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ABSTRACT

This thesis relates the resurgent evangelical Protestantism of mid-twentieth century New Zealand to the extensive international historiography which has emerged over the last thirty years, especially through the work of such scholars as David Bebbington in Britain and others in the USA, Canada and Australia. Understanding evangelicalism as both an historical movement and a recurring set of doctrinal commitments, the new literature has highlighted evangelicalism as a trans-denominational and international movement, sharing such features as those identified in Bebbington's quadrilateral. Weaving together the study of numerous key individuals, churches and organisations, the thesis argues that a self-aware, cross-denominational and fairly cohesive evangelical stream developed within New Zealand Protestantism between about 1930 and 1965. The thesis demonstrates that the university Evangelical Unions and the Inter-Varsity Fellowship (NZ) – both founded following a schism with the more liberal SCM in the early 1930s – were key factors in the reconstruction of evangelical identity and confidence and in the development of vigorous and expanding evangelical movements in New Zealand's two largest Protestant denominations. The two key pre-war church leaders who inspired those movements, Thomas Miller (a confessionalist Presbyterian) and William Orange (a devotional Anglican), worked closely with the Evangelical Unions and IVF, and the leaders of the post-war evangelical movements (such as Graham Miller) had been significantly shaped by the EUs and IVF. Mid-century New Zealand evangelicalism was theologically conservative, but also emphasised reason, moderation and restraint, and those values were constantly reinforced by such leaders as Dr. John Laird and Professor E.M. Blaiklock. The renascent New Zealand evangelical movement rejected extremism, anti-intellectualism and ecclesiastical separatism. It explicitly distanced itself from American fundamentalism. In its outlook and cultural style, mid-twentieth century New Zealand evangelicalism largely reflected the prevailing Britishness of New Zealand in that period, and was
strongly influenced by the British IVF. By the early 1960s, evangelicalism had become an increasingly significant element within Protestantism in New Zealand. As the movement matured, it had also become less cohesive.
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INTRODUCTION

In all the Protestant denominations in New Zealand there exist a large number of those who are called “evangelicals”...and in some they are a majority...¹

This thesis has arisen as an attempt to place the emerging evangelical Protestantism of mid-twentieth century New Zealand into the large and expanding body of international historiography which has developed in the last thirty years, and which has recognised the importance of studying evangelical types of Protestantism within worldwide Christianity.

In this introduction, the subject of the thesis is placed in its historical context in relation to both international historiography and the New Zealand church.² The argument, shape and scope of the thesis are outlined and methodological issues are addressed.

A The Historiography of Evangelicalism

The study of evangelicalism³ by historians has often been problematical. As a mind-

¹ Robert Withycombe, TSCF NI/1.
² The thesis limits its discussion of the international historiography to those countries which have most influenced New Zealand (the USA and Britain) or which have had a very similar background as British colonies (Canada and Australia). It is recognised that, especially in recent decades, various expressions of evangelical Protestantism have become very important in parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America, but such developments are beyond the scope of this introduction.
³ In this thesis, the term “evangelicalism” primarily denotes the historic movement within Protestantism that began in the eighteenth century. Prior senses of the word “evangelical” – which derives, through Latin (evangelium), from the Greek euangelion – include (1) its basic meaning “of the gospel” (as used throughout church history, and still, to denote an emphasis on New Testament doctrines of salvation and their proclamation, and sometimes to denote an ideal of a simplified Christianity reflective of the canonical “gospels”) and (2) the doctrines of the Reformation and those committed to them (and as still commonly used in or about churches that directly came out of the Reformation). Examples of the first sense can be found in Wyclif and Hus, and among modern evangelicals, e.g. John Stott has asserted that “the evangelical faith is nothing other than the historic Christian faith”: John R.W. Stott, Make the Truth Known (Leicester: UCCF Booklets, 1983): 3, cit. Timothy Dudley-Smith, John Stott: The Making of a Leader (Leicester: IVP, 1999): 15. Examples of the
set or attitude rather than an organization or closed system, and as an amorphous trans-denominational movement occurring across many ecclesiastical and national boundaries, evangelicalism has sometimes eluded attention from historians, who have more often been preoccupied with the history of denominations, institutions and key leaders. As an ecclesiastical party based on a theological position (and one that was frequently critical of other viewpoints), evangelicalism has often been controversial, and so has sometimes been inadequately portrayed by historians with other sympathies. Older evangelical historiography, penned from within the tradition, was frequently marred by hagiography, populism and polemics. It also had a proclivity to portray evangelicalism as if it were one undifferentiated (doctrinal) continuum, without regard to major variations of emphasis and expression at different times and in different contexts.

Since the 1970s the new scholarly literature reflecting the study of the evangelical movement has shown impressive development. Without denying the obvious continuities of evangelicalism with the Reformation, and with the post-Reformation puritan and pietist movements, the new historiography has argued that the modern evangelical movement first emerged as a cohesive and readily identifiable movement from the 1730s in Britain and its colonies: that the revivals, the "intense religious

second sense can be found in Thomas More's description of the English supporters of Reformation as "Evaungelicalles." That meaning has persisted, especially among evangelical Anglicans. In the continental churches that directly came out of the Reformation, the words evangelisch and évangélique have often meant little more than "Protestant".

4 See Alister McGrath, Evangelicalism and the Future of Christianity (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988): 14-17. Some, often older, historiography, especially from conservative evangelical or reformed viewpoints, has tended to see the Reformation and Evangelicalism as in a barely differentiated continuum, e.g. E.J. Poole, Evangelicalism in England (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1965) - first published in 1951, or Bernard Ramm, The Evangelical Heritage. A Study in Historical Theology (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1973): 23-40. Such approaches are reinforced by the common use of the term "evangelical" in the sixteenth century, by or of the Reformers, to denote such emphases as justification by faith and the primacy of scripture.
experience”, the characteristic “enthusiasm” and the new emphasis on evangelism jointly constituted evangelicalism a “new phenomenon”.5

The new literature has recognised that evangelicalism needs to be understood as both an historical movement and a recurring set of doctrinal commitments (such as high regard for scriptural authority, and belief in the necessity of personal faith, the new birth, and evangelism).6 Some studies of evangelicalism have included within its scope any group appearing to share generic “evangelical” beliefs, whereas other scholarship has focused only on those explicitly identifying themselves as evangelicals.7 One historian has suggested that those in the latter category could be described by the neologism “evangelicalist”.8 Such self-aware evangelical identity was fostered by pan-denominational evangelical organisations, especially those with an explicitly evangelical title,9 and also tended to be sharpened when evangelicals within a denomination defined themselves in opposition to other theological parties.

The new historiographical movement has demonstrated that evangelicals10 emphasised different doctrines and practices at different times, and were constantly

---


6 “The historical sense of ‘evangelical’ is complemented by a parallel use of the term designating a consistent pattern of convictions and attitudes,” Bebbington: 6. For the definition of evangelicalism in terms of key doctrines, see e.g. Alister McGrath, *Evangelicalism and the Future of Christianity*: 49-88 (with summary on 51).


9 E.g. Evangelical Alliance, Evangelical Union, National Association of Evangelicals.

10 This thesis notes the convention of commencing “evangelical” in lower case when it is an adjective, and in upper case when it is a noun. The latter practice is followed where evangelical people clearly or explicitly identified themselves as “Evangelicals”, as members of a distinct theological or ecclesiastical stream. But in other instances, the less definite and more informal lower case is used. In quotations, the original form is unchanged: historically, Evangelicals/evangelicals appear to have been inconsistent in this matter. The same variance is reflected in contemporary historiography.
adapting to different contexts. Noting all the variations within British evangelicalism, David Bebbington has proposed a quadrilateral of recurring characteristics that defines evangelicalism: "conversionism", "biblicentrism", "crucicentrism" and "activism". Evangelicals, he argues, are "those who displayed all the common features that have persisted over time". Some have modified or restated the formula. One of the strengths of Bebbington’s formula is that it combines both beliefs and practice. Although some have argued for the inclusion of new categories, such as Christocentricity or aspirations for revival, or have discerned "twin and rival axes" (conversionist-activist on the one hand and biblicist-crucicentrist on the other), the formula offers a widely-accepted working basis for the discussion of evangelicalism. Mark A. Noll offers as an alternative the triangular

---

11 E.g. Bebbington: 271-5.
13 Bebbington: 2-4.
14 E.g. Alister E. McGrath, *A Passion for Truth: The Intellectual Coherence of Evangelicalism* (Leicester: Apollos, 1996): 22. The four characteristics of evangelicalism suggested by McGrath broadly correlate to those of Bebbington but do not use the latter’s terms, and the category relating to “crucicentrism” is widened to become a Christocentrism which includes an emphasis on the cross: “A focus, both devotional and theological, on the person of Jesus Christ, especially his death on the cross.” Bebbington’s formula may have influenced McGrath to abandon his own earlier description of evangelical characteristics in terms of six key convictions, which included “the lordship of the Holy Spirit” and “the importance of the Christian community” – see Alister E. McGrath, *Evangelicalism and the Future of Christianity* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988: 51, 53-88).
15 It has also been suggested, though, that such mixing of categories was problematical e.g. John R.W. Stott, *Evangelical Truth: A Personal Appeal for Unity* (Leicester: IVP, 1999): 28.
17 Ibid.: 20.
description of evangelicalism as "culturally adaptive biblical experientialism", suggesting that in different times and contexts any of those three propensities might be foremost, and notes that the evangelical movement has always been "flexible", "multi-form" and "populist" (and informally transmitted by voluntary associations, hymns, and key individuals and books). Timothy Larsen has recently suggested a five-point definition that begins by identifying an evangelical as "an orthodox Protestant" who "stands in the [historic evangelical] tradition". Among evangelical leaders themselves, some have argued for long lists of defining characteristics.

18 Noll, American Evangelical Christianity: 2.
20 Timothy Larsen, "Defining and Locating Evangelicalism", in Timothy Larsen and Daniel J. Treier (eds), The Cambridge Companion to Evangelical Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 1-14. Larsen argues that while it was self-evident in Bebbington's book that evangelicalism was a movement emerging in the eighteenth century, Bebbington's quadrilateral needs to be linked with that historical context when applied more widely (e.g. St. Francis arguably exemplified aspects of the quadrilateral but was clearly not part of the historic evangelical movement). Larsen's other three points relate to scripture, atonement, conversion and evangelism.

21 In 1871, for instance, Bishop Ryle (vehemently opposed to both ritualism and rationalism) claimed the "absolute supremacy" of Scripture as the first hallmark of evangelical faith, but also stressed belief in human sinfulness, the saving work of Christ, and the role of the Holy Spirit in bringing repentance, faith and sanctification: John Charles Ryle, Knots Untied. Being Plain Statements on Disputed Points in Religion from an Evangelical Standpoint. (James Clarke and Co.: London, 1954, 31st Edition. First published, 1871. Condensed and revised in 1927 by C. Sydney Carter): 10-13, 80-93. In 1950, T.C. Hammond listed evangelical principles as biblical authority, substitutionary atonement, justification by faith, regeneration, the assurance of salvation, and the distinction between "the Church Visible and the Church Invisible": T.C. Hammond, What Is An Evangelical? (Beecroft, N.S.W.: Evangelical Tracts and Publications, n.d.): 5-8, 14, 17. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, having identified subjection to Scripture as the central principle of evangelicalism, and other familiar features (e.g. emphases on human sinfulness, evangelism, the new birth, prayerfulness, preaching, and revival), also identified such markers as a concern doctrine and for guarding the true Gospel, a willingness to oppose unscriptural beliefs and practices, the priority of evangelical commitment over denominational affiliations, a distrust of human reason and philosophy, a rejection of formalism, a concern for simplicity, and a "low" view of the sacraments: D. M. Lloyd-Jones, What Is an Evangelical? (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1992): 37-61, 68-85. The book was based on addresses given in 1971.
J.W.R. Stott, however, has identified evangelicalism with just two key markers (Bible and Gospel),
and Dr. J.I. Packer has reduced that to one. Tidball, wanting to represent the multiplicity of evangelical variables, has proposed the image of a Rubik's Cube (with great diversity within each of three dimensions: church, world, and spirituality).

B  The International Context: Evangelicalism in the USA

In North America, where evangelical Protestantism has been so influential in shaping religion and culture from the mid-eighteenth century to the end of the nineteenth century, and then resurgent from the mid-twentieth century (in recent decades accompanied by a clamorous public fundamentalism), there has been extensive historical study of evangelicalism, exploring the complexities of how it was both affected by its various contexts and also formative of those contexts. Timothy Smith

---

22 Evangelicals are “Bible people,” with a “Gospel” to proclaim: Stott, What Is an Evangelical? (London: Church Pastoral Aid Society, 1977), cit. Bebbington: 4. On the biblical aspect, see e.g. Stott, Christ the Controversialist: A Study in Some Essentials of the Evangelical Religion (London: Tyndale Press, 1970): 32 (“It is the contention of evangelicals that they are plain Bible Christians, and that in order to be a biblical Christian it is necessary to be an evangelical Christian.”); Tidball: 12-13. For a similar identification of evangelicalism with the two key characteristics of Gospel and Bible, see e.g. John D. Woodbridge, Mark A. Noli and Nathan O. Hatch, The Gospel in America: Themes in the Story of America’s Evangelicals (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979): 14. Later, feeling uneasy with the mixing of categories of truth, experience and activity evident in Bebbington’s formula and in Packer’s list of six evangelical characteristics, Stott suggested a theological, trinitarian definition, in which all aspects of evangelicalism were anchored in “the revealing initiative of God the Father, the redeeming work of God the Son, and the transforming ministry of God the Holy Spirit”: Evangelical Truth: 28.

23 The “single foundation” of evangelicalism is that all views must be brought subject to the touchstone of Scripture: J.I. Packer, ‘Fundamentalism’ and the Word of God: Some Evangelical Principles (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1958): 38.

24 Much of the literature does not relate directly to the time frame of this thesis. For evangelical roots, and evangelicalism’s relationships on both sides of the Atlantic with movements such as puritanism and pietism, and with enlightenment emphases on individual reason and experience, and then for the history of evangelicalism in the nineteenth century across the English-speaking world, note especially the first three volumes in the important new IVP series (“A History of Evangelicalism”) edited by Bebbington and Noll: Mark A. Noll, The Rise of Evangelicalism: The Age of Edwards, Whitefield and the Wesleys (Downers Grove and Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 2004); John Wolfe, The Expansion of Evangelicalism: The Age of Wilberforce, More, Chalmers and Finney (Nottingham: InterVarsity, 2006); D.W. Bebbington, The Dominance of Evangelicalism: The Age of Spurgeon and Moody (Nottingham: InterVarsity, 2005). See also W.R. Ward, The Protestant Evangelical Awakening (Cambridge: Cambridge University
and others have acknowledged the complexity and changeability of the American evangelical “kaleidoscope”. Webber identified fourteen types of evangelicalism in the USA. This is not the place for a survey of what is now a vast literature, and it will suffice to highlight the work of three historians in particular, George Marsden, Joel Carpenter and Mark Noll, and to give an indication of their overall interpretative framework for the periods relevant to this thesis.

Marsden’s writing is rich in its analysis of evangelical thinking in all its variety, and of conceptual tensions within it. Although writing from within the reformed tradition of evangelicalism, Marsden’s treatment has maintained a strong critical perspective. He has been criticised by some for having too “Presbyterian” and “Reformed” a paradigm. Carpenter has given particular attention to grassroots
evangelicalism, including its revivalistic, separatistic and fundamentalist expressions. Noll, an historian of American Christianity in general, with interests in theology and the intellectual life and the relationships of Christianity with science and politics, and with Calvinist sympathies, has written prolifically on evangelicalism, sometimes with a Canadian slant.

"The Essential Evangelicalism Dialectic: The Historiography of the Early Neo-Evangelical Movement and the Observer-Participant Dilemma", Church History 60, 1 (March 1991): 70-84 (73-6). Dayton had previously made the same criticism of Bernard Ramm: Donald W. Dayton: "The Limits of Evangelicalism: the Pentecostal Tradition", in Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston (eds), The Variety of American Evangelicalism (Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1991): 36-56 (50); Dayton was defending the holiness traditions, vis à vis that of the Princeton, Machen, and neo-evangelical tradition, seeing the former as dynamic and innovative and the latter as conservative.


In placing American evangelicalism in its various historical contexts since the late nineteenth century, such historians have discerned several key phases.

In the first of these, c.1870-c.1930, various divergent developments helped shape a more reactionary evangelicalism. These included not only the revivalism and inter-denominationalism of Moody and the golden age of evangelical Protestant missionary work, but also massive non-Protestant immigration and widespread urbanization. There were powerful new challenges to faith arising from science and biblical criticism, and the resultant ascendency of theological liberalism, modernism and the social gospel (each an attempt to retain a tenable Christianity), and the secularisation of higher education. A “vastly different” understanding of the gospel

37 In this thesis, “America” refers to the USA.
38 Darwinism appeared to question the accuracy and therefore authority of the Bible, which was at the heart of Protestantism; by appearing to erode the argument from design, it undermined the previously co-operative relationship of Christianity and science in which revelation and nature were seen to be in harmony since God is the author of both (George M. Marsden, Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism: 36). Evangelical Protestant responses to Darwinism ranged from various degrees of resistance to various types of accommodation: see e.g. David N. Livingstone, “Situating Evangelical Responses to Evolution”, in David N. Livingstone, D.G. Hart, and Mark A. Noli (eds), Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Chapter 8, “Science”, in Noli, American Evangelical Christianity: 148-182. Many nineteenth century evangelicals already believed in an old earth (understanding the days of creation as long periods of time related to geological developments) and followed Asa Gray in accepting evolution as part of God’s creation. Note Noll’s comment that “simple statements about evangelicals and science are almost always wrong”.159. Marsden (136, 139-40) rejected, as an invention of nineteenth century Darwinian crusaders such as Huxley, the claim that Christianity had always been the obscurantist enemy of science; nevertheless, by the early twentieth century, it was common in scientific and academic circles to assume that biblicist Christianity and science were entirely incompatible; for fundamentalists, evolution became a symbol of godless atheism.
39 See e.g. George M. Marsden, Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991): 32-6. The terms “liberalism” and “modernism,” in a Protestant theological context, have often come to be used interchangeably. The former term derives from the basic idea of freedom from tradition and from the Enlightenment heritage of reason applied to religion; the latter derives from the idea, much emphasised by the late nineteenth century, of adjusting the faith to the modern world (Marsden, ibid.: 32). Liberals/modernists had concluded that, in the light of scientific discovery and biblical criticism, traditional evangelical doctrines, including the reliability of scripture, were no longer credible and that Christianity must be radically modified if it were to survive. Strategies included “deifying historical process” (identifying human progress with the growth of Christ’s kingdom, and retaining the Bible as a fallible but instructive record of religious development), “stressing the ethical” (the teachings of Jesus, including the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of mankind), and following Schleiermacher the “centrality of religious feelings”, thus rendering faith immune to scientific and rational criticism (ibid.: 33-6).
was emerging, so by 1900 religious conservatives were “deeply disturbed”.\(^{40}\)
Conservative reactions included a stronger and narrower insistence on biblical
authority (including “inerrancy” as articulated by conservative theologians at
Princeton).\(^{41}\) the deepening hold of the holiness movement (stressing a supernatural
sanctification rather than natural human goodness), dispensational millennialism
(replacing both post-millennial and liberal confidence in progress with a pessimistic
and other-worldly outlook), the writing of *The Fundamentals* (1910-5), and the
subsequent battles and schisms of the 1920s.\(^{42}\) From its earlier position at the heart of
American society, evangelicalism had lost its public presence, and by 1930 had
become a “disintegrating force”.\(^{43}\)

\(^{40}\) Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*: 32, 37. In part, Marsden was quoting
eloquenty expressed conservative alarm. He saw modern theological liberalism as “a different
religion from Christianity”, “more destructive of the Christian faith because it makes use of traditional
Christian terminology”; rather than liberalising Christianity it narrowed it (because it excluded any
non-naturalistic acts of God); “in trying to remove from Christianity everything that could possibly be
objected to in the name of science, in trying to bribe off the enemy with what he most desires, the
apologist has really abandoned what he started out to defend”; if liberalism were to prevail, then
“Christianity would at last have perished from the earth”: J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and

\(^{41}\) Marsden argues that ‘This doctrine of ‘inerrancy’, as it came to be known, was no invention of the
late nineteenth century. Many Christians in the past had said or assumed much the same thing. But
the fact that now some conservative Christians were making biblical inerrancy a central doctrine, even
sometimes virtually a test of faith, signalled the degree to which the new scientific and historical
threats to the Bible were forcing everyone to shore up whatever he or she considered the most critical
line of defence” (*Understanding*: 37-8). He argues (117) that it reflected not a pre-modern epistemology
but an early Enlightenment one (as later bolstered by Common Sense philosophy), stressing
empiricism and reason, and assuming that “human beings are capable of positive knowledge based on
sure foundations”; such an assurance about the objectivity of “facts” was in contrast to the liberals’
“Heraclitean sense that: all is change”, which “invites relativism or at least the seeing of ambiguities”.
Protestantism.” *Church History* XXXI, 3 (Sept. 1962), 307-32.

\(^{42}\) For this period, see especially George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping
George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century
work of Sandeen, who rejected the earlier explanations of fundamentalism as a movement of social
reaction, and identified fundamentalism’s doctrinal roots (i.e. inerrantism and premillennialism):
Ernst Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930* (Chicago:
University of Chicago, 1970). On pre-millennialism and on the Victorious Life holiness movement,
note Douglas W. Frank, *Less Than Conquerors: How Evangelicals Entered the Twentieth Century* (Grand

As for the next period, c.1930-c.1945, Noll described it as a time when evangelical Protestantism had a "fluid, shifting life in the shadows"; many "self-identified fundamentalists" had splintered off into separatism, leaving a remnant in mainline churches.\textsuperscript{44} With American Christians generally thinking of themselves as either "modernist" or "fundamentalist", the identity of "evangelical" was little used (and it was of little use, since both camps had used it earlier).\textsuperscript{45} Conservatives were shut out of the academy and were generally anti-intellectual, and Gresham Machen – heir of the Hodge-Warfield tradition – was one of the few American evangelicals active in theological scholarship.\textsuperscript{46} Carpenter, however, has argued that while conservative and "fundamentalist" evangelicals had lost influence, it was often "thriving" at congregational level (including within mainline denominations) and was busily developing its own vibrant institutions and organisations.\textsuperscript{47} "Fundamentalist" evangelicalism was also the seedbed which produced the progressively-minded leaders of the post-war evangelical resurgence, leaders who were certainly not separatist, anti-intellectual or defeatist.\textsuperscript{48}

For the third period, c.1945-c.1970, the new historiography has argued that evangelicalism moved from relative isolation and obscurantism to become once

\textsuperscript{44} Conservative elements formed many independent churches, denominations and institutions. Protestant "fundamentalism" in this period can be understood essentially as militant anti-modernism. The world was seen in terms of stark antitheses between good and evil, truth and error. Richard Hofstader wrote of the fundamentalist mind as "essentially Manichean" (cit. Marsden, \textit{Understanding:} 178).
\textsuperscript{45} Marsden, \textit{Understanding:} 66.
\textsuperscript{46} For assessments of Machen, see Marsden's "Understanding J. Gresham Machen," in \textit{Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism:} 182-201; C. Allwyn Russell, \textit{Voices of American Fundamentalism: Seven Biographical Studies} (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976): 135-61. Note also Ned B. Stonehouse, \textit{J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir} (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1987). Machen was profoundly opposed to theological liberalism, which he considered a naturalistic, non-Christian religion, but he did not call himself a "fundamentalist" but a "Calvinist"; Machen to F.E. Robinson, 25 June 1925, cit. Russell: 43-4. Many of those who later led a resurgence of evangelical scholarship had had links with Machen. For Hodge and Warfield, see e.g. Noll, \textit{The Princeton Theology}.
\textsuperscript{47} Carpenter, \textit{Revive Us Again:} 13-32. Such growth included tertiary colleges such as Wheaton, Dallas, and Moody (and Fuller in 1947), and media initiatives such as Charles Fuller’s "Old-fashioned Bible Hour" (which by 1944 had an audience of 20 million).
again a positive, intellectually self-assured and apparently united movement. Evangelicals held hopes of again being “culture-shaping”. Reformist leaders such as C.F.H. Henry, H.J. Ockenga and E.J. Carnell distanced themselves from fundamentalism and saw themselves as “neo-evangelicals” reclaiming a confident mainstream evangelical Protestant tradition, as in the mid-nineteenth century. The National Association of Evangelicals (1943) had helped forge a differentiation of neo-evangelicals from the militant and separatist fundamentalism represented by Carl McIntire and the American Council of Christian Churches. The key public – and unifying – figure in the recovery was Billy Graham, who gained national prominence from 1949. Marsden even suggested that one definition of an “evangelical” could be

---

48 The apparent monolithic unity of the movement was to some extent illusory. Among other things, the neo-evangelical combination at that time did not obviously include Pentecostals, Afro-American churches or Southern Baptists.
50 Noll, American Evangelical Christianity: 18.
51 See e.g. Ockenga, “Can Fundamentalism Win America?” Christian Life and Times (June 1947): 13-15, cit. Carpenter, Revive Us Again: 147; Ockenga, “From Fundamentalism, Through New Evangelicalism, to Evangelicalism,” in Kenneth Kantzer (ed.), “Evangelical Roots” (Nashville and New York: Thomas Nelson): 35-46; Rudolph Nelson, The Making and Unmaking of an Evangelical Mind: The Case of Edward Carnell (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Richard J. Mouw, The Smell of Sawdust: What Evangelicals Can Learn from Their Fundamentalist Heritage (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000). In some cases, at least in the earlier stages of neo-evangelicalism, there seems to have been not so much an attempt to differentiate semantically the terms “fundamentalist” and “evangelical” as to call the fundamentalist-evangelical movement (perceived as a whole) to major changes of approach; for instance, Carl Henry’s The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947) calls the movement to confront the world’s social evils, and to bring a “New Reformation”, but still appeared to use the two terms “fundamentalist” and “evangelical” interchangeably e.g. 23, 44-5, 64. Fourteen years later, writing in a time when the differentiation had become more established, Carnell described elements of the “mentality” of fundamentalism: separatism, anti-intellectualism, premillennialism, pride, legalism, negativism, the elevation of soul-winning above all else (including charity), a “magical” attitude to the Bible, hero-worship, a lack of courtesy (cf. Titus 3:3), the elevation of minor issues to a place of major importance, the toleration of one’s own prejudice but not that of others, and the use of Scripture as an instrument of self-security but not of self-criticism; it was dominated by “ideological thinking”, which was “rigid, intolerant, and doctrinaire”, which saw principles everywhere (and “all principles in tones of black and white”), and which created “new evils while trying to correct old ones” – Edward John Carnell, The Case for Orthodox Theology (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1961): 113-126, 141. “Fathered by misguided zeal, not malice”, Carnell asserted, fundamentalism was “orthodoxy gone cultic”.
53 Carpenter, Revive Us Again: 141-160.
54 See Noll, “The Significance of Billy Graham”, in American Evangelical Christianity: 44-55. Noll noted
“anyone who identified with Billy Graham”. Also important in the new “post-fundamentalism” coalition were the development or reform of evangelical seminaries (especially Fuller), the establishment of Christianity Today (1956), the inclusion of the (Dutch American) Christian Reformed Church (with its scholarly tradition and strong publishing houses), the publishing partnership of Eerdmans with the British IVF, and the huge readership that developed in America for C.S. Lewis and for various British evangelicals such as F.F. Bruce, J.I. Packer and J.W.R. Stott. Another significant development – as elsewhere, including New Zealand – was the arrival in the USA of the IVF. Carpenter suggested it brought with it a “high regard for the life of the mind” (which he saw as a feature of British evangelicalism), it helpfully emphasised central doctrines rather than minutiae, and thousands of IVCF graduates provided a “natural constituency” for neo-evangelicalism.57

In American historiography, the relationship of “evangelicalism” and “fundamentalism” has been a key underlying issue, which remains only partially resolved (and which has been complicated in recent decades by the common application of the latter term to conservative religious extremism in general). Historians are not agreed about the nature and boundaries of either movement, in any period. In the USA, between the world wars, the terms “evangelical” and


56 Note especially Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), which identifies Fuller Seminary (founded 1947) as a key “window” through which the development of a reforming element within fundamentalism can be observed.
“fundamentalist” were often used “more-or-less interchangeably”. Debates with McIntire helped move NAE-affiliated “evangelicals” to make an explicit distinction between themselves and “militant fundamentalism”, a demarcation that firm up in the post-war era. Fundamentalism could thus be defined as “militantly anti-modernist Protestant evangelicalism”, a sub-set of evangelicalism. Who belonged to which category (whether by beliefs, attitude, self-assignation or ecclesiastical connection) is not always straight-forward, not least because of the extent to which the movements were inter-twined. Some question the distinction, or the validity of the term “evangelicalism”. It is also debatable how much the term “fundamentalist”

58 Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*: 152; also C.F. Henry to Marsden, “In the 1930s we were all fundamentalists....The term ‘evangelical’ became a significant option when the NAE was organised”, cit. Marsden, “Fundamentalism and American Evangelicalism”, in Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston (eds), *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1991: 34, n.16.

59 The NAE’s paper *United Evangelical Action* wrote of a “growing chasm” with “militant fundamentalism” and “those we will designate as evangelicals, for the sake of distinction.” See “An Issue of the Present Hour”, *United Evangelical Action* 2 (Aug. 1944): 2, cit. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*: 151.

60 Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*: 6; also, “an American fundamentalist is an evangelical who is militant in opposition to liberal theology in the churches or to changes in cultural values or mores”; Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991): 1; Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*: 6-7, 10-1. Harriet A. Harris, however, has argued that the defining characteristic of fundamentalism (which she discussed both in relation to historical movements on both sides of the Atlantic and contemporary theological attitudes within evangelicalism) is not militancy but a preoccupation with biblical facticity: *Fundamentalism and Evangelicals* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

61 “All fundamentalists were evangelicals....[but] by no means all evangelicals were fundamentalists”: Marsden, “Fundamentalism and American Evangelicalism”, in Dayton and Johnston (eds): 23; he suggested that the characteristics of the fundamentalist movement were not only militant anti-modernism (resulting in inerrantist and literalist emphases, 24-5), but also “militant soul-saving” (26), pre-millennialism and dispensationalism (26-8), and separatism (28-31); he conceded that fundamentalists and evangelicals are “particularly close relatives within an extended family” (33). Some who see themselves as neither “evangelical” nor “fundamentalist” make little or no distinction, and may suspect that an evangelical is but a covert fundamentalist – as Carpenter expressed it, “an up-town fundamentalist, with perhaps more education and nicer manners” (“Introduction: Researching American Evangelicals”, in Blomhofer and Carpenter: X). Some who wear the label “fundamentalist” suspect that “evangelicals” are covert “liberals”. Bob Jones Sr is reported to have said that an evangelical is someone who says to a liberal, “I’ll call you a Christian if you call me a scholar” (ibid).

62 In his 1997 study of evangelical boundaries, J.R. Stone has argued that “evangelicalism is a fiction,” a “social structural” construct devised by one set of 1940s fundamentalists to delineate themselves from other more exclusively-minded fundamentalists, and that the demarcation was one of methods rather than theology: theological differences were the symbol of difference rather than the differences themselves. Although he criticised Marsden et al. for “analytical oversight” it may be questioned
can be applied outside of an American context. But this thesis adopts as its working basis the historical differentiation of the two terms: in part because it corresponds to how post-war “evangelicals” designated themselves, and in part because it usefully distinguishes the more moderate evangelical traditions from other evangelical tendencies towards combativeness, separatism and anti-intellectualism.63

whether his own analysis provided any additional insight. Jon R. Stone, On the Boundaries of American Evangelicalism (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997): 2, 12, 15, 73-116, 179. Similarly, D.G. Hart, writing from a confessional Presbyterian and reformed perspective, declined to be called “evangelical” and provocatively asserted that evangelicalism is “largely a constructed ideal without any real substance”, an “abstraction” invented by 1940s fundamentalists and found useful by late twentieth century historians, which has done “damage...to historic Christianity: ” D.G. Hart, Deconstructing Evangelicalism. Conservative Protestantism in the Age of Billy Graham (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004): 17-19. Similarly D.W. Dayton argued that the differences among those claimed as “evangelical” (e.g. the reformed versus the holiness traditions) render the category incoherent: Donald W. Dayton, “Some Doubts about the Usefulness of the Category ‘Evangelical’ ”, in Dayton and Johnston (eds): 245-51. Together, such critiques may be understood as reflecting the particular features of late twentieth century American evangelicalism, including its populism, its vast cultural and ecclesiastical diversities, its politicisation, and the break-up of the apparent evangelical coalition and identity that had emerged by the 1950s. Others have acknowledged the diversities of American evangelicalism but have insisted on the viability of the category and the commonalities it denotes, e.g. Robert K. Johnston, “American Evangelicalism: An Extended Family”, in Dayton and Johnston (eds): 252-72; Johnston argued for a “family resemblance” of all evangelicalism’s strands, citing numerous others who assert such commonalities as beliefs in conversion, personal faith in Christ, salvation by grace, biblical authority, holy living, evangelism and mission; note also George M. Marsden, “Fundamentalism and American Evangelicalism”, in ibid: 24; “is there one evangelicalism or many? The answer, of course, is both. This means that no one part can be equated with the whole. On the other hand, it affirms that there is a whole, even if sometimes it is difficult to define precisely.”

63 The idea of “anti-intellectualism” has its complexities. Any theology (whether conservative or liberal) with a popular following was likely to have many adherents (maybe a majority) whose views were relatively unsophisticated and unexamined. A more telling issue may be whether a movement’s leadership was anti-intellectual, regarding study as helpful or dangerous, important or unimportant. Many “fundamentalists” were clearly suspicious of academia; but some of their leaders were quite intellectual in their opposition to modernism. Likewise when mid-twentieth century “evangelicals” gathered together in popular conventions and meetings they emphasised a “vital personal missionary-minded faith, and a holy life” and gave the impression that academic theological disciplines were “not really all that important” (Very Rev. Dr. Ian Breward, interview, 2002, hereafter IB, ¶41, 43); many evangelical leaders echoed those priorities, but some also acknowledged the importance of intellectual issues and academic study. Note also Noll, The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind.
The International Context: Evangelicalism in Britain

For the study of modern British evangelicalism, David Bebbington has provided the key framework. His work is complemented by that of others, including Manwaring, Randall, Harris and Warner. Bebbington notes significant influences from America, which – from the late nineteenth century onwards – included Moody and Sankey, the holiness movement (helping create a new evangelical climate in Britain of experientialism and non-denominationalism), the modernist-fundamentalist debates, and the growth of pre-millennialism. But there remained much that was distinctive about earlier twentieth century British evangelicalism.

While there was a liberal-conservative divide in Britain, reflected in such developments as the CICCU-SCM split of 1910, the Modern Churchmen’s Union, and the growth of a “liberal evangelical” movement, Bebbington argues that the divisions in Britain (and perhaps especially in Scotland) were less sharp and that

---

64 His primary opus is D.W. Bebbington, Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: a History from the 1730s to the 1980s (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989).
68 Ibid.: 151-80, especially 177-80 re Keswick. For the Keswick movement in general, see Randall, Evangelical Experiences: 14-45.
69 Bebbington: 190-4.
Britain was untouched by the “blizzards of invective” that swept the USA, for several reasons: the prevailing Romanticism gave more scope for concepts of natural and historical development, Keswick had developed a non-controversialist emphasis on spirituality rather than doctrine, and many British biblical scholars (combining orthodox devotion with critical study of the Scriptures) took a mediating approach, and moderate evangelical leaders had a restraining influence.\(^72\) Without any strong British tradition equivalent to that of Warfield and Machen, conservative evangelical scholars in Britain avoided an insistence on biblical inerrancy, preferring to use the language that the Scriptures were trustworthy.\(^73\) Most British evangelicals were much less focused on disputing evolution than many American counterparts.\(^74\) Perhaps influenced in part by Keswick’s emphasis on being “all one in Christ Jesus”, they did not embrace schism. They generally showed no enthusiasm for the identity of “fundamentalist” (a term which they saw as “alien, uncouth and pejorative”), and various British evangelical leaders such as Graham Scroggie, F.B. Meyer and G. Campbell Morgan returned from visits to America and publicly deplored the extremism of fundamentalism.\(^75\) Rather than spending their energies on denunciation, many moderate conservative evangelicals were devoted to youth work as a deliberate strategy to win the next generation; such initiatives included the Crusaders organisation and Eric Nash’s camps for Public School pupils.\(^76\)

Conservative evangelicalism in Britain, Bebbington asserts, had probably reached its nadir in about 1940.\(^77\) Between the wars, evangelicalism was under pressure on two fronts: a theologically liberal position was “almost universally assumed” in the

---


\(^73\) Keswick’s non-controversialist approach developed after it had moved away from its initial Perfectionist teaching.

\(^74\) E.g. W.H. Griffith, G.T. Manley, T.C. Hammond. See Bebbington: 188; Tidball: 84-87.

\(^75\) Bebbington: 207-9.

\(^76\) Ibid.: 182, 222.

\(^77\) Ibid.: 226, 258; Manwaring: 57-8

\(^77\) Bebbington: 252.
universities\textsuperscript{78} and Anglo-Catholicism was at its height in the Church of England. Evangelicals had been steadily losing young leaders to the other streams and were isolated, discouraged, legalistic and intellectually defensive.\textsuperscript{79} In the 1950s and 60s, however, British evangelicalism experienced a "remarkable resurgence".\textsuperscript{80} Bebbington argues that the Second World War and ensuing Cold War had a sobering effect on British society, creating a greater openness to Christian orthodoxy and spiritual reconstruction.\textsuperscript{81} The biblical theology and neo-orthodox movements were weakening theological liberalism.\textsuperscript{82} Emphases on evangelism by such mediating figures as Bryan Green in England and Tom Allan in Scotland were gaining some momentum, and Billy Graham’s campaigns, especially Haringay (1954), had an extremely significant effect on British evangelicalism, greatly increasing its profile, confidence and vitality.\textsuperscript{83} Expository preaching, modelled by Martyn Lloyd-Jones\textsuperscript{84} and John Stott,\textsuperscript{85} became highly valued in evangelical circles, and Stott also became an effective university missioner. The number of students at evangelical theological


\textsuperscript{79} Manwaring: 17-56 (his chapter titles were "The Defensive Years", "Through the Waste Land", "Continuing Nadir"). Manwaring cited Bishop Hensley’s assertion that evangelicals were "an army of illiterates, generalled by octogenarians" (35); the two leaders in view – Joyson-Hicks and Inskip – were aged sixty-three and fifty-two).

\textsuperscript{80} Bebbington: 252; also e.g. Hylson-Smith: 287-90, Manwaring: 87-95.

\textsuperscript{81} Bebbington: 253-4. Note also the effects of the writings and wartime radio talks of C.S. Lewis and the conversion of such figures as C.E.M. Joad (see e.g. Manwaring: 60-2, 81-3).

\textsuperscript{82} Bebbington: 253-5.

\textsuperscript{83} Ibid.: 251, 253, 288-9. Randall noted that a total of two million people attended Haringay and associated meetings, that there were thirty thousand respondents, and that the Crusade "served to promote conservative evangelicalism in a way that would have been unthinkable earlier in the century" (\textit{Educating Evangelicalism}: 68, 90). In Glasgow, one million heard Graham in 1955. Note also the many campaigns of British evangelist Paul Rees, including fifty-four mass rallies in London.

\textsuperscript{84} Martyn Lloyd-Jones, previously a physician at St. Bartholemew’s Hospital, had been a pastor in Wales before becoming an assistant to Campbell Morgan at Westminster Chapel in 1938 and minister in 1943. His preaching showed a strong emphasis on God’s holiness, sovereignty, and wisdom and authority, and modelled verse-by-verse exposition.

colleges markedly increased. By the end of the 1950s, evangelicals sensed a much more favourable spiritual and theological atmosphere in Britain, and were very encouraged.

Of particular relevance to this thesis is the significance Bebbington accords to the IVF: “Probably the most important single factor behind the advance of conservative Evangelicalism in the post-war period was the Inter-Varsity Fellowship.” The IVF basis of faith was “resolutely conservative but by no means extreme”. Bebbington notes the IVF’s crucial contribution in training future evangelical leaders and, above all, its role in sponsoring the revival of conservative evangelical scholarship. He observes that the IVF had deliberately planned to remove from conservative evangelicalism “the reproach of obscurantism and anti-intellectual prejudice”. The crucial outcome was a strong publishing work, articulating evangelical beliefs in an academically credible manner and ending a long famine of scholarly evangelical publications. There followed a growing influx of evangelical scholars into British university teaching positions. Similar assessments on the importance of IVF to the recovery of British evangelicalism and its intellectual life have been reached by Randle Manwaring, Ian Randall, Douglas Johnson, Oliver Barclay, Harriet

---

86 Randall, ibid.: 95.
87 Randall, ibid.: 51, 96, 139. Randall noted, however, that British evangelicalism in the post-war era did not achieve a profile that was “in any way comparable to that attained by American evangelicalism”: 95.
88 Bebbington: 259; similarly Hylson-Smith: 287, 290, 296.
89 Bebbington: 259.
90 Ibid.: 260. Important IVF initiatives included the 1938 IVF Biblical Research Committee (which included Martyn Lloyd-Jones, F.F. Bruce, G.T. Manley, John Wenham and Alan Stibbs), Tyndale House (1943), and the Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical Research (1945).
94 Ian M. Randall, Educating Evangelicalism: The Origins, Development and Impact of London Bible College (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2000). Randall’s history was modelled on the methodology of Marsden’s Reforming Fundamentalism and provides an excellent commentary of the changes within British post-war evangelicalism. LBC was established (1943) in part on the initiative of IVF leaders, as another
Harris, Tidball and David Goodhew. While it may be noted that Johnson and Barclay were former IVF leaders, the conclusions of the others were no less strong. Noting the wide effect of CICCU within British Christianity, Goodhew asserted that "the history of the modern Church is incomplete without an understanding of the role of conservative Evangelicalism within student Christianity." He argued (contra Barclay) that "soundness" was insufficient to account for CICCU's vitality in the 1950s and 60s, and suggested other factors such as maintaining a "clear message," the avoidance of unnecessary controversies on eschatology, evolution and inerrancy, internal leadership development, and an

strategy for the intellectual renewal of evangelicalism: 12, 15, 18.

Douglas Johnson, *Contending for Faith: A History of the Evangelical Movement in the Universities and Colleges* (Leicester: IVP, 1979). Johnson, who had trained in medicine and was theologically astute, had organised IVF conferences from 1925 and was Gen. Sec. of the IVF from its inception in 1928. His leadership was behind the scenes, strongly visionary, and internationalist in focus.

Oliver Barclay, *Evangelicalism in Britain, 1935-1990.* (Leicester: IVP, 1997). This work was written not as a history of IVF but of British evangelicalism. It has a wealth of useful material. At points it is quite partisan. It gives a central place to the IVF. Barclay made too neat a distinction between Conservative and Liberal Evangelicals and showed a deep suspicion of the latter, e.g.: 43, 137.

Harris: 51, 54.

Tidball: 47, 49, 89.


Goodhew: 64.
apologetic for Christian belief (with "modernist epistemology" and an emphasis on "the objective, factual basis of Christianity") that suited the times.102

Bebbington rejects attempts (such as that of James Barr103 to equate British conservative evangelicalism – including IVF – with "fundamentalism" as "doomed to failure", in part because evangelicalism in Britain has "changed so much over time".104 Also, he suggests, the fundamentalist hallmarks of strict inerrantism and a strongly denunciatory tone have been atypical within British evangelicalism. Most British evangelicals have consistently rejected a "fundamentalist" identity.105 However Harris, while fully accepting the historical distinctions between the two movements,106 has argued – following Barr – that many British evangelicals have at least elements of a "fundamentalist mentality", which reflects the "empirical rationalism" of early Enlightenment and Scottish Common Sense philosophy and is expressed in a strong evidentialist preoccupation with the accuracy of Scripture.107 But she conceded that the IVF was not fundamentalist "by American standards" and

102 Ibid.: 86-88. Similarly, with reference to "conservative Protestantism" in general, but largely with IVF groups in view, the sociological analysis of S. Bruce emphasised the advantage to conservative religion of its clear "boundaries" in belief and identity; conservatives know what they believe and who they are, whereas "liberalism is very poorly defined. By its very nature it cannot produce creeds and so it tends to be associated with some very general and vague perspectives": 80
104 Bebbington: 275-6.
105 E.g. J.I. Packer, writing on "Fundamentalism: The British Scene" in Christianity Today in 1958 said "though it is the term which critics habitually use, the majority of British conservatives have never espoused it, do not like it, and prefer ... to call themselves evangelicals, on the grounds that this term is more scriptural, meaningful, and less encrusted with unhelpful associations", cit. Harris 55; also e.g. Clive Calver and Rob Warner, Together We Stand (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1996): 19-20; John R.W. Stott, Fundamentalism and Evangelism (London: Crusade for the Evangelical Alliance, 1956); John R.W. Stott, Evangelical Truth: A Personal Appeal for Unity (Leicester: IVP, 1999). In the former work, Stott noted fundamentalism's "extremes and extravagances," especially a rejection of all biblical criticism, excessive literalism and too mechanical a theory of biblical inspiration: 2-6; in the latter work, Stott claimed "at least ten" differences distinguishing fundamentalism from evangelicalism, including anti-intellectualism, decontextualised biblical application, anti-ecumenism, ecclesial separationism, aloofness from the world and eschatological dogmatism: 20-24.
106 Harris: 14, 19-56; similarly Warner: 28 ("many evangelicals have fundamentalising tendencies without being unreservedly fundamentalists").
107 Harris: 1, 9-10, 12, 14. Note also her comment that British evangelicals' "attempts to preserve the maximum amount of factual truthfulness in scripture render their concept of inerruality very close to that of inerrancy" (Harris: 86).
quoted Marsden’s comment that the IVF placed “far more emphasis on the personal piety and evangelism reminiscent of the Moody-Keswick era ... than on the doctrinal militancy of the fundamentalist era”.\textsuperscript{108}

Given the strongly “British” cultural identity of New Zealand up to at least the 1960s, two articles by Bebbington comparing evangelicalism in modern Britain and America have relevance to this thesis.\textsuperscript{109} In addition to dissimilarities already mentioned above (the restraining influence of Keswick, the relative lack of advocacy for inerrantism and separatism\textsuperscript{110} and the more moderate tone of British fundamentalist elements), British evangelicalism reflected the context of a dominant state church in England: evangelicals within it were characteristically concerned for moderation and good churchmanship, and were also under constant pressure from the other two parties.\textsuperscript{111}

In Britain, evangelicalism was led by socially conservative clergy, whereas in the USA evangelicalism had a more “lay” and entrepreneurial tone and had much stronger financial resources. In Britain, there was more respect for education, and a corresponding greater evangelical awareness of the issues raised by biblical criticism. Evangelicals – whose ministers generally did not do their training in separate institutions – recognised the need for academic standards, were less given to

\textsuperscript{108} Ibid.: 54-5.
\textsuperscript{110} Note Bebbington’s discussion of the characteristic “fissiparity” (separatist tendency) of American evangelicalism, “Evangelicalism in its Settings”: 370-3.
\textsuperscript{111} A similar dynamic may have operated within the Church of Scotland, even though in that context there were less visible parties. In the 1977 article cited above, George Marsden noted the longstanding tradition of latitude and toleration in the Church of England, and that in America, with no dominant or state church, an “unopposed revivalism” was characterised by individualism, primitivism, and dichotomization (Hart (ed.): 306, 314).
“idiosyncratic exegesis”, and were more open to incorporating an acceptance of evolution. In Britain religion was “wedded to social conformity” and evangelicals were constrained by the need for “respectability”, whereas in the USA religion was “democratic” in character and could be “raucous” in style. British evangelicals emphasised restraint and prudence, whereas their American counterparts increasingly emphasised growth and success. Such British-American contrasts, it could be suggested, reflected the differences between a smaller, older, more traditional society which valued order and restraint, and a newer, more expansive society which rewarded innovation. But Bebbington concluded that the disparities primarily reflected the different “settings” of the two movements, in particular the fact that in Britain a considerably smaller percentage of the population were evangelical. In a much more secularised society, British evangelicals consequently had much less access to the media. It could also be argued that – unlike most evangelicals in America – evangelicals in the Church of England were constrained by having to face pressure on two fronts (from both liberal and high church alternatives), and that their resultant caution helped set a tone for the rest of British evangelicalism.

112 “Evangelicalism in Modern Britain and America”: 204. In the nineteenth century, such accommodation had been common in America also. Warfield had rejected Darwinian natural selection but accepted evolution and the “days” of creation as denoting long periods: David N. Livingstone, “Situating Evangelical Responses to Evolution”, in David N. Livingstone, D.G. Hart, and Mark A. Noll (eds), Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999): 208-211. Later, several authors and editors of the Fundamentals had also shown an openness to evolution: Mark A. Noll, American evangelical Christianity: an introduction (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001): 163, 171.
113 “Evangelicalism in its Settings”: 375. Bebbington noted that IVF-associated research scientists in Britain took such an approach. Note also the stance of James Orr at the turn of the century. Marsden argued that British evangelicals showed a “recognition of historical development”, in contrast to the “heightened supernaturalism” of American fundamentalists (Marsden, in Hart ed.): 306, 314): 320-1.
114 “Evangelicalism in Modern Britain and America”: 206.
115 “Evangelicalism in its Settings”: 377-8, 382.
116 In the UK media was publicly controlled, and overt evangelicalism was excluded as “contentious” – whereas in the USA the media was open to anyone who could pay.
**D The International Context: Evangelicalism in Canada and Australia**

Historical studies of evangelicalism in other English-speaking former British colonies are of special relevance to the study of New Zealand evangelicalism, and are suggestive of many parallels.

In relation to Canada, Noll has argued that the characteristics of its evangelicalism included values of co-operation, deference to authority, moderation, and more intellectual openness, and that such features reflected a comparatively small population (dispersed over vast distances) and strong cultural influences from Britain. R.P. Burkinshaw likewise discerned a strongly British flavour to British Columbian evangelicalism, and noted the comparatively irenic tone of their inter-war leaders and institutions, and their positive emphases on individual piety, evangelism, missions and student work. John Stackhouse, who has emerged as a prominent voice of Canadian evangelical historiography, has agreed that Canadian evangelicals united around piety and mission, and that their doctrinal statements were in the British tradition (emphasising evangelical commonalities rather than

---


118 "Conservative Evangelicalism in the Twentieth-Century 'West': British Columbia and the United States", in *Amazing Grace*: 317-48. Note, for instance, Burkinshaw's comments on the Vancouver Bible Training School and its Principal, Walter Ellis: 327-44. Ellis was a strong supporter of the IVF.

taking sides on secondary issues, and avoiding the language of inerrancy).\textsuperscript{120} He has noted that large numbers of evangelicals remained within their mainline denominations rather than separate, but often with a strong sense of alienation from the denominational leadership.\textsuperscript{121} He has suggested that there are two tendencies within Canadian evangelicalism, a “churchish” strand reflecting British evangelical patterns and a more “sectish” strand reflecting American fundamentalist models.\textsuperscript{122} Bebbington has observed a characteristic “sobriety” in Canadian evangelicalism.\textsuperscript{123}

The establishment of IVF in Canada has been recognised as extremely important in shaping twentieth century evangelicalism in Canada,\textsuperscript{124} as in Britain and elsewhere. Influenced by Keswick and the CIM, the IVCF’s emphasis was on holiness and evangelism rather than theological controversy,\textsuperscript{125} and Stackhouse described its effect on Canadian evangelicalism as “broadening”.\textsuperscript{126} It was also led by a strong-minded Australian – Stacey Woods – who had “an abhorrence” of American ways.\textsuperscript{127} In all of this, whether it was Canada’s British-style evangelical moderation or the role in Canada of the IVF, there are implications for the study of evangelicalism in New Zealand. It may also be noted that the assimilation of most of Canadian

\textsuperscript{120} Stackhouse, “More Than a Hyphen”: 380, 378-9.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid.: 385.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid.: 387-9. Note also his discussion of the “church-sect” typology and how it might apply to Canada in Canadian Evangelicalism: 12-17.
\textsuperscript{123} David Bebbington, “Canadian Evangelicalism: A View from Britain”, in G.A. Rawlyk (ed.), \textit{Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience} (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1997): 38-54 (see 39, 54, also 44: “The chief reason for the similarity of expressions of evangelicalism in the two countries was the presence in the newer land of so many \textit{emigrés} from the old one.”)
\textsuperscript{124} Stackhouse, “Proclaiming the Word”: 100-137; Stackhouse, \textit{Canadian Evangelicalism}: 89-108;
\textsuperscript{125} David Burkinshaw, “Conservative Evangelicalism”, \textit{Amazing Grace}: 338-9.
\textsuperscript{126} Stackhouse, “Emergence”: 253.
Presbyterianism into church union in 1925 was identified by New Zealand evangelical Presbyterians as the prime example of what they wished to avoid.128

Australia, as New Zealand’s nearest neighbour and sharing a similar colonial background, is obviously the most likely country to have similar patterns of evangelical history.129 Stuart Piggin, a leading figure in evangelical Australian historiography, has identified evangelicalism as “the commonest expression of Protestantism in Australian history”, and has argued that it was at its strongest whenever it held together its constitutive elements of experientialism, biblicism and activism.130 In the late nineteenth century, the holiness and millennial movements had lessened evangelical interest in the world, and, in the early twentieth century, reactions to liberalism made evangelicals defensive and isolated. But in the 1950s the three elements re-synthesised, and there was an Australian evangelical “resurgence.”


130 Stuart Piggin, Evangelical Christianity in Australia: Spirit, Word and World (Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1996): vii-xi. Piggin acknowledged that his work was focused on Sydney and Anglican evangelicalism, rather than on developments in other states and other denominations. Note also his earlier related articles: Piggin, “Historical Streams of Influence on Evangelical Piety”, Lucas: An Evangelical History Review 18 (June 1994): 5-20 (an article contrasting the competing streams of Protestant scholasticism and pietism and their respective reflections in Sydney); Piggin, “Towards a Bicentennial History of Australian Evangelicalism”, Journal of Religious History 15, 1 (June 1988): 20-37 (an article in which he reflected on evangelicalism “tenacity” in the face of secularism because of its transcendent “meaning system”, its authority (scripture) “external to social norms”, and its families and institutions); Piggin, “Bicentennial History of Australian Evangelicalism: Thesis and Themes”, Lucas: An Evangelical History Review 4 (Sept. 1988): 5-27 (an article in which he concluded that while evangelicalism failed to “establish evangelicalism as the mainstream of religious practice in Australia”, and so “failed decisively to shape Australian society”, it “did, however, succeed in producing an energetic, growing movement devoted to the evangelisation of the population”, “a significant movement with potential, rather than a dominant movement).
Along the way, Piggin discusses much else which parallels developments in New Zealand: the strength of revivalism at the turn of the century, the impact of large numbers of overseas missioners (especially Torrey in 1902), the close inter-denominational evangelical links (such as those between the CIM, the Keswick-type conventions and the Bible institutes), the importance of lay evangelical networks and organisations, the ascendancy of liberalism among the Congregationalists and Methodists (and many Presbyterians), the effect of avant garde liberal figures such as Samuel Angus in provoking evangelical reaction, the emergence of the Baptists as the denomination least affected by liberalism, some outstanding trans-denominational evangelical leaders (such as Nash, Morling, and Mowll), the widespread post-war fears of nuclear annihilation, the influence of British and American evangelical vitality, the role of the IVF in strengthening evangelical faith among students and in mediating new evangelical scholarship from overseas, and


134 Howard Mowll, with a background in CICC (he was President in 1911), had taught at Wycliffe College in Canada and had then served in China with CIM and become Archbishop of Western China. He came to Sydney in 1934 and became Primate of Australia in 1947. With a compelling personal presence and imposing physical stature (he was six foot four), Mowll was a high-profile evangelical statesman and revered for his spirituality and leadership. See: Marcus Loane, “Mowll, Howard West Kilvinton”, in Dickey (ed.): 272-4; Piggin: 133; Brewster: 304-7; Stephen Judd and Kenneth Cable, *Sydney Anglicans: A History of the Diocese* (Sydney: Anglican Information Office, 1987): 226-30; Loane, *Archbishop Mowll: The Biography of Howard West Kilvinton Mowll Archbishop of Australia and Primate of Australia* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1960); Loane, *Makers of our Heritage: A Study of Four Evangelical Leaders* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1967); Manwaring: 85-7.
the “general spiritual awakening” associated with the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade. Elsewhere, Piggin has expanded on the impact of faith missions on Australian evangelicalism, noting their influence on spiritual commitment and evangelistic zeal.

But, in some other respects, the Australian evangelical experience had no parallels in New Zealand: there was no major Anglican diocese in New Zealand akin to Sydney, which since the 1930s had been almost exclusively controlled by conservative evangelicals, and which had its own increasingly significant theological college.

Piggin has also written elsewhere on the respective influence of British and American influence on Australian evangelicalism. While acknowledging the individualism and informality valued by both newer societies, Piggin has asserted that Australian

---


137 Sydney had a continuous evangelical tradition, but that had been challenged by other traditions. In the 1930s, under Archbishop Mowll, the diocese was firmly secured for conservative evangelicalism. With his background in CICCU and CIM, Mowll was uncomplicated in his conservative evangelical loyalties, and authoritarian. He was a strong strategic thinker. Liberal evangelical elements became marginalised in his time. From 1933, the Anglican Church League with its how-to-vote cards dominated synodical elections. See e.g. Judd and Cable. Other dioceses in Australia were more mixed. Melbourne, for instance, had a definite evangelical as archbishop in Charles Perry, but the character of the diocese changed with James Moorhouse (1876-1886), and was thereafter pluralistic. The Reformed and neo-Puritan emphases of the Sydney diocese belong to a later period.

138 In some respects New Zealand’s Diocese of Nelson was an outpost and echo of the Diocese of Sydney, but it was not a major diocese and was not highly influential on the rest of the Anglican Church in New Zealand. It also lacked any equivalent to Moore College, which became revitalised under Mowll and his appointee as Principal, T.C. Hammond, who replaced a “liberal evangelical”, D.J. Davies (Judd and Cable: 233-4).

139 Stuart Piggin, “The American and British Contributions to Evangelicalism in Australia,” in Noll, Bebbington, and Rawlyk (eds). At the beginning of this article Piggin asserted that evangelicalism, measured as a proportion of the total population, is about twice as strong in Australia as in Britain and about two-thirds as strong as in the United States.
religion was nevertheless characterised by “British reserve”, conformism, and a lack of interest in forming new denominations. While he attributed such attitudes to the greater relative strength and “hegemony” of Anglicanism in Australia and a consequent hierarchicalism, they could perhaps be equally explained in terms of continuing British cultural influence in general. Piggin also noted that the Australian religious psyche had not been swept by successive waves of revival, as in the United States. The prevailing Britishness of Australia only began to dissipate in the Cold War era, when there began a much stronger interest in things American, as evidenced in the fascination with Billy Graham.

E The Focus and Argument of the Thesis

Clearly, New Zealand evangelicalism was part of a world-wide evangelical movement. But New Zealand’s part in that story has not yet been thoroughly examined, in the contexts of either the international movement or of New Zealand’s own general and religious history. This thesis is intended to help address that

---


Breward (A *History of the Australian Churches*: 121) noted the “evangelical sub-culture” within most mainstream Protestant denominations, sustained by inter-denominational evangelical entities and networks such as Bible colleges, conventions, missionary societies and evangelistic organisations.

historiographical lacuna. Against the backdrop of what also occurred in Britain, the United States, Canada and Australia, this thesis is a study of a resurgent Protestant evangelicalism in New Zealand after World War II.

In relating Protestant evangelicalism in New Zealand to the study of the same phenomenon internationally, various questions arise which are addressed by this thesis. The primary question is: why and how did a self-aware evangelical Protestant Christianity develop in New Zealand in the mid-twentieth century? Secondary questions include: what ministries and contexts were key sources or catalysts? What were the main overseas influences? Was evangelicalism a reactive or a positive development? To what extent was it “fundamentalist”? What phase of development can be discerned in each decade (and why)? How did evangelical consciousness and strength vary from denomination to denomination (and why)? What were the regional differences? How have evangelicals related to others? Was there anything particularly distinctive about NZ evangelicalism?

Evangelicalism has many faces. The subject of this study is not the more separatist, anti-intellectual or fundamentalist forms of evangelicalism in mid-twentieth century New Zealand, but the more moderate and trans-denominational conservative
evangelical stream that developed in the universities and in two important denominational settings. The thesis argues that a self-aware, cross-denominational and fairly cohesive evangelical stream developed within New Zealand Christianity from about 1930 to 1965, in part as a defensive reaction to liberal, modernist and ritualist trends in the main churches, but primarily as a reassertion of a Protestant Christianity that was positively biblicist and evangelistic. The thesis shows that the university Evangelical Unions were a key factor in the reconstruction of evangelical identity and confidence, and in the development of vigorous evangelical movements in New Zealand’s two largest Protestant denominations. The two key church leaders who inspired those movements, Thomas Miller and William Orange, worked closely with the Evangelical Unions. Notwithstanding denominational and regional distinctives, a clear trans-denominational evangelical identity had emerged in New Zealand. It was theologically conservative, and defensive, but it will be demonstrated that any simple equation of the movement with fundamentalism would be unsustainable. In its attitudes and practices, and in the many overseas influences it welcomed, this resurgent New Zealand evangelicalism largely reflected the prevailing Britishness of the country at that time. 

143 For that Britishness as a “central message” in New Zealand identity, see James Belich, Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2001: 11, 27-108. Belich argued that between the 1880s to the 1920s, in what amounted to an ideological “recolonisation” that transcended the separating 12,000 miles, New Zealand markedly intensified its sense of its British identity and came to see itself as the “Britain of the South”, a “Better Britain” which had all the advantages of Britishness but without the faults of a crowded industrial society. In contrast to Australia, New Zealand was seen as superior because it had more Scots and fewer Irish, and was not founded as a convict settlement. Refrigerated shipments of meat (from 1881) led to extremely close trade links: New Zealand’s British identity and economic basis were intertwined. In peacetime and in war, New Zealand was eager to demonstrate itself as Britain’s most loyal offspring. Natural wonders and Maori were integrated into the national neo-British image. From 1930 through to the mid 1960s, British identity prevailed, but was threatened by the Depression, the influx of American popular culture (e.g. in films, music and radio plays), and by World War II. Belich rejected as anachronistic Keith Sinclair’s more nationalistic reading of New Zealand identity, as in A Destiny Apart: New Zealand Search for National Identity (Wellington: Unwin Paperbacks, 1986). British identity was often illustrated in the primary sources for this thesis, e.g. a 1958 article in the Evangelical Presbyterian referred to New Zealanders (inter alia) as “we British people” and called for “revival in all Her Majesty’s Dominions”: S.S.Green, “The Challenge of Today,” *EP VI*, 2 (Sept. 1956):17-19; the same
Zealand naturally had some of its own characteristic flavours and patterns, reflective of New Zealand’s own distinctive setting and history, opportunities and restraints.

F The New Zealand Context in the Earlier Twentieth Century

The thesis opens in New Zealand in around 1930, at a stage when evangelical confidence, cohesion and identity were generally at a low ebb. The broad societal context was a general moral conservativism, valuing rectitude, self-discipline and domesticity; Belich has argued that there was a “Great Tightening” in New Zealand society, commencing in the 1880s and still influential as late as the 1960s. But religious conservatives believed that moral and spiritual decadence was nevertheless worsening. The vast majority of New Zealanders still identified themselves in the census with some denomination and were christened, married and buried by a minister. But the ecclesiastical reality was that church attendance in the main Protestant denominations (which had not been particularly high in the nineteenth century) was declining and by 1926 had reduced to about 27% of the adult European population aged 15 and above, a 44% decrease from an estimated peak of 48% attendance in 1891. The theological context, as in Britain and Australia, was that

year, the editor of that magazine annotated an article reassuring readers that a writer was “a Scot by birth, and still a British subject”; John Murray, “Christ and the scriptures”, EP VIII, 1 (Jan. 1958): 1. 144 Belich, 157-88. Belich argued that while “moral evangelism” was supported by Protestant churches, it had the support of almost the whole of society, including the State and medical profession; his assertion that the movement was “mainly secular” is open to question. As evidence of the general tightening, Belich noted the temperance and prohibition movements, concerns about sexual immorality, tightening censorship, restrictive immigration laws, the closure of shops and bars on Sundays (and the time devoted to silent prayer on 1920s radio), and the Plunket Society’s hostility towards infantile self-indulgence.

145 W.H. Oliver, “Christianity among the New Zealanders”, Landfall 20 (1966): 4-20; Oliver was writing about a period a generation later, when 80% of marriages were still solemnised in church (4). For a brief discussion of how “Christian” New Zealand society has been, see John Stenhouse, “Secular New Zealand, or God’s Own Country?”, in Bruce Patrick (ed.), New Vision New Zealand, III (Auckland: Tabernacle Books, 2008): 79-92.

146 Hugh Jackson, “Churchgoing in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand”, New Zealand Journal of History 17, 1 (April 1983): 43-59 (51). Jackson suggested the relatively low rates of attendance in New Zealand,
liberal and modernist tendencies were ascendant in mainline Protestantism.\textsuperscript{147} But revivalism still attracted significant support.

Among the Anglicans (New Zealand's largest denomination, 40% of census respondents, 15% of whom regularly attended\textsuperscript{148}), an overt evangelicalism was relatively rare. The evangelicalism of many of the earliest settlers, reflecting the dominance of evangelicalism in the Church of England up to about 1850, had later been gradually modified by (and mixed with) more ritualistic tendencies.\textsuperscript{149} Among the Protestant denominations, the Anglicans had been the least affected by

\textsuperscript{147} For a historical sketch of New Zealand's theological patterns, see Peter Matheson, "The Contours of Christian Theology in Aotearoa New Zealand", in Susan and William W. Emilson (eds), Mapping the Landscape: 255-72. Matheson suggested the following periods for NZ theology: "Settler Orthodoxy, 1840-70: The Evangelical Era"; "Loosening up, 1870-1919: The Liberal Era"; "From Polarisation to Postmodernism, 1960-". He also suggested that New Zealand theology was largely derivative and that the pragmatic colonial context and the lack of any university tradition of theological scholarship worked against theological originality. With reference to the whole of Australasia, Jackson and Breward have written on general theological developments, noting the rise of critical and scientific questions late in the nineteenth century and the ascendency of liberal theology among Protestants by the time of World War One: H.R. Jackson, Churches and People in Australia and New Zealand, 1860-1930 (Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1987); Ian Breward, A History of the Churches of Australasia (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) e.g. 194, 196, 198, 423-5.

\textsuperscript{148} Belich: 163. His figures relate to 1926. See also his earlier volume, in which he suggested in nineteenth century colonial New Zealand pakeha (non-Maori) were generally not "intensely" religious, and that rates of regular church-going were lowest among Anglicans: James Belich, Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century (Auckland: Penguin Books, 1996): 439. The numerical predominance of the Anglicans reflected the fact that "most migrants from England declared themselves members" regardless of whether they were regular attenders: Erik Olssen, "Towards a New Society", in W.H. Oliver (ed.), The Oxford History of New Zealand (Oxford: Clarendon Press; Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1981): 264; see also: Oliver (7); Jackson, "Churchgoing".

\textsuperscript{149} Note Brian Carrell, "Evangelical Anglicans and the Canterbury Settlement" (A paper presented to the Latimer Fellowship in Christchurch, 13 Oct. 2000). Carrell argued that despite the Tractarian connections of many of those in the Canterbury Society, the actual settlers (from 1848) included many of evangelical and low church sympathies, and that the Anglicanism established in Canterbury reflected the varying tendencies in England at that time and was characterised by moderation. But from the 1870s that there were controversies over ritualism, followed by some accommodation.
revivalism.\textsuperscript{150} There were scattered individual ministers who had leanings towards Low Church tradition, and others who had been influenced by the spirituality of the English Keswick tradition, the CMS or the CIM.\textsuperscript{151} Such ministers were more often imports from Northern Ireland or England, rather than those trained in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{152} There was also an enclave of Low Church and evangelically-minded Anglicans in the isolated and largely rural diocese of Nelson, where the bishops were often Australians or Englishmen with CMS connections and many of the clergy were graduates of Moore College in Sydney. Across the country, however, the prevailing pattern among clergy was a traditional Anglicanism modified – in varying degrees – by successive high church movements.\textsuperscript{153} Many clergy were “broad church”, defying

\textsuperscript{151} Any exploration of the influence of the CIM on the New Zealand churches is beyond the scope of this thesis. Some indication of the links with New Zealand churches (those these were not explored in depth) are evident in Marcus L. Loane, \textit{The Story of the China Inland Mission in Australia and New Zealand, 1830-1964} (Sydney: China Inland Mission/Overseas Missionary Fellowship, 1965). For a brief exploration of comparable links with Canadian evangelical Protestantism, see Alvyn J. Austin, “The Transplanted Mission. The China Inland Mission and Canadian Evangelicalism”, in G.A. Rawlyk (ed.), \textit{Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience}: 351-68.
\textsuperscript{152} Right Rev. Max Wiggins, interview, 2 Nov. 1999 (hereafter MW), \$26, \$28, \$62.
\textsuperscript{153} The movements, in some senses in continuity with the High Church movement arising out of the Reformation settlement, were the Oxford (or Tractarian) movement emerging in the 1830s and the later nineteenth century movements of Ritualism and Anglo-Catholicism. Such developments as implemented in a New Zealand setting have been traced in Marie Peters, \textit{Christchurch – St. Michael’s: A Study in Anglicanism in New Zealand, 1851-1972} (Christchurch: University of Canterbury, 1986): e.g. 37, 40-1, 100-1, 104. Building on the Oxford Movement, the Ritualists had emphasised ceremonial and worked for more frequent communion, choral and weekday services, more congregational responses, surplices for clergy and choirs, candles and crosses, and a raised chancel. Theologically, Anglo-Catholicism had emphasised the “real presence” in the eucharist and the “Catholic” identity of Anglicanism (thus challenging its reformed and protestant identity); practically, Anglo-Catholicism had favoured the eastward position during communion, mixing water with wine in the chalice, lighting candles on the altar, and the use of eucharistic vestments, unleavened wafer bread and incense. In 1877, H.E. Carlyon at Kaiapoi had been suspended for promoting ritualistic practices. From 1910-16, H.D. Burton had introduced into St. Michael’s in Christchurch a thorough-going model of Anglo-Catholicism, provoking considerable local and wider controversy. Such trends worried some in other denominations: in 1912, a “well-informed” work by a Presbyterian minister and historian had warned of increasing Anglican ritualism and its possible threat to the reformed Protestant faith of New Zealand’s other churches. John Dickson, \textit{Shall Ritualism and Romanism Capture New Zealand? Their Ramifications in Protestant Churches} (Dunedin: Otago Daily Times, 1912): 1-66; Peters: 104. “Legally and morally”, Dickson asserted, “we have a right to protest against the noxious weeds that are growing in our neighbour’s garden.” For comparable developments in England, see e.g. Bebbington: 203-5.
neat classification.¹³⁴ Laity were often more theologically conservative and Protestant in outlook than clergy. They often preferred a Low Church approach and resisted ritualistic innovations.¹³⁵ In two dioceses, Auckland and Dunedin, Anglo-Catholicism was favoured by the bishops. Ministerial training – mostly conducted in two diocesan colleges in Auckland and Christchurch – tended towards a theological flavour of mild liberalism.¹³⁶ A survey of Christchurch’s diocesan newspaper in 1930 reveals an overwhelming preoccupation with the mundane, minimal theological content, and nothing indicative of any revivalist emphases or evangelism.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ Right Rev. Brian Carrell, interview, 1 Oct. 2001 (hereafter BRC), ¶303-6: “I would say that a large swathe of Christchurch was “broad church”, if you want to use that term. Which means almost indefinable. It may have been one situation with a bit of this and a bit of that. You couldn’t classify them.”

¹³⁵ David G.S. Rathgen, “The Church in New Zealand 1890-1920, with Special Reference to W.A. Orange” (Joint Board of Theological Studies Licentiate of Theology thesis, 1969): 68-75. Note also the debates in connection with the election of a new bishop to succeed Bishop Churchill Julius in 1926, when laity made clear their preference for a Low Church bishop (MW, ¶23-5); Wiggins was reflecting perceptions held by Orange.

¹³⁶ But overall, theological liberalism was not particularly conspicuous in New Zealand Anglicanism in this period. Matheson noted that in New Zealand Anglicanism in this period, theology had a “low profile”, with the priorities being “sacramental and pastoral” (“Contours”: 259). New Zealand had produced a radical modernist Anglican, H.D.A. Major, who described himself as “a prophet of modernism” and became editor of The Modern Churchman. But Major had left New Zealand for Britain in 1902, for further study. For appraisals of Major, see Clive Pearson, Allan Davidson and Peter Lineham, Henry D.A. Major: The Face of Anglican Modernism (Auckland: Polygraphia, 2006). For a history of St. John’s College in Auckland, giving insights into the flavour of the Auckland Diocese at least, see Allan K. Davidson, Selwyn’s Legacy: The College of St. John the Evangelist, Te Waituata and Auckland, 1843-1992 (Auckland: College of Saint John the Evangelist, 1993).

¹³⁷ The Church News for the Diocese of Christchurch, LIX, 7 (Jan. 1930) - LXI (Dec. 1930). Much of the material related to reports of parish activities, such as Mothers’ Union sales of work, Sunday School picnics and choir boy sports days, and reports of such matters as the problems at Leeston with borers, gutterings and downpipes. There were hints of anxiety about the popular neglect of religion and the church’s loss of young people, reassuring editorials from the bishop (and accounts of his travel to and from Lambeth), photographs of impressive church buildings, missionary reports (both the Melanesian mission and the CMS), prayers for intercession, an article refuting rationalism, an article against Bolshevisim, and occasional mild commendations of SCM literature.
Among the Presbyterians (24% of census respondents in 1926, 28% of whom regularly attended), there were still memories – especially in the southernmost provinces – of a conservative and generally evangelical heritage. From 1848, Otago and Southland had been settled by serious-minded Free Church settlers, veterans of the 1843 Disruption. For many decades, Bible reading, family prayers and Sabbath rest were commonly observed. Ministers serving in nineteenth-century Otago-Southland generally reflected the dominance of evangelicalism in late nineteenth-century Scotland. Many had been influenced in Scotland by the 1859 revival or by Moody in 1873-5. In the 1880-90s there had been indications of local revival across

---


159 E.g. Belich: 163.

160 Jackson suggests that “generally speaking, evangelical religion had the stronger hold in Scotland” than in England, where from the 1830s the dominance of evangelicalism began to be affected by the Oxford Movement; in Scotland, sabbatarianism and family worship had taken hold: H.R. Jackson, *Churches and People in Australia and New Zealand, 1860-1930* (Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1987): 11, 6.


the Mataura and Clutha districts.\textsuperscript{164} The 1902 campaign by American Presbyterian revivalist R.A. Torrey attracted strong support from many Presbyterians.\textsuperscript{165} Prior to World War I, organisations such as Christian Endeavour, YMCA and the Presbyterian Bible Class Movement\textsuperscript{166} showed considerable spiritual intensity and evangelistic zeal. Conservatives in the Free Church tradition had also been greatly fortified by the Princeton theologians, with their sturdy scripturalism, reformed confessionalism, and Common Sense philosophy emphasising the reliability of knowledge, evidence and logic.\textsuperscript{167} There were also frequent infusions into the New Zealand ministry of zealous evangelicals from Scotland.\textsuperscript{168}


\textsuperscript{166} Maureen Nola Garing, "Four Square for Christ. The Presbyterian Bible Class Movement, 1902-1972: Its Background, its Rise, its Influence and its Decline" (M.A. thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 1985): e.g. 79; EP Blamires, \textit{Youth Movement: The Story of the Rise and Development of the Christian Youth Movement in the Churches of New Zealand – As Seen by a Methodist}. Auckland: Forward Books and Wesley Historical Society, 1952. The BC movement was begun in 1889 at St. John's Wellington by George Troup, a definite evangelical (the Union was founded in 1902), and J.C. Jamieson the first travelling secretary (1903-7) was an enthusiastic evangelical (Blamires: 14-15). Similar movements were begun by the Methodists, Anglicans and Baptists; together, the Bible Classes constituted NZ's largest youth movement: Peter J. Lineham, "Finding a Space for Evangelicalism: Evangelical Youth Movements in New Zealand", in W.J. Shiels and Diana Wood (eds), \textit{Voluntary Religion} (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986): 477-94 (480).

\textsuperscript{167} See Mark A. Noll, \textit{The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921: Scripture, Science, and Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield} (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983). For the Scottish Common Sense Philosophy developed by Thomas Reid, see e.g. P. Helm, "Scottish Realism", \textit{Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology}: 759-60.

\textsuperscript{168} Examples included J. Kennedy Elliott (1845-1929), Isaac Jolly (1853-1938), H.B. (Henry) Gray (1862-1933), P.B. Fraser (1862-1940), A.G. Irvine (1886-1952), and C.A. Kennedy (1880-1959). Some of these are further referred to below. Gray began his New Zealand ministries at St. Andrews' Auckland (1901-6) and ended them at Waikato (1923-5), but his most notable evangelical ministries were in Dunedin's North East Valley (1906-17) and at Hawera (1917-23); the revivalist flavour of his ministry is apparent in his statement "The Fire of God" [1932], in which he wrote of congregational prayer meetings with sustained attendance of up to 110, and of times (at North East Valley, Pounawea and Hawera) when "The fire of God fell". Irvine had a fruitful evangelical ministry at Hawera (1929-50). A later arrival
After World War I, there had been a marked societal shift in the religious and moral climate. Following earlier trends in the northern hemisphere, there had also been a significant theological swing, and strict doctrine was no longer favoured. At the Theological Hall (where all PCNZ ministers were trained) John Dickie had since 1910 been advocating a “progressive orthodoxy”. An older scholarly evangelicalism was being displaced by a newer, less conservative tradition. Reformed confessionalists such as P.B. Fraser felt increasingly marginalised. The growing attitude among

(1912) was Geordie (George Morrison) Yule (1888-1967), who had been converted under evangelist W.P. Nicholson. He served in ten parishes as home missionary or minister, and had strong links with New Zealand’s Keswick movement: Rev. G. Morrison Yule, interview, 12-13 Aug. 1999 (hereafter GMY), ¶13-23. The impact of emigration on colonial religion has been noted by e.g. David Bebbington, “Of this train, England is the engine; British Evangelicalism and Globalization in the Long Nineteenth Century,” in Mark Hutchinson and O. Kalu (eds), *A Global Faith: Essays in Evangelicalism and Globalisation* (Sydney: Centre for the Study of Australian Christianity, 1998): 131-2; Donald M. Lewis, “Globalization: The Problem of Definition and Future Areas of Historical Inquiry,” in ibid.: 42.

The international social and religious mood has been described as one of “mollifying and humanising”: Rev. Dr. J. Graham Miller, interview, 23 25 Nov. 1999 (hereafter JGM), ¶104. In relation to Scotland, Bebbington summarised the causative factors of the theological “broadening” beginning in the late nineteenth century as “historical relativism, the moral criticism of doctrine, the challenge of science, optimism about human nature, greater tolerance, a preference for apologetic over dogmatism and knowledge of other religions” (“Evangelicalism in Modern Scotland”: 8-9).

Deeply committed to Westminster confessionalism and the Free Church tradition, Fraser was an ardent and scholarly evangelical, and prolific writer. He was also influenced by the Princeton school, and had personal links with B.B. Warfield. In 1909 he wrote his *Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith*, which was commended by Assembly: *A Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith. A Help for a Better Understanding of Our Christian Faith. In Agreement with Recognized Standards of Presbyterian Churches throughout the World. A Living Creed for Today* (Dunedin: Stanton Bros, 1932). Fraser became an increasingly agitated defender of historic reformed orthodoxy. From 1914 to 1935 he was editor and publisher of the *Biblica Recorder*, a monthly paper. He became increasingly controversialist. For appraisals of Fraser, see: Allan K. Davidson, “A Protestng Presbyterian: The Reverend P.B. Fraser and New Zealand Presbyterianism, 1892-1940”, *Journal of Religious History*, 14, 2 (Dec. 1986): 193-217; *Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand*, 1940: 12; *Evangelical
ministers, especially those schooled by the SCM (which was at its height in the interwar period), was that classic evangelical and confessional doctrines such as substitutionary atonement and eternal punishment were no longer tenable in the light of the new challenges and questions raised by modernity, science and higher criticism, and that theological conservatives were remnants from a bygone era. Revivalism still appealed to many Presbyterians and was conspicuously promoted by such Auckland-based figures as the Revs. Evan Harries (St. James’ Presbyterian), Joseph Kemp (Baptist Tabernacle), and Lionel Fletcher (Beresford St. Congregational).172

Presbyterian VII, 1 (May 1957): 9; Outlook XLVII, 48 (27 Nov. 1940): 7; JGM, ¶814-5; J.G. Miller to Peter Barnes, 30 April 1987.

172 (1) Kemp was highly influential within the Baptist denomination, and was also the founder of the New Zealand Bible Training Institute (see below). While Kemp was primarily a revivalist, his opposition to modernism was illustrated in his organisation of the 1929 Great Bible Demonstration intended as a counterweight to the visit of H.D.A. Major. It was held in the Town Hall and attended by 3,000. In his address he once used the term “fundamentalism”, to describe the position opposed to “modernism”, but expressed his dislike of both terms; he exclaimed that “I charge modernism with being a menace to the whole work of God. It has attacked our mission stations. It has destroyed faith in the miraculous. It has banished God from the world. It denies worship to Christ. It has smitten the pulpit with a paralysis of unbelief. The churches have withered under its influence. It has lowered the standard of ethics. It has robbed us of the Bible. It has taken away my Lord and I do not know where they have laid him”: “Great Bible Demonstration in Auckland”, Reaper, 7, 2 (April 1929): 26-42 (27, 29).


(2) For Harries and Fletcher, see below, in the context of discussion of the ministry of Thomas Miller.

(3) Other revivalists and evangelists in this period included W.J. Mains (Presbyterian layman and honorary BTI principal), J.O. Sanders (BTI staff) and Andrew Johnson (BTI evangelist – see below). (4) For perspectives on revivalism in New Zealand, see Douglas Pratt (ed.), ‘Rescue the Perishing’: Comparative Perspectives on Evangelism and Revivalism (Auckland: College Communications, 1989). For an overview of revivalism in the 1920s and early 30s, see Douglas Ireton, “O Lord How Long? A Revival Movement in New Zealand, 1920-1933” (M.A. thesis, Massey University, 1985). Ireton identified the heart of the movement as the belief that revival was the answer to the problems of church, society and individual (85), and its key institutions as NZBTI (36-41), the Reaper (41-5) and the conventions (especially Ngaruawahia); he asserted that “fundamentalist” opposition to modernism was secondary in the movement to the emphasis on revival (though more prominent in Kemp than in Fletcher or Harries). He noted an important element in the movement of pre-millennialism(28-31) but
From 1918 to 1934 the PCNZ retained an official Evangelist, John Bissett, who was welcomed by many rural parishes, but the sort of revivalistic piety he represented was sneered at by some, and after his retirement Bissett was not replaced. Nationwide, the Presbyterian environment at the beginning of the 1930s was neither clearly “evangelical” nor clearly “liberal”. It was broadly evangelical, and mildly liberal. The denomination and its ministry had generally adopted a cautiously progressive theological outlook. But, to a significant extent, it also preserved a devotional piety and activism that reflected a more evangelical past. Such elements were combined, often uneasily, in the Presbyterian Bible Class movement. A national BC conference might be found singing songs by Alexander and Sankey, the two great revivalist hymn-writers.¹⁷³ Easter BC campers might be urged to come forward explicitly to “confess faith in Christ as their Saviour” or – more often – they were challenged with a more generalised exhortation to “follow the call of Christ” to a life of heroic Christian service.¹⁷⁴

A survey of the pages of The Outlook (“The Official Organ of the Presbyterian Church in New Zealand”) in 1930-1 reveals a denomination that was theologically mixed. Articles in the Outlook could tilt either way, depending on the writer, but there was

incorrectly asserted that “all” revivalists “probably” held such views. He reflected that the leading revivalists all looked a: NZ through the eyes of British revivalism (90). He argued that while general revival did not occur, churches were reinvigorated and the movement’s most enduring effect was its inter-denominationalism, centred on NZBTI and representing “a new alignment of evangelical forces”: 5. Note also anecdotal comments on NZ revivalism in the 1920s and 30s in J. Edwin Orr, Evangelical Awakenings in the South Seas (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1975): 151-7.


¹⁷⁴ Outlook (2 June 1930): 5-6 (the camp at Kelso) cf. 27 (the camp at Masterton). Similarly, at the Wellington [Girls’] Easter Camp, Rev. R.S. Watson appealed for recruits for “the crusading army of Jesus Christ, to do the work that Jesus began”. The next day, Miss Hardie followed up that talk with one on “duty” as “active crusaders”, Outlook XXXVII (7 July 1930): 23. JGM, ¶115: “It [the PCBM Easter Camp] still incorporated an appeal on Sunday night, at every camp. That was part of the ritual” ; “This was the heroic period. Jesus was the hero to follow. It was definitely a mood. I remember it well. The Bible Class appeals were not biblical appeals” (JGM, ¶117). For the next two decades at least, reports of BC camps and conferences continued to reveal a concern for evangelism, expressed with varying degrees of biblical language and doctrine: see e.g. Outlook XLVII (21 Feb. 1940), 8: 4-5, 9, 13, 17, 23, 29; LVIII (14 May 1941), 20: 20; 49 (13 May), 19: 9-19.
an overall theological blandness, suggesting an editorial avoidance\textsuperscript{175} of theological divisions; where controversy was reported, it was overseas.\textsuperscript{176} In 1930, there was a passing reference to the “recent noisy debate” between modernists and fundamentalists.\textsuperscript{177} The Editor felt free to chide the SCM (and generally to ignore it),\textsuperscript{178} and to include pieces on repentance,\textsuperscript{179} predestination,\textsuperscript{180} Sunday trains,\textsuperscript{181} Fosdick’s Riverside Church,\textsuperscript{182} the obsolescence of mass evangelism,\textsuperscript{183} the Church’s 70 year “Egyptian Captivity” to “the modern Pharaoh and his great falsehood” (Evolution),\textsuperscript{184} Temperance,\textsuperscript{185} and instructions from The War Cry on “How to be saved”\textsuperscript{186} The pages of the Outlook indicate a denomination that was fretting – along with much of Western mainline Protestantism – about religious nominalism and declension.\textsuperscript{187} Its pages did not indicate a denomination closely tied to its

\textsuperscript{175} The Editor in the period 1928-1937 was Rev. George Jupp.

\textsuperscript{176} The majority of the news, in fact, was from overseas. It was presumably cheaper and easier to quote overseas church newspapers and magazines than to arrange reports from around New Zealand. On 22 Sept., for instance, “Points of View” has news briefs from the United Kingdom Lord’s Day Observance Society, the Irish Presbyterian Church, the [British] National Sunday School Union, United Methodist Church [England] and the Fifth International Congregational Council. In the last report, the quite liberal views of some speakers are reported. \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (22 Sept. 1930): 3-4.

\textsuperscript{177} W. McLean, “Has Protestantism anything to learn from Roman Catholicism?” \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (22 Sept. 1930): 7.

\textsuperscript{178} Editorial, \textit{Outlook} XXXVII, 23 (9 June 1930): 4. The Editor slates the “ignorant” and “high and mighty” article by the Secretary of the Auckland Rationalist Society (“Why I am not a Christian”), and asks why it is printed in Open Windows, the official magazine of the NZ SCM. In relation to the scarcity of reference to SCM, it should be noted in 1930 there was little reference in the magazine to news drawn from New Zealand; news of other New Zealand denominations, for instance, was rare.

\textsuperscript{179} E.g. “Waiting for the Troubling of the Pool”, \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (24 Nov. 1930): 3-4.

\textsuperscript{180} \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (17 Nov. 1930): 16.

\textsuperscript{181} \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (13 Jan. 1930): 11; ibid. (20 Jan. 1930): 24. In the earlier piece, it was noted that the Presbytery of Ashburton felt they eroded the “day of worship and rest” (one of our “most sacred traditions” in “our national religious constitution”) and they make “the work of the Church very much more difficult”.

\textsuperscript{182} \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (22 Dec. 1930): 6.


\textsuperscript{185} \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (20 Jan. 1930): 17.

\textsuperscript{186} “How to be saved”, \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (9 June 1930): 31. “If any reader should have reason to believe that he has not experienced conversion, and is still in his sins, his first duty is to seek God’s mercy.” The short piece includes the wrath of God, Christ’s sacrificial death, repentance, faith and conversion.

\textsuperscript{187} E.g. T.W. Armour, “The Nineteenth Centenary of Pentecost,” \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (2 June 1930): 4-5: the church today has “a sense of strain, a feeling of impotence”; \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (7 July 1930): 3: two separate reports of “great evidence of a spiritual deadness in Scottish life” and “spiritual privation” in the Church of Scotland. In New Zealand, the percentage of Presbyterian adherents in New Zealand (as recorded in the census) who regularly attended church had declined from 48% in 1896 to 28% in 1925.
confessional heritage – references to the Catechisms were rare, and even rarer to Calvin.\textsuperscript{188} Letters to the Editor were much less coy about admitting the existence of theological tensions. A 1930 correspondent urged a “stand” against “modernism” and “rationalism” and urged the formation of an “an Evangelical Truth Society” to “fight ... for the Bible.”\textsuperscript{189} Another correspondent, however, urged the Editor to be less cautious about “modern scholarship” and the Bible.\textsuperscript{190}

A frequent contributor to the \textit{Outlook} was PCNZ missionary J.L. Gray, who clearly believed in conversion and in consecrated prayer.\textsuperscript{191} The only weekly column that was consistently “evangelical” in its concerns was “Our Evangelistic Page” by Evan R. Harries, the revivalistic minister of a thriving church in Auckland.\textsuperscript{192} Harries’ page was non-polemical, characteristically focusing not on theological issues but on fervency in prayer, Holy Spirit conversion, the surrendered life, and – sixteen times in late 1930 – excited anticipations of imminent Dominion-wide revival.\textsuperscript{193} With reports of fevered all-night inter-denominational prayer meetings,\textsuperscript{194} Harries sensed “the beginnings of a prayer revival” (June 9) and warned the Presbyterian Church

\textsuperscript{188} In 1931, though, Calvin was to receive more coverage, as John Dickie and especially J.V.T. Steele gave recognition to Karl Barth’s affinities with Calvin.

\textsuperscript{189} D. D. Sutherland, Letter to the Editor, \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (24 March 1930): 7.


\textsuperscript{191} A typical Gray article was “The Sin of Prayerlessness”, \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (22 Sept. 1930): 28. Gray’s articles were all re-prints from the \textit{United Church Review}, North India. J.L. Gray was the son of H.B. Gray (see above).


\textsuperscript{193} \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (2 June 1930): 32; (9 June ): 20; (14 June): 28; (21 June ): 25; (7 July): 34; (14 July): 25; (21 July): 23; (28 July): 20; (11 Aug.): 25; (18 Aug.): 18; (25 Aug.): 19; (1 Sept.): 34; (20 Oct.): 25; (3 Nov.): 7; (1 Dec.): 34; (15 Dec.): 29.

\textsuperscript{194} Between early June and late August there had been at least seventeen all-night prayer times: \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (25 Aug. 1930): 19.
not to be left out (June 14). Later, he noted that “revival tarries”, and variously attributed the delay to unbelief, sin, lack of prayer and the church’s unreadiness.

The 1931 *Outlook* fare was similarly mixed. There were conservative items on dancing at BC socials,\(^{195}\) and one on the saintly character of the typical BC girl (daily she is “growing sweeter, purer, kinder…”).\(^{196}\) There was an article lauding the SCM.\(^{197}\) There was a series of very solid doctrinal studies by Isaac Jolly, who emphatically believed in substitutionary atonement, and who regretted “modern critical study” (which had ignored that doctrine) and the “very pretentious and shallow” preacher who had recently denied it when Jolly had the “misfortune” to be present.\(^{198}\) There were articles on the theology of Barth,\(^{199}\) and assertions that “faith cannot be built upon history”,\(^{200}\) that Bultmann represented “present-day” biblical scholarship,\(^{201}\) and that “one could say without fear of contradiction that there is no Presbyterian theologian of any standing within the British Empire that would not call himself Liberal.”\(^{202}\)

Of particular significance for this thesis, the *Outlook’s* usage of the term “evangelical” in 1930-31 demonstrates that the meaning of the word “evangelical” in New Zealand had become extremely diffuse. Sometimes the term meant “Protestant” or “Reformed.”\(^{203}\) Sometimes it meant “non-conformist” (i.e. “non-Anglican”).\(^{204}\)

\(^{195}\) *Outlook* XXXVIII (16 Nov. 1931): 16. At a ministerial retreat for Auckland Presbytery, it was said that “experience throughout the world had proved that when dancing came into Church life it tended to kill everything else.”

\(^{196}\) *Outlook* XXXVIII (21 Sept. 1931): 17. She is contrasted with the drinking, smoking “worldling” girl, who through self-indulgence is likely to lose all that is “sweet and gracious and womanly.”


\(^{199}\) *Outlook* XXXVIII (18 May 1931): 13-14; ibid.: 19.


\(^{201}\) Ibid.


\(^{203}\) E.g. *Outlook* XXXVIII (Oct. 6, 1930): 5; *Outlook* XXXVIII (1 June 1931): 3.

\(^{204}\) E.g. *Outlook* XXXVIII (22 June 1931): 6. The Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches (U.K) included Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians – the “Free Churches”. Similarly,
Sometimes it meant “evangelistic” (which might involve the practice of “soul-winning” as Harries or Bissett would understand it).\textsuperscript{205} Or it might indicate a general “zeal” for evangelism.\textsuperscript{206} More broadly again, it might mean a “campaign for the enrolment of men and women in the Kingdom of God”.\textsuperscript{207} “Evangelical” did not necessarily imply biblically conservative: modernist Fosdick could readily be described as leading “modern evangelical Christianity.”\textsuperscript{208} Barth – although adopting a critical view of the Scriptures – could be acclaimed as “thoroughly evangelical in the truest sense of that word”.\textsuperscript{209}

It was clear that, in the early 1930s, the term “evangelical” did not exclusively belong to any particular theological tendency. The term could still be used historically, to denote an identifiable stream in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century church, especially within the Church of England, and some in 1930s New Zealand owned that heritage. But, since the rise of theological liberalism, and then of neo-orthodoxy, the term “evangelical” appeared to have lost much of its usefulness as a “party” label. It could be used by those of several theological tendencies. In New Zealand Presbyterianism, as the 1930s began, the term “evangelical” had yet to be claimed as a distinct mark of identity by those who were both biblically conservative and evangelistically active, and those who attempted to reserve the term for themselves would encounter considerable resistance.

---


\textsuperscript{206} E.g. \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (23 June 1930): 5. In an obituary, Mr. David Todd (former elder, BC leader and SS teacher of Knox Church, Dunedin) was said to have “evangelical zeal”.

\textsuperscript{207} \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (7 July 1930): 5: The new Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland called for such a campaign, arising out of a new “evangelical Christianity, reborn, restated”.

\textsuperscript{208} \textit{Outlook} XXXVII (22 Dec. 1930): 6.

\textsuperscript{209} J.V.T. Steele, “The Theology of Karl Barth”, \textit{Outlook} XXXVIII (May 25, 1931): 20. Those with a liberal view of Scripture, Steele added, can certainly “preach a full evangelical Gospel.” Note Karl Barth’s own use the term “evangelical”, as in, for instance, his work \textit{Evangelical Theology: An Introduction}.
G The Shape and Scope the Thesis

It was in that somewhat muddied context that a new type of New Zealand evangelical identity began to develop, from about 1930. The assertion by some of a clear sense of the term "evangelical" was a key aspect of the resurgence of a vigorous, self-aware evangelicalism in this country. The key catalyst was the advent of the university Evangelical Unions. Part One of this thesis traces the 1930s and 40s formation of a new type of New Zealand evangelicalism. The first chapter, interwoven with aspects of the wider evangelical context in the 1930s, is on Thomas Miller, a leading confessional Presbyterian who embraced the evangelical identity offered by the EUs and who inspired a strong movement of Presbyterian evangelicals. Chapter Two focuses on the founding of the Evangelical Unions and how they helped shape a redefined New Zealand evangelicalism. Chapter Three investigates the ministry of W.A. Orange, from whom there arose a new stream of Anglican evangelicalism. Chapter Four maps the emergence of a new generation of young evangelicals – nurtured by Miller, Orange and the EUs – who would later become leaders of post-war evangelicalism.

Part Two (cc. Five-Nine) explores the post-war movement. Chapters Five and Six document the growth of the Anglican and Presbyterian evangelical movements, to 1955. Chapter Seven analyses the post-war EU/IVF movement, which was a key unifying element in the post-war evangelical resurgence, and thus serves as a pivot to the whole of Part Two. The final two chapters discuss the further expansion of the evangelical movements in the Anglican and Presbyterian contexts.

Because of the large amount of relevant historical data, a clear focus for this study was essential. The selection of evangelicals within the Anglican and Presbyterian

denominations was for several reasons: firstly because of the size and significance of
those two denominations in twentieth-century New Zealand; secondly because those
were the denominations most clearly affected by the rise of the evangelical student
movements; thirdly, because the stories of the Anglican and Presbyterian evangelical
movements have not previously been studied — either in depth, or in a comparative
study, or in relation to EU/IVF; fourthly, because the Anglican and Presbyterian
evangelical movements were self-consciously, explicitly “evangelical” in identity.
There were additional reasons for not selecting other, smaller Protestant
denominations: the Methodists\(^ {210}\) and Congregationalists were not selected partly
because of their small numbers, and partly because they were generally uninvolved
in the EU\(\text{s}\) and in this period contained few evangelical elements.\(^ {211}\) The Baptists
were not selected, because the EU\(\text{s}\) and IVF appear to have had a much smaller role
in shaping the distinctive Baptist evangelical flavour and identity than internal
factors;\(^ {212}\) the Brethren were not selected, because they had always been evangelical.

\(^ {210}\) For a survey of New Zealand Methodism in the period being studied, from a liberal insider
perspective, see E.A. Hames, Coming of Age: The United Church, 1913-1972 (Auckland: Wesley
Historical Society of New Zealand, 1972). Hames wrote that the emotions and techniques of the
Evangelical Revival “seem questionable to us” and that after about 1915 the Methodist Church went
through a “theological adjustment” in which “the traditional views of the atonement” and of hell (the
latter a “legacy from the Dark Ages”) were abandoned: 36, 43; similar attitudes are expressed in
Hames’ survey of the previous period — E.A. Hames, Out of the Common Way: The European Church in
For a critical analysis of New Zealand Methodism, see Peter J. Lineham, New Zealanders and the
Methodist Evangel: An Interpretation of the Policies and Performance of the Methodist Church of New Zealand
(Auckland: Wesley Historical Society, 1983). Noting the “drastic” decline of New Zealand Methodism
throughout the twentieth century, Lineham suggested that Methodism’s anxiety to be “respectable”
made it hostile to revivalism, and its moral crusades and social gospel did not foster evangelism and
church growth: 5, 10, 13, 18, 20-21. For a rather light survey of evangelical and charismatic movements
within the Methodist Church, mainly in the period subsequent to that of this thesis, see Bill Clifford,
“The Evangelical/Charismatic Aspect of Methodism in New Zealand,” Wesley Historical Society Journal
1997; Clifford notes the 1961 formation of a Methodist Revival Fellowship in New Zealand, as a
branch of the British movement founded in 1952.

\(^ {211}\) Likewise the Pentecostal denominations were not selected, because of their smallness and isolation
in the period under review, and because at that time they had negligible involvement in the
universities. For a historical overview of those movements, refer James E. Worsfold, A History of the
Charismatic Movements in New Zealand (Bradford, England: The Julian Literature Trust, 1974).

\(^ {212}\) For the history of Baptists in New Zealand, see especially: J. Ayson Clifford, A Handful of Grain. The
Centenary History of the Baptist Union of New Zealand, vol. 2, 1882-1914 (Wellington: New Zealand
Baptist Historical Society, 1982); G.T. Beilby, A Handful of Grain. The Centenary History of the Baptist
and because they did not have any ordained ministers (who are a key focus of this study). Nevertheless, the contributions of both Baptists and (especially) Brethren to the inter-denominational EU/IVF movement were considerable, and are acknowledged at many points.

This thesis is not about evangelical organisations in general, but argues that the EUs and IVF played a crucial role in the recovery of evangelical Christianity in two key denominations. It is not about popular evangelicalism as a whole, but mainly about its university-trained leaders. The thesis concentrates on the evangelical formation of future evangelical ministers, since in the period being studied leadership within the two principal Protestant denominations was primarily by ordained ministers. Many other EU members became leading lay people in various churches, and that is often noted. But lay leaders are not the focus of this study: it would be possible, but beyond the scope of this study, to track the contribution of EU-trained laity in other professions and in society generally (and in overseas mission). Despite the focus on clergy, this thesis is nevertheless about a popular religious movement that was primarily made up of laity. With regard to gender, it should be noted that in this period women were not permitted to become Anglican or Presbyterian ministers, so none of the individuals singled out for closer attention were women. Nevertheless, women were heavily involved as members and leaders

Baptists were by no means homogeneously conservative evangelical, and such leading figures as Dr. J.J. North (Principal of Baptist College, Editor of *The New Zealand Baptist*, and twice President of the Baptist Church) reflected a more liberal evangelical perspective, and resisted the theological conservatism engendered by Joseph Kemp (which they saw as fundamentalist); see e.g. Beilby: 3-4.


The contributions of many New Zealand evangelical organisations and movements are noted, where relevant, but are not the focus of this study. Such groups include Scripture Union, the New Zealand Bible Training Institute, the Bible Society, Youth For Christ and the Billy Graham crusades. Bibliographical details are generally given when they are first referred to.


See Jane Simpson, “Women, Religion and Society in New Zealand: A Literature Review”, *Journal of*
in EUs, and in church life. With regard to ethnicity and culture, it may be noted that this thesis explores a period when Maori participation in university study was much lower, when overseas students from Asia were rare, and when New Zealand society appeared much more mono-cultural.

Why were the years 1930-65 chosen for this study? 1930 was in the period when evangelical Christianity was at its weakest within the universities and the main Protestant denominations. 1930 was when the first EUs were established. Orange commenced his crucial ministry that year, and Miller two years previously. The 1930s and 40s saw the genesis of a new evangelical movement. The movement flourished from the late 1950s, and was at a high point in the early 1960s. There were several reasons for choosing a terminal date of 1965: first, the movement continued to grow beyond that, but became less cohesive; second, from the late 1960s, various additional factors began to complicate the profile of New Zealand evangelicalism (such as the Geering controversy, the charismatic movement, increasing diversity, the intensified influence of American models of evangelicalism, and the deepening secularisation and polarisation of New Zealand society); third, there was too much historical material to enable the period beyond 1965 to be covered in sufficient depth.


218 Initially, the period tentatively chosen was up to 1985 but for all the above reasons it became apparent that 1965 was a better terminal date.
H Some Methodological Issues

This thesis is a study of beliefs, values and identity. Such research necessarily involved the study of individuals who were generally representative of the movement being studied, were illustrative of various strands within it or were especially influential. Inevitably, they were but a sample. The study of particular individuals and particular events has not been intended to create a sort of evangelical “family history”, fascinating though that might be. Rather, the intent has been to build up a composite picture of the movement under scrutiny and to explain and demonstrate its growth. Due account needed to be taken of many important beginnings, turning points, ideas and personalities. Within the fabric of this thesis, therefore, there is thus both biographical comment and narrative. However neither comprehensive narrative nor full biography is intended.

Extensive archival research (particularly in the records of the IVF, Westminster Fellowship and Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship) was a mainstay of this study. Evangelical periodicals and publications were also fertile sources, as were some personal papers, memoirs and diaries. Local church records tended to be weak in theological awareness, and were less helpful.\textsuperscript{219} Written sources were complemented

\textsuperscript{219} Published local parish histories characteristically concentrate on such matters as buildings, ministers’ arrivals and departures, long-serving lay leaders and changing patterns of worship and service but rarely differentiate between theological emphases. Parish minute books can be dominated by the mundane and usually ignore anything theological: the minutes of the Shirley Vestry, for instance, faithfully recorded that a Mr Hocken was “empowered to look at the Church Vacuum Cleaner” (Vestry Minutes, 11 Aug. 1957) but never gave the slightest hint about the parish’s emerging evangelical ethos (Shirley – Vestry Minutes, 1951-57); the minutes of the Sumner Vestry in the time of W.A. Orange’s ministry (Minute Book, Summer Parish, 5 May 1927- 3 Nov. 1960) referred to the word “evangelical” in one instance only – and in that example it was probably a misquote (Vicar’s Report, Minutes of Annual Meeting, 21 April 1937). In the interests of smoothing out anything controversial, minutes also “often conceal more than they reveal” – Ian Breward, Religion and New Zealand Society ([Dunedin]: Presbyterian Historical Society, 1979): 4. Parish newsletters retain much that is mundane, but can offer superior insights into a parish’s theological flavour because the newsletters record various discretionary parish activities (e.g. prayer meetings, cf. dances), and the minister’s pieces in the newsletters can often give an indication of the minister’s theological emphases.
by about fifty oral history interviews, mostly preceded by detailed questionnaires. Apart from adding to the colour and texture of this study, such interviews provided a wealth of knowledge and insights not otherwise available. Such data included invaluable information about the theological formation of evangelicals. Other informants corresponded, often in great detail.

Throughout this study, a number of theological descriptors (e.g. "liberal", "conservative", "middle of the road") are used, together with qualifiers or intensifiers (e.g. "moderate/ly", "broad/ly", "irenic", "emphatic", "definite"). Those descriptors and qualifiers are all inherently problematical, as they are elastic, relative terms, subjectively applied and subjectively understood and may denote style and attitude as much as theological position. But their use can hardly be avoided in a study where questions of theological conviction and theological self-identity are of central importance.

---

220 Most interviews were for one to two hours. The most extensive interviews were conducted with Rev. Dr. J.G. Miller, with several sessions spread over a period of three days.
221 A free-ranging, qualitative approach was taken in the interviews, in addition to standard questions. The interviews proved most valuable in relation to attitudes and feelings rather than factual details: emotions often remain fresh in human memory, long after details of time, sequence and place have faded (e.g. two informants recounted their own side of a minor disagreement they had had while on a bike trip some seventy years previously, and what they felt at the time). Because of the propensity of the mind to reconstruct the past erroneously, data from interviews was correlated with other sources wherever possible. A few informants proved to have impressively accurate recall. Caution was taken in relation to informants reading back into their memories their more recent attitudes. All informants were given opportunity to check and revise a transcript or summary of what they had said: informants were often much more circumspect when they saw what they had said in written form (e.g. an Anglican informant, referring to the many objects such as bishops' chairs, memorials, and flower bowls that might take up a space near a communion table exclaimed "There was so much junk in Anglican churches!", but later changed "junk" to "furniture": Anon., ¶48). Informants were especially likely to tone down personal comments about other people. Requests for anonymity (in whole or in part) have been respected, and the name of the informant has been withheld for particular pieces of information where discomfort might be possible. Marsden made similar comments on the value and limitations of oral history: e.g. it provides information about the "personal dynamics that shaped activities and relationships", "general insights and isolated anecdotes" and "invaluable clues for further enquiry" (Reforming Fundamentalism: viii).
All writing of history has a perspective. This researcher could be described as an observer-participant within the evangelical movement, but from a period much later than that being studied. On the one hand, an established profile as a participant has allowed the researcher privileged access to sources both archival and oral. On the other, time and generational differentials have assisted the maintaining of some detachment. This thesis is written with considerable awareness of evangelicalism’s vulnerabilities, over-emphases and excesses. This study thus attempts to understand and explain an important twentieth-century movement of New Zealand Protestantism in a “critical yet empathetic manner”.

223 Note the discussion in e.g. Keith W. Sewell, “Christian Historiographical Methodology: Some Foundational Considerations”, Lucas: An Evangelical History Review 15 (June 1993): 1-13. Sewell writes: “our work is interpretative, but so is everyone else’s” (13); “Christian historians, who know that theirs is a creaturely and limited perspective upon human history, should never deny that they are offering an interpretation...But at the same time, we should never accept from others that our work is ‘unscholarly’ because of its Christian bias, whereas theirs is ‘scientific’ on account of its presumed non-interpretative ‘objectivity’ ” (12); he claims that “ideological and other distortions” are “inevitable” in historiography from a non-religious perspective (13).

224 Other researchers have identified similar relationships to movements they have studied, e.g. Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism: xi; note the discussion about being an “observing-participant” in Rob Warner, Reinventing English Evangelicalism, 1966-2001: A Theological and Sociological Study (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2007): 20-22. Warner writes (33) that “The participant-observer dialectic rejects the naive positivism of presumed absolute neutrality, but also rejects the dogmatic postmodern relativism that collapses social scientific enquiry into subjectivism.” See also Sweet, “Wise as Serpents, Innocent as Doves” (411-3); Sweet argues that “critical history of a tradition presupposes inside-out immersion in that tradition” (413).

225 As an evangelical minister in a mainline denomination, as the church historian on the faculty of a well-known evangelical college and as a leader and spokesperson of a national evangelical organisation.

226 Warner writes that his participation enabled “exceptional access to the data, archives, and leading personnel” of the movement: 21.

Part One:

A TURN OF TIDE, 1930-45
Chapter One:
The Evangelical Ministry of Thomas Miller in Dunedin, 1928-44

One of the people who made a critical contribution in the 1930s and 40s to the post-war evangelical renaissance was the Rev. Thomas Miller (1875-1948). Miller was important in bridging earlier confessionalist and revivalist expressions of Protestantism with the new evangelical synthesis that was articulated by the Evangelical Unions, and in inspiring a post-war movement of evangelical Presbyterians.

Miller was not a man easily ignored. Confident, articulate, tenacious and sharp in mind, he was a serious man with very strong convictions. He was a commanding biblical preacher. His sermons were thoroughly prepared. He preached winsomely, very fluently, and with great earnestness. Perhaps in unconscious imitation of the fervent and expansive preaching of Rev. Dr. Gibb under whose ministry he had grown up, Miller would “get indignant in the pulpit, and hammer the pulpit cushion”. Standing tall in a ministerial frock coat, Miller “would preach for 30-35

---

1 Thomas Miller. Miscellaneous undated ms. sermon notes, e.g. "The Wonders of Prayer" (Matt. 7:1-11); "Remembrance of Jesus" (Luke 22: 19); "The Divisive Power of the Cross" (Luke 23: 23-4, 39-43); "The Preciousness of Christ" (1 Peter 2: 7); "The Unchanging Word of Christ" (Heb. 1); "Christ and the Home" (Luke 1: 43-56, 2:7); "What an Exchange" (Phil. 2: 1-16); "The Sovereignty of God and Freewill of Man" (John 15: 16); "The Ministry of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2: 1-12; John 16: 7-14); "No Cross, no Crown" (1 Pe. 4: 1-5); "Sorrowful Yet Rejoicing" (Hab. 2: 10-11); "Christ’s Love for the Church" (Eph. 5:25); "Jesus, the Name Above Every Name" (Matt. 1: 21); "The Bible – A Miracle" (Ps. 119-112).

2 GMY, ¶70.


4 JGM, ¶75.
minutes and could pray for 20". Miller regularly read the sermons of Charles Spurgeon, and modelled his pulpit ministry on Wesley and Spurgeon. His preaching "warmed the heart and informed the mind". Miller had anointed urgency. There was "an air about the Reverend Thomas Miller, you couldn't help but sense that he lived reverently in the presence of God". Helmut Rex (a lecturer at Knox\textsuperscript{10}) recalled a 1939 sermon of Miller as a "rare combination of devoutness, clarity of thought and beauty of language".\textsuperscript{11}

In July 1928, Miller had arrived in the North Dunedin parish of St. Stephen's. The year before, he had unsuccessfully gone looking for a call in Victoria, Australia.\textsuperscript{12} In moving to Dunedin, Miller was aware of St. Stephen's strategic location adjacent to the University of Otago and near Knox College.\textsuperscript{13} With a good population of families still resident in the surrounding North Dunedin area, Miller's preaching attracted a growing following, not only among Presbyterians.\textsuperscript{14} Although there were other

\textsuperscript{5} GMY, \$70.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., \$246.
\textsuperscript{7} JGM, \$441; Rev. Rymall Roxburgh, interview, 2-3 Nov. 1999 (hereafter RR), \$336.
\textsuperscript{8} GMY, \$246.
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., \$75.
\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., \$70. Frances Thomson attended Miller's BC and evening service while a student in Dunedin, 1933-34: because of his preaching, "we all looked up to him with such awe...Anything he said, we took as Gospel", Mrs Frances Milmine (nee Thomson), interview, August 2002 (hereafter FM), \$18.
\textsuperscript{12} J.G.Miller, "A Day's March Nearer Home"(unpublished memoirs, typescript, n.d., hereafter ADMNH) 1: 30. He also considered the parish of Surrey Hills.
\textsuperscript{13} TM: 35-36. Knox Church, however, less than a mile away, was regarded as "the student church".
\textsuperscript{14} When Miller arrived, the St. Stephen's congregation initially numbered about 160 in the morning and 130 at night, ADMNH 1: 45. His ministry followed other ministries of an evangelical flavour. W. Fairlie Evans (1917-24), a Welshman, exhibited "intense evangelical fervour" in his preaching (\textit{Proceedings}, 1967: 18); see R.G. McKenzie, \textit{One Hundred Years of Parish Life: A Souvenir History of St. Stephen's Presbyterian Church, North Dunedin, 1871-1971} ([Dunedin]: [St. Stephen's Presbyterian Church], [1971]): 42-56. Miller's immediate predecessor, J.M. Simpson (1925-28), was originally from the Irish Presbyterian Church, had "an evangelical testimony" and had sometimes spoken at the Pounawea Convention (ADMNH 1: 45); see also R.G. McKenzie: 56-61.
evangelicals in Otago pulpits, Thomas Miller stood out. Many existing parishioners (including the man who referred to Miller as "that yellow-livered tripe hound") decided that Miller's ministry was not for them and left. But Miller began to attract into his congregation people from other parishes and denominations.

A Influences Shaping Miller's Evangelicalism

Born in Stirling, Scotland, Miller was raised in a family that remained proudly Scottish in outlook. He had arrived in New Zealand at the age of two, and was raised in Dunedin in a devout Presbyterian family of "decidedly U.P." background. At fifteen, Miller left school to work in a foundry and qualified as a blacksmith. He had a conversion experience, responding under the gaslights at a revivalist street mission conducted by a Christian Endeavour group. Miller was mentored by William Gray, Vice Principal of the Training College, and became very active in the Russell Street Bible Class, a mission outpost of First Church. Miller was also strongly influenced by First Church's newly-formed Christian Endeavour Society, with its emphases on consecration and prayer.

15 ADMNH 1: 47. Miller was unable to retain P.B. Fraser, who had been instrumental in securing the call to Miller. Within a year Fraser left and later worshipped at the Salvation Army: J. Graham Miller to Peter Barnes, 30 April 1987. The reason for Fraser's departure is obscure but it may relate to Miller not allowing Fraser to share his pulpit; Miller rarely shared it with anyone: RR, ¶148. Graham Miller also alludes to Fraser's "growing instability", ADMNH 1: 48.
16 Kenneth Meikle, for instance, came to St. Stephens from Knox Church, and later became SS Superintendent and Session Clerk, ADMNH 1: 50. Non-Presbyterians who were attracted to become associated with St. Stephen's included the Cree Brown family (Open Brethren), JGM, ¶63f., and H.R. Minn, a Classics Lecturer who had been excluded from his Exclusive Brethren chapel for attending other churches while studying in London, ibid., ¶19; RR, ¶190.
17 TM: 9-10.
19 TM: 10; JGM, ¶69. The United Presbyterian Church (1847-1900) emphasised voluntarism and favoured the disestablishment of the state church. In 1900 it united with the Free Church to form the United Free Church (1900-29) which reunited with the Church of Scotland in 1929.
20 JGM, ¶71.
21 TM: 12; JGM, ¶72-3; Garing: 44. The Russell St. BC was the first such in Otago.
22 The beliefs and practices of the CE are explored below.
Miller had felt a call to ministry. At school, Miller had shown little promise but after his conversion became a voracious reader. He gained an MA with first class honours in Mental and Moral Philosophy. He was an effective university debater. At the Theological Hall (1905-7) he had appreciated his teachers, was active in the SCM, and was chosen to tour New Zealand one summer to promote overseas mission. In his final year, Miller had a spiritual crisis and experienced a profound apprehension of substitutionary atonement and the work of the Holy Spirit.

In his first three ministries, at Westport (1908-11), Rangiora (1911-15) and Feilding (1915-1928), Miller established the patterns of ministry that he was later to employ in Dunedin: Bible exposition, prayer meetings, an earnest spiritual emphasis, eagerness for conversions, one-to-one evangelism, the use of visiting missioners, and – above all – a strenuous development of young men’s Bible Classes. In 1909 Miller had married Marion Strang (MA), a high school teacher who ran Bible Classes for young women.

B Thomas Miller the Controversialist

Although genial in disposition, Miller did not shrink from controversy. In Westport, a small town with seventeen hotels on the main street, Miller had tangled with the

---

23 TM: 11. When he left school, a master said: “Well, Miller, ...I wouldn’t advise you to take up any work which would require you to use any brains”.  
24 JGM, ¶71. Miller also won a Debating Society prize.  
26 Ibid.: 15-16.  
27 Professors Watt, Salmond and Dunlop.  
28 Ibid.: 16,15.  
29 Ibid.: 17-18. Miller was considerably helped by Bishop Handley Moule’s Veni Creator.  
30 Before those ministries, Miller had also (in 1903) been a Home Missionary in Central Otago, Ministers’ Directory. For a general account of the work of Home Missionaries, see Harold Scott, A Pioneering Ministry: Presbyterian Home Missionaries in New Zealand, 1862-1964 (Wellington: Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, 1983).  
32 JGM, ¶79-81.
liquor trade. In Feilding he had been beaten up by Catholics after a rally for Howard Elliott of the Protestant Political Association.

In church, Miller made it known that he was opposed to sales of work and that only direct congregational giving was biblically appropriate. As Presbyterian theology became more liberal after World War One, Miller became more combative. "One cannot remain silent", he wrote, without becoming "in measure a consenting party". He was in close touch with P.B. Fraser and reading Fraser's Biblical Recorder, which was bitterly critical of the new theological developments. In 1916 Miller wrote an article for the Outlook, eloquently deploring the arrogance, glee and "airy confidence" with which "arrogant" and "destructive" biblical critics were attacking the veracity of Scripture. Miller noted that the "destructive" sort of critic,

---

33 TM: 22; JCM, ¶83-84. Thomas Miller "heartily supported" the Temperance Movement and its Band of Hope, ADMNH 1: 37.
34 JCM, ¶604. Some agitators were upset that Elliott had been smuggled out a back door of the hall. The Methodist minister: also got beaten up, but the Salvation Army officer fought back. The assailants were later taken to court, ADMNH 1:14. For the PPA (1917-) and its context, see e.g. Davidson: 88-9; Miles Fairburn, "The Farmers Take Over (1912-1930)", in Sinclair, Keith (ed.). The Oxford Illustrated History of New Zealand. Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1990: 211-236 (192-5; 201-3); Belich: 114-5; Oliver, "Christianity among the New Zealanders": 9-10. Protestant anxiety and suspicion about Roman Catholicism reflected not only historic fears of Catholic doctrine and practice and resentment of Catholic opposition to such Protestant causes as religious education in State Schools and Temperance, but also alarm about the Irish Easter rising, suspected Catholic disloyalty to Britain in the context of World War One, and the appointment of Sir Joseph Ward (a Catholic) as deputy PM in 1915. Many Protestants had also felt affronted by the 1908 papal Ne Temere decree, which declared that only marriages conducted by a priest were valid (Dickson: 176-96). Elliott, with strong Orange Lodge links, was an "electrifying orator" (Fairburn: 193) and prodigious propagandist and organiser. There is no evidence that Miller adopted Elliott's inflammatory tone; it is more likely he adopted the tone of fellow Presbyterian Dickson, who had prefaced his work with a disavowal of any personal hostility towards "our Roman Catholic Brethren", whom he described as "opponent friends": John Dickson, Shall Ritualism and Romanism Capture New Zealand? Their Ramifications in Protestant Churches (Dunedin: Otago Daily Times, 1912); vi.
35 ADMNH 1:53; R.G. McKenzie: 64.
37 J.G. Miller to Peter Barnes, 30 April 1987: "Mr Fraser and father were in a kind of David and Jonathan fellowship of mutual encouragement and support for much of my father's lifetime."
38 Miller, "Inerrancy": 17-9. Instead of scepticism, Miller wrote, difficulties in the Bible should produce humility and reverence, an attitude of "Here is something I cannot understand" rather than "Here is something wrong". Faced with biblical mysteries, Miller's faith was deepened: "I believe it to be the Word of God not only in spite of its difficulties but because of its difficulties. As God's Word, it must transcend my powers of comprehension."
deering the possibility of either an infallible pope or infallible book, loftily assumed
the role of "infallible critic". His use of the word "inerrancy" suggests the influence
of B.B. Warfield and the Princeton school.

Under the tutelage of Dr. J. Kennedy Elliott (Wellington), Miller became a frequent
speaker at General Assembly, debating issues forcefully, but without acrimony.39
Elliott had a strong affinity with the Princeton school.40 From 1917 they collaborated
in opposing church union, a cause that was beginning to polarize the Presbyterian
denomination.41 Miller penned the Twelve Points against the Grand Betrayal, and the
leaflet was posted from Feilding to every Presbyterian parish in New Zealand.42
Miller's opposition to church union was essentially theological; he regarded
ecumenism as doctrinally reductionist. In the 1919 General Assembly Miller made a
notable anti-church union speech,43 arguing that Christian unity is spiritual not
external, and that, by the providence of God, every denomination brings a unique
testimony to the riches of divine revelation.44

39 JGM, 97-9, see also Memorial Minute, Proceedings, 1930, 54. Elliott (1845-1929) came to Wellington
in 1884 from Northern Ireland and was the first minister of Kent Terrace, serving there from 1886 until
retiring in 1920. He was prominent in negotiations leading to the 1901 union, was the last Moderator
of the Northern Church, and constituted the first united Assembly. According to J.G. Miller, Elliott
was an "earnest evangelical. He was a mentor to Father [both at Assembly and generally], when
Father was at Westport and Rangiora, and he had Father as a useful junior counsel. He was a
recognised leader in the Assembly," and had "a conspicuous ministry."
40 In 1908, citing a letter from Warfield, Elliott had been a key figure in the case against J.G. Smith,
whom Assembly found in breach of the Westminster Confession in denying substitutionary
atonement (James Veitch, The Great 'Sin' of John Gibson Smith: The Story of the 1908 Heresy Trial in the
41 TM: 60. For a comprehensive and sympathetic account of the worldwide ecumenical movement, see
Ruth Rouse and Stephen Neill (eds), A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948 (London: SPCK,
1948).
42 [R.S. Miller], "Previous moves for Church Union in New Zealand", Evangelical Presbyterian VII, 1
(May 1957): 8-10; TM: 60.
43 JGM, §98
44 Miller, speech notes; ADMNH 13. Miller quoted such diverse authorities as Schaff (on Cyprian)
and the 1910 Edinburgh Missionary Conference. Miller then seconded an amendment by Elliott, in an
unsuccessful attempt to block a motion by Gibb seeking union of the Presbyterians, Methodists and
Congregationalists (Proceedings, 1918: 19-21). The amendment asserted that "there is no desire on the
part of the great bulk of the membership of our Church for union" and suggested that, instead, there
be a "Federation" of the three denominations to achieve co-operation in social questions and to avoid
wasteful overlapping. The motion gained 115 votes, but the amendment just 15.
Thomas Miller’s Blend of Evangelicalism

When Miller arrived in Dunedin to begin his most influential ministry, he was fifty-two and at the height of his powers. His methods of ministry were well practised. His theological and ecclesiastical outlook was well established: it gave priority to disciplined prayerfulness, it was couched in biblical, faintly revivalist language (rather than that of strict Calvinism), it was plain (rather than technical), it was spiritual (rather than abstract), it was definite (rather than speculative), it was indignant about theological modernism (but not extreme in tone), it was strikingly inter-denominational (but also utterly loyal to Presbyterians’s confessionalism and polity). In eschatology, Miller rejected pre-millennialism.

45 TM: 32, 34, 65. Miller rose early to pray, sometimes for hours, ibid.: 66-7. Family breakfast and dinner always concluded with a hymn (from the Sankey hymnbook), a reading, and the family kneeling for prayer, ibid: 63; ADMNH 1: 8-9. Miller also had a set half hour prayer time every evening with his wife, TM: 66-7. In the parish, there were up to three weekly prayer meetings, and also some special weeks of prayer. In Miller’s 1943 IVF Presidential address, “Three essentials of a Christian Student”, Miller gave prayer as the greatest priority, and cited such examples of prayerfulness as Torrey, Wesley, Forsyth, Spurgeon and Luther. See also “The Wonders of Prayer” (Matt. 7:1-11), undated ms. sermon notes.

46 See e.g. “The Sovereignty of God and Freewill of Man” (John 15: 16), undated ms. sermon notes. Miller was less explicitly or technically Calvinist than his son Graham was to become. “He did not use the categories of the Reformed faith.” Miller owned a full set of Calvin’s commentaries, but his son did not later see many marginal notes that would indicate Miller was particularly versed in Calvin. JGM, ¶441, ¶444. Nevertheless, Miller was, according to Milmine, an associate editor of the Reformed Theological Review based in Melbourne: Milmine to Malcolm [Buist], 26 Mar. 1945, TSCF 17/12.

47 Note the 1930 publication of W. Gray Dixon, The Romance of the Catholic Presbyterian Church (Melbourne: Board of Religious Education, Presbyterian Church of Australia, 1930), an eloquent and idealised history of Scottish Presbyterianism, tracing the story of the Waldensians, Hussites, Reformers, Covenanters and the Disruption. The author, a Scotsman, had been Moderator of the New Zealand church in 1919, had retired in Dunedin, and was much appreciated by Miller: 2.

48 Reformed eschatology tended to be a-millennial or post-millennial. Machen, whom Miller admired, described pre-millennialism as “serious heresy”: Mark A. Noll and Cassandra Niemczyk, “Evangelicals and the Consciously Reformed”, in Dayton and Johnston (eds): 204-21 (209); also Russell: 142. According to his son, Miller did not obviously adopt any particular position, but preached the second coming in a more general way, regarding the details as unimportant: JGM, ¶671. For family devotions, the Miller family used the Scofield Bible because it was a “safe” conservative Bible (cf. the Moffatt translation), with good cross-references, but they used the notes only selectively: ibid., ¶667-9. Graham Miller felt pre-millennial theology was uncommon among Presbyterians at that
A series of four articles by Miller in 1929 offers excellent insights into the shape of his theological thinking and identity. An all-important principle for Miller was the authority of the Bible, as inspired and revelatory: he argued that humanity is powerless to know God without revelation, that Christianity is “from beginning to end the religion of revelation”, and that the Bible was “the central citadel of the Christian faith”. While acknowledging that biblical revelation came through the “prism” of human personality, he believed that it was the divine rather than the human authorship of Scripture that really counted. Miller deplored that many had “betrayed what they were appointed to defend.” He suggested that theological modernism was in continuity with unbelief in every age, such as that of Celsus and later the deists. He argued, citing examples, that the ministries of those who “believe and use” the Bible experienced blessing, whereas modernist ministries proved “barren”.

The four articles clearly show that Miller’s evangelical identity was that of the British evangelical tradition, not that of American fundamentalism. Although making scattered references to America, Miller obviously saw him himself as part of a British story; he warmly referred to Knox, Chalmers, McCheyne, Wesley, Whitefield, Martyn, Livingstone, Brainerd, Mackay, Spurgeon, Griffith Thomas and Campbell Morgan. His use of language was also indicative; he twice used the term “evangelical”, but not the term “fundamentalist.”

---

50 Reaper, April 1929: 43.
51 Ibid: 44.
52 Reaper, April 1929: 43.
53 Reaper, June 1929: 90-1.
54 Reaper, July 1929: 120-1. He asked: “Where can we find one square mile which destructive criticism has changed for the better?”
55 Miller quoted Warfield, mentioned Moody, and listed American colleges once endowed by “warm-hearted evangelicals” which had become modernist.
Miller was an “omnivorous” and “retentive” reader of church history and theology, and owned a library of some 3,000 volumes. He subscribed to several international Christian magazines, including the Evangelical Quarterly, and closely followed the overseas debates over Scripture and theology. His 1934 book demonstrated a familiarity with scholars on both sides of many issues. He was disdainful of what he saw as the presumptuousness of modernists, who ignored “objective facts” and made unsubstantiated assertions. He was adept at citing the conservative opinions of various British academics.

Miller was fully aware of the American debates between modernism and fundamentalism. Like many ministers of his time, he possessed a set of The Fundamentals. In the 1930s he corresponded with the leading American theological conservative, Machen, who wrote to Miller of “their fellowship together in the great battle against Modernism”. Miller, primed in the conservative Presbyterian theology of the Princeton tradition, was naturally drawn to such a warhorse for orthodoxy as Machen and no doubt admired his clear-cut beliefs and intellect. Like Machen, Miller did not identify himself as a “Fundamentalist.” Miller also saw the term as foreign and a “theological swear-word”. He was content to see himself as

---

56 TM: 70.
57 Thomas Miller, Archaeology and the Bible: A Romance and a Vindication (Dunedin: Evangelical Bible League of Otago, 1934).
58 Miller indignantly wrote that, until about fifty years previously, those eager to claim “errors, discrepancies and deficiencies” in the Bible were all outside the church, infidels such as Voltaire, Thomas Paine and Robert Ingersoll, but such people (including Angus in Sydney) had come to dominate the church and academy: 7. Contradicting the views of Prof. S.F. Hunter at Theological Hall (Foreword; 46), Miller cited numerous academics (mainly in Britain, and often professors in such disciplines as Assyriology) who believed that the discoveries of archaeology had refuted the sceptical claims of higher criticism; these included A.H. Sayce, A.S. Yahuda, F. Petrie, A.J. Montgomery, J.R. Mackay, C.H. Irwin, and S.H. Langdon; he claimed that the “objective facts” of modern archeological discovery had disproved the higher critical “theories” of higher critics (24-5). Miller dismissed evolution as unbiblical and unproven (9-12), but gave relatively little attention to the evolution issue.
59 JGM, ¶507, ¶517.
60 TM: 58.
62 GMY, ¶180.
"evangelical", "reformed", "conservative" or "biblical". Miller identified himself with the historic world-wide evangelical tradition and in particular with the Scottish evangelical tradition; he saw the first few decades of the Free Church, following the 1843 Disruption, as the golden age of Scottish theology. Miller abhorred some of the key characteristics of a militant fundamentalism; he had a "dread" of schism, and in debate he was careful to avoid personal acrimony.

D  \textit{Thomas Miller's Bible Class: An Evangelical Strategy}

Apart from preaching and pastoral visitation, a major focus for Miller was Bible Classes. This work among youth and young adults, in a key university and theological education centre, was to prove a crucial factor in the emergence of a new Presbyterian evangelical movement after World War II. Miller’s strategy was deliberate: he “had an axiom that a minister who grasped control of his senior young men’s Bible Class not only stabilised the youth work but also the future of the congregation”. Every Sunday at 4 p.m., Miller taught a Young Men’s BC with a regular attendance of about forty – a “rare” size even then. Mrs Miller taught a similar group of young women. The Millers’ three sons and four daughters provided a ready nucleus, and an effective means of recruiting others. Classes were often followed by tea at the manse, and always by the evening service.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{62} Ibid., ¶262.\textsuperscript{63}
\item \textsuperscript{64} TM: 57.\textsuperscript{64}
\item \textsuperscript{65} TM: 46.\textsuperscript{65}
\item \textsuperscript{66} JGM, ¶97.\textsuperscript{66}
\item \textsuperscript{67} ADMNH 1: 46. Eager to maintain consistency of teaching according to his own standards, Miller also established himself as Superintendent of the Sunday School (which met at 2-30 p.m.).\textsuperscript{67}
\item \textsuperscript{68} TM: 38. The average age of the members was in excess of twenty-one years.\textsuperscript{68}
\item \textsuperscript{69} There were also junior classes for both genders.\textsuperscript{69}
\item \textsuperscript{70} Miller’s offspring were Jean (1911-90), Graham (1913-), Robert (1915-81), Thomas (1917-98), Beatrice (1919-46), Marion (1921-), Margaret (1925-1994). Several would later be at the heart of a new generation of Presbyterian evangelical leadership.\textsuperscript{70}
\item \textsuperscript{71} ADMNH 1: 50. JGM, ¶55: “...when we went to Dunedin, in June of that year [1928], I suddenly found myself in uniform to Dad as his curate...He would meet a boy on the corner of a street, ‘Hullo, what’s your name, do you go to any Bible Class on Sunday?’ ‘No’. ‘Where do you live?’ ‘I’ll send my boy Graham along, he’ll pick you up at 2-30, you’ll enjoy it’ ”.\textsuperscript{71}
\end{itemize}
Miller’s approach to BC was stern: there was minimal interaction and he insisted on "absolute reverence." This style did not appeal to all, and there was an early revolt and walk-out. But enthusiastic Christian youth arrived from elsewhere, including five young Presbyterian men who had been converted through York Place Hall (independent Open Brethren). By 1929 the YMBC exhibited "a great earnestness" and its members were enthusiastically meeting for prayer. Whenever newer recruits to the class showed signs of serious spiritual interest they would be summoned to the manse for a personal evangelistic interview, where Miller would read them various Bible verses and invite them to repeat a prayer for salvation. In the language of that time, Miller was a "soul winner".

72 JGM, ¶204. The YMBC was based on an "assignment" (i.e. one member would be asked to prepare a brief talk based on a set Scripture portion and then to read it out, which might take only three minutes). Miller then followed up. There were few questions. Miller also led singing, accompanied by the organ.

73 Ibid., ¶199. The BC used the choir seats. Some boys rattled a pew, and "Father said, 'I understand that you are disturbing this prayer. Remember that you are in the presence of Almighty God. I want absolute reverence in this class.' " That was the day most of the original BC left, ADMNH 1: 46.

74 ADMNH 1: 46; JGM, ¶200. This event was late in 1928.

75 JGM, ¶57-58; ADMNH 1:48.

76 ADMNH 1:50.

77 JGM, ¶56: "He dealt with them as he had dealt with me...I would hear the doorbell ring, Dad would take him up to his study and I knew exactly what was happening, exactly what had happened to me...About half of those fellows really went ahead...Mother dealt with the girls in exactly the same way." Graham Miller described his own experience, at the age of fourteen: "My conversion was a classic example of how Father went about his work." His father called him to his study, and with open Bible began to take his son through various verses relating to salvation such as Isaiah 53 and Romans 3:21 and then asked him if he realised he was a sinner. "I said 'Yes, because I knew that was the right answer. I was negative in my disposition towards Father during the whole interview. I had to comply, but I was reluctant at each point. He quoted Isaiah 53, and then asked, 'Do you realize, Graham, that this is speaking of you, and every sinner?' He then went on to Romans 6:23. "After a long period of the direct use of Scripture - he did not attack me at any point, on what I had done, or failed to do, he just presented the Scripture - he said 'Well, Graham, you know exactly what you are and what you need to do, and the promise of God through Christ'....We knelt, and I was silent, very reluctant to open my mouth. So Father said, 'Just say the words after me' and dictated the appropriate brief prayer and I repeated them in a fairly subdued voice, and then we rose, and I made for the door thinking 'that's over'. But Father called me back: he reached for a Bible, and inscribed my name. It was 1928. And I realise now that Father was preparing me to take my vows at Communion. I thought 'that's great. Dad thinks I'm a Christian. I know I'm not, I won't be troubled by him again'. I was daily going by train to Palmerston North Boys High School. I found in the next few days, in spite of myself, that my language, my larrakinism was being exercised, and I was seeing this in myself. This was not something I had planned to do, but it was happening, and I was getting a change of disposition...I had to say to myself, 'Something's happened'. So it was grace triumphing over everything conscious."
E Thomas Miller’s Separatism and Ecumenism

Unhappy with what he perceived of the theological direction and spiritual climate of the wider Presbyterian BC movement, and irritated at having to read out weekly invitations to dances, Miller in 1928 disaffiliated the St. Stephen’s BC from the Presbyterian Bible Class Union. Miller was not just reacting against dancing, which he presumably rejected as a worldly indulgence in sensuality. The wider context which Miller deplored was what he saw as the spiritual lassitude and moral laxity that had gripped society and church after World War I and the national BC movement as well. He rejected the movement’s adoption of a “four square”...

(JGM, ¶46-54). The younger Miller had already made responses at campaigns by Bissett and Mains, ADMNH 1: 26-8.


79 For conservative evangelical attitudes towards dancing, see e.g. Ian Munro, “The Christian and Amusements,” Evangelical Churchmen’s Review 7 (Feb. 1961), which quoted R.A. Torrey: “the modesty of every intelligent thinking woman must be shocked to see what you see in every ballroom – a familiarity of contact permitted between the sexes, that is nowhere else permitted in decent society.” Munro indicated that dancing alone was acceptable (as in 2 Samuel 6), as is group dancing such as Scottish Highland dancing. What was inappropriate was “ballroom or couple dancing”. Note Jackson’s general comment, in the context of discussing sabbatarianism, of “the cleavage which existed for evangelical Protestants between grace and nature. Evangelicals tended to have an aversion to the life of the senses: the body was in an obscure way corrupt and a means of sin” (Jackson: 113). But note also the mildness with which The Reaper discussed dancing in 1929, acknowledging that dancing was a “natural expression of youth and health” and “a doubtful pastime, if not dangerous”: “The Dance Again”, Reaper, 7, 4 (June 1929): 81-2.

80 Miller’s views are probably reflected in those of his son, who recalled: JGM, ¶109: “The era of ....good responses ....seemed to peter out with World War One... The cigarette in the mouth became a commonplace,...the contraceptive became a commonplace...I think you can trace it to the insidious influences of World War One - the breach of the Lord’s Day, our troops were encouraged to use contraceptives when they went on blighty [leave in England] and it was regarded as almost a command...You could see this in many of the men who came back from World War One.”

81 JGM, ¶190: “The loss of life in the leadership of movements like CE and BC was so horrific...That same thing hit the BC movement, so it had to grow a new generation in a new climate, [and] they didn’t inherit the zeal of the early founders, and the only climate was this post-war madness, the women smoking, the fellows having an uproarious time, football [rugby] was a great game, so there were football tournaments in the BC everywhere.” Up to 90% of men in the Senior BC movement had enlisted (Garing: 96). Society’s change in mood may in part have been a reaction to the horrors of war: New Zealand had lost 14,000 young men, 25% of the male population of military age.
approach (spiritual, mental, physical, social), an approach which helped attendance but de-emphasised the spiritual. Others shared similar perceptions. The Union sent Miller an envoy, to whom Miller explained that he wanted a spiritual rather than a social BC. His own youth socialised informally, with walks and bike trips (ideal no-cost activities during the Great Depression, and suitably wholesome), but the aim of the St. Stephen's BC was definitely not social. A local dance would have been unthinkable. Miller retained the more restrictive moral and social mores he had grown up with and had no time for what he saw as the giddy and ungodly innovations of the 1920s.

The more zealous youth readily accepted the moral code at St. Stephen’s.

---

82 JGM, ¶111: “Men who set up the first Bible Class movement, just before the turn of the century, very quickly adopted the four square motto, and began to major on the athletic prowess of Bible Class. St. John’s Wellington came down for an annual match with First Church Dunedin, and this became a great new discovery in Christian youth work; it must be four square.”

83 Garing: 195-6. National membership in 1932 was 15,788. It peaked at 21,989 in 1964, then fell away quickly (ibid.: 221, 225).

84 Morris Yule went to a district PBCM camp in the 1930s and was “most disappointed”. The “main feature appeared to be the Mount Eden BC clothed in red shirts splattered with black arrows all over them” ganging up against another large contingent from St. David’s. “There was no spiritual emphasis or desire with either group. So the next year I was at Ngaruawahia [Easter Convention]” (GYM, ¶78). Yule believed (GYM, ¶83) that the PCBM, although containing many evangelicals, was theologically “middle of the road, scared to go too far”; with their four square motto, “they tended to make the spiritual only one quarter of the emphasis”. There were “restraining hands somewhere in the quiet and hidden areas just watching the movement and not allowing it to get too hot” (GYM, ¶85). Nevertheless, Yule conceded, the Presbyterian BC movement was “often a means of distinct Christian commitment, growth and service” (GYM, ¶87).

85 JGM, ¶20; ADMNH1: 50. The emissary was Reg Gardiner of Maori Hill, an evangelical, and later very active in the leadership of the Bolivian Indian Mission (which was renamed the AEM) and very active in the the Layman’s Association (see Proceedings, 1970: 116-7).

86 Miller remained, for instance, a strict Sabbatarian, and was opposed to shaving on Sundays (on that specific point his son Graham “never quite saw his point of view”: ADMNH 1: 57).

87 The Session of St. Stephen’s was opposed to liquor, and protested when the moderator of the General Assembly was entertained in licensed premises (R.G. McKenzie: 68). Also frowned on at St. Stephen’s were cards and the cinema. These taboos were shared by most other evangelicals of the time (e.g. for discussion of similar social-moral views among British conservative evangelicals in the same period, see Bebbington: 209-211). Some members of the St. Stephen’s youth – in retrospect anyway – found the code of behaviour “a bit narrow” and “you had the feeling there was almost a party line. You didn’t feel happy querying anything. You didn’t like to step outside the accepted way of thinking”. (Name withheld, interview, 15 Nov. 1999). For comments on changing social customs in the 1920s (such as more flamboyant and revealing female clothing and bathing costumes) see e.g. Laurie Barber, New Zealand: A Short History (Auckland: Century Hutchinson, 1989): 120.

88 “The instinct of it came out of the Scriptures, ‘if any man be in Christ he is a new person, old things have passed away.’ Why waste your time at the pictures, when you’re a Christian and you’ve got
The move to disaffiliate his BC illustrated an interesting set of contradictions in Miller: intensely loyal to his denominational heritage, and personally active in Presbytery and General Assembly (he served as Moderator of both Presbytery and Synod). Miller increasingly resisted contact between his young people and those in other Presbyterian churches. While he staunchly resisted church union, Miller was enthusiastically involved in numerous interdenominational organisations and missions: he had prominent regional leadership roles in the Evangelical Bible League of Otago, the Pounawea Convention, CE, the Bible Society of Otago and Southland, the CIM and the EU/IVF movement; he was Chairman for the Dunedin campaigns of several evangelists including Lionel Fletcher (1929) and W.P. Nicholson (1933). Within his own denomination, at parish level, Miller was practically a congregationalist. But within a wider network of evangelical churches, Miller was practically an ecumenical. That was a common pattern among

books to read? It was instinctive to ignore them [the pictures], [it was] the outgrowth of a new life...It was a divine priority to 'seek those things that are above'... "[It was] never a problem, and I never sensed any harsh directives of legalism," JGM, ¶192-5.

90 TM: 40. Nominated for Moderator of General Assembly, Miller declined to let his name proceed.
91 Miller attended in 1928, and was Chairman from 1928-46.
92 Miller served as President of both the National and Otago Unions of Christian Endeavour.
93 Secretary, 1929-1944.
94 Miller was on the South Island Council, and involved in the local Prayer Circle.
95 Miller was an Advisory Councillor and strong supporter from the inception of EU in Otago University in 1930, a frequent speaker, and later a conference speaker, Advisory Councillor, Vice President and President (1943) of IVF.
96 For Nicholson, see below. Other Dunedin evangelistic missions chaired by Miller included those of Captain Reginald Wallis (1939) and Oswald Smith, TM.: 49.
evangelicals: they often deeply distrusted the state of their own denominations, and disdained the initiatives of the ecumenical movement, but they warmly embraced fellowship and co-operation with those who shared their evangelical beliefs and priorities. In their inter-denominationalism, evangelicals were often less cautious than those in other streams in the church.

F Another Miller Strategy: Christian Endeavour

For Miller, the BC was not in itself sufficient: he wanted a work in even greater depth. In 1929, to help preserve the fruit of a parish mission by John Bissett, Miller had begun a Christian Endeavour (CE) group at St. Stephen's. CE became a very important adjunct of Miller's Bible Class. CE would meet for ninety minutes every Saturday night, with Miller and his wife always present. The aim of the CE was not evangelism and basic teaching, as in the BC, but Christian consecration and training. As a method of conserving and discipling converts it was similar in principle to the Class Meetings of the early Wesleyans. It was a self-consciously "spiritual" movement, intended for those already converted and committed. Once a month, the CE pledge was repeated: "Relying on the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation and trusting in God for strength, I promise Him that I will endeavour to lead a

97 In 1943, for instance, Miller's Session declined a request from the Campaign for Christian Order to start a parish study circle on social issues (R.G. McKenzie: 68).
98 Note the reference in Davidson to "evangelical ecumenism": 143.
99 An interesting example of trans-denominational evangelical ecumenism was in 1943, when Miller was reportedly "delighted" at the prospect of Bishop P.W. Stephenson preaching at St. Stephen's for a church service associated with the IVF conference. But the Bishop of Dunedin declined permission for Stephenson to do so: RR, ¶120, 123.
100 TM: 38, 44.
101 Ibid.: 38. There were Senior, Intermediate and Junior CE Branches in St. Stephen’s, as in most churches that ran CE.
102 CE was begun by Dr. Francis E. Clark at Portland, U.S.A., in 1881, a Congregational minister (TM: 44). The movement was promoted by F.B. Meyer, RR, ¶162. The movement had become established in the U.K. in 1888: Miller, “The CE Movement”, Outlook XXXVIII (12 Oct. 1931): 5f. In 1930, CE worldwide claimed 75,000 societies and four million members: Minutes of AGM, Otago CE, 1930.
103 Ibid.; RR, ¶162.
104 Thomas Miller, “The CE Movement”. Miller was making an implicit contrast with the Presbyterian BC movement, which had developed a strong social element.
Christian life...". CE members also committed themselves to personal Bible reading and prayer.\textsuperscript{105} The meetings were highly participatory, so as to provide training in ex tempore prayer, testimony, leading worship, chairing meetings, and contributing to Bible study.\textsuperscript{106} The New Zealand unions used British or Australasian CE study manuals. Bible passages for each session were assigned to members to prepare and speak on.\textsuperscript{107} Unlike BC, CE was co-ed.\textsuperscript{108} It was a "very rich and warm and intelligent fellowship" - and it also usefully kept young Christians away from the pictures, dances, and socials.\textsuperscript{109} In addition, CE fostered a lively missionary interest, especially at rallies and conventions, where missionary speakers served as exemplars of the consecrated life.

Although the CE had flourished in Otago prior to World War I, it had become almost defunct during that war: a key factor was the crippling loss of leaders.\textsuperscript{110} The re-introduction of the CE at St. Stephen's followed the 1929 visits to Dunedin of evangelist Lionel Fletcher\textsuperscript{111} (a CE "zealot")\textsuperscript{112} and the energetic Jennie Street (from

\textsuperscript{105}See also F.B. Meyer, "I Promise": Talks on the Christian Endeavour Covenant. Re-print (London: CE Bookroom, 1929).

\textsuperscript{106}RR, \textsection 158; JGM, \textsection 214. Graham Miller found the training "excellent", and commented: "I attribute any gift of speaking to the training that came in CE. It was not off the cuff, it was disciplined, you were meant to speak sense - from a manuscript." Members were required to bring to the meeting a hymn or a verse, and to send on with someone else if unable to attend. Miller, "The CE Movement".

\textsuperscript{107}JGM, \textsection 214.

\textsuperscript{108}This feature was appreciated by at least one member: "It helped us to an appreciation of the young women in the congregation" (RR, \textsection 159).

\textsuperscript{109}It was "tremendous", commented Graham Miller, "Saturday night was cornered" (JGM, \textsection 214). CE was not strictly a youth movement. The lower age limit was fifteen, but there was no upper limit (GMY, \textsection 99). Miller's St. Stephen's group also attracted a few old people who had been active in CE in its heyday 30 years (ADMNH 1: 52).

\textsuperscript{110}RR, \textsection 162; JGM, \textsection 227. The dramatic decline of the CE had been national. In 1902 it had had 2,250 Presbyterian members, whereas in 1922 it had slumped to 377, and in 1923 to a mere 43 (in four societies): Outlook XVII (24 Feb., 1930): 10.

\textsuperscript{111}Fletcher was minister (1924-32) of Beresford St. Congregational Church in Auckland, during which time church membership grew from 224 to 825 (Davidson: 106). Converted in 1896, Fletcher had been the minister (1909-15) of the Port Adelaide Congregational Church (which became the largest Congregational church in Australia) and became Australia's most prominent evangelist (Piggin: 86-7). Charles W. Malcolm, Twelve Hours in the Day: The Life and Work of the Rev. Lionel B. Fletcher D.D. (London and Edinburgh: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1956); Lionel B. Fletcher, The Effective Evangelist (London: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.); Lionel B. Fletcher, Mighty Moments (London: The Religious Tract Society, [1931]); Lionel B. Fletcher, Prayer: The Secret of Power (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, n.d.). For some evangelicals, Fletcher was doctrinally too vague: John Laird wrote that "I am not
CE in Britain). Although she was Quaker, Miller “pounced on her” to preach, and she gave an “unforgettable” sermon. An Otago CE Union was formed, drawing support from evangelically-minded churches of several denominations. Later in 1929, Fletcher returned to speak at a CE rally attended by 1200, with 300 turned away.

Miller was the key figure in CE’s revival in Otago: “It can almost be claimed that the whole work grew around the name of Miller”. The Otago CE became the strongest in New Zealand, with the number of societies soaring from four in 1928 to thirty-seven in 1932. Miller was soon Chairman (and New Zealand President), and his

quite sure about Mr Fletcher. I heard him preach to 2500 in the Town Hall here. His appeal was entirely to the will...without any definite preaching of the atoning work of Christ” (Laid to Mervyn Milmine: 24 July 1931).

112 JGM, ¶217, ¶229; Otago CE Executive Minutes, 24 Oct. 1931. Fletcher channelled converts into CE, had revived the Auckland Union and became Dominion President. In 1932 Fletcher left New Zealand for Britain, to become [CE] “Empire Evangelist”, Otago CE Executive Minutes, 16 Feb, 1932.

113 Street was also representing several other organisations, including the National Sunday School Union of Great Britain and the Band of Hope: CE Otago Union, Miss J.M. Street, Papers re Visit of, 1929, 91/44/17. The CE meeting that planned for her visit included local representatives of the BC unions, Band of Hope Union, WCTU, and YWCA: Evening Star, 12 April 12, 1929. It was reported in the Dunedin papers that Street had edited the Band of Hope Review and the Sunday School Times, had worked for the Sunday School Chronicle, and had written a life of F.B. Meyer, a centenary of the Sunday School Union and numerous articles and poems: Otago Daily Times (13 April, 1929).

114 Evening Star (12 April 1929); Otago Daily Times (13 April 1929).

115 JGM, ¶218. Seventy years later, Miller’s son Graham recalled that she expounded Romans 16. The young Miller was greatly impressed by her “exquisite feeling” and “huge mouth”.

116 CE, Otago Union, Executive Minutes 1929-33, 91/44/11. Rev. Haddon (Church of Christ) was elected President; Miller was elected Vice-President; the other Vice-President (D.Varley) was associated with York Place Hall (Open Brethren). The inter-connectedness of the conservative Christian community and its agencies was further illustrated when gifts and flowers were presented to Street from the Band of Hope Union, the WCTU Cradle Roll, and the St. Kilda Methodist Junior CE.


118 Minute of appreciation, 7 Oct.1948, in minutes of 19th Annual Meeting, 9 Oct. 1948. Continuing in eulogistic mode, the writer of the minute (EP Wilkinson) wrote “We may never look upon his like again” – Miller was “head and shoulders” above everyone else in the little band of CE enthusiasts.

119 Ibid.

120 CE Otago Executive Minutes, 16 Feb. 1932. Four other societies had left to form a North Otago Union.
eldest daughter (Jean) became the principal organiser of the Otago Union.\textsuperscript{121} CE also experienced marked growth nationally – mainly in Auckland, where Fletcher was based.\textsuperscript{122}

**Christian Endeavour as an Expression of Evangelicalism**

In its original aims and emphases CE was an expression of popular, pietistic evangelicalism. So long as CE was being led by Fletcher or Miller – its two most prominent New Zealand supporters – CE was unquestionably going to be evangelical in intent and style. The first Otago CE Convention, in 1930, had closed with an altar call and the singing of “All to Jesus I surrender”. Elsewhere, CE was not necessarily so evangelical.\textsuperscript{123} Also, even in its 1930s and 40s Otago expression, CE’s evangelicalism was implicit rather than explicit. Nowhere in the Otago CE minute books does the word “evangelical” appear;\textsuperscript{124} that reflects the context of a lay-oriented youth movement where the focus was on Christian living, not on theological definition.

The records of the Otago CE provide a striking example of grassroots cross-denominational evangelicalism. At Conventions, Rallies, and Executive meetings, Miller and CE members developed strong fellowship across many denominations:

\textsuperscript{121} Jean Miller married another CE enthusiast, Ken Bell. Bell was a convert of Fletcher’s at Beresford St. Congregational Church in Auckland (JGM, \textsuperscript{9}1217) and later became a Congregational minister.

\textsuperscript{122} Street also spent time in Auckland. Between May and December 1929, the number of registered societies in NZ increased from 72 to 130, Otago CE Executive Minutes, 26 Dec. 1929. Late in 1931, Miller claimed the number of CE societies had grown to 213, comprising 5,000 members: Thomas Miller, “The CE Movement”. Rowland Harries (Rev. E. Rowland Harries, interview, 16 Aug. 1999, hereafter ERH, \textsuperscript{9}27) described the Auckland CEs at this time as “very influential and very strong”. There were unions in several of the key inner city churches, including the Baptist Tabernacle, Pitt St. Methodist, Beresford St. Congregational and St. James’ Presbyterian, and combined rallies were held.

\textsuperscript{123} One informant suggested that, in the USA, CE had “often gone liberal” but generally “remained conservative” in the UK: RR, \textsuperscript{9}162. Another, influenced by the atmosphere of Miller’s CE, asserted that CE “would never have survived in an un-evangelical” setting because of its “emphasis on praying”: GMY, \textsuperscript{9}99. LMS-based churches in the Pacific Islands developed CE extensively, but – perhaps reflecting twentieth century Congregationalism generally – that work did not appear conspicuously evangelical (personal observation in New Zealand, early 1980s).

\textsuperscript{124} See CE Otago Union, Executive Minutes 1929-33, 91/44/11.
Baptist, Methodist, Church of Christ, Congregational, Salvation Army, Brethren and Presbyterian — but never Anglican. Through CE, Miller formed strong ties with such men as C. Hedley Bycroft, minister of the nearby United Congregational Church. Yet, while the CE movement fostered cross-denominational friendships, it also stressed loyalty and service to one’s own church.

At Miller’s initiative, the CE began Easter Conventions. The first was in 1933 at Purakanui school and church, with blind evangelist Andrew Johnston as speaker. Subsequent conventions were held around Otago and Southland, with Miller and his wife always participating. An examination of attendance registers indicates that most Protestant denominations were represented, except Anglicans, with Presbyterians normally more than half (reflecting the large evangelical Presbyterian base in Otago-Southland, especially in rural areas). The conventions stressed the “surrendered life”, and — compared to a BC camp — devoted much more time to worship, teaching and prayer. The days included prayer circles, study circles, and at least three sermons per day. Speakers spoke on topics such as “The Holy Spirit”.

125 Initially, Baptist and Methodist Churches predominated in the Otago CE Union. Apart from St. Stephen’s, Presbyterian involvement was at first modest. Stevely (First Church) spoke at a CE Rally on 4 Oct. 1930 (and later joined the Executive) and F. Fish (Caversham) spoke at the 1930 Convention. Later, Presbyterian members were at least 50% of the CE members present at the Easter Conventions: CE Otago Union, Convention Attendees Register: 1935-52. The post-WWI weakness of the CE movement among Presbyterians can perhaps be attributed to the growth of the BC movement; some smaller denominations supported CE because they had no national BC movement (ADMNH 1:53).
126 The United Congregational Church was situated on the corner of Albany and King Streets.
127 RR, ¶162. CE’s motto was “For Christ and the Church”.
128 JGM, ¶222; ADMNH 1:74. This first convention had eighty present.
129 Waiwera South (1934, 104 present), Gore (1935), Pounawea (1936), Mosgiel (1937), Mataura (1938; 214 present). CE Otago Union, Convention Attendees Register: 1935-52, 91/44/2. JGM, ¶224-6. There was tension with the SCM about the CE’s use of the Pounawea campsite in 1936: “CE had Easter Conventions, Pounawea had summer conventions. The SCM always had Easter conventions at Pounawea. One year (1936) the Millers got in ahead and booked Pounawea for CE. The SCM was ‘really pipped about it’”: RR, ¶336. The Millers, as prominent supporters of the young Otago EU, would not in any case have been popular with the SCM.
130 CE Otago Union, Convention Attendees Register: 1935-52. The country areas with an evangelical flavour among Presbyterians included much of South Otago, West Otago, and Eastern Southland, and reflected in part the influence of earlier revival movements in Waikaka Valley and elsewhere.
131 RR, ¶164.
“Consecration” and “Power from on High.”132 There were testimony meetings, and missionary speakers from faith missions such as CIM and SSEM.133 Apart from the CE distinctives (badge, pledge, membership), and the younger average age, the CE Conventions appeared to be almost indistinguishable in theology, intensity, hymnology134 and patterns of piety from any other New Zealand evangelical convention of this period. All of these conventions broadly reflected Keswick traditions and values. CE was an expression of popular evangelicalism being itself: earnest, immersed in Scripture, devotional, eager to be spiritual, practical, mission-minded, and untouched by theological liberalism. It was a formula over fifty years old. For Miller, it still worked well. Miller was in any case no innovator, always preferring to work with what he knew had been successful in his earlier years.

Christian Endeavour and the Presbyterian BC Movement
In much of the PCNZ, CE was seen as an old-fashioned movement that had been eclipsed by the denominational BC movement. Notwithstanding ecumenism, some perceived the revival of the interdenominational CE as a potential threat to the denominational BC movement. A hostile piece was published in the 1930 Outlook. It argued that one organisation (the BC) is “sufficient”, that the control of the BC is “within” the church (whereas the CE’s is “without”), that the CE sent a “propagandist” (Miss Street) without consulting the PCNZ, and that the Pledge creates a “spiritual egotism” in the pledgers.135

Miller’s prominent support of the CE may have contributed to the perception that he was an anti-establishment maverick, separatist in spirit. His critics may not have been reassured by his 1931 article on CE in Outlook, ostensibly to mark the CE’s

---

132 CE Otago Union Convention Committee, Minutes 1936-40, 91/44/3. Frequent speakers included Miller, Hedley Bycroft, Andrew Johnston and Charles Kennedy (Mataura).
jubilee but also an implied rebuttal of the previous attack. Miller quietly sketched CE’s history, its international strength, its commitment to “Christ and the Church” and its “complementary” role to the BC.

By the mid-twentieth century, CE as a movement appeared to many to be old-fashioned, too spiritually intense, too serious for modern young people. Its recovery under Miller would not endure. But CE’s local role during Miller’s ministry was very significant. From 1929-44, 150 people in St. Stephen’s signed the Active Members Covenant. For those young people at St. Stephen’s who were not studying at university and in EU, CE was often the key instrument in their evangelical Christian formation. But in some other evangelical settings around New Zealand, however, CE had no presence, and formation occurred in other ways.

G Thomas Miller and Another Expression of Popular Evangelicalism: The Keswick Conventions

For those who missed out on CE conventions, there was always the summer Pounawea Convention. In the Keswick tradition, Pounawea matched similar conventions in the North Island, at Cambridge and Ngaruawahia, but was smaller.

134 The Otago CE Union owned a set of Keswick hymnbooks: Annual Meeting, 7 Nov. 1942.
135 Outlook XVIII (24 Feb. 1930): 10. The article also stated that in 1902 the number of young Presbyterians in CE was 2,250 (cf. 3,265 BC members), whereas in 1922 the relative figures were 377 in CE and 11,046 in BC.
136 Thomas Miller, “The CE Movement.”
137 Tension between the CE and the denominational BC was not unique to Presbyterians. Beilby alludes to such tensions in a Baptist context: 69.
138 TM, 38.
139 The Pounawea Convention had begun in 1908. The summer conventions at Cambridge (later Rotorua) were closest to the Keswick model and theology: GYM, ¶481; the Ngaruawahia Easter Conventions, established by A.A. Murray (q.v. Ireton: 64-68) in 1921 and later run by NZBTI, were “the least tied” to the Keswick model: JGM, ¶275. Ngaruawahia, drawing on a larger population base, appeared to at least one participant “very large and impressive” (Dr. Bruce Harris, letter, 30 May 2001); Ngaruawahia could attract up to 1,000 people, whereas in the late 1920s the more isolated Pounawea drew about 200 (Ireton: 47). For an account of a claimed “revival” at the Ngaruawahia Convention in 1936, see Orr, Evangelical Awakenings: 153-4; Orr, All Your Need: 15-36.
The conventions were intended for serious believers thirsty for spiritual refreshment and the deeper Christian life. They offered a strong dose of biblical exposition, testimony, prayer, and spiritual fellowship. The make-up of the Pounawea set was "strongly Open Brethren, Baptist, and godly Presbyterian," the Presbyterian component largely reflecting those country districts affected by an 1880s revival. The Miller family always attended the Pounawea Convention, along with others from St. Stephen's; at his first convention after arriving back in Dunedin in 1928, Miller had been elected Chairman. Speakers at Pounawea included Miller, John Bissett, Andrew Johnston, Evan Harries, and J.O. Sanders. There was always a presence of BTI students and of overseas missionaries. The characteristic Keswick themes of consecration and surrender were always evident, but at Pounawea there was not usually a strict adherence to the five-phase Keswick formula; attendees with a more reformed theology were in any case wary of "second blessing" theology.

---

140 GYM, ¶488 Yule recalled them as “rich times of Christian fellowship and...biblical teaching”. There were biblical expositions morning and evening, and also a missionary emphasis.
141 JGM, ¶261. J.G. Miller listed as particularly affected the districts of Gore, South Clutha, Waiwera, Warepa, the Catlins and Waikaka. Whereas the majority of the Pounawea attendees were Presbyterian, Baptists and Brethren predominated in the northern conventions: GYM, ¶489.
142 TM: 50. Not all St. Stephen's people were entirely positive about Pounawea conventions. One of them reported that, after some years, he developed a scepticism about the repeated testimonies he heard: name withheld, ¶21.
143 JGM, ¶262; RR, ¶114-116. For Sanders, see “Sanders, John Oswald: 1902-1999”, DNZB 4: 449-50. Sanders, a Southlander with a legal background, had experienced a spiritual turning point at Pounawea as a young man (Harries was speaking), and after that regularly attended the convention: J. Oswald Sanders, This I Remember (Eastbourne: Kingsway, 2002): 137. He was on the staff of NZBTI from 1926 and became Superintendent in 1933 after Kemp's death. He was an incisive speaker and from the late 1930s became a prolific writer. In 1946 he moved to Melbourne to become CIM Home Director of Australia and New Zealand, and in 1954 to Singapore as General Director (and was a key figure in the transition of CIM into OMF). His books (of which there were dozens) included: The Divine Art of Soul-Winning (London: Picketing & Inglis, 1937); Heresies Ancient and Modern (London & Edinburgh: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1948); Christ Indwelling and Enthroned (London & Edinburgh: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1949); Christ Incomparable (London & Edinburgh: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1952); Men from God's School (London: Lakeland, 1965); Spiritual Leadership (Chicago: Moody Press, 1967).
144 Ireton: 46.
145 J.G. Miller, later a frequent speaker at Keswick Conventions in New Zealand and internationally, noted "the pattern of preaching was that you begin by dealing with sin in the believer. Then on the second day you go on to the blood of Christ, as the remedy for sin, and the need for the continuous living in communion with the living God and cleansing by the blood of Christ. The third day, you are brought to the point...'how can you have this deliverance and victory without the abiding presence and enabling of the Holy Spirit?' so there is the strong teaching on the second blessing, as it came to be
At the 1929 Convention, Harries spoke on the Holy Spirit, and those present were invited to "stand and pray for refreshment by the Holy Spirit in a deepened spiritual consecration", to "yield completely to the Saviour", or to "testify". Many did so—including R.S. Cree Brown, former Professor of Engineering in Poona, who rose to confess a comment he had made about someone else. A young member of Miller’s congregation was then on his feet "in an act of full surrender, imploring the empowering of the Holy Spirit". It was reported to readers of the Outlook that at the Convention there had been "a deep work of the Holy Spirit" and a "great outpouring of the spirit of prayer". Harries had already shared with readers his "deep impression" that "the Word of the Lord is rare in these days", many are "famishing" for the Gospel but the Conventions "are thus supplying a very urgent need, and God is richly blessing them". The next year, another young camper from St. Stephen’s inscribed in the front of a new copy of Daily Light the words "To-day 27th of Dec 1930 I give myself all to God for the service of Jesus", and the following day: "I received on this day the filling of the Holy Spirit".

mis-called, or the anointing of the Holy Spirit, ...victorious living, but it became quite muted as I watched during my years at that convention. By the fourth day, what was meant to be the result, Christian service, and on the fifth day would be the missionary meeting, with experienced missionaries as speakers and a call for surrender for service": JGM, ¶265. He found English Keswick, Katoomba (NSW) and Belgrave Heights (Victoria) more insistently formulaic: JGM, ¶266. The younger Miller increasingly had "deep misgivings" about "second blessing" theology: JGM, ¶270-2. Ironically, his own experience "appeared to corroborate the Keswick theme": he noted that as a result of the 1929 Convention his own Christian experience became "vivid, reassuring, and dynamic": JGM, ¶270.

146 JGM, ¶262.
147 Ibid.
148 "This proved a turning point in my life. I wrote in the flyleaf of my Bible... 'I received the fullness of God's Holy Spirit on 27th December at the Pounawea Convention, 1929...For the first time in my life I experienced a settled assurance of faith. With that came a new motivation in Christian obedience and service. This focused in future missionary service. I found new application in study, new zest..., and even new levels of achievement in athletics. All things had 'become new' " (ADMNH 1: 60-61). Another person deeply moved by the Convention was future missionary Cliff Mitchell, later murdered in Ethiopia at the time of Mussolini’s invasion (ibid: 60).
150 "Our Evangelistic Page", Outlook XXXVIII (13 Jan., 1930): 28. Two other "Keswick" conventions were held that summer, at Saltaire (Christchurch) and Cambridge. William Orange spoke at the former, as did Harries.
151 RR, ¶205.
A Liberal Presbyterian Assault on Keswick

Pounawea, with the glowing reports of it by Harries in his weekly “Evangelistic” page in the Outlook, was not appreciated by everyone. It helped provoke Rev. J.V.T. Steele in 1931 to write a blisteringly polemical article against “Pietism”, contrasting it with “Calvinism”.152 The “worst forms of the Pietistic Movement today”, he wrote, “are seen in the Keswick teaching and similar conventions in NZ, and in what is known as revivalism generally”. Pietism, he noted, is contrary to the methods and spirit of “OUR church”, it is an “importation”, it is “Sectist”, it produces “emotional outbursts” and “emotional perversions”, it is “one of the most dangerous and disintegrating of all psychological conditions” (disturbing the “deep roots” of personality), it is similar to “primitive religions”, it stirs up a “highly ...artificial sense of sin”, and it has been opposed by Jeremiah, Paul, Augustine, Calvin, Forsyth, and Barth.153 Steele’s attack inspired many to respond, including a quietly reasoned letter from G.M. Yule.154 E.M. Blaiklock (Classics Lecturer in Auckland and first-time attender) wrote in defence of Pounawea, stressing the “sanity” of the convention’s teaching and the spiritual genuineness of those present: Blaiklock had observed “a simplicity almost apostolic”, “no extravagance, no emotionalism, but a quiet earnestness, a reality of devotion, and a self-effacement that rang true”.155

152 J.V.T. Steele, “Calvinism or Pietism”, Outlook XXXVIII (30 Nov. 1931): 9-12. The primary targets of Steele’s invective were Assembly Evangelist, John Bissett and his publicist in the Outlook, Evan R. Harries (also see discussion below). As a moderate Calvinist, Miller was unlikely to have enjoyed the contrast made by Steele between Calvinism and Pietism. Arguably, Steele’s article caricatured both.
153 Steele did not elaborate on his understanding of Calvinism but indicated that he had become aware of the writings of Max Weber and Ernst Troeltsch, now made available in English, which he felt gave a “thorough-going scientific investigation into the fruits of Pietism for the first time”. He understood Weber, in his work The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, to have shown that Calvinism gave an intellectual, commercial and social lead to Calvinist countries and that any “infiltration” of Pietism had always weakened that. In addition, Steele asserted (without any further detail) that “modern psychology” had now explained “these emotional outbursts” of the Pietists. Giving other clues to the basis of his thought, Steele revealed an admiration for Barth, and regretted that, for the Pietist, “an infallible Church is replaced by an infallible book... which, for a man influenced by the thought of his day... is an intellectual feat of no mean order”.
154 George Morrison Yule, “Calvinism or Pietism”, Outlook XXXIX (January 18, 1932): 26-27. See other responses e.g. Outlook XXXVIII (December 21, 1932): 7-8;
Steele’s attack on Pounawea would not have changed Miller’s thinking, but would merely have confirmed his assessment of the parlous theological condition of his denomination. Nor would it have affected what Miller did: he knew that, along with the CE Easter Conventions, Pounawea was an important “building block” in the life of St. Stephen’s.

H Thomas Miller and Evangelical Agencies and Missioners

The work of Miller cannot be understood only in relation to his local parish. His ministry was being constantly reinforced by an interlocking mesh of other evangelical ministries and organisations, especially the regional CE movement, Pounawea conventions and visiting evangelists. Other evangelical agencies also played a significant supporting role: missionary societies, Scripture Union, and the BTI (mainly through The Reaper). The new university-based Evangelical Union (and the supporting schools-based Crusader Movement) would become especially critical.

Quite apart from his own theological convictions, there was every reason for Miller to ignore denominational youth work and vigorously to encourage explicitly evangelical organisations and initiatives: it was obvious that they provided considerable momentum, especially among young people. When Fletcher conducted a mission in Dunedin late in 1928 over 1000 men attended a Sunday afternoon session and 200 responded, including some from St. Stephen’s. When W.P. Nicholson conducted his extensive New Zealand campaign in 1933-4, Miller

---

156 JGM, ¶263.
157 ADMNH 1: 49; JGM, ¶170. The mission (sponsored by the Dunedin Ministers’ Association) was held in the Empire Theatre, with the Sunday afternoon meeting in the Methodist Central Mission.
158 For an overview of Nicholson, see Ian Breward, “Nicholson, William Patterson”, in Dickey (ed.): 284-5. Nicholson (who had extensively toured Australia in 1926) was in New Zealand from March 1933 to mid-1934. He first made his impact at the 1933 Ngaruawahia Easter Convention, where he was one of the main speakers. With crowds of up to 800 present, Nicholson was credited by Harries with raising the convention “to the highest state of ... fervour that it has yet known in its 13 years of existence”: “Our Evangelistic Page,” Outlook XXXX (12 June 1933): 24; also ibid. (1 May 1933): 28. A
chaired and promoted the Dunedin meetings and saw some lasting results among his young people. In the course of his ministry at St. Stephen’s, Miller several times used BTI evangelist Andrew Johnston. In 1930, in the depths of the Depression, Miller and St. Stephen’s supported a tent mission by Harry Dawson. In 1936, Miller hosted at St. Stephen’s one of the Dunedin meetings of revivalist Edwin Orr, at which he publicly prayed for revival. Such itinerants all reinforced the ministry of Miller, and each played a role in developing the identity of Presbyterian evangelicals.

**Thomas Miller and W.P. Nicholson**

In the case of the fiery, unconventional Irish evangelist W.P. Nicholson, liberals were outraged and evangelicals emboldened. Nicholson had a deliberately blunt and

---

month-long campaign followed in Auckland, with nightly meetings in Scots Hall (Symonds St). On 19 May, 1700 were present, and two days later 700 were turned away. In the inquiry room, “conversions” had been recorded. It was decided to extend the campaign, in the Town Hall. See ibid. (22 May): 24; (12 June): 28; “Rev. Wm. P. Nicholson’s Mission in Auckland,” Reaper XI, 8 (Sept. 28, 1933): 62-4. On 11 June he preached to a congregation of 300 at Papakura Presbyterian, where the Home Missionary (G.M. Yule, Snr) was a convert from a Nicholson campaign in Scotland. Until early in 1934, campaigns followed in other main cities and in numerous smaller centres such as Gisborne, Palmerston North and Hamilton. At Punawaea (1933-34) Nicholson drew a record attendance.

Nicholson conducted a mission in Otago University, which “raised interest but left little in the way of results”, and later conducted a Dunedin mission sponsored by the Otago League, with meetings in the Town Hall for several weeks; the latter mission had much more impact, ADMNH 1: 75. Converts from the Dunedin meetings included Charlie and Muriel McLean (who later became Baptists, and enthusiastic CE people) and May Roy (who later went to BTI, and to China and the Philippines as a missionary with CIM/OMF), JCM, ¶305. The claim was frequently made by informants that Nicholson's converts were more enduring than those of many other evangelistic campaigns e.g. Rev. Stephen Clark, interview, 16 Aug. 1999 (hereafter SC), ¶266; RR, ¶199; JGM, ¶305. Miller was of the same view. Yule was especially appreciative of Nicholson, and was aware that his own father (Geordie) had been converted under Nicholson’s ministry back in Scotland: GMY, ¶54. Yule also “always felt his mission had the greatest impact on NZ of any visitor I have known”: ibid., ¶58.

Miller had had Bissett as a missioner at Feilding, where he had also had missions conducted by William Mains, who was an Auckland businessman, Presbyterian elder, and Honorary Principal of BTI (ADMNH 1: 26).

Ibid.: 1: 50. In Dunedin, however, Miller did not appear to have sponsored any missions by Mains.

J. Edwin Orr, *All Your Need: 10,000 Miles of Miracle through Australia and New Zealand* (London: Marshall Morgan and Scott, 1936): 47-48. Orr devoted three chapters to describing what he (and others at that time) saw as the beginnings of New Zealand revival based on public confession and prayer: 15-65. Orr gave accounts of such outpourings of confession, prayer and “blessing” at Ngaruawahia Easter Convention and in transdenominational meetings in all the main centres.

But none of them appear to have contributed to Anglican evangelicalism.

Reactions to Nicholson in New Zealand appear similar to those he had provoked during his 1926
provocative style. Nicholson went out of his way to blast the modernists as traitors, and to mock Presbyterians as nominal or lukewarm. He offended some when he joked that “the road to hell is lined with the skulls of Presbyterian ministers.” He angered others with his frequent and passionate denunciations of Principal Dickie and the Theological Hall. At one Dunedin meeting he announced: “Your professors at the Theological Hall, [they] don’t believe a thing. If I weren’t a converted man, I’d go up and shoot them in their beds”. Thomas Miller appeared uncomfortable with such outbursts of “roughness” and “Nicholsoniana”. But New Zealand’s future evangelical Presbyterian leaders were

CICCU mission at Cambridge University: his bluntness surprised some and outraged others, but Nicholson nevertheless had an “indelible” effect on the CICCU, Pollock: 219-29; F.D. Coggan (ed.): 71. According to Owen Chadwick, biographer of Archbishop A.M. Ramsay, Ramsay never quite forgave CICCU for inviting Nicholson, and always consequently thought of evangelicals as anti-intellectual and overly emotional (Barclay: 29); “That one evening”, Ramsay wrote in 1956, “created in me a deep and lasting dislike of the extreme evangelical style of evangelism” (cit. Randall: 99).

Nicholson has been described by those who heard him as “crude” and “shocking”: SC, ¶265. There are many stories about this, e.g. “A woman came in late to the Hamilton Baptist Church, wearing a yellow coat, and was dithering about where to sit. He said, ‘when that canary finds a perch, I’ll continue’”: ibid. His language was peppered with mild swear words, such as “damn” and “bastard”, which “deeply disturbed” those on the platform at his first meeting in Auckland such as Laidlaw and Harries: GMY, ¶55, ¶57. Nicholson did not only insult the Presbyterians: he also mocked the Baptists, Brethren and Salvation Army; he “took shots at anybody and anything”: GMY, ¶61. Graham Miller summarised the three-week Dunedin campaign thus: “The first week, horror; the next week relief; the next week a very full attendance of grateful Christians who had been nominal members and who were converted” (JGM, ¶302). Yule suggested some explanations for Nicholson’s style: apart from his personality and cultural background, Nicholson had had a riotous youth, serving six years on windjammers, and his evangelical identity had been shaped in part by the tumult during his years in the USA in the 1920s: GMY, ¶56-7.

Nicholson was a minister of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland.

After about the second Nicholson meeting in Dunedin (it was a three-week campaign), Miller got a call from the clerk of Presbytery, reporting complaints about this statement. In response, Miller explained that the statement originated with Dr. Alexander Whyte (of Free St. George’s Church, Edinburgh, and the Principal of New College, Edinburgh, 1909-1921), who had said it in a church service. When on Monday his students stamped their feet in disapproval, Whyte said [according to Graham Miller]: “Gentlemen, I gather there is some disapproval of what I may have said yesterday in St. George’s. Permit me to add that not only is the road to hell paved with the skulls of Presbyterian ministers, but there is enough material coming on to keep it in repair for all eternity”: JGM, ¶303; also SC, ¶265.

CMY, ¶306.

Thomas Miller, “Rev. W.P. Nicholson in Dunedin”, Reaper XI, 10 (30 Nov. 1933): 213-4. Nevertheless, Miller praised Nicholson as a godly preacher of rare “compass and power and elevation”: “you can hear the wail of the lost, the shout of the free, the song of the saved” (ibid.). The two men became life-long friends and corresponded thereafter, TM: 58.
delighted at such entertainment: “we youngsters thought it was terrific!” It was Nicholson’s audacious humour that helped make him seem – to the emerging generation – so “amazingly lovable”, and which helped consolidate their own “them and us” outlook. For them, Nicholson’s rhetoric helped grow their awareness of theological battle-lines and their own identity as evangelicals. Presbyterian officialdom, however, was definitely unamused: outside of Harries’ “Evangelistic Page”, the Outlook studiously ignored Nicholson.

More widely, it was noted that Nicholson’s plain-speaking, non-clerical style appealed to working people, including Depression relief workers. Nationally, Miller’s known converts included at least seven future Presbyterian ministers. A by-product of the Nicholson missions was his energetic promotion of his New Zealand sponsoring body, the Bible Training Institute. Nicholson lauded BTI as the

---

170 JGM, ¶306. Six and a half decades later, Graham Miller reflected that the humour was sometimes “regrettable” and not very gracious, reflecting a “barbaric North of Ireland language of strife”.
171 GMY, ¶63.
172 Ibid., ¶554.
173 Ibid., “his bolstering of BTI, his lambasting modernism – including ...Knox, all contributed to building up a growing sense of distinction between ‘them and us’, a growing conviction that the Church is too much under the direction of a middle of the road or modernistic group”: GMY, ¶332: [through Nicholson] “evangelicals became increasingly aware of their own identity in contrast to the identity of others”.
174 Harries, too, tried to be sensitive in the way he reported the missions and often quietly defended Nicholson. He obliquely acknowledged Nicholson’s criticism of the theological and ecclesiastical establishment, noting that Nicholson was “fearless in his denunciation of ... disloyalty to revealed truth on the part of those who profess to teach it”, Outlook XXXIX (15 May 1933): 24, but argued that “some allowance has to be made for his American experience” (22 May 1933): 24. He conceded that “one may not agree with all of his [Nicholson’s] prohibitions”, ibid., and that “some of his sayings offend the fastidious” (15 May 1933): 24. Harries defended Nicholson against the charge of organised emotionalism, pointing out that there was no preceding choir or soloist (12 June 1933): 24, and that Nicholson’s addresses were “straight ...Bible teaching” with “a clear presentation” that was “addressed far more to reason and conscience than to emotion” (29 May, 1933): 29. Harries noted that once the mission expenses were covered, offerings were discontinued (22 May). As the year continued, Harries’ reports of Nicholson became fewer, perhaps reflecting his awareness of how Nicholson had become persona non grata in official Presbyterian circles on account of his attacks on the Theological Hall and its staff.
177 Founded in Auckland 1922 by Joseph Kemp, the NZBTI advertised itself as “An Inter-Denominational Evangelical Missionary Training School...for Christian work at home and abroad”,
New Zealand seat of orthodoxy, in contrast to Knox, and as the ideal place to go for training. For many of his young hearers, Nicholson “put BTI on the map” and helped build its growing reputation – across a wider denominational base – as a key “custodian” of evangelical faith.

**Thomas Miller and BTI’s “Blind Evangelist”**

Andrew Johnston, as BTI evangelist, helped enhance the credibility of BTI and of evangelicalism generally. Itinerating from 1929-1940, Johnston had none of the eccentricities of Nicholson. The “Blind Evangelist” was quiet and earnest. He was palpably sincere, with “absolute integrity in his person and in his presentation”. Johnston prepared thoroughly, often sending new messages to Blaiklock to be checked. His speaking was straight-forward, thoughtful and full of Scripture: Johnston “preached in a logical and convincing manner, with liberty and fire”. He avoided controversy. His blindness, and the fact that it had happened at war, commanded both interest and respect. His missions were booked a year ahead. His

---


BTI played a similar role to that of many colleges overseas, where the disappearance of Bible training colleges played a significant role in the maintaining of evangelical theology; see e.g. Robert K. Burkinshaw, “Evangelical Bible Colleges in Twentieth-Century Canada”, in G.A. Rawlyk (ed.), *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience* 369-84.

178 BTI played a similar role to that of many colleges overseas, where the disappearance of Bible training colleges played a significant role in the maintaining of evangelical theology; see e.g. Robert K. Burkinshaw, “Evangelical Bible Colleges in Twentieth-Century Canada”, in G.A. Rawlyk (ed.), *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience* 369-84.

179 GMY, ¶59; also JGM, ¶290, ¶300: although Nicholson’s excesses “almost sank them [BTI] for a start”, the mission ultimately “greatly multiplied their influence”

180 Ibid., ¶104, ¶100-1. That reputation was also being built by *The Reaper*, by the Ngaruawahia Convention, by staff such as J.O. Sanders and by BTI evangelist Andrew Johnston. By the early 1930s, two St. Stephen’s people had gone to study at BTI, ADMNH 1: 50.

181 JGM, ¶174.

182 JGM, ¶174.


184 Thomson: 32.
impact was mainly in the country areas, but was also felt in larger centres. From 1929 his influence was as pervasive for godliness as any influence in New Zealand. It was characteristic of Miller to recognise such a ministry, and to use it to grow his own.

Thomas Miller and John Bissett

Miller also had a parish mission conducted in St. Stephen’s by John Bissett, the official (PCNZ) Assembly Evangelist (1918-34). Bissett was a product of 1890s revivalism in the Scottish Counties. With a “very lively” manner, Bissett was not a “hell-fire” preacher but “sound and sane and warmly persuasive.” He would conduct about a dozen major parish missions a year, not in large city parishes but usually in rural and developing charges. Missions usually spanned about two

---


186 Rev. C.J. Tocker of St. Paul’s, Invercargill, gave a glowing account of Johnston speaking to a packed church and hall of over 1000 people: “The evangelist was very quiet, very simple. A more humble, modest, sincere man never breathed. ‘God help us to get low enough’ was a prayer often on his lips. It was utterly genuine, and he lived his prayer. He was himself so manifestly the embodiment of the Gospel he preached. Andrew Johnston speaks with an authority that silences every criticism. Moreover, he is such a radiant, joyful personality, as fresh as the morning dew. His amazing command of the English Bible gave great weight to his preaching and teaching. I have never known anyone with a memory so richly stored with the English Bible, and the stores so readily at his command. He has no crankiness. A strong ethical note took the place so often occupied in evangelistic mission by controversial, secondary topics. Evangelism such as this is surely the first and greatest need of the Church today.” C.J. Tocker, “A Remarkable Mission”, Reaper, Nov. 1934: 237-9.

187 JCM, ¶173.

188 ADMNH 1: 49; Proceedings, 1930, Appendix XXX, Report of Life and Work Committee: 194. The mission was in 1929.

189 GMY, ¶54. That revivalism was in the long after-glow of the 1859 Revival. After several years leading the Lanarkshire Christian Union, an evangelistic organisation, Bissett (1868-1943) had accepted a call to come to New Zealand in 1910 to lead the Auckland Central Mission. He was appointed Assembly Evangelist by the 1917 Assembly and served in that role 1918-1934. He was ordained by the 1921 Assembly.


weeks (with three Sundays). In 1929, a Bissett mission made an impact on a young Rymall Roxburgh; during the sermon Roxburgh was “convicted in the Holy Spirit” and waited anxiously for the end of the meeting “fearful that something might happen” and he might lose the opportunity to respond. As often, such experiences were about assurance of salvation rather than a dramatic change of direction. Other future ministers who had made responses at Bissett meetings included Mervyn Milmine, Jack Smith, Morrison Yule and Jack Somerville. To small or country parishes, a Bissett mission was a major event and could have enduring consequences. To ministers like Miller, Bissett was a reassuring link with a time when the denomination had seemed more evangelistic and spiritually ardent, but to some younger, more liberal ministers, Bissett was an embarrassment and a relic.

---

193 RR, ¶87-89. The Bissett mission – at Anderson’s Bay Presbyterian - was Roxburgh’s first experience of an evangelistic meeting, but Roxburgh had already had considerable exposure to church. At Tawa Flat, Roxburgh had been influenced by home missionary Hedley Bycroft (Methodist, but later Congregational): Bycroft would “cycle down from Porirua, on a gravelly road. On Sundays he would travel in a gig, driven by an inmate from the mental hospital, who would sit in the gig throughout the service. He [Bycroft] was keen, he showed a personal interest that inspired me, [and] he had given a New Testament to my sister”: RR, ¶97-8.
194 When Roxburgh reached home he told his mother “I’m a Christian”. She asked “Haven’t you always been one?” He replied “Now I know I am.”
195 Milmine 23; Proceedings, 1981: 112. For Smith, Proceedings, 1981: 119. For Yule, his response at the Bissett meeting was not especially significant, given both his family background and his responses at other times, GMY, ¶52. Somerville responded at the same Anderson’s Bay meeting as Roxburgh. In his autobiography, Somerville questioned whether his response – in a “hothouse” context – had been motivated in part by subtle pressures to please his parents and peers, and whether, in view of the faith he had “naturally” absorbed from his family, it ultimately made any difference (Somerville: 36-7).
196 J.G. Miller came home from work one day to the St. Stephen’s manse and heard Bissett’s estimate of his Waikaka Valley mission: “We’ve had revival”. Miller asserted: “that place had the warmth and fragrance of his presence for years”: JCM, ¶175. Possible support for that assertion may be found in the 1941 finding of the Presbytery of Mataura triennial visitation of the Waikaka Valley parish, that: “every work prospers. The spiritual state of the church is truly ‘evangelical’ ”: Outlook XLVIII (22 Oct. 1941): 7.
197 The Life and Work Committee report to the 1930 Assembly noted that the work of the Assembly Evangelist was not being supported by “the larger congregations” and that the committee sensed “in some quarters...a certain amount of opposition” to the Evangelist’s work, Proceedings, 1930: 82.
I  Thomas Miller and the Atonement Debate

Because of all his local commitments, Miller’s wider denominational involvements were relatively sparing, but were sufficient for him to be recognised as a leading evangelical voice within Presbyterianism: someone too strong and eloquent to be ignored, someone too moderate and reasoned to be easily discredited.

Occasionally, Miller wrote for the Outlook. In 1923 he wrote an article defending the divine inspiration of Scripture.198 In 1926 – more controversially but with characteristic courtesy – he wrote of his concerns that ministry education in theological colleges around the world majored on “barren negations”, was lost “in the mist of unproved and unapplied theory,” and lacked emphasis on evangelism.199 Miller’s words were oblique, but were an implied criticism of the Theological Hall. They were interpreted as such. Some were also offended by Miller’s assertion that the teaching of Bible Training Institutes was “near[er] the living heart of things”.200 Dickie took great offence and responded in a tone that was deeply condescending, obviously intending to put Miller in his place:201 Miller, deficient in both “knowledge and mentality”, was “living in an intellectual back-wash” and had a “crude” conception of salvation; long before Miller had “discovered Dr. Hodge on the West Coast”, Protestantism “had left Dr. Hodge far behind”; the Bible Institutes were

198 Thomas Miller, “The Inspiration of the Bible. Introductory and Textual”, Outlook XXX (20 Aug. 1923): 3-5. This was the leading article in this issue and was not polemical in tone.
200 ibid.
201 John Dickie, “Preparation for the Ministry”, Outlook XXXIII (20 Nov. 1926): 25. Miller, Dickie suggested, was uninformed and out-of-date on most subjects yet had presumed to be “a universal preceptor”. Miller should have worked harder at the Hall: he should have been “more anxious to equip himself quietly and unobtrusively for the work of the ministry and less concerned to show the light of his transcendent gifts on the mysteries of philosophy”. Dickie assured readers that, with regard to the Hall staff, “an occasional ray of vital Christianity still shines upon our drowsy souls”. Henceforth, Dickie declared, he would ignore Miller “unless he has something to say that is worth replying to”.

"intended as short and easy roads to the Christian pulpit for men incapable of thinking things out for themselves".

Unabashed, Miller wrote back deploring Dickie’s descent into personal attack. In a response containing numerous repetitions of the words “real scholar”, Dickie announced his “general finding ... that Mr Miller has been talking at large about a number of important and difficult subjects about which he does not know enough to know his own ignorance”; when he is old, Miller will thank him for teaching him a painful lesson that “books and words must be understood in their context, ... weighed and not simply counted.” Unrepentant, Miller noted Dickie’s “self-imposed mantle of omniscience” and his “wild and whirling” opinions which all must accept “purely on his own authority” if they are to escape being “instantly bludgeoned.” At this point, the Editor called a halt. The exchange of letters had highlighted the profound differences between Miller – an articulate and uncowed spokesman for an older evangelical Presbyterian confessionalism – and Dickie, the rather prickly defender of the new and more liberal theological establishment.

---

204 Thomas Miller, “Ministerial Training”, Outlook (4 April 1927): 5-6. Miller writes: “my contributions were expressed, I believe, in perfectly courteous terms. Not so Dr. Dickie. Do I mention a way in which our training may be improved? My mentality is sneered at.” Miller concluded with the hope that in future Dickie might show more respect for those with whom he differed.
205 In another context, King notes Dickie’s “touchiness and even a certain pugnacity” and his “overriding passion to be seen to be in the right”: 269.
Thomas Miller and the 1932 General Assembly

At General Assemblies, Miller continued to speak up. Miller was frequently fighting against the current:

The other side would raise points of order so as to curtail Thomas Miller's flights of oratory, to break in on the thread of his argument, they just didn't like some of the things he said. He perhaps overstated some things. He was strong, he was battling for the truth in those pretty tough days. He was a lone figure.206

Miller felt he had very little support from other Evangelicals, who often appeared intimidated by the prevailing mood of Assembly.207 Such an occasion was in 1932. Miller was eager to counter the subjective "moral influence" theory of the atonement, ostensibly being promoted at the Theological Hall by Dickie. The 1931 publication of Dickie's *Organism of Christian Truth* had made public Dickie's views on many key doctrines.208 Isaac Jolly wrote a careful letter to the *Outlook* that Dickie's explicit denial of substitutionary atonement and his neglect of the Cross was a "direct contradiction" of Scripture and contrary to the teaching of the Presbyterian Church and "every evangelical church".209 Miller prepared to move a motion at the Assembly that substitutionary atonement be taught at the Hall, that James Denney's work on the atonement be prescribed for examination and that Assembly reaffirm "its strong adherence" to the doctrine of substitutionary atonement as "central and essential to

206 GYM, ¶283.
207 Ibid.
209 Isaac Jolly, "Principal Dickie and the Atonement", *Outlook* XXXIX (4 Jan.1932): 27-8. Jolly alluded, for instance, to Dickie's denial of substitutionary atonement (Dickie: 275) and compares his statements with those of St. Paul, the Catechisms and James Denney. See also King: 244-9. King (246) describes Jolly's critique as "fairly compelling".
the preaching and reception of the Gospel”. In consultation with Jolly, Miller prepared a substantial speech. Without any hint of personal rancour, Miller argued that in Dickie’s book there had been a “a radical and serious departure” from historic orthodoxy, with two essential Christian doctrines explicitly compromised: the Scriptures as the ground of authority, and substitutionary atonement as the heart of the gospel. Miller’s key concern was that the church’s teaching be upheld in the college responsible for shaping future ministers.

Once at Assembly, at Christchurch, Miller could not find any minister willing to second his motion. The failure to find a ministerial seconder was interpreted by Miller and his family as evidence of liberal dominance over the Assembly and that evangelical ministers were intimidated and fearful. In the end, he persuaded an elder from Waiwera South, George Neale, to do so. Neale uttered just four words (“I second the motion”), returned to his seat and collapsed.

Instead of supporting Miller’s motion, Assembly pointedly heaped praise on Dickie. In critiquing Dickie’s theological position, Miller may have become too

---

210 Proceedings, 1932, 26: “In view of the clear and consistent teaching of the Word of God on the death of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in view of our Church’s subordinate standards as expressed in recent times by the Declaratory Acts, viz., ‘This Church most earnestly proclaims, as standing in the very forefront of the revelation of grace, the love of God … in the coming of the Son to offer Himself a propitiation for sin’, the Assembly re-affirms its strong adherence to the substitutionary atonement made by our Lord in His offering Himself for us and for our sin upon the Cross; the Assembly enjoins that this truth be impressed upon its students, and that to this end Dr. James Denney’s book ‘The Death of Christ’ be prescribed for examination. The Assembly would also impress this truth upon the whole Church, ministers, office-bearers, and people, as central and essential to the preaching and reception of the Gospel.”


212 By this time, Miller must have known Dickie well – quite apart from regular association at Presbytery, Miller was a member of the Theological Hall Committee. Miller would also have been very careful, in view of Dickie’s very personal response to previous (implied) criticisms in 1926-7.

213 There were several ministers of conservative evangelical sympathies on the Assembly roll who would have been capable of seconding the motion, e.g. F.B. Barton, E.J. Orange, G.P. Mitchell.

214 JGM, ¶94-96.

215 Proceedings, 1932, 27. “The Assembly takes this opportunity of affirming its confidence in its honoured principal and professor of systematic theology, in whose hands it has placed for the past 21
closely associated in the eyes of many with P.B. Fraser, whose protracted campaign against Dickie was often perceived as a tasteless personal vendetta. A reaffirmation of basic doctrine might have been achievable, but anything that could be construed as an attack on the denomination’s eminent theological Principal was unlikely to succeed. Miller was undeterred. A few hours later, he attempted an amendment to stall movement towards church union. That too was lost. 

Miller’s perception that he was part of a beleaguered and browbeaten minority, making little headway against a strong tide, must have strengthened when the Outlook failed to give any adequate coverage of the Assembly debate or its issues. The Outlook had a policy of ignoring Fraser, and in 1932 Miller too was made to feel the same cold wind. The Outlook refused to print his speech, a decision to which Miller took “grave exception”. Such official censorship no doubt deepened the feeling among conservative evangelicals that they were being deliberately locked out of real voice or influence by the controlling forces in the denomination. Such

years the duty of training students for the ministry in the verities of our Christian faith. The Assembly records its appreciation for his distinguished services to the Theological Hall and to the Church, upon which his great learning has shed such lustre; and further congratulates him on the success of his book, ‘The Organism of Christian Truth’. The minutes recorded that the motion was passed by “an overwhelming majority”. Following what was perceived as personal criticism, such a motion was always likely to attract strong support.

Assembly appeared unpersuaded by Miller’s assurance that “in this motion there is no personal reference to anyone.” Much later, and in the same venue (St. Paul’s Christchurch), similar dynamics were perhaps at work in the 1967 debate relating to Principal Geering.

Miller claimed that since only seventy-two out of 370 Sessions had voted on the proposal sent down to them, there was general “apathy” and the matter should be dropped.

A brief item gave the wording of both Miller’s item and the motion that was carried, but made no comment on the debate except that following Miller’s “well-prepared” speech “there followed a full discussion”; “The Organism of Christian Truth”, Outlook XXXIX (7 March 1932): 5. It also noted that the vote was “overwhelming.”

“The Synod and The Outlook. Editor’s action questioned,” Outlook XXXIX (5 Sept., 1932): 27. King comments: 242: “Once again a dissonant voice had effectively been silenced by the editorial policy of the Outlook; once again the ‘liberal theological establishment’ had triumphed over a solitary conservative voice raised in protest.”

“The treatment which Fraser, Miller and especially Isaac Jolly received at the hands of John Dickie and some of his friends and colleagues did little to allay ‘conservative’ fears of a ‘liberal’ conspiracy to control not only the education of the church’s future ministers, but also to censor what ordinary
feelings contributed to the post-war emergence of the Westminster Fellowship: seeing themselves as the faithful remnant in a compromised denomination, conservative evangelicals would conclude they must work together to guard and promote the true faith.

Meanwhile, with all other doors closed to him, Miller took the unusual step of protesting to the Synod of Otago and Southland, asking the Synod to express its "regret" at the Outlook's editorial decision. Again, there was a struggle to find a seconder. The clerk moved "That the Synod proceed to the next business" and it was carried. The motion's failure was inevitable, given what had immediately preceded it: the Synod had received a letter from Fraser requesting that the Synod establish an enquiry into whether the teaching at the Hall was consistent with the Westminster Confession and the Synod had ruled that "it is not competent for the Synod to deal with the character or the teaching of Dr. Dickie's book". As for Dickie, his position was as secure as ever. A few months later, Assembly would further endorse him by unanimously choosing him as Moderator-Elect. After that,
Miller missed the next five Assemblies. But he was unbowed: his 1934 book was in part a direct response to the views on Scripture of one of Dickie’s staff, Prof. Hunter.

J  *Thomas Miller’s Church Union Campaign*

Late in 1940 Miller was back at Assembly, seconding an unpopular amendment opposing church union. Ironically, the amendment was moved by Dickie, who since about 1918 had also been opposed to church union. When the amendment was lost, 11/147, three individuals asked for their dissent to be recorded: Dickie, Miller and D.N. McKenzie. Over the next few years, those three joined forces as the leaders of a major anti-Union campaign. In the face of a strongly pro-Union editorial stance, and to the frustration of Dickie’s professorial colleagues and ministerial protégés (especially Bates), Dickie was one of three signatories to a key letter: “The Case against Church Union: Twelve Reasons”. The *Outlook* received a flood of letters,

---

227 1935 to 1939.
228 Miller: Foreword; 46.
229 Proceedings, 1940: 38. The substantive motion was by J.M. Bates, and proposed negotiations with the Methodists. The amendment argued that it was “inexpedient” to initiate a controversy “while the Empire is fighting for its existence”.
230 King: 129, 266.
233 John Dickie, D.N. McKenzie, Thomas Miller “The Case against Church Union: Twelve Reasons.” Outlook XLIX (25 Mar. 1942): 15. Readers were challenged to preserve the Presbyterian “Church’s historic witness to the Christian revelation”, to hold “to that anchor by which it has weathered many a storm and borne its great testimony.” Reasons included (in summary): (1) “There shall be *many folds, but one flock, one shepherd*” – Scripture does not require uniformity of creed or organisation, but “unity of the Spirit”. (2) Previous unions have led to decline, and to (5) discord and division. (3) Solemn vows will have to be repudiated and “we shall sever ourselves from historic and world-wide Calvinistic Presbyterianism, to become a strange medley, a creedless Church, ...the child...of ecclesiastical opportunism”. (6) A “new creed” reflects “the *spiritual atmosphere* of its time” – and there could not be a worse time than now. (7) “Ecclesiastical despotism” and “monopoly”. (10) The controversy will distract from the primary task of evangelism. (11) The greater need than re-organisation is “deeper devotion to Christ”. (12) There is “no adequate justification” for such a “revolutionary” and “irrevocable” move, combining churches that are different in “creed and polity”. A couple of weeks earlier, Miller had written that Church Union mistakes shadow for substance and Church Union for Church Unity. The former is a human organisation, a “house that Jack built”, a Tower of Babel, an illusory
both pro- and anti-Union: the trio were castigated as “miserable and mean”, “trouble-makers”, a “few intolerant isolationists” who cannot “discern the times”. Miller was evidently an acceptable personal target, but nobody mentioned Dickie himself. The correspondence suggests that, as with Miller, the chief objection of evangelical conservatives to church union was the fear of doctrinal indifferentism.

Once again, Miller found himself a dissident. Throughout the 1930s and 40s, Miller had retained a voice in the courts of the church and in the Outlook. But he had sensed the strong disdain of the denominational establishment.

K Other Presbyterian Evangelicals under Fire

Miller was not the only conservative evangelical who felt off-side with the denominational leadership. Fraser had been banished to the margins. Jolly, a former Moderator and once widely respected for his scholarship and churchmanship, found that by the 1930s his conservative biblical and doctrinal emphases were no longer favoured in high places. Bissett, Assembly Evangelist, old-style in both things, created “to hide the facts” and devised when “life within the church runs low”: ibid. (4 Mar. 1942): 29-30.


235 Prof. S.F. Hunter was especially scathing, scorning Miller as “the omniscient Antipodean”: “Church Union,” ibid. (22 April, 1942): 21. Dickie did not write to defend his position, and died in June 1942.

236 E.g. D. Sutherland, who claimed anything miraculous or to do with judgement was downplayed in the inter-church SS and BC syllabi, XLVIII (3 Sept. 1941): 23; ibid. (16 July 1941): 23; “The Evangelical witness of the Church will be weakened by union rather than strengthened,” T.G. Calder, XLIX (22 April, 1942): 9.

theology and practice, had increasingly become the target of liberal murmurings. By 1931, dissent against Bissett and what he stood for had become open and virulent: "The time has come", Steele had declaimed in his article, "for ...opposition to be freely and fully vented..."  

A greater target still was Harries, Bissett's faithful publicist. Week by week, with a content and idiom increasingly in contrast to the rest of the *Outlook*, Harries had been calling for a new "Pentecost", "the fire of the Holy Spirit", a "quickened Church", and - incessantly - for nation-wide revival. In November 1931, putting aside his normally irenic tone, Harries had spoken out on behalf of "the Bible believer" and "the godly remnant". He had denounced the "mischief" of those theologians who assume a "patronising attitude ...toward the Bible" and who prefer the "nebulous realm of 'experience' to the solid realities of the Divine Word". Only a Church which trembles at God's word, he had declared, is one which God could use...  

Will such a Church have to be called out from the existing churches? Or shall it remain within the Churches the godly remnant who shall be saved, and who are even now doing the work of bringing salvation to others? It is not surprising to find in dead or dying churches so much hatred of evangelism, so much indifference or antagonism towards the teaching of holiness, or separation from the world, or the spread of the

---

238 1909.  
239 *Outlook* XXXVIII (10 Aug. 1931): 27. The Convener of the Assembly Life and Work Committee noted that some unease had been expressed at Assembly [June 1931] about Bissett's position and called for further discussion. "A certain amount of opposition" to the role had previously been reported by the Life and Work Committee to the 1930 Assembly (*Proceedings*, 1930: 82).  
240 J.V.T. Steele, "Calvinism or Pietism," *Outlook* XXXVIII (30 Nov. 1931): 9. Such an attack was contrary to the expressed view of Assembly, which invariably passed a resolution - originating with the Life and Work Committee - commending the work of Bissett and assuring him of the Church's prayer and support e.g. *Proceedings*, 1927, 12; *ibid.*. 1930, 10. In 1931, a few months previous to Steele's article, Assembly had expressed its "absolute confidence" in Bissett (*ibid.* 1931: 25).  
242 *Outlook* XXXVII (3 Nov. 1930): 28.  
244 See above.
gospel in all the earth ... and the Bible is little known by or it has never conquered the heart of the average church member.\textsuperscript{248}

Harries’ contribution the following week had been similarly inflammatory.\textsuperscript{246} But, by then, Steele’s red-hot counter blast was probably already on its way. After countless \textit{Outlook} columns from Harries about all-night prayer meetings, conversion, the surrendered life, Keswick, the blessings of Bissett’s missions, and imminent revival, Steele finally boiled over.\textsuperscript{247} With barely concealed rage, he scornfully dismissed revivalism (“Pietism”) as primitive, emotionally excessive, un-Presbyterian, un-Calvinist, sectarian, self-righteous, manipulative in method, psychologically dangerous, and “evil”. With Harries obviously in his sights, Steele railed against “a certain section of people in our own Church who repeatedly tell us in the Assembly, and in the pages of the \textit{Outlook}, that the salvation of Presbyterianism in NZ depends on a spiritual revival of this kind in our midst”. The ferocity of Steele’s attack on such “godly” evangelical figures as Bissett and Harries, and on all that they and Miller stood for – and the fact that the \textit{Outlook} printed it – must have seemed a powerful indication to old-style Presbyterian evangelicals that the denomination no longer stood where they did. It would not have been lost on them that after Bissett retired, the decision was taken not to replace him.\textsuperscript{248}

\textsuperscript{245} \textit{Outlook} XXXVIII (16 Nov. 1931): 20.
\textsuperscript{246} He quoted L.B. Fletcher, from \textit{The Reaper}: “His Word has lost its authority.” Hold a mission, and three quarters of your people will avoid it, because they “are not prepared to accept the evangelical conception of a surrendered life”. “There is no repentance. Only the Holy Spirit can produce repentance. And some of our younger ministers are saying there is no Holy Spirit.” Ibid. (23 Nov.): 21.
\textsuperscript{247} J.T.V. Steele, “Calvinism or Pietism,” \textit{Outlook} XXXVIII (30 Nov. 1931): 9-12. Steele’s article was also cited above in relation to his attack on the Keswick movement.
\textsuperscript{248} The 1935 Assembly re-established the Life and Work Committee under a new convener and its sympathies appeared to be different from those of the committee in earlier years. The Committee’s first deliverance lavished praise on Steele and Bates for the literature they had produced on Calvin. The committee asserted that evangelism was the responsibility of every minister and recommended that the position of Assembly Evangelist not be filled (Life and Work Report, Appendix XXXV, \textit{Proceedings}, 1936: 257-62). Apparently reflecting a wariness of revivalism, the committee also proposed that Presbyteries be advised of any parish plans involving a non-Presbyterian missioner.
L  The Fading of Confessionalist and Revivalist Voices

By the early 1930s, both confessionalist and revivalist elements within the New Zealand Presbyterian Church were thus on the defensive. Jolly and Fraser (and to some extent Miller) represented the traditional confessionalist emphasis. Bissett and Harries (and to some extent Miller) reflected the revivalist element. By 1928, when Miller began at St. Stephen’s, both Jolly and Fraser had retired. In 1934, Bissett would retire, and Harries would resign and go overseas. The period when Fraser, Jolly, Bissett and Harries would exert an influence was ending. But in 1928 Miller, at fifty-two, was at the beginning of his most important ministry, and it was Miller who was to have the much greater long-term impact.

M  Thomas Miller’s Key Legacy: The Next Generation

The impact of Miller’s ministry was extremely significant. His legacy did not relate to the size of his congregation: St. Stephen’s remained a relatively small parish, still dwarfed by First Church and Knox Church, and barely holding its own against the demographic trends of Dunedin’s inner suburbs. Miller’s legacy was the direct

---

240 Jolly was seventy-five years old and Fraser was sixty-six. Jolly died in 1938, Fraser in 1940.
241 The 1933 General Assembly had extended Bissett’s term for one year beyond the date when he was due to retire, Proceedings, 1933: 10. Reasons cited included the marked success of his work in 1932, which Bissett thought his best year yet, and the number of unfulfilled requests from parishes for missions, “Life and Work [Committee] Report”, Appendices, Proceedings, 1933: 131. Bissett took a position with BTI. He died in 1943.
252 In 1929, St. Stephens had an average of 210 attending worship and 192 members. In 1936, it had 240 attending worship and 163 members. In 1944, it had 180 attending worship and 151 members. The decline in attendance in Miller’s last year may reflect the effect of both the war (on a youthful congregation) and Miller’s retirement mid-year. In the same period, 1929-1944, Knox Church consistently claimed an average of 1000 attenders; First Church rose from 600 in 1929 to 1000 in 1944. See General and Financial Statistics, 1929, Appendix XXXVIII, Proceedings, 1930; 278; General and Financial Statistics, 1936, Appendix XLII, Proceedings, 1936: 368; General and Financial Statistics, 1944,
result of his work among the next generation. By 1944, some thirty of them were either in full-time Christian work or in training for it (or, by a more conservative reckoning, twenty-three). Miller’s protégés included numerous future Presbyterian ministers. It is not easy to say precisely who these were. Some ministers very obviously were (or became) protégés of Miller, including his sons Graham and Rob, his sons-in-law Morris Yule (who married Marion Miller), Bill Wallace (who married Beatrice Miller) and others such as Rymall Roxburgh. Some – such as J.D.S. Moore, William (Bill) Moore, Ian McMillan, Ian Fleming, George McKenzie and Irvine Roxburgh – were substantially products of St. Stephen’s, but Miller’s influence on them was, in some cases, somewhat less. 

Because of St. Stephen’s proximity to the university and to the Theological Hall, many other future ministers passed through Miller’s congregation. Such men included David Sage (who married Miller’s daughter Margaret), Roy McKenzie, Bill Milligan, Gordon Reid and John Johnson. But their primary formation had often been elsewhere. Sage, for instance, came from the evangelical Hawera parish, and both McKenzie and Reid also trained in BTI. Many of them, too, were also profoundly influenced by EU and IVF. But, even with all those qualifications, there was no other evangelical Presbyterian minister in the inter-war period who had

---


254 In the family tribute, R. S. Miller gave the figure of eight, TM, 41. His brother, though, listed ten, “Record”. In addition, George Munro became a minister with the Southern Baptists, USA: ibid.

255 But before Yule was ever a protégé or son-in-law of Miller, he was deeply influenced by his own father. In his “Record”. J.G. Miller did not list Yule.

256 Irvine Roxburgh moved away from an evangelical position in the post-war period.

257 Reid (1917-66) was born in Gore, served overseas, was at the Hall 1946-1948, was ordained 1948, served in Wyndham (1948-1953), Miramar (1953-1963) and Morrinsville (1963-1966). He married Rymall Roxburgh’s sister, Hazel.
anything like the influence that Thomas Miller had on future ministers. His role in shaping a new generation of Presbyterian evangelical ministries was unparalleled.

Apart from the future ministers, there were also scores of evangelical lay people who were shaped by the ministry of Thomas Miller. A 1939 photo of the CE includes some of these.258 Eight members of St. Stephen’s became Presbyterian ministers’ wives—and another the wife of a Congregational minister. Three lay members of the church became missionaries, two of them after attending BTI: Nora Morris (SSEM), Ken Roundhill (WEC), and May Roy (Central Asian Mission and CIM).259 Roundhill also spent some years as a Travelling Secretary for IVF.260

Perhaps it was Miller’s influence on so many future ministers that prompted J.D. Salmond of the Theological Hall to consider Miller “the most influential man in the [Presbyterian] Church”.261 Reflecting on Miller’s impact, not only in the parish but also in the wider evangelical community, and in the evangelical student area, John Laird, who probably knew the national evangelical scene better than anyone, wrote to Miller with the assessment that “I have always felt that your work at St. Stephen’s has been monumental in the evangelical and student life not only of Dunedin but of the Dominion”.262

When Miller died in 1948, his gravestone carried the inscription “Valiant for Truth”.263 Miller’s critics, of course, would have had a different assessment: they could not dismiss him as a light-weight, but they regarded him as outmoded and

---

258 David Paulin, Stan Lamb, Bill and Joyce Carr (nee Brown), Betty McDonald, Aileen Wilson, Walter Pullar and Ina Cormack: photo in the possession of Rymall Roxburgh, Geraldine.
259 “Record.”
260 Roundhill, from Fairlie, was associated with St. Stephen’s Presbyterian while at university but later joined the Baptists (ADMNH 1: 78). After working for IVF, Roundhill served with WEC in Japan.
261 J.D. Salmond to Miller family, [1948], cit. TM: 56. Salmond was writing after Miller’s death, presumably in tribute mode. But he wrote that he had “on occasion” previously voiced that assessment to other people. Salmond also noted Miller as “a witness to Evangelical Protestantism at a time when that witness is greatly needed”, ibid.
262 John Laird to Thomas Miller, n.d., cit. TM: 47.
263 ADMNH 1: 14
obscurantist in his theology, suspect in his pietistic and revivalist sympathies, narrow-minded and obdurate in his opposition to church union, divisive and stand-offish in his rejection of the wider BC movement and SCM, and treacherous in his support of the Evangelical Union. The post-war significance of Miller’s legacy was probably unanticipated by most of his contemporaries: it is Breward’s assessment that Miller was seen by Presbyterian leaders as a “crank”, “with nothing to contribute to the questions of the day”.

N  Thomas Miller and Evangelical Self-identity

In inter-war New Zealand the word “evangelical” had become blurred in its meaning and usage. In characteristic Presbyterian use, it had come to mean little more than (non-Anglican) “Protestant” or “evangelistic”. But Miller was always an “Evangelical”. Well-read in Protestant evangelical history, he had unquestionably identified himself with the historic evangelical tradition, the tradition of Luther, Calvin, Bunyan, Wesley, Erskine, McCheyne and Spurgeon — and of Hodge, Warfield and Machen. At no point did Miller identify himself as “fundamentalist”.

The agencies and individuals Miller had co-operated with (CE, Keswick, and various missioners) were all recognisably within the evangelical tradition, sharing its characteristic emphases of evangelism, biblicism, personal salvation and consecration. Such agencies and individuals did not necessarily explicitly refer to themselves as “evangelical”. They could just as readily portray themselves with such descriptors as “spiritual”, “vital”, “godly”, “Bible-believing”. Others could describe

264 Breward: 257. Breward was commenting on denominational leaders’ views of both Miller and Fraser. John Collie was likely thinking of Miller when he wrote of the “intransigent element”, the “determined Presbyterian minority which may block union for a generation or more”: 181. Note the similar “sub-zero rating” given in mainline Protestant circles in America to one of Miller’s heroes, Machen, who was seen as excessively narrow, a “troublemaker and sectarian crank” (Marsden, Understanding: 184).
265 TM: 85.
them as “conservative” or “revivalist” or – less sympathetically – as “pietistic” or “fundamentalist”. Throughout the 1930s and 40s, the Evangelical Unions would made a significant contribution to sharpening evangelical self-identity in New Zealand. Thomas Miller clearly embraced that identity, and his many protégés would make it into a movement.

O Conclusion

Historiographically, Miller’s significance has been signalled, but not much explored. After Miller’s death, his family published a short, reverential biography, with many useful insights into his convictions and spirituality. Miller has also been touched on by King’s thesis (in relation to controversy over Dickie), by a parish history, and in passing by Breward. In the 1990 multi-author history of the PCNZ, Davidson includes brief but fair-minded comments on Miller, identifying Miller as “the foremost evangelical minister” and St. Stephen’s as an evangelical “rallying place”; he noted Miller’s vigorous preaching, loyal Presbyterianism, opposition to church union and “evangelical ecumenism”. In Christianity in Aotearoa, Davidson notes Miller’s involvements in Pounawea and the Evangelical Bible League and his opposition to modernism. Simon Rae, in Southern People, notes Miller’s enduring influence as an evangelical leader, and that those nurtured in his BC and CE “have transmitted his legacy into a third generation, maintaining a strong, thoughtful,
evangelical strand within and beyond the Presbyterian Church".²⁷² Other than in those sources, however, Miller’s contribution has escaped notice.²⁷³

This chapter has sought to develop a fuller picture of Miller’s evangelical ministry and significance. Miller’s approach reflected various influences upon him, including the Free Church tradition and revivalism. In seeking to combat theological modernism, Miller buttressed his biblicist theology through identifying himself with older Scottish and Princetonian evangelical confessionalism, with the British evangelical tradition, and with the new IVF. In seeking to advance his local ministry, Miller freely utilised the more pietistic, activist evangelicalism of non-denominational revivalism, as expressed in CE, Keswick, NZBTI, and the work of visiting missioners. In the wider church, Miller was an articulate, reasoned and unfearing advocate for theological conservatism, in a period when both confessionalism and revivalism were under strong assault, and when other voices were fading. His key legacy was with the next generation. Those nurtured under Miller’s preaching, BC, and CE, including his own family, would become the core of a resurgent Presbyterian evangelical movement. For Miller’s protégés in the university and Theological Hall, the sharp new evangelical self-awareness fostered by the Evangelical Union would prove to be a critical development.

²⁷³ Miller did not, for instance, make the cut into the DNZB.
Chapter Two:
The Evangelical Unions – A New Evangelical Movement, and a New Evangelical Identity, from 1930

A The Role of the Evangelical Unions in Shaping a Clearer Evangelical Identity

More than anything else, it was the Evangelical Unions that effectively re-launched New Zealand evangelicalism. Here – in the name, the ethos, and the IVF doctrinal basis – was the basis for a clear, explicit and cohesive new identity for New Zealand evangelicalism. It was an identity that was understandable and readily communicable. In the Evangelical Unions large numbers of younger New Zealanders first became fully aware of the term “evangelical”, learnt its meaning and adopted it for themselves. They then grew towards leadership while holding that understanding of who they were and what they stood for.¹

From the outset, Miller and his young people enthusiastically embraced the Evangelical Union and the identity it expressed. In Christchurch, William Orange

¹ Dozens of interviewees were asked the question: “When did you first become aware of the term ‘evangelical’?” Almost invariably, they indicated that it was through the Evangelical Union, e.g. Kevin O’Sullivan, interview, Nov. 2001 (hereafter KO), ¶50; MW, ¶35. With regard to EU and the label “evangelical”, Wiggins said: “We rejoiced to have it [the term and identity ‘evangelical’], we were the Evangelical Union”. The exceptions were those few such as Graham Miller and Morris Yule who had grown up in families that were theologically very aware and who believed they knew the term earlier, and those who believed they first encountered it in BTI (e.g. Rev. J. Lewis Wilson, interview, 1 Nov. 1999 (hereafter LW), ¶104).
was to do much the same. The significance of their own ministries was significantly strengthened, and made significantly more enduring, by the emergence of the Evangelical Unions. The partnership of Miller, Orange and others with the nascent Evangelical Unions was to prove extremely important in shaping the evangelical self-awareness of a coming generation of leaders and ministers.

B The Formation of the Evangelical Unions

The Evangelical Unions began in New Zealand in 1930 as a direct result of the visit of British IVF emissary Dr. Howard Guinness. The British IVF had formed in 1928, as the culmination of a major schism within Christian student work in Britain. The Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian Union (CICCU), reacting against a theological broadening in the SCM, had disaffiliated from the SCM in 1910 and had been at the heart of the emergence of a separate evangelical work. The weight of student

---

2 Some material in this chapter overlaps to some extent with the third and fourth chapters of Lineham’s No Ordinary Union: both pieces of research involved working through some of the same original sources (the archives of Scripture Union and TSCF) and resulted in similar broad conclusions. Lineham was the primary supervisor of this thesis. This chapter is focused on the Evangelical Unions rather than the Crusaders, and builds on Lineham’s work in relation to the former.

numbers and of prevailing theological opinion was solidly against CICCU, and in the
inter-war period CICCU’s greatest achievement may have been to survive. 4
Nevertheless, CICCU represented a resilient minority strain within British
Protestantism in that period. In the next decade and a half, several other similar
conservative evangelical student groups were to begin in other British universities,
including London and Oxford. 5 From 1919, CICCU and its London counterpart had
sponsored a series of evangelical student conferences culminating in 1928 in the
formation of the IVF. 6 Although the British IVF began small, and with the disdain of
the theological and ecclesiastical establishments, the emergence of such a movement
was a critical factor in the eventual recovery of an educated evangelicalism in
twentieth-century Britain, since the IVF offered “a new kind of intellectually
adequate classical evangelicalism” which “combined evangelistic zeal with doctrinal
substance” in a time when much of the conservative evangelical community lacked
one or the other. 7

Late in 1928 the IVF had sent Guinness to Canada, to establish an IVF work.
Guinness was in Canada for most of 1929 and his achievements were publicised by
IVF. An Australian evangelical businessman then paid for Guinness to spend time in

4 Goodhew: 72.
5 In 1912 the London Inter-Hospital Christian Union (LIHCU) was formed. The Oxford University
Bible Union was begun in 1919 but reabsorbed into the SCM in 1925; a new OICCU began in 1928.
Other CICCU-like groups began at the universities of Dublin (1920), Aberdeen (1921), Bristol (1921),
Belfast (1922), Edinburgh (1922), Cardiff (1923) Londonderry (1925), Manchester (1927), Reading
(1927), St. Andrews (1927), with additional groups affiliating in the 1930s. Johnson: 97-104, 132-3.
6 See Coggan, Johnson, Tatlow, Pollock.
of IVF in Introduction (above).
Australia. From there Guinness was invited to New Zealand by R.S. Cree Brown, a Dunedin engineer associated with the Brethren.

Existing Evangelical Student Groups

In both Dunedin and Auckland, there were already small student groups of evangelicals who, disaffected with SCM’s liberal theology, had left SCM. In 1927, the Student Bible League had begun in Auckland. Leadership was given by Dr.

8 Peter J. Lineham, No Ordinary Union. The Story of the Scripture Union, Children’s Special Service Mission and Crusader Movement of New Zealand 1880-1980 (Wellington: Scripture Union in New Zealand Incorporated, 1980): 38 (hereafter Lineham denotes this work, unless otherwise indicated); Howard Guinness, Journey Among Students (Sydney: Anglican Information Office, 1978): 61. Guinness’ autobiography is anecdotal rather than reflective, and contains only a few pages on his New Zealand tour, ibid.: 71-3. The donor’s name was J.B. Nicholson.


10 For a history of the SCM in New Zealand, see Christine Berry, The New Zealand Student Christian Movement, 1896-1996. A Centennial History (Christchurch: Student Christian Movement of Aotearoa, 1998). This work is based on a thesis and has critical perspective. Berry noted that Mott’s founding vision had included uniting Christians and Christianising future leaders of society, that the movement was “largely Methodist and Presbyterian”, and that it aimed to incorporate (and thus influence) as many as possible (Ch. 1: 2, 7-8). The movement was originally part of the Australasian Christian Movement, but became independent and known as the NZSCM from 1921. The adherence of the New Zealand movement to liberal theology and a social gospel had become apparent from about 1912 and climaxed under the 1926-9 leadership of General Secretary Rev. Donald Grant, an enthusiastic modernist from Scotland (Ch. 1: 8-13; Ch. 2: 7-8 – pagination starts afresh with every chapter). Grant favoured a non-credal Christianity, denied the divinity and resurrection of Christ, and championed modernist views on scripture and the atonement; he opposed the expression in discussion or in literature of conservative evangelical views, asserting “The fundamentalist viewpoint is diametrically opposed to the view point of the SCM”: see W.H Pettit, “Experiences in Christian Work Among New Zealand Students”, in N.Z. Varsity Papers No. 2: The Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions (N.Z.): A Sketch of its Origins, Doctrine and Practice. A Booklet for Officers and Members (Wellington: IVF, n.d. [c.1940]): 22-36; also “Notes of an Address Given By Dr. R. Pettit, M.B.E., M.B., Ch.B., at the first IVF Conference, Roseneath, 11/4/36,” TSCF N7/62; Archie Morton to Mervyn Milminej, n.d., copy, TSCF N7/76). Pettit had been a foundation member of the Otago CU, and twice its President; he considered it “definitely evangelical” (“Experiences”: 23); he described a 1909 conference of the Australasian Christian Movement as the spiritual “high-water mark” of the movement (ibid); after service as a medical missionary in India (1910-15), Pettit resumed involvement in the movement, and was a leading evangelical agitator in NZSCM in the mid 1920s.

11 The League was formally inaugurated on 15 Aug. 1927, at a meeting held in the Auckland Missionary Association Prayer Room, conducted (with Pettit in support) by Atholl Donnell, a master at Auckland Grammar School: “Auckland”. Typescript history, n.a., n.d., B1/066, TSCF archives; Lineham: 37; J.S. Burt noted that Pettit had earlier called a meeting on 27 February in the YMCA rooms and that a group began soon after: [J.S. Burt, in] Coggan: 190. The information about the Auckland group was presumably supplied to Coggan by Burt (listed in Appendix C as a contributor).
William Pettit (Brethren), J.S. Burt (Brethren, lawyer), Atholl Donnell (Presbyterian, schoolmaster) and E.M. Blaiklock (Baptist, Classics Lecturer). Prayer and Bible study were the key activities, with an emphasis on the “evidential side”. Members—mostly drawn from one of the large evangelical churches in central Auckland—were required to sign a detailed doctrinal statement. By 1928, “after much difficulty”, the League had gained recognition as an official student society. In 1928, a similar prayer and Bible study group had been established in Dunedin in the home of Cree Brown.

The Impact of Guinness

Guinness was in New Zealand for eight hectic weeks, from 22 September to 18 November, 1930. Twenty-five years old, Guinness was Irish, good-looking and...
charming, and a gifted speaker and evangelist. He made a strong impression on many, and his evangelistic appeals provoked large responses. An SCM observer described Guinness as “a man with a most vital Christian experience, full of power and persuasion and simply radiating personality”. Guinness’ impact on students during his ten days in Dunedin was compared to that of Mott in 1896. Guinness spoke twice at the SCM’s Otago branch (the Christian Union), at eight CU study groups, at large city churches (Knox and First), and at a university meeting where one third of the student body was present and over 40 responded to an appeal. The SCM had little option but to give Guinness a good hearing. If they did so, they might retain the evangelicals; if they did not, there might be a breakaway movement. SCM’s Otago President had been advised by evangelicals that “if the SCM could be

---

20 Ibid.: 38, 50-1.
21 B. Griffiths to A. Stewart, 6 Oct. 1930, SCM file 31 (cit. Lineham: 51). References in the minutes of the Otago CU reflect a general SCM uncertainty about Guinness, his connections “at home,” who he was working for, and what his intentions were e.g. on 25 May 1930 it was resolved to seek more information on “the man’s views.” See also extract minutes for 26 Mar. 1930, 8 July 1930, 23 Sept. 1930, “Extracts from minute books of Otago University Christian Union”, TSCF archives.
22 Cree Brown to Pettit, 6 Oct. 1930 (SU), cit. Lineham: 44. Guinness’ impact on students was made notwithstanding what he later admitted (in his autobiography) what was his “serious flaw” in such a context: he had no idea how to respond to questions about higher criticism, Howard Guinness, Journey Among Students (Sydney: Anglican Information Office, 1978): 73. For Mott, see C. Howard Hopkins, John R. Mott, 1865-1955: A Biography (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979). Mott, a Methodist, was a pietistic, prayerful “evangelical”, but an “essentialist” not especially interested in theology, and not at all in controversy (Hopkins: 628-32). When in New Zealand in 1896, he had noted the dominant puritanical and evangelical values, the intense interest in British debates over evolution and biblical criticism, a reaction against the rigidity of the Disruption era, and growing secularism and materialism (Hopkins: 163).
23 To gain such access to the CU and to Knox Church (a Presbyterian church with an attendance of 1800 and the largest student church in Dunedin) reflected the careful strategising of Cree Brown and Stallworthy, who were working through the CU President, Tennyson Howie: Cree Brown to Guinness, 19 June 1930, TSCF A2c. In 1930 there were about 1000 students at OU. The 6.30 p.m. First Church service had 1200 present, many of them school girls from St. Columba College, and 100 responded. At the 8.30 p.m. university meeting that followed, Guinness spoke on “The Fact of Christ.” Before the appeal, “Just As I am” was sung. A time of testimonies followed and “the mighty power of the Spirit was manifest”. Guinness was counselling students until 1.00 a.m. Guinness, “The Universities of New Zealand,” Terminal Magazine of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions III, 3 (1931), TSCF A2c/20. Guinness’ reports on his visit to New Zealand were rather slapdash and impressionistic. He guessed at numbers, misspelled names, wrote that Auckland was the capital, and (rather overstating the earthquake’s effect) commented that the city of Napier had “now ceased to be”.

brought back to a real evangelical basis we would rejoice to see it”; but if not, it was likely that a new body would be formed “to maintain true testimony to evangelical truth”.24

In each main centre Guinness enjoyed the support of some key evangelicals: in Dunedin, Cree Brown and Miller;25 in Christchurch, Botany Lecturer Miss Herriot (Brethren),26 W.A. Orange (Anglican), T.N. Gibbs (a Brethren accountant), K. H. Fountain (Brethren dentist) and his son Murray;27 in Auckland, Pettit (Brethren), Blaiklock (Baptist), Harries (Presbyterian), Donnell (Presbyterian) and R.A. Laidlaw (Brethren);28 in Wellington (which Guinness considered “a great stronghold of the devil”29), “probably” businessman A.E. Birch (Anglican).30 The support for Guinness was indicative of the strength of the evangelical community’s interdenominational

25 In Dunedin, the Evangelical Bible League (under George Miller as President and George Buckley as Secretary) distributed a special appeal for “most earnest and continuous prayer” in connection with the visit. The EBL was well informed about Guinness’ effectiveness in Canada and Australia as an evangelist, and about his pattern of establishing new evangelical groups in universities and schools. “Evangelical Bible League, Dr. Howard Guinness, Special Appeal for Prayer”, [1930], TSCF A2c.
26 Herriot appears to have been a member of the Reading Brethren, a “semi-exclusive” strand of Brethrenism, but was herself very open in her attitude: Lineham, “Evangelical Witness at Canterbury University: A History of the EU/CU 1930-1974”, unpublished paper, TSCF archives, 1974; Lineham, e-mail, 26 April 2007. Exclusive Brethren were not usually involved in EU, and any who tried to become so came under great pressure from their church fellowships. Some Open Brethren could also face pressure from within their fellowships to remain “separate”.
27 See e.g. D. Penman, untitled ms. notes on the history of NZ(IVF), n.d., TSCF A2c/23.
28 Robert A. Laidlaw (1885-1971) was a noted Auckland businessman. Converted in Dunedin at the 1902 Torrey mission, he was a leading member of Howe St. Brethren and a key backer of BTI. He was a frequent speaker and missioner. In 1936 he would arrange the hundred New Zealand meetings for Edwin Orr, whom he then accompanied to Melbourne and Sydney. In Europe at the outset of World War Two, Laidlaw would become an Army Scripture Reader for the next five and a half years, with his family back in New Zealand. After the war he would devote much of his time to Christian work. By the time of his death, it was claimed that his pamphlet The Reason Why had been printed sixteen million times and translated into thirty languages. See Ian Hunter, Robert Laidlaw: Man for our Time (Auckland: Castle Publishing, 1999); Graham C. Stoop, “Laidlaw, Robert Alexander Crookston: 1885-1971,” DNZB 3: 271-2; R.A. Laidlaw, The Reason Why (Auckland: Institute Printing and Publishing Society, n.d.); Robert A. Laidlaw, The Story of The Reason Why’. Auckland: G.W. Moore, 1969.
29 Howard Guinness, “The Universities of New Zealand”, in the Terminal Magazine III, 3 (1931), TSCF A2c/20. Six years later, Orr noted Wellington’s reputation for being spiritually “cool” (Orr: 39).
30 Lineham: 46. Birch ran a vigorous Bible Class at All Saints’ Church in Kilbirnie.
spirit. Such a working coalition across denominational boundaries would become increasingly important, and characteristic of the movements which Guinness was about to pioneer.

The Evangelical Dilemma

Guinness had been brought to New Zealand “to restore an evangelical witness to the university colleges”. The question was how best to achieve that. It was a dilemma whether a separate evangelical student work should be started or whether Evangelical Unions could be formed as an evangelical wing within SCM. Pettit had emphatically favoured the former approach, and his group had already become a separate rival to the Auckland CU. But Cree Brown in Dunedin was initially open to the latter course. He knew of SCM members with strong evangelical sympathies and all the members of his group remained members of SCM’s Otago group.

In Auckland, the Student Bible League staged a 1600-strong Town Hall meeting to welcome Guinness, chaired by Blaiklock. The League had not been aware of IVF prior to Guinness’ visit. At the prompting of Guinness, a change of name was

---

31 Ibid.: 39.
32 The EBL prayer letter noted that in Canada some SCM groups had been “brought back to a true evangelical basis” and that Guinness’ “first appeal” was always to the SCM. But where the SCM was “unresponsive” separate groups were founded: “Evangelical Bible League, Dr. Howard Guinness, Special Appeal for Prayer”, [1930], TSCF A2c. See also Cree Brown to Alexa Stewart, 15 Sept. 1930 (SU), cit. Lineham: 40.
33 Cree Brown to Guinness, 19 June 1930, TSCF A2c.
34 Cree Brown to Guinness, 19 Mar. 1930, TSCF A2c; Cree Brown to Guinness, 29 Mar. 1930, TSCF A2c. In Cree Brown’s perception, immediate ex-President Jack Stallworthy was “a true evangelical” who had who had managed to “stem the rot to some extent”. Stallworthy had been eager for Guinness to influence the SCM and helped arranged opportunities for him to speak to the CU. Cree Brown feared that, with Stallworthy no longer in office, the CU would “revert to its dead estate”. The President for 1930 was Tennyson Howie, whose views were considered “modern”. Cree Brown implied that his group in Dunedin was less obviously a separatist “rival” to the CU than was Pettit’s group in AUC. Another noted evangelical within the Otago CU was Hallam Howie, who was both on the CU Executive and a member of Cree Brown’s group, and who worked hard for Guinness’ reception and for the affiliation of EU within the SCM: M.G. Milmine to Rymall [Roxburgh], 4 Oct. 1948, TSCF N7/75.
35 Terminal Magazine II, 2 (1931), TSCF A2c/19.
36 Coggan: 190-1.
announced: to reflect “affinity” with the British IVF, the League would become the “Evangelical Students Fellowship”.\textsuperscript{37} Previously accused of being “fundamentalist”, “Bible-bangers” and “sectarian”, they hoped association with an Empire-wide university movement might help the group be better accepted.\textsuperscript{38} The new letterhead declared that the ESF was “associated with” the IVF “of Great Britain, Canada, Australia”, and ESF established direct links with British IVF.\textsuperscript{39} But it retained its original doctrinal basis\textsuperscript{40} and did not formally become an EU until 1935.\textsuperscript{41}

In Dunedin, Cree Brown came to the view that “you can’t do much in a mixed movement with unsaved and doubting leaders”, that a “half-awakened” SCM would not suffice, and that “God’s purpose is to raise up a new testimony to His truth and saving power”.\textsuperscript{42}

C  \textit{Schism}

The nucleus of a future EU already existed, in Cree Brown’s study group.

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Terminal Magazine} III, 2 (1931), TSCF A2c/20.
\textsuperscript{38} Coggan: 191-2. Guinness – not always a reliable source – wrote that the name was changed “in the hope that this would aid them in their desire for a more aggressive Evangelistic testimony as against a mere Fundamentalist one”: \textit{Terminal Magazine} II, 2 (1931), TSCF A2c/20.
\textsuperscript{39} A.W. Morton to [Basil] Williams, 31 May 1932, TSCF A2c/003. In 1932, the AUCESF was meeting twice-weekly, on Tuesday and Thursday nights – the former a student-led meeting, the latter addressed by “well-known Christian men with discussion following”. In the University Library, from 1931, the ESF had a special alcove containing “the latest and best volumes on Evidential and Evangelical topics”, some 100 volumes: R.F. Judson to [Basil] Williams, 25 May 1932, TSCF A2c/002; A.W. Morton to [Basil] Williams, 31 May 1932, TSCF A2c/003.
\textsuperscript{40} The doctrinal basis (as printed on the letterhead of Morton to Williams, 31 May 1932, TSCF A2c/003) was “That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the inspired Word of the Living God, inerrant as to their originals, and that they are the supreme guide and final authority in all problems of life, in all matters of faith and doctrine”. The four objects can be summarised as evangelism, deepening the spiritual life through devotional Bible Study and prayer, making a stand in the university for “foundation truths” of Christianity, and providing Christian fellowship for students.
\textsuperscript{41} According to the AUCEU President in 1936, the Auckland EU initially became an EU “in name only” and “its policy never varied” [from its days as the Bible League]: Archie Morton to Mervyn Milmine, n.d., copy, TSCF N7/76.
\textsuperscript{42} Cree Brown to Guinness, 19 Mar. 1930, TSCF A2c; to J.B. Nicholson, 19 Mar. 1930, TSCF A2c; to Pettit, 19 Aug. 1930, TSCF A2c.
Three times, the request was made that an Evangelical Union be officially recognised within SCM’s Otago branch\(^3\) – but with a constitution requiring a clear profession of faith for members and subscription to the British IVF doctrinal basis for officebearers.\(^4\) The outcome was predictable: it was a non-negotiable policy of the SCM to remain doctrinally open and comprehensive, whereas the defining basis of the IVF was to insist on a clear doctrinal position.\(^5\) The two approaches were mutually exclusive. The SCM declined, and there was no option but for EU to form a separate movement, in Otago and elsewhere.\(^6\) When the SCM wished to discuss the

\(^3\) “EU-SCM Relations”, TSCF N7/62a, 1946, 4. The first request was at a meeting with the SCM leaders held at the YMCA and attended by Guinness; the next two requests were by letter. (From 1928, a local unit of NZSCM was officially known not as a “Christian Union” but as a “Branch”.)

\(^4\) The IVF Doctrinal Basis, adopted by the New Zealand IVF when it formed in 1936, was part of the IVF Constitution, which stated that the Fellowship’s purpose was “to uphold in the Universities the truths of Christianity, including:

- (a) The divine inspiration and infallibility of the Holy Scripture, as originally given, and its supreme authority in all matters of faith and conduct.
- (b) The unity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in the Godhead.
- (c) The universal sinfulness and guilt of human nature since the Fall, rendering man subject to God’s wrath and condemnation.
- (d) Redemption from the guilt, penalty and power of sin only through the sacrificial death (as our Representative and Substitute) of Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son of God.
- (e) The Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.
- (f) The necessity of the work of the Holy Spirit to make the Death of Christ effective to the individual sinner, granting him repentance toward God and faith in Jesus Christ.
- (g) The indwelling and work of the Holy Spirit in the Believer.
- (h) The expectation of the Personal return of the Lord Jesus Christ”.

Clauses (a) and (d) would give particular difficulty to those following the prevailing theological directions of SCM, and also, perhaps, (h). *Inter alia*, modernist theology rejected verbal inspiration, biblical infallibility and substitutionary atonement.

\(^5\) IVF people, however, questioned whether SCM was truly open: they noted that at the 1926 Conference NZSCM had committed itself to a modernist outlook and that there were objections to evangelical literature in the SCM bookroom, Morton to Mervyn Milmine, n.d., copy, TSCF N7/76.

\(^6\) 27 Oct. 1930 E.G. Jansen moved “that affiliation be declined; [it was] unanimously carried”.

“Extracts from minute books of Otago University Christian Union”, TSCF archives. See also TSCF N7/80 [Copy of] O. Eaton to the Sec. OUEU, 30 Oct. 1930: “While we too believe that Christian forces must be united, if much progress is to be made, we are unanimous that it would not be in the best interests of the Kingdom to affiliate your Union to the SCM. The following motion was unanimously carried – ‘That we do not allow the OU Evangelical Union to be affiliated to the SCM.’” A founding OUEU member, Mervyn Milmine, summed up the OUEU origins thus: “We did, at one stage, offer to become part of S.C.M., a kind of evangelical wing. After some discussions between the leaders of the two movements, the S.C.M. declined, and so we went on our own.” M.G. Milmine to Robert Withycombe, 27 July 1971, TSCF A1/81; similarly M.G. Milmine to Rymall [Roxburgh], 4 Oct. 1948, TSCF N7/75.
matter again, the EU declined: they were not about to forego the righteous status of having been forced to begin a separate work. When, from time to time, the EU was subsequently accused of schism, they were always quick to point out the history of the matter as they perceived it. Within the SCM at Otago, there remained some evangelical elements agitating for reforms and an accommodation with the EU. But the EU had gone for good, and was beginning to relish developing a life of its own.

In the early days, friendships and family relationships often bridged the divide: the first OUEU President was brother of the immediate past President of the SCM group, both living in the same home. Cree Brown wrote to the SCM in Wellington promising that the EU’s relationship with the SCM would be “independent but friendly”. The subsequent relations of the two rival movements were certainly

---

47 M.G. Milmine to SCM, 9 April 1931: “our executive feels that the matter has already been fully dealt with and a further discussion would be fruitless”, TSCF N7/81. Also: “Extracts from minute books of Otago University Christian Union”, 20 April 1931, TSCF.
48 E.g. [IVF] General Secretary to the Editor, the Methodist Times, Auckland, 24 July 1945, TSCF N7/74. NZIVF pioneers emphatically denied any suggestion from within SCM circles that Guinness had come to NZ under the auspices of SCM and had then broken faith with it. Rather, they insisted that Guinness had come out under IVF and been given a hearing by SCM, but that SCM had been unwilling to accommodate a separate evangelical group within SCM: Archie Morton to Mervyn, n.d., copy, TSCF N7/76; M.G. Milmine to Rymall [Roxburgh], 4 Oct. 1948, TSCF N7/75: “The SCM proved to be a narrow, biassed [sic] movement, not big enough or broadminded enough to include those who held to the old fashioned Reformed faith...The EU was forced into being by the narrowness & bigotry of those who now strongly oppose it...both in the discussions during Dr. Guinness’s visit in October 1930, & in the later approach we made at the beginning of 1931, the SCM leaders were relentlessly opposed to any kind of amalgamation, union or cooperation [sic].”
49 Ibid. On 29 July 1931 and 22 Sept. 1931 concerns were expressed about the need to have an agreement with the EU. At the 1932 AGM, a Mr Quennell expressed “aversion to the lack of reverence in the Movement for people who clung to a rather orthodox religion”, and also objected to the “rather irreverent songs of the movement”. On 20 Sept. 1934 views were expressed that the EU had done much more than the CU in Bible study and in evangelism. On 26 Sept. 1935 it was unsuccessfully moved by Messrs Hogg and Graves that the present songbook be destroyed and replaced by the Sankey Moody hymnbook. They claimed that some songs were “disgraceful” and “almost blasphemous”, and that the song-book was symptomatic of a “general weakness” in the SCM, i.e. members were not prepared to “carry their witness to the extent of becoming a people apart as the EU people were – in short, they were afraid to talk about Christ to other people.”
50 M.G. Milmine to Rymall [Roxburgh], 4 Oct. 1948, TSCF N7/75. The individuals concerned were Hallum and Tennyson Howie.
51 Cree Brown to Stewart, 6 Oct. 1930 (SCM file 30). See also Cree Brown to Pettit, 6 Oct. 1930 (SU); Bob Griffiths to A. Stewart, 6 Oct. 1930 (SCM file 31): all cit. Lineham 45; Terminal Magazine III, 3 (1931), TSCF A2c/20.
independent, but not always friendly. Although the CU Executive in 1932 was hopefully informed of a “new attitude” replacing “antagonism”, the prevailing relationship between the two movements was one of suspicion and coolness. The SCM felt it had proprietary rights over Christian witness in the universities and resented the EU. Its members suspected the EU members of narrow-mindedness, fanaticism and obscurantism. For its part, as in any schism, the EU probably exaggerated the failings of the movement it had deserted. It saw itself as having originated in a heroic struggle for truth against fierce and unjust opposition: the EU was established, they felt, “against a very cold blizzard from the SCM”. A decade and a half after the schism, John Deane observed of the EU that “they heartily despised the SCM, and from the little contact I had with SCM the hostility seemed ... reciprocated”. The stand-off perhaps also reflected the tendencies of zealous youth – of all stripes – to over-simplification and dismissiveness.

As a result of Guinness’ visit, an EU was also established in Canterbury University College, Christchurch. He was unable to get an EU started in Victoria University

51 Reported to the Executive by Jansen, 14 Mar. 1932, “Extracts from minute books of Otago University Christian Union”, TSCF.

52 E.g. 29 July 1931 the Otago CU Executive agreed that “the President inform the Rev. Hamblett that we resent the introduction of a Christian speaker to the university over the heads of the SCM”, ibid. W.A. Hamblett was the vicar of St. Matthew’s and on the OUEU Advisory Council, and was one of the small number of Dunedin ministers who were invited by EU to be a speaker, RR, ¶180.

53 GM, ¶162. He continued: “At first they despised us, then they were alarmed at us.”

54 John Deane to T.C. Cocker, 19 March 1947, TSCF A3c. But gestures of friendship, at least at the level of leadership, were common e.g. the OUEU and OUSCM regularly extended invitations to each other’s meetings, and when during the war the SCM lost their meeting room to the military, the EU allowed them to use their own, RR, ¶371.

55 Prior to 1961, the University Colleges of Auckland, Victoria and Canterbury were University Colleges of the University of New Zealand. In 1961 they became separate universities. The University of Otago was always so called.

56 The group existed from the beginning of 1931 as a prayer and Bible study group under the leadership of Miss Herriot, meeting in her study. Pioneer student members of the group included Hugh McFedries and Jim Cross (both Brethren), and Bob Nicholson (an Anglican associated with W.A. Orange). The group was officially constituted an EU in April 1933. Basil Williams served as the first President, to 1937, and was succeeded by Max Wiggins. CUCEU’s history is traced in Lineham’s “Evangelical Witness”. He notes that, despite considerable prejudice in the university against evangelicals, the group had by 1938 eclipsed the SCM as the largest Christian group on campus: 26.
College (Wellington), but one began there in 1933. In 1935 Auckland’s ESF renamed itself (again) as the Evangelical Union and altered its membership basis to be the same as that of other EUs. In each context, it was a struggle to persuade the Students’ Associations to affiliate the EUs: it was argued by SCM supporters that the EU was too similar to the SCM. Upon examination of the respective doctrinal positions, it was eventually recognised that the two movements “differed to an irreconcilable extent”.

D SCM and EU Contrasted

The breach between the SCM and the EU was symbolised by different styles of spirituality and mission, often minor, but considered very significant at the time. A meeting between the leaders of the Otago SCM and EU finished with a time of prayer. “All the EU fellows knelt, and all the SCM ones sat bolt upright in their chairs, and this seemed to be a true paradigm for the difference between the two”. The EU – whose members always knelt at their early morning prayer meetings – suspected (probably unfairly) that the SCM members would “not be used to praying at all, as a group”.

---

58 Terminal Magazine III. 3 (1931), TSCF A2c/20.
59 There had been an earlier attempt to begin something in 1931, with some women students praying together, but this stopped “for reasons of privacy”: B1/074 VUCEU Annual Report for year ending 31 Aug. 1945, TSCF.
60 “Auckland”. Typescript history, n.n., n.d. B1/066, TSCF archives. Assent to a detailed doctrinal statement was no longer required of members, but only of the Executive (as in the British IVF). The main differences between the ESF and IVF doctrinal basis was that the former used the word “inerrant”, and the latter was more comprehensive in the range of doctrinal matters it addressed.
61 VUCEU Annual Report for year ending 31 August 1945, B1/074, TSCF. In Auckland, there was “vigorous opposition” to such affiliation. AUCEU Annual Report for year ending 31 Aug. 1945, TSCF B1/074; ADMNH 1: 72.
63 Ibid. See also: “Notes of Discussion between O.U.E.U. and S.C.M. (at request of S.C.M.) re Co-operation in the University”, 14 Mar. 1938, TSCF N762; “Notes of Talk given by Mr J. Graham Miller (Trav. Sec., IVFE.U.) at meeting of Auckland E.U. Executive, 2 April 1938”, TSCF N7/137.
64 JGM, ¶612. Similarly GMY, ¶95.
The differences between the two movements were partly theological, partly sub-cultural. The differences were important, because it was primarily against the SCM that the EU defined itself. The SCM prided itself on being the Christian presence in the university, welcoming all, and intelligently exploring new horizons; the EU prided itself on being the true believers. The SCM had discussions; the EU had Bible Study. The SCM had “socials”; the EU had “fellowship”. The SCM might entertain itself with secular songs, sometimes bordering on the bawdy or the irreverent; the EU would sing songs from Sankey, Alexander or Keswick for spiritual uplift. The SCM might have a dance; the EU would not dare. The SCM was interested in speculative theology; the EU was interested in biblical doctrine. The SCM valued “breadth”; the EU valued “soundness”. The SCM was open to the world, and wanted to study it and change it; the EU was wary of the world, and sometimes tried to avoid it. The SCM embraced modern science and philosophy; the EU was defensive. The SCM believed in evangelism, and sometimes felt guilty about not doing much, but it was nevertheless generally coy about evangelism because it feared “unsound emotional revivalist methods”; the EU, however, claimed evangelism as its raison d’être, and did not scruple at a touch of revivalism. The SCM was uncomfortable with religious excitement; the EU – within limits – welcomed spiritual fervour, and loved a good conversion. The SCM – in the eyes of EU members – was “wishy-washy” and “ambivalent about everything”; the EU was definite about most things.

---

65 SCM (and EU) member Malcolm Buist, writing his letter of resignation from the SCM, majored on theological concerns but also objected to “worldly” entertainments such as dances and bridge evenings, and the “ribald blasphemy” of a skit “The Darkies Sunday School” at the Roseneath Camp (Buist to the Secretary, SCM, VUC, 25 July 1935, TSCF N7/70).
66 In matters of morality and lifestyle, the EU was conservative, and considered the SCM “worldly” and risqué. The SCM, for instance, was believed by EU members to be holding house parties without camp parents – something “not done” in those days, FM, ¶14.
67 7 Nov. 1936, “Extracts From Minute Books of Otago University Christian Union”. A proposal to have a “mission” was being discussed, with some opposed and some supportive.
68 GMY, ¶95. Yule noted that Owen Baragwanath, once very active in the SCM, was heard to refer to the SCM as the “Scarcely Christian Movement” (perhaps suggested by the other common jibe, the “Society for Courtship and Marriage”): GMY, ¶96. See also Buist to Sec., SCM, VUC, 25 July 1935, TSCF N7/70. Buist argued that in its desire to “allow free expression of all shades of opinion”, the SCM welcomed “false doctrines” and showed “that it pays but lip service to Revelation”. He added that the “general practical attitude” of the SCM was one of lessened faith and witness: “the Movement
The EU was committed to having a defined doctrinal position, the SCM to avoiding one. Because of its commitment to Christian unity, the SCM regarded the existence of the EU as “sinful”, and “a calamity”.69 Because of its desire for united witness and mission, the SCM would frequently make overtures to a local EU for “co-operation”. The EU would almost always decline those overtures, and so frustrate and offend the SCM. But the EU had little room to manoeuvre: it was a basic principle, consistently written into its constitutions, documents and publications, that it could not co-operate with those who did not hold to the same doctrinal position.70 It was pointless, they felt, to co-operate in mission with those who held to “a different faith”.71 They also felt co-operation was very dangerous, and potentially “fatal”:72 the EU had been formed out of a rejection of doctrinal indifferentism and it had no wish to succumb to it, too. “To maintain our existence”, they argued, “we have to stay separate”.73 In

69 J.M. Bates, “Memorandum on the Relationship of the SCM to the EU”, c.1945, n.p., NZSM papers, MS papers 1617: 632, ATL, cit. Berry Ch. 3: 8. Bates argued that the two movements were essentially the same, a claim that EU would never have accepted.

70 The policy was spelled out, for instance, in Principles of Co-operation (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions, n.d.) and in Clause 9 of the Constitution of the [IVF-sponsored] International Conference of Evangelical Students, as adopted by the General Committee, Stockholm, 9 Sept. 1935: “Relations with other religious organisations: There shall not be arranged by, in the name of, or in connection with the Conference, any meeting (or activity of any description) jointly with any religious organisation not having the doctrinal basis of the Conference, or its equivalent.” H1/2, TSCF.

71 JGM, ¶613. These are Miller’s words, rather less subtle than the official EU/IVF wording.

72 Colin [?] Becroft to Jack [McQueen], 13 Aug. 1941, TSCF B4: “it would be fatal to budge one inch towards co-operation”.

73 When Harold Turner became Otago university chaplain he sought EU support. Roxburgh told him “I think we have to stay separate to maintain our existence” and went on to explain that on the basis of British IVF history: that when the Oxford ICCU had joined with up with the SCM, they had lost their identity, cf. “CICCU...which had existed prior to the SCM, never went in completely”. RR, ¶370.
practice, too, any missioner being sponsored by the SCM was almost certainly theologically unacceptable to the EUs.\(^74\) Such matters were also being decided in an atmosphere where the EUs were deeply suspicious of the SCM, always wondering what the SCM was “up to” and what was behind it latest “move”.\(^75\) The 1941 decision of OUEU to allow the SCM to share the EU meeting room was regarded by some EU people elsewhere with alarm: OUEU was warned that “the whole situation is fraught with danger” and “savours of compromise”.\(^76\)

E   Sociological Aspects of the Division

The existence of two rival student Christian organisations accentuated the very sharp sense of theological polarisation in the 1930s and 40s. There were two distinct ecclesiastical “tribes”, each loyal to itself and privately dismissive of the other. The SCM promoted itself in the official church newspapers, as the natural choice for discerning students, with the EU implicitly excluded: “there is no place in the student community for division of activity... the SCM needs all the Christians in the University”.\(^77\) The SCM was regarded with loyalty by denominational leaders and many ministers, and the EU was seen as a reactionary intruder.\(^78\) There were

\(^{71}\) E.g. Dr. C.F. Andrews, who came to NZ as an SCM university missioner in 1936. The Otago EU had no confidence in Andrews, JGM, ¶611. The BTI also thought Andrews unsound, inter alia for his alleged rejection of the Pauline gospel, his disavowal of evangelism among Hindus and his endorsement of Schweitzer’s view of the historic Jesus. See H. Yolland, “Is Rev. C.F. Andrews a Trustworthy Leader of Christian Thought?” Reapers XIV (25 June 1936): 97-100.

\(^{72}\) E.g. B.H. Williams to [Becroft], n.d. [1941], TSCF B4; Williams to Becroft, 2 Sept. 1941, TSCF B4.

\(^{73}\) Williams to Jack [McQueen], 7 Sept. 1941, TSCF B4. Williams repeated Laird’s story of warning about a camel that put just its nose in an Arab’s tent one night but ended up eventually displacing the Arab. The SCM’s own meeting place had been lost to military use. A year later, OUEU declined an SCM request to have shared devotions once a week, with each group alternately leading: Jean Calder to McQueen, 23 Mar. 1942, plus annotation, TSCF B4.

\(^{74}\) J.A. Linton [SCM General Secretary], “Student Christian Movement”, Outlook 23 Feb. 1938: 30.

\(^{75}\) The 1931 Outlook, for instance, does not mention the EU. But it carries an unabashedly pro-SCM article by A.M Richards, presumably as a timely defence against the EUs. The article is condescending towards “conservatives”: it recounts an imaginary 1892 march of OICC “Evangelicals”. “Mostly” they were “decent fellows”, but with a “disconcerting” anxiety for your “soul,” and they buttonholed people and asked them “direct questions”, and held “decision meetings” and “testimonies”! (Richard’s disdain is palpable). By contrast, the SCM has been at the heart of the missionary
certainly significant differences of belief and emphasis. But in part the differences were sociological: when students began at university, there was a tussle between SCM and EU to recruit them first. Induced to join one or the other group, students were then acculturated into the group’s own values, customs and prejudices. Those who tried to retain links with both organisations were regarded with suspicion, especially in the EU camp. If graduates continued on into theological colleges they remained involved in SCM or EU, retained the identity they had learned, and associated closely only with their own group. Many senior student leaders in each movement remained active members for many years, through university, theological college and beyond.

**F Regional Distinctives**

The four Evangelical Unions were all distinctive in various ways. Otago EU was a critically important one, in part because of its relationship with Presbyterian theologues and with New Zealand’s sole Medical School. More than any other EU, movement, and has provided “intellectual leadership” to the church. But now it is called to “a greater adventure and campaign than all these – a concerted attempt of students in many lands to rethink, persistently and consistently, what Christian theology implies and Christian practice involves, that they may have a real message (or gospel) for the world.” This, he notes, has “alarmed the conservative” – who wishes to return to “the ‘fundamentals’ and to ‘evangelical preaching and teaching’. But many reject the “crudity” of that. The fresher, being a “thoughtful chap and backed by the sound advice of minister or BC leader to ‘link up with the SCM’, does so”. He will soon start reading such SCM books as Fosdick’s *Modern Use of the Bible* or Streeter’s *The Uncelestial City*. A.M. Richards, “The Adventure of the SCM”, *Outlook* XXXVIII (2 Mar. 1931): 5-7.

Frances Thomson, for instance, was invited out to dinner in Dunedin by an SCM student eager to recruit her for SCM. But she disappointed him by then joining EU: FM, §13.

E.g. R.A. Carson, who was on the Executive of the CUCEU while a Vice President in the SCM group.

Rymall Roxburgh, for instance, was actively involved in the OUEU and IVF for ten years (1933 to 1943), on account of his part-time undergraduate studies, graduate studies, and studies at the Theological Hall. Elected to the Executive in 1933, he was Secretary (1937-1939), Secretary of the TSPU and IVMF, and short-term Travelling Rep (Dec 1942- Feb 1943), RR48. He was also a regular attender at national IVF conferences and those of the IVMF. In the Dunedin context, a similar pattern prevailed with many SCM members, many of whom became very prominent in SCM e.g. J.M. Bates.

PCNZ ministers (apart from ministers received from overseas or being accepted from other denominations) were all trained at the Theological Hall based at Knox College.
the OUEU contained a disproportionate number of Presbyterians.\(^83\) The EU was supported by a small number of local ministers, including Miller, W.A. Hamblett of St. Matthew’s Anglican, and Alan Stevely of First Church.\(^84\) Classics lecturer Dr. H.R. Minn was a frequent speaker, and became closely identified with the OUEU.\(^85\) W.A. Orange sometimes came down from Christchurch to speak at OUEU houseparties, and he and Minn became friends.\(^86\) OUEU student presidents in the 1930s and early 1940s included Hallam Howie,\(^87\) Mervyn Milmine,\(^88\) Harry Thomson,\(^89\) Graham Miller,\(^90\) Rob Miller\(^91\) and Russell Kenward.\(^92\) In common with other EUs, OUEU observed the usual pattern of daily prayer meetings, weekly meetings for Bible

\(^83\) Apart from the presence of the Theological Hall, the Presbyterian dominance reflected the origins of Otago and Southland as a Free Church settlement, and thus the continuing high proportion of Presbyterians in the region’s population.

\(^84\) RR, \(1\)80-81. W.A. Stevely (1886-1950), from the United Free Church in Scotland, had studied under James Denney and James Orr, had moved to Australia in 1912, and was minister at First Church from 1930 (Proceedings, 1950: 21-22). He was a popular preacher, with a “warm manner and simple direct message” (Somerville: 42). Another minister who spoke at EU was S.T. (Stanley) Nicholls, from Milton. Both became members of the OUEU Advisory Council, and were later members of the IVF ministers’ group, the TSPU Post-Collegiate Section: “TSPU Post-Collegiate Section”, [1942], TSCF II/038. The father of the Union, Cree Brown, died in a mining accident in 1934.

\(^85\) So much so, that a student newspaper carried a reference to “the E.U. and its Minn-ties” (Minties were a popular sweet), ADMNH 1: 83. In 1937, for instance, Minn was to speak at the Freshers’ Tea, and then weekly throughout Term One, New Zealand Inter-Varsity News’ Bulletin 2 (June 1937). Minn also spoke at the second IVF Conference, held in Christchurch in 1937: ibid. Minn was “a man of sensitive and self-effacing godliness,” ADMNH 1: 83. Minn had earlier done an MA in classics at Otago and a doctorate in London on Tertullian. Minn later taught at Moore College, and then Blakelock brought him back to New Zealand to be a Senior Lecturer in the University of Auckland Classics Department, JGM\[91, \]246. Minn wrote several books on scripture, including volumes on the gospels (1939), Isaiah (1946), John 1:1-18 (1948), Amos (1949) and Job (1965), and also The Universality of Christ (Dunedin: IVFNZ, 1939). Other friends of the EU included S.C.Hercus (Baptist layman) and C.J. Romeril (Brethren): RR, \(1\)80.

\(^86\) Both bachelors, they were similarly devout and bookish, ADMNH 1: 83.

\(^87\) 1930-2.

\(^88\) 1932-4. Milmine was later a Presbyterian minister.

\(^89\) Thomson, a protégé of Orange, was at Selwyn College preparing for the Anglican ministry. His involvement in the Otago EU increased awareness there of the Christchurch evangelical work associated with the ministry of Orange.

\(^90\) 1935-6.

\(^91\) Rob Miller was later a Presbyterian minister.

\(^92\) 1942. Kenward, later a Presbyterian minister, had been a member of Kent Terrace in Wellington. Other OUEU Presidents in that period included Cuth Stewart, Gordon Smith, Colin Morrison and Jack McQueen. Other active early OUEU members included Jean Hanning, Alister Loan, Marjorie and Ruth Pettit, Eunice McLean and Caleb Tucker: RR, \(1\)78.
teaching, and monthly teas – and occasional special meetings, missions, and weekend houseparties.  

The Canterbury EU was characterised by a mix of Open Brethren and evangelical Anglicans; other denominations (including Baptist and Presbyterian) were rarely present. Almost all of the Anglican members were associated with the influence of Orange, who frequently spoke at EU. Another influence on CUCEU was Orange’s close friend Howell Fountain, a Brethren leader whose home was frequently the venue for Christchurch evangelical gatherings and prayer meetings. The EU held its main meeting (every Friday night) in the “Catacombs”, an underground room that to a visiting Thomas Miller “seemed to be a conspirators’ chamber, a subterranean vault: …surrounded by beams and pipes”.  

The Auckland EU was numerically strong, and reflected the strength of several strong evangelical churches in Auckland. It was predominantly Brethren and Baptist in make-up, but it did have some Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Church of Christ (Life and Advent) members. In contrast to Christchurch, AUCEU had very few Anglicans. It enjoyed the strong support of Dr. Pettit and especially classics  

---

93 In 1936, for instance, there was a mission to Stirling-Benhar and Kaitangata Presbyterian parishes. Notable speakers at meetings included Edwin Orr and Dr. C.J. Rolls (BT). There was a Missionary Fellowship of about ten students. An additional weekly Theological Study Group was held in Term 1, mainly for theologues, with studies on Romans conducted by Thomas Miller. *NZ Inter-Varsity News’ Bulletin* 1, no.1 (July 1936).  
94 MW, §35. That was still so in the late 40s and early 50s, LW69 et al.  
95 “Tour of the New Zealand Colleges by the Rev. Thomas Miller, M.A.” n.d. [1945]. TSCF C5/2. This room, in the university’s old central city site, was known as the room where Ernest Rutherford began his scientific research. Miller made a tour in 1945, after retirement, also visiting EU graduates and Crusader contacts: Milmine to Malcolm [Buist], 26 Mar. 1945, TSCF J1/12.  
96 The 1936 Freshers Tea, for instance, was attended by 170 and monthly teas attracted about 100: *NZ Inter-Varsity News’ Bulletin* 1, 1 (July 1936).  
97 Dr. Bruce Harris, letter, 30 May 2001; KO, §19.  
98 Local churches contributing students to the EU included St. James’ Presbyterian, Beresford St. Congregational and West Street Church of Christ (Life and Advent: JGM, §239; ADMNH 1: 95.  
99 KO, §19.  
100 Pettit’s influence and involvement gradually declined as he became older and more insular in his Brethrenism: KO, §18.
lecturer Dr. E.M. Blaiklock. For at least three decades, the Auckland EU was to be "very strongly associated with the mana and influence" of Blaiklock (1903-1983): he was its key "mentor", casting a "great benign shadow" over the EU. A "magnificent" orator and Bible teacher, Blaiklock frequently spoke at EU. For EU, and later for the whole evangelical cause in New Zealand, Blaiklock's combination of strong Christian commitment with outstanding eloquence and erudition lent "respectability as well as substance" to the evangelical position. As an increasingly well-known writer, speaker and columnist, Blaiklock in the post-war era would arguably do more than any one else to raise the public profile of evangelical Christianity in New Zealand. At first, Blaiklock was the only prominent university staff member publicly involved in the EU, and he seemed to feel that his own credibility as an academic was tied up with EU and that he should "make sure that the EU didn't do anything stupid". The support of Blaiklock was hugely reassuring to the young EU, which was being grown in a fairly hostile environment, and the support of any eminent academic or churchman was always welcomed by EUs. The AUCEU brochure portrayed the EU as "the original Christian Movement among Students", and listed IVF's distinguished international leaders.

---


102 KO, ¶18. Blaiklock was not always benign. As President of AUEU, O’Sullivan became aware of Blaiklock’s tendency to view disagreements in highly personal terms.

103 Ibid.

104 Dr. Bruce Harris, letter, 30 May 2001.

105 Ibid. The other main contender, at a more popular level, was Billy Graham.

106 KO, ¶18.

107 A similar pattern was evident in Britain. The infant IVF was glad to have the support of Martin Lloyd Jones, Daniel Lamont, and some of Scotland’s Free Church Professors (Barclay: 135).

There were many other evangelical ministers and leaders AUCEU could call on to speak, including Robert Laidlaw, Rev. C.H. Lowden, and BTI staff J.O. Sanders and H. Yolland.\(^{109}\) In common with all the other EUs, AUCEU also liked to bring Orange from Christchurch to speak at some of its house-parties: on the first such occasion many were deeply impressed at Orange’s teaching and spirit, at the “fragrance of a life lived in closest touch with God”.\(^{110}\) Dr. John Laird, too, was another regular visitor.\(^{111}\) Along with Orange and Blaiklock, Laird had a profound effect on many young EU members.\(^{112}\)

In the earliest years of AUCEU, a key student leader was Archie Morton, later an Anglican minister in Sydney.\(^{113}\) In 1938, the President was Colin Becroft, a future General Secretary of Scripture Union. Many other future evangelical leaders were produced by AUCEU, such as those who were members in the closing years of the war: Les Allen, Ivan Moses, Ian Kemp, Arnold Turner, Francis Foulkes and Kevin O’Sullivan.\(^{114}\) Also, with many male students on war service, women such as Mavis Addison and Jean Day had opportunity to exercise significant leadership.\(^{115}\)

\(^{109}\) The NZ Inter-Varsity News Bulletin 1, 1 (July 1936); The New Zealand Inter Varsity Supplement 5, 3 (Nov. 1941. Others included W. Fortune and Dr. Alex Hodge. Speakers in 1936 included T.F. Haughey and Revs. A.V. Grace, T.N. Cuttle, A. Nelson and E.T. Olds.

\(^{110}\) Ibid. Orange was also the main speaker at the 5-day AUCEU houseparty in 1937, speaking on the “Kingdom of God” from Daniel and Matthew 13. Blaiklock also spoke (“Moral difficulties in the Old Testament”), as did John Laird. The Laidlaws were the house parents. New Zealand Inter-Varsity News Bulletin 3, no.3 (June 1937). In 1939, Orange was invited by all four EUs to speak at their annual house-parties: New Zealand Inter-Varsity Supplement 3, 3 (July 1939), TSCF (no ref.).

\(^{111}\) For Laird, see below.

\(^{112}\) These three were cited by Francis Foulkes, for instance, as key influences upon him: “The Richness of Life. Recalling the Past” (unpublished memoirs, typescript, n.d.): 11, 13. He noted that EU was a critical “formative influence” on him. Apart from the speakers and theology he was exposed to, he was shaped by the strong emphasis on early morning personal devotions.

\(^{113}\) Morton was President for four of the six years prior to his departure in mid 1937 for Moore College. New Zealand Inter-Varsity News Bulletin 3, 3 (June 1937).

\(^{114}\) KO, ¶10, ¶13-14.

\(^{115}\) KO, ¶15.
The weakest EU was in Wellington, reflecting what was recognized as the “rationalist” and “hostile” environment of Victoria University College, and the lack—until the 1950s—of any substantial evangelical base in the Wellington churches. An internal EU report noted:

> Church life in Wellington lacks, in general, an evangelical element of any strength. This possibly has some connection with the rationalist bias in V.U.C. There is a marked lack of evidence of the evangelical viewpoint among the city’s clergy.\(^{116}\)

In such a situation, the EU became even more important in shaping evangelicals: EU students “look to the EU for the instruction which they do not get from their church”.\(^{117}\) VUCEU also suffered through the weakness of the city’s school-based Crusader Unions, many of which were forced to meet after hours outside school premises. Consequently, the annual influx of ex-Crusader members into VUCEU was minimal.\(^{118}\) Unlike other EUs, VUCEU was denominationally non-descript.\(^{119}\) For a long time, it was also dependent on the “fatherly care” of John Laird\(^{120}\) and Cliff Cocker.

G The Evangelical Unions and “Fundamentalism”

An issue that needs some exploration is the extent which the pioneer Evangelical Unions were “fundamentalist”.

---

\(^{116}\) “Notes for incoming president”. Raymond Honey, 3 Dec. 1949. B2/12, VUCEU, TSCF. Re rationalism: “Victoria [UC] can be described as a ‘hostile environment’. While this may not be actively expressed, it is very definite. The influence of rationalism in its many forms is deeply marked in the college both among the staff and in the more active student activities”. Re the lack of evangelical strength in the churches: it “makes it very difficult to obtain ‘outside speakers’ apart from the ‘IVF hierarchy’ and Brethren circles.”

\(^{117}\) Ibid.

\(^{118}\) Ibid.

\(^{119}\) JGM, ¶248.

\(^{120}\) VUCEU, Annual Report for year ending 31 August 1945, B1/074, TSCF.
An initial element to be considered is that the EU members themselves did not identify themselves as “fundamentalists”. They knew they were sometimes called that by others. But that worried some, but not others. It was not a term EU members normally used, in part because it was a foreign, North American term. But the assumptions, influences and identity that shaped the Evangelical Unions were overwhelmingly British rather than North American. The American neologism “fundamentalist” had not gained any strong acceptance in British evangelical circles. The word “evangelical” seemed sufficient to EU people. In part that was because it was enshrined in the name of their movement, and in part because it had long been part of the British theological and ecclesiastical scene. For most EU members, the evangelical glory days were not in America in the 1920s, but in Britain in eighteenth-century revival and in nineteenth-century evangelical vitality.

New Zealand evangelicals were also realising that “fundamentalist” was becoming a pejorative term. In the 1920s and 1930s, some New Zealand evangelicals may have seen the terms “fundamentalist” and “evangelical” as synonymous, and sometimes in the pre-war era no clear distinction was made. But the equation of the two terms gradually became less common, as EU members became increasingly aware of the negative connotations of the American term. In 1939, for example, EU leader Max Wiggins warned that:

---

121 MW, ¶40.
122 JGM, ¶497.
123 Rev. Maurice Betteridge, interview, 26 Nov. 1999 (hereafter MB), ¶84; RR, ¶327; JGM, ¶495-6, ¶512.
124 ERH, ¶61, ¶68, ¶70. Harries was reflecting on his background at BTI (1934-5), where many were happy to wear the label “fundamentalist”; similarly LW, ¶126-8. Note also Edwin Orr’s comment en passant in 1936 that: “I am an evangelical, a fundamentalist” (Orr: 49); but Orr had spent much time in North America, in the period prior to the emergence of the neo-evangelical movement (which he later became strongly associated with).
125 RR, ¶344. But that did not mean that the terms were used as equivalents, or that the latter term was used much in a non-American setting.
126 In Britain, too, the differentiation of the two terms and movements may have been less apparent in the 1930s than it was later. Barclay suggests that in that period British conservative evangelicalism was closer to American fundamentalism than it was half a century later. He also argued, though, that it was always “more doctrinally mature” and “less fierce” and was subsequently able to grow into something very distinct – something “able to confront the culture in a much more positive way that
One of the difficulties under which the Evangelical movement labours is its association in the minds of many with the extremes and extravagances of American Fundamentalism. It is the opportunity of the Evangelical Unions...to counteract this impression. 127

By the 1950s, there would be a general awareness in EU circles that “fundamentalist” was a compromised and negative term.

Nevertheless, members of the pre-war EU’s were universally prepared to identify with the earlier, more benign sense of the term “fundamentalist.” They shared in the general evangelical assimilation of the word “fundamental” (as used in the American context from 1910) to denote core orthodox doctrines that were believed to require defending. The OUEU, for instance, was happy to state that one of its three aims was establishing Christian students “in the fundamentals of the Christian faith.” 128 “I was probably called that [‘fundamentalist’],” recalled one EU stalwart, “but I did not mind it. I understood that it had a ‘good’ meaning, that you believed in the fundamentals.” 129

Quite apart from questions of nomenclature, it is a legitimate question to ask whether the EU’s were “fundamentalist” nevertheless: crypto-fundamentalists who fitted the definition even if they avoided the terminology.

If the word “fundamentalist” is defined simply as “biblically conservative”, then certainly the EU’s were in that category: they expected of their members a strong,

---

127 IVFEU TSPU circular, April 1939, TSCF II/035. What distinguished evangelicalism from fundamentalism, Wiggins implied, was that “God has given us the spirit of a sound mind”, which meant “sobriety and balance”.
128 OUEU, [introductory] card, 1944, TSCF.
129 RR, ¶364.
unequivocal faith commitment: “being an evangelical meant you had to be willing to stand for the Gospel and proclaim it ... to be counted as a bit different from others”.

If the term is defined as “reacting against theological modernism,” then the term also fitted: the EUs consistently, self-consciously perceived themselves as upholding the true biblical faith against the inroads of a diluting modernism, and the EU attitude to modernist thinking was unquestionably defensive.

But such definitions of the term “fundamentalist” may not be very useful. “Fundamentalism” does entail biblical conservatism, and does entail a reaction against modernism: but there are varying degrees of biblical conservatism, and not all biblical conservatives may be “fundamentalist”. In their reactions against modernism, conservatives showed many different tones and stances.

It can be argued the EUs’ biblical conservatism was not extreme. The Doctrinal Basis shared by the EUs (the British IVF basis) was conservative, and was firmly held, and it avoided ambiguities on points where liberals and conservatives clearly differed. But it was not in itself excessively narrow or prescriptive. It avoided unnecessary precisianism or elaboration. It left some things – such as the nuances of “inspiration” and “infallibility” – undefined. It ignored secondary controversies, and avoided the subjects of evolution, for instance, or the Virgin Birth, or competing eschatological schema. It avoided any hint of stridency or militancy. It was couched in the language of classical doctrinal confessions, rather than in language that suggested a direct reaction to modernist positions.

---

130 RR, ¶366.
131 See above.
132 The DB made no reference to creation or evolution. In relation to eschatology, the DB simply asserted an “expectation of the Personal return of the Lord Jesus Christ”.
Doubtless many individual EU members at times displayed elements of a supposedly “fundamentalist” mentality, such as arrogant dismissiveness of other views, the rejection of scholarship as unspiritual and unbelieving, oversimplification, excessive literalism, the piling up of proof-texts without reference to context, clumsy or negative styles of evangelism, and legalistic anxiety about peripheral matters. EU was, after all, a movement of young students, and some of its members had come from very conservative backgrounds.

Nevertheless, especially at leadership level, there was a characteristic moderation about the EUs, in keeping with the firm but nuanced conservatism of the British IVF movement and with educated British culture in general. As the EUs grew in numbers and confidence, and as the intensities of the schism with SCM began to fade, a moderate spirit increasingly prevailed. That moderation was conscious, and deliberate: an important value in the EU movement, pervading and restraining everything, was “sobriety and balance”. Very significantly, EU leaders articulated the importance of “sobriety and balance” in precisely the context of contrasting [British] evangelicalism and American fundamentalism.

With the tone in EUs set by leaders such as Orange, Blaiklock, Minn, Laird and Miller, EU meetings were characterised by a temperate, restrained atmosphere. The activity par excellence in EU settings, apart from prayer, was the thoughtful devotional exposition of Scripture. The pitch of such exposition was “spiritual”. It was not polemical. While Orange’s biblical typology could border on the whimsical, there was a prevailing attitude in EUs – and with Orange too – that biblical exposition should be careful and judicious and based on sound, sensible exegesis.

Pre-war EUs were consistently anxious for intellectual and ecclesiastical respectability, and their letterheads and brochures always prominently listed the

---

133 Max Wiggins, IVFEU TSPU circular, April 1939, TSCF 11/035.
names of respected academics and clergy on their advisory councils. With their own reputation at stake, those so listed had a vested interest in guiding the EUs away from anything extremist. Blaiklock in particular was hyper-sensitive about anything in the EU that might appear ignorant, irrational, fanatical or emotionally excessive. Instinctively, the EUs veered away from anything eccentric or sectarian. Bible study leaders from the Brethren might sometimes promote elaborate eschatologies, but there was little general enthusiasm for those. It was assumed by most EU members that biological evolution was contrary to Scripture, but in practice there was in most EUs very little focus on opposing or discussing evolution, and there was considerable variety (and liberty) in the ways in which EU members might correlate science and creation.

If "fundamentalist" denotes "anti-intellectual", then that designation did not fit the EU. It is true that EU members were not encouraged to speculate, or to accommodate their faith to the latest winds of contemporary human thought, or to be theologically sophisticated. It is true that spiritually zealous students could be tempted towards anti-intellectualism, especially if they had absorbed the popular idea that scholarship led to doubt and unbelief. But anti-intellectualism was not encouraged by the EU leadership or by the movement's most eminent speakers. The movement was committed to the reasonableness of Christian faith, and one of the things that the EUs craved most was intellectual respectability. EU students were encouraged to have a resoluteness and boldness in their faith, but the whole movement was premised on the principle that a clear understanding of biblical doctrine was an essential foundation for strong faith. A high premium was laid on instructional reading and teaching: the basic EU text, *In Understanding Be Men*, was an attempt to have EU students thinking, studying and well-informed, at least to the same level that they attained in their university studies. It successfully revolutionised the outlook of

---

134 Ibid.
some. Hammond himself was anything but anti-intellectual. The EUs were intellectually committed, in directions some deplored; but at their best they were certainly not anti-intellectual.

If “fundamentalist” denotes a strident Bible-thumping revivalism (such as that of W.P. Nicholson) or high-pressure evangelism, the description would not generally fit the EUs. Such an image for AUEU would have been anathema for Blaiklock. EUs were anxious to evangelise, with their anxiety often exceeding their action, but there was nevertheless a restraint in the manner in which they went about evangelism. There was always a consciousness that the gospel was being articulated in a university setting, and that scepticism had to be countered with rationality rather than hype. The messages in EU missions were pitched to promote the overwhelming reasonableness of Christian faith, and excessive emotional intensity or pressure would have fatally undermined that approach. Orange, the star speaker of the pre-war EUs, never issued an evangelistic “appeal”.

If “fundamentalist” denotes “separatist”, the answer must be qualified in at least two directions. The EUs had grown out of a rift with the SCM, and were steadfastly intent on maintaining a distinct, “sound” Christian work among students. In their desire for doctrinal clarity and purity, the EUs were certainly doctrinally “separatist”: they were wholly opposed to any compromise with theological modernism, and consistently resisted rejoining or co-operating with a student movement that seemed to them to be doctrinally indifferent and spiritually lax. But the EUs were never ecclesiastically “separatist”: they held no brief at all for ecclesiastical separatism, or for church splits along theological lines. The EUs invariably taught loyalty to one’s own

document for non-theological students. Emphasising the coherence of biblical revelation, it represented a “moderate Calvinism” and avoided controversy in such matters as evolution and eschatology (Goodhew: 70; Barclay: 30-31).

138 E.g. Dr. Bruce Harris, from a Brethren family, wrote that his reading of the book’s first edition “opened my eyes to serious theological writing” (letter, 30 May 2001).
denomination. They encouraged EU members to be active in their local churches, and to engage with and reclaim their denominations rather than leave them.137

In summary then, the EU movement in New Zealand was not about producing “fundamentalists”, either in identity or in mentality. EU members in the 30s and 40s saw themselves as simply “evangelical”, in the milder British IVF tradition.138 Such an identity was not at heart a militant or extreme one; it was not characterised by strong anti-intellectualism, aggressive revivalism, or consistent separatism. It was an identity in which “sobriety and balance” were key values.139

H The Evangelical Unions and Evangelical Identity

The critical significance of the EUs was not “fundamentalism”. It was the formation of an explicit “evangelical” theology and identity among a generation of New Zealand students. That development would be important for the post-war Protestant church. Many members of the EUs could echo the assessment that EU was “one of the greatest influences in my life, helping me to formulate and ...crystallize my basic theology and providing me with ongoing fellowship of like-minded people”. It was that growth of a confident, new, university-based evangelicalism that would be the key contribution of the Evangelical Unions.

I The Crusader Movement as an Evangelical Seedbed

Guinness was not only interested in university-based EUs. He was also enthusiastic

137 Another sense of separatist, not discussed above, relates to separation from the world. The SCM saw itself as embracing the world which Christ had come to save, and the IVF as other-worldly: e.g. J. Davis McCaughey, Christian Obedience in the University: Studies in the Life of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland, 1930-1950 (London: SCM, 1958): 176-7. McCaughey cited the IVF as an “extreme” example of Ernst Troeltsch’s world-denying “sect-type” movement, whereas the SCM, as a “church-type” movement, was positive and affirmatory about the world.
138 RR, ¶365; ERH, ¶62.
about establishing a feeder movement in New Zealand secondary schools. Much of his time in New Zealand was dedicated to that end. It was Guinness’ view that “the secret to the Varsity work lies in the schools”.  

An effective schools’ work would ensure strong EUs. In turn, EU members could help run the school groups. It was in some ways a brilliant strategy, which Guinness had already been developing while in Canada and Australia. In New Zealand, Guinness strenuously visited secondary schools, and a large number of evangelical school groups were begun, mainly lunchtime groups which met with official permission in the schools themselves.

As in Australia, Guinness called the school groups “Crusader Unions” in an unauthorised borrowing of the name of the English “Crusader Bible Class” movement. Originally affiliated with CSSM, the English “Crusaders” had targeted Grammar School pupils and met (outside the schools) on Sunday afternoons. Guinness had himself been converted through such a group and liked the biblical symbolism of being a “soldier of Christ”. His use of the Crusader name and badge was regarded as an unforgivable impertinence by the English movement, whose secretary A.J. Vereker doggedly refused to affiliate the New Zealand movement. The true nature of the NZ Crusader groups, however, was made explicit in their constitution, which included the British IVF Doctrinal Basis, required committee members to accept that basis, and made provision for half the local committee members to be members of EU.

---

139 IVFEU TSPU circular, April 1939, TSCF 11/035.
140 Guinness to Cree Brown, 11 April 1930 (SU), cit. Lineham: 42.
141 Up to a point, the SCM also had a schools’ work. There were fifteen groups in girls’ schools, but only four in boys’ (ibid.: 57).
142 The AUCEF souvenir programme of Guinness’ visit to Auckland noted that “Dr. Guinness represents the Crusader Union” and included a statement from Guinness himself that “The Crusader Union [i.e the NZ one] is linked with a somewhat similar movement in England”, Archie Morton to Mervyn Milmine, n.d., copy, TSCF N7/76.
143 The Crusader Cards included “a call to arms”: Crusader Union card, 1930.
144 The New Zealand badge had stars inserted to represent the Southern Cross.
145 Lineham: 62. Because of that refusal (despite the pleas of British IVF Secretary Douglas Johnson), the NZ Crusader movement became linked with the local CSSM and SU.
146 Ibid: 43, 55.
In the secular environment of New Zealand state secondary schools, the establishment of Crusaders depended upon the permission of the Principal and the availability of suitable leadership. Permission was sometimes withheld, and sometimes Principals wanted to foist non-evangelical leaders on the group. The Crusader movement avoided appointing "legalistic zealots" as leaders, who would undermine a group's acceptance.

The Effect of the Crusader Movement

The Crusader Unions proved highly effective in feeding young Christians into the young EUs. Rymall Roxburgh, for instance, who had been at the initial meeting at Otago Boys High School with Guinness, "naturally" went from Crusaders to EU when he went to university; with Graham and Rob Miller as his friends, he felt he "could scarcely have done otherwise". He had attended Crusader “squashes” at the Cree Brown home and went on to attend EU “squashes” there as well. The two movements consistently complemented each other and their ministries cannot be separated. In 1940, for instance, three of the four EU Presidents had been converted through Crusaders.

Some significant groups were established in key schools. The Crusader Union at Auckland Grammar School, for instance, “trained a generation of future Christian

---

147 Secondary Schools in New Zealand were not required by law to be secular, and often had hymns or prayers at school assemblies, but were nevertheless influenced by the secular atmosphere of both primary and tertiary education. The 1877 Education Act, bypassing denominational rivalries, had stipulated that primary schools be "secular". That provision was anti-sectarian rather than anti-religious, but a more rationalistic understanding of the secular clause gradually gained ground. See Ian Breward, *Godless Schools? A Study of Protestant Reactions to the Education Act of 1877* (Christchurch: Presbyterian Bookroom, 1967): 102-26, especially 102-3.

148 Lineham: 74.
149 Ibid.: 72.
150 RR, ¶153.
151 RR, ¶156, ¶110.
152 Lineham: 79.
leaders’, including Rowland Harries, Bruce Harris, John Sturt and Ivan Moses. In 1942, in his sixth form year, Kevin O’Sullivan was persuaded to attend Crusaders at that school. Although confirmed at his local Anglican church, O’Sullivan “suddenly saw personal Christianity – for the first time”. When he went to university, his Crusader leader strongly urged him to join EU.

The Crusader Union at Christchurch Boys High was also influential. It shared many of its members with Orange’s Bible Class at Sumner. Other important Crusader Unions included those at Otago Boys High School, Palmerston North Boys High School, Epsom Girls Grammar, Mt. Albert Grammar and Nelson College. There were also many smaller groups, such as that at Christchurch West High School, which also performed a crucial role in nurturing young evangelicals.

The Role of Crusader Camps

An important adjunct to the school groups were the holiday-time Crusader Camps. The first camp to be so named appears to have been at Governor’s Bay in May 1931, involving both high school and university students. The speakers were Orange (just a few months into his ministry at Sumner) and Laird. Campers included Max

153 Ibid: 73.
154 Harries (son of Evan Harries) became a Presbyterian minister. Harris (later a lecturer in Classics) became very active in the Graduates Fellowship, before taking up a post in Macquarie University in Australia; see Hutchinson, Mark. “Professing History III: An Interview with Professor Bruce Harris, 27 Oct. 1990.” Lucas: An Evangelical History Review 10 (Dec. 1990): 27-34. Sturt became a prominent Christian doctor. Moses became an IVF Travelling Secretary, leading educationist, Presbyterian elder, and senior leader in several evangelical organisations.
155 KO, ¶8.
156 Ibid., ¶10. The leader was Atholl Donnell.
157 e.g. Murray and Mort Fountain, David Aiken, John and Edwin Judge, Lester Pfankuch and Maurice Betteridge. For that Bible Class and those individuals, see below (Chapter Three).
158 Lineham: 74.
159 John Lewis Wilson Memoirs, Sept. 1993, unpublished typescript, 8. Lewis and Challis Wilson, attending a Brethren Assembly in rural Canterbury, later became Presbyterian ministers. Wilson refers to the school as Hagley High School, anticipating what it was later known as. The group there was led by Jim Irwin, an Anglican later killed in the war.
160 Dr. John Laird, No Mere Chance (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1987): 51. A house-party for eight university students and eight senior high school boys had been held the month before, at Karitane
Wiggins, Bob Nicholson, Roger Thompson and Basil Williams – all later important in the growth of Anglican evangelicalism. Bob Nicholson was converted. Max Wiggins recalled praying aloud for the first time, in a group at the end of the pier, and soon after sensing a call to ministry.

In January 1932 the legendary Ponui boys’ camps began, in the Hauraki Gulf near Auckland. These hardy camps were under canvas on the remote island farm of Fred and Gertrude Chamberlain. The formula included much natural beauty, boisterous activities and robust evangelical piety. It modelled a very “masculine” Christianity. Leaders at the first two camps included future evangelical leaders such as Rowland Harries and Steve Clark (later Presbyterian ministers), David Burt (Brethren elder), Vine Martin (later a Crusader staff member) and Colin Becroft (later SU General Secretary). Notwithstanding the Depression and wartime conditions, the Ponui camps were “hugely formative” for many. Wyn Fountain, later a prominent Auckland layman, recalled a spiritual awakening as he looked out across the bay at the first camp in 1932:

The setting sun was painting the hills a hundred shades of red and orange. The black silhouette of the bushes on the point against the western sky all suddenly came alive. I had not noticed this sort of beauty before, but now I said to myself: ‘This didn’t happen by chance. God must be real.’

---

162 MW, ¶131.
163 See Laird, 52-3; Don Biggs and Lawrie Becroft (eds). The Ponui Story. Celebrating 75 years of Scripture Union Camping (Wellington: Scripture Union New Zealand, 2006).
164 David Wood, interview, Nov. 2004 (hereafter DW), ¶7. Wood, a rugby player, felt wide games at Ponui were more rugged than anything he ever encountered on a sports field.
165 RR, ¶156.
166 K. O’Sullivan, “From Camp Leader to Scripture Union Council member,” Biggs and Becroft: 17.
167 Biggs and Becroft: 11. Fountain made a commitment a few months later at a Nicholson meeting. After the war, he led the Auckland Grammar Crusader group for eight years.
Ian Kemp, later a Baptist minister, missionary and BCNZ Principal, recalled his first conscious appreciation of expository Bible teaching from a series at Ponui by Becroft and Laird:

A hundred or more boys, huddled in the marquee.... or spread out in the grassy glade among the manuka trees up the hill by the old Maori fort, drank in every word. Our teachers were men of God whom we respected beyond their formative teaching for their manly approach to life and their genuine interest in each one of us. As I moved into leadership myself I entered this tradition of Biblically based godliness and pastoral care. It was foundational for my own ministries...  

The Significance of the Crusader Movement

In numerical terms, the impact of the Crusaders should not be overstated. In 1939 there were still only sixty-four Crusader Unions (cf. a total of 226 secondary schools in New Zealand), with a combined membership of 1,100 (cf. a total secondary school population of 42,000). In 1935 the Annual Report had noted that Crusader groups were still largely “small and few and feeble”. The significance of Crusaders did not lie in its numbers, however, but in the foundations it was laying for the future. Guinness’ grand vision was beginning to be realized. A new generation of evangelical leaders was being nurtured in the schools. They were then being handed on to the EUs: to be strengthened doctrinally, offered opportunities in leadership, and given a clear identity as “Evangelicals”. An EU annual report in 1941 noted that “Again, many of our new members are ex-Crusaders. Year by year, the Crusader unions supply new members reared in an evangelical atmosphere at their

---

169 Lineham: 73. Sixty-seven of those schools were ordinary state secondary schools, ninety-six were district high schools, and sixty-three were private schools.
170 Ibid.
171 Lineham (81) argued that the small, low-budget Crusader Movement was “perhaps” more important in shaping NZ evangelicalism than were the conventions such as Pounawea and Ngaruawahia or the visits of successive revivalists such as Nicholson, Orr (1933), and Captain Reginald Wallis (1939). Certainly, in the Christchurch evangelical Anglican context, Crusaders was extremely important, whereas the impact of Keswick and the visiting evangelists was negligible.
respective secondary schools”. EU members were also being constantly channelled back into producing more young Evangelicals, through serving as leaders in CSSM missions and at Crusader Camps. Lists of camp leaders include large numbers of future evangelical leaders. O’Sullivan, for instance, went as a leader to Ponui at the end of his first year in EU, and that was his “launching” into a life-time of evangelical Christian leadership.

J  The Critical Role of John Laird in Shaping the New Evangelical Movement

It was Guinness who had pioneered the evangelical student movements. But it was Laird who had ensured their survival and growth. The two men were both products of British IVF. Laird had been President of the 200-strong CU in Glasgow and also had strong CSSM links. Laird had come to New Zealand in December 1930, a month after Guinness had left. He arrived in Auckland as a ship’s doctor, intending shortly to become a CIM missionary. Through a contact in a bookshop, Laird met Pettit. That was a critical encounter. Pettit, concerned about the future of the movements begun by Guinness, discerned in Laird someone suited to continue the work, and a formal invitation followed from the Auckland Crusader Committee.

---

172 AUCEU Annual Report for year ending 31 August 1941, B1/070, TSCF.
174 KO, ¶12. O’Sullivan, a lawyer, became a prominent Anglican layman and a leader in IVF.
175 Lineham: 53-4.
177 Laird: 37-40, 43-4; Lineham: 52-6. The Auckland Crusader Committee initially oversaw the Crusader work nationally, and – in the absence of a national IVF – also in effect the Evangelical Unions. There were corresponding members elsewhere, such as Cree Brown, Orange, Basil Taylor, and Alan J. Petrie (vicar of Ashburton). With CIM’s support, Laird eventually put aside his missionary intentions and received as a call the need to concentrate on strengthening home-side evangelicalism. To help Laird make the decision the CIM Council declined him, ibid.: 69. CIM’s view was that without a strong evangelical base in the “sending” countries the missionary cause would founder, Laird: 65-70.
Laird’s entry to schools was assisted by newspaper publicity about his medical help in the immediate aftermath of the 1931 Napier earthquake. Complemented by a co-worker in the girls’ schools, Laird worked hard to consolidate and grow the Crusaders. He was less flamboyant than the somewhat erratic Guinness, and steadier. He was thoughtful and affable. Someone who later worked alongside Laird described him thus:

A man sent from God... [with] a rich Scottish dialect, ... a most engaging way of meeting people...shiny eyes, a sparkling wit - never mordant or sarcastic...He brought with him a spontaneous Scottish enjoyment of good fellowship and fun... At any [event], he was the life of the party... God gave him [Laird] the faculty for choosing leaders. He had almost a divine intuition for the men or women he felt would be prepared for leadership.

**Laird's Role in Building Evangelical Unity**

Laird inspired widespread trust: he was “a man with natural graces, firm convictions, a warm heart and capacity to relate to all kinds of people”. It has been suggested that Laird had drawn together an evangelicalism in NZ that had been “so fragmented and scattered that confidence in Laird was almost the only attitude they all shared”. In Britain, the London Council of the CSSM was told that Laird had “drawn together the various evangelical circles in the Dominion”. Certainly, under Laird’s steadying and unifying lead, support for several key evangelical movements became more nationally cohesive.

---

178 Laird, 40-2, 46; Lineham, 54-5. The earthquake, on 3 February, killed 256 people. Laird’s ship (the SS Northumberland) was at anchor off Napier when the earthquake occurred.
179 E. Winifred Robertson, followed by Margaret V. MacGregor.
180 JGM, §232. Miller’s first phrase is probably an unconscious echo of Lineham’s fourth chapter heading, itself an echo of John 1: 6. Others also recalled Laird’s sense of fun: e.g. FM, ¶22.
181 ADMNH 1:92.
182 Lineham: 65.
The movements themselves, especially Crusaders, and (from 1936) the IVF, gave new opportunities for evangelicals from across New Zealand and across the denominations to work together in a way that had not previously happened.

Through Crusader camps, CSSM beach missions, and IVF conferences, and through various national councils, a new and unprecedented network of evangelical leaders was to develop.\textsuperscript{184}

In 1933 Laird accepted an invitation to work on behalf of CSSM as well and in 1934 the two movements were united as the “CSSM and Crusader Movement”.\textsuperscript{185} He married Marion Thomson, an Otago EU member from the evangelical Presbyterian parish of Hawera,\textsuperscript{186} and established an office in the capital, a location he felt appropriate for a serious national movement.\textsuperscript{187} Laird also watched over the young EUs and for the first few years was effectively their national leader.\textsuperscript{188}

### The Nature of Laird’s Evangelicalism

Laird was no fundamentalist firebrand or separatist. He was very much in the moderated conservative evangelical tradition of Britain. In all his work, he was eager to reassure both mainline denominations and high school principals. Laird was worried that the Crusader movement was popularly perceived as run by Brethren and Baptists\textsuperscript{189} and made strenuous efforts to recruit Anglican ministers to its...

---

\textsuperscript{184} That network also had links with existing movements e.g. Laird enjoyed the friendship of BTI stalwarts Joseph Kemp and J.O. Sanders (Laird: 53-4).

\textsuperscript{185} The full official title was “The Children’s Special Service Mission and The Crusader Movement of New Zealand with which is associated Scripture Union”.

\textsuperscript{186} Thomson was also Cree Brown’s niece and boarder.

\textsuperscript{187} The information in much of this paragraph is drawn from Laird: 61-74, Lineham: 64-8.

\textsuperscript{188} JGM, ¶162. Bishop Howard Mowll of China (and later Sydney) visited New Zealand in 1931. He told Laird he was concerned about the lack of intellectual quality of students in England, and strongly encouraged Laird to stay in New Zealand and to help strengthen the student work, Laird: 57. Laird’s role diminished after Cliff Cocker became IVF General Secretary in 1937. Laird enjoyed facing the gauntlet at EU-sponsored “Heckling Meetings”, where non-Christian students could ask him any question. In 1934, such meetings were held at lunchtime in the university canteen at OU – see e.g. OUEU, “Heckling Meeting, June 21st and 22nd, 1934”, card, TSCF B4/002.

\textsuperscript{189} John Laird, “Report to the Crusader Council on work amongst children and young people in New Zealand”, 8 June 1931, cit. Lineham, 161-164.
committee.\textsuperscript{190} Although Brethren, Laird attended the most “open” Assembly in the country\textsuperscript{191} and was strongly inter-denominationalist in spirit.\textsuperscript{192} He was wary of extremes of any type: he discouraged religious emotionalism,\textsuperscript{193} and counselled the first IVF Travelling Secretary not to “go overboard” on Calvinism.\textsuperscript{194} Laird was not given to legalism, or to withdrawing from the world. He supported calls for Crusaders to excel in sports and become prefects.\textsuperscript{195} When Laird met a group of EU and Crusader supporters gathered in the Cree Brown home to welcome him back from his 1933 honeymoon trip, he warned them about what he had observed of some American evangelicals: they were “too hard-line”, he asserted, and what was needed was “fundamentalism plus love”.\textsuperscript{196} Like British IVF leaders, Laird was uncomfortable with American fundamentalism, and it appears he was eager that the evangelical movement in New Zealand should be distinguished from it.\textsuperscript{197}

Under Laird’s leadership, a clear evangelical identity and style was emerging within New Zealand Protestantism: a strain of evangelicalism that was positive in tone, conservative but not pugnacious, and evangelistic rather than revivalistic. It was also inter-denominationalist, less legalistic than some of its sources, and increasingly cohesive and self-aware.\textsuperscript{198}

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid.: 63.
\textsuperscript{191} Lineham: 68.
\textsuperscript{192} RR, ¶109.
\textsuperscript{193} Lineham: 81.
\textsuperscript{194} JGM, ¶233. The conversation took place in 1938, on the railway platform at Ashburton. Miller was being slowly drawn towards a more Calvinistic theology and was also reacting against what he saw as the “Arminian extremes” of the Auckland evangelicals. Theologically, he felt the Auckland EU “fairly superficial.”
\textsuperscript{195} Lineham: 72-3.
\textsuperscript{196} RR, ¶338-42.
\textsuperscript{197} RR, ¶358.
\textsuperscript{198} Laird left New Zealand for the UK in 1945, and was succeeded by Colin Becroft, who had been a staff worker since 1938 (Laird: 99-101).
J Conclusion

Historiographically, the formation of the Evangelical Unions has previously been traced primarily by Lineham, in three contexts: in his unpublished 1974 study of the Canterbury EU, in his 1980 history of New Zealand's Scripture Union (in which he highlights the links between the EU and Crusader movements and identifies the critical roles of such figures as Guinness, Laird and Orange), and in part of a piece published in 1986. EU beginnings were summarised in an early IVF(NZ) publication, and Coggan's work included narrative sections relating to New Zealand. There is a brief allusion to the formation of the EUs in Davidson's Christianity in Aotearoa.

This chapter has investigated those beginnings more thoroughly, exploring the dynamics and significance of the schism with SCM and contrasting the many theological and sub-cultural differences between the two movements: one movement reflected an insistence on broadness, the other an insistence on soundness. Various regional distinctives in the EUs were noted, including the different denominational mixes in each centre. In discussing the question of whether the early EUs were fundamentalist, this chapter suggested that the EUs reflected not American


\[203\] F.D. Coggan (ed.), Christ and the Colleges: A History of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions, 1934). D. Penman later compiled an unpublished narrative of IVF (NZ) but it was unreferenced and not very reliable, e.g. Pettit's group was called an EU and Guinness' visit was dated in 1929. D. Penman, ms. notes on the history of NZIVF, n.d., TSCF A2a/23 and B4/001.

\[204\] Davidson: 112. Davidson noted that the 1930 groups began because of disaffection with the SCM. (He referred to the EUs as "the IVF", but the actual IVF was not founded until 1936).
fundamentalism (from which their leaders increasingly distanced themselves) but
the milder and less polemical tradition of British conservative evangelicalism. It was
argued that the EUs did not generally exhibit such fundamentalist traits as militancy,
strident revivalism, or anti-intellectualism. There was no endorsement of any
particular eschatology. Opposition to evolution was usually assumed, but was not an
obvious preoccupation. While doctrinally separatist, the EUs were not so
ecclesiastically. It was noted that for such leaders as Blaiklock, Orange and Laird, and
across the whole EU movement, there was a characteristic emphasis on “sobriety and
balance”, on the reasonableness of Christianity, and on understanding the faith with
the mind.

This chapter has suggested that the critical contribution of the emergent EU
movement was to foster among many New Zealand students a clear “evangelical”
theology and identity. That development, explored further in later chapters, would
help shape post-war New Zealand Protestantism.
Chapter Three:
W.A. Orange, and the Emergence of a New Evangelical Anglicanism, 1930-45

A The Role of W.A. Orange

In Dunedin, the key evangelical leader had been Miller. In Christchurch, in the same period, it was William Orange (1889-1966), vicar from 1930 to 1945 of the quiet seaside parish of Sumner.1 Orange described his ministry at Sumner as “greatly blessed”, producing much “spiritual life”.2 There developed an outstanding movement of Christian devotion among young people, with many conversions and an unusual depth of discipleship.3 As a result of that movement Orange became the father of Anglican evangelicalism in Christchurch. Through his influence, and his protégés, evangelical Anglicanism was strengthened in several other dioceses. Orange was the key inspiration for the post-war Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship.4 Orange also had a significant influence on evangelical students nationwide, and on Christchurch Brethren. In Orange’s time, it has been asserted, the Sumner parish “knew no boundaries”.5

---

1 Orange had completed an LTh (1916) and BA (1919). He became a deacon in 1919, and a priest in 1923. He was a curate at Sydenham (1920-23), Acting Vicar of Fendalton (1923-24) and Vicar of Waikari (1924-30). After Sumner he was Warden of the new Tyndale House (1945-7), Acting Precentor of Christchurch Cathedral (1947-9), Precentor (1949-62), Hon. Precentor (1962-63), Hon. Canon (1951-62), and Chaplain to the Cathedral Grammar School (1954-60).
2 Orange, diary: 7 July 1935.
3 Minutes of AGM: 3 May 1933. Minute Book. Summer Parish. 5 May 1927- 3 Nov. 1960;
4 Orange, diary: 7 July 1935
6 All Saints’ Church, Sumner Centennial. Parish of Sumner/Redcliffs ([Christchurch], no publisher: n.d.): 1.
Orange came to Sumner from the North Canterbury parish of Waikari. Sumner was already known as a “low church” parish, under the ministry of Rev. E.C.W. Powell, one of several clergy in the diocese who were “low church” but not overtly evangelical.

An intensely spiritual figure, Orange was a devotional expositor of outstanding giftedness. The heart of his spirituality was devotion to the person of Christ. A bachelor, Orange poured his energies into preaching and Bible teaching among youth. Orange and his ministry became something of a phenomenon; every Sunday large numbers of young men cycled out to Sumner (about 40 minutes by tram, longer by push-bike) to attend Orange’s afternoon Bible Class. The BC had about forty members. It was not interactive, but a straight hour of Bible exposition. Orange began with Genesis and later worked his way through such books as James, Exodus, Acts, Leviticus and Job, at the rate of one chapter per week. The Bible Class was followed by a prayer meeting, meal and evening service. In all of this, Orange

---

7 1924-1930.
10 Estimates of numbers vary widely, as—presumably—did the actual numbers. Orange himself—who was fastidious about detail and would have kept a membership roll—noted in mid-1935 that the BC had grown from nine members [in 1930] to 33, diary entry: 7 July 1935. Former participants generally gave the number at about 40 e.g. “It [the BC] grew to 40—it might have been 50 at the most,” Rev. Roger F.N. Thompson, interview, 1 Nov. 1999 (hereafter RT), ¶91. Graham Lamont, with reference to the middle years of World War II, estimated that the numbers in the BC were “about 25”: Graham Lamont, interview, Dec. 2001 (hereafter GL), ¶4. Betteridge, a member of the BC from 1940-45, said there were “30-40 in the BC, from 13-14 [years] to about 20. The main body of them were in their late teens.” He presumed the older ones were missing because of the war, MB, ¶28. Goodall, however, suggested that in 1945—at the end of the war—numbers at the Sunday Afternoon BC were “probably 75 or 80 of us... all young men”: Right Rev. Maurice Goodall, interview, 22 Nov. 2001 (hereafter MG), ¶8. The wide age range was deliberate: Orange taught them all in one group, presumably hoping the older ones would disciple the younger ones, and would say “the sheep must feed with the lambs”: MB, ¶27.
showed great "moral earnestness": in the times of prayer before the evening services "his very soul was laid bare, and we young ones could not fail to be aware that we were on holy ground".\(^{15}\)

Affectionately known as "Pekoe" (after a type of tea)\(^{14}\) or "Willie,"\(^{15}\) or more reverentially in his later years as "Canon Orange", Orange became spiritual mentor and model to an extraordinary number of young evangelical protégés. Most of the group were not local – but some were, including Max Wiggins,\(^{16}\) Harry Thomson and Maurice Goodall. Many of the BC members were also members or ex-members of the Crusader Union at Christchurch Boys High School.\(^{17}\) A common pattern was for youth to be converted through the CHBS Crusaders and then be nurtured by Orange's BC – and, if at university, also by EU.\(^{18}\) Many of Orange's charges then became leaders themselves, in Crusaders, CSSM, and EU. Many later entered the ministry or served as missionaries.\(^{19}\) From the late 1940s, those whom Orange had inspired to become ministers were commonly dubbed "Orange Pips."

---


\(^{14}\) Orange Pekoe Tea. The nickname was originally given to Orange when he began at College House, Rathgen: 120, n.1.

\(^{15}\) E.g. GL, \(\S\)2.

\(^{16}\) Wiggins recalled Orange's first appearance at the BC. His first impression of Orange was of "a funny little man with a great beak of a nose": Wiggins, interview by R.M. Glen, n.d. [c.1990], \(\S\)18.

\(^{17}\) GL, \(\S\)2. In 1944, perhaps half of the Christchurch Boys' High School Crusaders attended the Sumner BC: GL, \(\S\)3. But some members of the BC were not members of the CBHS Crusader Union: Harry Thomson and Roger Thompson went to Christ's College, a private Anglican school with a daily chapel service but no Crusaders. Goodall went to Christchurch Technical. John Meadowcroft had come to Christchurch as a university student from an essentially evangelical background in Nelson, under Archdeacon Kimberley and curate Bob Nicholson (a Pip) at All Saints'; when he went to Christchurch, he was drawn into the fellowship of various Pips: Rev. Canon John Meadowcroft, interview, 1 Nov. 2001 (hereafter JM), \(\S\)1-14, \(\S\)25. Wallace Marriott came out of Presbyterian background at Knox Church (Christchurch) and was converted in 1946 at St. James' Riccarton under Rev. Carl Tanner: Rev. Wallace Marriott, interview, 29 Sept. 2001 (hereafter WM), \(\S\)9-10.

\(^{18}\) RMG, \(\S\)9. An example would be Graham Lamont, who had attended church as a child but whose faith became a "reality" through the CHBS Crusaders: GL, \(\S\)1-3.

\(^{19}\) Wiggins claimed that "more than 80" people went into full-time Christian work because of Orange's ministry (Wiggins to Clark, August 1993, cit. Clark: 40). That claim may be excessive.
Orange’s Sunday afternoon Bible Class did not include girls. His ministry was always primarily towards young men. But many females attended his evening service and also his Wednesday night Bible Class.

B  Orange’s Bible Ministry

Orange’s preaching and teaching consisted of powerful meditations on biblical passages. His language – “golden” like Chrysostom’s – conveyed the “absolute wonder and beauty of the Gospel”. It was carefully prepared, with every word crafted. Orange’s teaching was exceptionally rich in imagery and typology, with a powerful appeal to imagination. He would take details in the biblical text, such as those in Exodus or in the Genesis account of the Garden of Eden, and develop them into charming spiritual ideas. It was “intriguing”. Orange was often more straightforward on New Testament passages.

---

20 Vera Mott, interview, 21 April, 2006, (hereafter VM), VM, ¶1.
21 Orange himself was a confirmed bachelor, with no interest in women. One informant described him as a “misogynist”: Rev. R.M. Glen, interview, 27 Oct. 1999 (hereafter RMG), ¶24. Orange wrote to one young evangelical contact about a colleague: “like myself, Aubrey is a bachelor so that he is not in the least sylph-conscious, and wastes no time at all dame-dreaming”: Orange to G. Nicholson, 1 Feb. 1950. VM, ¶3. The Wednesday night BC was similarly held in the devotional atmosphere of the church and often had as many present as at the Sunday evening service: The Messenger 14 (May 1944), 15 (May 1945); Pfankuch, “The Reverend W.A. Orange”.
22 RMG, ¶12. Glen also described Orange’s language as “silky”.
23 Ibid. It appears that the notes from which Orange preached were written out in full with complete sentences and as final copies without words added or crossed out.
24 RR, ¶332. The same feature may be noted in a published sermon from Orange much later in life. It was a highly poetic meditation on biblical images of garments, flowers, and ornaments, as metaphors of personal holiness. With regard to the blue ribbons in Numbers 15:37, Orange said that “the general meaning of blue is clear – it is the colour of Heaven and the appropriate witness of a heavenly character”; with regard to the tassels, he said that the “tassels or flowers set forth the fragrance and beauty of holiness.” See “A Sermon Preached by Canon W.A. Orange at the ECF Quiet Day at St. Augustine, Cashmere, 1 June, 1964”, Latimer Magazine 20 (July 1964).
Orange's tone was gentle and spiritual in tone, and not polemical. He spoke quietly, with sincerity. His teaching was suggestive rather than dogmatic. He might say, after making some tantalising (but perhaps tenuous) allegorical comment, "I don't wish to press this matter. You will have your own thoughts. I simply leave you with that suggestion". His speaking was also enlivened with frequent humorous asides. Orange avoided giving any discernible headings or imposed structure to his exposition and simply worked through the text section by section. He disavowed rhetorical tricks. Curiously, Orange appears to have been very reluctant to allow his talks or sermons to be either published or taped.

Orange had an exceptional capacity to captivate. His speaking was felt by some to have "an anointing", an unusual spiritual endowment. His words were "deeply moving." One of his curates recalled an experience in about 1941:

I came back early one Sunday night from taking a service at Redcliffs, and as I arrived at the door of the church – which was at the back of the church – along the back seat there was a row of people with their eyes glued on the preacher, and leaning forward, neck outreached, to get every word that fell from his lips. It was exciting to watch, to see the interest that was being maintained. And then when they came out of church, I was standing there still, and I saw these people with their radiant faces, they had a

---

28 JGM, ¶236.
30 RMG, ¶13-16; JGM, ¶236. Glen assumed it was because of perfectionism, and also, perhaps, because when speaking Orange often used sources without acknowledging them (some of the content of Orange's talks could be traced to G. H. King's *A Belief that Behaves* and the Brethren series *A Handful of Purpose*). In 1947, the ECF published a précis of an address given by Orange: "The Church in the Light of the New Testament", Report of the Second Annual Conference, ECF. In 1964, the ECF published another Orange sermon, probably abridged: "A Sermon Preached by Canon W.A. Orange at the ECF Quiet Day at St. Augustine, Cashmere, 1 June, 1964", *Latimer Magazine* 20 (July 1964). Many manuscript sermon notes by Orange are retained by the Latimer Fellowship. Vera Mott also took down sermons and Bible Studies in shorthand then typed them up. Glen has in his possession a copy of what he believes is the only known extant tape of Orange speaking, secured by a woman placing a microphone in a bowl of flowers: taped address, "Friends of the Cathedral", April 1961.
31 JGM, ¶236.
32 RMG, ¶12.
tremendous blessing, it was a real work of the Holy Spirit, ministering the Word through his servant Canon Orange.33

A member of his BC commented: “The thing about Pekoe is that he made Jesus Christ absolutely real to you. I don’t know how he did it, looking back on it now... He made the Bible the most interesting book you could possibly want to read” – “the Scriptures came alive”.34 He noted that most of those who went out to the Sumner BC were “fairly academic kids”, and found his interpretations “fascinating.” Another Orange Pip recalled Orange’s ability to hold “spellbound” a large BC of youths, even on Leviticus.35 Another recalled that Orange was deeply convincing: “he could make you believe anything!”36 Above all, he imparted to his hearers “a sheer delight in the marvels of Scripture”.37 Another, later a classical scholar, was “profoundly influenced” by Orange’s “intense respect and interest in every last detail of the text. Every word. That remains with me to this day.”38 Someone else gained a life-long appreciation of the “wonderful wholeness of Scripture...the New Testament was foreshadowed in the Old, and the Old was fulfilled in the New.”39 Orange’s teaching, another Pip recalled, “informed the mind, warmed the heart, and transformed the life.”40

---

33 RT, p.370. He also commented: “He spoke with authority, he knew the scriptures and he had a great and gifted ability of penetrating the scriptures for deeper truths, expounding the word, it was really wonderful and always heart-warming. He addressed the heart as well as the head and that won my heart, because I was converted at that time”: RT, p.14.
34 MB, p.32.
36 RMG, p.12.
37 Glen, in Thompson/Glen interview, p.10.
38 Hutchinson, “Interview with Professor Edwin Judge” (37). “The extraordinary thing is that though I think the methodology was wrong, its effect was profound.”
39 Coulthard/Glen interview, p.17.
40 Thompson/Glen interview, p.8.
Someone who often heard Orange at student conferences observed:

At any IVF conference, he [Orange] had them eating out of his hand. I was one of them. You put your pen down. It was sacrilege to go on scribbling your notes. When he spoke to students in Dunedin on the book of Esther, our hearts burned within us. It was the voice of the Lord we heard speaking, and our eyes were opened to behold wondrous things out of a book that is so little regarded and understood.

Orange’s charisma was not only evident behind lectern or pulpit: his personality “drew you like a magnet.” At conference mealtimes students vied to be near him to hear his humorous anecdotes. At Sunday night suppers at Sumner he would sometimes tell joke after joke, leaving his audience paralysed with laughter. Orange’s own mirth was “infectious.” That social aspect – the hilarity and the camaraderie – was a significant dimension in Orange’s appeal to young men and helps explain the strength of the group that grew up around him. As in many other evangelical settings, group solidarity was based on more than doctrine alone.

Some of Orange’s hearers felt his teaching did not always adequately address their scientific, theological or biblical-critical questions. His allegorising sometimes irritated evangelicals beyond his circle, including those of a more reformed approach (such as Les Gosling) and those of a more scholarly background (such as E.M.

---

41 JGM, ¶236. In his memorial tribute to Orange, Miller related the effect of the preaching of Orange to that of Savaranola in the cathedral of Florence, where the man taking shorthand notes wrote “at this point I was overcome with weeping and could not go on”. “Further tributes to valuable ministry of Canon Orange”, Challenge 24, 30 (6 Aug. 1966): 12.
43 RT, ¶26.
44 JGM, 236.
45 RT, ¶370. On Orange’s humour generally, see also Rathgen: 153, 155-156.
46 Pfankuch, “The Reverend W.A. Orange”.
47 RR, ¶333; Carson/Glen interview, ¶12.
48 Gosling was upset by Orange’s attempt to give an allegorical meaning to the “four anchors” let out from the ship’s stern in Acts 27:29, JGM, ¶236. Also, GMY, ¶89.
Blaiklock). Some EU students joked – unfairly – that when Orange referred to a fig tree, every leaf had a meaning; they were most likely influenced by an incident at an IVF Conference, where the speaker T.C. Hammond quipped “We’ll leave the significance of the third fig leaf to Canon Orange”. Orange’s protégés held their spiritual father in awe, but did not generally emulate his typological approach.

C  The “Orange Pips”

The term “Orange Pip” may initially have been a jibe, by some clergy who felt uneasy about the flood of young new ministers in Orange’s image. But Orange’s protégés were proud to wear the label. The term became variously applied: while it primarily denoted those who later became ordained Anglican ministers or missionaries, it was also used in relation to some Anglican lay people, or people of other denominations. Some who were often considered Orange Pips had hesitations about accepting that identity. But in all cases the “Pips” were members of one of Orange’s Bible Classes and acknowledged his effect on them.

49 HT, §16: “I had too much of a scientific background ... I could not feel that typology had any empirical basis.” Re Blaiklock: O’Sullivan, §18 (O’Sullivan spoke of Blaiklock’s rejection of Orange’s typological approach and his antagonism towards him generally. By 1948, when O’Sullivan was President of AUEU, he found Blaiklock and John Deane had become “quite opposed to W.A. Orange as a reliable teacher at EU”. Orange had spoken at the Auckland EU house-party in 1946.) H.R. Minn wrote that on the whole he agreed with Orange’s typological approach, but that problems arose when Orange moved from typology into allegorisation: Minn to Moses, 31 Oct. 1948, TSCF N12/49.
50 RR, §332.
51 Russell Fountain, interview by P.J. Lineham, n.d.; also R.M. Glen recollection, August 2006.
52 E.g. Carson/Glen interview, §4, §11; Coulthard/Glen interview, §18; Hutchinson, “Interview with Professor Edwin Judge” (37). As a youth, Judge had been “totally captivated” by Orange, but still often wondered how one could for oneself arrive at such “bright insights”.
53 Thompson, Victory, 9; L.E. Pfankuch, “The Reverend W.A. Orange”.
54 As understood by another (and younger) Orange Pip, Robert Glen (conversation, Jan. 2006) or by lay woman Vera Mott (VM, §7). Glen cited the example of Edwin Judge.
55 Harvey Teulon, for instance, was considered an Orange Pip by observers, but when interviewed he denied that he was one, expressing the feeling that he owed more to his background in a Presbyterian family in Palmerston North, Teulon, §16. There were also indications, in the interview, that Teulon valued feeling independent: e.g. Teulon §14, §83. A quarter century earlier, however, Teulon had indicated he was a Pip: Harvey Teulon, interview by P.J. Lineham, n.d. [c.1973]. Some may have felt that being associated with Orange only after he had left Sumner may have made them less of a Pip, e.g. John Meadowcroft, who first went to the BC when it was already at Cashmere, may have been
The earliest Pips included the Revs. Harry Thomson (his first convert at Sumner), Maxwell Wiggins, Roger Thompson, Basil Williams, Bob Nicholson, Dick Carson, Andy Pinwill, David Aiken, Harvey Teulon, Victor Maddick and Peter Tovey. Later Pips – first at Sumner and later at Tyndale House – included the Revs. Maurice Betteridge, Maurice Goodall, Lester Pfankuch, Graham Lamont, Robert Glen, John Meadowcroft and Wallace Marriot. Most of these were ordained to the Anglican ministry in Christchurch but some were ordained by Orange’s friend P.W. Stephenson, the evangelical bishop of Nelson. Most served in New Zealand parishes but many also spent at least part of their ministry as overseas missionaries (most often with the CMS, in either South Asia or East Africa). It has been claimed that Orange had inspired over forty others to enter the ordained ministry, but, given the widely varying extent to which Orange may have influenced different individuals, it is impossible to verify such a quantification. In the estimation of Martin Sullivan, the “Pips” amounted to a “vast company”. Orange himself came to realise the very expressing that when he said “I never became fully an Orange Pip, I suppose”: JM, ¶24. Most Orange Pips, however, were unequivocal in identifying themselves as such, e.g. “Yes, I am labelled as an Orange Pip and am proud to be so labelled. I am deeply indebted to Peckoe [sic] for his systematic exposition of the Bible which he conducted at Tyndale House”: Wallace Marriott, e-mail, 19 Jan. 2006.

A turning point was when Orange took Thomson to hear a missionary speaker from the Afghan Border Mission, Wiggins/Glen interview, ¶23.

Thompson had first had contact with Orange in 1923, at Fendalton, when Orange was interim vicar there for a year. Thompson remained at Fendalton. Every Sunday he would catch the 9.30 a.m. Sumner tram from the Square, teach Sunday School at Sumner from 10 a.m., attend the 11 a.m. service, have lunch at the vicarage, attend a prayer meeting at 3 p.m., attend 6.30 p.m., attend church at 7.00 p.m., and go to supper in the vicarage at 8 p.m: Thompson/Glen interview, ¶7.

Carson, from Ashburton, was at College House and a university student. He was recruited for the Sumner BC in 1932 by Williams and Nicholson: Carson/Glen interview, ¶2, ¶5, ¶6.

Pinwill was an exceptionally gifted youth worker and led the CBHS Crusader Group at the height of its evangelistic impact in the school. In 1947, about 100 boys were attending the Crusader Union (the school roll was about 900). Discussion with Robert Glen, 12 Sept. 2005. Because of personal issues that emerged later, Pinwill was not ordained.

Many other future Anglican ministers may not have been Orange Pips in the narrower sense but were nevertheless associated to some extent with Orange and his circle. They included such people as Bruce Beattie, Bob Hughes and Hugh Thompson.


wide impact he would have through those under his tutelage and is claimed to have said: “I see the seeds of thousands in my boys”.63

D William Orange’s wider Christian influence

Many others in Orange’s circle went on to become strong lay Evangelicals. These included the three Judge brothers (John, Edwin and Robin),64 John Twentyman,65 Allan Stott66 and Robin Currie.67 Edwin Judge later became Professor of Ancient History at Macquarie University, and John Judge became the SU administrator.

There were many women who could be regarded as “Orange Pips”, including Hope and Shirley Greenwood, Vera Mott, Alison Moore and Josephine Dingwall. Vera Mott was a Sumner local, invariably attended Orange’s evening service and Wednesday study, took copious short hand notes, and later became heavily involved in the Christchurch evangelical movement.68 She certainly considered herself a Pip, and felt the term applicable to anyone who was part of Orange’s BCs.69

Orange also had a significant effect on many non-Anglicans. They heard Orange at his evening service (which numerous Brethren people attended70), through his Wednesday night BC,71 through his post-war BC at Tyndale House, and through his frequent speaking at EU and IVF gatherings. Whenever Orange did a series at CUEU,

63 Comment by Glen in Thomas/Glen interview, ¶46.
64 The Judge family was associated with Trinity Congregational, near the Cathedral.
65 Later a Bible Society worker in Peru.
66 Stott became a teacher and leading layman both in St. Martin’s Spreydon and in the Diocese.
67 Later a university lecturer. Other prominent lay protégés of Orange were Hedley Thomas, Crellin Dingwall, Edwin Close, Murray Wilson and Ray Blakely: GL, ¶7.
68 VM, ¶1: “I would not miss it for anything. His exposition of the Scriptures, how he saw Christ in everything, it was wonderful.”
69 VM, ¶7,3.
71 This group was held on Wednesday nights, from 7.15 p.m to 8.15 p.m, and attracted about 70 people, of both sexes.
there was much expectancy among students and attendance rose sharply. Some from other denominations such as John Grundy (Methodist) and Bruce Thompson (Baptist) had links with Orange and were later ordained.

E Orange’s impact on the Open Brethren

In particular, Orange had a deep effect on many Brethren. Sometimes, Orange spoke at Rutland St. Chapel. But Brethren mainly heard Orange at his Bible Classes, or in EU. Through Orange, there developed a significant intermingling of Christchurch’s Open Brethren community and its newer evangelical Anglican community. There was a natural affinity, and no other major players:

We were all very close, really. I mean the evangelical Anglicans, our natural relationship was often with Brethren people, rather than anyone else. There weren’t too many evangelical Presbyterians around [in Christchurch], and the Baptists tended to stand apart, on the whole.

Many Brethren leaders also could thus be claimed as “Pips”, including Russell Fountain and Hedley Thomas. In the EU, at Crusader Camps and at CSSM missions, evangelical Anglicans and Brethren worked as leaders in the same teams, often developing strong friendships. A further consequence – ensuring continuing mutual influence – was numerous Anglican-Brethren marriages.

74 Fountain/Glen interview, ¶27. Some Brethren were a little startled that Orange chose to retain a clerical collar on those occasions. Other ordained non-Brethren who spoke at Rutland Street included John Deane and Frank England: e-mail, Dr. John Hitchen, 13 May 2007.
75 MB, ¶128.
76 Another person in this category was Owen Beaumont (retail entrepreneur: e-mail, Dr. J. Hitchen, 13 May 2007.
77 Peter Tovey, for instance, married Majorie Fountain, and David Aiken’s wife Jean was the daughter of Colonel Bissett, a leading member of the Brethren.
F  **William Orange’s Formation as an Evangelical**

It is not entirely clear who or what influenced Orange to be an Evangelical. Some closest to him, including those who often stayed or holidayed with him, later admitted that they did not know what made Orange evangelical. The thesis by Rathgen, which is helpful on the Anglican context between 1890 and 1920, implies that it was the influence of Low Church/evangelical ministers in Orange’s youth that shaped his evangelicalism; but that thesis was weakened by lack of direct access to Orange’s diaries and in any case does not cover beyond 1920.

Orange, the child of a doting mother and an alcoholic father, was in Sunday School and choir as a child and in Kaikoura was close to his vicar. At the age of ten Orange had made a response at a parish mission in Kaikoura, in the Nelson Diocese. At the age of twelve he felt a call to ordained ministry. From 1904, in Christchurch, he attended St. John’s (Latimer Square) under the ministry of two Low Church, evangelically-minded vicars, H. Purchas and then P.J. Cocks.

---

78 MW, f44, r46.
79 At the time when Rathgen was writing, the diaries were in the possession of the Thomson family. Because of their personal nature and their comments on people still living, Orange’s Literary Executor withheld direct access and, instead, the diaries were searched on Rathgen’s account. This thesis, however, has had the advantage of access to the Orange diaries. The research essay by Clark relates to the period 1930-45 and does not throw any light on Orange’s formative years.
80 Rathgen: 123-7. Orange was the second child in a family of eleven children. He was a serious-minded, bookish child, not interested in sports. He was virtually adopted by the vicar, Rev. C.E. Livesey, who saw potential in him and later paid his fees at College House. Livesey had trained at St. John’s and was at Kaikoura from 1896-1903, and then in the UK: Clergy Database.
81 Rathgen: 124-6.
82 Rathgen: 129-32. Purchas was vicar there from 1906-1913, Cocks from 1913-21. Some indications of Purchas’ approach might be seen in his preferences for voluntary giving rather than fund-raising (William Orange diary entry, 13 June 1909) and for simple worship, and in his rejection of baptismal regeneration (ibid.: 10 May 1912). Laird recorded, presumably because Orange told him, that when Orange was serving in the choir at this time he had a visionary experience of Christ in which he felt he heard the words “I have chosen you to be a witness…” (Laird: 49).
Orange as a Devout Young Churchman

An examination of Orange’s diaries in the period 1909-1912 reveals an intensely devout and lonely young man, often oscillating between spiritual despair and exhilaration. He was drearily employed in two department stores and unenthusiastically studying for matriculation. His consuming passion was the church. On a typical Sunday, he would attend 8 a.m. Holy Communion, 10 a.m. Matins, and Evensong at night; in the afternoon he would teach Sunday School and for Evensong he had extensive duties setting up and collecting things. Sunday was his favourite day: he mused that he would have preferred six Sundays every week and only one workday. During the week he would begin his day with daily devotions. He spent his lunchtimes praying in the Cathedral and visiting the CEMS. In the evenings, he attended choir practice, Sunday School teachers’ preparation class, and the vicar’s Bible Study. His diary carefully recorded saints’ days, and was often in the form of a prayer. He lamented the “utter godlessness” of his peers and felt “it is simply awful what indifference there is to religion”. He was repelled by “vulgar” talk, and bored by conversations about boxing, prizefights, racing and girls. He was deeply inspired in 1910 by a parish mission and on his

83 E.g. 15 Jan. 1909: “I am so lonely. Let me feel thy presence in and around me...there is none upon Earth that I desire in comparison with thee;” 11 Nov. 1910: “I felt a terrible loneliness. I could only turn to Christ ...Friend of friends.”
84 Diary entry: 5 Jan. 1909,
85 E.g. 4 March, 12 June, 18 June 1909.
86 28 Feb. 1909.
87 E.g. 25 May 1910, 2 July 1911.
88 E.g. 31 Jan., 1 Feb., 2 Feb. 1911.
89 Church of England Men’s Society.
90 Initially, this gathering seems to have been part of a St. Andrew’s Guild and included a study of Shakespeare after the Bible Study, 29 July 1909.
91 E.g. 18 Jan. 1909, “Prisca Roman Virgin and Martyr”. Two years later Orange ceased this practice.
92 18 Jan. 1909
93 5 April 1909.
94 2 Nov. 1911.
95 18 Jan. 1909.
96 Canon Ivens, the missioner at St. John’s, spoke on “Life Eternal” and “My Sins.”
knees made a “full surrender”.97 A few days later he felt his soul “stirring” and “knew intuitively” that he was “born to do great things...I imagined myself a Missioner swaying a multitude of people.” 98

A De Facto Evangelicalism

There were clear indications that Orange’s theology was already evangelical in effect, if not in name. He was deeply concerned for his Sunday School boys’ “salvation”99 and praying for them earnestly.100 He showed them a print of Holman Hunt’s *Lux Mundi* (Rev. 3:20).101 He understood salvation as by grace not by works.102 He wrote that he was “looking unto Jesus day by day” in the hope of “being so filled with Him that sin finds no place”103 – a hope of victory over sin that could have been proclaimed on any Keswick platform. All this reflected the more-or-less evangelical environment Orange was growing up in: an environment variously shaped by the Low Church and Evangelical traditions within the English church and by the diffused influence of nineteenth-century movements such as revivalism, Keswick and the CIM. It was a context in which evangelistic parish and open air “missions” were still widely regarded as effective. The whole Anglican Church in New Zealand had participated in a General Mission in 1910,104 many Christchurch Anglican parishes had participated in co-ordinated missions in 1911,105 and the St. John’s parish itself continued to have a monthly open air mission followed by an evening

98 7 Nov. 1910. The next sentence reads: “I the leader, they the led.”
99 18 June 1911.
100 16 July 1911.
101 30 July 1911.
102 Ibid.
103 22 July 1911.
104 The General Mission emphasised prayer and aimed at the conversion of the irreligious masses. It was conducted by twelve missioners from the UK. The missioners were mostly Anglo-Catholic but also included some Low Church men. See Josephine E. Welch, “A Pilgrim on God’s High Road: Canon Wilford in New Zealand” (Canterbury University MA thesis, 2006): 42-8.
105 22-8 Oct. 1911.
“mission” service. It was an atmosphere that Orange eagerly imbibed and which he never repudiated.

Orange’s Evangelical Identity Begins to Form

Orange had become more aware of differing emphases within the Anglican Church. He noted that many ministers “never preach the Gospel” but only preached about “how to live”. Being not “truly converted” their preaching “seldom” produced conversions. Whereas in 1909 Orange had been impressed by a purple chasuble, by mid-1911 he was finding “high church” practices “dreadful”. A visitor from England sought out St. John’s as “an evangelical church” in contrast to New Zealand’s many “high church” parishes. When Orange heard that the Church of England was “torn between the sacerdotalists and the Evangelicals” it was apparent that he rejected the former and identified with the latter. Both those comments suggest that in this period Orange understood “Evangelical” primarily as an antonym to “High Church”. There was much less evidence in the diary that Orange was particularly aware of “modernism”. But he continued to decry the “terrible” incidence of “ritualistic practice” and was “stirred” by Dickson’s *Romanism and Ritualism*.

Strong influences on Orange in his youth included two members of St. John’s, Harry Funnell and George Stening. Both taught Sunday School and Bible Class, were

\[106\] 18 June 1911.
\[107\] 8 Sept. 1911, also 6 Nov. 1911.
\[108\] 8 Sept. 1911.
\[109\] 28 Feb. 1909.
\[110\] 4 July 1911.
\[111\] 27 Sept. 1911.
\[112\] 6 Nov. 1911.
\[113\] On 25 Nov. 1911, however, Orange recorded his shock at a newspaper report about Australian clergy who did not believe in the divinity of Jesus or the inspiration of Scripture.
\[114\] 21 Jan. 1912.
“missionary-minded” and “full of evangelistic zeal”. Over half a century later, Orange would pay tribute to their influence on him.

A salutary influence on Orange was an acquaintance who was an “Exclusive”, whom Orange concluded was “bigoted”. More positively, Orange was significantly influenced by an (Open) Brethren man whom he knew at work, who amazed Orange with his prodigious biblical knowledge and understanding and who may have prompted Orange to begin his life-time practice of independent and intensive Bible Study, using a concordance and recording findings in a hard-bound exercise book. Orange also filled more exercise books with copious notes of other things he read, such as a book on soul-winning, an article on “The Protestant Conception of the Church” and Ryle’s exposition of the 39 Articles.

A Spiritual Crisis

In 1911-12 Orange experienced a severe crisis of faith. He doubted whether he was converted and was “almost in despair”. He could not feel “assured” of salvation. In part this crisis was about classical evangelical introspection. But Orange’s spiritual melancholy may also have reflected an element of emotional depression. At times he was elated, surrendering himself “unreservedly” to Christ; at other times he was close to despair.
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117 Ibid. In 1909, Funnell left Christchurch to study at Moody Bible Institute (Chicago), and then to serve with CIM in West China: 27 Jan. 1909.
118 2 July 1909.
119 5 Sept. 1911. The man’s name was Herd.
120 8 Aug., 7 Sept 1911.
121 Rathgen: 141 Rathgen refers (n. 65, 141) to “R. Thompson MSS collection, St. John’s Latimer Square”. The book on soul-winning was H.C. Turnbull’s *Taking Men Alive*. In note-taking, as in much else, Orange was meticulous.
122 21 July 1911; also 23 Nov. 1911.
124 7 Nov. 1911: “I am utterly bad and depraved”; also 16-17 Nov. 1911, 15 Mar. 1912.
125 Quite apart from the religious crisis, there were several factors in Orange’s life that could have contributed to depression at that time, such as a tedious and stressful work situation and the constant instability of his alcoholic father’s relationship with his mother. Orange himself noted “a feeling of depression”: ibid.
126 2 Dec. 1911; cf. 17 April 1912.
times he plunged back into desolation. The crisis drove him to new spiritual depths: he became more sure of justification by faith, more focused on the Cross, more intent on deep study of Scripture. He concluded that “the work of preparation is still great...I must go into God’s Foundry and come out a vessel meet for the Master’s work”. My great ambition,” he wrote, “is that love for Jesus may become the one absorbing passion of my life”. Such struggles may have helped shape the distinctive intensity of Orange’s later ministry.

The Influence of the Brethren

Orange had been increasingly impressed – and also inwardly conflicted – by his contact with the Brethren. He accepted Brethren literature and went with Herd to an all-day Brethren meeting at Springston. He was astounded at the “plain but spiritually-minded men talking in an animated and cordial way of the sweetest truths”. He felt that “the Brethren have grasped Scripture truths that Churchmen are hungering for” and that their gatherings were just like those in the early church. From another “brother” Orange heard the fascinating idea that beneath the “surface” meaning of Scripture there lay another, “under a veil”. Orange was “in raptures” as he heard the brother unravel obscurities in Scripture. Orange himself later adopted a similar hermeneutic both in study and in preaching. He concluded that “oceans of truth lie before me as yet unexplored and I have a key that will unlock all I need to know.” From the Brethren, too, Orange decided that he did not accept baptismal regeneration.

127 E.g. 24 Nov. 1911, 20 April 1912.
128 14 May 1912.
129 29 Dec. 1911.
130 11 Sept. 1911.
131 10 Nov. 1911.
132 9 Nov. 1911; 10 Nov. 1911.
133 24 April 1912.
134 Ibid.
135 Ibid. The key was Young’s Analytical Concordance.
136 8 Nov. 1911. He was later surprised to discover that Purchas did not accept it either, 10 May 1912.
Herd badgered Orange to leave the “apostasy” of the Anglican denomination. He told Orange he was “bound hand and foot with the graveclothes of the System.” The Lord, Orange was informed, would spew the Anglican Church out of his mouth. Orange was troubled. One could attend an Anglican church and leave “with no knowledge of God, of sins forgiven, no assurance of salvation, nor anything else”. He came close to leaving the Anglicans. But that may have been too costly a step: Orange did not know how he would tell Purchas or his own family, and it would have meant putting aside ordination, a goal that had dominated much of his life. If he stayed, he could preach biblical truth from an Anglican pulpit. He became worried about historic internal divisions within the Brethren movement. He was lent a book by Purchas on the biblical basis of Anglican doctrine. He decided that “Darbyism” was “an abomination”. His eyes, he wrote, were opened “in the nick of time.” He decided to continue towards ordination.

Theological Training

In 1914, Orange entered College House and began reading for the LTh and BA. For the latter, he studied Greek, Hebrew and philosophy. He was involved in the
The issues at College House were still primarily those of churchmanship: College House in Orange’s time had scarcely been touched by Higher Criticism and liberal theology. Orange’s theological education gave him tools for further study and broadened his reading but did not change his theology.

The Principal of College House was J.R. Wilford, a strong Anglo-Catholic. Orange reacted against Wilford, and his own stance hardened. Orange was older than most and not easily persuaded. As “Head of the House”, he appears to have vied with Wilford for influence over the students, whose numbers were few because of the war. Both Wilford and Orange were stubborn and the clash developed into personal antagonism. The night before ordination, Wilford told Orange that his theology made him “not fit to be ordained”. After Orange left College House, Wilford banned Orange from visiting College House students. The underlying issue, as one of Orange’s fellow students saw it, was “opposition between the religious authority of the Bible and that of ‘Mother Church’”. But Wilford may also have been concerned about Orange’s intensity, his crusading attitude and his sway over young students.

---

153 Rathgen: 169, 178. Orange was Chairman of the Canterbury University College SCVM in 1918.
154 Ibid.: 150. It was under the next Principal, Parr (1933-50), that liberal criticism and theology gained more traction at College House.
155 Orange developed a life-long friendship, however, with a scholarly “High Church” roommate, L.G. Whitehead, later Warden of Selwyn College.
157 E.g. Diary, 6 May 1914. Orange told Wilford that he had an aversion against “ritualistic practices” and that, for him, the ministry of the word was much more important than the ministry of the sacrament. Wilford told Orange he was “very sad” to hear his views and that he had not “shifted one iota”.
158 1918-19.
159 Between 1914 and 1918, the number of theological students ranged between 1 and 8, and the total number of students between 8 and 17. Appendix 1, Welch: 141.
160 Interview with J.H.E. Schroder, 1 April 1969, cited Rathgen: 144-5.
161 Wiggins/Glen interview, ¶4.
162 Schroder, cited Rathgen: 144. See also Wilford’s own reflections on the conflict, Wilford: 146.
Ordained a deacon in 1919, Orange became Assistant Curate at St. Saviour’s, Sydenham. From 1921-23, he went on an extensive world trip, invited along as tutor-companion to a wealthy heir. He served as locum tenens at Fendalton, 1923-24, and then as vicar at Waikari (1924-1930).

**Intensive Biblical Study**

In Waikari, Orange devoted himself to intensive biblical study, particularly of Genesis, which he studied throughout 1924.

Spent some time in further studies in Genesis. It really is most absorbing and I am quite thrilled by it. Genesis I is an amazing chapter. It seems to foreshadow every blessed thing that the rest of the Bible treats of. It comprises the past, present & future of the world under man, giving its origin, present condition and destiny. Never before have I been so profoundly impressed with the truth of the Word and its undoubted plenary inspiration.

Through such independent biblical study and reflection, Orange’s distinctive biblical theology took shape. He arrived at Sumner as someone with a consuming passion for teaching Scripture: he struck Laird as like someone who had just emerged from the wilderness “where he had been with God and his books. He was aglow with the Spirit and to meet him was an inspiration”.

**Preaching**

From the outset of his ministry at Waikari, Orange’s preaching appeared to be exclusively textual and expositional. There was no trace of thematic or topical

---

163 See Welch: 82-3; Wilford: 146-7; Minutes of the Christ’s College Board of Governors, 19 Aug. 1920 375; ibid., 9 Sept. 1920: 384.
164 Orange had become friends with C.E.N. (Ned) Smith and had spent many weeks tramping with him in the Mt. Cook alpine region. Diary reference also: 24 May 1938. Another broadening experience had been for Orange to be called up for war service. He went into military camp, hated it and was relieved not to have to do active service (Rathgen: 153).
165 1924 diary entries: 30 April, 19-20 June, 2 July, 8 July.
166 Diary entry: 30 April 1924.
preaching: week by week, his diary from the Waikari period simply records the biblical passage or verse he was expounding. In the mornings, he preached on the passages prescribed in the lectionary, but not in the evenings. In the evening services, it appears he chose favourite texts to preach from, reflecting common evangelical themes such as the new birth and Christian consecration. Orange’s approach – whether he was using the lectionary or not – reflected the traditional Protestant and evangelical emphasis on directly preaching the “word of God” – and the purist notion (held by forbears such as Simeon and Spurgeon, and by contemporaries such as Scroggie) that biblical exposition was preaching par excellence. More indirect forms of biblical teaching were considered less effective in arousing and nurturing faith. By the time he arrived at Sumner Orange would be well established in such a pattern of preaching. As he matured, he would preach more from the Old Testament, and less on isolated verses.

Prayer

Orange’s spirituality was grounded not only in Scripture but in intense prayer. In that respect too he was characteristic of the evangelical tradition. On 7 April 1924, for instance, Orange had “felt the burden of my work greatly, and spent most of the morning in prayer”. He was convinced that only through prayer could the hard hearts of the people be turned to God: “I feel that I can do absolutely nothing, but God will & must do something”. A spiritual turn-around, he believed, “shall be accomplished by unceasing prayer and by nothing else”. When there was a dramatic increase in the number of people attending church at Waikari, a new spiritual eagerness and a first conversion, he understood those developments as

167 Laird: 50.
168 Diary entries, 6 April - 20 July, 1924.
169 Peter Lineham, comparing data supplied from the diaries with the 1924 lectionary, confirmed that: e-mail, 10 May 2007.
170 E.g. 6 April 1924: Rev. 21:3; 20 April: 1 Peter 1:3; 4 May: Heb. 4:12; 11 May: Mt.4:4; 18 May: Jn.13:10; 15 June: John 3:3.
171 Diary entry. Similarly 12 July 1924
172 Ibid.: 2 May 1924, also 11 July.
divine responses to faithful prayer. Orange’s practice of prayer was inextricably linked with his evangelical hunger to see conversions: in the context of prayer, his diary expresses the profound, almost imperious yearning: “I must have souls”. Orange could feel humbled in prayer:

If you don’t pray there is laid upon your heart the urgent need of it, and when you do pray, long and earnestly, God seems to take away from you all sense of its having accomplished anything, which is His way I suppose of using it to the full without any hindrance from the instrument. I don’t think He can trust us with anything. We lose our balance so quickly.

Like many Evangelicals, Orange was anxious about his supposed neglect of prayer: having read E.M. Bounds’ Purpose in Prayer, he felt convicted of his “criminal negligence”. In all of this, in the self-critical introspection, in the heart that ached for spiritual break-through, in the hints of fideism, there were echoes of evangelicalism’s celebrated exemplars of faith and prayer, figures such as McCheyne, Mueller and Hudson Taylor. Orange’s prayerful habits were facilitated by his strong self-discipline and by the quietness of a celibate’s vicarage. He would often spend Saturday evening in prayer for the services the next day.

**Reading**

Orange was strongly independent in his cast of mind. He firmly resisted anyone’s attempts to organise him or to tell him what he should think or do. “I will not,” he

---

173 Ibid.: 12 July 1924.
174 Ibid.: 12-13, 21-2 July. Some months earlier, nobody had turned up at some outlying church services or at the 8 a.m. communion, e.g. 4 May, 1 June 1924; attendance went from fourteen at Evensong on 4 May to seventy-two on 13 July.
175 Diary entries: 29 June, 11 July 1924.
176 Ibid.: 7 April 1924
177 Ibid.: 11 July 1924.
178 Pfankuch, “The Reverend W.A. Orange”.
179 Orange believed that the (Christian) “Sabbath” began at 6 p.m. on Saturday nights: ibid.
wrote, "be dragooned into anything". But Orange did not form his ideas alone: he was an avid reader, with a huge personal library, his books stored in every room and along both sides of the hallway. His library was claimed to contain 14-15,000 volumes (by one account, 30,000) and was said be the second largest personal library of any minister in New Zealand. In his biblical study, early Brethren commentaries were evidently a strong influence. But Orange also read very widely. One Orange Pip described Orange’s wide tastes in reading as “Catholic”, and noted his indebtedness to J.A. Bengel, Von Hugel, Dean Inge, William Kelly, C.H. Macintosh, G. Campbell Morgan, Handley Moule, B.W. Newton, F.W. Robertson, Westcott and Lightfoot. Orange also no doubt read deeply from the English evangelical tradition: from Whitefield, Wilberforce, Newton, Cowper, Simeon and Ryle.

G Orange and the Anglican Evangelical tradition

Orange certainly knew the writings of Ryle, the late nineteenth-century champion of Anglican evangelicalism. He was familiar with Ryle’s Knots Untied, a book which

180 Diary entry: 20 June 1924. He was referring to a clumsy attempt to get him to speak at an archdeaconry conference, without consultation, on topics he knew nothing of. But the comment expressed Orange’s characteristic attitude.
181 Pfankuch, “The Reverend W.A. Orange”.
183 Pfankuch, “The Reverend W.A. Orange”.
184 The largest such library was that of Orange’s friend, L.G. Whitehead (Clark: 43).
185 MW, ¶44.
186 Dean Martin Sullivan, who worked alongside Orange at Christchurch Cathedral for eleven years, described Orange’s library as “amazing” and claimed that few in the Anglican world read so “widely or deeply”. “Like a Father”, Rev. Martin Sullivan, Challenge Weekly 24, 28 (23 July 1966): 6-7.
188 Ryle held a D.D., was bishop of Liverpool (1880-1900), and was well known and forthright as a champion of evangelicalism. He announced to his Bishopric Committee: “I come among you as a Protestant and Evangelical”, 6. He wrote some 300 tracts, with a total of more than 12 million copies, and larger works such as Expository Thoughts on The Gospels, Holiness, Practical Religion, Old Paths, Principles for Churchmen, and Knots Untied. See Peter Toon and Michael Smout, John Charles Ryle: Evangelical Bishop (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co., 1976); Marcus L. Loane, John Charles Ryle, 1816-1900: A Short Biography (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1983), also Marcus L. Loane, Makers of our
provided a strong template for an Anglican evangelicalism¹⁸⁹ and was much prized by Orange Pips.¹⁹⁰ In that work, Ryle laid out what he saw as the five principles of “Evangelical Religion”,¹⁹¹ including the “absolute primacy” of Holy Scripture¹⁹² and doctrines of human sinfulness, the work of Christ, and the role of the Holy Spirit in producing repentance, faith and a fruitful life. Ryle insisted on the need for personal regeneration,¹⁹³ contrasting that with mere formalism and ritualism:

We dread fostering man’s favourite notion that a little church-going and sacrament-receiving – a little patching, and mending, and whitewashing – is all that his case requires. Hence we protest with all our heart against formalism, sacramentalism, and every species of mere external or vicarious Christianity.¹⁹⁴

For Ryle, the “vast majority” of people – and “the greater part of those who are called Christian” – remained spiritually dead.¹⁹⁵ Ryle defended baptism (including infant baptism, on the analogy of circumcision) but denied that baptism was essential to salvation or that baptism can regenerate. He argued that what is essential to salvation is the inward baptism of the Holy Spirit.¹⁹⁶ For both sacraments, “all we say is that grace is not tied to the Sacraments, and that a man may receive them, and be none the better for it”.¹⁹⁷ Ryle denied that Communion is a sacrifice, or that it

---

¹⁸⁹ John Charles Ryle, *Knots Untied, Being Plain Statements on Disputed Points in Religion from an Evangelical Standpoint* (James Clarke and Co.: London, 1954. 31st Edition. First published, 1871. Condensed and revised in 1927 by C. Sydney Carter.) The copy held by the Latimer Library is of a new edition (1964) without Orange’s name in it; he would have had an earlier edition, no longer held by the library. Wallace Marriott was sure he previously owned Orange’s copy but he has since sold it: telephone conversation, 16 June 2004.

¹⁹⁰ Rev. Lester Pfankuch, interview by P.J. Lineham, n.d.

¹⁹¹ Ryle: 80-93.

¹⁹² Cf. “antiquity, the church, tradition, the fathers, the councils”.


¹⁹⁴ Ibid.: 11.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.: 86-88.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.: 65-73.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.: 16, 58.
involves “any corporal presence” of Christ. For Ryle, ministers are messengers, servants, and shepherds, but can never be “sacrificing priests”.

Ryle valued episcopacy and thought it the best form of church government – but asserted that bishops could err, and had even sometimes “ruined the church”. He refused to deny the validity of other forms of church government or of non-Anglican ordination. He defined evangelicalism primarily not against theological liberalism (which he mentions only sparingly) but against High Church views and practices (which he saw as subverting the Reformation and substituting “another gospel”).

Ryle claimed Anglicanism for Evangelicalism: “I believe firmly that impartial inquiry will always show that Evangelical Religion is the religion of Scripture and of the Church of England”. He honoured the Prayer Book as “a matchless form of public worship”, but also asserted that it is not above Scripture and that valid worship can be conducted without it. He lauded the 39 Articles, asserting that “in tone, temper, spirit, intention and meaning” they are “eminently Protestant and eminently Evangelical”.

---

198 Ibid.: 16.
199 Ibid.: 15.
200 Ibid.: 17. He was referring primarily to the time of Charles I but also to the exclusion of the Puritans (1662) and of the Wesleyans (Eighteenth Century).
201 Ibid.
202 It is not until p.61 that Ryle notes the views of some who are “clever, liberal, scientific, and confident” that the Bible is an “uninspired, imperfect, defective book,” to be put aside where it contradicts “modern thought”, ibid.
203 Evangelicals must “stand fast in the old paths, the good way of our Protestant Reformers”, Ryle: 20. Indications of “another gospel” (Gal. 1: 8-9) included such “shameless additions” (19) as incense, lighting candles, using sacrificial vestments, prayers for the dead, auricular confession, the Reserved Sacrament (7,15) and an “unblushing avowal of Popish opinions” (19).
204 Ibid.: 14. Ryle did not claim that non-evangelicals are not Christian: “But I do say that they appear to me to teach that which is not Christ’s whole truth. In a word, they do not give full weight, full measure, and the prescription of the Gospel accurately made up. The parts are there, but not the proportions”: 18.
205 Ibid.: 16.
206 Ibid.: 62; also 13, 50, 58.
In all those areas, Orange would have concurred. But there were some differences of emphasis and tone, and of context: Orange was less tub-thumping in his Protestantism. Ryle was seeking to save evangelicalism within Anglicanism (against the rival claims of High Church parties and a Catholic presence in Liverpool), whereas Orange was seeking to re-establish evangelicalism (in a context where it had long been out of clerical favour). Ryle was critical of the Keswick movement, whereas Orange warmly approved it. But the congruences are beyond question.

One cannot argue that Ryle – or any other Evangelical in the Church of England – was the decisive influence on Orange. It may be that, for Orange, independent biblical study was the key dynamic. All one can say is that, however he may have got there, Orange ended up in a similar place to Ryle and to Anglican Evangelicals generally. The theological and ecclesiastical views that Orange and his followers adopted were essentially similar. What differed was the tone.

H Orange and Sydney Evangelicalism

Orange made several visits to Sydney and had close contact there with many leading Anglican evangelicals. The day he arrived, he had lunch with Archbishop Howard Mowll. Mowll invited Orange to come back to Australia to do Bible teaching in the universities with the EUs, and also wanted him to become an IVF Travelling

---

207 Ryle, for instance, wrote that the times are “very critical, full of danger to our beloved Church” (19), that evangelicals must “stand up and fight” (22), must “resist all attempts to Romanize it [the Church of England] to the very death” (15) and “must not allow evangelical religion to be thrust out.” Such utterances would be foreign to both the context and attitude of Orange.

208 Comment by R.M. Glen, Aug. 2006.

209 Note also Orange’s subscription to the principal evangelical publication within the Church of England, The Churchman. Clark: 38.

210 In 1935 he had three months off, on medical rest, and was in Sydney from 7-20 July and on 29 July. In 1938 he had six months’ unpaid leave accompanying an aunt on a visit to Italy and the UK, and was in Sydney in April.

211 Orange, diary entry: 7 July 1935. Orange had met Mowll on the latter’s visit to Christchurch the previous year (q.v., Loane: 134-5).

212 Orange, diary entry: 8 July.
Secretary. On Orange’s 1938 visit, Mowll (exploring the possibility of Orange becoming Vice Principal of Moore College) again asked Orange if he would be willing to move to Sydney. Mowll confided in Orange his concerns about theological struggles in the Sydney Diocese, and asked his advice about bringing Bishop Hilliard back from Nelson.

In Sydney Orange had significant contacts with other evangelical Anglicans, including Marcus Loane (lecturer at Moore and later Archbishop) and R.B.S. Hammond (a noted missioner among the poor), and T.C. Hammond (Principal of Moore College). Orange would later share IVF Conference platforms in New Zealand with them all. At such conferences, Loane was a compelling speaker: he “could talk about half a verse in 30 minutes, get us to stand up and stretch and then complete the verse in the next 30 minutes, and we were sorry when he stopped.” With both Mowll and Loane, Orange also discussed their interest in training New Zealand evangelicals at Moore.

Despite such warm contacts, and despite Orange uncritically recording a claim that “the Diocese of Sydney is the greatest Evangelical Diocese in the world,” Orange developed some personal reservations about Sydney Anglicanism: he was troubled
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213 Ibid. Orange heard this second-hand. He was troubled by it, writing in his diary that he would not leave his work in NZ without a definite call from God.
214 Diary: 22 April 1938.
215 Ibid.: 17, 29 July 1935; 22 April 1938. A key issue was the “determined effort ...being made to deliver the College from the curse of Modernism and to fill it with staunch evangelicals.”
216 Ibid.: 22 April 1938.
217 Ibid.: 17 July 1935.
219 See below.
220 Cynthia Tracey, e-mail (6 Jan. 2006).
221 Diary entry: 29 July 1935.
222 Ibid.: 17 July 1935.
223 By 1938, there were two New Zealand students at Moore: Vernon Leaning and Fred Fischer. More significantly, a steady stream of Australian graduates of Moore would become ministers in New Zealand in the Diocese of Nelson.
224 Diary entry: 17 July 1935.
by the controversies,\textsuperscript{225} by the driving pace of work expected of the clergy,\textsuperscript{226} by the low emphasis on the Second Coming,\textsuperscript{227} and above all by what he perceived as a deficiency in Sydney's spiritual tone:

I realised that there were very many fine evangelical and godly men in Sydney yet I was conscious of a lack on every hand. There are many here who know the Gospel and are able to preach it. They are able to present doctrine also in a masterly manner but what I miss is the fragrance and sweet savour of Christ. The Scriptures are not presented in such a way as to bring out of them what is Christ in them, so that the house is filled with the ointment.\textsuperscript{228}

It is would seem that Orange's devotional approach was not quite in tune with the somewhat more rationalistic, doctrinal, and polemical approach of some Sydney evangelicals. For him, it was of paramount importance that evangelical belief was not enough in itself but must be associated with a depth of spiritual experience.\textsuperscript{229}

**Orange and T.C. Hammond**

Orange's theology was already well formed by 1936, the year that T.C. Hammond arrived in Australasia from Ireland to take up the principalship of Moore College in Sydney.\textsuperscript{230} Hammond, emphatically evangelical,\textsuperscript{231} and with a heritage of anti-Catholic attitudes,\textsuperscript{232} was the writer of the key IVF theological handbook, *In*...
Understanding Be Men (1936), an evangelical volume that most Orange Pips valued highly. Hammond first visited Christchurch in June 1938, when Orange was away in the UK. But Orange had already met him in April at Moore College, where Orange was invited to speak at the chapel service; he spoke on “the fragrance of Christ”. In the afternoon Orange heard Hammond teach the students and was very impressed. Orange considered Hammond “a man of immense erudition, a militant Protestant, [and a] very able and a skilled debater” and saw his coming to Moore as “an event of prime significance for the Diocese of Sydney” – and an event which “has its value for us also in N.Z.”

Hammond was often a speaker in New Zealand at IVF Conferences; his talks were both entertaining and solidly intellectual. Although Hammond was more outspoken and controversial than Orange, and intellectualist rather than devotional in focus, Hammond’s bold Anglican evangelicism must have played a part in fortifying Orange’s own, and in giving confidence to other evangelical Anglicans in New Zealand.

I Orange’s Theological Identity

Orange himself was not, however, naturally a “party” person, and he was too much of an individualist to fit into any rigid theological system. There was no chance he would ever be a clone of the Sydney evangelicals. Orange did not quite fit the classic

came from a polarised religious environment in which controversy and polemics were the order of the day”: 233.
233 In Understanding Be Men reflected a “broad evangelical consensus”, was “mildly Calvinistic” and was “somewhat Anglican in ethos” (Nelson: 133).
234 Otago Daily Times (June 9, 1938). Hammond arrived in Wellington, and then went to CUC, OU, VUC and AUC, visiting Massey Agricultural College en route.
235 Orange was away from April to December.
236 22 April 1938.
237 E.g., 1945: The Tenth Inter-Varsity Conference of Evangelical Unions, Christchurch, 1945, brochure. Also, e-mail from Cynthia Tracey, 27 Dec. 2005.
238 Piggin: 126. Hammond had “a mind like a rapier and a tongue like a whip”.


Anglican evangelical mould, or any other mould. He was, for instance, better read in
the Fathers than in the Reformers—a pattern characteristic of those more “Catholic”
in tendency.240 Like many Anglican evangelicals, Orange was broadly reformed, but—
unlike T.C. Hammond—he did not subscribe closely to Calvinism.241 Unlike many
Anglican evangelicals, Orange often quoted J.N. Darby.242 He was profoundly
influenced by the Brethren, but he did not accept the particularities of their
dispensational or eschatological teachings.243

Orange believed in evangelism, and yearned and prayed for conversions. But he was
no classic revivalist: People were converted under Orange’s ministry, but he never
gave “appeals”.244

Orange rejected theological liberalism: but he refused to accept the label
“fundamentalist”.245 The “label”, he noted, had become a “libel”.246 He deplored the
fact that he was regarded as such by the bishop and clergy of his Diocese.247 On one
occasion, however, his diary uses the term approvingly of someone else—probably
as an approbation, in the earlier sense, of that person’s effectiveness in resisting
theological liberalism.248

---

238 Ibid.: 131.
239 RR, ¶333.
240 Not, at least, by the standards of Graham Miller, who by the late 1930s was becoming more
consciously and strictly reformed, JGM, ¶236.
242 Maurice Goodall recalled Orange saying about the Second Advent: “No one will turn to his
companion, and say ‘I told you it would be like this when it happens’”. MG, ¶11. Clark claimed that
Orange was strongly pre-millennialist and noted his subscription to the Advent Testimony and
Preparation Movement Magazine (Clark: 34, 38).
243 MW, ¶75: “I never heard him press for a decision, he just let Scripture loose upon us, left it free to
244 Diary entry: 7 July 1935; also J. Spence interview, 19 Aug. 1969, cit. Rathgen: 141.
245 Diary entry: 7 July 1935.
246 Ibid.
247 Ibid.: 17 July 1935. The individual concerned was Marcus Loane, Vice Principal of Moore College,
about whom Orange recorded comments (of others) that Loane was “exceptionally brilliant” and had
“read enormously”.

In theology and identity, Orange was content to be simply “evangelical”. He openly embraced that label. In his diary he used the term repeatedly and readily. He used the word in relation to both theology and people, both as an adjective and as a noun.

At least in Christchurch Anglican circles, however, Orange did not normally wear the label “evangelical” militantly, or uncharitably. By temperament, Orange “loathed” controversy. For Orange, to be “evangelical” was a positive not a negative thing: it meant to be “biblical” and “spiritual”, to be a Bible expositor, to emphasise conversion and devotion. Orange was evangelical in doctrine, but his evangelicalism was not primarily doctrinal: it was primarily spiritual. His faith was essentially devotional, rather than an intellectual system. If Orange had somehow been forced to choose between being saintly or sound, he might have chosen the former.

Orange valued his evangelicalism above his Anglicanism, and in that regard was not typically Anglican. But he remained loyally Anglican. Like other Anglican evangelicals he was very appreciative of the Prayer Book, and claimed it as an evangelical document. He would read the Prayer Book liturgy with a profound sense of devotion. Like Newton, Simeon, and Ryle, he claimed the Reformation heritage and the 39 Articles as his own. For Orange, an Evangelical was a type of Anglican, and the best type.

249 RT, §§68-71. Thompson also claimed, RT, §§91-93, that Orange used the word in his Bible Class, and explained it – a recollection which may or may not be reliable. Thompson probably heard the term being used and explained much more frequently in EU circles. Many of the Sumner BC were also in the EU, as was (unofficially) Thompson himself.

250 Diary entries (excluding references to the Evangelical Unions): e.g. 9, 14, 17, 18, 29 July 1935; 22 April 1938 (twice); 26 April 1938 (four times); 11 May 1938; 14 July 1938 (twice).

251 In using the word as a noun, Orange employed both the upper and lower case E.

252 Pfankuch, “The Reverend W.A. Orange”.

253 MW, §§54.

254 Williams, “Passing”. 
Another important clue about Orange’s theological self-identity was supplied in the memorial article by his protégé Pfankuch, who denied that Orange was “puritanical and fundamentalist,” as supposed by some, but asserted that Orange was “in fact a classical example of Evangelical Churchmanship of the Charles Simeon mould – loyal to the Church and faithful to the Gospel of Grace unfolded throughout the New Testament”.\(^{255}\) There were clearly similarities between Simeon’s ministry in Cambridge and Orange’s in New Zealand. Both were loyal to the Anglican Church and both steered a moderate course in most matters. Both were independently-minded in their profound evangelical emphases, and in their passionate commitments to biblical exposition and to evangelical work among students. Both were bachelors, who fathered a movement among young people. Orange would probably have been familiar with his affinities with Simeon.\(^{256}\) It is not clear, however, whether Pfankuch had simply reflected on the likenesses, or whether Orange had specifically confided in Pfankuch that he identified with Simeon’s theology and churchmanship.

Although a loyal Anglican, Orange’s evangelicalism was by no means restricted to Anglican circles alone. He enthusiastically embraced the evangelical inter-denominationalism of IVF/EU (in New Zealand, Australia and the UK), CSSM, CIM and Keswick (both in NZ and Britain).\(^{257}\) But his evangelical faith was paramount: he was more at home in the inter-denominational (and staunchly evangelical) IVF than in the Anglican (but theologically mixed) pre-war CMS.\(^{258}\)

\(^{255}\) Pfankuch, “The Reverend W.A. Orange”.

\(^{256}\) There were also dissimilarities: Orange was more timid than Simeon, who was quite forthright in his dogmatism. Simeon was also more Low Church than Orange.

\(^{257}\) When in Britain in 1938 he spent time with Douglas Johnston, spoke at a CICCU house-party and a national meeting of IVF leaders and took delight in attending the Keswick Convention (as part of a CIM “houseparty”): diary entries: 14-17 July, 1938.

\(^{258}\) Orange believed “Modernism” affected many parts of the CMS, including Britain and most of Australia: ibid.: 22 April, 14 July 1938.
By the late nineteenth century, a Low Church outlook had become associated with the use of unelaborated Prayer Book services and the rejection of Catholic ritual. It had also often become associated with evangelical theology. In conformity with the Reformation tradition, the Low Church approach made preaching (rather than communion) the key element in a church service, and also often emphasised congregational prayers and singing. But for Anglican clergy there was no necessary correlation between holding an evangelical theology and a Low Church practice. Like many New Zealand Anglican clergy – and unlike his Sydney or Nelson fellow evangelicals – Orange remained slightly “high” in his churchmanship relative to a Low Church stance. It may be that Orange continued to reflect the mediating position arrived at by Christchurch Anglicanism by about 1920, a compromise between traditional Prayer Book Anglicanism and the newer Anglo-Catholic tendencies being promoted by some, as Orange had begun his ministry at that time. He may also have mellowed with age and have been more militantly Protestant in the 1930s than in the post-war era. Some protégés observed that there was something in Orange’s personality that was attracted to Anglican “ritual”. They sensed an inner conflict in Orange. His growing fondness for ritual and mystery seemed to sit uneasily with his biblicist convictions, his Brethren sympathies, and his Protestant distaste for Anglo-Catholic extremes. In his later years, he would feel able

259 T.C. Hammond, What Is An Evangelical? Beecroft, NSW: Evangelical Tracts and Publications, n.d. [1959]: 4. Hammond stressed that the two were not the same. He traced the Low Church position back to those who – with Richard Hooker in Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity – saw the episcopacy as ancient and “lawful”, but not – with Bishop Bancroft – of “divine right”. Later, under Laud, ritual as well as episcopacy became an issue. Hammond also claimed that the Low Church gave rise to Latitudinarianism and “the Broad Church …the precursors of the Modernist school of thought”.  
260 See Rathgen: 90-118. Rathgen claims a turning point in New Zealand Anglicanism was when, in 1909, Bishop Neligan of Auckland brought out to New Zealand many “Catholic” clergy; 90; another was Bishop Julius’ judgements in the Christchurch case of Gossett vs. Perry, seen as signalling a new tolerance for Anglo-Catholic practices: 110-4.  
261 Thompson/Glen interview, ¶2.
to accept a position as Precentor at the Cathedral, and even sometimes to attend and preach at St. Michael's, an Anglo-Catholic stronghold.263

Unlike some of his vehemently “Protestant” colleagues in Christchurch (often those of Irish background), Orange happily wore a stole.264 He was sufficiently “high” enough in his views for an Australian minister to write to Moore College warning them that Orange was “an Anglo-Catholic posing as Evangelical”.265

Unlike his Anglo-Catholic colleagues, Orange did not wear “vestments” such as alb, chasuble, or maniple (which he would associate with Anglo-Catholic yearnings for “Mass”)266. For Orange, and other Evangelicals, any such practice which might have suggested eucharistic sacrifice was unacceptable. Many other Anglo-Catholic and Ritualist practices would remain anathema to them.267 Orange remained firmly opposed to Roman Catholicism itself.268

262 Ibid.
263 Orange was nevertheless heard to say, when he heard bells at a requiem mass at St. Michael’s: “St. Michael’s Junction. All change for Rome” (Peters: 190).
264 R.A. Carson interview, Aug. 1994, cit, Clark, 33. A stole is a coloured scarf and was seen as a symbol of priesthood. Low Church people held that they were forbidden at the time of the Reformation and opposed their reintroduction. Evangelical ministers in Nelson, Sydney and England at that time would normally have worn a black scarf, academic hood, surplice and a cassock. RMG, ¶20, MB, ¶112. The surplice (replacing a black gown) had also previously been controversial, but in England had become accepted by Evangelicals by about 1914 (Rathgen: 22-3).
265 Orange, diary entry: 26 April 1938.
266 MW, ¶52. “Vestments” such as alb, chasuble and maniple were Catholic priestly garments which changed according to the liturgical seasons. These were re-introduced into Anglicanism by the developments that began with the 1830s Oxford Movement, and which developed into Anglo-Catholicism and Ritualism. Privately, Orange was heard to joke about “Anglo-Catholic dolls”, a reference to all their “dressing up”: interview with J. Spence, 19 Aug. 1969, cit, Rathgen: 157. In his diary, he used the pejorative term “spiky” (a reference to Anglo-Catholics, who were sometimes referred to as “Spikes”, 11 May 1938).
267 Such practices included elevation of the consecrated elements, candles before images, prayers for the dead, use of the term “Mass”, the use of wafers, prostrations during the Creed, the adoration of a crucifix (Rathgen: 75-8, 84, 110-114). Orange may have softened in his views in his latter years: he was friendly with Father Muschamp of St. Michael’s and All Angels (Clark: 33).
268 When staying in northern Italy in 1938, Orange regularly attended Mass – there was no alternative (diary entry: 29 May 1938). But he felt repelled by the “awful” popery and superstitions he encountered in Rome, which he thought “bunk” (ibid.: 26 May).
With similar moderation, Orange did not adopt the Low Church practice (prescribed in the 1552 Prayer Book) of presiding over communion from the "North End" of the table. Just like most other New Zealand Anglicans of his time, he stood with his back to the congregation, facing "east".

Some Pips — often those with Nelson links — appear to have felt that Orange was a little too "High" in his churchmanship, and in their own ministry they preferred a more Low Church style. The majority of the Orange Pips, however, simply followed whatever Orange did, which was neither Low Church nor Anglo-Catholic but somewhere in between. In the Christchurch evangelical context — but not the Nelson one — those who took a more staunchly "Protestant" line could be counselled against it.

270 The North side is the left of the church, when seen from the rear — it was customary for Anglican churches to face East. During the English Reformation, in 1550, the communion table was brought out from the (east) wall and placed lengthwise in the chancel, and the minister stood on the north side (a long side) with the congregation gathered around on the other side and at the ends. Under Laud, in 1633, the table went back against the wall and was railed off. In the 1662 Prayer Book, it stipulated that the minister shall stand at "the North End" (facing south). That became the standard Anglican practice. The 1830s Oxford Movement re-introduced the practice of facing east (back to the congregation). That was resisted by those who wished to remain "Protestant": they retained the Anglican tradition, and were known as "North-siders" or "North-enders". The Prayer Book practice was normal in New Zealand in the nineteenth century, but by the early twentieth century the Oxford practice had taken over. Orange grew up with that. The Pips did not generally become North-Enders. Some, however, opted for standing on the congregation's side but side-on and facing south so that at least the "manual acts" would be visible. RMG, ¶37-40. With the 1990s liturgical reform in New Zealand through the New Zealand Prayer Book, it became normal for Anglican ministers to stand behind the table facing the congregation.
271 E.g. Betteridge (MB, ¶113), Marriott (WM, ¶72). For many clergy in the Nelson Diocese who were Sydney Anglicans, stoles were "anathema", WM, ¶70, MB, ¶112. Stoles were generally only seen in the Cathedral. In contrast to Orange, Bishop Stephenson of Nelson had no time for stoles (MB, ¶69).
272 E.g. MW, ¶57, RT, ¶79. Wiggins: "I just imitated him."
273 Teulon told Robert Glen: "If you don't wear a stole, you will not be ordained [by Bishop Alwyn]. Do you want to ruin your ministry before it's started over this little piece of coloured rag?" (Glen, ¶22).
W.A. Orange's Attitudes toward the Diocese

Orange was faithful to Anglicanism – as he construed it – but also stood aloof in many respects. Privately, he considered much of the NZ Anglican Church to be "apostate". In contrast to Miller, Orange did not block his Bible Class from being associated with the Anglican Bible Class Union. But, like Miller, he took no part in such bodies, and had no interest in their sports events and other "distractions".

Orange was fearful of diocesan life. He avoided clerical societies or diocesan committees, and "just ran his own parish". He went to Synod "duty-bound, but he sat in the back and he never spoke". He felt Synod was "very dull" and a waste of time: "No one," he is reported to have said, "ever got converted at Synod".

Orange was very cautious in his dealings with the bishop: he was conscious that West-Watson had been in CICCU as a young man but was now liberal in outlook. He knew that the bishop disapproved of the establishment of the Evangelical Union as a rival to the SCM, and that he regarded Orange as "the power behind the throne". West-Watson later told Orange that conservative Evangelicals had "closed their minds" and therefore his protégés would be of limited usefulness in modern parish ministry. Orange respectfully replied that, on the contrary, he was only "opening" their minds to "a line of truth which I certainly never received while

274 Thompson/Glen interview, ¶2.
275 MW, ¶39.
276 MW, ¶53.
277 Ibid. Wiggins noted that – in the time of Bishop Julius – Orange had once spoken out in Synod, in opposition to a healing mission, and had come into strife with the bishop. Orange felt burned by that experience (MW, ¶50).
278 Diary entries: 20-24 Oct. 1924. In that year, Orange's diary recorded that he "bunked" most of Synod: he "stayed a little while for decency's sake & got away as soon as possible," and spent most of his time visiting friends and doing business.
279 Anon., ¶50.
280 C.K. West-Watson, 1926-1951.
281 MW, ¶24; Wiggins/Glen interview, ¶8.
282 Diary entry: 7 July 1935.
at College House".\textsuperscript{283} The intensity and self-righteousness of some of Orange's zealous young charges sometimes raised hackles and did little to reassure the bishop.\textsuperscript{284} In time, as various Pips proved themselves in ministry, Orange's standing with the bishop improved, and his relationship with the next bishop (Alwyn Warren)\textsuperscript{285} was more positive. But in his Sumner period, Orange seemed to fear that evangelicals would always face "persecution."\textsuperscript{286} He believed that he should maintain a low profile, keeping his spiritual ministry a "secret work".\textsuperscript{287}

Quite apart from his desire to concentrate his energies locally, Orange was not a willing controversialist, either publicly or privately, and he found conflict distasteful. Although feeling as "timid as a sheep" he had experienced some serious opposition at Waikari when he had insisted on the "faith principle" of direct giving (rather than fund-raising through bazaars, jumble sales, concerts and dances). Such a stance was intended as a witness to the power of faith and prayer and their superiority over worldly entertainments and methods.\textsuperscript{288} There were complaints to the bishop, and Orange was hauled over the coals, and feared he would be dismissed.\textsuperscript{289} In the Sumner parish, too, the bishop intervened after Orange and a curate had removed and accidentally broken a memorial crucifix in the Heathcote church.\textsuperscript{290} Some locals were upset, and the bishop required Orange to replace the crucifix.\textsuperscript{291}

\textsuperscript{284} One of them, in particular, embarrassed his fellow evangelicals with what seemed an exaggerated fervency. He had a reputation for awkwardness in personal evangelism, and people on a tram would sometimes change seats to get away from him. He attempted to evangelise university staff. One of the staff met him after such an attempt and asked him, "How's your damned soul?" Nicholson responded, "Fine, how's yours?" Names of sources withheld.
\textsuperscript{285} 1951-6. Warren asked Orange to provide the readings for his two-week spiritual retreat prior to his consecration as bishop (Thomas: 57).
\textsuperscript{286} R.A. Carson expressed the view that Orange had a "persecution complex" and that most persecution of evangelicals was imaginary: interview by P.J. Lineham, n.d.
\textsuperscript{288} 1924 diary entries: 3 May, 19 May, 25 May, 17 June, 22 May; also 7 July 1935 reference. The controversy involved his banning dances in the church hall, heated meetings, and the eventual deposition of some local church officers.
\textsuperscript{289} Ibid.: 7 July 1935.
\textsuperscript{290} Clark: n.29, 19 (Heathcote had amalgamated with Sumner in 1937).
\textsuperscript{291} Thompson/Glen interview, ¶18.
Despite nursing many private fears and suspicions, Orange tried hard to be irenic, and generous about those he disagreed with. He wrote to a young Evangelical who was beginning ministry under a vicar whom Orange described as a “High Churchman”: “it will do you no harm to have to rub up against something you do not much care for. It tests patience, and charity, and enables you to see Christ in the face of someone with whom you may not agree”.292

But Orange’s principal strategy was simply to keep his head down. Among his diocesan colleagues (apart from his “Pips”) Orange was socially and theologically isolated. “He felt a lone ranger, really, and he preferred to work away from the church [diocese]”.293 Despite Orange’s strong appeal to spiritually-minded youth, and his extraordinary gifts as speaker and raconteur, among his clerical contemporaries Orange may have seemed an oddball, and out of step with the times. It was perhaps only in his venerable latter years, when his impact on so many was beyond question, and when he was serving in the eminently respectable Anglican context of the Cathedral, that Orange was regarded with more general respect.294

---

293 RT, ¶197.
294 “Everybody loved him for his worth and goodness.” Rev. Martin Sullivan, “Like a Father”, Challenge Weekly (23 July 1966); Sullivan also paid tribute to Orange in Watch How you Go, writing that Orange was “a staunch conservative Evangelical, a gifted preacher, and a most amusing conversationalist. He read practically everything in the fields of doctrine and biblical study, but never swerved from his deep convictions. He was not an ordinary literalist in his interpretation of the Bible, but seemed more interested in typology. His nimble brain would dart from Genesis to Revelation, collecting all kinds of loose ends and tying them together with extraordinary skill....He would rise every morning at six a.m. and begin his day with Bible study. This was his real sacrament and when he came, for instance, to the Holy Communion at eight a.m. on a Sunday, he gave the impression that ...God and he had had an earlier tryst. I loved him dearly....I knew that every time I met him I was in the presence of a man of God.” Martin Sullivan, Watch How you Go (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1975): 124-5. Sullivan, who identified himself as in the liberal tradition (ibid.: 117), was Dean of the Cathedral at the same time as Orange was Precentor.
L Orange and Moral Separatism

Orange was not conspicuously a legalist, and did not have a fixed view on every issue. But he was a man of his times – and influenced by the Brethren. His young converts observed much the same code as did other young Evangelicals at that time, in regard to matters such as dancing, smoking, drinking and films. To those who asked for dances at Sumner, Orange retorted that his role was “feeding the sheep rather than entertaining the goats”. The tone of the BC, commented one of its members, was fairly “monastic”, and friendships with girls were not considered a priority. Captured by spiritual ideals, the young people did not find such a code restrictive and were barely aware of it. It was largely assumed. They felt they had their mind on higher things: “As I look back, what has remained is an overwhelming sense of the reality of the presence of God in our Bible studies, services and singalongs, our retreats and especially in our prayer meetings”.

As with Miller, Orange’s separatism may have been essentially constructive rather than reactive: it was primarily separation to rather than from. At least one Pip, though, later felt Orange’s doctrine of “separation” from the values of the world was “pharisaical” and “mistaken”: it sheltered the converts, but it cut them off from influencing their contemporaries and was inconsistent with Jesus’ association with publicans and sinners. But such an assessment may not give sufficient weight to

295 Note Manwaring’s description of the moral and social outlook of young Anglican evangelicals in England between the wars: 54.
296 MB, ¶142-152; RT, ¶342. As a young man, Orange had written that because of his father’s drinking he found alcohol “loathsome”: diary, 21 Sept. 1914. One of his curates believed Orange was not personally teetotal, Coulthard, ¶22; diary entries confirm that e.g. 25 July 1935, 25 June 1938.
297 Clark: 6. Likewise, Orange had not been impressed when at his first appearance at the Sumner BC the first thirty minutes had been taken up with discussing the arrangements for the BC tennis club; he informed the members that from now on it would be a Bible Class: Thomas, ¶15.
298 MB, ¶111.
299 Ibid.: 198.
301 Carson/Glen interview, ¶13; such attitudes created a “ghetto mentality” and “holier-than-thou” attitude in Orange’s protégés, and an “invisible barrier” between them and those they disapproved of
the deep personal disgust that Orange and some of his evangelical contemporaries felt when they observed what seemed to them to be serious moral declension in society.302

M The Long-term Significance of W.A. Orange: an Evaluation

Orange’s Sumner ministry was clearly remarkable in its tone, its appeal, its enduring legacy. Its significance did not rest in numerical growth in the Sumner parish itself: while Orange was at Sumner, numbers swelled at church services and Bible Classes, with many non-residents attending, and the church was regularly “overflowing”;303 but the wider pattern of growth in the Sumner parish appears to have been more or less consistent with growth in the local population.304

An Anglican Evangelical Movement

The greatest significance in Orange’s ministry was in the Anglican evangelical movement he inspired. Orange’s many converts and admirers were the basis of a very distinctive new strand within Christchurch Anglicanism, a tightly-knit and increasingly confident group of protégés who were self-consciously “evangelical” and “proud of it”.305 It was a group that owed its identity jointly – and inseparably – to Orange, Crusaders and the Evangelical Union. For a few, the EU may have been a greater influence, but for many of the Orange Pips it was Orange who most

---

302 On board a ship, for instance, Orange was appalled at the behaviour of the passengers, especially of the women: coarse talk, dancing, drinking, smoking and “canoodling” with officers in dark corners (diary entry: 6 Mar. 1938).
303 Ibid.: 18 April 1938.
304 VM, ¶2; Clark: 12, also Appendix III, 46-8. See also Year Book for the Diocesan Year 1929, 1930, 1935, 1936, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1945; the statistical returns from the Sumner parish to the Diocese appear to have been very incomplete.
profoundly and indelibly shaped them. One such Orange Pip asserted that Orange was "the influence" of his life. More than one asserted that Orange taught them "two things": to preach and to pray. Another reflected on Orange’s key legacy, to him and others: Orange’s “firm conviction that God speaks in his Word.”

Orange’s ability to inspire others to enter the ordained ministry was a phenomenon, unparalleled by any other New Zealand minister. It was of concern to Principal Parr of College House: in 1934 he complained to the bishop that four of the six new ordinands were theological conservatives associated with Orange. A special meeting of the Clerical Society was called, to discuss the threat of the Diocese being swamped by “Orangemen.” Some of Orange’s BC members later became his curates: Harry Thomson (1936-38), Roger Thompson (1937-41), Basil Williams (1940-2) and David Aiken (1943-47). These men extended the ministry of Orange. Through their ministries many other young men (such as Maurice Betteridge and Graham Lamont) were converted, especially in the context of Crusaders, and then nurtured by Orange’s BC. Aiken, for instance, led the Crusader Union at Christchurch Boys’ High School, and about half of that group also travelled out to Sumner for Orange’s BC.

As the Orange Pips moved into parish ministries of their own, they emulated Orange’s ministry. They embraced his evangelical identity. They shared his emphasis

306 Ibid., p.100.
307 Ibid., p.43.
308 Wiggins, in conversation, 1999; RT, p.38-41. The reference is to private prayer, not public. RT, p.41: “Willie would say, ‘coming to know God intimately, personally.’”
309 MB, p.197. Similarly Thompson/Glen interview, p.8: Orange showed him “the power of the Word.”
310 As noted by Sullivan:125.
311 Orange, diary entry: 7 July 1935.
312 In 1948, Priest-in-charge, while Orange was overseas.
313 Clerical Directory, 1981. Aiken continued in Sumner after Orange left. There were further evangelical curates in Sumner, including R.E. Coulthard (1948-51) and L.E. Pfankuch (1951-54).
314 MB, p.21; GL, p.4.
on conversion and spiritual growth. They copied his strategies of BC and mentoring young people. Above all they imitated his expository preaching, seeing that as an essential aspect of being evangelical:

To be evangelical was to be an expository preacher. This was very clear. The only sort of preaching was expounding the Scripture. This was what Pekoe did, week after week. We simply worked our way through certain books, whether it be in the sermon or the Bible Study.

An Effect on Anglicanism beyond Christchurch

The impact of the new Anglican evangelicalism that had arisen in Christchurch was not limited to that city. Through the Orange Pips (and their own protégés) Anglican evangelicalism would eventually develop outposts in other dioceses such as Auckland and Dunedin. It would greatly encourage the nascent Anglican evangelical work in Wellington. From the beginning, it would have a major revivifying effect on evangelicalism within the Nelson Diocese, New Zealand’s only “evangelical” diocese: Nelson students would come to Christchurch for study, fall under the spell of Orange, and then (joined by some Christchurch “Pips”) would take up ministries in the Nelson Diocese.

A Nationwide Inter-Denominational Impact

More broadly, Orange’s example of “spiritual” evangelicalism and of devotional biblical exposition left its mark on people of many denominations. In part, that had been through the considerable non-Anglican presence at his local church services and Bible Classes, both at Sumner and later at Tyndale House. Orange’s widest (and perhaps most incalculable) influence was through his heavy involvement in the Evangelical Unions and IVF. Orange spoke frequently at the Canterbury EU, and at

315 Aiken closely followed Orange’s style: “It got to the stage where we would say, ‘shut your eyes and you won’t know whether it’s Canon Orange or Dave Aiken’ ” (HT, ¶17).
316 MB, ¶29.
least once a year in each of the other three university EUs. He often spoke at EU house-parties and at national IVF conferences.

Given Orange's high standing among evangelicals, his consistent public support for the EUs and IVF made a significant contribution to that movement's growth. In the course of his international travels (and in his correspondence), Orange had a major behind-the-scenes role in building NZIVF's relationships with key IVF figures in other countries. Whenever Orange was overseas, he spent time with IVF leaders such as Douglas Johnson and Stacey Woods, who would discuss with them the perennial issues such as requests from SCM for "co-operation" and brought back policy documents for the benefit of NZIVF. He also mixed (especially in Australia) with many of those who were then invited to come to New Zealand as EU missioners and IVF Conference speakers, such as T.C. Hammond, Loane and Mowll.

In IVF and EU settings, Orange's preaching was usually received by students with awe. Orange's model of devotional biblical exposition is thus likely to have had a considerable effect in helping shape the future ministries of Evangelicals within many denominations. There were some similarities, for instance, between the preaching style of Orange and that later developed by Graham Miller, who was to become a noted convention speaker. Like Orange, Graham Miller spoke quietly, with polished language and rich imagery, and with great spiritual intensity. Miller had been exposed to Keswick preaching, and to his father's, but it is also highly likely that his style was moulded in part by the example of Orange, whose preaching Miller found very moving.

---

317 Diary entry: 11 July 1938.
318 Ibid.: 8 July 1935.
320 JGM, ¶236.
Unlike other New Zealand dioceses, the Diocese of Nelson had had a predominantly Low Church flavour. Such a churchmanship was not necessarily self-conscious: for many Nelson people it was "just normal Anglican" as they knew it, and, geographically isolated, they were not particularly aware of patterns elsewhere.

Ault may have been over-simplifying matters when he wrote: "The Diocese of Nelson has ever been an evangelical diocese". The Nelson diocese has never been uniformly evangelical, and at times was more obviously Low Church than overtly evangelical. But it is true that, more than other dioceses, it had a continuous evangelical tradition supported in varying degrees by all previous bishops. There was also a vigorous tradition of lay evangelicalism, often expressed in strong enthusiasm for overseas missionary work, and there had often been clergy with a conspicuous passion for evangelism. Bishop C.O. Mules (1892-1911) had been regarded as "saintly", and was a pioneer in establishing the NZCMA (later NZCMS). Bishop W.C. Sadlier (1912-1934), an Irish-born Australian, was patent...
evangelical. Most of the new clergy during Sadlier’s time came from England and were Low Church rather than evangelical. But there were also some experienced evangelical clergy who came from Sydney, including O.J. Kimberley and Donald Haultain, who in the 1930s were vicars of the largest parishes, both essentially evangelical, All Saints’ (Nelson) and the Church of the Nativity (Blenheim).

Bishop Hilliard, 1934-40

Bishop W.G. Hilliard, arriving from Sydney in 1934, was a “staunch Evangelical”. He told one of his clergy: “I am a strong Evangelical, with an emphasis on the strong”. Learned and oratorical, he was a brilliant preacher. Hilliard, at whose consecration Archbishop Mowll had preached and called for closer ties with Sydney, continued to recruit clergy from NSW, most of them Moore-trained and definite Evangelicals. One such was Paul Kirkham, in 1935. Kirkham would be a vigorous advocate for the Sydney connection and for continuing the Nelson succession of evangelical Australian bishops. Kirkham was firmly conservative, and strict on issues such as dancing. Another notable evangelical recruit from Sydney was T.E. (Eric) Champion (1937). Not everyone from Sydney who had been trained at Moore, however, was evangelical: an example was Keith Aubrey (1940), who was not

---

329 Canon William F. Wilkens, interview, 1 Aug. 2005 (hereafter WW) ¶4. He listed such clergy.
330 Ordained in 1904, his first placement in the diocese was at Awatere (1922).
331 Ault, Centennial history: 102-111; Haultain, who also had missionary experience with CMS, was New Zealand-born (ibid: 103).
332 WW, ¶7.
333 Haultain was at All Saints’ from 1932-1939; Kimberley at the Blenheim church from 1929-39.
334 Orange, diary entry: 22 April 1938.
337 Loane: 134-5.
338 Kirkham became curate at Blenheim, vicar of Collingwood (1936-37), Motueka (1937-41), Greymouth (1941-7), Blenheim (1947-66), Archdeacon and Vicar-General.
339 JF, ¶40.
340 Champion came to New Zealand after studying at Moore College because he was unable to be ordained in Sydney: WM, ¶22. Sometimes those who came from Sydney to Nelson had not attained the academic level required for ordination by the Diocese of Sydney.
evangelical but more High Church. A sign of things to come was when the first of many Orange Pips (Bob Nicholson) came up in 1938 from Christchurch to join the Nelson Diocese.

**Bishop P.W. Stephenson, from 1940**

When Mowell persuaded Hilliard to return to Sydney in 1940, Hilliard was replaced by his friend P.W. Stephenson (1940-54), another evangelical Sydney Anglican. The new bishop was regarded by his clergy as both “saintly” and “scholarly” (he had been Professor of Theology at St. John’s College, Winnipeg). A former CMS missionary in Peshawar, who in Australia had headed up both CMS and the BFBS, he remained very missionary-minded. In New Zealand, Stephenson became a prominent supporter of the EUs and other evangelical organisations. To the diocesan Synod he publicly declared himself “evangelical”, and explained what that meant. He became an “ardent” backer of the New Zealand CMS and was the key person holding it together during the war years. In churchmanship, Stephenson was “very Low Church and Protestant... He had no time at all for things like stoles”.

---

341 In the Diocese of Nelson, Aubrey stood out. In theology he was probably middle of the road, PK, ¶5, but he appeared eager to distance himself from an evangelical identity: Rev. John Greenslade, interview, 21 Nov. 2001 (hereafter JG), ¶8; WW, ¶29; ¶27; Rev. Guy Nicholson, interview, Dec. 2001 (hereafter GN), ¶65. Ordained in the UK, K.G. Aubrey was at Collingwood until 1947, then at Greymouth (1947-56).
342 WW, ¶29. There was a furore among other clergy when he introduced candles into Holy Trinity, Greymouth, in the early 50s. Another Moore College graduate, Ross Dalby (arriving 1936), was Low Church but was perceived to distance himself from an evangelical perspective, WW, ¶32, 68.
344 WW, ¶3 PK ¶6. Stephenson’s D.D. was honorary, and was from that college.
345 British and Foreign Bible Society.
346 Cole: 114-5. In 1946 Stephenson quoted at length a speech from Dr. Garbett, Archbishop of York, which identified the three emphases of evangelical faith as evangelism, conversion, and the Scriptures, and then went on to explain that rather than dividing the church, evangelical faith made a contribution to the life of church “without which...the Church will be immeasurably poorer.”
347 He was elected its chairman five weeks before he arrived in New Zealand, and he became in effect its General Secretary (and later President). Gregory: 129-31.
348 Ibid.
personality, Stephenson was “humble and unassuming”.350 His other-worldliness was incomprehensible to some.351

In the wartime conditions of his first few years, Stephenson had been unable to bring in many new Australian ministers,352 or any others for that matter. But he would arrange a major influx of new evangelical clergy in the early post-war years. Those he did ordain during the war included Vernon Leaning (1941), a New Zealander trained at Moore, and Bernard Machell (1944), who trained at College House and was in Orange’s circle.353

In General Synod, Stephenson strongly resisted a 1943 move to constitute St. John’s College (which he considered Anglo-Catholic) as a provincial (i.e. national) college for ministry training. He told Synod that “any province within our Communion that leaves out the need for training men of evangelical conviction in an atmosphere that is in keeping with that conviction – or is at least not opposed to it or scornful of it – is doing a disservice towards the Church as a whole.”354

Notwithstanding such self-aware evangelical leadership in Nelson, and the presence of many evangelically-minded parishes, clergy, laity and emphases, it would be misleading to assert that the Diocese of Nelson in the 1930s and 40s was emphatically or self-consciously evangelical. It was more a matter of broad ethos, reflecting both the assumed tradition of the diocese and the general theology and practice of its clergy and laity. The Diocese of Nelson remained a small and predominantly rural entity, in a sparsely populated and isolated provincial area. It was something of an ecclesiastical backwater. Nelson had no university, and was cut off from the main

350 MB, ¶44; also Cole: 86-7.
351 Cole: 119.
352 One such who did come was Ernest Harding (1942).
353 Leaning died suddenly in 1949. Machell (q.v. VM, ¶10) became curate of Blenheim (1944-7), and thereafter served as vicar of Amuri, Richmond, Wakefield.
streams of national and ecclesiastical life. For all that most Nelson Anglicans knew, they were simply traditional Prayer Book Anglicans, believing and practicing their faith in the way that Anglicans had always done. Orthodoxy was assumed, and not under discussion. This was also a period when New Zealand Anglicans were often not particularly theologically-minded. In Nelson, in a setting that was more-or-less theologically homogeneous, little need was felt to define or declare one’s theological position or to articulate it in relation to other theologies. The people of Nelson grew up and attended church in an atmosphere of “unquestioning faith”,\(^{355}\) in which Scripture was “used and respected” and accepted as simply “part of the works”.\(^{356}\) The BCs “taught the word of God”,\(^{357}\) and in the 1940s the extremely popular diocesan BC camps were invariably strongly evangelistic.\(^{358}\) Consequently, Anglicans growing up in Nelson parishes, including those more obviously evangelical in emphasis, rarely or never heard the term “evangelical,” or what were the issues at stake...

That sort of language wasn’t used in [Nelson] – that was all there was in Nelson, except for the Cathedral...in fact I did not know [what an] Evangelical [was] until I came down to Christchurch.\(^{359}\)

In the same church (All Saints’) another future minister was teaching Sunday School and reading the lesson, but...

We were never taught anything about theology...We just listened to sermons, and worshipped on Sundays. We didn’t know that there were differences in the church.\(^{360}\)

---

\(^{354}\) Morrell: 218-9, quoting the *Yearbook of the Diocese of Nelson*, 1946: 28. As a result of the stance of Stephenson and two other bishops, College House and Selwyn College remained open.

\(^{355}\) JM, ¶16

\(^{356}\) WW, ¶12.

\(^{357}\) JM, ¶14.

\(^{358}\) JM, ¶14; JF, ¶19. Ford noted that such camps were at their most popular in the era before many families had cars, caravans and regular holidays: ibid.

\(^{359}\) JM, ¶11.

\(^{360}\) JF, ¶12. Similarly JF, ¶11: as a young man JF knew nothing of evangelical, high church, whatever: “we just went to church, and accepted what we were given”. Informants recalled Archdeacon Kimberley not for his evangelicalism, but for his strict, authoritarian style; JF, ¶12; WW, ¶11.
A third informant commented ...

I guess if ‘evangelical’ had been used in those days, he [Kimberley] would have been called an ‘evangelical.’ But you didn’t really. You spoke about ‘Low Church’.361

Thus Nelson’s evangelicalism, in the pre-war and wartime period, was rarely an overt or an examined stance. What would change that, and gradually lead to a more self-aware evangelicalism in the Diocese of Nelson, would be the influence of the growing evangelical Anglican movement in Christchurch, especially once Nelson ordinands began to be influenced by it at College House,362 and once Orange Pips began to move northward and enter the ministry in the Nelson Diocese. The Evangelical Union would play a critical role in sharpening theological awareness and evangelical self-identity. These changes would eventually make the Nelson Diocese almost an extension of the Christchurch evangelical movement arising out of the ministry of William Orange. The wind-shift was still some time off: it would not be clearly apparent until well into the 1950s.

N Evangelical Anglicans in Auckland

A strong Anglican evangelical presence in New Zealand’s largest city, however, was still a long way off. Bishop W.J. Simkin (1940-60) was High Church and kept an unusually tight control over his diocese. He resolutely opposed anything he considered un-Anglican, including evangelicalism and its mission arm, CMS.363 There was no overtly evangelical Anglican parish in Auckland until the 1960s.364 Parishes in

361 WW, ¶11. Similarly, WW, ¶12.
362 Since the closure of Bishopdale College in 1920, all ordinands from Nelson had had to train elsewhere, mainly at College House in Christchurch, Morrell, 127. Apart from issues of size, theological education in Nelson had suffered from the lack of a university.
363 Similarly, he opposed the ecumenical movement, Davidson, 120.
364 Ellerslie, under Guy Nicholson. His ministry was low-key evangelical, and known to be so, but the parish itself was not strongly evangelical.
Auckland tended to be either traditional or High Church; they were not necessarily liberal. There were a few vicars who appeared to have Low Church and evangelical sympathies, such as Frank Willis of St. Andrew's Epsom, but under Simkin they may have felt quite constrained. A more clearly evangelical Anglican minister – but not in a mainstream ministry, and in a slightly later period – was H.W. (Harry) Funnell, who worked in Auckland with CIM from 1946 through to 1954.

From the 1940s through to the 1960s, a group of about ten evangelical Anglicans in Auckland would sometimes gather in an informal fellowship group at the Epsom home of retired vicar Llewellyn Foulkes, and later at the Remuera home of school teacher Stan Rosser, a Lay Reader and former Church Army officer. Aware that they were a tiny and suspect minority, and perhaps in echo of clandestine wartime resistance movements, they affectionately nicknamed their group “The Underground”. It was essentially a Bible study meeting, and a support group for “those of us who were Anglicans who had a sense of being born anew and wanted to... go on in a biblical way – in the very frigid general environment of the Anglican Church in Auckland in those days”. The group met several times a year, often with

---

365 KO, ¶23.
366 Marjorie Foulkes, interview, 2 Feb. 2005 (hereafter MF), ¶17. (MF, ¶19). Wood had been ordained in 1896. F.P. Willis, a New Zealander ordained in the UK, served as vicar of St. Andrew’s from 1927-46 (and from 1951-54 in Manurewa). In 1937, he visited the UK in connection with the Oxford Group Movement. Foulkes also cited the earlier ministry of Rev. W.C. Wood (1869-1954), who was vicar of Papakura from 1912-36.
367 Funnell was from Christchurch and had served with CIM in China from 1912-36: Crockford’s Clerical Directory; see also Loane, The Story of the China Inland Mission in Australia and New Zealand: 106-7, 126. Funnell was Assistant Home Director from 1946, and after retirement he ended up in Christchurch: e-mail, Pam Singleton (OMF Secretary), 17 Feb. 2005. Funnell was “evangelical, in the OMF mould”; O’Sullivan “thought – in those days – [that] he was the only evangelical ordained man I had ever met in Auckland - with the possible exception of Mr Foulkes, [who was of] a different sort ... he was just a quiet, godly man”: KO, ¶23.
368 Llewellyn Foulkes (1864-1941) was from the UK. Ordained in Montreal, he came to New Zealand in 1913. He served in parishes in Auckland, South Auckland, Bay of Plenty and Hawkes Bay. After retirement he continued to officiate in a number of Auckland parishes. He was Low Church, and evangelical in his preaching; he was aware that the Bishop did not approve of him: MF, ¶27.
369 MF, ¶27; also GN, ¶8.
370 The name appears to have been used post-war, rather than earlier, and was mainly used in retrospect: MF, ¶25.
371 KO, ¶23.
speakers from elsewhere such as CMS missionaries on furlough, Christchurch evangelicals, or visitors from the Anglican evangelical paradise across the sea, Sydney Diocese (especially when speakers such as Loane and Hammond were in town to address EU camps or conferences). Some of the group's older members were retired vicars, including Foulkes and his friend Harold Jecks; Willis also sometimes came, as did Funnell. Most members were lay people, drawn from parishes across Auckland. Many of the younger attenders had made definite Christian commitments through the influence of Crusaders or EU, and were active in CSSM missions. Although loyal Anglicans, they often felt isolated, and cold-shouldered by their vicars or by the bishop. They were among those youthful Anglicans who, finding their own parishes "as dry, dry as dust" would go on Sunday evenings to churches of other denominations for biblical exposition and extra spiritual sustenance.
O Conclusion

Historiographically, Orange has attracted some limited attention. There have been some brief tributes, and an appraisal in the *DNZB*. Rathgen’s thesis explores the Anglican context out of which Orange emerged, and Clark’s essay sums up Orange’s ministry at Sumner. Lineham emphasises Orange’s close connections with the Crusader and EU/IVF nexus. Davidson has a sentence on Orange, noting that his influence led to the post-war Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship.

This chapter has explored in depth the nature of Orange’s evangelicalism, as characterised by such features as evocative bible teaching, an emphasis on prayerfulness, the mentoring young men, and tendencies towards ecclesiastical and cultural separatism. His biblicism was in part a reflection of Brethen influences. Through reading and travel Orange was well aware of the evangelical party in the English Church, but within Anglicanism in New Zealand Orange felt isolated, was ironic in tone and shy of publicity. Unlike some English evangelicals, Orange was not consistently or emphatically Low Church. He was also familiar with Anglicanism in spiritual feed in the evening.” Other young evangelical Anglicans might attend the Wayside Mission, or go and hear Lionel Fletcher: MF, §6.


Sydney, but was more self-consciously "spiritual" and experientialist than that developing tradition (and less polemical or reformed than such figures as T.C. Hammond). Orange identified himself with neither the revivalist nor fundamentalist traditions. He saw himself as "evangelical" in the British tradition. Orange openly embraced the evangelical identity of the Evangelical Unions.

This chapter has also pointed to the significance of Orange for New Zealand evangelicalism: he fathered an evangelical Anglican movement in Christchurch, strengthened evangelical elements in several other dioceses, and inspired the nationwide re-establishment of an evangelical Anglican stream. That was highly significant: prior to Orange's ministry at Sumner, evangelical Anglicanism in New Zealand had for several decades had negligible profile. Through his numerous protégés, Orange's "secret work" at Sumner had a very extensive influence.

Orange's movement coincided with the establishment in New Zealand of the new interdenominational evangelical organisations, the EUs, IVF and Crusader Movement. Orange was a strong influence on those movements, which in turn fostered a very clear evangelical identity, and helped nurture a new generation of evangelical leaders.
Chapter Four:
A Generation of New Evangelical Leaders is Shaped, from the Mid-1930s

A Formation of the New Zealand Inter-Varsity Fellowship

Since their inception, the New Zealand EUs had been a little unsure of their relationship either to each other or the wider IVF movement.¹ To strengthen their work and identity, it was desirable to build a national structure similar to the IVF structures in Britain, Australia and Canada. This came about in 1936, on the initiative of the Auckland EU Executive and the Auckland-based Crusader Council.² Stacey Woods, the IVF leader in Canada, had visited the New Zealand EUs the year before and was a key catalyst.³ Helpful leadership was also provided by Laird. At Easter 1936 thirty-nine representatives met at Roseneath School in Wellington. The speakers

¹ In 1932, for instance, a group of Christchurch students on retreat had developed a proposal for an “Inter-Collegiate Fellowship for Evangelical Study” to establish an evangelical library in each university, with sharing of books, articles and notes of addresses. The [British] IVF was listed as a resource but only as one of many; others included The Evangelical Quarterly, The Bible League Quarterly, Bishop Ryle’s Knots Untied and Machen’s Christianity and Liberalism: Basil Williams to [K.J] Moore, 10 May 1932, TSCF A2c/001. The AUCESF thought the proposal for an extra organisation confusing and preferred that the NZ EUs link with the British IVF: R.F. Judson to Williams, 25 May 1932, TSCF A2c/002; A.W. Morton to Williams, 31 May 1932, TSCF A2c/003.

² T.F. Haughley and A.W. Morton to the Executives of [the] EUs, “Re proposals for an IVFEU for N.Z. and the subsequent appointment of a Travelling Secretary”, 30 July 1935, TSCF A2c/006. A copy of the letter included a handwritten post-script by Haughley, suggesting Orange, Blairlock, Tanner, and [Harry] Thomson as suitable for the position of Travelling Secretary. Three of the EUs were enthusiastic; the Otago Union agreed in principle but wished to proceed more slowly: G.M. [Yule] to [A.W. Morton], 26 Sept 1935, TSCF A2c/009; J.G. Miller to Williams, 30 Sept. 1935, TSCF A2c/010. See also AUCEU Executive to the Executives of [the] EUs, 9 Sept. 1935, TSCF A2c/008.

³ Stacey Woods visited New Zealand in July 1935. He was himself Australian, but had graduated in the USA. He later pioneered the IVF in the USA, and for twelve years (until 1952) was General Secretary of both the Canada and USA IVF movements. In 1947 he became General Secretary of the new IFES (International Fellowship of Evangelical Students).
included Laird, Funnell, Pettit and Edwin Orr. In Depression conditions, travel to such an event had not been easy, and the five Dunedin delegates had competed in inter-faculty athletic races in an attempt get their fares paid to the national university athletic competitions, being held in Wellington on the same weekend as the inaugural IVF conference. Graham Miller ran the mile (coming second) and Gordon Smith ran the three miles (and won). The four EU presidents were all present in Wellington: Archie Morton (Auckland), Rob Miller (Victoria, a law student – and another son of Thomas Miller), Basil Williams (Canterbury) and Graham Miller (Otago). Jointly, the four EU Presidents moved that the doctrinal basis of the new Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions be that of the British IVF.

The New Zealand SCM, understandably, was very disappointed. It had been hoping that the breach might heal, as the SCM was “gradually strengthening its own testimony to the central things in Christian faith”. But the IVF insistence on biblical infallibility as an essential doctrine was unacceptable to the SCM. With the formation of the IVF, the “disastrous division” of Christian witness in the colleges

---

4 *New Zealand Inter-Varsity News Bulletin* 1, 1 (July 1936): 8. The conference was addressed late in the weekend by Orr, who had just arrived from a revival atmosphere at the Ngaruawahia Convention, and who reported a time of “heartsearching and confession and blessing” (Orr: 37). But the IVF leaders may not have been entirely comfortable with Orr’s approach, as the Bulletin referred to “others” but did not list Orr by name as one of the speakers. Reservations about Orr’s individualist and triumphalist tendencies were later discreetly articulated within Crusader and IVF circles: [Bruce Lumsden] to M.H. Lamb and Vine Martin, 19 April 1956 (with reference to the views of Becroft, Laird, and Troutman).

5 JGM, [163. The national event was the “Annual Quadrangular Tournament”.

6 A Presbyterian, Morton later studied at Moore College, was ordained into the Anglican Church, and took a DPhil at Oxford. He became Dean of St. Andrew’s Cathedral, Sydney.

7 Williams was ordained into the ministry in New Zealand. In Australia he lectured at Moore College, and later became Archdeacon of Wollongong, Australia.

8 All four of the 1936 EU Presidents were to become ministers, and all four were at some stage to move to Australia, ADMNH I: 72.


10 Lex Miller construed the EU position as “the theory of the literal inerrancy of the Scriptures.” For the SCM, he wrote, “it must always be insisted that whether or not Biblical literalism be true, the Christian fellowship cannot be narrowed to include only those who assent to it”. 
looked set to be continued. It was a division not only continuing but expanding: by 1936, EU groups had been established not only in the universities but also in the teacher training colleges and agricultural colleges.

B The New Zealand IVF’s British Evangelical Identity

The pioneer “Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions (New Zealand)” unashamedly saw itself as a distant extension of the British IVF movement. It consciously modelled itself on the British IVF, including its constitution and institutional structures. IVF pioneers in New Zealand read in magazines about the British IVF fellowships for missionaries and theological students, and “we patterned ourselves on what they were trying to do there.” Various IVF subs-sections were thus constituted in New Zealand: the Teachers’ Prayer Fellowship, the Inter-Varsity Missionary Fellowship, the Theological Students’ Prayer Union and a Graduates’ Fellowship.

11 Ibid.
12 J.G. Miller, “Annual Report”, 1936, cit. D. Penman, MS. history of IVF, n.d., TSCF A2c. The teachers’ colleges were in Dunedin, Christchurch, Wellington, and Auckland. The agricultural colleges were Lincoln College (near Christchurch) and Massey Agricultural College (Palmerston North).
13 ADMNH I: 84.
14 RR, ¶343.
15 Later known as the Teachers’ Prayer Fellowship, it had 150 members by the end of 1941: NZ Inter Varsity Supplement 5, 3 (1941).
16 The last named, initially known as the Theological Colleges’ Prayer Union, had only 14 members in its first year (1936): New Zealand Inter-Varsity News’ Bulletin 3 (June 1937). In 1939 it was the Theological Students’ Prayer Union: IVFEU TSPU circular, April 1939, TSCF II/035. Max Wiggins remained the secretary. The mailing of the NZ newsletter included copies of the UK counterpart. The TSPU was part of a deliberate strategy to strengthen evangelical ministry in the churches: its stated aim was “to be a means of helping men to enter the ministry on fire with a passionate loyalty to Christ. Such men, having a strong grasp of truth and a deep spirituality, will take a lead in promoting spiritual life in the churches and in reviving the school of Evangelical Theology”: The Aim of the TSPU of the IVF, n.d., TSCF II/033.
17 The British IVF launched its Graduates’ Fellowship in 1940; in 1949 its newsletter became The Christian Graduate magazine, with 11,000 subscriptions at its peak (Barclay: 56). In 1943 the NZ conference resolved to establish such a fellowship, adopting in full the Declaration of Membership and Main Aims of the British IVGF: Malcolm Bui st to Alan F. Cook, 4 July 1943, TSCF J1/006. TSPU, IVMF and TPF were to be sub-sections. The NZ movement was “formed to link the academically trained Evangelical Christians of New Zealand in Fellowship and Service”: pamphlet, “The Graduates’ Fellowship of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions (NZ).”
British IVF papers, magazines and publications were to become the basic resources of the New Zealand IVF. The IVF magazine was regularly read by the New Zealand student leaders, as was the magazine of CICCU.\textsuperscript{18} British IVF publications (\textit{Effective Witness, Decently and In Order, Problems of Faith and Conduct,} and \textit{Evangelical Belief}) laid out the template on which EUs should be organised, and the subsequent New Zealand IVF handbook manual referred frequently to them.\textsuperscript{19} Of particular importance was the IVF book \textit{Principles of Co-operation}, which strongly discouraged EUs from working with any other movement (i.e. SCM) that did not share a similar doctrinal basis to that of the IVF.\textsuperscript{20}

\section*{C \ IVF (NZ) and Evangelical Belief}

A core resource for the New Zealand IVF was \textit{Evangelical Belief} (1935). Subtitled \textit{The Official Interpretation of the Doctrinal Basis of the IVF}, it clarified and explained IVF’s teachings. It was intended as a “useful general standard” for Evangelical Unions (each of whom was autonomous and theoretically free to have its own doctrinal basis).\textsuperscript{21} The IVF doctrinal basis, Evangelical Belief asserted, reflected both “the general belief of Christendom” and “universal Evangelical belief” and was consistent with the chief British confessions of faith, the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Westminster Confession.\textsuperscript{22} The booklet’s careful explanations appear intended to protect the EUs both from hyper-conservative understandings within the movement and from

misunderstanding beyond it. The exposition of Clause One of the DB made it clear that the IVF understood the Scriptures as “the Word of God”, that all parts of it were given by divine inspiration and revelation, that such inspiration was unique, and that all parts of Scripture are necessary but not all are of the same importance. It was careful to state that inspiration was not “mechanical” and was only “verbal” in the sense that it involved “the whole personality of the individual”, with “such a measure of Divine supervision that the words employed are the proper expression of the thought communicated to the inspired writer by God”.23 Similarly, the word “inerrancy”, often favoured in the American context, was avoided. Biblical “infallibility” meant that the Scriptures, rightly understood, “will never lead astray”; the Bible is “a true and complete guide, and requires no external correction”, and “the matters in it which are plainly stated as facts are to be received as such by the reader”.24 There was a qualified openness to biblical scholarship: “true scholarship” to discern the true sense of Scripture had always been a “legitimate” use of God-given “means.”25

The booklet, as one might expect, insisted on the divinity of Christ, substitutionary atonement and Christ’s bodily resurrection. It emphasised the need for regeneration and the work of the Holy Spirit. It asserted both the certainty of the return of Christ, and uncertainty over the details of that event.26 The booklet ended with reassurances that the IVF was fully committed to “the Evangelical Protestant position as represented by the chief English and Scottish Reformers”, and that it was neither a Church nor a Sect.27 Bibliographies followed.28 Curiously – despite the title – the

23 Ibid.: 7-9. The analogy given was the combination of divinity and humanity in the person of Jesus.
24 Ibid.: 9-11.
26 Ibid.: 23.
27 Ibid.: 24-25.
28 In the 1935 edition, books recommended included works by Griffith Thomas, R.A. Torrey, A.E. Litton, C.H. Hodge, A.A. Hodge, James Orr, Gresham Machen, A.H. Strong, W.G.T. Shedd, H.M. Gwatkin, James Denney, H.E. Guillebaud, G.T. Manley. The dated nature of those sources was tacitly acknowledged when it was admitted that many of them were out of print: 34. It was also an indication
booklet never commented on the word "evangelical": the implication of the whole book was simply that the beliefs it described were "evangelical". *Evangelical Belief* was to remain extremely important in IVF circles in New Zealand, for at least a generation.\(^{29}\) One of its key roles was to define the doctrinal distinctives of the IVF against the implied backdrop of the SCM.

### D Other Key Resources of the New Zealand IVF

T.C. Hammond's book *In Understanding Be Men* (1936) became familiar to almost everyone in EU/IVF circles in New Zealand. A solid handbook of biblical doctrine, it was written as a resource for EU study groups, with the idea that a different section would be studied each week.\(^{30}\) As with *Evangelical Belief* and the IVF Doctrinal Basis, Hammond began with what were the key issues for Evangelicals: authority, revelation and Scripture (including the nature of inspiration).\(^{31}\) Hammond clearly acknowledged an "Evangelical" perspective,\(^{32}\) but did not discuss the word itself.\(^{33}\) He twice implied, though, that the essence of an "Evangelical" position was to see Scripture as the primary authority – cf. the "Catholic" and "Modernist" positions (respectively seeing the Church and "Human Reason" as the ultimate authority).\(^{34}\)

---

\(^{29}\) *Evangelical Belief* was first published in October 1935, with further editions in 1951 and 1961. Apart from some amplifications of the text, the key difference in the latter editions was in the bibliographies (which reflected the growing body of post-war evangelical biblical scholarship).

\(^{30}\) The book appears to have been the idea of Dr. Douglas Johnson, Secretary of the British IVF from its inception in 1928. He worked on the book with Hammond, and polished it after Hammond left for Sydney (Barclay: 30-31).

\(^{31}\) Hammond, *In Understanding Be Men*: 24-40.

\(^{32}\) Ibid.: ix.

\(^{33}\) Hammond discussed that issue directly, however, in his work *What Is An Evangelical?* (Beecroft, N.S.W.:Evangelical Tracts and Publications, n.d.).

\(^{34}\) Hammond, *In Understanding Be Men*: 22, also 39.
Familiar too were the 1933 IVF booklet *The Quiet Time* (reinforcing the devotional disciplines expected of all serious evangelicals)\(^{35}\) and the 1934 IVF Bible Study manual *Search the Scriptures*.\(^{36}\) Another early IVF publication — picking up a key area of contention — was H.E. Guillebaud’s *Why the Cross?* (a defence of substitutionary atonement).\(^{37}\) Other British writers with IVF links, such as Daniel Lamont and Rendle Short, were also frequently read.\(^{38}\) The latter wrote *The Bible and Modern Research* (on reconciling new scientific discoveries with biblical teaching).\(^{39}\) Such IVF and IVF- associated publishing was making a start at redressing the paucity of contemporary evangelical writings at an intellectually adequate level, but it was not until the 1950s and 60s that there would be an obvious renaissance in evangelical scholarship.

Howard Guinness’ *Sacrifice* (1936) was a call to costly personal discipleship in such areas as money, love and marriage, prayer and service, and inside the front back cover contained a pledge for readers to sign and date.\(^{40}\) The book reflected the great spiritual and moral earnestness of the early IVF, and helped define the spirituality of at least a generation of young evangelicals (and not just in the IVF).\(^{41}\) It was an age,
perhaps, in which calls to serious self-discipline were more readily received than in the more individualistic post-1960’s era.

E An Adopted Evangelical History

The story of CICCU and its disentanglement from SCM, and of the British IVF, was known – and owned – by the New Zealand IVF as the beginning of its own story too. That history was told, from a CICCU and IVF perspective, in various published accounts. Such works were generally restrained in tone and factually careful, but were nevertheless at great pains to depict a stark and all-important choice for student Evangelicals: either they insisted on faithfulness through a separate witness, or they would suffer the loss of the Gospel through succumbing to doctrinal inclusiveness.

The historical writing of the British movement was self-justifying. It provided a rationale for IVF’s continuing existence, an existence that was deplored by many. Such a history depended on SCM being painted in negative terms. That understanding, and the recounting of the CICCU and British IVF story, were hugely important in shaping the evangelical identity of 1930s New Zealand student evangelicals. The same story was at the heart of New Zealand IVF’s own work of history and self-justification, published in 1941.

fool who gives what he cannot keep to gain what he cannot lose, we regarded the kind of ‘sacrifice’ Guinness spoke about as our ‘reasonable service’ and bounden duty. This language embraced a series of ontological realties and priorities that really were foundational for our value systems at that time. I took it for granted that Ann and I should not become engaged until it was clear that marriage was right for the place of mission service the Lord planned for me – even though that meant an eight year wait before marriage” (E-mail, Dr. John Hitchen, 14 July 2008).


43 N.Z. Varsity Papers No. 2: The Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions (N.Z.): A Sketch of its Origins, Doctrine and Practice. A Booklet for Officers and Members (Wellington: IVF, n.d. [c.1940]). The booklet was largely the work of Graham Miller.
F IVF (NZ) and an Identity Grounded in Persecution

Less restrained than some of the other histories, Basil Atkinson’s *Valiant in Fight* surveyed the whole of church history, with the current experiences of the IVF a constant implied backdrop. Atkinson pressed the theme that genuine Christian faithfulness had always involved a heroic struggle for biblical truth and the Gospel: the IVF, a godly remnant standing firm against a floodtide of apostasy, was in the glorious tradition of the martyrs and the Reformers, so misunderstanding, persecution and suffering were inevitable. Atkinson captured the 1930s mindset of

---

44 Dr. Basil Atkinson was on the staff of the university library, and was strong in classical Greek and linguistics. Often “idiosyncratic”, he was a key influence on CICCU from 1919 through to the 1960s (Goodhew: 68, 85, also Barclay: 26-7).

45 Basil F.C. Atkinson, *Valiant in Fight: A Review of the Christian Conflict*. London: IVF, 1947 (revised). The book was intended to “prove an inspiration to Evangelicals sacrificing to-day [sic].” vii. Chapter One (“The Conflict Begins”) related the persecution of the early church to the trials of the IVF groups: if there was the prospect of “burning alive in the marketplace”, “would a man allow himself under such circumstances to be elected president of the Christian Union? Would the membership be less? ...The early church welcomed these fierce trials as its opportunity for giving witness to its Master. Its members believed simply the statements of the New Testament that persecution was inevitable.”

Atkinson made much of the horrors of the Inquisition torture-chambers, as examples of unjust oppression by the official church (113-9) – and as an expression of the “dreadful creed” of Catholicism (124). He argued that Waldo demonstrated the need for evangelicals’ “separation;” the “survival of our witness depends upon it” (86-7). With the Reformation (121), the “waters of life burst out over Western Europe.” The Reformation martyrs and the Covenanters will ask us [the IVF] whether we “guarded the truth of the Gospel which they suffered so much to win, whether we kept ourselves unsullied by the subtleies of their foes and ours [italics not original]: 144. Atkinson extolled the glories of the Evangelical Revival: 144-58. The book was not subtle in its Anabaptist sympathies (161, 179) or in its simple equation of Protestantism with true Christianity: under Mary Tudor “Christians were burnt alive simply because they were Christians” (163). Atkinson compared “Liberalism” to Gnosticism (25) and the “deadness... of the [medieval] schoolmen (188). Chapter Seven in the 1st edition (1937) was ever more strident. It declared against the omnipresent “spirit of tolerance and compromise” (187-8) in which any “definite stand for Truth” is considered out-of-date and crude. He described Anglo-Catholicism as “traitorous” (199), reflective of Jesuit “deceit” (200). Atkinson suggested that Europe was poised to suffer a cataclysmic “Armageddon, the mount of slaughter ...the end of her history” (204) and that even in Britain “civilisation” would be overwhelmed and the visible church erased (21); the only hope was “the true Scriptural Protestant Evangelical church” (204) and the second coming (212). Allowance needs to be made for the book being an early IVF work, based on an in-house address: it was motivational rather than educational.
some theological conservatives, and his call to join battle was clearly heard in EU
circles in New Zealand.\(^{46}\)

G  **IVF (NZ) as an Expression of Classic British Evangelicalism**

In all of this – the story, the identity, the theology, the nuances, the sub-culture – the
outlook of the NZ IVF was that of classic British evangelicalism, as mediated through
the British IVF. If there was any trace of American fundamentalist influence on the
New Zealand IVF, it was well hidden. Fundamentalism was certainly not part of the
history that the New Zealand IVF claimed for itself: instead, the first New Zealand
General Secretary asserted that the IVF members were in continuity with (and
"residuary legatees" of) the heritage of the Reformation, Reformed Confessions of
Faith, Puritans, Wesleyans, CICCU (1877) and the early British SCM.\(^{47}\) Some early
IVF writers noted with approval the American fundamentalists’ struggle against
modernism – but delved no deeper.\(^{48}\) In Britain and New Zealand, fundamentalism
remained an essentially foreign phenomenon.

H  **The Role of IVF Conferences in Fostering a Cohesive Nationwide Evangelicalism in New Zealand**

In New Zealand, the fledging IVF was to become a crucial factor in developing a
more confident, cohesive and expansive New Zealand evangelicalism, a movement
both trans-denominational and national. A key factor in that was the annual IVF
conference.

\(^{46}\) Pfankuch/Lineham interview.
similar list was claimed by Coggan (12), whose evangelical succession included Wycliffe, Tyndale,
Owen, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer and Bilney.
At an individual level, such conferences were often profoundly inspiring for those who attended, and life-shaping. Francis Foulkes, for instance, considered his first IVF conference the key spiritual event of his early years. In addition to the “heart-warming” worship and fellowship, Foulkes was “very greatly moved” by Orange’s exposition of core Christian doctrine, and inspired by Laird’s series on Amos to begin his own life-long study of the Scriptures.49

But the IVF Conferences had an effect much wider than on individuals. The conferences played a critical role in bringing together young evangelicals – and future evangelical leaders – from across the whole country, and from across the denominations. The second IVF conference (Easter 1937) was held in Sumner, a venue indicative of the close links between Orange and the EU. It brought together evangelicals of several denominations: a photo from that conference included Anglicans, Brethren, Presbyterians and Baptists.50 Subsequent IVF conferences51 demonstrated the same strongly inter-denominationalism character: a photo of a group at the 1938 conference also included members of the Church of Christ (Life and Advent) and Methodist churches.52

In particular, the IVF conferences brought together the Dunedin (mainly Presbyterian) evangelical movement centred on Thomas Miller with the Christchurch (Anglican/Brethren) evangelical movement centred on Orange. The conferences also brought together evangelicals of the same denomination but from different parts of

48 E.g. Atkinson: 205.
49 Foulkes, unpublished memoirs: 13. The conference was in May 1942.
51 E.g. 1938, Auckland (at Parnell School); 1939, Dunedin; 1940, Wellington (Te Aro); 1941, Christchurch (St. Andrew’s College).
the country: Christchurch evangelical Anglicans mixed with those in Nelson, Wellington and Auckland, and northern evangelical Presbyterians mixed with their southern counterparts. A photo taken at the 1940 IVF conference, for instance, shows three Miller brothers (South Island) and three Kirkby brothers (North Island): five of these later became Presbyterian ministers and leaders in the Westminster Fellowship. Unwittingly, IVF was thus strengthening the foundations of future denominational evangelical movements. It inspired the national spread of such movements: at the 1941 Conference a young evangelical Anglican student from Auckland was both astonished and heartened by the impressive line-up of Anglican clergy from Sydney and Christchurch, many of them as speakers; a photo of that conference includes the Revs. Marcus Loane, William Orange, Basil Williams, Walter Wisdom and Harry Thomson – and at least six others who would later be Anglican ministers.

The IVF conferences also forged links between the South Island evangelical networks of Otago and Canterbury (respectively Presbyterian and Anglican-Brethren), and the more Baptistic-Brethren evangelical community of Auckland. The conferences also brought encouragement to the weaker evangelical movement in Wellington. The IVF and its conferences intensified – and placed on a national level – the inter-denominational and intra-denominational evangelical mixing that had already typified the Crusaders, CSSM missions, and local EUs. Such inter-mingling also produced many inter-denominational marriages.

53 MF, ¶16.
54 W.C. (Walter) Wisdom, ordained in 1933, served in China (1934-9, with CMS), Rakaia (1939-42) and Temuka (1942-6), and then succeeded Orange in Sumner: Crockford’s Clerical Directory.
55 Roger Thompson, Dick Carson, Peter Tovey, David Aiken, Harvey Teulon, and Ted Coulter. There did not appear to be ministers of any other denomination present, but there were several who would later become so. A few years later, another young Anglican evangelical from Auckland, Kevin O’Sullivan, was greatly impressed by Harry Thomson, especially by his enthusiasm and biblical expositions: Tribute from Kevin O’Sullivan (former Chairman NZCMS), in “With thanks to God for the life of Harry Thomson,” CMS News (Sept. 1987).
56 E.g., Rymall Roxburgh (Dunedin Presbyterian) married Betty Carson (Christchurch Anglican). Although his future wife was at earlier conferences, Roxburgh first particularly noticed her at the 1940 Conference as she “peeled potatoes and argued pro-Calvin”: conversation, 2 Nov. 1999.
I  The Role of IVF staff in Nurturing NZ Evangelical unity

IVF staff, too, developed strong trans-denominational friendships and helped foster a growing evangelical unity. The first IVF Travelling Secretary, Graham Miller, was appointed in 1938. Through IVF, the ardent young Presbyterian (later a key leader in the Westminster Fellowship) formed friendships with such Anglicans as Maurice Goodall and Roger Thompson (later key leaders in the Anglican Evangelical Fellowship). Miller frequently stayed with Brethren stalwarts such as Howell Fountain (Christchurch) and William Pettit (Auckland). The latter would take Miller out on his medical rounds and talk to him between visits, sometimes lapsing into a Brethren proselytism that was contrary to the strictly inter-denominationalist ethos of IVF. In Auckland, Miller would also stay with the Secretary of the Baptist Tabernacle and with a Church of Christ Life and Advent family. In Wellington, he would stay with Cliff Cocker, an evangelical Methodist who served (part-time and honorary) as national IVF Secretary from 1937 until his sudden death in September.

57 Miller had been working as a law clerk in Wellington and studying at VUC since 1937, where he was a member of Kent Terrace Presbyterian Church, Miller to D.C. Herron, 27 Aug. 1938, Theological Hall Student files, I-R, Graham Miller, 1938, Box 2. In commending Miller to the IVF constituency, John Laird wrote of his “outstanding gifts” and “sane well-balanced judgement and true spirituality”: NZ Inter-Varsity News’ Bulletin 1, 4 (Oct. 1937).
58 JGM, 783-4. Miller described them as “choice friends who loved their church and saw eye to eye with us”.
59 JGM, 238. Pettit would ask Miller: “Why don’t you obey the Scriptures in your churchmanship?” (i.e. “Why don’t you join the Brethren?”). Pettit gave Miller books to read such as Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. He “worked on Rymall too” [IVF travelling secretary, Dec. 1942-Feb. 1943], a “regrettable lapse in his pastoral care” of the young IVF staff. Notwithstanding that, Miller and Pettit had an enduring mutual respect.
60 ADMNH 1: 95. Stephen Page had been secretary of the Tabernacle in the days of Joseph Kemp. David Green was one of many Church of Christ Life and Advent students who strongly supported EU.
61 Ibid.: 98.
1956. Other IVF staff in the 1930s and 40s, such as travelling secretary Rev. Basil H. Williams (1941), similarly moved among evangelicals of many denominations.

**J IVF Speakers and Growing Evangelical Cohesion**

Through the IVF conferences, through local EU missions, and through national tours by IVF-sponsored speakers, the evangelical movement was exposed to a number of key evangelical figures. One such was Orange, a frequent speaker in all the EUs and also at IVF conferences. It was the EUs and IVFs that gave Orange a national profile among New Zealand evangelicals. Emerging leaders such as Blaiklock likewise gained a national following.

IVF-sponsored international visitors were also important. One such was T.C. Hammond, Irish theologian and the author of the much-used IVF doctrinal handbook *In Understanding Be Men*. Since 1936 Hammond had been the Principal at Moore College, Sydney, and was to have a key role in tightening the grip of reformed theology over that college and diocese. Hammond was blunt, incisive, and rigorously doctrinal. His 1938 visit was helpful in dispensing any assumption that the IVF was anti-intellectual, in reinforcing the role of *In Understanding Be Men* in the formation of IVF evangelicals, and in setting the tone of the New Zealand IVF in the 1930s and 40s. Hammond would return to New Zealand several times as an IVF conference speaker and EU missioner.

---

62 Ibid.; Memorial Minute, in IVFEU (NZ), “Annual Report by the General Secretary on behalf of the Executive Committee”, [1957]. T.C. Cocker, B.Com., A.R.A.N.Z, worked in the Government Treasury. He was a close friend of Rob Miller. He had been a foundation member of the VUCEU in 1933, and had been at the inaugural IVF conference in 1936. Cocker “carried in his soul the deepest strains of evangelical godliness – [he was] quiet, patient, sensitive, transparent”, ADMNH 1: 93.
63 Williams was a Christchurch Anglican, and associated with W.A. Orange. He subsequently moved to Australia, to work with IVF and CSSM, and became SU General Secretary in NSW.
64 He was the main speaker, for instance, at the 1939 conference. He regularly did teaching series at the Canterbury EU, and visited the other three EUs at least annually: Orange, diary, 18 April 1938.
65 ADMNH 1: 98.
66 He was speaker, for instance, at the 1945 IVF conference held at Tyndale House, Christchurch.
K IVF-SCM Relationship

The relationship of IVF and SCM remained taut. Early in 1938, four representatives of OUEU met with the local SCM, at the request of the latter, who wished to explore "co-operation". This was a significant meeting, apparently the first such since the breach, and the memories of old hurts were still raw. The EU had prepared by spending thirty minutes in prayer. Graham Miller was present and spoke on behalf of the current OUEU chairman. He was determined to review the events of 1930, and came prepared with documentary evidence of SCM’s exclusion of EU and its subsequent attitude to EU. With the relentlessness of a zealous young lawyer, Miller asked the SCM to read out some of their previous decisions and comments about EU. He chided the SCM for its “uncharitableness”. He pointed out that if in fact some SCM members believed the same things as did the EU, the only “logical” course was for them to join the EU. Combat over, the EU asked that the meeting close with ten minutes prayer together.

Graham Miller had also met with the SCM General Secretary (Jim Linton) for a frank discussion of their different perspectives. In his confidential report to IVF, Miller claimed the SCM conceded “full responsibility” for the 1930 schism, on account of its being so “humanistic and liberal” at that time. The SCM had now become decidedly

---

68 Gordon Smith.
69 He gave as an example a 1936 editorial in the SCM magazine.
70 This appears to have been the same meeting described above, with the EU members kneeling and the SCM members sitting in their chairs. The context was SCM’s desire to have EU co-operate with the Andrews mission.
71 “Confidential. Notes of Conference with General Secretary of SCM on 11 Feb. 1938 in SCM Headquarters”, TSCF N7/62; “Notes of Talk given by Mr J. Graham Miller (Trav. Sec., IVFEU) at meeting of Auckland E.U. Executive, 2 April 1938”, TSCF N7/137. Linton was a Knox graduate, whom Miller described as a “modern evangelical” (i.e. Barthian) and “very earnest”; he noted that Linton had had an Oxford Group experience.
72 “Confidential. Notes of Conference...”: 2, 1. Miller appeared to mix reporting of what was said with his own comments.
more “conservative”, having adopted a Barthian theology. Nevertheless, the “strict adherence” of the IVF to Scripture and the lack of a fixed SCM doctrinal basis remained insoluble points of difference. Although the SCM had unquestionably moved in its theological focus, there was no way the IVF was going to abandon its raison d’être and become reabsorbed into a movement without firm doctrinal safeguards: “the SCM, if uniform with EU today, might again drift, as it had [previously] done... this drift is almost inevitable in a movement possessing no precise Doctrinal statement”.

If the SCM had hoped that a meeting with IVF would resolve the schism, it was being overly hopeful. The same issues and tensions in the relationship of the two movements were to be evident for many more decades. The SCM remained the much stronger movement, numerically. It remained widely respected. It continued to stimulate and inspire many students, who were often convinced that the SCM was on the cutting edge of church, society and even the world. But the IVF was there to stay. Through the 1940s its university groups would experience – with fluctuations –

---

73 “Confidential. Notes of Conference...”: 4. The change in theology and emphasis is noted by Berry, who asserts that from the mid 1930s, the SCM “dramatically changed its focus”: there was a renewed emphasis on biblical and doctrinal study, and a conscious adoption of impartiality on social issues except where the churches had already given a lead (Ch. 3: 1, Ch. 3: 2, Ch. 3: 9). These changes reflected several causes, including concern about the EU schism, internal reaction to the previously very strong social focus, criticism by the churches and the PBCM, the influence of neo-orthodoxy, and the leadership of Lex Miller. (Ch. 3: 1, Ch. 3: 3). Miller wrote in the Outlook (14 Dec. 1936) of Barth and Brunner “delivering a grand assault on ‘liberal idealism’, the overoptimistic [sic] view which thinks of the ‘Kingdom of God’ as being the new and harmonious society which men... are building” (Ch. 3: 2). Young Presbyterian theologians such as J.M. Bates (who had studied under Brunner, 1934-5) strongly promoted neo-orthodoxy within SCM. There was a striking new interest within SCM in such subjects as “the Word”, Sacraments, Ministry, and church union, and leadership in SCM was dominated by serious-minded theological students (C3-3, C3-4). The wind-shift in the SCM lasted from the mid-1930s to the mid-1960s. Conservative evangelicals, while appreciating Barth’s kerygmatic emphasis, generally suspected him of a liberal view of Scripture and of universalism: see e.g. Stone: 153-7.

74 “Confidential. Notes of Conference...”: 5, 7.

75 Ibid.: 7.

76 Many decades later, R. Thornley reflected on SCM in the 1930s and 1940s: we “felt then that we were Christians living on the frontier,” re-thinking the faith, the church and the world, and coming up with answers for the world, TSCF N7/40. The fellowship and stimulus of SCM at that time, recalled J.M. Bates, was “something almost too good to be true”: ibid.
an overall pattern of “steady though unspectacular growth”. More importantly, however, the IVF was now producing a steady stream of young evangelical leaders.

L IVF Evangelicals Training for Ministry (1930s -40s)

Within a few years of the Evangelical Unions being formed, evangelicals who had been shaped by EU were beginning to train for ministry. This pattern became observable at the Presbyterian Theological Hall at Knox College in Dunedin and at College House (the ministry training centre for the Anglican Diocese of Christchurch). It was a phenomenon that would have a significant effect on the post-war church.

M Evangelical Presbyterians in Theological Training

In Dunedin, the first of the new generation of EU-influenced Presbyterian ministry trainees was Mervyn Milmine. Converted at a meeting addressed by Bissett, Milmine did an MA at Otago and then studied at the Theological Hall (1933-35). Throughout those years he was closely involved in EU. He had earlier been part of Cree Brown’s evangelical student group and a key figure in EU’s founding. At the Hall he felt theologically isolated but in his final year he was joined by Stanley Nicholls. Both took up parishes in 1935. In the same year A.H. (Aubrey) Lowden

---

77 H1/22 “IVF work in New Zealand”. Document attached to letter [from Cliff Cocker?] to Bruce [Harris], 28 Aug. 1950.
78 FM, ¶23. The year of that response was about 1926.
79 GMY, ¶196.
80 FM, ¶27. Assembly required Nicholls to do one year only at the Hall, as he had done theological study at seminaries in Los Angeles and St. Louis and had served in the Presbyterian Church of Canada.
81 Milmine (1906-81) was minister at Waikaka Valley (1935-39), Dargaville (1939-44), Waverley (1944-50), Owairaka (1950-7), Rangitaiki (1957-64), and St. David’s Gisborne (1964-71), and Nicholls (1897-1991) at Waihola-Milburn (1935-7), Tokomairiro (1937-48), Carterton (1948-55) and Avondale (1955-62).
arrived at the Hall from the Auckland EU. Like many other evangelicals he joined St. Stephen’s. In 1937, two more EU members arrived, from the Auckland and Victoria EUs: Reg Judson and Rod McKenzie. In 1939, four more evangelicals arrived, bringing the total to seven: Jack Johnston (from the Auckland EU), J.N.A (Jack) Smith, Morris Yule (Auckland EU), and Graham Miller (from the Otago and Victoria EUs). Johnston would become a PCNZ missionary to China. Smith, Yule and Miller would later become stalwarts of the Westminster Fellowship. Yule would serve as WF

82 A.H. Lowden (1913-92) was the son of ordained Home Missionary Rev. C.H.R. Lowden (1878-1955), an ex-Methodist serving in the Point Chevalier Parish (1931-37). With a keen interest in Old Testament studies Lowden made a strong impression on the local EU: RR, ¶425-6. “He had strong convictions and had read a great deal...[He] had a big influence on us as EU members.” In Australia Lowden did an MA and followed his interests in Syriac, Hebrew and Aramaic.

83 Lowden was in ministry in Tuakau (1939-42), military chaplaincy (1942-44), Waipawa-Otane (1944-49), (Melbourne (1949-54), New Hebrides (1954-56), NZ Army chaplaincy (1957). Mt. Wellington (1958-64), Drury (1964-71), and then in the USA (1971-75).

84 Rev. Reginald Frank Judson (1911-1977), previously a home missionary at Maungaturoto, was minister at Popotunoa Parish (1937-40; 44-5), as military chaplain (1940-44), and at St. Andrew’s Manurewa (1945-47). He resigned and became mayor of Manurewa (1948-53).

85 McKenzie (1916-1993) was minister at Forest Hill in Southland (1940-46), Martinborough (1946-49), Pahiatua (1949-58), St. Stephen’s (Dunedin, 1958-77), and Waikouaiti (1977-81).

86 Rev. John Dinsmore Johnston, originally from Ireland, was raised in Whakatane, and had been in AUEU. After Home Missionary service (1935-7) he was ordained in 1940 to missionary service in China. He was in internment 1942-5. He left China in 1949. From 1954 he served in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church of USA. This John Johnston is to be distinguished from an older John Johnston (1869-1959), minister of Dipton (1926-38) and uncle to evangelist Andrew Johnston.

87 Rev. John Nicoll Angus (Jack) Smith (1914-1981) served in the Maori Mission (1942-55 - at Reporoa, Taupo, Te Teko, and Whakatane), Raikorai (1955-65), and Papakura East (1965-79). Smith did not do a university degree, so would only have joined the Otago EU after arriving at the Theological Hall. He was a convert of a Bissett mission (Proceedings: 1981, 119).

88 Rev. George Morrison Yule, B.A (1915-), the son of Geordie Yule, was from an evangelical home and had come through BC, CE and EU. Formerly a student HM at Henderson (1937-9), he was minister at Mt. Ida (1942-7). Edendale (1947-60), Ponsonby (1960-75) and Greyfriars (1975-81).

89 Rev. John Graham Miller, LL.B., B.D. (1913-2008) did two years at the Theological Hall. At the request of the Missions’ Committee, Assembly waived the requirement for him to do a third year at the Hall. He served as follows: New Hebrides (1941-53), Papakura (1953-1965), Principal of Melbourne Bible Institute (1966-1970), lecturer at OMF Discipleship Training School in Singapore (1970-1971), Principal of the Bible College of the Presbyterian Church of New Hebrides (1971-74), Hurstville Parish NSW (1974-78). Miller received Honorary Doctorates from Berean Christian College USA (1974) and the Central School of Religion, England and USA (1984), apparently in recognition of his missionary work and historical publications. Like other evangelicals training at the Hall in the war years, Miller had had no objection to going overseas on military service, but the Presbyterian denomination appealed against the call-up of ordinands (ADMNH 1: 11).
Secretary, Chairman and President. Miller would become the outstanding evangelical Presbyterian leader of the 1950s and 60s.

In 1940 C.L. (Les) Gosling began studies at the Theological Hall. Gosling had been active in VUCEU. Of "far more than ordinary ability", Gosling had previously been a journalist with The Dominion, a prominent amateur debater, and had preached fifty-five times in the year before he went to the Hall. In 1945 he would succeed Thomas Miller at St. Stephen’s. He would also become an energetic leader in the Westminster Fellowship and the first editor of The Evangelical Presbyterian. In 1940 W.J. (Bill) Milligan also arrived at the Hall, from OU. So did E.C. (Ernie) Walsh, an evangelical who had been through BTI and had served as a Home Missionary in backblocks places such as Mamaku, Denniston, and Tolaga Bay.

The next year, 1941, W.G.K. (Bill) Moore began his theological studies. Moore had an M.A. from Otago, and had come up through St. Stephen’s and the EU. Rymall Roxburgh came to the Hall in the same year. Roxburgh already held a B.A. (in Greek and Philosophy) and an M.Com., and had been very closely associated with St. Stephen’s, the Otago EU, and the national IVF. A third EU member to begin in 1941

---

90 Dawson Madill to Dave [Herron], 22 May 1935, Theological Hall Student files, A-H, Colin Gosling, 1934-43, Sc. Colin Lesley Gosling (1913-1998) was from Blenheim. He had left school at 14.
91 Gosling to Student Convener, n.d. [early 1940]. ibid. 
93 Milligan (1914-66) came from Dipton and was at OU from 1937. He served at Wanaka-Hawea (from 1942), as RNZAF chaplain (from 1947) and at Whakatane (1954-66) where he died in office.
94 Walsh (1903-1997) had served as a Home Missionary in Hinds, Johnsonville and Waitati. After the Hall he served at Roslyn (1942-3), Mornington (1943-51), St. Helier’s (1951-69) and East Coast Bays (1964-69). See also: Proceedings, 1998: 34-5. For a brief history of Presbyterian home missionary work, see Harold Scott, A Pioneering Ministry: Presbyterian Home Missionaries in New Zealand, 1862-1964 (Wellington: Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, 1983).
95 Moore (1918-), was ordained to as Assistant at St. Andrew’s New Plymouth in 1944, and subsequently served at Waiwera-Warepa (1945), Waihao Valley (1948-51), Limestone Plains (1951-67) and as a hospital chaplain (1967-81).
96 Roxburgh (1915-2006) was ordained to the Dargaville parish (1944-5), then served as a missionary in India (1945-65), at St. Alban’s Palmerston North (1967-75) and St. Paul’s-Trinity-Pacific (1975-81).
was Russell F. Kenward, a B.A. from Victoria.\textsuperscript{97} W.J. (Bill) Wallace – another evangelical former Home Missionary – arrived at the Hall in 1942.\textsuperscript{98} The next year, he was followed by J.A. (Jack) Scarrow.\textsuperscript{99} Several other evangelicals who might otherwise have begun at the Hall did not yet do so, because of the war, but arrived soon after it.

Those who clearly identified themselves at the Hall as evangelicals of the EU type remained a minority. The majority of Hall students were of a more middle-of-the-road stance, reflecting their PBCM background, and remaining loyal to the SCM. Evangelicals recognised many in this middle group as “at heart evangelical”, and felt much in common with them.\textsuperscript{100} Another minority – most of them more strongly linked with the SCM – tended towards more overtly liberal views.\textsuperscript{101}

**Presbyterian Evangelical Ordinands as a Group**

The seven EU members at the Hall in 1939 met frequently for prayer. Together, they were members of the (IVF) Theological Students’ Prayer Union – other TSPU members were in Christchurch at College House (Anglican) and in Auckland at Trinity College (Methodist), Baptist College, the Congregational College, and – later

---

\textsuperscript{97} Kenward (1917-86) served at Tirau-Putaruru (1944), as chaplain to J Force (1945) and at St. Paul’s Timaru (1952-64), St. Heliers (1964-70) and Trinity Nelson (1970–80), with two exchanges overseas.

\textsuperscript{98} Wallace (1918-1983) was from Dunedin, and came to an assured faith under the ministry of Thomas Miller. He had been a HM in Henderson, Lower Hutt, and South Clutha. In 1942 he had married Thomas Miller’s daughter, Beatrice. He was minister at Dipton (1944-49), Mataura (1949-1969) and St. Andrew’s Invercargill (1969-78). See also: Proceedings, 1983: 102-3.

\textsuperscript{99} Rev. John Alexander Scarrow (1905-1989) had been a farmer and Home Missionary. He had not come up through EU, but had some contact with VUCEU when he was HM at Johnsonville. The HM Superintendent considered him “a real worker, a man’s man” with “undoubted religious fervour and enthusiasm”: George Budd to D.C. Herron, 5. Nov. 1936, Theological Hall Student files, 1930-45, J.A. Scarrow, Box 5-2. Scarrow did minimal university work. After ordination, he served in Dargaville (1945-49) and Howick (1949-53), and subsequently joined the Reformed Presbyterian Church of NZ.

\textsuperscript{100} RR, ¶401, ¶404. Roxburgh and others gave examples of such: Doug Storkey, Ernie Brown, and Fergus Hume, all of whom entered the Hall in 1941. Some SCM-associated theological students became more obviously evangelical when in ministry.

\textsuperscript{101} Former Hall students who were in the EU named some SCM students with more liberal views.
– at St. John’s College.102 As a movement, the TSPU was committed to both evangelical zeal and a revival of “sound Evangelical scholarship”.103 Within Knox, the TSPU students were keenly aware of their minority status in what they felt was still “an SCM stronghold”.104 When they emerged from praying together in Johnston’s study, just before lectures, they felt the “sour” looks of their peers and the “intense” pressure on other students not to join them.105 In general, evangelical students felt more pressure from fellow students than from the teaching staff. The staff were usually respectful.106

The Evangelical Presbyterian Experience of Theological Training

Knox’s wider reputation in the conservative Christian community was not high: when one Presbyterian was accepted for theological training, his family dissuaded him, protesting: “No, you can’t go down there. Professor Dickie is not a believer”. T.C. Hammond advised him that the Hall was “a bed of modernism”.107 But there are indications that the Theological Hall was not, in this period, extremely liberal. All the teaching staff had adopted a critical view of Scripture, and conservative evangelical students were always going to be at odds with them over doctrines of biblical authority, inspiration and revelation. Yet the staff mostly appear to have been

102 Newsletter, IVFEU TSPU, 10 Sept. 1941, TSCF II/036. Across the country, TSPU had grown to thirty-two by the end of 1941, with six others overseas: these included ten at Baptist College, seven at Knox, six at Trinity Methodist, five at College House, and one at the Congregational College. By 1943, the TSPU had forty-three members. IVFEU(NZ) TSPU, n.d. [1943], TSCF II/048.
103 “While opposing the methods and rejecting the main conclusions of the destructive school of criticism, it believes a revival of scientific, conservative scholarship to be essential for a true and lasting awakening of the Christian Church. Members are encouraged to be diligent in such studies as will promote and further this revival”: “The Aims of the TSPU of the IVF”, n.d., TSCF II/033. IVFEU, Tenth Annual Report of the Theological Students’ Prayer Union, 1944, TSCF II/054.
104 In 1939 there was a total of forty-one ordinands (Appendix XIII, Theological Hall Committee, Proceedings, 1939: 164); in 1940, thirty-six (Proceedings, 1940: 155).
105 JGM, ¶165. The EU students drew in one or two others who defected under the pressure. Roxburgh, who was at the Hall in the years 1940-3, similarly suggests that the common feeling was that the EU/TSPU were causing a division in the student body: RR, ¶419.
106 GMY, ¶218; RR, ¶406.
107 HT, ¶12. Hammond was a family friend through links with NSW. He urged Teulon to study instead at Canterbury University and to go to Orange’s BC. Teulon took this advice and was later ordained as an Anglican minister. Teulon’s mother had lost her faith through a modernist ministry in Wellington but she and her husband had later responded in a Bissett mission: HT, ¶10.
broadly orthodox in the other main points of their doctrine and most retained some broadly evangelical fervour. Principal Dickie, considered suspect by most evangelicals on the atonement, believed not only in the divinity and resurrection of Jesus but also in the Virgin Birth, and he retained an obvious piety. Evangelicals also noted – with surprise and satisfaction – some of Dickie’s more conservative-sounding utterances, such as the occasions when he provocatively expressed a preference for fundamentalism over modernism, and for the EU over the SCM. But they were always unhappy with Dickie’s basis of religious authority: the opening assertion of his magnum opus dismissed the idea of an “inerrant book”; following Schleiermacher, Dickie elevated “experience” over Scripture, and saw Scripture not as revelatory but as a faith-sustaining record of it. New Testament Professor John Allan, sometimes suspected of a “rationalist streak” (an anti-supernaturalist stance on miracles), was appreciated by Evangelicals on justification by faith and

108 Dickie: 324, 327, 13; GMY, ¶231. See also Professor John Collie, “The Moderator Designate, an appreciation,” Outlook XL1 (5 Nov. 1934): 13-14 (cit. King, 6); Collie:202
109 RR, ¶409: “Bob Sprackett asked Dickie in class: ‘Dr. Dickie, are you a modernist?’ Dickie replied (and I’ve got his answer here [i.e. written down at the time]), ‘If I had to chose between being a through-going modernist and a fundamentalist I’d sooner be a fundamentalist’. There was hush in the class. Then we heard him say, ‘They have convictions.’ ” Roxburgh repeated this story twice, in briefer (but consistent) versions. Corroboration of this account was found in W.G.K Moore to Geoffrey King, 22 August, 1995, as re-told by King: “A student recalls Bob Sprackett asking him [Dickie] if he were a modernist. [Dickie replied] ‘No’, and if he were forced to choose between that and being a fundamentalist he would choose the latter: ‘they have convictions’ ” (King: n.18, 337). The date of this incident is not clear, but Roxburgh, Moore, and Sprackett were all at the Hall in the same three years, 1941-43. In The Organismo {Christian Truth, Dickie stated that his own position was intended as a mediating one between fundamentalism and modernism: 8.
110 GMY, ¶232. Yule gave his memories of a different incident: “When Lloyd Geering preached in chapel, in 1941, he [Geering] ‘thundered’ out a sermon on pacifism. Dickie stomped out angrily. When lectures resumed, he [Dickie] was still visibly angry, and said, ‘I don’t suppose the EU would care to have me as its president, but I would far rather be the president of the EU than be president of the SCM of which Mr Geering is a member, for the EU has got a Gospel – even if it’s got more than a gospel – and its attitude to the Old Testament in particular makes it more robust in its attitude to war, and the SCM has no Gospel.” This incident is consistent with Dickie’s well-known hostility to pacifism (King: 295), which he considered highly unpatriotic. Dickie almost equated the British Empire and the Kingdom of God (ibid: 48-9), and had been deeply offended by Germany’s role in World War One (ibid.: 126). The outburst should be seen against that backdrop and as reflecting an ageing Dickie’s anger and exasperation with those less conservative than himself rather than as indicating Dickie’s unqualified support for the EU or its doctrine.
111 Dickie: 7. The statement was in the second sentence of the Preface.
112 Dickie: 312-3; ADMNH 1:104-5.
113 GMY, ¶226, ¶235.
atonement. Prof. J.D. Salmond (Christian Education) was felt by Evangelicals to be the most sympathetic to their position. They noted that Professor S.F. Hunter, even though very "critical" in his approach to the Old Testament, appeared to believe in conversion and student missions and that he warmly recommended Jamieson’s book on evangelism. Evangelicals felt supported by other students when, in 1943, Helmut Rex appeared to deny the Virgin Birth: an entire class of thirteen students wrote a complaint.

EU-associated students arrived at Knox with firm evangelical convictions. They had read the IVF books, and they had often read works by such writers as Ryle, Denney and Machen. They felt they knew what was right in their own system, and what was wrong in a liberal one. They were well aware of what, for them, would be the main points of tension: a critical approach to the Bible, a downplaying of its divine inspiration, authority, and reliability, and a liberal theology that questioned miracles and denied substitutionary atonement. They came expecting a “spiritual battle”.

Some evangelicals were more wary or defensive than others. A small minority of evangelicals – especially some of those without a university or EU background –

---

114 Ibid., ¶225, ¶234; RR, ¶127.
115 RR, ¶124.
116 RR, ¶1480. Roxburgh described Hunter as “liberal evangelical”, a descriptor that could have been applied to most of the Theological Hall teachers at that time.
117 RR, ¶401: “All 13 of our final year [1943] plus those in other years behind us objected to Rehbein’s denial of the virgin birth, though one later withdrew his objections.” Also GMY, ¶243. See also OA201, Minutes of a Special General Meeting of the TSHU, 17 March 1943, Theological Hall Students Union, Minute Book 1932-43, cit. David Scott Clark, “Our Interests and Christ: The Christian Existentialism of Helmut Rex” (Ph.D. thesis, University of Otago, 2003): 92. The resolution, moved by Wallace and Scarrow and carried 13/4, expressed both respect for Rehbein and “concern at the dogmatic manner in which teaching rejecting the Virgin Birth had been put before us”. The actual letter is not extant: email, Jane Bloore, Archive Assistant, 21 Jan. 2005. The Senatus reacted sternly at what they saw as “censure” of one of the teaching staff, objected to the letter as “ultra vires” and demanded an apology: Minutes of a Special General Meeting of the TSHU, 26 March 1943. The TSHU apologised for a “breach of etiquette” but did not withdraw the substance of the letter.
118 E.g. GMY, ¶147. James Denney (1856-1917) was a Free Church theologian and biblical scholar. His Christocentric theology included a very strong emphasis on objective atonement through Christ’s death as a propitiation of God’s wrath (K.R. Ross, "Denney", Nigel M. de S. Cameron, Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology). Evangelicals appreciated Denney’s Death of Christ [1902] but deplored his modernist views on scripture in his Studies in Theology [1894]: JGM, ¶146.
119 GMY, ¶203.
came expecting to resist most things, and sometimes got into arguments with staff.\textsuperscript{120}

But most evangelicals of the EU stamp came intending both to learn and – where necessary – to be “discriminating”\textsuperscript{121}. They were eager to acquire knowledge and skills, but still unwilling to have their perspective substantially altered. Most were happy enough, most of the time, but sometimes suffered in silence. Some EU theologues, such as Graham Miller, occasionally challenged the staff: in his quiet, reasoned way he would sometimes politely corner a teacher with an awkward question.\textsuperscript{122}

**Graham Miller**

Graham Miller stood out. As a son of Thomas Miller, he was already a marked man.\textsuperscript{123} The younger Miller – a lawyer – had a sharp mind, a close eye for detail, and an attentive memory. He was crisp and articulate in speech and gracious in manner. He was being coached in Hebrew and Greek by his friend (Classics lecturer H.R. Minn), and had come first in the Hall’s entrance exam.\textsuperscript{124} He was a studious reader, and for almost a decade he had been poring over serious works, painstakingly indexing them and taking detailed notes.\textsuperscript{125} An early significant book for him was Canon Liddon on the divinity of Christ.\textsuperscript{126} He was soon devouring literati such as

\textsuperscript{120} This embarrassed other evangelicals: GMY, ¶219.

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., ¶203.

\textsuperscript{122} In 1939, in Miller’s first year at the Theological Hall, Prof. Hunter handed out cyclostyled notes in which he repeatedly used the word “revelation” to denote the brilliant human insight of the prophets. Miller asked him: “I notice you are using the word ‘revelation’ in the sense of human insight and discernment. Would that be the historic position of the church?” Hunter replied, “I would have expected that from the son of your father”. A week or two later he gave Miller a copy of Denney’s *Studies in Theology*, urging him to read the chapter on Scripture: JGM, ¶146. Another day, Miller recounted the same anecdote, with minor differences in the details of the dialogue: JGM, ¶534. Miller also told similar stories about other incidents, e.g. JGM, ¶533.

\textsuperscript{123} The younger Miller had felt some tension when he was applying for the ministry and was being interviewed by D.C. Herron, the Convener of the Theological Education Committee of Dunedin Presbytery – and the minister of Knox Church, neighbouring parish to St. Stephen’s. Herron awkwardly said: “We don’t understand your father” (ADMNH 1: 101).

\textsuperscript{124} Ibid.: 102.

\textsuperscript{125} JGM, ¶367-8, ¶374.

\textsuperscript{126} “The first significant book I read was *The Divinity of our Lord*, by Canon Liddon, the Bampton Lectures for 1866...It completely mastered me. Fidelity to the doctrine of Christ, fidelity to the Scriptures, masterly use of English prose, brilliant! Unforgettable reverence...I then began a life-long
Dante, Milton and Cowper, theologians such as Edwards, Hodge, Warfield, and Machen, and all the IVF writers. He was reading many periodicals, of which the Evangelical Quarterly was the key influence. In his first year in Knox, Miller became absorbed by the works of Loraine Boettner. The key integrating book for Miller was Boettner’s The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination:

> If anything was needed to suddenly bring my bits of conservative thinking into a beautiful mosaic, that was the book. It suddenly became a mosaic, so instead of being an IVF fellow with this conservatism and that hang-up and this other, it was all a system.

This led on to the works of Kuyper (which he acquired from the library of P.B. Fraser in 1940), Calvin, Augustine, and the Puritans. Unlike many other evangelicals,
Miller was not drawn to apologetic works. In theology, Miller was definitely very conservative. He was not readily swayed by the latest wind of thought. He could be seen as resisting modern critical scholarship. But nobody could accuse Miller of being ignorant or anti-intellectual. He was clearly capable and scholarly.

Like Lloyd Geering, one year behind Miller at the Hall, Miller would make his mark on the post-war New Zealand church. When Miller and his wife departed for the New Hebrides, in March 1941, his missionary career would be characterised by both a strong biblicism and an advanced emphasis on indigenisation. He would be honoured by being elected as the first moderator (1949-50) of the newly independent church.

Rymall Roxburgh

Rymall Roxburgh, likewise, was something of a heavy-weight. Thoughtful, extremely thorough, and with a prodigious memory, Roxburgh – an accountant – arrived at the Hall with three degrees already behind him. Roxburgh read extensively, and very carefully. In comparison to Miller, Roxburgh appears to have

---

134 He inherited the fourteen-volume Marcus Dods edition of the works of Augustine, and a fifteen-volume set of John Owen: JGM, ¶375. These, said Miller, were “very influential”.
135 “You know what Calvin thinks of apologetics. What’s the use of apologetics, when you have the testimonium Spiritus Sancti”? Apologetics are “redundant”: JGM, ¶377.
136 Miller had married Flora McDonald of Dipton, who had been active in St. Stephen’s and had trained for two years at the Presbyterian Women’s Missionary Training Institute in Dunedin.
137 In developing his missionary ideology Miller was strongly influenced by two of Roland Allen’s books: Missionary Methods, St. Paul’s or Ours? (London: World Dominion, 1912); The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church and the causes which hinder it (London: World Dominion, 1927). Alf Roke of SIM – whom Miller had met at an IVF Conference – spoke on indigenous missionary principles at an OUEU house-party and introduced Miller to Allen’s books (ADMNH 1: 98). Others similarly influenced by Roke and by Allen’s books included Rymall Roxburgh (missionary to India) and Norman Perry (missionary to East Coast Maori and a close friend of Roke since BTI days).
138 A list of some the books Roxburgh had studied prior to the Hall included confessional material such as P.B. Fraser’s A Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith, various IVF offerings, J.G. Machen, Griffith Thomas, Samuel Chadwick’s The Path of Prayer and The Way to Pentecost, R.A. Torrey’s The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, works on the relationship of Christianity to civics and economics, missionary
been more evidentialist in his approach, less obviously Calvinistic, and perhaps a little more open to other theological traditions. After ordination he, too, would go overseas on missionary work, and spent twenty years in India.

**Evangelical Presbyterian Theologues and Academic Attainment**

Conscious that "conservatives" were sometimes assumed to be intellectually weak, Miller and Roxburgh and most other EU-associated students worked hard at being good students. As university graduates, several of them (including Gosling and Moore) studied for the graduate Melbourne BD degree, whereas most Hall students studied at Diploma level only. None of them, however, were granted scholarships to join other Hall graduates pursuing higher degrees in Europe or Britain. If such opportunities had been offered, they might not have been interested. They might have preferred missionary or parish work. In New Zealand, the evangelical pursuit of advanced scholarship would be at least one generation further into the future.

**The Role of the Evangelical Union in Undergirding and Stabilising an Evangelical Theology**

It was not unknown for theological students to shift in their theological position. Those who had come from a PBCM background, but had not been through biographies, missiology and comparative religion (e.g. C. H. Titterton’s *Five Great Non-Christian Religions* and Samuel M. Zwemer’s *Thinking Missions with Christ and The Law of Apostasy in Islam*). A list he supplied of his reading while at the Hall included – apart from the set texts, or those he found unhelpful – the following: *The Institutes*, James Orr (*The Problem of the Old Testament*), Daniel Lamont (*The Anchorage of Life*), C.A. Anderson Scott (*Christianity According to St. Paul*), John Baillie (*Invitation to Pilgrimage*), Emil Brunner (*The Mediator; Divine Imperative; The Philosophy of Religion*), Vincent Taylor (*Jesus and His Sacrifice*), James Denney (*Studies in Theology: The Atonement*), T.C. Hammond (*Reasoning Faith*), F.R. Barry (*The Relevance of Christianity*), C.S. Lewis (*Broadcast Talks*), D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones (*The Plight of Man and the Power of God*), D.R. Davies (*Secular Illusion or Christian Realism?: On to Orthodoxy*), and S.M. Zwemer (*Dynamic Christianity and the World Today*). After ordination, Roxburgh continued to read more widely: not just IVF and reformed works, but also SCM Book Club works and those by William Temple and Emil Brunner (*Man in Revolt, Justice and the Social Order*). He was also reading extensively on Hinduism and other religions.

Miller claimed that, academically, “We were good students...the results came our way”, and that that was obvious to other students. Miller himself topped the entrance exam, won the Church History
university or EU, sometimes accommodated their views on Scripture to a more liberal approach, but retained a broadly evangelical piety: they emerged as theological “moderates”.\footnote{\textsuperscript{140}} Students who had been through EU, however, appeared less likely to undergo any major theological change – at least in the 1940s. The crucial difference was that EU members had already done some wrestling with issues related to evangelical/liberal distinctives, and had already received their basic theological formation. If they had absorbed books like \textit{In Understanding Be Men}, and had studied the exposition of the IVF doctrinal basis in \textit{Evangelical Belief},\footnote{\textsuperscript{141}} they knew where they stood. Throughout their years at the Hall, such IVF books were often their constant guides.\footnote{\textsuperscript{142}}

\section*{EU-Associated Presbyterian Theologues and Critical Scholarship}

The EU-associated theological students appreciated gaining the biblical languages,\footnote{\textsuperscript{143}} and became much more aware of historico-critical issues.\footnote{\textsuperscript{144}} Up to a point, they saw the value of such criticism,\footnote{\textsuperscript{145}} but contested its conclusions where they thought them unhelpful, and rejected any view which implied a solely human provenance of Scripture.\footnote{\textsuperscript{146}} They did not necessarily hold to a full or explicit doctrine of “inerrancy” – they all preferred the EU-favoured term “infallibility”\footnote{\textsuperscript{147}} – but it remained very important to them to defend the essential veracity of Scripture. In an effort to find “convincing” answers to the more sceptical conclusions of modern criticism, evangelical students Roxburgh and Kenward scoured the biblical commentaries of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{140} JGM, \textsuperscript{1552}.
\item \textsuperscript{141} JGM, \textsuperscript{1536}-7, \textsuperscript{1542}, \textsuperscript{1551}.
\item \textsuperscript{142} JGM, \textsuperscript{1515}; RR, \textsuperscript{1491}.
\item \textsuperscript{143} E.g. JGM, \textsuperscript{1212}. They became aware of “pitfalls” in a more conservative approach.
\item \textsuperscript{144} GMY, \textsuperscript{1290}.
\item \textsuperscript{145} RR, \textsuperscript{1391}：“For me a lot of the effort seeking to understand the WORD ‘contained’ in the Scriptures by tracing its evolution from human elements alone, was a waste of time.”
\item \textsuperscript{146} E.g. RR, \textsuperscript{1388}：“I did not like the word \textit{inerrant}. I preferred the word \textit{infallible}, which was the IVF word...in the sense that if you were searching for the truth, the Word of God – as written – would not
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
moderate late nineteenth-century British scholars such as Ellicott, Lightfoot and Westcott. If they had studied the IVF’s explanation of biblical inspiration, EU-trained students at Knox did not come to theological training with a mechanical doctrine of inspiration but one that allowed for human factors in biblical authorship. EU students at the Hall tried to distance themselves from “obscurantism” and literalism, and often became more nuanced in their thinking. But almost all retained their key evangelical convictions and usually such convictions became strengthened. “The one great consequence of my time in the Theological Hall”, asserted one, “was it confirmed me in the evangelical faith”. Another reflected: “I emerged more firmly committed”.

lead you astray.”

148 RR, ¶384-5. Also ¶379: “Russell Kenward and I spent hours together examining in depth item by item of Scripture being questioned for its reliability...Ellicott’s commentary helped a lot.” RR, ¶386: “We did not answer every question, but for every one we really looked into we got a satisfactory answer. We stayed academically honest.”

149 RR, ¶383: “I already had a non-mechanical view of inspiration, thanks very largely to that statement of the IVF” – the exposition of the doctrinal basis, where ‘verbally inspired’ meant to most of the Advisory Board in England ‘sufficient control by God of the choice of language so that the ideas were correctly expressed’. It was not a dictation word for word, but God controlled the content. It allowed for the human factor – something I grew to appreciate.” Also ¶378.

150 GMY, ¶207. RR, ¶384: “I did not go through blindly, with my eyes shut and my ears plugged as some evangelicals were accused of, and I think some did.”

151 Roxburgh learnt “to concentrate more on the WORD as Message than the words per se... I personally came to recognise that many of our differences flowed from valid differences of interpretation – what was meant to be taken as literal/historical and what as parable or poetic or allegory”: RR, ¶382 [italics are his].

152 E.g. RR, ¶387: “When I [had] finished the Hall, I think I had worked in my own mind a kind of second line defence This was similar to one earlier developed by Aubrey Lowden, who came to the position that inspiration applied to everything that was important – and therefore allowed for discrepancies in minor details.”

153 JGM, ¶520-2. His evangelical stance was “greatly strengthened.” The key reason was seeing “the shallowness of the alternatives”: JGM, ¶521, also ¶515, ¶522, ¶530.

154 GMY, ¶205, ¶209. Similarly RR, ¶375.
Evangelical Anglicans and Theological Training

Among Anglicans in the pre-war period, ministry training was considerably less exacting than in the Presbyterian context, in part because it was dispersed among the various dioceses. Even the largest centres of training, St. John's in Auckland and College House in Christchurch, lacked much scholarly weight. In College House, the only full-time theological teacher was the Principal (Stephen Parr), who taught most subjects. Parr was liberally-inclined in theology and promoted Schleiermacher.

Carson, Thomson, Nicholson and Williams

Through the 1930s and 40s, Orange Pips were beginning to enter theological training, mainly at College House. The first of these was Richard (Dick) Carson, who already held an MA in Classics. Carson was an excellent biblical linguist, and an independent thinker. He often felt caught between the contrasting approaches to Scripture he heard at College House and at Orange’s BC. After some curacies Carson left New Zealand in 1939 for CMS missionary work in what later became Pakistan, and returned to parish ministry in Christchurch in 1958. Harry Thomson, having completed a BA at Otago and preparation for ministry under the tutelage of Orange’s friend L.G. Whitehead at Selwyn College, began in parish ministry in 1936 as curate to Orange. After the war, his major contribution would be to revive the New Zealand CMS. In 1936 and 1937, Bob Nicholson and Basil Williams completed their courses at College House and began ministry.

---

155 MW, §§31; RT, §§35.
157 In Latin and Greek. He had done some Hebrew in his first degree.
158 RMG, §81. Also Carson/Glen interview, §§14, §§12, §§14.
159 Carson/Glen interview, §12.
160 Nicholson had several ministries in the Nelson Diocese. Williams served in New Zealand with the IVF (1940), was a curate to Orange (1940-2), and then moved to Australia.
Roger Thompson

In 1937, Roger Thompson completed his LTh and entered ministry. Unlike most of the Pips, Thompson had not first done a university degree – he had worked at the Canterbury Jockey Club. Thompson felt he was treated respectfully. Nevertheless, he simply “endured” his theological training. He felt that Parr had “no influence whatsoever” on his own theology:

I was so … [influenced] by Canon Orange’s biblical truths … that I didn’t need … Parr, so I rejected these liberals and of course he [Orange] was very clear in his rejection of liberalism as such.

Thompson felt that the key theological change taking place in his time at College House was not Evangelicals being subdued by liberalism, but low-church ordinands being drawn in by the “vital” and “exciting” character of Christchurch evangelicalism. After the war, Thompson was to be at the heart of Christchurch evangelical Anglicanism, both in his parish ministry at Spreydon and in his leadership within the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship.

Max Wiggins

After completing a BA in Greek and Hebrew, Max Wiggins finished his LTh and was ordained in 1938. He had not enjoyed his theological studies, which he appeared to keep at arm’s length:

I got all the tags from all the German liberals and so on, so that I could use them in my exams. It was a real element that I might get knocked back if I expressed evangelical opinions…The Principal was Stephen Parr, a liberal. He wasn’t a theologian…He brought textbooks in, and said ‘you ought to take note of this, it’s important’, and it was not much more than annotating textbooks. It was very poor. I topped Old Testament stuff quite

---

161 Initially he was a curate to Orange at Sumner. From 1941-6 he was vicar at Woodend.
162 RT, ¶171.
163 RT, ¶37.
164 Ibid., ¶163, ¶167. However he gave the name of only one such a recruit, who did not endure.
easy, because I got a lot of tags to the German critics and put it all in - they thought I knew it all. I didn’t really know their stuff, I knew their names...I was getting indications that some of the people examining on the Prayer Book were Anglo-Catholics, so I was very careful how I answered from that point of view.165

Wiggins felt challenged, up to a point: “It made me read my theology. It made me read the evangelical stuff – I got the books I knew I wanted to know.” College House did not change Wiggins’ theology or modify his view of Scripture. Wiggins related well to Parr personally, but took almost nothing from him. His real teacher remained the vicar of Sumner: “sitting under Willie Orange, he made Scripture come alive, and you couldn’t rubbish it [Scripture] like that, and he [Orange] didn’t really do much of the controversial bit, he just made it live”.166 Wiggins left New Zealand in 1945 for CMS work in Tanganyika, where he later became a bishop.167

**Aiken and Teulon**

Another Orange Pip, David Aiken, finished at College House in 1943. After some years as vicar of the Chatham Islands168 Aiken would become a missionary.169 Harvey Teulon was ordained in 1943. After some curacies he left to study at Cambridge University and to work under Bryan Green in Birmingham.170

---

165 MW, ¶38. The emphasis was his.
166 Ibid.
167 Wiggins was curate at Merivale and vicar at Oxford, 1947-1950. Prior to that Aiken was curate at Sumner (1943-7) and Merivale (1950).
168 Aiken left New Zealand in 1950 for CMS missionary work in Pakistan.
169 Fendalton (1943-5), Kensington-Otipua [Timaru] (1945-6), Lithgow [NSW] (1946-7). After study at Cambridge (1947-9) he was a curate with Green at Birmingham (1949-50). Bryan Green was well-known for his evangelistic effectiveness. He tended towards a “liberal evangelical” viewpoint but did not call himself that - he called himself “evangelical”: HT, ¶61. Green visited NZ as a missioner in 1952 and 1953. Back in NZ, Teulon was a curate at Fendalton (1951-3) and later vicar at Hokitika, Highfield, and Cashmere Hills. He completed a Cambridge MA in 1954.
O  The significance of Presbyterian and Anglican Evangelicals in Ministry Training

The first wave of EU-associated evangelicals who emerged from Knox College and College House in the 1930s and early 40s was not large. But it was a significant development, for all that, and it swelled the numbers of ministers who identified as "evangelical".\textsuperscript{171} It heralded a coming recovery, within New Zealand Anglicanism and Presbyterianism, of an overt, educated and confident evangelicalism.\textsuperscript{172}

P  Conclusion

This chapter has traced the formation of IVF(NZ), a development which has received negligible attention from historians,\textsuperscript{173} but which was important in reinforcing the emerging new "evangelical" identity in New Zealand among EU-associated students in the 1930s and 40s. It was an evangelical identity closely patterned on the British IVF, which shared with the parent movement the same

---

\textsuperscript{171} The records of the TSPU and EMF given some indication of the growing number of evangelical ministers. In 1942, a TSPU document usefully lists by denomination the names of thirty-five ministerial members; "Post Collegiate Section circular, IVFEU TSPU (Post Collegiate Section), 31 Oct. 1942, TSCF II/042. By 1944 the "Post-Collegiate Section" had become the Evangelical Ministers' Fellowship: "Tenth Annual Report of the Theological Students' Prayer Union, 1945", TSCF II/054. Its Chairman commented in 1944 that the EMF was "still lamentably weak numerically," implying that many eligible ministers had not yet joined: K.S. Millerto Malcolm [Buist], 21 July 1944, TSCF JI/027. A document in 1944 lists thirty-nine members of the EMF: "List of Graduate Fellowship Members", 30 Oct. 1944, TSCF JI/056.

\textsuperscript{172} This study focuses on the growth of Presbyterian and Anglican evangelical streams, but it is interesting to note the ten Trinity College theologues listed as TSPU members in 1943: L.W. Allen, R.H. Allen, L.F. Bycroft, L.P. Gordon, W. Green, W. Gregory, L. MacDonald, N.W. Olds, L. Shapcott, T. Shepherd: "Trinity Theological College, TSPU membership", 1 Nov. 1943, TSCF II/050. The year before, the following TSPU members had graduated from Trinity College: J.B. Chambers, A. Jolly, G. Crammond: IVFEU(NZ) TSPU, 1943, TSCF II/045.

doctrinal formulations, attitudes, and literature. It was a strongly British identity, reflecting both the classic British evangelical tradition and a shared interpretation of recent theological history especially in relation to IVF’s differentiation from SCM. From 1936, the fledgling IVF(NZ) was a critical factor in developing a cohesive, nationwide and new type of evangelicalism in New Zealand. Among other things, its conferences brought together Evangelicals of different denominations, and previously isolated Evangelicals from within the same denominations. Through the New Zealand IVF, the impact of Thomas Miller and William Orange was being both strengthened and expanded.

A crucial development in the late 1930s and early 1940s was that a new generation of Evangelicals, very definitely shaped by the EUs and IVF, was doing theological study and entering Anglican and Presbyterian ministry. Many of that generation would be significant leaders in the coming post-war resurgence of Protestant evangelicalism. As the war came to an end, many hundreds of other ex-EU members would be spread across New Zealand in various professions and involved in churches and in youth work.174

Slowly, and just perceptibly, the tide was beginning to creep back in.

---

174 By 1944, 235 of these saw had seen fit to join the IVF Graduate Fellowship. 139 of those were teachers and 39 were ministers: “List of Graduate Fellowship Members”, 30 Oct. 1944, TSCF J1/056.
Part Two:

A RISING TIDE, 1945-65
Chapter Five:
Anglican Evangelical Expansion, 1945-55

A Post-War Moods

The effects of World War II on the religious mood in New Zealand in the decade or so that ensued appear to have been similar to those experienced in many other countries: the horrors of war tempered liberal optimism about human nature, and made some people more receptive to the idea that hope for humanity ultimately depended on God. J.M. Bates, for instance, wrote to the Outlook that "the events of our time have given such a blow to any facile belief in the power of man to save himself". The advent of atomic weapons and Cold War fears of communism deepened a sense of human vulnerability and insecurity. At the same time, there was a widespread eagerness to work for reconstruction and a more secure future. Returning servicemen were often serious about working for a better world. In such an environment of anxiety and activism, and in the height of the post-war "baby boom", there was a new door of opportunity for Christianity generally and many churches experienced much growth and vitality in the period 1945-60. Some have seen the period as a brief

---

1 Re England, for instance, see O. Barclay, Evangelicalism in Britain, 1935-1990 (Leicester: IVP, 1997): 20, 46; Goodhew: 75, 88 (the "privations of war" were "fertile ground for religion"; "Spores of belief baked hard by critique suddenly bloomed when the Second World War made talk of sin and death seem relevant"). Ian Breward made similar comment, in relation to a world-wide evangelical renaissance: IB, ¶78.
4 Similar patterns were experienced internationally e.g. John G. Stackhouse, Jnr., "The Protestant Experience in Canada Since 1945," in Rawlyk (ed.), The Canadian Protestant Experience, 1760-1993: 198-
return to the idea of Christendom. For many, evangelicalism’s confident biblical faith particularly addressed the anxieties of the era. For those who wanted to build a better future, evangelicalism offered strong emphases on outreach, church expansion, children’s work and youth work.

The rebuilding of church and faith in the 1950s was against the background of other major changes in New Zealand society: the burgeoning of many new suburbs, the expansion of the welfare state, greatly increased rates of car ownership, the arrival in most homes of new household technologies (including washing machines, electric stoves, and refrigerators), the development of secondary education, full employment, and growing affluence (based on unlimited access to the British market for New Zealand meat, wool, and dairy products). In the early post-war decades there was a pervasive “desire for normalcy” focused on family, job, home and section. That may have reflected a reaction to the traumas and deprivations of the 1930s and 40s, and also Cold War anxieties. Through to the later 1960s, New Zealand society was conservative in outlook, retaining a respect for Christianity, church, and traditional morality, and emphasising home and family. As in Britain, society retained a pervasive and conventional Christian “discourse” in its beliefs and values, even if

251, especially 199-202. In NZ, the baby boom meant an increase in births from sixteen births per 1000 population in 1935-6 to twenty-six per 1000 in the later 1940s through to a peak in 1961: Michael King, The Penguin History of New Zealand (Auckland: Penguin, 2003): 412; Belich: 493.

5 In retrospect, it can be seen as “the last gasp of Christendom” (Harold Turner, “Theology 1900-1950 in Relation to Society”, paper presented to Anglican clergy seminar in Auckland in Feb. 2000: 9; Turner was referring to the view of W.M. Thompson).

6 Such changes are noted in e.g. Ian Breward, A History of the Churches of Australasia (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001): 302-3.


often neglected or flouted. The erosive effects of television, sexual revolution, youth cultural change and a deepening secularism were still at least a decade and a half into the future.

The war had helped reduce New Zealand’s isolation from the rest of the world, and the isolation of each provincial unit from the others was being gradually reduced by easier motoring and increased air travel. The ecumenical movement and the interdenominational evangelical movements had contributed to a lessening of denominational barriers. New Zealand’s Protestant evangelicalism, made stronger and more confident by the EUs and Crusaders and with a new generation of young leaders emerging, was well placed to experience considerable expansion. As the 1950s proceeded, evangelicals would also be given fresh heart by reports of a strengthening mainstream evangelical Christianity in Britain and America.

B  The Effect of Orange Leaving Sumner

When Orange left Sumner parish late in 1945, Christchurch evangelical Anglicanism moved with him. Orange’s successor at Sumner, Walter Wisdom, was an ex-CMS missionary, Low Church and moderately evangelical. He was articulate and charming, but, whatever its merits, his preaching could not attract the same following as that of Orange.

Away from Sumner, Orange’s orbit of influence continued to widen. His Sunday afternoon Bible Class was relocated to Tyndale House and attracted up to a hundred

---

10 VM, ¶22. He had trained at Trinity College, Dublin, and served in western China.
11 Canon R.E. and Mrs Helen Coulthard, interview, 19 April 2006 (hereafter REC), ¶12.
men and women. Orange remained a very strong influence over the EU, and many in his circle were studying at College House with the intention of entering the ministry. But Orange’s departure from Sumner created the need for a new evangelical parish base and the opportunity for such to develop.

C  The Evangelical Presence at St. James’, Lower Riccarton

While several of Orange’s protégés had been ordained, none of them had yet become vicars of Christchurch parishes. For a few years, the favoured parish for young Anglican evangelicals became St. James’, Lower Riccarton. A key figure there was Andy Pinwill, the leader of the CHBS Crusader Union and an ordinand. A contagious enthusiast, Pinwill ran a “brilliant” Sunday School and recruited others to help. Several other evangelical ordinands were attending St. James’, including Lester Pfankuch, Bruce Beattie, Bob Hughes, and Hugh Thomson. There were clearly some strong social dynamics at work. Other evangelical young people attending St. James’ included another six who later became ministers (Graham Lamont, John Meadowcroft, Wal Marriott, Robert Glen, Gerald Clark) and at least a dozen others. Many of these were living at College House. Many also continued to sit under the teaching of Orange and attended his Bible Class at Tyndale House.

---

13 VM, ¶22 “anyone following Mr Orange...[would have seemed less effective]”; REC, ¶12. Mott was Wisdom’s parishioner and Coulthard was his curate (1948-51).
13 GL, ¶9. Regular attendance was about sixty.
14 JM, ¶27.
15 GL, ¶13.
16 E.g. Keith Mitchell, Margaret Cummings, Hope and Shirley Greenwood, Helen Marriott, Monica Morris, Vera Mott, David Powell, John Powell, Peter Rawley, Hedley Thomas, Pam Scott, Murray Wilson and Crellin Dingwall (ibid.; WM, ¶13. Many of these people appeared in a photo of a St. James’ BC retreat in Easter 1948; GL, ¶20. Some were from other home parishes: e.g. the Greenwood sisters were from Sumner, and Glen was from St. Barnabas’, Fendalton. Lamont later married Helen Marriott, Meadowcroft later married Monica Morris, and Hugh Thomson later married Margaret Cummings. Ian Nelson, a St. James’ local, was later converted through the ministry of Roger Thompson.
17 College House was on the corners of Hereford St., Rolleston Ave and Worcester St., across the road from the university. In the early 1950s College House had about twenty-five theologues in residence and about fifty university students.
18 WM, ¶10.
James' would retain its pre-eminence among young evangelicals for several years: Sumner had lost its previous lustre, the ministry of (Orange Pip) Roger Thompson at Spreydon had yet to gain any wider traction, and the ministry at Woolston of Harry Thomson (another Orange Pip) would not begin until 1950.

The minister at Lower Riccarton was Carl Tanner, a moderate evangelical. Tanner preached for conversion, and some were converted under his ministry. The Tanners were hospitable and welcomed students. The parish had Low Church tendencies but not an evangelical tradition. Tanner found himself caught between pressures from opposite sides: from the zealous evangelical youth and from more conventional Anglican parishioners. Some of the former felt the latter were not Christian enough and suspected that Tanner was theologically “not quite sound.” In 1948 there was controversy in the parish over a proposed fund-raising revue and a scheme to decorate the church ceiling with medieval symbols. Some judged these plans “worldly” and believed that Tanner should resist them. Against that background there was a sudden and rather puzzling case of church discipline. Consequently Tanner lost the trust of many of the young Evangelicals and there was a major exodus. Thereafter, if not before, Tanner was suspected by some Orange Pips of

---

19 Tanner, who was at St. James' from 1944-55, had been converted in Dunedin (WM, ¶10) and trained at St. John's. After curacies in Auckland and Hastings he moved to the Nelson Diocese (1935). Lamont (eager to defend Tanner in the light of later suspicions) described Tanner as "a convinced Bible loving evangelist" with a "faithful expository ministry": GL, ¶22. Mott, an Orange protégé with strong CMS and ECF connections, saw both Tanner and his parish as "evangelical": VM, ¶21, ¶18.

20 These included in 1946 Wallace Marriott, a young Presbyterian who came to St. James' because of his interest in a girl in the choir whom he had met at the skating rink: WM, ¶14. He became Anglican.

21 Anon., ¶14.

22 E.g. Meadowcroft, JM, ¶27. Meadowcroft had thought that Tanner was evangelical "but subsequent events suggest he was not completely in sympathy...He eventually had to make a choice between the evangelical students and some of his parishioners, who were a bit more Anglican."


24 GL, ¶22.

25 Because of the required confidentiality Tanner was unable to explain his actions, which were unfairly interpreted by some as arbitrary and as evidence of doctrinal unreliability. Most informants who were interviewed only become aware of the circumstances some years later.
being a "liberal evangelical." There is some evidence that Tanner himself liked to be known as such. While Tanner’s ministry was clearly broadly evangelical in emphasis and effect, Tanner may have identified himself as “an Evangelical” less consistently – or narrowly – than was the case with the Orange Pips.

D The Ministry of Roger Thompson at Spreydon-Hoon Hay, 1946-61

Following the troubles at St. James’, the new regional evangelical hotspot became St. Martin’s, Spreydon. The vicar was Roger Thompson, a young “Orange Pip”. Thompson was a “man of passion, [and of] deep conviction.” Significantly, Thompson was the first of the Orange Pips to be appointed as a vicar within Christchurch. Thompson had been at Spreydon since September 1946, in a new parish unit that was struggling. Socio-economically the district was less than prosperous, and included much State Housing. In the Hoon Hay district, there was considerable new residential growth. St. Martin’s had no previous evangelical tradition and had hitherto been placidly “middle of the road”. Thompson’s striking

---

26 GL, ¶79. Lamont was reporting not his own view but that of others, particularly Thompson.
27 WM, ¶20: “Carl Tanner described himself as a ‘liberal evangelical’, but I think that was going too far. He would probably have found a few things...I can’t think of any, where he might take a more generous view than classical evangelicals.”
28 When in his next parish, Tanner told Rymall Roxburgh that he did not call himself “evangelical” but “reformed”: RR, ¶335. But Tanner may still have been feeling hurt about some of his experiences at St. James’ with self-avowed young “Evangelicals”.
29 WM, ¶21. Lamont arrived at St. Martin’s after spending the rest of 1948 at the Cathedral, where Orange had recently moved. Orange – who had left Tyndale House – was holding a Sunday afternoon BC in the Bell Tower. But the Cathedral was not a parish, and lacked a warm community: ibid., ¶23.
30 JC, ¶11.
31 St. Martin’s had previously been an outstation of the Addington parish, but in 1946 had become a separate Parochial District.
32 In the earlier post-war period, however, being a State Housing area did not imply a district had any of the problems often later associated with some lower socio-economic areas, such as gangs, drugs, unemployment and high crime rates. In the era in view, full employment and stable family life were still the norm.
33 Neil G. Lancaster, Our Hope for Years to Come: St Martin’s Parish Spreydon 1909-1984 [Christchurch: Parish of Spreydon, 1984]: 21-2, 25. Church records up to 1946, according to Lancaster, evinced no evidence of “any particular evangelical or low church fervour”, but just a concern for “Christian
new approach provoked a "culture shock" among many existing church members. Thompson was at odds with much of the congregation on account of his directness, his uncompromising insistence on people having to be "saved" and his opposition to dances and fundraising.\(^{34}\) His ban on young people's dances had put him off-side with some parents, and his prohibition on fundraising (because of his belief in the "faith" principle of direct giving alone)\(^{35}\) had alienated groups who had previously worked hard on fairs and sales.\(^{36}\) "There was real strife, and he [Thompson] was on the point of resigning."\(^{37}\) Thompson was also very short of Sunday School teachers and BC leaders.\(^{38}\) Near despair, Thompson had gone to see Orange, who urged him to persevere.\(^{39}\)

There arrived at Spreydon one Sunday in 1948 a group of about eight young people, including Graham Lamont and Helen Marriott.\(^{40}\) They took up roles such as teaching Sunday School and became core members of a new Sunday afternoon BC. Another dozen or so soon followed.\(^{41}\) They joined with a very small group of local young people, such as Brian Carrell and Jill Morrison.\(^{42}\) Bill Wilkens, an ordinand from Nelson, had come earlier.\(^{43}\)

Education", dignified worship, a "deep, but reticently expressed faith" and "living a good Christian life" (ibid.: 22).

\(^{34}\) GL, \$24.

\(^{35}\) RT, \$35: "We [were] pretty tough on direct giving, and I think people probably found that a bit hard. We liked people to give to God, not... to give a cabbage for it, ...[that] sort of thing" [Rena Thompson].

\(^{36}\) Especially the Ladies' Guild

\(^{37}\) GL, \$24; Anon., \$16.

\(^{38}\) GL, \$24.

\(^{39}\) Thompson, \textit{Victory}: 21. Orange told him that "experience has taught me that, in life's journey, the darkest hours are just before the dawn".

\(^{40}\) Also John and David Powell, Pamela Scott, Colleen Prince, Peter Rawley and Jimmy Simpson GL, \$24; cf. Thompson, \textit{Victory}: 22.

\(^{41}\) These included Wallace Marriott, Ian Nelson, John Meadowcroft (a university student from Nelson), Gerald Clark, the five Bruhn sisters (Helen, Esther, Marie, Margaret, May), David Bremner, Shirley Sandford, Ailsa Murphy and Sally Hodgson. Ian Nelson, like some others, remained a member in his local parish but attended St. Martin's for the BC, prayer meeting and evening service.

\(^{42}\) GL, \$24. Other locals included Runa Brandon, an early convert, and Noelene and Shirley Sandford: BC), \$80.

\(^{43}\) WW, \$18.
Thompson’s Ministry Patterned on that of Orange

In many respects, Thompson modelled his ministry on that of his mentor. As with Orange, the core of Thompson’s ministry was biblical exposition. Thompson was a thorough-going Biblicist; he was “unrelenting” in his belief that the Word of God was the final authority in all matters of doctrine. His hearers were encouraged to have a “logical and reasoned faith” based on careful study of the Bible. Like many evangelical preachers of his time Thompson’s appeal was not primarily to emotion but to reason: Scripture was seen as the pre-eminent source of divine revelation, which (with the help of the Holy Spirit and faithful preaching or study) could readily be apprehended by human reason. In preparing his messages Thompson worked hard and read strongly. He always had “very good content”. Expository preaching became a feature of every church service at Spreydon; to thwart those he called “sermon-dodgers” Thompson also preached at the 8 a.m. Holy Communion service. In morning services he followed the lectionary and in the evenings he preached series on biblical books or themes. His expositions covered a wide range of subjects. In delivery, Thompson was less gentle and more direct than Orange. Thompson was an “eloquent, fiery preacher” – a “preachers’ preacher”. To some who heard him, his dark beady eyes seemed to bore straight into their souls – but in reality Thompson was short-sighted, and could not clearly see further back than the front two pews.

A key strategy for Thompson was his Sunday afternoon BC. As with Orange, the BC was intended to be both instructive and inspirational. Thompson’s primary aim was

--

44 Lancaster: 29.
45 Lancaster: 28.
46 Ibid.
47 RMG, ¶67
49 RT, ¶81-89.
50 RMG, ¶67.
51 Lancaster: 30.
to "make disciples", especially of the young. The BC included some 50-60 minutes of Bible teaching, with no interaction. His material was well-considered, practical and of high quality. Thompson’s teaching appears to have been less typological than that of Orange. He taught the internal consistency of the Bible as an interpretative principle, that Scripture must be tested by Scripture. In contrast to Sumner, the BC included young women, with males sitting on one side of the church and females on the other. As at Sumner, the BC was followed by tea, a prayer meeting and evening service.

Thompson emulated Orange’s approach of verse by verse exposition, both in church and in the BC. There is no question that it made a deep impression on many.

Someone who spent two years in the BC recalled:

For me it was the first time I had ever heard anyone literally open up the Word of God. I remember singing those old Keswick hymns, one each week before Bible Class – ‘Silently now we wait for Thee.’ …‘Let This Time of Worship be a Hallowed Hour.’ The time would fly by – sometimes an hour over one or two verses of Scripture. He made life make sense as the Word was opened up. Principles of Scripture were shown and the Bible became to us the Living Word. We were encouraged to expect fresh truth each time we studied it. The teaching was authoritative and well researched and no one spoke during the hour.

---

52 Ibid.: 29.
53 BRC, ¶6.
54 Ibid., ¶6, ¶10, ¶13.
55 Ibid., ¶13. Teulon thought Thompson strong on typology “all through his ministry”: HT, ¶17. But Carrell (who sat under Thompson’s ministry) did not see it that way. As evangelical biblical scholarship developed in the post-war years, Thompson would have been using some different commentaries to those used by Orange.
56 Untitled St. Martin’s BC Reunion booklet, n.a., n.d., 199: 19.
57 BRC, ¶15.
58 See e.g. St. Martin’s BC Reunion booklet: 18-20.
59 Lancaster: 27.
Others were inspired to emulate Thompson:

Straight biblical exposition...That was what appealed to me. He and Pekoe made the Bible come alive to me, this explanation of Scripture with Scripture. I never heard that in Nelson, that I was aware of. That would be the mark of his ministry. Roger was also a good evangelist – and a very good pastor as well. But his love was for the word. He gave me the model I have tried to follow. 60

Thompson and Evangelism

In the BC in particular, and to a lesser extent in the parish at large, considerable numbers of people were converted or quickened in faith. The BC eventually grew to number about ninety.64 Some arrived for social reasons but then got converted. 62 Young people “were getting converted all the time.” 63

A young Sunday School teacher from another parish went on a walk from Sumner to Lyttleton with Thompson and forty other young people, and Thompson asked him “Have you ever invited Christ to come into your life?” Thompson drew a line in the dirt with his shoe and said there comes a time when it is necessary to step over the line and make a commitment. He urged the teenager to “accept Christ”. The youth said “yes”, and “meant it, for the first time in my life.” 64 This was not an unusual incident and it illustrated some common evangelistic techniques: the call for decision, the use of Rev. 3:20, and the prayer of response.

Thompson would also challenge people from the pulpit. Many were “converted” in the regular church services. 65 Thompson would not press hard or give an overt

60 JM, ¶33.
61 RT, ¶126-130; Thompson, Victory: 23.
62 Anon., ¶19.
63 JM, ¶33.
64 Anon., ¶19. Previously, he had been confirmed in his own parish: “It meant a little bit, but I did not know what I was doing.... I was sincere, but I did not want to know any more”. After BC, he would “sneak around the back for a fag”: Anon., ¶18.
65 RT, ¶246.
“appeal” (i.e. require people to come forward), but would often finish preaching with words such as “you know you have to decide for Christ. I will give you two minutes after the sermon, two minutes just to sit and be quiet, or kneel, [to] think over what you have heard.” He would then encourage respondents to tell him later.57

Thompson’s Theological Identity

In theological position and identity, Thompson was unabashedly and unshakeably “evangelical”. He had learnt the term from Orange.68 He had associated – though not a university student – with the Evangelical Union.69 He and other Orange converts “were conservative Evangelicals and…proud of it.”70 When, in 1945, Thompson was the key figure in founding a new Anglican organisation, he called it the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship.71

Thompson did not call himself “fundamentalist” – but was not offended if others called him that.77 Notwithstanding his awareness of the negative connotation of that term,73 he regarded it “very positively” because of his belief in “the fundamentals of the faith.”74 Thompson took a conservative position on a number of issues: he personally believed in a literal six day creation; he respected those who understood the days as long periods of time, but ruled out theistic evolution.75 Like many other conservative Evangelicals, he believed the Bible contained no errors; like many other Evangelicals in the British and IVF tradition, he avoided the word “inerrancy”.76 For

66 Ibid.
67 Ibid., ¶248.
68 Ibid., ¶90-93. Thompson claimed that Orange “used it [the word ‘evangelical’] in his Bible Class.” Likewise MB, ¶32.
69 RT, ¶22.
70 Ibid., ¶100. Also ¶98-9. Question: “Did you ever call yourself a ‘conservative evangelical’?” Answer: “Yes, yes, that’s a term we used.” Similarly, MB, ¶34-5, ¶40.
71 Emphasis added.
72 RT, ¶376.
73 Ibid., ¶374.
74 Ibid. The emphasis reflects Thompson’s own verbal emphasis.
75 Ibid., ¶232-8.
76 Ibid., ¶227-30: “This was a word we avoided.”
Thompson, liberal academics who sowed doubts were a greater danger than literalists. He claimed not to be an extreme literalist, but in contentious matters he “would line up with the literalists.”

**Social Dynamics and Thompson’s Youth Ministry**

A feature of Thompson’s youth ministry was his annual camp in North Canterbury, with a strong evangelistic focus. Another hallmark was the hospitality of the vicarage; despite the six children the vicarage was an open home. Thompson’s vocation to ministry was strongly shared by his wife Reena, and the openness and fellowship of his home and family were a potent component of his influence on young people. After the BC and evening service a crowd of young people would gather in the vicarage for singing from the Keswick hymnbook and for supper. Several decades later, those writing tributes for the BC reunion would mention the crowded “sing-song” and supper as often as they mentioned Thompson’s biblical teaching.

**Thompson’s Style**

Thompson carried lightly his status as vicar and was very approachable. “Some like to be known as the Vicar and called the Vicar or whatever the title was. He [Thompson] was just ‘Roger’…he didn’t carry any airs or graces…. He was down to earth, a practical person who anyone could get along with.”

---

77 Ibid., ¶381.
78 The camps were held on a farm at Ethelton.
79 Lancaster: 25.
80 Mrs Thompson was from Orange’s parish of Sumner; as a curate he had boarded with her family.
81 BRC, ¶146.
82 In the morning services the standard Anglican hymnbook was used, *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, WM, ¶45. At Sumner, Orange had used a set of Keswick hymnbooks, which were later purchased by Ian Bourne in the North Island, the Venerable Ian G. Bourne, interview, Nov. 2001 (hereafter IGB), ¶74.
83 St. Martin’s BC Reunion Booklet: 18-19.
84 BRC, ¶144.
In style, Thompson was straight-forward and decisive. He spoke in a cheerful and compelling manner, peppering his talks with humour.\(^{55}\) Evangelicalism was “a cheerful affair, and that is the way Roger projected himself...There were always lots of laughs and good fun”.\(^{56}\) Thompson was also somewhat introverted and melancholic, and given to pessimism.\(^{87}\) He appeared to live with some inner insecurities.\(^{88}\) He doubted his own effectiveness,\(^{89}\) and was conscious that he was one of the few Christchurch Orange Pips who lacked a university degree.\(^{90}\)

### Thompson and Battle

Like some other evangelicals, Thompson saw the world – and the church – in terms of battle. From his own experience (both at Woodend\(^{91}\) and at Spreydon) he had concluded that within the church there would always be a struggle between spiritual and social emphases,\(^{92}\) and out in the world there would always be spiritual opposition and deep moral degeneracy.\(^{93}\) Thompson often signed off letters beneath the words “Yours in the fight,” ...”\(^{94}\) In his ministry memoirs Thompson noted that he saw himself as a “soldier” in the “Church Militant”, fighting against the forces of evil and darkness.\(^{95}\) Thompson wanted the church not to be “an institution primarily for elderly women and little children” but “an army on the march.” Accordingly, there was no place for leadership that was “mamby-pamby” [sic], “milk-and-water” or

---

\(^{55}\) His humour – if his memoirs were any indication – appears to have included many colloquialisms, puns and popular aphorisms e.g. Thompson, *Victory*: 7 (“I copped the lot...If I went into that house as green as grass, I came out as yellow as a canary”); 20 (in the pub “a good time was had by ale”).

\(^{56}\) JM, ¶32.

\(^{87}\) Ibid.; BRC, ¶331.

\(^{91}\) Thompson, *Victory*: 12-14 (Thompson was vicar at Woodend from 1941 to 1946).

\(^{92}\) Nevertheless, as Meadowcroft noted, Thompson held the standard qualification among Anglican clergy of his day, the LTh.

\(^{93}\) Thompson: *Victory*: 2-4.


\(^{95}\) *Victory*: 1.
"lovey-dovey". 96 Thompson’s defensive sort of pugnacity was not uncommon among Evangelicals, and echoed some of the blunter tones found in Scripture. But there also appear to have been some roots in his own personality. Thompson’s polemical style did not, however, indicate any difficulties relating to people pastorally, and as a minister he was seen as very caring.97

Thompson and Evangelical Moral Taboos

In teaching young people Thompson assumed the same sort of attitudes that had often applied in the pre-war generation, with regard to such things as drinking, smoking, dancing and going to the pictures.98 Thompson was vehemently anti-alcohol and preached against it, publicly denouncing the Black Horse Inn across the road. 99 Many – perhaps most – BC members readily accepted such taboos of the evangelical subculture, but some later claimed they felt uncomfortable.100 In retrospect, even Thompson’s wife wondered if things had sometimes been a little too narrow.101 As with Orange, Thompson’s approach to social and moral issues reflected an attitude of “separation”: the Christian who is “godly” had a duty to keep separate from “wordly” people and activities. The text “come ye out from among them” had been an important one for many Brethren people, and in the earlier post-war period it still constrained the thinking of many other conservative Christians also. The lifestyle strictures also reflected a positive preoccupation: young evangelicals were often too excited and busy with spiritual activities to be bothered with what they saw as trivial and distracting entertainments.102 While some overseas neo-evangelical

96 Ibid.: 12.
98 BRC, ¶19. In the 1950s, beer and shandy were often drunk by working-class people, but other types of alcoholic beverage were not so widely available as now. Middle-class people often did not drink. Likewise Betteridge about Anglican evangelical youth and their attitude to alcohol in a slightly earlier period: “We never touched the stuff, in fact you never really saw it. Beer was the only alcohol that was really available. Beer was not considered appropriate” (MB, ¶147). He believed Orange and most of the Pips were teetotallers: MB, ¶148-51 (cf. TEC, ¶22, re Orange himself).
99 JC, ¶41.
100 BRC, ¶32-46.
101 RT, ¶335-67.
102 That was implied by Thompson, in the context of when the taboos were being discussed in the
thinkers were beginning to call for a renewed evangelical humanitarian engagement with much wider social evils and to question the evangelical fixation on relatively trivial lifestyle matters in the 1950s such an awareness was not yet part of post-war New Zealand evangelicalism.

**Thompson’s Approach to Church Finances**

Under Thompson, church sales of work and raffles had quickly been dispensed with. The annual fair had been replaced by an annual “Day of Prayer and Giving”. Thompson saw the faith principle as demonstrating God’s faithfulness, and faith as practical. He was consciously influenced by the approach of Hudson Taylor, the founder of CIM. Although Spreydon was a working class district, the stress on consecration and direct giving had produced comparatively healthy church finances. In a time when many other Anglican parishes were working with the Wells Organisation or employing full-time financial canvassers, Thompson had instead instituted “Our Move Forward”, a programme which included a monthly evening Guest Service, a Visiting Committee, a Pick-Up Committee and weekly Bible Study; evangelical activists like Thompson typically placed such a premium on whatever promoted evangelism and church growth, and scorned more “worldly” programmes.

---

104 Ibid.: 20.
106 Ibid.: 23.
108 Lancaster: 23.
Thompson's Evangelical Churchmanship

In churchmanship, Thompson followed Orange and never adopted a strictly Low Church approach. He was happy, for instance, to wear a stole, and was not a north-ender. He saw himself as simply conforming to what was "traditional". On the other hand, Thompson would never have consciously made any concessions to anything he regarded as "High Church."

In his relationships with the Diocese, Thompson likewise emulated the approach of his mentor and kept his distance. Thompson's awareness that he was part of a small minority had reinforced in him a defensive, almost ghetto-like attitude toward the wider church. Of all the Orange Pips, it was Thompson who was arguably the most defensive, the most obviously suspicious of non-evangelicals. He would have nothing to do with the Anglican BC movement or its camps – he presumably considered them weak in theology and evangelism, and social in emphasis. He would have nothing to do with the Melanesian Mission – he believed it was full of "Anglo-Catholics". He was extremely wary of the bishop. One of his colleagues felt that Thompson "saw the bishop with a devil's tail and horn". Thompson dutifully attended Diocesan Synod but rarely spoke: since he considered most of those who attended as either "liberal" or "Anglo-Catholic" he felt it "futile" for Evangelicals to speak. As for diocesan committees, he "avoided them as much as

109 BRC, ¶268. Those more Low Church than Thompson had no candles on the communion table, wore a scarf rather than a stole, and celebrated communion from the north end of the table: ibid., ¶280.
110 RT, ¶77.
111 Thompson was "always such a suspicious character, [suspicious] of anything of the Diocese": HT, ¶91. He was "almost paranoic" about those who were not evangelical: JC, ¶11.
112 RMC, ¶68.
113 Thompson "always felt the bishop was trying to entrap him": name withheld. The bishop during most of Thompson's time at Spreydon was Alwyn K. Warren (1951-1966), who succeeded West-Watson.
114 HT, ¶128.
115 RT, ¶195. Thompson variously estimated the proportion of "liberals" in the Synod in the 1960s as 80%, and the number of "Anglo-Catholics" as 10%: ibid., ¶199. Carrell argued (BRC, ¶306) that there were never more than three or four Anglo-Catholic parishes in Christchurch; that was in contrast to
possible”. A key reason was that he was “too busy”: he was “preoccupied with soul-winning, and going out to find [people] ...and help them spiritually. It was very much personal work that I engaged in. We had a thriving church, and when you have a thriving church you have lots of things on your plate.” It was the next generation of Evangelicals, considerably more numerous, better educated and more confident, who would start to emerge from such self-imposed evangelical isolationism.

**Thompson and the Evangelical Network**

As with other denominational evangelicals, Thompson’s work was not done in isolation. His young people in particular were very much participants within a wider evangelical nexus, both evangelical Anglican and inter-denominational. Many were heavily involved with Crusaders, EU/IVF and CSSM. The activities of other organisations (such as daily prayer meetings at Crusaders or being on the EU Executive) could put significant extra pressures on the young people, competing with sport, study and engagement with non-Christians. To some extent the evangelical young people existed in a “hothouse”, spiritually and socially satisfying in itself but somewhat cocooned from the outside world. Through the EU and associated literature, some would find answers to intellectual issues that were not being adequately addressed at church. They were often leaders at CSSM beach missions and at Crusader camps, mixing there with evangelical people from many Dunedin, where the great majority of Anglican clergy were Anglo-Catholic (ibid: 298-301). Thompson’s attitude to the diocese was shared by other Pips, and came from the same source: Lester Pfankuch noted that Orange never spoke at Synod and “we imbibed that spirit”: Pfankuch/Lineham interview.

116 RT, ¶187.
117 Ibid., ¶186.
118 E.g. GL, ¶26; BRC, ¶48-54.
119 E.g. BRC, ¶202. Through EU Carrell became aware of C.S.Lewis, and found his works very helpful, such as *Screwtape Letters*, *Miracles* and *Mere Christianity*. “I remember him helping me through some intellectual problems... He was helping me in my own mind, with some of the questions I heard my SCM friends raise, that there were answers to them.”
120 E.g. GL, ¶28.
other churches (but especially from Brethren assemblies). They were office-holders at EU. At IVF conferences they would mix with evangelicals from across the country.\textsuperscript{121}

The evangelical network was small enough at that time to be closely inter-connected, each part reinforcing essentially the same message and values: its effect on young people was of "everything together. It all said the same thing, [it was] very clear".\textsuperscript{122}

In other places, and in other denominational settings, the precise mix of evangelical organisations differed: Anglican evangelicals had nothing to do with Christian Endeavour, for instance, and usually little or nothing to do with Keswick Conventions.\textsuperscript{123} But in all contexts the principle was the same: local evangelical churches worked in concert with interdenominational evangelical organisations, each bolstering the work of the other.

\textbf{Thompson's Legacy}

For much of Thompson's time at St. Martin's, church life was "booming".\textsuperscript{124} When Thompson had arrived, average weekly attendance was 50-60 (a total of all congregations); the year he left (1961), the average was 300.\textsuperscript{125} In 1960, average Sunday School attendance was over 400.\textsuperscript{126} The growth in the church was

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[121]{E.g. ibid., \textsection 27.}
\footnotetext[122]{JM, \textsection 120.}
\footnotetext[123]{No Anglican informant had any contacts with CE, and none had any substantial contact with Keswick in New Zealand. That may or may not be an illustration of the tendency of non-Anglican ("non-conformist") Protestants to share attitudes and relationships from which Anglicans were often excluded: Lineham, "A Church on Every Corner - The Origins and Effect of Nonconformity in New Zealand," \textit{Otaki Historical Society Historical Journal}. 4 (1981): 9-20 (9); but, contrary to the suggestion that Anglicans held - or were held - aloof, Anglicans were fully involved in the CSSM-Scripture Union-Crusaders-IVF network. While the Keswick convention at Pounawea became a favourite gathering place for evangelical Presbyterians in Otago, no equivalent tradition developed among Christchurch evangelical Anglicans. They formed their own networks such as ECF, NZCMS and the League of Youth. Anglican evangelicals did, however, use the Keswick hymnbook and often read reports of Keswick in the UK (note WM, \textsection 43: "It was big factor in reading. The Keswick Year Book, we all read it"). Orange was a notable exception: he enthusiastically attended the Keswick Convention in England and spoke at several Keswick Conventions in New Zealand, including those in Wellington, Palmerston North and Christchurch (diary entries: 18 April 1938, 15-17 July 1938.}
\footnotetext[124]{JM, \textsection 120.}
\footnotetext[125]{Lancaster: 30.}
\footnotetext[126]{\textit{Year Book for the Diocesan Year}, 1960.}
\end{footnotes}
attributable, in part, to new housing in the Hoon Hay area, but it also reflected the vigour of Thompson's ministry and the distinctive appeal of his evangelical emphases. There was also the effect of the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade, from which Thompson estimated there were “50 or 60 converts”, though some of those would already have been in the parish. Under Thompson, the church had gained “its own very distinctive evangelical flavour – a flavour which attracted people from throughout the city”. It was difficult – for Thompson admirers at least – to separate the growth of the church from the effectiveness of its evangelical ministry.

A new church building (financed by direct giving) was opened at Spreydon in 1959, with an opening day congregation of 1,000. A daughter church (St. Andrew’s) was begun at Hoon Hay, with ministry there provided there (from 1959) by retired CIM Home Director Harry Funnell, who was very energetic in both teaching and visiting. As a consequence of the solid growth, the Spreydon-Hoon Hay “Parochial District” graduated to the status of a “Parish”, giving it the right to be directly involved in the selection of a new minister. When Thompson left, the four local (lay) nominators were thus able to ensure an evangelical succession.

As with Orange, however, Thompson’s most significant legacy was in the very large number of young people he helped to shape. At least thirty persons who spent time

---

127 For the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade in New Zealand, see especially Gilling, “Retelling the Old, Old Story”: 240-95.
128 RT, ¶159. For the crusade in general, see e.g. Gilling, “Retelling the old, old story”: 240-95.
129 Lancaster: 21.
130 E.g. “For many, St. Martin’s Church and Roger Thompson are the same thing”: ibid., 28; also 41.
131 400 of those were inside and 600 outside.
133 There were also four nominators appointed by the diocese, but the role of the local laity was crucial. Evangelicals believed it was the “unstated policy of the Diocese not to allow a theological succession where there had been an evangelical ministry...They would appoint an Anglo-Catholic to succeed an Evangelical”, or a liberal, where “they could get away with it”, and such a change was most likely to occur where it was considered “unspiritual” to manage elections: WM, ¶16.
in Thompson’s BC later became Anglican ministers – by one reckoning, thirty-eight.\textsuperscript{134} Three of those became bishops. In many cases they also became missionaries. Such ministers included\textsuperscript{135} Bruce Beattie, Maurice Betteridge (later Principal of Ridley College, Melbourne),\textsuperscript{136} Jan Bourne (a ministry student from Wellington),\textsuperscript{137} Colin Clark, Gerald Clark,\textsuperscript{138} Bernard Cox,\textsuperscript{139} Peter Edridge, Bill Gaudin,\textsuperscript{140} Robert Glen (later with CMS in East Africa),\textsuperscript{141} John Greenslade (later with CMS in Pakistan), Fred Greig, Graham Lamont, Gordon Langrell,\textsuperscript{142} Wallace Marriott (later with OMF in South East Asia), John Meadowcroft (later with CMS in Pakistan),\textsuperscript{143} Ian McLellan, Keith Mitchell (later with NZCMS in Pakistan),\textsuperscript{144} Ian Nelson, Henry Paltridge (later with CMS in East Africa, and a bishop), Lester Pfankuch,\textsuperscript{145} David Pickering,\textsuperscript{146} George Spargo,\textsuperscript{147} Ron Taylor (later with CMS in Tanzania),\textsuperscript{148} Colin Tonks, Dick Tripp, Laurie Wards,\textsuperscript{149} and – much later again – Cushla McMillan (nee Brereton)\textsuperscript{150} and Patricia Allan (nee Robinson).\textsuperscript{151} In some cases, their involvement with Thompson was very substantial; in other cases, the future ministers still had associations with another parish, or were only involved at St. Martin’s while studying in Christchurch; in some cases, they were also Orange Pips and had earlier been involved with St. James’. In some cases they were ordained with Thompson’s

\textsuperscript{134} John Meadowcroft, “Roger Thompson: An Appreciation”: 9.
\textsuperscript{135} List drawn up from information provided by several informants, plus St. Martin’s BC Reunion Booklet: 20.
\textsuperscript{136} In BC: 1946-48.
\textsuperscript{137} In BC: 1951-5.
\textsuperscript{138} In BC: 1949-56; with NZCMS, 1958-67. Clark was a teacher, and was ordained in Tanganyika. After his return to New Zealand he would become Principal of Samuel Marsden College, Wellington.
\textsuperscript{139} In BC, 1949-54.
\textsuperscript{140} In BC, 1949-59.
\textsuperscript{141} In BC: 1947-51; with CMS, 1960-73.
\textsuperscript{142} In BC: 1960-1. Langrell spent some years with CMS in Singapore.
\textsuperscript{143} In BC, 1949-52. In Pakistan, 1957-75.
\textsuperscript{144} In BC: 1948-54.
\textsuperscript{145} In BC: 1946-51.
\textsuperscript{146} In BC: 1956-8.
\textsuperscript{147} RT, ¶320, ¶368. Don Williams – younger brother of Basil – was not in the Bible Class, but Thompson saw him as “a convert”: ibid.
\textsuperscript{148} In BC: 1949-56. Taylor also became General Secretary of the Board of Mission.
\textsuperscript{149} In BC: 1955.
\textsuperscript{150} In BC, 1959. After a career in teaching, she was ordained in 1985.
\textsuperscript{151} In BC, 1951-61. She was ordained in 1987.
influence still very recent in their lives; in other cases, more formative influences and experiences had intervened. But, by any measure, such a list indicates the considerable significance of Thompson in modelling an evangelical style of ministry – and in reinforcing the impact of Orange.

Apart from many of the ministers already mentioned, there were also numerous others in Thompson’s BC who became missionaries. Excluding spouses who came from elsewhere, the total number of missionaries who passed through Thompson’s BC amounts to about thirty-five.

Many others in the BC entered a variety of professions and became leading lay people in various Anglican parishes. Others became active in other denominations. Among those in the BC who were not ordained, it appears that a considerable proportion became teachers and nurses; a minority became doctors or tertiary educators.

Another long-term consequence of Thompson’s ministry at Spreydon was the number of marriages that occurred between evangelical young people associated

---

152 These included Edna Brooker (with CMS in Northern Australia), Ronalda Connor (with OMF in Malaysia), Ian Foster (with NZCMS in East Africa), Allison Moore (East Africa), Phillipa Reaney (Northern Australia), Wallace Searle (with AEM in Bolivia and Peru), Elaine Smith (East Africa), Elizabeth Smith (Malaysia and Singapore), Catherine Sellman (East Africa) and Anne Scott (with OMF in Taiwan).


154 These included Noelene Adcock, Allan Bean, Susan Bent, Graham Bisphan, Runa Brandon, Cushla Brereton, Melva Brooker, Laurie Burrows, Anthony Carrell, Robin Carrell, Jeanette Ede, Sally Hodgson, Mabel Pate, Jenny Penny, Murray Pickering (later a lecturer in the London School of Economics), John Pilbrow (later appointed to a chair in Physics in Melbourne), Caroline Porteous, Anne Probert, Graeme Robinson, Graham Seton, Pamela Scott, Margaret Webster, Derrick White, Tony Williams, and Brian Vincent.

155 E.g. Muriel Falcon became a Salvation Army officer, and David and Jill Powell (nee Morrison) and Denis and Helen Millson (nee Hobern) became Baptists.

156 1992 BC Reunion Booklet: 4-17.
with St. Martin’s." Many in Thompson’s BC married Anglican ministers. Others in the BC married ministers of other denominations.

The Significance of Roger Thompson

Although Thompson was not a pioneer like Orange, his ministry could be argued to have had an almost comparable impact. Of all the Orange Pips’ local parish ministries in New Zealand, Thompson’s ministry at Spreydon appears to be the one that had the greatest effect. Its impact was greatly magnified through it being a ministry that attracted many university students and ordinands. Many of Thompson’s protégés, however, would not model their ministry quite so closely on Thompson as had the Orange Pips on Orange. The 1960s and 1970s would bring considerable societal change, and the outlook of evangelicals would also undergo some shifts. Some of his protégés would consciously develop a style of ministry that was less defensive. But there is no denying that Thompson’s influence was considerable, not least in his energetic continuation of Orange’s emphases on biblical exposition and work among young people. His role in the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship was also of critical importance.

E The Ministry of Harry Thomson at St. John’s, Woolston, 1950-61

Another popular evangelical ministry, parallel to that of Roger Thompson at

---

157 E.g. David Powell married Jill Morrison, David Bremner married Pamela Scott.
158 E.g. Margaret Bruhn (who married Ian Bourne), May Bruhn (who married Brian Carrell), Marie Bruhn (who married Dale Oldham), Helen Fountain (who married Chris Parry-Jennings), Gaenor Hoyle (who married Allen Quee), Barbara Kerr (who married Ron Taylor), Janet Mapp (who married George Spargo), Monica Morris (who married John Meadowcroft), Jackie Phillips (who married Colin Tonks), Rose Prendergast (who married Wallace Marriott), Noelene Sandford (who married Gerald Clark), and Patricia Robinson (who married Peter Allan).
159 E.g. Wendy Stokes and Ronalda Connor.
160 As observed by Marriott: WM, ¶83.
161 The ECF is discussed below.
Spreydon, was the ministry at St. John's Woolston of Harry Thomson, another Orange Pip. Thomson's ministry in Woolston began in part through the strenuous efforts of local nominator and foundry owner, L.R. (Les) Burgess. A very committed layman with a strong belief in Scripture, Burgess had been a member of Orange's Sunday afternoon Bible Class at Sumner; his daughter recalled his "enormous excitement" when it became clear that it would be possible to have Thomson as minister in the Woolston parish.

A Comparison of the Ministries of Thomson and Thompson

Both Roger Thompson and Harry Thomson had been Orange's curates at Sumner, and both closely copied his methods of ministry: the two Pips "stood shoulder to shoulder", very similar in emphasis and conviction. Both had gained further experience as vicars of country parishes. Both had moved to working-class suburbs. Like his counterpart in Spreydon, Thomson was an activist, a man of "great energy and huge enthusiasm." He was passionate about youth ministry and evangelism, and was likewise an ardent biblical expositor. He held similar beliefs about direct giving and about Bible teaching being more effective in holding youth than socials. Thomson immediately closed down the dances and Sunday afternoon tennis club, and, in close emulation of Orange, began a 4 p.m. Bible Class in which he directly taught through successive scriptural books. As with Thompson, the Scriptures were the "keystone" of Harry Thomson's spirituality and ministry. Like Thompson, Thomson was very active in prayer meetings. As with Thompson, the evening service was followed by a lively supper at the vicarage, and the vicarage

---

163 Rosemary R. Troughton, interview, 20 April 2006 (hereafter RRT), ¶1, 5.
164 MB, ¶75.
165 JG, ¶53.
167 RRT, ¶10,8.
168 Ibid., ¶11. Thomson probably used notes he had taken while in Orange's Sumner BC: ibid.
169 "Tribute from Kevin O'Sullivan (former Chairman NZCMS):" ibid.
170 RRT, ¶8. At Woolston, the main parish prayer meeting was on Saturday night.
became the centre of many young people's lives.\textsuperscript{171} As with Thompson, Thomson’s wife was highly committed to the parish’s ministry: Gabriel Thomson – a descendant of pioneer CMS missionary Richard Taylor, and previously very active in CSSM, Crusaders and EU – was a woman of vibrant personality and spiritual depth, and gave strong support to Thomson’s ministry.\textsuperscript{172} Like Thompson, Thomson “transformed” a parish: Woolston had previously been a conventional parish under a middle of the road ministry.\textsuperscript{173} Within a few years, Thomson had “resurrected the parish, and raised a very spiritually-minded, solid congregation”.\textsuperscript{174} Thomson likewise had a profound impact on some young people (e.g. Tony Andrews, later Dean of Cairo Cathedral).\textsuperscript{175} As with Thompson, Thomson gained a loyal following among some leading layman, especially Burgess, whose people skills and practical wisdom helped make Thomson’s ministry effective.

Spreydon and Woolston became two of the most vigorous parishes in the diocese.\textsuperscript{176} In neither case was the growth explicable in terms of demographics: both areas were long established.\textsuperscript{177} As with Thompson, Thomson’s period of ministry saw the building of new church buildings. Like Thompson, Thomson felt somewhat cold-shouldered by other Anglican clergy, and his parish ministry under-valued by the Diocese; passed over for diocesan responsibilities, he was happy to devote his energies to local ministry, and to avoid engaging with the Synod.\textsuperscript{178}

\textsuperscript{171} RRT, \textsuperscript{12}.
\textsuperscript{172} [Harry Thomson], “Edith Gabriel Thomson, A Brief Memoir,” n.d. [1971], in misc. papers relating to Harry Thomson, in possession of Dr. Andrew Bayley.
\textsuperscript{173} RRT, \textsuperscript{4}-\textsuperscript{5}. The previous vicar was Rev. Harold Norris.
\textsuperscript{174} RMG, \textsuperscript{80}.
\textsuperscript{175} Tribute from Les Burgess, CMS News.
\textsuperscript{176} RRT, \textsuperscript{22-23}.
\textsuperscript{177} In the case of the Spreydon parish, though, there was major new housing development at Hoon Hay.
\textsuperscript{178} RRT, \textsuperscript{13}.
Some Distinctives of Harry Thomson’s Evangelical Ministry

But there were some distinctives in Thomson’s ministry. Harry Thomson was exceptionally gifted in children’s work, and came to Woolston directly from several years service as a staff worker for CSSM and Scripture Union.179 At Woolston, Thomson personally led the Sunday School, trained teachers and every week taught several classes of Bible in Schools.180 He held a children’s mission and recruited large numbers of local children for Sunday School. Through the children he drew their parents to church, and captivated the parents with his children’s talks.181 By 1960, Thomson’s Sunday School had an average attendance of over 300.182 Despite its local impact, however, Thomson’s ministry never developed a comparable ministry among university and theological students: it was St.Martin’s that had became the favoured place for students to gather, not St. John’s. Also, Harry Thomson had a dual focus: apart from the parish, he had a consuming zeal for overseas missionary work through the New Zealand CMS.

In personality, Thomson was “warm, human, bouncy, charming”.183 He was an “infectious enthusiast”, someone “enormously...engaging”.184 He had ready rapport, a generous disposition, and a lively sense of humour. With his “great sense of joy and fun,” Thomson’s presence at an event was a drawcard.185 “Harry Thomson was ... radiant. He had a big mouth that would smile from ear to ear, and it was a great joy to meet him, and you felt a great sense of uplift as a result of his enthusiasm about the Word of God and the preaching of the Gospel.”186

179 1946-50.
180 RRT, ¶6.
181 Ibid., ¶7-8. The children’s missioner was Steve Clark from CSSM.
182 Year Book for the Diocesan Year: 1960. The Spreydon-Hoon Hay average attendance in that year was higher, at 406, but that parish had two separate churches and Sunday Schools, St. Martin’s and St. Andrew’s.
183 RMG, ¶80. Glen, another Orange Pip, became Thomson’s curate in 1958
184 ‘Tribute from Kevin O’Sullivan...’; ibid.; ‘Tribute from Vera Mott (Personal Secretary for 16 years),’ ibid; RRT, ¶2.
185 RRT, ¶19.
186 RT, ¶383.
As with most others of his generation who had come up through EU, Thomson closely maintained his devotional life. He was perceived as a “man of prayer.”\textsuperscript{187} Thomson’s evangelistic zeal and spiritual intensity, however, made some people uncomfortable.\textsuperscript{188}

F \textit{The CMS and Evangelical Expansion within New Zealand}

Concurrent with his work in St. John’s parish, Harry Thomson developed a remarkable leadership role within NZCMS, a role that had significant effect on the expansion of evangelicalism in New Zealand. Late in 1947 Thomson became Chairman of the Christchurch Committee of CMS.\textsuperscript{189} He at once organised a Spring School for the following August: Orange gave the Bible Studies, there were several missionary speakers, over a hundred people attended, and eight of them offered for missionary service.\textsuperscript{190} Thomson’s dedication and energy in promoting missionary work became apparent. In 1953 he became Honorary Clerical Secretary, and from 1954 he became CMS General Secretary\textsuperscript{191} while still vicar of Woolston. With Vera Mott as his secretary,\textsuperscript{192} Thompson worked for CMS from offices built in the St. John’s grounds. In 1961 he resigned as vicar and went full-time with CMS.\textsuperscript{193} Thomson has been widely credited with reviving the New Zealand CMS.\textsuperscript{194}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{Mott} Mott to Andrew Bayley, 2 June 2003, in Thomson papers.
\bibitem{Thomson} “Harry Thomson was such an earnest, zealous evangelist, and had a love for the Lord that sometimes was embarrassing”: name suppressed.
\bibitem{Mott2} Ibid. The missionary speakers included Graham Delbridge (Australia), Selby Spence (Karachi), Marion Laugeson (Karachi) and Violet Bargrave (China). The venue was St. Margaret’s College and St. Mary’s, Merivale.
\bibitem{Mott1} He served in that capacity until retiring in 1971.
\bibitem{Mott3} From 1955, Mott had been raised in the Sumner Parish, under Orange, and as a curate there Thomson had prepared her for confirmation.
\bibitem{Mott4} At that point the CMS office was shifted to Wairakei Rd.
\bibitem{Egerton} E.g. RMG, ¶35; JG, ¶53: “Harry wrested it [the CMS] back for the evangelicals.”
\end{thebibliography}
transforming it theologically and rejuvenating it organisationally.195 Under Thomson’s hand, NZCMS flourished from about 1955, and at the peak of his leadership he was responsible for eighty-three New Zealand missionaries.196

Thomson’s impact overseas, through that work, is beyond the scope of this study. But, through his CMS role he had a significant indirect impact on the New Zealand church. Whereas NZCMS had previously had a “liberal evangelical” flavour,197 Thomson closely linked the NZCMS with the new evangelical movement that had arisen from the ministry of Orange. A high proportion of the new generation of NZCMS missionaries initially came from the Bible Classes of Orange, Thompson and Thomson.

The Contribution of the Spring Schools to NZ Evangelicalism

A key strategy of Thomson’s was the CMS Spring School, held every second year. Typical elements of the event included inspirational missionary talks, prayer for missionaries and challenges to missionary involvement.198 Thomson saw no need to limit the missionary speakers to CMS, or to Anglicans: he was happy to invite speakers from CIM, for instance, presumably believing that anyone who could inspire a passion for missionary work would assist the CMS.199

While Thomson’s primary focus in CMS was overseas mission in the classical evangelical missionary tradition, he appears to have been keenly aware of CMS’s potential to foster evangelicalism within the Anglican Church generally. At Spring

195 Apart from his obvious spiritual and missionary passions, Thomson had a meticulous attention to detail, was very pastoral towards missionaries and their families, and enlisted the help of several key Christian businessmen including Don Laugeson (motor industry) and Ron Mauger (builder).
196 Mott to Bayley, 2 June 2003.
197 RMG, 335. Note the influence of the theological split in the CMS in Britain, q.v. Bebbington: 218.
198 Gregory: 134.
199 In 1952, for instance, the missionary speakers included CIM’s Norman McIntosh, ibid.: 135. Nevertheless, the majority of speakers would always be Anglican.
Schools Thomson was careful to have biblical exposition modelled. He was mindful of those Anglicans who were willing to come to a CMS gathering but who might have avoided an explicitly “evangelical” context such as an ECF conference. Those attending Spring Schools heard Orange, Orange Pips, and a range of overseas evangelical speakers.

Through the NZCMS Thomson helped spread evangelicalism to other Anglican dioceses. The Spring Schools were a critical factor (among others) in Orange-style evangelicalism steadily gaining greater influence in Nelson, Wellington and beyond. There was a discernible relationship between support for CMS and the growth of evangelicalism. The converse also held: in a diocese such as Auckland, where Bishop Simkin would not allow the CMS to operate officially, Anglican post-war evangelicalism was a relatively late starter.

G The League of Youth and Evangelical Expansion

Another important (and related) strategy of Harry Thomson was the CMS League of Youth, which began in 1948. The idea had come from Graham Delbridge, a CMS missionary from Australia who was at the 1948 Spring School. With his background in CSSM, Crusaders and EU, it was not surprising that Thomson promoted a youth movement. The League of Youth was unequivocally evangelical in character, with a strong note not only of missionary support, prayer and recruitment, but also of Christian conversion, discipleship and local evangelism. The League was aimed at those from mid-teens through to the age of thirty. Leadership was by

---

200 RMG, ¶9.  
201 VM, ¶18. BRC, ¶65, ¶69-70.  
202 Gregory: 134.  
203 There already existed an after-school Young People’s Union for children, run by staff member Miss Davis: VM, ¶19.
young adults. The main activity at League of Youth meetings was Bible study. The League also ran weekend “house parties,” and would send “flying squads” out to parishes to run special Saturday events.

While the purpose of the League of Youth was to encourage missionary interest, prayer, and recruitment – in which aims it was conspicuously successful – it was to become a key instrument in strengthening and promoting evangelicalism among the next generation of Anglicans. For some young Anglicans – especially those who were not in EU – the League of Youth was to be the single greatest factor in their forming an evangelical identity. That identity transcended parish boundaries. The League of Youth would soon become a vibrant new city-wide fellowship of young evangelical Anglicans. For some years, the League of Youth’s members were mainly drawn from Thompson’s and Thomson’s own BCs. But, as other Anglican parishes around Christchurch became more evangelical – sometimes as a result of their youth going to League of Youth meetings – the movement steadily extended its reach.

Evangelical Cross-Fertilisation

The burgeoning of the League of Youth and the revitalisation of NZCMS did not occur simply as isolated developments within Anglicanism, but were part of a wider groundswell largely fostered by the new trans-denominational youth organisations. The official NZCMS history confirmed that evangelical inter-connectedness, when it noted - in relation to this period – that “NZCMS has drawn its recruits mainly from those active in the SU, Crusaders, IVF and NCF, and...the League of Youth.”

---

204 The first President was John Meadowcroft and the first Secretary was Vera Mott; another early leader was Cliff Pearce: VM, ¶18.
205 VM, ¶18.
206 Ibid.
207 E.g. Rev. Dale Oldham, interview, 24 April 2003 (hereafter DO), ¶42.
208 Mott to Bayley, 2 June 2003.
209 Gregory: 143.
The League of Youth Spreads North and South

The League of Youth also became active in the Nelson diocese, with branches in both Nelson and Blenheim. From Nelson, the League spread in 1956 to the Wellington diocese, with Wal Marriott visiting Wellington to help get the movement started there. In the same year, a League of Youth was founded in Dunedin. The spread of the League of Youth was indicative of an evangelical movement that – now involving a further generation – was beginning to expand beyond Christchurch, where Orange’s ministry had been the key historic catalyst.

H Evangelical Anglicanism Strengthens in Nelson, 1945-55

In the post-war era, under Bishop Stephenson, the evangelical identity and vitality of Nelson Anglicanism steadily strengthened. In part, the change in the Diocese of Nelson reflected a changing make-up of clergy.

Australian Evangelicals

There were several new imports from the Diocese of Sydney, all graduates of Moore College. Such Australians did not always stay long, and once established in ministry they often returned to their own country. It is clear that there was an understanding that Moore would recommend to Nelson some of its students who – perhaps because

---

210 Gregory notes that it began in Nelson in 1951, through Rev. Hugh Thomson: Gregory, 135; Thomson, an Orange Pip, was a curate at the Cathedral in Nelson from 1948-52. Thomson then left for East Africa. When John Hewlett (curate at All Saints’ from 1955-8) arrived in Nelson the local branch was not active. He and Wallace Marriott (curate at the Cathedral) put much energy into helping the League become vigorous: Rev. John Hewlett, interview, 9 April 2003 (hereafter JH), ¶30.

211 The Blenheim branch was based at the Church of the Nativity, where Paul Kirkham was vicar.

212 Ian Grant Bourne, “A life observed”, typescript, n.d.: 109. Marriott was a curate at the Cathedral in Nelson, and heavily involved with the Nelson branch of the League of Youth. The key church base in Wellington was St. James’, Lower Hutt.

213 Gregory: 210. A Dunedin CMS Committee was formed in the same year.

they did not have a degree – were thought to be less suitable for ordination within the Sydney diocese.  

**English Evangelicals**

Stephenson also brought out several committed evangelicals from England. One of these was Kenneth Gregory, an ex-British Army officer with a robust evangelistic style. Gregory arrived in 1948, and for some years was the Diocesan Evangelist. He ran both youth camps and his subsequent parishes with a somewhat military style. He would later be a key figure in revitalising St. Matthew’s in Dunedin. Other English evangelicals coming to Nelson included James Dyer and George Hull (both 1950). In the same year Stephenson brought out Eric Gowing, an Australian from Sydney who had trained and ministered in England, to serve as his dean. Gowing was later Bishop of Auckland; his churchmanship was broad but he had definite evangelical sympathies.

**A Wave of Orange Pips Enter the Ministry in Nelson**

More significantly, perhaps, there were a number of Orange Pips who came to be ministers in Nelson, following the precedent established by Bob Nicholson in 1938. These included Hugh Thomson (1948), Bob Hughes (1949), Bruce Beattie (1948), Maurice Betteridge (1951) and Wallace Marriott (1954). It is very likely that Orange and other Pips encouraged some of them to seek ordination in Nelson and commended them to Stephenson: Orange would have realised there was a limit to the number of Pips that the Bishop of Christchurch might be willing to accept. Some Christchurch evangelicals believed that Bishop Warren (1951-66) was less accepting of their position than his predecessor West-Watson (1926-1951): the older Pips had been ordained in Christchurch in significant numbers, but in Warren’s time evangelicals felt the situation

---

215 T.C. Hammond to P.W. Stephenson, 22 Feb. 1950, Former Clerical Employees, Box 5, Archives, Anglican Centre, Nelson; Marcus Loane to Stephenson, April 17 1953, ibid.
216 JM, ¶130.
217 F, ¶28; Anon., ¶255.
had changed. When evangelicals were declined for ordination training, they tended to interpret it on theological grounds.  

Nelson Ordinands

Also, a number of men from the Nelson Diocese itself entered the ministry. Most of them had done university study or theological training in Christchurch, and almost all of them were strongly influenced by the Evangelical Union, Orange and Thompson. Some of them had already been mentored in the Nelson setting by Orange Pips. These included Bill Wilkens (1948), John Ford (1949) and John Meadowcroft (1951).

Ordination without Theological College

Stephenson was happy to accept into ministry those who had trained at College House, whether Orange Pips or local ordinands, and those New Zealanders who wished to go over and train at Moore. One such New Zealander ordained after training at Moore in this period was Wallace Marriott (ordained 1954). Stephenson was also willing to ordain evangelical university graduates who never attended any theological college, but who were studying extramurally: Maurice Betteridge and John Meadowcroft, both earlier under the influence of Orange in Christchurch, were ordained after studying for a Licentiate in Theology while working in Nelson. Such extramural studies remained generally liberal in content and emphasis. Betteridge

218 WM, ¶23.
219 Marriott made the initial approach to Nelson, on the encouragement of Andy Pinwill (himself a candidate with Nelson) and their vicar Carl Tanner. Marriott was initially accepted in 1948 as a candidate for ordination by Vicar General Donald Haultain, as Stephenson was at that time travelling to the UK for the Lambeth Conference: Wallace Marriott, e-mail, 19 Jan. 2006.
220 Meadowcroft: “I did not think College House had an awful lot to offer...I did not deliberately avoid it, but I was glad I did not have to go”: JM, ¶68.
221 Ibid.: he noted a “fairly strong” liberal bias, but “I was conditioned against that”. “You had to reproduce what was expected of you.” “You had your textbook, and you had to learn from it.” JM, ¶69. The examining body was the NZ Anglican Board of Theological Studies.
felt his lack of attendance at any theological college accented Orange’s effect on him: “I never went to a theological college, and the only pattern I had was Pekoe.”

The Nelson Clergy in 1950

A tentative analysis of the 1950 clergy list for the Diocese of Nelson suggests that at least ten of the thirty-two registered ministers had trained at Moore College. Six of the ministers were Orange Pips who had come up from Christchurch. Seven were from England: four of those could be categorised as Low Church and three as clear-cut Evangelicals. Two could be described as local Evangelicals (but both influenced by the Christchurch movement), and the rest were New Zealanders who appeared to be not particularly evangelical.

Several of the younger evangelical ministers – especially those influenced by Orange – were at the forefront of introducing new evangelical emphases and initiatives, such as the very evangelistic diocesan youth camps, the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship and (a few years later) the League of Youth. Together, they helped generate in Nelson a growing wave of evangelical and evangelistic confidence.

Meanwhile older evangelical Australian ministers had continued to work in key parishes. Probably the most influential of all these was Archdeacon Kimberley at All Saints’ in Nelson (1939-49). Kimberley was very Low Church, and his manner was stern. His theology was conservative, with a strong emphasis on the Scriptures. His preaching was solid: one young hearer felt that Kimberley, in contrast to the “milk and

---

222 MB, §30. Betteridge’s claim was not entirely accurate: in the late 1950s he studied for an M.Th. at Union Seminary in New York, and later again (1979-92) he was Principal of Ridley College in Melbourne.

223 This derives from an examination of the background of the clergy, and from assessments made by Canon Bill Wilkens and the Venerable John Ford et al.


225 Published clergy records usually record the place of training, but not always.
Kimberley had a succession of young evangelical curates and his parish had a large and active Bible Class, the largest in the Nelson area. All Saints' was the seedbed for a significant number of future ministers, including Charles Haskell, Herbie Rowe, John and Rex Ford, John Meadowcroft and Owen Kimberley.

Any survey of Evangelicals in the Diocese of Nelson must also acknowledge the ongoing strength of lay evangelicalism in that diocese, often expressed in youth and children’s work, evangelism and church leadership. Key evangelical laity in this period included such figures as W. Girling, Mayor of Blenheim, his son Russell, and Frank Bythell.

However, despite the swelling of evangelical numbers among the Nelson clergy in the first ten years after World War II, as a result of both the increased Sydney connection and the new Christchurch influence, the Diocese of Nelson was not yet overtly or overwhelmingly evangelical. The high point of evangelical awareness and vitality was still to come.

The Evangelicalisation of Students from Nelson

A striking new trend, post-war, was for Nelson ordinands and other Nelson people to be influenced towards a definite evangelical identity through the example of Orange Pips who had gone up to Nelson, or through the Orange Pips’ influence when the Nelson people were studying in Christchurch. There are numerous examples of this process taking place.

---

226 JM, ¶17. The Cathedral parish in Nelson characteristically had a significantly less low church approach and less evangelical theology than the diocese as a whole, and was more in step with the conventional, middle of the road Anglicanism found elsewhere in New Zealand. As a boarder at Nelson College, Meadowcroft often heard sermons at the Cathedral.

227 WW, ¶11.

228 WW, ¶10.
Bill Wilkens, like most of the Nelson students and ordinands who went down to Christchurch, became involved with the Evangelical Union and with associates of Orange. Wilkens, and others from the Diocese of Nelson, seemed to feel a natural affinity with both EU and the Orange group. Wilkens also became heavily involved in Thompson’s parish, St. Martin’s.229

John Meadowcroft, from All Saints’ in Nelson, went down to university in Christchurch in 1946. Bob Nicholson, curate at All Saints’, had told Meadowcroft that there were two student Christian groups, and that he would be more at home in the EU.230 This was when Meadowcroft first became aware of the term “evangelical”.231 Meadowcroft went to EU, often heard Orange at EU and at Tyndale House, and was strongly mentored by Orange Pips such as Maurice Betteridge.232 At College House (where he was boarding), there were several Orange Pips, including Pinwill, Beattie, Hughes, and Hugh Thompson.233 Meadowcroft adopted a clear evangelical identity.

John Ford, from the same parish, went down to study theology at College House. Bob Hughes, an Orange Pip who was Stipendiary Lay Reader at All Saints’, had already been talking to him about being evangelical.234 In Christchurch, Ford observed the contrasting theological streams. He was influenced by Lester Pfankuch, an Orange Pip with whom he shared a study, and he sometimes heard Orange speak.235 Hughes took him to meet Orange for a private interview.236 Ford’s study of the 39 Articles, especially their teaching on the sufficiency of Scripture, helped shape

229 WW, ¶15-18. As it happened, Wilken’s sense of being an evangelical was sharpened not so much by EU as by Rev. George Jackson, an evangelical Congregational minister whom Wilkens met while on holiday at Anakiwa.
230 JM, ¶24.
231 JM, ¶41-42.
232 JM, ¶24.
233 JM, ¶26.
234 JF, ¶15.
235 JF, ¶29.
236 “The questions he asked me had no significance to me [yet]. I did not really know what they were talking about: theology, and which school I belonged to”: JF, ¶15.
his outlook.\textsuperscript{237} Pfankuch got him reading Bishop Ryle and Griffith Thomas.\textsuperscript{238} Ford was thus drawn into the evangelical network, and once in ministry he attended CMS Spring Schools and conferences of the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship, and read the \textit{Evangelical Quarterly}, John Stott and “anybody else recommended by the evangelicals.”\textsuperscript{239} Among other clergy he identified himself as “evangelical”,\textsuperscript{240} but was never “rabidly” so.\textsuperscript{241} He saw the essence of being an evangelical as “sticking to the Bible.”\textsuperscript{242} Ford had no links with the Evangelical Union,\textsuperscript{243} which in so many other cases had a decisive role in defining and cementing an evangelical outlook; but Ford’s experience illustrates that there were other ways for an evangelical identity to take shape. But it was nevertheless EU graduates who were mentoring him.

Two more examples highlight the process of young Anglicans from the Nelson diocese being recruited for evangelicalism, or confirmed in it. Rose Prendergast, from Reefton, had been under the ministry of evangelical ministers such as Vernon Leaning and Bernard Machell. When she came over to Canterbury in 1951 to attend university, Machell arranged for her to stay with Roger and Reena Thompson, and thus she joined both St. Martin’s and the Evangelical Union. “From there”, she recalled, “I never looked back”.\textsuperscript{244} She later married an evangelical minister.\textsuperscript{245}

John Greenslade, arriving in Christchurch in 1953 from Greymouth, had come from a non-church family and from a parish with a non-evangelical vicar.\textsuperscript{246} But Greenslade had gone to several summer Youth Camps run by the diocese, and in 1950 had had a

\textsuperscript{237} JF, ¶29.
\textsuperscript{238} JF, ¶30.
\textsuperscript{239} JF, ¶36, 29-30.
\textsuperscript{240} JF, ¶33.
\textsuperscript{241} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{242} JF, ¶30. As the years passed, Ford “became more liberal in interpreting [the Bible], as I mixed more and read more.”
\textsuperscript{243} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{244} WM, ¶56.
\textsuperscript{245} Wallace Marriott.
\textsuperscript{246} The Diocese placed with the vicar concerned (Keith Aubrey) a succession of evangelical Stipendiary Lay Readers, including John Meadowcroft: JM, ¶66.
conversion experience at a camp under the ministry of Ken Gregory.\textsuperscript{247} When Greenslade arrived in Christchurch he was drawn into the Evangelical Union, both at teachers' college and at university, and found it a “powerful” movement. He formed many friends within EU.\textsuperscript{248} He also became part of St. Martin's Spreydon under Roger Thompson. St. Martin's was a “very significant close-knit fellowship – a very strong place for nurturing young people in the evangelical faith.” In both contexts, he commonly heard the word “evangelical” and took that identity as his own.\textsuperscript{249} St. Martin’s and the Evangelical Union were part of a package: both contexts made young people evangelical, or made them more firmly so.

**Nelson and Christchurch Evangelical Anglicans Compared**

From the 1940s on, the Low Church and quasi-evangelical Anglicanism of Nelson was being increasingly influenced by the more overt evangelical Anglicanism in Christchurch. But there remained subtle underlying differences. The Nelson style was Low Church; the Christchurch movement was much less so. Nelson evangelical Anglicanism had robust and manifold links with the Diocese of Sydney; the Christchurch group had few direct links. Nelson evangelicalism was isolated, uncontested and thus not very self-aware; the Christchurch Evangelicals were very conscious of being a minority stream: “The Evangelicals here [in Christchurch] had to know what they stood for, and were perhaps a bit more vocal about their beliefs, because they had to stand alone against all the liberals and High Church [elements]”.\textsuperscript{250} The Evangelicals in Nelson enjoyed the kindly patronage of unequivocally evangelical bishops; the Evangelicals in Christchurch always trod circumspectly, anxious about how their non-evangelical bishops might regard them. Many of the Nelson evangelical ministers did not have degrees; typically, the Christchurch evangelical ministers were graduates, and their more academic

\textsuperscript{247} JG, ¶7.  
\textsuperscript{248} JG, ¶10.  
\textsuperscript{249} Ibid., ¶14.  
\textsuperscript{250} JF, ¶48.
approach often reflected their university and EU background. The Nelson setting received evangelical ministers from elsewhere; the Christchurch setting produced them. The Nelson movement reflected the tempo and family atmosphere of a small provincial centre and predominantly rural hinterland, where good relationships were paramount; the Christchurch movement was based on one of New Zealand's largest cities, where more debate and choice were possible.

As more Orange Pips came up to Nelson, and as more of the younger Nelson ministers became influenced by the Christchurch movement, a significant degree of convergence was beginning to take place. The newsletters and personal contacts of the Evangelical Churchmen's Fellowship, and of the revitalised CMS, would contribute to that convergence.

I Evangelical Anglicanism in Wellington, 1945-55

W.F. Bretton

A key figure in the growth of evangelical Anglicanism in Wellington was the Rev. W.F. (Bill) Bretton, an evangelical from England. With a Cambridge MA and experience in four English parishes, Bretton emigrated to New Zealand in 1946. A former Rowing Blue and athlete, he was an imposing, colourful figure and highly personable. His first New Zealand parish was Johnsonville (1946-1950), which grew under his ministry. But Bretton's most significant ministry was at St. James', Lower Hutt (1950-6). The parish's active parishioners included Walter Nash, the "grand old man" of New Zealand politics who would shortly become Prime Minister. For

252 Bourne: 117; IGB, ¶29. This was also a period in which Johnsonville was experiencing significant growth as a suburb.
some time St. James' had been in the doldrums. Forthright, dynamic, and appreciated by ordinary people, Bretton turned the parish around. The services were packed, with 200 in the morning and 300 in the evening. A large new church building was constructed and there were numerous confirmations. Bretton was considered by some a "superb, magnificent" preacher: "his preaching was easy to understand and he drew you into the sermon". He was a biblical expositor, who held the congregation's attention and applied Scripture to everyday life with warmth and directness. Although a "clear-cut evangelical," his preaching appealed to a wide audience. Bretton led the whole service in a compelling manner. One curate recalled that ...

The services were so different. He was communicating when he talked. Even taking his services [he] made sense, not the usual Anglican drawl, you know, how they mumble their way through...He was fantastic.

As the most evangelical Anglican minister in Wellington, Bretton drew people from across the region. Anglicans shifting to Wellington from Christchurch would also often go to St. James' on the recommendation of Orange or Thompson. Bretton was a tireless visitor, with a gift of putting people at ease. He had a very "forceful"

---

254 Leader of the Opposition from 1950; Prime Minister, 1957-60. For comments on Nash's faith, see Keith Sinclair, Walter Nash (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1976. 1976): e.g.16, 18-21 (Nash, involved in the Church of England Men's Society and with some SCM links, had a simple faith which emphasised prayer and ethics but was doctrinally indifferent); see also Barry Gustafson, "Nash, Walter: 1882-1968," DNZB 3: 71-2. During the waterfront crisis in the early 1950s, Nash and Bretton prayed together daily (Edmiston: 112). Later, Nash's State Funeral was held at St. James'.
255 Bourne: 117.
256 IGB, ¶32. The figure for the morning was the total of two services.
257 Bourne: 111. On 31 Oct.1956, for instance, 108 persons were confirmed, 25 of them adults.
259 Edmiston: 59.
260 IGB, ¶30.
262 DP/Tel., 20 Jan. 2006. In Pickering's view, Bretton's preaching could reach a wider audience than that of Roger Thompson.
263 Canon D.S. (Doug) Edmiston, interview, Nov. 2001 (hereafter DE), ¶27.
264 IGB, ¶32.
265 Bourne: 102; Edmiston: 67. Under Bretton's direction, Edmiston visited over a thousand homes in his first year as a curate.
character, and did not suffer fools easily. He had rigorous expectations of his curates.267

Bretton’s Theological Style

A booklet by Bretton, The A.B.C. of our Religion, was widely used by the Diocese of Wellington in parish missions.268 In fresh, common-sense style, Bretton argued for “plain practical religion”. He pitched his appeal to ordinary people, appealing to their desire to do the right thing. The booklet was a low-key apologetic for orthodox Anglican faith. Intended for use across the church, the booklet avoided evangelical jargon or partisanship.

Bretton began with allusions common in the Cold War: the world is “in danger of blowing itself up” but the world could be saved through the “revolutionary living that comes from Jesus Christ”. Moving to basic questions about Christ and the meaning of existence, Bretton declared that Jesus was not just “another man groping in the darkness of this vast mysterious universe”, but a unique intervention by God and “the key to the riddle of the universe”. With the decisionism characteristic of his time, Bretton explained that a faith response is necessary: “There is no value in that until the great fact of Christ is your own and you have made your own decision and your own surrender to Him.” With regard to death, judgement and heaven, Bretton waxed eloquent on heaven,269 and was clearly no universalist; but neither did he

266 OP/Tel., 20 Jan. 2006.
267 Bourne: 102. Bretton required his curates to be at Matins at 7 a.m. every day, and could be “devastating” when he told them off: IGB, ¶34.
269 “And shall we be alive? Why, there is no comparison between then and now! Now I’m half-alive at best – then I’ll begin to live fully, and the limitations of this life will fall away – sorrow, pain, death itself – for now I’ve entered life abundant. I’ve passed the portal so many dread. We need not fear it if we see it as the entry to the next stage – the untidy part of moving house, with its rubbish to be destroyed and the initial awkwardness to be overcome in a new place. I leave off my old body of the flesh – just as I take off an old suit of clothes – and I step forth with a new body of the Spirit....It is still me, recognisable and able far more than before, to know and recognise and enjoy that which is good and godly...Death “need not be dreaded. It is the most glorious move possible, into a new house – into a new body – into a new world, face to face with a Saviour King.”
quite assert justification by faith alone;\textsuperscript{200} he mildly asserted the need for conversion, but mixed that with a recurring ethical appeal to duty and fair play.\textsuperscript{271} The booklet’s statements on Scripture were conservative, and dispel the possibility that Bretton was a “liberal evangelical”: the Bible, he insisted, is “not good advice but plain fact”.\textsuperscript{272} With regard to the Anglican Church, Bretton took the positive attitude typically held by Anglican evangelicals: the Church of England is “based upon Scripture, sound learning and sound tradition”; it did not begin with the Reformation but threw off Rome when Rome became “corrupt” and remains “the ancient, reformed, Catholic Church of England”.

\textbf{Bretton’s Churchmanship}

Bretton was Low Church, but not emphatically so: like Orange, but unlike Bishop Stephenson, Bretton wore stoles,\textsuperscript{273} and presided over communion with his back to the congregation.\textsuperscript{274} Nor was he a hardliner on behavioural issues: he was teetotal\textsuperscript{275} (a common stance among evangelicals in those days), but appeared to permit church dances.\textsuperscript{276} Like other evangelical Anglicans, he insisted on an open (communion) table, and resisted attempts to ban non-Anglican visitors from taking communion at his services. “Nonsense,” he said, “it’s the Lord’s table and they can all come.”\textsuperscript{277}

\textsuperscript{270} “How a man can expect to enter the heavenly regions without something of Heaven about him already, beats me... Those who reject the things for which Christ stands cannot hope to be with Him in the next world ... The men and women who have thought nothing but their own pleasure and position, making themselves the centre of the universe, will find there is no room for them.”

\textsuperscript{271} E.g., under the heading “Take your share of responsibility,” Bretton commended “regular and decent giving”. He asked “What is your Christian faith worth to you? What is your church worth? Look facts decently in the face. You will never have a religion worth keeping unless your heart is converted and your pocket.”

\textsuperscript{272} He also stated: “People don’t want opinions – they want facts. And the facts of our faith are set forth in the New Testament.”

\textsuperscript{273} IGB, ¶37; DE, ¶56.

\textsuperscript{274} IGB, ¶33, DE, ¶54.

\textsuperscript{275} Edmiston: 75.

\textsuperscript{276} Bourne: 106.

\textsuperscript{277} IGB, ¶105.
Bretton and South Island Evangelical Anglicans

Bretton’s ministry gained a wide audience. He was a frequent speaker at Crusaders and EU. He spoke at least twice at NCC theological students’ conferences, and made a strong impression.\textsuperscript{278} He spoke at the College House theological students’ retreat.\textsuperscript{279} He became a regular speaker at ECF Conferences in the South Island. He developed warm links with the Christchurch evangelicals, including Orange. From 1954 he also formed a close friendship with the new evangelical Bishop of Nelson, Francis Hulme-Moir (1954-1965).

For the first time, there were now three senior evangelical Anglican figures spread across three New Zealand centres: Orange in Christchurch, Hulme-Moir in Nelson, and Bretton in Wellington. That may have suggested that evangelical Anglicanism was about to become established in Wellington. It would eventually do so, however, without Bretton’s direct involvement: late in 1956 Hulme-Moir would recruit Bretton as the new Dean of Nelson Cathedral and Bretton would be lost to St. James’ (where he was replaced by a vicar who was not evangelical)\textsuperscript{280} and to the Wellington region. Indirectly, however, Bretton’s influence would still help establish evangelical Anglicanism in the Diocese of Wellington, primarily through younger ministers he had mentored as his curates.

“Bretton’s Buttons”

When in Wellington, Bretton had made some effort to recruit others to an evangelical stance: he had written to several diocesan colleagues, urging them to identify with an evangelical approach.\textsuperscript{281} There is no evidence that anyone accepted the invitation.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{278} IGB, ¶36. “The Second Ecumenical Theological Students’ Conference” was held at Tyndale House in August 1953: Bourne, 64; Bretton would appear to have been the only Anglican speaker apart from David Taylor of College House. For the NCC, see Colin Brown, \textit{Forty Years On: A History of the National Council of Churches in New Zealand, 1941-1981} (Christchurch: National Council of Churches, 1981).

\textsuperscript{279} Bourne: 85.

\textsuperscript{280} IGB, ¶39. One of the curates claimed that, over the next year, the congregation reduced by 50%.

\textsuperscript{281} IGB, ¶38.
\end{flushright}
Bretton was much more successful in recruiting and training up a number of young protégés. Probably in imitation of Orange’s “Pips”, someone nicknamed Bretton’s charges “Bretton’s Buttons.” That term was not commonly used, however, and one definite protégé had never heard of the term. The number of Bretton protégés was always inconsequential, compared to the number of Orange Pips. But a key effect of those mentored by Bretton is that several of them would eventually help establish a continuing evangelical Anglican presence in the Wellington region.

Those who could be listed as protégés of Bretton include the Revs. Doug Edmiston (curate, 1951-3), Ray Somerville (curate, 1954-5), Ian Bourne (curate, 1956), and – to varying extents – Ron Taylor, Bernard Cox (curate, 1956-8), Malcolm Oatway (curate, 1958-60), and David Pickering (curate, 1960-5). The first two of these became evangelical essentially because of Bretton, but the remainder became evangelical through a range of influences including EU and the Christchurch evangelical Anglicans.

**Ian Bourne**

Ian Bourne first met Bretton at a BC camp, and Bretton took an interest in his progress from that time. In 1951, Bourne went down to Christchurch to College House to begin university and theological studies. The Rev. Les Morris, a family connection, took the young Bourne along to St. Martin’s and “talked like a Dutchman about being evangelical”. Bourne was impressed by St. Martin’s “liveliness”, and

---

282 DP/Tel., 20 Jan. 2006. Some Christchurch evangelicals without any close links with Bretton had also not heard the term, e.g. JC, ¶49.

283 When interviewed, Bourne listed only four such (Somerville, Edmiston, Taylor and himself): IGB, ¶42. He may not have been intending to give a comprehensive list, but only Bretton’s curates in Wellington. It is questionable whether he should have included Taylor, who missed out on being a curate under Bretton (see below). Oatway and Pickering were Bretton’s curates in Nelson, but had known him in St. James’, Wellington. There were some other curates in Nelson who should probably not be considered protégés: DP/Tel., 20 Jan. 2006.


285 IGB, ¶16.

286 Bourne: 68.
became one of the forty young adults in Thompson’s BC. He went to EU, in part to hear Orange, and was strongly influenced by young evangelical peers. Bourne became a convinced Evangelical. He became so not because of Bretton, but through the 1950s Christchurch combination of EU, Orange, Thompson, St. Martin’s and evangelical friends. Other evangelical influences on Bourne included Harvey Teulon (curate of Fendalton and Bryndwr), leaders at a BC camp at Otaki (most of them evangelicals from Christchurch such as Edwin and Robin Judge and Ian Nelson), visiting British missioner Canon Bryan Green, and IVF conference speakers and missioners such as Marcus Loane, Howard Guinness, Leon Morris and Francis Hulme-Moir. Bourne also found his future wife at St. Martin’s, thus becoming brother-in-law to a number of other evangelical Anglican ministers. Bourne’s induction into the Anglican evangelical community continued when he attended an ECF conference and his first CMS Spring School. At the latter, he was “enthralled” by the quality of the missionaries and became a vigorous CMS supporter.

Bourne was eager for his faith to be intellectually well-grounded; in his year at College House, he and another evangelical (Taylor) were the only university graduates. Bourne was not a narrow or exclusive type of Evangelical: he was able

---

287 IGB, ¶17.
288 Bourne: 37.
289 Ibid.: 41.
290 To many evangelicals, Green was suspect (he was seen as liberal evangelical), but Bourne was greatly impressed by Green’s clarity, warmth, and common sense, and felt that he was similar as a preacher to Bretton (ibid.: 42). When Green returned in 1953, Bourne took eighteen pages of notes in his diary (ibid., 62).
291 Ibid.: 41, 51, 73, 82. All those were either Australian or based in Australia: the New Zealand evangelical community, especially EU and IVF, looked to Australia (and primarily to Sydney Anglicans) for most of its overseas speakers. Bourne was less impressed by Dr. Stuart Barton Babbage, whom he found too philosophical.
292 Bourne married one of the Bruhn sisters, Margaret.
293 Ibid.: 85, 73.
294 Ibid.: 74.
296 Bourne: 63-4.
297 Ibid.: 82.
to relate across theological divides, enjoyed NCC conferences, was open to church union,\textsuperscript{298} appreciated his College House lecturers,\textsuperscript{299} admired Bishop Warren,\textsuperscript{300} found Roger Thompson (at least in retrospect) too conservative in some matters,\textsuperscript{301} held to "theistic evolution",\textsuperscript{302} was able (as a curate) to maintain a working relationship with an emphatically non-evangelical vicar,\textsuperscript{303} and (as a vicar) would play the piano for church dances.\textsuperscript{304} But there were limits to Bourne's catholicity: at NCC conferences, Bourne was embarrassed by what he saw as the "extreme ritualism" and "ostentatious vestments" of some Anglo-Catholics.\textsuperscript{305} Bourne was a loyal Anglican; but, as with most of his evangelical colleagues, Bourne's evangelical theology and practice was more important to him than his Anglicanism. He felt it "more important to be a biblical Christian than an unbiblical Anglican".\textsuperscript{306}

Bourne was ordained in February 1956 as curate to his old mentor, Bretton. Mid-year, there came the bombshell that Bretton was leaving for Nelson. Bretton was replaced by a vicar actively opposed to evangelical emphases and practices.\textsuperscript{307} St. James' changed dramatically, and over the next year the congregation fell away by fifty per cent.\textsuperscript{308} Many of the changes instituted by the new vicar related to evangelical sub-culture: the new vicar banned \textit{ex tempore} prayer at youth meetings, burned the Sunday School's \textit{Golden Bells} hymn books (he insisted on only "Anglican" hymns).

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid.: 42; IGB, ¶9, 102-3.
\item Bourne: 50. He saw them as "liberal evangelical". In 1954 and 1955, he was chosen by College House staff as the Head Student.
\item Ibid., 44.
\item IGB, ¶71.
\item IGB, ¶92. One cannot discount that the informant's recollections may have been influenced by his thinking in later years. The same thing may have happened in relation to Bourne's views on the historicity of Jonah and Daniel: IGB, ¶93.
\item Another evangelical curate in the parish at that time was less able to do so (ibid.: 123).
\item Bourne: 111.
\item Ibid.: 42-3.
\item IGB, ¶113.
\item Bourne: 123.
\item IGB, ¶39.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
and forbade his curates (or their wives) to attend the CMS League of Youth.\textsuperscript{309} The next year Bourne moved to a new parish.

Bourne unequivocally considered himself as an evangelical – even a “conservative evangelical” – and would become the key ECF leader in the Wellington region. But in parish contexts (where he wished to offer ministry to all), he did not use the term “evangelical”.\textsuperscript{310} He would also “very rarely” use it among non-evangelical colleagues.\textsuperscript{311} Such a reserve was not unknown among evangelical ministers. Their caution related to how the term could be misunderstood by those outside the movement, and how theological labels could create impediments to wider ecclesiastical relationships.

**Doug Edmiston**

Another curate of Bretton, Doug Edmiston, had felt called to ministry before he began attending church: he had experienced a spiritual awakening while walking down Featherston Street in Palmerston North.\textsuperscript{312} Despite very tenuous church connections, Edmiston had been accepted for ministry training. At College House (1950-51) he thought his evangelical fellow students too “pious” and had preferred rugby and “being part of the gang”.\textsuperscript{313} He resisted evangelical attempts to recruit him and refused invitations to hear Orange.\textsuperscript{314} In his second year, it was mooted that he become a curate under Bretton. He went up to Lower Hutt for a weekend and was deeply impressed. “Gosh!” he asked himself, “What’s this fellow got?”\textsuperscript{315} He was Bretton’s curate from 1951-3, and it was Bretton who made Edmiston an evangelical. Along the way, Bretton introduced Edmiston to the Evangelical Churchmen’s

\textsuperscript{309} Bourne: 122.

\textsuperscript{310} IGB, ¶69.

\textsuperscript{311} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{312} DE, ¶22, ¶24.

\textsuperscript{313} DE, ¶44.

\textsuperscript{314} DE, ¶26. “The evangelical boys were always around trying to persuade us.”

\textsuperscript{315} DE, ¶27.
Fellowship and took him to an ECF conference in Christchurch. After Lower Hutt, Edmiston served in several parishes in the Wellington diocese, doing ministry with a clear evangelical flavour:

I had this real sense that to be a Christian you had to make a personal commitment to Christ, and his word, and his work. Those are the key factors: the reality of Jesus as you meet him through the Scriptures.

David Pickering

Bretton also had a strong influence on David Pickering, who had been Bretton’s parishioner in Lower Hutt. Pickering found Bretton helpful on issues of faith and science, and appreciated having a “scholarly” minister. Pickering was also in Crusaders, from where he was actively recruited for the EU. In 1956 Pickering transferred to Canterbury University to begin his BE. He boarded in College House, thus entering a principal seedbed of evangelical Anglicanism. Through College House and EU, he gained evangelical friends. He appreciated the frequent visits to College House and EU by Bretton and Bishop Hulme-Moir whenever they were down from Nelson. As with so many others, Pickering’s immersion into the Christchurch evangelical Anglican scene involved attending St. Martin’s, where he

---

316 DE, ¶28.
317 DE, ¶43.
318 Pickering, who arrived in New Zealand as a teenager, had previously been in an Evangelical parish in Liverpool.
319 DP, ¶33.
320 Ibid.; DP, ¶80.
321 The leader was Sam Utting, a Baptist teacher: DP, ¶19.
322 DP, ¶34. Pickering found the VUEU “mainly Brethren and Baptist,” but there were also “one or two good Anglicans” such as Don Matheson; leading figures in the VUEU at that time were Wilf Malcolm and Guy Jansen (DP, ¶34, ¶36.) As a science student doing an intermediate for engineering, Pickering remained very interested in the relationship of Christianity and science, and particularly appreciated the attention given to such issues by EU missioner Frank Andersen (lecturer at Ridley College, Melbourne): DP, ¶38. He was also greatly moved by the film “A Man called Peter,” which was showing in the main theatres, and by the mission of Dr. Howard Guinness (DP, ¶39, ¶37, ¶70). He appreciated the “Fact and Faith” films (DP, ¶70). Another influence that began in Wellington, which he heard about through the EU, was the Navigator’s scripture memory programme (DP, ¶44).
323 DP, ¶41.
324 DP, ¶56.
found Thompson’s ministry “unbelievably powerful”. In the eyes of evangelical students in Christchurch at that time, Thompson was unquestionably the “star”. Pickering greatly admired Thompson, but not uncritically. When Pickering felt a call to ministry Thompson took him to talk with Orange, and subsequently Pickering often visited Orange for encouragement and advice. Whenever Pickering heard Orange at EU he took copious notes. Because Bretton had moved to Nelson and because of his respect for Hulme-Moir, Pickering decided to offer for ministry through the Diocese of Nelson. After three years’ exposure to the incumbent College House lecturers at chapels, Pickering opted to do his theological training at Ridley College (Melbourne), where Leon Morris and Frank Anderson were significant drawcards. He then became Bretton’s curate in Nelson.

Others Influenced by Bretton

Bretton’s curate in the years 1954-5 had been Ray Somerville. As with Edmiston, Somerville had not been an evangelical when at College House. It was Bretton who induced Somerville to become evangelical, during his curacy. Somerville attended all the evangelical (ECF and CMS) Anglican conferences. He would later have evangelical ministries in the Wellington Diocese, especially in Naenae (1959-63), and was also considered as an evangelical contender for the bishopric of Nelson.

---

325 DP, ¶45.
326 Ibid.
327 Pickering was ambivalent about Thompson’s “slogans” and “slick sayings” e.g. his aphorisms such as “Champagne: sham in the evening, pain in the morning”: DP, ¶51.
328 DP, ¶53.
329 DP, ¶54.
330 Pickering still considered Bretton “the outstanding vicar in the country”: DP, ¶57.
331 DP, ¶71-3. Chapels were held three or four times a day, starting at 7 a.m. (Bourne: 35).
332 He had decided to go into ministry while a member at Wadestown under the ministry of Monroe Peaston, who appears to have been in the English liberal evangelical tradition: IGB, ¶41; GL, ¶79.
333 IGB, ¶41.
334 DE, ¶32.
335 Somerville had leadership gifts and a “sound biblical ministry” (Edmiston:171).
336 Later again, Somerville left the ministry on account of a moral issue, but regained his licence later in life: IGB, ¶41.
Ron Taylor, originally from Timaru, became an evangelical while at College House, and was nurtured as such by St. Martin's and EU. He went to Lower Hutt to become Bretton's curate. But he found himself under a new incumbent, for whom he was too ardently and outspokenly evangelical. Taylor served in two other parishes in the Wellington region, and in 1964 left for Tanganika with CMS.

Another Bretton curate, in Nelson, was Malcolm Oatway, a former parishioner of Bretton in Lower Hutt. After training at Moore College and serving as a curate (1958-60), Oatway became a vicar in the Nelson Diocese. Another Nelson curate of Bretton was Bernard Cox (1956-60). He too had trained at Moore, and would serve in various parishes in the Nelson diocese.

Numerous others were influenced by Bretton, including many parishioners at St. James'. Such people included Don Matheson (later a lawyer and senior TSCF leader), his wife Sally (nee Gentry), Graham Ross (TV producer) and David Penman (later a prominent CMS missionary, vicar in Palmerston North, and Archbishop of Melbourne).

J The Evangelical Churchmen's Fellowship

As the post-war era began, it was clear that the phenomenon of William Orange had birthed a significant movement within Christchurch Anglicanism. But the movement’s future was not yet assured. With Orange moving from Sumner and the loss of that original parish base, and with Orange Pips beginning to disperse to

337 IGB, ¶43.
338 Curate of Masterton (1958-60), vicar of Martinborough (1960-4).
339 Alan Nichols, "Penman, David John", in Dickey (ed.): 299-301; Alan Nichols, David Penman: Bridgebuilder, Peacemaker, Fighter for Social Justice (Sutherland, NSW: Albatross Books, 1991); Nichols noted Penman's sudden conversion through a mission by Howard Guinness, and the early nurturing role of a Bible Study of the CMS League of Youth led by Kevin O'Sullivan: 22-3; in Canterbury, Penman was President of EU. Nichols does not mention Bretton. There were others in the parish who later became
country parishes and overseas, there was some concern about how the movement might best be nurtured and perpetuated. The strategy that emerged was the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship, formed in 1945.340

Essentially, the ECF began as a fellowship of like-minded clergy,341 all of them inspired by Orange. The key original organiser – working in collaboration with Orange – was David Aiken, an Orange Pip who was curate at Sumner.342 Laymen were included in the ECF from the outset but, for a year or two, the ECF was a male-only organisation: evangelical women such as Vera Mott had to make earnest overtures to Orange before they were allowed into the ECF.343

The ECF was the vehicle which would shift the Christchurch evangelical Anglican movement from revolving around an individual to being constituted on the basis of a shared evangelical theology and practice. The ECF gave prospect of preserving the movement beyond the lifetime of its founder and far wider than his personal influence. As the years went by and as the ECF extended its reach to other dioceses, the number of Anglican evangelicals with strong links with Orange diminished. When Orange died in 1966, the ECF magazine was so concerned with the evangelical issues of the day that it devoted only two of its forty-two pages to a eulogy of its founder.344

The ECF’s overwhelming preoccupation was to help people be both Anglican and “Evangelical”. The ECF stated that its purpose was unity among all those “who are loyal to the Reformation settlement, and who desire to maintain the position of Holy

341 HT, ¶123.
342 VM, ¶20. It was Aiken who asked Vera Mott to type up the first ECF leaflet.
343 Ibid.
Scripture in the Church as the supreme rule of faith and practice”. Its Constitution gave an expanded version of those aims, in two clauses:

(a) To unite in one association the members of the C of E in NZ who are loyal to the Reformation Settlement and who desire to maintain the principles of the Church as based on the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer.

(b) To maintain the position of the Holy Scriptures in the Church as the supreme rule of faith and practice: to encourage the study of Church History and Doctrine; and to provide instruction in these subjects by lectures, meetings, literature and other means.

The ECF’s early material cited prominently two of the Thirty Nine Articles: Articles 6 and 20. The former article addressed the authority of Scripture and included the lines “whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man”. Article 20, ostensibly on the authority of the church, in effect limited that authority and made it firmly subject to Scripture:

The Church has power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in matters of Faith; and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, yet it ought not to decree anything against the same...

The ECF’s key concern was thus to uphold the authority of Scripture over and against what it saw as unscriptural practices and beliefs, whether Anglo-Catholic or liberal. In appealing to the historic (and legal) Anglican basis of the Thirty Nine Articles the ECF presumably felt it was on safe ground, and may have hoped to garner support from Low Church and traditional Anglicans and to reassure other

346 As cited in, e.g. the flier for the 1955 ECF “Martyrs’ Commemoration Year Conference.”
streams of its impeccably Anglican credentials. A few years later, the evangelical arm of the Presbyterian Church would similarly anchor its new movement in adherence to the Westminster Confession. But, in both cases, the crucial and pervasive concern was not denominational loyalty (important as that was) but to safeguard and promote a biblical basis. At heart the ECF was a society of Evangelicals who were Anglican, rather than a society where Anglicanism was paramount and evangelicalism was secondary. Despite its emphasis on the historic Anglican basis, and despite its later attempts to engage with the wider church, the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship’s name, personalities and preoccupations identified it as essentially a sectional group. It was always going to be perceived by non-evangelical Anglicans as a fellowship of “Evangelicals” rather than of “Churchmen.” There would be no rush by non-evangelical Anglicans to join the ECF on the basis of its claimed Reformation basis and loyal Anglicanism.

The inspiration – and President – of the ECF was Canon Orange. The ECF’s choice of the Bishop of Nelson as official Patron reflected its hope of coalescing the Christchurch and Nelson evangelical Anglican movements. It also illustrated the Evangelicals’ characteristic pattern of citing eminent persons on the letterheads of their organisations to lend a respectability they sometimes feared was lacking. When the ECF began to publish the Latimer Magazine, for instance, it regularly stated on the back cover that “The Fellowship ... received episcopal sanction and recognition from the late Primate of New Zealand, Archbishop Campbell-Watson.”

In 1947 the ECF’s initial organiser (Aitken) had left for the remote Chatham Islands, but Roger Thompson had moved back to Christchurch. Thompson became ECF Chairman and its key leader: “To a fair extent it [ECF] was Roger, [and] Roger was

---

347 A.S. Wright, ECF circular letter, 1 Aug. 1949, Latimer.
349 A.S. Wright, ECF circular letter, 1 Aug. 1949, Latimer.
The organisation began to reflect Thompson’s clear-cut, somewhat defensive approach.

Earlier ECF discussions had raised the issue whether it might be less divisive to strengthen the CMS rather than start a separate evangelical organisation. Similar fears of Evangelicals appearing divisive would be raised when a comparable Presbyterian evangelical movement was established a few years later. Evangelical movements often included the voices of some who were anxious about separation and concerned to be as irenic and open as possible. But, in a situation where evangelicals felt themselves a tiny minority, it was perhaps inevitable that the evangelical Anglicans would start their own safe and “sound” organisation. Those who began the ECF had been raised within the EU and IVF, which were emphatic about the impossibility of co-operating with any who did not hold to the Doctrinal Basis.

In the UK, and around the world, there were longstanding precedents for such groups as the ECF – which, in some respects, could be construed as an ecclesiola in ecclesia. Quite apart from the earlier medieval precedents such as the permitted Orders and various reform movements, inter-denominational and intra-denominational societies were numerous within Protestantism itself. The essential raison d’être of such groups was to preserve or promote sectional interests that could never be adequately served by denominations as a whole. Liberal and High Church traditions had their own organisations, such as the Modern Churchmen’s Union, but no Protestant theological tradition had been more prolific in forming societies, leagues and fellowships than the Evangelicals. In the UK there were the Evangelical Alliance, the Protestant Reformation Society, the Bible leagues and countless evangelical missionary societies. In Australia there was the Church of England

350 HT, ¶126; MB, ¶147.
351 WM, ¶168.
352 HT, ¶124.
Evangelical Trust. Within New Zealand, the recent emergence of the Evangelical Unions and IVF probably predisposed those who had come up through those organisations – and were now beginning ordained ministry – to hanker for a fellowship of similar ethos within their own ecclesiastical setting. One clue as to where the ECF’s natural affinities lay may be in the one periodical it originally subscribed to, the UK’s *Evangelical Quarterly*. In the course of time, similar evangelical Anglican fellowships to the ECF would be established in many other countries of the Commonwealth and linked through EFAC (the Evangelical Fellowship of the Anglican Communion, led by John Stott).

By March 1947 the ECF had a modest paid-up subscription of seventy-nine. Over the years its membership gradually increased. There was a quarterly newsletter. In 1949 the ECF held four meetings in Christchurch, including a Quiet Day: speakers included Colin Becroft (an Anglican and the General Secretary of SU), the Rev. R.C. Nicholson (an Orange Pip and a vicar in the Nelson diocese), Canon T.C. Hammond (Moore College), the Rev. R.E. Coulthard (curate at Sumner) and Canon Orange. In the same year, Francis Foulkes intimated that the Auckland “Underground” group now saw itself as part of the ECF.

The ECF held its first conference in 1946, at Easter. The venue was Tyndale House and Bishop Stephenson spoke. One Orange Pip who was present recalled little about it, except it was “very dull”. A second conference was held at Easter 1947, again at Tyndale. Stephenson spoke on episcopacy (which he saw as consistent with the New

---

353 A.R. Lormer to W.A. Orange, 18 April 1955.
354 Balance Sheet for year ending 31 March 1947, ECF, Latimer.
355 Ibid.
357 Statement of Receipts and Payments for the year ended 31 March 1948, ECF, Latimer. Copies of the actual newsletters were not evident in the Latimer archives.
358 A.S. Wright, ECF circular letter, 1 Aug. 1949, Latimer. Re this group, see Chapter Three.
359 Name withheld.
Testament but not mandated by it),\textsuperscript{360} and on vocation to Christian ministry. In the latter address, he expressed opposition to the idea of New Zealand having only one theological college and insisted that there be alternative “provision for evangelicals”.\textsuperscript{361} The “central feature” of the conference was the Bible Study series by Orange.\textsuperscript{362} At the third conference, in 1950, the Bible Studies were given by Funnell (CIM), but the three main addresses were by Orange, on baptism.

In general, the ECF conferences would be held on alternate years with the CMS Spring Schools. They were never as popular as the CMS Spring Schools and were usually about half the size of the latter. The speakers at the ECF conferences tended to include a mix of New Zealand speakers, such as Orange, Bretton and Stephenson (and increasingly some of the Pips, especially Thompson), and various Australian speakers (from both Moore and Ridley). In 1953, for instance, the speakers were Stephenson and Orange;\textsuperscript{363} in 1955 the speakers were Orange, Harry Thomson, Walter Wisdom, Bernard Machell, Frank Anderson (Ridley College), Bretton and Francis Hulme-Moir (the new Bishop of Nelson).\textsuperscript{364}

The ECF conferences would become extremely important in inculcating evangelical theology, in reinforcing the intellectual basis of evangelicalism and in modelling expository preaching. Evangelical authors would be strongly promoted. A perennial recommendation –especially useful for Anglicans– was Bishop Ryle’s \textit{Knots Untied}.\textsuperscript{365} Other older works were recommended, including those by Tomlinson on the reformation settlement and by Barnes-Lawrence on communion and the church. The

\textsuperscript{363} A.S. Wright, ECF circular to members, April 1953, Latimer.
\textsuperscript{364} Bourne, ¶85; also 1955 conference brochure, Latimer.
\textsuperscript{365} IGB, ¶108.
ECF also recommended the new St. Paul’s Library series, which included titles by Max Warren and F.D. Coggan, and applauded its “recovery of a more definite and authoritarian tone in the full presentation of the Christian faith” in contrast to the “vague humanitarianism” and “barren substitute” of “Liberal Protestantism.” The ECF distributed free copies of some books, including Allison-Week’s Anglo-Catholicism and the Oxford Movement, and Stibb’s The Church Universal and Local. In the next few years, there would be a great number of books being written by scholarly evangelical Anglicans in the UK and some of these would be publicised by the ECF. But the ECF was also circulating older, more polemical booklets opposing Romanism and addressing the concerns of anxious Protestants within the Church of England.

Both through its teaching and the fellowship, the ECF was very important in strengthening a sense of evangelical identity and belonging. The ECF would be a principal means of bringing together Christchurch and Nelson evangelicals, and in making the Nelson Diocese more consciously evangelical. The ECF would be a key instrument in recruiting some (such as some of Bretton’s curates) to an evangelical identity, and in strengthening evangelical Anglicanism in the Wellington Diocese. A symbol of expanding ECF influence was when, in 1953, the ECF conference was first held in Nelson.

Within the denomination, the ECF continued something of the same identity-defining role that the Evangelical Unions had performed for ministers when they were undergraduates and theological students: because of the ECF, evangelical ministers had less chance of gradually settling into an undifferentiated theological

blandness. But, with such ministers widely dispersed and often living in isolated places, the ECF with its newsletters and biennial conferences could not achieve anything like the intensity of a weekly EU. Outside of Christchurch, the ECF only rarely had local events – and even in Christchurch, meetings were held only a few times a year.

The ECF always had a narrower appeal than that of the CMS. The latter was still regarded with great suspicion by some high churchmen, who sometimes struggled to see it as Anglican, but throughout the New Zealand Anglican Church in general there were some who were sympathetic to missionary work who would support the CMS but consider the ECF a partisan and unhelpful development. For some, the CMS was an easier entry point into evangelicalism. But, in the post-war period, under the influence of Harry Thomson and the Christchurch movement, the core support of CMS was increasingly conservative evangelical, and the work of the CMS and the ECF was intertwined and complementary. That development was in contrast to the situation in the U.K., where CMS was more theologically inclusive.

At a denominational level, the formation of the ECF helped raise awareness within the church at large that a conservative evangelical stream was now a recognisable element within New Zealand Anglicanism, both in Christchurch and more widely. Some may have assumed that an overt and conservative evangelicalism had died out among Anglicans in New Zealand, but the creation and gradual growth of the ECF signalled otherwise.

**K Evangelical Anglican Ministers in Training, 1945-55**

In the 1940s, there had been an early wave of evangelical Anglicans entering ministry, almost all of them Orange Pips. In the early 1950s, many more followed:

---

369 DE, ¶28, ¶32.
these were younger Orange Pips, or members of Roger Thompson’s congregation, or from Nelson, or from Wellington (and associated with Bretton). These categories significantly overlapped. Likewise, the new evangelical theologues all had strong links with the Evangelical Union. In all of this, social factors sat along theological convictions: friendships and a sense of belonging helped confirm evangelical identity.370

One such Evangelical in training for Anglican ministry was Graham Lamont. From Christchurch, he lived in College House from 1949 to 1954, doing both university and theological studies, attending St. Martin’s under the ministry of Thompson and taking leadership roles in EU. A similar pattern of involvements was followed by many of his Anglican peers: other Evangelicals training for ministry in Lamont’s time at College House included Lester Pfankuch, Maurice Goodall, Ian Bourne, Brian Carrell and Ron Taylor.371

The main lecturer at College House in the 1950s was Rev. Monroe Peaston. An effective teacher, he was respected by most evangelicals.372 They saw him as “liberal evangelical:” someone who “really did know the Gospel” but had adopted a more critical view of the Scriptures.373 The other lecturer, Rev. David Taylor, was thoroughly SCM in his sympathies.374 Lamont saw Taylor as “Anglo-Catholic in churchmanship” and “liberal” with regard to the Scriptures.375 Evangelicals regarded Taylor as a boring lecturer and often clashed with him on that account alone.376 The Principal – teaching pastoralia and not much else – was the Dean of Christchurch,
Martin Sullivan.\textsuperscript{377} He was good-natured and practical; theologically, he declared himself in the liberal tradition.\textsuperscript{378} Apart from Peaston, the academic and pedagogical standard at College House in this period was quite low.\textsuperscript{379} In the second half of the 1950s, evangelical students welcomed a new part-time lecturer in Hebrew and Church History, Orange Pip and former schoolteacher Maurice Betteridge; he would present liberal views but also critique them.\textsuperscript{380}

As the 1950s began, about a third of the theological students at College House were evangelicals.\textsuperscript{381} There is some evidence that this group, in concert with the Evangelical Union and with Roger Thompson’s ministry at Spreydon, had a more formative effect on some students than did the College House staff. Ian Bourne, for instance, arrived at College House believing that the Bible contained legendary material: evangelical students persuaded him to embrace an approach that took the Bible as historically true.\textsuperscript{382} John Ford arrived at College House without clear theological convictions: he was influenced towards an evangelical approach by Lester Pfankuch, with whom he shared a study.\textsuperscript{383} Another ordinand – already evangelical – was impressed by the calibre of the evangelical students, and (probably unfairly) perceived in non-evangelical students a “lack of conviction”; his experience of theological training “confirmed my view that the Roger Thompson attitude seemed to be [the] more authentic Christianity”.\textsuperscript{384} Some students, however, were resolutely impervious to evangelical influences from EU-associated students, and others again came no closer than the fringes of the Christchurch evangelical movement.

\textsuperscript{377} Sullivan was Principal from 1950-8. After he was appointed Dean in 1951 Peaston was appointed as a residential Master to do most of the teaching and day-to-day college leadership (Morrell: 219).
\textsuperscript{378} Sullivan: 117; Lamont saw him as “in essence a good-hearted liberal”: GL, §31.
\textsuperscript{379} Such an assessment was made in retrospect by various evangelicals, e.g. IGB, ¶21; MG, ¶32.
\textsuperscript{380} IGB, ¶23.
\textsuperscript{381} MG, ¶38: “about ten were evangelicals, about half a dozen were committed Anglo-Catholics, and the rest were spread out in the middle…”
\textsuperscript{382} IGB, ¶25.
\textsuperscript{383} JF, ¶29-30.
\textsuperscript{384} Anon., ¶32.
In the first ten years or so of the post-war period, evangelical students at College House tended to “cocoon” themselves rather than debate or engage.\textsuperscript{385} In part, that was a matter of busyness: apart from studying, evangelical students were likely to be teaching Sunday School, leading Crusaders and very active in EU.\textsuperscript{386} But, in part, it was matter of evangelical students not yet finding the confidence to speak out.

I saw my job as to pass exams. The general feeling was [that] there was another side to things, but obviously you couldn’t get into debate with the lecturers that we had. I can remember writing an essay...I thought my arguments were pretty good. Martin Sullivan rubbed it. So it made me retreat from debate.\textsuperscript{387}

A few years later, however, Graham Lamont was determined to be less defensive in his theological studies than some of his evangelical predecessors. He felt they had either “regurgitate[d] what they [the lecturers] wanted to hear, in an uncritical, disengaged way” or had just dismissed it as “garbage” without giving reasons. Lamont was happy to interact with the liberal material. He was prepared, for instance, to discuss the arguments about the unity of Isaiah, or to consider less literal ways of understanding the early chapters of Genesis.\textsuperscript{388} In all of this, Lamont’s eagerness to think for himself and his willingness to engage intellectually with liberal approaches portended an incipient generational shift in evangelical thinking: the Orange Pips had felt themselves part of a small, thoroughly marginalised minority but the next evangelical generation would have greater numbers, greater theological resources (especially because of burgeoning evangelical biblical scholarship in the northern hemisphere) and greater confidence. Lamont and some of his evangelical contemporaries seemed more irenic and positive in spirit than some of their Anglican

\textsuperscript{385} MG, ¶36.
\textsuperscript{386} MG, ¶36.
\textsuperscript{387} MG, ¶35. The emphasis was Goodall’s.
\textsuperscript{388} GL, ¶31.
evangelical predecessors had felt free to be. They were also less inclined to be intellectually intimidated and were willing and able to debate with anyone:

They were much more secure in themselves, they had academic standing and credibility, and that gave them a base from which they could be irenic. They were strong in themselves, so they could be generous to others....they would debate with any one, and would do so from a position of strength.389

Lamont and his peers came through their theological studies with their evangelical faith sharpened and "informed", but intact.390 They denied that it altered their view of the Scriptures.391 They remained highly critical of liberal theology and methodology, which Brian Carrell felt “contemptible and corrosive”:392 contemptible in that they “didn’t take me anywhere”, and corrosive “where more time was spent on trying to dismantle the Scriptures than to understand what the message really was”.393 It was, he much later reflected,

a bit like appointing a mortician as your personal fitness trainer. They could lay you up on a slab and dissect you, likewise the Scriptures. They could tell you what they died from and what was wrong with them and so on, but there was no life in them.394

Lamont, Carrell and some other Evangelicals were good students. While a ministry student at College House, Carrell completed an MA and was taking extramural BD papers from Otago University. Lamont would later do post-graduate study in the UK. Such students were becoming aware of the post-war renaissance of evangelical biblical scholarship, but were frustrated that it was being ignored by the theological establishment.395 Fortified by their studies, by their growing numbers, by their

389 WM, ¶169-170.
390 GL, ¶31.
391 E.g., MG, ¶35; Anon., ¶33.
392 BRC, ¶454.
393 Ibid.
394 BRC, ¶457.
395 BRC, ¶448-9.
church, by EU and by the Theological Students' Fellowship, the evangelical students increasingly became prepared to challenge their lecturers rather than just keep their heads down. They became prepared to question the theological presuppositions of their lecturers. Martin Sullivan asked Pfankuch about the Crusader movements, "Are you fair? Do you present both sides?" Pfankuch replied: "We are as fair as you are here [in College House]". 396

Through the TSF, Lamont and others would hear such speakers as Bruce Harris (Classics lecturer in Auckland), Ian Kemp (an enthusiastic exegete of the Greek text) and Presbyterian heavy-weights Graham and Rob Miller. 397 Lamont was greatly encouraged to meet evangelical theologues from other places, especially those at Knox College. In this period the TSF did not yet appear to have any local meetings at College House; 398 it appears to have had a limited impact on some evangelical ordinands, 399 and none at all on at least some of the evangelicals. 400 But evangelicals in College House would meet informally for prayer and support, 401 sometimes as part of EU. 402 The key supporting group for evangelical ordinands at College House was not the TSF but simply the Evangelical Union. 403

Lamont, Goodall and Carrell all served as EU presidents, as part of a remarkable succession of Anglican EU presidents. In years to come, Lamont (who was ordained in 1954) would himself be a speaker at the TSF, would become a leading thinker within the Anglican Evangelical Fellowship, and would be a rare – and effective – evangelical voice within General Synod. Goodall (ordained in 1951) and Carrell (ordained in 1956) would likewise become prominent evangelical Anglicans, strongly

396 Pfankuch/Lineham interview.
397 GL, ¶31.
398 Ibid.; BRC, ¶ 477.
399 IGB, ¶21.
400 MG, ¶39; Anon., ¶37.
401 GL, ¶31.
402 Anon., ¶36.
403 MG, ¶39.
involved not only in evangelical leadership but also in wider denominational affairs. Both would eventually become bishops.404

These three future evangelical Anglican leaders were also much less drawn to the older evangelical (and rather fundamentalist) attitude of separation. Although they were deeply committed to an evangelical theology, and to evangelism, they were less convinced about some of the evangelical sub-cultural moral taboos such as avoiding dances or the picture theatre.405 Again, their less cautious outlook reflected a growing evangelical confidence and a weakening – among some – of the evangelical's laager mentality.

While students such as Goodall, Lamont, Carrell, and Bourne represented the beginnings of a new and more open type of evangelical Anglican leadership, the attitudes of their own generation of evangelicals were by no means monolithic. There were many evangelical ordinands who were more conservative than they were: some of those had come into Anglicanism from a conservative Brethren background; some identified closely with the more defensive outlook of Roger Thompson, who in the 1950s was at the height of his influence; some may simply have reflected different personality types.

L Conclusion

In New Zealand historical writing, the Anglican evangelical expansion in the period 1945-55 has previously gone largely unrecorded.406 This chapter has shown that by

404 Note also Carrell's interest in history, and his *Moving Between Times* (Meadowbank, Auckland: Deepsight Trust, 1998).
405 BRC, ¶19.
406 An exception, but with a local focus only, is Lancaster's short history of the Spreydon-Hoon Hay parish. Lancaster's booklet is historically and theologically reflective and gives prominent attention to the ministry of Thompson. Note also the useful sketch in John Meadowcroft, "Roger Thompson: An Appreciation", *Latimer Focus* 10 (Mar. 2003): 9-10.
1955 the evangelical Anglican movement seeded by the ministry of William Orange in the 1930s and 40s had taken deep root, especially in Christchurch. Its continuance was ensured by the large number of Orange Pips who were entering the ministry. In particular, the ministry of Roger Thompson at Spreydon had given major boost to the Anglican evangelical movement. The Evangelical Union had been a crucial auxiliary to the ministries of Orange and Thompson. The CMS and the ECF had been very significantly in consolidating the Anglican evangelical movement and in helping extend its reach. In the Diocese of Nelson, the influence of the Christchurch evangelical movement had begun to make for a more self-aware evangelicalism. In Wellington, W.F. Bretton had moulded a number of evangelical ministers. In all these developments, the Evangelical Union played a critical role in nurturing and shaping young Anglican evangelicals.
Chapter Six:  
Presbyterian Evangelical Expansion, 1945-55

The 1950s and early 1960s were periods of strong growth and optimism in the Presbyterian Church generally. Between 1949 and 1961, 138 new parishes were formed, communicant membership increased by 27% and Sunday School numbers by 43%.\(^1\) Such growth may have reflected both the baby boom and society’s post-war interest in moral and spiritual reconstruction.

A New Evangelical Presbyterian Ministers

It was in such a context that many young evangelicals became Presbyterian ministers. Many of them had been profoundly shaped by the Evangelical Unions. Most began their ministries in rural settings, in parishes without much wider influence.\(^2\)

Rob Miller

One notable new evangelical minister was R.S. (Rob) Miller,\(^3\) another son of Thomas Miller. Before the war he had been a stalwart of OUEU and VUCEU and President of both. He had graduated LLM in 1939 and served in the navy during the war.\(^4\) As was often the case with young New Zealand evangelicals, Miller’s time overseas reinforced his evangelicalism through the contacts he made; he formed links with

---


\(^2\) It was common for younger ministers to begin their ministries in rural parishes. Evangelicals also believed they were in any case locked out of many parishes, with Presbytery representatives on Boards of Nomination quietly easing evangelicals off the parishes’ lists of prospective ministers: Rev. John McKinlay, interview, Aug. 2001 (hereafter JBM), ¶127.


\(^4\) Miller was in both the Royal Navy and New Zealand Navy, rising to the rank of Lieutenant.
Martyn Lloyd-Jones and the British IVF. After the war Miller entered the Hall and completed a BD. He began ministry (1947) in the Upper Clutha parish then became minister of St. Stephen’s in Dunedin (1950-8). Like his father, he concentrated on preaching, BC and CE. Rob Miller was emphatically “evangelical” in identity, but with a Reformed flavour. He was a prodigious reader and scholarly in habit. He had deep interests in Calvinist theology, Scottish church history, historical biography and the history of missions. He spent much time in private prayer and was a fervent expositional preacher. He insisted on public prayers being ex tempore. He shared the Miller family aversion to dancing, entertainments and “stunts.” Somewhat more shy than his brother Graham, he was more direct in manner. He became a key writer for the Westminster Fellowship and the second editor (1955-1962) of the Evangelical Presbyterian. Over the years he would write countless weighty magazine articles and publish several titles.

Moore, McKenzie and Webster

J. (Jim) D.S. Moore, previously a scientist with the DSIR, was a product of St. Stephen’s. Moore was firmly evangelical but something of an independent thinker in relation to the views of the Millers and the Westminster Fellowship. Ordained in 1950, his ministry was mainly in Otago-Southland. Also ordained in 1950 was R. (Roy) H. McKenzie. With a background in BTI and OUEU, McKenzie spent most of

---

5 He also had contact with East African churches and missions affected by revival.
6 Robert Strang Miller: 45.
7 Ibid.: 44.
8 RR, ¶745.
9 E.g. ERH, ¶183; SM, ¶59-60. By contrast, another informant considered Rob Miller “very gracious”: BTD, ¶14.
10 His major publication was Misi Gete – John Geddie, Pioneer Missionary to the New Hebrides (Launceston: Presbyterian Church of Tasmania, 1975).
11 1920-
12 Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.
13 Owaka, 1950-4; Wyndham, 1954-63; St. Andrew’s Invercargill, 1963-68; Glendowie, 1968-75; Mornington, 1975-85. At Owaka, where he was a young minister, Moore impressed a youthful Simon Rae, who concluded that “being religious and being human was a possible combination”: Rev. Dr. Simon Rae, interview, 11 Sept. 2001 (hereafter SR), ¶6.
his ministry as a military chaplain.\textsuperscript{15} Cliff Webster\textsuperscript{16} completed a BA at Victoria and BD at Otago. He was ordained in 1948 in Otago-Southland, but later moved north.\textsuperscript{17} Webster became very active in the Westminster Fellowship. All three men had a background in EU and IVF.

**Alex Munro**

In 1950, A.S. (Alex) Munro was ordained.\textsuperscript{18} After war service with the 2\textsuperscript{nd} New Zealand Expeditionary Force and the YMCA, Munro had been a Home Missionary in the isolated coal-mining settlement of Denniston.\textsuperscript{19} Unlike many other leading evangelical Presbyterians, Munro was not a university graduate so he had not been shaped by EU or IVF. With marked emphases on prayer and evangelism, Munro’s theology was pietistic and revivalist rather than reformed. Munro became an effective evangelistic preacher, authoritative and clear-cut in style. He was a frequent speaker at parish missions and Keswick-style conventions.

**The Kirkby Brothers**

A remarkable new evangelical trio in the post-war Presbyterian ministry were the three Kirkby brothers, all products of the evangelical Hawera parish, and all shaped – while at teachers’ college and university – by EU.\textsuperscript{20} After overseas war service, all entered the Hall. As did several other EU evangelicals, two of the Kirkbys studied for the BD. The eldest and quietest brother, E. (Ted) L. Kirkby,\textsuperscript{21} was ordained 1948, and

\textsuperscript{15} Raglan Union, 1950-1; Chaplain with K-Force, 1951-3; Chaplain with NZ Navy, 1953-70; Principal Defence Chaplain, 1970-2; Secretary of Bible Society of NZ 1973-75; Gen. Sec. 1975-80.
\textsuperscript{16} Alexander Clifton Webster (1915-2001).
\textsuperscript{17} Kelso (1948-52), Popotunoa (1952-7), Murupara-Galatea (1957-63).
\textsuperscript{18} Alexander Stuart Munro (1919-99) was born in Pitlochry, Scotland, and had emigrated to Dunedin with his parents. His first parish was Waiareka, followed by Fairlie (1956-1963).
\textsuperscript{19} 2 July 1946, Munro to RS. Watson, Theological Hall Student files, I-R, Alexander Stuart Munro, 1944-47, Box 2.
\textsuperscript{20} Their university and teachers' college studies were variously in Auckland and Wellington.
\textsuperscript{21} 1917-1988. During the war he had been a pilot with the Fleet Air Arm: E. Kirkby to Rev. N.E. Oakley, 4 Aug.1945, Theological Hall Committee, Students I-R, E.L. Kirkby, 1939-46, Box 2.
subsequently served in Tapanui, Katikati, and Helensville.\(^{22}\) The second brother, D.A. (Donald) Kirkby,\(^{23}\) had been President of VUCEU, and was a capable student.\(^{24}\) He was ordained in 1950 to the Northland parish of Dargaville (1950-7). This middle brother was the most flamboyant of the Kirkbys and related easily to most people. As a new minister he had appeared to some of his old EU friends to be moving into the ecclesiastical middle, but was drawn back into the narrower evangelical fold through a Keswick Convention and some deliberate mentoring.\(^{25}\) He was an exceptionally gifted preacher and evangelist and a talented organiser.\(^{26}\) He was increasingly in high demand in many other New Zealand parishes as a New Life missioner,\(^{27}\) and often absent from Dargaville.\(^{28}\) By 1956 Kirkby was claiming there was “a measure of revival” in the Dargaville parish, with “many ... finding Christ and winning others”.\(^{29}\) Parish statistics at Dargaville were certainly very positive.\(^{30}\) Don Kirkby would soon move south and be at the heart of the Presbyterian evangelical heyday in South Auckland in the late 1950s and early 1960s, and would become a leading personality in the Westminster Fellowship.

\(^{22}\) 1948-54; 1954-64; 1964-82.

\(^{23}\) 1918-1985.

\(^{24}\) Theological Hall Committee. Students I-R, Donald A. Kirkby, Taranaki, 1944-50, Box 2. In Greek I, he scored 91%. While at the Hall he was a member at St. Stephen’s.

\(^{25}\) JGM, ¶461: “Don Kirkby, when we rescued him for the evangelical cause, was teetering on the edge of joining Ian Dixon’s party. They were wanting to get Don. They had invited him to one of their conferences, more-or-less like one of those Catholic retreats. He had been to one of these. We took him to a Rotorua Convention, he got renewed and could see what the potential was for his parish at Dargaville. From then on, he pulled his weight with the convention, came in with the WF, seeing it was germane to the whole revival of his parish, and he became a great worker.”

\(^{26}\) RR, ¶754.

\(^{27}\) For an account of such a mission, see R. Ian Hall, J. Kingsley Fairburn, D.A. Kirkby, “Gisborne has been Thrilled,” *Outlook* 62, 19 (20 Sept.) 1955: 8-9. The ten day mission, which also involved six theological students, had nightly meetings attended by up to 500, with nearly 100 responses to appeals on the two final nights.

\(^{28}\) In 1956, for instance, he was a missioner for the EU in the University of Melbourne. *Outlook* 63, 4 (21 Feb. 1956): 19.


\(^{30}\) E.g., in 1956 there was an average Sunday attendance of 300, the largest in Northland Presbytery: *Proceedings*, 1956: 239a.
The third brother, R. (Rob) W. Kirkby, was ordained in 1951. Studious in his interests and “rollicking” in personality, he initially served as a missionary in the New Hebrides, succeeding J.G. Miller as Principal of Tangoa Teachers’ Training Institute. In 1958 he would return to New Zealand to the Mahurangi (Warkworth) parish.

B Parish Transfers of Key Evangelical Presbyterian Ministers

In the immediate post-war years, some young Presbyterian evangelical ministers were already moving on to their second or third ministries. In 1947, for instance, Morrison Yule moved to the parish of Edendale, in the southern Bible belt.25 After ministries at Waikaka Valley and Dargaville, Mervyn Milmine moved to Waverley. More significantly, Les Gosling in 1945 had stepped into the shoes of Thomas Miller at St. Stephen’s.26 Like his predecessor, Gosling was a capable preacher.27 Like many evangelicals, he saw exposition of the Scriptures as his primary role and gifting.28 In 1950 Gosling had moved to Dipton and was succeeded by Rob Miller.29 The demographic trends of the North Dunedin area meant that, under those two ministries, St. Stephen’s struggled to hold its own.

31 1921-1996. He trained at ATC (1939-40), served in the army (1941-6) and then studied at VUC (where he was Treasurer of VUCEU): Theological Hall Committee, Students I-R, Robin Walter Kirkby, Taranaki, 1946-7, Box 2.
32 GMY, ¶563.
33 Kirkby was in the New Hebrides with the Australian Presbyterian Board of Missions and then the PCNZ. He was Principal at Tangoa from 1953-8.
34 He was later Lecturer in Old Testament at BTI/BCNZ (1961-77).
37 JGM, ¶819.
38 Gosling to Malcolm [Buist], 10 April 1946, TSCF 17/21.
C The Formation of the Westminster Fellowship

In the late 1940s, the number of Presbyterian ministers who were conservative evangelicals was swelling but was still relatively small. Such evangelicals were encouraged, however, by the founding in 1950 of a formal evangelical Presbyterian association, the Westminster Fellowship.

A critical factor in the formation of the WF was the sense of alienation and isolation felt by many conservative evangelicals in the Presbyterian ministry. They were dissatisfied with the moderate liberal theology favoured by denominational leaders.40 The introductory pamphlet identified and expounded the WF’s “primary emphasis” as biblical authority – and gave adherence to the Westminster standards as “secondary emphasis”. The critical issue, the pamphlet asserted, was whether (with the Reformers) the church would locate authority in the “Word of God written”, or whether (in “reversal” of the Reformation) it would locate authority in the church itself.41 As with the IVF, the key challenge being addressed by the WF was thus theological liberalism. Morris Yule, entering the ministry in February 1942, had “felt the [liberal-evangelical] tension from the beginning”.42 The establishment of the WF reflected in considerable measure the suspicious stand-off between those who had aligned with SCM and those with EU. There was a strong sense of “them and us”. Naturally enough, many evangelicals warmed to the idea of associating with like-minded colleagues in a congenial ecclesiola in ecclesia.

40 For the flavour of that theology, note e.g. J.M. Bates, A Manual of Doctrine. Christchurch and Dunedin: Presbyterian Bookroom, 1950. Views which evangelicals did not warm to included his emphatic distinction between the Bible and the Word of God (55-6), his assertion that evidence for the virgin birth is “inconclusive” (100), his careful avoidance of substitutionary atonement in his section on the cross (90-93), his assurance (94) that the testimony of the Gospel writers to post-resurrection appearances was “substantially true” (but presumably not wholly so), his failure to mention the empty tomb, his statement that “only faith can apprehend” the resurrection (95) and his sympathy for universalism (99-100).
41 “Announcing the Westminster Fellowship”. Pamphlet and application for membership, n.d. [1950].
Both the name and the concept of the WF were borrowed from overseas. The WF stated that it was named after the Westminster Assembly (1643–9), which had "bequeathed to us our matchless and unsurpassed doctrinal standards". In the USA, Machen had founded the Westminster Theological Seminary. In the UK, Lloyd-Jones had convened since 1941 a 300-strong Westminster Fellowship for evangelical and reformed pastors: the name simply reflected that of his (Congregational) chapel and central London location, but may also have possibly influenced the New Zealand founders of the WF. In New South Wales, T.P. McEvoy had founded a Westminster Society (approved by the NSW General Assembly in 1948). At the New Zealand WF's inaugural meeting, a letter of encouragement was read out from "similar interests and convictions" in Australia. There is no evidence, however, of any continuing influence of any Australian precursor. Several years after its formation, the WF received greetings from what it saw as a "similar" body: the National Church Association in the Church of Scotland. There is no evidence that WF had based itself on that organization, but over the years contact with the NCA strengthened.

42 GMY, ¶331.
43 "Announcing the Westminster Fellowship".
44 Murray: 86-7; Barclay: 50.
45 JGM, ¶455; J.G. Miller to G.M. Yule, n.d., 2. It was not until 1970 that J.G. Miller became aware of a Westminster Fellowship functioning within the Presbyterian Church of South Africa, ibid. Hutchinson's history (Iron in our Blood) refers to the Westminster Society, strongly linking it with New Zealand's Westminster Fellowship, and notes the role of McEvoy and the Society's opposition to ritual and church union, but does not give any additional information on the origin, activities, or strength of the former, which he mainly describes through citations from the WF's Evangelical Presbyterian: Westminster Society: 370-1. The Society does not appear to be mentioned in Breward's 1993 A History of the Australian Churches.
46 Minutes of "special meeting of those interested in the exposition and maintenance of the Principles of the Reformed Faith", 28 Mar. 1950: Minute Book of The Westminster Fellowship, 1950-61. The letter (not extant) had been received by D.N. McKenzie.
47 Minutes of the Fifth Annual Meeting, 29 Mar. 1955. The NCA had arisen in 1932, in reaction to a decision of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to begin conversations with the Church of England (see D.F. Wright, "National Church Association," in Nigel M. Cameron et al., Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology: 619).
48 Minutes of the Sixth Annual Meeting, 12 Mar. 1956.
D  The Westminster Fellowship and Church Union

In New Zealand, a key catalyst for forming the WF was church union. Evangelicals felt the polarisation between liberal and conservative was intensified whenever the issue of church union was being debated, as in 1947-8.49 In New Zealand, the Presbyterian evangelical party line on church union had been clearly laid down by Thomas Miller, who had been implacably opposed to church union. In 1946, in conjunction with Wyvern Warin, Miller had formed the anti-Union “Presbyterian Church League” to fight a proposed merger with the Methodist Church.50 The League was a conscious imitation of a similar organisation in Canada in 1925.51 At the 1947 General Assembly, Miller moved a motion instructing presbyteries and sessions to present the case for remaining Presbyterian.52 The debate was torrid but his resolution was carried. Early in 1948 Miller composed the League’s anti-Union “Open Letter”, which was distributed throughout the denomination.53 The League’s campaign helped produce a 41.1% “No” vote in the 1948 referendum of church members, enough to stall progress toward union. Thomas Miller had died shortly before the results of the vote were known.54 His family took pride in the suggestion that their father had been largely responsible for blocking church union.55 They revered the stance he had adopted and were determined to uphold it.

In the 1950s and 60s, the push for church union would become the cause célèbre of those who were theologically more liberal. Opposition to church union was

49  Miller to Yule, n.d., 2.
50  R. Miller, “Some Thoughts Prompted by the Centenary of Father’s Birth”. Typescript, 8 Nov. 1978: 2.
54  JGM, ¶322.
55  TM, 61-62.
becoming a key identifying mark of Presbyterian conservative evangelicals (though some within the WF were privately more open to union)\textsuperscript{56}

In large measure the evangelical opposition to church union was doctrinal, and expressed a genuine fear of credal dilution. For at least half a century, conservative evangelicals had clearly been anxious about theological liberalism’s perceived corrosion of orthodoxy, and saw church union as a Trojan horse through which liberalism would complete its conquest of the church.

There also remained in evangelicals, in particular, a deep-seated Protestant apprehension about Roman Catholicism. As with many Low Church Anglicans, evangelical Presbyterians were horrified at the prospect of anything that might weaken or undermine the emphases and achievements of the Reformation: evangelical Presbyterians strongly identified themselves with the Protestant heritage, and claimed its sufferings, heroes and principles as their own.

More subtly, some evangelicals feared not Roman Catholicism or church union themselves but the loss of the Reformed faith in a new medieval-like ecumenical church that would impose uniformity, ritualism and an authority independent of Scripture. It was not just the “Catholic” ideas of authority, episcopacy, priesthood and the centrality of the eucharist that evangelicals rejected, but a non-Reformed soteriology: above all, evangelicals feared in both Catholicism and in Ecumenism a “gospel” that they felt required neither repentance nor faith.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{56}See e.g. Graham Miller \textit{et al.}, Reasons For Dissent to the decision of the Assembly on Clause 2 of the Deliverance of the Church Union Committee, \textit{Proceedings} (1954): 62-4.

\textsuperscript{57} “The real issue was not Church Union. It was...whether we shall adhere to the Reformed faith, or return to the religion of the medieval Church, Catholicism...It does not mean that we must all go back into the bosom of Rome...Catholicism is something deeper, and not at all dependent on the modern Roman Catholic Church...That the Church must be one ecclesiastical organisation, and that by uniting the denomination you unite the Church, of necessity is a Catholic idea. Still another is the idea that is the essential Christian worship, to which everything else is subordinate. Yet I do not think any of these is the real power and danger of Catholicism...It is a system which suggests that man can go to
But there were also other aspects to evangelical Presbyterian reactions against proposals for church union. For one thing, evangelicals reacted against the ecumenical rhetoric about the sin of disunity when their own powerful, effortless experience had been an evangelical inter-denominationalism. They felt that "ecumenicals" talked about unity whereas they had lived it. They insisted that the unity that mattered was spiritual, not formal.

Their resistance also reflected the deep general conservatism of Thomas Miller and clan: their opposition to church union was instinctive. The Miller family was well aware of historic Church re-unions in Scotland, particularly the 1900 merger of the Free Church with the United Presbyterian Church. They identified with the dissident minority which had refused to enter the union and instead formed the continuing Free Church of Scotland (and successfully argued in the courts for the right to Free Church property). The Millers were also intensely mindful of the Canadian experience of union (and schism) in 1925.

Group dynamics were involved, the stand-off among New Zealand Presbyterians between two rival ecclesiastical tribes. There was...

a clear cleavage - EU or SCM, Crusader or non-Crusader, SU or non-SU, which side they would go on. We were against it [Church Union]: 'because these guys are in it, we don't want to be with them'...It made it pretty easy to know where you were going, at that stage.58

The success of the Presbyterian Church League greatly encouraged conservative evangelicals. A number of younger evangelical ministers (such as Gosling, Rob

---

58 JGM, ¶874-5. Miller readily acknowledged that there were many in the church and Assembly who belonged to neither group but sat somewhere in the middle, JGM, ¶877-8. But it was the polarisation that shaped the perception.
Miller and Morris Yule) began thinking about reconstituting the movement on "a more positive" basis. In place of a single-issue, ad hoc political machine, they envisioned an organisation that might promote the Reformed Faith and also prayer, evangelism and missions. The 1948 AGM of the League requested the Executive to bring back proposals for founding such a movement. At the Executive meeting in March 1949, Rob Miller moved that the "Westminster Fellowship of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand" be established, with the key aim the exposition and defence of the Presbyterian confessional heritage. A circular promoting the Westminster Fellowship was sent out under the name of the League’s chairman, Les Gosling.

The concern about church union remained an underlying motivation. There needed to be "an on-going plan of re-education for the Church if we were to have a constituency which could intelligently vote for such issues". A new organisation could maintain a watching brief on church union and could resume the anti-union campaign as required. More positively, the WF was a pro-Presbyterian movement.

**D  The Westminster Fellowship and Evangelicalism**

It was not just any sort of Presbyterianism that the WF would promote. The WF exclusively favoured and promoted a self-consciously "evangelical" Presbyterianism. A key raison d'être for the WF would be to encourage the growth of evangelicalism within the PCNZ.

---

60 GMY, ¶999.
62 Ibid.
63 For instance Graham Miller, when questioned about the "principal dynamics beyond the foundation of the WF", immediately began to expound the history of the resistance to Church Union: JGM, ¶320. When Miller came home on missionary furlough in 1949 and saw a card about the WF proposal on the mantelpiece of his mother’s home in Caversham, she told him "That's because of this last vote on Church Union": JGM, ¶325.
64 J.G. Miller to G.M. Yule, n.d.
In its evangelicalism, the WF was a reflection of the sense of theological division that had developed within the PCNZ. It was an outgrowth of the clearer and more confident evangelicalism that had developed in the 1930s and 40s, under the inspiration and stimulus of the EUs, the Crusaders, and other influences such as the BTI.66

E  The Westminster Fellowship and Thomas Miller

In all of this, the WF was an implicit memorial to Thomas Miller – and a conscious attempt to perpetuate and promote all that Miller had stood for. Something similar had taken place in relation to William Orange, as younger evangelicals contemplated the end of his Sumner ministry and responded by founding the ECF. What was said of the published family tribute to Thomas Miller could equally be said of the WF itself: it was “designed to set forth a blue-print for evangelical Presbyterian witness and testimony”.67

F  The Westminster Fellowship as Reaction to the Liturgical Movement

At least one of the WF leaders saw the WF as “very distinctly” a reaction to another voluntary Presbyterian group, the Church Worship Society.68 Evangelicals perceived the Church Worship Society, with its emphasis on order and liturgy in worship, as “ritualistic” and “hidebound”, rendering congregational worship “ever so tidy, but

65 GMY, ¶502.
66 Ibid., ¶497, ¶494. Yule noted that the WF was the culmination of factors giving rise to a clearer evangelical identity. In explaining the sense of theological division, Yule emphasised the role of W.P. Nicholson in lambasting Knox and promoting BTI.
67 R. Miller, 4. The emphasis is Miller’s.
68 GYM, ¶498.
They also saw the Church Worship Society as yet another manifestation of theological liberalism. The evangelical distaste for the liturgical reform movement in New Zealand arose out of anxieties that the Presbyterian Church was drifting away from its Reformation roots in the direction of what an earlier generation had called “Romanism and Ritualism”. In support of the contention that the liturgical movement was a catalyst for the founding of the WF, it can be noted that McEvoy’s Westminster Society in NSW was primarily conceived as a challenge to “high church liturgical practices”: its official title was “The Westminster Society for the Study and Encouragement of Reformed Worship...”70 It can also be noted that the WF in New Zealand stated that its aim was, inter alia, to “defend our Confessional heritage of ... worship”. An early President of the WF wrote in the movement’s magazine against “ritualistic” and “popish” innovations in worship, calling for worship to be “simple, spiritual, reverent”.71

G The Founders of the Westminster Fellowship

Les Gosling, minister at St. Stephen’s, appears to have been the initial key player in the discussions leading to the formation of the WF.72 Under Gosling’s chairmanship the Church League resolved to wind up and to recommend the formation of a new movement. A circular was sent out by Gosling to publicise the proposal.73 When evangelicals met together at the 1949 Assembly, it became apparent that some of them were apprehensive that a WF might be seen as dividing the church,74 and the outcome of the meeting was inconclusive.

---

69 Ibid.
70 J.C. Miller to G.M. Yule, n.d. One of its leaders stated that the Westminster Society arose after an attempt to elevate the elements at an Australian Assembly Service “so incensed a number of Evangelicals”: T.P. McEvoy, “When the Candles Burn High the Gospel Burns Low,” EP XIII, 4 (July 1963): 223.
71 Hugh Reid, “The Worship of the Reformers”, EP II, 1: 11-13. Reid (1905-84), Glasgow BTI graduate and moderate evangelical, had been received into the PCNZ ministry from Scotland in 1948.
72 GMY, ¶503.
Graham Miller, away on missionary service in the New Hebrides, was not the instigator of the Westminster Fellowship. He claimed never to have heard of the initiative until he returned on furlough at the end of 1949 and saw the circular. But he was at once supportive and pushed for the proposal to be followed through.

Present at the 1949-50 Pounawea Convention as a speaker, Miller called an informal meeting of Presbyterians. About twelve came along, and it was agreed to further the formation of the WF by advertising a meeting in Dunedin, to follow the meeting of the Otago-Southland Synod.

The inaugural WF meeting was held on 28 March 1950 in the Burns Hall at First Church, Dunedin. Thirty-four ministers, elders, and divinity students – all men – were present. The hymn (“Come let us to the Lord our God with contrite hearts return”) and the reading chosen (2 Timothy 3) signalled that the beginning of a reformist movement was in view. The youthfulness of most who came held promise of a bright future for the WF. Gosling was in the chair. J.G. Miller – at that time Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of the New Hebrides – gave a weighty address on “Doctrine”. Liberally quoting Scripture, the Scots’ and Westminster Confessions, Calvin and Kuyper, Miller insisted on Scripture as the true source of

---

74 Gosling, 5.
75 JGM, ¶325.
76 Ibid., ¶337.
doctrines, lauded creeds and confessions as the true safeguards of sound doctrine and explicitly distanced the new movement from American fundamentalism.\(^80\)

Gosling then outlined the steps that had led to the formation of the Westminster Fellowship. Rob Miller – who was a key strategist at this time\(^81\) – moved that the WF be constituted and moved several motions defining the WF’s basis and aims.\(^82\) An Executive was appointed, with Gosling as Chairman, Yule as Secretary, and Graham Miller (who would soon be overseas again) as President.\(^83\) Clearly, the leadership of the new movement was by young men who had come up through the EU and IVF. In retrospect, Graham Miller saw the WF as raised up by the sovereign purpose of God, the culmination of “invisible and pulsating influences” at work in the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand.\(^84\) The aim of the WF, as he saw it, was “warm, positive, and scholarly participation” in the “reform” of the PCNZ as “a branch of the Reformed Church”.\(^85\)

H  The Basis of the Westminster Fellowship: Evangelical or Reformed?

The initial meeting agreed to a basis for the WF: “a full persuasion of the infallible truth and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, as given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life; a cordial acceptance of the subordinate standards of our Church, viz., the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms”. Some “Objects” were also adopted: “Doctrinal: to explain, expound, and defend the confessional heritage of doctrine, polity, and worship; Practical: to

\(^80\) “Doctrine,” handwritten notes for speech; also Miller’s later comments, ADMNH 7:21a.

\(^81\) JGM, \$388.

\(^82\) WF Executive Minutes, 28 Mar. 1950.

\(^83\) Other committee members included Rob Miller ( Wanaka) and Messrs A.J. Howarth (Maori Hill), A.J. Kerr (Gore), and J.D.S. Moore (divinity student). In April 1951, R.S. Miller replaced Gosling as Chairman: WF Executive Minutes, 10 April 1951.

stimulate prayer, to strengthen fellowship, to promote a deeper spiritual life, and to encourage evangelism”. Membership of the WF was to be open to any member of the PCNZ who was in sympathy with the Fellowship’s basis and objects.

With an emphasis characteristic of Evangelicals, the WF basis had thus begun by asserting the authority of Scripture: not only was the primacy of Scripture a key Reformation principle (and thus often mentioned at the outset of any doctrinal statement), it was also the veracity and authority of Scripture that Evangelicals felt was most under threat in the theologically liberal twentieth-century church. The IVF doctrinal basis had begun in the same way.

From the beginning, it was never entirely clear whether the WF’s theological stance was primarily “evangelical” or “reformed”.

It appears to have been simply assumed that the two were consistent. Such an assumption was implicit in the title of the WF’s quarterly, the Evangelical Presbyterian, and in its first editorial: “Why an evangelical fellowship of Presbyterians?”

The reality was, in the New Zealand evangelical Presbyterian context of the time, and in a way that was unique to Presbyterians, “evangelical” and “reformed” emphases were inextricably linked. Gosling, for instance, saw an “evangelical” Presbyterianism as expressing both the doctrines of the sixteenth-century Reformation (i.e. those held in common by all Protestant churches) and the spiritual legacy of the eighteenth century Evangelical Revival in Scotland (as mediated to New Zealand though the Free Church

85 Ibid.
86 For discussion of the tension between “reformed” and “evangelical” emphases within the same movements, in American contexts, see e.g. Mark A. Noll and Cassandra Niemczyk, “Evangelicals and the Consciously Reformed”, in Dayton and Johnston (eds): 204-221.
87 Note, for instance, Gosling’s statement about what he wrote in the first EP: “I said that the Presbyterian Church should be evangelical on the ground that it existed to make profession of the evangelical faith common to all the churches of the Reformation”. C.L. Gosling, “The origins of the Westminster Fellowship”, EP XIV, 6 (Nov.-Dec. 1964).
No distinction was made between any sixteenth-, eighteenth- or twentieth-century senses of the word.

To be an “evangelical” Presbyterian, in the tradition of Thomas Miller and in the emergent WF mould, clearly meant embodying both an “evangelical” and “reformed” identity. Each identity was held by key WF people, with varying degrees of explicitness and vehemence, but neither stance was held to the extent that the other was compromised.

To be an evangelical Presbyterian involved sharing the common commitments of Evangelicals of any denomination: an insistence on the overarching authority of Scripture and a preoccupation with individual salvation and evangelism. Evangelical patterns of spirituality were also suggested in the stated WF object “to stimulate prayer, to strengthen fellowship, [and] to promote a deeper spiritual life.”

For evangelical Presbyterians in the WF mould, to be an evangelical Presbyterian also meant being “reformed”: it meant a commitment to Reformation principles and heritage, and resistance to any doctrine or practice perceived as un-Protestant. It meant respect – at the very least – for the Westminster confessional documents. It also meant a wariness of anything smacking of Arminianism, evangelistic coercion, doctrinal eccentricity, immoderation, or denominational disloyalty. In a context where loyalty to one’s own denomination was seen as an important virtue (and something insisted on in EU and IVF, in part to make participation safe for members of various denominations), no contradiction was seen between evangelical Presbyterians enthusiastically mingling with non-Calvinists in evangelical interdenominational settings, while emphasising reformed doctrine within their own

---

89 Ibid. Gosling saw the Presbyterian Church [in New Zealand] as “largely” the offspring of the Free Church. The implication was that Free Church evangelicalism (which was represented mainly in Otago-Southland) was the true heritage of the Presbyterian Church in New Zealand. But there were also evangelicals in the Church of Scotland, and strands in the Free Church that were less evangelical.
denomination; in both settings, the real enemy that was perceived by evangelical Presbyterians was not Arminianism but liberalism.

In some individuals, the relationship of the “evangelical” and “reformed” elements in their doctrine appear to have remained largely unexamined. Others – such as Graham and Rob Miller – were acutely aware of the issues, and veered toward the “reformed” emphasis. So did Gosling. In the case of the Millers, “reformed” meant much more than simply Reformation principles in general: it specifically denoted Calvinism, and the doctrines of the Westminster Confession.

Nevertheless, WF leaders as a whole were not pronounced in their reformed (i.e. Calvinistic) beliefs. It may be that the majority of WF evangelicals were quite light in specifically “reformed” convictions. For one thing, by the inter-war period the Westminster doctrines were rarely taught in the parish, and were given scant attention in the Theological Hall. Don Kirkby and Lewis Wilson, prominent WF leader, admitted they would be unwilling to “die in a ditch” for the Confessions. Some WF leaders may possibly have owned a “reformed” identity primarily because that was more politically acceptable in the PCNZ than an overtly “evangelical” one.

For most WF evangelicals, the insistence on historic confessionalism owed little or nothing to a hankering after Presbyterian tradition per se. Confessionalism was not a matter of nostalgia but of helping to defend conservative doctrine against theological liberalism. In that wider struggle the Westminster confessional standards were seen as a strategically useful bulwark. The conservative evangelicals valued the confession and catechisms chiefly because traditional orthodoxy (including a high view of Scripture) seemed better honoured and safeguarded by historic confessionalism than
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90 Gosling: 5, 23-4. He asserted that most evangelicals did not understand Reformed doctrines any more than liberals did.
91 LW, ¶366; letter from Lewis Wilson, 8 Sept. 1999 (in which Wilson explained that “people could not for ever be dressed in 17 [th] C[entury] waistcoats.”).
92 GMY, ¶501.
it was by the newer liberal tradition. Presbyterian evangelicals were acutely aware that the Westminster Confession, in Chapter One, articulated a very high doctrine of the inspiration, infallibility and authority of Scripture.\(^{93}\) The evangelical Presbyterian commitment to the confessions may thus primarily have reflected a characteristic motivation of twentieth-century evangelicals: the defence of biblical orthodoxy and scriptural authority.

There was a strong sense among some of the WF’s founders that the modern church had culpably neglected the church’s confessional heritage.\(^{94}\) Graham Miller was scandalised that the official Presbyterian bookshops did not stock the Westminster Confession or the \textit{Institutes}, and that bookshop staff appeared not to have heard of Calvin’s commentaries.\(^{95}\) The WF was perceived by some of them as a conscious attempt to “re-educate” the Presbyterian Church\(^{96}\) with the aim that the denomination might once again value its doctrinal foundations and confessional heritage.

Against the backdrop of the widespread neglect of the confessions, at every level of the church, the WF’s promotion of Westminster confessionalism was always likely to be an uphill task. If there was any context in which a strong support base for a narrowly Reformed theology could have survived or developed in New Zealand, it might have been among Presbyterians. But the denomination as a whole had long since turned away from any tendencies towards a strict Calvinism, and its historic “reformed” stance had been much diluted by such factors as the moderating liberalism of the late nineteenth century, the messy outcome of various heresy trials, the marginalisation of P.B. Fraser, several decades of movement towards church
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\(^{93}\) E.g. [Ivan Moses?] to Ian _____, March 1946, TSCF N7/77.

\(^{94}\) Ibid. The writer felt “that from our [IVF] point of view it [the Confession] could not be better” but that most Presbyterian ministers and elders, despite subscribing to the Confession, “have never heard of it” [the Confession].


\(^{96}\) JGM, ¶340.
union, and the widespread discontinuation of catechetical and confessional instruction. In the John Dickie era at the Theological Hall, Calvin was barely in sight. There was also—in a small country—the effects of inter-church mixing, inter-marriage, and inter-denominational student movements. One might also speculate about tendencies in the New Zealand character that favoured a broadly pragmatic style of Christianity rather than a doctrinal precisionism. The WF evangelicals re-asserted the value of historic Presbyterian confessionalism, but their embrace was less than complete. Most WF leaders and members remained, in essence, evangelicals who had been shaped by the BC movement and the IVF, and few (except the Miller brothers) were firmly Calvinist.

The relationship of the evangelical and reformed approaches arose even in the inaugural meeting, in relation to the adoption of a doctrinal statement. It was suggested that the IVF doctrinal basis be adopted. Some objected that it was not a specifically “Presbyterian” formulation. The IVF statement was adopted, but was soon replaced by adherence to the Westminster Confession.

I How the Westminster Fellowship Was Regarded

The advent of the WF was not welcomed by all. Any group that set itself up to reform the church was bound to be met with suspicion, misunderstanding, and some hostility. In an era which generally respected those in authority, many church
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97 JGM, ¶451 “I barely remember Calvin’s name being mentioned, the whole time I was in Knox ...Dr Dickie was a Schleiermacher man, which was a reaction from the hardening of later Reformed teaching, but it was a great fault that Calvin was not invoked at any point”. Calvin’s doctrines of infant baptism and communion were not dealt with. “They were becoming very pragmatic. Whatever was the contemporary trend, that is what had to be expounded. Generations of our men appeared illiterate to Calvin.” In the 1930s, nevertheless, some younger PCNZ theologians such as Bates and Steele developed an interest in Calvin through their interest in Barth.
98 Anon., ¶165.
99 Ibid.
members of a conventional frame of mind simply wanted to be “Presbyterian.” ¹⁰⁰Those less doctrinally-attuned may have failed to see any need for the WF, and some may have suspected the WF represented a group of disloyal and presumptuous trouble-makers. Some disliked the idea of ecclesiastical “parties”. ¹⁰¹ Some felt the WF was “divisive” and even potentially schismatic. ¹⁰²

Many liberal and moderate churchmen, inspired by the SCM’s ecumenical vision, perceived the WF as obdurately opposed to church union and therefore as a negative development. Many Presbyterian leaders recalled with regret or disdain the EU’s schism from the SCM – and would have noticed that many early EU leaders had become leaders in the WF. The much-respected missionary J.L. Gray, an older evangelical who had come up through SCM, was thus uncomfortable with the formation of the WF. ¹⁰³ Those of a more liberal theology would have seen the WF’s confessionalism as die-hard conservatism, untenable in the modern age. Some, with their own conceptions of what it meant to be “Presbyterian”, may have progressed no further than the word “Evangelical” before immediately rejecting the WF as pietist or revivalist and therefore “un-Presbyterian”.

J The Westminster Fellowship and Loyalty to the PCNZ

The denominational loyalty of the WF Presbyterians was not in fact in doubt. Even though profoundly leery of the denomination’s liberalising trends, the WF movement remained deeply loyal to “Presbyterianism”. WF members felt it was they alone who were defending true Presbyterianism against its dissolution into church

¹⁰⁰ E.g. Samuel McCay, although evangelical, was “on principle” never a member of the the WF: “It was sufficient so far as I was concerned to be a minister of the church, and a member of Presbytery, and on occasion of the General Assembly”: Rev. Samuel McCay, interview, 12 April 2001 (hereafter SM), ¶65
¹⁰¹ Ibid.
¹⁰² GMY, ¶310; RR, ¶51; Gosling: 8.
¹⁰³ JGM, ¶122.
union – and it was they who were especially honouring the Westminster Confession, when others appeared to think it passé. The WF was, in part, an expression of theological disaffection. But the WF was unlikely to be an expression of revolution: in conception the WF was a monument to Thomas Miller, and thus emphatically committed to the Presbyterian tradition. What the WF was disloyal to was not Presbyterianism itself, as they understood it, but to a modern New Zealand manifestation of Presbyterianism that they judged to be unfaithful to its own roots.

The founding WF leaders were deeply opposed to secession. They had “not the slightest intention” of leaving the Presbyterian Church. They insisted they would never leave, unless forced out. They considered schism contrary to the “biblical doctrine of the church”. They were aware of historic examples of evangelical maintaining denominational loyalty in hostile contexts.

In the face of accusations that it was divisive, the WF insisted “we are not out to divide the Church, but to revive it”. Gosling at least also resisted the idea that the WF was “a church within a church”, for accepting such a sectional identity would have reduced the WF’s influence and undercut its own claim that evangelical Presbyterians, faithful and confessional, were the truest Presbyterians of all.

K  The Westminster Fellowship and “Fundamentalism”

An issue swirling the edge of the WF at the time of its formation was whether or not it would be “fundamentalist” in identity and tone (as opposed to simply “evangelical” and “reformed”). The WF invariably described itself as “evangelical”,

105 E.g. the principles of unity, and of the wheat and tares; they had no time for “perfectionism.”
106 E.g. George Whitefield, Ebenezer Erskine.
108 Ibid.
never as "fundamentalist". It was only prepared to accept the latter designator – from others – if defined in its original sense (i.e. faithful to the “fundamentals” of orthodox Christianity).  

As with other evangelical bodies in the same period, the WF needed to position itself not only in relation to Christian movements towards broadness, as in ecumenism and liberalism, but also in relation to movements towards narrowness. In the USA, the two polarities were represented by ecumenism, which in 1948 had established the World Council of Churches, and the fiery separatist fundamentalism of Rev. Dr Carl McIntire. Having separated from both the Presbyterian Church in the USA and the more conservative Presbyterian Church of America, McIntire was associated with the Bible Presbyterian Church. He was convinced that most of the worldwide church was apostate and deceived by Satan. In 1941 McIntire had established the American Council of Christian Churches. In 1948, a few days before the Amsterdam Conference had inaugurated the WCC, McIntire had set up the rival International Council of Christian Churches. 

The ICCC was conservative in all its emphases, rejecting the WCC’s modernism, inclusivism, and minimalist credal basis. The ICCC was in continuity with the early twentieth-century American movement which had listed fundamentals of the faith and then – in the 1920s – gone into battle against modernists. At one level, the ICCC’s basic doctrinal position was similar to that of the British IVF, as both held a list of 

109 E.g. “As for being bibliolaters and fundamentalists, if these words mean that we believe the Bible to be the Word of God and that we adhere firmly to the fundamentals of the Reformed Faith then we do not deny the accusation. Why should we? To do so would be to deny that we are Presbyterians, for Presbyterians by their very standards are bound to these things.” [A.G. Gunn?], “What is the Westminster Fellowship?” EP XIII, 5 (Sept. 1963): 260-1.


111 “What’s the Difference? Why the International Council of Christian Churches is opposed to the World Council of Churches,” pamphlet distributed by the Bible Union of Australia, n.d., Gosling papers, 396/18, Presbyterian Church Archives and Research Centre.
essential doctrines and both insisted on the Bible as the Word of God. But where the
ICCC strongly differed from the IVF, and from the emerging American neo-
evangelical movement, was in its virulent public denunciation of “mainstream”
Christianity. It was not so much McIntire’s beliefs that were extreme as his militancy.
His aggressive polemical tone made many evangelicals uneasy. Evangelical
moderate Carl Henry, for instance, described McIntire’s magazine the *Christian
Beacon* as “a religious smear sheet in the worst traditions of yellow journalism”.112
The more moderate conservative evangelical movements were always careful to
assert what they believed. But their focus was positive, not negative: they were
reluctant to denounce and were eager to avoid unnecessary controversy. The ICCC
recognised no such constraints. It felt a responsibility “to expose, to offset, and to
undo as much as possible the destructive work of the World Council”.113 There was
also an apocalyptic element in the utterances of the ICCC: McIntire feared that the
ecumenical movement and the WCC would ultimately establish the apostate
“Babylon the Great”.114

The ICCC’s explicit commitment to separatism pushed it to the margins of the
evangelical church. When (in 1953) a NZ branch of the ICCC was formed, with
veteran separatist D.B. Forde Carlisle providing leadership, support was meagre,
especially among those in the main denominations.115

McIntire first visited New Zealand in 1950, along with the veteran Canadian Baptist
fundamentalist leader T.T. Shields. Graham Miller, on furlough from the New
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113 “What’s the Difference?”
114 Ibid.
115 Carlisle had left the Primitive Methodist Church when it merged with the Wesleyan Methodist
Church and had adopted believer’s baptism. With A.A. Murray, an ex-Presbyterian, Carlisle had
subsequently established the United Evangelical Church. He later served as a Baptist minister and had
been outspoken about the Baptist Union’s theological directions. He died in 1962. Support for the
ICCC in New Zealand was limited, and appears to have been mainly from the Reformed Church and
some Brethren: see Gilling, “Contending”: 49-50, 60.
Hebrides, was invited by the Otago Evangelical Bible League to chair the public meeting in Dunedin. Miller, like McIntire, was deeply suspicious of ecumenism. He was probably unaware of the full extent of McIntire's extremism. But at that time Miller was himself under great pressure and perhaps more open than usual to a militant approach. Although Miller had received the honour of election as the first Moderator (1948-9) of the newly constituted Presbyterian Church of the New Hebrides, Miller was in dispute with the Executive of the PCNZ Missions Committee. The issue was the crucial first clause of the constitution of the New Hebrides church, which Miller had drafted. Miller had been adamant that the clause should avoid the ambiguous words – as in the PCNZ constitution – that the Scriptures “contain” the Word of God. Miller wanted a straightforward equation that the Scriptures are the Word of God. He considered such a formula consistent with both the intention of the Westminster divines and the convictions of the New Hebrideans. In insisting on making that change, Miller had attracted vigorous resistance from the NZ Missions Committee. In 1948, Miller had reluctantly deferred to their wishes, but gave notice that in 1949 (at the first Independent Assembly), he

116 JGM, ¶127.
117 Ibid., ¶327, Miller felt that McIntire was making a “proper protest” against the WCC “at a time when you looked almost in vain for any dissenting voice”. “Here was a dissident voice, with a reason, Presbyterian as well as Baptist”, and it [the ICC] looked like a “useful ally”.
118 Ibid., ¶127: “I was only too ready to listen to these men.”
119 “The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which are the Word of God.”
120 The word “contained” in the PCNZ formula reflects the wording of ‘Answer to Question 2’, Shorter Catechism. In the context of the other Westminster documents, Miller understood the words “contained in” to mean “comprised of”: ibid., ¶154. “There can be absolutely no [other] view of the meaning of the word ‘contained’ in the Shorter Catechism, in view of the formulations of the Larger Catechism and the Confession,” ibid., ¶154. See ‘Answer to Question 3’, Larger Catechism (“the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the word of God”); Westminster Confession 1:II (“under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the Books of the Old and New Testaments...all of which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life”); Westminster Confession 1:IV (“The authority of the holy scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God...the author thereof; and therefore to be received, because it is the word of God.”). A late sixteen-century Scottish profession used the words quidquid continentur, “whatever is contained”. Graham Miller’s understanding of such matters was shared by others in the WF, including his brother: for instances see R.S. Miller, “The Bible is the Word of God”, EP XIII, 4 (July 1963): 213-9.
121 At the 1949 Assembly in the New Hebrides, Miller ripped out parts of a Bible to illustrate his case, and claimed that “there was not a native person who did not get the message” (JGM, ¶150), and that New Hebridean support was “overwhelming” (ADMNH 5: 81).
would move an amendment to the constitution to achieve the wording he wanted. The day before the 1949 Assembly, Miller received a cable from the NZ Missions Committee instructing him not to proceed with the amendment. But Miller went ahead, arguing that the New Zealand church had no right to dictate the convictions or constitution of a sovereign church. The underlying issue for Miller was not primarily what he saw as the "divine imperative" of indigenization and national independence: for Miller the all-important question was the doctrinal issue of whether the New Hebridean church would be founded on an unequivocal understanding that the Scriptures "are" the Word of God rather than merely "contain" that Word. Miller believed that the word "contained" was interpreted by liberals in New Zealand as "their classic way of evading the authority of Scripture", as their "trump card" that "the PCNZ did not regard the Bible as the Word of God". It was a case, he later reflected, of "SCM versus EU." Back in New Zealand, and about to be summoned up to Auckland in May to give an account to the Missions Committee of his actions in the New Hebrides, Miller’s attitude toward the New Zealand church authorities involved elements of both indignation and defiance. It was in such a mood that he helped promote the formation of the WF, and agreed to chair the McIntire meeting. Miller sensed his actions sent a "shudder" through the upper echelons of the PCNZ structure, raising fears that Miller was a fundamentalist schismatic determined to deliver both the

122 ADMNH 5: 80; JGM, ¶129.
123 Miller’s reaction to the directive was to feel “what intolerable, inconceivable insolence...this is a self-governing church, and here is a missionary-sending church telling us what to do”: ibid. At the New Hebridean Assembly, Miller was opposed by his NZ missionary colleagues: ibid., ¶128-129; ADMNH 5: 81. Miller was Moderator, but left the chair to move the amendment.
124 JGM, ¶148.
125 In the New Hebrides context, Miller wanted no ambiguity or confusion: “the people were wedded to the Word of God, and this was the thin edge of the radical wedge”: ibid., ¶159.
126 Ibid., ¶152.
127 Ibid.
New Hebridean Church and as much as possible of the PCNZ into the camp of McIntire and the ICCC.\[128\]

The significance of these incidents involving Miller should not be over-emphasised, but they do illustrate an important decision facing evangelicals at that time, both in NZ and elsewhere. The issue was whether evangelicals should oppose ecumenism (as represented by the WCC, NCC and church union proposals) to the extent that they would become aligned with stridently separatist American fundamentalism, or whether they should remain associated with the softer, more constructive approach of both British evangelicalism and of an emerging American neo-evangelicalism.

The decision did not in fact prove difficult. At heart Graham Miller and the WF were neither schismatic nor extremist. They instinctively rejected both the militant tone and the separatist agenda of the fundamentalist ICCC. Anxious about the possibility of the WF somehow being associated in people’s minds with the ICCC, Mervyn Milmine had favoured delaying the WF’s formation.\[129\] After his drubbing at the Missions Committee meeting,\[130\] Miller had no further contact with McIntire or the ICCC. The ICCC would never prosper in New Zealand\[131\] – it was something too foreign and negative, and it never gained any significant church base in New Zealand.

New Zealand evangelicals were unimpressed by ICCC’s call for separation. Instead of being enlisted for separationism, Graham Miller and the WF were consistently and
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128 JGM, ¶599.
129 Gosling: 8.
130 JCM, ¶130-2. Miller faced about 40 people, including the Missions Committee and several other prominent churchmen such as R.G. McDowall, J.D. Smith, W.R. Milne and J.S. (Stan) Murray (Secretary of the Missions Committee). “They went for me, from the very beginning,” Miller’s position was saved when he revealed that – with Stan Murray present – there had been an agreement that he would defer to the Missions Committee in 1948 but would be free to bring an amendment in 1949. See also ADMNH 5: 61: the Missions Committee would have withheld permission for the inauguration of the new church to proceed if Miller had not agreed to their wording in 1948.
emphatically opposed to schism. Miller saw schism as unbiblical, an “evil thing” which would provoke the withdrawal of divine blessing; it was appealing to immature converts but displeasing to God. When WF member Alex Scarrow left the Presbyterian church in 1953 to plant an independent church that later became associated with the Reformed Church and the ICC, Miller lectured him on the wheat and the tares. Miller was equally dismissive of other New Zealand secessions, such as those of the United Evangelical Church founded by Carlisle and Murray, and – later – of those who left at the time of the Geering controversy. Morris Yule, another crucial WF figure, was equally opposed to schism. In all of this the WF reflected the attitude of its inspirational mentor: although Thomas Miller saw the PCNZ as “unfaithful”, and although at times he “felt the raw end of contempt”, he “never for a moment” considered leaving it. The WF was doggedly conservative, but not separatist.

In the light of the WF’s strong denominational loyalty, unnuanced historiographical assumptions that the WF was “fundamentalist” cannot be sustained. Like their evangelical Anglican counterparts, and like the New Zealand IVF, the WF leaders were scrupulously committed to the denominational church. It could be argued that – in their denominational loyalty and in their steady, moderate conservatism – the characteristic evangelical outlook was a *via media* between militant separatist
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132 JGM, ¶721, ¶728.
133 Ibid., ¶329, ¶334, ¶727. Scarrow was minister at Howick. A precipitating factor in his leaving was his Session Clerk being featured in the newspaper for winning a lottery. When Scarrow asked him to resign he complained to Presbytery, which upheld the complaint: ibid., ¶330.
134 JGM, ¶728. Miller commented on the UEC’s several congregations: “one by one they petered out...It was like a divine warning, that this is an evil thing...God withdrew his hand.”
135 Ibid., ¶729.
136 GMY, ¶444.
137 JGM, ¶724.
fundamentalism and liberal ecumenism. Unlike the liberals (who perceived denominations as symbols of a divided body of Christ soon to be reunited by ecumenism), evangelicals remained committed to their denominations, their doctrinal standards and their historic distinctives. Unlike the fundamentalists (who could perceive denominations as hopelessly apostate), the evangelicals remained generally hopeful about their denominations, believing them sometimes to be unfaithful in practice but essentially sound in basis.  

WF evangelicals were instinctively wary of the ICCC. The WF was much more comfortable with the theology and tone of America’s National Association of Evangelicals, formed in 1942. For some years, the WF leaders were only “barely” aware of the NAE. Similarly, they were only vaguely aware – at the time – of post-war American neo-evangelicals deliberately distancing themselves from the fundamentalists. Such a differentiation would not come into sharper focus until Billy Graham became known in New Zealand, from the mid-50s. Meanwhile, the WF deliberately avoided association with the ICCC. In 1955, the ICCC’s Contender magazine strongly criticised the WF, but the WF Executive resolved to ignore the “outburst”. The next year, the ICCC’s Auckland Committee mounted what WF saw as “an attack on the WF” and Ivan Moses took up the WF’s cause in an exchange of several letters. The following year, the Executive declined
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139 See Robert Wuthnow, writing on North America: “Fundamentalists thought of apostasy within the churches as monolithic, pervasive, and sufficiently extensive to have spoiled the entire apple barrel. Evangelicals thought apostasy was mainly limited to denominational bureaucrats and professors at liberal seminaries,” cit. by Gilling, “Contending for the Faith”, Gilling (ed.): 59-60.
140 Yule, for instance, found the Contender (someone sent him free copies) “unlovely” in tone and too rigid and exclusive: GMY, §§442-3.
141 Ibid., §§505-6.
142 JGM, §512.
144 Ibid.: 15 May 1956. The minute survives, but not the letters.
an approach from the ICCC and voted to adopt a policy that “the W.F. would do best if it were not associated with the I.C.C.C.”

While separatism was no part of Miller or the WF’s agenda, a concern for biblical authority certainly was. In that regard, Miller and the WF (as with the IVF) shared a broad affinity with fundamentalism. A few days after being put on the mat by the NZ Missions Committee, Miller was the main speaker at the May 1950 IVF conference and had chosen as his theme for all four addresses the authority and infallibility of the Word of God. But, even so, Miller’s evangelical theology of Scripture was much more nuanced than that of a “fundamentalist” approach: his addresses discussed the relationship of the Written and Living Word, the testimony of the Spirit and issues of biblical interpretation.

In contrast to the fiery polemicism of some fundamentalists, the WF maintained a restrained and somewhat scholarly tone. It was no militant warhorse. It was at pains to avoid any hint of controversy. It deliberately chose to style itself as a “fellowship” – not as a “league” or even as an “association”. It aimed gently and gradually to influence the denomination, not to confront or ruffle it. “We cherish”, its Executive asserted, “the wellbeing of the Church.” In its first few years, the WF was impeccably polite. Ten years on, Graham Miller could write, in fair comment, that in the WF “the ideal of a warm, positive, and scholarly participation in the reform of this branch of the Reformed Church has been maintained.”
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146 ADMNH, vol. 5, 88.
147 Gosling: 6.
148 WF Executive Minutes, April 1951.
L The Westminster Fellowship’s Early Years

After an initial flurry, the earliest years of the WF were fairly quiet. With Executive members scattered across Otago and Southland, it was seven months before the committee met. At first the Executive met in Southland, but from 1955 it was based in Dunedin. Travelling the country as a missionary on furlough in 1950, Graham Miller – as WF President – was very active in recruiting members. In 1951 he would be replaced as President by Frazer Barton, a respected older evangelical minister who was elected later that year as Moderator.

As the 1950s proceeded, the WF experienced steady growth. By 1951 there were 187 members; by 1956, 272. The lists of those attending AGMs suggest that, apart from many elders, the WF had successfully enlisted the support of most known Presbyterian evangelicals who were ministers or divinity students. It appears that almost all who had previously been in EU and IVF had been willing to join the WF. By 1955 the number of ministerial members of the WF stood at forty. That was still very much a minority (there was an overall total of about 340 ministers in the PCNZ), but it was a significant development nevertheless.

Events run by the WF included tea meetings at General Assembly. These meetings gathered together evangelical Presbyterians from across New Zealand, something...
otherwise impracticable for a small and scattered movement, and gave a visible national presence to the movement. There was prayer, encouragement, discussion of key issues and some planning of strategy for forthcoming Assembly debates. But such meetings were still small, relative to the number of those at the Assembly.

In the North Island, the WF organised no events prior to 1959. In the South, day-long rallies were scheduled by the WF to precede the annual Otago-Southland Synod meetings. Rallies were subsequently held in several South Island centres. The first WF rally (1953) heard papers on the Presbyterian heritage of doctrine, polity and worship, and later rallies were on similar subjects: the outlook of the WF was not radical or rebellious but a serious, historically-minded conservatism, calling the Presbyterian Church back to its roots.

M The Westminster Fellowship’s Journal

The most visible – and most appreciated – activity of the WF was its magazine, the Evangelical Presbyterian, which became the main means of spreading news of the WF’s existence and promoting its objects. At first, under the editorship of Les Gosling, the EP was just a quarterly broadsheet, a tabloid printed on newsprint. Its first editorial stated that the EP would be “the voice of the evangelical Presbyterians“, and that it would avoid “polemics“.

Members (ministers and elders) at the Assembly: Roll, Session I, Minutes of the General Assembly, Proceedings: 1-5.

Gosling: 9, 11.

At the time of writing this thesis there appeared to be no extant copies of the sixteen issues prior to June 1955, when Rob Miller took up the work of editor. However a number of articles from that period were also re-printed or referred to in later editions, e.g. Hugh Reid, “The Worship of the Reformers”, EP II, 1: 11-13, reprinted from April 1952. Between the submission of this thesis and the preparation of a final library copy some missing early issues were discovered among the papers of Morris Yule.

Like Gosling, Miller was emphatically committed to Reformed confessionalism, and to Presbyterianism in the older evangelical Free Church tradition. Miller’s initial editorial formula included regular expositions of both Scripture and the Westminster standards, topical articles, a page on overseas mission, a page on evangelism, an anti-church union “Ecumenical Page”, and reviews of literature. There was a preponderance of articles culled from overseas journals, most from Scotland, but also from reformed sources in the U.S.A. (mainly from the Princeton evangelicals and from Westminster Seminary). In 1955 there were articles on Calvin, the Reformation (especially in Scotland), the Westminster standards, and the Sabbath. The EP was a solemn magazine, neither racy nor populist. It was produced by earnest, historically-minded reformists who were deeply unimpressed by the prevailing trends of the mid-twentieth-century Presbyterian Church of New Zealand. A 1955 issue, however, carried two pieces – from overseas – which were unusually enthusiastic in tone: reports of the recent Billy Graham Crusade in Glasgow.

Initially, the WF was publicly coy about being too closely associated with the struggle against church union. In the early 1950s the WF was uncertain whether it should publicly state any policy on the issue. An AGM resolved to revive the Presbyterian Church League, and wanted Graham Miller to lead it, but Miller made it clear that he wished to work through the WF itself. When Rob Miller took over
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168 WF Executive Minutes, e.g. 30 Mar. 1954, 26 April 1954.
from Gosling as Editor, he made the WF’s opposition to church union more open and explicit.170

By 1954, the EP had just under 500 subscribers.171 Many copies were mailed to international addresses, often in exchanges with similar magazines. The WF was always encouraged when overseas readers, such as Douglas Johnson of the IVF, wrote and expressed appreciation of the EP.172 The Executive hoped that the EP’s influence was “far from negligible,” and that even those who do not agree with the WF “can’t quite ignore us.”173

N A Significant New Entity

The establishment of the WF had introduced an important new voice into the Presbyterian context in New Zealand. Instead of there being just a handful of embattled and isolated individuals (such as Fraser and Miller previously), there was now a national evangelical Presbyterian organisation, with support from a growing number of relatively youthful ministers. As a previous chapter has shown, most of the WF’s ministerial leaders were young men who had been considerably influenced by the IVF.

In the early 1950s, the WF was still a very small movement, numerically. But simply by being formed, and by publishing its journal and articulating its viewpoint, it would make an impact disproportionate to its numbers and would help give new heart and focus to conservative evangelical Presbyterians in general.

172 17 April 1956, WF Executive Minutes.
Every two years or so, as in 1952 and 1955, initiatives at General Assembly to advance church union would stimulate the WF into a burst of heightened activity. In 1954, the WF made a modest start in publishing, with a pamphlet on infant baptism. But the WF heyday was yet to come.

O Presbyterian Evangelicals and their Relationship with the Wider Church, 1945-55

Among the ministers of the Presbyterian Church, conservative evangelicals of the IVF and WF stamp remained in the minority. In the parishes, however, their biblically and theologically conservative approach resonated well with many people in the pews. The "grassroots" of the Presbyterian Church remained conservative: they were "evangelical and evangelistic without knowing it". Evangelicals with a lively style and a focus on young people were often invited to be speakers at Bible Class camps, or parish missioners.

In Presbyteries, evangelicals would usually find a way of working with the majority of their ministerial colleagues. But at General Assemblies, conservative evangelical ministers felt "very much on the outer". They were always outnumbered, and usually outgunned, by ministers of "moderate" and "liberal" persuasion. To the
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174 M. Buist, Why I Nearly Left the Presbyterian Church [not sighted].
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177 According to Yule (GMY, ¶277), and Miller (JGM, ¶293-4), the most influential churchmen in the 1940s and 50s – committee men, debaters, and moderators – included the Revs. J.D. Smith [Mt. Eden, 1938-52; Moderator, 1947-8], C.J. Tocker [St Paul’s, Invercargill, 1926-54; Moderator, 1948], R.G. McDowall [St Luke’s, Auckland, 1937-57; Moderator: 1957], F. Robertson [Director of the NCC Campaign for Christian Order], D.M. Hercus [Chaplain of Scots College, 1941-61; founder of the NZ Church Service Society], M.W. Wilson [Knox Church, Christchurch, 1951-61], R.S. Watson [Convener of the Theological Hall and Life and Work Committees; Moderator, 1949], Dr. J.D. Salmond [Prof. of Religious Education at the Theological Hall, 1932-64; Moderator, 1958], and J.M. Bates [Convener of the Life and Work Committee and Doctrine Committee; co-founder of the NZ Journal of Theology; author of A Manual of Doctrine; Moderator, 1965]. None of these were known as conservative evangelicals. To evangelicals, Bates appeared to be the key liberal strategist and "party whip" (GMY,
ecclesiastical movers and shakers of the early post-war period, conservative evangelical views were an obstacle to progress, and were to be disregarded. Evangelicals felt they were constantly being pushed to the margins. "They [the moderates and liberals] would not listen. They disdained our contribution, and swept it aside." The crucial issue, and recurring flashpoint, was often church union.

Lacking critical mass, evangelicals were easily quietened. "The other side amassed a big scrum down in the front pews. They were there as potential contributors to the debate, so they could get up and be on their feet at the microphone in no time". Sometimes evangelical speakers were harassed by repeated points of order. Sometimes there was brow-beating. "Time after time somebody would pop up from those liberals down at the front to blast the last evangelical who had spoken, to demolish him with a few words – but not his argument, to castigate the man and call him out of date and all the rest of it." Evangelicals also believed the business of Assembly was "managed", with some on the floor allowed "inside knowledge". Given all those perceptions, many evangelicals found Assembly intimidating, even "chilling".

P Presbyterian Evangelicals and the New Life Movement

Notwithstanding their frequent sense of embattlement at General Assembly,
evangelical Presbyterians in the 1950s nevertheless found a very positive point of contact with their denomination: the Presbyterian New Life Movement. Essentially a lay movement, and influenced by similar campaigns in Scotland and elsewhere, the NLM was not overtly or self-consciously "evangelical" but was nevertheless tacitly evangelical in its core emphases on spiritual renewal and church-based evangelism. Aiming to draw in the support of as much as possible of the church, across the spectrum, the NLM leadership was careful to avoid any hint of sectional interest or partisan theology. Nevertheless, the NLM was essentially evangelistic in motivation. Its emphases on strengthening the commitment of church members and expanding the church reflected the broadly evangelistic piety of many of the PCNZ's lay leaders, most of them brought up through the Presbyterian BC movement. The NLM's evangelistic aims meshed well with those of evangelical ministers. Most of them became enthusiastically supportive of the NLM, while interpreting and adapting its programmes to their own ends. Leading evangelical ministers such as Graham Miller, Arthur Gunn, Don Elley and Don Kirkby were frequent speakers at New Life missions in other parishes. Of all the New Life missioners, it was arguably Don Kirkby who stood out as the most inspiring and effective New Life missioner, and he was much in demand.

A key leader of the NLM was Norman Perry of Opotiki. Perry was the product of a conservative Christian home and had studied at BTI. In the 1930s he had served as a

---

184 GMY, ¶283, ¶275.
186 A Presbyterian BC member from the mid 1940s, using the word "evangelical" to mean "evangelistic", commented: "I can never recall Bible classes having called themselves 'evangelical', giving themselves that name, but undoubtedly they were, when you look at the people who were brought into faith, the people who came in from the outside, and were converted:” SM, ¶14.
187 GMY, ¶321.
188 Ibid., ¶354.
189 JGM, ¶756. Miller considered Kirkby “undoubtedly the most effective”.
190 An interview was conducted with Sir Norman Perry on 29 April 2001. The summary was not confirmed before he died, largely on account of his poor health.
missionary with BTI’s Maori mission in the Eastern Bay of Plenty. Through reading, involvement with Maori (including members of the Ringatū movement), war service with YMCA and wider denominational involvement, Perry became broader in his sympathies but remained at heart evangelical, especially in his strong continuing interest in evangelism. Perry placed a high value on unity, and was uncomfortable with evangelical partisanship. On occasion he chided Assembly for its “picky” theological divisions. He did not normally use the term “evangelical” of himself: he felt it compromised unity, and it “took too long to explain”. Perry sometimes read the Evangelical Presbyterian, but questioned the need for the WF, and never joined it. But Perry related very warmly to the leading evangelicals, who all respected him.

The other key lay leader of the NLM was T.I. (Tom) Steele, an Opotiki farmer and a product of the Bible Class movement. Steele’s evangelical piety showed through when he spoke at Assembly. Between them, Perry and Steele “won the heart of the Assembly”. Other NLM leaders included the Revs. A.D. (Arthur) Horwell, the dynamic (and theologically non-aligned) Director of Ministry, W.P. (Bill) Temple (broadly evangelical), and Don Kirkby (a card-carrying evangelical and WF insider).

191 At BTI, Perry was strongly influenced by Roland Allen’s books especially Missionary Methods, St. Paul’s or Ours?
192 GMY, §315, §317.
193 SM, §43.
194 Perry interview.
195 Ibid. “I did not know much about it” ... “I wondered why it was necessary”.
196 Steele, the son of Rev. John Steele, had formerly been a journalist and Travelling Secretary for the PBCM. Memorial Minute, Proceedings, 1962: 20-1.
197 For instance Steele told Assembly that “New Life’ to me is waking in good enough time to meet my Lord in the morning, and to seek his blessing on the proceedings of the day” (Yule’s paraphrase): GMY, §316. Steele was an “influential speaker: quiet, controlled, he almost looked blind, he [would] walk up [to] the front...and would stand there totally immobile, and speak quietly without raising his voice, and everyone was attentive. A remarkable approach of his own”: JGM, ¶182.
198 Ibid., ¶184.
199 Ibid., ¶592.
200 Ordained by the Church of Scotland in 1934, Temple (1907-1992) came to New Zealand in 1948 and served in St. John’s, Wellington, as Director of Religious Broadcasting, and at Kohimarama.
In evangelical parishes, NLM programmes took on a strongly evangelistic flavour. Evangelicals began vigorous evangelistic visitation campaigns. In parishes of a more liberal or traditional ethos, theological reservations could mean that little or no place was given to evangelism in implementing NLM programmes. An important component of the New Life Movement from 1954 was the “Stewardship Campaigns”. Evangelicals related the holistic emphasis on the “stewardship” of time and abilities to their existing stress on Christian consecration, and related the financial aspect to biblical concepts of tithing. All in all, the New Life Movement was readily embraced by Presbyterian evangelicals, and the movement strengthened their growing confidence in the post-war period.

**Q Conclusion**

Apart from some in-house remembrances by the Westminster Fellowship (including a booklet by Gosling), brief comments by Allan Davidson and James Veitch and

---

201 See e.g. New Life Visitation Mission Card, Presbyterian Archives, NL8, 11
203 See e.g. Stewardship Card, Presbyterian Archives, NL1.
204 See e.g. Tuakau Parish, The Call to Christian Stewardship. Some – possibly people of all theological persuasions – appeared more inclined to see “stewardship” as simply a programme to get people supporting the church financially, as a gentler equivalent of the methods of the Wells Fundraising Organisation being used in some Anglican and Methodist churches. See e.g. St. Andrew’s Presbyterian Church, Palmerston North, Combined Funds Canvass (1956).
205 E.g., R.S. Miller, “Recalling the First Meeting”, *EP* X, 6 (Nov. 1960): 3-4; J.G. Miller, “Joy Cometh in the Morning”, *EP XI*, 1 (Jan. 1961): 3-4; Les Gosling, *To Keep the Faith. The Westminster Fellowship’s Forty Years* (Manurewa: WF, 1990). The booklet by Gosling was commissioned by the WF for its fortieth anniversary. It gave a useful (but sometimes idiosyncratic) overview of the WF; reflecting Gosling’s disdain for the charismatic movement at the time when he was writing, the booklet rallied against “Pietism” and emphasised the reformed rather than the evangelical roots of the WF.
206 Allan Davidson, *Christianity in Aotearoa. A History of Church and Society in New Zealand* (Wellington: New Zealand Education for Ministry, 1997): 125-6, 165; Allan Davidson, “Depression, War, New Life”, in *Presbyterians in Aotearoa*: 142. Davidson identified the WF as a “defensive” confessionalist movement opposed to liberalism and Church Union but also noted its positive evangelical and missionary interests. In a volume devoted to “fundamentalism”, an essay by Veitch described the WF as “confessional” and “evangelical” rather than “fundamentalist” but suggested that on account of WF ministers’ belief in the 1910 “fundamentals” and their affinity with the Princeton theology they had “linkages” with fundamentalism: James Veitch. “Fundamentalism and the Presbyterian...
some other passing references,\textsuperscript{207} the growth of evangelical Presbyterianism in early post-war New Zealand has previously attracted little historical attention.

This chapter has traced the move by various young evangelicals into Presbyterian ministry, some of them protégés of Thomas Miller and some of them not, but almost all of them significantly shaped by the EU and IVF. The chapter then analysed the consequent formation of the Westminster Fellowship, as a reflection of several concerns and aspirations: indignation about liberalising trends in the national church; resistance to church union (and behind that fears of doctrinal dilution and drift towards Rome); reaction to the liturgical movement; the promotion of a seamlessly-fused evangelical and confessionalist Presbyterianism; the attempt to reclaim the Scottish Reformation and Free Church heritages; the desire to present evangelical confessionalists as the most faithful of all Presbyterians. The establishment of the WF in the 1950s was in many respects an ecclesiastical expression of the 1930s and 40s IVF/SCM schism, with regard to both key leaders and key ideas. The WF retained an IVF-style moderation, and was scrupulously loyal to the denomination. It was a reformist movement, not a schismatic movement. The WF was neither militantly Calvinist nor “fundamentalist”. It rejected the ICCC. Notwithstanding evangelicals’ enthusiasm for the New Life movement the WF and

\textsuperscript{207} Breward had a sentence noting the WF’s defence of “historic theology”: Ian Breward, \textit{A History of the Churches of Australasia} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001): 319. An essay by John Roxborogh listed the WF as one of several examples of New Zealand evangelical organisations: John Roxborogh, “Mapping the Evangelical Landscape in New Zealand”, in Susan and Willam W. Emilsen
its members were regarded within the wider Presbyterian denomination with considerable suspicion. But the WF, although initially modest in size and activity, had become a significant rallying point for Presbyterian conservative evangelicals and its sober little journal (*Evangelical Presbyterian*) was an important new voice.

Chapter Seven:
The Evangelical Unions and the I.V.F, 1945-65

We stand for sane conservatism.¹

A The Growth of the Evangelical Unions

In the post-war years, the EUs continued to experience “steady though unspectacular growth”.² As the 1950s began, there were EUs in the four universities, in the five teacher training colleges, and in Massey Agricultural College.³ At Ardmore Teachers’ College, evangelical students had taken the leadership in a Christian Union, which then affiliated with IVF.⁴ At Massey, too, EU had replaced SCM: the EU there was re-established in 1949 on the initiative of the (evangelical) SCM President, with the active encouragement of local evangelical ministers.⁵ By 1960 the number of EUs had grown to fifteen;⁶ by 1964, there were eighteen.⁷ By 1950 the combined number of students in IVF student groups was 400 at the most, about 3% of New Zealand’s total

² “IVF work in New Zealand”, document with letter [from Cliff Cocker?] to Bruce [Harris], 28 Aug. 1950, TSCF H1/22.
³ Ibid. The Massey EU had been in recess for some years, but was re-established in 1949. It had originally been formed in 1937: The NZ Inter-Varsity News’ Bulletin 1, 4 (Oct.1937): 11.
⁴ “IVF work in New Zealand.” The Ardmore group had begun as a Christian Union, which – on the insistence of the Principal – had been affiliated to neither SCM nor IVF. An ex-AUCEU student, (Bruce Nicholls) became President and gave “a strong evangelical lead”, and the group became “virtually an E.U.” In 1949 it affiliated with IVF.
⁵ Report on the re-forming of the Massey College EU, Mar.1949, initial illegible, n.d., TSCF B5/002. The SCM President was Ron Woolman, later HOD of Science at Thames. The evangelical ministers included Rev. Hayes Lloyd (Baptist) and a Rev. Fitch (Church of Christ). See also “Massey Agricultural College EU” (n.a., typescript, n.d. [c.1964]), TSCF B5/001.
⁷ John Brinsley, “Window on the World”, EP XIV, 2 (Mar.1964): 457-67. Other EUs existing in 1965 and not already mentioned included University of Waikato EU, Lincoln College EU, North Shore Teachers’ College EU, the Dental Nurses’ EUs (Wellington, Christchurch), the Overseas Christian Fellowships (Wellington and Christchurch) and the Ilam School of Engineering EU: TSCF A1a. There
of 15,000 students; by 1960 the combined membership of EU groups had grown to 1,000. In addition, there were EU-derived "Theological Student Fellowships" in four theological colleges.

As student groups lost at least a third of their members at the end of each academic year, there was a vulnerability to fluctuating numbers and the regular loss of experienced leadership. After the exodus of students at the end of 1955, for instance, only two previous members of the Massey EU remained at the beginning of 1956. But the corresponding growth of the Crusader movement in secondary schools (200 unions by 1964, with an attendance of 4,000) ensured that university EUs had a constant stream of new recruits. Guinness's strategy appeared to be working.

The growth of the EUs reflected the post-war major expansion of education at all levels. In the mid 1960s the baby boom contributed to a further swell in EU numbers. Demographic factors alone do not account for the growth of the EUs prior to that: in the same context the EU/IVF movement was steadily expanding, the SCM was steadily shrinking. That growth of the EUs and decline of the SCM was occurring in New Zealand's highly secular university environment, suggesting that evangelicalism (with its more definite doctrines) was better able to hold its own in that environment than liberalism (with its more accommodating approach).

---

were also numerous Nurses' Christian Fellowships.
8 "IVF work in New Zealand."
9 Stewart, Lawrence and Hutchinson to Davies, 20 Oct. 1960, TSCF N2/053.
10 Knox College, Church House (Christchurch), Baptist College, Trinity College.
11 "Massey Agricultural College EU."
12 The strongly secular outlook of New Zealand universities was noted by e.g. Sullivan: 112. Sullivan was pioneer SCM chaplain at Victoria. In the same work Sullivan also noted the growth of the EU/IVF movement, regretted their unwillingness to work with the SCM, commented that IVF growth reflected a desire for "authoritative, ...even dogmatic statements", and that the "woolliness of the S.C.M. dating from the 1930s has at length taken its toll": 116-7.
B The Evangelical Union in Canterbury

The EU at Canterbury remained dominated by Anglicans, almost all of them associated with Orange or his protégés, and also often with College House. Several Anglican members of the EU Executive were meeting at College House when Bob Lowe burst through the door, and exclaimed, “Ah, the Fundies with their mean little thoughts and mean little ways!” From 1949 there was a long succession of Anglican EU Presidents, mostly from Christchurch but some from Nelson. It was not until the later sixties that there would be a number of Presidents from other denominations.

Russell Fountain remained a prominent Brethren supporter of the Canterbury group, and his home was frequently the venue for special events. Presbyterian members included Lewis and Challis Wilson, who both later became ministers. There were very few Baptists, probably reflecting such factors as Baptists’ strong denominational loyalty, their socio-economic profile and lower attendance at university, and the predominance of Anglicanism in the province of Canterbury. The situation in Canterbury was thus very different from that prevailing in the Auckland EU, where Baptists were dominant.

EU meetings and house parties at Canterbury were often addressed by Orange, Roger Thompson and Harry Thomson. But there was also teaching from Brethren

13 From 1961, the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. Prior to that, the Canterbury University College.
14 Robert Glen anecdote. Also cited in “Evangelical Witness”: 37.
16 “Evangelical Witness”: 58. Prior to that Lewis Wilson (a Presbyterian) had been President in 1947-8.
17 MG, ¶19.
18 One such was Don Wilson, who later became Presbyterian and more liberal.
(e.g. Howell Fountain and Jim Cross, a local science teacher), from R.J. Thompson (minister of Opawa Baptist) and from visiting IVF staff workers such as Ivan Moses.  

Many of the Canterbury EU members served as leaders at CSSM beach missions, and in Crusader Unions, Camps and Conferences. In such settings they developed their skills, mixed with Canterbury’s wider evangelical Anglican and Brethren community, and worked alongside SU staff workers such as Colin Becroft and Lewis Wilson. The records – both at Canterbury and in all other EUs – constantly point to such an inter-denominational mixing and cohesion within the evangelical network, especially among those active in the evangelical children's and youth movements.

A highlight of the early 1950s for the Canterbury EU was the 1952 mission by Howard Guinness, who attracted an attendance of 1900 students and argued persuasively for Christian faith. Other notable visitors to EU included Edwin Orr (1956), John Stott (1958), Alan Cole (1958) and Masumi Toyatome (1961).

---

19 GL, ¶26; “Evangelical Witness”: 42.
20 GL, ¶28.
21 Ibid.
22 E.g.: GL, ¶29. “While at University and College House I led the CBHS Crusader Group, initially as co-leader with Lester Pfankuch. I led several holiday camps and cycling tours and Badgeholders’ Conferences both for the BHS Group and some for the wider (i.e. South Island) Crusader movement. The Camps etc. were fantastic individual and group leadership training opportunities. They gave me the opportunity to work alongside people like Colin Becroft, Lewis Wilson as well as ‘peers’ like Bob Glen, Lester Pfankuch. Edwin Judge, Maurice Betteridge, John Meadowcroft, Crellin Dingwall, Robin Currie, Don Wilson (Baptist from Timaru), the Broughton clan, and many others. They also gave us the chance to present the gospel to literally hundreds of teenage boys, many of whom became committed Christians. As I look through the photos of those camps I recognise many who have gone on to play leadership roles in the Christian community and society at large.”
23 “Evangelical Witness”: 42-43. Guinness gave a series of evening talks entitled “Six reasons for not being a Christian”. In the first half of each talk he would state objections to Christian faith, and in the second half he would respond. Many students came to faith and joined the EU.
By the early 1950s the Friday night Canterbury EU meetings often had an attendance of 150. By 1960 the EU had a signed-up membership of 128. The weekly routine included the morning Daily Prayer Meeting, in the tradition of CICCUs.

The EU was one of the largest student clubs, but its focus – apart from missions and evangelism – was essentially inward. In that respect it was no different from most churches. Individual members were often involved in wider student life, including sports clubs and student leadership, but the overwhelming preoccupation of the EU was with the formation of its members, rather than with the life of the university. As David Penman wrote in 1961, “EU’s aim is to make members into evangelicals and get them into key places as ‘Bible Men’”.26

The EU in Canterbury had surpassed the SCM as the largest Christian group on campus. It now clearly dominated the Christian student scene. The eclipse of SCM by EU among young future leaders was indicative of significant wider shifts within NZ Protestantism: the renaissance of a confident evangelicalism and the relative decline of theological liberalism.

C The Evangelical Union in Otago

With medical students from all over New Zealand, and with a large number of Presbyterian divinity students, Otago University was a highly strategic setting for the EU. Both elements helped give OUEU its unique flavour. The EU-SCM rivalry was

25 JG, ¶10. Greenslade arrived in 1953, and was a part of both the university EU and the Teachers’ College EU. The latter met during lunchtime. The university EU met after tea “in the lecture room above the catacombs, which was Rutherford’s Den, where we had our base”: BRC, ¶192.
26 “Evangelical Witness”: 69.
27 That occurred in 1938 (ibid.: 26). From 1961, the life of the CUEU was complicated by the beginning of the university’s graduated migration from the centre of Christchurch to a new campus at Ilam. The strategy adopted was to found a new EU at the new campus, initially comprising the schools of Engineering and Fine Arts. College House – where many evangelicals were studying theology – remained at its city site until 1965.
perhaps at its most acute in Otago: many members of the Knox Theological Hall student body were very active in the leadership of either EU or SCM. When new students arrived the two movements vied to recruit them.\(^{28}\) By the mid-fifties OUEU had grown larger than the local SCM group.\(^{29}\) In the mid-sixties OUEU was 175-strong and was the second largest EU in the country.\(^{30}\)

D  The Evangelical Union in Victoria

The EU at Victoria\(^{31}\) continued to struggle against the background of Wellington’s more secular atmosphere and the weaker base of evangelical churches in that city. The particularly secular culture of Wellington’s university was also observed outside IVF circles:

> In NZ the Universities have shared in the general tendency to regard educational institutions as purely (and even aggressively) secular. This has probably been more marked at Victoria than elsewhere in New Zealand... While the anti-religious bias of the University Council, administration, academic staff and Students' Association has markedly declined over the past few years, it is still by no means dead.\(^{32}\)

---

28 "The EU said ‘Come and join us, we’re having a tea’, and that sort of thing, and then the SCM was after us flat tack. This was personal approach from men who were in the College [the Knox College hall of residence]. Some of them belonged to SCM, some of them belonged to EU. I think that was the way it went, there was plenty of advertising around the university but people invited you along. So I went along to both of these and I still remember it as clearly as anything: EU I was very comfortable with, it was just like going to Bible Class. SCM, I did not know where I was. They talked in terms that were far removed from any conversation I was used to, I found them very abstruse, and I was by no means at home in it. And it was simply that feeling, I guess, that took me into EU, and away from SCM": SM, ¶15. McCay chose EU, and appreciated the EU’s biblical exposition and prayer meetings.

29 SM, ¶21.


31 From 1961, Victoria University of Wellington. Prior to that, the Victoria University College. There was also an EU at the Wellington Teachers’ College.

32 "A statement of the NCC Chaplaincy Advisory Board on the nature and function of the chaplaincy at Victoria, with special reference to its relationship with the intended appointment of an Anglican Chaplain", J.H. Ross, Chairman, 30 June 1963, TSCF N2/065. Martin Sullivan, SCM chaplain at Victoria from 1946, described Victoria as "the most secular of the secular", and noted the influence of the university college’s Principal, Sir Thomas Hunter, a "freethinker and ...sworn opponent of religious
In 1945 the EU at Victoria had only 35 active members.\textsuperscript{33} By 1956 it was still no more than 65, even after an influx of new members following a mission in 1955.\textsuperscript{34} But it continued to nurture future evangelical leaders: the 1956 Executive, for example, included Guy Jansen (later a leader in the field of Christian music), Don Mathieson (later a law lecturer and prominent evangelical Anglican layman), Peter Warner (later a Presbyterian minister and OMF missionary) and Wilf Malcolm (later General Secretary of NZIVF, lecturer in Mathematics and Vice Chancellor of Waikato University).\textsuperscript{35} By the early 1960s the EU in Victoria was considerably larger than the SCM.\textsuperscript{36} By 1965 it claimed 100 members.\textsuperscript{37}

**E The Evangelical Union in Auckland**

As with other EUs, the EU in Auckland received a flood of new students in the immediate post-war era, plus many returned servicemen. Thomas Miller, having visited all the EUs in 1945, felt that AUCEU was the strongest of the unions at that time.\textsuperscript{38} He was impressed at Blaiklock’s address to about 100 students, gathered on a Saturday afternoon.\textsuperscript{39} The 1946 President was Ian Kemp (grandson of Joseph Kemp and later a Baptist minister, missionary, and Bible College lecturer). The programme included lunchtime meetings, weekly Bible Studies, studies on the Doctrinal Basis, and extra activities such as hikes and discussion evenings at the Blaiklocks’.\textsuperscript{40}

---

\textsuperscript{33} VUCEU Annual Report for year ending 31 August 1945, TSCF B1/074.
\textsuperscript{34} Annual Report of the VUCEU, Sept. 1956, TSCF B2/037.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{36} NCC Chaplaincy Advisory Board statement by J.H. Ross, TSCF N2/065. Ross gave figures of 70 for EU, 40 for SCM, and 25 for the Anglican Society.
\textsuperscript{37} Entry on administrative return form, TSCF A1a.
\textsuperscript{38} “Tour of the New Zealand Colleges by the Rev. Thomas Miller, M.A.” [1945], TSCF C5/2.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{40} AUCEU Annual Report for year ending 31 Aug. 1946, TSCF B1/075.
Professor Blaiklock was a frequent speaker, and the Auckland EU’s key mentor and luminary. A visitor in 1955 reported that Professor Blaiklock was “a tower of strength to the Christian witness. His weekly Bible Expositions gather about 80, which exceeds in size any other meeting held in the College. His witness in the town, his ‘leaders’ to the papers, his Sunday preaching, and his influence on the Staff are outstanding.” But Blaiklock’s moral influence was not absolute: some students in the late 1940s were troubled by signs that Blaiklock had a “powerful antipathy” towards Orange and that his disagreements with others would sometimes become highly personal. Blaiklock also appeared to distrust student missioners (including Howard Guinness) and Calvinists (including Graham Miller).

Blaiklock was not, though, the only influence on AUCEU: other frequent speakers at AUCEU in this period included John Deane (BTI Principal and a Baptist minister from Australia), R.A. Laidlaw (prominent Brethren businessman) and Roland Hart (Baptist minister). Deane was a significant new arrival in the Auckland EU scene, and in NZ evangelicalism generally: he was a voice of theological moderation, and would help steer both BTI and NZ evangelicalism away from tendencies towards narrowness.

By contrast, the influence of EU pioneer William Pettit had faded. As Pettit had aged he had become increasingly insular and sectarian in outlook. In 1958 – against the counsel of Laidlaw, Deane and almost the entire evangelical establishment as

---

41 Ibid.
42 H. Guinness “Report on New Zealand”, 12 Aug. 1955, TSCF C5/7. Some caution may be in order about what Guinness wrote: his reports were typically impressionistic rather than careful.
43 KO, ¶17. “E.M. Blaiklock was my first demonstration of how great men can have feet of clay.... There was a degree of intolerance there. If he disagreed with someone, he disagreed in a very personal way.” Re the relationship of Blaiklock and Orange, see below.
44 See below.
45 E.g. JGM, ¶244.
47 Pettit’s influence also appeared to have waned more widely: early in the post-war era Gosling had written that Pettit was “making a nuisance of himself” and was embarrassing IVF by being too
represented by the IVF and the Crusader Council – Pettit had held public rallies to
denounce the forthcoming Billy Graham Crusade, on the grounds that it was
sponsored by “modernists and unbelievers”. Such an outlook could not be
accommodated within the canons of moderation and inter-denominationalism that
underlay the IVF and Crusader evangelical consensus, and in a Reaper editorial,
Blaiklock publicly rejected Pettit’s view.

The Auckland EU’s membership continued to increase. In the 1950s it eclipsed
SCM, and by 1959 it had 125 members. By 1960 the average attendance was 150, a
25% increase at a time when the overall university roll had increased only 7%. Such
an increase was another indication of an evangelical groundswell. By the early
sixties, it had 200 active members, and was the largest student club in the
university. By 1964 it was claimed that AUEU membership was 260, making it the
biggest EU in the country. As elsewhere, EU was regularly replenished by ex-
Crusaders. Strong Crusader groups feeding into AUEU included that at Westlake

---


48 KO, I18; Bruce Harris to Kaye [Johnston], 18 Aug. 1958, TSCF B1/093.
Pettit’s insularity also caused some problems in SU and Crusader circles: he would not, for example,
agree to any shared communion service at conferences or at the Crusader Council if it was proposed
that they be conducted by an Anglican minister, or presided over by anyone.

to the inter-denominational invitation to Graham, and without mentioning Pettit by name, Blaiklock
wrote: “Only those prepared to sacrifice the chance of a wide religious movement to the personal
prejudices of a rigid and brittle theology deplore such partnership. There are such. They are the
survivors of those wounded by a crude liberalism of a generation ago, who have been unable to cease
firing after the battle is done, and the evangelical position needs only vigilance and a ready guard.”

50 Dr. Bruce Harris, letter, 30 May 2001.

51 Brian [Jenkins] to Warner [Hutchinson], 15 April 1959.

52 AUEU, 33rd Annual Report [1960], TSCF B1/105. Similar spurts of growth occurred in many other
evangelical organisations and churches at this time, in the period surrounding the Graham crusade.

53 DW, I11 (Wood was EU Treasurer and had to contest student union funding for EU on the basis of
numbers); cf. a 1965 administrative return to IVF gave the figures of 112 signed-up members and 270


55 E.g. Fred S. Martin, OUEU circular, 12 Sept. 1957. [OU]EU Secretary’s File, TSCF]: “we depend very
largely on ex-Crusaders to fill our ranks.”
Boys', where there were several evangelical teachers including the contagiously enthusiastic Alex Black.  

Another significant trend in AUEU was the increase in members from mainline churches. Whereas AUEU had previously had a strong Baptist and Brethren base, by late 1959 half its Executive were either Anglicans or Presbyterians, which was interpreted as indicating "a growing evangelical trend in the larger N.Z. denominations". The IVF General Secretary reflected that "evangelicalism is certainly far more respectable in the Church life of the country as a whole than it was even ten years ago".

**F Spiritual and Rational Strands in the Evangelical Movements**

Blaiklock’s antagonism towards Orange highlighted the contrast between his own rationalistic cast of thought and the more spiritualising tone of Orange and his Christchurch circle. Orange was bookish but essentially his approach was spiritual, not rationalistic. Blaiklock was self-consciously rational. It would be saying too much to suggest that the tensions between Blaiklock and Orange indicated any rift in New Zealand evangelicalism. But it would be fair to say that their differences did illustrate the presence of perceptible strands even within such a cohesive movement as the New Zealand IVF.

Spiritual and rationalistic emphases were not mutually exclusive and both found their place in the priorities of each EU. A spiritual emphasis remained attractive to

---

56 DW, ¶7, ¶35. Black was later Principal at Inglewood, where he lost his life in tragic circumstances at the hands of a student. Other evangelicals on the Westlake staff in the early 1960s included Brian Wood, David Wood, John Rimmer, Peter Blackburn and Hugh Willis.

57 Barry Gufstafson to W. [Hutchinson], 15 Sept. 1959, TSCF B1/101.

many, in Christchurch and elsewhere, and it would recur in another form – neo-pentecostalism – in the late 1960s. But in the Evangelical Unions in this period a rationalistic approach was generally in the ascendency.

G  **Emphases on Reason and Evidence**

In EU after EU the rationalistic and evidentialist concerns were expressed. The Massey EU, for instance, had a series of addresses in 1951 on “Why Believe?” A few years later the same EU declared that it aims were “to provide an intelligently thought-out Christian witness, to show that the Christian Faith is grounded on evidence strong enough to satisfy the tests of higher learning and to help the members by fellowship and service” – prayer and evangelism may have been assumed, but were not mentioned.

At a popular level, the apologetic thrust in many EUs was complemented by the use of the Moody Bible Institute’s “Fact and Faith” films. The Auckland EU screened four of these in 1951 alone. The films – which were not theologically sophisticated – were intended to counter the modern idea that the scientific study of nature was erosive of Christian faith. They did not explicitly attack the theory of evolution, but confidently focused on the marvels and intricacies of nature as evidence of God’s design. *Dust or Destiny*, for instance, not only revealed “the wonders of the human heart and eye”, but “the remarkable homing-pigeon and the flight of the bat” and “the incredible

---

59 Massey Agricultural College EU, typescript history, c.1964, TSCF B5/001.
60 1959 Annual Report, Massey Agricultural College EU, ibid.
spawning habits of the grunion”. EUs were particularly eager for science students to see such films.

In the late 1960s the majority of AUEU meetings had an apologetic focus, and the expressed aim of VUEU main meetings was “showing that Christian faith is reasonable”.

H What EU Members were Reading

Emphases on reason and evidence (historical, archeological, scientific, philosophical) were also marked in many of the books being promoted and read in Evangelical Unions in the 1950s and 60s. The majority of these were published by the British IVF. They included classic IVF works such as Search the Scriptures (1934) and Hammond’s In Understanding be Men (1936), Guinness’ Sacrifice (1936), Rendle Short’s Modern Discovery and the Bible (1949), F.F. Bruce’s Are the New Testament Documents Reliable?, Hallesby’s Why I am a Christian and Prayer, Moule’s Charles

---

62 “Can a Thinking Man be a Christian?” [mission flier], TSCF C5/7.
63 Ibid. The Fact and Faith films, along with the popular Billy Graham films, were distributed by the Gospel Film Services Trust in Levin.
64 Cruse 2 (1968).
66 List compiled mainly from titles mentioned by W. Malcolm in his TSCF Jubilee Address. In each case the date of the first edition is given.
67 For an overview of the publishing activity of the IVF, see Ronald Inchley, “The Inter-Varsity Press,” Johnson: 314-32. The key aim of IVF publications was to redress the dearth of up-to-date evangelical literature.
Simeon, Tasker's The Narrow Way, Johnson's The Christian and his Bible (1953), The New Bible Commentary, Pollock's The Cambridge Seven, and The New Bible Dictionary. Many of these, such as those by F.F. Bruce and Rendle Short, were being constantly republished by IVF and went to many editions. Some non-IVF books were also influential, including Morison's Who Moved the Stone? and Pollock's A Cambridge Movement. C.S. Lewis's apologetic works were also extremely popular.

Together, such works shaped the outlook of at least one generation of EU people. IVF books were also widely used in the wider evangelical scene. The impact of IVF publications was immense, especially among evangelicals. Together, the IVF corpus provided a coherent, moderate and intellectually cogent apologetic of conservative evangelical faith. Because it confidently addressed key intellectual challenges, the IVF library was highly significant in the buttressing and recovery of post-war Protestant evangelicalism. While many ordinary Protestants remained barely aware of the IVF they would nevertheless be affected through the influence of IVF literature on a growing number of ministers and lay leaders.

72 Handley C.G. Moule, Charles Simeon (London: IVF, 1948). Moule's biography of Simeon was first published in 1892, but re-published by IVF.

73 R.V.G. Tasker, The Narrow Way (London: IVF, 1952). This book contained biblical expositions given mainly at King's College London. Professor of NT at London University, Tasker had changed to a conservative position after hearing an address by Lloyd-Jones (Murray: 183).


80 E.g. BRC, ¶202-6; NSC, ¶108.
Later, books being read in IVF circles included three 1958 titles: *Authority* (Martyn Lloyd-Jones), *Basic Christianity* (John Stott) and ‘*Fundamentalism* and the Word of God: Some Evangelical Principles* (J.I. Packer).82 Lloyd-Jones, incisive and stern, had long insisted on Scripture as the true source of unchanging truth.83 Stott – with his clarity, instinctive balance and careful biblical explanations – was emerging as a key voice of moderate British-style evangelicalism.84 His 1958 mission to American universities had raised his international profile, and provided the basis of his book. His output would become prolific, and increasingly influential.55

The book by Packer86 was particularly noteworthy, as a spirited restatement of mainstream evangelical Christianity in relation to authority, Scripture, faith and reason. It was written in the context of a wave of public criticism in Britain of Evangelicals, who were being pilloried by theological liberals as “Fundamentalists”.87 Billy Graham was one target and IVF another.88 Packer refuted “demonstrably false” caricatures, such as the claim that Evangelicals believed in the mechanical “dictation” of Scripture.89 Evangelicals at their best, he argued, have never been anti-intellectual or sectarian.90 He denied that evangelicalism was an innovation, a “new heresy”. He asserted instead that it was in continuity with historic Christianity, “the oldest

81 As in Dr. John Hitchen e-mail noted above, referring to the use of Howard Guinness’ *Sacrifice* in Christchurch in the late 1950s in a city lunch-time fellowship and in YFC circles.
83 See also his *Truth Unchanged, Unchanging* (London: James Clarke, 1951): 53-118.
84 Goodhew also compared the university missioners W.P. Nicholson (rough-hewn) with John Stott (urbane, well-educated and upper middle-class).
87 Packer: 14, 24.
88 Packer: 14.
89 Ibid.: 178-81.
orthodoxy". Defiantly, he argued that it was “Liberal Protestantism that is obscurantist and heretical and a deviation”, and that liberalism’s key flaw was its unscriptural subjection to human opinion. Packer’s work became “the standard evangelical apologia, a classic defence of B.B. Warfield’s view of inspiration”, selling 30,000 copies in its first year. It “moulded the thinking of evangelical students in the 1950s and early 60s”, resulting in “a significant growth in self-confidence within evangelicalism”. Within NZIVF, the book was strongly promoted – and more than any other book – for at least a decade.

The title of Packer’s book reflected the controversy around Ramsay’s charge that “Fundamentalism” was “heretical” and a “menace”. But Packer was primarily responding to Hebert’s *Fundamentalism and the Church of God*. Packer’s title was

---

90 Ibid.: 21, 23.
91 Ibid.: 38-40, 22, 170.
92 Ibid.: 22.
93 Ibid.: 21, 170. Packer argued, “authentic Christianity is a religion of biblical authority” (20); “subjection to the authority of Christ involves subjection to the authority of Scripture,” and anything less is “impertinence (21).”
95 McGrath: 86. For discussion of the book generally, see ibid.: 80-89. McGrath argues (99) that the book rehabilitated Packer’s reputation as a constructive evangelical theologian and spokesman, after the hurts aroused by his 1955 attack on Keswick theology (q.v. ibid.: 76-80).
96 WJR, §9; DW, §10; Neil C. Munro, interview, 23 May 2001 (hereafter NCM), §143; “The IVF and the SCM in New Zealand,” typescript, TSCF N7/30. [c.1960].
97 Michael Ramsay, “The Menace of Fundamentalism,” *Bishoprick* (Feb. 1956), cited Packer: 11. Ramsay’s attack followed a letter to *The Times* the previous year by Canon H.K. Luce attacking Billy Graham’s proposed mission to Cambridge University: “In this country, universities exist for the advancement of learning: on what basis, therefore, can fundamentalism claim a hearing at Cambridge?” (cit. e.g. Johnson: 247).
98 Gabriel Hebert, *Fundamentalism and the Church of God* (London: SCM, 1957). Hebert, an Anglo-Catholic and an apologist for the SCM, acknowledged the British Evangelicals’ rejection of the term “Fundamentalist”(9), but nevertheless wrote his book with Evangelicals in the Church of England and in the IVF in view (10), and consistently associated them with Fundamentalism. Hebert argued for a conception of Scripture very different from that of IVF, e.g. “It follows that, in regard to this Word of God spoken through the words of men, we are required to be at once humble and docile, and alert and critical, ...entirely able to discern truth from error and good from evil”, and not “gullible, foolish and superstitious” (11): it appeared that modern interpretation of the Bible thus required a discerning of which parts of Scripture were the Word of God, and which parts simply reflected the fallible human writers. *Inter alia*, Hebert politely accused the Evangelicals of “weak” and uncritical exegesis (84-98), self-righteousness (e.g. 103-116), a sectarian spirit (123), bibliolatry (139), closed minds (140-1) akin to Fascism (142), and an ignorance of church history (129). He implied that they supported the ICCC
arguably misleading. Packer never used the term “fundamentalist” except in quotation marks, and insisted that the term was one that most British Evangelicals “have always declined”. Stott had also publicly rejected the term, as had Johnson of the IVF. For Packer, the term was “objectionable” and “contemptuous”, combining “the vaguest conceptual meaning with the strongest emotional flavour”. “Fundamentalism” also unfairly denoted evangelicalism at “less than its best”: quoting Machen and Henry, Packer freely conceded the failings of historic American fundamentalism, such as separatism, anti-intellectualism and a narrow emphasis on personal religion.

Emerging IVF writers, soon to become prolific, included Michael Griffiths, Michael Green and Francis Schaeffer. Their works persuasively defended Christianity, against the backdrop of new moods in contemporary thought and culture, such as the emphasis on personal freedom.

Meanwhile, there was an increasing flow of academically credible evangelical commentaries and theological books, reflecting the post-war recovery of evangelical scholarship especially in the UK. Such works included the IVF’s New Bible Dictionary
(1962), Packer's *Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God* (1961)\(^{106}\) and the exegetical work of such scholars as R.V.G. Tasker, Leon Morris and F.F. Bruce.

The aim of the literature being promoted in EU and IVF circles was not to reframe Christian faith in the light of modern science and scholarship but to bolster it. The SCM diet of reading was intellectually broader and more open, and reflected an eagerness to keep up with the latest writers, theologians and winds of thought: those in SCM “tended to be much more intellectual than we were, in a sort of a pseudo way. They read a lot of books that we [in EU] never bothered to read”.\(^{107}\) The literature being read in EU circles could be intellectually rigorous, but it was invariably committed to a classical (and usually evangelical) Christian position: one way or another, the IVF type of books “all reinforced what you believed”\(^{108}\). Nevertheless, from the 1960s they increasingly represented a serious critical engagement with modern secular thought.

1 EU/IVF and Intellectual Formation

The effect on EU members of IVF teaching and reading was often profound. For many later Christian leaders, EU was the single greatest formative influence upon them – or the next so, after their home.\(^{109}\) At a minimal level, EU would merely assist some students from a conservative background to retain their faith in the face of various challenges at university. But, in some students at least, the influence of EU and IVF produced what amounted to a Christian intellectual awakening. “For the first time”, recalled a member of the Victoria EU in 1952, “I realised the gospel could be understood by the mind.”\(^{110}\) Students’ convictions often became intellectually

\(^{107}\) MB, ¶25.
\(^{108}\) MB, ¶26.
\(^{109}\) E.g. Malcolm, “Jubilee Address”.
\(^{110}\) Ibid.
buffeted, and then intellectually anchored. Many acquired a life-long habit of thinking and reading about Christian truth.

**J**  
**The Concern for Orthodoxy**

The IVF movement was about Christian intellectual robustness and clarity. It was never about theological sophistication or free-wheeling speculation. The constant exhortation was to faithfulness, not exploration. Exploration was good, but only within the bounds of faithfulness, and in so far as it deepened faithfulness.

Adherence to the Doctrinal Basis remained a *sine qua non* of the movement, at least for those in leadership, and anxiety about “unsoundness” was never far away. The IVF could not easily forget its origin as a movement of reaction against what was considered doctrinal deviancy. EU and IVF speakers were required to adhere to the DB, and peer pressure constrained most EU members from airing doubts or views of a heterodox flavour. Office-bearers were usually fastidious in toeing the IVF line: even though each EU was theoretically “autonomous” they would commonly seek and heed the advice of the IVF staff, especially that of the General Secretaries.

But it would be unfair to associate the EUs with an approach tantamount to indoctrination. For one thing, indoctrination would have been inconsistent with the goal of producing Christian graduates who would continue to study, read and think about the Christian faith and give leadership in both church and society. As it grew in numbers and confidence, IVF in New Zealand would become gradually more relaxed. General Secretary Warner Hutchinson would be especially noted for his stress on exploring and thinking through the faith. Notwithstanding the forces towards conformity there were always those in EUs who thought a bit differently or with more doctrinal latitude. Notwithstanding the constant promotion of IVF publications, EU members frequently read material from other perspectives also and
were not necessarily convinced by every word that issued from the IVF press: a future IVF(NZ) General Secretary admitted that in the 1950s he sometimes “began to recognise limitations of [IVF] viewpoints, or began to exercise differing judgement on the material in hand”. 112

K  Professor Blaiklock and IVF “Rationalism”

The most eloquent and learned exponent of evangelical Christian rationalism was Professor Blaiklock. In 1952, in his IVF Presidential Address, Blaiklock expounded his concern for rationality in Christian faith, especially among Christian university students. 113 “The Christian,” he claimed, “is the truest rationalist.” That is because the world of the Christian alone “makes sense”, because Christian conviction is “the most truly integrating of all ideas”. “Our faith,” Blaiklock asserted, “is a reasonable one.” Faith always involves rationality: “we are not asked to believe without the assent of our minds”. Human reason is foundational to human nature: “to deny the validity of reason,” he argued, “is to scorn the image of God within us.” Reason is not contrary to faith but a foundation for faith: “we must accept the reason of man as a legitimate road to God, and must be prepared to submit the tenets and attitudes of religion to its test.” Blaiklock decried the “widespread revolt against reason” that was becoming evident in modern art and literature: 114 it is “sheer craziness” reflecting “the insane theory that the intellect is of no consequence”, and “it is part of the revolt of man, the denial of the image of God within us.” By contrast, the rational Christian “should, indeed, be a fountain of sanity in a mad world”, avoiding all irrationality – and also both “false faiths and despair.”

111 E.g. see SR, ¶19-21, 29-31, 34.
112 Jubilee Address. Malcolm recalled being dissatisfied, for instance, with aspects of Packer’s Fundamentalism and The Word of God (1958) and being more persuaded in some respects by Gabriel Hebert’s Fundamentalism and The Church of God (1957) against whom Packer had (in part) written.
113 Presidential Address [1952, E.M. Blaiklock], TSCF A1/107. Quotes that follow are also from there. The address was later published by IVF(NZ) as a pamphlet.
114 As examples, he cited James Joyce and Rimbaud.
Given the lofty place Blaiklock accorded to reason, he was deeply troubled by any hint of irrationality among evangelical students. His observations of such irrational thought and behaviour had “not infrequently” caused him “pain”. It included “crudity of ...language” in public prayer (with a “childish attitude toward God revealed therein” and “a shallowness which is quite without excuse”), “boisterous leadership in a song service” and “stupidity in exposition”. His critique thus identified some recurring weaknesses of evangelicalism: in its enthusiasm, evangelicalism’s heavenly-minded theology was not always matched by concern for dignity or form; in its populism, evangelicalism was left vulnerable to superficiality and crassness.  

Perhaps it was inevitable that such a cultured, erudite orator-scholar as Blaiklock would increasingly become irritated with the lack of gravitas, polish and maturity among youthful students. Two decades on, Blaiklock would be moved to paroxysms of rage and despair at the irrationality he perceived in the neo-pentecostal movement: “The sound of hammering on the nails that close the coffin of the IVF is insistent in my ears. Lose the intelligent and we lose the lot - and I do know universities in four continents.”

Instead of irrationality, Blaiklock exhorted, IVF students should model “sanity, confidence and scholarship”. They should always be mindful of how they may be seen by others, for whom the atmosphere of evangelicalism is increasingly “an alien air”. Evangelical students must exhibit “grace”, “clarity”, and “culture, charm and polish – not boorishness, rough manners, and aloofness.” They must integrate their faith, life and studies. They must aim for the best possible academic results. They must read widely. As students and graduates, they must form “an intellectual

Note similar concerns for propriety as expressed in the updated IVF guidebook, C.J.E. Lefroy (ed.) Effective Witness: Practical Suggestions for Leaders Concerning the Detailed Organisation of Christian Union Activities (London: IVF, 1958), which called for “the highest standards of behaviour” (7), “clear thinking” (7), prayers to be “concise and definite”, (14), “reverent demeanour” (29) and “good manners” (31).

Blaiklock to John [McInnes], 3 Nov. [1972], TSCF A3b/17.
Christian elite of laymen informed in matters of faith and thought, aware of the scholarship that lies in and around their convictions, and trained in the exposition of what their minds have stored, in such language and form as befits the scholar”.

Despite Blaiklock’s emphasis on reason, he had no time for the sort of rationalism that led to religious scepticism. He deplored “the great tragedy of the last century that scholarship in those spheres which had to do with the Bible and Christianity was monopolised by the so-called liberals”. He argued that the “peculiar constitution” of the PhD in Germany had encouraged “audacious and insincere attacks on established beliefs”, and had introduced a “fashion of iconoclasm”. Part of the blame, he asserted, lay with those who “held the faith and neglected scholarship”. But he was heartened by a recovery of [conservative] “Christian scholarship” in the previous twenty-five years.117

Blaiklock was decidedly nervous about university missioners. In part it was because of an aversion to triumphalism: “missioners descend on the place and gain the impression that they have done marvels, and know nothing of the subtle damage left behind”.118 When it was first mooted that EU pioneer Howard Guinness be brought back to New Zealand for another round of university missions, Blaiklock wrote that “I view the whole project without enthusiasm” and that “I like Guinness immensely but should be horrified to let him loose in a public meeting of students”. Blaiklock brushed away an apparent reassurance that Guinness had now matured: “Basil William’s opinion, or that of any other outside opinion, weighs nothing with me.” Blaiklock seems to have been moved primarily by an intense protectiveness of his own more scholarly style of Christian witness, which could be undermined by emotional mass meetings,119 and by a concern for his own academic reputation: “I

117 Likewise Blaiklock, “The Task of Educated Leadership: The Presidential Address at the I.V.F. Conference, 1962,” NZIVF Christian Codex 4: 1-6 (5-6). In the same address, he identified himself with Scroggie’s phrase “informed conservatism.”
118 E.M. Blaiklock to Cliff Cocker, Feb. 3 [1952], TSCF C5. Quotes that follow are from the same source.
119 “Flamboyant...mass meetings.”
don't want my work hindered by well-meaning efforts from outside... I wish I could make plain to you how difficult some matters look from the point of view of staff, and how ultimately important that view is."\textsuperscript{120}

The concern for academic respectability was not unique to Blaiklock. The IVF leadership always craved such respectability, along with ecclesiastical respectability, while at the same time continuing to value spiritual enthusiasm and evangelistic zeal in its student constituency. These aspirations were always held together in some tension with the others. The 1952 IVF Board of Reference, for instance, was printed on each EU's letterhead\textsuperscript{121} and consisted of fifteen men including a university Professor, a university lecturer, a theological college Principal, a Presbyterian Moderator, an Anglican Canon, three other ministers, two medical doctors, two lawyers, two accountants and one civil servant.\textsuperscript{122} All academic qualifications were listed: all but one of the Board were graduates, the majority with Master's degrees. It was not uncommon, in that period, for organisations to list eminent supporters and their qualifications. The IVF, always striving for recognition, never lost any opportunity to do so.

\section*{LEUMissions}

Despite Blaiklock's nervousness, the IVF in the 1950s continued to arrange evangelistic missions in universities and training colleges. Dr. Howard Guinness (by then Rector of St. Barnabas in Sydney) conducted university missions in Otago\textsuperscript{123} and

\textsuperscript{120} The IVF leadership replied sympathetically (Cliff Cocker to EMB, 20 Feb. 1952, TSCF C5), but over the next few years numerous Guinness missions went ahead.
\textsuperscript{121} E.g. letterhead to "Mission to the University of Otago," OUEU, June 1952, TSCF C5.
\textsuperscript{122} Rev. A.W. Armstrong; Rt. Rev. F.B. Barton BA; Prof. Blaiklock MA DLitt; J.S. Burt LLM; Rev. A. Clifford MSc; T.C. Cocker BCom; H.R. Fountain MCom; Dr. J.M. Laird MB ChB; Rev. J.G. Miller LLB B.D; Rev. M.G. Milmine MA; H.R. Minn MA BD; E.A. Missen MA; Rev. Canon Orange BA; Dr. W.H. Pettit MBE MB ChB; G.E. Rowe LLB.
\textsuperscript{123} "Mission to the University of Otago", OUEU. June 1952, TSCF C5.
Canterbury in 1952, in Auckland and Victoria in 1955, and in Auckland again in 1959. In Otago, the names of thirty-two were recorded as “helped and desiring further contact”. Sixteen of these were already EU members (including some also on the mission’s organising committee), one was an SCM member, and only five were recorded as “converted”. Respondents were listed by denomination: this was an era when almost everyone had at least a nominal church affiliation. In Canterbury, the results were loosely reported as “at least a dozen converted”. Nevertheless, members of the Canterbury group felt that the mission had made a “tremendous impact” on the university. The 1952 Guinness missions may have marked the beginning of a period when EU missions would have an unprecedented level of effectiveness. Missioners at Canterbury in the next decade would include Stuart Barton Babbage (1955) and Alan Cole (1958).

A new input into the NZ Christian student scene, in 1952, was missioner David Stewart, an Australian Baptist minister and former CIM missionary. John Deane had previously been Stewart’s minister and presumably arranged the visit. Stewart had a strong academic background in both mathematics and theological study and was a persuasive Christian apologist and biblical expositor. In 1952 he did missions in AUC, VUC, Massey, and Ardmore and Wellington teachers’ colleges. In Victoria he captivated Wilf Malcolm at least with a more intellectual conception of Christian faith. In 1965 Stewart would commence a more permanent role within NZ

---

125 “Names and addresses of those helped and desiring further contact with Dr. Guinness”, with “Mission to the University of Otago.”
126 Notes from Graham Lamont [CCEU President] on CUC and OU missions by Rev. Dr. H.W. Guinness [1952], TSCF C5.
127 Brian Carrell/Peter Lineham interview, n.d.
129 Both came from Australia, but Babbage was a New Zealander.
130 “Introducing David Stewart,” leaflet [1952], TSCF C5.
131 Jubilee Address. In Palmerston North, however, Stewart was “very disappointed” with the mission: David Stewart to Prayer Companions, [1952] TSCF C5.
evangelicalism with his appointment as Principal of the BTL, where he significantly strengthened BTI's cross-denominational influence.\textsuperscript{132}

When Guinness returned in 1955, the publicity material was framed as an appeal to reason. The pamphlet was titled "Can a thinking man be a Christian?"\textsuperscript{133} Students were challenged to come to Guinness' meetings and to "consider the validity of the Christian claims", as Christianity "demands from all honest-thinking men and women a thorough and open-minded consideration, at the least". Students were assured that Guinness (a doctor, the author of \textit{The Sanity of Faith},\textsuperscript{134} and someone who had spoken in "every university in the British Empire"\textsuperscript{135}) would present the faith "in a reasoned, logical way" – and presumably without pressure or histrionics.

Guinness' list of speech topics indicated a clearly apologetic emphasis, with such titles as "Where Science and Faith Meet", "Why I am a Christian", "Five Good Reasons for Believing that Jesus Christ is the Son of God", and "Christian Sex Morality is Psychologically Sound and Medically Up to Date". The pamphlet recognised that the Christian faith "does present intellectual difficulties to some thinking men" – such as miracles (which are contrary to "physical laws") and the Resurrection. However, "once we accept certain other basic facts, Christ's miracles and His Resurrection are just what we would expect in fact! Christ claimed to be the Son of God, and once we accept this and the fact becomes a premise in our thinking, intellectual barriers are broken down, and difficulties are resolved." The pamphlet also commended the book of "one-time sceptic" Professor Hallesby (\textit{Why I am a Christian})\textsuperscript{136}. In a later newspaper report (possibly penned by the same publicist), it

\textsuperscript{132} Stewart ended the Baptist and Brethren domination of BTI (in part by adding Anglican and Presbyterian lecturers), changed BTI's name, and continued the move into degree-level programmes.

\textsuperscript{133} TSCF C5/7.

\textsuperscript{134} Howard W. Guinness, \textit{The Sanity of Faith} (Sydney: Omega, 1950).

\textsuperscript{135} Also in universities in Spain, Hungary, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Holland, and the USA.

was noted that Guinness believed that "the truth of Christianity is essentially reasonable".\textsuperscript{137}

Guinness reported that over two hundred students came to hear his talk on sex and were crammed into a room "packed to suffocation."\textsuperscript{138} The topic was a sign of changing times and probably would not have appeared on the programme a couple of decades earlier.\textsuperscript{139} Another notable aspect of the 1955 missions was that, in Auckland, someone arrived at a meeting dressed up as the devil. It turned out to be a member of the SCM.\textsuperscript{140} But some features of the 1955 missions remained familiar: the characteristic IVF concern for ecclesiastical recognition and academic respectability was reflected in such features as a special service in Wellington at St. Paul's Cathedral (attracting 700) and the chairing of the Auckland student meetings by the Professors of Modern Languages, Classics, Obstetrics, Law, and Botany.

In addition to the overseas missioners, who usually went the rounds of several of the larger university EUs, smaller EUs would also often call on New Zealanders to conduct local missions. The Massey EU, for instance, had Don Elley lead a mission in 1960 and Wynford Davies in 1961.\textsuperscript{141}

The impact of EU missions to university students in the post-war decades was constrained by a number of factors. In the mid-twentieth-century New Zealand university setting, religious scepticism was a considerable counterforce to evangelism. Within the overall student body the EUs remained minority groups, regarded with some suspicion by many students, staff and church leaders. For some, the term "evangelical" (in the EU name) may have caused "confusion in the minds of

\textsuperscript{137} Miscellaneous newspaper cuttings re H. Guinness 1955 mission to VUC, TSCF C5/7.
\textsuperscript{139} The topics of marriage and sex were reflected, however, in a number of post-war IVF publications.
\textsuperscript{140} Ibid. Guinness reported of the devil that "on the whole he behaved very well".
the untaught" and suggested red-hot revivalism. In most university centres, local church support for EU missions was limited. Most New Zealand university students remained non-residential and many were not eager to stay on campus outside of lectures. It was not easy for a week of special mission meetings to generate momentum. What was true of the university missions was true of EU as a whole: “it ought to be emphasised that a characteristic of the N.Z. work has been the building up of students in the faith rather than the conversion of outside students”. While the effect of EU’s university missions might not have been great in numerical terms, there was nevertheless often a profound personal impact on individual respondents. The missions also had considerably more effect than university missions a few decades later, when society became decidedly more pluralistic and secular: the 1950s through to the 1970s were a period of relative openness to Christianity, when an EU mission could still generate significant interest.

The 1960s Teaching Missions

The 1961 IVF missioner, Dr. Masumi Toyatome, took a strongly spiritual, “existential” approach, deliberately avoiding any intellectual defence of the faith. But Toyatome was the exception. In the early 1960s the IVF co-ordinated an annual round of “teaching missions” by overseas academics, including Dr. Hermann Sasse (1962), W.A. Andersen (1963), Dr. Bernard Ramm (1964) and Dr. Klaas Runia.

---

141 Massey Agricultural College EU, TSCF B5/001. An atypical EU mission was conducted at Auckland Teachers’ Training College in July-August 1959, with the American group the Nixon Musical Messengers (“Nixon Musical Messengers,” folder, TSCF).
142 Report of Travelling Representative covering year from Feb.1948 to Dec.18, 1948 [K. Roundhill], TSCF. A8b.
143 “IVF work in New Zealand”. Document attached to letter [Cliff Cocker?] to Bruce [Harris], 28 Aug. 1950, TSCF H1/22.
144 Ibid.
145 See e.g. University of Auckland EU report, Mission Report, July 1959. Over 200 attended twice-daily talks by Guinness, including many identified by the report writer as atheists and rationalists.
147 Lecturer in Systematic Theology at Lutheran Theological Seminary, Adelaide.
These represented “a new outlook” of “evangelism through teaching”. In a university setting, the scholarly defence of Christianity was increasingly seen as important. Ramm wrote that he wished to present the faith “in dialogue with the modern world rather than...allow the impression that evangelical Christianity is wholly obscurantist”. The strategy may also have reflected a perception that secular challenges to the faith were multiplying. The missions were not seen as evangelistic as such, but as an adjunct to evangelism. Both the strength and the weakness of the teaching missions was their sheer intellectualism, in isolation from the more experiential dimensions of evangelicalism. It was not the sort of approach that would have appealed to EU pioneer W.A. Orange, who last addressed an EU in 1965 and died the following year: in Orange, scholarly and spiritual emphases had always been melded.

M IVF as a Network of People Shaping People

The work of the IVF – nurturing evangelical belief, promoting evangelism, and encouraging evangelical patterns of personal piety – was much more than an abstraction or programme. It was very much embodied in people, both locally and nationally. Through conferences, correspondence and personal contacts, younger leaders in the movement were constantly being influenced by IVF staff and older leaders. There was an unending process of evangelical beliefs, values, and behaviours being modelled and transmitted to the emerging generation of evangelical leadership. It was a web of influence that operated across the whole

148 University of Sydney. Andersen’s key interest was in the relationship of Christian faith and modern psychology. Note W.E. Andersen, “A Philosopher Examines the Question”, in E.M. Blaiklock, The Bible and I (Minneapolis: Bethany, 1983).
149 Professor of Systematic Theology at California Baptist Theological Seminary.
150 Dr. Klaus Runia (Reformed Theological Seminary, Geelong).
152 “Memo. To Student Commission, 7/12/63, and local EU Executives,” TSCF C5/11.
153 Ibid.
154 “Evangelical Witness”: 60.
country: from his base in the Canterbury EU, for instance, Graham Lamont came to know people such as Kevin O’Sullivan, Ivan Moses, Bruce Nicholls, Ian Kemp, Colin Becroft and Lewis Wilson. He was impressed by their “intellectual sharpness – the[ir] willingness to think and debate”. He was positively influenced by Wilson’s “graciousness”, which “commended the Gospel”. Others in the same EU had appreciated the trio of stalwarts sometimes known as “the BBC” of IVF: Becroft, Buist and Cocker, who were meticulous custodians of the IVF vision. In a previous era, Laird had played a similar role as IVF mentor and guide. Warner Hutchinson and Wilf Malcolm would inherit the mantle and have considerable personal influence. So would various Travelling Secretaries: those mentioned above (Moses, Nicholls and Kemp), plus Ken Roundhill, Frank Stephens, Ruth Moses and Ken Ralph.

N  Warner Hutchinson and Wilf Malcolm

The General Secretary of the IVF, with much potential influence over future Christian leaders, was in one of the most strategic evangelical roles in New Zealand. The IVF was very conscious that the role was one of theological leadership. Late in 1958, Warner Hutchinson became the first full-time General Secretary. A Congregational minister from the USA, and former staff worker for IVCF, Hutchinson held degrees in both literature and theology. He explicitly rejected both fundamentalist and neo-orthodox conceptions of Scripture. He held the line against co-operation with a doctrinally inclusive SCM. He strongly affirmed core evangelical commitments,
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155 GL, ¶27.
156 Glen/Lineham interview; Pfankuch/Lineham interview.
157 A10/003 Confidential memorandum from the General Secretary, IVF of EUs (NZ), to the Governing Council 13 Nov. 1961.
159 Hutchinson, “Thoughts on the Doctrine of Scripture,” NZIVF Christian Codex III (Wellington: IVF(NZ), [1962]): 4-7.
but his manner was not defensive.\textsuperscript{161} He critiqued evangelicalism for its tendencies towards anti-intellectualism and its neglect of humanitarianism.\textsuperscript{162} He disapproved of faith and evangelism being reduced to doctrinal formulas.\textsuperscript{163} He was eager for students to explore their faith intellectually and to engage with other positions, and plied them with books and articles that would extend their thinking.\textsuperscript{164} He wrote material expounding the variations within evangelicalism and its approach to Scripture.\textsuperscript{165} He was especially attentive towards those doing theological studies.\textsuperscript{166} A man of “warmth and undoubted scholarship and vision”,\textsuperscript{167} Hutchinson had a very profound influence on many IVF students.\textsuperscript{168} Some were uneasy about his emphasis on love (rather than truth) as the essence of Christianity.\textsuperscript{169} His relatively open attitudes were questionable in the eyes of some IVF stalwarts: this was the time, Graham Miller suspected, when the IVF in New Zealand “was beginning to swither”.\textsuperscript{170} But, overall, Hutchinson lifted IVF’s reputation in New Zealand.

To replace Hutchinson (who left late in 1962), the IVF was eager to appoint an evangelical reflecting neither “a defensive ‘fundamentalism’ ” nor “an anti-intellectual ‘activism’ ”.\textsuperscript{171} They settled on Wilf Malcolm, who was General Secretary for five years before returning to his university teaching career in mathematics. Of Brethren background, and greatly influenced by the IVF, SU and Crusaders, Malcolm

\begin{footnotesize}
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\item \textsuperscript{161} SR \textsection 24, 27-28.
\item \textsuperscript{164} SR, \textsection 28.
\item \textsuperscript{165} “Thoughts on the Doctrine of Scripture.”
\item \textsuperscript{166} JBM, \textsection 68.
\item \textsuperscript{167} Hutchinson, “Professing History: An Interview with Rev. Professor Ian Breward, 10 July 1991”, \textit{Lucas: An Evangelical History Review} 12 (Dec. 1991): 54-71 (59).
\item \textsuperscript{168} BTD, \textsection 7; also Breward, in ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{169} DW, \textsection 26.
\item \textsuperscript{170} JGM, \textsection 839; cf. the positive comment from an Australian historian, in reference to Warner Hutchinson: “InterVarsity Fellowship (IVF) in particular allowed Presbyterians to broaden their stance, and avoid merely looking like reactionaries” (Mark Hutchinson: 371).
\item \textsuperscript{171} Confidential memorandum from the General Secretary, IVF of EUs (NZ), to the Governing Council 13 Nov. 1961, TSCF A10/003.
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was strongly inter-denominationalist in spirit.\footnote{172}{Jubilee Address [Wilf Malcolm, 1986].} He was warmly pastoral. He aimed for a “catholicity” of Christian conviction: to hold to “irreducible” evangelical beliefs while avoiding what was “sectarian”.\footnote{173}{Ibid.} His convictions exemplified both “depth and breadth”.\footnote{174}{WJR, ¶56.} As an academic, he stressed the “intellectual character” of IVF, offering a Christian understanding within the validity of the university’s pursuit of knowledge and truth.\footnote{175}{Jubilee Address.} He noted that “within the university world of learning and scholarship” it had not been easy for the movement “to maintain its distinctive witness to the authority and functions of the scriptures and yet properly resist some of the stricter formulations as to their nature pressed upon it by those of fundamentalist convictions, especially of the American variety”.\footnote{176}{Ibid. Malcolm’s comment may in part reflect the 1980s context, when the pressures from American fundamentalism had increased, and when more conservative American-based student movements were becoming established in the New Zealand.}

\section{The IVF-SCM Relationship, Post-War}

For both IVF(NZ) and NZSCM, their relationship remained a vexatious issue. Their fretting about each other generated huge amounts of correspondence and written material: for the IVF at least, much more than on any other matter.\footnote{177}{See e.g. SCM Handbook (Typescript [1967]): IV, 1; “The IVF and SCM in New Zealand. A Brief History and Examination of the Movement,” n.d., TSCF N7/30.} From the mid 1930s, influenced by the neo-orthodoxy of Barth, Brunner, and Niebuhr, SCM itself had discernibly modified its direction. It had moved away from a more radical and socio-political focus to one that emphasised church, sacraments, ministry, theology, biblical and doctrinal study, evangelism and prayer.\footnote{178}{NZSCM. Handbook for Committee Members, 1959: 1, 35-6, 39, 41-2; SCM Handbook (Typescript [1967]): IV, 1; Berry Ch. 3: 1-3, 9, 11. An SCM member in the 1950s, Ian Dixon, said, “The SCM ...was non-political in the extreme – we were close to the Church and spent long hours on our knees” (citing “The SCM looks at itself”, Outlook, 24 Oct. 1970: 6).} The SCM, profoundly
committed to Christian unity, continued to deplore the schism with the EU: the schism was “sinful” and a “calamity”.\textsuperscript{179}

Internally, and sometimes externally, the SCM continued to criticise the IVF as divisive and narrow-minded. Aware of its own shift in direction, the SCM also argued that a permanent breach in student Christian work was more unjustified than ever, that the two movements were now practically the same.\textsuperscript{180} SCM members were urged to “co-operate” with EU, so as to “lessen the scandal of disunity”; an SCM branch was to maintain “charity” when it found “the other group’s attitudes hard to understand.”\textsuperscript{181} Pressure to co-operate was always felt most acutely at the local level, whenever an SCM branch wrote to the local EU. Members of the EU would often feel some tension between personal friendships with SCM members and the very firm IVF policy of avoiding co-operation.\textsuperscript{182} The IVF head office theoretically acknowledged the autonomy of each EU, but in practice was extremely anxious to ensure compliance with the IVF party line: the doctrinal purity of the IVF’s witness was at the heart of IVF’s \textit{raison d’être}, and head office would never countenance any compromise of that. In 1948, for instance, Cocker circularised all EU’s with the resolution that “should any advances be made to your Union, the Executive feels that it would be in the interests of our Fellowship that, before taking any action, you refer the matter to headquarters so that we can be sure a common policy is adopted throughout the whole of the IVF”.\textsuperscript{183}

\textsuperscript{179} J.M. Bates, “Memorandum on the Relationship of the SCM to the EU”, c.1945, NZSCM papers, MS papers 1617: 632, ATL, cit. Berry, Ch. 3: 8. A similar view was held by SCM world-wide, e.g. J. Davis McCaughey. \textit{Christian Obedience in the University: Studies in the Life of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland, 1930-1950} (London: SCM, 1958): 179, n.1; McCaughey wrote that the schism was “wholly deplorable”, and that three SCM attempts to heal the breach had been rebuffed.

\textsuperscript{180} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{181} SCM \textit{Handbook} (Typescript [1967]): L.B.7. (d). The co-operation envisaged included joint prayer, discussions, and missions.

\textsuperscript{182} E.g. [Arnold Turner] to Malcolm [Buist], 6 May 1946, TSCF B4.

\textsuperscript{183} Cocker to Bill _____, 4 May 1948, TSCF B4.
The IVF recognised signs that SCM had shifted,\textsuperscript{184} but did not feel that the SCM had come far enough. The SCM, they felt, regarded the Gospel as “a matter of speculative discussion” whereas the IVF saw it as “the essence of revealed truth”.\textsuperscript{185} The SCM, they suggested, acknowledged the divinity of Jesus, but in practice seemed to regard him “more as Leader and Teacher than as Saviour”.\textsuperscript{186} The IVF believed in revelation, but the SCM, they noted, “welcomes all points of view”.\textsuperscript{187} The SCM represented “religion” but the IVF represented “Christian Faith”.\textsuperscript{188} The IVF was “conservative”, but the SCM fluctuated “from pseudo-conservatism to extreme liberalism”.\textsuperscript{189} The IVF, they believed, was custodian and heir to authentic Christian faith, whereas the SCM wished to whittle away at that orthodoxy: “the ‘EU point of view’ is precisely the historic Christian faith....Rejection of any item of the ‘EU point of view’ will involve rejection of the historic Christian corpus of faith”.\textsuperscript{190} The IVF, they claimed, “definitely supports the historic creeds”, whereas the SCM “frequently opposes” them.\textsuperscript{191}

The heart of the matter was the question of authority. The SCM, according to the IVF, had a different epistemological basis: the SCM held not the Scriptures themselves (which provided “clear data set out by God”) but merely their “echo” in a subjectively discerned and nebulous “Word of God”.\textsuperscript{192} The SCM, IVF alleged, had a different soteriology: they neither believed in universal human alienation from God

\textsuperscript{184} E.g. Report of Traveling Representative covering year from Feb. 1948 to Dec. 18, 1948, [K. Roundhill] TSCF. A8b. Roundhill noted that the SCM Conference included the topics “Word of God” and “Evangelism”.
\textsuperscript{185} “The Two Varsity Unions”, General Secretary to the Editor, Methodist Times, Auckland, 24 July 1945, TSCF N7/74.
\textsuperscript{186} [Ivan Moses?] to Ian ___, Mar. 1946, TSCF N7/77.
\textsuperscript{187} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{188} [Malcolm Buist] to Ivan [Moses], n.d., TSCF N7/82.
\textsuperscript{189} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{190} [Malcolm Buist] to Ivan [Moses], n.d., TSCF N7/82.
\textsuperscript{191} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{192} Ibid; Buist to Arnold Turner, 1 May 1946, TSCF B4.
nor in the necessity of individual spiritual regeneration. Consequently, “the battle of the Reformation” was being “re-fought with every SCM approach to the EU”.

A former EU student recalled:

There were two things that we fought for as students. I can remember having great debates with [the] SCM crowd, in university days. There were two things only, really. One was the defence of Scripture – the inspiration and authority of Scripture, and...the other thing was...Substitutionary Atonement, and we weren’t going to give an inch on it. It was all very simple, in a way: ...two issues that distinguished an evangelical from other people.

The SCM, the IVF complained, was forever asking to co-operate, but refused to accept the IVF’s “sole basis of joint activity”, the Doctrinal Basis (which included “the Infallibility of Scripture and the Substitutionary Atonement”). The SCM, they reasoned, did not truly respect the IVF’s doctrinal position: if the SCM did accept it, then “why [did they] not adopt the IVF Doctrinal Statement and join us?” The SCM, the IVF kept hearing, continued to whisper that the EU’s were the schismatic culprits and spoilers: but the true history, the IVF kept reiterating, was that the EU’s had been forced into existence “because the SCM leaders would not allow the Evangelical witness within the framework of the existing organization”.

The perceived theological thought-patterns of SCM people were often dissected and critiqued by IVF people. One such critic, thoughtful, spiritually passionate, unswervingly orthodox and penetratively logical, was lawyer Malcolm Buist. A lifelong friend of Graham Miller (from Feilding days) and a fellow Presbyterian, Buist

193 Ibid. The words were underlined in the original, for emphasis.
194 MB, ¶24. For better flow of thought, the order of the last two sentences has been switched.
195 [Ivan Moses?] to Ian _____, Mar. 1946, TSCF N7/77.
196 Ibid.
198 ADMNH 1: 25.
had been an early member of the Victoria EU. His theological misgivings about the SCM had gradually become overwhelming, especially its willingness to entertain any view, and he had resigned from SCM in the mid 1930s. In the early post-war decades, Buist was probably the New Zealand IVF’s most stern and unbudging defender of IVF doctrinal purity and identity. Although his critique of SCM could at times be overstated, Buist was self-consciously interested in analysing (and – as he saw it – exposing) the “theoretical presuppositions” of the SCM movement. Like many of the IVF people, Buist insisted on consistency of thought – an attribute he felt was lacking in what he saw as an amorphous and rootless SCM. He could not abide the implication, for instance, that there was more than one road to salvation – or that substitutionary atonement was an optional doctrine. He could not abide the SCM’s willingness to give a platform to both evangelical and anti-evangelical viewpoints.

In his own way, Buist and his IVF colleagues were expressing a yearning for Christian faith to have solid and consistent intellectual foundations: SCM thinkers shared that desire, but sought such foundations in what they saw as necessary accommodations to modern knowledge and thought rather than in rigorous

---

200 Buist’s analysis, for example, was that the SCM membership had trouble with accepting (a) being “finally bound by an external rational authority such as the Bible,” (b) that “guilt means a death-separation from God, pointing to reconciliation only through the shedding of blood,” and (c) that “man’s nature is corrupt and needs replacing by a truly divine nature in regeneration. Some SCM people, he claimed, would give assent to (b) and (c), but not (a), but that showed that (b) and (c) were “not fully grasped.” “The trouble with the ‘evangelical wing’ of the SCM, he argued, is that it held ‘bits of evangelical data in illogical suspense, without knowing ‘why’....In other words, they do not really hold those items in common with us, but rather travel through them in a direction different from ours. For instance, an S.C.M. man may claim to be with us re the Atonement. To the question ‘why hold it at all?’ he must either go with us or against us regarding the authority of Scripture. If he goes with us, then he must go against SCM and either he or his hold of Scripture will soon vanish from SCM. If he goes against us, then his grasp of the Atonement is likely to be precarious for lack of a divinely authoritative external rational foundation.” [Malcolm Buist] to Ivan [Moses], n.d., TSCF N7/82.

201 Ibid. Buist also wrote: “apparently the SCM is content with any kind of interest in Jesus Christ i.e. making no odds whether he be Saviour or not...Apparently the S.C.M. thinks a student may be left to his own option whether to come to God in the Bible way or some other way...If the SCM does not think there is only [one] way of salvation, it is not unreasonable to query whether it is still at all entitled to be called ‘Christian’ ”.

202 The SCM, he wrote, “might” be prepared to include evangelical points of view, but only if all points of view including anti-evangelical viewpoints were equally accepted. “That in a nutshell is why I myself left the SCM.” He could “last out a neutral atmosphere”, but “had no stomach for a Christian institution where Christianity stricto sensu was rejected via articles in the official publication”: ibid.
adherence to historic formulations. In spirit, Buist was modernist in his relentless concern for logicality and philosophical coherence, but also in deep reaction against modernism in his thorough-going determination to be credally and biblically faithful. In those patterns of thought, he was not unlike many other evangelicals around the world, deeply shaped by modernity’s rationalistic cast of mind, but rejecting modernity’s more critical and sceptical conclusions. A similar assessment could be made, for instance, of Machen, Kuyper or Hallesby.

The SCM appeared to believe that a shared Christian faith, a sense of kinship, and a commitment to Christian unity were sufficient foundations for healing the separation. But the IVF had only one, irreducible basis for re-union: an unequivocal subscription to the Doctrinal Basis. Since any such fixedness of doctrinal delineation would always be unacceptable to the SCM, there was no way any reunion could occur.

The IVF had no interest in co-operating with SCM, let alone reuniting with it. It declined co-operation with any who did not accept its own Doctrinal Basis. Since belief in the infallibility of Scripture and Substitutionary Atonement was an essential basis of IVF, the IVF felt that “we cannot ... consistently maintain our testimony and at the same time unite with those who do not share our convictions in these matters”. The EU also felt it differed from SCM with regards to the necessity of definite individual faith: with its “overriding principle” of “inclusivism”, the SCM had replaced “specific saving faith” in Christ with a “general” faith in God.

The SCM had limited respect for IVF, but its genuine desire for Christian unity compelled it to keep making overtures to individual EUs. Given that the IVF’s pre-

---

205 For an insight into SCM attitudes towards the IVF, see Rouse: 292-3. Rouse criticised the IVF as a “one-track” and “literalist” movement largely reflecting the “stricter section of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England” and as “divisive” because of its policy of not co-operating; as a result, the
conditions for co-operation with SCM could never be met, the SCM was setting itself up to be in a perpetual state of frustration.

Throughout this period, the IVF maintained its stand against co-operation. A paper in Hutchinson’s era carefully analysed SCM-IVF distinctives. In 1965, the next General Secretary reminded CUEU that, constitutionally, “no joint activities are to be undertaken with any bodies that do not share a statement of doctrinal belief in sympathy with that of the IVF doctrinal basis”. Likewise, he declined an invitation to attend the SCM conference as a “fraternal delegate,” because “the presence of official IVF delegates ... would be by implication a toleration of the teaching content of the conference.”

The IVF and NCC chaplains

Similar issues of co-operation arose with the promotion of university chaplains by the SCM and then the NCC. As student-led societies, EUs had little interest in chaplains. The IVF suspected NCC appointees would be de facto “SCM chaplain[s] on the NCC payroll”, that EUs would be expected to support and use the chaplains, and that chaplains would agitate to re-unite EU and SCM. CUEU’s experience of the first NCC chaplain (Paul Goddard) was not positive: Goddard was hostile towards the EU. The IVF formally adopted the policy that university chaplains should serve

SCM was forced “to fight the Christian fight in the universities with one hand, the right hand of fellowship, partially paralysed”. For similar issues of SCM and IVF in the UK, see Boyd: e.g. 83-9.

See e.g. “The IVF and the SCM in New Zealand.” It concluded that to be true to their respective convictions the SCM must keep seeking co-operation and the IVF must keep saying “no”: 16.

Wilf Malcolm to Gerald Court, 30 Sept. 1965, TSCF N2/068. The issue was whether CUEU should announce a service of induction for the NCC Chaplain.

Ibid. Malcolm continued: The IVF “holds firmly to the right of the SCM to exist” but “explicitly disagrees with the basic attitude of the SCM to Christian truth and the major substance of the resulting teaching content”.


all, but that the EUs would not use any who did not subscribe to the Doctrinal Basis.\footnote{R.A. Stewart, G. Lawrence and W.A. Hutchinson to W.E.D. Davies, 20 Oct. 1960, N2/053; see also N2/59.}

P  **IVF and the Methodist Church**

It was perhaps frustration among SCM leaders that helped inspire the *Methodist Times* in New Zealand to print a vitriolic anti-IVF article in 1955, from the pen of Britain’s leading liberal Methodist, Donald Soper.\footnote{Rev. Dr. Donald O. Soper, “The Inter-Varsity Fellowship”, *Methodist Times*, 22 Jan. 1955.} The article castigated the IVF as promoting a “short cut to authority” which suppresses doubt and appeals to the “unsophisticated adolescent” but which will not withstand the scrutiny of “intellectual honesty.” In its “disastrous intolerance and uncharitableness” and its “peculiarly objectionable attitude to any sort of criticism” the IVF is fostering “religious fascism” and “totalitarianism” based on “the violence of fear.”

Such opinions were not appreciated by IVF (NZ). The IVF President thought it “mean and despicable” of the Methodist Church in New Zealand to print such an article, especially at the beginning of the university year, and that its inclusion in its official paper showed “that there is within the hierarchy of the Methodist Church a deep hatred towards IVF”.\footnote{J.G. Miller to Cocker, 9 Feb. 1955, TSCF K3/1.} But, in keeping with its style of avoiding controversy, IVF in New Zealand appears to have let the matter die away rather than fuel a controversy through making a protest.
Q An Intra-Evangelical Crisis: Tyndale House, L.B. Miller, Orange and the IVF

The IVF-SCM relationship was not the only conflict that faced the IVF. In the late 1940s the close-knit evangelical leadership circle in New Zealand also had to contend with some internal conflict.

The tensions reflected the souring of a dream. The 10th IVF conference, in May 1945, had met in auspicious circumstances: just after VE Day, it was the first conference to use Tyndale House, the new evangelical conference and study centre on the hills above Christchurch. The property had recently been purchased by the Cashmere Evangelical Trust, which was bankrolled by prominent Christchurch businessman, L.B. Miller, a member of Rutland St. Open Brethren and a generous supporter of Christian work. The CET primarily saw itself as in partnership with IVF. Miller had hoped that IVF and SU would make Tyndale House their national headquarters. At the IVF conference, a special service had been held dedicating the venue for the use of IVF, SU and the Crusader Movement. There was talk of bringing to Tyndale House such figures as Graham Miller (to head a research centre), H.R. Minn and even Martyn Lloyd-Jones.

---

214 37 Hackthorne Rd, Cashmere.
215 Miller's Ltd. was involved in manufacturing, importing, and distributing clothing. It owned a woollen mill in Invercargill, a large store in Christchurch and branches elsewhere: Miller to Cocker, 6 May 1947, TSCF N12/19. Miller had begun work digging potatoes and later selling door-to-door on the West Coast. He was the epitome of a self-made man.
216 The key personal liaison was through Russell Fountain, who was on the council of the Trust and also a key figure in IVF. The IVF President was also on the Council, and later the General Secretary.
217 Fountain/Glen interview.
218 Miller attended a meeting of the CET Board and agreed to consider their offer.
219 Orange to Fountain, 11 June 1947, TSCF N12/23.
When Orange had resigned from Sumner to accept Miller’s invitation to become resident warden, Tyndale House looked set to become a new symbol of cross-denominational evangelical unity. Freed from the demands of a parish, Orange hoped to devote himself to Bible study and exposition, devotional retreats and IVF.\(^{220}\) In addition to being the venue for Orange’s relocated Sunday afternoon Bible Class (which could draw up to a hundred people), Tyndale House quickly became a favoured venue for IVF, EU, the Crusader movement, ECF and CMS. The Trust’s potential unifying role in the NZ evangelical scene was further extended when it co-opted John Deane, the BTI Principal in Auckland.\(^{221}\) The Trust began to publish.\(^{222}\) The IVF understood that the Trust would give considerable financial assistance to IVF.\(^{223}\)

In practice, the partnerships of Miller and Orange and the CET and IVF proved difficult. IVF, always anxious for its reputation, was nervous about being formally associated with another organisation. IVF fretted about the purpose of the CET: if its aims were the same as those of IVF, then why was the CET necessary? If its aims were different, then why was the IVF linked with it? IVF was sensitive about the CET as a “rich uncle” whom might influence IVF policy.\(^{224}\) Concerned about IVF’s lack of a vote on the CET, Cocker wrote to England to seek the advice of Laird.\(^{225}\) Discussions at the CET Council sometimes moved into whether or not IVF was fulfilling its calling,\(^{226}\) but IVF felt that Miller and his business colleagues had a limited understanding of student work.\(^{227}\) There was increasing uncertainty about the CET’s intentions, especially when the substantial financial donations that had been

\(^{220}\) Orange to Fountain, 11 June 1947, TSCF N12/23.
\(^{222}\) E.g. H.R. Minn’s *Amos of Tekoa*.
\(^{223}\) E.g. assistance with the travel expenses of overseas speakers, internal travel costs and the salary of the Travelling Representative (Ivan Moses): Cocker to Fountain, 1 May 1947, TSCF N12/17; Miller to Cocker, 6 May 1947, TSCF N12/19.
\(^{224}\) Fountain to Cocker, 30 Oct. 1946, TSCF N12/3.
\(^{225}\) Cocker to Laird, 18 Nov. 1946, TSCF N12/10.
expected came not from the CET but directly from Miller.\textsuperscript{228} The directions of the CET appeared to be subject to considerable variation. Within the CET, the IVF felt that it was powerless and that Miller’s thinking always prevailed.\textsuperscript{229}

Niggling concerns gave way to alarm when, in 1947, Orange resigned.\textsuperscript{230} Orange freely acknowledged Miller’s great generosity and zeal, but claimed he and Miller’s aims were almost entirely disparate. Orange had believed “this place was to be mine and handed over to me for my work” and that he would be “entirely free” to develop the venture in any way he saw fit.\textsuperscript{231} Orange had wanted to focus on his own “Biblical Research”, to run intimate spiritual retreats and to work as he felt led. He would trust all outcomes to the mysterious hand of God. Such outcomes would be modest, unquantifiable and generally invisible. Instead, Orange had discovered he was required to work closely with a Trust from whom he had to seek permission, and under Miller’s expectations to “produce …results”.\textsuperscript{232} Long accustomed to working in his own way and well known to be sensitive about pressure, Orange chafed under the “loss of independence and freedom”.\textsuperscript{233} He resented important decisions being made without his knowledge: he had no prior warning, for instance, that Tyndale House was being rebuilt by Miller as a conference centre with a large new dormitory block. Orange struggled with being financially “beholden” or with questions being raised “as to how the work was progressing, or whether there was even any work being done at all”.\textsuperscript{234} He worried that publicity was unspiritual and would block divine blessing. In retrospect, it is not difficult to see that there had been a mismatch: an individualist like Orange could never have adjusted to working

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{227} Laird to Cocker, 26 Nov. 1946, TSCF N12/8. Cocker had sought the advice of Laird, who was now in the UK.
\item \textsuperscript{228} Cocker to CET Secretary [Fountain], 4 Feb. 1948, TSCF N12/35.
\item \textsuperscript{229} Typed document annotated “To Mr T.C. Cocker, from M.B. [Buist],” n.d., TSCF N12.
\item \textsuperscript{230} Cashmere Evangelical Trust, Agenda, 12 June 1947, TSCF N12/24.
\item \textsuperscript{231} Orange to Fountain, 11 June 1947, TSCF N12/23. Fountain’s oral account of the controversy, fifty-three years later, was closely consistent with the documentary record.
\item \textsuperscript{232} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{233} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{234} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
under a committee, and an activist entrepreneur like Miller could never have had his expectations fulfilled by Orange’s studious, quietist, almost mystical approach. Miller lost patience with Orange’s quirks, and concluded Orange was lazy and “not doing his job.” Relationships became increasingly strained.

Orange’s resignation was handled quietly, and the CET was willing for his departure to be delayed at least six months. No salary was involved: from the outset, Orange had declined to be paid by Miller. Orange could have gone to another parish, but he still wanted to be in a work similar to what he thought he had left Sumner for. The IVF General Secretary was exploring whether Orange’s resignation could be revoked and the role re-negotiated. But Miller was adamantly opposed. He told an IVF staff member that if the IVF were going to support “a man like Orange” he would be “finished” with IVF. Miller appeared to be supported by all members of the CET except one. Meanwhile Orange continued to live on at Tyndale, unhappily. He would stay there well into 1948, until the Trust insisted on him leaving. Meanwhile, some 300 people were coming to Orange’s Thursday night Bible Class.

---

235 Miller told Fountain so, who angrily told Miller that “Christian work was not a slot machine into which you put money at the top and chocolates came out at the bottom”; Fountain later regretted saying that and apologised to Miller: Fountain/Glen interview, ¶15, ¶10.
236 Ibid., ¶16.
238 Fountain: 14.
241 Confidential source.
242 Confidential source.
243 Support for Miller’s approach included that of the two Auckland members, Alex Bain and John Deane: Moses to Buist, 18 Dec. 1947, TSCF N12/29. Russell Fountain was in a difficult position. He was Secretary of the CET but also an IVF leader, and Orange was a close family friend. Fountain loyally served the CET but in the controversy his sympathies lay with Orange and with the IVF.
244 Orange to Cocker, n.d., TSCF [N12].
245 Fountain to Cocker, 12 Mar. 1948, TSCF N12/38. Orange moved to a house in Cambridge Terrace, where he lived rent free; later he was helped to buy a house in Creyke Rd: Fountain/Glen, ¶18-19.
246 Cocker to Moses, 12 Nov. 1948, TSCF N12/62.
The IVF decided to withdraw from the CET. Cocker wrote to the CET explaining that – protective of its reputation – the IVF did not wish to be formally linked with an organisation within which it had “no control”. Cocker was keenly aware of the importance of his letter: for some time he had been working on (and circulating) careful, courteous drafts. The IVF also wrote to Miller, thanking him again for his personal generosity and assuring him of the “honour and esteem” in which IVF held him. The CET’s reply took a high tone: fearing a “wound in the body of Christ” they asked IVF for a meeting in which all issues could be “lovingly tabled and discussed”. Behind the scenes, Miller had become intensely distrustful of the IVF, riled by an unshakeable belief that the IVF had been plotting to vote him off the CET so as to force Orange’s retention. The IVF considered that “preposterous.”

Such an eruption of rancour and suspicion in the heart of the evangelical community was worrying. Shockwaves were spreading as far as Auckland: the BTI Principal, for instance, was backing Miller against the IVF. The IVF still expressed the desire “that cordial Christian relationships should continue between the two movements,” but privately its leadership thought the situation “well nigh hopeless.”

The IVF was further dismayed when Professor Blaiklock suddenly weighed in. His involvement raised the crisis to a new level of danger. Appalled at the “lamentable estrangement” of CET from IVF, whose “wisdom and testimony” was inextricable

248 Cocker to Secretary CET, 4 Feb. 1948, TSCF N12/35. Cocker was unhappy that as General Secretary he was made a member of the Trust but not allowed a vote. He also noted that the CET had originally said it would support the IVF financially, but had not done so; instead, Miller had personally given strong financial support.
250 Fountain to Cocker, 26 April 1948, N12/40.
252 Cocker to Fountain, 3 May 1948, TSCF N12.
253 Deane often stayed with Miller, did not agree with Orange’s typology, and – as a Baptist – struggled to understand Orange’s Anglican world: Fountain/Glen interview, ¶31.
254 [Cocker] to Fountain, 27 May 1948, TSCF N12/43.
from his own reputation, Blaiklock felt “impelled” to intervene. Blaiklock had recently stayed with Miller in Christchurch and had been readily persuaded that Orange and the IVF were at fault. Blaiklock already had a negative opinion of Orange: although he had not heard Orange speak, he rejected what he had heard of his typological approach and felt that Orange’s reputation in IVF circles was undeserved. Blaiklock thought it short-sighted of IVF to alienate L.B. Miller. The Professor also appeared to have caught the vision – long held by Orange and IVF – of a residential evangelical study centre and library, something akin to Tyndale House in the UK and devoted to “Evangelical Biblical Scholarship”. Blaiklock wrote to IVF rebuking it for its “grave and hasty error of judgement”. The fall-out from the Professor’s involvement was potentially serious: Cocker feared Blaiklock might force a schism in the IVF, presumably by inducing AUEU to withdraw. The strains were also felt in the Crusader movement.

Eventually, the eruptions subsided. Many people were involved in trying to heal the breaches, among them Lewis Wilson, Colin Becroft, Ken Roundhill, H.R. Minn and William Pettit. It probably helped when Orange vacated Tyndale House. IVF’s return to Tyndale House for its 1949 Conference, with Orange giving the Presidential Address, was a significant step forward. While there, the IVF General Committee

---

256 Orange to Cocker, n.d., TSCF [N12]. Blaiklock, Orange reported, had been “completely won over by ‘L.B.’”
257 Confidential source.
258 Blaiklock presumably rejected Orange’s scholarly credentials: not only did Blaiklock reject typology and allegorisation, he also believed that Orange took his addresses directly from books. See also Cocker to Moses, 12 Nov. 1948, N12/62.
259 Blaiklock to Fountain, 8 Nov. 1948, TSCF N12/58; Orange to Cocker, 17 Nov 1948, TSCF N12/17.
260 Blaiklock appears not to have taken into account the fact that a major part of the vision, Orange’s personal library, was no longer at Tyndale. Orange had moved to Cambridge Terrace.
261 E.g. Orange to Cocker, 17 Nov. 1948, TSCF N12/70.
262 Cocker to Fountain, TSCF N12/76c.
263 Burt to Cocker, n.d. [Dec. 1948], with TSCF N12/73.
264 E.g. Minn to Cocker, 15 Dec. 1948, TSCF N12/72; Pettit to Cocker, 6 May 1949, TSCF N12/76.
gave much attention to restoring the relationship with the CET. Later, letters profusely expressing warm Christian concord were mutually exchanged, and there was relief in all quarters.

By early 1950 L.B. Miller was once again an enthusiastic supporter of IVF: he was impressed with the new Travelling Secretary, Ian Kemp, and grateful for the influence of IVF on his family. With regard to the other half of the controversy — Professor Blaiklock — many had tried to mediate, including George Jackson, Ivan Moses, and Kevin O’Sullivan. Blaiklock’s relationship with the IVF remained tense, often requiring careful managing by IVF leadership. But in 1949, he was duly re-elected an IVF Vice President, and in 1952 elected President.

The affair took a considerable toll on several people. It remained a “bitter” episode in the life of Orange and he never fully recovered from it. The dispute illustrated how inter-woven, at a personal level, was the evangelical nexus constituted by Christchurch Anglicans and Brethren, the IVF and Crusader movements, Auckland Baptists, BTI and New Zealand evangelicalism generally. The reputations of several key figures had been directly involved, including Orange, Miller, Fountain, Cocker and Blaiklock, and many others (such as Deane) had also been drawn in. An IVF document ruefully reflected on the inherent dangers of confusion when organisations become formally associated, and on the ambiguities in the relationship of a benefactor and a Trust. The controversy also perhaps highlighted the role that Laird had previously performed: Cocker and his advisors had arguably been a little

---

265 Cockerto Fountain, 31 May 1949, N12/77. Several conciliatory resolutions were passed.
266 Cockerto Fountain, 31 May 1941, TSCF N12/77; W. A. Bascard to Cocker, 20 June 1949, TSCF N12/83; Cockerto Fountain, 21 June 1949, TSCF N12/81; also Cockerto Blaiklock, 13 June 1949, TSCF N12/78; ibid., 6 July 1949, TSCF N12/84.
267 Fountain to Cocker, 3 Mar. 1950, TSCF N12/90.
268 Cockerto Fountain, 20 Jan. 1949, TSCF N12/76c.
270 Thomas/Glen interview, ¶55. Miller, a “generous man in every way”, tried to be reconciled with Orange, but Orange declined to reciprocate: Fountain/Glen interview, ¶22.
inflexible and defensive; if Laird had still been in New Zealand, his skills in personal
diplomacy might possibly have averted or at least shortened the crisis.²⁷²

**R A Key Choice: The IVF and the National Association of Evangelicals**

Post-war, the IVF was often seen as a *de facto* leader of New Zealand evangelicalism. It was happy to accept that mantle. The recognition of IVF’s leadership role was illustrated in significant correspondence that took place in 1950. The correspondence related to an important choice that began to present itself to New Zealand evangelicals at that time.

In 1950 the National Association of Evangelicals (in America) wanted to establish links with evangelicals in New Zealand, and sent Dr. C.W. Taylor to visit and secure NZ representation at its international conference.²⁷³ The NAE was not wanting to establish a branch in New Zealand, but rather to help stimulate the development of similar movements in countries around the world. The NAE was unsure how to make contact with New Zealand evangelicals. It wrote to a YFC member in Wellington, who passed the letters on to the YFC leadership, who consulted Kevin O’Sullivan (Secretary of the Crusader Council), who suggested that IVF was the appropriate body to handle such a matter.²⁷⁴ The YFC recognised that the IVF had an interest in the “defence” of the Gospel, as well as its “propagation”, and that in the USA the IVF and the NAE were “linked”.²⁷⁵

²⁷² Tyndale House itself was eventually sold. The CET invested the money and continued to fund Christian work, including the IVF.
²⁷³ Such international NAE conferences had been held in Switzerland in 1948 and in England the year after, and another was to be held in Boston in September 1950.
²⁷⁴ Oliver H. Donnell to Cocker, 24 May 1950, TSCF N1/14.
²⁷⁵ Ibid.
The NAE, under the chairmanship of neo-evangelical H.J. Ockenga, introduced itself as representing 1.5 million "responsible evangelicals", the adjective "responsible" presumably differentiating the NAE membership from the more militant, separatist "fundamentalist" type of evangelicals associated with McIntire's ICCC.\textsuperscript{276} Cocker did not appear to have heard of the NAE before, but was immediately sympathetic to what it seemed to represent.\textsuperscript{277} Aware that there was more than one evangelical configuration in the USA (which indicates he was at least vaguely aware of the ICCC),\textsuperscript{278} he wrote to the IVF leader in America,\textsuperscript{279} Stacey Woods, asking him to "let us have the 'low-down' on the whole matter", including the relationships of different associations of evangelicals in the USA.\textsuperscript{280} In Australia, two evangelical leaders were writing to Woods with similar questions.\textsuperscript{281}

Woods wrote back at length, explaining that there were three "actual or potential" world-wide Christian organisations: the WCC, NAE and ICCC. The ICCC, he explained, was headed up by "a rather notorious man".\textsuperscript{282} McIntire, he noted, "thinks in a straight line", held "a rather rigid interpretation of the doctrine of separation", and believed in vigorously attacking the WCC. Woods confessed himself more in sympathy with McIntire's opposition to the WCC than against it but that McIntire's "methods and manners" leave much to be desired "from a Christian and Biblical point of view". The NAE, Woods wrote, had a less rigid doctrine of separation than the ICCC: even though at heart it had little time for the WCC, it did not believe in attacking it or those associated with it. The NAE wished to be positive in tone and to avoid condemning those it did not agree with. Perhaps making an unconscious contrast with McIntire, Woods noted that the NAE leader (Dr. J. Elwin Wright) was

\textsuperscript{276} J. Elwin Wright [Executive Secretary of the Commission on International Relations of the National Association of Evangelicals] to Bernard G. Holmes, 10 June, 1950, TSCF N1/4.
\textsuperscript{277} [Cocker] to Donnell, 21 July 1950, TSCF N1/4.
\textsuperscript{278} McIntire visited New Zealand in the same year.
\textsuperscript{279} In the USA the IVF was called the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship (IVCF).
\textsuperscript{280} [Cocker] to Woods, 21 July 1950, TSCF N1/4.
\textsuperscript{282} Ibid.
“rather like a good natured Newfoundland puppy”. Woods felt that IVF people would “feel at home” with the NAE “point of view and manner of life”. He also noted that the NAE was seeking links with the World Evangelical Alliance based in Britain.

Such correspondence is further evidence that the natural affinities of the IVF (in New Zealand and elsewhere) were not with militant separatist American fundamentalism, but with the more moderate strands of evangelicalism embodied by the American neo-evangelical movement and by much of British evangelicalism, with the NAE and the WEA representing the corporate expression of those movements.

With his letter, Woods sent an NAE flier, including a statement of faith. The leaflet stated that the NAE wished to be “a united voice on the essential doctrines of the Christian faith”. The statement of faith appeared to avoid narrow definitions of doctrine, focused on what was positively believed (rather than on what was rejected), and emphasised unity and regeneration. The leaflet listed NAE achievements.

International readers of the leaflet were assured that as “an American organization” the NAE had “no ambition to extend itself to other countries” but was simply hoping to inspire or assist similar evangelical bodies in other countries. Clearly, the NAE was seeking to promote a moderate, iringenious evangelical Protestantism, as an

---

283 Woods noted that the NAE included both Calvinistic and Arminian wings and “some rather strange bed-fellows in...Pentecostals of a moderate type”. The NAE and the IVCF had no formal links. Woods was on the Board of Administration of the NAE, but urged that that fact not to be made public, lest “very serious harm: be done to IVCF: presumably Woods was apprehensive about alienating from IVCF those who supposed the ICCC.


285 There was no use, for instance, of the word “fundamental”. The Scriptures were described not as “inerrant” but as “infallible”. The statement steered clear of any particular millennialist position and simply asserted Christ’s “personal return in power and glory”.

286 These included the journal (United Evangelical Action), religious broadcasting, curricula, evangelical ministers’ associations, co-ordination work among Christian schools and seminaries, an evangelical mission association and $40m sent to war victims.
alternative to either liberal ecumenism or hard-line fundamentalism, and as a counter to both the WCC and ICCC.

When the NAE made its overtures to New Zealand, its theological stance and tone readily found favour with New Zealand’s evangelical leadership, as represented by the IVF. Nevertheless, because the cultural, theological and ecclesiastical orientation of New Zealand in the early 1950s remained essentially towards what was British rather than what was American, knowledge of (and interest in) the NAE was limited in New Zealand. The Second World War (and the influx of American troops and the American victory in the Pacific) had heightened New Zealand awareness of America, as did the Cold War and Korean War. A sign of increasing American influence on the evangelical churches of New Zealand was the post-war importation of Youth For Christ, an evangelistic youth organisation. But in early 1950s New Zealand, in both society and church, Britain still loomed larger than America. Later in the 1950s, Billy Graham would increase the American influence on New Zealand evangelicalism. But, even then, that influence was mediated to New Zealand in the first instance by awareness of what was happening in Britain, in Graham’s 1955 Haringay Crusade.

The Evangelical Ministers’ Fellowship

From the early 1940s the IVF had dreamed of sustaining its influence with EU graduates through the Graduates’ Fellowship. Part of the plan was the Evangelical Ministers’ Fellowship, a sub-section of the GF. The vision was for a growing body of IVF-style evangelical ministers, continuing to encourage one another and keeping

---

287 Donnell to Cocker, 14 July 1950, TSCF N1/4. Donnell reported that “our work has now grown to include all parts of New Zealand”. YFC had been founded in the Chicago area in 1944, and British YFC was formed in 1947 (Randall: 58, 60).

288 The GF was renamed the Christian Graduates’ Fellowship in 1956, Annual Report of the CGF presented to the Annual Meeting of the IVF, 11 May 1956, TSCF (no ref.).

289 The EMF was a re-working of the Graduate Section of the TSPU, Buist to Milmine, 5 Feb. 1946. The GF was renamed the Christian Graduates’ Fellowship in 1956, Annual Report of the CGF presented to the Annual Meeting of the IVF, 11 May 1956, TSCF (no ref.)
the evangelical faith. It was also "a vision of a common witness among evangelical ministers", \(^{290}\) an expression of evangelical ecumenism.

The definition of "evangelical" in the EMF's title was not an issue: the EMF was a subsidiary of IVF, with exactly the same doctrinal basis. To keep ministers reading, there would be a postal exchange library of theological books. \(^{291}\) Along with other IVF graduates, it was hoped that EMF members would subscribe to the *NZ IVF Magazine*, the *GF Bulletin* (which had an EMF section) and to the British IVF magazine. \(^{292}\) Ministers would write articles and book reviews for the newsletters, would gather in their regions for prayer and fellowship, and would have occasional conferences (usually in association with an IVF conference). The EMF would be "the link which binds together the EU graduates of New Zealand". \(^{293}\) The EMF's first Secretary, Mervyn Milmine, and its first Chairman, Les Gosling, were both Presbyterians. \(^{294}\)

In practice, the EMF struggled. As an IVF organization, it held no appeal to graduates without an EU background. J.L. Gray, for instance, an older evangelical with an SCM background, declined to join: he responded to the invitation with a curt comment that "signing of such statements is divisive". \(^{295}\) But the main problem that faced EMF was enlisting the active support of EU graduates themselves. They were prepared to be listed as members, but usually could offer little more. New evangelical ministers were inevitably preoccupied with the present, rather than wanting to focus on something linked with their university past. Where evangelical


\(^{291}\) Milmine to Buist, 23 Nov. 1944, TSCF J17/6.


\(^{293}\) Milmine to Buist, 23 Nov. 1944, TSCF J17/6.

\(^{294}\) GF Secretary [Buist] memo. to EMF members, 3 May 1945. The other committee members were Harry Thomson (Vicar at Methven), Ayson Clifford (Baptist College) and Warren Green (Methodist minister at Huntly).
ministers had any energy for activities outside the parish, it tended to be devoted to such activities as extra speaking engagements (at BC camps, Crusaders, EU, or parish missions), local inter-church evangelistic campaigns, supporting overseas mission societies, responsibilities in Synod or Presbytery, involvement in ECF or WF, Keswick and CE. With ex-EU ministers dispersed over the whole country, many of them in remote rural parishes, EMF lacked critical mass in almost every region. EMF could only function as a movement based on correspondence and occasional newsletters, and failed to generate much momentum. EMF members, it appears, may have shared in the general lack of commitment among GF members to systematic scholarly reading, writing articles, or paying subscriptions. It was a matter of both genuine busyness and the characteristically pragmatic orientation of many New Zealanders. EMF office-bearers were themselves too busy to do much. They were often at a loss to know what should or could be done, and were sometimes dispirited. A committee spread throughout the country and communicating only by letter was also a major impediment.

---

295 Cited in Milmine to Buist, 14 Sept. 1943, TSCF J17/2. Gray added that he was "prepared to help all bodies who stand for evangelical truth" and that he would thus support both SCM and EU (underlining changed to italics).

296 Buist to Ivan [Moses], 20 Aug. 1946, J1/058. Buist bemoaned a "poverty of spiritual intellect" in the EUs, which was being reflected in the GF. Also [Doris Weir] to Buist, 28 May 1946, J1/051; Milmine to Buist, 2 Nov. 1944, J1/17.

297 "You know there are lots of things we could do if time and strength would let us. But a crazy idea exists that a minister is an automatic machine that can attend meetings 7 night and 7 afternoons a week, visit every afternoon and evening, hold 20 different things in his mind at once while he prepares 2 sermons, a children's address, and half a dozen other things a week. At the same time he will carry on exhaustive studies in the Scriptures, theology, philosophy, history, and a number of other cultural subjects, while he master the likes and dislikes of several hundred men, women and children. It is just crazy." Gosling to Buist, 10 April 1946, TSCF J17/21. At the time Gosling was also completing his BD.


299 E.g. a list of EMF members by Milmine (27 June 1945) was annotated "what can we get them to do?"

300 [Milmine] to Buist, 24 April 1947. Milmine resigned, and recommended that the committee be concentrated in one centre. He was replaced by R.S. Miller.
Because of the relatively small number of EU graduates in the ministry, the EMF membership was broadened to include non-graduate ordained ministers.\footnote{Buist to Milmine, 5 Feb. 1946, TSCF J17/18; Gosling to Buist, 10 April 1946, J17/21.} In 1946, the EMF had less than 45 members.\footnote{Membership list, Graduates’ Fellowship, October 1946, TSCF J1/061.} A third of these were Presbyterian. The Anglicans and Baptists had about ten members each. There was a smattering of Congregationalists and Methodists.

In 1950 a significant IVF document discussed the EMF, which still had only 70 members.\footnote{In contrast, the Teachers’ Fellowship numbered 220 and attracted 90 to its conference.} It was acknowledged that the EMF existed “largely in form and name only”. Apart from unspecified “practical difficulties” there were basic issues of identity and purpose: “it may be that an artificial fellowship is being forced and that the natural line of development would be an Evangelical Fellowship in each denomination where active work is accomplished and each denominational fellowship linked together in the EMF.” The report went on to note the formation of the ECF and the WF.\footnote{“IVF work in New Zealand.” Document attached to letter [from Cliff Cocker?] to Bruce [Harris], 28 Aug. 1950, TSCF H1/22.} The implication was that the EMF should give way to such denominational bodies. From the outset, some Presbyterian ministers had voiced a lack of enthusiasm for the EMF.\footnote{Gosling to Milmine, 15 March 1946, Gosling papers 396/18.} In his 1946 report, the EMF President had indicated “there is the real conviction amongst many Evangelical ministers that their real contribution to the Evangelical cause lies within their own denomination” and that he agreed with them that “an interdenominational movement must take second place”.\footnote{[C.L. Gosling], EMF President’s Report, 7 May 1946, Gosling papers 396/18; also his comment in a letter that many Presbyterian ministers thought their “real job” lay within the Presbyterian Church} Such a conscious resolve by the leader of an IVF subsidiary to favour denominational evangelical movements, over the EMF itself, indirectly underscores the contention of this thesis that the ECF and WF were largely the product of the IVF movement.

\footnotetext[301]{Buist to Milmine, 5 Feb. 1946, TSCF J17/18; Gosling to Buist, 10 April 1946, J17/21.}
\footnotetext[302]{Membership list, Graduates’ Fellowship, October 1946, TSCF J1/061.}
\footnotetext[303]{In contrast, the Teachers’ Fellowship numbered 220 and attracted 90 to its conference.}
\footnotetext[304]{“IVF work in New Zealand.” Document attached to letter [from Cliff Cocker?] to Bruce [Harris], 28 Aug. 1950, TSCF H1/22.}
\footnotetext[305]{Gosling to Milmine, 15 March 1946, Gosling papers 396/18.}
\footnotetext[306]{[C.L. Gosling], EMF President’s Report, 7 May 1946, Gosling papers 396/18; also his comment in a letter that many Presbyterian ministers thought their “real job” lay within the Presbyterian Church}
The EMF numbers swelled – some 90 were on the mailing list in 1956\(^{307}\) – but the increase reflected the growth in evangelicalism, rather than the vitality of the EMF itself. The denominations were represented in the greatest number by Presbyterians (about 30), followed by Anglicans then Baptists. The Presbyterian and Anglicans names listed largely coincided with the membership lists of WF and ECF.

The EMF lingered for some years yet. In 1955, it was lamented that the EMF was “a very passive body.”\(^{308}\) The EMF newsletter continued to carry brief reports of new books by evangelical scholars,\(^{309}\) and in 1957 about 25 attended a conference.\(^{310}\) In the same year, the outgoing Secretary (Betteridge) felt “more strongly than ever that an inter-denominational evangelical fellowship of ministers” could make a crucial contribution to the NZ church, as a “spearhead of biblical theology”,\(^{311}\) but the incoming Secretary (Maurice Goodall) however, soon concluded that for most of its members the EMF was “a good thing” but “on paper only”.\(^{312}\) In 1960, a CGF committee would note “the practical cessation of all EMF activity,” and recommended that provision for it be deleted from the IVF constitution.\(^{313}\) The draft motion amending the constitution explained that the cessation of EMF was “largely in favour of more effective avenues of activity by members within their denominational movements”.\(^{314}\)

---

\(^{307}\) EMF [mailing list], 25 Jan. 1956, TSCF J17/40. A handful of these were not in actual parish ministry, e.g. Prof. Blaiklock, H.W. Funnell (OMF) and John Deane (BTI).


\(^{309}\) Ibid.

\(^{310}\) Betteridge to Eric [Dunlop], 4 Oct.1954, J17/34a. Addresses were given by Roberts-Thomson (Baptist College), Edwin Orr and William Dunlap.

\(^{311}\) Betteridge to Eric [Dunlop], 2 July 1957, J17/36.

\(^{312}\) Goodall to Eric [Dunlop], 30 Oct. 1957, J17/38.

\(^{313}\) Minutes of Wellington Executive Committee of the CGF, 13 April 1960, TSCF J2.

\(^{314}\) “Memorandum regarding proposed termination of activities of Evangelical Ministers’ Fellowship,” 29 Mar. 1960, TSCF J17/41.
The lasting impact of the EMF was obviously limited: some who had some association with it later completely forgot it had ever existed.\textsuperscript{315} The EMF was a failure, and its specific goal of a widespread inter-denominational fellowship of studious evangelical ministers was not realised. The EMF's aim of encouraging evangelical ministers would be assumed by the ECF and the WF. Intra-denominational movements were perhaps a more natural development than a trans-denominational network based on previous involvement in a student-led movement. Despite the EMF's demise, the next decade would nevertheless see a steady increase in the number of conservative evangelicals in the ministry of the main denominations.

\textbf{T \quad The Graduates' Fellowship}

Overall, the Graduates' Fellowship did not thrive. Most graduates became refocused on their work, families and churches, and IVF became part of their past rather than their current commitment. GF members might subscribe to \textit{Inter-Varsity} (NZ) and the \textit{Christian Graduate} (UK), but in 1950 there were GF study groups only in Auckland and Christchurch.\textsuperscript{316} The GF consulted IVF in Australia, and discovered they had similar struggles.\textsuperscript{317} In the USA, where degrees were more common than the UK, the graduate work had "never ...caught fire".\textsuperscript{318} By far the strongest sub-section was the Teachers' Christian Fellowship, which ran viable conferences.\textsuperscript{319} Whereas the EMF members were preoccupied with their different denominations, and most other

\textsuperscript{315} J.G. Miller had no memory of it, even when prompted. He was listed as a member (membership list, Graduates' Fellowship, Oct. 1946, TSCF J1/06), but was at that time in the New Hebrides. On his return to New Zealand (1953) the EMF played little or no part in his life.

\textsuperscript{316} "IVF work in New Zealand". Document attached to letter [from Cliff Cocker?] to Bruce [Harris], 28 Aug. 1950, TSCF H1/22. The \textit{Christian Graduate} had been launched in 1949 and at its peak had 11,000 subscriptions, O. Barclay, \textit{Evangelicalism in Britain, 1935-1990} (Leicester: IVP, 1997): 56.

\textsuperscript{317} Charles Troutman to E.A. Dunlop, 22 May 1956, TSCF J1/087. Troutman reported that the GF was effective only in New South Wales.

\textsuperscript{318} "Minutes of a meeting of the Committee of the Christian Grads Fellowship... Paraparaumu," 2-4 June 1956, TSCF J2a.
graduates with their various professions, the teachers shared a distinctive but widespread vocation. In 1956, the committee of the Christian Graduates’ Fellowship was asking itself whether the CGF should exist. It was suggested New Zealand graduates were too lazy to support it. The CGF might also have been affected by the strongly pragmatic outlook of many New Zealanders, who often favoured activism to reflection.

Bruce Harris, an Auckland University lecturer who was familiar with IVF graduate work in Britain, put considerable energy into strengthening the New Zealand movement. In 1957 the CGF had 734 members (100 of them overseas) and groups functioning regularly or occasionally in up to seven cities. But a British graduate who was in New Zealand for several years never encountered any CGF members. In the early sixties, the groups in the four main centres – often largely supported by university staff – met several times a year for study sessions, overseas speakers, and conferences. The focus was fellowship and teaching. Auckland also had a subgroup for medical doctors.

The Theological Students’ and Tyndale Fellowships

The TSF, a CGF group for evangelical ordinands, had functioned to a limited extent, mainly in Dunedin and Auckland, and especially under the attention of Warner

319 Ibid. In May 1949, for instance, preceding the IVF conference, 90 teachers attended the TCF conference.
320 Thus renamed that year.
321 “Minutes of a meeting of the Committee of the Christian Grads Fellowship... Paraparaumu,” 2-4 June 1956, TSCF J2a.
322 Bruce Harris had been President of AUCEU in 1942. From a Brethren family, Harris moved in the 1940s to a reformed theological position. After post-graduate study in the UK he taught at Auckland University under Prof. Blaiklock. He was on the Session at Somervell Presbyterian and the Board of BTI. Leaving New Zealand at the end of 1969, Harris taught at Macquarie University in Australia.
323 “The CGF” [circular], 17 June 1957, TSCF J1/092.
324 Win Lewis to ____, 20 Jan. 1956, J1/084.
325 Minutes of a meeting of the CGF Executive Committee held at Scripture Union House, 7 Oct. 1961, TSCF J2; Minutes of the CGF Business meeting held on 6 Sept. 1962 at SU House, TSCF J2.
Hutchinson.\textsuperscript{326} It clearly delineated the points of difference between evangelical and liberal theologies.\textsuperscript{327} But the TSF was only for those in training. In 1965 Harris launched the IVF’s Tyndale Fellowship of New Zealand, based on the British and Australian counterparts.\textsuperscript{328} The aim was to foster evangelical scholarship, initially through gatherings in Auckland, and to help equip evangelicals to speak “knowledgeably and boldly” in a context of “increasing complexity and uncertainty” about the Christian faith. A draft IVF inventory of likely Tyndale supporters\textsuperscript{329} – possibly biased in its selection – offers a tentative profile of the evangelical theological establishment in New Zealand in 1965: apart from four members of the Auckland Classics Department, and lecturers at Baptist College and at BTI, it listed twenty-seven Presbyterian ministers (all associated with the WF), nine lay Presbyterians,\textsuperscript{330} fifteen Anglican clergy, five Methodists, four Baptists, three Reformed, and four Brethren.\textsuperscript{331} The first few TF speakers would include Klaas Runia, Blaiklock, David Stewart and F.F. Bruce.\textsuperscript{332}

\textbf{V EU Graduates and Theological Shifts}

By no means did all those involved in EU’s remain “evangelical”. Many who were active in EU’s (and often in leadership) eventually moved to embrace a rather different theological position and identity. Some would move away from any form of Christian belief or association. Some others would adopt a more radical Christian

\textsuperscript{326} The role of the TSF is discussed at various points above, in relation to evangelicals doing theological training.

\textsuperscript{327} E.g. J.G. Miller, “Sewing Clouts in Christ’s Robe”. TSF Lecture for 1947, TSCF (no ref.)

\textsuperscript{328} Circular letter on IVF letterhead, Assoc. Professor B.F. Harris, 7 April 1965, TSCF J1/103. In the UK, the IVF had established the Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical Research in 1945, following the IVF Biblical Research Committee (1940).

\textsuperscript{329} “Possible list for initial circulation”, Bruce Harris to Wilf [Malcolm], 21 April 1965, TSCF J1/104.

\textsuperscript{330} Five theological students and four others.

\textsuperscript{331} Also G. Parker, Canterbury History Department, and five others who cannot readily be categorised. One of the people listed was a woman, Mrs W.B. Lewis (Presbyterian).

\textsuperscript{332} Minutes of inaugural meeting, 26 June 1965, TFNZ, TSCF J1/106; Clive [Sage, at Glendowie College] (Hon. Sec., TFNZ) to Wilf [Malcolm], 6 Sept. 1966, TSCF J1/107.
theology. Ex-EU people making such transitions included Ian Cairns, who chaired the OUEU committee organising the Guinness mission in 1952, and was later an OT lecturer in Indonesia and Moderator of the PCNZ. One of those listed as converted in that 1952 mission was George W. Armstrong, later a controversial “frontier theologian” at St. John’s Theological College. Laurie Barber, later a Methodist minister and lecturer in Religious Studies at Waikato University, had been an Executive member of Massey Agricultural College EU in 1951-2. James Veitch, later teaching religious studies at Victoria University and identified by some as a protégé of Lloyd Geering and active in such bodies as the Jesus Seminar and the Sea of Faith, had previously been part of Crusaders, OUEU and TSF. Irvine Roxburgh, later endorsing a secular Christianity, had been involved in OUEU and in Thomas Miller’s parish of St. Stephen’s. Donald Shaw, sharing the same background, wrote an article vehemently denouncing evangelical attitudes. John Greenslade, in the 1950s involved in CUEU and in the 1970s a leader in the Latimer Society, later repudiated an evangelical outlook.

Some others who had been in EU retained strong evangelical sympathies, but developed a more moderate and nuanced theological identity with a broader churchmanship: examples might include Ian Breward (Professor of Church History at the Theological Hall, 1965-82), Samuel McCay (Presbyterian parish minister)

---

333 “Mission to the University of Otago”, OUEU, June 1952, TSCF C5.
335 Allan K. Davidson, *Selwyn’s Legacy*: 300; Andrew: 166.
336 “Massey Agricultural College EU”.
337 RR, ¶433-441.
339 JG, ¶73-6. His change of thinking occurred in the 1980s.
340 Muriel Porter, “Ian Breward. An Australasian Life”, in Susan and Willam W. Emilsen (eds), *Mapping the Landscape. Essays in Australian and New Zealand Christianity. Festschrift in Honour of Professor Ian Breward* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000): 9-23. Breward said of himself, in 1999 (IB, ¶19): “I would not have been in the ministry if it were not for the Evangelical Union in Auckland. I drew my theological and spiritual sustenance from that kind of tradition, and have continued to do so”. See also Mark Hutchinson, “Professing History: An Interview with Rev. Professor Ian Breward, 10 July 1991,”
and Simon Rae (Presbyterian minister, missionary, and theological educator). In such cases, key shifts of thought could include a more critical understanding of Scripture and a more accepting view of the wider church.

Changes of theological conviction and identity reflected a variety of factors, both personal and contextual. In some cases, those shifting position may have reacted against some of the more rigid or defensive aspects of evangelicalism. Some appeared to want to reposition themselves into a less isolated ecclesiastical identity within their denomination: pressures from peers were significant in both the retention and adaption of theological stances. In varying degrees, those who changed most were influenced by the emphases and methodologies of modern biblical criticism and theology, which continued to dominate theological colleges and higher learning. Some were influenced by new mentors, or through wider reading. Some became less confident of the particularities of a conservative theology and moved into a mediated position. Some, perhaps in reaction, and possibly lacking the intellectual underpinnings of their earlier position, swung from a defensively-held conservative stance to a defensively-held radical one, and in both positions were somewhat combative.

**X New Ferment in the 1960s**

New Zealand society as it commenced the 1960s was still relatively conservative. But the social and intellectual ferments affecting youth in the rest of the Western world

---

*Lucas: An Evangelical History Review* 12 (Dec. 1991): 54-71 (Breward included as important influences on him those associated with the Massey EU, in Auckland the trio of Blaiklock, Harris and Minn, and IVF General Secretary Warner Hutchinson).

341 McCoy, nurtured by the PBCM, OUEU and the Theological Hall, remained evangelical in doctrine and practice but was an irenic and denominationally-focused churchman who resisted being associated with an evangelical “party” or with evangelical “negativity”: SM, ¶56-8, ¶66, ¶77.

342 Rae retained some broad evangelical emphases, but became an independent thinker with regard to doctrine and scripture and was also influenced by Catholic and Russian Orthodox writers. SR, ¶19-21, ¶29-31, ¶34.
began to be felt in New Zealand too. Such upheavals, well canvassed elsewhere, included the elevation of individual choice and experience, widespread questioning of authority, non-conformity, the rejection of Christian beliefs and values, the contraceptive pill, television, less censorship, a music culture celebrating free love and the use of drugs, existentialism, and — among liberal churchmen — the advocacy of “secular theology” and the “new morality”. It was against that background that IVF and the EUs sought both to maintain the evangelical faith and to make some accommodations to the way it was expressed. New themes began to appear in IVF books and the topics at EU meetings: freedom, meaning, sex, and social concern. Such trends would greatly intensify in the decade after 1965. One expression of the new climate of experientialism was the advent of “neo-Pentecostalism”, the “tongues-healings-prophecy” movement that began to be discussed in IVF documents from the early 1960s.\textsuperscript{344}

\section*{Conclusion}

In contrast to the research on the IVF conducted in other countries, there has previously been virtually no historical study of the post-war EU/IVF movement in New Zealand, with the exception of Lineham’s account of the CUEU.\textsuperscript{345} In Davidson’s \textit{Christianity in Aotearoa} and in Veitch’s article on theological streams\textsuperscript{346} the role of the IVF and EU is briefly acknowledged, and Roxborogh’s article lists the IVF as one of several significant New Zealand evangelical institutions.\textsuperscript{347}

\textsuperscript{343} E.g. Greenslade, \textit{[15], [19], [37], [41], [44], [72], [74-6}.

\textsuperscript{344} E.g. “Speaking in Tongues”, Memo. No. 22, to Members of IVFC Staff, Charles H. Troutman, 2 April 1963, TSCF A3b/37. The archives indicate that the issue became acute for IVF from 1970.

\textsuperscript{345} Note relevant sections in Lineham’s unpublished account of CUEU, “Evangelical Witness”.


This chapter, which is pivotal to Part Two of this thesis, has shown that that the New Zealand EU/IVF movement was growing steadily in the period 1945-65. By the late 1950s it had numerically overtaken the SCM, its more liberal counterpart. The IVF’s growth both reflected the post-war recovery of evangelical Protestantism and also significantly contributed to that recovery. It emphasised biblical orthodoxy, the rational and evidentialist defence of Christian faith, and student evangelism. The EU/IVF movement had a crucial role in defining, defending and unifying New Zealand evangelicalism: it had become one of the key custodians and shapers of evangelicalism in New Zealand, gaining a leadership role that might otherwise have been assumed by more revivalist or militant voices. The movement tried hard to set a tone of moderation. In the words of Professor Blaiklock, its most eminent sponsor, the EU/IVF movement stood for a “sane conservatism”. It owed very little to American fundamentalism; inasmuch as it was conscious of the American scene, it instinctively warmed to the neo-evangelicalism of the NAE and rejected the stridency and separatism of the ICCC. It remained essentially an expression of British-style evangelicalism, in the (British) IVF tradition. The movement in New Zealand was greatly encouraged by the overseas renaissance of evangelical scholarship, which made its impact in New Zealand largely through the expanding body of IVF literature. The EU/IVF movement failed to establish through its ministers’ and graduates’ fellowships quite the impact it had hoped for. But the influence of EU graduates on New Zealand society must nevertheless have been considerable. The EU/IVF movement had become a significant player within post-war New Zealand

348 By the end of the 1960s, support for the SCM had collapsed. It retained only fifteen to twenty members in each of its four university branches (Berry, Ch. 4: 5).
Protestantism, especially because – deliberately and effectively – it had been “securing and shaping the faith of many future church leaders”.350

350 "The relationship of the EUs to the Protestant Churches." Adopted by the IVF General Committee, 16-7 Jan. 1964.
Chapter Eight:
Further Expansion of Anglican Evangelicalism, 1956-65

Evangelicalism is Anglicanism, and Anglicanism is Evangelicalism.¹

A  Anglican Evangelical Growth in Christchurch, 1956-65

In the late 1950s, the flagship of evangelical Anglican ministry in the Christchurch Diocese remained that of Roger Thompson at St. Martin’s, with energetic expository preaching and many young people and students. Likewise Harry Thomson had a vigorous but more localised evangelical ministry at St. John’s Woolston. But both of these notable ministries came to an end in 1961: somewhat surprisingly, Roger Thompson moved to a country parish in the Nelson Diocese; less surprisingly, Harry Thomson resigned from parish ministry so as to concentrate on his principal passion, the CMS. Thompson would return to a Christchurch parish in 1965.² Thomson would continue with NZCMS for many years. Nevertheless, the late 1950s saw a significant expansion in the number of other evangelical Anglican ministries in Christchurch.

Morris at Bryndwr

One of the new evangelical ministers, in the new suburb of Bryndwr, was Les Morris at St Aidan’s (1957-61). St. Aidan’s had originally been developed as an off-shoot of Fendalton parish under evangelical curates.³ Morris, from a Brethren and Methodist

² Thompson became Priest Assistant (1965-9) and then Vicar (1969-77) at St. John’s, Latimer Square, where he developed a strong evangelistic ministry among social misfits and homeless people.
³ Teulon (1951-3) and Morris (1954-7).
background, had been strongly influenced by Orange and Thompson.\textsuperscript{4} He was an uncomplicated conservative who "saw everything in black and white."\textsuperscript{5} Direct and "fiery",\textsuperscript{6} he was a passionate and gifted evangelistic speaker.\textsuperscript{7} Some of his evangelical colleagues wondered "how much he was really an Anglican".\textsuperscript{8} Morris energetically built up the new parish, and later succeeded Thomson at Woolston.

**Schurr and Goodall at Shirley**

In the late 1950s, St. Stephen's in Shirley joined those Christchurch Anglican parishes that were becoming definitely evangelical in identity and ethos. A key catalyst was the vicar Maurice Goodall (1959-67). Goodall, an Orange Pip, had been a president of CUCEU and was openly evangelical.\textsuperscript{9}

The parish had already been heading in an evangelical direction under Goodall's predecessor, Geoffrey Schurr (1953-9). Schurr was hard-working and warmly pastoral, and his ministry coincided with major population growth in Shirley (in a suburb which, like Woolston and Spreydon, was of modest socio-economic status). As elsewhere during the height of the post-war baby boom, the Sunday School was overflowing.\textsuperscript{10} The average Sunday School attendance had grown from 92 children in 1946 to 331 in 1959.\textsuperscript{11}

Schurr was a "traditional Anglican",\textsuperscript{12} who appears to have been evangelical in theology, in an irenic and undeclared manner.\textsuperscript{13} An evangelical parishioner reflected

---

\textsuperscript{4} As a lay preacher at Bryndwr he had also been under the tutelage of Teulon: HT, \textsuperscript{128}
\textsuperscript{5} Bourne: 36
\textsuperscript{6} Anon., II17.
\textsuperscript{7} RRT, II29.
\textsuperscript{8} JG, II61.
\textsuperscript{9} Goodall had previously been at Waikari (1955-9).
\textsuperscript{10} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{11} Year Book for the Diocesan Year 1946; ibid., 1959.
\textsuperscript{12} MC, II67.
\textsuperscript{13} VM, II13; REC, III5. The former informant was a parishioner, and a protégé of Orange; the latter was subsequently a minister in the same parish.
that Schurr was like the younger, more overt Evangelicals only “up to a point”, because he “did not give expositions of the Scriptures quite like the others”. Her qualifying statement suggests that it was a characteristic marker of self-declared Evangelicals that they did verse-by-verse exposition. An examination of Schurr’s many contributions to the parish magazine uncovered no trace of any liberal or high church tendencies. Schurr wrote that his priority was “prayer and ministry of the word” with “spiritual” duties above all “social” duties. His parish assistant and “Evangelist” was a Church Army officer, Captain J.T. Withers. Under Schurr the parish strongly supported the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade: they prayed for the Crusade for months, commended and defended it, and received “nearly seventy” decision cards for Anglican respondents within the parish; many respondents were publicly welcomed at the ensuing church services, and the church staff attempted to visit all seventy. In Schurr’s time there also developed a committed group of perhaps forty young people who were consciously “evangelical”. They had been heavily involved in the Billy Graham crusade and were primarily nurtured by the (CMS) League of Youth. Some of them later went into Anglican ministry (including Bob Barrett, Phil Thomas and Ross Elliott) and others became prominent lay people. Despite such a ministry, evangelical in tone and effect, it is not clear that Schurr overtly identified himself as an “Evangelical”: like many other churchmen he may have felt “party” labels unnecessary, confusing or divisive.

Under Goodall, a younger man with a definite evangelical identity, there was perceptible change. There was an intensified emphasis on prayer and a new weekly

\[14\] VM, ¶13.
\[17\] Ibid., 26, 9 (May 1959).
\[18\] MG, ¶67. The parish statistical return to the diocese in 1959 gave a total of 100 on the BC roll, which suggests an approximation: 1959 *Year Book*; Goodall may have more accurately assessed the active roll.
\[19\] MG, ¶67.
\[20\] Ibid. Goodall cited Anne Wetford, Glen Palmer and Glenys Falloon.
"Bible Study and Prayer Meeting". The evening service became focused on youth and the parish became a "magnet" for that age-group. The parish magazine became snappier and more evangelistic, and demonstrated a pre-occupation with subjects such as the Cross, Scripture, personal faith, and missionary visitors; there was much less material about buildings and social events. Whereas Schurr had seemed very interested in the annual fund-raising Dolls' Show, there was no sign of such schemes in the Goodall era. Whereas Schurr had worked with the Wells Organisation to raise parish income, Goodall instituted a Stewardship Programme, which emphasised not only direct giving but Christian commitment in general. The parish claimed that as a result there were increased confirmations and baptisms.

Goodall was an outstanding organiser and developed busy programmes for every age-group. As always, such a ministry depended on the supporting role of key lay people, such as BC leader Ross Elliott. Goodall’s ministry was also strengthened by evangelical influences beyond the parish itself: his young people were very active in the League of Youth, in evangelical organisations such as Crusaders and EU, and in summer camps in led by Thompson and the Spreydon parish. Someone who lived with the Goodall family in the Shirley vicarage in the mid-sixties observed Goodall’s strong friendships with other evangelical clergy, including Pfankuch, Marriott, Morris, Lamont, and Thompson. The Christchurch evangelical clergy were a tight network, leading a growing cluster of like-minded parishes, a discernible ecclesiola in ecclesia. Such an impression of evangelical networking is reinforced by many items in the Shirley newsletter: in 1965, for instance, visiting speakers to the parish included

---

23 Ibid.: e.g. 28, 3 (Oct. 1959).
26 Ibid. 27, 11 (July 1960).
27 REC, ¶36.
28 VM, ¶15.
29 MG, ¶167.
30 MG, ¶169.
Harry Thomson, Roger Thompson, Lester Pfankuch, Robert Glen, Elizabeth Purchas, Max Wiggins and John Hewlett.\textsuperscript{32}

In the mid 1960s, Goodall arranged a parish mission at Shirley, with nightly meetings and many sub-meetings. The missioner was Lance Sheldon, Rector of Holy Trinity (Adelaide) and later Dean of Sydney. Goodall recalled having a “huge” argument with the Bishop (Alwyn Warren), who objected to the parish bringing in an evangelical from overseas rather than using a local man such as Martin Sullivan: “you just want someone of your own outlook, don’t you?”\textsuperscript{33} The bishop was no doubt right about that: the fact was, Evangelicals rarely trusted non-evangelicals to do evangelism, especially in their own territory; only card-carrying Evangelicals could be trusted to present the whole Gospel, with sufficient “soundness”, conviction and urgency. The mission went ahead, and there were numerous conversions.\textsuperscript{34}

For Goodall and his friends, the most prominent ecclesiastical threat they appeared to perceive was not liberalism but “Anglo-Catholicism”: they gave the impression that, outside Christchurch and Nelson, the rest of New Zealand Anglicanism was “like a dark cloud” – with Auckland and Dunedin especially dark.\textsuperscript{35} But Goodall’s focus was wider than just the New Zealand Anglican church: he subscribed to \textit{Christianity Today}, and he and his friends also appeared worried about growing secularism in society.\textsuperscript{36}

Under Goodall’s leadership, it seemed to those who were part of it that the Shirley parish “grew dramatically.”\textsuperscript{37} The statistical returns suggest a more nuanced

\textsuperscript{31} BR, ¶12.
\textsuperscript{32} Shirley Parish Newsletter Clippings: 1965-72.
\textsuperscript{33} MG, ¶74.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid. Those who made commitments included several who later became prominent leaders in the Association of Anglican Women, at both diocesan and national level.
\textsuperscript{35} Rev. Dr. R.A. Robinson, interview, Nov. 2004 (hereafter BR), ¶12.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{37} BR, ¶7.
situation. Between 1960 and 1965, the average Sunday School attendance in the Shirley parish increased from 370 to 539. In 1960 the BC roll increased from 100 to 141, and then remained much the same. The parish was already large when Goodall came and may not have grown markedly except in the Sunday School. Quite apart from the statistics, the impression of growth may have derived mainly from a stronger sense of spiritual commitment and evangelical identity, especially among the young people. Another indicator may have been that the parish was beginning to export young adults to other ministries: Eric Baigent and Ross and Pauline Elliott joined the CMS, and Phil Thomas began theological training at Ridley.

From Goodall onwards, an overt evangelical succession was established in the Shirley parish, in a similar way to how it had become established in Spreydon, Woolston and Bryndwr.

**Lamont at St. Martin's**

The Spreydon-Hoon Hay ministry vacated by Thompson was taken up by Graham Lamont. Lamont was a previous member of the parish, one of those who had moved there from St. James' (Lower Riccarton) in the late 1940s. Lamont had been heavily involved in CSSM, Crusaders and especially EU. Ordained in 1954, he had been in ministry in Timaru, Hokitika, Kumara and Waikari. Lamont was very conscious of continuing the evangelical tradition begun by his predecessor. Like Thompson, Lamont openly identified himself as an Evangelical. He saw the heart of evangelicalism as helping bring individuals to faith and conversion, and saw

---

42 Goodall would be replaced by R.E. Coulthard (1967-78).
43 GL, ¶38.
44 GL, ¶73-4.
45 GL, ¶71.
biblical exposition as a key evangelical strategy. In presenting the intellectual bases of Christian belief, Lamont reflected the evangelical rationalism and evidentialism that was common in this period, especially among those of an IVF background:

We were concerned to stress the fact that the Christian faith is based on objective historical events (e.g. the resurrection)... Personal subjective experiences (e.g. testimonies) are important but at most they can be confirmations of objective truths about Christ and salvation.... we were concerned to try and ensure that appeals for commitment were made on the basis of a presentation of the gospel that was intellectually ‘honest’ and not simply emotional.47

Lamont did not have quite the same popular appeal as his predecessor, but the parish continued to grow. In 1965 the average Sunday School attendance was 520.48 Lamont maintained the Sunday afternoon Bible Class, with 80-100 young people coming from many parts of the city. Lamont later felt that was when his teaching ministry was at its highest point. As with Thompson, Lamont was conscious of his dependence on key lay people49 and assistants.50

There were also some discontinuities between Lamont and his predecessor. Lamont was willing to be called a “conservative evangelical”, but “disliked intensely” being labelled “fundamentalist”51 – whereas Thompson would not have cared.52 Thompson believed in a literal 6-day creation;53 Lamont “definitely” did not, and interpreted the

---

46 Ibid.
47 GL, ¶60. The books he refers to were both published by IVP, in 1967 and 1965 respectively.
48 Year Book for the Diocesan Year, 1965.
49 E.g. Alan Stott, Ken and Ian McClelland, David Powell, Edwin Close, Bert Riseley, John Smith, Connie Carrell, Elaine Cooper
50 E.g. Clarice Greenslade (youth worker), Harry Funnell, Gerald Tisch.
51 GL, ¶74.
52 RT, ¶373-6. Thompson did not use the label “fundamentalist” of himself. Lamont did not class Thompson as a fundamentalist but felt that some of his views were not far removed from those of the fundamentalists: GL, ¶78.
53 RT, ¶234. Thompson also said: “but I have respect for those who believed in a longer time period. I’m not too cut and dried on things like that”.

days in Genesis 1 as indicating long periods of time. While Lamont was a firm Evangelical who saw many doctrines as “non-negotiable” he consciously tried to be more open and less dogmatic on what he considered “second order” questions. Such issues included church union and social questions such as dancing. In relation to the wider society Lamont was less separatist than Thompson.

Lamont gave expository series but also preached according to the lectionary, and would sometimes give topical series on themes such as “Love and Marriage”, “Old Age”, “Sickness and Death”. He often ran an informal Saturday night outreach to local young people which was pre-evangelistic rather than directly proselytising. Lamont recalled having a panel discussion – at one such event – about sexual morality, following his screening of a “slightly risqué” secular film. Such innovations of content and method reflected growing evangelical concern about the accelerating social ferment affecting the western world in the 1960s, a climate of questioning, controversy and radicalism which was also beginning to affect New Zealand. It was the era of rock and roll, Elvis Presley and the Beatles, long hair, student protests, increasing promiscuity, the “death of God” theology and “the new morality”. In such a context, sexual ethics were being discussed much more directly and urgently by evangelicals than twenty years earlier.

54 GL, ¶44.
55 GL, ¶42.
56 GL, ¶76.
57 GL, ¶82.
58 GL, ¶38.
59 In relation to the USA, Ahlstrom dubs the period 1960-75 “the traumatic years”. The American experience also included prominent assassinations, ferment over civil rights and Vietnam, feminism, Watergate, eastern cults, and Jesus freaks.
60 In Britain, Callum Brown argues, changing youth culture created a “discourse revolution” that led to the widespread abandonment of Christian adherence and morality from the early sixties onwards (The Death of Christian Britain : 175-180). For changes in New Zealand society (but without any application to religious change), see e.g. Belich: 506-11; he alluded also to the “moral panic” evidenced a decade earlier in the 1954 Mazengarb Report on sexual delinquency: 504-5. For an overview of religious ferment in Australia in the 1960s see David Hilliard, “The Religious Crisis of the 1960s: The Experience of the Australian Churches”, Journal of Religious History 21, 2 (June 1967): 209-27.
Lamont was a careful thinker, and more scholarly than Thompson (who was energetic in study but had less formal education). Lamont was not an Orange Pip: he was partially moulded by an Orange Pip (Thompson), but he did not feel constrained to follow Thompson slavishly. Intellectually, Lamont had been shaped primarily not by Thompson but by the EU and his own university and theological studies. As a young man, Lamont had in some respects chafed a little under the more defensive style of Thompson. Lamont reflected a new generation of Anglican Evangelicals, eager to explore their own way of being Anglican and evangelical in a changing context. Lamont was consciously trying to help develop an Anglican evangelicalism that was ecclesiastically more open, and more intellectually engaged with non-evangelicals. Well-read and confident, Lamont was willing – in contrast to Thompson – to become actively involved in debates in the Diocesan and General Synods. He and others (such as Maurice Goodall and Brian Carrell) were beginning to give a new voice to evangelicalism in New Zealand’s Anglican church.  

Other Evangelical Ministries in the Diocese of Christchurch

In this period a number of evangelical ministers were serving elsewhere in the diocese, often outside the Christchurch urban area. Harvey Teulon was in Timaru (1957-70). Maurice Betteridge (an Orange Pip) was at Lincoln (1955-9) and also lecturing at College House. Brian Carrell, originally from the Spreydon parish, did two curacies, in one of them experiencing a remarkable response to the Graham

---

61 In the late 1960s, Lamont took leave to do post-graduate study (1967-8) at St. John’s College, Durham (he studied Anglican relations with non-conformity after 1662 – a topic with some application to the 1960s controversy about inter-communion). After Lamont returned, Hoon Hay became a separate parish, and Lamont himself moved to the Opawa church. In 1970 he moved to a university-based role in Hamilton (as Warden of the new inter-denominational Bryant Halls of Residence at Waikato University). He withdrew from leadership in the Christchurch-based Anglican evangelical movement, but remained evangelical. In the Spreydon parish, he was replaced by a protégé of Bretton and former Spreydon BC member, David Pickering.
62 Teulon was in the Highfield parish, and previously in the Hokitika parish on the West Coast.
63 When Betteridge was away on study leave in 1958, the Lincoln parish had another evangelical (Funnell) doing an interim ministry: REC, ¶15.
64 In Timaru (1956-58) and St. Alban’s, Christchurch (1958-60).
crusade. He was then vicar of Hororata (1960-5). Colin Tonks (who had trained at Ridley) was a curate in Timaru (1960-2).

R.E. (Ted) Coulthard was at Otaio-Bluecliffs (1955-9) and then at Lincoln (1959-67). Unlike most of the newer Christchurch evangelical ministers he was not an Orange Pip, but was from Auckland. He had made an initial Christian response at a Crusader meeting at Auckland Grammar School, and had been made a thorough Evangelical at the Auckland EU, and thus his mentor was not Orange but Blaiklock. Coulthard did his theological training at Moore College. Through H.R. Minn (a New Zealander then on the staff at Moore) Coulthard had been recruited as a curate for Walter Wisdom in Sumner. Coulthard would later move into the city to continue the evangelical succession in Shirley.

A 1959 register of ECF members in the Christchurch Diocese listed a total of fourteen clergy: Orange, Thompson, Thomson, Teulon, Coulthard, Goodall, Betteridge, Lamont, Morris, Funnell, Wisdom, J.J. Flewelling (Avonside), A.E. Rolleston (Hororata) and B.W. Don (Methven). The list did not include all known evangelicals (it did not list Brian Carrell, for instance, or Dick Tripp), but it

---

65 The vicar of the parish (St. Matthew's in the suburb of St. Alban's) was “totally” opposed to the Crusade. A large number of Anglican enquirers living within the parish bounds were referred to the St. Matthew's. Carrell taught an adult confirmation class (an unusual thing in itself) of thirty-forty people. These included his own father, of Irish Catholic background, and Bryan Drake, later an evangelical vicar. Many youth also responded, and the BC had a large increase in numbers (BRC, ¶101-116).

66 Two more curacies followed: Spreydon-Hoon Hay (1962-64) and Shirley (1964).

67 REC, ¶2-3. The speaker at AGS was Vine Martin, who was teaching a series on Luke. The student leader at the group was Bruce Harris.

68 REC, ¶11. Another strong influence on Coulthard in his time in AUCEU was Ivan Moses.

69 REC, ¶10. Coulthard had known Minn previously “at a distance” through AUEU. They had also both been at Anglican evangelical meetings at Stan Rosser's home, MF, ¶27. Coulthard asserted that before the bishop agreed to ordain him he subjected him (as someone who had been doing his theological training at Moore) to a thorough “grilling”.

70 List of ECF Clergy, Christchurch, Latimer; also E.C.F. Review 1 (Aug. 1959): 10. Initials and parish locations are supplied only where individuals have not already been referred to.

71 By 1959 Wisdom was in the Glenmark parish.

72 Flewellyn was evangelical but not an Orange Pip, according to Coulthard, REC, ¶16.

73 Tripp, who had attended St. Martin's in Thompson's era, did his theological training at Trinity
indicated something of the growing strength of evangelical Anglicanism in the Diocese. Relative to the total number of clergy in the Christchurch Diocese this was still a small minority. But it was an expanding minority.\(^74\)

In addition, the Diocese had several more evangelical clergy serving overseas as missionaries, including John Meadowcroft, Peter Tovey, Max Wiggins, Wallace Marriott, R.A. Carson, Gerald Clark, John Greenslade, Lester Pfankuch and Hugh Thomson. Some of these would soon return to parish ministry in the Christchurch Diocese: Pfankuch, for instance, became vicar of Belfast-Styx (1963-6).\(^75\) Thomson returned to ministries in Highfield and Riccarton and in 1964 became vicar of Avonhead. In 1963 Carson became vicar of St Aidan’s, Bryndwr. In 1963-4, Marriott worked in Hoon Hay during an interlude in his missionary service. A few years on, John Greenslade would be in ministry at Burnside, which began as a branch of the evangelical parish of Bryndwr.\(^76\) Such returning missionaries significantly increased the number of Orange Pips and protégés of Orange Pips who were now fanning out across the Christchurch parishes. Although all part of the same movement, they were not a completely homogeneous group: Carson, for instance, was more scholarly and less polemical than some more populist Evangelicals.\(^77\)

**An Anglican Evangelical “Bible Belt”**

By the mid-sixties, the number of Christchurch parishes of a definite evangelical stamp had become considerable: such parishes notably included St. Martin’s (Spreydon), St. John’s (Woolston), St. Stephen’s (Shirley) and St. Aidan’s (Bryndwr). That group of parishes constituted what was sometimes referred to, among

\(^{74}\) MG, ¶72-3.

\(^{75}\) He then moved to Woolston.

\(^{76}\) JG, ¶54.

\(^{77}\) JG, ¶63.
evangelical ministers themselves, as an Anglican evangelical “Bible Belt”. Those parishes would soon be joined by St. Timothy’s (Burnside) and St. John’s (Latimer Square). In the latter, Roger Thompson would begin another notable Christchurch ministry. Several more parishes were less consistently or emphatically evangelical but nevertheless had a number of evangelical ministers: these included Belfast-Styx, Avonhead and Cashmere. Together, all these parishes represented about a third of the urban or suburban Christchurch parishes. Several rural or non-Christchurch parishes were also developing a tradition – not always continuous – of having vicars or curates of an evangelical flavour. These included Waikari, Lincoln, Hororata, Methven and Highfield.

In 1961 Morris replaced Thomson as the vicar at St. John’s (Woolston), thus consolidating the evangelical character of that parish. In 1966 Morris would move to Belfast-Styx, on the northern outskirts of Christchurch. In Bryndwr, he would be replaced by another evangelical, Carson. In Woolston, he would be replaced by Pfankuch. It was clear that evangelical parishes were now insisting on an evangelical minister to replace those any moved on, and that the expanding muster of evangelical clergy within the diocese was being moved around within the growing circuit of evangelical parishes. Such a pattern of evangelical succession was dependent upon having become strong enough to have full “Parish” status (with the right to elect Nominators), rather than just “Parochial District” status (where the appointment rested with the Bishop).

The growth of a cluster of consciously “evangelical” parishes in the Christchurch Diocese, and the proliferation of evangelical ministries in many other parishes besides, had been gradual rather than sudden. But it was nevertheless a dramatic development. It reflected a situation very different from that prevailing in 1930,

78 MG, 553; REC, 27.
79 MG, 553.
80 Ibid.
when Orange had begun his rather lonely evangelical ministry at Sumner. It demonstrated the steadily growing vigour and significance of the evangelical movement in Christchurch.81

The 1959 Billy Graham Crusade and Christchurch Evangelical Anglicanism

There can be no question that the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade made an important contribution to Anglican evangelical growth in Christchurch, especially in those parishes with evangelical ministers. The Spreydon-Hoon Hay parish, for instance, estimated that it gained fifty new members from the Billy Graham Crusade.82 A follow-up mid-week “Christian Training Course” led by Funnell attracted up to one hundred people.83 The Shirley parish, which received seventy decision cards, welcomed many respondents into church and especially into the Bible Class.84 The effect of the Crusade was also felt in some country parishes, at least those with evangelical ministers. In Waikari there were some who made a decision at the Crusade but they tended to be people already associated with the parish; there was no great infusion of new people but rather a “quickening” of the congregation.85 In Kumara on the West Coast, the minister encouraged people to attend; some did, and some key lay people were “brought to conscious commitment”.86

81 The context in which that movement had grown had not been conspicuously evangelical. One possible indicator of the strength of any type of evangelical outlook among Anglican clergy in the Christchurch Diocese might be found in a 1957 study (by a member of the university Psychology Department) which canvassed (with a 98% return) ninety clergy of all denominations in the Christchurch area with various questions. In answering the question whether some “conversion experience or some personal experience of forgiveness” was necessary for ministerial candidates, 68% of Anglican ministers thought it essential, 100% of Baptists, and 95% of Presbyterians. R.H.T. Thompson, Training For The Ministry: An Exploratory Study (Christchurch: Presbyterian Bookroom, 1957). It may be concluded that at least a broadly evangelical emphasis on individual commitment to Christ was universal among Baptist ministers, was nearly so among Presbyterian ministers (not least because of the way Presbyterian Bible Class camps gave priority to calls to commitment), but was not found in perhaps half of Anglican clergy.

82 Lancaster: 26.
83 Ibid.: 24.
84 St. Stephen’s Review 26, 9 (May 1959); MG, ¶67.
85 MG, ¶66.
86 GL, ¶36.
The Crusade was clearly a decisive event for many individuals. A survey of parish statistics held by the Diocese, however, does not reveal any pronounced upswing in congregational numbers, BC membership or confirmation figures in evangelically-minded parishes in the years 1959-60. It appears that the Crusade made a significant contribution to the growth of evangelical parishes, but that it was only one of several factors encouraging growth. The Crusade coincided with a period when evangelical parishes (and many other Anglican parishes) were already experiencing definite growth. The growth that was occurring was reinforced by the Crusade, but was also explicable quite apart from the Crusade. The sustained work of the evangelical ministers, Bible Classes and League of Youth was probably more important.

Nevertheless, the Billy Graham Crusade (and reports of similar crusades in the UK and USA) appears to have had a definite effect on evangelical morale: the 1959 Crusade very publicly displayed and authenticated a conservative evangelical approach to matters of faith. It demonstrated – at least to evangelicals – that old-fashioned Biblicism and straight-talking appeals for decision still had currency in the public domain, that evangelicals were innovative and energetic, and that evangelical initiatives could give a lead even to an ecumenical body such as the NCC.

**CMS League of Youth in Christchurch, 1956-65**

In this period, the League of Youth was in its heyday in the Diocese of Christchurch. Its monthly Saturday-night meetings attracted up to 150 young people. The speakers would be missionaries on furlough, or local evangelical clergy called in “to give us a stir up”. 87 There were frequent challenges to deep commitment. The League also had an annual Easter house party at Tyndale House.

---

87 DO, ¶28.
Apart from its primary overseas mission focus, the League of Youth also had a vigorous emphasis on local and city-wide evangelism. One of those converted through an evangelistic barbecue held by the League was Bob Robinson, a young "agnostic" who had gained a scholarship to attend Christ's College and was thus required to attend church. The speaker was Les Morris. To Robinson it seemed as if it was the first time he had ever heard the gospel, and he was greatly stirred. The next morning, sitting in church, he had a conversion experience. Robinson later became a CMS missionary, General Secretary of NZCMS, and an evangelical theologian and lecturer.

The League of Youth drew youth from the principal evangelical parishes (Shirley, Spreydon, Woolston, Bryndwr), who thus came to know one other. The League therefore played a key role in unifying the youth of the Christchurch Anglican evangelical movement and in giving them a common sense of evangelical identity. The League also had a wider influence: it drew in some young people from parishes where the minister himself did not identify with the evangelical networks, but where the young people did.

As with other evangelical youth organisations such as Crusaders, and especially the EUs, the League of Youth was led by youth themselves, and was an important training ground for emerging leaders; League of Youth leaders in this period included David Powell, Derek Eaton, Phil Thomas, Tony Andrews and Dale

---

88 Ibid. Oldham quoted a slogan used at the time: "the light that shines the furthest shines the brightest nearest home."

89 BR, ¶3-5. Robinson was required to attend eight out of ten communion services per term.

90 Robinson did theological study at Ridley College and a PhD in theology at London University. He was later Dean of the Christchurch branch of BCNZ.

91 DO, ¶28.

92 Ibid.


94 Later a key ECF leader.

95 Later vicar of All Saints' Nelson, Dean of Cairo, and General Secretary of NZCMS.
Oldham. The League of Youth also encouraged its members to attend the CMS Spring Schools, where evangelical youth were drawn into the general community of Anglican evangelicals.

B  Anglican Evangelical Growth in Nelson, 1956-65

In this period, evangelicalism became more vigorous and overt within the Diocese of Nelson, and more home-grown. The influence of Sydney evangelical Anglicanism was maintained, but the influence of the Christchurch evangelical Anglican movement was deepened. Evangelical development in Nelson also reflected the general strengthening of evangelical confidence and energy that was taking place across the English-speaking world. The proportion of definitely evangelical clergy in Nelson increased.

A New Evangelical Bishop for Nelson

The new bishop, Frank Hulme-Moir (1954-65), continued the episcopal succession in Nelson of Sydney Evangelicals who had trained in Moore College. Hulme-Moir had been the Archdeacon of the large Summerhill parish and was a friend of Bishop Mowll. His election had been strongly promoted by fellow Australian Paul Kirkham, long-serving vicar of Blenheim.

Hulme-Moir was a popular bishop. He was a man of "immense physical stature" and of charismatic personality. He was a strong preacher "for the common man." With his large fund of stories, his experience as an army chaplain, and his "manly

---

96 Later ordained in the UK, a CMS missionary in East Africa and New Zealand, and vicar of Shirley.
97 BR, ¶10.
99 Hulme-Moir to Stuart Barton-Babbage, 29 Oct. 1958, Former Clerical Employees, Box 5, Diocese of Nelson archives.
100 JM, ¶51; BW, ¶49; PK, ¶7.
101 Edmiston: 112.
faith", Hulme-Moir was the sort of speaker who could establish rapport with a crowd of men in a freezing works. He was an effective missioner. Hulme-Moir also had a powerful voice, and could sing like an opera singer. He also appears to have been highly pastoral.

Hulme-Moir had definite evangelical convictions. He was explicit about his evangelical stance: he wrote to one of his evangelical clergy about how he had appointed two canons so as "to strengthen the evangelical cause". To someone planning to study at Ridley College, he wrote that he was sure that he would appreciate "the very direct evangelical lectures at the College"; he was later confident the student's time had been "more profitably spent" at Ridley than at College House.

There were many other indications of Hulme-Moir's evangelical sympathies. On arrival in New Zealand, he immediately assumed the Chairmanship of the New Zealand CMS; he also warmly supported the CIM, and endorsed two of his activist younger clergy joining the OMF for missionary service in South East Asia. He quickly established links with the EUs and IVF(NZ) and became a frequent speaker

---

102 PK, ¶7.
103 Edmiston: 112; JF, ¶26; PK, ¶7; JH, ¶41; Witness, 1 Oct. 1965, "Bishop’s Sermon at Enthronement Service".
104 DP, ¶85 (in New Zealand, “freezing works” are the abattoirs where meat is frozen for export).
105 MB, ¶46.
106 PK, ¶7: Anon., ¶49.
107 As evidenced in numerous personal letters to his clergy, Former Clerical Employees, Box 5, Nelson Diocese archives.
108 MB, ¶46.
109 Hulme-Moir to R.G. Nicholson, 22 Aug. 1962, Former Clerical Employees, Box 5, Diocese of Nelson archives. The clergy so appointed were Bernard Machell and John Ford.
110 Hulme-Moir to David Pickering, 2 May 1958, Former Clerical Employees Box 7, Diocese of Nelson archives.
111 Hulme-Moir to David Pickering, 22 Sept. 1960, Former Clerical Employees Box 7, Diocese of Nelson archives.
112 In NSW, Hulme-Moir had served as General Secretary of CMS.
113 Hulme-Moir to Wallace Marriott, 10 Mar. 1961, Former Clerical Employees, Box 6, Diocese of Nelson archives.
in those circles. Every year Hulme-Moir hosted an inter-denominational convention for the fostering of the “Spirit life”. When one of his clergy asked permission to train in evangelism with Open Air Campaigners, Hulme-Moir expressed himself “delighted”.

**Hulme-Moir Recruits Other Evangelicals**

In 1956, Hulme-Moir succeeding in enticing over Cook Strait his friend W.F. Bretton, the dynamic evangelical vicar of St. James’ Lower Hutt. Bretton became the Dean of Nelson. His departure from Wellington was a shock for the emerging Anglican evangelical movement in that diocese. While Bretton might arguably have had a greater influence by remaining in Wellington, he strengthened the senior evangelical leadership in Nelson: he was scholarly, disciplined, and a strong preacher and missioner.

While in Nelson, Bretton closely mentored a tight coterie of curates, including David Pickering and Malcolm Oatway. Bretton also developed an extensive ministry beyond Nelson: he often spoke in various EU settings, led retreats for theological students at College House, or acted as missioner.

As with his predecessors, Hulme-Moir brought into the diocese a number of others from the Diocese of Sydney, such as Bill Gregory, Kelvin Tutt, David Davis, Bill Burchill and Donald Wilson. Of these, Tutt stood out. A former protégé of Hulme-Moir in Sydney, he was vicar of Norfolk Island when he decided to come to Nelson.

---

114 DP, ¶85.
116 Hulme-Moir to M. Oatway, 13 March 1964, Former Clerical Employees, Box 5.
117 DP, ¶85.
118 DP, ¶66.
119 BW, ¶49.
120 Tutt to [Hulme-Moir], 13 Jan. 1956, Former Clerical Employees, Box 9, Diocese of Nelson archives.
He was a man of “evangelical fervour.”\textsuperscript{121} He served in two parishes (Stoke and Cobden-Runanga) but was especially active in youth work, camps, and missions.\textsuperscript{122}

**John Hewlett**

From 1955-58, All Saints’ Church in Nelson had an activist young evangelical curate, John Hewlett, who showed great energy and urgency in youth work and evangelism.\textsuperscript{123} Hewlett, from Auckland, had trained in Moore College. He had read Wesley’s life and felt “the world was before me”.\textsuperscript{124} As a zealous young evangelical, Hewlett felt that the Nelson Diocese was not quite as evangelical as its reputation, and that, instead, it was more Low Church and traditional Anglican. Hewlett – although he was not the only young evangelical – sometimes felt like “a voice crying in the wilderness”.\textsuperscript{125} He received support (and some tempering) from two older evangelicals, Machell and Nicholson, and much personal encouragement from Hulme-Moir.\textsuperscript{126} The All Saints’ youth became very involved in the large diocesan youth camps, and in the League of Youth.\textsuperscript{127} The church formed an evangelistic team, a “Flying Squad” that visited other churches.\textsuperscript{128} Hewlett sensed “a minor revival”.\textsuperscript{129} When he left Nelson to serve with CIM in South East Asia, he preached to a packed congregation of around 500 in All Saints’ Church, declaiming “I may never see you again, but not one person in this church is going to be able to stand before God and say you never heard the Gospel of Christ”.\textsuperscript{130}

\textsuperscript{121} Hulme-Moir to Archbishop [of Sydney], 12 Mar 1963, Former Clerical Employees, Box 9, Diocese of Nelson archives.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid.; JH, ¶35.
\textsuperscript{123} The vicar was ex-CMS missionary H.F (Frank) Ault. Ault was preoccupied writing the diocesan history and gave Hewlett “free range”: JH, ¶28.
\textsuperscript{124} JH, ¶39.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid.; JH, ¶41.
\textsuperscript{127} JH, ¶32-3, 30.
\textsuperscript{128} JH, ¶31.
\textsuperscript{129} JH, ¶29.
\textsuperscript{130} JH, ¶39.
Evangelical Clergy and Youth Work

Meanwhile strong youth work was being done in other parishes, such as in Stoke (under Tutt), Richmond (under Machell) and Blenheim (under Kirkham). Together with All Saints', these parishes represented a fresh wave of energy in the Nelson diocese.\textsuperscript{131} At the heart of that was “a key group of evangelical ministers who were eager to preach the Gospel and to develop strong youth work”.\textsuperscript{132} Such fervour and activism were characteristic of the evangelical movement. As elsewhere, the leaders of the evangelical Nelson youth groups refused to countenance the popular demand for dances, but instead ran Saturday night Bible Studies.\textsuperscript{133} Evangelical youth work flourished in this era, in part because of the vigour and conviction of its leadership. But it was also a phenomenon that reflected the heights of the post-war baby boom and the resurgence of church life across New Zealand: often church pews were likewise full and Sunday Schools overflowing. It was a period when many people in New Zealand communities acknowledged at least nominal Christian faith, and were often still willing to attend and support the church.\textsuperscript{134}

An Analysis of Nelson Clergy in 1963

A survey of the clergy roll for Nelson Diocese in 1963\textsuperscript{135} indicates that of the thirty-four clergy listed, ten were graduates of Moore College.\textsuperscript{136} This was similar to the proportion of Moore-trained clergy in 1950. Two of the Moore graduates were New Zealanders\textsuperscript{137}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[131] JH, ¶37.
\item[132] Ibid.
\item[133] JH, ¶38.
\item[134] The experience of the Wells campaign indicated that many non-attenders were prepared to give substantial financial support to the church.
\item[135] Year Book: Diocese of Nelson, 1963.
\item[136] For insights into the developing theological character of Moore College in this period, including the intensified emphasis on scripture, see e.g. Marcus L. Loane and Peter F. Jensen, Broughton Knox: Principal of Moore College, 1959-1985 (Sydney: Moore Theological College, 1994): 9-10, 14-22.
\item[137] B. Cox, M. Oatway.
\end{footnotes}
and the rest were Australians. With one exception, all the Moore graduates in the 1963 list were evangelical in outlook, in many cases emphatically so.\textsuperscript{138}

A smaller proportion (four out of thirty-four) of the Nelson clergy in 1963 were from England, and at least three of those were definite Evangelicals.\textsuperscript{139} The rest of the 1963 Nelson clergy (twenty-three of the thirty-six) were New Zealanders. Of these, about five tended towards a middle-of-the-road or liberal evangelical outlook – though some of them would nevertheless attend ECF conferences. The rest (sixteen of them) were all definite Evangelicals.\textsuperscript{140} There was a significantly higher proportion of evangelical New Zealanders, which explains the overall increase in the proportion of evangelical clergy in the diocese: that proportion had risen to about twenty-eight of the thirty-four clergy.\textsuperscript{141}

Some of the evangelical New Zealanders were originally from evangelical parishes within the Nelson Diocese: such clergy included Noel Bythell and George Spargo from Blenheim and Barry Loveridge from All Saints' Nelson. At least three (David Pickering, Dennis Barrett and Malcolm Oatway) came from Wellington, through the influence of Bretton. Six of them (including Donald Williams, Bernard Machell, Bob Nicholson, Bruce Beattie, Bob Hughes and Roger Thompson) were Orange Pips: the same number of Orange Pips as in 1950. Several others (such as Ian Nelson and Bernard Cox) were not Orange Pips, but had come through Thompson’s Bible Class at St. Martin’s Spreydon. Several of the local evangelicals had likewise gone through Thompson’s Bible Class, when they had spent time doing studies in Christchurch.

\textsuperscript{138} Theological comments on Nelson clergy reflect assessments made by Canon W. Wilkens and the Venerable John Ford et al. Another source was an (untitled) membership list of the ECF in 1958.
\textsuperscript{139} Bretton, Dyer and Gregory. The fourth person from Britain, G. Hill, was a member of the ECF, so possibly was also a definite Evangelical.
\textsuperscript{140} One of these (D. Pickering) had trained at Ridley College, Melbourne.
\textsuperscript{141} A few years earlier, based on the ECF membership list in 1958, the corresponding figure of evangelical clergy was twenty-three. ECF membership may not have necessarily denoted an unequivocally evangelical outlook, but would have indicated at least sympathy for that position.
When the make-up of Nelson clergy from 1963 is compared with that in 1950, it becomes apparent that Nelson Diocese – despite its bishop and the continuing infusion of Moore College graduates – was gradually becoming less of an outpost of the Diocese of Sydney, and more obviously a gathering place for New Zealand evangelical Anglican clergy. The reason was not a weakening of the Sydney connection, but rather a steady growth of evangelical Anglicanism within New Zealand. That home-grown Anglican evangelicalism had developed primarily in Christchurch, but it had also become much stronger in the Nelson Diocese itself. Within the Nelson context, evangelical Anglicanism had been strongly fostered by the conferences, publications and personal networking of ECF and CMS: in the 1960s, Nelson Evangelicals were much less isolated and were increasingly feeling part of a confident, expansionist evangelical network that now spanned two dioceses. Through the conferences, some clergy who had not been particularly evangelical were drawn into evangelical circles.

**Dorothy Hulme-Moir**

The bishop and his wife, Dorothy, formed a strong partnership. Mrs Hulme-Moir was considered by some a “magnificent” Bible teacher, better than her husband. Through her weekly lunchtime Bible Study at Bishopdale, Dorothy Hulme-Moir had a profound influence on many laity and young people in Nelson city and environs. Her Bible Class has been compared to that of Orange in Christchurch. Through it, she had a greater impact on some than her husband, whose work was diffused over the whole diocese. Mrs Hulme-Moir often wrote Bible Studies for *The Witness*, the diocesan newspaper. The bishop’s wife was also a prominent supporter of evangelical missionary work, EU and IVF. Mrs Hulme-Moir was not universally

---

142 JH, 41.
143 The bishop’s official residence.
144 BW, 69.
145 E.g. 1 April 1958; 1 Nov. 1958.
popular: some Nelson people appear to have struggled with her powerful personality and her adamant views on such matters as teetotalism.

The Flavour of an Evangelical Diocese

The Diocese of Nelson was unique among New Zealand dioceses, with its Low Church worship style and its majority of evangelical or evangelical-tending clergy. The evangelical flavour of the diocese was reflected in the pages of the diocesan newspaper, *The Witness*.

The pages of *The Witness* give the impression that Nelson’s Anglican evangelicalism was generally assumed rather than advocated: there was no contrary opinion in the diocese against which an evangelical approach needed defending. The Nelson brand of evangelicalism was implicit rather than explicit, and it did not employ technical terms or party labels. *The Witness* promoted an everyday style of Christianity that was practical, moralistic, and mildly biblicist and pietistic. The language and tone were homely, and inoffensive. Unlike some other diocesan papers, *The Witness* carried nothing that could be considered either ecclesiastically high or theologically liberal. In this period, there also appears to have been only one article that featured the ecumenical movement.146

While the word “evangelical” rarely appeared in the pages of *The Witness*, there were still innumerable evidences of evangelical piety and outlook, including the regular features on prayer,147 the frequent apologetic and devotional articles, the tone of the monthly Bishop’s Letter, a tribute to Archbishop Mowll,148 and numerous enthusiastic reports of great responses to the evangelistic appeals given at Easter

Visits and departures of missionaries were warmly recorded. So was the Bishop's "Annual One Day Convention for the Deepening of the Spiritual Life" held at Bishopdale; the 1959 report spoke glowingly of the speaker, Warner Hutchinson, commended the IVF, and urged prayer for both. The paper carried extensive (and entirely positive) reports on the Billy Graham Crusade and its enlivening effect on various parishes. There was also a major report on the inter-denominational Keswick-style "Second Mid-New Zealand Convention" held at Renwick, which featured talks by Rev. I.B. Davies (Presbyterian) on "Revival", six Bible studies by Roger Thompson, and missionary speakers from "faith" mission societies.

A Succession Crisis and an Evangelical Set-back

Given the increasing vitality of evangelicalism in the Nelson Diocese, evangelicals felt confident that another evangelical would be elected as the next bishop when Hulme-Moir returned to Sydney in 1965. The electoral Synod met twice, late in 1964. Bretton had hopes, but limited support. A serious contender was a definite evangelical, an Orange Pip who had been in Australia for over twenty years. He was nominated by Archdeacon Paul Kirkham, an Australian, but it might have been

---

149 E.g. 1 May 1959: 14. "A number sought Christ as Saviour... A time of rich spiritual experience;" Witness, 1 June 1960: 5.
150 E.g. Witness, 1 Nov. 1958: 10; 1 Sept. 1959: 8.
151 Witness, 1 April 1959: 4.
152 E.g. Malcolm Oatway, "The Billy Graham Crusade - and after," Witness, 1 May 1959: 11-13. As among Christchurch evangelical Anglicans, the Crusade was a high point and contributed to growth and to a sense of spiritual blessing but did not represent any obvious turning point. In provincial areas such as Nelson, the Billy Graham Crusade was participated in through "landline" relays to meetings held in large halls.
153 Witness, 1 Feb. 1964. LB. Davies was from Wales, and did interim ministries in New Zealand at Gonville (Wanganui Presbytery) and Tuatapere (Southland Presbytery). He was the father of Rev. Wynford Davies, an evangelical who emigrated to New Zealand and joined the Presbyterian ministry.
154 Hulme-Moir was invited back to become assistant bishop of Sydney.
156 Bretton could be dismissive and outspoken and considered some of the Moore-trained clergy too narrow (he called them "flat-foots"); David Pickering, telephone conversation, 20 Jan. 2006. Some in the diocese favoured Martin Sullivan.
157 The names of the various nominees are withheld, on the basis that members of the Synod were forbidden to divulge any names "either present or future".
better for the evangelicals if a New Zealander had championed him. Evangelical clergy were dismayed when it became evident that their nominee could not gain the support of the laity in the electoral synod. The opposition to the nominee reflected a firm and co-ordinated lay resistance to the prospect of another bishop from Sydney. There may have been an underlying reaction against the conservatism of the Sydney clergy generally. Hulme-Moir had been popular, but his wife’s powerful personality and moral strictness – especially her outspoken opposition to dancing and alcohol – had worried some, who now feared another similar regime. His predecessor’s wife had similarly provoked some dislike. The lay opposition, including some people who had come from other parts of New Zealand, argued that it was time for Nelson to drop its unique Sydney connection and to become more like all other New Zealand dioceses. Evangelical laity did not agree with those views, but were less prominent in the electoral synod than some of other sympathies. The opposition to the “Australian” nominee was not explicitly theological, but was perhaps implicitly so. The leadership of the lay resistance, articulate and persuasive, was centred on the Cathedral, which was characteristically less Low Church and evangelical than the diocese as a whole. More than one evangelical minister felt that the lay opposition was “anti-evangelical”.

At a second meeting of the electoral synod, the anti-Australian bloc backed another nominee, a former curate of Dean Bretton. But evangelical clergy as a whole felt he was a weak candidate and did not support him. With the Synod unable to reach a decision, it ceded its power to nominate Nelson’s next bishop to its “Commissary” (Bishop A.H. Johnston of Dunedin). Johnston nominated his own Dean, P.E. Sutton.

---

158 JF, ¶39.
159 Name withheld, ¶71.
160 MB, ¶46.
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162 MB, ¶46.
163 Ibid.; Anon., ¶49.
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165 “Summary of the Proceedings”.
When the appointment was announced in April 1965, many evangelical clergy in Nelson were "dejected" and struggled to come to terms with their new bishop being a High Churchman. Sutton was theologically conservative, and would prove "fair-minded"; while the Low Church and evangelical character of the Diocese was diluted during the time of Sutton's episcopate (mainly through his choices of new clergy), it nevertheless endured.

C Anglican Evangelical Growth in Wellington, 1956-65

When Bretton left the Wellington Diocese in 1956, the new senior evangelical in the diocese was Charles Haskell, a former CMS missionary in Karachi. Originally from All Saints' parish in Nelson, Haskell had trained at College House and was a "very staunch evangelical". Haskell came to Wellington in 1955 to serve as General Secretary of the Anglican Board of Missions, and in 1964 he became vicar of Naenae.

The number of evangelical ministers in the Wellington Diocese was growing, but remained small. An ECF membership list for 1958 lists only eight such clergy, widely scattered. Across the Rimutaka Ranges, R.J. Taylor and I.G. Bourne were serving in rural parishes. Two significant urban evangelical ministries in this period were those of Edmiston at Tawa-Linden (1958-67) and Somerville at Naenae (1959-63). These two younger evangelical clergy had become ministers in expanding new

---

166 Anon., ¶49; JF, ¶39.
167 MB, ¶46. Another feature of Sutton's episcopate was his national leadership, as a High Churchman, of Anglican elements opposed to church union.
168 Note C.W. Haskell, A Sinner in Sind (Wellington: [The Author], 1957).
169 BW, ¶11.
170 WM, ¶122; also Edmiston, 171; cf. MB, ¶121. Haskell had left for mission service in 1932. It is uncertain whether he had strong contact with Orange, but it is likely.
171 Taylor was curate at Masterton (1958-60) then vicar at Martinborough (1960-4); Bourne was vicar at Eketahuna (1958-65).
suburbs, giving them opportunity to grow sizable churches of enduring evangelical flavour.172

Edmiston’s Evangelical Ministry at Tawa

At Tawa, Edmiston’s parish had 500 regularly attending the Sunday School (with 40 teachers) and a BC of over 100.173 Edmiston preached expository, “preaching Christ and him crucified and the Scriptures as the key to our lives”.175 He would invite people to pray prayers of commitment and then to tell him at the door.176 He often used parish missioners, including Geoff Fletcher (from Lay Institute of Evangelism in Sydney) and Hulme-Moir.177 Like many of his evangelical colleagues, Edmiston was heavily involved with youth, and frequently went on camps with them.

Edmiston’s firm evangelical faith was clearly the theological, experiential and methodological framework out of which he worked. But – at parish level – he did not explicitly parade his evangelical identity: “I got on with the job, without thinking of the intricacies of the thing. I was a biblical Christian, I was an evangelical, but I never wrote it all over the wall”.178 Such a reserve about theological labels was common, and pragmatic: it saved complicating the message or creating unnecessary barriers. Locally, Evangelicals were often happy to let congregants assume that a biblicist and evangelistic Christianity was normative Christianity. In the late fifties and early sixties, such an approach was being conspicuously modelled in the preaching and films of Billy Graham, and may also have seemed to be vindicated by the apparent flourishing of some evangelical-style parishes.

172 Edmiston had been curate in Lower Hutt (1951-3), then vicar of Mangaweka (1953-8); Somerville had been curate at Lower Hutt (1954-5), then Vicar of Kiwitea (1955-8).
173 Edmiston: 118-9.
174 For morning services, he chose his biblical passage from the lectionary.
175 DE, ¶43, ¶46.
176 DE, ¶36.
Edmiston and the other Wellington evangelicals appeared to avoid some of the moral and ecclesiastical taboos held by their older counterparts in the Christchurch and Nelson contexts: Edmiston happily used the Wells organisation and also enjoyed co-ordinating an annual fair. Beyond the parish, Edmiston generally avoided diocesan roles: he wanted to concentrate on the parish. At Synod meetings, he often slipped out for a walk. But he was prepared to be a member of the diocese’s Youth Committee and Missionary committees, which related to two areas characteristically of interest to evangelicals. He was also willing to become Chair of the Wellington branch of CMS, and to join the Executive of the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade (on which he was in charge of “follow-up” for the Wellington meetings). The Crusade had a “huge influence” on Tawa parish: twenty-four parishioners trained as counsellors, there were fifty referrals to the parish, and Edmiston felt he “took courage” in both pulpit and personal evangelism. As an evangelistic aid, Edmiston began to use Billy Graham’s *Steps to Peace with God*.

**ECF Beginnings in Wellington**

For Anglican evangelicals in the Wellington Diocese, fellowship with other evangelicals was extremely important: Bourne and Taylor supported each other in the Wairarapa, as did Somerville and Edmiston in Wellington. Across the diocese there was also a smattering of lay Anglicans who clearly identified as evangelicals: these included Kevin O’Sullivan in Palmerston North, and Kaye Johnston and Ken
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179 Edmiston: 92-3.
180 Ibid.: 185.
181 Ibid.: 110, 119.
182 Ibid.: 236.
183 DE, ¶41.
184 Ibid.: 107.
185 DE, ¶35.
186 Edmiston: 210. In 1967, Edmiston left Tawa-Linden; after a time in the UK Edmiston would return to a ministry in Naenae, with an exceptionally strong youth work
187 DE, ¶32.
McKay in Wellington.\textsuperscript{188} The first ECF meeting in Wellington was initiated by Roger Thompson writing to Edmiston in 1959, asking him to host a small meeting of evangelicals in the Tawa vicarage.\textsuperscript{189} The meeting was not to be public, as in Wellington the ECF was still “underground”.\textsuperscript{190} Even so, Edmiston felt it necessary to seek the permission of the bishop, who lectured him on the “middle-of-the-road” approach of the diocese, and then gave permission.\textsuperscript{191} Thompson’s and Edmiston’s caution illustrates the extent to which many evangelical Anglicans in New Zealand still felt themselves irregular and illicit, and obliged to creep around the margins of most dioceses. It was not uncommon among Evangelicals to feel that their ministry emphasis was well-received by many lay people, but regarded with suspicion by ecclesiastical colleagues and authorities.\textsuperscript{192}

**CMS in Wellington**

Edmiston and Somerville helped establish a CMS Spring School in the North Island.\textsuperscript{193} The first such Spring School in Wellington, in 1960, attracted 85 live-in participants and up to 250 at evening sessions.\textsuperscript{194} CMS work was widely respected, especially by laity, and that it was thus an unthreatening entrée into evangelical circles. The CMS Spring Schools and ECF Conferences were critically important in consolidating the evangelical identity and approach of the isolated evangelicals of the Wellington Diocese. At such schools they “met so many evangelical people” and heard “top” speakers giving “excellent teaching”.\textsuperscript{195} There was also the strong personal influence of Harry Thompson and Roger Thompson “feeding into our lives”.\textsuperscript{196}

\textsuperscript{188} DE, ¶31. McKay was a Sydney Anglican and a lecturer in Greek.
\textsuperscript{189} DE, ¶31.
\textsuperscript{190} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{191} Ibid. Subsequent ECF meetings in Wellington were arranged on an ad hoc basis, most often to hear evangelical speakers who were visiting from overseas.
\textsuperscript{192} E.g. IGB, ¶78.
\textsuperscript{193} Edmiston: 110.
\textsuperscript{194} Gregory: 215.
\textsuperscript{195} DE, ¶31.
\textsuperscript{196} Ibid.
Evangelical Anglicanism Gains a Toehold in Dunedin,

For at least half a century the Diocese of Dunedin had been known for its High Church tendencies. St. Matthew's, in Hope St. on the south side of the city centre had been markedly Anglo-Catholic under the ministry of Archdeacon W. Curson-Siggers (1896-1922). Archdeacon W.A. Hamblett (1922-52) followed with ministry that was Low Church and supportive of missionary work, the Bible Society and the YMCA. In the 1930s, Hamblett was considered sufficiently "evangelical" for the fledgling EU to enlist him as one of its local advisors. He was later a member of ECF and attended CMS Spring Schools. Urban depopulation had led to serious decline in the parish, to the extent that by the 1950s closure of the parish was being considered. After Hamblett's retirement the parish lingered on under the care of a part-time incumbent and dwindled to an attendance of about ten. Meanwhile parish Nominators "fought for three and a half years" with Bishop Johnston to get an evangelical vicar. The eventual result was the appointment of Rev. Kenneth Gregory (1955-9). A former British army officer, Gregory was an evangelical firebrand. In Nelson, he had been Diocesan Evangelist. His peremptory, no-nonsense approach began to turn St. Matthew's around, and he helped established the parish as "evangelical".

When Gregory left (for Karachi) he was succeeded by an Orange Pip, Maurice Betteridge (1959-65). Betteridge had a strong preaching and teaching ministry. When
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197 St. Matthew's Anglican Church Dunedin (n.d., no publisher); no pagination.
198 Ibid.; entry in Clerical Directory, Anglican Church. Hamblett was president of the Bible Society (Otago and Southland), Chairman of the South Island Council of the Egypt General Mission and Nile Mission Press, and for twenty-three years diocesan Mission Secretary and representative of the New Zealand Anglican Board of Missions.
199 J.H. Cable.
200 WM, ¶17; MB, ¶97.
201 WM, ¶17.
202 St. Matthew's Anglican Church; MB, ¶97.
he came to St. Matthew’s, the Sunday morning attendance was about 40; by the time he left, it was 200-300. Like many other Orange Pips, Betteridge consciously emulated his mentor:

I preached four times a Sunday, two morning services, afternoon Bible study, and an evening sermon. You see, I replicated Pekoe. The strength of it was simply an expository preaching ministry.204

At 5 p.m. every Sunday there was the Bible Class, a solid Bible exposition for one hour.205 Then there would be tea, followed by a prayer meeting and the evening service. The evening service would be mainly of university students;206 it also often included people invited from off the streets. After church, some sixty or so would go to the vicarage for supper and a “sing-song”. All this was a very familiar pattern, derived from Orange and implemented by numerous Orange Pips; the details varied, but the underlying aims and strategies were always the same.

As the sole evangelical Anglican church in Dunedin,207 St. Matthew’s drew people from all over the city. Vicars of the parishes such people came from were often less impressed.208 The Bible Class and evening service also included a number of non-Anglicans, such as Graham Stanton.209

Betteridge left for Australia in 1965, and would eventually become Principal of Ridley College.210 But the evangelical succession in St. Matthew’s was firmly
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202 MB, ¶98.
203 MB, ¶99.
204 MB, ¶100.
205 Joyce Carswell arrived at St. Matthew’s in 1963 from a small country church, and found the “zeal and passion” of the congregation (mainly students) something new to her and almost “overwhelming”. But she “came to appreciate the solid evangelical faith and teaching”, the “missional emphasis” and “pastoral care and opportunities for service” (e-mail from Joyce Carswell, 4 July 2008).
206 MB, ¶93.
207 MB, ¶95.
208 MB, ¶102. Stanton was Presbyterian and later professor of New Testament at King’s College, London.
209 1979-92. Prior to that Betteridge was Chaplain at Armidale (1965-72) and then with the Australian
established: his next three successors would be Brian Carrell, Wallace Marriott and John Meadowcroft. St. Matthew's transformation into an evangelical stronghold was a strategic development: as a church with a strong ministry among students, in a key university city, St. Matthew's would have a disproportionate influence upon New Zealand Anglicanism. Over the years it would preserve and bolster the evangelical identity and fervour of a large number of young Anglicans who were studying in Dunedin.

E Anglican Evangelical Growth in Auckland, 1956-65

An overt Anglican evangelicalism was slow to get established in Auckland parishes, perhaps in part because of the staunchly High Church tendency of Bishop Simkin (1940-60). The effect of Simkin's episcopate was to discourage evangelical clergy from entering the diocese. As a result, there was no minister in Auckland who might have developed a strong evangelical parish. There were evangelical laity, but Anglican evangelicalism in Auckland remained a self-consciously clandestine movement, with a muted and barely visible presence. Stan Rosser, the leader of secretive gatherings of "Evangelical Anglicans", gloomily perceived the Diocese as exhibiting "increasing deadness".

In 1955, Rev. R.T. Everill, a former TCF worker, had become vicar of Papakura, a town twenty miles south of Auckland. He remained there until 1963. In 1958 he was the sole clerical member of the ECF in the Auckland Diocese. In 1961 Rev. Leo King, ...
who was broadly evangelical, became vicar of St. Andrew’s Epsom and served there until 1965.

More significantly, in 1963 Rev. Guy Nicholson became vicar of the Ellerslie-Mt. Wellington parish. Nicholson was a “definite Evangelical.” From a non-church family, Nicholson had been influenced before his conversion by his evangelical school teacher in Palmerston North (Stan Rosser), by Orange (whose BC he went to when he was studying in Christchurch) and by Lionel Fletcher’s *Mighty Moments*. Nicholson’s conversion in 1946 had been spiritually intense: he recalled that he “wept” his way into “the Kingdom of God”. Subsequently, Nicholson had had contact with evangelical Anglicans such as R.G. Nicholson (Nelson Diocese) and Colin Becroft (Crusader Movement) and had run the Crusaders at Wellington College. From that time, Nicholson had called himself “Evangelical.” For him, that meant a “real Christian, someone who had been born again”. He also identified with Ryle’s definition of Evangelical as someone who put the Cross at the forefront of ministry. Like most other evangelicals, Nicholson believed in the “fundamentals”, but never called or regarded himself a “fundamentalist”.

Nicholson had been “deeply moved” when he saw believer’s baptism within the Baptist church but had been retained for the Anglican church and its ministry by the example of Orange: he was sure “that Canon Orange had the truth” and was also
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215 GN, ¶34.
217 GN, ¶68.
218 GN, ¶19-20. There was no indication the two Nicholsons were related.
219 GN, ¶20. A respondent at one Crusader meeting was Edgar Hornblow, later a leading evangelical Methodist minister. But one boy (whom Nicholson claimed) attended Crusaders once only was Paul Reeves, later Archbishop and Governor-General.
220 GN, ¶48
221 GN, ¶49.
222 GN, ¶50: Nicholson’s paraphrase.
224 GN, ¶86.
225 Ibid.
impressed by Orange’s reported assertion that the Anglican Church was “a very
good fishing ground”.226 Nicholson himself reflected: “I wanted to see people
converted, and the Anglican Church is a good place to see that happen. People came to
church anyway.”227

After a year as a Stipendiary Lay Reader in the Nelson Diocese,228 and with the
encouragement of his evangelical Anglican friends,229 Nicholson had gone to England
for theological training at the evangelical London college of Oak Hill.230 He became a
curate to Rev. Guy King, an evangelical with CSSM and IVF links.231 While in
England, he attended Keswick Conventions and had been profoundly impressed by
Billy Graham’s 1954 Haringay Crusade.232 Nicholson had been eager to return and
serve in the Diocese of Auckland, but felt there was little prospect of while Simkin
was still bishop.233 Simkin retired in 1960 and E.A. Gowing became the new bishop.
Gowing, originally from the Sydney Diocese, had served in the Nelson and Dunedin
Dioceses and had become more High Church but retained a sympathy for an
evangelical position.234 Through members of the “Underground”,235 a nominator for
Ellerslie parish became aware of Nicholson.236 The parish had been High Church and
had not previously had an evangelical minister.237 It may have helped that the
Nominator had gone forward in the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade.238 Rosser was explicit
about why he wished Nicholson to come: “the road back to Evangelicalism will be

226 GN, ¶85.
227 Ibid.
228 GN, ¶24. He was placed in Greymouth, to assist Aubrey.
231 GN, ¶27.
232 GN, ¶29, ¶28.
233 GN, ¶31. Nicholson noted that Simkin was reputed to have declared: “I won’t have fundamentalist
in my diocese”.
234 GN, ¶33. Nicholson considered Gowing a covert evangelical: “His heart was still evangelical ... he
was evangelical [but] hiding it”.
235 Rosser and a Church Army officer called Barry Ingham.
236 GN, ¶35.
237 GN, ¶36.
238 GN, ¶35.
slow, and is dependent upon Evangelical clergy coming in from outside... We've been waiting for 30 years". 239 Rosser was delighted when Nicholson agreed to come. 240

In Ellerslie, Nicholson majored on “preaching the Gospel”. 241 His preaching was “crisp” but “stirring”. 242 Slowly, a stream of people was “converted”. 243 Some evangelical students at St. John’s College started attending, 244 as did evangelical young people from elsewhere. 245 Nicholson’s ministry became known among evangelicals as a safe haven. 246 Nicholson was very cautious: he ran Bible Study groups only during Lent, and continued to wear a stole. 247 But the organisations Nicholson worked with were clearly indicative of his evangelical convictions: within the parish he used Fact and Faith films, 248 Open Air Campaigners and Lay Institute for Evangelism. 249 Beyond the parish, he spoke at AUEU, 250 Crusaders, 251 BTI, 252 Rotorua Keswick Convention, 253 and at camps for evangelical churches of other denominations. 254 A few years later, he was on the Executive for the second Billy Graham Crusade (1969), 255 and preached at a crowded Town Hall pre-Crusade “Rally”. 256 But Nicholson would never speak at the diocesan
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240 [Rosser] to Nicholson, 26 Dec. 1962. He wrote: “come confidently, prayerfully, and humbly. You’ll be backed by prayer and at least one Warden eagerly feels and hopes you are the man God is sending... Let God’s word speak to hearts and His work will begin. Keep true, & you’ll be surprised what God will do and whom He’ll send to help and sustain you. The victory is His! I never doubted but that you’d accept, & rejoice that your coming is all of God.”
241 GN, ¶42.
243 GN, ¶42.
244 E.g. Bryan Drake.
245 E.g. Peter Skegg.
246 In the same vein, a secretary of the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen in the U.K. had written to Nicholson enquiring if there was “any safe evangelical [minister] in or near” Auckland for a family who was emigrating: N.L. Dunning to Nicholson, 14 Mar. 1962.
247 GN, ¶42.
248 GN, ¶43.
249 GN, ¶43-5.
250 GN, ¶37; also Felicia Auld to Nicholson, 24 April 1966: M. Powell to Nicholson, 5 May 1967.
253 GN, ¶61.
256 GN, ¶60.
synod, which he intensely disliked. He believed he was the only ordained evangelical Anglican in the diocese, and was not aware of any others outside of the Christchurch, Nelson or Wellington dioceses. Isolated in Auckland, he subscribed to Christianity Today but was "only dimly aware" of the ECF.

Nicholson’s ministry in suburban Auckland represented a quiet but significant extension of New Zealand evangelical Anglicanism. When Nicholson left Ellerslie he would be followed in that parish by other definite Evangelicals. But the Auckland Diocese was far from being transformed into an evangelical stronghold. Evangelicalism had not taken hold in any larger parish, or in any parish with a strong ministry among university students. In the upper North Island, evangelical Anglicanism would remain a weak presence for some time to come.

F The Evangelical Churchmen's Fellowship, 1956-65

ECF Growth

The ECF was essentially a fellowship. As an organisation, it initially had severe limitations: it lacked staff, funds or facilities. But by 1959 the ECF was buoyed by increased membership (331), by the Billy Graham Crusade, by the plans to start an
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257 GN, ¶64.
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259 GN, ¶46.
260 GN, ¶63.
261 GN, ¶81. Nicholson said that when [sometime from 1968 onwards] David Aiken asked Gowing for permission to start an Auckland branch of the ECF, Gowing declined: GN, ¶80.
262 E.g., Ian Nelson (1971-81).
263 The only other ECF members in the upper North Island in this period were the Revs. R.C. Firebrace at Te Awamutu and Canon W.T. Huata at Te Kuiti. Firebrace, an older man (b.1899), had been in ministry in the UK and in Sydney. Lamont, arriving in Hamilton in 1970, felt that there was only one overtly evangelical minister there at that time: Canon Tony Clarke, the Maori Missioner, GL, ¶111. The situation would change when charismatic renewal became a catalyst for significant evangelical growth.
ECF periodical, and by the forthcoming ECF Dominion Conference at Tyndale House.\textsuperscript{264}

The conference theme was "Our Glorious Heritage": the ECF was not wishing to promote something new, but to reinforce and revive something old. Almost all the addresses were on some aspect of scriptural authority, amply demonstrating the evangelical conviction that the Scriptures gave a foundation and a template for every aspect of the Church's life: Bishop Hulme-Moir gave an opening address on "The Authority of the Word", and Orange gave morning Bible Studies on "The Authority and Inspiration of Scripture".\textsuperscript{265} Somerville spoke on "The Word and Worship", Edmiston on "The Word and Ministry", Glen on "The Word and Sacraments", Bretton on "Reliance on the Word," and Betteridge on "Reform through the Word". The three "Prayer Sessions" focused on "The Growth of Sound Doctrine" (G. Lamont), "Men for the Ministry" (C. Haskell), and "Revival in New Zealand" (K. Gregory). The array of advertised speakers included ministers from four dioceses (Christchurch, Nelson, Wellington, Dunedin), perhaps as part of a deliberate policy to draw in scattered evangelicals and to emphasise the nation-wide potential of Anglican evangelicalism. The line-up of speakers included no laymen and no women. The format of the printed programme card was almost identical to that of corresponding IVF conference brochures, and thus would have seemed very familiar to most of those attending.

The 1961 Conference again had an opening address from the Bishop of Nelson, and three Bible Studies by Orange. The conference focus was activist rather than doctrinal: there were addresses on evangelism, the role of "evangelical laymen", and

\textsuperscript{264} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{265} Programme, ECF Dominion Conference, 1959.
on encouraging missionary interest. Two of the speakers were from Sydney. In 1963, the Conference would be held in Wellington.

The organisational growth of the ECF was slow. It did not institute a formal monthly committee meeting until 1961. At the same meeting, Graham Lamont was elected to the new office of Clerical Secretary, to address enquiries in the areas of doctrine, practice and liturgy, and to relate to theological students and libraries. The meeting was not particularly confident about the ECF’s effectiveness: two members of the committee bemoaned widespread ignorance in the church about both the ECF and “evangelical principles”. Two meetings later, a member of the committee questioned why the ECF existed.

By 1963 the ECF membership had reached 450. One of its leaders felt that growth had plateaued, and was too much dependent on personal friendships. In addition, many Anglican authorities frowned on any group perceived as fostering an ecclesiastical “party”. The ECF, he wrote, must maintain its freedom to associate (for study and fellowship), but must also be careful not to be seen competing with official Anglican programmes and events. In addition, members of ECF must take the fullest possible part in the affairs and councils of the wider church. In these few sentences, he had captured the tension faced by any evangelical sub-group: to guard its life, it must be distinct; to have influence, its members must also engage with the wider church. The ECF’s younger leaders would be increasingly concerned to do the latter.

266 The main speaker was the Rt. Rev. A.W. Goodwin Hudson (Sydney Diocese), supported by Basil Williams (an Orange Pip, but working in Sydney).
267 Minutes of the first meeting of the Christchurch Committee of the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship, 15 Sept. 1961; those present were Revs. R. Thompson, R. Carson, L. Morris, M. Goodall, G. Lamont, H. Harper, Messrs. A. Scott, H. Thomas, R. Mauger, A. Wright, Dr. J. Lewis and “by special invitation” H.R. Fountain.
268 Minutes of the third meeting of the Christchurch Committee of the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship, 2 March 1961. He appears to have been influenced by an article by J.I. Packer in the Church of England Newspaper, “Movements in the Church”, which warned against an excessive attachment to such movements.
The E.C.F. Review

The ECF began publishing a quarterly journal, the E.C.F. Review, in the spring of 1959. The Editor was Thompson, whose editorials and articles outlined the evangelical position with clarity and firmness. People often seek a definition of the word “Evangelical”, he wrote, and he was happy to give one: “An evangelical is one who holds devotedly and loyally to the great basic doctrines of orthodox Christianity, together with that particular emphasis which is accorded those doctrines in the pages of the New Testament”. His two key categories of evangelicalism were thus doctrinal orthodoxy and New Testament (Gospel) emphases. He endorsed Simeon’s insistence that evangelicals give primary focus to “Christ, and Him crucified”. He listed doctrines held and emphasised by Evangelicals: the authority of Scripture (taking precedence over Tradition and Reason, but not rejecting them), substitutionary atonement, justification by faith, assurance of salvation, the “right of private judgement” and the priesthood of all believers.

The E.C.F. Review demonstrated a concern that Evangelicals be seen as loyal and true Anglicans rather than – presumably – trouble-makers, sectarians or eccentrics. A key part of the Review’s purpose was to educate and assure evangelical Anglicans that – as both Evangelicals and Anglicans – they were not “strangers in a strange land” but could hold their heads high. The ECF existed, Thompson claimed, “for the
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269 [Goodall] to Archdeacon ____, 1 July 1963.
273 The Protestant principle of individual faith and conscience in the light of Scripture. Thompson gave a scriptural basis: Acts 17:10-11, 1 Cor. 10:15, 1 John 2:20, 27.
274 Thompson understood that doctrine as “the right of direct access to the Father through Christ and that there is no need of any intermediary.”
preservation and extension of the traditional orthodoxy of our beloved Church of England, to which we as Evangelicals most happily subscribe.” 276 Thompson quoted Hammond’s claim that “an Evangelical is a true son of the Church of England, and abides loyally by Scripture, the Articles and the Book of Common Prayer” 277; by implication, Evangelicals were the most authentic, faithful Anglicans of all – and Tractarians and Liberals were the aberrant ones. Thompson followed Packer in arguing that Evangelicals must not be content to be merely a tolerated minority; instead, they must insist that “theologically …we are the church of England”. 278 Consistently, the Review encouraged its readers to claim the high ground as Anglicans. Such a stance may be seen as evidence of a growing evangelical confidence, a confidence reflecting church growth, the success of the Billy Graham Crusade, and the articulate, well-informed writings of their counterparts in Britain. It may also demonstrate the reality that in the New Zealand context, evangelical Anglicans had long felt isolated and marginalised and were anxious to reassure themselves.

Articles in the Review were chosen to reinforce and defend the Evangelical position: pieces on Scripture and its authority, 279 justification, the history of the evangelical tradition in England, Holy Communion as sacrament not sacrifice, preaching, revival, repentance, the biblical warrant for infant baptism, parish evangelism, and the dangers of sacerdotalism, apostolic succession, and prayers for the dead. There was only one article on moral matters, a reprint of an Australian item rejecting raffles and ballroom dancing. 280 There was a curious snippet (from an Australian source) suggesting that the [European] Common Market was part of a Roman Catholic

276 Ibid.: 3
strategy to reverse the Reformation. Towards the end of his editorship, Thompson was beginning to perceive growing threats, and to publish articles against them: ecumenism, church union, criticism of the Thirty-nine Articles and Prayer Book revision.

Thompson eulogised both the 1662 Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty Nine Articles. The Prayer Book, he wrote, was a thing of “beauty, genius and abiding strength”: it was “unparalleled in the field of Christian literature, and unsurpassed in it power to awaken the conscience, touch the heart and stir the will of the worshipper”. Also, being “undeviating in its fidelity to N.T. truth”, the Prayer Book was a “bulwark of scriptural and spiritual truths”, and central to Anglicans’ “priceless and glorious heritage”. The Thirty Nine Articles, Thompson claimed, expressed truths that are “eternal and unchanging” – but (lest he accord them the respect due only to Scripture) he added that they also “invariably defer to the eternal and abiding Word of God”.

The E.C.F. Review frequently reviewed new evangelical titles from overseas: this was a key function of the publication. In the vast number of cases, the authors and books it recommended were evangelical scholars from Britain, most of them Anglican as well. In addition, the Review regularly commend the evangelical Church of England
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281 “The Roman Church and the Common Market”, E.C.F. Review 11 (Feb. 1962). The source was The Australian Church Record.


285 Thompson, Editorial, “Just Between Us”, Latimer Magazine, Quarterly Journal of the ECF (NZ) 16 (June 1963). Thompson’s phraseology was not in the form of quotations, but appeared to be heavily dependent on the work of Dyson Hague, Through The Prayer Book.

286 “Articles or obstacles”, E.C.F. Review 15 (Mar.1963). Thompson quoted the view of Dyson Hague that the BCP was the “culmination of centuries of spiritual aspiration and upheaval,” a “monument that stands from age to age as a sign of the victory won for the Bible and the Gospel and the pure worship of the Church as it existed in Apostolic and sub-Apostolic days....it represents the leading of the Holy Spirit, and a fullness of Scripture”.
Newspaper and The Churchman.\textsuperscript{287} On occasion, it made appreciative comments about the new evangelical American magazine, Christianity Today, established as an evangelical alternative to The Christian Century.\textsuperscript{288}

At first, Thompson himself was the key contributor to the E.C.F. Review in this period. From time to time, there were articles by other New Zealanders, including Betteridge, Haskell, Minn, Williams, Goodall, Machell, Aiken, Lamont, Funnell and – the sole non-Anglican – J. Oswald Sanders (international director of CIM). On occasion, something by Bishop Hulme-Moir was published. Surprisingly, the Review never included anything – not even a brief statement of support – from the ECF president, William Orange.\textsuperscript{289}

Overseas contributors (usually by way of re-print) included evangelical luminaries from the past (mostly Simeon and Ryle) and contemporaries such as Leon Morris,\textsuperscript{290} John Stott, D.W.B. Robinson\textsuperscript{291} and – above all – James Packer. Thompson no doubt respected Packer for his incisive scholarship and unflinching orthodoxy; Thompson was always likely to appreciate someone who could make such assertions as “evangelicalism is Christianity” and “the extent that you deviate from the

\textsuperscript{287} E.g. “Book Notes”, E.C.F. Review 9 (Aug.1961). The Church of England Newspaper, a weekly edited by John King, was described as having the standpoint of “progressive evangelicalism”. The Churchman, edited by Philip Hughes, was a quarterly theological journal which included notes relating to EFAC. From June 1963, when the Review’s name was changed to Latimer Magazine, the ECF journal ran a description of the two English evangelical publications in every issue, inside the front cover, and “highly recommended” The Church of England Newspaper.

\textsuperscript{288} “Book Notes”, E.C.F. Review 9 (Aug.1961). Christianity Today, a fortnightly publication established in 1956 with the support of Billy Graham and edited by C.F. Henry, was described by the Review as “the leading serious religious journal in the world”, with a circulation greater than that of the “elderly and more liberal” Christian Century and representing a “mature development of evangelical thought.” The Review distanced itself, however, from American “right-wing” politics: ibid.

\textsuperscript{289} Orange was known to be wary of appearing in print. Orange’s eulogy at H.W. Funnell’s funeral was published in Aug. 1962.

\textsuperscript{290} Ridley College.

\textsuperscript{291} Vice Principal of Moore College, Sydney.
evangelical position, you deviate from Christianity itself” – and even “Evangelicalism is Anglicanism, and Anglicanism is Evangelicalism”.292

Soon after he retired as Editor, Thompson wrote an article in which he deplored the inroads into the Church of both “apostasy” (i.e. liberalism) and “unreformed doctrines and practices” (i.e. high church tendencies). In both cases, the problem was “a failure to recognise the Holy Scriptures as the divinely-given norm in all the life of the Church”. Thompson declared himself unimpressed by “the popular and complacent acceptance of institutional Christianity with its harmless, toothless, soporific routine-ism”. The need today, he wrote, was for “another Reformation” recalling the church to the Scriptures. The church needed another Tyndale, Cranmer, Latimer. In what might possibly have been a subtle warning to his younger evangelical colleagues, Thompson declared that the church needed men of courage, not compromise: “This Space-age Church needs men who are not afraid, not ashamed, to own their theological convictions....Every spiritual revival, every reformation, every evangelical awakening in the Church has been at the cost of ecclesiastical promotion and popularity, and has been purchased by blood, sweat and tears.”293 Such metaphors were characteristic of Thompson, but his evangelical Anglican successors would soon adopt a rather different tone.

The ECF as a Lay Movement
The ECF was not just a movement of ministers. In Christchurch in particular, it attracted into leadership a significant group of laity. These included builders Ron Major and A.S. (Alf) Wright.294 One of the ECF clergy described Wright as well-taught, thoughtful and committed.295 Don Laugeson, the managing director of a large bus company, was “discipled” by Joe Simmons, the Merseysider who pioneered the

293 Thompson, “The Need Today”, Latimer Magazine 18 (Nov.1963.)
294 Wright was involved with the Opawa and Spreydon parishes.
295 GL, ¶46.
New Zealand work of the Navigators. Laugeson became a passionate evangelist and was later a key figure in the establishment of the Middleton Grange (school). Hedley Thomas, a businessman from Sumner parish, had been a close associate of Orange. So had foundry owner Les Burgess, who was very active in the Woolston parish and prominent in the Diocesan Synod. A key ECF leader was stockbroker Archie Scott, a Lay Canon in the Cathedral. Scott was “impeccably Anglican” and strongly traditional. He was a major financial backer of the ECF, especially after it purchased Latimer House. He was outspoken, and sometimes clashed with the younger evangelical clergy. As a whole, the lay leaders of ECF tended to be emphatically “Protestant”, and conservative in their evangelical convictions and practice. The lay leaders considerably augmented the ECF’s resources of energy, practical expertise, and finance. They also increased the ECF’s credibility and appeal among non-clergy. On occasion, some of them would visit parishes as a lay mission team, as laymen speaking to laymen.

The ECF as Part of a Wider Evangelical Nexus

The ECF was part of a wider evangelical Anglican network, in which the CMS was the key element. Evangelical Anglicans were usually active in both ECF and CMS: Don Laugeson, for instance, was also Vice Chairman of NZCMS. There was collaboration with regard to speakers: when the CMS sponsored conference speakers
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296 Joe Simmonds, e-mail, 15 Jan. 2006.
297 GL, ¶46; RRT, ¶34. Laugeson was not a strong denominationalist: although associated with the Spreydon and Bryndwr parishes, he was later spent time in Presbyterian parishes and a Brethren assembly
298 GL, ¶46.
299 BRC, ¶496-500. Among other things, Scott strongly objected to the Warden of Latimer House having a beard: BRC, ¶520-5. In the late 1960s and early 70s, beards and long hair were often seen as symbols of radicalism and revolt. In 1969 Archbishop Strong sparked a major controversy by dismissing two curates with long hair: David Hillard, “Australian Anglicanism and the Radical Sixties", in Emilsen: 107-8.
300 BRC, ¶496. In May 1960, for instance, there was a week-long mission to Belfast: Warren to Laugeson, 22 April 1960.
301 Gregory: 218.
such as John Stott, the ECF movement was strengthened as much as the CMS.\textsuperscript{302}

There was partnership with regard to literature: the \textit{E.C.F. Review} referred its readers to the CMS Bookshop to buy all the evangelical books it recommended.

The ECF was also part of a wider trans-denominational evangelical network. It has already been demonstrated how many of its members had strong links with CSSM, Crusaders and IVF. Its members likewise often developed links with newer ministries, such as YFC and the Navigators. In contrast to earlier times, evangelical Anglicans were becoming much more strongly present in the Bible Training Institute: in 1963 BTI had twenty-one Anglican students.\textsuperscript{303}

When there was discussion among evangelical groups about possibly circumventing the slowly-moving NCC and issuing a combined evangelical invitation to Billy Graham to return to New Zealand, the ECF was naturally part of that discussion.\textsuperscript{304}

When there was concern about \textit{Challenge Weekly}’s lack of presence in Christchurch, the ECF was one of the groups approached.\textsuperscript{305} When the Presbyterian evangelicals in the Westminster Fellowship were seeking a partner in an evangelical broadcasting venture to the New Zealand public, they asked the ECF\textsuperscript{306} (although ECF’s response suggests that evangelical Anglican concern for the sensitivities of their own denominational situation outweighed their interest in trans-denominational partnerships).\textsuperscript{307} When a New Zealand Evangelical Alliance was mooted, ECF leaders

\textsuperscript{303} \textit{Latimer Magazine} 20 (July 1964).
\textsuperscript{304} Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of the Christchurch Committee of the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship, 27 July 1962. The ECF felt the matter should be left in the hands of the NCC. The IVF and Scripture Union, CSSM and Crusader Movement took a similar position: Warner Hutchinson to J.G. Miller, 27 July 1962; B.C. Lumsden to Miller, 1 Aug. 1962.
\textsuperscript{305} Lloyd Williams to ECF \textit{[et al.],} 12 Aug. 1962.
\textsuperscript{306} John R. Brinsley to Wright, 28 Dec. 1961. Brinsley wrote on behalf of the “Far East Broadcasting Associates, New Zealand”; he and the other four office-bearers were also on the WF Executive. The ECF showed interest at first (e.g. [Goodall] to Graham Miller, 13 April 1962), but then decided not to be involved (Goodall to A.G. Gunn, 7 Aug. 1962).
\textsuperscript{307} Hulme-Moir to Goodall, 7 May 1962. The Bishop was worried about how Anglican beliefs and practices might be compromised by people of other denominations involved in the project, and how
were part of the conversation\textsuperscript{308} (there are indications, however, that some Anglican evangeli- cals were apprehensive about the possibility of being swamped in such a context by evangelicals with a less traditional ecclesiology).\textsuperscript{309} When ECF leaders felt the need to discuss "the growth of evangelical witness" in the Dominion, they wrote to the WF, the Methodist Revival Fellowship, IVF, SU, the CSSM and Crusader Movement, BTI, the Keswick Convention movement and the Canterbury and Dunedin Evangelical Alliances – all groups with which evangelical Anglicans had some broad affinity.\textsuperscript{310} With the issue of church union increasingly insistent, leaders of the ECF, the WF and the Methodist Revival Fellowship met together to see if they could find common cause.\textsuperscript{311}

The Evangelical Fellowship in the Global Anglican Communion

The ECF's life was stimulated, from 1961, by the formation of the international "Evangelical Fellowship in the Anglican Communion". This new grouping, committed to "Biblical truth and Reformation principle",\textsuperscript{312} reflected the post-war renaissance of evangelical life and confidence within the Church of England. A key thinker, advocate and travelling emissary of EFAC was its secretary, John Stott.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[308]{\textsuperscript{308} Memo from H.P. Hanna (Evangelical Alliance, Canterbury) to Council members, copy in ECF archives dated 29 Oct. 1963. It became clear that the ECF had some concern that the existing regional Evangelical Alliances were not broad enough in their support: Goodall to L. Becroft, 19 Aug. 1965. A decade earlier, there had been discussion between SU and IVF leaders about a possible New Zealand-wide Evangelical Alliance: C.K. Becroft to C. Cocker, 1 Nov. 1954, TSCF N1/6.}
\footnotetext[309]{\textsuperscript{309} E.g. Roger Thompson to Graham [Lamont], 21 September 1965. Thompson expressed concern about being dominated by "free-lancers" such as "O.A.C. etc." or imbalance with Baptists.}
\footnotetext[310]{\textsuperscript{310} Goodall to D.G. Stewart, 3 June 1965. At least four groups wrote back that a national Evangelical Alliance would be the best option for closer fellowship and consultation. The ECF handed the direction of the meeting to the Canterbury Evangelical Alliance: Goodall to G. Hughes, 6 Aug. 1965.}
\footnotetext[311]{\textsuperscript{311} Graham Miller and Arthur Gunn flew to Christchurch for a meeting with the ECF leadership on 8 Oct. 1965, and were joined by Rob Miller and Alex Munro: Gunn to Goodall, 10 Sept. 1965; see also [Lamont?] to O.T. Woodfield, 30 Sept. 1965. For the WF leadership, opposition to Church Union was almost an article of faith. For the ECF leadership, the matter was much more open. At the meeting various possible ECF-WF relationships were at least mentioned, including associate membership, an evangelical "fellowship" involving IVF, a "federation" of autonomous groups or churches, and an "Organic Union of Evangelical Ch[urch]es": "JCM's final summing up," ECF archives.}
\footnotetext[312]{\textsuperscript{312} EFAC circular, October 1961.}
\end{footnotes}
EFAC’s aims recognised that Anglican evangelical fellowships around the world were often “isolated and fainthearted” and sought to encourage such groups. EFAC was at pains to emphasise that its purpose was “not partisan in any narrow or negative sense, but positive and eirenical”, but it did wish to strengthen biblical and reformation principles within the world-wide Anglican communion, and to re-establish the “comprehensiveness” of the Anglican church in those parts where evangelicalism was weak or absent. Within Britain, the Church of England Evangelical Council had been formed to relate to EFAC. Internationally, EFAC initially related to affiliated movements in Australia, Canada, Tanganyika and New Zealand (ECF). The significance of EFAC for New Zealand was that it strengthened the confidence of the ECF, consolidated its identity as Anglican “evangelical”, and gave more direct access to the resources and leaders of Anglican evangelicalism in the UK. One of the challenges faced by New Zealand evangelicals was attracting high-calibre speakers from Britain: when ECF invitations to Packer and Motyer were declined, the ECF committee drew up a list of suitable Evangelicals and wrote to Stott with the request that he personally invite them.

Latimer House

After it had been arranged for Orange’s library to be gifted to the ECF, a property in Creyke Rd was purchased to house the collection. Initially, Orange would live there as Warden. It was hoped that the library and building would enable Orange’s work to continue “in perpetuity”, and that there would be “the beginnings of an evangelical centre of inestimable value to the spiritual life of the Church of God in

313 The Evangelical Fellowship of Sydney Churchmen and the Evangelical Fellowship of Victoria.
314 Canadian Anglican Evangelical Fellowship.
315 Tanganyika Anglican Evangelical Fellowship.
316 Minutes of the third meeting of the Christchurch Committee of the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship, 2 March 1961. The wish-list included F.D. Coggan, J.N.D. Anderson and Alan M. Stibbs. Stott was equally unsuccessful in securing any speaker from England so it was decided to settle for a speaker from Sydney: Minutes of the fifth meeting of the Christchurch Committee of the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship, 27 July 1962.
New Zealand”. The vision was in some ways a re-emergence of the vision that had created Tyndale House – but safely within the bounds of Anglican evangelicalism. The Latimer Foundation (N.Z.) Inc. was founded to own and manage Latimer House. Its sub-title was “Biblical Research Foundation”. The name chosen for the new centre – “Latimer House” – was in imitation of the evangelical prototype in Oxford (UK) where Dr. Packer was Warden. The ECF hoped to attract an “outstanding scholar” as warden. But the Foundation appears to have been under-subscribed and dependent on the generosity of Scott. After Orange’s death (1966) Latimer House was re-established in a property in Waimairi Rd. adjacent to the new sites of the university and of College House. The library holdings were rationalised, to cull many older titles, and were progressively expanded to reflect the growing body of evangelical scholarship.

G  A Generational Windshift within the ECF

Within the New Zealand evangelical Anglican movement, some generational differences began to emerge. The ECF included traditional evangelical elements, especially among laity and the older clergy. Roger Thompson “cast a long shadow over the Anglican evangelical scene” – an “honourable one,” but which nevertheless “inhibited...change.” The older Anglican evangelicals knew what had worked for them, and saw little need to distinguish between non-negotiable evangelical principles and those things which reflected an earlier societal context. The older leaders were conscious that they were considered the “tight and narrow” generation and that the next generation had a different outlook. The younger Anglican

317 Wright to ECF committee members, 9 Sept. 1959.
318 First Report to Members, Latimer Foundation (NZ) Inc.
320 E.g. Meeting of the Latimer Foundation, 5 Nov. 1962.
321 In this period, the latter was known as “Christchurch College”.
322 GL, ¶42.
323 Pfankuch/Lineham interview.
evangelical leaders tended to be less "partisan" and "adversarial" in their evangelicalism and more ironic towards other ecclesiastical streams. As a consequence, they were sometimes suspected of being a little "unsound".

The older Anglican evangelicals had been moulded primarily (and directly) by Orange, whereas many of the younger evangelicals had been influenced by the IVF's Warner Hutchinson, by a more open fare of theological reading, and by an increasing awareness of a changing society. The older Anglican generation had been shaped by their awareness that they were part of a tiny minority, whereas the younger leaders knew they were part of a movement that was growing in numbers, influence and intellectual clout. Younger leaders in the ECF such as Lamont, Goodall and Carrell wanted to steer the ECF towards a more confident, outward-looking stance. Goodall publicly called Evangelicals to avoid "a pious 'other-worldliness' or a gloomy reactionism".

The emerging evangelical Anglican leaders were eager to interact with issues being debated in the wider church and society. Within the church, such questions included church union, inter-communion, neo-pentecostalism, liturgical reform, and the social implications of the Gospel. None of these had been issues that their forbears had felt necessary to address. Lamont felt evangelicals "needed to apply the Scriptures to today's issues, and not simply rehearse the battles of yesterday".

Unlike their older colleagues, the younger Evangelicals did not regard involvement in the Diocese as unspiritual and fruitless. They increasingly wanted to debate, to be
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324 GL, ¶42.
325 GL, ¶43.
326 The ECF changed its name in Dec. 1969 to the Anglican Evangelical Fellowship.
328 GL, ¶42.
part of the decision-making and to exert influence. Before Synod meetings they met together to go through the agenda and to work out stances and strategies.

**Latimer Magazine**

The shift from a less defensive to a more constructive and engaged attitude by Anglican evangelicals was reflected in the ECF journal. Early in 1961, Goodall spoke to the ECF in Christchurch about the need to emulate the tone of the *Church of England Newspaper* and to avoid a “negative or protesting” attitude. Change was inevitable: there were several energetic younger evangelicals on the ECF Executive in Christchurch – and Thompson, isolated in Motueka in the Nelson Diocese, was not well positioned to offer any resistance.

In June 1963, there was a discernible modification of tone and content in the ECF journal. Goodall became Associate Editor. The journal’s title was changed to the *Latimer Magazine*. No explanation was given. The reason was, presumably, to emphasise the movement’s historic Anglican credentials, and it did not indicate any lessening of evangelical conviction or identity. There was a reassuring statement about continuing support for a “reformed and protestant position”, but a broader outlook was also foreshadowed: the *Latimer Magazine* would “seek to encourage constructive thought and understanding of the truths of the Gospel rather than promoting [sic] narrow party loyalties. Within the framework of historic Anglicanism a wide variety of opinion will appear in its pages.”

A new column was begun: “News and Views” by “Eutychus”. It became clear that Eutychus was the sort of Evangelical who was open to new developments. “By all means let us work and think hard on the Doctrinal truths we must teach and
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329 E.g. GL, ¶51.
330 GL, ¶88. Members included Lamont, Goodall, Tripp, Teulon, Pfankuch, Coulthard and Carrell.
331 Minutes of the third meeting of the Christchurch Committee of the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship, 2 March 1961.
defend”, Eutychus wrote, but “in our anxiety to defend the truth of the Articles we must be careful to recognise them as documents of the 16th Century”. Would we, Eutychus asked, want to hold to the Articles’ teachings on pacifism, the relationship of church and state, and predestination? In the next issue, Eutychus reported on younger evangelical theologians in the UK, and welcomed Michael Green’s rejection of evangelical isolationism and his call for evangelicals to enter into scholarly evangelical engagement with the whole church.333

In the next issue, Thompson’s retirement as Editor was announced; he was replaced by an Editorial Board comprising Pfankuch, Goodall, Lamont and Carrell.334 A new editorial outlook became apparent: successive issues carried positive (or at least constructively critical) articles on church union and prayer book revision; there were articles discussing the “new morality”335 and the emerging pentecostal movement;336 there were endorsements of the evangelical call to social action.337 The magazine evidently reflected a desire to project a new image for the ECF that was “positive rather than negative, evangelical rather than protestant, [and] the expression of an attitude to the Church rather than of a party within the Church”.338 Thompson continued to have a voice, however, writing articles under the pseudonym of “Veritas” and describing himself as “a plodding Evangelical of the Old School”.339

332 Latimer Magazine, Quarterly Journal of the ECF (NZ) 16 (June 1963).
333 Latimer Magazine 17 (Sept. 1963).
338 Aspirations expressed by Carrell when asked if he would become Editor: Carrell [to ECF], no date. He also wrote that he would want the freedom, so far as Scripture permitted, to be “for church union, for prayer book revision, for...pastoral psychology etc.” [the italicised words were originally underlined].
Prayer Book Revision

Whereas Thompson had extolled the 1662 Prayer Book, and struggled to countenance any thought of revision, the new generation of Anglican evangelical leaders were cautiously in favour of revision. They had sympathy for the principle that a modernised liturgy would be more accessible to most people. What was required of Evangelicals, argued Goodall, was not "catch-cries of a past age" but a "scholarly" and "thoughtful" response. Such an approach had been presaged in a 1961 article by Lamont, who argued that the crucial issue for Evangelicals was not the perpetual preservation of the 1662 form but the application of Cranmer's evangelical principle that there should be nothing in the liturgy inconsistent with Scripture. To help shape new liturgies, Evangelicals must be constructively involved. To that end, Lamont and some of his contemporaries closely critiqued emerging liturgies, and some of them later became members of the official drafting groups. But ECF was still prepared to contemplate legal action to block changes (such as prayers for the dead) that were inconsistent with the Protestant principles enshrined in the 1662 settlement.

Inter-Communion

There was unanimity among Anglican evangelicals that communicants of other denominations should be allowed to participate in Anglican services of communion. Inter-communion was consistently advocated by the E.C.F. Review and Latimer Magazine. Such an outlook reflected in part the very positive evangelical experiences of interdenominational fellowship in such contexts as Crusaders, CSSM, the EUs and IVF. They also felt a restrictive approach was biblically, theologically
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344 GL, ¶90.
345 L.C. Wards, "Intercommunion", Latimer Magazine 22 (May 1965).
346 GL, ¶91.
and historically untenable. They passionately believed it was “the Lord’s table”, not an Anglican one. Evangelicals such as Lamont – versed in Anglican history and theology – argued robustly that a closed communion was at odds with the spirit and practice of the Anglican reformers, and that an exclusive approach was an expression of much more recent Tractarian understandings of ordination and the eucharist.

The issue of inter-communion had sharply arisen in 1960, when Bishop Warren wrote to Anglican delegates about to attend an NCC Youth Conference advising them that “no loyal Anglican” should take communion at a non-Anglican service or encourage a communicant of another denomination to communicate at an Anglican service. Anglican evangelicals were highly indignant. Lamont wrote back to Warren, protesting. Subsequently, Lamont helped to shape a new approach in the Christchurch Diocese, and was asked by Bishop Pyatt to outline it to the Archbishop. At the 1970 General Synod, evangelicals successfully promoted a legislative proposal to accept inter-communion.
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347 GI, ¶92. GL, ¶91: “We believed, for example, that baptism was the sacrament relating to admission to the church of Christ and not simply to a particular denomination; church discipline with respect to admission to communion should therefore take account of the status of the believer with respect to baptism. Secondly, with respect to the history of admission to communion in the Anglican Church, we argued that the confirmation rubric [from the 1662 Prayer Book] had been interpreted and used as mechanism for ensuring that those accepted for communion had been adequately taught and were informed communicants. (The historical evidence for this position included such things as the way Huguenots and other reformed Christians who fled persecution on the Continent were allowed to communicate without first being confirmed; the way Dissenters were not only allowed but obliged to communicate (without first being confirmed) under the Test Acts; the statistics of confirmations in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England that show that episcopal visitations to many country parishes (and therefore confirmations) took place relatively infrequently and that many parishioners were admitted to communion in anticipation of being formally confirmed by their bishops; the application of the confirmation rubric as a device for ‘fencing the Lord’s Table’ was a consequence of Anglo-Catholic teaching that confirmation is a virtually indispensable sacrament effected by the laying on of hands by a Bishop who is in the apostolic succession.”

348 IGB, ¶104.
349 GI, ¶91.
350 Ibid.
Church Union

With regard to church union, Anglican evangelicals were not constrained by any strong evangelical “party line”, as were their Presbyterian counterparts within the WF. Younger Anglican evangelical leaders were often more positive about church union than their seniors, and did not accept that the only “biblical” stance toward church union was to oppose it. Thompson wrote in 1963 that the ECF was “not so happy” about church union, and gave six reasons. But the younger ECF leaders were more prepared to look beyond Anglican traditions and denominationalist assumptions and thought there might be a positive biblical mandate for church union. One of them wrote that it was a “Christian duty” to promote the vision of “unity”; another wrote that “as a Biblical Christian I must be involved in the pursuit of visible unity”. Such evangelicals accepted the practical arguments about denominationalism’s wasteful duplication of resources. They came to the conclusion that church union was “likely” given its apparent strong support among the “vast majority” of the members of the five negotiating denominations, and that to believe otherwise would be “ostrich-like”. They decided the wisest evangelical strategy was to work for the best possible basis for union, one “in accordance with God’s will”. By that they appeared to mean a union with an orthodox basis of faith within which evangelical doctrines – presumably inter alia – were “recognised”. Such doctrines included the “inspiration and authority of Scripture” and “justification by

351 GL, §52.

352 Roger Thompson, “Editorial: Church Union or Intercommunion?” *Latimer Magazine* 17 (Sept. 1963). His reasons can be summarised as follows: denominational divisions do not preclude “inner fundamental unity”; denominations are not sinful in themselves and arose out of conscience and conviction; union will lead to doctrinal compromise; union will give too much power to a small hierarchy; union will provoke further splits; union will not produce greater faith among unbelievers.


354 G.S. Lamont, “Thoughts on the biblical basis of Church Union”, *Latimer Magazine* 25 (June 1966).


356 “Editorial Note”, *Latimer Magazine* 19 (April 1964). The authorship of this editorial is unclear, since there was an editorial board rather than a single editor at this time. Also, “ECF Branch News”, *Latimer Magazine* 21 (Feb. 1965).

357 Ibid.
grace through faith alone".\footnote{B.R.C. [Carrell], “Church Union and a Country Parish,” \textit{Latimer Magazine} 19 (April 1964). They were prepared to allow “liberty of interpretation to other believers” providing no one was compelled to accept anything “repugnant” to the will of God as revealed in the Scripture: G.S. Lamont, “Thoughts on the biblical basis of Church Union”, \textit{Latimer Magazine} 25 (June 1966).} They also meant that there would be sufficient freedom for evangelical practices such as prayer meetings, evangelistic missions and “the preaching of the Word.”\footnote{B.R.C [Carrell], “Church Union and A Country Parish.”} Consequently, the younger evangelical leaders, although still offering “constructive criticism”,\footnote{“ECF Branch News,” \textit{Latimer Magazine} 21 (Feb. 1965).} were eager to participate in explorations towards an acceptable basis of union. The emerging Anglican evangelical leaders were also aware that their evangelical contemporaries in England were also taking a positive approach towards church union and were engaged in similar explorations.\footnote{E.g. \textit{Latimer Magazine} 23 (Aug. 1965): a review by John Wenham of J.I. Packer (ed.), \textit{All in Each Place. Towards Reunion in England} (Abingdon Berks: Marcham Manor, 1965); also “The Rev. John Stott speaks on Church Union”, ibid.}

When the ECF leadership had talks about church union in 1965 with their evangelical Presbyterian counterparts in the WF and with the Methodist Revival Fellowship, some of the younger ECF leaders felt uncomfortable with the implacably anti-Church Union stance of the WF leaders; to them, it seemed reminiscent of the rhetoric employed by McIntire.\footnote{GL, §52.} Carrell had already concluded that Arthur Gunn’s arguments against church union were “very thin” and that “they magnify minor issues into bogeys”.\footnote{Carrell to Lamont, 5 Oct. 1965.} Carrell felt that Anglican evangelicals “can do more by staying within the union movement than by withdrawing from it”.\footnote{Ibid.} In a report of the ECF discussions with the WF,\footnote{“Meeting of the Clerical Members of the Christchurch Branch of the ECF”, 11 Oct. 1965.} it was noted that the WF was primarily concerned about the loss of doctrinal standards. Lamont commented on the WF’s intention to stay out of union and to form a continuing Presbyterian Church. He argued that the New Testament emphasises fellowship rather than separation, and that, even in an apostate church, faithful witness is possible. He moved resolutions (all carried) that
church unity in the New Testament is of a "visible organic nature", that the ECF is "therefore committed to the pursuit of organic unity" and that "we view with concern any suggestion of secession and agree with those Evangelicals who hold that we should be critically involved in negotiations for church union". The meeting also resolved to write to the WF that they "looked forward to working with other Evangelical friends in a united church" and asking the WF to "re-consider" its apparent intention to form a separate evangelical Church. Lamont feared any intimations of secession would weaken evangelical attempts to establish a biblically sound basis for a united church. His approach gained widespread support from Anglican evangelicals elsewhere. Carrell, unhappy with the "harsh" and "militant" views of Arthur Gunn on church union, was worried that a WF secession into a continuing church would generally discredit the name of "evangelical", and would undermine the position of those evangelicals who entered the united church. In a postscript, he quipped that the problem might perhaps be solved by nominating Gunn as one of the new bishops.

In 1966, the ECF published a policy which included ECF's "positive duty" to support moves toward church union. The deepening controversy in the Presbyterian Church over the radical views of Professor Geering, however, induced some Anglican evangelical leaders to be more cautious about church union. The controversy may have pressed home to the Anglican evangelicals that theological liberalism was stronger in the Presbyterian context than in their own, and may have

366 Lamont, draft letter to WF, n.d.
367 E.g. Paul Kirkham to Lamont, 15 Oct. 1965; C.W. Haskell to Lamont, 15 Oct. 1965; Thompson to Lamont, 19 Oct. 1965. Thompson noted, though, that one day "fidelity" may become more important than unity.
369 Ibid.
helped them to understand some of the intensity of WF fears about doctrinal indifferentism in the proposed united church.371

**What Younger Evangelical Leaders Were Reading**

The younger evangelical Anglicans all appreciated the new American neo-evangelical magazine *Christianity Today* (1956-), which clearly distanced evangelicalism from the older fundamentalism, opened up issues sometimes previously neglected, and helped keep evangelicals aware of the flood of new evangelical writings coming out of both Britain and the USA.372 Nevertheless, the reading diet of the emerging Anglican evangelical leaders remained primarily British. Lamont, for instance, was sometimes reading American writers such as Henry, Lindsell, Carnell, and Young (along with earlier authors such as Warfield and Machen, and Reformed writers such as Van Til and Ridderbos). But his reading was still principally from the IVP and from Church of England evangelicals. His favourite writers included Bruce, Stibbs, Guthrie, Buchanan, Tasker, Morris and – especially – Packer and Stott.372 Lamont and Carrell had reservations about some of the American writers; they had little taste for American intra-evangelical divisions or for any hint of shrillness.

**Participating but Orthodox**

When a strengthening evangelical movement in England led to the pivotal National Evangelical Anglican Congress at Keele, in 1967, younger New Zealander evangelicals were willing to take their cues from that gathering: they became strongly committed to giving leadership within the denomination (cf. separation), to participating in ecumenical dialogue and liturgical reform, and to social involvement. As in Britain, the younger Anglican evangelicals in New Zealand were confident they were on the
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371 In the next few years, Bishop Sutton of Nelson gave leadership (from a High Church perspective) to Anglican opposition to church union.
372 BRC, ¶424-5; GL, ¶85.
373 GL, ¶83-87.
ascendancy: they wanted nothing of the ghetto outlook they discerned in a previous evangelical generation. Lamont, Goodall, Bourne and Carrell actively engaged with the wider denomination. Bourne, for instance, intentionally joined decision-making bodies of the diocese and national church: “I made it my business to get on to some of those committees.” He also served on the Standing Committee of the Diocese, on General Synod, and on the Prayer Book commission.

Emerging Anglican evangelical leaders remained firmly and self-consciously “evangelical” in identity: there is no evidence that, in the period under study, they ever questioned that identity or diminished in evangelical conviction or zeal. The Latimer Journal’s basic raison d’être remained the articulation and exploration of what it meant – in their new own Anglican context – to be “evangelical.” When the “God is Dead” debate made its impact in New Zealand, through J.A.T. Robinson’s Honest to God and the Geering controversy, Anglican evangelicals of all ages were of one mind in speaking and writing against such views.

H Conclusion

This chapter has completed this study’s exploration of the Anglican evangelical movement begun by Orange, fortified by the EU and IVF, and developed further by new leaders. The chapter has traced the development in the late 1950s and early 1960s of a cluster of evangelical Anglican ministries in Christchurch. The Diocese of Nelson under Bishop Hulme-Moir reflected the steadily increasing strength of
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378 There have been no previous historical studies of the New Zealand evangelical movement in the period 1955-65.
indigenous New Zealand evangelical Anglicanism. In Wellington, evangelical Anglicans were a small but growing minority. In Dunedin and Auckland, evangelical Anglicanism established significant new toeholds. Such evangelical growth across several dioceses was assisted by a range of factors including the proliferation of evangelical ministers and lay leaders, the encouragement of the ECF and CMS networks, the vigour of the CMS League of Youth, the stimulus of the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade, and the continuing work of Crusaders and EU and other interdenominational organizations.

This chapter has also discussed various inter-generational tensions becoming apparent within ECF in the early 1960s. Such growing pains were evidence that the evangelical Anglican movement in New Zealand was no mere fading afterglow of the William Orange phenomenon, but was a movement that had successfully reproduced itself within at least two more generations. Instead of ossifying, the Anglican evangelical movement was accepting new leadership and grappling with new intellectual, ecclesiastical and societal challenges. The more beleaguered and defensive evangelical outlook forged in the 1930s and 40s was giving way to a more confident evangelical mindset. That confidence reflected more than simply a growth in numbers. It also reflected the recovery of evangelical vitality and evangelical scholarship in both Britain and the USA, and especially in Church of England and IVF circles. Greater assurance led some within the movement to be more assertive and engaged on some issues, and more relaxed and irenic on others. As evangelicalism grew, it would inevitably become more diverse in outlook.

Other evidence of evangelical regeneration was that in 1965, several ECF members were preparing to train at St. Andrew's CMS Training Centre, Melbourne (including Mrs and Mrs Phil Thomas, Mrs and Mrs Ross Elliott, Rev. and Mrs David Penman, Eric Baigent and John Croucher). In 1964, ECF members who were ordinands included Gerald Tisch, Laurie Wards, Paul Hammonds, Ken Davy and Tony Clark; E.A Schroder was reading theology at Durham. “Did You Know?” Latimer Magazine 21 (Feb. 1965).
Orange’s death in 1966 quietly marked the passing of an earlier era, and signalled that the evangelical Anglicanism which he had cultivated had been coming of age. Evangelicalism remained a minority movement within the Anglican Church in New Zealand, but it had become a movement which had put down strong roots and which often appeared to be flourishing.
Chapter Nine:
Further Expansion of Presbyterian Evangelicalism, 1956-65

Inextinguishable witness, inextinguishable opposition.¹

A Presbyterian Evangelical Growth in South Auckland, 1956-65

Notwithstanding the post-war recovery in New Zealand of evangelical Presbyterianism, there had been no geographical centre to that growth, no Presbyterian equivalent to the evangelical Anglican movement based on the diocese of Christchurch. That difference probably reflected the stronger national focus of Presbyterianism, where ministers all attended the General Assembly, all read a national Presbyterian publication, and often moved from one end of the country to the other. In the Anglican communion, evangelical ministers had been largely concentrated in two dioceses. In the Presbyterian Church, such ministers were spread—fairly thinly—across many parts of the country.

From the 1950s, South Auckland became a notable exception to that pattern. There developed a significant cluster of vigorous evangelical ministers and parishes. The district, at that time an area south of the Auckland metropolis rather than the southern part of it, had previously been predominantly rural, and remained quite conservative in outlook.² Further study would be necessary to confirm it, but it is

¹ JGM, ¶851.
² Having heard a conference paper based on this thesis Dr. Alison Clarke wondered if the strong early background of Irish immigration into the Pukekohe district was a possible factor in the Protestant
arguable that at least a broad evangelicalism was the prevailing ethos of Presbyterianism in South Auckland, and that the more overt evangelicalism of the 1950s and 1960s developed in fertile soil.

**B  The Ministry of J.G. Miller at First Church Papakura (1953-65)**

Late in 1952, Graham Miller had returned (because of family needs) from missionary service in the New Hebrides and accepted a call to First Church, Papakura. The parish was 30 kilometres south of Auckland, in a country town which was becoming an outer suburb. There had been an unsuccessful attempt to block the call to Miller by Rev. Dr. Ian Fraser, a liberal member of South Auckland Presbytery. Fraser would have known that Miller was strongly conservative, determined and capable. But the parish welcomed Miller: First Church was already more or less evangelical in outlook, and had previously been under the ministry of Geordie Yule, a biblical conservative and passionate conversionist.

Graham Miller was subdued and gracious in manner and effortlessly eloquent. He had a piercing, ratchet-like intellect. He could reveal a dry humour, with a strong sense of irony and a droll turn of phrase, but he was essentially a serious man. Miller was instinctively conservative in doctrine, habits and manners, and was relatively impervious to modern fashions of thought or behaviour. He much preferred what he felt had stood the test of time. Miller valued propriety, duty and order, and had the formality of a bygone age. He stayed with most of the convictions and views of his

---


3 JGM, ¶181.

4 JGM, ¶578-9; ADMNH 1:53. Fraser had tried to dissuade the parish's Board of Nomination, noting Miller's opposition to church union and his enthusiasm for CE.

5 GMY, ¶23, 17-19. Miller's immediate predecessor was W.R. (Robin) Lapsley, whose theology was at least broadly evangelical: JGM, ¶558.
father, whose memory he revered. But Miller was not inflexible, or merely conventional: as a missionary in the New Hebrides, Miller had brought a fresh perspective to many issues and had been a vigorous champion of indigenisation. He was also capable of sudden and emphatic changes of mind.6

Miller was not given to self-doubt. He was completely unabashed at being in a minority, either in society or among his ministry colleagues. He was certain he was adhering to what was true and right and blessed by God. Reversals neither surprised nor discouraged Miller, who was deeply grounded in the writings of Calvin: problems and setbacks were but part of the mysterious outworking of Divine Providence. Miller was intensely loyal to Presbyterian doctrine and order. But he was scornfully dismissive of modern Presbyterian theological liberalism and deeply distrustful of its devotees. He struggled to understand why – to his eyes – liberals knew so little of their biblical or confessional heritage; he felt they were superficial and faddish, and he resented their presumption that they were the intellectuals and that “conservatives” were the obscurantists.

A Bible Preaching Ministry

Miller’s ministry at Papakura was distinguished primarily by his outstanding expositional preaching. Miller saw his ministry of the word, at both morning and evening services, as the heart of his ministry. His basic presupposition was that the faithful, regular preaching of the Scriptures was the crucial element that would help generate spiritual life and commitment. His preaching series were planned months ahead, and he impressed on his congregation that their “central duty” was “to come

6 In 1990, for instance, Miller was a senior (retired) leader of the Presbyterian Church of Australia which was moving towards a prohibition of the ordination of women. Through “a flash of mercy from God”, Miller independently came to the conviction that Acts 2: 16-21 (quoting Joel 2) is a primary mandate for the ministry of women and that the apparent vetoes of 1 Cor. 14 and the Pastoral Epistles should be seen as “an unresolved antinomy of revelation”. The ordination of women thus “became a crusade” for him: JGM, ¶683-6.
and listen to the Word of God.” He urged them to come twice a Sunday, bringing their Bible and notebook. Advance notice of his forthcoming expositions constituted the primary content of his monthly one page parish newsletters, which were distributed by a team of fifty to the letterbox of every known Presbyterian household. Miller announced the passages – with a brief title – so that the congregation could read and study them beforehand.

I did not fill the sheet up with news, or funnies… I just let them keep this centrality of what the preaching would be about, and I am sure that that gradually mastered the thoughts of the congregation…

Miller’s exposition was based on intensive study of the biblical text. Eager to convey the force of the original as it had first struck him, Miller avoided using commentaries in his preparation. Miller’s voice was not particularly strong but his language was evocative, and his speaking was redolent with allusions and quotes: Miller read very widely, systematically recording and storing material which he was able to retrieve and use in any sermon. His preaching was doctrinal but also had a marked spiritual tone. Miller’s application was clear and forthright: behind his mild manner, he was insistent. Miller captivated his congregation. They were often in awe of his command of the text, his erudition, his unshakeable faith, his rich poetic expression. Miller’s preaching was directed at teaching and inspiration rather than evangelism. Miller did not give “appeals”. He believed that the Holy Spirit “had his own way of evoking response” that was “diverse and profound”.

Miller’s ministry helped generate pronounced congregational growth: “it was only a few months and they didn’t have seating room, and this of course cheered them up

---

7 JGM, ¶792.
8 Papakura Presbyterian Church, “February 1963 Services” [parish newsletter].
9 E.g. Papakura Presbyterian Church, “September Services” [1953].
10 JGM, ¶792.
11 ADMNH 7:9.
immensely, because they had never [previously] been able to pay their budget".\textsuperscript{12} Within a few years the number of communicant members had more than doubled, from 174 in 1953 to 463 in 1957.\textsuperscript{13} The congregations were also swelled by trainee teachers and engineering students from Ardmore, many of whom came to hear Miller.\textsuperscript{14}

Miller’s exceptional capacities as a preacher were widely acknowledged by his evangelical colleagues. One of them, later familiar with the preaching of John Stott and Jack Hayford, rated Miller as the finest expositor he had ever heard.\textsuperscript{15} In retrospect, Miller acknowledged the influence on his preaching of Rev. George B. Duncan, a frequent speaker at the English Keswick Convention who visited New Zealand in 1958: “I benefited from Mr Duncan’s expository method, in which he selected salient thoughts from a passage and brought them home to the hearer with great urgency and gentleness.” In turn, Duncan himself admitted he was strongly influenced by the style of Paul Rees.\textsuperscript{16} But there were likely to have been other very significant influences on Miller, especially Thomas Miller and W.A. Orange.\textsuperscript{17}

\section*{Other Parish Activities at Papakura}

One of Miller’s key strategies for evangelism was the use of the Communicants’ Class – a class in which youth and adults were prepared for public profession of faith and church membership. By the time Miller left First Church in 1965 he had received 279 people into church membership by profession of faith.\textsuperscript{18} In the 1950s and 1960s,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} JGM, \S 792. Giving at Papakura increased 80\% in the first six months of Miller’s ministry: L.R. Garlick, Board of Managers Report, 98th Annual Report, Papakura-Hunua-Paparimu Presbyterian Church, 1953.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Proceedings, 1953: 256a; 1957: 278a; also Annual Reports, 1953 and 1958.
\item \textsuperscript{14} WJR, \S 15; the Vice Principal of Ardmore Teachers’ College, A.J. (Archie) Campbell, was Session Clerk. The Principal of Ardmore College, A.J. Hayr, was a guest preacher at First Church on at least one occasion: “November Services”, 1962.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Rev. Dr. John R. Brinsley, interview, Nov. 2001 (hereafter JRB), \S 41; similarly LW, \S 378.
\item \textsuperscript{16} ADMNH 7:7.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Re Orange’s effect on Miller’s approach to preaching, see Chapter Three.
\item \textsuperscript{18} ADMNH 7:45.
\end{itemize}
many people in society still commonly approached the church when they wanted to be married, and later for Christian initiation for their children. Miller made the most of interviews with such couples, often inviting them into his Communicants’ Class. Miller, like most of his WF colleagues, combined a staunchly reformed theology of paedo-baptism with a keen eye for evangelistic opportunity.

Another evangelistic strategy, appropriate in a societal context where many people still had some known affiliation (even if nominal) with a church denomination, was the use of trained visitors to make calls on “Presbyterian” households. This strategy was recommended by the New Life Movement and was widely implemented by evangelical parishes. For nurture, First Church had half a dozen adult Bible Study groups (with a focus of instruction rather than fellowship). Miller began a weekly Adult Bible School, in lecture style, which every communicant member was encouraged to attend. There were separate men’s and women’s prayer meetings: notwithstanding his strongly reformed theology of divine sovereignty, Miller also appeared to endorse the more revivalistic idea that the amount of spiritual “blessing” was related to the amount of prayer that had been occurring. Miller had little time for anything he considered a faddish innovation or gimmick. His ministry was sharply focused on spiritual ends: traditional social groups such as the Women’s Guild and Women’s Fellowship appeared to have a low profile within the parish and were very rarely mentioned in the newsletters. Miller taught the Senior Bible Class at Papakura, attended CE, was chaplain to the Boys’ and Girls’ Brigades, and spoke at

---

19 In his time at Papakura, Miller conducted weddings for 226 couples: ibid. In a Presbyterian context, infants were initiated with baptism.
20 Finding, Visitation Report, First [Church] - Papakura, South Auckland Presbytery Minutes, 10 Sept. 1965; Papakura Presbyterian Church, “April Services” [1959].
21 Papakura Presbyterian Church, “July Services” [1959].
22 “February 1963 Services.”
23 The following axioms were included in “July 1964 Services”: “No prayer, no blessing; little prayer, little blessing; much prayer, much blessing”; “A praying church is a growing church”. The men’s prayer meeting was at 7 a.m. on Sundays and the women’s prayer meeting was during the daytime on a weekday.
BC camps and Crusader and EU gatherings, but his ministry was not so clearly youth-oriented as that of many other evangelicals.

The church often received visits from missionariers\textsuperscript{24} and from representatives of mission agencies such as the Far East Broadcasting Company. Miller was ideologically committed to "indigenous" principles,\textsuperscript{25} and his cross-cultural experience in the New Hebrides probably helped inform his involvement with Maori people (in Papakura and also in such contexts as the Ngaruawahia Convention, the United Maori Mission, and annual Bible Class return visits with Maori youth in Murupara).\textsuperscript{26} Some Maori joined First Church and its daughter churches, but Miller sensed they often seemed ill at ease in predominantly Pakeha settings and thought it more fruitful to provide strong support to the Maori Evangelical Fellowship and its new Papakura work under the leadership of Tia Matiu. In Miller's time, several members of First Church moved to the Bay of Plenty to take up full-time work with the Presbyterian Maori Synod.\textsuperscript{27}

**Miller's Ministry and the Wider Spiritual Mood**

Miller's ministry at Papakura coincided with what he felt was an unusual public receptivity to Christianity in New Zealand in the late 1950s, in the years leading up to the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade.\textsuperscript{28} Such a spiritual atmosphere is not readily explained, but it was widely felt by many evangelicals, and was reflected in enlarged congregations, packed Sunday Schools, and overall church growth. When the Billy

\textsuperscript{24} E.g. Ian Kemp, Beryl Howie, Muri Thompson, Barbara Good, Mary Milner, W. Searle.
\textsuperscript{25} ADMNH 7:29.
\textsuperscript{26} "March 1964 Services"; "February 1963 Services": ADMNH 7:29. Miller spoke at UMM rallies, and gave them advice as they formed a constitution.
\textsuperscript{27} Mr and Mrs Jim Gordon went to manage the Maori Boys' Farm at Te Whaiti, Mesdames Watson and Stoddard to hostel work in Whakatane, Miss A. Turchi as a typist to the Synod offices, and Bruce Howie as a carpenter.
\textsuperscript{28} JGM, 794.
Graham Crusade occurred, its effect on the churches came as a “crowning encouragement” rather than something entirely new.29

For the Crusade, Miller’s parish booked large numbers of buses to take people into Auckland. The parish received sixty-nine decision cards. Miller visited all the individuals concerned. About half of the respondents were from his congregation or known to him, and were seeking assurance of faith or were making recommitments. The other half represented conversions, mostly of people he did not know. There was only one respondent who “did not advance”.30 Many respondents were received as new members at Saturday pre-communion services in 1959.31 The effect of the Crusade was also felt on the nearby Ardmore Teachers’ College, which had strong links with First Church: about half the student body attended the Crusade, many responded, and the weekly meeting of the Christian Fellowship grew from 50-60 to about 140.32

The effects of the Crusade were experienced – in Papakura and elsewhere – as an incomparable “outpouring” of spiritual “blessing” that continued for months: many in both church and community responded readily to calls to conversion or recommitment, congregations had a new fervour (often reflected in the singing), and there was “revival in the heart of ministers”.33

The congregation at Papakura continued to grow. Morning services in 1960 were attended by up to 250 adults, evening services by up to 180.34 The church was often overflowing in the morning, even after cutting the congregation twice to establish church plants in neighbouring new suburbs: eighty communicants were sent to

29 JGM, ¶794.
30 ADMNH 7:8; JGM, ¶806.
31 Papakura Presbyterian Church, “June Services” [1959]; “September Services” [1959].
Papakura East in 1959 and thirty-eight to Takanini in 1961. Miller claimed that "whenever we'd give them away, by the end of the year we'd nearly always got the same number back again"; official statistics corroborate that claim. Influenced by historical accounts of past awakenings, Miller was preaching – in hope and expectation – a series of sermons about revival.

The high tide was sustained for about eighteen months, and then Miller began to notice a drop in numbers at the evening service, which had previously been full. Miller and his evangelical colleagues began to talk among themselves about a coming spiritual regression, what they termed a "Counter Reformation", when the "times of refreshing" would come to an end. The content of a 1964 newsletter suggest the parish's spiritual fervour remained high: from 1963 to 1964, weekly giving doubled, and it was planned to give half of the income away to missions; it was also planned to have a monthly day of prayer, with several prayer meetings each day. But Miller was also acutely aware of a group of young men in the church who had previously professed faith and then became "impervious" to "spiritual truth".

**Christian Endeavour versus Church Dances**

A distinctive feature of Miller's ministry at Papakura – and one that his evangelical colleagues in this period did not generally emulate – was his introduction of CE, which had been so important in his own formative years, and which he had also used in the New Hebrides. Miller channelled younger converts into CE, which was additional to the BC and pitched for those eager for deeper spiritual growth.

---

34 ADMNH 7:32. In 1965, Miller's last year at Papakura, the morning congregations were comparable but the evening congregations were only a third as large as in 1960.
35 JGM, ¶806. The communicant roll had been about 120 when Miller arrived, including Hunua and Paparimu.
37 He had been reading Banner of Truth reprints of historic accounts of revival, ADMNH 7:32.
38 JGM, ¶573, ¶797. "It came, very quickly, [as] negative things began to appear in our Presbytery and in our churches" (¶573).
40 ADMNH 7:31.
Miller also saw the CE as a wholesome alternative to Saturday night dancing. While Miller had sat silent and disapproving, his Session had given permission for a square dance; in reaction, Miller had started up CE.\footnote{JGM, 7218-9. This was in 1954.} Miller felt – and resisted – a persistent pressure to allow dances among the youth. Churches in this period commonly allowed dances, and many of the Ardmore students at First Church came from such churches. A member of the BC stood at the manse door and remonstrated: “Why can’t we have dancing? Don’t you know that Papatoetoe [St. John’s] have ninety people every Saturday night?” But Miller wanted to know how many of those were present at church on Sunday night.\footnote{JGM, 7209.}

**A National and International Bible-teaching Ministry**

Within New Zealand, Miller regularly spoke at Keswick-type conventions including those at Pounawea and Rotorua Convention (where he was Chairman)\footnote{ADMNH 7:6.} and at Ngaruawahia Easter Convention. Miller was an outstanding speaker in such contexts.\footnote{Miller’s ministry at the 1957 convention greatly impressed Colin Becroft, who in a letter to the Scripture Union in the UK described Miller as a “most godly man, mighty in word and deed” whose ministry God has “greatly blessed” (Becroft was suggesting Miller as a writer for Bible reading notes): [Becroft] to A.M. Derham, 5 Dec. 1957; Barry Doig first heard Miller at Ngaruawahia, and found him “captivating”, a “very gracious and godly” man whom he regarded with “awe”: BTD, 712.} He also frequently spoke at parish teaching missions.\footnote{E.g. Otahuhu, 1955; Marton, 1962.} At one parish mission in a small town he spoke for ten consecutive evenings from Romans, with the crowds increasing from 200 to a peak of 530.\footnote{Arthur G. Gunn, “Editorial”, *EP* XII, 3 (May 1962): 2} Miller spoke at numerous Presbyterian BC Easter Camps; at one of these, he reluctantly gave an “appeal”, to which over 100 responded.\footnote{ADMNH 7:9. The camp concerned was in the Bay of Plenty.} Despite some official nervousness about evangelicals, Miller was invited to give the Bible Studies at a national BC conference.\footnote{Dunedin, 1958-9.} He was often invited to speak at the Ardmore Christian Fellowship, or in EU and IVF
contexts. In 1955 and 1959 he gave the Presidential Address at the IVF Conference. In evangelical contexts (whether Presbyterian or inter-denominational) Miller’s speaking was much appreciated; in official Presbyterian contexts, he felt his contribution was sometimes barely tolerated. When Miller spoke at the 1964 Theological Hall students’ retreat, the atmosphere was “frosty” and the questions antagonistic: he realised that as Chairman of the Westminster Fellowship he was regarded with considerable suspicion.

Internationally, Miller’s expositional gifts were reflected in invitations to speak at numerous overseas conferences. His overseas engagements included the 1962 Australian IVF conference at Narabeen, Sydney. Notably, Miller was invited to speak in 1963 at Keswick (UK), where 5,000 heard his series of messages on Hosea. Miller also spoke at similar evangelical conventions in Australia (Belgrave Heights and Katoomba), North London, Ireland (Portstewart) and India. In Keswick-type settings, Miller consciously avoided preaching according to a classic Keswick holiness formula, which sat uneasily with his Calvinist understanding; he kept such emphases in mind but assumed the freedom simply to expound Scripture with a spiritual emphasis on consecration.

---

49 Miller went from the Knox retreat straight to the Ngaruawahia Convention, and was struck by the greatly different reception, ibid.
50 ADMNH 7:32.
53 JGM, ¶263-275. Miller had “very deep misgivings” about the second blessing teaching: ¶268. As he later read Kuyper on the Holy Spirit, and Calvin, he became convinced that the Keswick theology was a “superficial interpretation of biblical realities. Our conversion is the work of the Holy Spirit, and he determines for us as the Word of God becomes attested to our conscience, so that some have assurance of salvation immediately, others never have assurance...others again have this vital experience later in life. I felt I was bound to the scriptural terminology, ‘If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature’...’ We are “complete in Christ...How can I then tell the people that there is some additional bonus, blessing, anointing, which I now have to tell the people that they need to have? I lost all interest in presenting a second phase of the Christian life. [But] I did always draw attention to the need of continuous surrender, every presentation of Scripture calls for a fresh surrender, body, mind, and spirit.” ¶271. It is not clear whether or to what extent Miller may have been influenced in this period by critique of Keswick theology in Britain from a reformed theological perspective, by Lloyd-Jones, Packer and Kevan. For that critique, see especially J.I. Packer, “‘Keswick’ and the Reformed Doctrine
Miller’s Writings

From the mid-1950s, Miller was writing up to half of each year’s Daily Notes for Scripture Union in the UK. With a world-wide readership in some 120 languages, such notes increased Miller’s international profile. Miller also wrote some daily Bible notes for the Outlook.

Miller’s pamphlet Baptism in the Presbyterian Church reflected a widespread concern in the church that many parents in the 1950s society felt a need to do the right thing by their children and have them “done” (as if it were some sort of inoculation) but then, after the ceremony, were rarely or never seen again. Miller provided an explanation of infant baptism and emphasised the need for parents themselves to profess faith and become involved in the life of the church.

Miller’s Regional and National Leadership Roles

In the Presbytery of South Auckland, Miller became the obvious leader and spokesman of the growing group of evangelical ministers. He became very active in the WF, after it moved its Executive to South Auckland. Within the national church, Miller was a member of the Overseas Missions Committee, and from 1954 he was also a (dissident minority) member of the Church Union Committee.

of Sanctification”, Evangelical Quarterly XXVII, 3 (July 1955): 153-67; also: McGrath, Packer: 76-80; Randall: 25, 73, 76, 108; J.H. Murray, D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The Fight of Faith, 1939-1981 (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1990): 73-4; Packer vigorously dismissed Keswick’s teaching as “attenuated and impoverished”, unscriptural, and “irreligious”; it is “Pelagian through and through”, in making sanctification dependent upon natural human will (cf. the “supernatural ability to will God’s will which Reformed theologians teach that regeneration implants and sanctification increases”); in Reformed doctrine, “the Holy Spirit uses my faith and obedience (which He Himself works in me) to sanctify me”, but in Keswick doctrine “I use the Holy Spirit (whom God puts at my disposal) to sanctify myself”; Keswick makes the Christian the employer, and the Holy Spirit the employee; the goal of “complete” victory over sin through consecration and Faith is “delusive”; Pelagianism “is the natural heresy of zealous Christians... not interested in theology”; the Convention would better promote holiness by being scriptural.

54 See Graham Miller, The Treasury of His Promises (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1986), which reprints many of Miller’s notes. SU notes were not regionalised until the 1980s.

55 Such concern was expressed, for example, in Angus Ross to Miller, 1 Oct. 1959 (ADMNH: 7).
Miller’s Protégés

While at Papakura, Miller had up to twenty younger protégés who later went into ministry, missionary service, or theological teaching. Some of these trained at the Theological Hall, some at BTI; one later studied at Princeton, another at Cambridge. They included Alistair McKenzie, Garth McInnes, Kenneth Ralph, Bruce Ralph, Graham Adams, Graham Hughes, Ed Norton, Thomas Strahan, Dennis Fitzpatrick, Roy Masters, Ian Keals, Marcus Willitts, W. Pierce Hobbs and Don Murray. A few of these later ceased to identify themselves as evangelical, at least in the Graham Miller or WF mould; there are indications that some of them reacted against the perceived narrowness of Miller’s expression of evangelicalism. Exposed to liberal scholarship and to the social changes of the late 1960s, some shifted in theological outlook.

Miller’s Departure from New Zealand

Towards the end of his time in Papakura, Miller received several approaches to serve elsewhere. A number of staff and board members were eager for Miller to succeed John Deane as BTI Principal; they knew Miller well through the Ngaruawahia and Keswick conventions. But Blaiklock (who was BTI President) refused to countenance

---

57 ADMNH 7: page number obscured; JGM, ¶560-70. McKenzie spent time in First Church but entered the ministry through his home Presbytery, Christchurch. Kenneth Ralph studied at BTI and OU, was a Travelling Secretary for IVF for two years, studied at Princeton, was ordained into the PCNZ, and later went to Australia. Graham Hughes later took his PhD at Cambridge, and became lecturer in Greek and New Testament in the theological college of the Uniting Church in Sydney. Don Murray was from the church planted by Papakura in Takanini, where John Brinsley became minister.
58 Another example of someone who was influenced by Miller and greatly respected him but later appeared ambivalent about some aspects of Miller’s very conservative type of evangelicalism was John Roxborogh, who attended First Church while a student at Ardmore Engineering School. Roxborogh was converted as Miller preached through Romans, and was later encouraged into ministry and missionary service by Miller. Roxborogh completed a PhD on Thomas Chalmers and pursued an academic career in the history of mission. Rev. Dr. W.J. Roxborogh, interview, 17 April 2003 (hereafter WJR), ¶5-6, ¶29, ¶23, ¶31, ¶91.
a Calvinist in such a position.59 Miller’s profile at Belgrave Heights in Australia led to invitations from across the Tasman. In 1962 Miller was informally asked to consider becoming Principal of Melbourne Bible Institute, but he shied off when he saw that its constitution required adherence to pre-millennial eschatology.60 A year or so later he was asked to become Principal of the new Christian Leaders’ Training College, in Papua New Guinea, but Miller felt he lacked the necessary practical skills.61 In 1965 he was invited to become Principal of Melbourne Bible Institute, and accepted.

Miller’s inter-denominational significance as an evangelical leader was highlighted when the Evangelical Alliance arranged a public farewell for him in the Auckland Town Hall. The venue was full. Tributes were given by Donald Kirkby, his colleague in South Auckland Presbytery (and Chairman of WF), John Pritchard (Auckland Evangelical Alliance) and evangelist Muri Thompson (“Representing Maori Christians”). Prayers were led by the Chairman of Rotorua Keswick (A.E. Williams) and R.A. Laidlaw (leading Brethren layman and BTI President). Miller spoke, with a title for his address that also summed up the heart of his own identity and purpose: “Evangelical Renewal”.62 The Challenge ran a large two-page feature on Miller and expressed the view that New Zealand was losing “one of its most gracious, able, and spiritual leaders.”63 The Outlook’s tribute was belated, and was much more restrained: the piece’s evangelical writer prudently concentrated on Miller’s loyalty,

59 JGM, ¶291. Miller believed, on the basis of what Les Rusbrook of the BTI staff told him, that a factor in Blaiklock’s rejection of Calvinism was his experience at Barnhouse’s Tenth Presbyterian in Philadelphia, where he was about to preach and was “grilled” by the Session and consequently “never forgave” the Calvinists. There might also have been some personal animus: Miller recalled how at the 1950 IVF Conference, where he was a speaker, Blaiklock said to him: “I see the IVF have done me the courtesy of not placing any of my books on the bookstall”; Miller reflected: “He was touchy, and my judgement was that the poor fellow could have done with Calvin” (JGM, ¶244).
60 ADMNH 7:39.
61 ADMNH 7:40.
graciousness and ministerial brotherliness, and made no reference to Miller’s theology or role in the Westminster Fellowship.  

C  The ministry of D.A. Kirkby at St. James’ Pukekohe (1957-69)

After an energetic evangelical ministry at Dargaville, Donald Kirkby moved in 1957 to the bustling country town of Pukekohe, an hour’s travel south of Auckland. Pukekohe’s prosperity reflected its fertile volcanic soils and surrounding market gardens, and both the town and its Presbyterian church were in expansive mode. As Interim Moderator (and thus overseeing the selection process), Graham Miller had strongly encouraged the call to Kirkby. Kirkby’s predecessor, F.E.H. Paton, had had a strongly spiritual ministry (1940-57), and there are indications of evangelical emphases in earlier Pukekohe ministries. Kirkby’s later claim that there had continuously been a “strong evangelical tradition” in St. James’ since its inception may have been an over-simplification but was at least broadly accurate: he defined the key elements of that tradition as “the authority and proclamation of the Holy Scriptures, the importance of biblical preaching to young and old, the place of prayer, together with the desire to give glory to God alone and to exalt the name of the Head of the Church”.  

---

64 J.N. Smith, “Graham Miller”, Outlook 73, 1 (5 Feb. 1966): 31. For further comment on Miller, in part in relation to his role in the Presbyterian Church in Australia, see Hutchinson: 369-70.

65 E.g. the zealous evangelical preaching and strong missionary interest of T.W. Dunn (1881-1887), mission services under W.F. Findlay (1888-1901), and a 1909 Gospel Mission conducted by well-known evangelical missioner A.A. Murray of St. Andrew’s: [B.R. Hyland (ed.)], Centennial History of the Presbyterian Church in Pukekohe 1868-1968 (Pukekohe: St. James’ Presbyterian Church, 1968): 8, 11, 20; re Paton, also RR, 1352.

Donald Kirkby (1918-85) was a man of keen intellect, and a careful exegete.\textsuperscript{67} He was an expository preacher of outstanding confidence and flair.\textsuperscript{68} His messages were thoroughly prepared, very eloquent, and dynamic. A young bank officer in the town, encountering expository preaching for the first time, was “totally gripped”: it was “a revelation to me”. He “could not get to church fast enough” and often could not sleep afterwards.\textsuperscript{69} There were full congregations morning and night. By 1962 average weekly church attendance had reached its peak of 620, with (adult) attendance at communion services averaging 370, and 304 in the Sunday School.\textsuperscript{70} St. James’ became the largest congregation in the Presbytery and the second largest in the upper North Island.\textsuperscript{71}

Kirkby was a hands-on, charismatic leader. He was able to establish rapport – especially with men, with whom he often shared a strong interest in sport.\textsuperscript{72} He had outstanding gifts in personal evangelism. He had strong organisational ability, and worked to mobilise his whole parish along evangelical lines, not least in the area of systematic outreach visitation by teams of lay people.\textsuperscript{73} He established a Saturday night pre-communion service, which could be attended by up to 200. He taught a large mid-week meeting (Bible study and prayer) and also the Senior BC. He wrote copious amounts of cyclostyled instructional material. He laid great emphasis on prayer: he published a Prayer Diary for daily use by church members,\textsuperscript{74} and organised men’s and women’s weekly prayer meetings. He actively fed people into

\textsuperscript{67} In his final year at the Theological Hall, Kirkby was awarded the Begg Travelling Scholarship for further study, but did not take it up.

\textsuperscript{68} Breward commented on Kirkby thus: “...he was very highly respected, he had lots of good things to say, he was a very acceptable speaker at EU in Auckland. He was a very fine parish minister, evangelist, spokesman for the Christian faith”: IB, §52.

\textsuperscript{69} JBM, §32.

\textsuperscript{70} Proceedings, 1962: 294a; St. James’ Presbyterian Church, Pukekohe, “Annual Reports”, 1962.

\textsuperscript{71} Proceedings, 1962: 291a-7a. Most of the other larger Presbyterian churches were from Oamaru southwards.

\textsuperscript{72} JBM, §32.

\textsuperscript{73} See, e.g., St. James’ Presbyterian Church, Pukekohe, “Centennial Visitation of the Parish. September 1968. Helps and Instructions to Parish Visitors”.

\textsuperscript{74} St. James’ Presbyterian Church, Pukekohe, “Your Prayer Diary”.
his communicant classes, which ran in three month series, and for which he used the 
WF manual Christ Our Life.\textsuperscript{75} There was a high number of Professions of Faith.\textsuperscript{76} The 
Billy Graham Crusade – for which the parish organised counselling classes and buses – led to thirty-six Professions of Faith at the next communion service.\textsuperscript{77} A new church 
was built in 1961. There were some limited attempts to reach out to Pukekohe’s 
Maori, Chinese and Indian communities.\textsuperscript{78}

In Kirkby’s time, the parish produced a large number of students for the ministry, 
including Tom Woods, John McKinlay, Neville Harris, Pat Connell, Graeme Murray, 
Ken Campbell, Brian Weston, David Jack, Bert Schoneveld and Rod Harris.\textsuperscript{79} Several 
church members went to BTI.\textsuperscript{80} Elinor Papesch went to Deaconess College. Several 
others became missionaries, including Robin Farnsworth (WBT), Robert and Sadie 
Elphick (CLTC), Claud Johnstone (WEC), Jeanette Grimmer (MECO) and Colin 
Wylie (BEM).\textsuperscript{81} It was claimed that, under Kirkby’s ministry, twenty-three people 
entered full-time Christian work.\textsuperscript{82} In support of them and of missionaries serving 
with evangelical missionary societies or with the PCNZ, Kirkby established in 1964 
the St. James’ World Missionary Fellowship, which produced extensive prayer notes, 
channelled donations to missionaries and ran missionary conventions.\textsuperscript{83} Kirkby 
lamented the weak connection between most Presbyterians and the denomination’s 
missionaries.\textsuperscript{84} Like other evangelical parishes, St. James’ had no hesitations about

\textsuperscript{75} Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, Christ our Life: A Communicant’s Manual (Christchurch: 
Presbyterian Bookroom, 1963). The classes were held after the evening service.

\textsuperscript{76} E.g. Proceedings, 1958: 281a.

\textsuperscript{77} Centennial History, 53.

\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., 53; Donald A. Kirkby, “Racial Problems in Pukekohe: What are the Churches Doing about 

\textsuperscript{79} Notes, Jewel Palmer, 15 June 2007

\textsuperscript{80} E.g. Shep Noon Fong.

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{82} “Presbyterian Church Celebrates Its Centennial”, \textit{Challenge Weekly} 26, 42 (Oct.12, 1968): 5.

\textsuperscript{83} E.g. St. James’ Presbyterian Church, Pukekohe, \textit{Invitation to Pray. World Missionary Fellowship Prayer 
Diary, 1967}; ibid., The Story of the St. James’ World Missionary Fellowship. A Congregation’s Pilgrimage in 
Faith, 1967. In the latter booklet, Kirkby called on other parishes to follow the St. James’ model: 12, 15-
16.

\textsuperscript{84} “Expanding Church Becomes Missionary Base”, \textit{Challenge Weekly} 26, 42 (Oct.12, 1968): 8.
supporting non-denominational missionary societies, and regretted that they seemed
invisible to denominational authorities. Kirkby argued that a church’s support for
missions is a measure of its spiritual state, and that “a Church which has an
aggressive and sacrificial missionary policy is bound to be a live, thriving Church
with evidence all about it of the blessing of God”. His strong missionary interest
was also associated with a very pronounced emphasis on Christian giving, much of
which went to missions.

To at least one observer, the state of St. James’ Pukekohe seemed akin to “revival”. Such an exceptional flourishing of the church cannot be directly attributed either to
the work of Kirkby or the effects of the Graham Crusade. Rather, the late 1950s in
New Zealand was a period of “unusual spiritual receptivity and fruitfulness”. Evangelical ministries did not produce that spiritual upswell, but were very effective
at tapping into it.

Kirkby was theologically astute, and profoundly evangelical by conviction. But he
was less rigorously or systematically reformed than Graham Miller. Whereas Miller
had “much more the legal mind”, Kirkby was more “the dynamic warm
evangelist”. Privately, at least, Kirkby was less committed to the Westminster
Confession than some of his WF peers.

Kirkby was a lively raconteur, and irenic in his attitude to non-evangelicals. More
than any of his evangelical colleagues, Kirkby was in wide demand outside the
parish. In 1955 Kirkby had been absent from his previous parish for a total of four

---

87 Kirkby was influenced by Rev. Neville Horn who visited St. James’ in 1963 and by “faith” principles
of giving as outlined in such pamphlets as J. Oswald Smith’s How God Taught Me to Give.
88 JBM, ¶34.
89 JBM, ¶34.
90 JBM, ¶37.
91 LW, ¶366.
months while engaged in speaking at camps and New Life missions. As a
missioner, Kirkby made much of his experiences as a pilot in the Fleet Air Arm. Of
all the New Life missioners, of every theological stripe, Kirkby was arguably the
most effective. More than Miller, who was more of a teacher, Kirkby was an
evangelist. Especially when on missions away from his own parish, Kirkby would
not hesitate to give an “appeal”. Kirkby’s move from rural Northland to the new
Presbyterian evangelical heartland of South Auckland had raised Kirkby’s profile
further. He was increasingly called on to speak at Keswick-style conventions, both in
New Zealand and overseas. In the early sixties, for instance, his speaking
engagements included missions in Melville, Mornington, Manurewa, Greymouth,
Taupo and Dunedin, four BC camps, a School of Evangelism, a Ministers’ Refresher
Course, lectures at the Theological Hall, an OUEU Houseparty and the Belgrave
Heights Convention (Melbourne). After Belgrave Heights, Kirkby declined an
invitation to become Principal of Melbourne Bible Institute. Like some other
evangelical colleagues peers, Kirkby was on the leadership bodies of several
evangelical organisations. But – unlike most of his evangelical peers – Kirkby was
on several national PCNZ committees, and convener of one; with his warm
personality and his focus on church growth and evangelism (rather than the more
controversial issues of doctrine or church union), Kirkby was more acceptable to the
wider church.

Kirkby was an enthusiastic and winsome advocate for the evangelical cause. He used
the word “evangelical” freely and commonly. He appeared to relish publicity, and
could exaggerate his successes; he may have succumbed to the evangelical

---

93 JCM, ¶756: “He was undoubtedly the most effective New Life missioner”. Similarly, LW, ¶403.
94 Centennial History: 54.
95 JCM, ¶757. Kirkby travelled to Australia to explore the invitation.
96 E.g. the NZ Council of the Scripture Union, CSSM, and Crusader Movement.
97 The Committee on Ministry Recruitment.
98 Three informants (names withheld).
temptation of triumphalism. His ministry at Pukekohe ended with his sudden resignation in 1968, but he later had an international ministry with YWAM.99

D  The Ministry of A.G. Gunn at St. Andrew’s Manurewa, from 1961

When Rev. Arthur Gunn arrived from Scotland in 1961 at St. Andrew’s Manurewa, it was clear that a powerful new evangelical constellation was forming in the Presbytery of South Auckland: Miller, Kirkby and Gunn. All three openly and unequivocally identified themselves as evangelical and actively championed evangelical theology and praxis. All three were gifted, articulate, energetic and determined.

Arthur Gunn was less measured and mild than Miller, and less positive than Kirkby. In personality, Gunn was a quiet person. He was also a highly partisan advocate of conservative evangelical theology, and a fearless polemicist. He could overstate his case. His dismissiveness towards other theological positions (whether Roman Catholic, liberal or ecumenical) contained few nuances, and some took offence. On account of his comments in General Assembly, in the Evangelical Presbyterian and in the media, Gunn soon became perceived by liberals and moderates within New Zealand Presbyterianism as the bête noire of WF-style evangelicalism. Gunn was not motivated by any anger or hostility, but by cool-headed, relentless conviction. At a personal level, he was friendly, relaxed and affable, with a strong sense of humour. He was matter-of-fact, and not intense; he was not trying to be provocative but just standing up for what he believed.100 As a strong individualist, he was unfazed by hostile reactions.

100 JRB, ¶138, ¶141.
Gunn showed no deference to those who saw themselves as the leading lights of the PCNZ. As a New Zealander who had done his ministry training overseas, Gunn may have been resented by some as a presumptuous, outspoken outsider. The denominational authorities were also probably irritated by Gunn’s willingness to make contentious unofficial comments about Assembly to the media, who often sought him out.\footnote{101}

Gunn (1912-1999) was the son of another New Zealand minister, a friend of Thomas Miller.\footnote{102} Active in youth and children’s work, and a lay preacher, Gunn had been accepted as a student for the ministry in 1931 but had decided instead to become a missionary.\footnote{103} At BTI (1937-8) Gunn had been a top student. Both Miller and Yule described Gunn as “brilliant”.\footnote{104} Gunn had worked as a YMCA religious secretary, and showed outstanding organisational abilities.\footnote{105} In conjunction with Laidlaw, Gunn had founded the Christian Men’s Business Association, which attracted hundreds of members. From 1939, Gunn had served in China with CIM; after China declared war on Japan he had served as a Royal Air Force pilot.\footnote{106}

Back in New Zealand, Gunn had reapplied to enter the Presbyterian ministry.\footnote{107} It was noted (presumably on account of Gunn’s BTI and CIM links) that “this young man has had a strong fundamentalist background” but “there is no doubt he has ability…and…a very pleasing way of speaking.”\footnote{108} Gunn had intended to go to the Theological Hall, but, frustrated at his prolonged failure to find accommodation in

\footnote{101} JRB, \textsection 139.\footnote{102} J.T. Gunn (Sen.), 1875-1919. They had both been influenced by R.A. Torrey, and at the Theological Hall had had the same lecturers: JGM, \textsection 766. The older Gunn had died during Arthur Gunn’s childhood.\footnote{103} Gunn to R.S. Watson, 30 June 1946, Theological Hall Student files, A-M, A.G. Gunn, 1945-8, 5c.\footnote{104} JGM, \textsection 762; GYM, \textsection 529. Also Elley: RDE, 247. Note also the comment of Ian Breward: “Arthur Gunn had a very keen mind, there is no doubt about that. If he had had a post-graduate theological education, he had the intellect to have been a pretty formidable teacher of the Church”: IB, \textsection 41.\footnote{105} GYM, \textsection 527.\footnote{106} Gunn trained in India and served in Egypt and Britain.\footnote{107} Gunn to Convener, Students’ Committee, Wellington Presbytery, 30 Oct. 1945, Theological Hall Student files, A-M, A.G. Gunn, 1945-8, 5c.
Dunedin for his wife and baby, had switched to New College in Edinburgh; an extensive correspondence reveals no hint of any motive to avoid Knox on theological grounds. Gunn hoped to do a BD and PhD and eventually return to New Zealand. Ordained in 1950, he served two parishes in Scotland: North Berwick and St. David’s, Glasgow. The latter was very large, with 2000 members and the largest BC in Scotland. At one communion service, 126 new members had joined. Mid-week, Gunn had run a children’s programme with an attendance of 400. As “Dominie” of a major Scottish kirk, Gunn had become accustomed to being in charge.

At Manurewa, where he followed a gently evangelical predecessor, Gunn was clearly an outstanding parish minister. With great personal “presence”, he preached strongly, and expositionally, and was always well prepared. From the pulpit, he frequently used the word “evangelical” or referred to the Westminster Fellowship. His preaching was instructional rather than evangelistic. It was dogmatic rather than pastoral. His speaking was not as warm as that of Miller or Kirkby, and included an element of denunciation. Both in preaching and in leadership style, Gunn was authoritarian.

Gunn was boundlessly energetic and prodigiously hard-working. He was diligent and effective in pastoral visitation, and organised a large team of twenty-eight elders to do likewise. He had another team of volunteers to deliver a newsletter to anyone.

---

110 Gunn to J.D. Salmond, 4 May 1948.
112 Gunn’s predecessor, Sefton Campbell, was sufficiently evangelical for Miller to have him conduct a teaching mission at First Church: “I was impressed at his faithfulness to the Word.” But Miller claimed Campbell retained some “inhibitions” inherited from the Theological Hall: he was “still getting out of his grave clothes” (JGM, ¶801). For Campbell (1919-84), see Proceedings, 1984: 96-7.
113 Alan and Muriel Lipscombe, interview, 26 Mar. 2007 (hereafter AL), ¶7,15, 25.
114 Ibid., ¶19.
115 Ibid., ¶11, ¶18.
who had missed church. Every Sunday night after church a different elder would be organised to bring those in his pastoral district to the manse for supper. With regard to activism, Gunn was the epitome of an Evangelical. He had nothing of the quietist streak that was in Graham Miller: where Miller might be content to leave some things to “the sovereign wisdom of God”, Arthur Gunn preferred to organise.

As in Papakura and Pukekohe, there was significant growth: average weekly attendance peaked at 470 in 1959. Such growth was not unique to evangelical parishes, however; in the same period St. John’s Papatoe (the only large parish in the Presbytery with a non-evangelical ministry) had similar growth to St. Andrew’s, but less growth than First Church Papakura or St. James’ Pukekohe.

As with Miller and Kirkby, though not to the same extent, Gunn spoke at conventions elsewhere – at Ngaruawahia, and at Keswick in New Zealand and Australia. In such contexts his ministry was one of teaching, not evangelism. When he spoke at a parish mission in Pukekohe, there were attendances every night of 400. But by far Gunn’s most prominent activity outside of the parish was his frenetic work writing and editing for the Westminster Fellowship.

E The Ministry of Lewis Wilson at Papakura East

From 1959 to 1964 Lewis Wilson was the first minister of the new parish of Papakura

---

116 Ibid., 9.
117 JRB, 138: the quote is from Brinsley, not Miller.
120 AL, 17.
East, a daughter congregation of First Church which firmly identified itself with the evangelical ethos and practices of its parent church.

Lewis Wilson’s Evangelical Formation

Brought up in inland Canterbury, Wilson (1916-2001) had been converted and nurtured through the Open Brethren, and influenced by Scripture Union and Crusaders and by such leaders such as Laird and Becroft. After study at BTI, and war service, Wilson had returned to his Presbyterian roots. He had completed his MA at Canterbury, where he was President of EU (1947-8) and mixed with Anglican evangelicals. Exposure to Orange had inspired in Wilson a commitment to expositional preaching. He had spent three years working for the Crusader Movement.

At the Theological Hall (1952-4), Wilson had felt theologically isolated, despite the moderating influence of biblical theology over earlier liberal emphases. He was a capable student (especially in biblical languages and exegesis), felt respected by the staff, was President of the Theological Students’ Association, had actively engaged with critical scholarship and had gained an appreciation of the diversity and humanity of Scripture. But he had retained a scholarly evangelical position on Scripture’s provenance, historicity and authority. At the conclusion of his studies,

---

123 LW, ¶45-6.
124 Wilson Memoirs: 11; LW, ¶56. He was at BTI in the years 1940-1. He felt BTI reinforced his attachments to scripture, evangelism, and spiritual disciplines.
125 LW, ¶76; Wilson Memoirs: 12, 16.
126 LW, ¶61-3. Two Anglican evangelicals he had been close to were Betteridge and Goodall.
127 Ibid., ¶99.
128 1948-51. He was based in Dunedin.
129 Ibid., ¶158.
130 Ibid., ¶135-6.
131 LW, ¶143.
132 Ibid., ¶141.
there had been a liberal attempt to block his call to his first parish, probably reflecting prejudice against him because of his Brethren and EU background.  

**Positive Evangelicalism**

Wilson blended in his person many of the key influences on evangelical Presbyterian ministers of his day, especially Crusaders, EU, the Theological Hall and the Westminster Fellowship. Wilson had moved away from his conservative Brethren background and had broadened in his churchmanship, but he remained a deeply committed evangelical, both in his view of Scripture and in doctrine. In outlook he was moderate and scholarly. His evangelicalism was centred on evangelical conversion and experience, “a conviction of the transforming power of the Gospel”, as with many other evangelicals in Crusader or SU circles, Wilson’s evangelicalism was essentially a positive matter of conversionism rather than of doctrine; he held to those doctrines, but they were not his key focus. He strongly rejected a fundamentalist position or identity and evangelical “extremes.”

Wilson held most of his evangelical theology in common with his conservative evangelical colleagues, but at certain points was less conservative than some. While holding to the Bible’s “final authority in matters of faith and life”, he believed it not necessarily inerrant in historical and narrative details. While “emphatically” believing in divine creation, he was open to theistic evolution. He accepted being

---

133 Ibid., ¶96. The parish was Rangiora, in the Presbytery of Christchurch. Those opposed to him, Wilson asserted, “put two and two together and made about ten.”
134 Ibid., ¶44. He had, for instance, moved away from any millennialist position: LW, ¶265-71.
135 Ibid., ¶102, 110.
136 Ibid., ¶121-2, 127.
137 Ibid., ¶101, 121.
138 Ibid., ¶246.
139 Ibid., ¶248-250.
called a "conservative evangelical"140 but tried to hold his evangelicalism positively rather than as a "slogan"141 or party label.

**Wilson and the Westminster Fellowship**

Involved in the discussions leading to the WF’s founding,142 Wilson was a member of the WF Executive. Unlike Miller (though like Kirkby) Wilson was ambivalent about aspects of the *Westminster Confession*,143 and felt the church could not “be dressed for ever in 17th Century waistcoats”.144 Wilson also represented a very different WF flavour to that of Arthur Gunn: Wilson was uncomfortable with Gunn’s narrower and more legalistic views and his polemical style.145 He considered Gunn “fundamentalist” in tone.146 Also, while Wilson voted against all the specific proposals for church union, he was unconvinced that being evangelical required opposition to church union in principle; a younger evangelical recalled him quietly asking “who do we owe the greatest debt to, the [UK] evangelical Anglicans, or the evangelical Presbyterians?”147

**Wilson and the Wider Church**

Wilson was one of the few leading evangelicals who was respected across the denomination.148 People of other theological positions appreciated his “gracious,  

---

140 Ibid., ¶112-3.  
141 Ibid., ¶102. Wilson’s comments have been used with care, and there is no evidence that he held different views at the time, but it is probable that his perceptions grew clearer in the light of late twentieth century concerns about fundamentalism.  
142 Ibid., ¶366, 368-370.  
143 Ibid., ¶366. Such aspects included the double decree.  
144 Ibid.  
145 Ibid., ¶123.  
146 Ibid., ¶429.  
147 JRB, ¶99. For Wilson’s views on church union, LW, ¶284-293.  
148 Note, for instance, tributes to Wilson posted on a Presbyterian e-mail discussion list: Ken Irwin to “NZPres@GodZone.net.nz”, 25 April 2001; Laurie Hampton to “NZPres@GodZone.net.nz”, 25 April 2001; Robin Lane to “NZPres@GodZone.net.nz”, 25 April 2001. Note also tributes from some known as evangelicals: Jack Foster to “NZPres@GodZone.net.nz”, 24 April 2001; Barry Doig to “NZPres@GodZone.net.nz”, 24 April 2001; Rhys Pearson to “NZPres@GodZone.net.nz”, 24 April 2001.
thoughtful...  irenic spirit”, “clear intelligence and strong integrity” \(^{149}\) and his commitment to unity.\(^{150}\) Someone who had moved away from the evangelical stream eulogised Wilson as...

Unquestionably ...one of NZ’s outstanding biblical scholars of his generation. His scholarship was driven by his love of the Scriptures but also by his determination that the Evangelical ‘position’ would be as disciplined, as academic and as robust as the prevailing Liberal “positions” of the day... There was a substance in his careful and caring scrutiny of Scripture that was enthralling as well as infectious.\(^ {151}\)

Ironically, although himself irenic and profoundly committed to the unity of the church, Wilson felt that ecclesiastical isolation was the prevailing experience of Presbyterian evangelicals of his day. Except in South Auckland, Wilson had a sense that as an evangelical “[you] were on your own”.\(^ {152}\) Although on various national church committees, representing “the conservative view”,\(^ {153}\) Wilson was never a convener; as an evangelical in a period when liberals were ascendant his abilities were may have been under-utilised by the national church.\(^ {154}\) Wilson felt he was always “marked down” because of his association with WF.\(^ {155}\)

Wilson left Papakura East in 1964 to pursue PhD study in London.\(^ {156}\) He was replaced by J.N.A. Smith, an ex-EU man and WF stalwart.

\(^{149}\) Lane, ibid.
\(^{150}\) Irwin, ibid.
\(^{151}\) Ibid.
\(^{152}\) LW, ¶95.
\(^{153}\) LW, ¶210.
\(^{154}\) Ken Irwin to “NZPres@GodZone.net.nz”, 25 April 2001: the PCNZ “was led by a group of fine Liberal leaders and somehow the ranks were never opened to one of Lewis’s huge capabilities. It was not by design..., rather by neglect”; L. Hampton to “NZPres@GodZone.net.nz”, 25 April 2001: “he had so much to offer. He appeared to be overlooked...”
\(^{155}\) Wilson Memoirs: 21-3. He also noted that the lists of nominations for Assembly committees were on at least one occasion already prepared, by some unknown group, before the Committee on Standing Committees had met.
\(^{156}\) Wilson Memoirs: 24. He studied Puritan catechising under G.F. Nuttall at New College, London. Funding mainly came from an Irish donor, through the WF. Because of ill health Wilson did not
The South Auckland Ministry of John Brinsley

From 1961 to 1967, John Brinsley was the first minister of the new parish of Manurewa South-Takanini.\(^{157}\) The new parish was firmly evangelical in outlook and identity. The Session Clerk, Ian Thomson, was also Secretary of WF and had a strong emphasis on prayer and missionary work. When Brinsley arrived there 60 communicant members, about half of them converts of the Graham Crusade.\(^{158}\) Over the next few years the number of members doubled, the Sunday School numbered over 360, and there were twelve parishioners either in full-time Christian work or training for it.\(^{159}\) Such growth, as elsewhere, could be attributed to several factors coming together: a population boom, urbanization, the spiritually receptive mood of the late 1950s and early 1960s, the expansionist mood of the New Life Movement, evangelical emphases on conversion and consecration, and characteristic evangelical activism on the part of minister and key lay people. Like most Evangelicals of his time, Brinsley was committed to expository preaching. Most Sundays Brinsley took two morning services, an evening service, a CE, a BC, and a Communicants’ Class;\(^{160}\) during the week, there was much pastoral and evangelistic activity. In retrospect, Brinsley did not regard South Auckland at that time as in “revival”; but he acknowledged that it was a period when “conversions came more readily”, and there was often a “ready response” to “direct simple presentations of the Gospel.”\(^{161}\)

---

\(^{157}\) The Manurewa South church had been established as a daughter congregation by St. Andrew’s Manurewa during the ministry of Sefton Campbell, Gunn’s predecessor. The Takanini church had been established as a daughter congregation by First Church Papakura during the ministry of Graham Miller. The two churches later formed two separate parishes, the former becoming St. Paul’s.

\(^{158}\) JRB, ¶29.


\(^{160}\) JRB, ¶30.

\(^{161}\) JRB, ¶43.
Beyond the parish, Brinsley did numerous missions in other parishes, both New Life missions and those arranged through WF contacts. He spoke frequently at BC and Crusader camps.162

John Brinsley’s Evangelical Formation

Brinsley – from a nominally Presbyterian family in Dunedin – had been taken to the Open Brethren by neighbours and had a conversion experience in a Fletcher mission.163 As a pupil at Waitaki Boys’ High he was recruited by Lewis Wilson for a Crusader Camp.164 The key influence on Brinsley as an evangelical was EU.165 In the same period (1953-60) he exhibited the sort of inter-denominationalism that was common among evangelicals: on Saturday nights he attended the CE at St. Stephen’s Presbyterian; on Sundays he attended the local Presbyterian church in the morning, a Brethren BC in the afternoon, and St. Matthew’s Anglican in the evening.166 Brinsley’s time at the Theological Hall (1958-60) had been positive, and he felt his evangelical convictions were strengthened. He had not found the staff overtly liberal.167 Such a constructive experience of theological training perhaps combined with his affable disposition to shape Brinsley as a less defensive type of Presbyterian evangelical; he did not share the sharp sense of embattlement that some evangelicals felt.

John Brinsley’s Theological Identity

Brinsley was aware that liberals categorised him as “conservative”.168 But the theological label he owned was “evangelical”.169 He freely used that of himself – but mainly among other ministers rather than in the parish. Unaware of the term “liberal

---

162 JRB, ¶88, ¶87, ¶31.
163 JRB, ¶1-2. The Fletcher mission was in 1941, at Hanover St. Baptist.
164 JRB, ¶5. Brinsley and others had then started a Crusader work at that school.
165 JRB, ¶9.
166 JRB, ¶10-13. He attended St. Matthew’s to hear the preaching of Gregory and Betteridge.
167 JRB, ¶17, 166.
168 JRB, ¶54.
169 JRB, ¶52.
evangelical” being used in New Zealand, Brinsley did not differentiate himself as a “conservative evangelical”: “you were either evangelical or liberal” and “that was the only evangelicalism we knew”. Brinsley did not call himself “fundamentalist”; he saw that as an American term, synonymous with “evangelical” and “in its most favourable sense referring to the fundamentals of the faith”. Nevertheless, Brinsley was also familiar with the negative use of the term “fundy” in relation to conservative Christians with a very narrow social-moral code.

Brinsley and the WF
Brinsley respected the Westminster Confession, and thought Chapter One (on Scripture) “absolutely magnificent”. But Brinsley’s interest in the WF itself was not primarily doctrinal. He felt the most significant benefit of the WF was how it stimulated and encouraged those who were passionate about evangelism and overseas mission; it went further in such matters than did the national church. Such an outlook identified Brinsley as one of those within the WF who were more focused on evangelistic activism than on reformed doctrine. Also, while Brinsley accepted the WF party position on church union, he was more open in principle than many of his older evangelical colleagues; like many evangelicals, Brinsley had enjoyed rich fellowship across the denominations, and his enthusiastic admiration for evangelical Anglicans (especially in the UK) more than counterbalanced his distaste for “Anglo-Catholicism”.

170 JRB, ¶54, 56.
171 JRB, ¶56. Brinsley was aware of Packer’s book ‘Fundamentalism’ and the Word of God; Packer’s approach may have reinforced among some evangelicals in the late 1950s a fairly positive view of the term “fundamentalist”, especially if they were not strongly aware of the efforts of American “neo-evangelicals” and some British evangelicals to distance themselves from the more negative connotations of fundamentalism.
172 JRB, ¶117-8.
173 JRB, ¶122.
174 Others of that outlook included Lewis Wilson and Steve Clark, both with a strong background in Scripture Union and Crusaders.
175 JRB, ¶98, ¶99, ¶123, ¶126. Brinsley was a member of the Church Union Committee.
176 JRB, ¶100-101. In New Zealand, Brinsley had been very impressed by Maurice Betteridge.
177 JRB, ¶102.
Other South Auckland Evangelicals

The centre of Presbyterian evangelicalism in South Auckland was the nexus of ministries that had developed around Miller, Kirkby and Gunn – in Papakura, Pukekohe and Manurewa, and in new congregations they had fostered. In the more rural areas of South Auckland, other evangelicals were in ministry and were influenced by the increasingly evangelical atmosphere in the Presbytery. In Te Kauwhata, a dynamic ministry (1960-5) was conducted by Tom Woods. In 1960, average attendances were recorded of 382, a remarkable figure for a small town. In 1963 P.W. (Peter) Warner, another Evangelical, became his associate minister. In Tuakau there was Rex Lange, called there on the initiative of Graham Miller. Lange’s energetic ministry (1957-62) was characterised by strong preaching, young adult Bible Classes, home Bible study and prayer groups, the Billy Graham Crusade (with twenty-four new church members resulting), a parish mission by Sam Green (mayor of Dargaville and a popular missioner across New Zealand), a stewardship campaign, a major building project and considerable parish growth. With a background in farming and home missionary work, in the BC movement and the Hall but not in EU, Lange’s evangelicalism was conversionist and activist but not heavily doctrinal, and he had some wariness of evangelical narrowness. When he left Tuakau, he was succeeded by A.C. (Cliff) Webster, who became very active in the WF. Other evangelical ministers in the Presbytery included A.H. Lowden (Drury),

---

178 Woods had entered the ministry from St. James’ Pukekohe, in the time of Kirkby.
179 Proceedings, 1960: 275a. In the same year there were 173 in the Sunday School and 99 in the BC. In 1962 and 1965, the comparable average attendance figures were 277 and 200, Proceedings 1962: 294a; 1965: 320a.
180 Warner left in 1966 to serve with OMF in Malaysia.
181 Rex. W. Lange, “From Plough to Pulpit” (unpublished typescript, 1995): 73. The parish was already evangelical in spirit: it had a strong men’s prayer meeting and previous ministers included Ian Grant and Geordie Yule (locum).
183 BTD, ¶9; “From Plough to Pulpit”: 72, 50-3.
By 1965, in contrast to most Presbyteries, a strong majority of ministers in South Auckland were associated with the WF.

H Presbyterian Evangelical Ministries Elsewhere

Auckland

In Auckland Presbytery, in 1960, there were a number of evangelical ministers, most of them quite irenic in their evangelicalism: E.C. Walsh at St. Helier’s (1951-64), J.T. Gunn at Titirangi (1953-66), Ian Grant at Orakei (1955-61), Douglas W. Watt at Mt. Eden (1953-67), A. (Bert) Tweedie at Birkenhead (1958-67), G.P. (Gwilym) Jones at Mangere (1958-61), and S.T. Nicholls at Avondale (1955-62). In the same year Rob Kirkby left Warkworth and Morrison Yule arrived at Ponsonby. In the early sixties the number of evangelicals swelled, with such new arrivals in 1961 as D.F. Sage (Mangere East), John Graham (Glen Eden) and W. Temple (Kohimarama), followed by R.J. Blaikie (St. Helier’s, 1962), Rex Lange (Forrest Hill, 1963), Challis Wilson (Orewa, 1963), E.L. Kirkby (Helensville, 1964), R.L. Poolman (Owairaka, 1964) and T.C. (Tom) Wilson (Kumeu, 1964). In 1965 Tom Woods began at Trinity (Glendowie), R.F. Kenward at St. Helier’s and A.D. (Arch) Davie at Glenfield. Some of these new arrivals (such as Temple and Blaikie) were moderate evangelicals from overseas who stood aloof from the WF, but some (such as Yule, Kirkby and Sage) were evangelicals

---

184 Watt had come to New Zealand from Scotland in 1949, and his ministry at Mt. Eden began a succession of evangelical ministries in that parish. Watt was never closely identified with the WF, but a clear indication of his evangelical sympathies is that he was invited to give the biblical exposition at the WF’s AGM in 1965: Minutes of the WF Executive, 3 Sept. 1965.

185 GMY, ¶308.

186 Ibid.; Proceedings, 1960-6; Ministers’ Register, PCANZ Archives.

187 Blaikie (1923-75) went to Mangere in 1964 and to Greyfriars (Mt. Eden) in 1971. He later became a key figure in the Geering controversy, but distanced himself from the WF. See also Proceedings, 1975: 79-80.

188 See Marilyn Lewis, Forrest Hill Presbyterian: 40 Years of Memories (Auckland: Forrest Hill Presbyterian Church, 2002).

who had come up through EU and who were active in the leadership of WF. Many of
the parishes would develop an evangelical identity and succession.

Of the four main cities, Auckland by 1965 had by far the largest minority of
evangelical ministers. That may have reflected the historic underlying strength in
Auckland of inter-denominational evangelicalism and the evangelical sympathies of
many laity: Auckland had been the city of Kemp, Fletcher, Laidlaw and Blaiklock,
and of BTI and the Baptist Tabernacle. 1960s evangelical growth among
Presbyterians in Auckland also mainly occurred at the periphery, in Auckland’s
many new suburbs, where the mood of confident expansion may have been
especially favourable to an evangelical strain of Christianity. The proliferation of
evangelical ministers in Auckland was of concern to at least some liberals.190

Evangelical Presbyterinan Ministries in Wellington, Christchurch and
Dunedin

No similar concentration of evangelical ministers developed in any of the other three
main centres, where evangelical ministers tended to be more isolated. In Wellington,
Les Gosling was at Island Bay (1958-68).191 His parishioners included Arnold
Nordmeyer, leader of the Opposition.192 Gosling lacked WF colleagues in other
Wellington parishes.193 Unlike most other WF leaders, Gosling was appointed to
numerous PCNZ national committees, in part because he was in Wellington and in
part because of his strong commitment to evangelicals engaging with others and
working constructively to serve the whole church. Gosling was hotly opposed to

190 GYM, ¶274; JBM, ¶128. Both cited an alleged comment by the Presbytery Clerk, H.O. Bowman,
about how no more evangelical ministers should be allowed into the Presbytery.
191 See Gosling Papers relating to Island Bay, Presbyterian Archives 396/18.
192 1963-65.
193 R.D. Elley came in 1960, as a hospital chaplain, and did a mission in Gosling’s parish in 1961. Elley
thought there may have been two other ministers with evangelical sympathies: RDE, ¶143; neither of
those was active in the WF.
evangelicals being isolationalist or unco-operative. In 1967, Gosling’s fair-mindedness was recognised in his appointment as Editor of the *Outlook*.¹⁹⁴

In Christchurch, the number of WF-associated evangelicals was similarly low. Wynford Davies, a strong evangelical preacher and a protégé of Lloyd-Jones, arrived from Wales to become minister of New Brighton (1960-3).¹⁹⁵ His flavour of evangelicalism reflected earlier Welsh strains of Calvinistic revivalism and strong IVF influence. J.S. Scarlet joined the Christchurch Presbytery in 1962, A.S. Munro in 1963, and R.H. Wells in 1964. Munro’s evangelical ministry at Hornby became particularly influential. His vigorous biblically conservative preaching attracted disaffected Presbyterians from other Christchurch parishes and also people from other denominations.¹⁹⁶ For some years, he was Chairman of the Evangelical Alliance of New Zealand.¹⁹⁷

---

¹⁹⁴ Another obvious factor was that Gosling had a background as a journalist.
¹⁹⁵ Rev. Wynford Davies, interview, Sept. 2001 (hereafter WD), ¶78. Wynford Davies had also been strongly influenced by his father, I.B. Davies (who also had two ministries in New Zealand) and by Douglas Johnson of the IVF, ibid. ¶20-2. He had been influenced by the writings of Charles Hodge and Warfield, and later Packer (ibid., ¶25, 84). As an IVF man Davies rejected the identity of “fundamentalist”, which he saw as meaning “literalistic” (ibid., ¶77.) Davies was later minister at Wyndham (1963-7), Greyfriars (1967-70), St. Andrew’s Invercargill (1977-85) and Glendowie (1985-91). From 1970-77 he left the Presbyterian Church because of the Geering controversy and was minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church at Bucklands Beach (1970-77). Davies quickly became a speaker at various EU missions and houseparties (e.g. [OU]EU President’s Log, 7 April 1963), TSCF BF/69. Whereas in the UK Davies (and other Welsh evangelicals) had avoided the Keswick movement because of its “suspect” (unreformed) doctrine of sanctification, in New Zealand he found the Keswick-type conventions less clearly defined in theology, and spoke at several (WD, ¶80 ). Note numerous references to Davies in Geraint D. Fielder, “Excuse me, Mr Davies – Hallelujah!” *Evangelical Student Witness in Wales, 1923-1983* (Leicester: IVP, 1983): e.g. 89, 90-1, 120-22, 149-51, 154-6, 158, 174, 189. For many New Zealanders, Davies was also respected because he had represented Wales in rugby.
¹⁹⁷ The Evangelical Alliance of New Zealand, inspired by the British movement, was constituted (1966) after the period addressed by this thesis. It primarily grew out of a Christchurch initiative. Other key leaders were Anglicans J.E. Davies and Harry Thomson. The other constituent bodies were the Evangelical Alliance (Auckland) and the Evangelical Fellowship of Otago. Other regions were invited to form alliances and join. The objects stated in the constitution included “to provide a consultative and advisory service” to district alliances, to convene conferences, “to testify to the unity of the holy universal church to which all true believers belong”, to provide intelligence and guidance on desirable
In Dunedin, there was a small group of evangelical ministers: Rod McKenzie was at St. Stephen's (1958-1977), Hessel Troughton (a BTI graduate and former missionary in Japan) at Ravensbourne (1949-67), Jack Smith at Kaikorai (1955-65) and Challis Wilson in the new suburb of Waikari (1956-63). J.A. Mitchell was in the rural hinterland at Strath-Taieri (1956-62).

Evangelical Presbyterian Ministries in Provincial New Zealand

Some provincial regions had a number of evangelical ministers, while many had few or none. In Hamilton's Knox Church, Rowland Harries had a lively Bible preaching ministry (1958-68) with a strong conversionist emphasis. In the year following the Graham Crusade (relayed by landline to Te Rapa racecourse), Harries felt his congregation doubled: "There was a sensitivity to things spiritual right through the community at that time". Another evangelical minister in Hamilton was Harries'

---

"evangelical action through the Churches and elsewhere", to arrange tours of teachers and evangelists from inside and beyond NZ, to initiate new district alliances, to convene Pastors' Conferences, to encourage agencies involved in telephone and mail counselling and Bible correspondence courses, to encourage the Evangelical Missionary Alliance, to operate student hostels, to "maintain a watching brief" over the ecumenical movement, Protestant-Roman Catholic relationships, Cults and "Public Issues as they affect evangelicals". Constitution, EANZ, Sept. 1966, TSCF N1/11

18 McKenzie: 78-87. By this time, St. Stephen's was declining. It had lost much of its population base. But McKenzie and his wife were appreciated by students for their friendship and hospitality: SR, ¶10. Evangelical divinity students at St. Stephen's at that time (and serving as elders) included Kenneth Calvert, Neal Whimp, Ralph Penno, Ernest Task, and Max Garrity.

19 During the war, Troughton had been Chaplain at Featherston Prisoner of War Camp working among Japanese prisoners. He helped quell a riot and some prisoners converted to Christianity. See: Michiharu Shinyu, Beyond Death and Dishonour: One Japanese at War in New Zealand (Auckland: Castle Publishing, 2001); Proceedings, 1986: 152-3.

20 E.R. (Rowland) Harries (1911-2004) was the son of E.R. (Evan) Harries (1872-1953), a leading evangelical Presbyterian minister in the 1920s and early 1930s (see Chapter One). In addition to family influences, the younger Harries had been shaped by Crusaders, BTI and missionary service in the Sudan (1936-1950).

21 He summarised an "evangelical" as someone "loyal to the Word of God and faithful to the Gospel", ERH, ¶51, and also as denoting "submission to the authority of Scripture and openness to its truth and to the leading of the Holy Spirit; belief in the inspiration and authority of Holy Scripture; belief in personal conversion as the key to a changed life": ERH, ¶44-46.

22 ERH, ¶124. The statistics point to significant growth but not quite a doubling: from 1958 to 1960, weekly attendance went from 375 to 500, and membership from 220 to 426; there were 36 professions of faith in 1959. Proceedings, 1958, 282a; 1959, 261a; 1960, 277a.
brother-in-law Stephen Clark at Melville (1959-67). Clark had been shaped by Scripture Union, CSSM and the Crusader movement, and was greatly influenced by Laird, although clearly evangelical in theology, his emphasis was evangelistic and devotional rather than closely doctrinal, and he was eager to maintain a positive tone. Both he and Harries had come into the ordained Presbyterian ministry after previous inter-denominational evangelistic ministries, and were less influenced by IVF than some. Both were also BTI graduates. Another Hamilton evangelical minister (though not a WF member) was I.D. (Ian) MacGregor at Frankton (1957-67).

In the Bay of Plenty, there was a smattering of evangelical ministers, including A.C. Webster at Murupara (1957-63), F.A. Hume at Opotiki (1956-65), M.G. Milmine at Rangitaiki (1957-64), W.J. Milligan at Whakatane (1954-66), G.A. McKenzie at Matata (1963-7), and E.L. Kirkby (1954-64) followed by A.J. (Bert) Orange at Katikati.

In Wanganui East (1955-60), and later in Wellington, there was Don Elley, who had firmed up in his evangelicalism through such influences as EU, Graham Miller (who introduced him to the Keswick movement), Edwin Orr (who spent ten days in Wanganui during his 1956 tour of New Zealand) and the Graham Crusade. Elley...
developed a ministry as an evangelist, frequently speaking at parish missions, and at some twelve BC Easter Camps;210 he was also a speaker at Ngāruawahia Convention, Keswick, and at university missions.211 From 1962-4 Wanganui briefly had an evangelical firebrand and WF activist in the ministry of I.B. (Ivor) Davies from Wales.212

In the South Island, outside the three southern Presbyteries, evangelical ministries were rare, and a conventional and middle-of-the-road Presbyterianism appears to have prevailed. In Blenheim, in the new Wairau parish (1958-66), Rob Miller was a very hard-working evangelical minister, with a robust and scholarly Bible preaching ministry. There was strong development in such areas as youth work, mid-week meetings, missionary support and new buildings. Also, influenced by his strong family background at Keswick-style Pounawea Conventions, Miller established the Mid New Zealand Convention at Renwick.213 In 1966, Miller accepted a call to Tasmania.214

Evangelical Presbyterian Ministries in the Deep South

Reflecting such factors as Free Church roots, late nineteenth-century revival, the influence of Andrew Johnston and, perhaps, rural conservatism, the three southernmost Presbyteries (Clutha, Mataura, Southland) had a relatively high proportion of evangelical ministers. These included S.C. (Cliff) Dunn at Owaka (1957-64).215 G.A.

---

210 Elley recalled in particular an Easter Camp at Stratford at which there were eighty-four “first-time decisions”: RDE¶, 74.
211 Ibid., ¶75-76.
212 I.B. Davies was the father of Wynford Davies. He later returned to New Zealand and was (locum) minister at Tuatapere.
213 Later, he established such a convention in Tasmania.
214 To St. Andrew’s, Launceston. Later, from 1978-81 he was Professor of Church History at the Theological College of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria.
215 Dunn (1909-2003) was from the Mataura Presbytery, had been a Home Missionary, and was ordained in 1952 at Sefton. He was founding Chairman of the Motukarara Keswick Convention, and strong supporter of the Pounawea Convention and of CE. After Owaka he was minister at Knapdale-
McKenzie at Lumsden (1957-63), Hugh Reid at Gore (1953-67), G.A. McLean at East Gore (1962-75), W.J. Wallace at Mataura (1949-69), J.D.S. Moore at Wyndham (1954-63), W.G.K. Moore at Limestone Plains (1951-67), R.N. (Roy) McKenzie at Otautau (1963-9), D.R. (Dallas) Clark at Merrivale-Waiau (1958-66) and N.R. (Norman) Sheat at Tuatapere (1956-65). These were all supportive of the WF. But even in the three southern Presbyteries, evangelical ministers in this period were not a majority, and many new ministers of other theological flavours often began their ministries in that region. Evangelicals suspected that the national church was attempting to break up the evangelical concentration in the rural south.

The Distribution and Strength of Presbyterian Evangelical Ministries

In general, Presbyterian evangelical ministers were still dispersed across the whole nation, lacking critical mass in most regions apart from those regions noted above. WF evangelicals also tended to be ministers in rural and suburban parishes, and in this period were almost never called to large and prestigious city churches.

Although spread fairly thinly and unevenly, by 1965 evangelical ministers had nevertheless established a significant presence across the Presbyterian Church in New Zealand. An indication of such growth is that, in 1965, the WF reported that about one hundred ministers were paid-up members, at a time when there were approximately 370 parish ministers in New Zealand.

---

216 Reid (b.1905) was from Scotland, and had studied at the BTI in Glasgow. He was received into the PCNZ in 1948.
217 Then at St. Andrew’s Invercargill, from 1963. At Wyndham, Moore was followed by W.A. Davies.
218 Liberals were “being shunted down there... to break up the evangelical thing. It was a deliberate move, you could see it”: WD, ¶106. It may also be, though, that the number of ministerial vacancies in the south exceeded the availability of new evangelical ministers.
219 A possible exception, in Invercargill, was Sefton Campbell at First Church (1960-66). But Campbell was a moderate evangelical and not obviously identified with the WF.
220 Year Book, 1965:3-24; in 1963, an Executive member claimed that 25% of the “total Ministerial membership” of the PCNZ were “within the WF”: [John Brinsley] to G.I. Williamson, 8 July 1963. The majority of the WF’s membership were lay people.
I  The Westminster Fellowship in the Late 1950s

From its base in Southland and then Dunedin, the WF self-consciously maintained the WF’s “evangelical testimony”.221 It held regional rallies, but only in the South Island.222 It made contact with many overseas evangelical organisations, editors and scholars.223 The WF had four publications, all re-prints: P.B. Fraser’s A Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith, Andrew Thomson’s A Sacramental Catechism (a communicant manual), E.J. Young’s Letters on Evolution and B.B. Warfield’s Christian Baptism. It also distributed tapes by E.J. Young on the Dead Sea Scrolls and pamphlets on “What is an Evangelical?”224 It sold various titles by reformed American theologian Loraine Boettner.225 It purchased mass copies of Packer’s Fundamentalism and The Word of God for distribution to Divinity students.226 It responded to an anti-Calvinist diatribe by E.M. Blaiklock in the Reaper.227

The Evangelical Presbyterian under Rob Miller as Editor

With Rob Miller as editor (1955-62), the bi-monthly Evangelical Presbyterian developed as a solid Presbyterian journal with a strong historical and confessional focus, and a print run by 1957 of 1,100 copies.228 The greatest number of articles was from Miller

221 8th Annual Report, 1958, WF Executive Minute Book.
224 Ibid.: 30 Sept. 1957. The pamphlet was from Evangelical Tracts and Publications, NSW.
225 Immortality; The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination; Studies in Theology..
227 Ibid.: 1 Feb. 1960. In a Reaper editorial, Blaiklock had listed four “hindrances to evangelistic effort” including “Calvinism, whose virus paralyses eagerness, zeal, and enterprise, and whose lamentable revival in the modern world goes back to Karl Barth”: Reaper XXXVII, 11 (1 Jan. 1960): 402-3 (403); the other hindrances he claimed were “prosperity”, “controversy” and “compromise”.
228 8th Annual Report, 1958, WF Executive Minute Book.
himself, and many others were from writers long since dead, particularly Warfield. Miller also reprinted pieces from Fraser’s *Biblical Recorder*. Only one or two New Zealanders contributed to most issues. The predominance of articles from overseas sources reflected the EP’s large number of exchange arrangements with other journals.

There were frequent articles on Presbyterian doctrine and distinctives, the Westminster standards, and some on evangelicalism. There were innumerable articles on historical figures: Calvin, heroes of the Scottish Reformation (Hamilton, Wishart, Knox), Jonathan Edwards, Scottish evangelical Andrew Thomson, missionary pioneers (e.g. Alexander Duff), the Princeton theologians (Hodge, Warfield, Machen) and Scottish Presbyterians generally. There were pieces on the

---

232 These included the *Bulwark* [Scottish Reformation Society], *Southern Presbyterian Journal* [USA], *Presbyterian Record* [Canada], *Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland*, *Irish Evangelical* [Belfast], *Blue Banner Faith and Life* [USA], *Evangelical Action* [Melbourne], *Presbyterian Guardian* [Philadelphia], *Evangelical Magazine* [London], from J.I. Packer, *Reformation Review* [Amsterdam], *Bible League Quarterly* [London], *Our Banner* [Sydney]. *EP IX*, 3 (May 1959): frontispiece; *EP IX*, 4 (July 1959).
Great Awakening, the Disruption, and the 1859 Revival, and almost an entire issue on the pioneer Free Church in New Zealand. Only one Anglican received attention (Ryle). Curiously, there were no articles on the Church Fathers (or anyone else pre-Calvin), and none on Puritans or Pietists.

There were numerous articles opposing church union, several Sabbatarian pieces and a few pieces (conservative but not extreme) on gambling, temperance and dancing. There was only one brief article on eschatology and a serialised feature on evolution (sceptical, but open to the earth being very old). There was warm commendation of the Keswick conventions, Billy Graham, and IVF; in a recommended booklist, eleven of the eighteen titles in the theology section were from IVF. Consistently, the magazine fully identified with evangelicalism, especially in its historic Scottish Free Church expression, but also in its Princetonian and British IVF forms. The sole mention of “fundamentalism” was that the term was “confusing.”


South Auckland Puts its Stamp on the WF

At the end of 1961 a highly significant change took place in the leadership of the Westminster Fellowship. The Executive was re-constituted in South Auckland, where there was a growing concentration of energetic younger evangelical Presbyterian ministers and staunch support from many evangelical elders. There was also the proximity of other evangelicals within Auckland itself. The new Chairman was Graham Miller, an evangelical of obvious stature. The new Editor of the *Evangelical Presbyterian* was Arthur Gunn, a man of prodigious energy and exceptional organisational skills. Other Executive members were Revs. Morrison Yule, Donald Kirkby, Rob Kirkby, Lewis Wilson, John Brinsley, David Sage, Mervyn Milmine and John Poon, and lay members Messrs. H.F. Thompson, G.I. Thomson, Norrie Fitzpatrick, M. Murphy, R. Clarke, R. Freeland, R.J. Wardlaw, S.S. Green and Mrs Winifred Lewis. It was a very capable team. Significantly, all the ministers on the Executive had previously been closely involved in EU and IVF; they included neither non-graduate evangelicals nor older evangelicals who had come up through the SCM only. The only woman on the Executive, Mrs W.B. Lewis (BA, BD), had a strong background in the British IVF.

With its Executive domiciled in South Auckland, the WF’s level of activity was set to increase to a remarkable new level. Rob Miller had worked very hard, but Arthur Gunn’s pace and productivity were frenetic. Gunn’s phenomenal productivity often

---

249 Poon, an Australian Chinese minister working among New Zealand Chinese people on behalf of the Presbyterian Church Overseas Missions Committee, was a possible exception. But he held a BA and BD and may well have had an IVF background.

250 Winifred Lewis (nee Jones) was originally from Wales and the widow of Rev. W. Leslie Lewis (1903-52). They had worked as missionaries for some years in India. She held a BD from the University of London and was strong in Greek. In Coggan’s history of the IVF, it was noted that Winnie B. Jones had been for five years “a mainstay” of the Cardiff Students’ Evangelical Union (Coggan: 151). She is referred to in Fielder: 37, 66, 69. In Auckland, Mrs Lewis was a high school Latin teacher. She wrote up her life in Winifred Betty Lewis, “I Remember, I Remember” (Auckland: unpublished book, 1996).
astounded his Executive colleagues. To them, he seemed at first like “a prophet from heaven”.

**A Reinvigorated *Evangelical Presbyterian***

Under the editorship of Gunn, from May 1962, the *EP* rapidly grew in circulation. By 1963, the *EP* was sixty-four pages long, bi-monthly, and 3,000 copies were being printed. By 1964, the print run was up to 6,000 (but that included many free promotional copies such as those sent to divinity students). By 1965, there were 3,500 paid subscriptions.

Gunn’s editorship meant definite shifts in focus and tone. Book reviews and serialised Bible Studies remained. There were two new extended series on prayer and missionary work. There were still weighty doctrinal articles, often by the ex-Editor, and the customary evangelical articles on the nature of Scripture. There were articles on expository preaching, evangelism, revival, Reformed worship, church music, the IVF, Keswick, BTI, new Bible translations.

---

251 “We would be amazed at what he would bring to the meetings, all this stuff ready to shoot out into the next issue”: JGM, ¶393. “He hand-wrote his articles and booklets and kept prodding the rest of us to work”: ¶351-3.
252 JGM, ¶351.
and Martyn Lloyd-Jones. There was one article on Calvin and his system. There was a brief, non-partisan article on the Second Coming, one on the Sabbath, but nothing on evolution.

Under Gunn, the flood of historical biographies suddenly ceased. So did all the contributions from those long deceased, such as Andrew Thomson and Warfield. Instead, the focus became strongly contemporary, and the tone became somewhat alarmist and indignant. There were frequent articles expressing anxiety about "a moral landslide of extreme danger": the sexualisation of the media, promiscuity among youth and liberal advocacy of "New Morality." Gunn and his sources depicted modernity as morally depraved and theological liberalism as complicit in

---

267 "NZBTI", EP XIV, 1 (Jan.1964): 425-7. The piece noted that there were thirty two Presbyterian students at BTI in that year.
273 Such an absence confirms the contention that evolution was not a preoccupation of New Zealand (and British) IVF-associated evangelicalism in this period. Any suggestion as to why discussion of evolution was not included in the EP by Gunn would be speculation only. It may be that for Gunn any acceptance of evolution was beyond the pale so not worth discussing, or that Gunn was simply preoccupied with other issues. While liberals (and some evangelicals) held to theistic evolution, liberals were not conspicuously promoting such an approach, and evangelicals and liberals alike rejected a secular, atheistic evolutionism, as evidenced in objections by J.D. Salmond to the 1947 "How Things Began" series being aired in schools: Ronald L. Numbers and John Stenhouse. "Antievolutionism in the Antipodes: From Protesting Evolution to Promoting Creationism in New Zealand", British Journal for the History of Science 33 (Sept. 2000): 335-50 (343-4).
that depravity. There were articles against universalism, neo-orthodoxy, theological double-talk, the theology of the NCC, and J.A.T. Robinson’s secular theology.

Gunn’s primary preoccupation was ecumenism, which he saw as the doorway to unspeakable calamity. Gunn’s outlook was obvious in his choice of articles and above all in his new multi-page feature “Window on the World”, intended to give news of “church trends throughout the world which are of particular concern to evangelicals”. Gunn saw the world-wide church as in an “extremely critical time”, a time of monumental crisis. In essence, he saw the Protestant church as perilously close to reversing the Reformation and capitulating to Rome. Gunn saw Roman Catholicism as cruel, sinister and benighted, the enemy of the Gospel and spiritual freedom. He seemed to fear Catholicism more than Communism. Hence Gunn selected innumerable news items and articles – several in every issue – showing Rome in a poor light. He also printed a quote from the Westminster Confession that the pope is “anti-Christ, that man of sin, son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ”.

---

279 The writer of the NCC booklet What is our Gospel? was L.G. Geering, Principal of the Presbyterian Theological Hall, who in 1965 began to promote publicly Robinson’s idea of a demythologised secular Christianity. A major controversy ensued, in the period beyond that of this study. The first mention in the EP of the brewing controversy was late in 1965: [Gunn], “Principal Geering’s ‘Outlook’ Article”, EP XV, 6 (Nov.-Dec.) 1965): 333.
281 Ibid.
What outraged Gunn most of all was that Protestantism – seriously weakened by theological liberalism – was being handed on a plate to Rome by the ecumenical movement. “All roads,” he wrote, “are now leading to Rome.”

The “one worldwide church” that the ecumenicals desire, he declared, was the church into which Luther was born, and it was because of that same church that “our forefathers dyed the Scottish heather red with their blood in defence of Presbyterianism.”

Gunn’s apprehension intensified further when, in 1965, the Anglicans joined the church union negotiations in New Zealand. Gunn claimed that, notwithstanding the negligible difference between evangelical Anglicans and Presbyterians, it was the Anglo-Catholics who were laying down the terms of church union, and those terms were calculated to ease re-union with Rome: “I have not the slightest doubt...that we will ...become Anglicans ... and that later on we will be asked to commit suicide as Protestants”.

One of the headings Gunn wrote summed up his perception: “THE LIBERAL PROTESTANT LANDSLIDE TOWARDS ROME – VIA ANGLICANISM”.

Gunn’s primary technique in the *EP* was to quote rather than comment. He scoured large numbers of liberal, ecumenical and Roman Catholic publications (including *Zealandia*) and relentlessly extracted quotations documenting the theological, spiritual and moral bankruptcy of the movements he feared. In successive issues Gunn printed snippets revealing wrongs he perceived about Catholics, such as

---
284 Arthur G. Gunn, “All roads are Now Leading to Rome”, *EP XII*, 4 (July 1962): 6-8. The article stated that liberals – who “don’t really believe” in Protestant truth – are happy to sell out to and rejoin Roman Catholicism. “It can be fairly stated”, Gunn claimed, that the WCC and the Ecumenical Movement is the “Reformation in reverse”.


287 Ibid. Gunn’s letter reiterated and explained what he said in debate at the 1964 Assembly. He claimed that Anglo-Catholics believed in baptismal regeneration, the confirmation of children, the confessional, prayers for the dead and the sacrifice of the Mass. Gunn wrote that he preferred “our eldership, our simple services, our lovely Communion, our ‘free’ prayer, our parity of the ministry, our Westminster Confession”.

persecution of Protestants, policy about Catholic-Protestant inter-marriage, the Catholic Enquiry Centre, Catholic support for lotteries, parishioners reading *Zealandia* during the mass, Mariolatry, transubstantiation, the wealth of the Vatican, and high rates of illiteracy in Catholic countries. He also documented the failings of ecumenism, such as the decline of the SCM, liberal curricula, left-wing political sympathies in the WCC, the problems of the United Church in Canada (and the vigour of Canadian Presbyterianism), the heterodox statements of leading liberals (for example, Lord Soper and Bishop Pike), and the desire of some ecumenists ultimately to fuse all world religions. In every issue, there were longer articles, most of them reasoned and moderate in themselves, critical of Roman Catholicism and Ecumenism. Gunn's few personal comments tended to be somewhat acidic. The overall effect was to create the impression that the Protestant church was in dire trouble.

In varying degrees, Gunn’s colleagues on the WF Executive shared some of his apprehensions. But none of them held or articulated Gunn’s scenario of impending doom with quite the same clarity, intensity or pugnacity. Wherever they could, his colleagues sought to tone him down. Whenever they themselves wrote for the *EP*, especially in the occasional editorial, they appeared to write with what may have

---


been a deliberately more peaceable and constructive tone.293 Whenever they compiled "Window on the World" they featured positive news (for example, items about Billy Graham, IVF, Crusaders, the persistence of Christianity in the USSR and China, and overseas missions).294

The WF's Publishing Breakthrough

Alongside his work on the EP, Gunn drove an ambitious programme of publications, mostly small booklets written by WF members. In 1964, for instance, ten titles were published.295 The WF programme of publications was unparalleled among other New Zealand evangelical movements, and reflected more than just the extraordinary vision and energies of Gunn. It expressed the heady reformist zeal and confidence of a movement that saw itself as bringing spiritual and doctrinal renewal to a whole denomination. The WF was a deliberate attempt to re-educate the church.296 The WF leaders saw their movement as akin to the Scottish Evangelicals who worked together with Andrew Thomson in the 1820s to reform the Church of Scotland from Moderatism to evangelicalism; by negative analogy, they were also inspired by the effect of the Jesuits297 and the Tractarians.298 As reformists, the WF leaders saw the flood of WF publications as a "brilliant break-through" significantly increasing the WF's impact.299

---

296 JGM, ¶340.
298 R.S. Miller, “Recalling the First Meeting”, EP X, 6 (Nov. 1960): 3-4. Miller claimed that as a result evangelicals “constituted once more the majority party in the General Assembly. It happened there in the 1820s; it could happen here in the 1960s.”
299 JGM, ¶343.
Some of the WF publications, such as Gunn’s *Visitation Evangelism* and *Elders’ Roll Book and Handbook*, were related to parish-based evangelism, a forte of the WF evangelicals in South Auckland. Such titles may have reflected, in part, the influence of similar overseas campaigns of visitation evangelism such as the “Tell Scotland” programme (with which Gunn would have been directly familiar). An important tool for church growth was the WF communicants’ manual *Christ our Life*, which was also adopted by the PCNZ. Some WF titles were evangelistic, such as *I Want to know God* (Elley) and *After Death What?* (J.G. Miller). Some were pastoral: *How Can I Overcome Temptation?* (Milmine) and *What Shall Be My Work?* (W.M. Ryburn).

Some WF publications were of booklets of about 50 pages. These included doctrinal and didactic works such as the symposium by five authors, *Authority of the Bible*, or R.S. Miller’s *Our Presbyterian Faith*, and his notable scholarly appeal for

---


302 Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, *Christ our Life: A Communicant’s Manual* (Christchurch: Presbyterian Bookroom, 1963). Written by several WF members in South Auckland as a WF publication, it was offered to the PCNZ and was published by the Presbyterian Bookroom but also promoted and sold by the WF: Minutes of the WF Executive 5 April 1963. It ruffled the WF Executive when the relevant PCNZ committee decided not to acknowledge the authors’ names when publishing the book: Minutes of the WF Executive, 2 Nov. 1962; the PCNZ body may have felt that such names as Gunn and Miller would work against the book’s wider acceptance and use. The other authors were D.A. Kirkby, J. Brinsley and J.L. Wilson.


305 A.G. Gunn (ed.), *The Authority of the Bible* (Manurewa: Westminster Fellowship, 1965). The contributors were J. Lewis Wilson, A.C. Webster, William Still, Herrmann Sasse and James I. Packer.

sabbatarianism, *His Day or Ours?* Also of some substance were the popular glossy-covered Bible study booklets for personal or group use such as *Nehemiah* (R.W. Kirkby), *Jonah* (J.G. Miller), *Romans* (D.A. Kirkby), *Ephesians* (Gunn), *Colossians* (J.G. Miller) and *1 John* (W.B. Lewis). In addition, the WF produced a solid and wide-ranging *Book List*. Based on the library of Donald Kirkby, it listed some 400 titles, not all of them from evangelical sources.

The booklet *Evangelicals and the Ecumenical Movement* (J.G. Miller and Gunn) addressed the church union issue. So did briefer works such as *Statement on the Draft Basis of Faith* (1962), *Ten Reasons Against the Present Church Union Proposals* (1965), and *Why we say “No” to an Act of Commitment* (1965). A 1964 pamphlet, *What is The Westminster Fellowship?* (J.G. Miller), was mild and reassuring in tone and obviously intended to allay suspicion. A more polemical offering was the WF’s attack on universalism, *Is Hell Empty After All?* (Webster and Taylor). Other titles were ethical, such as Gunn’s *Sex and the Christian*, or Webster’s tract against alcohol. But among the flurry of publications coming from

---

308 The titles as listed were published in the years 1963-65. Others in the series were published later, e.g. R.S. Miller, *Hebrews*. All had initially been serialised in the *EP*.
315 A.C. Webster, *It’s a Trap* (Manurewa: Westminster Fellowship, n.d.).
the WF in the early 1960s, there was nothing on evolution or eschatology: neither subject was a preoccupation among WF evangelicals.316

Almost all of the WF’s writers were indigenous to New Zealand, but the WF did publish a small amount of material from overseas sources, e.g. *The Roman Catholic Church* (Lloyd-Jones),317 *Dancing and the Christian* (Dwight Small),318 and A.F. Olsen’s *It’s a Scandal*.319 Some in the Executive felt that the latter two pamphlets, sourced from America and published by Gunn without authorisation from the Executive, were “harmful” to the WF, presumably because they were too narrow and vociferous and were from a different cultural and ecclesiastical context.320

Many of the WF publications were little more than tracts, usually re-prints of EP articles. Initial print runs of most titles ran to several thousand. Sales were vigorous, and many titles were re-printed.321 By the mid-sixties, the WF reported sales of 50,000 publications per year.322

316 In 1958, evidently at the instigation of R.S. Miller, the WF Executive had agreed to the printing of a pamphlet by E.J. Young, *Letters on Evolution*, previously published by the Committee on Christian Education of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in USA, WF Executive Minutes, Oct. 1958. This pamphlet was not promoted by the WF Executive once it was domiciled in South Auckland.
320 JGM, ¶749. Also ¶410: “it [the conservative religious scene in America] wasn’t our environment at all”). Olsen’s style was vigorously denunciatory, and would not have appealed to Miller. Olsen appeared to identify his stance as “fundamentalist”. The Executive may also have felt uncomfortable with Gunn’s suggestion in the *EP* that the leaflet was “Ideal for distribution at church union meetings”: “The WF...List of publications just released,” *EP XV*, 6 (Nov.-Dec. 1965): page following 352.
321 E.g. there was a 6,000 re-print of *After Death What?* Minutes of the WF Executive, 2 Oct. 1964.
The Further Development of the WF

In the early 60s, the WF was clearly in an expansionist, missionary mood. An office and secretary were arranged to handle dispatch.\textsuperscript{323} Eleven area committees were established.\textsuperscript{324} Annual “Rallies” were held in various cities and regional centres, featured exposition, prayer, and information about WF.\textsuperscript{325} In 1965, Gunn made a nationwide whirlwind tour (“Tell the Church”), addressing WF rallies in sixteen different centres over a period of nine days.\textsuperscript{326} AGMs, which always included both biblical exposition and an address called “Blueprint for the Future,” attracted up to 300 members.\textsuperscript{327} In 1964, the WF held its first national conference, on the theme of “Renewal of the Church”, with 300 present.\textsuperscript{328} This conference, with its unity and confidence, arguably represented the peak of the WF’s influence.\textsuperscript{329}

The WF seemed to be expanding on every front. A dramatic development occurred in 1964 when WF stalwart and Executive member N.C. (Norrie) Fitzpatrick and his wife decided to gift to WF their home and forty acres of farmland at Karaka.\textsuperscript{330} The WF began to dream of an evangelical conference and study centre, dedicated to the “renewal and revival” of the PCNZ; Donald Kirkby compared its potential to that of St. Ninian’s in Crieff or Calvin’s Academy in Geneva.\textsuperscript{331}

\textsuperscript{323} Minutes of the WF Executive, 4 Sept. 1964.
\textsuperscript{324} WF 15\textsuperscript{th} Annual Report, 14 Nov. 1966. Most were not successful. Gosling commented: “Most of them did not see the need to reply to letters” and “only in Otago and Southland did regional committees endure with a fitful existence” (Gosling, 15).
\textsuperscript{325} E.g. in 1962, Auckland, Pukekohe, Dargaville, Wellington and Dunedin: WF 13\textsuperscript{th} Annual Report, 26 Nov. 1962.
\textsuperscript{326} Minutes of the WF Executive, 2 July 1965.
\textsuperscript{327} E.g. Minutes of the WF AGM, 26 Nov. 1962; Minutes of the WF Executive, 3 Dec. 1965.
\textsuperscript{328} “Report of the First Westminster Conference, Massey University – August 1964.”
\textsuperscript{329} JGM, ¶385.
\textsuperscript{330} Minutes of the WF Executive, 2 Oct. 1964.
\textsuperscript{331} Minutes of a Special Meeting of the WF Executive, 16 Oct. 1964. In 1965, the Glenfield Bethel Trust was established: Minutes of the WF Special Meeting, 30 Aug. 1965.
The WF’s International Connections

Evangelicalism was characteristically internationalist in spirit, and the WF’s focus was always wider than New Zealand. The WF continued to have considerable contact with overseas evangelicalism through exchanges of journals, through publications of such organisations as IVF and the NAE, through new periodicals such as Christianity Today, through kindred organisations (e.g. Protestant Reformation Society, Scottish Reformation Society, Northern Ireland Evangelical Group), through its sympathies with certain churches (e.g. Free Church of Scotland, Presbyterian Church of Canada, Southern Presbyterian), through individuals (e.g. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Hermann Sasse, Klaas Runia), and through its designated overseas agents (e.g. J.D. Douglas in the UK).

A somewhat unexpected factor was the WF’s influence on conservative evangelical Presbyterians in Australia. Graham Miller, Gunn and Kirkby spoke on Keswick platforms in Australia and raised the profile of the WF. Rob Miller and Gosling preached from the pulpit of Robert Swanton, the leader of a resurgent reformed Presbyterianism in Victoria. The WF had official “Representatives” in five States, with their names listed on the EP’s inside cover. By 1964 there were 603 Australian subscribers to the EP, WF publications were selling well in Australia’s Presbyterian

332 As detailed above.
333 Mrs W.B. Lewis had known Lloyd-Jones in Wales, as had Wynford Davies. Graham Miller made contact with him when he was in the UK; Lloyd-Jones told Miller he “read every word” of the EP (ADMNH: 27). Sasse, formerly Professor of Church History at the University of Erlangen and active in the “Confessing Church”, was on the Faculty at Immanuel Theological College in Adelaide. Runia was a Professor at the Reformed College at Geelong, Australia. In relation to its campaign against Church Union, the WF also corresponded with T.F. Torrance and Karl Barth. Torrance made comments which Graham Miller used in the 1962 Assembly debate, but Barth wrote back that he was “too busy” to assist: Minutes of the WF Executive, 7 Sept. 1962.
334 “Victorian Newsletter,” EP XI, 1 (Jan. 1961): 13-15. Swanton, minister of Hawthorne Presbyterian Church (1940-68) had studied under Barth and founded the Reformed Theological Review (1942-). He was a key leader in the reviving of Calvinist theology in Australia, which was both a reaction against aspects of Barth and against the “subjective pietism” of evangelicalism as found in revivalism and second-blessing theology (Piggin:135); also Brian Bayston, “Swanton, Robert”, in Dickey (ed.): 361-2.
bookshops, and a sample EP was sent to every minister in Queensland.\textsuperscript{336} WF rallies were held in numerous Australian centres: in 1964, for instance, Gunn addressed rallies in Brisbane, Toowoomba, Sydney and Melbourne; he reported considerable interest in the establishment of similar fellowships.\textsuperscript{337} There was already such a fellowship in Queensland, and more were founded in New South Wales and Tasmania.\textsuperscript{338} Prior to his own departure to Australia, Graham Miller told the WF that “the spiritual destiny of our two countries lies together” and proposed to the WF its AGM that the WF be renamed “The Westminster Fellowship of Evangelical Presbyterians in Australia and New Zealand”.\textsuperscript{339} The proposal was not accepted in New Zealand, but it was indicative of how strong the Australian connection had become.\textsuperscript{340}

Another major overseas focus of the WF was its involvement in the work of the Far East Broadcasting Company, an evangelical radio station broadcasting into Asia and the Pacific from Manila. Several members of the WF Executive (including Gunn, Miller, Fitzpatrick and Brinsley) were enthusiastic supporters of the FEBC.\textsuperscript{341} The WF became responsible for weekly biblical expositions, with the tapes cut in South Auckland.\textsuperscript{342} The broadcasts could also be heard in New Zealand on short-wave radio.

\textsuperscript{337} Minutes of the WF Executive, 28 Feb. 1964; 2 Oct. 1964.
\textsuperscript{338} WF 15th Annual Report, 30 Sept. 1964. Those and similar meetings, the links with the Westminster Society, and the subsequent role in Australia of Graham Miller are noted in Hutchinson, with the suggestion that the EP provided a rallying point for Australian “evangelical activists” and the “mutual reinforcement of evangelical Presbyterian identity”: 371.
\textsuperscript{339} Minutes of the WF Executive, 7 Feb. 1964.
\textsuperscript{340} WF 15th Annual Report, 22 Nov. 1965.
\textsuperscript{341} That connection was not nearly so apparent, though, to most other members of the Executive, who did not share the same links.
\textsuperscript{342} Minutes of the WF Executive, 1 May 1964.
\textsuperscript{342} Minutes of the WF Executive, 2 Feb. 1962. The tapes were prepared by Mrs Sidney Brinsley.
The WF and the ICCC

The WF in this period carefully maintained its policy of avoiding any contact with the International Conference of Christian Churches. When the Contender implied that the WF had invited the NZICCC to send representatives to the WF conference, the WF chairman immediately wrote a letter refuting that claim, and also wrote to the Outlook stating that the WF had no connection with the ICCC. The WF had no desire to be associated – either in reality or in perception – with a strident separatist group. By contrast, the WF was happy to host a visiting leader of the NAE. The EP included articles from the NAE, but never included any material from the ICCC.

The WF and the Reformed Church

An issue related to the WF’s attitude to the ICCC was the WF’s connection with the ICCC-affiliated Synod of the Reformed Churches of New Zealand, a small cluster of churches which reflected the more conservative side of schism in the church in Holland. Its adherents looked askance at the confessional latitude of the PCNZ, but took considerable interest in the WF. An EP editorial in 1962 expressed warm admiration of the Reformed denomination and “gladly and joyously” extended “the hand of friendship.” Some Reformed leaders privately called for WF ministers to leave the PCNZ and join them in a denomination which was inerrantist, anti-modernist, anti-ecumenical and anti-Catholic – and which maintained Calvinist-style church “discipline.” WF leaders, however, buoyed by the groundswell of popular support they were receiving within the PCNZ, insisted that they were witnessing the beginnings of divine “renewal and revival” within the Presbyterian Church and that

343 Minutes of the WF Executive, 7 Aug. 1964; 4 Sept. 1964.
344 Minutes of the WF Executive, 6 Aug. 1965.
346 The Reformed Churches of New Zealand related to De Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland.
347 See e.g. Report of the Committee on Doctrine, Proceedings (1956): 104a-6a.
they had no intention of abandoning the thousands of faithful church members who looked to them for leadership.\textsuperscript{350}

Despite considerable common ground in such areas as biblicism, reformed theology and distrust of theological liberalism and ecumenism, there remained significant differences between the Reformed and WF groups. There were some differences in how far each group took its doctrinal tendencies and in the tone in which they articulated them: the Reformed Synod people were uncompromising on most issues; the WF leaders were still generally constrained by a concern for balance and moderation. There were differences of ecclesiology. The Reformed group based their sense of legitimacy – and thus purity – on the fact of their being visibly separate. The WF leaders were content to be a reformist element inside a greater whole, and accepted the identity of being a faithful leaven within the lump; the WF hoped not for a pure church but for a revived church, or at least an improved church. The Reformed group felt safely quarantined from those they considered apostate; the WF group still wished to reassure and persuade their co-denominationalists and were prepared to co-exist with those they disagreed with. These differences broadly reflected the differences between a more militant and separatist conservatism (what in America at least was called "fundamentalism") and the milder and non-separatist conservative evangelicalism modelled by the IVF.

**The WF, Church Union, and Schism**

Within the WF there were some different shades of feeling about church union. Some Executive members (for example, Wilson and Brinsley) were more open to union, if an acceptable basis could be found, but some of them (for example, Gunn and Miller) were inclined to resist union on almost any basis. Miller’s objections to ecumenism reflected a profound theological critique of that movement, and had been fortified by

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{349} E.g. G.I. Williamson to John [Brinsley], 3 July 1963; "Mangere Reformed Church", attached card.  
\textsuperscript{350} E.g. [John Brinsley] to G.I. Williamson, 8 July 1963.}
a recent work by Lloyd-Jones: for Evangelicals, the basis of unity was common doctrine; for Ecumenists, doctrine was “divisive”. Miller was nevertheless prepared to be a responsible voice within the church union Committee, engaging with the issues from an evangelical perspective. Miller saw separation as a last resort, but Gunn became increasingly impatient with the PCNZ and seemed to see church union as an opportunity for Evangelicals to separate into a remnant of the Presbyterian Church that would stay out of union. In 1962, the WF Executive hammered out a careful memorandum and sent it to the Outlook. The statement noted that there was no reference to church union in the WF constitution, the WF was “not...inherently opposed” and “in an ideal evangelical context [the WF] might conceivably participate in fostering such a union”. But in the “menacing climate of today’s world” and “in loyalty to the Reformed heritage” and the WF could not afford to be “ambiguously neutral”; basing its views on Scripture, it intended to participate in the debate “with serious purpose”.

Once the Anglicans joined the negotiations, the WF attitude hardened: the WF leaders could not accept the loss of the historic doctrinal standards; they recoiled from what they saw as a requirement for reordination; they were anxious about bishops and the authority they might exert over evangelical ministers and congregations; they wanted to retain elders and a simple non-liturgical worship. They believed Anglican demands were being dictated by a High Church outlook (with exclusive views on ordination and communion) rather than by the traditional reformed Anglican position (which had allowed inter-communion with members of

352 Miller felt that Gunn was schismatic “at heart”: JGM, ¶771.
353 Minutes of the WF Executive, 6 April 1962; 4 May 1962. The statement noted that WF members were “not required to share these views”.
other reformed churches). For Gunn, at least, these objections were compounded by his attitude to Roman Catholicism. Miller shared similar concerns, but they were expressed in a more thoughtful and nuanced way, and with strong historical awareness. Miller remained optimistic that the "swelling testimony" of international evangelicalism would lead to the renewal of a Protestantism that had temporarily slipped its moorings and succumbed to "collective delusions".

The WF Executive agreed that it oppose participation in the "Act of Commitment". But Gunn wanted to go further and presented the Executive with proposals for a "Continuing [Presbyterian] Church". In a prolonged debate, a majority of the Executive appeared to regard Gunn's proposal as "premature and unfortunate". Two months later, the Executive passed a resolution forbidding Gunn to publish his paper in the EP. In the Annual Report, Graham Miller pointedly wrote "We disown any thought of separation. We shall take our full and responsible part in the church

---

355 J.G. Miller, "Editorial", EP XV, 3 (May-June 1965): 130-2. Miller noted the Reformed nature of early Anglicanism, which practised "a living inter-communion with other Reformed Churches". He argued Archbishop Laud with his High Church approach initiated a "fundamental alteration", later followed by the Tractarian and Anglo-Catholic movements. He quoted W. Hastie (The Theology of the Reformed Church in its Fundamental Principles) who asserted that Anglo-Catholicism "has no ... standing in the Articles of the English Church and ... no right within the the Reformed Church at all", and that the Church of England has become "the most exclusive and the most schismatic church in Western Christendom". Miller then concluded: "The reformed ideal of the church is the most catholic of all; the High Church the most exclusive and bigoted".


357 J. Graham Miller, "The Ecumenical Movement – Threat or Blessing?" in ibid.: 1-13.

358 Ibid.: 11-12; Miller suggested the analogy of Deism being extinguished by the eighteenth century evangelical revival. Gunn tended to have a negative view of church history as a record of ecclesiastical failings. But Miller appeared to be shaped by a stronger doctrine of divine sovereignty: God will never leave himself without a witness; faithfulness to the Word will never lack opposition but victory is on the side of the faithful; there is "inextinguishable witness, inextinguishable opposition, and a certain divine outcome to God's glory": JGM, ¶849.

359 Minutes of the WF Special Meeting, 30 Aug. 1965.

360 Minutes of the WF Executive, 1 Oct. 1965.
union proposals now before the Church.”[361] Miller thus echoed his words a year earlier:

Let us be quite clear, ...we hold no brief for schism. Rank and untamed spiritual pride can appeal to Scripture in support of its separatist position, it can appear very right, very earnest, and very cogent; but it can prove an antichrist.[362]

Opposition to the WF

Notwithstanding the concern of Miller and most other WF Executive members to be moderate and non-separatist, the WF was regarded with considerable suspicion and hostility by some within the PCNZ. The WF saw its opposition to church union plans as the main contributing factor to such “prejudice”.[363] There were many evidences of antipathy: Westland Presbytery railed against any body other than the Presbyterian Bookroom publishing Presbyterian books and complained to the PCNZ Doctrine Committee about alleged heresy in the WF’s Elders’ Roll Book and Visitation Evangelism;[364] a minister complained to the Clerk of Assembly that the WF had the words “within the Presbyterian Church” in its name and later took an overture to Assembly on the matter;[365] a large city church in Wanganui withheld permission from the WF to use its facilities for a rally;[366] the Moderator (J.S. Murray) refused to attend the WF Conference and took exception to his name being used on the tentative programme.[367]

---

[361] WF 15th Annual Report, 22 Nov. 1965. In October 1966, Miller was present at the EA meeting in London in which Lloyd-Jones appeared to take a separationist position, which Miller felt was “untenable bibliically and historically”, and he agreed with Stott (ADMNH: 27).
A 1962 issue of *Forum*, the church's magazine for ministers, contained two spirited denunciations of the WF. Both articles referred to church union and to Gunn. One of the pieces charged the WF with self-righteousness, literalism, negativity, factionalism, and trying “to influence the rest of the Church”. The other article – by a minister who had come up through St. Stephen’s (Dunedin), BTI, EU and IVF – accused his former evangelical friends of narrowness, intolerance, bias, defensiveness, lack of charity, disloyalty to the church, self-congratulation, presumption and arrogance; lacking a reconciling spirit, WF people had no right to call themselves “evangelical”. Four decades later, a WF insider recalled the article as “bitter.” In the next issue, a liberal minister castigated the WF “sect” for “shameless” and “blasphemous” vilification of others: the WF lacked “elementary churchmanship” and was as blinkered as “an aged draught-horse”. In 1963 a bogus letter, written as if it were from the WF, was posted to every Presbytery.

As the only organised opposition to the prevailing tendencies within the PCNZ, the WF naturally provoked apprehension and antagonism. The WF was seen as a reactionary, backward-looking phenomenon, unjustifiably resisting more enlightened theologies; the WF was obstructing ecumenical dreams that seemed close to realisation; the WF was a threat to progress. The WF also attracted resentment from ecumenical voices beyond the PCNZ.

---

370 LW, ¶146. The accusations would have stung Wilson, who was a notably ironic member of the WF, and whose own writing (on the proposed inter-church Declaration of Faith) was criticised by Shaw.
372 ADMNH: 33. It was about “telephone evangelism.” Miller called it a “ribald caricature.”
373 [Gunn], “Westminster Fellowship News”, *EP* XVI, 1 (Jan-Feb.) 1966: 12. On the opening day of the 1965 Assembly a Methodist minister (A.J. Handyside) was quoted in the *Otago Daily Times* describing the WF as a “highly organised group” which was “unscrupulously attacking the [Church Union] Commission’s efforts”. Gunn commented (14-5) that as “the only group in the negotiating churches
Antipathy towards the WF can also be taken as evidence that the WF had established itself as a significant voice within the PCNZ, as an articulate conservative evangelical voice with effective organs of communication and growing popular support. Critics of the WF recognised that its leaders were “able and devoted” and highly energetic, and that they conveyed an “air of authority” that appealed to many. The vigour of the WF-associated ministries and parishes within South Auckland, and the confident expansion of the WF itself, made the WF seem all the more dangerous to those who regretted its existence. In large measure, the tensions reflected the rivalry of two competing tribes within the post-war PCNZ: those inspired and nurtured by the SCM, and those inspired and nurtured by the Evangelical Unions and IVF.

There was, however, another element in the mix: the public face and voice of the WF had become Gunn, not Miller, and the relentless preoccupation of the EP (under Gunn) with critiquing Roman Catholicism and Ecumenism had left the WF vulnerable to being misconstrued as a divisive and negative movement. To some reasonable people, the EP seemed unreasonable. In 1964, for instance, a carefully-worded letter from two Knox students and signed by nineteen others chided the EP for “intolerance” towards both Roman Catholics and liberals and for failing to fulfil the WF’s stated aim of being “as constructive and helpful as possible to the whole church, especially in the field of communication”.

exposing in print the weaknesses, fallacies and ambiguities of the present proposals the WF was bound to experience increased “misrepresentation”.

374 Ian Purdie to J.D. Salmond, 18 May 1962, 9A/110, Theological Hall Committee Secretary’s Papers (J.D. Salmond), 96/15/77, Presbyterian Church Archives and Research Centre.

The WF at General Assembly

Most evangelicals still felt intimidated by the phalanx of liberals and ex-Moderators seated in the front rows at Assembly. But as the evangelical stream grew in numbers and in confidence, and as the WF grew in influence, some of the Presbyterian evangelicals became more willing to speak out at Assembly. The South Auckland group provided leadership, and evangelicals often met together before Assembly to co-ordinate strategy. But it was still difficult for evangelicals to join a debate, and relatively few did so: “if an evangelical point of view was put up it would be countered, and despised, and there were some very vociferous speakers.” The evangelicals believed there was an “iron-clad” solidarity against them and that liberals “mutually supported one another like the shields on the back of a tortoise”.

Most often, the rallying point for both WF evangelicals and for opposition to the WF was church union. For evangelicals, the church union proposals raised essential issues, including the place of Scripture, orthodoxy, confessionalism and the Reformed faith.

Neither Arthur Gunn nor Graham Miller was given to timidity, and they were both willing to enter the fray. Gunn was an effective debater, and had a capacity for putting things in a memorable way. But he could provoke hostility by being overly...

376 JB, ¶68. There had been an “unbroken succession” of liberal or moderate moderators since 1951 (Barton): JGM, ¶84.
377 E.g. Minutes of the WF Executive, 5 Oct. 1962. A meeting was held at Island Bay prior to the 1962 Assembly in Wellington.
378 SC, ¶247, ¶118.
379 JGM, ¶835.
380 E.g. Proceedings (1962): 405a-6a. An overture by members of the Assembly – signed by evangelical ministers and elders from every part of the country – stated that they were “deeply alarmed” that the draft declaration of faith prepared by the Joint Standing Committee did not contain their “deepest convictions” about “the final authority of Holy Scripture as the Church’s supreme rule of faith and life,” the “doctrinal testimony” of the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds”, and the authority of the Subordinate Standards.
381 IB, ¶41.
trenchant or sweeping in his assertions. He appeared impervious to other viewpoints. When Gunn rose to speak, there was “shuffling of the feet, murmuring, sighing” on the floor of Assembly.\footnote{SM, \S 124: the mere mention of Arthur Gunn’s name was “enough to get some to switch off”. SM, \S 63: “Arthur Gunn often got up and said something that was perfectly good”, but it “went down like a lead balloon”. He was “very unfairly treated” …“but in large measure he brought it upon himself”.} The prejudice against Gunn was such that many were unable to hear anything good in what he said.\footnote{Don Elley recalled what he perceived as a “terrible” incident at the 1955 Assembly, when the Moderator (John Allan) “got the whole Assembly to jeer at Arthur Gunn”. The Moderator “fired the first shot, and then several liberal speakers took the cue and got up to lambast Arthur”:\cite{RDE, 134.} Elley also reflected: “They [the liberals] hated Arthur Gunn, because he used attack as a means of defence”: \cite{RDE, \S 125.}} On occasion there was open antagonism towards Gunn.\footnote{ERH, \S 182. Lewis Wilson recalled someone muttering as Miller went forward to speak, “there go the Wee Frees again”: \cite{LW, \S 384.} ERH, \S 182. Note also comments on Miller by Stephen Clark: SC, \S 118: “I sensed opposition to him. But they weren’t able to rebut the logic of his argument. It was strong, well-presented, but his whole thesis they would disagree with”. He was “warm and forceful” and “able and eloquent”. With his legally-trained mind, Miller was “devastatingly thorough”. SC, \S 225: “He had a very gracious way. It was a gloved fist with Graham. He said things so nicely, but he had terrific punch. Quite devastating, from the point of view of logic, I think the fellows just didn’t like it…They didn’t have an answer for him.” More critically, Elley thought Miller’s comments and asides could be “astringent” and therefore polarizing. “His zealotry sometimes over- rode his wisdom”: \cite{RDE, \S 244.} WD, \S 143-4. Wynford Davies saw Miller as “clarity all through”, “very gracious,” “very gifted, very personal, very humble”. On the steamer crossing the strait after Davies’ first Assembly in New Zealand, the ministers were all wearing clerical collars and Davies got talking with Salmond and Geering, whom he did not know. They asked him what he had thought of Assembly, and Davies said “I thought that man Graham Miller was most impressive”. Davies recalled: “That was the wrong thing to have said”. The temperature “plummeted”, and after an awkward silence the subject was changed.} Graham Miller was also a marked man,\footnote{ERH, \S 182. Note also comments on Miller by Stephen Clark: SC, \S 118: “I sensed opposition to him. But they weren’t able to rebut the logic of his argument. It was strong, well-presented, but his whole thesis they would disagree with”. He was “warm and forceful” and “able and eloquent”. With his legally-trained mind, Miller was “devastatingly thorough”. SC, \S 225: “He had a very gracious way. It was a gloved fist with Graham. He said things so nicely, but he had terrific punch. Quite devastating, from the point of view of logic, I think the fellows just didn’t like it…They didn’t have an answer for him.” More critically, Elley thought Miller’s comments and asides could be “astringent” and therefore polarizing. “His zealotry sometimes over- rode his wisdom”: \cite{RDE, \S 244.} WD, \S 143-4. Wynford Davies saw Miller as “clarity all through”, “very gracious,” “very gifted, very personal, very humble”. On the steamer crossing the strait after Davies’ first Assembly in New Zealand, the ministers were all wearing clerical collars and Davies got talking with Salmond and Geering, whom he did not know. They asked him what he had thought of Assembly, and Davies said “I thought that man Graham Miller was most impressive”. Davies recalled: “That was the wrong thing to have said”. The temperature “plummeted”, and after an awkward silence the subject was changed.} but usually got a better hearing, out of respect for his winsomeness, the eloquence of his language, and his “obvious Christian disposition”.\footnote{SM, \S 124: “Arthur Gunn often got up and said something that was perfectly good”, but it “went down like a lead balloon”. He was “very unfairly treated” …“but in large measure he brought it upon himself”.} Miller was a skilled debater. He spoke quietly and graciously, but with piercing reason, with a mastery of Assembly procedures, and with great tenacity. He was “steel clothed in velvet”.\footnote{ERH, \S 182. Lewis Wilson recalled someone muttering as Miller went forward to speak, “there go the Wee Frees again”: \cite{LW, \S 384.} ERH, \S 182. Note also comments on Miller by Stephen Clark: SC, \S 118: “I sensed opposition to him. But they weren’t able to rebut the logic of his argument. It was strong, well-presented, but his whole thesis they would disagree with”. He was “warm and forceful” and “able and eloquent”. With his legally-trained mind, Miller was “devastatingly thorough”. SC, \S 225: “He had a very gracious way. It was a gloved fist with Graham. He said things so nicely, but he had terrific punch. Quite devastating, from the point of view of logic, I think the fellows just didn’t like it…They didn’t have an answer for him.” More critically, Elley thought Miller’s comments and asides could be “astringent” and therefore polarizing. “His zealotry sometimes over- rode his wisdom”: \cite{RDE, \S 244.} WD, \S 143-4. Wynford Davies saw Miller as “clarity all through”, “very gracious,” “very gifted, very personal, very humble”. On the steamer crossing the strait after Davies’ first Assembly in New Zealand, the ministers were all wearing clerical collars and Davies got talking with Salmond and Geering, whom he did not know. They asked him what he had thought of Assembly, and Davies said “I thought that man Graham Miller was most impressive”. Davies recalled: “That was the wrong thing to have said”. The temperature “plummeted”, and after an awkward silence the subject was changed.} He was unperturbed by reversals. An evangelical newcomer to the PCNZ Assembly was “immensely impressed” by Miller.\footnote{ERH, \S 182. Lewis Wilson recalled someone muttering as Miller went forward to speak, “there go the Wee Frees again”: \cite{LW, \S 384.} ERH, \S 182. Note also comments on Miller by Stephen Clark: SC, \S 118: “I sensed opposition to him. But they weren’t able to rebut the logic of his argument. It was strong, well-presented, but his whole thesis they would disagree with”. He was “warm and forceful” and “able and eloquent”. With his legally-trained mind, Miller was “devastatingly thorough”. SC, \S 225: “He had a very gracious way. It was a gloved fist with Graham. He said things so nicely, but he had terrific punch. Quite devastating, from the point of view of logic, I think the fellows just didn’t like it…They didn’t have an answer for him.” More critically, Elley thought Miller’s comments and asides could be “astringent” and therefore polarizing. “His zealotry sometimes over- rode his wisdom”: \cite{RDE, \S 244.} WD, \S 143-4. Wynford Davies saw Miller as “clarity all through”, “very gracious,” “very gifted, very personal, very humble”. On the steamer crossing the strait after Davies’ first Assembly in New Zealand, the ministers were all wearing clerical collars and Davies got talking with Salmond and Geering, whom he did not know. They asked him what he had thought of Assembly, and Davies said “I thought that man Graham Miller was most impressive”. Davies recalled: “That was the wrong thing to have said”. The temperature “plummeted”, and after an awkward silence the subject was changed.} Miller’s brother Rob, likewise trained in law, was also a careful, scholarly speaker, incisive in his thinking, and very well-informed on
Presbyterianism’s historic and reformed heritage. Sam Green, an evangelical elder from Dargaville and WF President, was a pleasant, “rollicking” speaker who was able to sway Assembly.\(^{389}\) So could Les Gosling, who was an impassioned debater. Feisty, opinionated and individualistic, Gosling was widely liked, and his fiery indignation could change Assembly’s mind.\(^{390}\) Lewis Wilson, known to be irenic and scholarly, was usually well received.

Sometimes, the WF itself felt under attack. Such an occasion was in 1965, when church union plans were advancing rapidly, and there were several moves at Assembly against the WF. A minister from Auckland objected to the WF publications.\(^{391}\) The clerk of Dunedin Presbytery supported a motion that Assembly “direct” the WF to delete from its title the words “within the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand”.\(^{392}\) After the vote on church union, evangelicals signed their dissent.\(^{393}\) Immediately afterwards, they tried to present an overture about protecting the property rights of those parishes not entering church union; it was countered by an unusually haughty amendment that the overture should only be received _pro forma_ and that Assembly record a five-point statement why it “does not accept the premises of the overture”.\(^{394}\) At the same Assembly, the South Auckland Presbytery

---

\(^{389}\) ERH, ¶285.

\(^{390}\) GMY, ¶516; JGM, ¶349: Gosling could “definitely” be “a bit cranky” and “that was often an asset in the Assembly. He would get up and give somebody a great thumping, it would clear the air. I have seen him put J.D. Smith in his place...Gossy got up, and he exploded in a good Irish display of wrath, and completely banished [the opposing argument]. It was very good. He did that several times...He always got away with it. They knew it was his temperament”.

\(^{391}\) JGM, ¶410.

\(^{392}\) _Proceedings_ (1965): 63. Miller recalled that J.T. Gunn (brother of A.G. Gunn) had “stumped forward and said, ‘Moderator, we are brethren here, we are not going to have this division’, and there was a sudden relaxation of bitterness, and that overture [sic.] was thrown out”. Assembly voted to “pass to the next business”. In a conciliatory move, Miller then offered to recommend to the WF Executive that the wording be changed. The WF Executive later rejected his proposal.

\(^{393}\) _Proceedings_ (1965): 32. The key motion they rejected was that “The Faith We Affirm Together” was a “sufficient statement of the historic Christian Faith of the negotiating Churches to enable the PCNZ to share further in the preparation of a Basis of Union”.

\(^{394}\) Ibid.: 309a-310a, 33-4. The amendment was moved by J.W. Fraser and J.S. Somerville. Miller successfully moved a further amendment that both the overture and the amendment be referred to the Church Union Committee.
was accused of mishandling a disciplinary issue and WF members felt that the opportunity was being taken by some to vent a “malignant dislike” of the WF.\textsuperscript{395}

The enduring memory of Assembly among Presbyterian evangelicals from this period is that they were vigorously opposed by the prevailing church party, and were sometimes the objects of “astounding acrimony”.\textsuperscript{396} Even those evangelicals who went out of their way to be irenic felt pushed to the margins.\textsuperscript{397} Nevertheless, evangelicals comforted themselves with the thought that in the church at large they were “too numerous, useful and successful to be overlooked”.\textsuperscript{398}

**Intra-Evangelical Critique of the WF**

The WF was not only criticised by liberals and ecumenists, but also by some evangelicals, who were troubled in particular by the negative focus of Arthur Gunn. Through the *EP*, it was Gunn who dominated the WF’s public image, not the milder Graham Miller. In 1962, a letter to Gunn and the Editorial Board from Dunedin objected strongly to the judgemental tone of the *EP*: the writer saw the WF as exhibiting a “lovelessness” more akin to “the works of the flesh” than “the fruit of the Spirit”;\textsuperscript{399} a copy was sent to another Executive member, with a letter expressing the primary concern that the respect for the evangelical cause that had been built up by the IVF and EU was being destroyed.\textsuperscript{400} In 1964, the WF received a “severely...
critical” letter from Invercargill. A year later, WF supporter Rowland Harries wrote deploring a “spirit of intolerance dividing WF from the rest of the Church”. In the same year, an EP article by Gosling contained at least three thinly-veiled repudiations of Gunn’s assumptions and editorial style.

Within the Executive, Miller was one of several temperate voices. As Chairman, he tried to restrain Gunn. He objected, for instance, to Gunn re-printing two American pamphlets as WF publications, without WF authorisation. Miller said the material was “unduly strong for a New Zealand setting” and questioned whether one of the pamphlets (already printed) should be released.

The majority of the Executive supported “a more moderate line” than that adopted by Gunn. In 1965, Donald Kirkby wrote an editorial disavowing “unbalanced thinking leading to extremes in emphasis, and a striving for the truth divorced from grace”. But Gunn was not reined in sufficiently to avoid some damage being done to the image of the WF.

---

401 Minutes of the WF Executive, 1 May 1964. This was probably the “very hostile” letter from J.D.S. Moore, then in Invercargill, which was recalled many decades later by Yule: GYM, ¶28; Yule placed Moore’s letter in the 1960s and attributed it to Moore’s reaction to Gunn.
402 Minutes of the WF Executive, 3 Sept. 1965. The wording is that of the minutes, not the actual letter. Years later, Harries reflected: “Many of us were very unhappy at the time when Arthur Gunn was the leading light in the WF. He seemed to be using it as a means to prepare for schism, and was building an empire that did not serve the purpose of our existence”: ERH, ¶54.
403 (1) “That the Church is heading back to Rome is an emotional catch-cry that only relieves people from facing the issues properly.” (2) “Very early in my ministry I became convinced of the folly of mere anti-Catholic and anti-liberal propaganda of the type that is the regular fare of ‘the Contender’, and has sometimes appeared in the ‘Evangelical Presbyterian.’ This ultimately plays merely into the hands of the enemy... At the best it is like running up and throwing a brick through the kitchen window of your wealthy rival. It only irritates.” (3) “The purpose of the paper [the EP] was not polemics or heresy hunting.” C.L. Gosling, “The Origins of the Westminster Fellowship”, EP XIV, 6 (Nov.-Dec. 1964): 723-4, 7.
404 GYM, ¶530-2. Yule reflected that the WF Executive was “often embarrassed” by Gunn and made strenuous efforts to restrain him: JGM, ¶747.
405 JGM, ¶749. Miller recalled only one actual confrontation with Gunn, after he told Gunn there should be no more articles in the EP by Grahame Kerr (of Australia), whose writing Miller considered unnecessarily provocative. Gunn rang with his resignation but changed his mind overnight: JGM, ¶748.
406 Minutes of the WF Executive, 3 Sept. 1965.
After Miller left New Zealand, and against the background of advanced church union plans and the mounting Geering controversy, Gunn would become increasingly eager for schism; the unease of many moderate evangelicals intensified accordingly. In July 1966, with the support of Gosling, eleven evangelical students at the Theological Hall—all of them associated with EU, IVF and the WF—wrote to the WF expressing distress. They acknowledged the great popularity of the WF among laity, reflecting widespread dissatisfaction with liberal theology. But the unsubtle “populism” of the EP had been at the cost of “responsible theological leadership” and over the last three years the WF had “gradually alienated itself from almost all the University-trained students in the Theological Hall”. In particular, the movement had failed to represent views it did not share “fairly and objectively”, it had failed to show love for the whole church, and instead of engaging the Church’s attention it had repelled it. The letter indicated that the WF’s opposition to church union was a major obstacle. Such heavy insider criticism—from the sons and protégés of WF leaders—did not bode well for the WF, which forfeited the support of some in that generation.

408 The views of Professor Geering, Principal of the Theological Hall, were first discussed at the WF Executive late in 1965: Minutes of the WF Executive, 1 Oct. 1965. There was concern about Geering’s article in the Outlook, “The New Reformation”.
409 The 1966 Conference was faced with the apparent promotion of schism by Rev. Grahame Kerr, an Australian speaker who later founded the Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia; Gosling rose to oppose him, probably mindful of how Stott had publicly refuted separatist views expressed by Lloyd-Jones: JGM, ¶771-4.
410 A.G. Dunn, G.R. Hughes, J. McKinlay, J.C. Calvert, S.H. Rae, E.L. Brown, G. McInnes, B.T. Doig, R.B. Rofe, D.M. Fergus, R.M. Yule to the Secretary, WF Executive, with copies sent to to all Executive members, members of the Editorial Board, and to the Chairmen of regional committees, 6 July 1966. Minutes of the WF Executive, 5 Aug. 1966. In response, the new WF Chairman met with evangelicals at the Hall. The Executive also ruled that all material in the EP must be approved by the Editorial Board: Minutes of the WF Executive, 30 Sept. 1966.
411 The letter invited, inter alia, discussion of “Ecumenism and the Evangelical Doctrine of the Church.” Many years later, Rob Yule reflected that the primary reason he was unable to support the WF wholeheartedly was its “failure to grasp that Christian unity is a biblical mandate”: e-mail, 17 Aug. 2007.
412 Rob Yule, son of WF stalwart Morrison Yule and nephew of the Miller brothers, was among them. He suggested he was influenced by Ronald Nash The New Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, [1963]): e-mail, 17 Aug. 2007. He also referred to his published rejection of any evangelical “tunnel mentality”, i.e., a refusal to engage with contrary viewpoints: Rob Yule, Survival Strategies: Advice to
It was the EU and IVF that had nurtured the leaders of the WF, and given them a theological vision and confidence. But, to the extent that the WF had substituted tub-thumping populism for the moderation characteristic of the IVF, and denunciation for positive witness, it had weakened its theological leadership among IVF-trained evangelicals. Likewise, the IVF had been respectful of denominations, but profoundly inter-denominationalist in spirit; the defensive denominationalism of the WF sat uneasily with the ethos of Christian unity that was characteristic of IVF and related evangelical organisations.

Such internal tension within Presbyterian evangelicalism indicated that, despite an apparently easy cohesiveness in the earlier post-war decades, the evangelical movement was no longer an ideological monolith. The tension was a further illustration of inter-generational differences of focus and mood within evangelicalism, with the emerging generation asserting its freedom to hold its evangelical faith less defensively. The tension also adds weight to the contention that, while tendencies towards separatism and militancy were always inherently possible within evangelicalism, they were not the prevailing character or mood of the New Zealand movement: whenever anyone actively promoted such emphases, the unity of the evangelical movement was strained. The unease over Gunn’s confrontational

Students (Palmerston North: St. Albans Presbyterian Church, Feb.1996). Note also Breward’s comment, IB, ¶59: “They were very unhappy about Arthur’s highly polemical stance. They were uneasy about the way in which the Westminster Fellowship did not connect with contemporary theological debates that they had to wrestle with in the Hall, and I think they also felt they wanted to evangelise and share what they had discovered about the liberating power of Christ, and they were not interested in the polemics. They felt that there was a huge job to be done, and that the Westminster Fellowship was worthy but not in touch with where they wanted to be. The issues of how you dealt with biblical exegesis, how you dealt with the issues raised by Barth and Bultmann, how you dealt with the philosophical and scientific critics of Christianity.” For Simon Rae, the issues (as he recalled) were the WF’s anti-Catholicism, its opposition to Church Union, its doctrinaire views on secondary matters, and what seemed a failure to engage with contemporary theological issues: SR, ¶41. Another son of a WF Executive member (not a theologian and not one of those who wrote the letter) claimed that Gunn “lost my generation” (letter from Lewis Wilson, 20 Oct. 1999). But such a claim was rather too sweeping: another group of evangelical theological students, those generally without EU and IVF
approach was another pointer that the evangelical outlook and tone fostered in New Zealand by Laird, the Crusaders and the IVF – and embraced by successive generations of evangelical leaders – was essentially moderate and reformist, rather than truculent or separatist.

K Conclusion

The further expansion of Presbyterian evangelicalism, in the period 1955-65, has hitherto been largely overlooked. It receives little attention in the relevant section of the 1990 history of the PCNZ. In regard to that period Gosling’s history of the WF is quite negative and also neglects the contribution of Graham Miller. In a 1980s article attempting a “map” of theological strands within the PCNZ, Veitch recognises both “confessional” and “evangelical” streams within a majority “conservative” stream. He identifies the WF with the former, arguing that it revived within the PCNZ the influence of the Princeton theology associated with Warfield and Machen. He suggests that the WF had an impact out of proportion to its size because of the successful ministries of its leaders. Veitch also recognises the influence of the Crusaders, EU missions and Billy Graham crusades on the “evangelicals”. His observations are sound, but his proposed schema did not reflect the reality that, among WF leaders in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the confessional and evangelical streams were closely interwoven and were in fact mostly the same people.

This chapter has traced the national proliferation of evangelical Presbyterian ministries in the second decade after World War II. Except in Auckland, Southland and South Auckland, those evangelical ministries were dispersed. In South backgrounds, wrote to the Executive expressing support for the WF and making counter claims to the letter from the disaffected theological students: Minutes of the WF Executive, 2 Sept. 1966.

413 James Veitch, “1961-1990. Towards the Church for a new Era”, in Presbyterians in Aotearoa: 159. But Veitch noted that the WF represented one of the “influential sections” of the PCNZ.

414 Gosling appeared to have some personal animus against Arthur Gunn.

Auckland, there was a remarkable constellation of dynamic evangelical ministers and parishes. This chapter has explored those ministries in depth, identifying their commonalities (for example, emphases on exposition, visitation evangelism and prayerfulness) and also their differences (for example, varying degrees of reformed theology or of irenicism). The vitality of the South Auckland evangelical Presbyterian parishes in this period appeared to reflect a time of unusual spiritual receptiveness, which was further intensified by the effect of the Billy Graham Crusade.

The evangelical South Auckland phenomenon was also directly associated with the heyday of the Westminster Fellowship in the early to mid 1960s. Led by ministers who had been deeply shaped by the EU and IVF, the WF made considerable progress among many ministers and laity in encouraging an evangelistic, confessionalist and missionary-minded model of evangelical Presbyterianism. The vision was essentially positive and reformist and activist, and was fuelled by a renenergised EP and a prodigious output of semi-popular publications. Leaders such as Miller and Kirkby were at the height of their widespread evangelical influence. But this chapter has also shown that the WF's staunch opposition to church union plans provoked considerable hostility from liberal and ecumenical elements in the PCNZ, and the alarmist and somewhat militant tone of Gunn alienated a number of younger evangelical Presbyterians in the same movement (EU/IVF) which had so significantly helped shape the WF.
CONCLUSION

This thesis arose out of an attempt to relate the renascent evangelical Protestantism of mid-twentieth-century New Zealand to the extensive historiography surrounding similar movements in Britain, North America and Australia.

It has been demonstrated that New Zealand evangelicalism significantly grew in the first two decades after World War Two. There was a major increase in the number of evangelical churches, students, ministers and lay leaders. In the twenties and thirties, evangelical elements in the churches had often been regarded as old-fashioned Bible-thumping reactionaries. But by the late 1950s it was clear that evangelicals had a new confidence and vigour and that they were making a contribution to the denominations that could not so easily be dismissed. As Warner Hutchinson remarked in 1959, “evangelicalism is certainly far more respectable in the Church life of the country as a whole than it was even ten years ago”.¹

This study has argued that the seeds of New Zealand evangelical recovery were planted in the pre-war period, from about 1930. Two church ministries, that of Thomas Miller and William Orange, were particularly important for Presbyterian and Anglican evangelicalism. But the most decisive factor in post-war evangelical renaissance, this thesis has shown, was the role of the Evangelical Unions and Inter-Varsity Fellowship. Historians have noted the importance of the IVF in Britain, Canada and Australia, and to a lesser extent in the USA; in relation to Britain, Bebbington claimed that “probably the most important single factor behind the advance of conservative Evangelicalism in the post-war period was the Inter-Varsity Fellowship”.² The thesis has shown that in New Zealand the EU/IVF movement was

² Bebbington: 259; similarly Hylson-Smith: 287, 290, 296.
crucial in defining and re-establishing conservative evangelicalism: in giving it a clear name and identity, in restoring its intellectual confidence, and in fostering a transdenominational and cohesive sense of evangelical identity. EU/IVF in New Zealand was thus extremely important in preparing the ground for the post-war resurgence of a vigorous, self-aware evangelicalism in New Zealand.

Part One of this thesis showed that the EU/IVF movement arrived in New Zealand at a critical point. It arrived at a time when there was considerable unease among some conservative Christians with liberalism in the churches and in the SCM, and when—in part because the word “evangelical” was being widely used to mean many different things—evangelical identity in New Zealand had become diffuse and weak. While revivalism was still popular in some quarters, it was unable to provide much theological leadership. Chapter One showed that for disaffected conservative Presbyterian minister Thomas Miller, a confessionalist who also drew on elements of revivalism, the Evangelical Union offered a way of reasserting the evangelical faith. Strategically located near both the university and Theological Hall, Miller helped shape a new generation of future evangelical Presbyterian leaders. Chapter Two traced the beginnings from 1930 of the university Evangelical Unions and their separation from the SCM. This chapter described how, for many students, the EUs offered a clear evangelical identity and a strong evangelical formation. As will be discussed below, the EUs promoted an “evangelical” rather than a “fundamentalist” identity. Chapter Three explored the ministry of William Orange, a Brethren-influenced Anglican minister with very strong spiritual and Bible-teaching emphases. Orange attracted an extraordinary number of young protégés, many of whom later became evangelical Anglican ministers. Orange modelled in New Zealand a way of being both explicitly “Evangelical” and loyally “Anglican”. For those inspired by Orange, the evangelical identity and theology provided by the Evangelical Union were key factors in consolidating and extending his influence. Chapter Four traced the formation of a national IVF movement in New Zealand,
explored how the IVF helped bring a new sense of unity among young evangelicals from across the country, and demonstrated that those moulded by Miller, Orange and EU/IVF were beginning to move through theological training and to enter denominational ministry. Once in ministry they would replicate the key emphases and activities of the evangelical model they had been steeped in: prayerfulness, biblical exposition, “sound” doctrine, conversion, Bible Classes (especially for youth and young adults) and missionary support.

Part Two documented and analysed the post-war renaissance of New Zealand evangelicalism. The pivotal chapter in Part Two was Chapter Seven, which explored the EU/IVF as a key defining and unifying element in the post-war evangelical recovery. In a development that was perhaps symbolic of the rise of evangelical Protestantism vis-à-vis liberal Protestantism, the EUs by the late 1950s had eclipsed the SCM. Chapters Five and Eight investigated the new Anglican evangelical movement led by Orange protégés who had also been significantly shaped by EU/IVF. That movement, initially led by Roger Thompson, had by 1965 established evangelical ministries in a sizable bloc of Christchurch parishes. It had helped reinvigorate the evangelical character of Nelson Diocese, had established a growing presence in Wellington Diocese, and had gained beachheads in Dunedin and Auckland. The Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship and its journal the E.C.F. Review had introduced into New Zealand Anglicanism an important new voice: an overt, confident and well-read evangelicalism. It increasingly reflected the upturn in Britain of evangelicalism within the Church of England and the associated recovery of evangelical scholarship. The corresponding evangelical Presbyterian movement built on those who had been inspired by Miller and moulded by the EU/IVF movement had expanded significantly in the post-war period, especially in the dynamic South Auckland context. The Westminster Fellowship, the flagship of Presbyterian evangelicalism, was loyally confessional, became very active in its promotion of
evangelism and missions, and developed an influence beyond its numbers through the *Evangelical Presbyterian* and the WF’s many publications.

The evangelical identity re-established in New Zealand by the EU and the IVF was profoundly reflective of the conservative British evangelical tradition, as interpreted by the British IVF. It owed little or nothing to American fundamentalism, which was seen as a cognate but essentially foreign movement. The evangelical identity seeded by the EU and IVF in New Zealand soil was conservative, but neither extreme nor militant. It was indignant about “modernist” views, but was not anti-intellectual. It was eager to retain its independent doctrinal integrity, but was opposed to ecclesiastical separatism. It avoided controversy over inerrancy, evolution, or eschatology. Its tone was quintessentially moderate – it stood for “sobriety and balance”, for a “sane conservatism”. That ethos of moderation was carefully guarded by such leaders as John Laird, Cliff Cocker, and E.M. Blaiklock – and later by leaders such as Graham Miller, Lewis Wilson, Graham Lamont, Maurice Goodall and Warner Hutchinson. It ethos of being “moderate” was in part deliberate, because the IVF put a premium on gaining and retaining acceptance. But in part it was also instinctive, in a former colony where the majority of the population still considered themselves “British”. To the extent that evangelical leaders in New Zealand became aware of the variant streams within American conservative Christianity, they would explicitly repudiate a “fundamentalist” identity and its organisational expression in the ICCC. Instead, they felt a ready affinity with the more positive and irenic type of evangelical Protestantism being promoted in the USA by the NAE, Billy Graham and *Christianity Today*.

From the 1930s through to the mid 1960s, Protestant evangelicalism in New Zealand was by no means monolithic. Despite numerous evangelical organisations (e.g. Keswick, Scripture Union and BTI) which worked across the denominations, the vast majority of Protestants remained isolated within their own local churches and
denominational traditions. The EU/IVF movement (and the Crusaders) made a very important contribution to greater unity within New Zealand evangelical Protestantism, by bringing together future evangelical leaders from within and across various denominations. For a time, and at leadership level, New Zealand evangelical Protestantism was more cohesive than ever before. But there was not uniformity. There remained marked regional differences, such as the more Presbyterian character of Otago-Southland evangelicalism, the Anglican-Brethren character of the Christchurch movement, the more Low Church flavour of Anglicanism in Nelson, and the more Baptist-Brethren favour of Auckland evangelicalism. Within the New Zealand IVF movement itself, different strands and emphases were discernible, such as the more spiritualising approach of Orange and the more rationalistic (and ascendant) outlook of Blaiklock. Within the Presbyterian evangelical movement, some were more reformed and confessionalist, and some were more experientialist or activist. Within the Anglican evangelical movement, Anglican tradition was important for some, and less important for others. Within both the Presbyterian and Anglican movements, there were some inter-generational differentials: leaders who had been part of a small beleaguered evangelical minority were more likely to be defensive and isolationist; emerging leaders whose experience had mainly been that of an expanding, ascendant evangelicalism were more likely to welcome confident engagement with other viewpoints. The relative cohesiveness of evangelicalism in the 1950s and 60s was remarkable, but could scarcely last: as evangelicalism expanded further and as New Zealand society experienced major changes, the fragmentation of evangelicalism was inevitable.

One of the subsidiary questions that this thesis addressed was whether the emerging evangelical movement was positive or reactive. Unsurprisingly, the thesis has shown that it was both. Certainly, biblicist elements in the SCM and in various denominations were deeply unhappy with theological modernism, and the arrival of the Evangelical Unions provided a means of retaining and reasserting a more
conservative approach. Likewise, the ECF and WF created safe environments for anti-modernists (and for Protestant-minded Anglicans concerned about various types of ritualism). But arguably the impulse behind the re-emergence of evangelicalism was primarily positive: those of a more conservative faith simply wanted to get on with Christian faith, personal piety, nurture, Bible study and evangelism as they had always understood it; the evangelicalism that was emerging was in some ways a more refined and intellectually robust version of earlier pietism and revivalism. As evangelical Protestantism in New Zealand recovered in numbers, confidence and influence, it became less reactive and defensive, less mindful of its old foes, and more positive.

Another question that lay behind this thesis was the extent to which evangelical Protestantism in mid-twentieth-century New Zealand was distinctive. Broadly speaking, it was not distinctive at all. It had much in common with evangelical Protestant Christianity anywhere: the same Bible, similar doctrines and emphases, the same devotional disciplines, a comparable range of spiritual experiences, and many equivalent (or shared) organisations. The distinctiveness of New Zealand evangelicalism does not relate to the basic characteristics of evangelicalism: by its very nature, evangelicalism is international, with similar features in most contexts. As elsewhere, too, evangelical faith and practice was filtered and constrained by various denominational traditions, with those international ecclesiastical traditions sometimes more important than those distinctives among evangelicals that were related to nationality.

This thesis lends weight to the view that the greatest overseas influence on New Zealand evangelicalism in the period of this study was British evangelicalism. Notwithstanding perceptible distinctives often claimed for New Zealand culture (such as tendencies towards egalitarianism and pragmatism) and differences of context (such as the absence of a state church), much of New Zealand’s non-Maori
population derived from the British Isles and prior to about 1970 New Zealand highly valued its cultural affinities and links with Britain. It was inevitable that New Zealand evangelical Protestantism would thus be strongly influenced by British evangelicalism. That influence was both direct (through particular denominations, books, organisations, ideas, immigrants and speakers) and also indirect (through many shared cultural assumptions and values). An example of direct institutional transference, prominent in this thesis, was New Zealand evangelicalism's unquestioning adoption of the British IVF model (and along with that the close adoption of many IVF policies, including its avoidance of the language of “inerrancy” and of controversy on secondary matters). Another example of direct borrowing was the introduction into New Zealand of the Keswick convention model. Examples of indirect cultural influence, likewise important in this thesis, include: the instinctive preference for moderation and restraint that was evident among the leaders of New Zealand's EU/IVF/Crusader network; the empirical rationalism (derived in part from Common Sense philosophy) that characterised their concern for a reasonable faith buttressed by historical and scientific evidence.

This study has found that in this period the influence on mid-twentieth-century New Zealand evangelicalism from the USA was considerably less than that from Britain. Sometimes American influence had been indirect, and mediated through Britain. Nevertheless, New Zealand evangelicalism had earlier been influenced at least to some extent by American revivalism, and later by the fundamentalist resistance to theological modernism. There had also been various introductions of American hymnody and organisations. In the post-war period, by far the most significant American influence on New Zealand evangelicalism was the preaching and methodology of Billy Graham, an influence that was first-hand (through Billy Graham films and the Crusade), but also mediated through Graham's effect on Britain. The Canadian experience of evangelicalism was in some respects parallel to that in New Zealand (because of shared influences from British evangelicalism), but
this thesis has not noted any major Canadian influence on New Zealand evangelicalism.

Because of the broadly similar history of New Zealand and Australia as antipodean British migrant colonies, evangelical Protestantism in both countries were subjected to many similar cultural, theological and ecclesiastical influences. This thesis has illustrated many such commonalities, such as the sharing of key visitors from the northern hemisphere (e.g. Guinness and Stott), the exchange of influential evangelical personnel (e.g. Lionel Fletcher, John Deane, David Stewart, Edwin Judge, Graham Miller), and the importance in both countries of Keswick-style conventions, Bible institutes, missionary societies such as CIM, the IVF, and the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade. The New Zealand IVF movement regularly looked to Australia for its conference speakers and university missioners (e.g. T.C. Hammond, Howard Mowll, Marcus Loane), and New Zealand figures such as Graham Miller and Don Kirkby were frequent convention speakers and missioners in Australia. This thesis has discussed the strong (and changing) links between the Nelson and Sydney Dioceses, and the qualified attitude of Orange towards the type of evangelicalism he experienced in Sydney. In both countries evangelical Protestantism became more vigorous and assured in the 1950s and 60s. Both countries experienced a heightened spiritual receptivity in the late 1950s. Nevertheless, there remained many particularities of evangelicalism in each country that had no parallel in the other: there was, for instance, nothing in New Zealand resembling Sydney evangelicalism.

The distinctiveness of New Zealand's expression of evangelical Protestantism derived from the unique mix of New Zealand's geography, demographics, regions, denominations and personalities. Despite New Zealand being long and thin, in the period 1930-65 the relatively low population and the increasing ease of travel between regions made it possible for the IVF from 1936 to build a cohesive national evangelical movement. Several regions (including three of the four main cities) had
their distinctive denominational concentrations, and that helped give New Zealand some of its evangelical flavour. But such regional differences were not grounded in any significant cultural differences, and in a fairly small country no part of the evangelical community had sufficient critical mass to remain insulated from other parts, and there was also much inter-denominational mixing and inter-marrying. The key contextual factor affecting New Zealand’s evangelicalism, then, may be the country’s relatively small scale and (in that period) strong cultural homogeneity.

In such a New Zealand context, various personalities made their mark. Some figures stand out: the gentle, spiritual biblicism of Orange; the lonely resoluteness of Thomas Miller; the shepherding, movement-building skills of John Laird; the evangelical intensity and energy of Roger Thompson; the warmth and missionary focus of Harry Thomson; the gravitas and erudite oratory of Blaiklock; the gracious but piercing eloquence of Graham Miller; the cool-headed combative ness of Arthur Gunn; the flair of Don Kirkby; the irenic evangelical Anglicanism of people like Maurice Goodall.

Another way of highlighting the distinctive story of mid-twentieth-century New Zealand evangelicalism would be to suggest some defining moments. At the time, some of them would have been seemed fairly insignificant events. In 1926, for instance, E.M. Blaiklock was appointed to a university lectureship in Auckland – and thus gained a platform from which he would later become a leading voice in post-war New Zealand evangelicalism. In 1928, Thomas Miller missed out on a parish in Melbourne and instead moved to a Dunedin parish strategic for student work – and thus later became the leader of Dunedin and Presbyterian evangelicalism. A number of key things took place in 1930: William Orange transferred from rural seclusion to a parish on the outskirts of Christchurch – and thus began the work that would later make him the leader of Christchurch and Anglican evangelicalism; Cree Brown wrote to Dr. Howard Guinness inviting him to tour New Zealand – and thus the
Evangelical Unions were later established; Dr. John Laird came ashore when his ship visited Auckland – and thus there arrived someone who would soon became a key unifying figure among New Zealand evangelicals; in the Otago University CU, someone moved a resolution that the EU be declined permission to affiliate with the SCM – and thus there began a critical schism within New Zealand Protestantism. In 1936, representatives of the four EUs met in Wellington to establish a New Zealand IVF. In 1945, the Evangelical Churchmen’s Fellowship was founded, and in 1950 the Westminster Fellowship. In 1948, a group of evangelical young people turned up one Sunday at St. Martin’s, Spreydon – thus energising what was to become a highly influential evangelical Anglican ministry among young people in Christchurch. In 1950, Graham Miller and the WF resolved to have no contact with the ICCC. In 1959, Billy Graham held his first New Zealand crusade. In 1962, the WF Executive was relocated in South Auckland – thus beginning a dynamic new phase in the Presbyterian evangelical movement. In 1963, younger evangelical Anglicans took editorial control of the ECF magazine – thus heralding a more confident and less defensive style of evangelical Anglicanism. Together, these events helped a new type of evangelicalism develop in New Zealand in the mid-twentieth century.

In some respects, this thesis has discovered little that was surprising. The critical role of the IVF has already been identified in several other countries, and a number of historians (but especially Peter Lineham) have pointed to the IVF’s importance in New Zealand; Lineham has also clearly pointed to the new evangelical cohesiveness associated with the Crusader/EU/IVF/CSSM network in the 1930s. This thesis has not overturned that understanding but has rather confirmed it, filled it out, and explored its implications for the post-war era. This thesis has sought to analyse the nature of IVF evangelicalism in New Zealand, and has found it committed to a reasoned faith, to restraint, and to church loyalty; it has found it very much in the British evangelical tradition rather than that of American fundamentalism. Some key contributions of this thesis may be: the study of Miller and Orange in their 1930s and 40s context;
their relationship to the re-emergence of a clearer evangelical identity in New Zealand; the discussion of the EU/SCM schism as a way of understanding the theological contours of New Zealand Protestantism; the evidence given in the thesis of very strong links between the EU/IVF movement and the new post-war Presbyterian and Anglican evangelical movements; the documentation and analysis of those movements; the identification of generational shifts of attitude in those movements.

A number of issues for further study arise out of this thesis. These include: the impact of IVF-trained laity on New Zealand church and society; the extent to which (through EU/IVF involvement and IVF literature) the EU/IVF movement may have influenced the respective evangelicalism of New Zealand’s Baptist and Brethren movements; the relative importance of EU/IVF with other movements (e.g. BTI, Challenge Weekly) in determining evangelical identity in New Zealand; the influence (in the period of this thesis) of evangelical mission societies and overseas mission work on New Zealand evangelicalism; the possible influence on New Zealand evangelicalism of indigenous evangelical and revival movements in the Pacific, Africa and Asia; the theology, commonalities and diversities of evangelical hymns and songs used in New Zealand at different times; the effect of trans-Tasman exchanges of evangelical personnel and ideas; the effect of new evangelical organisations coming out of America, such as YFC and Navigators. More broadly, there needs to be a comprehensive study into the role of women within the evangelical movements. The connections between evangelicalism and Maori also need exploring. In relation to the periods before this thesis, there needs to be more research into evangelical elements within the Anglican Church in New Zealand prior to Orange and outside the Diocese of Nelson, especially in the nineteenth century; more is known of earlier Presbyterian evangelicalism, but its contours require closer delineation. In relation to the period after this thesis, research is required into the subsequent history of evangelical student work and of the evangelical Anglican and
Presbyterian movements, the continuing growth of evangelical Protestantism generally, its fragmentation, its complex conceptual relationships with the charismatic/Pentecostal and independent church movements, the rise and fall of various attempts at national pan-evangelical movements, and how evangelical identity fared in relation to an increasing diversity in New Zealand church and society.

This thesis has investigated the recovery of a more conservative Protestantism, at a time when a more liberal Protestantism had peaked and then was beginning to decline. It has been beyond the scope of this thesis to explore the reasons why, at a more philosophical level, those two processes were occurring. Some comments from overseas sources, however, are perhaps apt. Stuart Piggin attributed evangelicalism’s “tenacity” to the transcendence of its “meaning system”, its possession of an authority (Scripture) that was “external to social norms”, and the powerful socialising influence of its families and institutions. F.F. Bruce, reflecting on the IVF doctrinal statement, wrote “There is much to be said for a positive statement of faith”. It could be argued that IVF-style evangelicalism benefited from the definiteness of its evangelical faith, while generally avoiding excessive narrowness or specificity especially on secondary issues. S. Bruce, comparing IVF and SCM student groups from a sociological perspective, noted the advantages of theological conservatism over liberalism: clear beliefs and boundaries, simplicity, more active promotion and “product profile”, stronger differentiation from secularism, a greater investment (commitment) required of participants, and an effective network of

---

separate organisations which sustain faith. Such insights could readily be applied to the evangelical movement studied in this thesis.

Many different metaphors could be applied to describe the emergence of a renascent evangelicalism in post-war New Zealand, images of windshifts, re-birth, foundations and rebuilding, seeding and growing. But the metaphor chosen for the thesis title is a tidal one. The image arose from the words of a key informant, who suggested that "gradually, without any trumpets blaring, God brought this quiet tidal movement up the estuary and one by one the rocks and snags were covered".

In 1930, the evangelical tide was at its lowest ebb. Almost imperceptibly, in the 1930s and 40s, the tide had begun to turn. By the late 1950s, the tide was visibly coming back in.

---

5 Steve Bruce, *Firm in the Faith* (Brookfield, Vermont: Gower, 1984): 80-1, 82-4, 86-7. Note also comments in Dean M. Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches are Growing: A Study in Sociology of Religion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972). Kelley’s social-pragmatic treatment, at semi-popular level, seemed to suggest that conservative churches were better at “explaining the meaning of life in ultimate terms” (37; 161-6), at mobilizing members (57), and at maintaining controls (57, 119).

6 JGM, ¶161.
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The data collected will primarily be used to help the researcher build up a general understanding of evangelical Christianity in the period under study. In some cases, some items of specific information may be noted or quoted in the dissertation or in any subsequent published material (but only where a transcript, summary, or notes have been checked and confirmed by you). Your name will not be given, unless you have given permission for it to be used.

The data you supply will not be available to any other person for any other purpose. It will be available to the researcher only. At the completion of the research project, it will be deposited in the Archives of the BCNZ. The material will be filed with or without your name attached, in accordance with your wishes. In all cases access to the data by any other person shall be embargoed for a period of five years, and after that it shall be available only to bona fide historical researchers.

Results of this research project will eventually be available in dissertation form, parts or all of which might possibly be published.

**What if Participants have any Questions?**
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hermeneutics

evangelism

the missionary task

social justice
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CONFIRMATION/AUTHORISATION of data from INTERVIEW

PLEASE TICK AS APPROPRIATE

(1) Confirmation of accuracy...

☐ I confirm the accuracy of the notes/transcript/summary of the interview (if there is a problem, please correct it)

(2) Permission to quote by name...
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☐ OR: I am willing for the notes/transcript/summary to be used, but I do not wish to be quoted from it/them by name
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