taken too keen an interest in the doctrine of the Church began to do so. One of the ironic, if not amusing, features of this new-found concern was the facile and mistaken assumption that all evangelicals had been guilty of paying insufficient attention to this doctrine. Thus, at the 1966 National Assembly of Evangelicals, in his paper on Church Order, Julian Charley quoted from Calvin to suggest that the high view of the Church held by the Reformers was in stark contrast to the tendency of evangelicals to ignore the Church.²⁰ The irony was that Charley's paper presented an alternative view to that which had been presented the previous evening by Lloyd-Jones. Of all the evangelical leaders of that generation, none had worked more earnestly for serious study of the Reformers than Lloyd-Jones. It was precisely because of this emphasis and his concern to see *church* life, rather than *para church* life reformed and revitalised that he had been out of step with the prevailing ethos in evangelicalism. How far Charley was from a right understanding is revealed by his reference to the fact that Charles Hodge had evidently a low view of the Church because his *Systematic Theology* contained no section on the Church.²¹ On the contrary, so important was Hodge's view of the Church that he produced a special volume on it.²² This lack of historical and theological perspective on the part of those behind the Keele Conference meant that their new involvement in their Church was bought at a very heavy price. The benefit to be gained from this involvement was the opportunity to influence their Church for the gospel; the price which was exacted was that *within their denomination* – as distinct from their individual congregations – the uniqueness and exclusiveness of the evangelical understanding of the gospel was surrendered. In saying this I do not mean that evangelicals ceased to believe in the uniqueness of the gospel, nor that they did not emphasise this in their preaching. However, the public relations exercises, the courtesies and protocol required by their greater involvement in their church inevitably led to the perception that differences of understanding of the gospel were not truly fundamental. Inviting Archbishop Michael Ramsey to speak at the Keele Conference was a piece of good public relations, but it was inconsistent with evangelical principles and a departure from evangelical practice. Ramsey had been critical of evangelicalism and had wedded a Catholic view of the gospel and the Church to a liberal belief

concerning Scripture, yet he was invited to speak at this gathering.²³ One wonders how men such as Packer and Stott would have viewed it if the OICCU had invited the Archbishop to be the speaker at its triennial mission, or if the then IVF had asked him to speak at its Swanwick Conference on the doctrine of Scripture! Influence was to be gained by evangelicals within the Church by making concessions. Now this was a very different approach from that followed by men such as the eighteenth century leaders and Charles Simeon and Lloyd-Jones was surely not making mischief by calling attention to this.

It is preposterous for Packer to appeal to the example of Whitefield in support of the kind of approach which was adopted by those who agreed with Keele.²⁴ The words of Whitefield quoted by Dr McGrath are in the context of not allowing denominational differences to be a barrier to fellowship and co-operation amongst believers. But Whitefield was at pains to say: "God knows that I have been faithful in bearing a testimony against what I think is corrupt in the [Anglican] church".²⁵ Whitefield could be very outspoken in his criticisms of the clergy of his day. He certainly would not have had preaching with him someone who held a Deist view of miracles, a Catholic view of Scripture, and a moralist view of salvation. But inviting Ramsey to speak at Keele was to begin to go down that road. Lloyd-Jones still co-operated with those who behaved as Whitefield had done. Yet was Whitefield's stance which was now being abandoned by many evangelicals. Instead of their abandonment of pietism being the signal that they were now to fight for the gospel within their church and call upon adherence to its Articles, the leaders at Keele proclaimed that abandonment of pietism would entail greater co-operation with fellow churchmen who were not only not evangelical but who had been critical of the evangelical claim that liberal and Catholic understandings of the gospel were wrong and invalid. All this was occurring at the very same time that the ecumenical movement was seeking to push forward its agenda of the visible unity of existing churches.

A charitable interpretation of what men such as Stott and Packer were about would be along the following lines. Since men may have grace in their hearts when they are very muddled in their heads and since contending for the faith is to take place within the church as well as within the world,²⁶ it makes sense to stay aboard the ship to steer it back upon its true course rather than to abandon it, in order to seek to win back the minds of men who have the root of the matter in them. One is far more likely to win such men – and others – by courteous debate and discussion rather than by the intemperate denunciations which had disfigured American fundamentalism. Given the breadth of Anglicanism, this was the surest way of being a good, evangelical churchman. It was something of a long-term strategy, which might well encourage bright young men not to leave the fold but to become ordinands, thereby increasing the evangelical presence in the Anglican Church. Similar arguments were employed by men in the nonconformist denominations. It was this argument which Lloyd-Jones was rejecting. The reasons for this are clear. First of all, he had sufficient first hand, in-depth involvement with other non-evangelical church leaders to know that while there will always be good men who are muddled, many of the non-evangelical leaders knew exactly what they believed and it certainly was not the biblical gospel. Moreover, their opposition to the gospel was all the more deadly when they were prepared to accommodate evangelicals, on the condition that evangelicals give up their

unwillingness to accommodate non-evangelical views.²⁷ **This is the very essence of pluralism and this is what Lloyd-Jones was resisting.** It was to this spirit that many evangelicals were succumbing. Of course, if one heard men such as John Stott and Jim Packer preaching, they would emphasise the uniqueness of the gospel as clearly as ever they had done. But the new stance and the practice within the church was inconsistent with that emphasis. Those evangelicals in large denominations who did not approve of such a rapprochement with non-evangelicals were, in Lloyd-Jones' eyes, quite different from those who were pursuing this policy. It is this which explains the difference in Lloyd-Jones' relationship with men such as Eric Alexander, David Samuel, and conference members and speakers at the EMW Ministers' Conferences from his relationship with men such as Packer and Stott.

The analysis I have offered might be challenged by reference to evidence adduced by Dr McGrath that it was Lloyd-Jones who changed his views rather than men like Packer.²⁸ While superficially plausible, Dr McGrath's case is not truly borne out by the evidence. It is certainly the case that Lloyd-Jones had agreed to share in a mission with Alec Vidler, a liberal Anglican, in Edinburgh in 1949,²⁹ and that he had taken part in other events in which non-evangelicals were involved.³⁰ Contrary to the impression given by Dr McGrath, this was not only something which he did in student circles in the 1940s. As early as 1929, he had taken part in the Annual Conference of the Presbyterian Church of Wales. On this occasion a well-known liberal also took part.³¹ As Iain Murray comments, he was probably invited "as a representative of evangelical opinion".³² However, as is clear from Murray's account, Lloyd-Jones did not present his view simply as the evangelical opinion but as the very truth of God. Similarly, Iain Murray's account of Lloyd-Jones' visit to the Chataqua Institution for the "Chaplain's Hour" also provides evidence of his involvement in a non-evangelical gathering where he forcefully proclaimed the evangelical message as *the only way*.³³ His visit to the Presbyterian Church in the USA in 1937 also provided evidence of his concern to bring the gospel to bear upon the church scene.³⁴ Accordingly, the evidence to which Dr McGrath refers must be seen in the context of an unswerving commitment to the gospel and to a desire to do good to men by it. The kind of policy and practice espoused at Keele was very different. It involved accommodation to non-evangelicalism. What Lloyd-Jones' practice displays is a passionate concern to win men with, and for, the gospel, rather than the intolerant "oppositionalism" which characterised American Fundamentalism. But Lloyd-Jones was not prepared to seek to gain this influence at the expense of abandoning *in practice* the uniqueness of the gospel. Rather than change his mind, it would be more accurate to say that his thinking *developed*. The rise of ecumenicalism, the popular aversion to theological definition, together with the opportunity for evangelicals to stand apart from non-evangelicals *in order* to stand together, at a time when pluralism, was making massive inroads into the churches meant that he saw that obedience to Scripture required a very different policy from that which was pursued by men such as Jim Packer.

The positive policy that Lloyd-Jones advocated was demonstrated in his enthusiastic promotion of the British Evangelical Council. In the Luther Commemoration service at Westminster in 1967 he called on all conscientious evangelicals to come out of their denominations and to "... come into an association such as the British Evangelical Council, that stands for the truth and against

compromise, hesitation, neutrality and everything that but ministers to the success of the plans of Rome and the ecumenical movement. Come out; come in!"³⁵

Of course, this is all history. **The present-day relevance of this account is to be seen in the following.** Firstly, while it is undoubtedly the case that "evangelicalism" is much more respectable and respected today than thirty years ago and that there are probably more evangelical ordinands and evangelical gatherings today than then, the nature of evangelicalism is different and its influence not all that it may appear. Various commentators have observed the breadth of evangelicalism.³⁶ This breadth may be threatening, precisely because the definition of evangelicalism has become stretched at those very points where it needs to be precise.³⁷ Secondly, an experience-centred and mood-orientated approach to the gospel may well be an unintended, but direct, consequence of the somewhat latitudinarian approach to truth which began to influence evangelicalism in the 1960s.³⁸ Thirdly, huge changes have occurred. Some who stayed in denominations have gone further from the biblical gospel. Some who stayed in have themselves questioned the wisdom of the policy pursued in the 60s, and some evangelical Anglicans have been very critical of the stance adopted at Keele.³⁹ As for influence, the rise of the so-called "gay Christian movement" raises two questions: if evangelical influence has – as is sometimes claimed – increased, how on earth have denominations been riven by this issue? The second question concerns whether some evangelicals will leave their denominations if practising and avowed homosexuals are ordained. Some have indicated – John Stott among them⁴⁰ – that they would seriously consider leaving. Does this mean that Dr McGrath will then accuse John Stott of being a fundamentalist oppositionist? Presumably not. Which must mean that all who are seriously committed to the gospel will draw the line somewhere. It is unfair to charge those who draw it on the issue of deviant belief with being schismatic, when those who draw it on the issue of deviant behaviour are regarded as being principled. Nor can one – as is sometimes fondly imagined – simply say that *the* issue concerns one's submission to the authority of Scripture, for it is a simple, though alarming, fact that there are practising homosexuals who claim to accept the authority of Scripture but who interpret it differently from other evangelicals. Similarly, a Jehovah's Witness claims to accept the authority of Scripture. A true bowing to the formal authority of Scripture must be evidenced and accompanied by submission to the material teaching of Scripture.

Some who seceded did not have the gospel vision of Lloyd-Jones, and have been more concerned to maintain secession than promote the gospel. Some of those who stayed in have distanced themselves from theological pluralism. Some new charismatic churches which are not compromised in a denomination are, nevertheless, governed by expediency and experience rather than Scripture. The situation is vastly more complex than in the 60s. To the charge that Lloyd-Jones created this complexity by splitting evangelicalism, the reply is surely that he *exposed* a division which was there. How better the situation would have been today if more evangelicals had followed his lead!

In this situation we should:

1. Acknowledge that at the local level, there may be varying degrees of personal and church co-operation between evangelicals.
2. Recognise that what is true at the local level, may also be true at a regional or national level.

3. Avoid anything which promotes or gives countenance to theological pluralism.
4. Deal with the situation as it is today, not as it was in the 1960s. This will entail the realisation that there are evangelicals within denominations but who know nothing about the divisions of the sixties. Some of those are pluralist in their approach, while others are earnest in their contending for the faith. We need to distinguish between men who differ. This was, as we have seen, the principle upon which Lloyd-Jones acted.

References

- ¹ Alister McGrath, *Evangelicalism and the Future of Christianity* (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1993); *To Know and Serve God: a Life of James I Packer* (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1997)
- ² *Evangelicalism*, p. 41.
- ³ See *D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones: Letters 1919-1981* (Selected with notes by Iain H. Murray), (Edinburgh, Banner of Truth Trust, 1994), pp. 170-171; 180-181.
- ⁴ See his letter to Leslie Land in *Letters*, pp.58 – 59, especially his words in the first paragraph on page 59.
- ⁵ *Letters*, p. 183.
- ⁶ Even Lloyd-Jones' own grandson, as well as DA Carson seem to have misunderstood Lloyd-Jones' position in this way: see Christopher Catherwood, *Five Evangelical Leaders*, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1984), pp. 88,89.
- ⁷ The minister was Revd Dr Sinclair B Ferguson, who gave two addresses, one on Assurance of Salvation and another on Assurance in Guidance, at the 1978 Conference. Interestingly, Dr Ferguson – who divides his time between Westminster Theological Seminary, USA, and St. George's Parish Church, Tron, Glasgow (a Church of Scotland congregation) – has also spoken at the Close of Year Service at London Theological Seminary. Lloyd-Jones was instrumental in the setting up of this seminary, and its Board and lecturers are comprised of men who stood very close to Lloyd-Jones on a range of issues, including the issues surrounding the division with John Stott in 1966.
- ⁸ *Letters*, p. 216-217.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 216.
- ¹⁰ Chapter 26, paragraph 3.
- ¹¹ See Iain H. Murray, *David Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The Fight of Faith 1939-1981* (Edinburgh, The Banner of Truth Trust, 1990), pp. 313-320.
- ¹² *To Know and To Serve God*, p. 121.
- ¹³ John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Beveridge translation), 4.2.1.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.1.4.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 4.1.11.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 4.2.2.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 4.2.4
- ¹⁸ *Letters*, pp. 174-175
- ¹⁹ Iain H Murray, *D Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The First Forty Years, 1899-1939* (Edinburgh, The Banner of Truth Trust, 1982), pp. 294-295.
- ²⁰ *Unity In Diversity* (London, Evangelical Alliance, 1967), pp. 16,17.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- ²² *Church Polity* (New York, 1878).
- ²³ In *Fundamentalism and The Word of God* (London, IVP,1958) Packer demonstrated that Ramsey's criticisms of "fundamentalism" were directed as much at evangelical principles as at evangelical practice.

- ²⁴ *To Know and to Serve God*, pp. 121-122.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 121.
- ²⁶ For example, Jude 3-4 is addressing the need for believers to deal with decline which had entered the church, rather than to abandon the church because of the decline. Similarly, the letters to the Seven Churches in Revelation 2 & 3 call upon believers to *fight within* their churches. But it would hardly be obeying Christ's words if Jezebel were to be invited to expound her understanding of the Christian faith to the Church in Thyatira!
- ²⁷ See the quotations from Ramsey, John Lawrence, and the *Church Times* in *D Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The Fight of Faith*, pp. 539-540.
- ²⁸ McGrath argues this in *To Know and Serve God*, p. 122.
- ²⁹ A bad cold prevented him from actually taking part: *D Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The Fight of Faith*, pp. 189-190.
- ³⁰ *To Know and Serve God*, p. 122.
- ³¹ *D Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The First Forty Years*, pp. 189-190.
- ³² *Ibid.*, p. 189.
- ³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 274-276.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 327-329.
- ³⁵ *Unity in Truth*, ed. HR Jones, p 43
- ³⁶ See, for example, Derek Tidball, *Who Are The Evangelicals?* (Basingstoke, Marshall Pickering, 1994).
- ³⁷ The doctrine of Scripture and the doctrine of Justification by Faith are two examples. See, Carson & Woodbridge, *Scripture & Truth* (Leicester, IVP, 1983); Carson & Woodbridge, *Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon* (Leicester, IVP, 1986); PH Eveson, *The Great Exchange* (Epsom, Day One Publications, 1996).
- ³⁸ Numerous so-called charismatic congregations are not so much pentecostalist/charismatic in their understanding of spiritual gifts, but mood and feelings orientated in their worship. In this they reflect the prevailing cultural ethos. That this can be done in the name of an enhanced spirituality is only possible because the claims and demands of God's truth have been somewhat marginalised. But that process of erosion began when countenance was given to a pluralist position. Of course, men like Stott and Packer have tried to arrest the erosion process; but it was *their* policy which encouraged it in the first place.
- ³⁹ For example, Philip Jensen, a regular speaker at the Evangelical Ministry Assembly convened by the Proclamation Trust, has been very outspoken in his criticisms of the kind of policy pursued at Keele and the trend which it encouraged.
- ⁴⁰ Stated by Stott in an interview with Roy Jenkins broadcast by Radio Wales in the summer of 1997 in *All Things Considered*.

Rev. Stephen Clark MA, is minister of Freeschool Court Evangelical Church, Bridgend

Another FOUNDATIONS

It has come to our notice that a quarterly journal entitled FOUNDATIONS, published by the William Temple Foundation, made its first appearance in January 1998. It is a 32 x A4 page format, sub-titled "Making connections for Christian Action". Its aim is to provide radical theological and social thinking from an ecumenical perspective. The publishers are now aware that the BEC title has been in existence for 20 years and we have agreed that one way to minimise potential confusion is for a brief notice to appear in the next issue of each, making readers aware of the other publication.