

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

O Lord How Long ?  
A Revival Movement in New Zealand 1920-1933.

A thesis in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree  
of Master of Arts with Honours  
in History at  
Massey University

Douglas E Ireton  
1986

### Abbreviations

Bap Tab MinBks	Baptist Tabernacle Minute Books.
NZBTI MinBks	New Zealand Bible Training Institute Minute Books.
<u>NZH</u>	<u>New Zealand Herald.</u>
<u>NZJH</u>	<u>New Zealand Journal of History.</u>
<u>NZPD</u>	<u>New Zealand Parliamentary Debates.</u>
<u>NZMT</u>	<u>New Zealand Methodist Times.</u>

### Acknowledgements

There are a number of special debts of gratitude incurred in the preparation of this thesis that I would like to acknowledge. Library and archival staff throughout the country were helpful. Allan Knight went out of his way to assist me and Len Rushbrook was kind enough to grant me time to talk with him. Howard Knight gave me an enlightening and encouraging interview. I was saddened to hear of his death. He seemed a good man.

At Massey many have been good to me. Special thanks must go to John Stenhouse who read much of my work, as did David Thomson, whose comments were always incisive. Once again I acknowledge my great appreciation for my Supervisor, Peter Lineham, who always does more than anyone has the right to expect.

Finally, to Hugh O'Connell for typing the bulk of the text and for the use of word processor and home, and to Ernst, thank you. Although I have received much help in this thesis any faults are mine alone.



## Chapter One

### Introduction

New Zealand in the 1920s and early 1930s witnessed the development of a revivalist movement. This was in the context of a New Zealand that faced the future tentatively, in the shadow of the most apocalyptic war of modern times. It was a period of new beginnings, but many of the new beginnings had a familiar ring about them. While the period marked expansion in terms of communication and transport, power generation and land settlement, in the political arena much was reassuringly familiar.

The 1920s was a period of economic uncertainty with fluctuations of recession followed by slight recovery. As the decade progressed this uncertainty gradually deteriorated into what is now known as the Depression.

Politically, reassurance took a number of forms. W F Massey started the decade with his only overwhelming victory at the polls. The December 1919 election gave his Reform Party 47 seats in an 80 seat Parliament, the rest shared among Liberals, Labour, and Independents. To Massey the Bible and the freehold 'cow cocky' were the twin paths to prosperity. Not for him was the challenge of an independent line. He resisted Dominion status and regarded 'the British Empire as a single undivided unity'.<sup>1</sup> He was happy in the safe hands of British Imperialism.

Following Massey's death in 1925, Gordon Coates took the helm shortly before he destroyed his election opposition by new campaign advertising techniques selling a policy of security against new threats. But if Coates was in part an innovator, his successor was without question one who represented a return to the past. Sir Joseph Ward, whose revamped Liberal Party took the name United, managed to win enough seats to form a

---

<sup>1</sup> Keith Sinclair, The Pelican History of New Zealand, Revised Edition, Harmondsworth 1980, p 246.

Government that was dependent on the goodwill of at least one of the opposition parties in a confidence vote. Ward was an aging symbol of a bygone era. He was elected on the basis of his Liberal heritage and an illusory promise of a return to expansion by borrowing along the lines followed by Vogel in the colonial period.

The development of a revivalist movement in the 1920s and early 1930s marked a significant change in the religious pattern of the nation. It represented a response on the part of certain sectors of the Protestant churches to changes within the churches themselves, to changes in the role of the church and society, and it represented the re-emergence of a periodic call to renewal.

The New Zealand religious framework of the inter-war years was characterised by a decline in church attendance and by churches that increasingly looked towards social action rather than evangelism as a strategy to deal with the post-war world. Issues such as Sabbatarianism and opposition to gambling, as well as the two major issues, Prohibition and Bible-in-Schools, occupied much of the energy of the churches.

Prohibition was one of the great social issues of the day and was one in which the churches played a predominant role. 1919 was a significant year for the Prohibition movement in New Zealand. The 1919 licensing poll marked the most propitious time for a dry New Zealand: all that was needed was a bare majority instead of the two-thirds previously required. Moreover it had been legislated that subsequent polls were to include the third option of State Purchase and Control of the liquor industry, an issue which was to split the temperance vote and render ineffective any future campaign for Prohibition.

The 1919 poll very nearly was a victory for Prohibition. In fact the initial counting of the votes gave Prohibition a narrow victory, but the special vote count swung the balance back in favour of the status quo. The deciding votes proved to be those of servicemen still abroad from duty in World War One. It was further bitter irony that the cause was thwarted by those men who the churches had so recently eulogised as the cream of New Zealand society. 1919 marked the greatest success and ultimate failure of the movement. Never again did New Zealand come so close to national prohibition.

The Bible-in-Schools movement was the second most important movement in which the churches played a large part. The years immediately prior to World War One saw an increase in agitation for the church sponsored campaign to see Bible teaching in schools established. The 1877 Education Act had established teaching in Primary schools in New Zealand to be 'entirely of a secular character'.<sup>2</sup>

In 1912 the Bible-in-Schools League was formed and claimed the support of the major denominations and the Salvation Army. Smaller denominations such as the Baptists and the Brethren generally opposed the scheme. The League followed an Australian scheme whereby unsectarian Bible teaching would be given in school hours with the right of any minister of religion to teach children of his own denomination, and reserved the right for parents to withdraw their children.

Even in the mainstream denominations support was not universal. Several bills were produced in the 1920s to introduce the scheme but determined resistance by the Catholic Church and the lack of support of the smaller Protestant denominations meant victory was always unlikely.

The main fear about Bible instruction was that it would be of a sectarian character. This fear had been uppermost in the minds of the legislators of the 1877 Act and remained a major stumbling block to the Bible-in-Schools League. The fear was particularly strong on the part of Catholics who felt that such Bible teaching would inevitably be Protestant in nature. Slowly the 'Nelson System' emerged as a successful compromise whereby Bible instruction by ministers of religion could be given outside the hours stipulated in the Act but inside the hours that a school was normally open.

There was little organised evangelistic activity among the Protestant Churches. The Catholic church is not dealt with in this thesis not only because it was not generally conversionist, but also because the revivalists of the period regarded Catholics as

---

<sup>2</sup> cited in Colin McGeorge and Ivan Snook, Church, State, and New Zealand Education, Wellington 1981, p 9.

heretics. At this point it is enough to note that the Catholic Church was one of the main four churches to which the great bulk of the New Zealand population adhered. In that sense this lack of evangelical emphasis was significant.

Few churches in New Zealand had much evangelistic interest. The Anglican Church, apart from the Nelson Diocese, sponsored virtually no evangelism. By 1920 the Methodist Church was in the throes of a reaction against what it saw as an outmoded conversion oriented gospel, and had therefore dispensed with the services of its connexional evangelists.

The Presbyterian Church encouraged evangelism, but the power structure of that church was dominated by those who emphasised social or community, rather than individual salvation. Baptists were far more sympathetic to evangelism, although involvement in social issues such as Prohibition, had become increasingly important to key leaders in the movement. Congregationalism could largely be regarded as a liberal church.

As far as interdenominational co-operation was concerned, there was virtually none outside the social campaigns. The denominations tended to hold a keen sense of their own identity. The Salvation Army, though evangelistic in the main, was fiercely independent, and the Brethren Assemblies, though they were interested in evangelism, were very sectarian in their relations with other churches.

Auckland in 1920 reflected these trends. None of the churches in the city were particularly healthy. Even the Baptist Tabernacle, a church with a history of vigorous evangelism, was weak. The Presbyterian minister of St. Andrews had tried to stimulate aggressive evangelism, but his suspension in 1919 on the initiative of his fellow ministers in the Auckland Presbytery weakened the cause.

It was in this atmosphere that an unusual movement developed. The revivalist movement had no name, no distinct organisation. Nevertheless in the space of a decade it had developed an interdenominational network of activity and institutions unparalleled in New Zealand's history.

The movement was founded in Auckland out of concern about the state of the churches, but it was the arrival of several key people with similar ideas formed from overseas experience that gave that discontent a coherent outlet. At first the movement was based on the desires of a loosely-based ministerial fraternal, but the aspirations of these men soon turned to a number of revivalist activities. The revivalist movement took the shape of interdenominational campaigns led by visiting revivalists or local speakers, ministerial prayer meetings, conventions held throughout New Zealand, the New Zealand Bible Training Institute (hereafter referred to as the NZBTI), a revivalist magazine, an interdenominational evangelist, prophetic conferences as well as books and pamphlets by revivalist leaders.

Most of these activities and institutions were new to New Zealand in the 1920s. Even those activities not unique to the period saw a dramatic increase in their frequency. Visiting revivalists were far more common in the 1920s than in any previous period. Interdenominational conventions had been held before, but this period saw a new rise in both their number and importance.

All the activities of the movement were designed to produce converts. The most esteemed activity was the evangelistic sermon. If people were not preachers then it was their duty to pray for revival. Even the lectures at the NZBTI, the Reaper magazine and the conventions were designed to better equip Christians as effective 'soul-winners'. A revival was seen as a dramatic upturn in the number of conversions in a church or community. They were generally associated with conversion-oriented preaching and religious excitement.

The New Zealand church scene changed significantly from 1920 to 1933. Certainly the overall trend of decline was still very much in evidence, but a number of key churches had shown that on a local level that trend could be reversed. Perhaps the most enduring feature that the movement had on the New Zealand religious environment was its interdenominationalism. This was centred on the NZBTI and it represented a new alignment of evangelical forces. Evangelicalism in New Zealand had begun to develop a coherent identity of its own.

This thesis deals with religion as an entity in its own right. A good deal of research has been done on churches and social issues, and there has been a steady flow of denominational histories that have been largely narrative in nature. This thesis is an attempt to fill something of a gap in the study of New Zealand's religious history. It deals with a broad interdenominational movement, in terms in which the movement saw itself, namely as a religious movement. The terms of reference for this study are unusual for New Zealand in that it focuses on a branch of the whole Christian community rather than any single denomination, while at the same time it is primarily concerned with the movement's ideas rather than its sociological base. Because of this emphasis on ideas, this study is largely analytical, with little narrative. The aim is to explore whether the term 'movement' is appropriate to what developed, and therefore to examine the phenomenon of revivalism based in Auckland around J W Kemp and the NZBTI.

## Chapter Two

### Leadership

The role of leadership was vital in the formation of a coherent revivalist movement in the 1920s and early 1930s in New Zealand. A number of men were consciously aware that they were the focal point of something distinct within New Zealand Christianity. These men fashioned an independent interdenominational movement that was different from anything that had gone before it in this country. It was these leaders who shaped the movement, determined its nature and set its course.

The leadership left the only record of an otherwise anonymous movement obscured by its loosely affiliated interdenominational structure. The story of the development of a community of revivalist leadership largely reflects the development of the movement itself.

This chapter will explore what role leaders played in the movement, why they took on such importance, and how they led. It will explore some reasons for the directions in which they took the movement. Thus conclusions will be drawn about the nature of the movement itself.

The revivalist movement of the 1920s and early 1930s had a number of key personalities who were demonstrably leaders of a relatively coherent movement. When Joseph W Kemp, a Scotsman and a 'Transatlantic' revivalist, arrived in New Zealand in 1920 to take up the ministry of the Auckland Baptist Tabernacle, revivalism in the Dominion was not very organised. Prior to the 1920s revivalism had been a sporadic phenomenon which tended to focus on small town evangelism especially by Brethren evangelists and occasional visits by overseas revivalists such as Torrey and Alexander or Henry Varley. There was very little consistency maintained in revivalism, especially in the main centres.

The arrival of Kemp was a catalyst for change in this regard. Kemp was a compulsive organiser and institution-builder. He was dynamic in his capacity to find new projects to pioneer and therefore had a considerable reputation with his contemporaries. As a result he



proved a useful central figure in a network of relationship with his ministerial colleagues.

But above all else, Kemp was a revivalist. Though he had come as a minister committed first and foremost to the preaching ministry of the Tabernacle, the heart and soul of all his preaching, his institution-building and activities always remained his conviction that the promotion of revival was the most needed activity of the day.

Therein lay the heart of the revivalist movement. Organisationally it centred on the dynamic personality of J W Kemp. Theologically it centred on the doctrine of revival. These two factors were the inspirational forces of the movement. Everything in the movement touched both these factors. There were other important leaders and other important theological concerns, but these were paramount.

To say that Kemp was the central figure of the revivalist movement is not to say that he was the head of the movement or at the pinnacle of some organisational hierarchy. The movement had no such solidity of structure. It was based on the voluntary association of people with similar aims and interests. Kemp's main contribution to the leadership of the movement was as the key facilitator of a network of interdenominational connections based on the desire for revival.

He pioneered the establishment of the New Zealand Bible Training Institute, the Reaper magazine, and he was an important catalyst in the interdenominational ministers' meetings and revival campaigns. These activities together with the Christian conventions with which his relationship was more distant, were the main activities of the movement.

Although Kemp was the key figure in the movement, the very nature of his role, that of facilitator of joint projects implied that other figures were to play a part. Moreover, the nature of this interdenominational connection meant that geographical proximity between leaders was a crucial feature. For this reason the arrival in Auckland of several key revivalist preachers in the space of a few years was significant.

Kemp arrived in 1920. He was joined by A S Wilson who had recently returned from



Australia. Wilson served as Kemp's associate minister at the Tabernacle for a short time. He became an important convention speaker and a writer for the movement. Kemp also was quick to start the institutional framework within which the movement was to work. In 1922 he founded the NZBTI.<sup>1</sup>

The Institute was one of many founded throughout the world with the intention of providing quickly trained laity who could undertake foreign mission work without going through a longer and more academic course of ministerial training. The NZBTI was interdenominational and revivalist in outlook and became the base of the interdenominational network that was to develop.

In 1923 Kemp founded the Reaper magazine. Initially it was related to Kemp's work at the Tabernacle, but it became more and more an important vehicle for the interdenominational revivalist community. In 1929 this process was formalised when it became the official organ of the NZBTI.<sup>2</sup>

Two other figures, C J Rolls and Harry Yolland, arrived in New Zealand and settled in Auckland in the early years of the 1920s. Rolls had returned to New Zealand after serving in India as a missionary and became the Dean of the new NZBTI. Yolland, who emigrated from England, also played a role in the Institute.

1924 was a significant year in the foundation stages of the movement as two other key figures moved to Auckland. The more important of the two was Lionel B Fletcher. Fletcher had a world-wide reputation within the British Empire. With Kemp, he was looked to as an inspirational figure of the local revivalist movement.

The second was Evan R Harries, a Presbyterian minister. Though not characterised by the exuberance of speech of most of the revivalists, he had participated in the Welsh Revival of 1904, and was passionately committed to that experience being repeated in the New

---

<sup>1</sup> New Zealand Bible Training Institute Minute Books (hereafter cited as NZBTI MinBks), 10 January 1922.

<sup>2</sup> Reaper, June 1929, p 100.

Zealand context.<sup>3</sup>

The movement came to maturity with addition of the young J O Sanders to the NZBTI staff in 1925. He was, like Kemp, an organiser and the movement fell into his hands after Kemp's death in 1933. However he was not of the same stature as Kemp.

The movement was already in decline after 1931. The Depression limited funds, and as a result activities, but more importantly the Auckland network had begun to break down. Rolls, Harries and Fletcher left for overseas and Wilson moved to Christchurch. The death of Kemp was in one sense the final blow for the movement in its 1920s phase.

The main reason that the leadership was so important to the revivalist movement was the primacy of the conversion experience in revival theology. Those of the revivalist mould held that conversion experience was a point of disjunction, a complete break with past attitudes and ways of living. This was normally seen at a particular point of time when the truth of the gospel was suddenly revealed. This event was usually facilitated by a 'means of grace', especially that of preaching based on the Bible. The model for the revivalists was John Wesley's famous conversion. Upon hearing someone reading from Luther's Epistle to the Romans, he felt his heart 'strangely warmed'. He said 'I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins'.<sup>4</sup>

At the time Wesley had already been a missionary to colonial America and was rigorous in his devotional exercises. This pre-decision experience was another feature of all revivalist preaching - the dual nature of a decision/conversion. At a meeting both believer and non-believer could be called to full consecration to God. The revival movement in New Zealand maintained a doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, following the teaching of Charles Finney the renowned 19th century American revivalist. This experience was felt to be 'a divine purifying, an anointing bestowing on them a divine

---

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.*, July 1932, p 97.

<sup>4</sup> Nehemiah Curnock, The Journal of the Rev John Wesley, A.M., Vol 1, London 1909, p 476.

illumination, filling them with faith and love, with peace and power'.<sup>5</sup>

Lionel Fletcher, one of the key figures in the movement described this experience as the second greatest moment of his life besides his conversion. He said of the experience 'My life was never the same again, and every blessing I have received since, every soul won, and every Church revived in my ministry, is the result of that night'.<sup>6</sup>

These two experiences were at the very heart of the revival movement. Without them no revival was possible. Indeed revival was a massive upsurge in the numbers of conversions and consecrations. Because the moments were so important, the means for their attainment took on critical significance. That is why the revivalist magazine the Reaper, and other revivalist influenced writings so frequently lamented the lack of the 'old-fashioned gospel' from the pulpit. Preaching was seen as the main means to revival. Thus the preacher became the vital instrument.

But not just any preacher could bring revival. Not only did he have to preach the 'right' gospel but he had to be a man of great spiritual stature. He was not necessarily an eloquent speaker, but he turned people to Christ. Thus the distinction was made between the preacher who impressed people, and the preacher who left a divine impression.<sup>7</sup> The man's spirituality as well as what he said were seen as crucial keys to revival. The revival preacher was not merely a man with eloquence. He was seen to have a special place in establishing relationships between God and man.

As a result of the exalted place of the preacher, all the leaders of the revivalist movement based in Auckland were public speakers. Most were ministers of denominational congregations, but all of them spoke at revival campaigns or conventions. It seems one of the key leadership qualifications and responsibilities was to preach the revival message.

Even those leaders who were primarily recruited for their organisational gifts were

---

<sup>5</sup> Helen Wessel (ed.), The Autobiography of Charles G. Finney, Minneapolis 1977, p 51.

<sup>6</sup> Lionel B Fletcher, Mighty Moments, London 1931, p 16.

<sup>7</sup> Reaper, April 1925, p 44.

expected to be speakers. J O Sanders, to whom the mantle of leadership of the movement fell after Kemp died in 1933, was primarily an organiser. But although his organisational abilities were important, he was always expected to be an effective public speaker. This was evident as early as 1925 when he joined the NZBTI staff as a field officer related to finance. This position meant that he had to tour the country and speak at churches as a fundraiser. Later he moved even further into the organisational centre of the movement, serving from 1926 as Secretary-Treasurer<sup>8</sup> and in 1930 as Superintendent of the NZBTI, and from 1929 as Joint Editor of the Reaper,<sup>9</sup> but he was still used as a speaker, especially at conventions. By 1933 he had spoken at the Pounawea, Ngaruawahia, Cambridge and Christchurch conventions.<sup>10</sup>

Likewise Robert Laidlaw, the founder of the Farmers' Trading Company, was significant as a background person in leadership, serving as a key link between groups. But he too spoke at the 1925 United Tent Campaign and drew crowds to the 'BTI Week' in 1932.<sup>11</sup>

The main exception who did not have this dual role was Bruce Scott, an Auckland lawyer. He was an important figure in the movement, but rarely spoke at public campaigns. He did lecture at the NZBTI in English and also practical living, but it was his administrative ability that was most valued. He served on the NZBTI Board of Directors and as a live-in Superintendent. He was involved in the lay leadership of the Baptist Tabernacle. But his greatest contribution to the movement and that which made him too important a figure to ignore, was his role as the founder and Chairman of the Ngaruawahia Easter Convention, which was the most important convention of the period. He was the main driving force behind this endeavour from its inception until 1931 when he stepped down as Chairman in favour of Sanders.<sup>12</sup> But with this exception, the preaching function was a vital part of the leadership of the movement.

Preaching was the main function of leadership and success in leadership was measured by success in preaching. Large crowds at meetings and large responses to appeals for

---

<sup>8</sup> NZBTI MinBks, 13 April 1926.

<sup>9</sup> Reaper, March 1929, p 1.

<sup>10</sup> *ibid.*, May 1931, p 63; *ibid.*, December 1932, cover.

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.*, March 1925, p 19; *ibid.*, July 1932, p 97.

<sup>12</sup> Ngaruawahia Easter Camp Bible Study Notes, 1921, p 5; Ngaruawahia Easter Camp Committee Minute Books (hereafter cited as Nga MinBks), 26 January 1932.

conversions and consecrations were used as a measure of divine pleasure. Kemp acknowledged this when he commented that the large attendances at the Great Bible Demonstration of 1929 revealed divine intervention.<sup>13</sup> Thomas Miller made a similar point about the evidence of divine sanction that large attendances at 'fundamentalist' bible colleges implied.<sup>14</sup>

This was not a surprising attitude. The whole emphasis of the movement was to promote revival, which meant that its goal was massive church attendance which was held to be God's will. But the corollary of this emphasis on crowds was that whoever could draw the crowds and elicit decisions from them was esteemed in the movement as an important figure.

For this reason a person's past history took on an enormous significance. If preachers had had previous success they were looked to as being a likely means to success in the future. For this reason Kemp, Fletcher and visiting revivalists with well known reputations were looked to with considerable awe. They were seen as men who had brought about revival elsewhere, and they were expected to repeat it. As residents in New Zealand, Kemp and Fletcher took on an even greater importance and were looked to as supreme spokesmen of the movement. This was despite the fact that Fletcher played a less active role in the movement than several others. It is even possible that some in the movement would have preferred a man with stronger views on issues such as anti-modernism. However Fletcher's reputation as a revivalist preacher was impeccable, and that was what counted in leadership.

There were other consequences of this exaltation of preacher-leaders. These men determined the doctrine of the movement and created the coherence that made the movement a movement. These doctrines were communicated in a number of ways. The most important was preaching, for reasons already mentioned. But this preaching had a number of forms. The most important was the revivalist campaign which will be examined in more detail in Chapter Five. These campaigns were demonstrations of the heart of the movement. Leaders also preached at conventions. These, unlike the revival campaigns did not aim at conversion so much as inculcating followers with appropriate doctrine. The leaders were also generally ministers of local congregations and would

---

<sup>13</sup> Reaper, April 1929, p 25.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*, June 1929, p 91.

preach on Sundays, and Kemp and Fletcher took mid-week Bible studies which were popular with those outside their congregations as well as with those within.

Another means of exerting control over the movement could be seen in institution building, a part of the movement completely dominated by Kemp, as will be seen in Chapter Four. This aspect of Kemp's work made him effectively the leader of the movement. The main institutions were the NZBTI, the Reaper magazine and the conventions.

Books played a part in the expression of leadership. Fletcher was a popular author and although his greatest productivity in writing came slightly after this period, his books such as Mighty Moments and Effective Evangelism were well known. Evan Harries wrote a book and contributed to the Presbyterian Outlook, as did Thomas Miller. The most prolific writer of the movement was A S Wilson, whose books were in the main convention addresses written up for publication (a common pattern on the convention circuit).

Interdenominational societies were another means to extend the impact of leadership. Most of the important leaders played some role in mission work. The NZBTI curriculum was primarily a missionary training programme. Harries was Chairman of the Auckland council of the South Seas Evangelical Mission and also spoke on behalf of the Sudan Interior Mission. After he left New Zealand he became Field Chaplain for the British Syrian Mission.<sup>15</sup> Sanders was a council member for the China Inland Mission and later became its Home Director and eventually International Director of the renamed Overseas Missionary Fellowship.<sup>16</sup> A S Wilson chaired the New Zealand branch of the Worldwide Evangelization Crusade.<sup>17</sup>

Other interdenominational societies included the older YMCA, in which A S Wilson had been a driving force for many years, and was full-time General Secretary before joining Kemp at the Baptist Tabernacle. Fletcher served as the New Zealand President of the Christian Endeavour Union for seven years and was a World Vice-President of the organisation, and

---

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.*, July 1930, p 118; *ibid.*, November 1931, p 194; *ibid.*, November 1935, p 218.

<sup>16</sup> J Oswald Sanders, This I Remember, Eastbourne 1982, p 17.

<sup>17</sup> Richard Lanning Roberts, 'The Growth of Interdenominational Mission Societies in New Zealand', MA research essay, Auckland 1977, p 46.



Kemp served as its Auckland Provincial President.<sup>18</sup> With involvement in these societies and work within their own denominational structures revivalist leaders exerted considerable influence within the Protestant community.

Contributions to ventures that were not specifically Christian were not numerous. Involvement in the Prohibition campaign was the obvious exception. Fletcher was a New Zealand Alliance speaker<sup>19</sup> and Laidlaw was on the executive of its local branch.<sup>20</sup> Rolls prepared a tract for the NZBTI entitled 'Should Christians Vote?' which advocated Prohibitionist support.<sup>21</sup> NZBTI lectures were cancelled so that students could act as scrutineers at the 1925 licensing poll.<sup>22</sup> Kemp and Miller spoke in favour of the cause<sup>23</sup> and Harries urged Christians to pray for its success.<sup>24</sup>

The leadership had the vital function of providing coherence and doctrine through the above-mentioned means, but it was not merely theological and organisational coherence which the leaders offered. The leaders were bearers of a past history, which, as we have seen, was considered an important part of their qualifications. The fact that many of the leaders, especially the vitally important Kemp, Fletcher and Harries, were foreign born and experienced was important. Because their formative years were spent overseas, the movement that they played such a large part in establishing was not a truly indigenous force. One reason that the 1920s and early 1930s stand out as different in terms of revivalism was precisely because there was an unprecedented foreign influence in New Zealand. Not only were the foreign-born resident revivalists of an unusual quality and quantity but the number of visiting revivalists was also much higher than normal. This

---

<sup>18</sup> Charles W Malcolm, Twelve Hours in the Day. The Life and Work of Rev Lionel B Fletcher DD, London 1957 p 110; Reaper, November 1931, p 211.

<sup>19</sup> Malcolm, p 108.

<sup>20</sup> J Cocker and J Malton Murray (eds.), Temperance and Prohibition in New Zealand, London 1930, p 238.

<sup>21</sup> NZBTI MinBks, 13 November 1922.

<sup>22</sup> *ibid.*, 20 October 1925.

<sup>23</sup> Auckland Baptist Tabernacle Minute Books (hereafter cited as Bap Tab MinBks), 19 April 1922; Robert Strong Miller and Thomas F Miller, The Rev Thomas Miller MA. A Family Tribute, Christchurch 1949, p 22.

<sup>24</sup> Outlook, 23 October 1922, p 14.

overseas background had a considerable influence on the doctrine, expectations, type and temper of the movement.

This effect was most apparent in the very key characteristic of expectation of revival. Kemp had served as a Baptist minister in Scotland for about eight years and had seen his churches grow due to his aggressive evangelical preaching, but in 1904 he was able to visit the Welsh Revival on a recuperative holiday. This made a great impression on him. He returned to Scotland determined that there would be similar results in his own church. Apparently he got what he wanted. In the year after his visit to Wales, his church in Edinburgh had 1000 converts.<sup>25</sup>

Kemp's experience in Wales and Scotland did much to shape his view of what Christian life should be like. It convinced him of the need for revival, and it made revival seem obtainable. The fact that in his church much success came through prayer meetings, for conversions as well as the perceived divine pleasure, convinced Kemp of the method of ensuring revival, the heartfelt prayer.

Other leaders had similar experiences. Evan Harries was a product of the Welsh revival. That revival dominated evangelical thinking on revival around the world for a number of decades. Lionel Fletcher, an Australian by birth, had great success as a revivalist in Wales ten years after the famous revival. Membership of his church in Cardiff grew from 250 to 1600 in two years.<sup>26</sup> He claimed an average Sunday night congregation of 3000.<sup>27</sup> Following this success he was engaged as a prominent evangelist throughout Britain and worked in association with the bright star of the early 1920s evangelistic world, Douglas Brown.<sup>28</sup>

The successes that these men achieved in Britain led them to expect similar results by means of the same methods in New Zealand. Thus the leadership of the movement in New Zealand were agents of a cultural transfer from Britain. The variations in relative success between the British and New Zealand movements were largely due to the difference

---

<sup>25</sup> Winnie Kemp, Joseph W Kemp. The Record of a Spirit-Filled Life, London 1936, pp 12-13.

<sup>26</sup> New Zealand Methodist Times (cited hereafter as NZMT), 3 March 1923, p 1.

<sup>27</sup> Fletcher, Mighty Moments, p 108.

<sup>28</sup> NZMT, 24 May 1924, p 6.



in the receptivity of the respective populations. That revival failed to occur in New Zealand in the terms that British revivalists expected was largely due to the fact that the revivalist movement's message was better adapted to the population of the place where it originated. Nevertheless by New Zealand standards the revivalist movement was an outstanding success. Churches that housed revivalist preachers saw their congregations swell, while the New Zealand-wide trend was towards decline. The churches of Kemp and Fletcher especially, grew spectacularly. Fletcher's success was dramatic enough to reverse the trend of the small Congregational denomination in New Zealand. Until his arrival, attendance in the Congregational Church was in serious decline. Fletcher's brief stay of seven years marked a statistical renaissance for the whole denomination.

The leaders of the movement also determined the temper of the movement. New Zealanders were not given to religious polemics. The main exception was during the war years of 1914-1919 when Catholic-Protestant tensions became acute. But this was a function of war rather than purely religious feeling.<sup>29</sup> Congregations generally met the increasing liberalisation of theology in the churches of New Zealand with an easy acquiescence rather than a violent opposition.

However the arrival of a man like Kemp altered the organised reaction to liberalism. By developing an anti-modernism apart from the denominational structures and establishing a viable alternative theology to liberalism, the revivalist movement gave evangelicalism a much brighter future than if it had been left totally in the hands of acquiescers or the doomed rearguard actions of men such as P B Fraser who fought against liberalism in the Presbyterian Church (see Chapter Seven).

Kemp had spent five years in New York at the very time that fundamentalism became a viable reaction to liberal innovations. New York was one of the American cities where the issue was most keenly felt at the time.<sup>30</sup> Kemp's experience in New York was far from happy. He left his initial position at Calvary Chapel due to conflict with his lay leaders who disliked his ardent evangelical views. He and other disaffected evangelicals from a

---

<sup>29</sup> H S Moores, 'The Rise of the Protestant Political Association: Sectarianism in New Zealand Politics during World War 1', MA thesis, Auckland 1966, pp 54-55.

<sup>30</sup> George M Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture. The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925, Oxford 1980, pp 161-163, 171-172.

variety of denominations formed a new church, the Metropolitan Tabernacle.<sup>31</sup>

Because of this experience, Kemp brought with him a heightened sense of the dangers of liberalism which he in turn transferred to the movement. Though this was not a core issue to the movement it did take up a considerable amount of the movement's energies, largely through the efforts of Kemp and two of his friends, H Yolland and W H Pettit.

The leaders could affect the temper of the movement in other ways as well. Their personalities were different, and this led to some diversity in the movement as a whole. For example, Kemp was a stern fundamentalist. He was authoritarian, rigid in regard to amusements, (dancing was an anathema), and probably was prone to fierce temper (he was described as an 'unevenly sanctified' person).<sup>32</sup>

Fletcher, on the other hand, was a conservative evangelical interested in social issues, including Prohibition and aid to the poor. He was relaxed to the point of smoking a pipe (to the horror of Kemp), and due to his former involvement in boxing, at one point in his ministerial career had had a gymnasium installed in his manse.

Harries was different again. He was not the populist speaker of the Kemp and Fletcher mould. He was dignified and scholarly yet despite his quiet no-nonsense manner he was considered by some to be one of the finest convention speakers in New Zealand.

Kemp's experience in New York convinced him of the need for interdenominational co-operation, on the basis of shared beliefs. This seemed appropriate for a church under siege. This was evident not only in the attraction of followers from other denominations to the Metropolitan Tabernacle, but also in his establishment of a Bible Training and Missionary Institute there.

Fletcher too, had worked in the interdenominational field as an evangelist and saw the value of this inter-church co-operation. The fact that Kemp and Fletcher had considerable reputations amongst evangelicals, and that they both actively sought interdenominational co-operation meant that they drew together local evangelical leaders. Thus

---

<sup>31</sup> Kemp, pp 83-85.

<sup>32</sup> Geoffrey R Pound, 'Rev Joseph William Kemp and the Auckland Baptist Tabernacle 1920-1933', MA research essay, Auckland 1978, p 14.

interdenominationalism became a central component of the movement. Interdenominationalism reflected their conviction that certain doctrinal issues were more important than denominational commitments. This was especially true of the doctrines of revival and the Keswick teaching.

The most important leaders of the movement brought to it a conviction that the Keswick experience of a baptism of the Holy Spirit, or Second Experience, was a vital part of the Christian walk. Keswick was an important revivalist convention in Britain, founded in 1876. This convention and the many conventions and preachers it spawned believed that there was a second experience in church life after the initial conversion experience, where the Christian became filled with the Holy Spirit and empowered to overcome sin and to be an effective witness to the Christian truth.

The leaders preached this doctrine clearly because they had each had a distinct point in their Christian lives where an act of consecration or 'full surrender' had seemingly transformed their lives. Fletcher described his experience as the second greatest moment of his life. Because of the significance of this experience to Fletcher, he devoted much of his life not only to winning converts but also to seeing them achieve this second experience.<sup>33</sup>

J O Sanders's life fitted the revivalist emphasis. He had been converted at the age of eight, but had found his spiritual life unsatisfactory until he attended the Pounawea Convention in 1921 where he heard Evan Harries speak on the Keswick message of the fully yielded life. Sanders accepted the teaching and had 'a life transforming experience in which the outstanding factor was the joyous and almost overwhelming reality of the presence of Christ that followed'.<sup>34</sup> The doctrine implied that believers began with a spiritual state that was not fully satisfactory but could be overcome by this experience. This view of their own experience led the leaders of the revivalist movement to think of their audiences, and churches in general, as in need of revival and spiritual renewal.

The nature of leadership meant that geographical unity was important to the effectiveness of the movement. The movement was very much centred on Auckland and gained its coherence and some of its forcefulness through the close personal ties that developed at the local level. The twin centres of leadership of the movement were the NZBTI and the loose

---

<sup>33</sup> Fletcher, Mighty Moments, p 15.

<sup>34</sup> Sanders, This I Remember, p 137.

ministerial fraternal that operated on an informal basis and included on some occasions most of the ministers of evangelical churches in the city.

Because the movement itself had no official existence, control of the leadership was structurally loose. The small number of leaders involved and the geographical unity of the movement meant that one or two leaders with strong personalities could easily dominate it. This was in fact what happened. Kemp dominated the movement and most of the other public figures. Exceptions to this domination were Fletcher and to some extent Harries.

The role of the leadership in the revivalist movement showed much of the nature of that movement. This was a movement based on the concept of conversion of the individual and revival of the community. It was a populist movement. Public meetings and popular oratory were its style. There was a strong element of cultural transfer in the movement which was in form interdenominational, loosely knit and mainly concentrated in Auckland. It had some variety in temperament and it was dominated by one or two strong leaders.

## Chapter Three

### The Theology

The theology of revival was based on the assumption that God was ready and desired to send a special dispensation of grace to a locality or nation which would enable great numbers to become converts to Christianity. This grace would also renew the spiritual life of Christians to the point where they would resemble the apostle Paul in both fervency and success.

The type of change envisaged was modelled on the account in the 'Acts of the Apostles', Chapter Two, where the apostles were fearful and without direction until the dramatic transformation in the middle of the Feast of Pentecost when they were baptised in the Holy Spirit. The account said that 'tongues as of fire' rested on their heads. For this reason and for its symbolic implications, the baptism of the Holy Spirit was also known as the baptism with fire.

A revival was regarded as a tremendous change contrary to the direction that society was going. Revival took place when the church and society were a long way from where God wanted them. The turning point came when one or two were convicted of their sinfulness, and would earnestly pray to God to rescue themselves and their community from what they saw as a very desperate place. Usually a revivalist preacher would then start preaching a message of the need of repentance, urging people to stop 'playing' church and either be converted or reconsecrated to God's service. Revival fully arrived when a large number, or a whole community, were converted. Signs of the genuineness of the revival were hotels closed through lack of patronage, large scale restitutions of stolen property, and massive attendances at church. These events were on such a scale that the secular press could not ignore them. Such a revival marked the re-emergence of the church as a major force, if not the major force in the community. This assumed that the church had somehow lost its rightful place in society.

Such revivals had some historical basis in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Similar events occurred on occasions in communities that had a strong evangelical heritage and where social change and dislocation combined with declining church attendances. Examples could be found in the frontier towns of the USA in the 19th century and in Wales, Northern

Ireland and in some declining fishing towns in England early in the 20th century. It seems likely that social anomie encouraged a return to something familiar that had been deeply engrained in people's consciousness. Revivalism was such a proposition.

The effect of revival on the individual was described in the following hymn:

Oh for a passionate passion for souls!  
 Oh for a pity that yearns!  
 Oh for a love that loves unto death!  
 Oh for a fire that burns!  
 Oh for a prayer power that prevails!  
 That pours itself out for the lost,  
 Victorious prayer in the Conqueror's name,  
 Oh, for a Pentecost!<sup>1</sup>

It is well to note the passion behind these words. Revivalism was anything but formalism. This Pentecost experience would give the 'fire that burns' which was an allusion not only to the 'tongues as of fire', but also to the ardency which would overtake the recipients' lives to the point where they would desire nothing else in life but to serve God. The result would be a 'passionate passion for souls', and the conversion of others would become the Christian's main reason for existence.

What revival was to mean to the individual could best be seen in the doctrine of holiness, especially of the Keswick variety. This made a distinction between those Christians who were 'on fire for God' and those who merely believed in God. The distinction was said to be made by means of a 'second experience' after conversion known as a baptism in the Holy Spirit (also called 'the filling', 'the second blessing' and 'the assurance of faith'). This experience was understood to transform the believer into an effective evangelist due to their lives being empowered and emboldened. Without the experience even the most honest attempts to imitate Christ were doomed to failure. 'All true Christians are regenerated [ie converted]but how few claim the Great Gift'.<sup>2</sup>

The holiness doctrine was almost a mirror image of other aspects of revival doctrine. In

---

<sup>1</sup> Reaper, July 1923, p 141.

<sup>2</sup> A S Wilson, Definite Experience: convention aids and deterrents, Edinburgh 1937, pp 29,69.



the holiness schema there was normally a period between conversion and the fullness experience. The Christian would try hard to live out the demands of the gospel, but it would be futile. Some writers allowed that regeneration and sanctification (the second blessing) could be simultaneous, but this was held to be a rare occurrence. After a period of failure came the second experience against which all that went before paled in comparison. Holiness was revival of the individual. If enough people discovered holiness, then revival would be sure to follow. The Keswick connection had a great influence on New Zealand revivalism. Kemp spoke at Keswick and other leaders had attended and been involved in the world-wide movement that followed it. The New Zealand conventions that flourished in the 1920s were modelled on Keswick.

Keswick had been the means of transferring American holiness teaching to Britain. The British adapted an American phenomenon to their own theological temperament and then exported the new version around the world. Keswick holiness weakened the perfectionism of the American holiness movement, and indeed put stress on the enduement of power to overcome sin in the Christian life, rather than on the American concept of the eradication of the sinful nature.

The Keswick movement had its origins in revivalism. The main speakers at the inaugural conference at Brighton in 1875 were the American husband and wife revivalist team of Robert Pearsall Smith and Hannah Whittall Smith. The next year the conference moved to its permanent home in the Lake District and it was soon completely taken over by an interdenominational group of British evangelicals who met under the banner of 'All one in Christ Jesus'. Much of Keswick paralleled New Zealand revivalism. Like Keswick, members of the New Zealand movement remained in their denominations but held first loyalty to their Keswick or revivalistic network and theology.<sup>3</sup> Thus Keswick not only gave doctrine but structure to New Zealand revivalism.

The effectiveness of the soul-winner's attempts would be determined by the other Pentecost revitalised aspect of life, the 'prayer power that prevails,/ That pours itself out for the lost'. This 'prayer power' is of special interest as it was also seen as the key to obtaining the Pentecost experience. One was expected to pray fervently to be revived, and

---

<sup>3</sup> John Kent, Holding the Fort: Studies in Victorian Revivalism, London 1978 pp 298 - 317; Ernest R Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism. British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930, Grand Rapids 1970, pp 176 - 181.

yet it was acknowledged that this prevailing prayer came as result of a Pentecost experience. The prayer meetings that were organised to 'pray down a revival' were also seen as a sign that a revival was not far away.

The doctrine was confusing in its statements about when a revival would come. The assumption was, following Finney, the outstanding American revivalist of the 19th century, that since God always wanted to send a revival, humans were the chief hindrance to it, so according to the theory, it followed that it was man's responsibility to make a revival happen and therefore all the church needed to do was fulfil the conditions that God desired. This would be like the turn of a key or money in a slot - all would open, and the prize of Pentecost would be received. Charles Finney, who was the father of modern revivalism, stated 'A revival is a purely philosophical result in the right use of the constituted means. It is not a miracle, nor dependent on a miracle'.<sup>4</sup> This, though wonderful in theory, caused some frustration and bewilderment when after years of attempts to fulfill the pre-conditions of revival, no revival occurred.

The greatest pre-condition of revival was prayer. The Reaper magazine, which gave the clearest and most sustained coverage of revivalist doctrine, made the point repeatedly. E Nicholls commented that though Australasia had had no 'mighty revival', 'All revivals are born in prayer'. Sometimes this call to prayer was associated with the need for repentance but 'We must remember that all Revival begins and continues in prayer in personal Revival'.<sup>5</sup>

Although Finney was regarded as the example to follow, the frustration of doing all that he said was required, without results, was obvious, and sometimes the blame would be put back on God. 'Though prayer has been going up for months for a Divine visitation, the coveted blessing still tarries....No revival that is worth while can be invented by man. It is God-given and Divinely breathed'.<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless:

If we are to have such a revival..., or indeed if we are to have further blessing in any department of service we must prepare the way for it by earnest and continuous prayer. It seems like urging a duty which has been reiterated to weariness, but the need for fresh exhortation remains as great as ever.

---

<sup>4</sup> Reaper, August 1923, p 172.

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*, June 1923, p 118; *ibid.*, February 1925, p 314.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*, October 1928, p 170.



The writer of this comment, Kemp, went on to say that the call of God was a call to prayer and that 'He has promised and He will perform and they who prove God most fully in prayer draw most largely of His grace'.<sup>7</sup> This prayer was not to be merely recitation parrot-fashion, but instead soul-rending pleas.

Other hindrances to revival were lack of expectation and commitment, indifference and worldliness:

Sins of omission, want of love to God, neglect of the Bible....Failure to pray... neglect of family duties, neglect of self-denial, the breaking down of the family altar, failure at the point of full surrender, ingratitude to God.<sup>8</sup>

Problems and sins could always be found to account for the absence of revival.

The doctrine of revival was generally associated with a distinctive view of history. It was felt that the present was in a state of declension from former glory. This was seen to be true for both church and society. It was observed at the societal level in the failure of the moral reform movements such as Prohibition and in the apparent apostasy of Biblical Criticism. At the individual level, declension was evident in a fall off in religious observance, not just in church attendance, but in elements of personal piety such as prayer, Bible reading, family worship and evangelistic zeal.

William Mallis, an important convention speaker, author and missionary representative said that:

No call is so urgently needed in the Church of God to-day as the call to separation. Everywhere one sees the havoc wrought by the violation of this divine principle. The weakness of the Church is manifest in the face of a growing spirit of worldliness, a worldliness that is tolerated and even approved by the professed Church of God. The result of such an attitude is evident in the weakened grip on the conscience of the people and their absence from the place of worship.<sup>9</sup>

This belief in decline was not arrived at from an observation of New Zealand's religious history, but because of the belief that revival should be the normative experience for the

---

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.*, November 1926, p 225.

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.*, July 1929, p 114.

<sup>9</sup> W Mallis, The Way of the Wind and Other Devotional Studies in the Spirit-Controlled Life, Madras 1929, p 33.

Christian Church.

Another reason for this view can be seen in an article that the Reaper printed by a Scottish Baptist that referred to a decline in Scottish churches. Kemp added the comment that the statements 'may apply to a much wider field' in which he included New Zealand. The article asked:

What is wrong with the Churches at the present day? That everything is not right I am sure no thoughtful person will care to deny. Somehow they do not command the same respect which they enjoyed fifty years ago. They are not characterised by the same buoyant faith and burning zeal. A chilling formalism has supplanted the Evangelical fire which in past years wrought such transformation in the lives of men and women and shook nations from centre to circumference. The influence of the churches has to a large extent departed, and the service which once glowed with enthusiasm is now languid and drooping.<sup>10</sup>

This could hardly be a description of the history of the New Zealand church. The true source of this view lay in the overseas origin of most of the leaders of the revival movement.

This overseas origin not only gave revivalists a sense of declension but also shaped the whole movement. Because these leaders came from places where religious experience was valued more highly, they tended to see New Zealand as in a spiritual wilderness. This reinforced a world-wide pessimism in conservative Protestantism.

Kemp came from a Kirk-dominated Scotland and had spent time at the Welsh revival of 1904, and had subsequently experienced revival at his own church in Edinburgh. Harries was a Welshman and had been in the Welsh revival. This revival had an enormous influence on a generation of evangelicals and was important in that it proved the possibility of revival. Fletcher too had remarkable success in church growth and evangelism. The background of these leaders and of the overseas revivalist visitors meant that expectations for revival's success in New Zealand were rated higher than they otherwise might have been.

Revivalism esteemed highly the role of the charismatic leader. Thomas Miller commented that:

---

<sup>10</sup> Reaper, March 1928, p 8.

It may be said that the history of the Christian Church of all ages and lands may be written in terms of its revivals. But because almost every revival centres in and largely proceeds from a man, the Church's history may equally be written in terms of its evangelists.<sup>11</sup>

This came from a respected minister of the Presbyterian Church. This shows the extraordinary emphasis that revivalism placed, not only on single personalities, but also on the role of the ministry of the evangelist, in comparison with the ministry of the pastor. In fact revivalism held that the pastor should be an evangelist.<sup>12</sup> This theology suited the populism of the charismatic leader.

Heroes of history such as Finney, Wesley and Whitefield were held up not only to be admired but also to be emulated. Leaders that might possibly bring the long hoped-for revival were unselfconsciously bracketed with such men. The hold that this 'potted history' had on the revivalists was sometimes surprising in its strength. Kemp showed this when he said:

The name of Whitefield captivates me. My ears are attent as soon as it is mentioned. I eagerly devour all that I can lay my hands upon that is written of him....I may be forgiven my passion for my subject. My soul has been too often stirred to its depths as I have companied with this man of God to indulge in any cold calculation of his worth. When shall the world see his like again? He is my hero. He is my inspiration. "He being dead yet speaketh" to me.<sup>13</sup>

What emerged from this view of history was an adulation of the past that was such a 'golden age' that was difficult to believe. Principal Anderson of the Glasgow Bible Training Institute wrote in 'The Great Days of '59'" that at the time 'they preached the Word of God'. Also:

There was a note of authority and a note of urgency in the preaching then. Preachers did not apologise for saying hard things; they took the apostolic attitude....Their hearers ~~were not~~ to criticise the message; they had to humble themselves under the mighty hand of God. The note of urgency was heard in every meeting.<sup>14</sup>

Such were the expectations of revivalism.

---

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.*, February 1930, p 290.

<sup>12</sup> Lionel B Fletcher, Effective Evangelism, London 1932, p 101.

<sup>13</sup> Reaper, March 1925, p 11.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*, April 1925, p 44.

The heroic view of the past was not just a reflection of a dim view of the present. It was deliberately designed to stimulate faith. These stories were told to encourage the development of an enthusiastic and vital religiosity. The testimony of the past was used as a bench-mark for the present. Thus statements like the one that Whitefield and Spurgeon were 'too busy believing and using the Bible to be also criticising it'<sup>15</sup> were regarded as an emphatic final verdict on the inefficacy of biblical criticism.

Despite the purpose of arousing of faith, the revivalist view of the past came largely from a sense of alienation and pessimism about society and the church. If the revivalists were to be believed, the state of the church was anything but healthy. Indeed the sickness metaphor was sometimes used. The church was felt to be suffering from:

fatty degeneration of the heart (wealth, luxury and ease); pernicious anaemia (lack of blood in their theology and in their fight with sin); cerebro-spinal meningitis (destruction of the backbone and brain centre); cancer (unbelief in the supernatural); and neuritis (supersensitive to ridicule and criticism).<sup>16</sup>

Liberalism was perceived as a destructive offender which weakened the faith of godly people. But evangelicals came in for their share of the reproach. 'A Revival to-day will not come easily. The spiritual life of our Christian people is at a low ebb...[with] a dead mass of inertia to be overcome'.<sup>17</sup>

The use of reports from around the world designed to help produce faith for revival in New Zealand had a corollary. They heightened the sense of declension by the creation of the impression that revival occurred everywhere else but New Zealand. It followed that New Zealand's Christianity was in a sorry state. This sense of religious poverty was further underlined by the prestige given to overseas revivalists who, when compared with local preachers, seemed more gifted.

Another aspect of the doctrine was its pre-millennialism. Pre-millennialism was the belief that the world was heading for an apocalyptic end which would usher in a literal thousand year reign of Christ. This idea was based on 'The Revelation of St John'. The pre-millennial position was that the millennial reign would begin after Christ returned

---

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.*, July 1929, p 120.

<sup>16</sup> *ibid.*, May 1928, pp 49-50.

<sup>17</sup> *ibid.*, May 1926, p 261.

and conquered his enemies. The implication of this was that the power of Anti-Christ and Satan would be in pitched battle with the power of Christ, who would rescue the world from the evil that had overrun it. Post-millennialism on the other hand (a mainly liberal position) foresaw a gradual improvement in the human condition which would culminate in a thousand year reign of godly government before Christ returned.

Pre-millennialism fitted the revivalist picture of an age of declension. It projected a view of society that was to deteriorate and become more and more wicked. Revivalists felt that that was already plain for the world to see. World War One was the most apocalyptic war in modern history, and society seemed to have trouble to adjust to post-war life. The optimism that had marked liberal theology and the church in general was replaced by:

anxiety about the future of civilised nations. Little wonder. The world has gone through a frightful strain. New Conditions, full of peril and portent, are arising. The strain of getting out of old ways...is scarcely less heavy than the strain of war.<sup>18</sup>

As well as the war, the failure of the church to impress its morality on the nation and the decline in church attendance helped to make churchmen pessimistic.

Pre-millennialism fitted with revivalism for another reason. It reinforced the revivalists's belief in the possibility of a special move of God due to a special arrangement of circumstances. Conditions had become so bad that God would have to act and send a revival. In this sense the 1920s was seen as a special time to live. Pre-millennialism suggested that it might be the most special time since Christ first came to earth, for it was believed that the signs pointed out that the end of the age was close. Thus pre-millennialism gave Christians a sense of self importance at a time when on the surface of things the church seemed increasingly insignificant. But whether the signs indicated the end of the age or just a revival in the church, pre-millennialism was another aspect of belief in a God who worked miracles, who was transcendent and mighty, who wanted to work amongst humans.

The focus of pre-millennialism was on the Second Advent of Christ. The effect of the doctrine was to stir up the church to activity by emphasis on the urgency of the hour, for the time might well be short. Thus the church had a doctrine which was useful to sustain activity at a time when churches on the whole found that a difficult achievement.

---

<sup>18</sup> NZMT, 16 September 1922, p 1.

One aspect of pre-millennialism was its peculiar view of society. Pre-millennialists looked for signs of the end, and signs of the spiritual battle between God and Satan in the everyday events around them. Thus 'Locomotion and Science [were the] Twin Signals of the Advent'. Calvin Coolidge's comment that the 'American way' was being destroyed by people who always wanted government help, led to the question 'Is the Anti-Christ Soon to Appear?'. Scientists' predictions of weather changes, earthquakes and disasters possibly foretold the end of a dying dispensation.<sup>19</sup>

This view of society and nature was significant because it represented an opposite direction from the direction in which western society in general travelled. Most of society was dominated by a process of secularisation in which God was not viewed as the explanation for natural and societal events. Revivalism not only rejected this 'secularised' view of the world, but by the use of pre-millennialism emphasised very strongly the interventionism of God.

Pre-millennialism also affected evangelism and missions. Revivalism placed great emphasis on evangelical effort. Revivalism was an evangelical movement. An evangelical understanding of the gospel of grace was fundamental to it. A revival would represent a massive influx of souls into the Kingdom of God, and part of a revived life was an empowered witness to the gospel. The failure to testify would negate the effect of the revived life. 'Let us withhold our testimony and we lose power and, like Samson, soon find ourselves "as other men"'.<sup>20</sup> 'The Church's existence hangs upon the evangelization of men...that other duties are important we do not deny but evangelism we assign the first place'. 'THE CHURCH MUST EVANGELISE OR DIE'.<sup>21</sup> As a result revivalism encouraged bursts of evangelistic zeal which would see young people conduct gospel campaigns throughout New Zealand or join the flow of people en route to the mission field.<sup>22</sup>

The 1920s was still the heyday of modern missions. The interdenominational mission societies saw their greatest growth in that decade in New Zealand. Missionary endeavour was popular in all sections of Protestantism at that time and both conservative and liberal

---

<sup>19</sup> *Reaper*, February 1925, p 317; *ibid.*, January 1926, p 295; *ibid.*, June 1926, p 98.

<sup>20</sup> A S Wilson, *Concerning Complexities. Paradoxes and Perils in the Spirit-led Path*, Auckland 1932, p 74.

<sup>21</sup> *Reaper*, May 1926, p 71; *ibid.*, March 1932, p 2.

<sup>22</sup> *ibid.*, February 1929, p 267.



competed for greater impact in the mission field.

But despite the overall interest in missions, revivalism fostered an interest unique to its own theology. The mission field was seen as important and it needed to be flooded with revival-minded people both to counteract the bad effect of liberal missions and to facilitate a world-wide revival that would 'hasten the second advent and millennial reign of Christ.'<sup>23</sup> The revivalists did not believe that the whole world would be saved (as many post-millennialists did); their pessimistic pre-millennialism ended that idea. Pre-millennialism gave the revivalists a sense of nearness to the end that made evangelism and missionary work more urgent.

The aspect of revivalist theology that caused the most heated and vitriolic of debates was its anti-modernism. Anti-modernism was a reaction against the new or 'modern' approach to the theological approach of the Bible. Modernism or liberalism started with the attempt by theologians in the 19th century to get to the historical reality of the events that the Bible claimed to describe, by applying critical analysis of the texts. They treated the scriptures as pieces of historical evidence rather than in addition to, divine revelation. One of the main questions that 19th century modernists used higher criticism to try and answer was 'Who was the historical Jesus?' The gospel narratives were used as sources but were seen by modernists to be limited by their clear intention to persuade the reader to accept Christian beliefs, and by their distance in time from the actual events that they sought to describe. This historical criticism became a hunt for clues in the chase for the shadowy image of the 'real' Jesus who was hidden behind the 'authorised' version.

But modernism did not stop there. This type of criticism opened up a plethora of other issues about what was essential to Christianity and what was merely apostolic or post-apostolic tradition. As a result many cherished doctrines were challenged. As modernism grew there was a decline in emphasis on personal conversion. The role of Jesus as the sacrifice of atonement to God was rejected as a Pauline view, rather than a message that Jesus himself would have preached. Such scepticism towards what was the central truth of evangelical Christianity was anathema to the evangelicals.

The revival movement was anti-modernist. Revivalists saw modernism as the first step to unbelief. Many in the movement felt this acutely because they associated modernism

---

<sup>23</sup> *ibid.*, July 1927, p 106; *ibid.*, November 1928, p 197.

with a painful sense of betrayal. Revivalists felt that modernists were worse than heathens as they were seen to attack Christianity under the cover of the name of Christ. Theirs was held to be the role of Judas whose infamous place in Christian history was sealed with a kiss of betrayal. It was felt that modernism, by the:

vesting of the Old Book with uncertainty and the robbing it of its authority is sapping the spiritual life of the Church of God, destroying evangelistic effort and increasing the flood of worldliness which is swamping Christian profession on every hand.<sup>24</sup>

Some went so far as to say of the difference between fundamentalism and modernism that 'there can be no agreement between such opposites. Fundamentalism is Christian: Modernism is anti-Christian'.<sup>25</sup>

It would be a gross oversimplification to say that revivalism was simply a reaction against modernism, but the rise of modernism does account for much of the desperation of revivalism. In one sense revivalists wanted to see souls won for their Saviour's sake, but in another very real sense converts were an evidence of God's favour. Kemp stated in 1929 that the ability to fill the large Auckland Town Hall for the 'Great Bible Demonstration', 'with such a sympathetic audience with such a brief notice was no small achievement and we take it as a mark of the approval of God'.<sup>26</sup>

Thomas Miller felt that liberal theological colleges seemed to be unable to attract great numbers of students while conservative colleges were unable to accommodate student demand. Whether or not this is true does not alter the fact that from this he was able to argue that modernism did not get the results that conservative Christianity did because it lacked God's favour.<sup>27</sup>

Generally speaking the anti-modernist controversy did not drastically affect the theology of the movement. What it did was add to revivalism's militancy. There was a defiance about revivalism which was shaped in reaction to modernism and the associated pleas for respectability.

---

<sup>24</sup> *ibid.*, April 1928, p 25.

<sup>25</sup> *ibid.*, March 1928, p 7.

<sup>26</sup> *ibid.*, April 1929, p 25.

<sup>27</sup> *ibid.*, June 1929, p 91.



The area in which the modernist controversy had most impact was that of biblical inerrancy. The really distinctive element of modernism concerned the redemptive work of Christ, but it was not on this ground that the revivalists chose to fight. The cry was: 'Let us go back to the terms of the old preachers whose hearts were so on fire for truth, and whose faith so held to the Bible'.<sup>28</sup>

Modernism was associated with a decline in evangelical emphasis. Fundamentalists took the argument a step further and said that any criticism of the bible was the first step towards infidelity. Thus an anti-modernist book by Robert Anderson was promised to 'help steady the nerves of any who are wavering under the onslaughts of destructive criticism.'<sup>29</sup>

This approach ignored those who were ready to look critically at scripture but who nevertheless retained an evangelical theology. The most well known writer of this ilk was Henry Drummond of Scotland who, while he rejected a literalistic interpretation of the Genesis creation account, assisted the Moody revival campaigns in Scotland and was held in great respect by the world-wide evangelical community which included the New Zealand revivalists. In New Zealand there were those who managed to reconcile the two. *Knox Theological Hall* was much criticised for its biblical criticism, yet it held some evangelical missions.<sup>30</sup>

Anti-modernism had great appeal within revivalism. Biblical inerrancy was almost a pass-word for revivalists. The Great Bible Demonstration in Auckland which was held to present an alternative view to modernism, read like a 'Who's Who' of Auckland revivalism. On the platform were Harries, Kemp, Laidlaw, Wilson, Murray, Yolland, Rolls, Pettit and others. Even the moderate Harries described the modernists as Sadducees who were ignorant of the scriptures and the power of God.<sup>31</sup> Thomas Miller of Dunedin regularly contributed anti-modernist articles, attacked modernism in the Presbyterian General Assembly, and wrote a book on archaeology which attempted to validate biblical

---

<sup>28</sup> *ibid.*, April 1925, p 49.

<sup>29</sup> *ibid.*, February 1925, p 313.

<sup>30</sup> Ian Breward, Grace and Truth. A History of Theological Hall Knox College, Dunedin 1876-1975, Dunedin 1975, p 49.

<sup>31</sup> Reaper, April 1929, pp 26, 39-40.

literalism.<sup>32</sup> Fletcher too, was an anti-modernist but was not as vociferous as men such as Kemp, Yolland and Pettit. He felt that modernism would lead the church in the wrong direction, but he did not place great emphasis on the issue.<sup>33</sup>

Visitor evangelists tended to be the most ardent of all anti-modernists. French Oliver, who managed to offend a wide variety of people, was a typical example. One observer commented that 'Belief in the verbal inspiration of the scriptures is at the base of everything he says'.<sup>34</sup> His ability to create controversy was great and his statement that he would 'fight any dirty cur in New Zealand who questioned the Divine origin and authority of the Bible' is a good example of the bitterness that modernism seemed to be able to provoke.<sup>35</sup>

W P Nicholson, although esteemed more highly than Oliver in revivalist circles, was just as impassioned. He said in one sermon in New Zealand that liberals who remained in seminaries were more dishonest than politicians and:

they hold tight to their lucrative positions and deny everything they are paid to believe and teach, [which] puts them beneath the respect and esteem of every honest man, and wins their contempt and disgust for such mean, contemptible, despicable, low down, crooked ways. They are religious crooks dressed in the garb of religion, scholarship and morality.

All this in a sermon entitled 'Friendship'.<sup>36</sup>

Reaction to modernism was a driving force behind modernism. It inspired revivalism to new heights of invective. Revivalists tended to jump on any bandwagon that confirmed their declension model of history, for that model justified their existence. It seems that the failure of the churches to adequately cope with World War One made modernism a convenient scape-goat and in that sense was an important reason for the rise of revivalism in the 1920s.

---

<sup>32</sup> *ibid.*, June 1931, p 90; Biblical Recorder, May-June 1932, p 86; Thomas Miller, Archeology and the Bible. A Romance and a Vindication, Dunedin 1934.

<sup>33</sup> Fletcher, Effective Evangelism, p 13.

<sup>34</sup> NZMT, 17 February 1923, p 7.

<sup>35</sup> *ibid.*, 31 March 1923, p 1.

<sup>36</sup> W P Nicholson, Friendship - A Sermon, Auckland ca.1934.

In conclusion, although the theology of the movement was not totally homogenous, there was a common essence which made the revivalist movement distinctive. The movement held the idea of revival to be of supreme importance. To be in the revival movement was to be a promoter of revival, and the salvation of individuals was the prime concern. The theology which the movement used to justify revival was a Keswick model of the revived or empowered individual as a catalyst for general revival. This theology exalted the role of individual salvation, and for that reason the movement found itself opposed to modernism. This opposition varied in intensity, yet it was unanimous.

## Chapter 4

## Institutions

One of the key reasons for the solidity of the revivalist movement over the 13 year period of this study was that the movement quickly developed an institutional framework. These institutions consolidated the enthusiasm of the revivalist community. It was not easy to keep up enthusiasm for something that New Zealand had seen very little evidence of. The phenomenon of revival promised by revivalists had never been experienced in New Zealand, unless the small success of Brethren evangelism in small rural communities such as Rongotea in the 19th century is counted. The institutions were vital because their main function was the promotion of revival. Due to the minority position of revivalism in most denominations it was important for revivalists to find some institutional base from which they could work. If revivalism was an interdenominational phenomenon, for it to have any lasting impact it needed an interdenominational framework. Through the institutions the Auckland based leadership was able to exert a New Zealand-wide influence.

There were three main institutions which gave the New Zealand revival movement this interdenominational base. Firstly, the New Zealand Bible Training Institute served as a training school for missionaries and others who wanted quick preparation for christian service. Secondly, the Reaper magazine was the revivalist voice on the printed page, and thirdly, the various conventions held each year throughout the country provided common places at which to gather and hear movement leaders speak, exchange ideas and inspire one another.

The combination of bible institute, magazine and convention was not unique to New Zealand. In fact it was typical of revivalism since the late 19th century. The combination gained prominence with D L Moody in America who added to the already existing religious periodicals, the Northfield Conference, and was the inspiration for the important Bible Institute which took his name after his death. <sup>1</sup>

Paralleling the American experience, was the Bible Training Institute which served as the heart of the revivalist movement in New Zealand. Lionel Fletcher described Kemp as the

---

<sup>1</sup> Sandeen, pp 172 -183; Marsden, pp 128-129.

'very soul' of a great movement centred on the NZBTI.<sup>2</sup> The NZBTI was very much Kemp's project. He had received his own training at a similar institution in Glasgow and had founded a comparable school while he was in New York and was firmly committed to the idea of a school that catered for those who wanted to train quickly for the mission field or local christian service without the strict academic requirements of the normal seminary-style institution. Emphasis was on the English Bible rather than on Greek and Hebrew so that those who would struggle with a more formal education would not be hindered from service.

This concept of a 'gapman' or a layman that filled an urgent need in the absence of the more qualified ministerial candidate reflected the revivalist sense of urgency inherent in its pre-millennialist and evangelical theology. The world was seen to be drawing close to its end and the revivalist held it as his or her responsibility to rescue as many as possible before it was too late. Evangelism, to the revivalist, was the only hope for individuals in the world. The emphasis on quick training as sufficient, and the high value placed on a trained laity hinted at the anti-intellectualism and populism of the movement.

Leadership of the NZBTI was divided between the Board of Directors and the tutorial staff. The board was comprised of Auckland business or professional men with evangelical interests. It included R A Laidlaw who was an important revivalist figure who took a high profile in many revivalist activities. R L Stewart took over the job of President or Chairman of the Board following the death of the first President J Stewart, his lawyer brother. R L Stewart had co-founded a local stationery firm, was a long serving elder in the Presbyterian Church, a foundation member of the Auckland Rotary Club and was a life member of the YMCA, of which he served as President once and as Vice-President twice.<sup>3</sup>

Kemp chose businessmen deliberately. Before the NZBTI project had begun, Kemp's first move was to meet with local evangelical businessmen. It was only with the promise of sufficient support in terms of finance and time, that he proceeded with the school. Men such as Stewart, Laidlaw and the lawyer Bruce Scott, who also served on the board, committed themselves and gave years of support and administrative skill and each of them gave at least one contribution of £500 towards the Institute's second premises.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Reaper, February 1931, p 288.

<sup>3</sup> 'Newspaper articles 1895-1943', collected by W J Comrie, WTu.

<sup>4</sup> Reaper, September 1926, p 191; *ibid.*, July 1927, p 121.

These businessmen not only gave financial and administrative security to the Institute but they also added the weight of their respectability. Kemp was very much aware of the need to maintain respectability if the movement was to be accepted by the majority within evangelicalism. The prominence of businessmen was a characteristic means for evangelicals to achieve this end.

NZBTI revenue was drawn mainly from student fees for its day to day maintenance. Kemp tried to institute subscriptions from outside, but these never made up a substantial contribution. To house the Institute, extra finance by donation was raised to purchase a building and when that became too small, to build a new one in 1927.<sup>5</sup>

Staff of the Institute centred around the Principal and the Dean or Superintendent. Kemp was Principal from its inception until his death in 1933. Although he did not undertake the bulk of the teaching, Kemp dominated proceedings. C J Rolls was Superintendent for most of the period, a position that included responsibility for the students' overall well-being. He and Kemp did most of the teaching. It centred on study of the Bible. The entire Bible was studied synoptically book by book and several books were treated more analytically. Other topics in the curriculum included Exegesis and Interpretation, New Testament Greek, English and Practical Living, the Bible and Science, Homiletics and Systematic Theology, Church History, Music and Gospel Singing, and Spanish for those who intended to leave for South American missions. The Systematic Theology class included 'definite recognition...of dispensational truth' ie. pre-millennialist teaching.<sup>6</sup>

The NZBTI's central position in the revivalist movement can be seen in the range of people who taught there. Teachers included virtually the entire Auckland revivalist leadership. Apart from Kemp and Rolls, A S Wilson, E R Harries, H Yolland, J O Sanders, W H Pettit, E M Blaiklock and Bruce Scott all taught there. All these men had other connections with the revivalist movement. There were one or two other teachers whose connections with other revivalist activities were more limited but were church officers at Kemp's Baptist Tabernacle. This included F S Battley who taught Spanish, Arthur E Wilson, the Tabernacle's choir master, and Kemp's associate pastor T Russell Cameron.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Averil D McIntosh, 'The History of the New Zealand Bible Training Institute Inc. 1922-1966', Diploma in Education research essay, Auckland 1966, pp 26-27.

<sup>6</sup> Reaper, July 1927, pp 108-111.

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.*, March 1929, p 3.



The main function of the NZBTI was to quickly produce men and women trained for the mission field, particularly foreign missions, but also for full time work in New Zealand. Because of the NZBTI's role in training it held an important position for the missionary focus of New Zealand's evangelicalism. The emphasis on foreign missions was due to the view of Kemp and associates that the vast majority of the world was not only unconverted, but had never even heard the gospel. Because New Zealand was reasonably well served with fully trained ministers the urgency there was not so great, and there were many opportunities to train at more traditional seminaries. But in foreign mission work (to which all intents and purposes was directed at Africa, Asia and South America) Christian clergy were few on the ground and thus people could be used with less than full training as long as they had grasped the basic doctrines and had had some practical training in Christian work, in order to fill the gap until more highly qualified ministers could take over the task. In Kemp's time as Principal, 100 students were trained and accepted for the mission field from the NZBTI.

The NZBTI's importance was not confined to foreign mission work. NZBTI trained people propagated the revivalist message within New Zealand. Those students that remained in New Zealand would often become Home Missionaries for their respective denominations and were often sent to small towns where there was very little clerical presence. Some, such as G V Nagel carried out itinerant evangelical preaching throughout the country. Nagel continued this work for over a year before he left to serve in India. Stanley Muir was another ex-student who remained in New Zealand and took an active role in the revivalist network. He became the key middle man in the negotiations to bring W P Nicholson out to New Zealand and played an important organisational role in this, one of the most significant missions of the period.<sup>8</sup>

Apart from the student endeavours, the NZBTI also employed a field officer to further accelerate interest in the Institute and revivalism. The relationship between the Institute and its first field officer, E A Israel, illustrated the sometimes difficult nature of the relationship between the central figures of the movement and some of its secondary figures. Israel was employed largely on the strength of his association with holiness preacher Herbert Booth who toured New Zealand in 1919. Booth was the renegade son of William Booth.

---

<sup>8</sup> Nga MinBks, 12 May 1931, 3 March 1932, 12 March 1934.



One of the most important acts Booth did in his New Zealand visit was to start the Christian Covenanters' Confederacy. This was an interdenominational group dedicated to Keswick style holiness doctrines and abstinence from alcohol and tobacco. But the Confederacy moved from the normal Keswick concept of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit when it sponsored the Pentecostal healing evangelist, Smith Wigglesworth. This was beyond the pale for Kemp, and when he heard that Israel was still associated with the Confederacy, Kemp wanted a clear undertaking from Israel that he was speaking in Churches only on behalf of the NZBTI, not on the part of the Covenanters.<sup>9</sup>

Evangelicalism always had a tendency to be divided by side issues. The case of the NZBTI and Israel showed the role of the Institute in its attempt to present a respectable image that would unify the evangelical community. Israel was dangerous to them because he did not allow sufficient distance between the Institute and the Covenanters, and to Kemp, the Covenanters were extremists, and therefore any association with them was a risk. The revivalist movement stood or fell on its ability to sustain an interdenominational group. This could only be achieved by conformity to generally held doctrinal positions. As a result, the pursuit of both orthodoxy and respectability was an important feature for the NZBTI and other revivalist institutions and activities.

Apart from field officers the NZBTI had representatives in various parts of the country. They also set up an Extension Department in 1927. This Department was responsible for outreach to other communities in New Zealand. It involved the travel of speakers, plus a book and tract ministry. W H Pettit was used to speak on topics such as evolution and modernism. Kemp and Rolls were also used. The NZBTI Bookroom was established as a publishing house, library and sales outlet. Tracts were printed on what were considered important subjects, such as testimony and evolution.

The principle work of the Extension Department was the ministry of the NZBTI evangelist Andrew Johnston. This blind ex-serviceman was employed in 1928 and was in constant demand. He played an important and consistent role in extending the influence of the revivalist movement throughout New Zealand. His message was twofold. His primary aim was to win converts and his success was largely measured in terms of such decisions, but an important aspect of the content of his message was directed towards the revitalisation

---

<sup>9</sup> NZBTI MinBks, 17 July 1923, 18 March 1924.

and consecration of believers. He spoke mainly at Baptist and Presbyterian churches but also in Brethren, Methodist and United Evangelical churches. On occasions a number of churches in a location would combine for his missions.

NZBTI students regularly participated in open air evangelistic endeavours and visited and preached in factories and other places of work.<sup>10</sup> In 1934 the City Evangelistic Mission was established in Eady Hall in Queen St under the supervision of a former Presbyterian evangelist John Bissett.<sup>11</sup>

The NZBTI had strong connections with the other two revivalist institutions. Students played a notable role in conventions especially Pounawea in Southland where time was set aside for them. Many travelled to Ngaruawahia to the convention there over Easter, and special admission concessions were arranged for them to enable as many to come as possible.<sup>12</sup> Lecturers from the Institute were among the most frequent of the conventions speakers and Bruce Scott and J O Sanders were the main organisers of the Ngaruawahia camp in the period. Likewise the Reaper magazine as Kemp's personal project always reflected a great interest in his other project, the NZBTI, and in 1929 it became the official organ of the Institute.

The Reaper was the second major institution that gave solidity and a New Zealand-wide influence to the revivalist movement. The Reaper grew out of the mid-week Bible Study at the Baptist Tabernacle. It included revivalist news throughout the world and locally, articles concerning different aspects of Christian service as well as a very strong emphasis on Bible study. Throughout the period, the magazine kept faithfully to its stated aims of 'the promotion of Bible Study, the cultivation of Spiritual Life, the dissemination of Scriptural Doctrine, and the development of Consecrated Service'.<sup>13</sup>

From the beginning of 1923 when it started, until 1929, when it was taken over by the NZBTI, the magazine was owned privately by Kemp and financed by collections at the mid-week Bible Study plus subscription and advertising revenue. Early in its life it

---

<sup>10</sup> Reaper, April 1928, p 45; *ibid.*, October 1928, p 191.

<sup>11</sup> NZBTI MinBks, 17 April 1934.

<sup>12</sup> Reaper, May 1926, p 78.

<sup>13</sup> *ibid.*, April 1923, p 35.

mainly focused on events concerning the Baptist Tabernacle, but as time went on it more and more took on the shape of a vehicle for an interdenominational revivalist movement based in Auckland. The 1929 takeover was recognition of the fact that the magazine had become the virtual mouthpiece of the movement. Despite these changes, the great bulk of the magazine, the bible studies and the articles on Christian life, remained very much the same.

Kemp was the main contributor throughout the period, and his contributions continued to appear for a time after his death. His contributions fell into three main categories. Firstly, he gleaned news of revivalist events throughout the world from overseas magazines and provided them in small passage form with his own comments. He also commented on some articles that he reprinted in the Reaper, especially if he felt that an overseas article needed to be shown to be relevant to the New Zealand context or if he felt it required an extra emphasis in some aspect. Secondly, he contributed Bible studies. These were of two main types, expository studies on a book, and doctrinal studies, such as the series on the Holy Spirit. Thirdly, he wrote articles on issues that he felt were relevant to Christian life. This included articles in revival, practical advice for Christian workers, soul-winning techniques, his trip abroad, book reviews and warnings of heresies such as Pentecostalism and Russellism.

Other contributors varied. Early on in the life of the magazine, Thomas Hill wrote a series on the history of the Baptist Tabernacle. William Luff contributed a monthly children's page from the inception of the magazine until early 1932. This column used scripture to convey a religious message (which was not always very clear), with the aim to inculcate piety. His article in 1929 on 'wheels' was typical. He gave scriptural references to wheels (to encourage familiarity with the Bible) and then went into an extended analogy which compared the Christian life with the progress of a wheel. He exhorted the children to avoid punctures such as David's puncture with Bathsheba, but comforted them that when we have punctures God can fix them. He finished with a note that automobile wheels were generally enclosed to keep the dirt out. This was 'A good plan, adopted by our Divine Lord and Owner, who thus preserves us passing over the dirty roads of life; and if soiled, He graciously cleans, and makes us fit'.<sup>14</sup>

Samuel Barry, a local optician contributed a missionary page for some years which was

---

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*, April 1929, p 55.

entitled "White Unto Harvest". This column indicated the missionary concern of the revivalists and especially the urgency for the need for dissemination of the gospel. The title, taken from a biblical reference, had the implication that souls were ready to be reaped but workers were desperately needed to do the reaping or the harvest would not be brought in.<sup>15</sup>

Information about the NZBTI soon began to play a part in the make-up of the magazine and more so as time went on. R A Laidlaw supplied a column on the Institute for a few months, but by the end of 1926 J O Sanders had taken over that responsibility. At first the column was merely a report on the progress of the building fund and was mainly a list of contributors and contributions, but it soon began to feature the coverage of former or current students and the various activities of the Institute.

For three years the Reaper ran a Bible reading system designed to help readers become systematic and regular in their personal daily devotional reading of the scriptures, a form of study very popular with evangelicals at the time. In 1924 the magazine adopted a Bible course for Sunday School from studies developed by T T Shields, a virulent fundamentalist from Toronto, and ran it for three years. Lessons from this were Bible studies designed to teach children such lessons as: 'To show that only those under the blood are safe from God's judgment' and 'To show how God delivers His own from every enemy, and provides for all their wants when they call unto Him'.<sup>16</sup>

The use of overseas fundamentalist writers was a significant feature in the tone of the magazine. Besides Shields, such writers included the two important American millennialist leaders, A C Dixon, editor of the important Fundamentals, and C I Scofield, editor of the influential Scofield Study Bible. J H Jowett, a transatlantic revivalist of some note and a friend of Kemp and Samuel Chadwick of Cliff College, one of the English holiness teachers, were also used. Contributors were generally pre-millennialists (and certainly that was the only end-time doctrinal position printed) but some were merely conservative denominational figures from England or Scotland, selected because the theme of their article overlapped with local issues.

The Reaper presented itself as the mouthpiece of the revivalist community and its

---

<sup>15</sup> see John 4:35, Matthew 9:37, 38.

<sup>16</sup> Reaper, July 1924, pp 134-135.

content reflected the message of revivalism. It was directed at Christians rather than unbelievers, and as a result there is a slightly different feel to it from that of the visiting revivalists who aimed at conversions at their meetings. In its desire for revival, for souls saved, and its pre-millennialist dogma and emphasis on the importance of the Bible, the Reaper gave a much more thorough and complete expression of the revivalist position than itinerant preachers could provide.

There were a number of influences on the Reaper that gave it something of a melting pot flavour. There was a strong conservative evangelical flavour especially in the articles of Scottish and English writers. A completely new influence in New Zealand was the fundamentalist contribution. The Reaper showed the effect of Kemp's stay in New York. His friendship with men such as T T Shields added to his conservative evangelicalism a militant defiance of anything that neared a liberal interpretation of scripture. This showed up in articles on Modernism and the authority of the Bible. Of all the contributors, apart from Shields, Kemp was the most scathing in his criticism of modernism. H Yolland and W H Pettit were others who felt strongly on the issue and contributed articles.

Another influence was the dispensationalist or millennialist aspect of revivalism. Other groups in New Zealand had expounded this type of teaching but few had had such a widely respected journal at their disposal. Again it was Kemp who was the most prolific contributor of this teaching, and it was as much his hobby-horse as was pure revival or anti-modernistic teaching.

The Reaper reflected the revivalist mentality of a 'Golden Age' view of history. Revivalist heroes of days gone by were revered as though they were superstars. Heroic descriptions of men such as Wesley, Whitefield and Finney were produced for all Christians to imitate. This reflected the revivalist tendency to view the extraordinary as the norm.

The Reaper did not have extensive dialogue with other magazines. The journal that was closest to it in content was P B Fraser's Biblical Recorder, which though of a different temperament, was none the less sympathetic to revivalism. Fraser's magazine was more purely fundamentalist than the Reaper, though they were both ardently anti-modernist. The Biblical Recorder had anti-modernism as its main message, whereas the Reaper was primarily interested in revival. Despite this difference, the two magazines looked upon one another as competing allies and when Fraser's magazine folded up in 1936 its subscription list was given to the editors of the Reaper to see if the subscribers wanted to



take the one in place of the other.<sup>17</sup>

The third institution that gave permanence and shape to the New Zealand revivalist movement was the series of annual conventions held throughout the country. These conventions gave the revivalist movement a sense of its own identity. People from various denominations came together at these meetings because they all believed the same things - the revivalist message. The conventions gave access to the leadership for people not living in Auckland. They gave encouragement to those in churches where the minister was either not a revivalist or was not as effective as the convention speakers.

The idea of conventions for revivalism harked back to 19th century American revivalism's use of camp meetings (extended revival meetings). Revivalism at that time was something of a frontier phenomenon and when a revivalist came to town all the shops and all work would stop for a number of days so that all thoughts would be on revival. However when the revivalism of the frontier came to the city it was no longer possible to exert such an influence on an entire community. When American revivalism came to England in the late 19th century, the idea of the camp meeting was transformed into the more respectable convention. The philosophy of the conventions was the same: the need to secure decisions, either for conversion or re-consecration.

The first of the conventions prominent in the 1920s was the Pounawea Convention which was held over the Christmas at the junction of the Catlins and Owaka rivers deep in south Otago. It was founded in 1908 by E G Harris along the lines of the Keswick Convention in England.<sup>18</sup> Not suprisingly, attendance figures were not large at a convention held in such an isolated area but towards the end of the 1920s about 200 people attended. If a well known speaker was the attraction this number could swell significantly with day visitors.

The message of Pounawea revolved around the central revivalist doctrine of the Holy Spirit and called for a deeper spiritual life. Appeals were made by speakers for 'a full surrender and reception of the Holy Spirit'. This was straight forward Keswick teaching. The corollary of this deeper spiritual life was active Christian service and one of the main emphases of the convention was Christian responsibility for foreign missions. While not everyone was supposed to go overseas, Christians were encouraged to see that all had a

---

<sup>17</sup> Reaper, August 1935, p 146.

<sup>18</sup> Roberts, 'The Growth', p 75.

responsibility to support the work. Nevertheless the missionary meetings that were a regular feature were specifically designed to challenge people to make a commitment to serve overseas as missionaries. In this they had some success, and in 1929 Sanders remarked that over the previous few years more than 30 people had enrolled at the NZBTI for foreign missionary training as the result of Pounawea.<sup>19</sup>

The relationship between the NZBTI and Pounawea was an important one as the influence of the Institute on the convention in the late 1920s and early 1930s was large. A number of students always attended the conventions and Sanders regularly went down to it. On occasions students would take a meeting in which they would give testimonies, sing gospel songs, and give short sermons.<sup>20</sup> The relationship was symbiotic as the convention provided new recruits for the NZBTI as well as the opportunity for students to test their newly acquired skills, and gave the Institute another opportunity to spread its teachings further afield.

Speakers at the convention included representatives of interdenominational mission societies, southern revivalists such as Thomas Miller and Frank Varley (both of them preachers in Dunedin), and representatives from the NZBTI. The NZBTI speakers tended to have a southern connection, Harries had served six years as a Presbyterian minister in Timaru,<sup>21</sup> Andrew Johnston was originally from Gore,<sup>22</sup> and Sanders was originally from Dunedin.<sup>23</sup> The convention acquired the services of W P Nicholson in 1934, who was a little different from the usual in the sense that he was an itinerant preacher from overseas, and was not attached to any missionary society, but he was a holiness teacher who was widely respected in revivalist circles and was available at the time, for he stayed for a whole year in New Zealand.

Although Pounawea was the longest established of the Keswick style conventions in the 1920s, it was quickly surpassed in importance by the foundation of the Ngaruawahia Easter Convention. Unlike Pounawea, Ngaruawahia could draw on a much bigger

---

<sup>19</sup> Reaper, November 1929, p 202.

<sup>20</sup> ibid., March 1928, p 18; ibid., February 1930, p 294.

<sup>21</sup> John Rawson Elder, The History of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand 1840-1940, Christchurch 1940, p 434.

<sup>22</sup> Reaper, September 1928, p 164.

<sup>23</sup> ibid., March 1926, p 27.



population base and was close to the Auckland home of the revivalist movement. As a result by the early 1930s, between 800 and 1000 people would attend some meetings.<sup>24</sup>

The Ngaruawahia camp grew out of desire to re-establish the annual Bible Class men's camp from the Hamilton Presbyterian and Baptist Churches as well as from A A Murray's Presbyterian church in Auckland. The camp had lapsed during World War One, but its influence was felt when the Ngaruawahia camp was formed in 1921 and there was a strong presence of the United Evangelical Church on the organising committee. A A Murray was a principal speaker at the first two camps in 1921 and 1922.<sup>25</sup> Despite this link to the pre-war camp the new convention was an Auckland inspired movement and was open to all men and women interested in the Keswick message.

The most important man in the formation of the Ngaruawahia convention was Auckland lawyer Bruce Scott, a church officer at the Baptist Tabernacle and tutor and later Superintendent of the NZBTI. He too had a connection with Murray, as his wife had formerly been a member of Murray's St. Andrew's congregation. Scott was the inaugural chairman and guiding light of the convention.

There was no doubt about the aim of the camp. 'The dream that has visited its promoters is of a North Island "Keswick" and gathering year by year of Christian people who are prepared absolutely to sink their denominational differences in the pursuit of holiness, victory and power'.<sup>26</sup> Its constitution read that its chief object was 'the practical instruction in spiritual things that each camper may go away filled with the Holy Spirit, and thus equipped to live the Victorious Life'.<sup>27</sup>

The camp was remarkably similar to Pounawea. Its missionary emphasis may be seen in the Auckland Star report that 30 missionaries had gone out from the convention in the ten years of its existence. The speakers as well as the subject were often the same as at Pounawea. Harries, Rolls, Pettit, Mallis, Bissett, Sanders and Nicholson all spoke at both. Mission society representatives made up almost half the speakers at Ngaruawahia and

---

<sup>24</sup> *ibid.*, May 1933, p 43; *ibid.*, February 1934, p 1.

<sup>25</sup> Nga MinBks, Donnell to Rushbrook, 24 March 1971; Ngaruawahia Bible Study Notes, 1922, p 6.

<sup>26</sup> Reaper, December 1924, p 254.

<sup>27</sup> Ngaruawahia Bible Study Notes, 1924, p 1.

speakers from the NZBTI made up the bulk of the rest with one or two itinerants completing the roll of speakers.<sup>28</sup>

Although the camp was primarily for the already converted, it also made provision for the unsaved. In fact at one stage they even baptised converts, though this was soon brought to a halt at the request of the Auckland Ministers' Association. After each camp there was a rally at Auckland which was designed to bring some of the enthusiasm generated at the camp to the city. The revival orientation of the camp could be seen in the pre-camp prayer meetings, which in 1930 combined with the Prayer and Revival Campaigners, a group dedicated to producing revival in New Zealand based on the campaigns of the local independent revivalist Harry Dawson.<sup>29</sup>

The Pounawea and Ngaruawahia conventions were the most important revivalist conventions in New Zealand, and although there were other camps their main importance lay in their proliferation, which reflected a degree of success in the transmission of revivalist ideology. Two other significant conventions started in the period. The Cambridge Convention began in Christmas 1924 as a northern equivalent to Pounawea with the same aim of a creation of a 'deeper more satisfactory Christian experience through a better knowledge of the ministry of the Holy Spirit'.<sup>30</sup> This camp mainly attracted speakers from the Auckland revivalist community such as Fletcher, Kemp, Harries, Mains, Bissett, Wilson, Rolls, and Barton. Late in the 1920s a convention was established in Christchurch to cater for similar demands. The speakers included Bissett, Johnston, Sanders, Miller and Nicholson.

It was obvious that these conventions were deliberately modelled on Keswick. They all emphasised the importance of the Holy Spirit and missionary service, and they all drew from the same pool of speakers and organisers. The conventions and their Keswick teachings were an important distinguishing feature of the revivalist movement.

The institutions of the NZBTI, the Reaper and the conventions, provided the core of the revivalist movement. These institutions gave solidity to the movement by giving it an institutional and interdenominational base. Each was faithful to the revivalist

---

<sup>28</sup> Nga MinBks, Auckland Star clipping and a list of speakers.

<sup>29</sup> *ibid.*, 11 February 1930.

<sup>30</sup> Reaper, November 1929, p 202.

message, and this meant that some doctrinal conformity could be established and they were each important in establishing the movement as something more than merely an Auckland phenomenon.

## Chapter Five

## The Revival Campaigns

The 1920s and early 1930s saw an unprecedented increase in revivalist activity. The revival campaign trail was full of visitors and local itinerants. There were various types of revivalists that toured the country. There were visitors from overseas. These had acquired something of an international reputation and were known to varying degrees by the evangelical community in New Zealand. Then there were overseas revivalists who became resident in New Zealand. Fletcher and Kemp were the most important of this kind. Finally there were the local itinerants, and representatives of missionary societies. However not all revivalist campaigns were conducted by a single revivalist. Some campaigns used a number of speakers, and sometimes utilised local clergymen who would not normally be thought of as 'revivalists'.

The revival campaigns are useful in trying to see the nature of the revival movement. In one sense they were the very heartbeat of the movement, as they tried to bring about the long sought-after revival through conversion oriented preaching. But in the organisational sense the campaigns presented a different view of the movement than other aspects. The revival campaigns were the most popular aspects of the movement and as such they involved people who would not normally be considered part of the movement.

The campaigns were an important indicator of the success of the movement. Certainly they were the main gauge of success that those in the movement considered. There were other important indicators such as church growth and the number of missionaries trained at the NZBTI, but the revival campaign was an important psychological test of the movement's effectiveness, as it was deliberately instituted as a method of presentation of the revival message to the unconverted.

The revival campaign was the movement's main offensive weapon against the encroachment of secularisation. It was at these meetings that revivalists sought to turn back the tide of 'godlessness', which was the main function of the movement. If they were not successful in their campaigns, the movement, at least in its own eyes, was not what it should be. The campaigns were not merely important in terms of converts. They facilitated the New Zealand-wide extension of what was an Auckland based movement.

They were the oldest and most easily recognised feature of revivalism. They illustrated the movement at its widest and most influential. They showed clearly the central issues of the movement, the promotion of the revival and the salvation of the individual. They highlight more dramatically than elsewhere the central method of conversion oriented preaching that sought a clear and instant response from the audience. They revealed much of the temper of the movement. The revival campaigns were the movement's most public face.

The first of the visiting revivalists was Herbert Booth, son of Salvation Army founder, William Booth. He had left the Army and toured New Zealand in 1919 and 1920 as an independent revivalist. Although he spoke at the Baptist Tabernacle and gave hearty approval of the news of Kemp's appointment there, Booth was not a part of what became the revival movement.<sup>1</sup>

Although he was known as a friend of Kemp, his New Zealand visit was prior to the formation of the movement, and his influence lay in a different direction. It was paradoxical that a friend of Kemp, that ardent anti-Pentecostal, should have played such an important antecedent (though unwitting) role in the establishment of Pentecostalism in New Zealand, through the agency of the Christian Covenanters' Confederacy, which Booth founded on his visit.<sup>2</sup>

The second major figure to tour New Zealand in the period was the Anglican James Moore Hickson. Hickson was not an ordinary revivalist. His main attraction was his apparent ability to heal sickness. But he was no ordinary faith healer either. His appeal was not to the most ardently evangelical, but to the most respectable within Protestantism. His mission was officially an Anglican one, though other churches supported it. The Anglican Bishop of Wellington, T H Sprott, eulogised him and spoke of a new age with a 'revived Ministry of Healing' as its proclamation. Bishop Averill of Auckland promised to ensure the continuation of 'spiritual healing' in his diocese. Hickson was not part of the revival movement, though Harries vigorously supported him in the pages of the Presbyterian

---

<sup>1</sup> Reaper, December 1925, p 254.

<sup>2</sup> Douglas E Ireton, 'A Time to Heal: The Appeal of Smith Wigglesworth in New Zealand 1922-24', BA(Hons) research exercise, Massey 1984, p 15; J E Worsfold, A History of the Charismatic Movements in New Zealand: Including a Pentecostal Perspective and Breviate of the Catholic Apostolic Church in Great Britain, Bradford 1974, p 95.

Outlook.<sup>3</sup>

In 1924 Gipsy Pat Smith toured New Zealand. He fitted the normal mould of revivalist and the by then largely formed movement fully supported him. His visit was not a long one. He arrived on 28 April 1924 and over the next few months held campaigns in the main centres. The most important aspect of his visit was the degree of unity and support by the various churches. In Auckland there was almost total support from Protestants. Even ministers such as the Presbyterian D Herron, who later became identified as anti-revivalist, at that stage supported the Smith mission.<sup>4</sup>

His Auckland campaign was supported by ~~the Anglican Church of~~ All Saints Ponsonby, the YWCA, all the Presbyterian churches, all the Methodist circuits and churches, all the Baptist churches, all but one of the Congregational churches, and one of the two of the United Evangelical Churches. The main exception to those advertising the campaign were the Brethren Assemblies, whose view of denominationalism probably hindered them, though R A Laidlaw, a leading Brethren, played an active role in the campaign.<sup>5</sup>

Smith was conciliatory towards the clergy and said that he did not 'abuse the ministry or abuse the churches' as some did. It was said that 'he stood on the broad platform of evangelical truth. And from this platform he succeeded in gathering around him and unifying different churches', although by the same token he 'held no truck with modernism'.<sup>6</sup> In that sense he represented the conservative evangelical revivalist and emphasised evangelism as an end in itself.

Not only did Smith's evangelical message appeal to a wide range of ministers, it also appealed to the laity. In Auckland the arranged venues had to be transferred to the Town Hall to cater for the response. The Town Hall which held about 3000, was largely filled throughout the three week campaign in the city. The organisers estimated that over the entire period, including daytime meetings, over 85 000 attended (multiple attendances included). It was also claimed that over 1000 'converts and friends' attended a special

---

<sup>3</sup> Ireton, pp 28, 29.

<sup>4</sup> New Zealand Herald (hereafter cited as NZH), 17 May 1924, p14; Brown to Guinness, 19 June 1930, Dunedin, Tertiary Students' Christian Fellowship, Wellington, File no. A2c.

<sup>5</sup> NZH, 17 May 1924, p 14.

<sup>6</sup> Reaper, July 1924, p 115.

meeting on a Saturday evening.

It seems that one of Smith's objectives was to present the gospel message in a simple and unemotional way. This was further evidence of the tension in revivalism between emotions and respectability. Thus Smith himself could have a 'passionate conversion' yet he did not 'traffic in the emotions of others'.<sup>7</sup>

Like all revivalist preachers he was a populist. His sermons were anecdotal and heavily punctuated with humour. He played continually on his gipsy background which proved to be a crowd-pleaser. His sermons were conversion oriented as indicated by such sermon titles as 'Ye must be born again', 'Coming to Jesus' and 'One thing thou lackest'.<sup>8</sup>

Paul Kanamori, billed as the Moody of Japan came to New Zealand in June 1924. His visit was arranged by P B Fraser. He spent a month in Auckland and Kemp and Bruce Scott served as joint secretaries of the campaigns. He spoke at a large number of churches.<sup>9</sup>

Gipsy Rodney Smith was the most well known of the visiting revivalists of the period. He arrived on 17 August 1926 and conducted campaigns in the main centres. He left New Zealand on 21 December 1926. When he arrived in New Zealand he had an established reputation and came out under the auspices of the Associated Free Churches of New Zealand.<sup>10</sup> Immediately prior to his arrival in New Zealand he had held successful missions in Australia.<sup>11</sup>

Smith travelled through the main centres and attracted large audiences. At one service in Auckland it was reported that long before the meeting began the Town Hall was full and that those who were turned away possibly outnumbered those inside.<sup>12</sup> In Dunedin he consistently drew crowds of more than 1000 and on occasions had as many as 3000 present.<sup>13</sup> In Christchurch he managed to attract as many as 4-5000 to some

---

<sup>7</sup> NZH, 5 May 1924, p 9.

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.*, 24 May 1924, p 14; *ibid.*, 2 June 1924, p 8; *ibid.*, 21 May 1924, p 10.

<sup>9</sup> Biblical Recorder, August 1924, p 244.

<sup>10</sup> NZH, 18 August 1926, p 13.

<sup>11</sup> NZMT, 8 May 1926, p 7; Reaper, October 1926, p 213.

<sup>12</sup> NZH, 30 August 1926, p 10.

<sup>13</sup> NZMT, 20 November 1926, p 13.



meetings.<sup>14</sup> The Auckland campaign saw 5036 decision cards signed (these cards replaced the traditional enquiry room appeal). Of these 1394 were first time decisions, which was an exceptionally good return for a three week mission. But more significant were the 3642 reconsecration cards which highlighted Smith's relative emphasis on the already converted.<sup>15</sup> This was a feature of revivalism. Although revivalists claimed to be evangelising the lost, often their main function was reviving the found.

Although Smith had consistent success as an attraction for crowds, and although he consistently avoided controversial topics and attitudes, his tour was marked by a good deal of bad feeling. The cause of the ill-will was due to a feeling of some that Smith was a little too interested in money and that his motivations were less than purely altruistic.

Midway through the first mission which was in Auckland, Smith said he had encountered more criticism in New Zealand than anywhere else.<sup>16</sup> In Dunedin it was reported that 'deepened prejudice had increased criticism' and that his message had offended some.<sup>17</sup> The Christchurch mission was hindered by his apparent lack of generosity on hearing of the death of one of the ushers at the Dunedin mission. He contributed only five shillings to the widow's fund. To make matters worse, when this became public, Smith tried to deny knowledge of the dead man's connection to the mission, a story which was refuted by one of the organisers of the campaign, Rev E H Bellhouse. Such inconsistencies appeared to affect the mission and attendances fell.<sup>18</sup>

On social issues Smith took the position that society was in decline. He attacked jazz, alcohol, and the absence of sufficient Sabbatarianism and school Bible teaching.<sup>19</sup> The remedy was revival. The way to achieve revival was to 'draw a chalk ring round yourself and ask God to begin inside the ring. If you get your own heart right others will soon follow'.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Press, 13 November 1926, p 22; *ibid.*, 22 November 1926, p 8.

<sup>15</sup> NZMT, 9 October 1926, p 9.

<sup>16</sup> NZH, 6 September 1926, p 12.

<sup>17</sup> NZMT, 20 November 1926, p 13.

<sup>18</sup> Press, 30 November 1926, p 11; *ibid.*, 1 December 1926, p 10.

<sup>19</sup> *ibid.*, 23 November 1926, p 11; *ibid.*, 4 December 1926, p 5; *ibid.*, 7 December 1926, p 11.

<sup>20</sup> NZMT, 11 September 1926, p 3.

William P Nicholson was an Irish evangelist who toured New Zealand from March 1933 to mid-1934 which was an unusually long period of time. Because he spent over a year in New Zealand he was able to visit smaller centres than those on the usual trail of the important revivalists. He arrived on 27 March 1933, and after a welcome in Auckland went to Hamilton where he conducted a campaign as well as being the main speaker at the Ngaruawahia Convention. From there he spoke in Auckland and travelled to Dunedin, primarily to speak at Otago University, although he did speak elsewhere in the city.

In July Nicholson started a four week campaign in Gisborne. It was unusual for such a well known revivalist to speak there, but Stanley Muir, a former NZBTI student and liaison officer for the New Zealand mission was a local resident.

Nicholson held a campaign in Palmerston North in August, and then a five week mission in Dunedin from 8 October to 12 November. He campaigned in Invercargill for more than a week and in Nelson for a whole month in January/February 1934. He spent between 25 February and 18 March campaigning in Christchurch and then finished his stay in New Zealand by speaking at the Ngaruawahia Convention and a long stay in Auckland until his departure on 8 July.

Despite the fact that Nicholson had a established a world wide reputation as the leader of a revival in Northern Ireland in the 1920s, he failed to elicit the large crowds of the two Gipsy Smiths. This was due to the fact that the organisers, the NZBTI in association with the Ngaruawahia Easter Camp Committee,<sup>21</sup> failed to mobilise the great bulk of evangelical churches behind the mission. To some extent this can be explained by the more impressive reputation that Gipsy Rodney Smith brought with him, a reputation that Pat Smith no doubt benefited from due to similarity of names. Also as time progressed throughout the 1920s and into the 1930s the polarisation between liberal and conservative in theology grew more distinct which made it far more difficult to gain co-operation on a broad evangelical platform.

However the main reason that Nicholson did not receive the support of many evangelicals was that he was much more intolerant of organised Christianity. Although the Smiths were no friends of modernism, they were relatively inoffensive in their pleas for greater evidence of

---

<sup>21</sup> Reaper, May 1933, p 43; Sanders, This I Remember, p 54.

heartfelt religion. Nicolson, in contrast, was a blunt talker. His humour was described as 'crude' and his language 'vulgar'.<sup>22</sup>

His central message was the Keswick doctrine of revival of the individual which would lead to a general revival.<sup>23</sup> His sermon topics reflected the Keswick influence. He spoke on the fulness of the Spirit, Christian living, the Second Advent, prayer, as well as the more directly evangelistic subjects.<sup>24</sup>

William Lamb, who taught about the fulfillment of prophecy in the contemporary, toured New Zealand between February and July 1931. He held meetings in the four main centres and Invercargill. Lamb's message concerned his conviction that the end of the world, as described in prophetic scriptures, was not far away. He did not attract consistently large crowds although he did manage to fill the Auckland Town Hall on one night when he discussed 'World Revolution and the Collapse of Civilisation'. It was described as a 'boisterous and stormy' meeting.<sup>25</sup>

His messages were virtually all on the same theme. Titles such as 'Some Recent Startling World Happenings and Their Significance' and 'What's Wrong with the World, A Mighty Impending Event' give an indication of the type of message that he repeated in each city. They could be remarkably explicit about what he thought was happening in the world. 'Russia, Great Britain and the Nations in Relation to Palestine and the Jews' and 'Mussolini and the Resurrection of Ancient Rome' indicated the specific nature of his predictions.<sup>26</sup>

Some visitor revivalists in New Zealand were problems for the revivalist movement. French Oliver who toured in 1923 came to be considered as such. So were the Pentecostals, especially Smith Wigglesworth who was in New Zealand for a short time in 1922 and again in 1923, and A H Dallimore who infuriated evangelical church leaders in Auckland in the early 1930s. These problem revivalists will be discussed in Chapter

---

<sup>22</sup> J Edwin Orr, Evangelical Awakenings in the South Seas, Minneapolis 1976, p 135.

<sup>23</sup> Wilson, Definite Experience, p 7.

<sup>24</sup> Reaper, January 1934, p 243; W P Nicolson, The Christian Life, Auckland ca.1934; Press, 24 February 1934, p 21; *ibid.*, 17 March 1934, p 20; *ibid.* 3 March 1934, p 21.

<sup>25</sup> Reaper, June 1931, p 95.

<sup>26</sup> Press, 14 March 1931, p 22.

Seven, and it is enough to say that they were seen to be in competition with the movement. The second category of revivalist to play a dynamic role on the revivalist campaign trail were the resident revivalists. These were men who had gained a reputation overseas but were resident in New Zealand for a considerable time in the period. The two most important were Kemp and Fletcher. These two had considerable international reputations and found it a simple thing to draw a crowd.

Kemp mainly conducted campaigns in the Baptist Tabernacle as a supplement to normal church life. His eleven week campaign from May until August 1921, was a significant one. He saw 160 decisions made and the campaign helped establish him as a leader of Auckland evangelical activities.<sup>27</sup> In 1928 he tried to repeat the success of the 1921 campaign, but there were only 50 decisions, which was considered a disappointment.<sup>28</sup>

Occasionally Kemp ventured to other parts of the country such as his week long campaign at Christchurch's Oxford Terrace Baptist Church in May 1923,<sup>29</sup> and during his Presidential year he visited every Baptist church in New Zealand.<sup>30</sup> Such journeys were exceptions, as it was unusual for him to vacate the Baptist Tabernacle pulpit.

Fletcher too, did not leave his pulpit very often but he did conduct some missions both at individual churches such as at the First Presbyterian Church of Dunedin in 1925,<sup>31</sup> and also at united missions which combined a number of churches, such as at the three week Dunedin United Mission in October 1926.<sup>32</sup> He also campaigned for the New Zealand Alliance as a Prohibition speaker, and conducted some Youth Campaigns. He had experienced some success in youth work in the United Kingdom and that success was repeated in New Zealand at such missions as the Pukekohe Youth Evangelistic Campaign. That Campaign ran for ten days under the auspices of the Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist and Salvation Army churches, and there were 297 converts.<sup>33</sup> His final farewell service in the Auckland Town Hall epitomised Fletcher's achievement. The service netted another

---

<sup>27</sup> Bap Tab MinBks, 3 May 1921, 16 August 1921; Kemp, p 101.

<sup>28</sup> Reaper, June 1928, p 74.

<sup>29</sup> *ibid.*, July 1923, p 120.

<sup>30</sup> Kemp, p 95.

<sup>31</sup> Reaper, March 1925, p 1.

<sup>32</sup> NZMT, 16 November 1929, p 6.

<sup>33</sup> *ibid.*, 9 January 1932, p 3.

fifty converts.<sup>34</sup>

The other main foreign revivalist resident in New Zealand was Frank Varley, son of the well known trans-Atlantic revivalist, Henry Varley. The son was not of the same stature in the revivalist sub-culture, nor was he as important as Kemp or Fletcher, but his father's reputation and his own ardent evangelical views made him a significant minor revivalist figure.

He came to New Zealand in 1928 to take up pastoral work at the York Place Hall in Dunedin.<sup>35</sup> He spoke at conventions, especially at Pounawea, and in 1930 he resigned from York Place to 'be open to receive invitations for supply work'.<sup>36</sup> He made little impact in this capacity.

The next main group that conducted revival campaigns were the local itinerant preachers. These men lacked the prestige of the overseas revivalists and often their energies were spent on the smaller centres ignored by the more widely respected preachers. The most significant evangelist for the revivalist community of the local variety was the NZBTI evangelist, Andrew Johnston.

Johnston, who was employed by the Institute from 1928, travelled widely through New Zealand and was well received by churches who could not attract more prestigious revivalists. Such churches were grateful for the ability of Johnston to win a few extra converts and for his ability to inspire congregation members to greater commitment. Although a reconsecrated believer was not seen to be of the same value to a church as a new convert (for a convert meant direct growth), the reconsecrated believer at least meant that the church did seem to offer real answers and after consecration people were more likely to be committed to church life.

Sometimes he spoke at combined church campaigns and could attract substantial crowds. At Hamilton in August 1929, 600 attended the final service.<sup>37</sup> Often he held missions for

---

<sup>34</sup> Malcolm, p 112.

<sup>35</sup> Reaper, August 1928, p 122.

<sup>36</sup> *ibid.*, December 1930, p 237.

<sup>37</sup> *ibid.*, September 1929, p 174.

a specific church such as the Tory Street Hall where he held a number of missions.<sup>38</sup> Besides larger campaigns, Johnston spent much time in very small centres such as in the period between June and August 1930, when he held campaigns in Kimbolton, Broadwood, Kohukohu, Waimakau, and Ravene.<sup>39</sup> These smaller campaigns did not produce large crowds and sometimes the results were disappointing. At Edendale in Southland in 1931 the local church put a great deal of effort into preparation with door to door visits but saw little result from the campaign.<sup>40</sup> At other times the response could be gratifying such as at the combined Shannon campaign which saw 40-50 converts in two weeks in September/October 1931.<sup>41</sup>

John Bissett and W J Mains were also itinerant revivalists. Both were evangelists for the Presbyterian church. Bissett became a Presbyterian evangelist in 1919. Although his main function was to revitalise Presbyterian churches he did, on occasion, conduct combined campaigns, such as at Dannevirke in 1920, where Presbyterians combined with Methodists and the Salvation Army. At the last service of that campaign 30-40 professed Christ.<sup>42</sup> In 1934 he helped establish the Eady Hall Mission in Auckland.<sup>43</sup>

Harry Dawson was an Auckland businessman who formed the 'Harry Dawson Prayer and Revival Campaigners'. His influence was mainly in the Auckland area. He ran a two month campaign in A S Wilson's Grange Road Baptist Church in 1930.<sup>44</sup> He did occasionally run campaigns elsewhere such as in Palmerston North in 1932.<sup>45</sup>

A number of other members of the revivalist movement toured the country. The representatives of the various interdenominational mission societies were not revivalists in the normal sense of the word, for their main target was not converts, but rather

---

<sup>38</sup> *ibid.*, November 1929, p 222; *ibid.*, December 1930, p 239; *ibid.*, August 1932, p 110.

<sup>39</sup> *ibid.*, June 1930, p 96; *ibid.*, July 1930, p 119.

<sup>40</sup> *ibid.*, July 1931, p 119.

<sup>41</sup> *ibid.*, November 1931, p 215.

<sup>42</sup> *NZMT*, 9 October 1920, p 7.

<sup>43</sup> *Reaper*, September 1943, p 123.

<sup>44</sup> *ibid.*, July 1930, p 117.

<sup>45</sup> *Manawatu Daily Times*, 17 November 1932, p 8; *ibid.*, 24 November 1932, p 12.



to persuade men and women to leave for overseas mission fields, and to obtain local support in prayer and monetary terms. However they did preach the message of the revival movement at conventions such as Pounawea and Ngaruawahia and at local churches throughout New Zealand. There were a number of such representatives. The more important of them were 'Cairo' Bradley, William Mallis, John Southey, Northcote Deck, R V Bingham, and C N Lack. The wife of the famous English missionary C T Studd also toured the country in 1924.

The combined revivalist campaigns that the Auckland revivalist community organised in the period were important to the movement. These campaigns were not only interdenominational but were conducted by a selection of revivalists from different denominational backgrounds.

For three years from 1925 the movement produced a campaign known as the United Churches Tent Campaign which was held in a large marquee in Civic Square, Auckland over the summer vacation period. The campaign was the result of the ministerial prayer meetings that Lionel Fletcher's arrival had fostered.

The two main speakers were Kemp and Fletcher but they shared the platform with others over the four to five week long campaigns. The Methodist minister C H Laws took a prominent part in the campaigns which reflected the broad appeal of the revivalist movement early in the period. This broad appeal was created by the esteem in which Fletcher was held, and the fact that the respect that many had for Kemp had not at that stage been fully tested, as it was to be in the late 1920s, by the polarisation between the fundamentalism eschewed by the NZBTI and the liberalism evident in other churchmen.

Other speakers included Harries, Laidlaw, Bissett, Mains, Pettit, R L Stewart, as well as the Methodist H Ranston. That the Presbyterian Herron spoke in 1925 reflected the broad base that the revival movement created in the campaigns, as he was later identified as antipathetic to revivalism.

The Great Bible Demonstration held in the Auckland Town Hall on 14 March 1929, was an illustration of the collapse of that broad base. It was evidence of a move in a different direction away from the toleration of the early campaigns in the pursuit of converts and towards a more militant anti-modernism.



The Bible Demonstration was not so much a revival campaign as a re-affirmation of the pre-eminence of the Bible. For this reason the speakers were different from those used in the earlier campaigns. Speakers such as Laws, Ranston and Herron took no part, for all of them might have felt uncomfortable on an anti-modernistic platform. The most interesting omission from the list of speakers was Lionel Fletcher. Whether he was unavailable is a matter for conjecture, but he was softer on liberals than most of the revivalists.

The change that the Bible Demonstration symbolised was reflected in all the revival campaigns. The early important missions and the early combined campaigns in Auckland were marked by toleration and a broad evangelical base that had been a feature of late 19th century revivalism. Gipsy Rodney Smith was the only world renowned revivalist who had gained fame in the previous century to continue beyond World War One. His type of toleration became increasingly unusual. Gipsy Pat Smith continued in conscious imitation of this style. Fletcher, too, was of this older school. But the emphasis of the revival movement was increasingly towards a newer style of revivalism that was more aggressively anti-modernistic and that could no longer draw together a widely diverse group of evangelicals.

The revival campaigns were important to the revival movement. It was believed that if revival was to come to New Zealand it would be through such meetings. The main emphasis of the movement was 'the decision', either of conversion or of reconsecration, and it was at the revival campaign that the decision was expected.

As a result the revival campaign became something of a test of the authenticity of the revival message. Crowds were seen as a measure of God's pleasure, but decisions were even more so. The revival movement was populist, and the campaigns were its most populist face.

The message of the campaigns of the most successful revivalists were anecdotal. Even the type of anecdote reflected this populism. The two Gipsy Smiths told stories about an exotic gipsy background and their always captivating wartime experiences. The appeal of the more successful preachers reflected a natural desire for something exotic from overseas. The visitor always seemed to speak with more authority than those who stayed at home.

The preachers were seen as heralds of new hope. Those from overseas were looked to even

more, their foreignness seemed to add authority to the reputations they had already established. They were symbols of what were held to be successful moves of God elsewhere. Revivalism implied a dissatisfaction with the state of New Zealand and though the hoped-for change was sought from God, God always seemed more likely to intervene through someone from outside New Zealand.

This dependency was more than a mere desire for the exotic which appears to be natural to all communities. Dependency on overseas influence, especially British influence, was prevalent in most aspects of New Zealand life. In the political arena this was typified by Massey's British Imperialism (which was related to his religious ideas). It was true in entertainment, as foreign shows were the order of the day. In education there was a definite preference for overseas appointments, especially for prestigious positions such as professorships, as one of Kemp's protégés, E M Blaiklock, discovered when he was passed over for the Chair in Classics at Auckland University.<sup>46</sup>

Such dependency represented the plight of a migrant community which formed a cultural fringe as opposed to the heartland of the mother culture. Unless the migration involved a strong identity in opposition to the parent culture, such as with the Puritans in New England, cultural dependency and the lack of a strong independent culture was likely. In New Zealand this dependency was strengthened due to the dependent nature of the economy on its trade with Britain.

Respectability played an important role in the determination of the relative success of the revival campaigns. Some revivalists such as Gipsy Rodney Smith had an established reputation throughout the different denominations. Such a reputation made relative success likely. Some of the revivalists managed to add to this an air of respectability in their presentation which was of great advantage. Gipsy Rodney Smith managed this combination. When he arrived in New Zealand he was 66 years old and he was well established as a preacher of international repute. He had gained an OBE for his services as a preacher in World War One.<sup>47</sup> He added to this an evident desire to work in with a variety of people in his campaigns. As a result his meetings were very well attended.

---

<sup>46</sup> E M Blaiklock, Between the Foothills and the Ridge. A Tale of Two Climbers, Palmerston North 1981, p 18.

<sup>47</sup> NZH, 18 August 1926, p 13.

Smith was in sharp contrast with the prophetic teacher William Lamb. The type of message Lamb delivered severely narrowed the type of audience he could attract. Many people who liked the old-style revival preaching of Smith could not abide the bold predictions of end-time events that Lamb indulged in. J J North, a prominent Baptist preacher, who showed some sympathy towards revivalist preachers, found that type of prophetic teaching offensive. After one such visitor spoke on the imminent approach of the Millennium, North replied with a sermon 'The Millennium is Here'.<sup>48</sup> Such reaction was evidence of frustration at the smugness with which the future was predicted. North rejected post-millennialism, and while he criticised dispensationalism, he did so in a cautionary sense, and held that 'we are certainly meant to be very modest in our conclusions'.<sup>49</sup>

Nicholson, too, lost out on the broad base of support that the two Gipsy Smiths had because his style of presentation was too unpredictable. His 'unusual statements' and blunt talk on Hell, the Devil and modernism caused some difficulties.<sup>50</sup> Such unconventionality was demonstrated in his prayer about the Devil where he asked God to 'tie a knot in his tail' <sup>51</sup>

Gipsy Pat Smith showed that it was possible to attract broad appeal despite having little or no past reputation. He came to New Zealand with less reputation than Nicholson and yet united a broad spectrum of churches behind him. In part this was due to associations with the name Gipsy Smith. But Smith's success was also due to his mixture of urgency with respectability, which was a feature of the revival movement in general. Smith made a conscious effort to allay clerical fears. He also played upon his very respectable wartime role as a captain in the British Army in France. For these reasons he was very successful in New Zealand.

---

<sup>48</sup> E W Batts and A H MacLeod, J J North. The Story of a great New Zealander, Wellington no date, p 73.

<sup>49</sup> J J North, Features of the Future. Here and Hereafter, Auckland, 1939, pp 20-22.

<sup>50</sup> Reaper, May 1933, p 42.

<sup>51</sup> Sanders, This I Remember, p 54.

## Chapter Six

### The Denominations

The revival movement was not restricted to any one denomination. One of its distinctive features was the desire of its participants to cross denominational boundaries in order to find what was considered to be the essence of Christianity. The movement's leaders often felt greater loyalty to activities outside their denominations than to much inside them. On occasions revivalist activities led to a clash of interests between the revivalist and the denominational hierarchy.

The role of Reverend Alexander A Murray in both the Presbyterian Church and the revivalist movement was one that illustrated the difficulties of a minister out of step with his denomination. In 1908 Murray became the minister of St Andrew's Presbyterian Church in Auckland. This was his first ministerial position although he had previously served in India with the Poona and India Village Mission. He was at no time one of the 'inner circle' of Presbyterians who wielded power as ecclesiarchs of the denomination. He, like most of the revivalist movement, gave his first loyalty to his theological temperament rather than his denomination. Murray's allegiance to the revivalist position ahead of the Presbyterian was shown in his service with the inter-denominational mission in India and in his contemplation of joining the Baptist ministry while at theological college. His interests always lay in evangelical work. He was energetic and popular with the young. In 1917 he began to hold evangelistic services in the Tivoli Theatre. This was to prove highly controversial and to permanently rupture his relationship with the Auckland Presbytery.<sup>1</sup>

The issue was controversial not so much because of the use of an amusement theatre, although this may have been very distasteful to some, but rather because it was claimed that the special services would draw people away from other Presbyterian churches

---

<sup>1</sup> Linley Wood, The History of St Andrew's. The Pioneer Presbyterian Church of Auckland 1847-1947, Auckland 1947, pp 66-69.

in Auckland. Attendance at Presbyterian churches had been declining throughout New Zealand and the arrival of a 'popular' style service was feared likely to accentuate this trend, especially since Tivoli Theatre was situated toward the St David's end of the St Andrew's parish.

Murray attempted to gain approval from the ministers of St David's, St Peter's and St James's for the services. J M Saunders of St David's objected. R L Walker of St James's gave his personal approval on the telephone but this was reversed when his kirk session objected strongly. Murray and his kirk session tried to negotiate with St David's but on failing to come to agreement went ahead with the services despite the objections. The Auckland Presbytery moved a motion of censure against Murray but showed no real enthusiasm for dragging the matter out any further. Murray proceeded with the Tivoli Theatre project with some success but at the cost of alienation from the rest of the Auckland Presbytery. Two years later in 1919 when the more serious issue of Murray's baptism by immersion surfaced, the Presbytery was in no mood to tolerate his continued intransigent and independent line.

As already mentioned Murray had entertained thoughts of the Baptist ministry while a theological student, but had decided to remain in the Presbyterian Church. But by 1919 he became convinced that the biblical method of baptism was the full immersion in water of the adult believer. As a matter of conscience he was baptised in mid-1919 by the Baptist minister W L Salter in a Brethren Gospel Hall in Parnell. This event, although done without publicity, soon became known throughout Auckland Presbyterianism. As a result several of the ministers and elders of the Auckland Presbytery met at St James's to discuss the issue. They sent a delegation of three ministers to talk to Murray in the hope that he could be persuaded to resign quietly. However the meeting with Murray only served to inflame the issue. Murray spoke to the New Zealand Herald (he claimed that the newspaper came to him about the issue) and the problem soon became a heated topic of debate in the correspondence columns of that newspaper. Murray and a large number of laity saw the controversy as a simple case of victimisation arising out of the Tivoli Theatre incident.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> NZH, 4 September - 10 September 1919.

But if Murray found support in the press account of the battle and in the minds of the laity, he was well out of his depth in the proceedings of the ecclesiastical courts. For there in the closed meetings made up of the heart of Presbyterian leadership, he found little sympathy. The General Assembly found him 'liable to discipline' for his 'irregular' behaviour regarding his re-baptism and refusal to baptise infants. The matter was then referred back to the Auckland Presbytery who had a free hand to deal with him. Murray was suspended from the ministry. His defence lay on three main points: his desire to have the matter tried publicly, not in closed session, knowing that his strength lay in public approval; an appeal to his liberty of conscience regarding the 'appendages of the gospel'; and an appeal to biblical authority.<sup>3</sup> All three of these were firmly rooted in the revivalist position. The revival movement was populist, interdenominational to the point of emphasising what was common between evangelicals, and regarded the Bible as the highest form of authority for the believer.

P B Fraser, who like Murray had a good deal of sympathy for the revivalist position, and had some contacts with the movement, defended Murray in the General Assembly. He believed that the issue of baptism was 'only the occasion not the cause of the hostility to Mr. Murray'. Fraser felt the reason to be Murray's theological position. 'The plain fact is that Murray has been an out-and-outer against the Liberals and a live Pre-Millennialist against Modernism'.<sup>4</sup>

The upshot of the controversy was that Murray found himself suspended from the ministry. As a result he established an independent church that represented the bulk of the former St Andrew's congregation. Murray's unorthodoxy found him few friends in the Presbyterian hierarchy but amongst his lay supporters he was lionised. The new United Evangelical Church met on Sundays in the Tivoli Theatre and for a time held their mid-week meetings in Kemp's Baptist Tabernacle.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, Proceedings of the General Assembly, 1919, pp 201-205; *ibid.*, 1920, pp 18, 159-170.

<sup>4</sup> cited in Allan Davidson, 'A Protesting Presbyterian: The Rev P B Fraser, Defender of the Faith', in Religions and Change, Wellington 1983, p 181.

<sup>5</sup> Bap Tab MinBks, 1 December 1920, 12 December 1922.



Murray's theological emphasis put him at odds with the Presbyterian hierarchy. To say this is not to blindly accept the words of fellow controversialist Fraser. It was not only his pre-millennialism and his extremely evangelical approach that alienated him. He could have survived still holding those views. The factor that combined with his theological unorthodoxy (in the sense of not being in the mainstream of contemporary Presbyterian emphasis) was his independence and his seeking of publicity at the expense of his fellow ministers. That put him beyond the pale.

His refusal to accept the authority of church officers when he had popular support and his own personal sense of righteousness, made him a frustration and nuisance to the Auckland Presbytery. An interesting comparison may be made between the Murray case and the Presbyterian handling of the dissidents on the liberal side of the theological fence. Murray, like the liberals, did not accept the judgement of the church and confessional standard as ultimate authority. He, like the liberals, was guided by personal conscience, the difference being that his conscience was based on his interpretation of scripture.

Although not a confessionalist, in some ways Murray was more in line with the Westminster Confession than the Liberals as the confession did not limit the mode of baptism to sprinkling, and he did not say he would not permit sprinkling though he would not perform the act himself. Even James Gibb, one of Murray's opponents in the issue, had previously been acquitted in a heresy trial in 1890 though he had openly rejected the confessional phrase that 'God having out of his own good pleasure from all eternity elected some to everlasting life', before New Zealand had adopted its own Declaratory Act allowing for liberty of conscience over non-essentials.<sup>6</sup> One cannot help feeling that Murray's greatest mistake was his alienation of his presbytery. This also illustrates the fact that in the mainline churches in New Zealand, forms of church practice tended to be regarded as more important than doctrine. This was the reverse of the revivalist position.

Murray provides a good representation of revivalists within the Presbyterian denomination. He was loved by the laity and loathed by many in the ministry. He

---

<sup>6</sup> L H Barber, 'The Social Crusader: James Gibb at the Australasian Pastoral Frontier, 1882-1935', PhD thesis, Massey 1975, p 60.

highlighted the difficulties of the revivalistic tender conscience towards biblical injunction, as well as the difficulties that arrogance and publicity seeking could bring. Like most revivalists Murray was a populist, a charismatic leader whom the officialdom of the church found difficult to control. When Murray found himself inhibited by the bureaucratic elements in the church, he moved on to where he held the most sway, with the people.

Besides Murray, the Presbyterian Church also contained another important and contrasting revivalist figure. Evan R Harries was a popular preacher and was eventually to have more of an influence than Murray on New Zealand revivalism. He did not share Murray's arrogance and independence and was able to remain in the Presbyterian Church. Harries seemed to be content with the church in that it provided him a satisfactory base for his real aspirations, the teaching of the fulness of life in Christ through the Holy Spirit. Harries probably regarded the condition of the Presbyterian Church as unhealthy but this was not a problem to one who held so dearly to the revivalist proposition that all churches needed to be revived. In this sense Harries was more in harmony with the revival movement than Murray, even though he lacked Murray's extremely populist approach, and tended to be more scholarly and subdued. Harries was a passionate promoter of revival. This was the very heart and soul of his message.

Harries showed that a revivalist preacher could make headway in a denomination dominated by those either opposed to or not interested in revivalism. Apart from his normal ministry in his church, St Paul's in Wanganui and after March 1924 at St James's in Auckland, Harries made an important contribution to Presbyterian activity by editing what was called 'Our Evangelistic Page' for the Presbyterian official organ, the Outlook. This was an important contribution to Presbyterianism because it ran against the direction that the Church was to take in those years. The Outlook was by no means liberal but its editorial policy and the main tenor of the articles were unsympathetic though not openly hostile to modern revivalism. The magazine tended to emphasise the natural rather than the supernatural, encouraged moderate biblical criticism and had a tendency to view salvation on the national rather than individual level. To this view Harries was able to provide a foil as well as cater for those who might otherwise be alienated from the magazine and the Church.

It is possible to see Harries's contribution to the Outlook as paradoxically serving liberal trends. He was, unlike Murray, of moderate speech and non-aggressive in temperament. This enabled him to maintain, in an otherwise unsympathetic journal, a voice for the more supernaturalistic and evangelical elements of Presbyterianism which had much popular support. Nevertheless by maintaining this non-aggressive voice he could be said to have served as a palliative, in that he might have placated some who might otherwise have been completely disillusioned with the direction of the Church. The point is arguable. It is doubtful that not having a revivalist voice in a non-revivalist magazine would have achieved anything positive and it is likely that Harries's articles inspired support for the revival movement.

'Our Evangelistic Page' provided reports of 'revival' overseas, particularly in Great Britain. This made the network of revivalism not just interdenominational but international. The names of Gipsy Smith and W P Nicholson were well known before they visited New Zealand.<sup>7</sup> The page also gave the impression that great events were happening overseas which added to the sense of declension at home that was so important to revivalism. The column also gave anecdotal stories highlighting conservative Christian views and events from the life of such heroes as Brainerd amongst the Indians and Finney the American evangelist.<sup>8</sup> The column frequently mentioned and often sensationalised the word 'revival' across its pages, and called for prayer that it might come to New Zealand and the world. At the time of the visit of the Anglican healer J M Hickson in 1923, Harries commenced a persistent campaign to make divine healing acceptable to readers, which highlighted the supernaturalist element in revivalism.<sup>9</sup>

Harries showed that revivalist teaching could survive in the Presbyterian Church. But Harries carried out most revivalist activities outside the auspices of the Church, within the interdenominational sphere. Thus revivalism was insulated from the mainstream of denominational life and is one reason why interdenominationalism was such a strong force in the period.

---

<sup>7</sup> Outlook, 23 April 1923, p 21; *ibid.*, 21 May 1923, p 28.

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.*, 16 April 1923, 21; *ibid.*, 23 July 1923, p 28.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.*, 4 June 1923, p 29; *ibid.*, 18 June 1923, p 29; *ibid.*, 13 August 1923, p 29.

Within the Baptist Church, revivalists had an easier existence. Revivalist doctrine and temperament had much in common with the Baptist movement. Revivalists might rise to the highest position within the Baptist power structure, as Kemp's election to the Presidency of the Baptist Union in 1929 showed. At the local level the autonomous nature of the local churches meant greater freedom for revivalistic individualism. Kemp loved his ministry at the Baptist Tabernacle and while he was there it became the most prominent church in the Dominion. Baptist church government was democratic, and this suited the populism of the revivalist movement. Populism meant a successful revivalist could translate democracy into autocracy through his prestige. Kemp provided a classic example of this. But authority from charisma could be a tenuous path for the less genuinely charismatic, as A S Wilson found.

Wilson was a popular convention speaker and author, but he had a great deal of trouble to maintain the loyalty of his congregation at Grange Road Baptist in the late 1920s. In the end many of his church members left to set up another Baptist Church. Grange Road lost a total of 112 out of 264 members during the upheaval.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless a revivalist would always prefer the approval of the people to the approval of a clerical elite.

The Baptist denomination tended to be dominated by preachers in the local community who had strong forceful personalities with a high public profile. This suited the revivalist. But not all such leaders were revivalist. J J North was Kemp's only challenger as the leading Baptist in the country in the 1920s, and he was no revivalist. But North did share many of the revivalist values: the love of controversy, the sense of fighting for righteous causes, and popular oratory. North used these techniques, not to bring about revival in the nation, but to achieve the other traditional but competing evangelical goal, the righteousness of the nation by social legislation. There is no means of judging where the denominations as a whole lay in this dichotomy but going by the apparent interests of the more public Baptists, it probably lay somewhere between the two.

The 'Open' Brethren groups, like their Baptist colleagues, enjoyed the freedom of

---

<sup>10</sup> New Zealand Baptist Union and Missionary Society of New Zealand, New Zealand Baptist Handbook, 1925-7; Grange Road Baptist Minute Books, 18 March 1925-19 May 1926.

autonomous assemblies and the movement as a whole looked favourably on revivalism. Unlike most churches in New Zealand, the Brethren had a recent history of revivalism as a fundamental part of church life. For this reason they found both revivalist activity and theology readily acceptable. In fact 20th century revivalism owed its pre-millennialism to the dispensationalism of the pioneer Brethren leader J N Darby. Important Brethren personalities were often important revivalist personalities, and the two movements had something of a dialectical relationship, both shaping each other. Key revivalist personnel such as Laidlaw, Yolland and Pettit were also important in the Assembly Bible Class movement which became a focal point for inter-assembly Brethren outreaches.<sup>11</sup>

In England and America revivalism often worked through a network of independent mission halls, but there were very few of these in New Zealand. Although the post-World War One period saw a proliferation of them, they were very small and never made much impact. As a result virtually all revivalists remained within the denominations, and had to face the issue of divided loyalties.

By 1920 the Methodist Church of New Zealand had moved some distance from its distant Wesleyan revivalist heritage. The emphasis was increasingly centred on the great social campaigns of the day such as temperance and sabbatarianism. In the years after World War One there was a deliberate attempt on the part of Church leaders to move away from the 'Old Evangel' which some blamed for Methodism's poor record in attendance.<sup>12</sup> Others of less influence argued that Methodism's failure was due to precisely the opposite reason, that the church had not had enough of the 'Old Evangel' and was forced to rely on a nominalism that was more suited to Anglicanism than Methodism.<sup>13</sup>

Methodist leadership succumbed to the desire to 'breathe the spirit of the age'<sup>14</sup> and as a result produced few people interested in revivalism which was anti-modernist in outlook.

---

<sup>11</sup> Sandeen, pp 101-2; Lineham, There We Found Brethren, Palmerston North 1977, p 132.

<sup>12</sup> Methodist Church, Minutes, 1921, p 53.

<sup>13</sup> NZMT, 27 May 1922, p 8.

<sup>14</sup> Methodist Church, Minutes, 1923, p 70.



There was some revivalistic activity but it was insipid compared to the campaigns held within the revivalist movement itself. The 1925 Spiritual Advance Campaigns, long postponed due to a lack of money and enthusiasm, had the effect of placating some of the 'old school' without ever amounting to much. Most of the campaigns were by little known evangelists in small towns with little results. The one exception to this was Gipsy Smith in whom Methodism took great pride in as he was a Methodist. Smith in fact was in the mainstream of revivalism and had little in common with the new Methodism.

C H Laws was one of the few Methodist leaders to move in revivalist circles. He represented an older school of Methodism and had much sympathy for the 'Old Evangel'. He had contacts with the Auckland revivalists through interdenominational ministerial prayer meetings for revival and as a result of this contact was asked to participate in the United Churches Tent Campaign of 1925. 'He surprised all by the passionate presentation of the great facts of the gospel' and he 'gripped the hearts of the people'. After this success he said publicly that he would devote himself to the soul-saving ministry.<sup>15</sup> However this was not to be. He became Principal of the Methodist theological college and remained active in Church politics. Nevertheless he did represent an element within Methodism that wanted a return to a more evangelical religion. This desire was widespread amongst the laity and was sympathetic to the values of the revival movement.

Congregationalism was not particularly receptive to revivalism due to the tendency for its ministers to flirt with liberalism. The performance of the church in New Zealand had not been spectacular and even in the 19th century, before the decline in church attendance had become most pronounced, it had dropped from just under 2 percent to under 1 percent of the population by the turn of the century. This trend continued until the arrival in New Zealand of Lionel Fletcher. He had a dramatic effect on every aspect of congregationalist life and 'was the major reason for the recovery of Congregational attendances in the late 1920's'.<sup>16</sup> Between the beginning of 1927 and the end of 1931 total Congregational membership rose by 153 while Fletcher's own church at Beresford Street had increased

---

<sup>15</sup> Reaper, March 1925, p 19.

<sup>16</sup> Hugh Jackson 'Churchgoing in Nineteenth Century New Zealand' in NZJH, 17, 1983, p 47.



by 292 in the same period.<sup>17</sup>

Fletcher was Chairman of the Union in 1928 and was elected President of the Congregational college. His world-wide reputation (he was well-known throughout the denominations for his evangelism in Britain), and his outstanding success when other congregationalists were failing, meant that a revivalist could dominate a denomination not otherwise sympathetic to revivalism. It must also be said that Fletcher's manner, like that of Harries among the Presbyterians, was not arrogant or aggressive. He was uncompromising in his theology but he was no extremist. In private life he showed little of the austerity that many revivalists showed. For example early on he operated a boxing gymnasium at his manse (while in Australia) and he smoked a pipe.

The Salvation Army seldom associated with the mainstream revivalist community though the Army was respected by the revivalists. In 1926 it gained the services of Commissioner James Hay who was a Salvation Army officer of the old style. He held marches mourning for the sins of Wellington and sought a return to the 'no nonsense' approach of William Booth based on the teaching of sin, salvation and judgement.

The reason Hay was sent to New Zealand was probably related to his dissatisfaction with the direction of the Army away from Booth's early emphasis. Bramwell Booth, William's son and successor, took the Army in a more 'respectable' direction, and Hay's demotion from Commissioner of Great Britain first to Commissioner of South Africa and then to New Zealand, probably owed much to Booth's displeasure with Hay's independent views on Army policy and government. Hay was to have his revenge a few years later by playing a prominent role in the toppling of Booth by the High Council. Hay's stay in New Zealand was a productive one for the Army and he reversed the downward trend in attendance, and his stay saw a 10 percent rise in the enrolment of soldiers and attendance and a 20 percent rise in Sunday School attendance.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Congregational Union, Yearbook, 1928, p 68; *ibid.*, 1931, p 60.

<sup>18</sup> Cyril R Bradwell, Fight the Good Fight: The Story of the Salvation Army in New Zealand 1883-1983. Wellington 1982, pp 92-93.

Hay viewed his task in New Zealand as an attempt to stir up the Army to its former glory, as he felt that Salvationists were 'not as active they used to be'. To him the manifestation 'of revivals, and the spirit to seek them, and the responsibility to promote them, as well as the necessity to constantly pray for them, is as much the work of the Army to-day as it ever was'<sup>19</sup>

Because of his position of authority, and the distinctiveness of the strong revivalist heritage of the Army, even in its New Zealand history, this revivalist activity could be carried on without a great deal of dependence on the revivalist network. Contact amounted to little more than co-operation for meetings such as at the Gipsy Smith missions.<sup>20</sup>

Revivalism fared better in the churches that were most evangelical. This was understandable as revivalist theology placed a great deal of emphasis on individual salvation and the responsibilities that salvation implied. Revivalism did not exist within Anglicanism because the church as a whole was not conversion-oriented. It also lacked a heritage of populism and lay involvement in religious matters, and revivalism was a populist wing of Protestantism. Although revivalism placed great emphasis on a few names at the head of the movement, those leaders gained their authority, not from theological seminaries or ministerial recognition, but from the acceptance and adulation of the church population as a whole. This worked well in congregationally autonomous churches such as the Baptist and Brethren, but did not appeal to hierarchical churches such as in Anglicanism, and caused problems in churches such as the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches that had a mixed tradition in regard to populist and conversionist religion and where a sense of church order was deeply ingrained.

As a sense of declension was important to revivalism, a feeling for church heritage was a factor in how a denomination coped with revivalism. Presbyterians appeared to have a stronger sense of the importance of maintaining their theological heritage intact than Methodists. Methodist ministers were more willing to accept the idea of an evolutionary

---

<sup>19</sup> James Hay, The Fiery Cross. An Appeal to Salvationists and others, Auckland 1929 pp 32, 44.

<sup>20</sup> Press, 25 November 1926, p 13.

theology whereas within Presbyterianism there was a distinct group of ministers that felt that the church was in danger of drifting towards a man-centred gospel devoid of redemption. Such a position was fertile ground for revivalism.

## Chapter Seven

## The Fringes

One of the distinguishing features of any movement is the tendency to differentiate itself from other similar groups with whom it sees considerable areas of disagreement. The way in which a group tries to dissassociate itself from another tells a great deal about its own sense of identity and coherence and what it was based on. This was true for the revivalist movement.

The New Zealand revivalist movement had a number of groups and individuals who were close to it either in personal relationships or in doctrinal similarity who did not fit comfortably into the movement. Some were regarded as allies and friends, others were regarded as dangerous enemies, but in either case, the differences remained and reveal a great deal about what was central to the movement.

The United Evangelical Church or UEC was on the periphery of the revivalist movement. It would be misleading to say it was excluded from the movement, but the relationship was strained. A A Murray, the leading figure of the UEC, played a not insignificant role in the movement, and the UEC might even be regarded as the only entire denomination within the revivalist movement, for it was established in part to further revivalism. But to say that would be to ignore the centrality of the concept of interdenominationalism to the movement.

The UEC was formed out of dissatisfaction with the traditional churches (especially the Presbyterian Church), over issues that were dear to the heart of the revivalist movement, such as the role of the Bible and evangelism. The first major disagreement that Murray had with the Presbyterian Church was caused by his passion for aggressive evangelism, the plea of a frustrated revivalist. The issue that finally led to his suspension from the ministry, his baptism by immersion, was the same issue that saw a young Joseph Kemp leave the Scottish Presbyterian Church and become a Baptist.<sup>1</sup> This likemindedness was acknowledged by Kemp in Kemp's offer of the use of the Baptist Tabernacle until Murray could obtain his own building.<sup>2</sup> Murray's affinity to the movement as a whole was further demonstrated when he spoke at movement activities such as the Great Bible

---

<sup>1</sup> Kemp, p 9.

<sup>2</sup> Bap Tab MinBks, 1 December 1920.

## Demonstration and the Ngaruawahia Easter Convention.

Despite these connections and similarities, Murray and the UEC were on the periphery of the revivalist movement for a number of reasons. The first was that the UEC was a separatist group. Although there was a good deal of sympathy for Murray's struggles with the Presbyterian Church, the revivalist movement was interdenominational and the individual denominations were respected by the revivalists. That there were problems in the denominations they did not doubt, but the general line was to preserve the integrity of the denomination and work to promote revivalism within it. For this reason a member of the movement would contribute to their denomination as well as to the more independent revival activities.

The two most important figures of the revival movement, Kemp and Fletcher, took considerable pride in their denominational heritage and worked hard within those denominations. This was despite the fact that the Congregationalism to which Fletcher was a part, was considered an extremely liberal denomination.

The UEC separatism was not considered a problem at first, but it soon bred troubles. The first problem arose with the antics of the revivalist preacher Dr French Oliver. Oliver toured the country in 1923 and was important in the foundation of the Palmerston North UEC (the Auckland and Palmerston North groups were the only substantial congregations of this small denomination. In 1926 there were 416 adherents of which 313 lived in the two cities).<sup>3</sup> The UEC backed Oliver and Oliver backed the UEC. This could have been a profitable relationship for the UEC had not Oliver drawn a great deal of opposition as well as attention. His penchant for exaggerated hostility in speech soon made him enemies.

Oliver soon fell out with Kemp and the NZBTI even though among the revivalist leaders, Kemp was the most likely to countenance Oliver's aggressive anti-modernism. Whether it was his excess or perhaps some fault of a different nature there remains doubt, but Oliver's credentials came under scrutiny and were found wanting. Oliver was considered a *persona non grata* by the revival movement after 1924.<sup>4</sup> Such a judgment could not fail to reflect on his supporters, the UEC.

---

<sup>3</sup> Dominion of New Zealand, Population Census, Vol 8 (1926), pp 8,16.

<sup>4</sup> NZBTI MinBks, 19 February 1924.

The other main disagreement caused by separatism was over the NZBTI. In 1921 when the Institute was still in the planning stages, A A Murray and his chief helper, Ward Campbell, approached the newly formed Board of Directors with the news that they too, in conjunction with P B Fraser, had plans for a college, and suggested that the two schemes co-operate.<sup>5</sup>

The matter of rival or co-operative colleges was dropped until 1923 when another school known as the Palmerston North Bible Training Institute was founded by the UEC minister in that city, D B Forde Carlisle. Carlisle was well known to the Auckland revivalists and throughout the period maintained connections with them and co-operated with Auckland organised revival activities. Carlisle claimed that the UEC was not the official sponsor of this rival, but the NZBTI directors knew, through personal connections, of the wholehearted UEC support of the rival, and they regarded the rival effort as a symptom of UEC separatism.<sup>6</sup>

The crisis passed as the Palmerston North Institute proved unable to match the appeal of the NZBTI and soon foundered. Despite these problems, Murray and Carlisle continued to participate in revival movement activities.

If a continuum was drawn showing the shades within the revival movement, it would indicate conservative evangelical at one end and fundamentalist at the other. On this continuum the UEC would be on the extreme edge of the fundamentalist side. However not all fundamentalists could be considered to be part of the movement. Perhaps Kemp and Murray would be best described as fundamentalist revivalists, but there were those who would be better described as pure fundamentalists. The clearest example of this fundamentalist emphasis was the Presbyterian minister, P B Fraser.

The difference between the two groups was that the fundamentalist revivalists, though deeply concerned about the modernist tendencies with Christianity, saw these as a catalyst for greater energy to be spent on converting more people. The fundamentalist tended to exert all his energy to protect the church's doctrinal standards. The revivalist who was fundamentalist saw the need for protection of the traditional truths, but saw the greater

---

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*, 25 July 1921-8 August 1921.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*, 24 October 1923.



truth as 'go ye into all the world and make disciples', whereas the pure fundamentalist tended to place greatest emphasis on the issue of biblical inerrancy or confessional standards. The revivalist version was an offensive strategy to win converts and prove God's pleasure by outnumbering modernists, whereas men such as Fraser were mainly interested in ensuring that the standards of the church did not decline any further.

Fraser's book, A Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith, showed his main area of concern, the preservation of confessional standards as described in the Westminster Confession. It is interesting to note that in this main statement of his faith, there is no mention of the Keswick teaching on the Baptism of the Holy Spirit. Pre-millennialism found a place, as did attacks on the Papacy ('the primary Apostasy and Counterfeit') and on pacifism, and unionism, but his section on the Holy Spirit found no room for the revival movement concept of the second blessing.<sup>7</sup>

Other groups that had similarities with the revival movement were those committed to evangelism but were not part of the movement. There were two features of this. Firstly, evangelism was not revivalism. Although evangelism was part of the revival movement, it was only one aspect of it. Kemp himself made this distinction in his Presidential Address to the Baptist Union. The speech was entitled 'Revival and Evangelism' and made the point that evangelism was the effort that people made to bring others to Christ, but revival was that special time of God's favour when the hearts of people were especially open to the gospel.<sup>8</sup> Not all of those who evangelised were committed to the concept of revival, or had that as their greatest longing.

The second feature is that there were numerous evangelists operating in New Zealand in the period who did not have any connection to the movement. These evangelists were normally associated with a particular denomination. Some denominational evangelists were at the centre of the movement. Men such as W J Mains and John Bissett were actively involved, but there were those who seemed to have no connection. One such case was the Methodist evangelist Mrs F M Cribb who visited New Zealand in 1928 for health reasons and conducted 11 evangelistic missions, mainly in small towns. She did not attract large audiences. At her first service in Helensville she drew an audience of only eight people. Similarly, small attendance in Wanganui was blamed on inclement weather,

---

<sup>7</sup> P B Fraser, A Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith, 2nd Edition, Dunedin 1932.

<sup>8</sup> Kemp, p 42-44.

and at Pahiatua the non-churchgoer was 'hardly touched'.<sup>9</sup> The Methodists also had the services of H L Piper, the 'singing evangelist' who sang gospel songs, after which the local minister would preach.<sup>10</sup>

There were two other groups that had certain affinity to the revivalist movement but were never accepted as part of it. These groups, Pentecostalism and British Israelism were less accepted by revivalism than fundamentalism and the UEC. They were seen to have gone beyond the realm of a different emphasis and into the area of error. This was especially felt about Pentecostalism, and Kemp became that group's most staunch opponent. Nevertheless British Israelism infiltrated revivalism and Pentecostalism was an extension of revivalism, an extrapolation of the central issues of revivalism.

Pentecostalism was born out of holiness revivalism. It simply took the revivalistic teaching on the Baptism of the Holy Spirit that was expounded at Keswick in Britain and at the NZBTI and New Zealand conventions one step further. Keswick held that the Baptism, or second experience, was a return to the New Testament experience that had been neglected for centuries. Pentecostalism took this another logical step: if this Baptism was a New Testament phenomenon and available today, surely the signs of the Baptism evident in the New Testament should also be evident in the present? For this reason Pentecostals expected and experienced the accompanying manifestations of the Baptism, including speaking in tongues (unlearned languages), prophesying and most importantly in the 1920s, miraculous healings.

At this point the Pentecostals parted company with their erstwhile revivalist friends. Though an essential part of revivalism was a desire to return to a New Testament intensity, commitment and faith, mainstream revivalism saw this return filtered through the heritage of the historic churches' positions. Although they sought the essence of New Testament Christianity they were not primitivists for they felt that circumstances had changed and that there was no need for the spectacular 'sign' gifts once Christianity was established as a major world religion. Although revivalists saw a need for re-invigoration in their churches, they did not like the idea that the day of the denominations was over, as the Pentecostals implied. Presbyterian revivalists valued their confessional standards and dignity, and Baptists valued their nonconformist heritage.

---

<sup>9</sup> Methodist Church, Minutes, 1929, p 111; NZMT, 25 August 1928, p 3; *ibid.*, 15 December 1928, p 3.

<sup>10</sup> NZMT, 25 October 1924, p 7.

The Brethren saw themselves as the ultimate step in the final dispensational period of history and thus did not look kindly on a new group who claimed to have a new truth that superceded them.

This conflict between biblicism and church loyalty fluctuated according to personality but it is certain that Harries's position on healing and a return to Pentecost mentioned elsewhere, was an unusual one and marked the extreme edge of the revivalist movement on this issue. Pentecostalism was an extremely embarrassing phenomenon for the revivalists as they had so much in common. Pentecostalism even held itself to be the manifestation of the revival that the revivalists were waiting for. This was seen in the title of the Pentecostal account of the Smith Wigglesworth campaign that effectively started Pentecostalism in New Zealand. It was called New Zealand's Greatest Revival.<sup>11</sup>

But doctrines were not the only area of overlap. New Zealand Pentecostalism owed much in its origin to the inadvertent influence of the revivalist hero Herbert Booth. No doubt this closeness was one of the reasons for the heated refutation of Pentecostalism. The revivalists endeavoured to strictly differentiate between the two groups so as not to be seen to be tarred with the Pentecostal brush.

The revivalists worried that the Pentecostals were too emotional and credulous. Revivalism was emotional and asked for a belief in discernible divine intervention, but there was a respectability gap between them and the Pentecostals. Some of these fears were based on ill-founded rumours such as the idea that Pentecostals were 'known to crow like roosters and hiss like serpents, shriek like madmen and bark like dogs'.<sup>12</sup> But there was an extremism about Pentecostalism. Wigglesworth regularly hit people in the process of praying for them and often blamed a failure to heal on the patient's lack of faith.<sup>13</sup> A H Dallimore provoked claims that alleged healings had resulted in cases of further serious breakdown and even death as a result of sick people refusing medical assistance because of Dallimore's insistence on faith and not medicine.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Harry V Roberts, New Zealand's Greatest Revival Under Smith Wigglesworth, Wellington 1951.

<sup>12</sup> Reaper, April 1926, p 48.

<sup>13</sup> Ireton, p 23.

<sup>14</sup> Auckland Council of Christian Congregations. The Dallimore Campaign Exposed. The Full Report of the joint Clerical, Medical, and Professional Committee of Inquiry into the Faith Healing Mission conducted by Mr A H Dallimore. 1932, Auckland 1932, pp 3-4.

Revivalist concern over British Israelism was less urgent than over Pentecostalism. The common ground between them was less obvious to public scrutiny and British Israelism was less spectacular and eye-catching than the much publicised healing campaigns of Pentecostals Smith Wigglesworth and A H Dallimore. Nevertheless there was a degree of overlap between the British Israel and revivalist movements, shown by revival movement warnings about the theory.

The British Israel theory maintained that the ten tribes of Israel described in the Old Testament as being sent captive to Assyria, later migrated to Britain. This supposition arose over speculation about the destiny about the 'ten lost tribes' who are not specifically mentioned in the return of Israel after the Babylonian captivity. The theory ran that these lost tribes were the forefathers of the modern Anglo-Saxon people. For this reason the British Empire was seen to have a special dispensation from God to bring about the Kingdom of God on earth. Because the idea of the special place of the Empire in the world was widely held amongst the British in both Christian and secular circles, British Israelism held some appeal.

The leaders of the revivalist movement were united in their opposition to the theory, with one exception. It appears that C J Rolls was interested in the idea, though it was not until 1936 that any evidence was produced in public to suggest this. The Reaper made the following comment which indicated at least sympathy for British Israelism on the part of Rolls. It said:

we hear that Dr. C J Rolls has had very appealing overtures made to him by the British Israel Federation concerning undertaking service for them next year. We are able to report for the sake of our interested readers that the matter had been finally refused.<sup>15</sup>

It seems highly unlikely that 'very appealing overtures' could be made to someone who rejected the theory out of hand as other revivalist leaders did. The fact that the report used the word 'finally' in relation to Rolls's refusal implied that he very seriously considered the possibility of actively campaigning for the Federation.

The revivalist leaders were horrified by Rolls's fraternisation and in the same editorial Sanders said that 'we desire to state emphatically that neither the Bible Training Institute nor any member of its staff has any leaning towards the British Israel theory. We

---

<sup>15</sup> Reaper, September 1936, p 179.

recognise that there are many true Christians who are attracted by its seemingly satisfactory arguments but we are not among that number'.<sup>16</sup> Rumours of NZBTI sympathy appears to have been circulated by British Israel leaders who sought to latch onto the respectability of the Institute.

An interesting example of this was Major Mackesy who in the foreword to his British Israel book What of the Future?, described his correspondence with Kemp on the matter. He implied that Kemp had come around to the British Israel position just before he died.<sup>17</sup> This seems highly unlikely, but Kemp was not then alive to repudiate it. However the Reaper did publish his opinions on the theory. In that article Kemp was remarkably tolerant compared to his normal rebuttals and stated that it was a 'very plausible theory' and that he knew 'some most estimable people who belong to this persuasion - most earnest and devout souls - who would not flinch at going to the stake for their Lord'. Kemp then went on to deny the theory's validity in no uncertain terms.<sup>18</sup>

Such tolerance indicated that either there were some amongst the revival fraternity who held to the theory, or that there some who held the theory that were respected by revivalists though they were not themselves revival-oriented. We are unsure of just who believed it, but because British Israelism was both biblicist and patriotic in temperament it was quite likely to appeal to Bible-believing 'pillars of the community' who were looked up to by people like Kemp. The fact that W F Massey was a British Israelite (and Kemp made it plain that Massey was held in high esteem) was an interesting example of the correlation. <sup>19</sup>

One factor which made the revival movement's counter-attack on British Israelism mild in comparison with its attack on Pentecostalism was that it was not separatist and was not so directly competitive. Though the British Israel Federation did hold separate meetings, on the whole the theory was non-separating. The broad appeal of the theory can be seen in that it was held by such diverse characters as W F Massey and A H Dallimore, the Pentecostal healer.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> *ibid.*, p 178.

<sup>17</sup> Major Mackesy, What of the Future?, Auckland ca.1939, pp 8,9.

<sup>18</sup> Reaper, March 1935, p 26.

<sup>19</sup> NZPD, Vol. 206 (1925), p 14; Reaper, June 1925, p 90.

<sup>20</sup> A H Dallimore, Healing by Faith: including many Testimonies of healing received by people in New Zealand, Auckland 1932, p 9.



The reason that British Israelism appealed to some revivalists lay in the theory's prophetic interpretation of scripture, which closely paralleled the pre-millennialism of revivalists. Instead of prophetic focus on the Jews in Palestine, the British Israelites focused on British endeavours. It is interesting to note that it was left to visiting revivalist W Lamb to write books against the theory.<sup>21</sup> Lamb was a prophetic teacher and as such had the most to lose from the theory as it was competing for a similar Bible prophecy oriented audience.

But if it bore comparison to the prophetic elements within revivalism it was completely dissimilar to revivalism in its lack of interest in evangelism. Indeed Sanders wrote later in his book on cults and deceptions that the main problem with the theory was that in practice the people who became involved in it became so engrossed in searching for hidden secrets in scripture and world events that they seemed to have little interest in saving the lost (which was the touchstone for genuine revivalists). Also their efforts tended to be towards proselytising amongst churchgoers as the theory was an additional truth to the salvation message and so new adherents to the philosophy were unlikely to be found outside the church.<sup>22</sup>

The revival movement was primarily interested in the promotion of revival. Any group that could not fit into that scheme could not function in the movement. It had to be respectable revivalism, but anything less was not enough.

---

<sup>21</sup> W Lamb, Anglo-Israelism. True or False?, Sydney 1935; W Lamb, Great Britain in Prophecy and Anglo-Israelism under the Searchlight, Sydney 1918.

<sup>22</sup> J Oswald Sanders, Heresies: Ancient and Modern, London 1948, p 126.



## Chapter Eight

### Conclusion

This thesis has shown that there was a revivalist movement in New Zealand in the 1920s and early 1930s. This has been demonstrated by identifying and demonstrating the coherent nature of the institutional, theological and personal affiliations of a group of conservative evangelicals and fundamentalists.

The main basis for their coherence and therefore the main proof of the existence of a movement was the all-importance they placed on their doctrine of revival and their belief that such a revival was the only solution to the problems of the church, society and the individual. This desire for revival overshadowed all the denominational and temperamental differences that otherwise could have been divisive.

All the main leaders of the movement held a similar concept of revival. They held that God always wanted the church to be in a state of considerable religious excitement and fervour and that a healthy church would have a continuous stream of conversions as a result of heartfelt prayer and 'old-fashioned', 'Bible-based' evangelical preaching.

In this belief there was both a sense of something lost by the present generation and also an emphasis on biblical literalism. All the revivalists painted a gloomy picture of contemporary church and society, both of which were seen to have declined from a better past.

The importance placed on the doctrine of revival blurred the distinction between the various individuals that made up the movement. Instead of the typical image of narrow-minded fundamentalists that is sometimes temptingly easy to portray, the revival movement had some important elements of toleration. Indeed one of the essential elements of the movement was interdenominational tolerance based on the common adherence to the promotion of revival. Although revivalists tended to take great pride in their individual denominations, denominational differences were seen as trivial compared to the importance of revival. For that reason the revivalist institutions were

interdenominational. Revivalism of this kind sought unity based on essential truth that retained much diversity. Separatism on the basis of revivalist frustration within the denominational structures was not encouraged and was treated with a mixture of sympathy and suspicion.

This unity within diversity was further evidenced in the distinction between the fundamentalist and the conservative evangelical wings of the movement. These two approaches lived side by side in the same movement. They both contributed to the joint revival campaigns, to the conventions, and to a lesser degree to the NZBTI and the Reaper. This alliance was not an unlikely one. The two wings had much in common. They both saw the new day as portentous and desired a renewed dose of former glories. Nevertheless it remains that the revival movement was not an essentially fundamentalist rearguard action.

The usefulness of the term 'fundamentalist' lies in the fact that it denoted a change in groupings and attitudes in the early part of the 20th century. The emergence of fundamentalism marked a new era of antagonism based on the determination not to yield an inch of ground to biblical literalism.

There were many in the revivalist movement to whom the label can be justly applied, among them the central figure of J W Kemp. To apply the term to the likes of Fletcher or Gipsy Smith however, would be to overemphasise the continuity of fundamentalism with 19th century evangelicalism and to obscure an important discontinuity that it represented. Fletcher and Smith represented the old-school of revivalism, while the Kemp had added fundamentalism to the essence of his position, his revivalism. There were differences of temperament within the revivalist movement that depended on the extent to which the individual was coloured by fundamentalism, but this never obscured the essential unity of the belief in the need for revival.

This blind eye towards differences was further exhibited over the issue of pre-millennialism, a doctrine that all the revivalists probably held, but with a great variety of intensity. For the fundamentalist wing the issue was of dire consequence. Disloyalty on this issue to them was a sure sign of a treason, and end-time speculation was

a favourite fundamentalist pastime. However for the conservative evangelical, the issue of the urgency of the hour due to the nearness of the Return of Christ was a theme remarkable in its underutilisation.

This distinction was again evident on social questions. Although there was no question that all revivalists would agree on most social questions, the conservative evangelical was much more likely to play an active role in those areas. Whereas Fletcher was an active Prohibition campaigner and his church ran social programmes to provide for the poor of the city, the fundamentalists were more likely to merely bemoan further erosion of godly standards and cry out for revival.

The movement was by nature populist. It was based on the ability of popular preachers to draw crowds and keep them. It measured its own success in these terms, to the extent of judging God's favour in terms of numbers of conversions. The preachers were always on the look-out for the conversion, the decision, the act of full surrender - the audience response. This was an important reason why preachers in the movement were more successful than other types of preachers in terms of church growth. This is not to say that the leaders changed the content of their message to win favour, but they were certainly always conscious of the need to entertain as well as instruct.

Because the movement was leader dominated, one of the main aspects that contributed to its unity was the personal contacts of its leaders. The geography of the movement helped to mould it in this regard. The movement was based in Auckland. The great bulk of the leadership lived in the city and the fact that they could meet together readily and regularly was a vital aspect in its formation and shape. Although the movement included others based outside Auckland notably Thomas Miller and Frank Varley, they represented additions to the Auckland core rather than key driving forces in the movement. Indeed the coherence and effectiveness of the movement declined drastically in the 1930s as one by one the leaders of the movement either left the city or died. The leaders in Auckland had begun to meet and pray together out of a general feeling of concern for the evangelical witness in the city. From this common concern and activity grew greater co-operation and coherence.

The movement was loose-knit. It had little organisational structure. However it did have a sense of being a movement, sometimes articulated but never closely defined. Fletcher described Kemp as the 'very soul' of a great movement centred on the NZBTI.<sup>1</sup> This was not far from the truth.

The connections that gave the idea of unity an organic reality were formed largely on the basis of personal affinities of the individual leaders of different religious groups, especially those in Auckland. Vitally important in this regard were the regular ministerial prayer meetings and ministers' meetings in Auckland. But the NZBTI was a useful outlet for the common interests that were held. Other outlets were the interdenominational evangelistic campaigns and the plethora of conventions that emerged in the period. The NZBTI, the conventions and the Reaper magazine were especially important and central, in the sense that they transformed the movement from a purely local Auckland phenomenon into a national movement. The campaigns, conventions, NZBTI and magazine also gave the movement a visibility and a body of supporters which reinforced the leaders' sense of importance and destiny.

The 1920s saw a revival of the heyday of conventions in New Zealand. These were gatherings where those of like-minds could mingle, hear the latest speakers, and be inspired, away from their denominational structures and constraints. The conventions gave the revivalist movement a living and active base where the intense religious experience that revivalism preached could be fostered away from the 'affairs of life' and day to day concerns. It was far easier to create an atmosphere conducive to intense commitment in a camp miles away from home, friends and job, surrounded by religious zealots in idyllic environs. These powerful experiences and the sheer size of the camps combined to give the movement a sense of identity. For here was a group that was wholeheartedly committed to the revivalist message. Even at revivalist campaigns in the city, which were the bread and butter revivalist activities, the audiences were less likely to be filled so totally with revivalist supporters. The conventions also served to add further coherence to the movement through their dissemination of a rather narrow range of convention topics, usually focused on the role of the Holy Spirit in the believer's life,

---

<sup>1</sup>Reaper, February 1931, p 288.

which was the individualised version of the doctrine of revival. If revival normally spoke of changes in whole communities, the convention teaching centred on the personal aspect of that change.

The New Zealand Bible Training Institute was another agent that gave the movement solidity and form. It could almost be said to have been the focus of the movement, and along with the Auckland ministers' fraternal and the Ngaruawahia Easter Camp, it was a springboard for much of the interdenominational revivalist activity in New Zealand. As well as promoting campaigns the NZBTI provided a useful core of a revivalist network. Most, if not all of the revivalist leaders resident in New Zealand had some connection with the Institute, either as members of the staff or in some honorary or support capacity. Added to this was the importance of second generation continuity that a training institute naturally provided.

The coherence of the movement was clearly demonstrated by those young people. Often they were recruited for the NZBTI at a convention or a revivalist meeting, trained at the NZBTI and then went back to their communities or overseas to foster a similar procession for others by support of conventions or revivalist campaigns or both.

The NZBTI funded another revivalist institution, the Reaper magazine, which was an important unifying force for the movement with its propagation of the revival message throughout the year and throughout the country as well as being a source of information about the various revivalist activities that took place. Other magazines helped service the revivalist message through individual contributions, but the Reaper was totally dedicated to that message and with its interdenominational format exemplified the spirit of the movement.

The importance of interdenominationalism as a means of unity was seen in the way the revivalist dealt with his own denominational commitments. Those revivalists that best typified the movement were at peace with both their denomination and the revivalist movement. People who had much in common with the revivalists but had severe problems with their denominations were least accepted by the movement. The UEC breakaways, Murray and Carlisle, participated in the movement but seemed to be treated with some

caution. P B Fraser, who fought a continual battle with the Presbyterian Church, had little in the way of ties to the movement, despite having much in common with it.

Those who exercised the greatest control over the direction of the movement, and were the visible leaders of it were all ardent supporters of their denominations, as well as being strongly committed to their interdenominational connections. Kemp was the Baptist Union President, Fletcher the Congregational Union Chairman, and Harries, while never aspiring to church politics, was at home as a Presbyterian minister and exercised control of a section in the Presbyterian official organ, the Outlook.

To a degree the revivalist movement represented an attempt by New Zealanders to keep up with overseas trends. All New Zealanders were tremendously aware of the rest of the world, especially Britain. New Zealand Christians kept up with what happened overseas with regard to religious excitement. New Zealand religious publications were filled with reports of revivals and controversies in Britain. Men such as Kemp regularly received and read a range of foreign Christian publications. It seemed almost as though the British, and to a lesser degree the American experience was superimposed on the minds of the revivalists when they looked at New Zealand. This was mainly due to the fact that most of the important leaders and visitors were foreign born and experienced. They not only brought a British heritage with them, but they seemed to continue to view New Zealand in a British context, divorced from historical reality.

New Zealanders had not achieved confidence in a uniquely New Zealand religious experience (apart from the important Maori religious groups such as Pai Marire). Speakers still found a legitimization in overseas origin, and a revival was still the fantasy found in the reports of overseas periodicals, the autobiography of Charles Finney, and in the memories of men like Kemp.

The revivalist movement was at once both a defensive reactionary response to social changes and at the same time merely a reaffirmation of a much earlier tradition. The defensive aspect of revivalism lay in the fact that a good deal of the impetus for revivalistic theology and activity lay in the concern at an apparent decline in the role of the church in society and concern about theological threats.



New Zealand had never been a society where the church had played a large or successful role at the political level. Despite this low profile, the first quarter of the 20th century saw an upsurge in church sponsored campaigns for legislative change. This included drives for legislated sabbatarianism, anti-gambling measures as well as the two big campaigns, Bible-in-Schools and Prohibition. The cause of this rise is not within the scope of this thesis, but the significance of the failure of all these campaigns should not be missed in any account of the rise of the revival movement.

The failure of a successive array of church sponsored campaigns prompted, in the imagination of some church leaders, a view that these failures were an evidence of a decline in the morality of the nation. This was not a fair conclusion given that it was the churches that were the innovators and had tried to improve morality by their endeavours. Nevertheless their failure was a cause of great discomfort. Even worse was the fact that just when the victory of Prohibition seemed won in 1919, it was overturned by the return of servicemen still overseas, the very men who had been so eulogised by churchmen as the cream of New Zealand manhood.

But the reasons for insecurity ran deeper than the failure of social reform. Church attendances were declining. Again this was not a new trend, but it was a trend that seemed to grow more acute every year. Finally, World War One seemed to usher in at first new hope for a new order, a new age full of new beginnings, only to dash all such hopes in a devastating apocalypse that destroyed most of the prevailing pre-war optimism.

Added to these social factors was the theological threat to evangelicalism of liberal theology. The liberals, because of their emphasis on social salvation rather than conversion of the individual and their re-interpretation of the position of scripture, challenged the evangelical position. This was the essence of the fundamentalist reaction which had a large effect on the revivalist movement. Even those who had not the temperament for a wholeheartedly fundamentalist response were saddened by what was seen as an unfortunate error, and called for a revitalised return to the centrality of individual biblical revelation.

That all these conditions combined in the space of a few years made for a fertile ground for

a theology that recognised decline but provided answers in the form of a return to a cherished past. Revivalism viewed declension as a fact of life, unfortunate, evil, but a fact nevertheless. What is more, revivalism offered a way out. Revival was something to be desired above all else. It represented a transformation of a defeated church that had failed socially, numerically and theologically, into a triumphant church which would make headlines that the rest of society would have to notice. In reports of revivals in Britain, revivalists often mentioned that the secular press and other secular positions such as judges and employers had to acknowledge the work of God. Here was the prospect of a church once again in the driving seat of society. Once more churches would be full. The corollary of this was that if revival came, it would be the revivalists who would win all the converts, which would mean that they could afford to ignore the liberals, who, it was assumed, would have none.

If the revival movement was a reaction to threats and insecurities, it was also a reaffirmation of longstanding continuities within the Christian tradition. The revivalists certainly did not see themselves as recent usurpers. They saw the history of the church as a history of revivals interspersed with declension. There was some validity to this as restoration movements had always played an important part in church life. For example it is possible to view Monastic reforms in the Middle Ages as an example of a similar desire to return to the essence of Christianity that had somehow been lost. The Reformation was certainly an attempt to do this. The more specifically revival oriented movements from the 18th century until the present day have all held this return to lost truth theme.

In this sense, the revival movement was a representation of an enduring element of continuity, a positive reaffirmation of an ancient idea. But whether it was a reaction or reaffirmation, this sort of revival movement does not represent an isolated occurrence. Such movements had been seen before, and will no doubt be seen again. It is very likely that some among new generations will also cry out 'O Lord how long? Wilt thou not revive us again?'. The revival movement in the 1920s and early 1930s did not see success in its own terms. It saw no revival. But in a climate of decline it did much to see a dying church revived.

### Bibliography

#### A) Manuscript Sources:

Auckland Baptist Tabernacle Minute Books. 1920-1933.

Brown to Guinness, 19 June 1930, Dunedin. Tertiary Students' Christian Fellowship. Wellington, File no. A2c.

Grange Road Baptist Minute Books. 1921-1931.

New Zealand Bible Training Institute Minute Books. 1921-1936.

'Newspaper Articles on the early history of Auckland, the Presbyterian Church of NZ and on the history of NZ 1929-43'. Collected by W J Comrie, WTU.

'Newspaper Articles 1895-1943'. Collected by W J Comrie, WTU.

Ngaruawahia Easter Camp Committee Minute Books. 1928-33.

Pentecostal Mission of New Zealand Minute Books. 1922-34.

#### B) Published Minutes, Yearbooks and Official Publications:

Congregational Union. Yearbook. 1928-1931.

Dominion of New Zealand. Population Census. Vol 8 (1926).

Methodist Church of New Zealand. Minutes of Annual Conference. 1921-1923.

New Zealand Baptist Union and Missionary Society of New Zealand. New Zealand Baptist Handbook. 1920-1934.

\_\_\_\_\_ Yearbook.1956.

NZPD. Vol 206 (1925).

Presbyterian Church of New Zealand. Proceedings of the General Assembly.1919-1925.

C) Newspapers and Magazines:

Biblical Recorder. 1921-1935.

Manawatu Daily Times. 1932.

New Zealand Herald. 1919-1933.

New Zealand Methodist Times. 1920-1933.

Ngaruawahia Easter Camp Bible Study Notes. 1921-1933.

Outlook. 1922-1923.

Press. 1920-1933.

Reaper. 1923-1945.

D) Contemporary Books:

Adams, John A D. Optimists and Pessimists. Dunedin 1910.

Auckland Christian Council of Christian Congregations. The Dallimore Campaign Exposed. The full Report of the joint Clerical, Medical, and Professional Committee of Inquiry into the Faith Healing Mission conducted by Mr A H Dallimore, 1932. Auckland 1932.

Dallimore, A H. Britain-Israel: Chats about our Empire, our People and our Origin. Auckland 1932.

\_\_\_\_\_ Healing by Faith: including many Testimonies of healing received by people in New Zealand. Auckland ca. 1932.

Fletcher, Lionel B. Effective Evangelism. London 1932.

\_\_\_\_\_ Kneeling to Conquer. London 1939.

\_\_\_\_\_ Mighty Moments. London 1931.

\_\_\_\_\_ Skipper my Chum and other true dog stories. London 1935.

Fraser, P B. A Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith. 2nd Edition, Dunedin 1932.

\_\_\_\_\_ An Irenicon on Baptism with the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand issued in connection with An Appeal For Liberty of Conscience from St. Andrew's Congregation and Minister. Hokitika 1919.

Harries, Evan R. The Gift of the Holy Spirit in Promise a Fulfilment. A Series of Addresses at the Upwey Convention 1931-32. With a Final Message given on the Last Day of the Convention. Melbourne 1932.

\_\_\_\_\_ Receive Ye the Holy Spirit. London ca. 1937.

Hay, James. The Fiery Cross. An appeal to Salvationists and others. Auckland 1929.

Hutson, B. The Premillennial Advent of the Lord Jesus. Being a reply to a booklet by Rev ISAAC JOLLY. Wellington 1919.

Jolly, Isaac. Our Lord's Second Advent. Dunedin 1919.

Kemp, Winnie. Joseph W Kemp. The Record of a Spirit-Filled Life. London 1936.

Lamb, W. Anglo-Israelism. True or False? Sydney 1935.

\_\_\_\_\_ Great Britain in Prophecy and Anglo-Israelism under the Searchlight. Sydney 1918.

Mackesy, W R. What of the Future? Auckland ca.1939.

Mallis, W. The Way of the Wind and Other Devotional Studies in the Spirit-Controlled Life. Madras 1929.

Miller, Thomas. Archaeology and the Bible. A Romance and a Vindication. Dunedin 1934.

Murray, A A. Bolshevism and some of its causes. Auckland 1919.

Nicholson, W P. The Christian Life. Auckland ca. 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_ Friendship - A Sermon. Auckland ca. 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_ The Problem of Prayer. A Sermon. Auckland ca.1934.

North, J J. Features of the Future. Here and Hereafter. Auckland 1939.



Oliver, French E. Cain's Wife and Other Addresses. Kansas City 1909.

Orr, J Edwin. All Your Need. 10,000 Miles of Miracle through Australia and New Zealand. London 1936.

Pettit, William H. Evolution. Is it Scientific? Shall we teach it in our Schools? Auckland 1929.

Roberts, Harry V. New Zealand's Greatest Revival under Smith Wigglesworth. Wellington 1951.

Rolls, C J. Palestine Awakes: The Rebirth of a Nation. Canada ca.1938.

\_\_\_\_\_ The Return of Our Lord or The Home Call of the Christian Church. Auckland 1927.

Sanders, J Oswald. Heresies: Ancient and Modern. London 1948.

Urquhart, H R. 'Weeping Angels' or 'Poison Gas'. Being sundry reflections on Mr. Gipsy Rodney Smith's address. 'Three Years of Blood and Mud in France'. Auckland 1926.

Wilson, A S. Cleansed Personality. Auckland 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_ Cleansing by Faith. Auckland 1930.

\_\_\_\_\_ Concerning Perplexities Paradoxes and Perils in the Spirit-led Path. Auckland 1932.

\_\_\_\_\_ Definite Experience: convention aids and deterrents. Edinburgh 1937.

\_\_\_\_\_ Faith's Fight. Auckland 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_ NZBMS: A Mighty Mass Movement. Christchurch no date.

\_\_\_\_\_ Pentecostal Christianity: The Conference Sermon Preached at the N Z Baptist Union Meetings at Nelson, November 1908. No place of publication 1908.

\_\_\_\_\_ Seeking or Resting Faith (Sanctification by Faith) With a Striking Preface and Tesimony by Mr Charles J Rolls, of Auckland, N Z. 2nd Edition, Auckland 1930.

## SECONDARY

### A) Books:

Batts, E W. and A H MacLeod. J J North. The Story of a great New Zealander. Wellington no date.

Beilby, G T. A Handful of Grain: The Centenary History of the Baptist Union of New Zealand 1914-45. Vol. 3, Wellington 1984.

Beresford Street Congregational Church Auckland. These Hundred Years. A Short History of the Beresford Street Congregational. Auckland, NZ 1852-1952. Auckland 1952.

Blaiklock, E M. Between the Foothills and the Ridge. A Tale of Two Climbers. Palmerston North 1981.

\_\_\_\_\_ Between the Morning and the Afternoon: The Story of a Pupil-Teacher. Palmerston North 1980.

Bradwell, Cyril R. Fight the Good Fight: The Story of the Salvation Army in New Zealand 1883-1983. Wellington 1982.

Breward, Ian. Grace and Truth. A History of Theological Hall Knox College, Dunedin 1876-1975. Dunedin 1975.

Burdon, R M. The New Dominion: A Social and Political History of New Zealand 1918-39. Wellington 1965.

Chambers, J B. 'A Peculiar People': Congregationalism in New Zealand 1840-1984 including The Congregational Union of New Zealand 1884-1984. Wellington 1984.

Clifford, J Ayson. A Handful of Grain: The Centenary History of the Baptist Union of New Zealand 1882-1914. Vol. 2, Wellington 1982.

Cocker, J and J Malton Murray (eds.). Temperance and Prohibition in New Zealand. London 1930.

Colless, Brian and Peter Donovan (eds.). Religion in New Zealand Society. Palmerston North 1980.

Curnock, Nehemiah (ed.). The Journal of the Rev John Wesley, AM. Vol 1, London 1909.

Elder, John Rawson. The History of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand 1840-1940. Christchurch 1940.

Evans, Eifion. The Welsh Revival of 1904. Bridgend 1969.

Hutchison, William R. The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism. Oxford 1976.

Kent, John. Holding the Fort: Studies in Victorian Revivalism. London 1978.

Lineham, Peter J. No Ordinary Union. The Story of the Scripture Union, Children's Special Service Mission and Crusader Movement of New Zealand 1880- 1980. Wellington 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_ There We Found Brethren. Palmerston North 1977.

Loane, Marcus L. The Story of the China Inland Mission in Australia and New Zealand 1890-1964. Sydney 1965.

McGeorge, Colin and Ivan Snook. Church, State, and New Zealand Education. Wellington 1981.

Malcolm, Charles W. Twelve Hours in the Day. The Life and Work of Rev Lionel B Fletcher, DD. London 1956.

Marsden, George M. Fundamentalism and American Culture. The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925. Oxford 1980.

Miller, Robert Strong and Thomas F Miller. The Rev Thomas Miller MA. A Family Tribute. Christchurch 1949.

Oliver, W H with B R Williams (eds.). The Oxford History of New Zealand. Wellington 1981.

Orr, J Edwin. Evangelical Awakenings in the South Seas. Minneapolis 1976.

Parker, Wesley (ed.). Rev C H Laws. Memoirs and Addresses. Wellington 1954.

Sandeen, Ernest R. The Roots of Fundamentalism. British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930. Grand Rapids 1970.

Sanders, J Oswald. Expanding Horizons. The Jubilee History of the New Zealand Bible Training Institute. Auckland 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_ This I Remember. Eastborne 1982.

Sherburd, E F and A L Silcock. Eighteen Thousand Yesterdays. The Story of the NZ Baptist Theological College. Auckland ca.1977.

Sinclair, Keith. The Pelican History of New Zealand. Revised Edition, Harmondsworth 1980.

Wessel, Helen (ed.). The Autobiography of Charles G Finney. Minneapolis 1977.

Wood, Linley. The History of St Andrew's. The Pioneer Presbyterian Church of Auckland 1847-1947. Auckland 1947.

Worsfold, J E. A History of the Charismatic Movements in New Zealand: Including a Pentecostal Perspective and Breviate of the Catholic Apostolic Church in Great Britain. Bradford 1974.

#### B) Articles:

Davidson, Allan. 'A Protesting Presbyterian: The Rev P B Fraser, Defender of the Faith', in Religions and Change. Wellington 1983

Jackson, Hugh. 'Churchgoing in Nineteenth Century New Zealand', NZJH. 17, 1983.

Lineham, Peter J. 'New Zealanders and the Methodist Evangel', Wesley Historical Society (NZ) Proceedings. 1983.

Oliver, W H. 'Christianity among the New Zealanders', Landfall. 77, 1966.

C) Unpublished:

Anderson, Ross Malcolm. 'New Zealand Methodism and World War One: Crisis in a Liberal Church'. MA thesis, Canterbury 1983.

Barber, L H. 'The Social Crusader: James Gibb at the Australasian Pastoral Frontier, 1882-1935'. PhD thesis, Massey 1975.

Grigg, Anthony R. 'The Attack on the Citadels of Liquordom: A study of the prohibition movement in New Zealand, 1894-1914'. PhD thesis, Otago 1977.

Ireton, Douglas E. 'A Time to Heal: The Appeal of Smith Wigglesworth in New Zealand 1922-24'. BA(Hons) research exercise, Massey 1984.

McIntosh, Averil D. 'The History of the New Zealand Bible Training Institute Inc 1922-1966'. Diploma in Education research essay, Auckland 1966.

Moore, H S. 'The Rise of the Protestant Political Association: Sectarianism in New Zealand Politics during World War 1'. MA thesis, Auckland 1966.

Papesch, Micheal E. 'Church Attendance in New Zealand 1919-1939'. BA(Hons) research exercise, Massey 1983.

Pound, Geoffrey R. 'Rev. Joseph William Kemp and the Auckland Baptist Tabernacle 1920-1933'. MA research essay, Auckland 1978.

Reid, A J S. 'Church and State in New Zealand, 1930-1935: A study of the social thought and influence of the Christian Church in a period of economic crisis'. MA thesis, Victoria 1961.

Roberts, Richard Lanning. 'The Growth of Interdenominational Mission Societies in New Zealand'. MA research essay 1977.