

The Pacific Journal of Baptist Research

Vol. 9, No. 1

May 2014

CONTENTS

Festschrift for Dr Laurie Guy

<i>John Tucker</i>	1
Editorial: 'As Broad as the Gospel is, and as Narrow': New Zealand Baptists and Social Issues	
<i>David Bebbington</i>	8
Nineteenth-Century British Baptist Attitudes towards the Relations of Church and State	
<i>Peter Lineham</i>	22
The Unexplained Religion of the WCTU	
<i>Allan Davidson</i>	35
Remembering—War and Peace: Reflections on Memorialisation	
<i>Martin Sutherland</i>	48
Laurie Guy: A Critical Appreciation	
Bibliography of Laurie Guy's published work	57

The Pacific Journal of Baptist Research

ISSN 1177-0228

Editor

Dr Myk Habets
Carey Baptist College,
PO Box 12149,
Auckland, New Zealand
myk.habets@carey.ac.nz

Associate Editors

Rev Andrew Picard
Dr John Tucker

Book Reviews Editor

Dr Sarah Harris
Carey Baptist College,
PO Box 12149,
Auckland, New Zealand
sarah.harris@carey.ac.nz

Editorial Board

Prof Paul Fiddes
Regent's Park College

Dr Steve Harmon
Gardner-Webb University

Dr Steve Holmes
St. Andrews

Dr Donald Morcom
Malyon College

Dr Michael O'Neil
Vose Seminary

Dr Frank Rees
Whitley College

Dr Jason Sexton
University of SoCal

Dr David Starling
Morling College

Dr Martin Sutherland
Laidlaw College

Dr Brian Talbot
Dundee, Scotland

Contributing Institutions

Carey Baptist College (Auckland, New Zealand)
Malyon College (Brisbane, Australia)
Whitley College (Melbourne, Australia)

Morling College (Sydney, Australia)
Vose Seminary (Perth, Australia)

The Pacific Journal of Baptist Research (PJBR) is an open-access online journal which aims to provide an international vehicle for scholarly research and debate in the Baptist tradition, with a special focus on the Pacific region. However, topics are not limited to the Pacific region, and all subject matter potentially of significance for Baptist/Anabaptist communities will be considered. *PJBR* is especially interested in theological and historical themes, and preference will be given to articles on those themes. *PJBR* is published twice-yearly in May and November. Articles are fully peer-reviewed, with submissions sent to international scholars in the appropriate fields for critical review before being accepted for publication. The editor will provide a style guide on enquiry. All manuscript submissions should be addressed to the Senior Editor: myk.habets@carey.ac.nz.

URL: <http://www.baptistresearch.org.nz/the-pacific-journal-of-baptist-research.html>

All business communications

Dr John Tucker

Carey Baptist College

PO BOX 12149

Auckland

New Zealand

Fax: +64 9 525 4096

Email: john.tucker@carey.ac.nz

The Pacific Journal of Baptist Research is sponsored by the N.Z. Baptist Research and Historical Society and the R.J. Thompson Centre for Theological Studies at Carey Baptist College.

© *Pacific Journal of Baptist Research*, All Rights Reserved, Auckland, New Zealand

EDITORIAL:
‘AS BROAD AS THE GOSPEL IS, AND AS NARROW’:
NEW ZEALAND BAPTISTS AND SOCIAL ISSUES

JOHN TUCKER
Carey Baptist College
(john.tucker@carey.ac.nz)

In his address to the inaugural meeting of the New Zealand Baptist College, J.J. North, the principal, outlined his vision for the infant college. Its purpose, he declared, was to train ministers who “both know Christ and know the thought currents that flow through [their] age.”¹ “We want”, he insisted a few months later, “to make [our students] conversant with the great things of the Faith and we want that faith in its whole extent applied to the whole life of the whole [person], and to the whole community.”² As principal of the College for twenty years, this was North’s recurring theme. Ministers of the gospel must occupy two worlds—the world of scripture and the world of culture—and be able to relate the two. “We do not”, North wrote, “allow that the Christian faith is open to serious revision. It is the firm foundation, and it stands sure.” But, he said, “We do feel in every fibre of our being the urgent need of relating Christ and the implications of His Gospel to the thoughts and problems of our age.”³ For North and many of the students that he would train, these convictions translated into a passionate commitment both to personal evangelism and broader social concern. “A good minister of Jesus Christ”, in North’s view, “must be as broad as the Gospel is, and as narrow.”⁴

In Laurie Guy’s estimate, most New Zealand Baptists have tended to be narrow, but not broad. They have “commonly not engaged to any great extent with major issues of social and public life.” They have been “inclined to stand outside society”.⁵ This assessment is surely right. Mainstream New Zealand Baptists have often struggled to relate the insights of the gospel to the issues of their day. However, one stream of New Zealand Baptists, exemplified by J.J. North, has understood the gospel more broadly. In the late nineteenth century and for the first half of the twentieth century that stream flowed strongly. While it was never dominant, it was influential beyond its size. Its leaders, like North, tended to occupy the major pulpits in the main city churches and held significant leadership positions within the Baptist Union. Energetic and articulate, they had a profound impact on their relatively small denomination. Their

¹ ‘A Baptist Manifesto,’ *New Zealand Baptist (NZB)* (April 1926): 96-97 at 96.

² ‘The College: A Dream Fulfilled’, *NZB* (January 1927): 1-2, 4 at 2.

³ *NZB* (December 1928): 355.

⁴ *NZB* (September 1930): 282.

⁵ Laurie Guy, ‘Three Countries, Two Conversions, One Man: J.J. Doke: Baptists, Humanity and Justice,’ in *Interfaces: Baptists and Others* (ed. David Bebbington and Martin Sutherland; Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2013), 265-76 at 266-67.

views seeped widely through the Baptist network. During this period, annual assemblies and regional association meetings devoted considerable time and energy to wrestling with social issues. In conjunction with other churches, Baptists contributed meaningfully to public debate and the shaping of public life in New Zealand. They played, for example, an important role, in the shaping of public attitudes and practices regarding alcohol and gambling. But they also had a hand in other significant developments, such as the birth of the welfare state and the suspension of compulsory military training in the 1930s.

From the late 1960s, however, there was an evident decline in the level and breadth of Baptist engagement in public debate. There was a growing sense among some Baptist leaders that their denomination was failing to relate the gospel to the wider world. In a 1969 sermon on the church's responsibility in the political sphere, the Rev. Roy Bullen bemoaned the fact that many Baptists were now "so obsessed with their 'heavenly citizenship' that earthly responsibilities are neglected".⁶ The following year the Rev. Bert Whitten reflected on the fact that while scores of people were willing to serve on the Evangelistic Committee of the Auckland Association of Baptist Churches, only one person was willing to serve on the Public Questions Committee. "As a people," he declared, "we are too prone to regard our mission over much in terms of soul saving, and too little in terms of social responsibility."⁷ In the centennial issue of the *New Zealand Baptist*, the editor lamented the decline in the number and quality of letters that he received on broader issues confronting the church and society. Observing that this was not paralleled in other religious papers, he asked of his movement: "Have we become 'pietistic', preferring to shelter under an umbrella of spirituality that ignores the world about it, seeing God as interested only in Church newsletters and sickly songs of praise?"⁸

Increasingly, it seems, the answer was: Yes. By the end of the century the denomination's Public Questions Committee had disappeared.⁹ Public questions very rarely, if ever, figured at annual assemblies. And broader social issues hardly rated a mention in the *Baptist* magazine. Religious historians in New Zealand's have observed that, from the 1960s, the mainstream Protestant churches were increasingly outspoken on issues of social justice. No longer "chaplain to the nation", they took on the role of "prophet at the gate".¹⁰ During that period Baptists, by contrast, moved in the opposite direction. Today, the radical stream of the Baptist movement—the stream typified by the likes of J.J. North—is now rarely, if ever, heard.

The declining interest of New Zealand Baptists in broader social issues can be traced to a number of factors. In his recent study on the church in post-sixties New Zealand, Kevin Ward points to the rise in

⁶ Roy Bullen, 'The Christian and Politics,' sermon preached at Gisborne Baptist Church, 1969: Roy Bullen Papers, AN 1561, Box 5, File 'Social Questions', New Zealand Baptist Archives.

⁷ NZB, (August 1970): 1.

⁸ NZB (November 1980): 2.

⁹ A small Public Questions Committee was resuscitated briefly between 2000 and 2004 on the initiative of a member of the Tawa Baptist Church. Since 2004, however, the Baptist Union has not had a Public Questions Committee.

¹⁰ Allan K. Davidson, 'Chaplain to the Nation or Prophet at the Gate? The Role of the Church in New Zealand Society,' in *Christianity, Modernity and Culture: New Perspectives on New Zealand History* (ed. J. Stenhouse and G. A. Wood; Adelaide: ATF Press, 2005), 311-31 at 330. See also John Evans, 'Church State Relations in New Zealand 1940-1990 with Particular Reference to the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches' (PhD thesis, University of Otago, 1992), 128.

western societies of values like individualism and privatism.¹¹ But beyond the shifting topography of western culture, there have been several key developments within the New Zealand Baptist movement. One of these was a shift in the denomination's cultural allegiance. In 1965 Judge K.G. Archer, son of the notable Baptist minister, J.K. Archer, lamented: "I am under the impression that our Baptist Union is no longer imbued with the liberal principles of the English Baptists from whom its founders sprang, but that it now looks for leadership to the ... Southern Baptists of America."¹² This impression was accurate. After World War Two New Zealand Baptists were increasingly "mesmerised by things American", forgetting "the pit from which they were hewn."¹³ This was a significant development. The modern American evangelical movement, did not have 'the kind of sustained, theologically grounded reflection on social and political issues that shapes some other Christian traditions,' such as the English Baptist tradition.¹⁴ Their energies tended to be channelled more towards evangelism.

Post-war New Zealand Baptist churches followed their example.¹⁵ This preoccupation with evangelism tended to push other concerns, such as theological reflection and social action, off the agenda. In an address to the 1968 Assembly, the Baptist Cabinet Minister, Lance Adams-Schneider, warned Baptists against speaking out on controversial political issues. The church's major task, he argued, was evangelism, proclaiming a gospel "which relates primarily to the issues of eternity". When the church embarks upon public controversy it is moving away from its primary message to peripheral matters, from "Christian centralities" to "Christian supplements".¹⁶ Letters to the editor suggests that he had plenty of support. "Our main task", declared one correspondent, "is to preach the Gospel, and involvement in controversial social issues only serves to obscure our mission."¹⁷

This focus on personal evangelism to the exclusion of wider social issues was intensified by the widespread adoption of American church growth principles. The Church Growth movement, associated with Donald McGavran and Fuller Theological Seminary, promoted the use of quantitative research to develop sociological awareness of "target populations" and factors affecting their receptivity to the gospel. The emphasis was on technique and method, deploying the right presentation or programme to achieve maximum evangelistic returns. The New Zealand Baptist Union embraced it enthusiastically. Ministries and programmes were created to meet the "felt needs" of the "target market". Worship services were renovated so as to become "seeker-sensitive". The emphasis was on whatever would produce "results" in numerical terms.¹⁸ Unfortunately, one of the effects of this church growth focus was to shrink mission

¹¹ Kevin Ward, *The Church in Post-Sixties New Zealand: Decline, Growth and Change* (Auckland: Archer Press, 2013), 15-41.

¹² NZB (September 1964): 230.

¹³ NZB (September 1964): 221.

¹⁴ Ronald J. Sider and Diane Knippers, eds., *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy: Political Strategies for the Health of the Nation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2005), 9. See also Mark A. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 3, 12-13, 61, 160. This perhaps reflects what a number of commentators have observed is an anti-intellectual or pragmatic bent to the American mind generally: David F. Wells, *Above All Earthly Powers: Christ in a Postmodern World* (Grand Rapids & Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2005), 37-38.

¹⁵ John Tucker, *A Braided River: New Zealand Baptists and Public Issues 1882-2000* (Peter Lang: Bern, 2013), 181-82.

¹⁶ NZB (March 1969): 4-5.

¹⁷ NZB (January 1971): 20.

¹⁸ John Tucker, 'Prophets at the Gate? New Zealand Baptists and Social Justice in the 1990s,' in *Interfaces: Baptists and Others* (ed. David Bebbington and Martin Sutherland; Carlisle: Paternoster, 2012), 277-91.

down to personal evangelism—“getting bums on seats and people into heaven”, as one leader put it.¹⁹ Not surprisingly, the wider prophetic role of the church in society was neglected. Most Baptist leaders saw little value in relating Christ and the implications of his Gospel to the thoughts and problems of their age because it did not translate into “church growth”.²⁰

New Zealand Baptists were evolving in other ways. From the 1960s the charismatic renewal movement developed a momentum in New Zealand which was unprecedented in other western countries.²¹ Baptist churches were affected more than most.²² The charismatic renewal led many Baptist congregations to express their faith in a form that reflected the changing social and cultural context of post-sixties New Zealand. Informality, spontaneity, immediacy, an emphasis on emotions and individual experience—these were all values that came out of the counter culture.²³ However, these very values tended to spawn among those same congregations a “pietistic individualised spirituality” that neglected the public implications of the gospel.²⁴ This was evident in the pages of the *New Zealand Baptist* during this period. In 1973 the Rev. Gordon Hambly criticised the charismatic renewal for generating “an un-Biblical other-worldliness”. “Many,” he said, “make the elaborate effort to create their own world instead of living in the real world as it is, painful as that may be.”²⁵ In a 1978 editorial, the Rev. Barry Hibbert commented: “Most of my charismatic friends get full marks for brightness, but don’t score so well when it comes to breadth. ... If anything, they tend to be more inward looking, more restricted, more world-denying.”²⁶ Again, in 1983, the president of the Baptist Union lamented that, “So often renewed churches have become introverted and could be described as ‘bless me clubs’ where the emphasis is exclusively on the individual’s spiritual growth and enjoyment of worship, instead of leading to evangelism and social concern”.²⁷

So charismatic influences, along with American church growth principles, certainly account for the narrowing vision of New Zealand Baptists and their failure to apply the insights of the gospel to all of life. During these years, however, Baptist churches were also reacting to the rise of neo-liberalism within the mainline Protestant churches. Robert Wuthnow has observed in relation to North America that from the 1960s evangelism and social justice “became the polar positions around which religious conservatives and religious liberals increasingly identified themselves.”²⁸ A similar dynamic was at work in New Zealand. Many Baptists came to associate the socio-political action of mainstream Protestant churches with the

¹⁹ Ian Brown, interview by author, digital recording, Cambridge, 28 May 2008.

²⁰ NZB (March 1989): 16. See also Neville Emslie, ‘Silver and Gold Have I None,’ NZB (August 1993): 5.

²¹ Allan K. Davidson and P.J. Lineham, eds., *Transplanted Christianity: Documents Illustrating Aspects of New Zealand Church History* (Auckland: College Communications, 1987), 324.

²² Elaine Bolitho, *Meet the Baptists: Post-war Personalities and Perspectives* (Wellington: Christian Research Association, 1993), 37.

²³ Ward, *The Church in Post-Sixties New Zealand*, 190-91.

²⁴ Allan Davidson, *Christianity in Aotearoa: A History of Church and Society in New Zealand* (Wellington: Education for Ministry, 1991), 173. See also Colin Brown, ‘How Significant is the Charismatic Movement,’ in *Religion in New Zealand Society* (2nd ed., ed. Brian Colless and Peter Donovan; Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1985), 99-118 at 107.

²⁵ NZB (September 1973): 16-17.

²⁶ NZB (June 1978): 2.

²⁷ Walter Lang, NZB (November 1983): 5.

²⁸ Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 148-49.

liberal theology—and the numerical decline—of those same churches. In the words of the Rev. Walter Lang, evangelical Baptists by the early 1980s tended “to polarise evangelism and social action instead of wedding them together”.²⁹ When the annual Baptist Assembly voted to oppose the 1981 visit by the South African rugby team, it provoked considerable protest. One correspondent to the *Baptist* wrote that he was deeply concerned “at our denomination going the same liberal socio-political road as one Church where I was actively engaged for over twenty years. Once it was spiritually virile, but now it is scrambling for Union with anyone, just to survive.” He pleaded: “May we not conform to that which the world would have us be: a political [World Council of Churches]-type organisation, forgetting our Lord’s commission to preach, and teach a spiritual Gospel to all the world.”³⁰

From the 1960s, then, the New Zealand church became increasingly divided along theological lines, leading to a “collapse of the theological middle”.³¹ At the one end liberals affirmed the centrality of love, the importance of contextualising the gospel, and the mandate to seek peace and justice in society. At the other end conservatives affirmed the authority of Scripture, the fundamental truths of the gospel as embedded in the creeds, and the importance of personal evangelism. As a result of this polarisation, New Zealand Baptists withdrew from ecumenical contact with theological liberals.³² They pulled back from participation in wider public debate. They became “more retreatist, more pietistic and more narrow in their understanding of the gospel”.³³ They struggled, in terms of J.J. North’s vision, to apply the whole of the gospel to the whole of life.

Kevin Ward has observed that the “churches which are most likely to have experienced growth in New Zealand since 1960 are those which have combined a strong adherence to the basic tenets of orthodox Christian belief with an ability to adapt their life and message to forms that relate effectively to the rapidly changing social and cultural context in which they exist.”³⁴ These churches, rather than embracing an extreme conservative position or an extreme liberal position, have united the strengths of both positions. This should come as no surprise. Ian Pitt-Watson wrote that every Christian sermon must be “stretched like a bowstring between the text of the Bible on the one hand and the problems of contemporary life on the other. If the string is insecurely tethered to either end, the bow is useless.”³⁵ This connection between word and world is an indispensable characteristic not just of all Christian preaching, but of all Christian ministry and mission. If churches are to follow in the way of Christ, who entered into humanity without surrendering his deity, then they must refuse to compromise either the divine content

²⁹ NZB (November 1983): 5.

³⁰ NZB (February 1981):6. The WCC or World Council of Churches was viewed with deep suspicion by conservative Christians for its emphasis on social action at the apparent expense of evangelism and discipleship.

³¹ This term was used by Robert A. Evans, ‘Recovering the Church’s Transforming Middle: Theological Reflections on the Balance between Faithfulness and Effectiveness,’ in *Understanding Church Growth and Decline, 1950-1978* (ed. Dean R. Hoge and David A. Roozen; New York: Pilgrim Press, 1979), 288-314 at 290.

³² See S.L. Edgar, ‘New Zealand Baptists and the Ecumenical Movement,’ *New Zealand Journal of Baptist Research* 1 (1996): 9-25.

³³ Laurie Guy, ed., *Baptists in Twentieth Century New Zealand: Documents Illustrating Baptist Life and Development* (Auckland: NZ Baptist Research and Historical Society, 2005), xiv.

³⁴ Ward, *The Church in Post-Sixties New Zealand*, 53.

³⁵ Ian Pitt-Watson, *Preaching: A Kind of Folly* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), 57.

of the gospel they proclaim or to ignore the human context into which it must be spoken. They must incarnate, or contextualise, the gospel. They must be securely tethered to both the Bible and life.

This issue of the *Pacific Journal of Baptist Research* has been compiled as a Festschrift to honour Dr Laurie Guy. For forty years Laurie has given outstanding service within the Baptist movement of New Zealand, first as a minister in Auckland, then as a missionary to Papua New Guinea, and, for the last twenty-five years, as a lecturer at Carey Baptist College. During his academic career, Laurie has persistently urged Baptists to reclaim the vision of J.J. North and recover the theological middle ground—to be a people who are both faithful to Scripture and sensitive to culture. In his teaching Laurie has always urged his students to apply their subject matter, to think through its significance for ministry and mission in today's world. His frequent in-class reference to missionary experiences in Papua New Guinea, while a source of amusement for students, expressed a deadly serious commitment on Laurie's part to integrate text and context. In his commitment to a Socratic or dialogical method of teaching and in his sensitivity to students whose cultural backgrounds made western-style education a challenge, Laurie has embodied a concern to incarnate and contextualise the message.

This impulse to integrate word and world has also been evident in Laurie's research and writing. A select bibliography of Laurie's published work is included in this volume. His primary focus has clearly been the church's participation in public debate. On difficult and complex social issues, like homosexuality or race relations, Laurie has provided the church with a well-informed and articulate voice. But Laurie has also made an important contribution to our understanding of the early church and the New Testament. In these fields Laurie has deliberately sought to "bridge the gap" between the academy and the church. His success can be measured by the extent to which the church has called on his services. He has been a frequent speaker in local churches, at youth camps, and at Baptist assemblies. He is currently chairing a Baptist Union taskforce on same-sex marriage.

Besides his teaching and writing, Laurie has, through his leadership at Carey, frequently sounded the call to mission. It was at his instigation, and with his generous support, that Carey established a Maori and Pacifica student support fund. While serving as interim Principal, Laurie also proposed an alteration to the field education of pastoral leadership students. Instead of spending three years in a church, Laurie recommended they spend one year working in a "non-church" organisation like Women's Refuge or Drug Arm. The proposal was not taken up, but Laurie's report captures his heart to engage with the world: "If we are serious about training for mission as well as for ministry, then this sort of training exposure could be hugely beneficial. There may be a few students who don't see this as particularly relevant to their training—but that may stem from a church-only vision, a vision which is too small for the realities of the 21st century." These were not idle words. Through his church ministry and community involvement—as much as through his teaching, research, and leadership—Laurie has sought to know both Christ and culture and bring the two together. He has endeavoured to apply the whole gospel to the whole of life.

The contributors to this volume are all colleagues or peers of Laurie who have made a significant contribution in the field of religious history. They have all written papers that connect with Laurie's primary interest in the relationship between church and society. Professor David Bebbington explores the

changing attitudes towards the relation of church and state among nineteenth century British Baptists. In doing so, he shows how these attitudes—and the different understandings of the gospel and mission which underlay them—had an impact on the colonies. Professor Peter Lineham traces the theological debates within the New Zealand Women’s Christian Temperance Union during the 1890s. His paper shows just how profoundly first wave feminism in New Zealand was shaped by evangelical influences, and by international theological currents. Dr Allan Davidson explores the memorialisation of war and peace in New Zealand—a very timely essay as we approach the centenary of World War One—and how this remembering presents ongoing challenges for church and society today. Finally, Dr Martin Sutherland provides a critical but appreciative analysis of Laurie published work. His essay highlights Laurie’s versatility as a scholar, his capacity to communicate effectively the fruit of his scholarship to a wide array of audiences, and, above all, his passion for mission.

This passion is particularly evident in one of Laurie’s recent essays, where he examines the colonial ministry of the Rev. J.J. Doke. Doke was trained in England, but had a significant ministry in New Zealand—where he mentored J.J. North—and in South Africa. His ministry was securely tethered both to the word and the world, and it was marked by a deep commitment to both personal evangelism and social justice. It was “as broad as the gospel is, and as narrow”. Summarising his ministry, Laurie wrote: “Doke’s evangelicalism was a big evangelicalism. He was a man of two conversions: to humanity as well as to Christ.”³⁶ The same could be said of Dr Laurie Guy. He has consistently called the churches of New Zealand to relate Christ and the implications of his gospel to the thoughts and problems of our day. The Baptist movement, in particular, is deeply indebted to him. So it is with a deep sense of gratitude that we, his colleagues and peers, present this Festschrift in his honour.

³⁶ Laurie Guy, ‘Three Countries, Two Conversions, One Man: J.J. Doke: Baptists, Humanity and Justice,’ in *Interfaces: Baptists and Others* (ed. David Bebbington and Martin Sutherland; Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2013), 265-76 at 276.

NINETEENTH-CENTURY BRITISH BAPTIST ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE

DAVID BEBBINGTON
University of Stirling
(d.w.bebbington@stir.ac.uk)

The problem of church and state for British Baptists is well illustrated by an episode at Acadia College, Nova Scotia. Other denominations in the colony received public money for education and so, following the foundation of the college in 1838, it was natural for the new institution to obtain a state grant. In 1844, however, Joseph Belcher arrived from England as minister of Granville Street Baptist Church in Halifax. Almost immediately he questioned the rightness of accepting the grant. It was, he claimed, public, not denominational, money. Baptists should rely on their own fund-raising abilities and have nothing to do with state help for teaching theology. Belcher actually discouraged his friends in England from giving to Acadia College. Leading members of his congregation at Granville Street, formerly an Anglican place of worship that had gone over to the Baptists only in the late 1820s, were incensed by Belcher's sabotaging of their efforts to provide a good education for the sons of their new denomination. They had recently given their political allegiance to the Conservatives partly in order to ensure public financial support for their college. Now their own minister was undermining the whole scheme. They wanted him out of their pulpit. Belcher resisted, but because the leading members were trustees of the building, the minister was forced to leave. There was schism in the church, but Belcher departed for the fairer pastures of Philadelphia.¹

Joseph Belcher was neither wild nor eccentric; he was certainly no angry young man. In fact he was fifty years old in 1844. He had served in England as Baptist minister at Greenwich and from 1832 to 1840 he had acted as secretary of the newly reinvigorated Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland. He was clearly a man who enjoyed the confidence of his fellow ministers. From 1832 he had also edited *The Revivalist*, a periodical that carried news of Charles Finney's evangelistic successes in the United States.² His special hobby-horse was more the effective harvesting of souls than radicalism in public affairs. So Belcher was no political hothead. His views simply reflected his background. It might have been expected that a man upholding a rigorous dichotomy between church and state would be American, and so

¹ R. S. Wilson, "British Influence in the Nineteenth Century," in *Baptists in Canada: Search for Identity amidst Diversity* (ed. J. K. Zeman; Burlington, Ontario: G. R. Welch, 1980), 27-8.

² D. M. Lewis, ed., *The Blackwell Dictionary of Evangelical Biography, 1730-1860* (2 vols.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), I, 78-9.

influenced by the wall of separation in the federal constitution. But Belcher did not come from the United States. His strong views on separation were derived from Britain.

Belcher's attitudes were part of the first flush of enthusiasm for what was called Voluntaryism. The belief was growing that religion was a voluntary affair, a matter of free choice and so not a proper field for government involvement. In the year before Belcher arrived in Nova Scotia, 1843, there had been a political crisis in England over the issue. The Conservative government of Sir Robert Peel was keen to promote education. There was a sullen hostility towards government among many of the workers in the growing cities, giving rise to Chartist disturbances. It was hoped that popular schooling would enlighten and civilize them. Because the government was Conservative and so closely related to the established church, it was natural to propose that the new system of education should be controlled by the Church of England. Beside the parish churches there were to be parish schools. Dissenters outside the Church of England, by contrast, would receive no state aid. The result of the proposal was a cry of outrage from Protestant Dissent. Why should the state help one denomination against all the others? Baptists protested; so did Congregationalists, with whom Baptists acted closely on public issues. Even the Wesleyan Methodists, who normally observed a "no politics" rule, were galvanised into strenuous objection. The resistance was so widespread that the government felt it prudent to withdraw its intended legislation. Dissenters had won a notable victory against a dangerous Conservative measure. Education was not to be a fiefdom of the Church of England.³

In the course of the 1843 agitation, however, Dissenters had realised that they could deploy a powerful argument to back their case. It carried some weight to say that it was unfair for government to give exclusive support to a single denomination. The state, Dissenters were contending, should not be guilty of religious discrimination. But it carried far more weight to contend that it was wrong for government to support religious education of any kind. If that argument were accepted, the schools would be securely protected from all state interference. There was a further inducement to take that line. It was axiomatic at the time that any schooling must include religion. All agreed that the Bible was to be the main textbook for learning to read. So if government were to become involved in the funding of schools, it would necessarily be concerned with Christian instruction. Radical Dissenters had already arrived at the Voluntary principle in relation to churches. The government, they believed, should not advance the interests of any religious body, because faith was essentially a personal matter. The state must leave religious institutions entirely alone. During 1843 Dissenters took an additional step, beginning to argue for the first time that the state must also leave educational institutions entirely alone. Voluntaryism was extended to the schools. Belcher arrived in Nova Scotia fresh from this debate, strongly convinced that there must be no contact between government and education. That meant that Acadia must be left to the support of voluntary donations alone. The controversy in Halifax illustrates the set of attitudes to the relations of church and state among British Baptists that had arisen immediately before Belcher's departure for the new world.

³ G. I. T. Machin, *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain, 1832 to 1868* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 151-60.

The constitutional background needs to be sketched in here. England and Wales possessed in the Church of England an established church. The formal link between church and state was a complex matter at many levels. The crown exercised its royal supremacy over the Church of England, for example, by choosing bishops. Those bishops then sat as “Lords Spiritual” in the House of Lords, exercising equal powers with the Lords Temporal. The House of Commons operated as the governing body of the Church of England. Since there was no separate synod for ecclesiastical affairs, all central decision-making for the church took place in the Commons. A web of interlinking legal rights bound the clergy into the system of government. Scotland was different, for there, since the seventeenth century, Presbyterianism had prevailed and so the national church contained no bishops. Yet there was an established church, for the state recognised the Church of Scotland in many and various ways. Ireland was more similar to England, for an episcopal church was established there. Since the Act of Union between Britain and Ireland of 1801, there was technically a United Church of England and Ireland. Notwithstanding the overwhelming Roman Catholicism of the population, Anglicanism was the constitutionally recognised form of religion. So there were established churches throughout the British Isles.⁴

The Church of England had become notorious for its abuses. By the 1830s considerable efforts were being made to provide remedies, but the problems were still deep-seated. One was pluralism. Members of the clergy held several posts simultaneously to enhance their incomes even though they could perform the duties of only one of them. In 1830 fully one third of incumbents were pluralists.⁵ Those who were non-resident in the parishes they were supposed to serve normally did appoint curates as replacements, but paid them only a pittance. More than half the clergy, furthermore, were chosen by lay patrons, chiefly members of the aristocracy and gentry. They often selected their own relations, commonly sons or nephews. Candidates for preferment from outside the family were sometimes expected to fawn on their potential patrons, as does Mr Collins in the (admittedly fictional) account in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*. To radicals the whole system seemed hopelessly corrupt. Patronage appeared to be merely a convenient system for providing financial support for the idle dependants of the landed rich. In the early nineteenth century there were almost as many calls for the reform of the church as for the reform of parliament.

The Protestants outside the Church of England, the Dissenters, functioned in public affairs around 1800 as a single unit. “The Dissenting Interest” embraced, alongside the Baptists, the Congregationalists together with the “Presbyterians,” who were gradually turning into Unitarians. These groups shared a common view of the Church of England. Their basic conviction was that it was wrong to impose ceremonies and creeds on the individual conscience. That, however, was exactly what the state did, commanding uniformity of religion in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer. Some of the practices of the Church of England, according to Dissenters, could not stand the test of Scripture. Other

⁴ S. J. Brown, *The National Churches of England, Ireland and Scotland, 1801-46* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), ch. 1.

⁵ Peter Virgin, *The Church in an Age of Negligence: Ecclesiastical Structure and Problems of Church Reform, 1700-1840* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1989), 102.

liturgical and credal points might in themselves be tolerable, but the fundamental objection was that the secular power was arrogating to itself the right to enforce religion at all. So argued, for example, Joseph Gutteridge, a prosperous London merchant and leading Baptist layman in 1812. Nevertheless he insisted that he was not on that account hostile to the Church of England. He hoped, on the contrary, that its pews would be full.⁶ Nor did his stance affect his political obligation. He felt bound to give his unqualified allegiance to the state. Dissenters such as Gutteridge held views that made them take exception to the current bond between church and state. Yet they did not draw the implication that there should be any major alteration in the relationship. Fundamental change seemed out of the question, for Dissenters were few and the state appeared ineluctably Anglican. Calls for severance between church and state were left to secular radicals such as Tom Paine. The Dissenting attitude was that the conscientious person must separate from the Church of England, not try to amend it. So Dissenters, including Baptists, did not, in the early nineteenth century, agitate for disestablishment. They were merely thankful to be tolerated.

That stance was reinforced by the circumstances of the times. The French Revolution infected Britain with a fear of a similar outbreak of social anarchy at home. In the 1770s and 1780s, Dissenters had been politically active in radical causes, notably in calling for reconciliation with the American colonies.⁷ In the 1790s, by contrast, after the French Revolution, most Dissenters avoided politics. The government of William Pitt was known to be suspicious of Dissenters, who were thought to harbour sympathy for the revolutionaries across the English Channel. It seemed only prudent for Dissenters to keep their heads down. In the wars against the French beginning in 1793 any political radicalism could be stigmatised as unpatriotic. Baptists tried to parade their loyalism. John Rippon, minister of Carter Lane, Southwark, preached to the Volunteers raised to defend the country against French invasion.⁸ Although radical tendencies survived in some quarters, they were inhibited by fear of government repression.

Religious circumstances had a similar effect. The Evangelical Revival was in full flood during the European conflict between the 1790s and the 1810s. It was the era of the foundation of the overseas missionary societies including, as the first, the Baptist Missionary Society (BMS) in 1792. Home missionary activity was even more vigorous. The spread of the gospel, it was thought, must take priority over all other concerns, including political objectives. Some of the evangelism, furthermore, was undertaken in co-operation with other denominations, even including evangelical members of the Church of England. In this atmosphere of “catholic Christianity,” there was no question of criticising the established church. The prevailing attitude was expressed in a letter from Andrew Fuller, Baptist minister at Kettering and secretary of the BMS, to the pioneer missionary William Carey in 1797: “I am more and more of the opinion that political changes are matters from which it becomes good men in general to stand aloof...the political world is a tumultuous ocean; let those who launch deeply into it take heed lest they be drowned in

⁶ Edward Steane, *Memoir of the Life of Joseph Gutteridge, Esq, of Denmark Hill, Surrey* (London: Jackson and Walford, 1850), 65-8.

⁷ J. E. Bradley, *Religion, Revolution and English Radicalism: Nonconformity in Eighteenth-Century Politics and Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

⁸ Deryck Lovegrove, “English Evangelical Dissent and the European Conflict, 1789-1815,” in *The Church and War* (ed. W. J. Sheils; vol. 20 of *Studies in Church History*; Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 267.

it...Time is short, Jesus spent His in accomplishing a moral revolution in the hearts of men.”⁹ Efforts should be concentrated on gospel work, not political action, however desirable it might be. An old-fashioned Dissenter, Walter Wilson, writing in 1814, made a similar point from a different perspective. He hankered after the time when Dissenters had been staunch in the cause of civil and religious liberty. Now they had forgotten their principles, he claimed, because of evangelical catholicity. They had imbibed the “unaccountable notion” that “the affairs of government should be left to the wicked.”¹⁰ Political pressure of any kind was not on the Dissenting agenda. There was no question of trying to do anything about the condition of the established church in the opening years of the nineteenth century.

The position was totally transformed by the 1830s for a variety of reasons. For one thing, the number of Dissenters, who were increasingly called Nonconformists, grew enormously. Between 1773 and 1851 the population of England and Wales expanded by 155 per cent. Over the same period the number of Nonconformist congregations mushroomed by 975 per cent. By 1851, the year of the only official census of churchgoing ever taken in Britain, nearly half the worshippers were Nonconformists. The first half of the century was therefore a period when their numbers were swelling. To the Old Dissent from the seventeenth century was added the New Dissent of Methodism, with its vigorous evangelism and enormous growth. Baptists shared in the expansion. In 1773 there were 402 known congregations; by 1851 there were 2,789.¹¹ The Dissenting community, which in the eighteenth century had seemed marginal to national life, started to challenge the Church of England in terms of numbers. The self-confidence of Nonconformity grew, and with it a desire for equal recognition in society at large.

A second reason for a growing willingness to be more assertive was the constitutional revolution of 1828-32. Catholic emancipation came in 1829, but there were two other measures that transformed the political standing of Nonconformists. In 1828 there took place the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. Originally passed in the later seventeenth century, the acts had in theory prohibited Dissenters from occupying local offices including seats on borough councils. Although in practice they were widely disregarded, they remained a slur on the political reliability of Dissenters and so were deeply resented. The repeal of 1828 meant that Nonconformists were no longer second-class citizens. Four years later came the Great Reform Act. Parliament had gone unreformed, except on points of detail, since the middle ages. Gross anomalies survived, several boroughs notoriously sending MPs to the Commons but having hardly any voters. The worst abuses were swept away in 1832. The effect was to enfranchise many Nonconformists for the first time so that, as a grouping, they carried far more weight than hitherto. They showed their new sense of power before the year was out. At the first general election for the reformed parliament, Nonconformity as a whole, together with Evangelical Anglicans, mounted a mass campaign against slavery in British territories overseas. Baptists were to the fore. William Knibb, a BMS agent in

⁹ Andrew Fuller to William Carey, 18 January 1797, in E. A. Payne, “Andrew Fuller as Letter Writer,” *Baptist Quarterly* 15 (1953-54): 295.

¹⁰ Ian Sellers, *Nineteenth-Century Nonconformity* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), 3.

¹¹ M. R. Watts, *The Dissenters: Volume 2: The Expansion of Evangelical Nonconformity, 1791-1859* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 24, 27.

Jamaica, travelled the country calling for abolition of the institution and on one occasion dramatically brandishing slave shackles.¹² The result, alongside the carrying of abolition in the first session of parliament, was the mobilisation of Dissent for a political object. Nonconformity showed itself that it was capable of successfully flexing its political muscles.

A third development was the eclipse of the Unitarian leadership of Dissent. Traditionally, Baptists and other Dissenters had followed the guidance of the English Presbyterians in public affairs. The Presbyterians were generally of higher social standing, including several MPs in their ranks, and so their leadership was natural. It continued even while they were becoming Unitarian in theology. Their views were characteristically moderate. Believing in reasonable and respectable behaviour in all spheres, in public affairs they favoured accepting whatever concessions the Whig grandees were disposed to grant them. Such views were embodied in the Dissenting Deputies, the organisation of London laymen that existed to defend the civil rights of Dissenters, and especially its chairman, the Unitarian William Smith. In 1828, immediately after the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Smith wrote as follows to Lord Holland, the Whig peer:

As for the Conduct prudent to be pursued by the Diss[entin]g Body at the present time, I have publicly advised the most conciliatory Course - declarations of Satisfaction on all proper Occasions, with what has been done, & a constant readiness to meet Members of the Establishm[en]t with open Hearts and friendly dispositions; not fastidiously dwelling on the comparative Trifles of Difference that yet remain. . . . The only Grievance really grievous now remaining is too closely interwoven with the Establishment itself to be as yet seriously attacked - viz. the compelling us to pay rates for Building, endowing &c &c the New Churches....¹³

The letter breathes a spirit of respectful deference and the question of raising the relationship of church and state is clearly beyond bounds. That attitude on the part of Dissent was soon to be swept away. Orthodox Nonconformists became dissatisfied with the passivity of the Unitarian leaders. Furthermore their evangelical theology made them restive in being yoked together with an unorthodox denomination. Eventually, in 1836, the Unitarians, believing that co-operation with the orthodox was no longer practicable, withdrew from the Dissenting Deputies. Already, four years earlier, Smith had been replaced as their chairman by the Baptist Henry Weymouth.¹⁴ The changes were indications that Evangelical Dissent was becoming more willing to press its own interests.

These circumstances precipitated an upsurge of Dissenting agitation over church-state relations in the years 1833-34. Towns held public meetings, petitions to parliament were drawn up, memorials of Dissenting views were issued. Baptists participated fully in this break with traditional attitudes. In the bewildering variety of statements published at this time, three broad positions can be distinguished. First,

¹² E. A. Payne, *Freedom in Jamaica: Some Chapters in the Story of the Baptist Missionary Society* (London: Carey Press, 1946), 41.

¹³ William Smith to Lord Holland, n. d. [after 28 April 1828], Holland House Papers, British Library.

¹⁴ B. L. Manning, *The Protestant Dissenting Deputies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), 69-80, 481.

there was the bare assertion of grievances. Many Nonconformists simply demanded the removal of their practical disabilities. In a sense, what they wanted was the completion of toleration, a full end to civil penalties for religious belief. Several issues were canvassed. There were calls for a public system for the registration of births, marriages and deaths. The existing arrangements consisted merely of the parish registers maintained by the clergy. The only way in which the arrival of infants could be recorded was by entries for their christenings and so Baptists were necessarily excluded. Serious problems could arise in consequence: a clergyman might decline to conduct a burial service for someone without a baptismal record; or he might refuse to marry a Baptist who, in his view, lacked a Christian name.¹⁵ Another disability was associated with marriage itself. Since 1753, the only legal marriages, except for those of Jews and Quakers, had to take place in Anglican churches. Most Dissenters could not have their wedding in their own places of worship. They did have the right to burial in the parish churchyards, but not according to their own form of worship. Funerals had to include a ceremony performed by the parson, not by the Dissenting minister. The cost of the upkeep of the parish churches, furthermore, was levied on propertied parishioners whether or not they attended. Hence Dissenters who had their own meeting houses to maintain were compelled to pay church rates for buildings that were not their own as well. And degrees were not available at the ancient English universities—a deprivation of less concern to Baptists since they produced few who might have been eligible for higher education. The list of disabilities, however, amounted to a substantial catalogue overall. Many Dissenters' meetings in 1833-34 simply called for remedies for these grievances without considering the basic question of church and state. That was commonly the case at more out-of-the-way places such as Devonport and Abergavenny.¹⁶ Some Nonconformists would have been content if the established church merely ceased to infringe their liberties.

Others, however, went beyond practical disabilities to the theoretical issue of establishment. Thus at Newcastle, F. A. Cox, Baptist minister at Mare Street, Hackney, was one of the speakers. "But suppose [he remarked] all these grievances redressed, would their ground of complaint be then entirely removed? By no means. The great grievance still remained - viz., the alliance between the Church and State."¹⁷ Yet this position was often a relatively moderate one. Its advocates might ideally wish for the separation of church and state, but they often rejected political action as the way to achieve it. Joseph Jarrom, for example, the tutor of the General Baptist academy at Wisbech, argued that as the nation became enlightened, all connection between church and state would be dissolved. "Let not Dissenters," he declared, "become agitators, and imitate some of the worst men in the Kingdom."¹⁸ No doubt the disciples of Tom Paine were in his mind. A combination of theoretical disestablishmentarianism with very

¹⁵ *Baptist Magazine* (May 1833): 229. Minutes, Vol. 2 (22 June 1835) Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty Records, Dr Williams's Library, London.

¹⁶ *Patriot* (25 December 1833): 429; *ibid.*, (1 January 1834): 6.

¹⁷ *Patriot* (8 January 1834): 11.

¹⁸ Joseph Jarrom to editor, *Patriot* (18 December 1833): 423.

limited proposals for action was characteristic of London Dissenters.¹⁹ They were more respectable, often more educated, perhaps more worldly-wise. Voluntaryism as a political philosophy, together with inhibitions about actual pressure as tainted with a suspect radicalism, was a formula well fitted to metropolitan tastes.

The truly radical position was that church and state must be torn apart. At a public meeting in Birmingham, where the Baptist minister Thomas Swan presided, there was agreement on a memorial claiming that grievances could not be fully remedied until the separation of church and state. At Manchester the attenders of a similar gathering announced that all establishments are wrong and declared their intention of exerting themselves to end them.²⁰ From Nottingham a delegation of two was sent to the Prime Minister, Lord Grey. One was the General Baptist minister Hugh Hunter, the other the Quaker William Howitt. At their interview Lord Grey expressed the wish that their memorial had confined itself to practical grievances. "Did they," he asked rhetorically, "want to do away with all establishments of religion?" "Precisely!" replied Howitt, and Grey was horrified.²¹ The programme of disestablishment was usually adopted not in obscure places and not in the capital but in towns like Birmingham, Manchester and Nottingham—the great provincial cities that were rising to prominence in an industrial age. Here was the Nonconformist policy of the future.

This radical approach made headway among Baptists during the 1830s and 1840s.²² There were several reasons for its increasing popularity. Evangelical Nonconformists saw the alliance of church and state as a handicap for the gospel. A public meeting of the Baptist Union resolved unanimously in 1839 that the establishment was "the most formidable obstacle in the land to the diffusion of true piety."²³ The Anglican system encouraged unconverted younger sons of the gentry to enter the ministry for the sake of a regular income. They did not preach the gospel, and so hungry flocks went unfed. Disestablishment, with its corollary of disendowment, would end the attractions of the church for such men. The strong element of anti-clericalism in this critique was reinforced from the late 1830s by the rise of the Oxford Movement. Now clergy seemed to be introducing Roman Catholic doctrine into the Church of England, and so the powerful anti-Catholicism of the chapels was roused against the established church. If the Church of England taught a message contrary to Scripture, it constituted a threat to souls, a spiritual danger, something intrinsically wrong. When evangelicals decided that anything was wrong—whether slavery or an establishment—they mobilised against it.

Secular attitudes exerted a similar effect. There was a growing feeling that to accord special privilege to one denomination was unfair. There should be equitable treatment of all denominations under the watchword of "religious equality." The Church of England, furthermore, contravened the basic principles

¹⁹ David Bebbington, "The Dissenting Political Upsurge of 1833-34," in *Modern Christianity and Cultural Aspirations* (ed. David Bebbington and Timothy Larsen; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003) 232-3.

²⁰ *Patriot* (19 February 1834): 57.

²¹ *Patriot* (29 January 1834): 39.

²² The attitudes of Dissenters from the 1840s to the 1860s are set out in Timothy Larsen, *Friends of Religious Equality: Nonconformist Politics in the Mid-Victorian England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1999).

²³ Minutes of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, 1833-1842 (1 May 1839), Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford, 181.

of political economy, which was growingly accepted in this period. It was a “church monopoly.” In the economic sphere, it was generally agreed, there should be no regulations giving one party the advantage over another. Why should the same principle not apply to the religious sphere? Good quality Christian merchandise would drive bad out of the market so long as the bad was not artificially favoured. The government, according to Francis Clowes, a tutor at the Baptist Horton Academy near Bradford, in 1843, had no right to interfere in trade or in religion.²⁴ Voluntaryism seemed the natural counterpart of economic liberalism. Disestablishment was bound up with the rising tide of liberal thought that marked the early Victorian period.

Two examples from outside England and Wales encouraged the disestablishers. In Scotland, the Seceders from the established church were active during the 1830s in pressing for the removal of all Dissenting disabilities in the name of Voluntaryism. In 1834, a Voluntary Church Society was established in England in imitation of the Scottish pioneers, drawing Baptists including Charles Stovel into its ranks.²⁵ America provided an even more attractive example, because there its establishments had already been abolished and yet evangelical religion flourished. “All things,” wrote Stovel in 1834, “relating to religion in America are perfectly free.”²⁶ In 1851 John Howard Hinton, a secretary of the Baptist Union, wrote a book entitled *The Test of Experience: or, The Voluntary Principle in the United States*.²⁷ To many the American experience seemed to vindicate efforts to overthrow establishments in Britain.

Early successes in exerting political pressure also fostered the belief that Dissenting aims could be achieved. Calls for relief brought results because the Whig governments of the 1830s were distinctly sympathetic. In 1836 civil registration was introduced. In 1837 there was legislation allowing Dissenters to be married in their own chapels. Already in 1834 there had been an unsuccessful bill to open Oxford and Cambridge degrees to Nonconformists. Although it failed, the measure was another symptom of a willingness to redress grievances. No progress was made at a national level to deal with church rates, but in several local cases they were terminated by Nonconformist votes in the vestries that set them.²⁸ At Scarborough, for instance, the doughty Baptist minister Benjamin Evans successfully resisted attempts to levy a church rate there three times during the 1830s.²⁹ Inexorably progress was being made towards Dissenting political objectives. Disestablishment seemed a reasonable ultimate target.

The education controversies of the period inevitably raised the church/state question in an acute form. Before 1833, there was no state involvement in education in England and Wales whatsoever. In that year for the first time the reforming government gave grants to promote schooling to the Anglican National Society and the undenominational British Society, which enjoyed much Dissenting support. There were several attempts over the next twenty years to expand and regularise the flow of public money to education. Each time Baptists were roused to express their point of view, most decisively, as we have

²⁴ Francis Clowes to editor, *Baptist Magazine* (May 1843): 272.

²⁵ *Patriot* (10 May 1834): 163.

²⁶ *Baptist Magazine*, Supplement (1834): 539.

²⁷ J. H. Hinton, *The Test of Experience: or, The Voluntary Principle in the United States* (London: A. Cockshaw, 1851).

²⁸ W. R. Ward, *Religion and Society in England, 1790-1850* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1972), 178-89.

²⁹ Christine Paine, “Benjamin Evans of Scarborough, 1803-1871,” *Baptist Quarterly* 21 (1965-66): 174.

seen, in 1843. Hinton was one of those who in that year declared that Nonconformists could not accept the right of the state to interfere in religious education at all.³⁰ Thus the Voluntary principle was extended to education. Hinton went later on to identify with the Voluntary School Society that tried to raise money for schooling entirely independent of government.³¹ Not all Nonconformists embraced educational Voluntaryism, but that principle became general among Baptists. In 1847 the Baptist Union revoked a previous endorsement of the British Society because it continued to receive a public grant.³² Schooling, which necessarily touched the lives of many Baptists, stirred them to back the radical programme for church/state relations put forward by Voluntaries.

An organisation was soon set up to channel the newly released energies of Dissent towards separation of church and state. In 1844 the Anti-State Church Association was formed by the Congregational minister Edward Miall, who already published the militant newspaper *The Nonconformist*. The association acted as the focus of the disestablishment movement for the rest of the century, taking the name of the Liberation Society in 1853. It gathered extensive Baptist support, the Baptist Union being the only denominational body to be officially represented at its foundation conference. Baptists played a prominent part in the society. Of the first set of officers, the treasurer was Thomas Price, the Baptist editor of *The Eclectic Review*, and one of the two secretaries alongside Miall was F. A. Cox of Hackney. C. J. Foster, Professor of Jurisprudence at University College, London, was the dynamic organiser of the society's Parliamentary Committee from 1856 to 1863.³³ The society's well publicised efforts to champion the Nonconformist cause did much to further a rigorous disestablishmentarianism.

For these reasons, the urgent need for the separation of church and state became a normal Baptist attitude in the later nineteenth century. The main monthly denominational periodicals were committed to the cause: *The Baptist Magazine* that lasted the whole century, the shorter-lived *The Church* (1844-65), and *The Baptist Examiner* (1844-45). Crucially, the denominational weekly begun in 1855, *The Freeman*, took the same line. Its original editors were Benjamin Evans and Francis Clowes, two of the most ardent disestablishers. Successive issues were interpreted in the light of the imperative to free the Church of England from its alliance with the state. In 1861, for instance, there was published *Essays and Reviews*, a volume that created worries because its Anglican authors espoused several of the assumptions of German higher critics of the Bible. The controversy that ensued was plainly theological, not political. Yet the Baptist Union resolution, after deprecating the book's teaching, continued as follows: "That these efforts are more deeply to be deplored, because their force is greatly augmented through the alliance of the Church of England with the civil power, by virtue of which alliance the teachers of error are supported out of national property, and from the taxation of English citizens, multitudes of whom abhor the error,

³⁰ *Baptist Magazine* (October 1843): 523.

³¹ *Baptist Magazine* (June 1854): 354-5.

³² *Baptist Magazine* (August 1847): 512.

³³ W. H. Mackintosh, *Disestablishment and Liberation: The Movement for the Separation of the Anglican Church from State Control* (London: Epworth Press, 1972), 28, 58-9.

and yet are thus compelled to uphold and maintain it.”³⁴ The controversy was an excuse for scoring another point against the church establishment. Even Charles Haddon Spurgeon, the great preacher of the Metropolitan Tabernacle, was drawn in. He was one of the platform speakers, for example, at the 1868 Triennial Conference of the Liberation Society.³⁵ The disestablishment principle was part of the creed of a normal Victorian Baptist.

Several qualifications, however, have to be made to this generalisation. Wholehearted endorsement of the Liberationist cause was not universal for a number of reasons. In some quarters, for one thing, there was opposition to political activity aiming for disestablishment. Public affairs seemed too worldly to some. In Scotland, the influential James Haldane published in 1839 a pamphlet entitled *The Voluntary Question Political not Religious*. Campaigning for Voluntarism, he contended, was to be eschewed by the true Christian.³⁶ Ten years later James Lister of Liverpool said much the same about politics in general: “I cannot reconcile this warm part in all political matters which is taken and openly defended, with the spirit of Christ's kingdom, which is not of this world, nor with the true position of Christians as strangers and pilgrims on earth. Nor have I ever seen one example in which devotedness to politics did not injure the spirituality and piety of the individual.”³⁷ Others, though content with participation in public affairs, were averse to Voluntarism. Thus Hugh Stowell Brown of Liverpool remained unpersuaded of the disestablishment cause.³⁸ Consequently the separation of church and state enjoyed less unanimous support among Baptists than their periodicals might lead one to suppose.

There were specific reservations about the Liberation Society. Edward Miall, the moving force of the society, could be intemperate in his denunciations of the Church of England. That is partly why, as Thomas Price noted in 1846, distinguished Baptists were standing aloof from the association. They accepted the Voluntary principle, he said, but they did not believe in organised action.³⁹ Reservations over agitation clearly persisted. Even John Howard Hinton, who had thrown himself into the organisation's early work, withdrew after 1855 because he found it too militant for his liking.⁴⁰ Later in the century, as it became necessary to convince secular-minded MPs of the validity of its case, the Liberation Society dwelt far less on the religious reasons for disestablishment and encouraged freethinkers to join. In 1891 Spurgeon left the society in a burst of publicity because he did not wish to be yoked by it to unbelievers.⁴¹ So the organisation that did most to rally supporters to the cause could also alienate them.

Another factor weakening the campaign was the gradual disappearance of grievances. Partly because attention was drawn to Dissenting disabilities by the Liberation Society, the Liberal party of the later part of the century took them up and provided remedies. In 1868 W. E. Gladstone ended

³⁴ *Baptist Magazine* (March 1863): 175.

³⁵ *Baptist Magazine* (June 1868): 377.

³⁶ J. A. Haldane, *The Voluntary Question Political not Religious: A Letter to the Rev. Dr. John Brown* (Edinburgh: William Whyte and Co., 1839).

³⁷ *Baptist Magazine* (January 1849): 7.

³⁸ W. S. Caine, ed., *Hugh Stowell Brown* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1887), 63.

³⁹ *Baptist Magazine* (December 1846): 778-81.

⁴⁰ Lewis, ed., *Biographical Dictionary*, I, 557.

⁴¹ D. W. Bebbington, *The Nonconformist Conscience: Chapel and Politics, 1870-1914* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1982), 28.

compulsory church rates; in 1871 university tests for most degrees at the ancient universities were abolished; and in 1880 Dissenters were granted the right to use their own form of burial ceremony in parish graveyards. Although minor grievances survived into the twentieth century, the sense of harsh treatment by the laws of the land decayed. In 1869 disestablishment was actually enacted for Ireland. It was thought at first that the English establishment would soon be ended, but in fact the removal of the most anomalous established church tended to reduce the pressure on the others. Only in Wales, where disestablishment turned into a national cause, was the campaign finally successful, in 1920. In England and Scotland the bond between church and state, though in very different forms, survives to this day. So the steady erosion of pressure points had the effect of weakening support for the main ultimate aim.

There were also problems in applying Voluntary theory to the issues of the day. How far should the principle of the non-interference of government in religion be taken? The fast days during the Crimean War raised the question in an acute form. Baptists approved of times of national humiliation to pray for victory, but should they accept that the state had the authority to proclaim a fast day? Compliance would imply the acceptance of secular powers in the religious sphere; but non-compliance might suggest indifference to a Christian duty. The Baptist Union was reduced in 1855 to the rather weak compromise of requesting an alteration in the language of the proclamation so that the observance became voluntary.⁴² More persistent was the problem of Sunday. Was the state's enforcement of sabbath legislation to be endorsed? As evangelicals, Baptists cared deeply about the hallowing of the Lord's day; but as Dissenters they had qualms about legislation compelling people to perform a religious obligation. Consistent Voluntaries such as James Acworth, the principal of Horton Academy, rejected sabbath enforcement by the civil power.⁴³ Most Baptists, however, like other Nonconformists persuaded themselves that there were social, rather than religious, grounds that justified, for example, the prohibition of Sunday trading.⁴⁴ But the effect of these differences of opinion was to lay bare the problematic nature of Voluntaryism. It was hard to turn it into a wholly coherent political philosophy, and so its persuasive power was diminished. Baptists were not as entrenched in their Voluntaryist perspective as might at first appear.

The issue became most pressing over education. The question of the relations between church, state and schools would not go away. By the late 1860s it had become clear that the mass of the population would receive no formal education at all unless the state moved in. Hence the 1870 Education Act set up publicly funded elementary schools wherever there were no existing places of instruction. For Nonconformists the measure raised a central point of Voluntary theory. They had generally held that the state must sponsor no religious education. Now they could simply abandon that position, arguing that government help was essential, and some took this course. The Bible, they held, should continue to be taught in the schools as it always had been. Others, however, pursued the logic of their earlier Voluntary position. Since religion and the state must be kept apart and the state was now providing schools, there must be no religious teaching in the national system of education at all.

⁴² *Baptist Magazine* (June 1855): 358.

⁴³ David Milner, "J. P. Chown, 1821-1886," *Baptist Quarterly* 25 (1973-74): 17.

⁴⁴ John Wigley, *The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Sunday* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980), 99-101.

The Bible must be excluded from the schools; the churches must assume sole responsibility for the religious instruction of the young. At first the Baptist Union accepted this so-called secular solution.⁴⁵ It proved, however, unpopular in the chapel pews. Why, asked ordinary Nonconformists, should the Bible be banished from the schools? The Education Act itself was a compromise measure. Religion was to be taught, but it was not to be distinctive of one denomination. The instruction could be biblical, but it must be undenominational. As Nonconformists became accustomed to this policy in operation, they began to regard it as theirs. In 1887 the Baptist leader Charles Williams declared that in theory the members of his denomination wanted a secular education system. In practice, however, he explained that they generally accepted the unsectarian Bible teaching given in the publicly-provided schools.⁴⁶ By the end of the century few Baptists extended their Voluntarism to education. They had come to accept that the state might have a role in encouraging the common faith of the community.

These factors sapped the strength of radical disestablishmentarianism. By the last years of the century the movement for the separation of church and state was clearly in decay. The Liberation Society was not covering its costs and there were few new recruits. Some younger men, in fact, were willing to challenge traditional shibboleths. In 1894, for example, E. J. Poole-Connor, the twenty-two-year-old Baptist minister in the garrison town of Aldershot, expressed a willingness to take a state stipend as a military chaplain.⁴⁷ In the twentieth century disestablishment was to be a fading cause among Baptists. Ernest Payne, the general secretary of the Baptist Union, was actually to be responsible for the eventual closing down of the Liberation Society in the 1950s.⁴⁸

What, then, was the significance of the issue of church and state among nineteenth-century Baptists? It illustrates the perennial tension for the Christian between political passivity and political activity. Evangelical Christians such as the Baptists take the transmission of the gospel as a supreme value. Many in the early nineteenth century thought spiritual work of this kind so transcendently important as to demand the avoidance of questioning church/state relationships. Concentration on the cause of the gospel, together with co-operation with any others who would join in its propagation, formed the overriding priority. Later in the century some such as Haldane and Lister continued to hold this view. The gospel for the individual was so crucial that all effort must go into it. Politics was no more than a worldly diversion. Such Baptists opted for passivity.

Others, however, saw politics in a different light. When there was a righteous cause, it could legitimately be pursued. The interests of the gospel might actually compel action. If the Church of England's establishment constituted an obstacle to the gospel, it must be swept away. Furthermore, according to those who thought like Edward Miall, the rule of Christ should not be limited to the private sphere of the individual. The Lord must rule over public life as well as in the believer's heart. This stance

⁴⁵ *Baptist Magazine* (November 1869): 698.

⁴⁶ Bebbington, *Nonconformist Conscience*, 132.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁴⁸ Information from the late Dr E. A. Payne.

pointed towards the social gospel resolution of the issue that prevailed in the thought of John Clifford at the end of the century and into the twentieth.⁴⁹ Many Baptists went into politics with this motive. At least a quarter of Baptists who entered the ministry between 1810 and 1849 were active in politics, and almost all would have taken up the disestablishment question.⁵⁰ It was felt to be the cause of Christ himself and therefore a vocation suitable for a minister of the gospel.

The differences of opinion over the relations of church and state therefore reflected contrasting strategies of mission. Should the gospel be promoted solely by evangelism? Or might it also be advanced by political action? The tension would not go away. Perhaps it was a result of being in the world, and so bound up with public life, and yet not of it, and so concerned with the gospel of eternal life. Consequently it is not surprising that some Baptists desired to escape political entanglements altogether; that others wanted no more than the removal of the disabilities imposed on them by the state; that others believed in the separation of church and state, but stopped short of agitation; that others again tried to press the Voluntary cause with all their powers; and that still others insisted that Voluntaryism must be applied rigorously to every sphere including education. Joseph Belcher was among the last group, the most militant of all. That is why, in 1844, he fell foul of the Nova Scotia Baptists over the funding of Acadia College.⁵¹

⁴⁹ David Thompson, "John Clifford's Social Gospel," *Baptist Quarterly* 31 (1985-86):199-217.

⁵⁰ K. D. Brown, *A Social History of the Nonconformist Ministry in England and Wales, 1800-1930* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 209.

⁵¹ I am grateful to Acadia Divinity College, Nova Scotia, for the invitation to deliver this paper as one of the Hayward Lectures in 1998.

THE UNEXPLAINED RELIGION OF THE WCTU

PETER LINEHAM

Massey University, Auckland

(P.Lineham@massey.ac.nz)

Laurie Guy's fine book on the churches and their social engagement has made very clear that Baptists and evangelicals at various times played a crucial role in social reform. Responding to recent feminist scholarship he emphasised the level of evangelical involvement in first wave feminism.¹ Taking his emphasis further, this paper offers an interpretation of the Women's Christian Temperance Union paying particular attention to theological debates within the movement. A fine group of historians from Pat Grimshaw onwards have addressed the values of first wave feminism. The interpretations of Grimshaw, Raewyn Dalziel and Phillida Bunkle have done much to explore the minds of the early franchise reformers. Their interpretations have, however, given little weight to the theological issues that were inevitable in a movement which saw itself as an organisation of Christian women. We can draw on rich literature on the religious culture of late nineteenth century English and American Protestantism, which places the WCTU in a fresh context.

That context is, as Guy recognises, primarily evangelical. The identity may surprise readers in the modern era. Pentecostal women became notorious for busting up the women's forums in the 1980s and have never quite recovered their reputation.² So what sort of evangelicalism was it that produced the first wave feminism of the nineteenth century? Neither Dalziel nor even Bunkle have much to say about this, but Laurie Guy suggests a step towards understanding when he portrays how late nineteenth century Christianity was very optimistic. It is the aim of this paper to deepen this interpretation. Any religious tradition is always mutating and evolving, and it is my argument that the WCTU in New Zealand has a historical interest because it occurred at a particular point in that evolution.

At the Fifth Convention of the Women's Christian Temperance Union held at Dunedin late in February 1890, Miss W. Wieneke proposed that office holders in any WCTU must profess faith in Christ Jesus as her Saviour. Guy is the only one to notice this debate. In an attempt to divert debate over this contentious issue, the meeting passed a resolution affirming the importance of evangelism:

We recognise the fact that the foundation of our work lies in the acceptance and practice of the Gospel of Christ, and believe that greater effort should be made by our membership during the year along all evangelistic lines. We affirm our belief that God in Christ is the king

¹ Laurie Guy, *Shaping Godzone: Public Issues and Church Voices in New Zealand 1840-2000* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2011), 177-92.

² See Ruth E. Low, "The Debate on the United Nations Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women: Motivated by Fear or a Clash of Ideologies," *Stimulus* 13, 4 (2005): 23-30.

of nations, and as such should be acknowledged in our government, and his word made the basis of our laws.³

The issue did not go away. In the 1891 Convention at Christchurch the motion held over from the previous year was presented by Mrs Fulton, the new President of the national body. The proposal was worded “That no one may be office-bearers in any W.C.T.U. who does not profess faith in Christ Jesus as her Saviour.” The initial debate on the second morning of the convention was indecisive.⁴ In the lengthy and “warm” debate which resumed on the Thursday there seem to have been attempts to amend it into a motion about membership of the Union.⁵ The issue was put to the vote in the final session on Monday 9th March, when it was defeated 18/23 but in what may have been an appeasing gesture to the defeated voices, the local unions were invited to discuss the issue and return comments to the next AGM.⁶ The issue was one with perils whatever the outcome. It had the full backing of Mrs Fulton, as National President, and her predecessor in the years before 1889, Emma Packe. When the issue returned on the agenda for the next annual meeting Catherine Fulton was absent, citing the death of her husband James, and so she could not be at the Seventh Convention in Auckland in 1892. Consequently it was Mrs Packe who proposed an even tougher amendment to the constitution at that meeting, “that no member be eligible for election who does not accept the Bible doctrine of the atonement through Christ Jesus.” The amendment seems aimed to exclude Unitarians and “modernist” Protestants from the Union.

There must have been widespread discussion in the affiliated Unions about it that year, since some felt very strongly for or against the issue. Mrs Elizabeth Brown Miller, a Dunedin delegate who was instrumental later in developing a home economics programme, proposed to avoid the problem through a pacificatory amendment:

that the convention, whilst its individual members hold firmly and lovingly to the doctrine of the atonement, believes that it would be unwise to make any alteration to the constitution, in the direction of introducing theological doctrine.⁷

This, however, was lost, and the original motion was voted down.⁸ It was an unlikely stance in the face of a stinging series of attacks on the proposal by Kate Sheppard (presenting herself as “Penelope”), the editor of the WCTU pages in the *Prohibitionist*.⁹ One can feel the force of her withering scorn as well as her sustained argument:

We are banded together to rescue our neighbours from the curse of the liquor traffic, with its train of attendant evils, and we have gladly welcomed all who have so much of the spirit of Christ as to be wishful to engage in this good work. Many true followers of Christ would,

³ WCTU Minutes (1890): 14, cited from the *Temperance Herald*. There is no hint of these discussions in general press reports, the longest of which is the *Southland Times* (26 February 1890): 2.

⁴ *Star*, Christchurch (4 March 1891): 3.

⁵ *Star*, Christchurch (6 March 1891): 3; and motion, cited in letter to *Star* (7 March 1891): 3.

⁶ *Star*, Christchurch (10 March 1891): 4.

⁷ WCTU Minutes (22 March 1892): 6.

⁸ See *Star*, Christchurch (26 March 1892): 3, and *Evening Post*, Wellington (26 March 1892): 2; *Hawkes's Bay Herald* (26 March 1892): 3.

⁹ See Judith Devaliant, *Kate Sheppard: A Biography* (Auckland: Penguin, 1992), 74-75. *Ibid.*, 20, suggests that there was a running conflict between Sheppard and Fulton.

from conscientious scruples, hesitate to sign such an article as proposed. Are we to refuse their assistance? Have we, who call ourselves Christians, not yet learned the lessons taught in the parable of the Good Samaritan? Have we forgotten Who it is Who said, "A tree is known by its fruits"? Why, then, this desire to exclude from our temperance work all who cannot pronounce our particular shibboleth?¹⁰

If this was not strong enough she turned her attention on those who proposed it, and recognised that both theology and practice divided them:

The desire for change seems to emanate from those specially interested in Evangelistic work, but it is not the work for which our Unions were called into existence. Indeed, but for the fact that the Evangelistic department gives facilities for the special bent of some of our women, which the churches do not afford, it would be well to leave this kind of work to the Evangelical churches. The primary object for which we are united is to abolish the use of intoxicants. To accomplish our aim, we gladly enlist rich and poor, high and low, Priest, Levite or Samaritan...

She was not the only opponent. In reaction to the 1891 measure, M.A. Clark wrote to the Christchurch newspaper criticising the measure:

allow me through your paper to protest most emphatically against altering the constitution in the way that was proposed, ... I ask in all seriousness who are the women in the W.C.T. Union that they should interfere with the right of private judgment in religious or theological questions. ... It seems strange that the Evangelical section should forget that their work is only one of the many factors in the work. Already the spirit of this clause has wrought cruel injustice. It will break up the Union just as the Young Men's Christian Association in Dunedin was broken up by the introduction of sectarian strife.¹¹

This was very strong language about other members of the sisterhood, who included the National President, and it provoked a concerned letter from Catherine Fulton in the next issue of the *Prohibitionist*, and further letters from Mrs Packe and a Mrs Tattle. Mrs Fulton suggested that the "Christian" in the name WCTU might as well be dropped if it could not be given some meaning.¹² Mrs Packe pointed out that the C in WCTU stood for Christian, not civilised or cultured. Mrs Tattle warned that some people would drop out of the Union if it went the way that Penelope suggested.¹³ But Penelope was unrepentant, and unabashedly criticised both Fulton's and Packe's arguments. She cited the authority of Frances Willard, and made clear her definition of "Christian" was much broader than Fulton's, insisting that "all who take Christ for their guide and teacher are His disciples, and have a right to be called by His name."¹⁴ It seems clear, judging from that damning remark about "theological doctrine" and a later comment in the *White Ribbon*, that the proposal was criticised as a religious inquisition aiming to exclude a certain group of

¹⁰ *Prohibitionist* (2 January 1892): 8. (Issue numbers from Devaliant, since the microfilm lacks these.)

¹¹ *Star*, Christchurch (7 March 1891): 3.

¹² *Prohibitionist* (16 January 1892): 8.

¹³ *Prohibitionist* (3 February 1892): 8.

¹⁴ *Prohibitionist* (2 January 1892): 8.

supporters. There were complaints that one total abstainer who was not a prohibitionist had been excluded, and complaints at attempts to exclude Catholics from the WCTU in parts of the American movement.¹⁵ And since this was the year of a full-scale assault in Parliament over the franchise, the movement needed all the support it could get.

The controversy was not without consequence for the WCTU. Mrs Fulton did not offer herself for the Presidency at the next Convention, and was replaced by Mrs Annie Schnackenberg. Packe and Wieneke also disappeared from the Union at the same time. It is curious to think of this heated theological dispute at the very stage in the WCTU when its intervention into the franchise issue was reaching a height. It sharpens the issue of how the character of the WCTU was understood, for it is clear that the movement was not unanimous on this point.

The WCTU is in many respects a baffling organisation, which might easily be characterised as an extremely narrow-minded fundamentalist body. The debate which took place between 1890 and 1893 seems to have clarified the organisation's focus and location, and its place in the spectrum of Christian organisations. Before 1893 the organisation had a different flavour. The organisation before 1894 had several types of participants, and one of these sectors was a group of earnest evangelical Christians. The range of members is surprising. One somewhat surprising group was members of the new and intensely evangelical Plymouth Brethren movement. This movement had two sections, the Exclusive and the Open Brethren, and the supporters came from the more open wing. One, who was rather influential in the early WCTU was Miss W. Wieneke, who died in 1925 after founding the kindergarten movement in New Zealand, having trained in this in her native Germany, setting up her first kindergarten in Christchurch in 1885, and then serving as the first staff member of the Otago Free Kindergarten from 1889-1899. In her retirement she travelled the country as a kind of itinerant children's evangelist.¹⁶ Another person with Brethren links was Jane Costall. Her husband was the Government Printer, and the couple had founded an interdenominational mission in Boulcott Street, Wellington, in 1873, and this later became the Herbert Street mission, also described as the Bethel Baptist Church. This church was the precursor to both the Brethren and Baptist denominations in Wellington.¹⁷ Mrs Costall was the Wellington President of the WCTU in its earliest years, and her congregation hosted the 1889 WCTU Convention.¹⁸ Another example is in the Manawatu, where the Brethren were particularly strong. The WCTU in Palmerston North included Mrs Anderson of Rongotea, a Brethren name from a Brethren stronghold.¹⁹

Alongside these Brethren stood alongside other advocates of evangelical Christianity. Mrs Packe, who like Kate Sheppard lived in Upper Riccarton, was the wife of Colonel George Packe (1836-1882),

¹⁵ *White Ribbon*, 1, 9 (March 1896): 7.

¹⁶ Peter J. Lineham, *There we found Brethren: A History of Assemblies of Brethren in New Zealand* (Palmerston North: GPH Society, 1977), 80, 125; *Treasury*, 8 (1906): 132a; *ibid*, 9 (1907): 76; *ibid*, 13 (1911): 142; *ibid*, 16 (1914): 95; *ibid*, 18 (1916):14; *ibid*, 19 (1917): 15; *ibid*, 21 (1919): 151; *ibid*, 24 (1922):127; *ibid*, 29 (1927):111 for obituary. See also *ibid*, 36 (1934): 15.

¹⁷ See Lineham, *There we found Brethren*, 31, 54, 114. It is described in *New Zealand Baptist*, 1 (1880): 76, as "Wellington Bethel Baptist."

¹⁸ See "Women's Meeting," *Star*, Christchurch (7 March 1891): 4.

¹⁹ WCTU Convention Minutes for 13 March 1902. See Catherine Birch and Audrey Cox, *Rowe Family History* (Rongotea Rowe Reunion Committee, 1999), 60, 80, 82.

who came from a Lancashire military family and served in the Welsh Fusiliers during the Indian Mutiny, and then retired to Canterbury.²⁰ Although the Colonel had been a loyal Anglican, evidently Mrs Packe became a Salvationist after her husband's death. Her presidential addresses suggest a severe woman with a strong emphasis on biblical values.²¹ Her links with the Union faded after 1893, but in 1897 she attended the Kaiapoi Union, and quoted scriptures suitable to inspire it.²² Catherine Fulton is an even more striking example. The National President from 1889-1892 was born a Valpy, one of the daughters of a former East India judge and prominent Anglican. One of her sisters sponsored the establishment of the Salvation Army in the colony in 1883. Catherine married James Fulton, the future Member of the House of Representatives, moved to West Tairei and joined the Presbyterian church, although she was rebaptised at Hanover Street Baptist in 1868 and the Fultons seem to have been Baptist in Dunedin but Presbyterian in Tairei.²³ She supported many evangelical causes, beginning with Dr Somerville's Mission, operated a local mission hall and Sunday school, and supported many home and foreign missions. Her husband's death in November 1891 was offered as the reason why Catherine ceased her link with the WCTU, but her biographer in the DNZB considers it more likely that she was disenchanted with the national Union as an evangelical body.²⁴

Those inclined to support evangelistic endeavour had from the outset aimed to make the Union a sponsor of evangelism. The structure of the WCTU included "departments" and branches were able to select which departments operated in their region. Consequently the WCTU was never just a prohibitionist body. The evangelistic department was the key department in the eyes of some, and some of the other departments (including, for example, the cottage meetings department) were clearly associated with it.²⁵ The second superintendent of the evangelistic department was none other than Miss Wieneke. After Wieneke left the WCTU, Mrs Kirkland was the superintendent of the evangelistic department. She was the wife of the Rev. James Kirkland, Presbyterian minister of West Tairei (Catherine Fulton's parish) from 1875. Presbyterians from this district were renowned for their intense evangelistic fervour. Meanwhile, Mrs Costall took responsibility in the WCTU for the Sabbath Observance Department, and

²⁰ Guy C. Bliss, *Gunners' Story: a short history of the Artillery Volunteers of Christchurch, 1867-1967* (Christchurch: Canterbury Artillery Officers Mess, 1970), 21; Macdonald Index (Canterbury Museum).

²¹ Jeanne Wood, *A Challenge Not a Truce: A History of the New Zealand Women's Christian Temperance Union, 1885-1985* (Nelson: N.Z.W.C.T.U., 1985), 92; Jolene A. McKay, "The Tie that Binds: Christianity in the New Zealand Women's Christian Temperance Union, 1885-1900" (B.A. Hons. diss., University of Otago, 1995), 15.

²² *White Ribbon*, vol. 2, no. 23 (May 1897): 4.

²³ See *New Zealand Baptist* (November 1885): 165, where James Fulton says at a public meeting he chaired at the Baptist Union that "His entire sympathy and best wishes were with the Baptist section of the Christian Church" and *New Zealand Baptist* (December 1885): 185, where James and Catherine's daughter volunteered to serve as a Baptist missionary (although the offer was withdrawn later). James Fulton served on Union committees and gave generously to the Union.

²⁴ Rosemary Entwistle, "Fulton, Catherine Henrietta Elliott," in *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, Vol. 1* (ed. W.H. Oliver; Wellington: Allen & Unwin, 1990), 141. See also McKay, "The Tie that Binds," 46. It is curious that Fulton does not mention the WCTU in her autobiography, written in 1915 (available from the LDS Family History Library).

²⁵ *White Ribbon*, 1, 1 (January 1895).

Mrs Packe was in charge of getting churches to adopt unfermented wine, while Catherine Fulton supported Sunday school, juvenile, and peace work.²⁶

We will form a better idea of the tone of the Union if we bear in mind the opportunities for united evangelism which the organisation afforded. So in Wellington Mrs Costall pushed members to help at the Quin Street Mission of St Peter's Church in Mitchelton—the rough part of town. Their work was also assisted by a Mrs Hinse.²⁷ By 1898 a whole range of cottage meetings, drawing room meetings, house to house visits and literature distribution were sponsored by the Union.²⁸ Missionary involvement, distribution of religious literature, and carefully planned events designed to bless and redeem men from rough backgrounds, were characteristic activities.²⁹

Evangelism in the larger cities often involved support for Sailors Rests. Most of these Sailors Rests were inspired by the advocacy of the remarkable Alexander Falconer, who had begun the Port Chalmers Sailors Rest in 1872 having previously run a diggers rest in Hokitika from the early years of the goldrush.³⁰ The WCTU supported Falconer and supplied him with a building to serve as his Dunedin Sailors Rest. The Dunedin union worked closely with Falconer for his Sailors Rest was the strongest non-denominational mission in the city. Non-denominational organisations were more willing to encourage independent women's work, while the denominational bodies were much more coy about such activity.

This evangelism was quite important to some members of the WCTU because as an organisation its American roots lay in a fervent campaign to reach and rescue men.³¹ The Women's Crusade, as it was called, had been responsible for a transformation of old-style evangelism into a new and socially relevant pattern of gospel temperance missions which became very popular in New Zealand.³² Gospel Temperance missions were popular in the late nineteenth century because they combined religious fervour with an intense awareness of social issues. Such missions combined political campaigning and moral exhortation. The preaching became a category with its own values and traditions; it emphasised that the converts should become Christians and renounce the demonic power of drink, which had kept them from salvation.

Support for overseas missions blended well with this emphasis. The WCTU eagerly supported some of the first single women working overseas as Christian missionaries. This category of missionary was justified because single females had a unique opportunity to rescue women from evil conditions,

²⁶ *Star* (10 March 1891): 4 (although this concerns Miss Juliet Fulton); WCTU, Report of First Annual Meeting (1886); Report of Fourth Annual Meeting, (1889): 6.

²⁷ Of Hinse nothing more is known. A Miss Hinse travelled from Wellington to Lyttleton in 1905. *Star* Christchurch, (5 October 1905): 3. A Mr Hinze travelled to Hokitika in 1891. *West Coast Times* (7 January 1891): 2, and a German, Hinze, was touring the colony in 1904. *Evening Post* (30 September 1904): 5.

²⁸ See Kirkland's report in *White Ribbon*, 3, 33 (March 1898): 7-8.

²⁹ *White Ribbon*, 2, 20 (February 1897): 3.

³⁰ Jane Thomson, ed., *Southern People: A Dictionary of Otago-Southland Biography* (Dunedin: Longacre Press, 1998), 154-55; Alexander R. Falconer, *The Harbour Reached: a Report of the Port Chalmers Sailors Rest* (Dunedin: Fergusson & Mitchell, 1903); P. J. Lineham, *There we found Brethren*, 26, 109-111.

³¹ Ruth Bordin, *Woman and Temperance: the Quest for Power and Liberty 1873-1900* (Philadelphia: Temple Press, 1981).

³² I have commented briefly (and critically) on this in Peter J. Lineham, *New Zealanders and the Methodist Evangel* (Wesley Historical Society Proceedings 42, 1983), 12-13.

inviting them to become Christians, and working to transform their treatment by heathen societies. Thus the WCTU supported the work of Miss A. J. P. Newcombe, Australian Baptist missionary in India.³³

Recent American religious historians have gone a long way to analyse the tone of post-Bellum American society. They have noted that in the mood of ebullient optimism after the Civil War, a new wave of revivalism transformed the mid-west of American society. This revivalism emphasised the ways in which the work of salvation empowered women and men so that they could be agents of transformation both of themselves and their world. The new measure revivalism of C. G. Finney, which bent the old Calvinist rules because of its strong emphasis on voluntarism, gained new momentum with the urban evangelism and activities of Dwight L. Moody. Beginning in the YMCA in Chicago, he shaped a distinctive non-denominational evangelism, which was positive, involved in community concerns and very internationally minded. This fits into the pattern described by Nathan Hatch as the democratization of American Christianity.³⁴ Out of it sprang the Student Volunteer Movement, the Bible Institute movement, and a great surge of home and foreign missions. The Women's Crusade flourished in this environment, for the whole movement was not shaped by Calvinist emphasis on the universality of sin, and so was eager to harness the energies of ordinary laymen and laywomen. "Work for the night is coming" they sang. Thus it is possible to speak of the evangelical roots of feminism.³⁵

The Women's Christian Temperance Union thus emerged as a result of the new inter-denominational evangelicalism which flourished in late nineteenth century society. Many aspects of the WCTU, including its focus on prayer, and its belief that it was called to create a purified nation under God, were a reflection of this background. Later authors have described this outlook as fundamentalist, but this adjective is inappropriate as well as anachronistic. For while fundamentalism grew out of this kind of movement, so too did "modernist" religion. It is necessary to understand the character of this religiosity to understand the character of the WCTU. It was not fundamentalist because while many members upheld a Protestant gospel of salvation by conversion through the cross of Christ, they were anything but separatist from society but were constantly engaged in the work of transforming church and society.³⁶

A further aspect of this movement was the place it gave to evangelical piety. In 1891 Christian Endeavour was introduced to New Zealand starting at Ponsonby Baptist Church, which aimed to help young people move from Sunday school to church and was characterised by an emphasis on fervent lay testimonies and unscripted prayers.³⁷ This tone reflects that of the evangelical members of the WCTU. At first the Union (with some notable dissenters) made much of the symbolism of sharing together the "noontide prayer." Prayerful dedication was seen as essential to evangelism (perhaps because their

³³ "Our Missionaries," *New Zealand Baptist* (October 1890): 154.

³⁴ Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1989).

³⁵ Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 85-98.

³⁶ Ian Tyrrell, *Women's World, Women's Empire* (Chapel Hill & London: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 62-70, recognises the role of evangelical support, but these tensions do not seem to have had wider international equivalents.

³⁷ See *New Zealand Baptist* (October 1892): 157-58. H. Bush & W. J. E. Kerrison, *First Fifty Years: the Story of Christian Endeavour under the Southern Cross* (Melbourne: National C.E.U. of Australia & New Zealand, 1938).

audiences of men did not relish women seeking to evangelise them). Later members believed that the Union's success was dependent on its spiritual power, and this was proportionate to the levels of fervent personal piety of members.³⁸ In Palmerston North the Union held a prayer meeting on election day in 1896.³⁹ This tone seems to have been particularly strong in the Wellington and Dunedin Unions. The Auckland and Christchurch branches were much more politically attuned. In Wellington the Southern Cross Society competed with the WCTU from 1893 until it was closed in 1898. Possibly this was a local version of the controversy about whether the movement had room for women like Lady Stout who, as a Unitarian, did not hold evangelical views of the atonement, and was not part of the Union in the early days but was very active in it by 1897.

One can detect the deep influence of Moody on the New Zealand union, not least in the enthusiastic singing of Moody's lieutenant, Sankey, at meetings. The movement was characterised by a warm fervency of faith, such as was common in the Christian Endeavour Movement, but it also had an activist fervour for creating a better world using politics, and this certainly troubled some.⁴⁰ The hymns were straight out of this stable. For example the favourite "Till we meet" was a hymn of the Sankey revival.⁴¹ The Crusade Psalm⁴² and the White Ribbon Hymn Book were used at meetings.⁴³ It is interesting that the union cited Moody's opinion in its support for divorce legislation.⁴⁴ When American speakers toured the New Zealand branches they often appealed to this tradition. Mrs Leavitt on her tour of the churches in 1885 combined intense scientific analysis of the evils of alcohol with a spirituality drawn from Sankey's "Sacred Songs and Solos." Consequently she was aware that it was more difficult to receive a positive reception from Anglican churches.⁴⁵ Mrs Barney, who visited in 1897, was appreciated for her combination of action and spiritual life, her motherly appearance, and gospel temperance addresses.⁴⁶ So the WCTU reflects the growing influence of American Christian patterns on the colonial faith and that its debates also became evident in what developed in New Zealand.⁴⁷

Bunkle, and others influenced by her, have argued that a notion of purification was central to the values of the WCTU.⁴⁸ Sarah Dalton has developed this into a comprehensive interpretation of the

³⁸ This is already clear in Kirkland's report on the evangelistic department in *White Ribbon*, 2, 24 (June 1897): 5, but becomes very pronounced in the 1917 Annual Convention minutes.

³⁹ "Palmerston North," *New Zealand Baptist* (January 1897): 10.

⁴⁰ See for example the account of Frances Willard's death in *New Zealand Baptist* (June 1898): 96. Also the cautious account of the WCTU in "American Notes," *New Zealand Baptist* (April 1886): 51.

⁴¹ See John Kent, *Holding the Fort: Studies in Victorian Revivalism* (London: Epworth, 1978), 215-235.

⁴² For example *White Ribbon*, 2, 23 (May 1897): 4.

⁴³ *White Ribbon*, 2, 22 (April 1897): 10.

⁴⁴ *White Ribbon*, 2, 23 (May 1897): 10.

⁴⁵ "Christchurch," *New Zealand Baptist* (June 1885): 90; *Auckland Star* (26 June 1885): 2.

⁴⁶ *White Ribbon*, 2, 23 (May 1897): 4, 8.

⁴⁷ Colin Brown, "The American Connection: The United States of America and Churches in New Zealand 1840-1940" in *Religious Studies in Dialogue: Essays in Honour of Albert C. Moore* (ed. M. Andrew, P. Matheson, and S. Rae; Dunedin: Department of Theology, University of Otago, 1991), 153-62.

⁴⁸ Phillida Bunkle, "The Origins of the Women's Movement in New Zealand: The Women's Christian Temperance Union 1885-1895," *Women in New Zealand Society* (ed. P. Bunkle & Beryl Hughes; Auckland: Allen & Unwin, 1980), 52-76.

WCTU as an organisation devoted to the social purification of both womanhood and manhood.⁴⁹ While these themes were undoubtedly present in the movement, there is little evidence in the first years of the movement that these values were shared by all members. Religious motivations rather than eugenic theories seem to be the key to the motivation of early members of the Union. Jolene McKay, in her fine Otago dissertation on the Dunedin WCTU, probes these issues well. McKay repeatedly emphasises the small scale of the churches which supported the WCTU.⁵⁰ This emphasis is somewhat surprising for a thesis written in Dunedin, for the supportive churches surely included the Free Church Presbyterians who were so dominant in Otago.

Yet a significant group in the WCTU were increasingly suspicious of this evangelical tone in the Union. This reflected a growing debate over the issue of the inspiration and authority of the Bible within the erstwhile evangelical churches.⁵¹ Within the WCTU one group was enthusiastic for the radical *Women's Bible*. A series of events in that same period show evidence of debates within New Zealand Nonconformist evangelicalism. The debate over evolution in the Dunedin YMCA in the 1870s was referred to by one of the newspaper correspondents commenting on controversy over membership of the Union. Even more relevant are the debates over doctrinal orthodoxy in the southern Presbyterian and the Methodist churches in the early 1890s. The debate over the views about immortality expressed by William Salmond, former Presbyterian Professor of Theology, in his pamphlet probably provoked reactions in the union.⁵² Only a year later James Gibb, the recently arrived minister of First Church, Dunedin, was arraigned for heresy for his rejection of the doctrine of the predestination of sinners to hell.⁵³ In 1893 C. H. Garland of the Methodist Church's Theological Institution was accused by Shepherd Allen of Morrinsville (whose wife was probably active in the WCTU) of introducing higher criticism into the Connexion.⁵⁴ These events, highly relevant to the debate in the Union, were provoked in part by the charges against Charles Strong of Scots Church, Melbourne, for his rejection of the penal substitution theory of the atonement, one of the key issues raised in the WCTU debate. In essence the WCTU flourished within the world of Moody's rich blend of undenominational evangelism and education. It is this world which shaped what we call both the "fundamentalist" and the "liberal" world especially within Nonconformist (non-Anglican) Protestantism. But growing tensions sundered this work. Moody was faced with increasing division among the "bible conference" supporters on the one side, and the YMCA supporters on the other. The Student Volunteer Movement planted in New Zealand by John R. Mott in 1896 was convulsed with controversy over the same issues in the early 1920s. By the 1920s in America

⁴⁹ Sarah Dalton, "The 'pure in heart': the New Zealand Women's Christian Temperance Union and social purity, 1885-1930," (M.A. Diss., Victoria University of Wellington, 1993), 45-72.

⁵⁰ McKay, "The Tie that Binds," 8, 14.

⁵¹ Barbara Brown Zikmund, "Biblical Arguments and Women's Place in the Church," in *The Bible and Social Reform* (ed. Ernest R. Sandeen; Philadelphia & Chicago: Fortress/Scholars Press, 1982), 85-104.

⁵² William Salmond, *The Reign of Grace: a Discussion of the Question of the Possibility of Salvation for All Men* (Dunedin: John Horsburgh, 1888). See Lawrence H. Barber, "An Otago University Academic on Trial for Heresy," *Forum* (November 1975): 9-11; Alison Clarke, "Heavenly Visions: Otago Colonists' Concepts of the Afterlife," *Journal of Religious History*, 30 (2006): 2-17.

⁵³ Lawrence H. Barber, "James Gibb's Heresy Trial," *New Zealand Journal of History*, 12 (1978): 146-57.

⁵⁴ E.W. Hames, *Out of the Common Way: The European Church in the Colonial Era 1840-1913* (Wesley Historical Society Proceedings. 27, 1972), 81.

and in New Zealand, the debate over prohibition led to sharp division within evangelicalism into fundamentalism and modernism.

So it is not surprising that this one debate was echoed in later debates in the WCTU about the place of Scripture. The *White Ribbon* noted in April 1897 that the misconstruing of Scripture was a way in which women were kept subject to men, and it urged the interpretation of passages in the context of their times and circumstances.⁵⁵ Mary Powell battled with a Lutheran pastor near Palmerston North over the interpretation of Paul's letters.⁵⁶ In the Christchurch Diocese of the Anglican Church these same passages were cited in the debate in which women continued to be excluded from participation in synod proceedings.⁵⁷ There was a sharp exchange in 1898 between the *White Ribbon's* regular reviewer, Vesta, and a challenger probably from the Manawatu, Veritas, after Vesta recommended a book by Professor Walter Adeney, *The Construction of the Bible*, which promoted Wellhausen's notorious documentary theory on the compilation of the Pentateuch, and other approaches based on the so-called literary theory—the very issues which had been at stake in the attack on C. H. Garland. To Veritas this was outrageous: “Let us never allow of lowering the sacredness of the Scriptures by the teaching that speaks of man's “compiling” the records therein given to us.”⁵⁸ Others in the movement took the approach that Scripture did ban the public ministry of women, but that exceptional talents and opportunities could occasion a circumstantial waiver of these rules.⁵⁹ Curiously the controversy was entered by Mary S. Powell, the travelling secretary of the movement, who disavowed this tentative fundamentalist position: “I believe a large number of infidels have been manufactured by Christian people claiming for the Bible a verbal infallibility which it does not claim for itself.”⁶⁰

The strands of the emerging diversity within the WCTU are relatively easily identified. A religious awareness certainly enables us to identify the “forward movement” within the WCTU as progressive in its theological outlook. It is little wonder that other members complained that the *White Ribbon* was “too advanced.” Mrs Sheppard and others involved in the publication took pride in their awareness of the issues of the day.⁶¹ The favourite notion of “scientific temperance” was in many respects loaded in favour of a Social Darwinist perspective. Miss Freeman of Dunedin referred confidently to Herbert Spencer's ideas of “conscious evolution.”⁶² Although Professor Bickerton of Canterbury College treated Christians with derision, Sheppard and friends cited him as an authority.⁶³

⁵⁵ *White Ribbon*, 2, 22 (April 1897): 8.

⁵⁶ *White Ribbon*, 3, 26 (August 1897): 5.

⁵⁷ *White Ribbon*, 3, 29 (November 1897): 8.

⁵⁸ *White Ribbon*, 4, 37 (July 1898): 1-2; *ibid.*, 4, 39 (September 1898): 4-5, *ibid.*, 4, 43 (December 1899): 5; *ibid.*, 4, 44 (January 1899): 9.

⁵⁹ Miss Ackermann's Farewell, *Otago Daily Times* (30 April 1889), 3. The argument was made by Rev. Porter visiting from America.

⁶⁰ *White Ribbon*, 4, 40 (October 1898): 9.

⁶¹ *White Ribbon*, 3, 33 (March 1898): 9; *ibid.*, 3, 36 (June 1898): 7-8.

⁶² *White Ribbon*, 1, 7 (January 1896): 3-4.

⁶³ For example *White Ribbon*, 3, 31 (January 1898): 9; *ibid.*, 4, 42 (December 1898): 3.

There was a regular invective in the *White Ribbon* against the church because it did not express love but was rather judgemental and harsh.⁶⁴ In an editorial on the longing for peace, Kate Sheppard noted the longing for the fulfilment of the promise of the Christmas angel, and presented the classic liberal Christian dream:

On every side we see unmistakeable evidence that the teaching of the prince of peace is sinking into the hearts of men. The idea of brotherhood and goodwill is growing. Tribes and factions that were formerly hostile have been knit into nations. Nations are forming alliances with each other with the avowed object of preserving peace. In every land there has been good social progress. Our prisons have been improved; hospitals have been built, slavery is being suppressed; the poor are being educated. Hundreds of thousands of good men and women are giving freely and voluntarily of their time, thought and money to relieve the wants and right the wrongs of those unable to help themselves. Is not this goodwill? Has the prophecy failed? Is it not being very slowly but markedly fulfilled? It is our privilege to help, to keep step with God. Shall we take advantage of it? Let us each cherish the message and strive to do our mite towards filling the world with light and love.⁶⁵

Similarly the movement drew much from Josephine Butler's view of Christ as the leader of a great rebellion.⁶⁶ Kate Sheppard shared the same view of Christ, who was hardly the Christ worshipped in the churches, in their narrow approach to divinity:

yet such was His appearance to those who had no eyes save for externals. But in him dwelt the living God, the God of love, of mercy, and of peace. And the light of his message and life has never ceased to shine. Obscured often by clouds of superstition, of unbelief, of error, it has sent beams of sunshine into many a dark region and cheered many a heart.⁶⁷

She believed that Christianity was the brotherhood of humankind, and reverence for the temple of God in the heart. Professor Herron's description of Christ as the true socialist was cited in another issue of the *White Ribbon* with approval.⁶⁸ Even more striking were the views of Eveline Cunningham of Christchurch who, although she was Anglican, had highly unorthodox religious approaches.⁶⁹ The new creed by the American novelist and poet, Mrs Elizabeth Phelps, was cited:

I believe in the life everlasting, which is sure to be; and that it is the first duty of the Christian faith to present that life in a form more attractive to the majority of men than the life that now is. I believe in women, and in their right to their own best possibilities in every department of life. I believe that the methods of dress practised among women are a marked hindrance to the realisation of these possibilities, and that they should be scorned or persuaded out of society. I believe that the miseries attendant on the manufacture and sale of

⁶⁴ For example *White Ribbon*, 2, 17 (November 1896): 1-3.

⁶⁵ *White Ribbon*, 2, 18 (December 1896): 7.

⁶⁶ *White Ribbon*, 2, 19 (January 1897): 1.

⁶⁷ *White Ribbon*, 3, 30 (December 1897): 7.

⁶⁸ *White Ribbon*, 3, 32 (February 1898): 3.

⁶⁹ E.W. Cunningham, *The Lectures and Letters of E. W. Cunningham*, edited by her children (Christchurch: Lyttleton Times, 1918), 100-104.

intoxicating liquors are so great as to command imperiously the attention of all dedicated lives. I believe that the urgent protest against vivisection which marks our immediate day, and the whole plea for lessening the miseries of animals as endured at the hands of men, constitute the “next” great moral question which is to be put to the intelligent conscience. I believe that the condition of our common and statute laws is behind our age to an extent unperceived by all but a few of our social reformers; that wrongs, medieval in character, and practically resulting in great abuses and much unrecorded suffering, are still to be found at the doors of our legal system.⁷⁰

She goes on to cite Henry Drummond. Drummond was a follower of Moody who, in his much-read book *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* (1883) argued that evolution was a spiritual principle. Drummond was Moody broadened, Moody without doctrinal restraints.⁷¹

These forces were probably intensified in the late 1890s. Some WCTU members were intensely frustrated with the churches, when the parliament of the Colony allowed women to vote, but the churches that supported this measure failed to admit them to their vestries, diaconates, presbyteries and conferences.⁷² Yet it is fair to note that the colony did not permit the election of women as members of the legislature, and some conservative voices in the WCTU certainly thought this was a proper biblical approach.

The terms of this debate are significant. For the concerns of the more radical members of the WCTU reflected the modernist thrust of the social gospel movement.⁷³ The conservatives of the debate were well informed about debates on these issues.⁷⁴ The references to verbal inspiration suggest informed awareness of current theological debates.⁷⁵ Thus the WCTU is living proof that the “trans-Atlantic world” of religion also enveloped New Zealand. Both the liberals and the conservatives in the WCTU were part of a rich and wide world of late nineteenth century intellectual transition, which cannot be read in an exclusively New Zealand context.

I do not wish to argue that the WCTU was focused on theological debate, for in that case its extraordinary energy and activism to change the world would have been circumscribed. Conservative and liberal differences were framed within common ground which was a heartfelt desire to change the world for Christ, converting all opponents, transforming all obstacles, and cleansing it from all impurities. Thus activism was the feature of the unions. The WCTU emphasis was on women’s responsibility to God (not to their husbands) for their high calling as mothers, although at the same time the softening of the old-style Calvinism is evident in the emphasis that the motive should be love, not fear of punishment, and an

⁷⁰ *White Ribbon*, 2, 20 (February 1897): 10.

⁷¹ *White Ribbon*, 2, 24 (June 1897): 1.

⁷² For example the comments on the Anglican General Synod, *White Ribbon*, 3, 32 (February 1898): 7-8.

⁷³ William R. Hutchison, *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).

⁷⁴ See for example George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: the Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism 1870-1925* (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

⁷⁵ Mark A. Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelical, Scholarship and the Bible in America* (2 ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991), 11-31.

optimism that God willed to see the world follow Christ.⁷⁶ They were deeply convinced that Christianity ought to make a better contribution to civilization. When Jessie Mackay commented on the atrocities in Armenia, her appeal was to her readers “As Britons, as citizens, as Christians.”⁷⁷

We might argue that the WCTU members on the conservative evangelical side in the debates were traditionalists in their view of society. But this is not the case. Wieneke for example, shared the forward thinking of other members of the WCTU. Coming to New Zealand from Germany about the time of the commencement of the WCTU, she had evidently been trained in Froebel’s ideas of infant nurture. Then in 1889 she expressed a profoundly child-centred view in her vision of the Dunedin Free Kindergarten.⁷⁸ Yet Wieneke was also strongly evangelistic in orientation, having joined the Brethren shortly after arriving in New Zealand and made it a condition of taking the Dunedin job that she could teach the children Christian truths—an approach which did not endear her to all parents, according to later memories.⁷⁹ Others who shared her conservative theology were just as committed to the women’s franchise. So one and all in the Union worked with intense devotion for redemption of society in both the narrower and broader sense.

Curiously, although the WCTU effectively chose the broad path in the 1890s, by the 1920s it had returned to a narrower path. The Women’s Christian Temperance Union was by the 1970s on the conservative side regarding reformist measures like abortion, taking very seriously its focus on home, family and humanity. These emphases had always been part of its appeal; by the 1970s they led it to take their stand against second wave feminism. Back in the 1890s it was theological, not ideological issues, that divided feminists.

⁷⁶ *White Ribbon*, 3, 35 (May 1898): 9-10, 11.

⁷⁷ *White Ribbon*, 2, 15 (September 1896): 5.

⁷⁸ Beryl Hughes, *Flags and Building Blocks, Formality and Fun: One Hundred Years of Free Kindergarten in New Zealand* (Wellington: New Zealand Free Kindergarten Union, 1989), 9.

⁷⁹ For WCTU references see WCTU minutes, 1889, 1890. Helen May, *The Discovery of Early Childhood: mid-Eighteenth-century Europe to Mid-20th century New Zealand* (Auckland: Auckland University Press & Bridget Williams Books, 1997), 70; Lineham, *There we found Brethren*, 80, 125; Gertrude Robinson to Peter Lineham, (private communication, 16 December 1975).

REMEMBERING—WAR AND PEACE: REFLECTIONS ON MEMORIALISATION¹

ALLAN DAVIDSON

St John's Theological College

(nzallan.davidson@gmail.com)

*Laurie Guy and I were colleagues in the Auckland Consortium for Theological Education and the School of Theology at the University of Auckland for a number of years. We jointly taught a postgraduate course on Twentieth-Century New Zealand Church History which included sessions on "Issues of War and Peace." This was a subject which Laurie also dealt with in his book, *Shaping Godzone*.² In honouring Laurie with this contribution, I am mindful of the way in which historical objectivity can easily become entangled with personal subjectivity and historical advocacy. Laurie writes about how "War-and-peace issues and national identity issues have been much entwined in New Zealand history."³ This essay reflects the way in which this "entwining" has been part of my own experience, as I have reflected on the impact of war on the church, my own family, community and country; as I've travelled to sites of memory associated with war; and as I've struggled to reconcile remembering those who died in war with those who opposed war and promoted peace.*

Memory is one of the things that makes us human; we are the past made present. We carry within ourselves not only the genetic heritage of our parents and ancestors, but memories from the past both inherited and experienced. These memories continue to shape and influence us. We are re-membering people!

For Christians, the actions of breaking and sharing bread and drinking from a common cup of wine are part of a ritual that defines who we are. "Do this in remembrance of me" (Luke 22:19 NRSV) was the instruction of Jesus to his followers. The church is a remembering community, linked in the present with the long chain of people who have broken bread and shared wine, going back to an upper room in the first century. But remembering is not only backward looking; it is an action in the present that has a proleptic or anticipatory dimension. For Christians, the eucharistic observance is both an act of remembrance and also forward looking: "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." (1 Cor 11:26)

¹ This paper has been adapted and revised from a presentation originally titled: "Lest We Forget! Remembering War and Those Who Opposed War" given to an Anglican Pacifist Fellowship symposium, "Anzac Day: where to from here?" held in Auckland in October 2009. n.p. [cited 23 April, 2014.] See Online: <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/apf/apfAD1009.pdf>.

² Laurie Guy, *Shaping Godzone: Public Issues and Church Voices in New Zealand 1840-2000* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2011), 235-82.

³ *Ibid.*, 235.

How we remember those who fought and were killed in war and those who opposed war and promoted peace has many of the powerful characteristics associated with memory. We encounter the past through memory, symbols, literature, art and ritual actions in the present. The ways in which we do this shape and influence how we go forward into the future. This essay explores aspects of the personal, communal and national memorialisation of war and peace and how this remembering presents ongoing challenges for us in the present.

My memory of the observance of ANZAC Day in the 1950s when I was growing up, living in a small town, was of a solemn and sacred day. The morning was observed as a holy day. Church and civic services brought the community together. Young people were inculcated into these observances through parading with youth organisations. An ecumenical Protestant service was led by the local ministers. After the service the old soldiers and youth organisations would march from one direction, and Catholics, who had been attending a separate service in their own church, marched from another direction. They all met together outside the War Memorial Hall which housed the offices of the Returned Services Association. There a civic service was held with the Mayor presiding. Usually an army officer or old soldier would speak, one of the local ministers would lead prayers, and hymns would be sung. There would be a firing of volleys by a unit of cadets from the local high school and the laying of wreaths. The old soldiers and youth organisations would march off, led by the local municipal brass band, the short distance to the clock tower. This was a memorial to those who had taken part in what was then called the “Boer War,” now referred to more correctly as the “Anglo-Boer War” or the “South African War.” There were still some veterans from that war present at the parades in the early 1950s. After laying more wreaths the parade would march some distance to the local recreation ground. There at the Cenotaph, listing those from the local community who were killed in the First World War, more wreaths were laid and volleys fired. The old soldiers would then return to the RSA for a day of reminiscing, aided no doubt by liquid refreshment. The rest of the parade would disband.

There was nothing out of the ordinary in these acts of commemoration. They were repeated throughout the length and breadth of the country. ANZAC Day developed its own rituals: a mixture of funereal sadness and grief, expressions of patriotism and national identity, a strange mixture of religious symbolism and language rooted in the Bible, Christian hymns such as “Eternal Father Strong to Save” and “God of Bethel,” prayers and civic pride (what was described in the United States as a form of “civil-religion”). There was a looking back to South Africa, the First and Second World Wars and some acknowledgment of war in Korea and then later in the fifties, Malaya. The ANZAC Day rituals were an expression of community solidarity with an intermingling of militarism, sacrifice, patriotism and vague hopes about peace.

Fifties children were very aware of the recent war in which our parent’s generation served but we had little sense of its horror. A stream of books and films such as *The Cruel Sea*, *The Dam Busters*, *The Wooden Horse*, *The Great Escape*, and *Colditz Castle*, gave a rather Boys’ Own, romanticised heroic view of war. It was difficult for young people to appreciate what the recent war meant, let alone the First World War.

Bill, a first cousin of my father, was a survivor of the First World War. He was an alcoholic, a petty criminal, an outsider, almost a “Man Alone” figure. We knew that he had been gassed, but we did not really understand what that meant. Bill never married; he was an odd man out. Bill was not only a survivor of the First World War but also a victim. Those men who marched on ANZAC Day wearing their medals, and Bill was one of them, carried memories of war which shaped their lives. They did not talk about its horrors. Only when the remnant of First World War survivors were in their eighties did some of them begin to tell of the awfulness of Gallipoli, the Somme, Messines and Passchendale.⁴ Cecil Burgess is quoted as saying, “I went home to a father, a mother and four sisters and no one ever asked me what it was like. For seventy years no one ever asked me what it was like.”⁵ There was no post-traumatic stress counselling for returned soldiers; no organised programmes to help those struggling with mental and social readjustment haunted by the horrors of war. The rituals surrounding ANZAC Day were the only major public acknowledgement of their service and those who had been killed in war.

As a country, New Zealand takes pride in the contributions its soldiers made in war. The public memorials listing the names of those killed were, as the title of Chris Maclean and Jock Phillips’ book indicates, expressions of community “sorrow and pride”—grief and honour.⁶ First World War memorials are ubiquitous in the New Zealand landscape. They are permanent reminders of past conflicts and what those wars have cost families through the deaths of sons, fathers, brothers and uncles. Jay Winter, in his study of the First World War within the context of “European Cultural History,” entitled his book, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning*. The individual name on a memorial is both a site of memory and mourning. But the individual name is listed among the tens, hundreds and even in some cases, thousands of other names, pointing to the way in which these sites of memory and mourning are both individual and communal memorials. They became surrogate tombstones for both the dead and their grieving relatives who had no bodies to bury or local grave to visit. They are sites which express the involvement of nations in war and perpetuate the memory of those who fought and died. Significantly, they have usually been called “war memorials,” not “peace memorials.” Maclean and Phillips, in describing the “Wellington Citizens Peace Memorial” at the entrance to Parliament, point to the ambiguity of this description, indicating that peace “is not the dominant tone” but rather “triumph and pride.”⁷ For the Second World War, the names of New Zealand’s war dead were often added to existing memorials while government subsidies were given for “living memorials” such as memorial halls and community facilities.⁸

⁴ See for example: Nicholas Boyack and Jane Tolerton, *In the Shadow of War: New Zealand Soldiers Talk About World War One and Their Lives* (Auckland: Penguin, 1990); Jane Tolerton, *An Awfully Big Adventure: New Zealand World War One Veterans Tell Their Stories* (Auckland: Penguin, 2013). These oral testimonies were accompanied by the publication of extracts from diaries and letters: Jock Phillips, Nicholas Boyack and E.P. Malone, eds., *The Great Adventure: New Zealand Soldiers Describe the First World War* (Wellington: Allen & Unwin, 1988); Nicholas Boyack, *Behind the Lines: The Lives of New Zealand Soldiers in the First World War* (Wellington: Allen & Unwin, 1989); Glyn Harper, ed., *Letters from the Battlefield: New Zealand Soldiers Write Home 1914-18* (Auckland: Harper Collins, 2001).

⁵ Quoted on the back cover of Chris Pugsley et al., *Scars on the Heart: Two Centuries of New Zealand At War* (Auckland, David Bateman, 1996).

⁶ Chris Maclean and Jock Phillips, *The Sorrow and the Pride: New Zealand War Memorials* (Wellington: Historical Branch, 1990).

⁷ *Ibid.*, 126.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 137-55.

WAR MUSEUMS (ANTI-WAR MUSEUMS—PEACE MUSEUMS)

Winter writes that “After August 1914, commemoration was an act of citizenship” in which the affirmation of community and assertion of “its moral character” excluded those who had “placed it under threat.” The “collection and preservation for posterity of the ephemera war” was “a patriotic act.” He pointed as an example of this to the founding of the Imperial War Museum in London in 1917, initially at the Crystal Palace, and then, ironically “on the grounds of the former ‘Bedlam’ lunatic asylum.”⁹ The use of museums to perpetuate the memory of a nation’s contribution to war through “housing military objects, and records,” “photographs, manuscripts, books, works of art” is seen in New Zealand and Australia in the Auckland War Memorial Museum, the Waiouru National Army Museum, and the Australian War Memorial Museum in Canberra. These are primarily “War Museums,” rather than “Peace Museums,” in contrast to Ernst Friedrich’s Anti-war Museum in Berlin, set up in 1924. Winter noted that the Berlin Museum’s “collection of documents and gruesome photographs showed everything the patriotic collections omitted.”¹⁰ While noticing the biases of the War Museum and the Anti-war Museum, Winter pointed to the way in which “both arose out of prior political commitments,” concluding that “Commemoration was a political act; it could not be neutral.”¹¹

Friedrich’s first museum was destroyed by Nazis in 1933, indicating that the subversive message of an anti-war museum was not allowed to continue under a Fascist regime. Subsequently, Friedrich opened another museum in Belgium. During the Second World War he joined the French Resistance. Later he opened a museum in Paris. In 1988 the Berlin Anti-Kriegs or Anti-War Museum was opened with a Peace Gallery.¹² The naming is significant, going beyond the anti-war sentiment into a pro-peace approach. Those who opposed war were pro-peace, but as with the message of many protestors, what they were against was often heard more loudly than what they were for.

War Museums not only serve as sites of memory, but also help perpetuate attitudes about war. *Scars on the Heart*, a book about the Auckland War Memorial Museum and New Zealand’s two centuries at war, indicates something of the cost of war as do the list of names in the Museum’s First World War “sanctuary” and Second World War “Hall of Memories.” But the ambiguities seen in the use of military force to achieve peace are unresolved in the way in which these museums commemorate past martial glories and defeats without denouncing war itself as an evil to be avoided. This raises the questions: how far does memorialisation help to normalise war and make it acceptable, or how far does it perpetuate or challenge the glorification of war? Is there a tension between honouring the war dead and promoting peace?

⁹ Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 80.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 81-82.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 82.

¹² “Anti-Kriegs Museum,” n.p. [cited 29 March 2014]. Online: <http://anti-kriegs-museum.de/>.

Jonathan Vance, in examining memorialisation of the First World War in Canada, pointed to the difficulty the memory of the war created for pacifists: “According to that memory,” there was “a choice: either fight to preserve the values that were deemed to underlie society, or sacrifice those values in the interests of preserving peace.” War was seen by the majority, even some who abhorred war, “as a necessary evil.”¹³ New Zealand churches during the First World War, for example, had helped create the rhetoric sanctifying duty, sacrifice and death which assisted the war effort.¹⁴ While strong voices were raised within the churches in favour of peace and the work of the League of Nations in the 1920s and 1930s, the realities of Fascism and the threat to peace were seen by the vast majority in 1939 overriding the calls for peace.¹⁵ The memorialisation of war both reflected and shaped community perceptions.

WAR MEMORIALS

Winter highlights the way in which war memorials carry “symbols of national pride” and at the same time they are “places where people grieved, both individually and collectively.”¹⁶ They are an international phenomenon that has flourished particularly over the last 150 years. In listing names they express the honour given to those who served and were killed; they enshrine the cult of patriotism seen in going to fight and die for your country; they powerfully evoke the commitment made by communities in support of imperial causes; they are evocative sites of gathering to commemorate and remember the deeds of those who fought and in particular those who died. War memorials in New Zealand range from the national and state, civic and public memorials, the humble honours board in churches and schools, to the small towns with their statues, cenotaphs and memorial gates with lists of names.

New Zealand’s National War Memorial in Wellington carries many of the ambiguities associated with the public memorialisation of war. It acts as a national shrine. Clergy from the Anglican Cathedral in Wellington, acting as chaplains to the nation, play an important part in the annual ANZAC Day service at the National War Memorial. The military precision of the honour guard and the laying of wreaths by members of the diplomatic corps are caught up with prayers using Christian formulas and the evocation of national identity.

The building is not a church but is described as “a Hall of Memories.” In the vestibule under the Union Jack and the New Zealand Ensign are plaques with the words:

Let all men know that this is holy ground.

This shrine commemorates our people’s fortitude and sacrifice,
therefore give remembrance.

¹³ Jonathan F. Vance, *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning and the First World War* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997), 30.

¹⁴ Allan K. Davidson, “New Zealand Churches and Death in the First World War,” in *New Zealand’s Great War: New Zealand, the Allies & the First World War* (ed. John Crawford and Ian McGibbon; Auckland: Exisle, 2007), 447-66. See also *ibid.*, Peter Lineham, “First World War Religion,” 467-92.

¹⁵ See Guy, *Shaping Godzone*, 260-82; Allan K. Davidson, “Peace and Pacifism; New Zealand Presbyterians 1901-45,” in *Reforming the Reformation: Essays in Honour of Principal Peter Matheson* (ed. Ian Breward; Melbourne: Australian Scholarly, 2004), 181-96.

¹⁶ Winter, *Sites of Memory*, 79.

They gave their lives for their country, that we might live in peace.

The Hall of Memories has six recesses or “mini-chapels” with “plaques of remembrance” for the forces in which people served. Carved above what is described as “the Sanctuary” (an interesting appropriation of religious language) are doves of peace and words from Psalm 139: “If I climb up into Heaven, thou art there. If I make my bed in Hell, behold thou art there also. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there also shall thy hand lead me and thy right hand shall hold me.”

Lynden Smith’s statue of a *Mother and Children* is the focal point of the sanctuary. This has been described as “both a gentle and powerful image of the suffering and burden carried by a family during time of war.”¹⁷ There is no glorification of war in this representation. The statue is flanked by two large brass urns, Greek symbols of death. Two columns at the front are inscribed with “the coats of arms of members of the Commonwealth” and they are both surmounted by “a cross in bronze and glass.” In the Hall of Memories there is a syncretistic mixture of classical, biblical, Christian, national, and military imagery. The language and symbolism surrounding memory and remembrance of war is charged with multiple meanings and ambiguities. The potential message of peace can very easily be swallowed up by sacrificial, patriotic and militaristic dimensions which these memorials enshrine.

Outside the Hall of Memories is the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior, where the body of a New Zealand First World War soldier was entombed in November 2004. What amounted to a state funeral service in the Anglican Cathedral was part of what has been described as “probably the largest commemorative programme ever undertaken in New Zealand.”¹⁸ Memorialising the war dead, as Winter suggested, is a very powerful political act. The combination of ritual associated with memorials, with its mixture of Christian, military, civic and national symbols and rhetoric is a potent force that has been used in various ways in our history. In the late sixties and early seventies, for example, there was great outrage when protestors used services at public memorials on ANZAC Day as an occasion to challenge New Zealand’s involvement in the Vietnam War. The opposition of war and the cries for peace were heard by many as dishonouring the memory of those who had died in war.¹⁹ There is a question as to how far the almost cultic and mythic aspects around our memorialisation of war can prevent or enhance the promotion of peace.

¹⁷ Ministry of Culture and Heritage, “Hall of Memories,” n.p. [cited 29 March 2014]. Online: <http://www.mch.govt.nz/nz-identity-heritage/national-war-memorial/hall-memories>.

¹⁸ Ministry of Culture and Heritage, “Tomb of the Unknown Warrior,” n.p. [cited 29 March 2014.] Online: <http://www.mch.govt.nz/nz-identity-heritage/national-war-memorial/tomb-unknown-warrior>.

¹⁹ Church and Society Commission, National Council of Churches, *The Observance of Anzac Day* (Auckland: Church and Society Commission, 1972).

REMEMBERING THOSE WHO OPPOSED WAR

In the face of the hundreds of war memorials and the annual rituals associated with memorialisation, how are the voices and memories of those who opposed war, who promoted peace, kept alive? Where are the monuments to the pacifists, the conscientious objectors, the defaulters in New Zealand? What are the rituals which help keep alive their memory? Where in our churches or cathedrals do we have monuments, memorials, honours boards, stained glass windows that memorialise those who opposed war? The name of Ormond Burton is on the Honours Board of St Luke's Presbyterian Church, Auckland, where he is remembered as a First World War soldier, not as New Zealand's leading pacifist in the Second World War.

The irony is that in cathedrals and churches, whose congregations follow "the Prince of Peace," those who have fought in war are remembered, whereas those who opposed war are usually ignored. When the church acts as "chaplain to the nation" it is difficult to condemn war and proclaim peace. Archbishop Robert Runcie at the National Service of Thanksgiving in 1982 held at St Paul's Cathedral in London at the end of the Falklands War incurred the wrath of Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, when he prayed for the dead on both sides of the conflict. Coventry Cathedral, with its ministry of reconciliation, arising out of the ashes of the cathedral's destruction in a bombing raid in 1941, offers a very positive example of constructive memorialisation.

A counter-cultural approach is the Peace Abbey in Sherborn, Massachusetts, a multi-faith retreat centre founded in 1988. In the Conference Center they have what is described as "The Pacifist Living History Museum, containing relics, personal affects, manuscripts and documents placed at the Abbey by members of the Peace Movement, friends and supporters." The Abbey has memorials to Pacifists and to the "Unknown Civilians Killed in War"—a reminder of the millions of victims of warfare who are seldom memorialised or remembered and the ways in which war memorials are often a very masculine construction of memory.²⁰

There are some memorials in New Zealand that help keep alive the witness of people who opposed war and promoted peace. The community led by Te Whiti o Rongomai and Tohu Kakahi at Parihaka in the 1870s and 1880s offered an alternative pathway to the violence and wars of the 1860s. Their passive resistance resulted in many men being taken away to Wellington, Dunedin and Hokitika where they were unjustly imprisoned.²¹ The remembrances in stone in these three places are a silent witness today to an alternative pathway to violence. The Parihaka International Peace Festival, which began in 2006, has become a contemporary vehicle for keeping alive the memory of the Parihaka prophets as well as reaching out to the future with its commitment to peace and sustainability.

Wellington City in 1993 was declared by Mayor Fran Wilde as a "Peace Capital." The City has been active in memorialising peace. It "planted a number of trees and installed a range of sculptures and

²⁰ Peace Abbey, "The Peace Abbey," n.p. [cited 11 Jan. 2000]. Online: <http://www.peaceabbey.org/about/>.

²¹ Richard Knight, "Parihaka Heroes Honoured," *New Zealand Herald* (11 January 2000), n.p. [cited 29 March 2014]. Online: http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=109600.

monuments, commemorating peace and peacemakers” on what is called the Wellington Peace Walk.²² An Auckland Peace Heritage Walk was created in 2009.²³

Memorialisation, keeping alive memory, involves more than physical memorials. Poets, writers and artists have often led the way in expressing opposition to war. The First World War poetry of men like Wilfred Owen and Siegfried Sassoon, and the homespun rhymes of Studdert Kennedy, often with Christian imagery, savagely remind people of the horrors of war. New Zealand does not seem to have produced its own soldier poets. The poet, Basil Dowling, a Presbyterian minister 1938 to 1941, was jailed as a conscientious objector, resigned from the ministry and abandoned his faith. In “Air Bombardment” he evoked the crucifixion of Jesus and the dropping of bombs, concluding: “Once, for our life, a good Man died alone; / But O for what can all this blood atone.”²⁴ “In Time of War,” Dowling again thinking of Jesus, pointed to the “shock and shame of war, while arms the meekness mock” and finds solace in calling

... saints to witness; hear all angels,
Mothers, and martyrs hymn thee in quiet tone;
Christmas and Easter read me their evangels
Of peace in weak and foolish things alone.²⁵

In the area of fiction writers we have produced few notable opponents of war who seize the imagination and inspire readers with the alternative vision of opposing war and thereby promoting a peaceful world. Maurice Gee’s character, Plumb, is based on his grandfather, the onetime Salvation Army Officer, Presbyterian then Unitarian minister, J.H.G. Chapple. Chapple was a pacifist and opposed the First World War. He spent eleven months in jail for “seditious utterance.” Chapple’s socialism and attraction in the 1930s towards Russian communism, however, alienated him from many.²⁶

Ray Grover, in what Gee commended as “likely to be judged our best war novel yet,” *March to the Sound of the Guns*, gives a sympathetic portrayal of soldiers caught up with the fighting in the First World War. James Gibb, the minister at St John’s Presbyterian Church in Wellington, has a prominent part in the novel. Gibb is depicted using his pulpit as a recruiting platform. Gradually as the war comes to its end, Gibb adopts a strongly held pacifism that continued to mould his ministry until his death. One of the main characters, Harry the Christian sniper, returns home and becomes a minister. He is given the last

²² The Peace Foundation, “Wellington as a Peace Capital,” n.p. [cited 29 March 2014]. Online: <http://www.peace.net.nz/index.php?pageID=62#pwalk>.

²³ “Auckland Peace Heritage Walk - a self-guided walk around peace sites in central Auckland,” n.p. [cited 29 March 2014.] Online: <http://www.peace.net.nz/uploads/Auckland%20Peace%20Heritage%20Walk%20Brochure%202010.pdf>. For a list of peace memorials in New Zealand see: “Peace Memorials in New Zealand / Aotearoa,” n.p. [cited 29 March 2014.] Online: http://peace.maripo.com/x_nz_aotearoa.htm.

²⁴ Basil Dowling, *Signs and Wonders* (Christchurch: Caxton Press, 1944), 7.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 8.

²⁶ Maurice Gee, *Plumb* (Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1978). See also Geoff Chapple, “Chapple, James Henry George,” from the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, updated 6-Jun-2013, n.p. [cited 29 March 2014]. Online: <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/3c12/chapple-james-henry-george>.

chapter of the novel, ending with the words, “There it was. A true follower of our Lord must be an apostle of love and labour for peace.”²⁷

In New Zealand non-fiction there is a large library that tells the story of those who opposed war: Archibald Baxter’s classic, *We Will Not Cease*;²⁸ Ormond Burton’s writings; numerous autobiographical accounts by defaulters; biographies such as Ernest Crane’s account of Ormond Burton, *I Can Do No Other*;²⁹ histories of conscientious objectors and pacifism by Elsie Locke and David Grant.³⁰ In the area of television and film there is the poignant story of Rita Graham in Gaylene Preston’s documentary, *War Stories*; Russell Campbell’s powerful documentary, *Sedition: The Suppression of Dissent in World War II New Zealand*; Barry Barclay’s account of the destruction of the Moriori on Rekohu (the Chatham Islands), *The Feathers of Peace*. But while the war dead have their memorials and days of remembrance, pacifists, conscientious objectors and those who opposed war are easily overwhelmed by the mainstream public memorialisation associated with war. The adoption of white poppies as an international symbol “to remember all casualties of war and to promote peace” has provided for some an alternative or a complement to the red poppies traditionally worn on ANZAC Day.³¹

Our national art was still in its infancy when the Second World War broke out. In the paintings of Rita Angus we have some bold statements of her own commitment to pacifism. Much of this work was held in her own collection until after her death and so it had reduced public impact. Angus’ pacifism originated from a combination of socialist and Christian influences. Her paintings are a reminder today of what she and people like her were willing to stand up for. Jill Trevelyan describes *Dona Nobis Pacem* (Grant us Peace) as “the most overt expression of her pacifist vision.” She depicts the English pacifist composer, Ralph Vaughan Williams, who was her friend Douglas Lilburn’s tutor. Williams composed a cantata, *Dona Nobis Pacem* in 1936.³² The painting of the apple and the Nelson landscape in the bottom right probably references the Riverside Community established by Christian Pacifists in 1941 where Angus worked for a period during the war. A painting like this, when it is seen within the context of Angus’ life, takes the viewer into her opposition to war. As she wrote in 1944: “My pacifism and my paintings are now closely linked, I hope all my life.”³³ Angus at some personal cost resisted the attempt to “manpower” her into an

²⁷ Ray Grover, *March to the Sound of the Guns* (Dunedin: Longacre, 2008), 447. See also Laurie Barber, “Gibb, James,” from the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, updated 1-Oct-2013, n.p. [cited 6 April 2014]. Online: <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/2g5/gibb-james>.

²⁸ Archibald Baxter, *We Will Not Cease: The Autobiography of a Conscientious Objector* (2nd ed.; Christchurch: Caxton, 1968).

²⁹ Ernest Crane, *I Can Do No Other: A Biography of Ormond Burton* (Auckland: Hodder & Stoughton, 1986). See also O.E. Burton, *The Silent Division - and Concerning One Man’s War 1914-1919* (Christchurch: John Douglas Publishing, 2014). For examples of publications about and by defaulters see: W. J. Foote, *Bread and Water: The Escape & Ordeal of Two New Zealand World War II Conscientious Objectors* (Wellington: Philip Garside, 2000); Alan Handyside, *Indeterminate Sentence* (Wellington: Philip Garside, 2005); Walter Lawry, *We Said No To War!* (Dunedin: Wordspinners, 1994).

³⁰ Elsie Locke, *Peace People: A History of Peace Activities in New Zealand* (Christchurch: Hazard, 1992); David Grant, *Out in the Cold: Pacifists and Conscientious Objectors in New Zealand during World War II* (Auckland: Reed Methuen, 1986); David Grant, *A Question of Faith: A History of the New Zealand Christian Pacifist Society* (Wellington: Philip Garside, 2004).

³¹ Peace Movement Aotearoa, “White Poppies for Peace,” n.p. [cited 29 March 2014]. Online: <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/poppy09.htm#history>.

³² Jill Trevelyan, *Rita Angus: An Artist’s Life* (Wellington, Te Papa Press, 2008), 178.

³³ *Ibid.*, 178.

essential industry, declaring: “I believe that in living, is the task of peace, and not killing, which is war. If men and women gave to the creation of life, and not to destruction, the peoples of this world would live in greatness, without false ideals.”³⁴

In the work of artists such as Lois White, Colin McCahon, Ralph Hotere, Gil Hanley and Nigel Brown there are statements against war and militarism, its horror and its destructive force. Artists, poets and writers, are often the visionaries who keep alive for us the memory of those who campaigned for peace and enable us to see alternative possibilities.

WAR CEMETERIES

War cemeteries are a powerful site of memorialisation. In New Zealand, fortunately, we do not have the vast cemeteries that crowd northern France and southern Belgium although there are over sixty memorials “to the dead of the New Zealand Wars.”³⁵ The disastrous Northern War in the Bay of Islands in 1844-45 can be recalled in the graveyards at St John’s Church at Waimate North, Christ Church Russell and St Michael’s Ohaewai. The memorial at St Michael’s was erected over Pakeha soldiers with the words in Maori: “This burying-place was laid out by the Maoris after the making of peace.”³⁶

Among the memorials and burial grounds for the New Zealand Wars of the 1860s are: St John’s Te Awamutu where soldiers killed at Rangiwahia are buried; at All Saints, Howick; at Te Papa, the Mission, Tauranga, where both Maori and Pakeha soldiers who were killed at Gate Pa are remembered; and at St Mary’s New Plymouth. Some of the memorials from the New Zealand Wars have become controversial because of their wording and their colonial construction of memory. That was the case at St Mary’s New Plymouth where a one-sided Eurocentric view of the Taranaki War was reflected in wording on tombstones and the placement of regimental hatchments inside the church. Over time these views were challenged and a memorial panel installed depicting “two warring tribes ... reconciled through the love of two young people.” This serves as a reminder that “By mutual acceptance of the God of Love, the two peoples, Maori and Pakeha, can live together in common respect and peace.”³⁷ The past is not erased here by removing memorials. Through honestly recognising the deep division caused by war, symbols can help point to the way of reconciliation and peace-making. The Peace Altar Frontal being made at St Mary’s as “a memorial for Te Whiti o Rongomai, Tohu Kakahi and their followers” is seen as contributing “to the conversation of reconciliation.”³⁸ Sites of memory and memorialisation can help a community to

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 184.

³⁵ New Zealand History Online, “New Zealand War Memorials,” n.p. [cited 29 March 2014.] Online: <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/war/new-zealand-wars-memorials>.

³⁶ New Zealand History Online, “Ohaewai NZ Wars Memorial,” n.p. [cited 29 March 2014.] Online: <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/media/photo/ohaewai-nz-wars-memorial-cross>.

³⁷ The Taranaki Cathedral Church of St Mary, “Love One Another,” n.p. [cited 29 March 2014.] Online: http://www.taranakicathedral.org.nz/maori_memorial.php.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, “Peace Altar Frontal,” n.p. [cited 29 March 2014.] Online: <http://www.taranakicathedral.org.nz/peace-altar-frontal.php>.

understand the past proleptically so that formerly divided communities can live more justly in the present and into the future.

The European war cemeteries were intended to bring comfort to the grieving and be a permanent record of the death and sacrifice of those killed. The visit of Australasian young people to Gallipoli in recent years has become almost a rite of passage and a necessary part of the Overseas Experience. There is a form of secular pilgrimage in visiting these sites where battles have taken place, soldiers have been killed and memorials erected. A strong personal resonance is evoked where a relative lies buried or whose name is engraved on a memorial. And yet there is a disjunction between the past and the present. There is something almost surreal standing at North Beach, Gallipoli, where the annual commemorations on ANZAC Day are held, with the “Sphinx” and cliffs towering above from which Turkish soldiers shot down on the landing soldiers. The nearby memorial with the famous words of the Turkish General, Kemal Ataturk, who made his reputation at Gallipoli, highlight the tragedy and legacy of war:

Those heroes who shed their blood and lost their lives, you are now lying in the soil of a friendly country. Therefore rest in peace. There is no difference between the Johnnies and the Mehmets to us where they lie side by side in this country of ours. You, the mothers who sent their sons from far away countries wipe away your tears, your sons are now lying in our bosoms and are in peace. After having lost their lives on this land they become our sons as well.³⁹

High above ANZAC Cove stands the New Zealand memorial at Chunuk Bair. Here Colonel Malone and the Wellington Regiment gained a sight of the Dardanelles in the distance only to be repulsed and killed. Inscribed on the towering monument are the words: “They came from the ends of the earth.” As distance intervenes between the then and the now the loss of life of both “allies” and “enemies” hits home. War memorials in their own way can serve as pointers to peace in the present.

There is a quiet beauty at many of the war cemeteries with the headstones lined up with military precision. This cannot erase the sense of horror that they evoke as you survey the ages of those who died. At Cassino, the Second World War Commonwealth Cemetery is overlooked by the rebuilt Benedictine Monastery which the Allies bombed. The Cross of Sacrifice in the cemetery is invested with all the pathos of the death of Jesus and yet the connection between a man crucified by Roman soldiers and the death of soldiers in combat is ambiguous. In order to justify war there has developed a rhetoric which co-opts Jesus, the “Prince of Peace.” A supreme irony is faced at the entrance way to Monte Cassino with the Benedictine motto “Pax” above the portal. The rebuilding of the monastery is itself a testament and pointer to Pax/Peace.

At Maleme, on Crete, there is a thought-provoking experience when you see the sign: “Late Minoan Tholos Tomb” (dating back some three and a half thousand years) above the sign pointing to the German War Cemetery. The tombs of a previous era have become an archaeological site. As time passes, what will become of the twentieth century war cemeteries? Above the airstrip where the New Zealand soldiers were

³⁹ Words transcribed from a photo taken by the author.

repulsed in 1941, the bodies of the German dead were not interred until 1971 and the cemetery not consecrated until 1973. Coming to terms with the dead, particularly of those who were seen as the invaders, was a long and painful business for the people of Crete. The signage includes words of Albert Schweitzer, the German missionary doctor and Noble peace laureate: “The soldier’s graves are the greatest preachers of peace”; and “The dead of this cemetery admonish to peace.”⁴⁰ Memorials to the dead in war are not only sites of memory but can also serve as reminders of peace.

MEMORIALS TO PEACE

Those who opposed war probably would not want their names kept alive on memorials, in statues or stained glass. Without some form of memorialisation, however, we can too easily erase from our historical memory their sacrifice. A creative use of the money given to New Zealand by the French Government in compensation for the sinking of the *Rainbow Warrior* is the website, “Lest We Forget—Remembering Peacemakers on ANZAC Day.” Eleven New Zealanders are named and biographical information given about them.⁴¹

In *All the Saints*, which provides background detail about those listed in the New Zealand Anglican Calendar, there is material for ANZAC Day on 25 April, and a day entitled “Prayers for Peace” although with no designated day. The calendar includes people like Dietrich Bonhoeffer who died as a result of his implication in the bomb plot against Hitler, Maximilian Kolbe the Catholic priest who took the place of someone else in going to the gas chamber, Heni Te Kiri Karamu who supplied water to soldiers dying at the Battle of Gate Pa, Te Whiti o Rongomai the great Parihaka prophet of peace, Henare Taratoa who carried with him battle instructions based on the New Testament, and Wiremu Tamihana who valiantly sought peace in the face of Pakeha aggression.⁴² Should the church calendar be extended to include Methodists such as Ormond and Helen Burton or Archibald Barrington; or Anglicans like Charles Chandler the Dean of Hamilton who was prominent in his opposition to war, or Thurlow and Kathleen Thompson, noted Anglican pacifist leaders in Christchurch?

Christians are shaped and moulded far more than they often realise by the ritual activities in which they engage: memory—“Do this in remembrance of me”—action—“Whenever you break this bread and drink this cup you remember me.” Looking back to the past from our position in the present to go forward into the future, that is part of the challenge of good liturgy. Shirley Murray, in her hymn for ANZAC Day, has provided words that honour both those who fought and those who opposed war. The

⁴⁰ Wording copied by the author when visiting Maleme, Crete.

⁴¹ Those named are: A. Lois White, Alan Graham, Archibald Baxter, John Miller, Malcolm Kendall-Smith, Merv Browne and Chris Palmer, Ormond Burton, Rod Donald, Rua Kenana, Te Whiti o Rongomai, Moana Cole, along with the Families of Conscientious Objectors. “Lest We Forget: Remembering Peacemakers on ANZAC Day,” n.p. [cited 2 April 2014]. Online: <http://lestweforget.org.nz/>.

⁴² Ken Booth, *For All the Saints: A Resource for the Commemorations of the Calendar* (Hastings: Anglican Church, 1996), 489-91, 506, 120-33, 302-304, 139-43, 415-20, 229-33, 235-39. This material is reproduced at: The Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia, “For All the Saints: A Resource for the Commemoration of the Calendar,” n.p. [cited 7 April 2014]. Online: <http://www.anglican.org.nz/Resources/Lectionary-and-Worship/For-All-the-Saints>.

“fighting brave” and those buried in a “foreign grave are to be honoured.” The tears that flow are for “places ravaged,” “young bones buried in mud.” Those who followed their conscience and opposed war are honoured, who “suffered in prisons of contempt and shame, / branded as cowards in our country’s name.” Tears flow for the waste and cost of war, the ache and pain of loss, the continuing sanction of war. Honouring the dream of those who died for a better world leads on to honouring “their vision on this solemn day, / Peace known in freedom, peace the only way.”⁴³ The honouring of conscientious objectors in this hymn has provoked some negative reaction from those who have difficulty reconciling memorialisation of those who have died in war with remembrance of those who opposed it.⁴⁴ Shirley Murray wrote about how Ormond Burton’s address to a student conference she attended was the inspiration for this hymn. She concluded: “Whenever you sing this hymn, don’t focus only on the past—think of what you can do for positive peacemaking in your lifetime, and respect those who will never commit themselves to killing another family’s son or daughter in warfare.”⁴⁵ The most effective memorialisation of both those who were killed in war and those who opposed war is to pray and work for peace.

⁴³ For the full words of the hymn, © Shirley Erena Murray 2005, see Liturgy, “Hymn for ANZAC Day,” n.p. [cited 7 April 2014]. Online: <http://liturgy.co.nz/anzac-day>.

⁴⁴ See for example, Amanda Wells, “Hymn writer stresses the power of words,” n.p. [cited 7 April 2014]. Online: <http://www.presbyterian.org.nz/publications/spanz-magazine/2009/december-2009/hymn-writer-stresses-the-power-of-words>.

⁴⁵ Mission Resourcing Network, Uniting Church of Australia, “Hymn for ANZAC Day,” n.p. [cited 6 Oct. 2009]. Online: <http://mrn.sa.uca.org.au/component/content/article/531-hymn-for-anzac-day.html>.

LAURIE GUY: A CRITICAL APPRECIATION

MARTIN SUTHERLAND

Laidlaw College

(MSutherland@laidlaw.ac.nz)

I have had the privilege of engaging with Laurie Guy across his entire quarter century of teaching at Carey Baptist College. In 1990 I was completing my undergraduate degree via the Auckland Consortium for Theological Education's arrangement with the University of Auckland. In that final year I included a number of history papers, in order to prepare me for subsequent postgraduate study at the University of Canterbury. Laurie had begun teaching part-time at the college and was also completing history papers, in his case for the Master of Arts. On Tuesdays we would travel together to the Auckland campus, discussing method, politics, church trends, our current essays, etc. This was the fertile beginning of a connection that would a few years later cement itself around our collegial relationship as lecturers at Carey. Laurie was appointed to the lecturing staff in 1991; I began in 1995. We would be close colleagues for thirteen years, until I departed to take up my current role at Laidlaw College.

Laurie and I had much in common: a background in law (Laurie as a trained Barrister and Solicitor, I as a Court Registrar), training in history, and a commitment to mission as the context for theology. This did not mean, however, that we naturally agreed on all or many issues. The shared shaping of our backgrounds had one obvious effect, which could be at times a little disturbing to our other colleagues: we argued a lot. Both of us were used to environments of robust debate and the need to penetrate to the source of an issue to wrestle the truth out of it. Staff meetings and tea-room conversations could frequently narrow to the two of us contending for strongly held positions. There was much (then, as now) on which we did not agree, but the robust contention did not (as was sometimes feared by those around us) signal or create a lack of friendship or respect. Indeed, in my case, I came to regard Laurie as one of those few in whom one could fully entrust one's soul. We would tussle over college policy and plans but just as frequently, and to more lasting effect, we would engage issues which touched our teaching and research interests. I have therefore walked with most of Laurie's projects as a critical friend and it is in that spirit that I offer this reflection on his work.

The focus of this essay will be on Laurie's multi-faceted published work, but note must first be taken of Laurie as a teacher. This is no mere polite aside, as the concerns Laurie brought to his research both reflected and informed his teaching. In small colleges one is often handed, at short notice, classes and themes which are not particular areas of expertise. In our recently-completed joint history of Carey Baptist College, Laurie notes that, in his first years, he was called on to teach "church history, homiletics and missions courses, but his initial primary responsibility was New Testament." There was in fact some

student concern that his qualifications in New Testament studies were inadequate. As he suggests, at least on appointment, Laurie was “the last of the generalists.”¹ This is a tough assignment, especially when one has to take over a course another lecturer has been teaching, often with the dubious advantage of using their notes and materials. It takes some time to develop one’s own voice. But develop his own voice in the classroom Laurie most certainly did. Gradually he became able to specialize, primarily in history but, fruitfully as will be seen, also in aspects of New Testament studies. Laurie became one of the most popular lecturers, with a keen eye for application and for the essential points that students needed to absorb. As crucially, his sensitivity to his students, especially those whose cultural backgrounds made western-style learning a challenge, reveals his dual commitments to mission and to stripping away the unnecessary. Both may be observed in his scholarship.

By any analysis, Laurie Guy’s scholarly output is impressive, especially given the fact that he made a late start. Almost all his published work has come within the last 15 years of his career. It would be wrong, however, to conclude he was a late bloomer. Laurie was marked for academic success from High School. He was successful in the national scholarship examination system of the day and could have taken up a range of tertiary options. In the event, he pursued history and law at the University of Auckland. Here too he gained some distinction, completing an LLB (Hons) with a dissertation on the arcane legal concept of “The assignability of choses in action.”² The course of Laurie’s career, however, was not to be a straight line into specialized jurisprudence. After a period practising law, he trained for Baptist ministry. Typically, however, church ministry alone was insufficient to contain his restless mind and after a time he returned to part-time legal practice alongside his pastoral work. By now his concern for mission was clarifying. In 1983 the family moved to West New Britain in Papua New Guinea under the auspices of the New Zealand Baptist Missionary Society. As that season came to an end, Laurie’s academic skills and interests meant that first study, then a secondment to the N.Z. Baptist Theological College (later Carey) made sense. He arrived there on this basis in 1990 and was appointed as a permanent full-time lecturer in late 1991.

Conscious of his “generalist” demands and aware of his thin academic preparation Laurie speedily completed not one but two Masters degrees—the first in history, the second in New Testament. This established a pattern, whereby Laurie’s growing confidence in scholarship would never become limited to one field or discipline. An engagement with his published work must thus recognize at least four strands, each of which reveal aspects of his central concerns.

- a) *Ways of reading the New Testament*, represented in The Master of Theology thesis, which produced a chapter in a *festschrift* for Principal Brian Smith, and then powerfully in his study on the book of Revelation which is in turn about to be supplemented with a forthcoming second book on the apocalypse.

¹ Martin Sutherland and Laurie Guy, *An Unfolding Story: a history of Carey Baptist College* (Auckland: Archer Press, 2014), 183.

² This dissertation is held in the Davis Law Library at the University of Auckland (Laurie Guy, 1969). For the uninitiated (including me, I had to look it up) “choses in action” are legal rights or claims which are valid but need to be established as such through legal action.

- b) *The experience of the early church*, found most extensively in his 2004 volume *Introducing Early Christianity: a Topical Survey of its Life, Beliefs and Practices*.
- c) *The experience of the church in New Zealand*, including a source book of Baptist documents, a small number of articles and the college history.
- d) *The church's response to public issues in New Zealand*. This will be seen to be Laurie's principal focus, at least in terms of the extent and significance of his published work.

READING THE NEW TESTAMENT

When he commenced as a lecturer in 1991 Laurie was conscious of the essential truth behind some student concerns that he was not sufficiently qualified to teach in his designated area of New Testament studies. With his historical studies for the moment cleared away he launched into a Masters degree in the subject. This was awarded in 1996 by the Australian College of Theology for a thesis entitled "Here, there, among and within: a critique of western dichotomous approaches to the Kingdom of God with reference to selected passages in the Gospel of Luke." Although skilled in Greek, Laurie did not limit himself to a merely technical exegesis here. This was a thesis inspired by the mission field rather than the lexicon. In a later essay, drawn from this material, he notes that "missionaries have the privilege of being allowed into another world, of being enriched by another culture and of recognising that what our own culture takes for granted is often, in fact, not to be taken for granted, that there are other ways of thinking and perceiving and valuing."³ Addressing this missionary insight to the world of biblical interpretation Laurie cites the Chinese concept(s) of Yin and Yang as an example of an alternative way of understanding which enables a release from "western dichotomous approaches" to reading New Testament texts. His test case is Jesus' enigmatic response in Luke 17:20-21 to the demand from the Pharisees as to when the Kingdom would come. Reading with different eyes enables us to recognise "the possibility that Luke has intentionally juxtaposed present-and-future-oriented material in Luke 17:20-18:8 in order to express a total understanding.... His language is allusive, suggestive, equivocal. It embodies a richness of meaning which is lost if one views the Kingdom solely, or even primarily, as either present or future in Luke."⁴

Laurie's concern is typically missional: how are we to read the Scripture more effectively? For a time he now turned his focus elsewhere. A more conventional New Testament PhD thesis might have been the logical next step, but not for Laurie. He needed to return to history. However the concern for better reading of the scriptures did not disappear. It surfaced again in 2009 with his short study *Making Sense of the Book of Revelation* in the Regents Park Study Guides series.⁵ Disturbed at the poor use of Revelation in popular Christianity Laurie sets out to bring the fruits of good scholarship to bear in a manner which enables the glory of the text fully to be captured. Employing his expertise as both an

³ Laurie Guy, "The Kingdom, Present and Future," in *Mission Beyond Christendom: exploring the site* (ed. Martin Sutherland; Auckland: Carey Baptist College, 2000), 63-78, 63.

⁴ Guy, "The Kingdom," 78. See also Laurie Guy, "The Interplay of the Present and Future in the Kingdom of God (Luke 19:11-44)," *Tyndale Bulletin* 48, 1 (1997): 119-37.

⁵ Laurie Guy, *Making Sense of the Book of Revelation* (Oxford: Regent's Park College, 2009).

historian and a biblical scholar he includes a key chapter on “The Social Context of Revelation” which begins:

It is a great pity that there is commonly a huge gulf between the insights of academic scholars and the views of much populist writing in relation to the Book of Revelation. For this gulf, academic scholars are significantly to blame. Commonly they write primarily for fellow academics. The result is that their arguments are often too dense, too complex, too rarefied for the non-expert. A main purpose of this book is to attempt to bridge that gap.⁶

It seems Laurie largely achieved his goal. The book is often cited in ministry and preaching websites and a second volume “Unlocking Revelation” is to be published by Paternoster.

THE EARLY CHURCH

Laurie has never regarded himself as a New Testament specialist. His areas of greatest concentration have been historical. As indicated, however, even here his interests are many. Most closely linked to his teaching is his work on the early church. The outstanding contribution in this area has been the 2004 *Introducing Early Christianity: a Topical Survey of its Life, Beliefs and Practices*.⁷ Here Laurie deliberately took an unusual approach. The topical arrangement, as compared to the more complex and potentially confusing chronological approach, sets this textbook (for that is what it is intended to be) apart from most others in the field. This is Laurie the up-to-date scholar once again writing with a mission. It is another attempt to bridge a gap. It is “a book for the educated layperson and the undergraduate student....seeking to make modern scholarship available to a more general audience.”⁸

Introducing Early Christianity is Laurie’s best seller. It may not be found in too many airport bookshops, but it remains in print ten years on and the paperback version has been reprinted at least ten times. Reviewers have been enthusiastic, if a little cautious about the limitations of the format. Such reservations are of course unfair. There is no value in reviewing a book the author has *not* written. Accepting what the volume sets out to be, Peter J. Judge, in a lengthy review in *Review of Biblical Literature* sums up its value:

[The author] does not take too much for granted, but he does not insult his reader’s intelligence; he provides plenty of detail but does not sink into a morass of intricacy that can frustrate one who wants intelligently to grasp the big picture.... Guy demonstrates his own command of the material in his comments and analysis along with that of other scholars, as he appropriately draws on the secondary literature as well. This, again, is a rewarding way to

⁶ Guy, *Making Sense of the Book of Revelation*, 15.

⁷ Laurie Guy, *Introducing Early Christianity: a Topical Survey of its Life, Beliefs and Practices* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2004).

⁸ Guy, *Introducing Early Christianity*, 7.

be introduced to these materials, a way that inspires confidence in the student who wishes to go further.⁹

Judge is describing, of course, the ideal textbook. One which succeeds when the user can say, “I know how to explore further!”¹⁰ It is Laurie Guy at his communicative best.

Laurie has published little else on early church topics. However, one of the secondary items he cites in his textbook is his own article on baptism rituals. “‘Naked’ Baptism in the Early Church: The Rhetoric and the Reality” appeared in the *Journal of Religious History* in 2003.¹¹ Potentially prurient interest aside, this article reveals another aspect of Laurie’s scholarship. Although a generalist in many matters, he at times would get the bit between his teeth on a particular fine point. In this case the issue at stake is the use and meaning of the word *gymnos* in early references to baptism. Always alert to the social context, Laurie was able to argue that the literal sense “naked” need not be assumed and that the shedding of outer clothing only was more likely, especially in the case of female candidates. A strange point to argue? Actually one with significant ramifications, as it potentially called into question whether baptism of females was regarded in the same sacramental light as that of males, and thereby requiring to be performed by a male priest. It is difficult to make original contributions in early church studies, especially from New Zealand. However it is a shame that Laurie, clearly with such a grasp of the overall picture, was not drawn to more such targeted work.

THE CHURCH IN NEW ZEALAND

Sources and gaps in early church studies may be difficult to pursue but the same is clearly not the case for the history of the church in New Zealand. Here too Laurie has played his part. Most recently he provided new impetus and the final sections which enabled the completion of the history of Carey Baptist College, cited earlier. Yet, it is clear that the internal life of the church has not been a principal interest. Once again we come up against the outward, missional focus Laurie brings to all matters. This is illustrated in his volume of documents on Baptist life in twentieth century New Zealand (2005).¹² This was a companion to a volume covering the colonial period, which I had edited a few years earlier. Laurie and I worked closely on the planning and production of his volume. I remember well his natural inclination to focus on mission and society issues and his concomitant reluctance to seek out material illustrating the internal and constitutional dynamics of the denomination. He was eventually persuaded, but the debate indicates the commitment he has shown to public and social issues, which we will discuss in greater depth below.

As with the early church, Laurie’s interest could be piqued by particular issues. He once considered a major study of the ructions at the Auckland Tabernacle in the 1940s—a series of controversies that

⁹ Peter Judge, review of Laurence D. Guy, *Introducing Early Christianity: A Topical Survey of its Life, Beliefs and Practices*, *Review of Biblical Literature*, 9 (2007), 489-93.

¹⁰ Judge, review of Laurence D. Guy, 490.

¹¹ Laurie Guy, “‘Naked’ Baptism in the Early Church: The Rhetoric and the Reality,” *Journal of Religious History* 27, 2 (June 2003), 133-42.

¹² Laurie Guy, ed., *Baptists in Twentieth-Century New Zealand: documents illustrating Baptist life and development* (Auckland: Baptist Research and Historical Society, 2005).

rocked the entire denomination—but felt the outcome could only be negative. Of greater interest has been the more flamboyant public ministries area. In 2005 he was published in the Ecclesiastical History Society proceedings on the ministry of A.H. Dallimore.¹³ In a 2007 article in the *Pacific Journal of Baptist Research* he related the Ivor Powell mission of 1955-56.¹⁴ And in 2010 he joined a number of scholars in a book on spirit possession in which Laurie examined the deliverance ministry of the Auckland Assembly of God.¹⁵ Yet, these exceptions prove a rule. Laurie is largely impatient of church-focused, “in-house stuff.” Missionally, theologically, historically, personally, his chief interest lies elsewhere, in the challenging and complex world of social issues and public engagement. It is in this area that the bulk of his published historical work is to be found and arguably where he has made the greatest contribution to scholarship.

PUBLIC ISSUES

Given Laurie’s particular attention to the issue of homosexuality, his many contributions on that subject need to be treated separately as a group. He has, of course, turned his attention frequently to wider public issues. This interest runs right back to the early 1990s with his 1992 M.A. research essay on “The cinematograph film censorship debate in New Zealand, 1965-76.” This would be summarised in his first publication in the *New Zealand Journal of Baptist Research* in 1998.¹⁶ He would follow this up with studies of pacifism,¹⁷ prohibition,¹⁸ and sabbath observance.¹⁹ In 2009 this attention to the regulation of public morality and in particular the role of Christians and the churches in the issues broadened to a re-examination of the 1954 Mazengarb enquiry into underage sex.²⁰ All this is an impressive enough list of studies but they were but preparation for a much larger overview of related questions.

Shaping Godzone: Public Issues and Church Voices in New Zealand 1840-2000 appeared in 2011, published by Victoria University Press.²¹ At over 600 pages it is clearly Laurie’s “big book” and it examines all the types of issues that have compelled his religious history writing. Racism, biculturalism, sex and sexuality, prohibition, war and pacifism, sabbath observance, censorship: subjects he had written on and spoken to for years. It is a massive effort, though not, in my view, his most important. For positive reasons outlined below I will suggest that another of his books deserves recognition as his most significant contribution to

¹³ Laurie Guy, “Miracles, Messiahs and the Media: the Ministry of A.H. Dallimore in Auckland in the 1930s,” in *Signs, Wonders, Miracles: Representations of Divine Power in the Life of the Church* (eds. K. Cooper & J. Gregory; Studies in Church History 41; Woodbridge: Ecclesiastical History Society, 2005), 453- 63.

¹⁴ Laurie Guy, “‘The Man from Wales’: A Study of the Mission of Ivor Powell in New Zealand 1955-1956,” *PJBR* 3/1 (April 2007): 21-46.

¹⁵ Laurie Guy, “Spirit Possession and Deliverance Ministry in the Auckland Assembly of God, 1970–1983,” in *Spirit Possession, Theology and Identity: A Pacific Exploration* (ed. E. Wainwright; Hindmarsh, Sth. Aust.: ATF, 2010), 209-40.

¹⁶ Laurie Guy, “The Cinematograph Film Censorship Debate in New Zealand, 1965-1976,” *NZJBR* 3 (1998): 19-39.

¹⁷ Laurie Guy, “Baptist Pacifists in New Zealand: Creating division in the fight for peace,” *Baptist Quarterly* 40/8 (2004): 488-99.

¹⁸ Laurie Guy, “‘Romanists’ for Rum, Baptists against Booze: Two Churches in the struggle over prohibition in 1919,” *PJBR* 2/1 (April 2006): 63-82.

¹⁹ Laurie Guy, “The Rise and Fall of the Sabbath in New Zealand 1860-2000,” *PJBR* 5/2 (October 2009): 5-38.

²⁰ Laurie Guy, “‘Moral Panic’ or Pejorative Labelling? Rethinking the Mazengarb Inquiry into Underage Sex in the Hutt Valley in 1954,” *Journal of Religious History* 33, 4 (December 2009): 435–51.

²¹ Laurie Guy, *Shaping Godzone: Public Issues and Church Voices in New Zealand 1840-2000* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2011).

New Zealand religious history. What, then, of *Shaping Godzone*? Is it open to critique? In my view, yes. Laurie will recognise echoes of tea-room wrangles when I suggest that there is not enough church in his big book. Naturally I wish to avoid the reviewer's curse, already mentioned, of demanding a book not written. This book is a huge achievement, one which probably no-one among us but Laurie could have pulled together, but I wonder if the churches don't disappear into the issues. More than one reviewer (some pushing their own barrows) has pointed out that the author's disapproval of a number of historical church attitudes or campaigns comes through clearly, at times sharply.²² In and of itself I do not regard this as a fault. The best history (or at least the most influential) is usually opinionated in some way. However, what I would have valued, and what Laurie's natural impatience with "in-house stuff" perhaps precluded, was a more sensitive exploration of *why* our forebears thought as they did. By such, I suggest, we are more likely to recognise our contemporary blind spots. So, extensive as it is, in my view *Shaping Godzone* does not provide a full picture. In the final analysis no one book could, of course, and despite my questions, it comes closest yet to a Christian narrative of the New Zealand story.

I turn, finally, to the corpus of work Laurie has produced on the social issue which has clearly fascinated him and which was the focus of his PhD research: the New Zealand debate over homosexuality. His work in this area has been prodigious, leading to a stunning range of article-length treatments and of course the monograph (also with Victoria University Press) which contains the findings of the PhD research. I will return to the monograph with its infamous pink cover directly. It is, however, worth noting first the remarkable nature of the project itself. As do many Christian historians, Laurie elected to conduct his research under the auspices of a secular institution, in this case, the University of Auckland, where he was ably supervised by Linda Bryder and Judith Bassett. This in itself was clearly the sound choice. Christian historians, no less than any others, will be credible only if they are attuned to the conventions of the discipline and its debates. However, to choose a topic imbued with this level of passion and controversy and to submit methodology and findings to that wider environment was a bold decision. The project without question would have failed had he not done so, but it is the measure of Laurie's commitment to this level of public engagement that he pursued it in the way he did. He built relationships with many among the gay community and gained access to key players and archives. The result was a thesis produced in not much longer than the minimum time, during most of which he was carrying a full lecturing load at Carey.

In 2002 the thesis was published as *Worlds in Collision: the Gay Debate in New Zealand, 1960-1986*. It has become one of the standard texts on this area of social history in New Zealand. Reviewing the book in the *New Zealand Journal of History*,²³ David Hilliard of Flinders University concluded it was "to be warmly welcomed as a significant contribution to our understanding of New Zealand society in the latter half of the twentieth century." Importantly, Hilliard also ponders the unexpectedly measured and even handed treatment of the issues.

²² See eg. Jonathan Beazer, *New Zealand Sociology* 28/1 (2013), 175; Paul Morris "Retro Righteous Indignation," *New Zealand Books*, December 2011; Mike Grimshaw, *NZ Journal of History* 46/1 (2012), 110.

²³ *New Zealand Journal of History* 37, 2 (2003): 220.

As a lecturer in the New Zealand Baptist Theological College, in a denomination whose members were mostly vehemently opposed to relaxing the law on male homosexuality, Guy understands the mind-set and rhetoric of religious conservatives and fundamentalists but he maintains a critical stance. Not many historians of this subject have managed to present the views of both sides with such balance.

This is a fair assessment and a stunning endorsement for any historian. That more can be and has been said on the subject matter is obvious, but the tone and excellence of Laurie's work was such that his standing as a voice to be heard on the matter was securely established. It is, moreover, research which has continued to bear fruit.

Some half-dozen substantial papers and articles plus numerous columns have appeared.²⁴ Laurie has presented in medical forums and in various news media as well as to a wide variety of interested church groups from youth to retired ministers. Indeed, here we get to the nub of the significance of this body of Laurie's work, and in fact his contribution to Christian scholarship in New Zealand. Laurie has been invited to address the fraught and complex, certainly controversial issues of human sexuality in many places, to many audiences. He has done so with aplomb and with wide acceptance. He has taken stances, most recently over marriage equality with which not everyone agrees. Yet, he remains a voice to be heard in the public square and among the churches. That is a massive achievement. There are many voices on such issues, clamouring to be taken notice of, but few achieve the audiences that Laurie has. Why? Because his views are anchored in a deep, scholarly understanding of his subject matter. He is in fact a great advertisement for the PhD process. Few others reach the audiences he does—because, put simply, most know little about which they speak. Laurie has shown what genuine scholarship can produce.

There is another sense in which Laurie's work in issues of sexuality is significant for all of us seeking to be Christian scholars in the contemporary world. Here is someone who has successfully tackled the most controversial of issues and more than held his own in the marketplace of ideas. Peter Lineham has recently noted that, although the flourishing of religious history in this country has yet to register a major impact on general histories, "as the single narrative of New Zealand history is slowly dislodged, it is bound to happen."²⁵ It will be work of the calibre of Laurie's which achieves this breakthrough. He has shown that, if prepared well, Christians can indeed live in the public square. If this can be done with a question as divisive societally as homosexuality has been, then other issues need not intimidate us. Christians in universities have known this for a long time but scholars in the denominational and independent colleges have often found it easier to recycle the same issues to the same weary audiences.

²⁴ See e.g. Laurie Guy, "'Straightening the Queers': Medical Perspectives on Homosexuality with Particular Reference to Mid-Twentieth Century New Zealand," *Health and History* 2, 2 (2000): 101-20; Laurie Guy, "Between a Hard Rock and Shifting Sands: Churches and the Issue of Homosexuality in New Zealand, 1960-86," *Journal of Religious History*, 30, 1 (February 2006): 61-76; Laurie Guy, "Evangelicals & the Homosexual Law Reform Debate 1985-1986," *Stimulus: The New Zealand Journal of Christian Thought and Practice* 13, 4 (2005): 69-77; Laurie Guy, "Is gay good?: Responding to Brian Harris's discussion of Stanley Grenz in the context of the Gay Marriage debate," *Stimulus: The New Zealand Journal of Christian Thought and Practice* 19/ 3 (Nov 2012):18-26.

²⁵ Peter J. Lineham, "Trends in Religious History in New Zealand: from Institutional to Social History," *History Compass* 12/4 (2014): 333-43.

Laurie Guy has shown us a better way.

Not bad for a generalist.

LAURIE GUY: SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

An Unfolding Story: A History of Carey Baptist College. Auckland: Archer Press, 2014 (co-authored with Martin Sutherland).

Shaping Godzone: Public Issues and Church Voices in New Zealand, 1840-2000. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2011.

Making Sense of the Book of Revelation (Regent's Study Guides 15). Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2009.

Baptists in Twentieth Century New Zealand. Auckland: NZ Baptist Research and Historical Society, 2005 (edited).

Introducing Early Christianity: A Topical Survey of Its Life, Beliefs and Practices. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 2004.

Worlds in Collision: The Gay Debate in New Zealand, 1960-1986. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2002.

CHAPTERS

'Three Countries, Two Conversions, One Man: J.J. Doke: Baptists, Humanity and Justice.' Pages 265-76 in *Interfaces: Baptists and Others*. Edited by David Bebbington and Martin Sutherland. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2013.

'Spirit Possession and Deliverance Ministry in the Auckland Assembly of God, 1970-1983.' Pages 209-40 in *Spirit Possession, Theology, and Identity: A Pacific Exploration*. Edited by Elaine Wainwright, Philip Culbertson and Susan Smith. Hindmarsh, SA: ATF Press, 2010.

'Miracles, Messiahs and the Media: the Ministry of A.H. Dallimore in Auckland in the 1930s.' Pages 453-63 in *Signs, Wonders, Miracles: Representations of Divine Power in the Life of the Church* (Studies in Church History, Volume 41). Edited by Kate Cooper & Jeremy Gregory. Woodbridge: Ecclesiastical History Society, 2005.

'A Response.' Pages 271-73 in *He Kupu Whakawairua: Spirituality in Aotearoa New Zealand: Catholic Voices*. Edited by Helen Bergin & Susan Smith. Auckland: Accent Publications, 2002.

'Where Is Christianity Going in the 21st Century? (Particularly in the Context of the Sexual Revolution Which Has Been Occurring in the Latter Part of the 20th Century)'. Pages 1-10 in *Quo Vadis*. Edited by Barry Crichton. Manukau: Trinity Methodist Church, 2001.

'The Kingdom, Present and Future. Pages 63-78 in *Mission without Christendom: Exploring the Site: Essays for Brian Smith*. Edited by Martin Sutherland. Auckland: Carey Studies in Theology, 2000.

ARTICLES

'Back to the Future: The Millennium and the Exodus in Revelation 20.' *Evangelical Quarterly* (June 2014) (forthcoming)

'Fightings Within and also Without: New Zealand Baptists, the Public and Gay Issues 1970 to the Present.' *Pacific Journal of Baptist Research* 8:1 (2013): 1-8.

'Respect and Ridicule: The Church and the Public Square in Contemporary New Zealand.' *Colloquium* 44:1 (2012): 3-16.

'Is Gay Good? Responding to Brian Harris's Discussion of Stanley Grenz in the Context of the Gay Marriage Debate.' *Stimulus* 19:3 (2012): 18-26.

'The Rise and Fall of the Sabbath in New Zealand 1860-2000.' *Pacific Journal of Baptist Research* 5:2 (2009): 5-38.

'"Moral Panic" or Pejorative Labelling? Rethinking the Mazengarb Inquiry into Underage Sex in the Hutt Valley in 1954.' *Journal of Religious History* 33:4 (2009): 435-51.

'Between a Hard Rock and Shifting Sands: Churches and the Issue of Homosexuality in New Zealand, 1960-86.' *Journal of Religious History* 30:1 (2006): 61-76.

'"Romanists" for Rum, Baptists against Booze: Two Churches in the Struggle over Prohibition in 1919.' *Pacific Journal of Baptist Research* 2:1 (2006): 63-82.

'Sharing the Gospel in a Sexually Permissive Society: Contemporary Baptist Mission in the Western World.' *Baptist Ministers' Journal* (October 2006): 23-28.

'"The Man from Wales": A Study of the Mission of Ivor Powell in New Zealand, 1955-1956.' *Pacific Journal of Baptist Research* 2:2 (2006): 21-46.

'Evangelicals & the Homosexual Law Reform Debate 1985-1986.' *Stimulus* 13:4 (2005): 69-77.

'Baptist Pacifists in New Zealand: Creating Division in the Fight for Peace.' *Baptist Quarterly* 40 (October 2004): 488-99.

'One of a Kind? The Auckland Ministry of A.H. Dallimore.' *Australasian Pentecostal Studies* 8 (2004): 125-45.

"Naked" Baptism in the Early Church: The Rhetoric and the Reality.' *Journal of Religious History* 27:2 (2003): 133-42.

"Straightening the Queers": Medical Perspectives on Homosexuality with Particular Reference to Mid-Twentieth Century New Zealand.' *Health and History* 2:2 (2000): 101-20.

'The Cinematograph Film Censorship Debate in New Zealand, 1965-1976.' *New Zealand Journal of Baptist Research* 3 (1998): 19-39.

'The Interplay of the Present and the Future in the Kingdom of God (Luke 19.11-44).' *Tyndale Bulletin* 48:1 (1997): 119-37.