

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Christian Brethren Review* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_christian-brethren-review.php

Tongues Must Cease: The Brethren and the Charismatic Movement in New Zealand

PETER J. LINEHAM*

In the nineteen-sixties, many churches throughout the western world were deeply affected by the Charismatic Movement. Nowhere was the impact larger than in New Zealand, and in no church in New Zealand at that time were the consequences so extensive, so divisive or so early, as they were in the Open Brethren assemblies. The aim of this paper is to investigate the reasons for this.

The problem may seem a trivial one. Doctrinal and ecclesiastical differences between the Brethren and the Pentecostals have always been accentuated because the two groups are in so many ways alike. Both have common roots in the pre-millennial movement, and both are separatist churches in the English pattern of evangelical or fundamentalist fellowships which seek to be fully obedient to the New Testament. Both disdain emphasis on office and prefer to give scope to the spiritual gifts of their members. This is not a sufficient explanation of why the Brethren found it so painful to take a stand against the Charismatic Movement, nor why that stand proved so unacceptable to people within the assemblies. Nor does it explain why the New Zealand Brethren were obliged to grapple with the issue before almost any other church throughout the world except the Episcopal Church in California. This paper will show how a number of theological and personal dimensions to the confrontation gave it significance.

Some people have told me that this subject is too delicate to be discussed in print. Brethren are an informal and intimate fellowship, and they not unnaturally regard what happens among them as private. Yet unfortunately this very attitude can lead to a feeling of resentment and bitterness on the part of those who disagree with their elders. It certainly has done so in this case. As I have collected a prolific number of tracts and pamphlets on the issue, and as I have corresponded and conversed with a diverse group of people involved in the controversy, I have

**Peter Lineham teaches History at Massey University, Palmerston, New Zealand. He is the author of There We Found Brethren, A History of Assemblies of Brethren in New Zealand (G.P.H. Society Ltd., Palmerston North; Paternoster Press, Exeter).*

realized how traumatic the conflict was. Subsequent access to a unique collection of letters and papers¹ on the issue assembled by two leading Brethren has enabled me to understand some of the less public aspects of the controversy. Memories of the events analysed in this paper are reawakened whenever the charismatic issue surfaces in Brethren assemblies. Yet often those memories are inaccurate or incomplete. Consequently time has proved less a healer than one might hope. Yet there is a need for greater understanding, for the good of both parties, and I believe that the issue will be clarified rather than exacerbated by historical analysis and accurate detail. Like many who were Christian young people in that era, I have known for myself the bitterness of the debate; the intensity of the pressure to receive and to avoid the baptism in the Spirit. I do not speak in tongues, and my use of the expression 'the baptism in the Spirit' is a matter of convenience rather than of conviction. Yet I owe much to the inspiration of charismatic spirituality, just as I owe much to the godliness and good example of the Brethren, for they have lived up to their name in my own experience. Perhaps the healing process can begin only when wounds are carefully and sensitively exposed.

The Development of the Rift

The early history of the Brethren is entangled with that of the Pentecostals. In the eighteen-twenties and thirties Edward Irving's proto-Pentecostalism was as burning a topic among evangelicals in Great Britain as was J. N. Darby's doctrine of the church. Darby's desire to return to apostolic patterns of worship is usually related to his view that the dispensation of the church, the church age, was coming to an end and that the church was in ruins. It was therefore necessary for Christians to separate from existing churches and become a little flock obedient to New Testament patterns. Yet his thinking was also shaped by a distinctive belief that the ministry of the Holy Spirit was not confined to the inner experience of the individual believer, as Protestant theology tended to imply. It was also a ministry of directing the congregation in its worship and witness. In rediscovering this, the Brethren returned to the New Testament pattern of deriving all genuine Christian ministry from spiritual gifts. Moreover this emphasis on the Spirit was accompanied by the hope that their stand would be confirmed by an outpouring of spiritual power and life. Captain Hall, A. N. Groves and Darby himself were particularly interested in the question, and 'the duty of seeking for miraculous gifts was strongly insisted on' at the 1832 Powerscourt Conference.² When these men heard that Edward

Irving, the minister of the National Scottish Church in London, believed that the supernatural gift of tongues had been restored they were very curious, for they shared many of Irving's eschatological views. Thomas Douglass of Plymouth and H. B. Bulteel of Exeter College, Oxford, were among those who decided that Irving had more returned to apostolic patterns than had the Brethren. Others hesitated, and, although they would not reject the theoretical possibility of miraculous gifts, they were unconvinced that Irvingite tongues were the same as the Biblical gift.³

The Brethren had not found it easy to evaluate Irvingism, but their final assessment was to prove enduring. Irving's unusual views on the nature of Christ's humanity proved adequate grounds to doubt that the Irvingite charismata came from the Holy Spirit.⁴ Indeed more than a century later, when evaluation of the Charismatic Movement proved essential, identification of the phenomena as neo-Irvingite short-circuited the task of assessing the charismatic gifts. The memory of Irvingite excesses, especially as described by a former disciple of Irving, Robert Baxter, in his *Narrative of Facts* was not forgotten. In 1908, when Pentecostalism first reached London, this information was used by Sir Robert Anderson as evidence of tendencies inherent in all such movements.⁵ Thus rescued from oblivion, Baxter's pamphlet was to inspire many subsequent cautionary tales about the history of Irvingism. When the New Zealand Brethren denounced the charismatics their spokesman recalled:

Our assemblies came into being, we believe, as a very definite movement of the Spirit of God about 1830, at the very same time as the 'Tongues Movement' led by Edward Irving ... was sweeping London. ... With this distressing example before them, all our most gifted and well-taught brethren during the whole of the 130 years that have intervened, have themselves neither spoken in tongues nor countenanced its introduction into assemblies.⁶

Irvingism did not flourish for long. The Catholic Apostolic Church of Irving established a branch in Dunedin in New Zealand, but it was characterized more by ritual than by charismatic gifts.⁷ The historical origins of the Charismatic Movement of the sixties are more accurately traced to the emergence of the Pentecostal churches from the Wesleyan holiness movement in America in 1905-6.⁸ For in the evangelical world of the day, revivals and manifestations were publicized swiftly and emulated enthusiastically. By 1907 Pentecostal phenomena of the kind seen at Azusa Street, Los Angeles, were in evidence right across Europe, and even in Australia.⁹

The typical English response to the early Pentecostals was hardly

enthusiastic. A series of evangelical leaders voiced their criticism of it in no uncertain terms. In New Zealand, the revival caused alarm, but there were no attempts to emulate it. Among the opponents of the distant phenomena, one may number the Brethren who repeated the criticisms of their English friends. Robert Anderson's attack on the Pentecostals seems to have been distributed in the dominion. The comparisons he drew with Irvingism and with the millenarian follies of J. H. Prince and the Agapemone were complemented by the theological argument that the 'Pentecostal Dispensation' was a distinctly temporary phase in the life of the church, and its gifts were intended for Jews and not for the Gentile church. In other words he adopted the traditional Calvinist view of the temporary character of miracles and adapted it to suit the dispensational framework by which Brethren and their friends organized biblical history, dividing God's dealings with man and the Bible into seven ages culminating in the millennium.¹⁰

Although this warning was only one of several, its analysis was of particular importance. The *Treasury*, the magazine which served effectively as a channel of communication among the New Zealand Brethren, reprinted a denunciation of the heresy by the Anglo-American preacher and biographer, A. T. Pierson, which echoed Anderson's views. Later a prominent New Zealand brother, Captain Robert Neville of the Union Steam Ship Company, who had observed Pentecostals in Melbourne, criticized belief in a baptism in the Spirit subsequent to conversion as unbiblical. Edgar Whitehead, who was on a tour of mission fields, added a warning from his observations of Indian Pentecostals.¹¹ Soon the movement faded from the public gaze. It was shortly after this that a writer in the *Treasury* first referred to the completion of the canon of Scripture to explain the perfect state mentioned in I Corinthians 13 as the time when tongues would cease. 'But when the perfect has come that which is imperfect shall vanish away', reads verse ten of that chapter, and verse eight reads: 'As for tongues, they shall cease, as for prophecies they will vanish away.' Thus the subsequent debate over these verses was already foreshadowed. But the issue was as yet somewhat distant from the concerns of the New Zealand Brethren.¹²

A potential basis for the establishment of the Pentecostal Movement in New Zealand lay in the undoctinaire interest in revival and spirituality among New Zealand Christians. New Zealand increasingly lay on the international sawdust trail of revivalists like Herbert Booth and others in the holiness tradition. Books by Hannah Whittal Smith, R. A. Torrey and Andrew Murray were widely read, and they introduced concepts like the 'baptism of the Holy Spirit' and 'baptism of fire' and 'power from on high' to colonists. Such views were even preached to

some Brethren congregations.¹³ The distinctive views on a 'higher Christian life' popularized at the annual Keswick conventions in England soon spread to the dominion. About 1910 the Reverend H. B. Gray organized a Keswick-style convention at Pounaweia, near the southern city of Dunedin.¹⁴ This 'revivalist' tradition, as we shall term it, which encouraged deeper spiritual experiences and evangelistic energy was stimulated after the first world war by the appointment of one of the great trans-Atlantic revivalists, Joseph Kemp, to the pastorate of the influential Baptist Tabernacle in Auckland, the country's burgeoning northern city. From 1920 until his death in 1933, Kemp was a powerful advocate of 'old-fashioned religion', and he established three institutions which perpetuated this emphasis after his death. They were the Ngaruawahia Easter camp-convention, commenced at a site fifty miles south of Auckland in 1921 on Keswick lines; the Bible Training Institute which was modelled on the Chicago Moody Bible Institute; and an interdenominational magazine for revival, the *Reaper*.¹⁵ He was able to enlist the support of other enthusiasts for revival, including a former Brethren missionary, C. J. Rolls, who became the first superintendent of the B.T.I. By the 1930s several interdenominational conventions had become regular events in the New Zealand evangelical calendar, and drew huge crowds, while intending missionaries from many denominations, including some Brethren, attended B.T.I. in preparation.

Perhaps a more important precursor to the Pentecostal Movement in New Zealand was the widespread interest in healing in the dominion. Several divine healers established a surprisingly large following. A. B. Worthington, a former Christian Scientist, gained a very large following in Christchurch, one of the two main cities in the South Island, in the nineties, until he was exposed as a bigamist. Another visitor to the Antipodes, John Alexander Dowie, who established a healing mission called the 'Free Christian Church' in Australia between 1878 and 1893, visited New Zealand in 1888.¹⁶ Friends made then remained faithful when he subsequently established a healing community called Zion on the shore of Lake Michigan in the United States. His flamboyance did not endear him to the Brethren and he was criticized in a debate on healing in the *Treasury* in 1903.¹⁷ However the sectarian and revivalist character of the early New Zealand Brethren meant that some of them were open to the miraculous. The followers of Alfred Feist had experimented with faith healing in the 1870s and this interest had not completely died out. In 1904 when the broken arm of Hans Hansen, an ex-Feistite of Feilding, was miraculously mended, the event led to renewed interest in healing among local Brethren.¹⁸

Nevertheless most Brethren hesitated to accept contemporary mani-

festations of the supernatural. They believed in the literal truth of the Bible, but they were also empiricists, and assumed that miracles were no longer likely. The discussion on healing in the *Treasury* in 1903 illustrates this. One of the contributors was John A. D. Adams, subsequently the founder of a 'full gospel' mission in Dunedin, who was then evidently a member of an assembly. His defence of aspects of the work of Dowie (whom he had met in 1888) was not appreciated by the editor of the magazine, Franklin Ferguson, who stood for Brethren orthodoxy. Yet Ferguson was anxious to allow that he was not totally hostile to the possibility of healing. 'We have great faith in the Lord's ability to perform miracles if need be for his own glory', he wrote.¹⁹ And in this age Brethren elders willingly obeyed the injunction of James 5:14 and prayed for the sick, anointing them with oil. Sometimes healings occurred after this had been done.

This ambivalent interest in healing was not confined to the Brethren. In the era after the first world war the healing of a Nelson Baptist, Miss Fanny Lammas, was widely acknowledged, especially since the account of it came from the pen of the Rev. Joseph Kemp.²⁰ About the same time the Maori prophet and healer, Ratana, attracted many Maoris into a new sect, and the miracles associated with his sect aroused great interest within the main churches. In 1923-4 an English layman, J. M. Hickson, toured the Anglican province of New Zealand with the blessing of the Archbishop of New Zealand, although local evangelical Anglicans were more cautious about him.²¹

Pentecostalism was established in New Zealand by the famous English healer and evangelist, Smith Wigglesworth, (himself of Brethren stock). It is not surprising to find that when he arrived in New Zealand in 1922, there was a large degree of interest in his mission, and it was very successful, attracting very large crowds. His visit had been sponsored in the first place by the Wellington Christian Covenanters Confederacy, a body dedicated to the promotion of deeper spirituality, which had been formed after Herbert Booth's visit to New Zealand and included some well-known supporters of revival from within the main churches.²² However the respectable public was not so impressed by Wigglesworth. Nor were the evangelicals, who were probably aware of his Pentecostal background. The leading ministers of the city of Auckland united behind J. W. Kemp in their denunciation of Wigglesworth, who seemed to be breaching and disturbing evangelical harmony.²³

The leaders of the assemblies also took the part of critics, for similar reasons. In Wellington, where Smith Wigglesworth made his largest impact, C. J. Drake, one of the leaders of the Tory Street Open Door Mission which was about to become an assembly, took up the subject in a long and passionately argued address. In its published form Charlie

Drake's address used the argument that the miracles and signs reported in the Acts of the Apostles 'were not strictly Christian in character', but were intended specifically as signs to the Jews.²⁴ The Darbyite thesis that the establishment of the church is not prophesied in the Old Testament allowed him to argue that supernatural gifts were reserved for Jews entering the new dispensation.

Yet the fact remains that the preaching of Smith Wigglesworth made a small but significant mark on the assemblies and on evangelical life in general, which had not been forgotten by the 1960s. The Pentecostal congregations proved to be small and uninfluential and very separatist in outlook. Yet when they sponsored healing missions they attracted public attention. Healing caught the interest of press and people, far more than tongues did in this era. The visit of A.C. Valdez in 1924, and A. H. Dallimore's huge meetings in the Auckland Town Hall in 1931, with his bizarre healings of animals and blessing of handkerchiefs, made good newspaper copy. Evangelicals voiced fierce criticisms of the healings. Joseph Kemp lashed Dallimore with his pen, describing his meetings as 'a deliberately "cooked up" frenzy of religious emotionalism of the most morbid kind', deriding the healings as 'displays of undoubted hypnotism' and the healed as 'poor dupes'.²⁵ The theology of the baptism in the Spirit was also criticized, especially by the capable administrator of the Bible Training Institute in Auckland, J. Oswald Sanders, himself of Brethren background. In a series of articles written in 1939 he sought to distinguish the Keswick concept of holiness from the misnamed 'baptism in the Spirit'. He wrote cautiously, and displayed the same care in his comment on the gift of tongues:

We would not dogmatically state that the manifestation of this gift is impossible today, but we would say that most of the cases where it is claimed, so violate the conditions imposed for its exercise, as to give abundant evidence that they are counterfeit and not genuine.²⁶

Some Brethren critics went a little further. The 'Tongues Movement' seemed to them to be dangerous, divisive and influenced by Spiritualism. Two pamphlets prepared by Brethren missionaries for the guidance of Indian Christians were of this character. They were circulated in New Zealand, as was another by Kate Dawson of Bayswater in Auckland (an interesting example of female Brethren scholarship).²⁷ Other Brethren concentrated their criticisms on healing missions and on the teaching that Christ's death atoned for men's illnesses as well as their sin. Henry Yolland, who was Dean of the B.T.I. wrote sharply against 'the present-day impostures', and a number of articles and tracts reiterated the same point.²⁸

Despite all these denunciations the Pentecostals made some gains at

the expense of the Brethren, notably among dedicated young people who were attracted to a new movement where everyone was totally committed. The influence of R. A. Torrey's writings led some young men to seek the baptism in the Spirit as a path to spiritual power. Colin Graham, later a notable Brethren evangelist, was interested in it until he received a careful rebuttal of the teaching from his old Bible Class leader, Ralph Groves. Arthur E. Birch, who became the foundation treasurer of the Wellington City Mission which was the first Pentecostal church in New Zealand, had previously been an assistant at the Tory Street Mission, and he did not entirely break his links with it. In the same city, Keith Robertson left the Vivian Street assembly for the Pentecostal church, and later went to Japan as a missionary with the Apostolic Church, while Edward R. Weston, who had left the assemblies to become a Baptist minister, was a leading Apostolic pastor in the 1930s.²⁹ A number of full-time workers in the assemblies came in contact with Pentecostalism on their itinerations, and found it attractive. Harold Jenkins, a retired Gospel Carriage and Maori worker, joined the Pentecostal Church in its early days.³⁰ Collett L. Saunders, a Nelson Gospel Carriage worker from 1932 to 1935, made his interest so clear that he was excommunicated and joined the Apostolic Church. (He later left that church and founded his own Universalist fellowship in New Plymouth).³¹ In 1934-5 three other missionaries to the Maoris, Elsie Phillips, Katie Rout and Sylvia Martin, who were based in Te Puke, grew frustrated with the restrictions they faced as women, and associated for a time with the Apostolic Church, which sent A. L. Greenaway to promote revival there. A hasty campaign against the Apostolic Church was mounted by a local Brethren elder, Albert V. Brown, and the women subsequently returned to assembly fellowship.³²

Changes in Pentecostalism

In the years after the second world war, interest in healing and in 'higher life' teachings quickened. New Zealanders shared a high standard of living and placed a priority on leisure and enjoyment. It was a practical and pragmatic culture, less interested in fact than in feeling. And it affected the church too. Interest in sensational revivalism was growing and suspicion at reports of the miraculous declined. Magazines about healing seem to have been widely read in New Zealand, and Oral Roberts' campaigns, especially those in Australia in 1956, awakened fresh interest.³³ The Pentecostals were ready to respond to this renewed interest.

The Pentecostal churches of Australia and New Zealand had

splintered into several denominations in the 1930s including the Apostolic Church and the Assemblies of God, and what became the Elim Church. Ten years later some of these small denominations were further fractured by a series of disputes over theology and over the nature of the church. The teaching of an American pastor, W. H. Offler of Seattle, created particular tensions in the post-war era. In a book entitled *God and His Bible*, published in 1946, Offler had used a typological method to demonstrate the absolute gulf between the Old Testament and God's new and supernatural New Testament principles. In his 'Latter Rain' teaching he insisted that true believers must be baptized or rebaptized 'in the name', that is, not according to the trinitarian formula. Only people baptized in Jesus' name could be part of his new work. The existing churches, which were characterized by the appointment of ministers, by membership rolls and by doctrinal statements and creeds, thereby identified themselves as Babylon, not God's church.

This teaching was promoted by three American pastors who served the Pentecostal Church (later called the Elim Church) from 1945 until their resignation in 1946.³⁴ They then formed a small and informal separatist sect, isolated from the other Pentecostal churches. It was these men, chief among them Ray Jackson, who were to break the barriers which prevented the Pentecostal sects from making an impact in the mainstream churches. In New Zealand and then in Sydney and Melbourne, Ray Jackson attracted very talented men around him. His 1953 Bible school in Melbourne included men who were to be of great influence in the future, including his son Dave Jackson, Ron Coady, Kevin Connor, Peter Morrow and Rob Wheeler.³⁵ Such men held evangelistic missions in tents and even non-Pentecostal churches, moving beyond the confines of Pentecostalism since they disdained the institutionalism of its sects. Rob Wheeler travelled throughout New Zealand in the later 1950s as a tent evangelist, and made quite an impact. And in Tauranga, in the North Island's Bay of Plenty, a winter Bible school was held, led by Wheeler, Coady and Ray Necklen, which served as a home base for the work.

In consequence a series of independent but close-knit congregations began to be created. Not all of them were associated with Wheeler. In Palmerston North, near Wellington, another base was established by Keith Whitehouse, a New Zealander who had visited from the United States. He held tent missions in many places in the North Island. His mission in Rotorua led a young man in the Brethren assembly there to receive the baptism in the Spirit and become a very active member of the Apostolic church. Whitehouse commenced a small Bible school in Palmerston North, and some of those touched by him, including the

White family, Methodists from the nearby Rongotea district, founded the Open Door Mission which gained quite a name in the district. Antaneas (Bill) Bloomfield and his son Ray were also among these independent men. Bill Bloomfield was probably from Brethren stock, and retained sufficient acceptability among them to enable him to speak in some assemblies. He founded what he called the People Worship in Freedom Movement, which had a chapel in Auckland.

An evangelist from the United States, A. S. Worley, was another of these independent itinerants. Worley had a healing ministry, and was noted for his gift for healing toothache with miraculous silver fillings. In 1960 he was touring the South Island and was invited by L. E. Murray to visit Timaru. In April he held a small mission there, and then felt called by the Spirit to return and work on a larger scale. And so it proved to be. His twice-daily meetings from 17 June until 24 July 1960 created a sensation among the churches and the dentists. The congregation established at the conclusion of the mission became a crucial base for further evangelism of the South Island by Ron Coady, Peter Morrow, Paul Collins and David Jackson, and the congregation pioneered distinctive neo-pentecostal patterns of worship.³⁶

These little congregations with their dynamic leaders were remarkable for their dedication and their experimentation. Angelic visitations, unstructured and intense sessions of praise and worship, victory marches, and children drunk in the Spirit were characteristic of these new groups, which were later often known as 'New Life Centres' but at this stage were called Revival Fellowships. It was the millennial quality of these groups which attracted other Christians to visit them, and in the 1960s they became a force to be reckoned with. The most significant one began as an upstairs coffee bar, 'Adullam's Cave', in Christchurch, at the instigation of Peter Morrow.³⁷

In the 1970s these fellowships were among the most dynamic forces in the religious life in New Zealand. They were certainly not free from problems. One of Peter Morrow's assistant evangelists established a separatist sect in Rangiora, with its own school and workplaces, in disillusionment about the way in which the world had infiltrated the revival. Another preacher fled the country to escape prosecution by the Inland Revenue Department. Yet indirectly and directly this group of independent Pentecostals and reactions to them shaped some of the Brethren response to the Charismatic Movement.

Post-War Changes in the Assemblies

However this is to anticipate. For in the years after the second world war

interest in Pentecostalism was almost universally taboo among evangelical Christians. The dalliances of the preceding years were succeeded by a hardening of attitudes. Yet the ground was being prepared for a new wave of interest. The indication of this was a surge of interest in 'higher life' teachings within the evangelical world. The perennial interest in faith healing also survived, and the literature of faith healers like Oral Roberts and William Branham were widely read in the dominion. Moreover these views became associated with a longing for world revival which was in sharp opposition to the Brethren belief that the age preceding the return of Christ would be one of decline and lukewarmness. In interdenominational circles this teaching received particular support at the Easter and New Year conventions at Ngaruawahia and elsewhere. Among the overseas speakers on these platforms were Alan Redpath and Major Ian Thomas. W. Ivor Davies, who had been a missionary in the Belgian Congo during the semi-Pentecostal revival there, came to New Zealand about 1960 as local director of the Worldwide Evangelization Crusade (W.E.C.). His advocacy of the higher life inclined in a 'charismatic' direction. Although J. H. Deane, the principal of the Bible Training Institute, was partly influenced by this theology, the successor after his tragic death in 1959, the Rev. Allan Burrow, who remained at the Institute only until 1964, was particularly interested in the Keswick teaching. This interest in how to live a victorious Christian life was not necessarily associated with an Arminian theology, but in the late 1950s American missionaries established branches of the Church of the Nazarene in New Zealand, and this church caused considerable controversy both in the Auckland area and in Christchurch through its ardent advocacy of the Wesleyan goal of Christian perfection.

The first Billy Graham crusade in New Zealand in 1959 contributed significantly to the growing interest in Christian experience. For that crusade in the cities of Wellington, Christchurch and Auckland, and its landline links to towns all over New Zealand, attracted a proportion of the population virtually unequalled either in New Zealand or beyond.³⁸ It thus promoted a sense of evangelical identity. The crusade also created an interest in vigorous non-denominational evangelism in every denomination. Even members of the Pentecostal churches had assisted, and they thus became more acceptable to other church people. The converts of the crusade were its most important fruit. They had undergone a very deep and emotional experience, and they did not all fit easily into the existing churches. Many of them hungered for deeper knowledge of Christian realities, which led them in their dissatisfaction toward the emerging Charismatic Movement. They had accepted Jesus as Saviour; now they wanted to experience his power.

Among the Brethren the impending crisis over the Charismatic Movement was not really anticipated. In that era criticisms of the Pentecostal churches were blunt but unconcerned. Yet one must not overlook a series of cases where Brethren were touched by Pentecostal teachings in the 1940s and 1950s. Some Brethren became interested in these doctrines through a desire for faith healing. In the late 1940s John H. Manins, a capable and influential Brethren expositor, known for the depth of his faith, began to show symptoms of Parkinson's disease, and attended healing services in the United States conducted by Oral Roberts, in search of relief. On his return he recorded his testimony that he had seen genuine miraculous cures at the meetings, but his own continued illness did not help his case. In response Bob Auld wrote a series of studies on healing in the *Treasury*, emphasizing that while God could heal, prayer was not a way to force his hand. But this did not end discussion of the subject.³⁹ Paradoxically Auld himself was later to experience a remarkable remission of a cancerous growth.

Subsequently there was a burst of interest in healing and spiritual experiences in Wellington, and this moved in a Pentecostal direction. Frank Garrett, one of the sons of a prominent Napier Brethren family, was an elder at Tory Street Hall, and a popular evangelistic preacher. He had long searched for a deeper experience of spiritual power, and through fasting and prayer and the laying on of hands he had come into what was virtually a baptism in the Spirit. Then one Saturday in June 1953 he invited his friend Noel Gibson and a small group of friends to hear Ray Bloomfield, one of the independent Charismatics, at Frank's business premises and explain more about the baptism in the Spirit. The friends included A. E. Birch, who had left Tory Street at the time of Smith Wigglesworth's campaign in 1922. Bloomfield's encouragement led Garrett and Gibson to experience the baptism and the gift of tongues. It was not in Frank Garrett's nature to keep his experience to himself, but naturally his distribution of Pentecostal literature caused concern to the Tory Street elders. It was the turning point in Frank Garrett's life; his considerable influence in charismatic circles may be traced to this experience and his subsequent departure for the Elim Church. Yet he continued to have many contacts in the assemblies, and through his influence Frank Carlisle of Moera assembly in the nearby Hutt valley joined him at Elim.⁴⁰ That same year Frank also shared his experience with his Napier Brethren relations. At his recommendation Ray Bloomfield held meetings in the homes of some of them. Their elders were very troubled, and required them to say nothing in favour of Pentecostalism or they would be put out of fellowship. Two of those involved decided to join the Baptist church, although they were not warmly received there either.⁴¹

The most notorious case of 'Pentecostalism' during those years was the secession in 1955 of Ezra M. Coppin, an itinerant evangelist and son of Enoch Coppin, the best-known of all Brethren full-time workers. Ezra, whose published autobiography is certainly colourful, experienced a kind of baptism in the Spirit in September 1954. The chief influence on him seems to have been Kiwi Thorne, a former W.E.C. missionary, who moved among the Auckland assemblies and was an influential advocate of deeper levels of Christian experience. Ezra subsequently left the assemblies and departed for the United States, although he did not develop as a Pentecostal for some years. His experience nevertheless embittered his father's attitudes to Pentecostalism.⁴² Late in 1955 Enoch Coppin was preaching in Tasmania at the time when Oral Roberts was holding his sensational Sydney crusade, and he seized the opportunity to join the chorus of criticism of Roberts and faith healing and Pentecostalism in general.⁴³ He remained a vociferous critic for the rest of his life.

Thus from 1953 to 1956 people in the assemblies had been caught up in a debate over the Pentecostal signs. About 1956 someone went to the trouble of sending to every assembly copies of W. F. P. Burton's account of the Congo Evangelistic Mission, with its accounts of supernatural gifts in action.⁴⁴ Yet in spite of so many ardent advocates this wave of interest was short-lived, and went unnoticed in many places. A few evangelists beside Enoch Coppin felt the necessity to denounce it. Colin Graham did so at a meeting at Queen Street assembly in Palmerston North. He was undeterred by prophecies by a local Pentecostal pastor that he would become insane if he publicly criticized the movement.⁴⁵ The failure of the prophecy increased Colin's distrust of their beliefs. There were a few later cases of anti-Pentecostal campaigns. For example the 1958 crusade of Tommy Hicks in Wellington and Christchurch, which was sponsored by all the Pentecostal churches, was tape-recorded and replayed with a critical commentary by evangelist Ces Hilton at the 1958-9 Mount Maunganui camp.⁴⁶

It may be wondered why this should have been significant for the Brethren. For theirs was a church held together not by formal organization but by constant and warm fellowship. The basic character of the Brethren was reasonably clear. There were a few distinctive assemblies like the very open Elizabeth Street Chapel (formerly Tory Street Hall) in Wellington and the 'inner ring' of conservative assemblies which looked to Mornington assembly in Dunedin as their 'cathedral', and there was a tendency for assemblies further north to be more open in outlook. Yet these variations were relatively minor, considering that there were 20,000 Brethren and 250 assemblies. One magazine served the whole fellowship, and Brethren of almost every ilk attended the

same conferences. When problems arose, southern and northern, and conservative and open leaders consulted with each other; indeed, as Arthur Wallis has commented, the telephone seemed to work overtime in New Zealand. Brethren had an acute sense of their own identity, yet they were far more accustomed to associating with other Christians than were most Baptists or Presbyterians. Many Brethren were eagerly engaged in interdenominational work, finding opportunities beyond their local assembly which were not available to them there. Yet such Brethren still retained a very strong sense of identity, and this created real problems for interdenominational groups like Scripture Union which received support from them. In the words of a staff member of that organization, Brethren 'had to fight all sorts of prejudices' which had been ingrained into them.⁴⁷

Yet in the 1950s this distinctiveness had significantly declined. The old sectarian atmosphere with its enthusiasms and its absolute interpretations was beginning to be replaced by a more restrained and genteel image. As the Brethren grew more wealthy after the war, they rebuilt their halls as chapels, they ceased to give loud 'amens' to prayers, and they sought a better image in the community. Their most respected leaders were laymen rather than full-time Christian workers.

While this process was inevitable among a group which had prospered through their diligence, it had also been a matter of deliberate policy on the part of some influential assembly leaders, notably those in Auckland where the assemblies were more open and less divided than those in many other places. The thirty-five assemblies in Auckland (the highest concentration of assemblies in any city in the world), tended to look to the mother assembly at Howe Street where the elders were men of stature both in the wider evangelical community and in the outside world. The leading elder in this assembly was Robert A. Laidlaw, the founder of the large and prosperous 'Farmers' Trading Company' retail and mail order department store. 'Bert' Laidlaw combined evangelistic zeal, deep spirituality and a personal prestige which he placed at the service of many evangelical institutions. The Brethren have always highly respected laymen who are at once prosperous and godly, and for Laidlaw they felt what one observer identified as an 'undue deference'.⁴⁸ By 1960 he was 72 years old, and the weight of advising the assemblies had made him more cautious. He listened increasingly to another of the patriarchs at Howe Street, Dr. William H. Pettit, 'Mr. Valiant for Truth', who had led the fundamentalist fight against the Student Christian Movement in the 1920s which led to the foundation of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship: he was temperamentally inclined to be combative.⁴⁹ Other leaders of the Auckland assemblies included the brilliant lawyer and intimate friend of Laidlaw, Jim Burt, who died in

1961, Stan Goold, Leo Clarke and Jack Hume.

It had long been the policy of Bert Laidlaw to fashion the assemblies into a more outward-looking and aggressively evangelistic body. In the 1930s the leaders at Howe Street gave warm support to interdenominational bodies like the Bible Training Institute, Scripture Union, the Inter-Varsity Fellowship and the missions of many visiting interdenominational evangelists at a time when Palmerston North assembly leaders like Charlie Hewlett were much less sympathetic to ministry beyond the perimeter of the assemblies. After the war this policy became more influential. It was epitomized by the whole-hearted support given by most leading Brethren to the Billy Graham crusade, and the genuine efforts made to accommodate converts in the assemblies.⁵⁰ This policy was accompanied by another which originated with these Auckland men, to establish more formal assembly institutions.

They began in 1920 by founding a property holding body, the Steward's Trust, and after the war they supported the formation of a uniformed youth movement exclusive to the assemblies, the Every Boy's and Every Girl's Rallies, and the establishment of the New Zealand Assembly Bible School in 1959. In Auckland the assemblies also co-operated in the Assembly Bible Class Movement, which held large quarterly rallies. Since the 1930s the elders of the Auckland assemblies had met quarterly to discuss matters of mutual interest. The assemblies south of Auckland in the Waikato area later established a similar body. Thus although the Brethren remained essentially a fellowship of independent churches, in practice they were tightly knit, and they now had institutions capable of acting in a denominational manner. Laidlaw and his friends had supported the foundation of these institutions because they believed that by such means the assemblies would be better equipped for zealous evangelistic work. But they were to show their potential as instruments to encourage denominational loyalty in the 1960s. There was by then sufficient institutionalism to enable assembly leaders to enforce a standard interpretation of Brethren doctrine.

At the same time, paradoxically, the old sectarianism had been profoundly altered. In the aftermath of the Billy Graham crusade the Assembly Bible Class Movement's quarterly rallies were reshaped under the influence of a youthful committee led by David Jacobsen into a lively Christian Youth Crusade. And at the same time the 'higher life' teaching began to find more supporters within the assemblies. Evangelicalism had always experienced a tension between Biblical fundamentalism and revivalist excitement, and traditionally the Brethren were inclined to the fundamentalist pole. However this was changing.

Bert Laidlaw had spoken at the Keswick convention in England. Keith Liddle, a builder who attended the Wiremu Street Gospel Hall, was an even more ardent advocate of Keswick teaching, and these views began to be heard at the large Christmas convention at Mount Maunganui. It seems that the newly established Willow Park Easter Camp in Auckland was intended to be more firmly in this mould. In essence some younger men in the Auckland assemblies had come to give their first allegiance to revival rather than to the assemblies. That change in emphasis was to become apparent in the next few years.

In the period after 1959 when Dennis Bennett desired to accept charismatic gifts, and yet remain within the Episcopal Church in California, the Brethren were thus somewhat susceptible to this Neo-Pentecostal movement, as it was termed before the introduction of the term 'Charismatic Movement'. But the basis was also laid for highly effective opposition to it. The rest of this article will investigate what happened.

The First Brethren Charismatics

Thus by 1960 there were people within non-Pentecostal churches who were quietly beginning to advocate the baptism in the Spirit. The influence of W. Ivor Davies and Kiwe Thorne in Auckland is one example. In Wellington, where Pentecostalism's impact was assisted by the unsectarian attitude of Frank Houston, the minister of the Assembly of God at Lower Hutt, a number of Baptists were baptized in the Spirit in the 1950s, including Trevor Chandler, the lay-missioner at Titahi Bay in 1957, and the minister of the Berhampore church, Eric Sherburd.⁵¹ Frank Carlisle, who had been Brethren but had moved to the Elim Church, began to attend Berhampore Baptist, but after the neo-Pentecostal views of the minister were exposed, he decided to move back to the old Tory Street assembly, now meeting in Elizabeth Street Chapel. Although Frank Garrett had left this assembly, he too remained in close contact with some of its members. Noel Gibson, now local director of the Open Air Campaigners, was still in this assembly, although he never sought to discuss his views on spiritual gifts there. Overseas influences were to be responsible for a much greater impact. David Wilkerson's *The Cross and the Switchblade* was very widely read in New Zealand and awoke interest not only in ministry to gangs but also in spiritual gifts. Public acceptance of the gifts within the main churches, which is crucial to the distinction between Pentecostalism and the Charismatic Movement took a significant step forward when the Rev. Dennis Bennett of St. Mark's, Van Nuys, California remained

in the Episcopal ministry after he told his congregation in 3 April 1960 that he spoke in tongues. In New Zealand this may have seemed a mere Californian fantasy, but the visit of Leonard Ravenhill en route to and from Australia in December 1960 and January 1961 introduced similar teachings to the country. For the author of *Why Revival Tarries* had come to experience more than the usual form of the higher Christian life. Ravenhill spoke at several Youth for Christ gatherings, and may also have addressed the Brethren Christian Youth Crusade in Auckland.⁵²

The arrival of Campbell McAlpine in New Zealand in 1959 preceded Ravenhill's visit, but its significance only slowly unfolded. Campbell's father, John McAlpine (1877-1960), had been an evangelist among the Brethren in Scotland and beyond. On his retirement he had visited South Africa and then decided to settle in New Zealand, living at first near his daughter in Hamilton, and then subsequently in Rotorua. He also conducted meetings in various parts of New Zealand and became quite well known.⁵³ Meanwhile his son had shown talent as a youth evangelist and served with Youth For Christ in South Africa, later moving to a wider European ministry. His desire to visit his ageing father (who died in 1960) attracted Campbell McAlpine to New Zealand, but he came because he felt guided to seek opportunities as an evangelist in the dominion.⁵⁴ Arriving in Auckland in mid-1959, he was welcomed at Howe Street assembly by R. A. Laidlaw who greatly respected his father, and he quickly befriended Will Miller, the Scottish-born naturopath who was giving most of his time to pastoral work within Howe Street. Miller understood that Campbell McAlpine was accepted as a preacher by overseas assemblies, and not just by Youth For Christ, so he arranged speaking engagements for him both at Howe Street and on rather less open platforms further south, beginning with a young people's conference at Wanganui in August 1959. Campbell proved to be a dynamic speaker who made a deep impression both on Christians and unbelievers. His sermons on the gates of Jerusalem mentioned in the book of Nehemiah were long remembered. His constant and searching theme, illustrated from his own experience, was the intimate fellowship a Christian could have with God. Campbell had a winning personality, and an aura of saintliness about him. His mission at Roslyn assembly in Palmerston North in September 1959 was very successful, and he was urged to stay in New Zealand and take up the many invitations to minister. So with generous assistance from R. A. Laidlaw, who arranged a mortgage for him on a house in the Auckland suburb of Mount Roskill, he arranged for his family to remove to New Zealand.⁵⁵ He spoke at the 1959-60 Christmas camp at Mount Maunganui and he held notable crusades at Te Puke and at Sylvia Park and Tamaki in

Auckland. He became a regular speaker at the Auckland Bible Class movement's Christian Youth Crusade meetings, and at Howe Street he began a long series of sermons on the book of Romans. He also spoke at the 1960 B.T.I. graduation service.⁵⁶

However the Brethren who welcomed McAlpine did not realize that he and his friend, Denis Clark, had experienced a filling of the Spirit in South Africa, and that he spoke in tongues in his own private devotions. His public ministry was not on the subject of spiritual gifts, although it was very much in the tradition of 'higher life' teaching. Privately he was willing to discuss the gifts, although he never identified himself wholly with the Charismatic Movement. His emphasis was not unacceptable at first. For example his action against an apparent case of demon-possession at the 1959-60 Mount Maunganui camp was sympathetically supported by most of the leaders of the camp.

It was through Noel Gibson rather than Campbell McAlpine that the first overtly charismatic event occurred within the ken of the assemblies. For in June 1960 Trevor Chandler of Titahi Bay Baptist Church, who was a member of the O.A.C. committee, spoke at the annual Queen's Birthday weekend O.A.C. conference at Otaki, north of Wellington. Open Air Campaigners was largely supported by Brethren; it was acceptable as an organization in which Brethren young people might be urged to profitably devote their energies, and it was a training-ground for potential full-time Christian workers. It was firmly anti-Pentecostal in its official stance. In Australia it had been involved in the ardent campaign against Oral Roberts and it would not allow Pentecostal speakers on its platform. Manawatu young people assisted in the assembly-based Manawatu Gospel Messengers, but these young people often attended O.A.C. conferences as well. This however proved to be no ordinary conference. For the assembled young people were given opportunity in an unofficial session to hear Trevor Chandler explain the meaning of the baptism in the Spirit. Some of those present experienced the baptism at that meeting. Others came into the experience at subsequent cottage meetings at which Chandler and Gibson spoke in Nelson, Wellington and Palmerston North. Furthermore in 1961 Gibson assisted Campbell McAlpine at an after-meeting at Elizabeth Street Chapel at which they laid hands on those who were seeking the blessing. To those who heard about it, it sounded rather like a Pentecostal tarrying meeting.

It was not the Wellington Brethren but those in Auckland who felt the need to do something. In Auckland there was also discussion about charismatic gifts among young people at the Assembly Bible School and at the Bible Training Institute. Among those attending these institutions was Colin Campbell who had been at the 1960 O.A.C. conference.

At the Assembly Bible School the book *Rees Howell, Intercessor* sparked off a debate, which Bob Auld, a senior lecturer, could not contain. The young people also attended Campbell McAlpine's sermons on Romans at Howe Street and this stimulated further interest in forms of Christian experience. Ken Calvert experienced the baptism in the Spirit and spoke in tongues while at the Bible School. McAlpine's sermons drew to a close, however, and so did all his public ministry there. For when Will Miller preached on 1 Corinthians 13 at Howe Street, McAlpine's expression of reservations about his interpretation led Will Miller to give more credence to reports about the Scotsman's Pentecostal inclinations. A meeting was convened with R. A. Laidlaw and Dr. Pettit to discuss his views. Faced with a direct question at that meeting, McAlpine confirmed that he believed the gift of tongues was still available, and that he used tongues himself in his private devotions. No-one in New Zealand had been so generous to him as had Bert Laidlaw and Will Miller, and no-one was more concerned to protect him, so he agreed at their urgent pleading not to propagate his views, but he felt unable to change them.⁵⁷

Nothing else was done, and nothing was said in public. But McAlpine was under observation. He had not been invited to speak at the 1960 Christmas camp at Mount Maunganui despite his great impact there in 1959, and when he spoke at the largest Brethren Easter camp at Marton in 1961, one of the other invited speakers, Selwyn Cunningham of Elizabeth Street Chapel, Wellington, insisted that there be no mention of the Holy Spirit in his talks. He spoke instead on the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, and did not fail to draw out the necessity of deep personal fellowship with Christ. Hostility to 'Neo-Pentecostalism' thus tended to quicken interest in his views rather than to quench it.

Much of his subsequent ministry took place in 'cottage meetings' in private homes, where he responded to questions and told of his experience in greater detail. If some felt that his theology was inadequate, his life had a quality about it which was compelling. Moreover Campbell prophesied that New Zealand was about to experience a great revival, and people were eager to be spiritually equipped in readiness for it. Prayer groups began to be established throughout the country by assembly members and other enquirers. It was among young people, many of whom were eager for spiritual power but restive in the face of the Brethren establishment, that most support arose. In Wellington a number of Brethren and Baptists received the baptism in the Spirit at this time. Tom Marshall at Wainuiomata formed a charismatic prayer group in his Baptist church, at which McAlpine, Gibson and Chandler spoke. Barry Martin of the Stokes Valley assembly was another person who received the baptism in the Spirit. During 1962 Ron Hardman,

who had been a Brethren full-time worker since 1955, first in his home district around Auckland and after 1961 at Titahi Bay, where he was doing visitation work, came into a charismatic experience, and joined Trevor Chandler's Baptist congregation. This caused shock waves in those assemblies at which he had frequently preached.⁵⁸ The recently formed Wellington Assembly Research Fellowship chose this moment to discuss the Charismatic Movement. G. A. Hughson's paper on the Holy Spirit delivered in August 1962 led to a vigorous discussion on the charismatic issue, which was enlivened by a contribution of an ex-Pentecostal, W. J. Redit. The issue was so topical that W.A.R.F. boldly invited D. Crozier, a former assembly member who had become a Pentecostal, to discuss his views at their November meeting. To their surprise Crozier brought with him Rob Wheeler and a number of others including Frank Garrett, who were eager to bear testimony to Pentecostal gifts, although their exegetical basis for them seemed as shaky as Hughson's belief that tongues had ceased when the canon of Scripture was closed.⁵⁹ Meanwhile in Palmerston North interest continued among the Manawatu Gospel Messengers, and some were influenced by the Open Door Mission and by the tent missions of Rob Wheeler. Colin Campbell was cold-shouldered out of Queen Street Chapel because of his association with Pentecostals, although he had not then experienced the baptism in the Spirit.

It was Campbell McAlpine's deep impact on other Brethren full-time workers which was most important. His ministry made a large impression on the Maori evangelist, Muri Thompson, and on his friend, David Jacobsen, the full-time pastoral worker at the Sylvia Park and Tamaki assemblies in Auckland, and convenor of the Christian Youth Crusade rallies. Meanwhile in the absence of many invitations for service among the Brethren, Campbell McAlpine considered leaving New Zealand until meditation on Jeremiah chapter 42 led him to dream of a crusade to 'Tell New Zealand' the gospel by placing a copy of John's Gospel in every home in the country. 'God has clearly shown that we have to do this distribution here', he told the General Secretary of Scripture Union in December 1961, and he expected that a revival would occur once the distribution had been completed.⁶⁰ Those who assisted in the distribution of the Gospels included many Brethren and assemblies, and his team of full-time assistants included several charismatic Brethren young people, including Colin Campbell, Rowley Houghton, David Harrison, Gordon Adair and Brian Pearson. The distribution was completed by mid-1963, but the expenses were heavy, and R. A. Laidlaw assisted generously with paying the bills. Meanwhile McAlpine's vision had expanded to one which aimed to 'Tell the Nations', and in September 1963 after a friendly farewell from R. A.

Laidlaw who loved him, although he disagreed with him, he and some of his New Zealand team left for the Philippines. He returned to England on 6 December 1963.

Confrontation

It took very little to harden Brethren attitudes against the Charismatic Movement. Its associations, whether real or assumed, with Pentecostalism, Irvingism and Spiritualism were decisive. Increasingly Brethren observers interpreted it as a movement inspired by the Devil. It was not just an unsound movement, or a work of the flesh; it was an instrument of Satan himself. The decisive swing of Brethren opinion occurred during 1962. On Queen's Birthday weekend in the June of that year, one of the best-known of Brethren evangelists, Colin Graham, was invited to give a series of talks on the orthodox doctrine of the Holy Spirit at a Christian Progress Camp for Brethren young people at Mount Maunganui. He was excused from preaching on the Sunday night because of a prior engagement at Te Awamutu, some seventy miles away. The next day he told his audience that he could no longer regard tongues as a work of the flesh in every case; for he had witnessed a satanic attempt to disrupt his Te Awamutu meeting. His preaching had been interrupted by a man speaking in a tongue which a Brethren worker among the Maoris had identified as a series of Maori obscenities. 'Was that of the Holy Spirit of God?', asked Colin Graham. 'Well then, what spirit was it? Is it of the flesh, or is it another spirit? ... It won't make you any more spiritual, any more holy, any more godly.' And he used the story repeatedly to prevent acceptance of charismatic gifts.⁶¹

In Auckland critical comments were not sufficient to destroy the influence of Campbell McAlpine. The youthful committee which had established the Willow Park Easter camp in 1961, including David Jacobsen, John Massam, and C. Blythe Harper, declined to ostracize him, and in 1962 he spoke at the camp. However they also invited R. A. Laidlaw, and he used the opportunity to denounce the Pentecostal heresy. Laidlaw's message was made available on tape by the Gospel Publishing House.⁶² This concern was already shared by the editor of the *Treasury*, the devotional expositor widely respected far beyond New Zealand, H. Charlie Hewlett. In 1961 he began to use the *Treasury* to criticize the 'phantasy' of any idea of a second blessing, and he used the October 1961 issue to promote his opinion that the 'sign gifts' described in Mark chapter sixteen were of limited duration.⁶³ One month later J. Foster Crane, the senior assembly missionary in Fiji, used the same journal to denounce tongues as a product of 'the flesh [which] loves any

kind of show and excitement'. The same view was further elaborated by Gordon Junck, the new editor of the magazine, in May 1962.⁶⁴

These were strong statements, but they received an able answer in a cyclostyled booklet prepared by G. Milton Smith and entitled *Tongues shall cease*. A pamphlet from Milton Smith's hand naturally attracted attention. Smith had come into the Brethren when he joined the ultra-conservative assembly at Mornington in Dunedin about 1940. Qualified with an M.Sc., he had taught mathematics at the Secondary School at Suva in Fiji, and later held a position at New Zealand's leading state secondary school, Auckland Grammar. He was also well read and an enthusiast for painstaking exposition. His reputation was large, and beside ministering in his home assembly at Waikowhai in Auckland he was a respected preacher and lecturer at the Assembly Bible School, and led a Bible study group for Brethren students. His careful analysis of 1 Corinthians chapter thirteen weakened the usual Brethren demonstration that tongues had ceased, for he argued that the 'perfect' state mentioned in the chapter was none other than the perfection which believers would receive when they saw Christ at his second coming.⁶⁵

This pamphlet was quite a milestone in charismatic literature. Pentecostal theology had argued on the basis of passages in the book of Acts that there was a baptism in the Spirit subsequent to conversion which was always evidenced by speaking in tongues. But most charismatic publications were essentially testimonies, and the use they made of Scripture was rarely very accurate. They were thus very vulnerable to criticisms from the Brethren who wanted Biblical evidence, and better evidence than strained interpretations of the book of Acts. Milton Smith had caught them out on their own principles, for he showed that their dismissal of tongues was itself based on a forced interpretation of Scripture. There was a flurry of responses. Dr. Pettit, who quickly became the stoutest opponent of Neo-Pentecostalism, suggested to a young student at Auckland University that he write an answer. So Murray Harris, who was later to be recognized as a notable New Testament scholar, prepared a critical analysis of the pamphlet, but he did not attempt to defend the usual Brethren interpretation. At a more popular level, gospel halls began to resound to frequent denunciations of the movement. An eloquent exposé by Gordon Maclachlan, a Wellington public servant, at Vivian Street Gospel Hall in Wellington in April 1962 was serialized in the *Treasury*.⁶⁶ Indeed for two years the *Treasury* returned to the subject every month with monotonous regularity. The fiercest condemnation came from the prolific pen of the lawyer, W. G. Broadbent of Paeroa. Taking 1 Corinthians 13, and applying an ultra-dispensational method to assist his interpretation of it, he proved to his satisfaction that 'tongues shall cease' means neither more nor less than

that 'tongues have ceased'. Assuming that this was the text as it should have been written, he thus convinced himself that tongues were hypnotically induced voices of evil spirits which seduced men to worship a Jesus other than the Biblical one.⁶⁷

Circumstances soon seemed to necessitate more authoritative answers than had so far been produced. For the arrival of Arthur Wallis in New Zealand in 1963 signalled a new challenge to Brethren orthodoxy. Arthur was the son of the great preacher, Captain Reginald Wallis, who visited New Zealand in 1939, and he himself was a free-lance English preacher with half a foot in the assemblies, although he ministered far beyond their confines. He was an advocate of 'deeper life', and in 1956 he had written a book, *In the Day of thy Power*, which predicted a coming age of world revival. He had become interested in the charismatic renewal shortly after its commencement although he did not initially experience the gift of tongues. Early in 1962 the editor of the *Witness*, Cecil Howley, invited him and a number of other men touched by the renewal, including David Lillie, Denis Clark and William Ward, to discuss their views with a number of open-minded Brethren including W. G. Norris, Douglas Brealey, Alan Nute and Stephen Short. Howley and his friends doubted the theology of the charismatics, but conceded that Wallis in particular was a man of real godliness.⁶⁸

Wallis was invited to New Zealand by the Willow Park Easter Camp committee to speak at the 1963 camp. He took the place of Milton Smith who was now unacceptable to many Brethren. They invited him not because he spoke in tongues (they probably were unaware that he did) but because of his great reputation as an advocate of revival. In the view of the early charismatics, tongues was no more than a subsidiary issue, a pathway to power. Wallis received the invitation in mid 1962. However while he was considering the invitation his sympathy towards Pentecostalism came out into the open, due to the publication of an address he had given at Eastbourne early in 1962 on the subject of revival and reformation in the church. In the course of his survey of church history he remarked that: 'thoughtful Christians, who are not blinded by prejudice, are coming to realize increasingly that the Pentecostal movement in the providence of God has come to make its special contribution to the great unfolding of God's truth.'⁶⁹ A copy of the published text of the address fell into the hands of a noted assembly evangelist, Ransome Cooper, who had spent a year in New Zealand in 1954 and was well informed by letters and visitors about the growing tensions over Pentecostalism in the antipodean assemblies.⁷⁰ On hearing of the invitation to Arthur Wallis he seems to have written in some haste to advise R. A. Laidlaw of Wallis's views. Consequently Laidlaw brought heavy pressure to bear on the Willow Park committee to

persuade them to cancel the invitation.

The committee resisted this pressure for they had not lost the independent outlook which had led them to invite Campbell McAlpine to speak in 1962. They had received a gift which enabled them to pay Wallis's return fares to New Zealand, and they believed he was the speaker God wanted at the camp despite his own reluctance to attend. Wallis had originally consulted R. A. Laidlaw before he initially declined the invitation, but the reiterated request had about it a new urgency, and when the words from Jeremiah, 'Go ... and I will teach you what you are to say' were impressed on his mind, he decided to come.

The camp went ahead as planned, and Wallis shared the ministry with the Rev. Allan Burrow, the principal of the Bible Training Institute, who was noted for his own revivalist emphasis. Burrow had written in the B.T.I. magazine, the *Reaper*, on the subject of tongues, and although he was very cautious about their authenticity, he insisted that there were no Biblical grounds for dismissing them as spurious.⁷¹ Once again tension arose between advocacy of revival and the defence of fundamental truths. R. A. Laidlaw was concerned at the turn of events, and so too was his old friend, Dr. Pettit, who was swiftly becoming a seasoned campaigner on the subject. On 6 May 1963 at Dr. Pettit's invitation the camp committee gathered in his surgery with Arthur Wallis in attendance, to discuss the charismatic issue. Arthur Wallis arrived with a message for the doctor which he had received in a dream three days earlier. 'Tell him', the prophecy said, using the words of Ecclesiastes chapter eleven which were taken up by Bunyan in the second part of *Pilgrim's Progress* when advising Mr. Valiant for Truth of his forthcoming death, 'Tell him "the pitcher is broken at the fountain"'. Although Arthur Wallis never offered any interpretation of those words, Dr. Pettit took it to be a threat that he would die if he opposed the new teaching.⁷²

Division

The pressure to take action was by now considerable. Inevitably the issue was discussed by the Howe Street Chapel elders and they decided to make a public gesture to dissociate themselves from Campbell McAlpine, since access to Howe Street's pulpit had been the vehicle by which he had first gained the attention of the assemblies. They inserted a notice in the *Treasury* in May 1963, announcing that 'We cannot allow our brother Campbell McAlpine either to occupy our platform or minister in our assembly, owing to the views he has on "tongues".⁷³ The action was of no practical significance; there had been no likelihood

of Campbell McAlpine preaching at Howe Street for more than a year and he was about to leave New Zealand. It was the symbolism which mattered, and the respectful attention which any warning from Howe Street was bound to command. Some of the leading Howe Street elders also thought of a more official way to thwart the new teachings and their teachers. R. A. Laidlaw forwarded a draft manuscript of a denunciation of Neo-Pentecostalism to many leading brethren all over the country, inviting them to add the weight of their signatures to an attempt to put an end to Pentecostal influence in the assemblies once and for all. Once the draft had been revised twenty Brethren agreed to their names being used; they were A. G. (Alex) Bain, Dr. Pettit, H. C. Chenery, A. L. (Stan) Goold and Jack Hume of Auckland; from the Manawatu, W. Stewart, Ron Hathaway, Jack Moir and H. B. Honore and of course H. C. Hewlett; from the East Coast of the North Island, David A. Hewlett (H. C.'s brother), F. W. Brown and John C. Henderson; from Christchurch, R. H. Aston and Charlie Purdie, and from Wellington, Gordon Maclachlan, Ron. J. Drown and the man who had opposed Smith Wigglesworth forty years earlier, Charlie Drake. They were a distinguished group of men, some of them in the professions, others prosperous employers. There were no full-time Christian workers in the list except for H. C. Hewlett.

A number of other Brethren declined to sign. One may understand their reluctance on examining the emphasis of this 'letter of twenty'. For the pamphlet put forward a very simple and straightforward case. It did not contend that there were special 'sign-gifts'. It disputed Milton Smith's interpretation of the perfect state mentioned in 1 Corinthians 13 by referring to the chapter's statement that even when the perfect had come faith and hope would still continue. Surely faith and hope would be redundant in heaven? The gifts must therefore have ceased much earlier; to be specific they must have ceased with the completion of the canon of Scripture. The tract was bolstered by lengthy quotations from Graham Scroggie, Campbell Morgan and Harry Ironside (Laidlaw's brother-in-law), which implied that these notable preachers had used the same arguments against Pentecostalism as the pamphlet. However this was not the real focus of the pamphlet. It turned from scriptural exegesis and interpretation to another kind of evidence:

Even if there were any room for a difference of opinion of what God has written, there can surely be no difference when we interpret what He has written by what he has done ... [If tongues were a genuine gift] all our assemblies of reasonable size would have at least one worker of miracles, one healer, and one speaker in tongues and one interpreter.⁷⁴

It was a species of reasoning based on a very idealistic interpretation of the character of the assemblies.

The logic of the pamphlet was curious; Professor F. F. Bruce exposed the weakness of its Biblical interpretation in answer to a question in the English magazine, the *Harvester*, in 1964. And Cecil Howley, the editor of the *Witness*, passed a trenchant comment on its arguments in a private letter:

I think it very unwise to engage in sweeping condemnations. To overstate a case never strengthens it, but weakens it. The booklets that I have seen from the New Zealand assemblies are, frankly, disappointing; and I hope they are not panic measures. You see the exegesis of I Cor[inthians] 13:8 given is, I believe, quite wrong. ... [To answer Pentecostal teaching] the really valid portions [of Scripture] need to be understood, then expounded clearly; and we need to be very careful about talking about excommunication when control would probably solve the matter. ... I cannot believe we can put away for tongues alone.⁷⁵

Howley's closing comment was particularly apposite. The exegesis of the pamphlet was less important than the advice it gave to elders. Appealing as it did to the opinion of 'the very great majority of responsible brethren', and to Brethren history, it urged the necessity of action 'to preserve the testimony which God has committed to the Assemblies'. Its advice was forthright: 'We cannot give tacit approval to brethren holding that the gift of tongues is for today, by putting them on our platforms or allowing them to minister.' A covering letter insisted that the signatories did not wish to restrict the autonomy of assemblies, but no-one could have missed the hint.⁷⁶

7,500 copies of the pamphlet were distributed, although its appearance was privately regretted by a number of Brethren. One man put his criticisms into print. Frank Carlisle had already withdrawn from Elizabeth Street Chapel in Wellington after a controversy about his suggestion that a charismatic Baptist minister address the young people of the chapel, so he had nothing to lose when he published a reply, which cleverly had the same title and format as the letter of the twenty. His fifty-page booklet argued that the letter of twenty misrepresented both Scripture and the exegetes it cited. In conclusion he challenged the Brethren to be genuinely obedient to Scripture:

If we cannot produce a valid case from the Scriptures against the presence of the gifts in the church today, then we must adopt a positive attitude to all the relevant Scriptures and apply them in our fellowship.⁷⁷

Several thousand copies of his pamphlet were distributed, including one to every New Zealand assembly, but its very tone discounted it in the eyes of most Brethren. Missionaries were warned by the Palmerston North Missionary Funds office to ignore it. However other discordant voices were less easily silenced. In a letter published by the Wellington

Assembly Research Fellowship, Dr. Douglas Stewart, while solemnly denying that he had any sympathy for the Charismatic Movement, warned of the danger of 'insistence on a uniform interpretation of the work of the Holy Spirit'. He concluded his letter: 'This recent controversy is a method of the Devil to neutralize many of our best men.' And in the letters published in answer to Stewart's, several Brethren concurred with these views.⁷⁸

This call for charity had come too late. By 1963 most of the leaders of assemblies had decided it was necessary to take a stand. The first to do so were the elders of the Christchurch assemblies (where as yet there had been little Brethren involvement in things charismatic). In September 1963 they held their first ever combined meeting at which they reiterated phrases of the letter of twenty in a resolution which read:

The standard interpretation accepted throughout 130 years as assemblies is that "apostles" have passed away, that "prophets" have ceased with the completion and circulation of the full Word of God, and that miracles, gifts of healing and tongues were given as Divine signs at the introduction of this dispensation, but having served their purpose have ceased.⁷⁹

When this resolution was published in the *Treasury* the news editor confidently commented that 'assemblies are solidly behind the conclusions reached in the pamphlet', and indeed after the assemblies in the Hutt valley forwarded a similar resolution a month later, a halt was called to printing more protestations of loyalty. They were unnecessary. This sequence of public statements had already exerted heavy pressure on assembly members who were straying from the fold. And the threat of loss of fellowship was more alarming to Brethren than any official discipline could be.

It was one thing to pass resolutions; it was quite another to implement them. Assemblies inevitably turned to this next. The chief person to fall under suspicion was Don Caldwell, the thirty-nine year-old Brethren evangelist who had been commended by the Te Puke assembly in 1949. Te Puke was in a vicinity in the Bay of Plenty in the North Island where charismatic questions were very live ones. Twenty-five years before, the Apostolic Church had disrupted Brethren outreach to the Maoris there. Nearby Tauranga had subsequently become a centre for the dissemination of neo-Pentecostal teachings. The chief influences were Rob Wheeler, Des Short, who was pastor of the local Assembly of God, and Eric Sherburd, who had moved from Berhampore to the Tauranga Baptist Church. Moreover within the Te Puke assembly there were several ardent advocates of revival, including the Bowen family, and for many years a regular revival prayer meeting had been held there.

These were matters of concern for the Te Puke elders, but they were

of little relevance to Don Caldwell, for he was an explicit opponent of Pentecostalism. However he had worked with Campbell McAlpine, and was deeply impressed by him. News that Campbell had experienced the gift of tongues forced him to reconsider whether such a gift could be genuine, and after long study he came to the conclusion that God could still bestow the gift. He did not claim to have received it himself. Bert Laidlaw eventually heard with concern that Caldwell had become at least sympathetic to the new teaching. So he invited Caldwell to his office for a five-hour meeting, and lent him a draft of the letter of twenty. To Laidlaw's horror, Caldwell did not find it convincing, and in his reply he was sharply critical of the tenor of the pamphlet. He felt it misquoted Scroggie and the other exegetes it cited, and that it disposed of the gifts by inventing an unbiblical category called 'sign-gifts'. He concluded with a warning which so upset Laidlaw that he was later to quote just those paragraphs of the letter as proof of Caldwell's obduracy. Here are those paragraphs in full:

The sending forth of such a statement as theirs is going to have very much greater repercussions than ever anticipated. Furthermore, for them to have deliberately ignored and omitted the clear-cut written expositions of such saintly and scholarly teachers as Drs. Scroggie, Ironside and Campbell Morgan, is going to seriously undermine the confidence of younger men in the spiritual integrity of their elders throughout the whole country. This is indeed a grave situation, and to take any action outside the will of God will be disastrous. That our senior elder brethren who sign the proposed statement are in God's perfect will in this matter is open to serious question.⁸⁰

His words may have been accurate but especially out of context they seemed very sharp. R. A. Laidlaw hastily replied, urging Caldwell to fall into line, and to accept that standard evangelical teaching had been correctly cited. He pleaded with Caldwell to: 'put aside all thought of any of the lesser gifts, about which there is so much controversy and devot[e] yourself to the use and development of the far more important gifts which God has already bestowed upon you'.⁸¹ A month later he wrote again in earnest desire that he would not have to publicly criticize Caldwell. Why, he asked, 'should we be divided on such an unimportant subject as tongues?'⁸²

Bert Laidlaw valued evangelism, but he was consciously warning Caldwell that his evangelistic work was less important than his loyalty to assembly beliefs. The choice was an unpalatable one, and it was only after 'many months of burning heart-searching' that Caldwell finally wrote to Laidlaw in July 1963 declining to accept an interpretation of I Corinthians 13:8 on the supposed authority of exegetes like Scroggie who had in fact denied the accuracy of such interpretations. 'If assembly

Christians would gain the tacit approval of their Brethren they must repudiate the expositional ministry of these mighty men and rigidly adhere to the signed assembly statement', he lamented. And this he would not do.⁸³

Bert Laidlaw was conscious that in this correspondence he was acting as a representative for the Brethren. He was aware that there were agitators abroad who were not beyond accusing himself of being soft on Pentecostalism, and in the existing atmosphere he realized that some would believe them. Elder Brethren are always very conscious of the opinions of their peers. So Laidlaw decided that it was time to take action, and unbeknown to Caldwell he reproduced much of the correspondence and forwarded it to the signatories of the letter of twenty. He asked for their suggestions as to appropriate action, for, he wrote, 'I feel sure he will not be able to resist propagating amongst our young people what he believes so deeply'.⁸⁴ The Wellington signatories responded urging Laidlaw to forward copies of the correspondence to the Te Puke elders with the suggestion that his commendation be withdrawn. 'Firmness' was essential, and if the Te Puke oversight was unwilling to act, then might not the signatories of the statement expose Caldwell's views in the *Treasury*? In such a way the autonomy of local assemblies might be circumvented.⁸⁵ However this eventuality never arose, for the Te Puke elders swiftly advised Caldwell to write 'a very humble apology and also a statement from you that no controversial teaching would be given or propagated by you in any way'. Caldwell did write the demanded apology, but he declined to write more than this, and Laidlaw was not appeased.⁸⁶ A debate with Charlie Hewlett in the presence of the Te Puke elders failed to change his views.

The Te Puke elders presented Caldwell with two alternative statements. In signing one he would reaffirm standard Brethren teaching; in signing the other he would declare that his views had changed so much that he saw that he could not remain as a Brethren commended worker. He was willing to sign neither. Consequently his elders felt obliged to deal firmly with him. It would have been easier for them if Don Caldwell had been directly involved in the Charismatic Movement, but Caldwell always stoutly denied rumours to that effect, so his crime remained one of declining to criticize speaking in tongues. Rowland Rogers, the son of E. W. Rogers, who had urged the Te Puke elders into action, participated in the correspondence on the subject within the Wellington Assembly Research Fellowship in 1964. He argued that if a person 'refuses to give ... an assurance [that he will not propagate Pentecostal teachings], declaring that he is answerable to the Lord alone, and that he must be free to do as the Lord tells him to', then the platform had to be closed to such a person.⁸⁷ He was plainly referring to Caldwell.

Late in May 1964 the Te Puke elders announced to their assembly that the commendation of Don Caldwell had been withdrawn, and a notice was inserted to this effect in the June issue of the *Treasury*.⁸⁸ To the surprise of many, Caldwell did not leave the assembly, and he continued his full-time evangelistic work in wider circles than previously. But the door was effectively closed to many of the assemblies where he had previously ministered.

Not long after this action a dispute broke out at Paeroa, not far from Te Puke. Two of the leaders of the assembly, W. G. Broadbent and the evangelist Ces Hilton, found themselves in the minority in their identification of a case of alleged charismatic activity. A tussle for the control of the chapel resulted, and the Waikato and Bay of Plenty elders at their regular meeting decided that the Stewards Trust had better adjudicate, since they held the deeds of the recently-built chapel. It was a touchy issue, for on it hung the issue of whether everything called Pentecostal had to be purged. When the integrity of the Stewards Trust adjudicators was impugned by the minority, the Stewards Trust invited a representative group of non-Aucklanders to assist their deliberations, and seventeen men were at the meeting when the issue was resolved. They included Cecil Grant and Charlie Brace from Wellington, John Henderson of Hastings, A. W. Emmett of Wanganui, Eric Edwards of New Plymouth, Courtney Lawry and Peter Greenfield from Nelson and R. H. Aston and Charlie Purdie from Christchurch. Their solution was to leave the chapel in the hands of the allegedly pro-charismatic majority, but to issue a statement denying that they were sympathetic to Pentecostalism, and insisting that tongues and healing were strictly confined to the apostolic age. 'As the knowledge of God increased, and the churches were established, God's purpose for the gifts was achieved and they ceased', read the third clause of their public statement, and the fourth declared: 'We believe that the present-day teaching that the gift of tongues and healing are still in operation is divisive and erroneous.'⁸⁹

The uniform line now being demanded did not in fact receive the support of all elder brethren. In some assemblies the charismatic party seemed quite strong. In Auckland in particular the number of committed Brethren charismatics was naturally large. At Waikowhai assembly in the city, the elders were deeply divided on the issue, and one of those elders was Milton Smith, who conducted the Bible Class. Consequently Waikowhai was the only assembly in which Arthur Wallis ministered at any length when he remained in New Zealand after the Easter camp of 1963. However by 1964 a majority of the elders led by Eric Purchase decided that the time for tolerance had passed, and this led to a division in the assembly. Some went to the large Hillsborough Baptist Church, including Jim Dawson and his wife Joy, who was the

daughter of J. H. Manins. Milton Smith decided to shift his allegiance to the Te Papapa assembly in the south of the city. Te Papapa assembly had been established in a state housing district in 1948, and it developed a very significant outreach in the neighbourhood. It had been here that Ezra Coppin had been preaching when he received the baptism of the Spirit in 1954. By 1964, under the guidance of its leading elder, Les Faithful, it had become a haven for charismatic Brethren from all over Auckland. Naturally they expected that its forms of worship should reflect this.

When Dr. Pettit heard that some such concessions had been made, he and another elder from Howe Street, Jack Hume, visited the assembly, and then reported what they had discovered to the quarterly meeting of elder Brethren of the Auckland assemblies at the Wiremu Street Hall on 14 March 1965. This body was responsible for inserting advertisements in the Saturday editions of the Auckland newspapers containing information on the meeting times and places of 'Christians known as Open Brethren', and it had also advertised to dissociate the assemblies from the Exclusive Brethren excesses which had been the focus of considerable attention from the media.⁹⁰ It felt a similar responsibility to preserve the pure character of the assemblies when it heard the report about Te Papapa. So a statement was unanimously agreed upon which led to the omission of Te Papapa from the newspaper list of assemblies, and to a remarkable notice which was printed in the *Treasury*:

Brethren taking responsibility in Te Papapa Gospel Centre have decided that, while not permitting women to teach, they allow them to participate in the Lord's Day morning meeting by (1) Reading Scriptures (2) Announcing hymns (3) Engaging in prayer (4) "Prophesying". They also stated that, on three occasions, women had already "prophesied". Furthermore they said that they would allow speaking in tongues if an interpreter was present.

In view of the above this meeting of elders of Auckland assemblies considers that Te Papapa Gospel Centre has put itself outside the fellowship of Assemblies known as "open brethren".⁹¹

It was a drastic step, and evidently it was felt necessary to justify it as a defence of the longer established Brethren orthodoxy on the role of women. (It is true that one appeal of Pentecostalism was the opportunities it gave to women.) Nevertheless the announcement was in fact directed against Neo-Pentecostalism. For Milton Smith it was a very real shock. 'Suddenly', he writes, 'I found myself alone, unrelated to Brethren Assemblies and leaders with whom I had warm fellowship and mutual service for years. I felt this very keenly.'⁹²

The action did not escape criticism, especially among Brethren beyond New Zealand. In 1965 an avid discussion had developed in the

pages of the *Witness* in response to an article by A. E. Horton which had admitted that: 'frankness demands that we cannot prove from Scripture that all supernatural manifestations of the Spirit's power have completely and permanently ceased'.⁹³

Stung by these comments, R. A. Laidlaw, Dr. Pettit and Will Miller wrote to the English magazine insisting that the policy of 'extreme caution' which Horton had advised, had failed in New Zealand, and that 'definite opposition' was the only safe policy. In illustration of their point they quoted the text of the expulsion of Te Papapa.⁹⁴ To their surprise their letter provoked a rash of horrified answers. Eminent Brethren who emphasized that they had no sympathy with the Charismatic Movement expressed their distaste for a step which savoured of the Exclusive Brethren policy of 'disfellowshipping' people by isolating them. If Paul had not separated from the Corinthian assembly, despite all its faults, was it right for Brethren to be more discriminatory? 'In what way', asked one correspondent, 'does this action differ in principle from the Papal Convention now being held in Rome?'⁹⁵

These unsympathetic remarks caused considerable irritation in New Zealand, for the strength of its assemblies compared to those of Britain, lay in their unity and uniformity. Laidlaw, Pettit and Miller said as much when they replied to their critics in a subsequent issue. Denominationalism was a fact of life in any vigorous movement. 'Why try to live in a world of make believe instead of facing reality?', they retorted.⁹⁶

By 1964 the views of the New Zealand assemblies were altogether clear. In order to confirm waverers a conference on tongues, healing and prophecy was held in Howe Street Chapel on Saturday 21 November 1964. This conference proved to be an unusual event, because the quarterly meeting of the Auckland assemblies accepted a resolution by Mr. McCaskill of Eden Chapel that both sides of the issue be presented at the meeting. Consequently Don Caldwell's name was substituted for that of Leo Clarke, after consultation with the Te Puke elders. Don was a convenient choice to state the 'other side' just because his views were so moderate. Yet his talk, with which the conference commenced, caused quite a stir, for he emphasized the injustice of the manner in which he had been treated, and emphatically denounced the excesses of Pentecostalism, denying that he had any personal experience of things Pentecostal. 'I believe the angel of the Lord is standing over the assemblies with his sword drawn in his hand, to execute judgement', he declared. These words caused considerable unease, and the organizers felt obliged to invite a Te Puke elder to explain why action was taken against him. The other speakers at the conference were Bert Laidlaw, Dr. Pettit, Charlie Hewlett (despite his unhappiness at attending a conference at which a troubler of the assemblies was permitted to speak)

and Will Miller. Opportunity was also given for brief ten-minute contributions, and among those who took part were Enoch Coppin, Arthur Vine, Bill Turkington and Ralph Dowdell of Waikowhai. A few contributors from the congregation of three hundred men dared to present a viewpoint sympathetic to charismatic claims, and towards the end of the conference Mr. McCaskill lamented that so much of the proceedings of the day had consisted merely of denunciations of people and their heresies, instead of analyses of the controverted passages of Scripture. This was unusual for a Brethren conference, but then this was no ordinary conference, but an attempt to goad assemblies into action.⁹⁷

Local assemblies soon began to investigate the actions and beliefs of their members and especially full-time workers commended by them. This was not an easy operation because charismatic sympathizers were reluctant to state their views publicly, and such people were also privately inclined to denigrate the spirituality of elders who had not come into the blessing. In one assembly the elders issued a statement, and then required individuals to assent to it. It read, in part:

Those members of this assembly who in any way hold the signs gifts ... or those who associate with people who hold these views, are not to take part in any assembly gathering or activities, whether in the remembrance meeting of a Sunday morning, the Sunday School, the rallies, the women's meeting, or any other activity at all, until they are freed from their error to the satisfaction of responsible brethren. ... If ... brethren and sisters continue to fellowship with other professing Christians who hold and practise the sign-gifts they will have to withdraw ... because we will have nothing to do with these practices.⁹⁸

This decree was probably fairly typical of many. As a result many people left the assemblies, including a number of full-time workers such as David Jacobsen. The Maori work of the assemblies suffered severely. In Wellington there was a series of explosions over the issue. At Elizabeth Street Chapel in the city, the elders had reacted in a low-key manner to early indications of charismatics in the assembly. However several of these elders were on the national committee of Open Air Campaigners, and when the issue erupted in that organization it spilt over into the assembly. In July 1965, after an incident in the Nelson district, the O.A.C. committee issued a statement insisting that despite 'certain incidents', 'O.A.C. ... does not and will not permit any of its members to practise or propagate such teachings'. Noel Gibson was required to read a public apology at Elizabeth Street Chapel. At Taupo, Palmerston North, and the Hutt, assemblies were badly split.⁹⁹

One of the chief culprits for the trouble, according to the Brethren, was Arthur Wallis. He had remained in New Zealand after the 1963

Willow Park Easter Camp, and preached wherever he was welcome. He was invited to only two or three assemblies, but he did hold private cottage meetings all over the country. He remained for twenty-one months, and in that time he helped to bring charismatics who were not in Pentecostal churches into contact with each other, and to assist them to retain their own identity separate from other Pentecostals. A key aspect of his ministry was his extensive use of the 'word of knowledge' and 'deliverance' by means of the laying on of hands. He gave an interesting evaluation of his work to his English friends:

I did not meet with any unhealthy preoccupation with spiritual gifts such as tongues or healing. Though gifts are being received, my impression is that they are being used sparingly. ... I do not want to suggest that mistakes have not been made, or that unwise things have not been said and done. The infallible Spirit is pleased to work through fallible instruments, but it *is* the Holy Spirit who is working, not self or Satan ... Fear of the Lord and love of the brethren forbid me to say anything concerning the policy of those who view very differently what is taking place. Let us pray for them and for the crisis that has arisen in their circles. I can see no happy issue, only sorrowful division, so long as the present policy is pursued.¹⁰⁰

To consolidate his work, he and some friends including Milton Smith planned a conference of charismatic Christians at Massey University in Palmerston North for August 1964. The conference was intended to direct the charismatics toward New Testament ecclesiology as well as spirituality. The speakers at the Massey Conference also included Milton Smith and Campbell McAlpine, who returned from England to participate. The only non-Brethren speaker was Tom Marshall, a Wellington Baptist, although several people of other denominations including Frank Houston of the Assemblies of God also shared in the testimony meetings. The conference had been advertized in a circular which offered a solution to all the tensions of the past years. It read:

The time has come for a larger coming together to share the great vision that the Spirit of God is unfolding. ... the Holy Spirit of God is wanting to work in Apostolic power through a fully-functioning local body, fed and led and governed by spiritual elders, amongst them those with special gifts and callings.¹⁰¹

Those who attended the conference regarded it as a remarkable experience, but no new local churches were established as a result; indeed Arthur Wallis in the opening session went to some lengths to deny that this had ever been his definite intention. This conference, he declared:

has *not* been convened to call any individual to leave his denomination,

church, assembly or fellowship. This conference has *not* been convened to form anything; a new movement or a new church. If any of these things are involved, then God must do them; the onus is upon the Almighty. We would not presume to raise a little finger to precipitate anything.¹⁰²

Yet it is plain enough that some of those present had hoped for such an outcome. When Brethren leaders had seen the conference brochure they felt justified in regarding anyone who went to such a conference and then returned to his assembly as a subversive agent. R. A. Laidlaw and eleven North Island elders hastily printed and circulated a letter to the assemblies denouncing the conference as 'a call for a division in the church of God', and there were attempts to infiltrate the conference. Many Brethren who attended it were identified, and their assemblies warned about them. Fortuitously Bill Turkington of Wellington had just distributed widely among the assemblies packets of literature exposing Pentecostalism, including booklets by Enoch Coppin, Charlie Drake, Cyril Maskery and a compilation of cases of alleged Spiritism associated with tongues. They popularized the view of Enoch Coppin that the Charismatic Movement was 'Satan's rival programme'. Intended to dampen interest in the movement, they had an opposite effect in some cases.¹⁰³ However the conference was more significant in stimulating charismatic interest in other denominations, especially in Palmerston North. It was from this time that the Awapuni Baptist Church began to evolve into the independent charismatic Christian Centre, which attracted many former Brethren. Moreover several Anglicans became involved in the movement as a result of the conference, including the Rev. Cecil Marshall, who along with a Palmerston North curate, the Rev. Ray Muller, arranged the visit to New Zealand by Father Dennis Bennett in 1966. That tour marked the commencement of the Charismatic Movement in the main churches.¹⁰⁴

After 1964 the issue gradually subsided among Brethren, who became renowned for their opposition to things charismatic. The most notable campaigner was Dr. Pettit, whose prolonged life (he is still alive, aged 97, as this article is being written) testified to the failure of at least the apparent meaning of Arthur Wallis's prophecy. Several evangelists including Enoch Coppin, Colin Graham and Ces Hilton repeatedly condemned the 'error'. When Ces Hilton began to establish a chain of evangelistic institutions he expected his assistants to agree to a doctrinal statement including an assertion that 'some of the gifts of the Spirit such as tongues and healing were evidently limited to the early church and have thus ceased'.¹⁰⁵ Every year a few more Brethren removed to churches where charismatic gifts were more acceptable, although not all of them settled easily in these churches. Here and there the charismatic

issue blew up at regular intervals, and the list of assemblies which experienced disputes over the matter became a long one. Some of these divisions led to the formation of essentially ex-Brethren charismatic churches, most notable among them the Palmerston North Christian Centre, but also including the Christchurch East Revival Centre, and the Northcote Christian Fellowship in Christchurch, the Upper Hutt Christian Fellowship and the Strathmore Fellowship in the Wellington district and the Fairlie New Life Centre. Such fellowships have since tended to absorb a much wider group than simply ex-Brethren, but they do differ from the Pentecostal churches in their desire to avoid one-man ministry. A conference of such churches in Taupo in July 1981 attracted 150 pastors and elders of whom some 40 per cent had a Brethren background. Many other former Brethren drifted in other directions; the Baptist Union, which eventually decided to tolerate charismatics, attracted many ex-Brethren, some of whom have become prominent ministers and lay leaders in it. It is difficult to estimate the extent of Brethren losses through the dispute. They were certainly extensive. Beside the people who departed from the assemblies in the period from 1963-5, many more have drifted out, then or later, through disenchantment at Brethren intransigence. The decline of Brethren affiliation in the 1966 census by several thousands owed as much to this issue as it did to the tensions within the Exclusive Brethren. All told the assemblies are perhaps ten per cent smaller than they would have been had the schisms been avoidable, assuming that no major evangelistic advance was thwarted by the division.

Wider Ripples

Brethren leaders exported their anguish concerning neo-Pentecostalism in various directions. It showed up in the interdenominational groups in which they played such a large part. Conservative Evangelicals as a group were cautious at the undoctinaire quest for experience by charismatics, but it was the Brethren who were most eager to force the issue. In Scripture Union, in the Inter-Varsity Fellowship (later the Tertiary Students Christian Fellowship), in Youth For Christ, in the Child Evangelism Fellowship, in the Open Air Campaigners and in the Bible Training Institute (now the Bible College of New Zealand), Brethren supporters urged that action be taken against charismatics. In a few places this did take place, but by-and-large the leaders of these organizations felt there were lessons to learn from the experience of the Brethren, and these were the lessons of cautious tolerance of divergent views of non-essential issues wherever possible. For example when Professor

E. M. Blacklock and Dr. Pettit expressed their concern at the infiltration of Pentecostalism in the Inter-Varsity Fellowship in 1970, a survey revealed that: 'some of the most able and conscientious students [are charismatics] ... there is no question of their showing disloyalty, schism or suchlike'.¹⁰⁶ Yet tensions were felt by Brethren involved in these organizations, tensions which were sometimes resolved by either withdrawing or succumbing.

The experience of the New Zealand assemblies also caused repercussions on the Brethren world-wide. In the aftermath of the Massey Conference, Ransome Cooper warned the English Brethren to close their platforms to men like Arthur Wallis and Campbell McAlpine. Some of the literature circulated in New Zealand gained a larger readership among the English assemblies. David Lillie wrote a booklet for the Fountain Trust to counteract this teaching, and this was widely distributed in New Zealand also.¹⁰⁷ However, many of the more open English Brethren followed the advice of Professor F. F. Bruce in avoiding the exegesis of the New Zealand Brethren. They were influenced by the cautious analysis of the issue by the evangelical Anglican leader, the Rev. John R. W. Stott, although this caution certainly did not prevent divisions. When F. F. Bruce visited New Zealand there was some alarm that his undogmatic views would encourage the Charismatic Movement, but in fact the controversy had died down by then.¹⁰⁸ The House Church movement which is now one of the major charismatic bodies in the United Kingdom has quite a number of ex-Brethren leaders, among them Arthur Wallis. In the United States, where Brethren assemblies are less numerous, Enoch Coppin on a 1964 visit to California persuaded assemblies there to emulate the reaction of the New Zealand Brethren.¹⁰⁹ Brethren missionary work was extensively affected, according to a recent analysis.¹¹⁰

Changes in attitude are now occurring. C. Ernest Tatham, the author of the Emmaus Bible Course on the Holy Spirit, came into a charismatic experience in the 1970s, but he did not leave the assemblies, and he has written on the subject using the subtitle: 'for all who want God's gifts but are unable to accept mainstream charismatic theology'.¹¹¹ Even in New Zealand the trauma of maintaining such fierce opposition to the Charismatic Movement persuaded many Brethren to be more cautious, and over the last ten years fewer have left the assemblies on these grounds. The wave of Jesus marches in 1972 was supported by many Brethren. The surge of centripetal forces among the assemblies encouraged by the dispute waned after the death of R. A. Laidlaw, for there was no leader who has taken his place. The assemblies have become more diverse, and many have become rather more open. 'Scripture in Song', which was initiated by David and Dale Garrett, the former of whom has

a distinguished Brethren and charismatic pedigree (he is the nephew of Frank Garrett), is now almost universally used by assemblies, as it is in other churches. Many open assemblies do not trouble to check whether there are those among them who used tongues in private. Some assemblies have sought to go further, and the Te Atatu assembly in Auckland recently adapted a joint statement by English evangelical Anglicans and charismatics to express their views. They also suggested the need for more openness to charismatic gifts in an open letter in the *Treasury*.¹¹² Yet it has rarely proved easy for charismatic and non-charismatic to be members of a single congregation, and toleration is more easily discussed than practised. Many charismatics feel the frustration expressed by one former Brethren pastor: 'the church structured as it is just doesn't meet the needs of so many. ... The Brethren assemblies we believe, are too restrictive'.¹¹³ Yet, as the later history of Te Papapa assembly indicates, charismatic churches are not necessarily free from problems. After nearly twenty years of development some of them are facing the same pressures of institutionalisation and loss of purpose which come in the aftermath of every revival. Certainly most of the growing churches of today are charismatic, whereas some formerly large congregations of the Brethren including Howe Street Chapel have declined in the same era. Yet there is no single formula for church growth, and many assemblies continue to be vital and vibrant in their witness to their community.

Some Reflections

At the Howe Street Conference in 1964 Charlie Hewlett described the period as: 'the most critical days our assemblies have ever known'. The reaction of the Brethren to the Charismatic Movement has left a deep scar on both the assemblies and charismatics in New Zealand. The last twenty years have not been easy ones for Brethren. Gordon Junck sadly remarked in 1964: 'It seems that the Lord is scourging the assemblies today. Need we wonder at this after years of careless ease and wholesale materialism'.¹¹⁴ In many ways a more significant threat to assembly life triumphed unnoticed during that painful age. Tension and distrust and declining commitment to the faith by many of the Brethren who remained combined to distort their spiritual vision. An age akin to the McCarthyite era of anti-communism in the United States broke out. Sometimes the mere mention of the Holy Spirit led to suspicion of the speaker's orthodoxy. The most strident opponents of Pentecostalism gained a large following. Unknown tongues may have been silenced, but, as Don Caldwell commented at Howe Street, lying tongues were

not. The call for renewal of the assemblies in recent issues of the *Treasury* reflects a now widespread realization of the problem. Charismatics see this situation as the judgment of God on Brethren for resisting newly revealed truth. Because the impact of the charismatic renewal has been so extensive in New Zealand churches, the assemblies have been isolated and branded with a peculiarly negative stigma.

The Charismatic Movement in New Zealand owes much to the Brethren in its spirituality, its eschatology, its ecclesiology and its leadership. Many people left the Brethren reluctantly, but they felt a greater loyalty to their new spiritual experience. Such people still greatly respect the Brethren heritage, but they believe that by institutionalizing this the Brethren have destroyed it.

Among Brethren, on the other hand, there is a feeling of frustration at the persistence of charismatic demands that they should change. Most Brethren did not seek the reputation for intolerance which they have gained. They are willing to maintain friendly fellowship with members of charismatic churches, but they feel that frank recognition of the distinctiveness of the Brethren concept of the Spirit's work is the prerequisite for fellowship with charismatic churches. Fellowship within congregations is possible only if each person recognizes and respects the work of God in others in the church. Too often charismatics proselytize within churches by denigrating the spirituality of other members, and especially the elders of the church. It is interesting that Douglas Stewart, whose passionate plea for mutual tolerance has been quoted earlier, subsequently admitted that tolerance simply did not work.¹¹⁵ There is also concern at the unbiblical and unwise behaviour of many Pentecostal groups and leaders. In a Christian world which tends to decide everything not by its truth but by how it feels, Brethren want to continue to be faithful to the truths of the Bible in as much as they understand them. Criticism of Brethren often overlooks the value of their example of faithfulness to revealed truth. Brethren justifiably complain at the monstrous abuse of the Bible by some charismatic leaders. They recall examples (even if they are exceptional) of prophecies which have failed, healings which have proved fraudulent, and former charismatics who now no longer profess to be Christians, and they feel that the charismatic experience is over-rated. They also doubt whether all the spectacular attention which the Charismatic Movement has drawn over the last few years has really increased the number of faithful disciples of Jesus Christ. They recall with sorrow the decline in the evangelistic work of assemblies during the 1960s. It is all very well longing for revival, but the work of evangelism calls for patience, diligence and informed understanding of the faith and not just enthusiasm for signs and wonders.

Thus there are hurts on both sides which will not easily heal. It may seem presumptuous to hope that this paper might ameliorate the situation. Yet it would be helpful to both sides to see some of their mistakes. For example the tensions of the sixties led to an abuse of Scripture on both sides of the fence. Both the Charismatic and the Brethren orthodoxies then formulated are on insecure biblical bases. The Brethren interpretation of I Corinthians 13 was ill-founded, and so was the charismatic use of the Book of Acts to demonstrate the necessity of a post-conversion baptism in the Spirit. The Brethren thought that they had found a simple scriptural argument against the continuance of tongues in I Corinthians 13:8. If it was not obvious then it is generally recognized today that this verse does not define the perfect state as the period after the New Testament was completed, and that this interpretation is therefore guilty of reading a meaning into the text rather than out of it. The argument based upon the temporary and Jewish nature of the sign gifts mentioned in Mark 16 is a stronger one, but one should recognize that the concept of a 'sign gift' necessitates conflating of two quite separate Biblical categories. Both arguments employ an ultra-dispensational analysis of Scripture which effectively reduces the authority not just of I Corinthians but of many other parts of the Bible. To recognize these mistakes is not to establish agreement upon the Biblical doctrine of the Holy Spirit, but it is interesting to note that some recent charismatic writers including Tom Smail and Ernest Tatham are seeking a better theological basis upon which to explain the work of the Spirit in the life of individual and congregation. Brethren should surely participate in this reconsideration of what the Bible teaches on these subjects.

The whole dispute casts an illuminating light on the Brethren. There is reason to believe that Brethren views were in fact based less on their reading of I Corinthians than on their fear of anything irrational in their midst, or anything which would distract young people from their loyalty to the assemblies. They were deeply offended that some in their midst should implicitly criticize the spirituality of their elders by seeking for and claiming a higher level of spiritual life. Perhaps the Brethren looked too proudly at themselves as God's unique instrument in an age of decline and modernism. They thought of themselves as important to God, and they were confident that they knew all that God had for them to do. Theirs was a lay religion, which distrusted worldly religiosity and adopted the implicitly secular attitude which had undergirded Protestant capitalism and Protestant science in a previous age. They were empiricists at heart, and so they sought other explanations for charismatic claims of supernatural manifestations in the present age. Both parties need to seek a more Biblical understanding of divine

involvement in human experience than is possible when one assumes a sharp divide between natural and supernatural.

There have been many subsequent regrets about the over-reaction to the Charismatic Movement in the 1960s. Many of the fears which were very understandable in the 1960s, when the Brethren felt that they alone were being challenged, may now be discounted. One may have understandable hesitations about aspects of the Charismatic Movement, yet one cannot avoid seeing that the Spirit of God has used it. It has been a very significant agent in renewing an evangelical witness in the main churches. Now that it is better known, the charge that it is Spiritualist may be dismissed apart from exceptional cases. The weak theology of the older Pentecostal churches and the excesses of the independent Pentecostals have earned the criticism of many participants in the Charismatic Movement. Indeed there is less unity in the Charismatic Movement today; it has developed a variety of streams and factions. The variety of the movement means that criticisms are not universally applicable. Certainly some of these groups and their leaders demand and receive a blind loyalty which is subversive both of truth and trust. It was these things to which Brethren have reasonably objected. Yet the same accusation could be levelled against the demands which the assemblies made on their members in the same period. Loyalty is a necessary tool, but blind loyalty is very dangerous.

Readers may detect a somewhat critical view of the Brethren in this article. Perhaps that is inevitable. Any institution has a tendency to develop mechanisms to cope with threats to its own existence. Unfortunately those mechanisms develop unthinkingly, and thus Christian institutions resort to quite unchristian reactions to problems. There is good reason to think that had this article focussed on the Pentecostal churches, it would have recorded institutional behaviour which is at least equally objectionable. The reaction of the Brethren assemblies to the Charismatic Movement was paradoxically the consequence of their trying to copy the pattern of the churches of the New Testament age. For all churches require some agreed basis, but the Brethren earned distinction for their refusal to impose on their congregations any authority other than the Bible. Yet a standard 'Brethren' understanding of the meaning of the Bible inevitably evolved, and all assembly members were expected to accept it. The attempt to enforce a standard denominational reaction to the Charismatic Movement was of the same character. The relative success of this attempt indicates the extent to which sectarian isolation survives among them. However that stand was also unfortunate, for Brethren chose to speak most emphatically on an issue on which they were most susceptible to criticism. There does need to be a common understanding of Biblical truth and a fellowship of

assemblies, but it is easy to lurch into either anarchy or tyranny, and this principle applies as much to denominational groups as it does to individual congregations. Christians who want to be faithful to the Bible must allow to each other the same right.

If this is conceded, then we may be able to learn from each other. For both Brethren and charismatics have valuable insights for the church, but both also have inherent shortcomings, and the movements do not easily find common ground. We cannot avoid the fact that both movements exist. Yet in the end God will judge people separately from the movements under the banner of which they justify their acts. This should cause us to ponder our values. We should all be willing to repent where we have erred, and be eager to love all of our brothers and sisters in Christ, seeking to discern within each other the mark of the one indwelling Lord. It may not be easy, but that is our common calling as fellow Christians.

Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

NOTES

1. This file, cited below as Drown-Cooper Papers, consists of letters and papers collected or written to and by Ransome Cooper and Ron Drown. It has been deposited in the New Zealand Assemblies Archive. I have supplemented it with other relevant materials. I have also interviewed or corresponded with most of the people mentioned in this paper who are still living. I am grateful to several readers of varying perspectives who have carefully read and criticized this paper. Nevertheless its accuracy and interpretation rests only with me, and is not intended to be used in criticism of any person, living or dead. I am grateful to Massey University for secretarial, library, computer and research facilities which made this research possible.
2. H. H. Rowdon, *The Origins of the Brethren* (1967) 80
3. Rowdon, *op. cit.* 66-69; 78-81. See also T. C. F. Stunt, 'Irvingite Pentecostalism and the early Brethren', *C.B.R.F. Journal* 10 (Dec. 1965) 40-48
4. J. N. Darby, *The Irrationalism of Infidelity* (1853) 378
5. R. Anderson, *Spirit Manifestations and the Gift of Tongues* (1908)
6. cyclostyled letter to [N.Z.] Brethren, Aug. 1964, accompanying *Is the Gift of Tongues for Today?* (1964)
7. J. E. Worsfold, *A History of the Charismatic Movements in New Zealand* (1974) 64-79
8. W. J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals* (1972) and J. T. Nichol *Pentecostalism* (1966)
9. for Australia see *Treasury* 9 (1907) 179-181
10. Anderson, *op. cit.* 19-24 His booklet was used by J. W. Kemp, *Pentecostalism and the Tongues Movement* (n.d.) 6.
11. *Treasury*, 9 (1907) 179-181; *ibid.* 10 (1908) 5-7; E. Whitehead, *Through Foreign Mission Fields* (1909) 56
12. *ibid.* 10 (1908) 89; *ibid.* 14 (1912) 137; *ibid.* 21 (1919) 124 For the Calvinistic view of the gifts, see Jonathan Edwards, *Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of*

- God* (1741) section II; in *Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. E. Hickman (1974) vol. 2, 274, 275.
13. D. B. Forde-Carlisle, *Human Failure and Divine Progress* (1915); James Lyall, *The Promise of the Father or Pentecostal Fullness and how to obtain it* (n.d.); and generally, Worsfold, *op. cit.* 80-97; and P. J. Lineham, *There we found Brethren* (1977) 39
 14. *Reaper*, 9 (Dec. 1931) 223-6
 15. W. Kemp, *Joseph W. Kemp, the record of a spirit-filled life* (n.d.); *Reaper*, 57 (April 1979) 43-44
 16. Worsfold, *op. cit.* 86
 17. *Treasury*, 5 (1903) 25-6, 76, 105-6
 18. *Treasury*, 6 (1904) 248; Lineham, *There we found Brethren* 43
 19. *Treasury*, 5 (1903) 76, 106 For Dowie and Adams see Worsfold, *op. cit.* 88-90.
 20. J. W. Kemp (ed.), *How I was healed: a New Zealand Miracle* (1921); *Reaper*, 4 (April 1926) 30; Worsfold, *op. cit.* 99-102
 21. W. Morrell, *The Anglican Church in New Zealand* (1973) 174; Worsfold, *op. cit.* 134-40, 147-8; *Nelson Diocesan Gazette*, April 1925
 22. Worsfold, *op. cit.* 107-8; H. V. Roberts, *New Zealand's Greatest Revival under Smith Wigglesworth* (1951) Some of its members supported the infant Crusader movement in 1930. P. J. Lineham, *No Ordinary Union* (1980) 56
 23. Worsfold, *op. cit.* 149; *Nelson Diocesan Gazette*, Jan. 1924; *Reaper*, 4 (April 1926) 43-49
 24. C. J. Drake, *Pentecostal Gifts, Tongues, Healings and Miracles; Should we accept them Today?* (c. 1927; reprint, c. 1965) 10, 15
 25. *Reaper*, 10 (Sept. 1932) 129-30; Worsfold, *op. cit.*, 224-236; J. W. Kemp, *Pentecostalism or the Tongues Movement* (c. 1931) 11-12
 26. J. O. Sanders, *The Baptism, Filling and Gifts of the Spirit* (1939) 17-18
 27. K. Dawson, *Pentecostal Signs and Gifts* (c. 1940); W. E. Irvine, *Is the Present Tongues Movement Scriptural?* (c. 1925); A. L. Goold, *The Promise of the Father* (1948; new edition 1972)
 28. H. Yolland, *Miraculous Healing or an examination of present day Impostures* (1927) See also two tracts, *Faith Healing: should bodily healing be preached as part of the Gospel?* (n.d.), and K. Dawson, *Pentecostalism and Healing* (n.d.).
 29. see Lineham, *No Ordinary Union* 46, 55-6; Worsfold, *op. cit.* 104, 127, 244-6, 251, 258, 321 For Colin Graham's concern, see R. Groves to C. Graham, 6.4.1937. I am indebted to Mr. Graham for supplying me with a copy of this letter.
 30. Lineham, *There we found Brethren* 146
 31. *Treasury*, 34 (1932) 111; Worsfold, *op. cit.* 256, 267
 32. Worsfold, *op. cit.* 158 See A. V. Brown, *The Apostolic Church in the Light of Scripture* (n.d.) See also Drown-Cooper Papers, C. Graham to G. Junck [early 1962]
 33. For an example see L. E. Murray, *Where to World* (1977) 15.
 34. F. Nichol, *Pentecostalism* 89-91; Worsfold, *op. cit.* 182-190
 35. M. Henderson, *From Glory to Glory* (1980), [29]
 36. Henderson, *op. cit.*; L. E. Murray, *Where to World* 24-29
 37. See two rare periodicals, *Church Bells and Revival News*, which cover the years 1966-8 and 1962-3 respectively in available copies.
 38. W. Hutchinson and C. Wilson, *Let the People Rejoice* (1959) 111, 128, 130, 142-3
 39. R. Auld, *The Bible and Healing* (1953) Manins recorded his experiences on a 78 rpm record.
 40. F. Garrett, 'Evening Meeting', Christian Advance Tape 459
 41. *Treasury*, 55 (1953) 162-3; Scripture Union archives: C. K. B. to K. J. O'S., 29.10.1953

42. *Treasury*, 56 (1954) 164, 170; *ibid.* 57 (1955) 154; the story of his life in the United States is told in E. M. Coppin, *Run Preacher Run* (1975); see especially 110
43. E. Coppin, *The Pentecostalist Spirit Baptism* (1957) See also *Treasury*, 58 (1956) 177; *ibid.* 59 (1957) 37
44. Burton, *God working with them* (1933); *Treasury*, 58 (1956) 177
45. C. Graham, *What about the Holy Spirit?* (1972) 22
46. Information from the Rev. Cecil Marshall; see Worsfold, *op. cit.* 194
47. Scripture Union archives: S. C. to B. C. L., 14.8.1956; Lineham, *No Ordinary Union*, 126-8
48. Scripture Union archives: I. M. to C. K. B., 10.4.1954
49. For Laidlaw see his *The Story of the Reason Why* (1969). For Pettit see Lineham, *No Ordinary Union*, 36-7, 53, 126-8.
50. *Treasury*, 60 (1958) 195; *ibid.* 61 (1959) 90-91, 95, 115
51. *I will build my Church: Massey Conference Report* (1964) 35
52. *Challenge*, 17 Dec. 1960, 14. Jan. 1961, 11 Feb. 1961
53. J. McAlpine, *Forty Years evangelizing in Britain* (1947); *Treasury*, 62 (1960) 240
54. Drown-Cooper Papers: 'Notes of a private conversation with W. J. Corpe of N.Z. Oct. 3 1964
55. *Treasury*, 61 (1959) 150, 158, 210
56. *Challenge*, 4 June 1960, 11 June 1960, 1 March 1961, 24 July 1961; *Treasury*, 62, (1960) 17, 52, 88, 106, 124, 142, 160, 232, 268, 286, 304; *ibid.* 63 (1961) 70, 124, 142, 196
57. Information from W. T. Miller, C. Campbell, J. Hitchen, C. McAlpine
58. *Treasury*, 57 (1955) 106; *ibid.* 63 (1961) 91, 124, 161, 269, 304, 340; *ibid.* 64 (1962) 232; Drown-Cooper Papers, Cooper to G. C. D. Howley, 25.9.1962
59. W.A.R.F. Issue 9 (1962, parts 3 a-c) and Issue 11 (1962, parts 5 a-d)
60. Scripture Union archives: McAlpine to B.C.L., 18.12.1961; *Challenge*, 22 September 1962
61. It was first used in print in W.A.R.F. Issue 11 (1962, 5b) 17-19; reported as quoted to Gordon Junck, Drown-Cooper correspondence; see also *Spiritism in the Tongues Movement* [1964] 4-5; C. Graham, *What about the Holy Spirit?* (1972) 20.
62. *Treasury*, 64 (1962) 142, 214a
63. *ibid.* 63 (1961), 291-2, 336-8
64. *ibid.* 63 (1961) 372-5; *ibid.* 64 (May 1962) 174
65. G. M. Smith, *Tongues shall cease, or have the supernatural gifts of the Spirit been withdrawn from the Church?* (mimeo, n.d.)
66. *Treasury*, 64 (1962) 161, 227-30, 257-66 M. J. Harris, 'Tongues shall cease': a reply to a recent exposition of I Corinthians 13:8-12 (mimeo, n.d.)
67. *Treasury*, 65 (April 1963) 11-13; *ibid.* (June 1963) 12-14; reprinted as W. G. Broadbent, *The Doctrine of Tongues* (n.d.)
68. Drown-Cooper Papers: G. C. D. Howley to R. Cooper, 29.8.1962
69. A. Wallis, *Revival and Reformation in the Church* (1962) 10-11
70. Drown-Cooper Papers: W. T. Stunt to Cooper, 2.5.1962; Cooper to A. F. Rose, 14.9.1962; Cooper to Stunt, 25.9.1962; Cooper to G. C. D. Howley, 25.9.1962
71. *Reaper*, 41 (1962) 176-80 His articles were reprinted as the booklet, *The Tongues Movement* (1963).
72. 'Message given to Dr. W. H. Pettit by Mr. Arthur Wallis' (signed statement); W. H. Pettit, 'Experiences in New Zealand regarding present-day claims relating to Tongues, Healing and Prophecy', 19.4.1967 Copies of these items have been given to the N.Z. Assembly Archives.
73. *Treasury*, 65 (May 1963) 16
74. R. H. Aston et al., *Is the Gift of Tongues for Today?* (1963) 3-7, 22-23

75. Drown-Cooper Papers: Howley to Drown, 22.4.1964; F. F. Bruce cited by D. Lillie, *Tongues under Fire* (1966) 9
76. *Is the Gift of Tongues for Today?* 4, 8, 21, 22
77. F. B. Carlisle, *Is the Gift of Tongues for Today? An Examination of the Brethren Statement of the same Title* [1963] 52
78. W.A.R.F. Letters on Pentecostalism, 23 March 1964 et seq.; W. J. Corpe (N.Z. Missionary Funds) to missionaries, 15 February 1964
79. *Treasury*, 65 (Oct. 1963) 16
80. Drown-Cooper Papers: Laidlaw-Caldwell correspondence, cited in Laidlaw to signatories, 17.7.1963; Don Caldwell has supplied me with a copy of the original; Caldwell to Laidlaw, 17.5.1963
81. *ibid.*, 5, Laidlaw to Caldwell, 20.5.1963
82. *ibid.*, 9, Laidlaw to Caldwell, 25.6.1963
83. *ibid.*, 10-11; Caldwell to Laidlaw, 5.7.1963
84. *ibid.*, 2; Laidlaw to signatories, 17.7.1963
85. Drown-Cooper Papers: C. J. Drake et al. to Laidlaw, 24.7.1963
86. Drown-Cooper Papers: Laidlaw-Caldwell Correspondence, Part Two, 1-2, 5-6, Laidlaw to Caldwell, 14.8.1963
87. W.A.R.F. 1964 letters, R. Rogers, 1.6.1964
88. *Treasury*, 66 (June 1964) 16 Further details on the Te Puke elders' discussions with Caldwell were given to the Howe Street Conference in November 1964 by Don Caldwell and K. Bowen.
89. *Treasury*, 66 (Sept. 1964) 15.
90. *Treasury*, 64 (1962) 246
91. *Treasury*, 67 (April 1965) 19
92. G. M. Smith to the author, 23.9.1981
93. *Witness*, June 1965, 205
94. *ibid.* Oct. 1965, 384-6
95. *ibid.* Dec. 1965, 465-7
96. *ibid.* March 1966, 110-111
97. I am grateful to Colin Graham for supplying me with a tape of the conference proceedings.
98. statement from a North Island assembly 1964 [supplied on condition that it was not named]
99. *Te Mahi Maori*, 15:3 (June 1963) 11; *ibid.*, 16:4 (Sept. 1964) 4. N.Z. Assembly Archives: W. Turkington to Elizabeth Street elders, 12.12.1964; Open Air Campaigners (N.Z. Inc.) *A Statement* signed A. S. Wyness and G. E. Bremner [July 1965]
100. Drown-Cooper Papers: Prayer Letter of A. Wallis, Jan. 1964
101. Drown-Cooper Papers: Circular Letter to Brethren in Oversight from R. A. Laidlaw et al. 5.8.1964 (citing the conference brochure)
102. *I will build my Church* (1964) 2
103. See the Circular letter of 5.8.1964 by Laidlaw et al.; see also W. Turkington's printed letter of August 1964, listing the leaflets enclosed; E. Coppin, *The Holy Spirit; C. Maskery, Pentecostal Error; C. J. Drake, Pentecostal Tongues, Healings and Miracles and Spiritism in the Tongues Movement*, all reprinted in 1964.
104. See A. G. Neil, 'Institutional churches and the Charismatic Renewal' (S. Th. thesis, 1974); and C. Brown, 'How significant is the Charismatic Movement?', in *Religion and New Zealand Society* ed. B. Colless and P. Donovan (1980).
105. Kiwi Ranch Training Centre, Kaitoke, brochure, 1973
106. T.S.C.F. Archives: C. Waldegrave, 'I.V.F. Controversials', Executive Paper, 13.10.1970, cited by permission of the T.S.C.F. General Secretary
107. D. Lillie, *Tongues under Fire* (1966)

108. F. F. Bruce, *In Retrospect*, (1980) 250; idem, *Tradition Old and New* (1970), 14, 15
109. D. Hunt *Confessions of a Heretic* (1972), 168-179
110. K. Lemon, 'The Effect of Charismatic Teaching on the Missionary Effort' [Paper for New York Brethren Missionary Consultation, 1979]
111. C.E. Tatham, *Let the Tide come In* (1976)
112. *Treasury*, 83 (1981) 194
113. D. Grennell, Circular to Rutland Street Assembly c. 1979
114. *Treasury*, 66 (Nov. 1964) 7
115. W.A.R.F. 1964 Letters on Pentecostalism; D. Stewart to Secretary, 23.11.1964