

Cultivating Community: Influences that Unite Us
Association of Nazarene Sociologists of Religion
March 16 - 18, 2000
Charles Crow, D.Min. & Bob Lively, PhD.

INTRODUCTION

The earliest influences for unity in what would become the Church of the Nazarene show up not so much in a particular organization as in a particular historical setting. The social unrest of the nineteenth century was echoed in the religious organizations of the period and provided a sense of urgency for a new movement of God.

What we have humorously called the “worship wars” in recent years are probably minor skirmishes by comparison to the contrast between the traditional worship of the mainline churches at the end of the nineteenth century and the style of the National Camp Meeting Association.

Long before there was a nation wide Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, there were smaller groups of people in a variety of areas who were experiencing similar influences which drew them together into communities. The changes in transportation and communications at that time allowed these groups to form a denomination in a way that was particularly unique. So unique in fact that Emma Erick loved to describe the Church of the Nazarene as different from any movement that had been before, saying: “we are not a split off, we are a ‘coming together.’”

That description of a “coming together” captures the nature of our conference title: “Cultivating Community.” While many of the issues and influences that provided the opportunity for cultivating community a hundred years ago were unique to that era, the broad areas such as shared experiences, shared organizational structure, shared beliefs, shared relationships, shared leadership, and shared external pressures would be useful in describing our current opportunities for cultivating community also.

SECTION I: Sociology & Community.

In recent years it has become popular in theological and ecclesiastical circles to use the word “Community” as the most authentic expression of the Church. It’s an exciting prospect for sociologists in that community and society have been a significant focus of sociology from the beginning. Sociologists of Religion have been intensely interested in the processes of dynamics within religious groups.

Words such as “community” have particular meanings that may not be shared exactly by everyone using the word. We could assume that most of those attending this conference have more in mind than Webster’s “any group living in the same area or having interests, work, etc. in common.”

In talking about the “Eight Cs of the Web” in his book *Futurize Your Enterprise*, David Siegel indicates that the web user of today sees community as the ability to “meet and interact with people like me.” (p. 156) Perhaps it is appropriate to remind ourselves of the nature and meaning of “community” as it has developed historically in the sociological literature.

Churches, individual churches and denominations, are groupings of persons into units which exist within the larger context of culture. Johnstone (1988) comments that although it may claim a unique (namely, super-natural) source for its norms and roles, yet as the religious group organizes itself and sets about doing what it feels it should be doing, it exhibits all the features of any and all other groups. At the level of organization and structure, it is no different from other groups. ...In short, a group is a group is a group.(p. 57)

Sociology, however, and the attempt to examine the church by the use of social science methods, is frequently met with strong resistance from religious organizations and religiously committed individuals. Ronald Johnston (1988) describes the resistance of religious leaders as being based in the following line of reasoning:

Since religion relates primarily to the supernatural—that is, to forces that are usually unseen-and involves matters of the heart as well, anything the sociologist can say about religion, limited as he or she is to describing the observable, will be at best superficial and unimportant, at worst false and misleading. (p. 2)

It is, however, this process of describing the observable that gives the sociologist the ability to gain insight into the characteristics of groups including the groups we know as churches.

Sociology is not completely unified in the development of theories into sets of tools for the process of research (DeCoppens 1976). The theories of sociology reflect a fairly wide range of assumptions about the nature of Divinity, humanity, society and history. And, having developed their theories of social reality, sociologists differ about what the ideal society or community should be. Many sociologists perceived change as progress with the larger and more complex structures as preferable. However, Ferdinand Tonnies hoped that the changes taking place in the late nineteenth century would lead to a rediscovery of the smaller, face to face bonds of traditional community life (Freund, 1978). In that thought, we hear a resonance with the theological and ecclesiastical voices of the late twentieth century. Other sociologists, such as George Simmel and Emile Durkheim chose not to view social structures in terms of which structure is more valuable, but rather to simply view them as a valuable source of information.

It seems appropriate to acknowledge that we come to this study with a bias that “community” is good. We, at this conference, have chosen to look at “Cultivating Community.”

As an emerging field in the nineteenth century, sociology drew its roots from the philosophy of history and focused attention on where society was headed. The industrial development of the period was creating larger and larger cities and therefore larger and larger societies. As a group, the nineteenth century sociologists seem preoccupied with the movement of people from small towns and rural areas where primary groups were adequate and appropriate for controlling individual behavior, to large towns and metropolitan areas where formal structures and legal systems were needed for the proper functioning and control. Feudalism had given way to a society based in industrial capitalism (Cosser, 1977; Johnson, 1981; McNall, 1979; Zeitlin, 1973).

Calling the extremes of group size by different names, early sociologists focused their attention on the differences between the small social structures many considered to be a part of a passing period of history

and the emergence and operation of the large scale society. They described the movement as being from status to contract, from “gemeinschaft” or community to “gesellschaft” or society (Tonnies, 1957), from “traditional authority” to “rational legal authority” (Weber, 1947) and as a shift from the old order to the new way in which the world of persons would function. They saw the coming society as impersonal, guided by actions based on calculated, rational management which would be highly individualistic.

Individualism was seen as ideal, but in those areas where behavior was still controlled or guided by authority, traditional authority was described as being replaced by rational-legal (bureaucratic) authority (Weber, 1947). Traditionally guided informal and intimate relationships and the groups they developed were regarded as archaic and inherited from an older rural or small town, pre-industrial society. This older operational style was not regarded as having a significant function in the emerging rational society.

Even Tonnies (1957), who very effectively examined what he labeled “gemeinschaft”, a type of social structure characterized by informal relationships, treated the two social structures of “gemeinschaft” and “gesellschaft” as incompatible and antithetical. Reverting to the historical thought form, he placed “gemeinschaft” in the previous period, and implied that its continuing presence had little more importance than hindering the complete development of “gesellschaft.”

Karl Marx, who lived from 1818 to 1883, was born in a Jewish German family in which he personally experienced poverty and the impact of industrial capitalism on families (Coser, 1977). Economics formed a substantial portion of the basis of his understanding of changing social structures (Pearman and Rotz, 1981). Since the ability to control people and their behavior was seen as based in the economic power of capitalist leaders (Marx, 1912), social change was assumed to be a process of struggle or conflict (Coser, 1977).

Drawing from philosophy and history, his observations of the social changes of his time are described in a way that pictured them as a continuation of progressive history that would have predictable results (Bottomore, 1978). He pictured the ultimate conflict between the proletariat working class and the bourgeoisie capitalists, and he predicted that the proletariat would win and establish a classless and communistic society (Pearman and Rotz, 1981). The people, who had been turned against each other by the exploitive behavior of capitalism, would respond to the triumph of a rational, socialist environment by becoming cooperative and supportive (Campbell, 1981). Small groups within that socialist environment were not considered as important as the eventual victory of large scale socialism. This view set the stage during much of the rest of the nineteenth century for focusing attention on the larger group success and little attention to studying smaller segments.

It brings to us a particular concern. We must be cautious that we don't imply that the success of the larger national and international church is somehow more important than the success of the smaller units; the local churches and districts. Additionally, we must be cautious that we don't imply that larger local churches are better than more typical smaller local communities of faith.

Georg Simmel and Emile Durkheim seem to have chosen not to view social structures in terms of the natural and good progression from older forms to newer forms but rather to simply view the social structures as they observed them as a valuable source of information.

Georg Simmel, who lived from 1858 to 1918, published his major sociological work in 1908 (Simmel, 1908). Much of his earlier work was in the field of moral philosophy and of the philosophy of history.

As he perceived it, sociology was primarily the study of the forms of social interaction (Pearman and Rotz, 1981). Coming from the field of philosophy, Simmel preferred to think of sociology as a study of sociation rather than as the scientific study of society (Szacki, 1979). He focused his attention on the ways people related to each other and described society as a network of patterned interaction (Simmel, 1950). Simmel saw the work of sociology as studying these patterns where ever and when ever they appeared in history.

Although his scientific approach to observing the patterns of interaction led others to call him a sociologist (Nisbet, 1966), his work was characterized by a style that we might call multi-disciplinary today. He studied the tendency of individuals to act on a variety of personal motivations like a psychologist, the tendency of individuals to include their interaction with others in their motivations like a social psychologist, and tendency for activities to develop in patterns guided by organizations and structures such as a church, school, or government like a sociologist (Freund, 1978).

For Simmel, the person and the society were interrelated. While there is no perception of society until individuals begin to interact, once formed by the interaction of individuals, the society affects the individuals as an outside force. The sociopsychological impact of urban living is described in an article titled The Metropolis and Mental Life (Simmel, 1950).

Simmel was not entirely comfortable with the impact and expressed a liking for the opportunities it provided as well as a disliking for the loss of freedoms brought on by the acceptance of societal norms and structures (Cosser, 1977).

Without regarding one form as more valuable than the other, Simmel (1950) held that as groups increase in size their nature inevitably changes.

A group upon reaching a certain size must develop forms and organs which serve its maintenance and promotion, but which a smaller group does not need. On the other hand, it will also be admitted that smaller groups have qualities, including types of interaction among their members, which inevitably disappear when the groups grow larger. (p. 87)

The small group, with its many face to face relationships, has a simple structure that must somehow be replaced or provided for in a larger group. Large groups must intentionally provide what naturally happens in small groups. Simmel (1950) also wrote that:

More generally, the characteristics of the large group can, to a considerable extent, be explained as surrogates for the personal and immediate cohesion typical of the small group. The large group creates organs which channel and mediate the interactions of its members and thus operate as the vehicles of societal unity which no longer results from the direct relations among its elements.
(p. 96)

However, he does not seem to position one size against the other in an attempt to say one is more valuable than the other. Personal attention and responsibility might be retained in larger groups by the presence of subdivisions of the total group. He said, "Life forms that originally were sufficient for the totality have come to characterize its subdivisions, as the totality itself has increased." Within these subdivisions members still experience:

the possibilities of personal relation, the approximately equal level among their members, and the common interests and ideals, by virtue of which social regulations can be left to such precarious and elastic a norm as custom... Only in those aspects in which the individual is still a member of smaller groups is he still governed, socially, by custom.(pp. 101-102)

Another exception of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was Emile Durkheim. Durkheim, who lived from 1858 to 1917, was the son of a Jewish rabbi who originally moved toward being a rabbi himself. Durkheim has been called the crucial figure in the emergence of sociology as a specific academic discipline (Coser, 1977).

While Durkheim is well known for his articulation of two types of societies with two different types of social bonds (Durkheim, 1947), he also “recognized that without some smaller groups to serve as a moral base and buttress for the individual, anomie would be even more widespread” (Shils, 1951, p. 45).

The mechanical solidarity of smaller, less sophisticated societies was contrasted with the organic solidarity of the larger, more complex societies (Durkheim, 1947). While smaller societies were seen to have a collective conscience in an environment with low division of labor, the larger societies with high division of labor relied on interdependence of the societal parts to create a societal conscience. In both cases the solidarity that emerged provided a set of general rules or expectations which governed relationships (Gusfield, 1975).

Durkheim suggests that societies of all sizes provide the general rules or expectations which guide relationships and interpersonal interaction. He perceived religion to be a valuable part of a society that raises the societies’ rules and expectations to the level of a sacred obligation. Religion itself did not provide the normative values, it simply reflected societies’ norms (Durkheim, 1915).

Max Weber appears to have viewed larger and more complex structures as better. Weber, who lived from 1864 to 1920, was born nineteen years before the death of Karl Marx in 1883 but was raised in a Protestant, cultured bourgeois family environment. The works of Marx and Friedrich Nietzsche significantly influenced his intellectual development (Coser, 1977). Like most of the early sociologists, Weber was multi-disciplinary. His academic background included economics as well as history, politics, law, art, literature, and religion (Freund, 1978).

Although he stated that sociology was “a science concerning itself with the interpretive understanding of social action and thereby with a causal explanation of its course and consequences” (Weber, 1978, p. 4), his work reflects a tendency to approach sociology from a cultural, historical perspective rather than a scientific process (Weber, 1930). For example, Coser (1977) suggests Weber believed that while behavior in the past had generally been motivated by tradition, affect, or value oriented rationality, in Western society it had changed to become driven by goal oriented rationality.

This echos the particular concern expressed earlier in this paper. We must be cautious that we don’t inadvertently replace the “tradition, affect, or value oriented rationality” of the early Nazarenes with a goal oriented rationality as we move into the next century.

Like most of the early sociologists, Weber saw the world and its’ societies moving toward a rational, legal, scientific style of operation. The development of the market economy during the industrial period and the emergence of bureaucratic organizations were closely related in Weber’s view (McNeal, 1978).

He believed that bureaucratic organizations were the best way to organize and control resources and power in such an environment. Weber (1946) said:

The decisive reason for the advance of bureaucratic organization has always been its purely technical superiority over any other form of organization. The fully developed bureaucratic mechanism compares with other organizations exactly as does the machine with the nonmechanical modes of production. (p. 214)

Weber used ideal types as reference points for identifying differences and similarities when evaluating real groups and organizations (Coser, 1977). He did not claim that any particular group was a perfect representation of the ideal type. Rather, he described the ideal type as being what “could be” based on logical reasoning. By measuring “real” groups or organizations he was studying against the “ideal” rather than against each other he was able to evaluate each more fairly and describe them more accurately.

Weber (1947) developed a typology of legitimate authority in which he suggested three ideal types: traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal.

Traditional organizations are formed on relationships and traditions. In these organizations, responsibility is assigned on the basis of long standing relationships. Decisions are made on the basis of precedents. Traditional authority is based on “an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority under them” (Weber, 1947, p. 328).

Charismatic organizations are based on the “charisma” of the leader. Weber’s use of the term charisma was drawn from the New Testament. Jesus was the example he used. A “charismatic leader” claims supernatural authority and his followers believe that claim. The charismatic leader breaks with traditions and establishes new patterns. Jesus’ statements, “You have heard that it was said... but I tell you...” (Matthew 5:38, New International Version Bible, 1984) are representative of the language used by Weber’s typical charismatic leader. In popular use “charisma” has come to mean merely dynamic personality, but in Weber’s ideal type, the term referred to a claim to authority that was not based in the group or granted by another authority. The apostle Paul claims this type of authority in his letter to the churches of Galatia when he introduces himself as “an apostle, sent not from men nor by man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father.” (Galatians 1:1, NIV, 1984)

In the charismatic organization, responsibilities are assigned and decisions are made by the leader. The followers accept the leader’s right to do this. Since the charismatic organization revolves around the leader, it does not persist as a charismatic organization beyond his leadership. If the organization survives, “Routinization of charisma” occurs, which often results in a rational-legal organization.

For Weber (1947), charismatic authority rests “on devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual person” (p. 328).

Rational-legal organizations are more commonly known as bureaucracies. In these organizations responsibility is assigned on the basis of rational criteria and election. Decisions are made according to established procedures and policies. The participants in these organizations believe “in the ‘legality’ of patterns of formative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands” (Weber, 1947, p. 328).

Mouzelis (1968) describes the rational-legal organization as “a system of control based on rational rules, rules which try to regulate the whole organizational structure and process on the basis of technical knowledge and with the aim of maximum efficiency” (p. 39).

The current community theme in theological and ecclesiastical circles suggests that we may be drawn to Tonnies thought that bigger is not better for all things. Smaller classes are now generally regarded as better for education. Smaller and less complex structures may prove better for many things.

Ferdinand Tonnies, who lived from 1855 to 1936, is most recognized for his work titled *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (Tonnies, 1971). Like other nineteenth century sociologists, Tonnies drew from more than one academic discipline and develops his theories with a multi-disciplinary style. He drew the biological, psychological and sociological aspects of human social life together in his study of society but worked to bridge these and the broad historical and philosophical, nineteenth century styles to the twentieth century analytic sociology (Szacki, 1979).

Tonnies viewed the world and its structures as inevitably changing. Rather than looking at the new structures in terms of the historic economic events which were driving them and the structures of businesses and organizations, he looked at the changes that were taking place in the social structures. His attention was drawn to the loss of community and its’ replacement by non-communal societies and cities (Nisbet, 1966).

For Tonnies (1957), *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft* represented ideal and polar types of social relationships. *Gemeinschaft* is a type of social organization characterized by primary relationships with emphasis upon tradition, consensus, informality and kinship. *Gesellschaft* is at the opposite end of the continuum where social relationships are rational, formal, expedient, and impersonal.

While Tonnies acknowledged the reciprocal nature of the two forms, he tended to dwell on the positive characteristics and results of *gemeinschaft* and the negative characteristics and results of *gesellschaft*. Although careful to support the scientific method, Tonnies was comfortable to articulate his value judgements as he developed his typology (Bell and Newby, 1974). Tonnies hoped that the social upheaval at the end of the nineteenth century would lead to a rediscovery of the organic, *gemeinschaft* bonds of traditional community life (Freund, 1978).

Cultivating a nation wide community of like minded believers at the end of the nineteenth century was far more possible than at any point in preceding history. The changes in transportation and communication had changed the meaning of “Living in the same area...” to such an extent that at least the leaders were able to cultivate an “organization characterized by primary relationships with emphasis upon tradition, consensus, informality and kinship” (Tonnies, 1957).

SECTION II: Historical Influences for Unity

I. Shared Environment and Experience: Politics, Society and Economy

The Church of the Nazarene came into existence during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, one of the most exciting and complex periods in our history. The beliefs and actions of the first Nazarenes were molded by the same environment and experiences that influenced American Society at large. During this

period, the country moved quickly beyond the divisiveness and destruction of the Civil War to become a major industrial power and to take its place among the great nations. In the process, the nation transformed itself from a society that was predominantly rural and agricultural to one that was largely urban and industrial. Advances in transportation, communications, and material culture radically altered the pattern of people's daily lives.

Tremendous economic growth was a hallmark of the Gilded Age was. However, the resulting prosperity also brought great inequality and widespread poverty. Enormous wealth produced decadence and corruption while poverty was accompanied by a variety of destructive social ills such as drunkenness and prostitution. Unchecked economic growth resulted in economic instability that produced periodic panics and depressions. There were major economic disruptions in 1857, 1873, 1893, 1907-08, and 1919-20. These events affected people at all levels of society, but, had a disproportionate impact on the poor.

An increasingly dominant middle class responded aggressively to the problems of the day and in the process created the most significant reform movement in American history. Progressives worked for political, economic, social, and moral reforms at the national, state, and local levels. For convenience sake progressivism is often referred to as a movement but it would be more accurate to view it as a mentality or mindset. That mentality was quintessentially middle-class, cosmopolitan and optimistic, preoccupied with order, efficiency and productivity, deeply concerned with corruption and social injustice. The inevitable progressive response to political, economic and social problems was to aggressively work for change through cooperation and organization.

The South was distinctive. Largely rural and agricultural, the region still suffered from the material and psychological effects of the Civil War. Progressivism had some impact south of the Mason Dixon Line but the South also produced its own brand of reform. Southern Populism was a rural insurgency, rooted in the fear and frustration created by poverty and injustice. The mind of the southern reformer was less optimistic and more defensive than his more fortunate northern cousins but still strongly inclined toward progress and humanitarian concern.

The early Nazarenes were very much people of their time. The dominant personalities of the movement were in many respects progressives. They were deeply anxious about the moral condition of the nation and equally committed to reforming American society. While the mainline churches responded to social problems with a secularized Social Gospel, Nazarenes and other holiness people were convinced that the transforming power of the Holy Spirit offered the only hope of true reform.

II. Shared Environment and Experience: Religious Roots

The religious roots of the Church of the Nazarene lay in the Holiness Revival which began just before the Civil War. This was in some respects a continuation or renewal of the Second Great Awakening that had transformed the nation in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Distinguished by an emphasis on the Wesleyan doctrine of sanctification, holiness people were unique in their intense desire for Christian perfection achieved through a second work of grace. Beginning within the northern Methodist Church in 1858, the movement eventually constituted a substantial minority within that body. However, the movement claimed adherents from many other denominations including, Wesleyan and Free Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Quakers, and others. Motivated by concerns for the increasing wealth and secularism of the churches, the movement was also in part a reaction against the forces of modernism which were seen as undermining faith. However, unlike fundamentalism, the holiness movement was not

primarily defensive. It instead took the form of a renewal or reform movement within the churches. Contrary to some interpretations, the movement was not predominantly rural, except in the South. Although rural people played a significant role in the movement, many of the early leaders and participants were urban and middle-class.

Within the Methodist Church there were some Bishops who adhered to the holiness doctrine and experience; however, the church hierarchy was at best lukewarm toward the movement. For this reason, in the years following the Civil War, holiness people channeled their energies through independent holiness associations such as the National Camp Meeting Association and the National Holiness Association. There was a rapid proliferation of such groups around the country working for renewal in the churches by means of camp meetings and revivals. Many of these para-church groups supported holiness periodicals with names like the Christian Standard and The Guide to Holiness. They also founded colleges. Asbury College, Taylor University and Malone College were all products of this movement. In addition to their doctrinal distinctiveness, the holiness groups were remarkable for their commitment to evangelization and their vigorous home and foreign missions efforts. Home missions went beyond church planting to active social work. In addition to meeting the short-term material needs of the poor, holiness social work aimed at a long term solution to poverty by providing a church home for poor. The experience gained in organizing and running these holiness organizations would later prove critical in the creation of the Church of the Nazarene.

The holiness associations contained some people who were radical come-outers and champions of non-denominationalism. There were also a great many moderates who desired to stay within the established churches. However, by the early 1890's opposition to holiness groups from the Methodist Episcopacy stiffened. Methodist bishops were caught between the increasingly influential modernists and advocates of the social gospel on one side and holiness enthusiasts on the other. Something had to give, and increasing pressure was brought to bear on the holiness people. At the same time there was a sustained attack on the doctrine of holiness from within the church. Many moderates realized that if they wished to adhere to their holiness ways and continue with vital evangelical work they would have to leave the church. This they did in a number of ways. Some formed new holiness groups such as the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America on the east coast and the Texas Holiness Association in the South. In some cases, individuals and groups left to form missions such as Phineas Bresee's Los Angeles Church of the Nazarene. Some joined established holiness denominations such as the Free Methodists although a strong anti-denominational bias often precluded that option. By the mid-1890's there was a proliferation of new holiness groups operating largely outside of established denominations.

While the most radical holiness people were happy to continue in that manner, moderate leaders quickly discovered the paradoxical nature of their situation. Needing freedom to pursue a more vigorous evangelicalism they had left the church and adopted congregational forms of church government. However, it soon became clear that the small groups, congregations, and missions lacked the resources and organizational capacity to accomplish ambitious home and foreign missions projects effectively. In addition, the disruptive activities of radicals focused attention on the need for order and discipline within the organizations. These conditions eventually led to calls for stronger supervision and caused some to reconsider the church question and look to the possibility of unification. That impulse eventually motivated the leaders of several small holiness groups to create the Church of the Nazarene in 1907-08.

III. Shared Doctrine

Timothy Smith has argued that the single most significant unifying force among the first Nazarenes was a shared spiritual experience of tremendous emotional power.(Smith, Holiness, 210) Living in an age of doctrinal apathy when ecstatic religious experience is often held in some suspicion, it is difficult for us to fully grasp the importance of the doctrine and the experience of sanctification to the early Nazarenes and the degree to which it was the driving force behind everything that they did. The tremendous effort that went into the founding of the church and the strenuous evangelicalism that characterized the first Nazarenes was energized by their enthusiasm and obsession with the transforming experience of holiness. That fact that the Church of the Nazarene was seen as a marvelous instrument of holiness also goes a long way toward explaining the tremendous enthusiasm and love early Nazarenes had for their church.

The doctrine of entire sanctification was not new. Since the eighteenth century Methodists had recognized it as a distinctive part of their own tradition. They had not, however, for the most part accorded it great importance. Groups who emphasized holiness were often made to feel unwelcome in the church. With the advent of the holiness revival the doctrine was rehabilitated in a somewhat Americanized form and given a position of primary importance. One author has described this as "John Wesley gone to camp meeting."(Bassett, 74) This American holiness doctrine was somewhat simpler and less nuanced than Wesley's original doctrine. There was more emphasis on the immediacy of the experience, a stress on human volition rather than free grace, and a tendency to focus on the experiential rather than the relational aspects of sanctification. These modifications undoubtedly made the doctrine more compelling in the late nineteenth - early twentieth century American environment. The original Wesleyan doctrine although at times neglected, remained an important point of reference. (Bassett, 73-76)

There were occasional disputes over the exact nature of the second work of grace. Ideals drawn from the Oberlin and Keswick traditions led some to adopt a more mystical approach to sanctification and to see the work of the Holy Spirit as a bestowal of power rather than a cleansing. (Smith, Holiness, 25) However, for the most part, early Nazarenes remained of one mind regarding sanctification, choosing to battle instead over matters of church polity and other non-essential issues. These conflicts were often intensified by the cleavage that existed between rural and urban traditions in the holiness movement. Phineas Bresee tended to be more flexible on doctrinal matters particularly those that he considered to be non-essential. Bresee's policy was to embrace what was essential to holiness and to leave nonessentials to "personal liberty."(Smith, Holiness, 193) Those from the rural tradition tended to be more dogmatic, particularly in their stand against what they considered to be worldliness. In spite of this it must be noted that at times all parties appear to have acquiesced in a policy of creative avoidance by refusing to allow controversial issues such as faith healing and dispensationalism to interfere with progress toward important goals. The margin between success and failure in the early days of the church was often to be found in the gracious and conciliatory attitude of exceptional leaders.

IV. Shared Leaders and Relationships

Critical to the development of a shared Nazarene identity was the availability of skilled leaders who were respected by church people and who could work effectively with each other. Leaders such as Phineas Bresee, H.F. Reynolds, C.W. Ruth, C. B. Jernigan, Bud Robinson, J.B. Chapman and many other talented men and women. These were the heroes of the movement. They differed in many respects. Some were more charismatic than others and some possessed idiosyncrasies. However, there were certain common characteristics that endeared them to the early Nazarenes and made them indispensable for the survival

and success of the denomination. They firmly believed in the absolute necessity of sanctification for the higher Christian life and all claimed the experience. Most of the early Nazarene leaders made substantial personal sacrifices to further the cause of holiness.

Traveling thousands upon thousands of miles in the service of the church, some appear to have literally worked themselves to death. The more cosmopolitan among them held to a national vision for the Church of the Nazarene and the cause of holiness. Such men respected the Wesleyan tradition and were strong supporters of education. Others who were more parochial had to overcome their suspicion of "ecclesiastical machinery" but were admired for their strong stand against worldliness and dedication to the cause. The fact that these leaders developed strong relationships with each other was critical to the young church. This did not happen by accident. They wrote, they rode the rails and they used the telegraph. They overcame disappointment and learned to live with each others quirks. We still talk about them today, we name our buildings after them. They are the shared heroes of the church.

V. Shared Organizational Structure

The first decade of the Church of the Nazarene coincided with the last years of the Progressive Era. The primary concerns of church leaders related to survival and growth. Doctrinal issues were important but not necessarily controversial. The most serious problems of the period related to issues of church administration. There was always a tension between a divisive congregationalism and unifying denominationalism. Within the original founding groups there were many who greatly feared the power of the episcopacy to undermine piety. For this reason, the nature and power of the superintendency was always a sensitive issue, even before the 1908 union. Conflicts such as the Seth Rees affair in 1916-17, awakened leaders to the dangers of sectarianism and the need for stronger leadership.

Apart from fears of secession and disorganization, there was still a strong national vision among major leaders, and that combined with their enthusiastic feelings toward the new church led them to work vigorously for unity. In addition, there were certain internal imperatives that worked in favor of unity. The needs of large and complex home and foreign missions programs required strong leadership and organization by the General Boards of the church. The same was true of the educational needs of the church which were taking on increasing importance.

The 1920's began inauspiciously with the country in the grip of a depression. This was perhaps an omen that the church's second decade would be nothing like the first. Many of the founders were gone replaced by a new generation of leaders, many of whom had no experience of any church but the Church of the Nazarene. The American people had lost interest in reform. Progressivism was dead, or at least dormant, as was the optimistic mentality that had accompanied it. Many Americans were disillusioned by the horrors of the Great War. The culture of the Roaring Twenties represented a rejection of Victorian morality and much of what Nazarenes believed in. This was the era of ragtime, flappers and bathtub gin, women voting and labor unrest, all threatening and demoralizing to Nazarenes. In response the church turned in on itself and in the process became more conservative and isolated. Social work was increasingly neglected. Caught between fundamentalism on the right and Pentecostalism on the left Nazarenes were forced to reevaluate who they were. Like other evangelicals they were besieged by anxieties. They feared that the intensity of the holiness experience was being lost, they feared backsliding, they feared that their children were drifting away from the faith

Paradoxically this difficult period witnessed steady growth and produced some of the most important

organizational advances in the history of the Church. A financial crisis in 1923 provided the impetus for a reorganization of the cumbersome board system. A General Board with a streamlined committee system was created to oversee the affairs of the church. Younger leaders such as R.T. Williams worked hard to achieve efficiency and austerity. Among other important changes was a reorganization of the Publishing House that established the business on a profit-making basis. The Herald of Holiness and The Other Sheep were seen by the leadership as an effective means for instilling denominational loyalty. Painful austerity measures reduced the number of foreign missions and streamlined mission administration. On the home mission front a new generation of talented District Superintendents produced steady church growth, even during the depression. In the field of education steady progress was made toward improving the liberal arts colleges and consolidating church control over the schools. Concerns for the youth of the church resulted in the creation of the NYPS in 1923 as well as an increased emphasis on Sunday School.

These changes represent only the most significant developments in a steady process of growth and organizational maturation that lasted through the depression and World War II. In many respects the creation of Nazarene Theological Seminary in 1945 served as a fitting conclusion to a challenging period of sustained progress. By that time the organizational structures of the General Church had become a significant element in the creation of a strong sense of shared institutional identity among Nazarenes. In 1962, on the completion of his history of the first twenty-five years of the Church of the Nazarene, Timothy Smith was convinced that the commitment and enthusiasm of Nazarenes for their church was as intense as it had been fifty years before. (Smith, Holiness, 349-50)

SECTION III: Present day influences for Unity

In section I, we looked at the continuum along which people organize their relationships. Tonnies (1957) provided an understanding of the way groups are structured and operate along a continuum between ideal types he labeled Gemeinschaft (community) and Gesellschaft (society). Gemeinschaft is a type of social organization which is “based on friendship, on neighborliness, and on Blood relationships” (1957, p.5). It is characterized by informal processes, face to face relationships, tradition, and consensus decision making. It is the old fashioned community where they didn’t need a lot of written rules because everybody knew everybody and they all knew what was expected of them.

Gesellschaft is at the opposite end of the continuum where relationships are formal, structured, expedient, and guided by procedures and policies. When the group is so large that everybody cannot know everybody and there is no good way for consensus to guide the actions of the group, a Gesellschaft emerges which replaces the informal with the formal. Unwritten rules must be written down and procedures must be developed which will guide the decision making process of the group.

The shift from the 1908 Manual with its broad statements to the very clearly articulated 1997-2001 Manual would suggest that we have become a very well structured organization. On the hand, a significant number of our leadership from all around the world actually know each other by first name and relate to each other as much as friends as they do as they relate to each other as organizational professionals.

The task of cultivating actual “community” as compared with “society” is made more complex by the genuinely international nature of our organization. Societal trends are not at the same place or even

moving at the same pace in all of the world areas.

In the early days of the denomination we could be described as an American Church with a world missions program. By itself, this focus aided in the process of cultivating community among the various groups that came together to form the denomination. As we have become an International Church, that focus has changed and United States churches are now adjusting to the idea that the United States itself is considered a “Mission Field.”

As we look at the issues and influences related to how we cultivate community in the early part of the 21st century, we see some similarities with the early part of the 20th century, and some significant differences as well.

I. Shared external pressures

The external environment of the early 20th century was marked by dramatic changes in many fields. Advances in transportation and communication technologies were shrinking the world to such a degree that like minded groups from various parts of North America were not only able to discover each other, but able to communicate and ultimately to gather at Chicago and Pilot Point to create a nation wide denomination.

The external environment of the early 21st century is also marked by dramatic changes in many fields. Transportation advances now make it possible to literally be anywhere in the world in less than twenty four hours. Communication advances make it possible to connect persons textually, visually and by voice using commonly available equipment nearly anywhere in the world. The shrinking world of one hundred years ago could barely imagine the shrinking world of today. One hundred years ago, we would have been more comfortable describing only the external influences of North America. Today we must attempt to at least recognize the external environment of the entire world.

Nations that didn't exist one hundred years ago now are taking their place in the world order. While we share a global environment, the adoption of technological and societal advances into the every day life of individuals is not the same for all peoples in all parts of the world. Nazarenes in North America and other highly technologically advanced countries have the opportunity to access and use the internet and other electronic gadgets in ways that may be years away for Nazarenes in other world areas.

In the United States, we have witnessed changes that are almost shocking. Harry Dent, in his book The Roaring 2000s (1998), provides a very compelling quick look:

- * Farm work comprised 70 percent of the jobs in our economy in 1820, dropped to 43 percent by 1890, and now comprises a mere 1.9 percent.
- * Factory work comprised about 50 percent of our economy and 40 percent of our economy and 40 percent of our workforce in the 1940s and is now at 15 percent and falling.
- * Managerial, professional, technical, service, and clerical work comprised only 4 percent of the jobs in 1850, 13 percent of the jobs in 1900, and now make up the overwhelming majority of the jobs in the American economy. (p. 57)

Dent also confirms a long standing observation of mine that there are large numbers of people moving up to the higher levels on Maslow's hierarchy of motivation. In the United States workers are “increasingly

being redirected into self-managing teams that make their own decisions. ...These workers are developing self-esteem instead of simply belonging and conforming to the system.”

They are moving from a sense of motivation that is based in “belonging” to being motivated internally to achieve their best. They are shifting from being directed by others to being self directed. They are shifting from “belonging” to “esteem.” What they are looking for from their churches and other social institutions is a partnership to assist them in their spiritual quest of becoming all that they can become.

Daniel Yankelovich describes a similar shift in the American population from an Ethic of Self-Denial to an Ethic of Self-Fulfillment. He suggests that the shift from an orientation to life that was directed by others to a self directed way of living started taking place about the middle of the twentieth century.

Fewer and fewer people are looking for a place to join and a responsibility to assume. In fact, most of us are looking for a way to quit some things rather than a new group with the opportunity for some new responsibilities.

Tex Sample suggests two new directions that are now characterizing baby boomers:

1. A search for deeper and more lasting relationships. “They know vividly now that the intrinsic value of life and its emotionally expressive possibilities will not happen apart from deep and lasting relationships.
2. An increasing desire to “give themselves to something important, something that counted.”
(Sample, 17)

These descriptions of the directions in which the people are moving give us insight into the ways in which we will be able to cultivate community in the twenty first century. Changes in the way people relate to each other and to their own sense of mission as a Christian are not new. The Church of the Nazarene was born of individual participants wanting a church that would be a reflection of who they were in Christ and how they wanted to worship and live. The technological changes of one hundred years ago allowed various like minded groups to find each other and form a new denomination. The technological changes of the current age will allow like minded individuals to find each other on the internet and connect in ways that we have only begun to imagine.

E-mail is considered “high touch” by much of the population under fifty years old today. Connections with individuals thousands of miles away have become possible for even those of modest means. The risk is high, but the opportunity to utilize the technology for the cultivation of community is also high.

In Nebraska, where the Crow brothers grew up, the teens on the District could only be together to cultivate a district community at camp and maybe at Assembly and NYPS Convention. Today, even on a District as far flung as Alaska, the teens can connect daily if they choose to. A “community of reference” can and does exist today that is helpful and supportive in many of the ways that an older model face to face community was as we began our denomination.

As band width problems are solved, virtually free voice conversations via the internet will become as common as e-mail is today. We are on the edge of a communication change as dramatic as the change that took place following the invention of the printing press.

Innovation and invention does change the church even though it is not often created by the church. At the time Gutenberg invented the printing press there were only about 300 Bibles in the world. Carefully protected and studied by church scholars, the Bible was not really available to the common person. The church held the keys to access to the scriptures. It was the following years and centuries that brought new forms of doing church in which each person has direct access to scripture and many avenues of participation.

Management and the ability of leaders to shape and guide the direction of churches has been a key function of denominations, but the role of management itself is changing in technologically advanced countries as more and more workers are connected directly with each other rather than being connected through a managerial hierarchy. The investment in network systems that we are making today is the first step necessary to fundamentally change the way in which members of the Church of the Nazarene relate to each other and work together to accomplish the mission of the church.

The likelihood that those systems will be equally accessible to all Nazarenes in all areas of the world any time soon is not high, but as Dent points out, people throughout the world are experiencing change.

Billions of people in developing countries, who are enjoying middle-class living standards for the first time, are now moving into the belonging stage. They will industrialize faster than we did, benefiting from our technologies, capital, and management experience. This may mean that they will move to the self-esteem stage of development more rapidly, too. The elite in these countries are already doing so. (Dent, p. 189)

We must be very aware that not every area is experiencing the same change at the same time. The corresponding issue is that not every opportunity is available for all of our people at the same time.

II. Shared experiences

The worship style of the early Nazarenes was a key point of identity. It might even be suggested that the worship style was a key point in their choice to form new churches in which they would be free to express and experience worship as they wished.

The worship style of Nazarenes today is not as likely to be the same from location to location even in the United States. In fact a growing number of churches are moving to multiple services with more than one worship style. At one end of the continuum we have a group of pastors leading their people in quite liturgical services in what they call the tradition of Wesley. At the other end we have what are called contemporary services. Contemporary is not a very exact word, but is used broadly to describe an informal service with considerable emphasis on singing choruses and may actually include music styles that are genuinely contemporary. In the middle, we have what is broadly called traditional. Traditional generally means that the church is still doing what it has been doing for most of the last 50 years.

In a recent workshop on a district in the United States, one of the participants commented that he used to be able to go from church to church and know the songs but he was dismayed that local churches are now developing their own music style and using choruses that have not even been heard at the church down the road.

One of the functions of the Camp Meetings was to serve as the music festival where members from the

churches learned new material to take back to their churches each year. In reality, the music and the preaching they heard every year at Camp Meeting were both probably the best they heard all year. Today, they can turn on the television and hear the best performers and preachers in the country virtually any night of the week.

Local church worship leaders have a very wide exposure to worship styles and appear to be incorporating what they like into Nazarene worship. It's entirely possible that a Nazarene might move to a new community and find that the Baptist church has a worship style more like what they have been accustomed to than the local Church of the Nazarene.

Worship has always been a high priority for Nazarenes. As such, worship will continue to be a unifying characteristic. However, the style of worship will not be the way in which worship is unifying.

Revivals were an experience shared by virtually every Nazarene. In the early years revivals were held every year and in most churches, two or three times a year. The revivals were not short week end events, they were generally at least a week and often longer. Like the camp meetings, the preaching evangelist and the song evangelist brought a new level of quality to local church members that was greatly enjoyed. Participation was high.

Since the evangelists moved from church to church the revival brought a shared event to the local church and to large numbers of people who might not otherwise have had such an experience. The evangelist provided news about what was happening all around the country. The evangelist was one of the best networking tools available to the church.

The role of the revival and the evangelist has changed dramatically. Many local church members would rather hear their own pastor and their own musicians than special workers brought in for a revival meeting. Their networking role has been almost made obsolete by the telephone and now the internet. Their role of encouraging the pastors and the laypersons of the church has not changed. Their role of calling men and women to repentance has not changed and their role of leading the churches in revival has not changed.

Several of the shared experiences of the early Nazarenes were related to scheduled gatherings of people. For example, camp meetings, zone rallies, District Assemblies, Missionary Conventions, Youth Conventions, General Assemblies, and General Conventions. Zone rallies are no longer common and camp meetings are harder and harder to promote.

One of the concerns facing the church in the United States is that participation in District Assemblies is falling and the delegates are frequently people who aren't working and "can go." The actual leaders in local churches are more and more frequently not sharing district experiences that cultivate district community.

Missionary Conventions have good participation, but the average age is high with Pastors and their spouses as the youngest participants.

Youth Conventions are a bright spot as we look at events that cultivate community. The NYI program is outstanding in providing experiences that are shared broadly not only in North America, but World wide through the World Youth Congress.

The informal ANSR poll taken at recent General Assemblies suggest that many who are attending are attending intentionally to reconnect with Nazarenes from North America and around the world. Most who attend are not official delegates but have chosen to participate in this important networking event. Cultivating community isn't the official agenda of the event, but it appears to be the specific and strong desire of the participants themselves.

III. Shared organizational structure - "...we own the building."

Our shared organization is perhaps our strongest unifying influence. Organizationally we are guided and directed by carefully designed processes and procedures. At every level of the denomination, the roles, requirements, and responsibilities are spelled out.

When I asked the question about what unites the churches and people on his district, one of the district superintendents asked for some clarification, so I asked "what keeps them being Nazarenes?" His response was simply: "we own the building." He was only partially being facetious. The fact that we do not sort of drift off in different directions is directly related to our organizational structure.

The strength of the organization is not in some sense of power to enforce cooperation. Quite the contrary, it is in the voluntary participation of the people.

Even when there are differences in the way the policies are carried out, the results are accepted broadly. Ordination credentials, for example, are accepted world wide, through out the Church of the Nazarene. This is uncommon. Most professional licenses are only recognized by the state in which they were issued. If a lawyer or a teacher or a counselor moves to another state he or she has to go through the process of getting a new license or being certified by the new state.

Experience tells us that not every district, even in the United States, applies the requirements for education and ordination with the same rigor. However, you never hear a comment about where a person was ordained. An ordained minister is recognized anywhere "we own the building."

Changes in the organizational structure are not always communicated easily to all participants in the denomination. The familiar way of doing things is more comfortable. The persons who are active in creating change in the structure enter into the new system with an understanding of how it is to work and who they are to talk with when they need help. The persons who are not active in creating change experience the new structure as unknown and unfamiliar. They may or may not make a commitment to the new way of doing things.

Those who have been involved in the internationalization of the Church of the Nazarene easily understand the new structure and systems, but the thousands of members of local churches who have always viewed the rest of the world as missions may be very slow in accepting what has already taken place. When they accept it they may well regard it as an opportunity drop their commitment to the World Missions Fund, reasoning that if "they" are the same as "us" then why do we still need this budget?

Our people are becoming "network" people. The organizational structures of the future will look more like the internet than like the army or general motors. As Dent points out: "Network organizations are fast, responsive, customizing, and entrepreneurial. ...Hierarchical assembly-line organizations are just the

opposite: slow, inflexible, standardizing, and highly managed, planned, and coordinated.” (p.137)

Becoming an organization that is based in a network of committed and entrepreneurial individuals scattered around the world will require us to become as clear about our strategic focus as we are attempting to become about our core values.

IV. Shared beliefs

The shared belief in the doctrine of Holiness may well have been the central unifying influence of the Church of the Nazarene in its early years. The early manuals allow for considerable variation in beliefs about issues such as the second coming and baptism, but Bresee’s voice was clearly heard to say: “In essentials, unity. In non-essentials, charity.”

We still have shared beliefs, but when talking with a broad group of Nazarenes we hear a variety of voices calling for different essentials. In a paper presented to this conference in recent years titled “Primary Theological/Sub-Cultural Identities in the North American Church of the Nazarene” Dr. Ron Benefiel identified six different theological styles present at that time.

As I was interviewing church leaders for this paper one of them, who asked to remain anonymous, commented about “the death of the Holiness movement” and said: “we have sounded an uncertain note, and nobody is marching.” His comment resonates with one of Ron’s concluding comments from the paper referenced above: “It does feel as though we are without a clear sense of mission and identity making us very vulnerable to whatever comes along.”

Perhaps Ron’s paper and concern have been useful. Since that paper was presented, we have seen an intentional focus on clearly articulating the core beliefs. Two of these will serve as examples for this paper.

The Core Values document created for the Millennial Celebration is a very important step in clarifying what beliefs we share.

- * a Christian people
- * a Holiness people
- * a Missional people

In his article titled “The Doctrinal Coherence of the Church of the Nazarene” Dr. Al Truesdale reminds us of the “compelling and defining convictions that give life and coherence to the Church of the Nazarene”. (Holiness Today, Feb. 2000) I recommend this article to anyone reading this paper since repeating them here would be too lengthy. Seven statements of doctrine are clearly articulated and the author concludes that: “These convictions constitute, unite, and inspire us.”

These are very encouraging steps in the right direction. It will take many more of these intentional expressions to sound a clear note that will challenge the people to march. As Dr. Truesdale writes:

Convictions can be renewed, receiving fresh endorsement and energy. Convictions can thrive from generation to generation. To do so, however, they must be intentionally renewed in a spirit of openness -to the Holy Spirit, to the Scriptures, and to one’s sisters and brothers in Christ.
(Holiness Today, Feb. 2000)

V. Shared relationships

Perhaps the most compelling influence for cultivating community is the cultivation of relationships that are significant enough to guide behavior. People from a variety of backgrounds gathered in camp meetings and formed relationships. The evangelists who traveled from place to place speaking at these camp meetings wove relationships from one end of the country to the other.

Evangelists were heroes. At least “Uncle Buddy Robinson” was in the central part of the United States. The general superintendents were held in great respect and awe. The district superintendents were the embodiment of the church for local church members.

Long gone are the days when a district superintendent could “place” a pastor by telling the church what they needed to do. The process of today is a consultative process. The task of the district superintendent has become largely a human resources assignment.

Somewhere in our rush to become efficient in the processes of the organization we have lost some effectiveness in the cultivation of community. Our people sense that leadership which was once defined in terms of ministry has become defined in terms of management.

The next generation of leaders may be quite different from the current leaders. We can expect that they will be motivated by different issues and goals. The bottom line for understanding them looks like this:

1. "Self directed" rather than "others directed".
Following the second world war, the population was largely "others directed" with a great deal of confidence in the orders from above. That is no longer true. They have the ability to be self informed as well as self directed. Millions of people are moving to higher Maslow stages.
2. "Bite size projects" rather than "long term commitment".
There is a new paradigm of voluntarism in North America. People are very busy and they only want to begin projects they can complete. They no longer like to support big, faceless organizational budgets or programs. They no longer compete to be Sunday School Superintendent.
3. “Blocks of time” rather than “daily involvement.”
The key players will give five hours in two time blocks.
4. "Spiritual quest" rather than "religious obligation".
There is a renewed interest in spirituality spreading across America. It is based in a desire to know and experience the divine. However, it will only result in increased church attendance in churches that are able to help them in their quest.
5. "Personal fulfillment" rather than "corporate agenda".
The volunteers of today want to make a difference in their world. They want their service to be meaningful. They want to help a particular person, or village, or any number of other things.

6. "Meaningful relationships" rather than "social club".
Networking is a reality. The local church will not be the only source of meaningful relationships for most of our participants. People are more likely to be looking for help with a particular area of their life than they are to be looking for a church to join and responsibility to assume. By the year 2010, it is estimated that 10-20% of the population will get their spiritual input from the internet. "Boomers" use the internet for information. "Busters" use the internet for relationships.
7. "Functional thinking" rather than "traditional thinking".
There is a declining interest in doing things for the sake of tradition, and a growing commitment to doing what is right, or useful for today. They appear to be keeping and supporting useful (functional) traditions.

People naturally try to form relationships. We can create forms that may be more organizationally efficient but hinder the formation of relationships or we can choose to create forms that allow people to "log on" and join in the challenge of the next second hundred years of the Church of the Nazarene.

CONCLUSIONS and OBSERVATIONS

Community, real community, is characterized by informal processes, face to face relationships, tradition, and consensus decision making. It is an old fashioned set of relationships where people don't need a lot of written rules because everybody knows everybody and they all know what is expected of them. As such, it is at its best in small groups.

The size of the group of men and women who form the leadership of the Church of the Nazarene is small enough that genuine community relationships exist among them not only in North America, but even around the world.

The current generation of leaders came of age at a time when it was still possible to know people who were at Pilot Point. And if they didn't know Pilot Pointers they were surrounded and influenced by people who were part of the first and second generations of Nazarenes. We, at this conference can talk the language of our founders.

The next generation will not be going to their pastor to find out who to talk to at headquarters about getting involved in a missions project. The next generation is already on the internet finding other Christians who are organizing missions projects throughout the world. Ten percent credit is not at all important to them.

If we as a denomination fail to move quickly to enable our people to connect with each other via the internet, they will log on to the Christian internet services that are already coming on line. Web sites have been a source of information. Today they are sources of connections. New Christian web sites include discussion groups, mission projects, job listings in ministry, music resources, chat room style Bible study, career development, message boards, spiritual guidance and a lot more. They are very interactive and a far cry from the electronic brochures and information sources of last year. For excellent examples, readers of this paper should log on to www.pastors.com and www.oneplace.com. If we don't connect our people with our people, someone else is going to connect them with someone else. Fear of people

doing things outside of our control is not a good enough reason to put off this critical task.

Becoming an organization that is based in a network of committed and entrepreneurial individuals scattered around the world will require us to become as clear about our strategic focus as we are attempting to become about our core values.

Community is the very first of the “Eight Cs of the Web.” Becoming an organization that is based in a network of committed and entrepreneurial individuals scattered around the world is a very real possibility and the very best hope of cultivating community in the new century.

Bibliography

Bassett, P. (1977). "The Theological Identity of the North American Holiness Movement: Its Understanding of the Nature and Role of the Bible." in Donald Dayton and Robert Johnson eds. *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipe & Stock Publishers.

Bell, C., & Newby, H., Eds. (1974). *The sociology of community: a selection of readings*. London: Frank Cass and Co., Ltd.

Bottomore, T. (1978). Marxism and Sociology. In Tom Bottomore and Robert Nisbet (Eds.), *A history of sociological analysis*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Campbell, T. (1981). *Seven theories of human society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coser, L. A. (1977). *Masters of sociological thought: ideas in historical and social Context*. (2nd. ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Dent, H. (1998). *The Roaring 2000s*. New York: Simon & Schuster

Dieter, M. (1980). *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press.

Durkheim, E. (1947). *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: The Free Press. (Original work published 1893)

Durkheim, E. (1915). *The elementary forms of religious life*. (Joseph Ward Swain, Trans.). New York: The Free Press.

Freund, J. (1978). German Sociology in the Time of Max Weber. In Tom Bottomore and Robert Nisbet (Eds.), *A history of sociological analysis*. New York: Basic books, Inc.

Gusfield, J. R. (1975). *Community: a critical response*. New York: Harper and Row.

Holy Bible, New International Version. (1984). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Johnson, D. P. (1981). *Sociological theory: classical founders and contemporary perspectives.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Johnston, R. L. (1988). *Religion in society: a sociology of religion.* (3rd. ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Jones, C. (1974). *The Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism, 1867-1936.* Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press.

Magnuson, N. (1977). *Salvation in the Slums: Evangelical Social Work, 1865-1920.* Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press.

Marsden, G. (1980) *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of American Evangelicalism, 1870-1925.* New York: Oxford University Press.

McNall, S. G. (1979). *Theoretical perspectives in sociology.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

McNeal, K. (1978). Understanding Organizational Power: Building on the Weberian Legacy. *Administrative science quarterly.* 23, 65-90.

Moberg, David O. (1972) *The Great Reversal: Evangelicalism Versus Social Concern.* Philadelphia: J.P. Lippencott Co..

Nisbet, R. A. (1966). *The sociological tradition.* New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Pascale, R. (1995). The paradox of "Corporate Culture" Reconciling Ourselves to Socialization. In David A. Kolb, Joyce S. Osland and Irwin M. Rubin (Eds.), *The organizational behavior reader.* (pp.18-29). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Pearman, W. A. and Rotz, R. (1981). *The province of sociology: selected profiles.* Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Purkiser, W. (1983) *Called Unto Holiness: The Second Twenty Five Years, 1933-1958.* vol.2. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House.

Siegel, D. (1999) *Futurize Your Enterprise: Business Strategy in the Age of the E-Customer.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Shils, E. A. (1951). The Study of the Primary Group. In Harold D. Lasswell and Daniel Lerner (Eds.), *The policy sciences: recent developments in scope and methods.* (pp. 44- 69). Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Simmel, G. (1908). *Soziologie.* Leipzig: Duncker and Humblet.

Simmel, G. (1950). The Metropolis and Mental Life. In Kurt H. Wolff (Trans. and Ed.), *The sociology of*

Georg Simmel. (pp. 409-424). Glencoe: The Free Press.

Simmel, G. (1950). The Social and the Individual level. In Kurt H. Wolff (Trans. and Ed.), *The sociology of Georg Simmel.* (pp. 26-39). Glencoe: The Free Press.

Smith, T. (1962). *Called Unto Holiness, The Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years.* Kansas City :Nazarene Publishing House.

Smith, T. (1957). *Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-nineteenth Century America.* New York: Abingdon Press.

Szacki, J. (1979). *History of sociological thought.* Westport: Greenwood Press.

Tonnies, F. (1957). *Community and society* (C.P. Loomis, Trans.and Ed.). East Lansing: Michigan State Press. (Original work published 1887)

Tonnies, F. (1971). The Concept of Gemeinschaft. *On sociology: pure, applied, and empirical* (Werner J. Cahnman and Rudolf Herberle, Eds.). Chicago: University of Chicago. pp. 62-72.

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: an outline of interpretive sociology.* 2 Vols. (Ephraim Fischhoff, Guenther Roth, and Claus Wittich, Trans. and Ed.). Berkley: University of California Press. (Original work published 1922)

Weber, M. (1946). *From Max Weber: essays in sociology.* (H. Gerth and C.W. Mills, Eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. (1930). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (Talcott Parsons, Trans.). New York: Scribners. (Original work published 1904)

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of social and Economic Organizations.* (A.M. Henderson and T. Parsons, Trans.), New York: Free Press.

Zeitlin, I. M. (1973). *Rethinking Sociology.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.