

GRASSROOTS UNITY AND THE FOUNTAIN TRUST INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCES: A STUDY OF ECUMENISM IN THE CHARISMATIC RENEWAL

by

HO YAN AU

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Theology
School of Philosophy, Theology and Religion
The University of Birmingham
10 November 2008

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

This thesis studies the nature of grassroots unity during the charismatic renewal of the 1970s and its significance for ecumenism. It argues that the renewal made an important contribution to ecumenism by means of complementarity of institution and charisms, and christology and pneumatology. It is based on the five international conferences of the Fountain Trust in the 1970s and focuses on two grassroots activities: worship in general and the celebration of the eucharist in particular. Worship in this setting nurtured unity through charisms, but the eucharist exposed the inadequacy of this grassroots unity because of doctrinal and ecclesiological differences.

The thesis aims to suggest a way forward by searching for the complementarity of institution and charisms, and christology and pneumatology in a charismatic context. It argues that the two emphases of the charismatic renewal, charisms and the Holy Spirit, complement the institutional commitments of the church and ecumenism. The concepts of *Christus praesens* and *Spiriti praesens* are considered intrinsic to the charisms, and thus christology and pneumatology should both be considered significant for ecumenism. It finally discusses the complementarity of ecumenical institutions and the charismatic renewal, the convergence of ecumenical streams and continuity in modern ecumenical history.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There is a number of people to whom I am indebted for the completion of the thesis. I would like to express my gratitude to Fr. Michael and Jeanne Harper. Their most welcoming hospitality, warmest sharing of their charismatic experiences and most generous offer of materials from the personal archive not only enabled me to gain abundant knowledge about the renewal, but also to see the lovingkindness as the result of the ongoing outpouring of the Spirit in their lives. I am also thankful for Mr and Mrs David MacInnes's gracious welcoming, detailed explanation of their personal experiences in the charismatic renewal. Special thanks to Mr MacInnes for kindly lending his collection of the *Renewal* magazines, cassette tapes and books, and his hard work on correcting my English without charge. I would also like to extend my thanks to Revds Tom Smail and Tom Walker for their detailed sharing of their personal experience and observation of the ecumenical aspect of the charismatic renewal, and to Mr Bob Balkam for his e-mails which explained the Roman Catholic Charismatic involvement in the British Charismatic Renewal. Their precious information helped me to depict a rich ecumenical scene in the thesis. I am also thankful for Mattersey Hall and St. John's College, Nottingham, for allowing me to access the archive.

I am very much indebted to my supervisors. In the first two years of my study, Prof. Allan Anderson guided me to look at ecumenism in the charismatic renewal and provided historical resources which were helpful for my study. I am grateful for Dr. Mark Cartledge's careful guidance, challenging comments, constant patience and hard work in the final two years. They both aimed at my final success of my study.

I want to give my greatest thanks to my parents: Mr Siu Ling Au and Mrs Mei Fong Tsui. They are not Christians but believe in traditional Chinese folk religion. They know neither the charismatic renewal nor ecumenism, but because they believe in education, they work hard day and night to support my doctoral education in Britain. Without their financial support and hope for my brighter future, this research would not have come into existence. This thesis is dedicated to them.

Finally I want to gratefully thank my gracious God who gave me strength when I was weak, gave me hope when I despaired, and reminded me of the goal that he had set before me when I forgot the reason why I was doing it. May the God of love, wisdom and knowledge be glorified!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION.....1

1. Definition and Literature Review of Grassroots Unity.....1

1.1. Distinctive Features of Grassroots Unity.....3

1.2. Two Models of Grassroots Unity.....6

1.2.1. Official Ecumenical Experiments in the Local Churches.....6

1.2.2. The Holy Spirit-Initiated Unity in the Charismatic Renewal.....8

2. Objective of the Thesis.....10

3. Methodology.....11

3.1. History..... 11

3.2.Theology.....13

4. Definition of Key Terms.....18

4.1. Charismatic Renewal.....18

4.2. Charisms.....24

5. Contributions of the Thesis.....26

CHAPTER ONE. THE HISTORY OF THE FOUNTAIN TRUST.....28

1. Background of the Charismatic Renewal in Britain.....28

1.1. The Decline of the Church.....29

1.1.1. Post-War Gloominess.....29

1.1.2. Formalism.....30

1.1.3. Billy Graham’s Preparatory Work.....31

1.1.4. Drop of Membership.....32

1.2. Economic Boom, Spiritual Gloom.....33

1.3. The Rise of Counter-Cultures.....34

2. The Development of the Charismatic Renewal in Britain.....36

3. A Brief History of the Fountain Trust.....39

3.1. Its Self Understanding in the Charismatic Renewal.....39

3.1.1. Stage 1: Initial Period (1964-1970).....39

3.1.1.1. The Ecumenical Nature.....	39
3.1.1.2. From Being a Community to Fellowship.....	41
3.1.1.3. Strengthening Local Churches.....	42
3.1.1.4. Three Aims.....	43
3.1.2. Stage 2: Maturing Period (1971-1974).....	43
3.1.2.1. 1971: “On the Move”.....	43
3.1.2.2. Theological Preparation.....	44
3.1.2.3. Looking Forward to 1974.....	45
3.1.2.4. New Aims in 1974.....	46
3.1.3. Stage 3: Plateau Period to the End (1975-1980).....	47
3.1.3.1. Ecumenical Breakthrough.....	48
3.1.3.2. Ministries in Wales.....	49
3.1.3.3. Social Outreach.....	50
3.2. Its Relationships with Others.....	51
3.2.1. Classical Pentecostals: Assemblies of God and Elim Pentecostal Church.....	51
3.2.2. Other Pentecostal Groups.....	56
3.2.3. Evangelicals.....	56
3.2.4. House Churches.....	59
3.2.5. Roman Catholics.....	61
3.2.5.1. Michael Harper’s Period (1964-1975).....	61
3.2.5.2. Tom Smail’s Period (1975-1979).....	63
3.3. Its Directors.....	65
3.3.1. From Michael Harper to Tom Smail.....	65
3.3.2. From Tom Smail to Michael Barling.....	68
3.4. Its End.....	70
3.5. The Ecumenical Loss of the Closure of the Fountain Trust.....	75
4. Conclusion.....	76
CHAPTER TWO. THE FIVE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES.....	78
1. Aims.....	78
1.1. General Aims.....	78
1.1.1. Two Periods.....	79
2. Participants and Venues.....	83
2.1. Attendance and Nationalities.....	83
2.2. Venues.....	89
3. Programmes.....	91
4. Feedbacks from Delegates.....	95
5. Impacts.....	98

5.1. Church Leaders in the United Kingdom.....	98
5.1.1. Anglicans.....	98
5.1.2. Roman Catholics.....	101
5.1.3. Leaders of Mainline Churches.....	102
5.1.4. British Council of Churches.....	102
5.2. International Church Leaders.....	103
5.2.1. Sweden.....	103
5.2.2. Norway.....	104
5.2.3. Australia.....	105
5.2.4. New Zealand.....	106
5.2.5. South Africa.....	108
5.3. Theological Awareness.....	109
5.4. Social Concern.....	114
6. A Reflection of the Five International Conferences.....	118
6.1. Guildford 1971: Coming of Age.....	119
6.2. Nottingham 1973: A Milestone of Maturity.....	121
6.3. Westminster 1975: Renewal on a Plateau.....	122
6.4. Westminster 1977: Retrospection and Ready for the Future.....	123
6.5. Westminster 1979: A March Towards a New Stage.....	125
7. Conclusion and Evaluation.....	126

CHAPTER THREE. THE GRASSROOTS UNITY OF THE FIVE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES.....129

1. Ecumenical Speakers.....	129
1.1. Two Key Ecumenists.....	130
1.2. Anglican and Episcopal Speakers.....	132
1.3. Methodist Speakers.....	139
1.4. Presbyterian Speakers.....	140
1.5. Baptist Speakers.....	142
1.6. Lutheran Speakers.....	143
1.7. Other Denominational Speakers.....	144
1.8. Independent Speakers.....	145
1.9. An Orthodox Speaker	148
1.10. Roman Catholic Speakers.....	149
2. Ecumenical Participants.....	155
2.1. Laity.....	156
2.2. Theologians and Church Leaders.....	158
2.3. Mutual Acceptance.....	161
3. Ecumenical Activities.....	163

3.1. Worship.....	164
3.2. The Eucharist.....	166
4. Ecumenical Cooperation.....	172
5. Ecumenical Conflicts and Conversions.....	175
5.1. Ecumenical Conflicts.....	175
5.2. Ecumenical Conversions.....	179
6. Conclusion and Evaluation.....	183

CHAPTER FOUR. AN ANALYSIS OF THE GRASSROOTS UNITY AT THE FIVE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES.....185

1. A Grassroots Activity (1): Worship.....	185
1.1. Worship: Life of the Charismatic Renewal.....	185
1.2. Charismatic Worship: Spring of Grassroots Unity.....	186
1.3. Charisms in Charismatic Worship and Grassroots Unity.....	188
1.3.1. Contextual Analysis.....	188
1.3.1.1. Speaking and Singing in Tongues: Sounds of Unity.....	188
1.3.1.2. Healing: Witnessing the Power of God and Human Weaknesses Together.....	192
1.3.1.3. Prophecy: A Collective Edification from the Same God.....	195
1.3.1.4. Intercession: An Empowered Action of Love in a Koinonia.....	196
1.3.2. Theological Analysis.....	199
1.3.2.1. One Spirit, But Many Gifts: Unity and Diversity in Charismatic Context.....	199
1.3.2.2. Charisms, the Presence of God and Grassroots Unity.....	200
1.3.2.3. Charisms, “De-clericalisation” and Grassroots Unity.....	202
1.4. Spontaneity in Charismatic Worship and Grassroots Unity.....	204
1.4.1. Contextual Analysis.....	204
1.4.1.2. Free Expression to God.....	204
1.4.1.3. Free Expression to Others.....	206
1.4.2. Theological Analysis.....	207
1.4.2.1. Unity of Oneself as a Human Being in Charismatic Worship.....	207
1.4.2.2. Vertical Communication: Unity with God.....	209
1.4.2.3. Horizontal Communication: Unity with Members of the Body of Christ...	210
1.4.2.4. A New Form of Liturgy.....	211
1.5. <i>Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi</i> in Charismatic Worship.....	212
1.6. Conclusion.....	217
2. A Grassroots Activity (2): The Eucharist.....	217
2.1. Contextual Analysis.....	218
2.1.1. An Exposure of an Incomplete Unity	218

2.1.2. The Roman Catholic Dogma.....	219
2.1.3. The Identity Crisis of Roman Catholic Charismatics.....	223
2.1.4. A Challenge to Grassroots Unity.....	224
2.1.5. A Neglect of the Eucharist.....	226
2.1.6. The Eucharistic Impossibility Became a Possibility.....	228
2.2. Theological Analysis.....	230
2.2.1. The Anamnetic Character.....	230
2.2.2. The Epicletic Character.....	233
2.2.3. The Eschatological Character	237
2.2.4. The Ecumenical Character.....	238
2.3. Conclusion.....	240
3. Final Conclusion.....	240

CHAPTER FIVE. IN SEARCH OF COMPLEMENTARITY.....243

1. Institution and Charisms.....	244
1.1. The Church.....	245
1.1.1. Institution and Charisms Should Be Complementary.....	245
1.1.1.1. Karl Rahner: Open/Closed System.....	245
1.1.1.2. Cardinal Suenens: Institution as the Base of Charisms.....	246
1.1.1.3. The Discussion in the Third Quinquennium of Roman Catholic- Pentecostal Dialogue (1985-1989).....	248
1.1.2. Complementarity of Institution and Charisms in the Charismatic Context.....	250
1.1.2.1. Charisms as the Forgotten Component of the Church.....	250
1.1.2.2. The Advent of the Charismatic Renewal.....	252
1.1.2.3. Charisms.....	253
1.1.2.4. The Holy Spirit as the Paraclete.....	255
1.1.2.5. The Complementarity Brought about by the Charismatic Renewal.....	260
1.2. Church Unity.....	261
1.2.1. The Complementarity of Institution and Charisms for Church Unity.....	261
1.2.2. Institution and Charisms: Visible Unity in Two Understandings.....	264
1.2.2.1. A Review of Visible Unity.....	264
1.2.2.2. Institution and Charisms are Both Entities of Visible Unity in the Charismatic Renewal.....	265
1.2.3. Conciliar Fellowship: A Model of Visible Unity and Complementarities.....	267
1.2.3.1. Uniformity-Diversity.....	268
1.2.3.2. The Council-Churches at Grassroots Level.....	269
1.2.3.3. Holy Spirit-Human Beings.....	270
1.3. Conclusion.....	272
2. Christology and Pneumatology.....	272
2.1. A Review of WCC's Christologies.....	273

2.1.1. International Missionary Council (IMC).....	274
2.1.2. Life and Work (L&W).....	274
2.1.3. Faith and Order (F&O).....	275
2.1.4. “Jesus Christ as God and Saviour”.....	278
2.1.5. Jesus is the Hope.....	280
2.2. A Review of Vatican II’s Christology.....	281
2.2.1. Christological Ecclesiology.....	282
2.2.2. Christological Ecumenism.....	283
2.3. In Search of the Complementarity of Christology and Pneumatology in Ecumenism.....	285
2.3.1. The Two Hands of the Father and <i>Perichoresis</i>	286
2.3.2. The Church.....	291
2.3.3. Church Unity.....	294
2.3.3.1. Primordial Experience: Common Experience in the Spirit.....	295
2.3.3.2. Collective Memory: Common Confession of Christ as God and Saviour...	295
2.3.3.3. Interpretation: “Common Responsibility” in the Ecclesia.....	296
2.4. Conclusion.....	296
3. Final Conclusion.....	297

CHAPTER SIX. COMPLEMENTARITY, CONVERGENCE AND CONTINUITY.....299

1. Complementarity.....	299
1.1. The WCC and the Vatican II: The Mutual Complementarity of Institutions.....	299
1.2. Vatican II and the Charismatic Renewal: Institution Complemented the Charismatic Renewal.....	301
1.2.1. Charisms.....	308
1.2.2. The Role of the Laity.....	309
1.2.3. The Liturgy.....	311
1.3. The Charismatic Renewal and the WCC: The Charismatic Renewal Complemented Institution.....	313
2. Convergence.....	317
3. Continuity.....	318
3.1. The Contemporary Ecumenical Situation.....	319
3.2. The Eschatological Continuity of the Ecumenical Movement.....	321
3.3. The Holy Spirit: Uniting the Past, Present and Future with Anamnesis.....	324
3.4. The Holy Spirit: Uniting the Present and Future by Prolepses.....	325
3.5. The Holy Spirit: The Rejecter of Status Quo.....	327
4. Conclusion.....	328

CONCLUSION.....	329
-----------------	-----

APPENDIX: NUMBERS OF NON-BRITISH ATTENDANTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES.....	333
---	-----

BIBLIOGRAGHY.....	335
-------------------	-----

1. Primary Sources

- 1.1. Fountain Trust Publications
 - 1.1.1. *Renewal* Magazines
 - 1.1.2. *Westminster Splash*
- 1.2. Fountain Trust Documents
 - 1.2.1. Fountain Trust Advisory/Consultative Council Meetings
 - 1.2.2. Documents of the International Conferences
 - 1.2.2.1. Guildford 1971
 - 1.2.2.2. Nottingham 1973
 - 1.2.2.3. Westminster 1975
 - 1.2.2.4. Westminster 1977
 - 1.2.2.5. Westminster 1979
 - 1.2.3. Other Documents
- 1.3. Fountain Trust Audio Tapes
- 1.4. Correspondence
 - 1.4.1. 1970
 - 1.4.2. 1971
 - 1.4.3. 1972
 - 1.4.4. 1973
 - 1.4.5. 1974
 - 1.4.6. 1975
 - 1.4.7. 1976
 - 1.4.8. 1977
 - 1.4.9. 1978
 - 1.4.10. 1979
 - 1.4.11. n.d.
- 1.5. Other Material
- 1.6. Interview

2. Secondary Sources

ABBREVIATIONS

Organisations

AoG	Assemblies of God
BCC	British Council of Churches
CMS	Church Missionary Society
DGC	Donald Gee Centre
FGBMFI	Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International
RCNSC	Roman Catholic National Service Committee
WCC	World Council of Churches

Documents

Fountain Trust Advisory Council Meeting

Agenda-FTACM (1 June 1967)

Agenda of Advisory Council Meeting, 12 Buckingham Street, WC2, Thursday, 1 June 1967, 11:00 a.m.

Minutes-FTACM (1 July 1967)

Fountain Trust Advisory Council Meeting, 12 Buckingham Street, WC2, 1 July 1967, 11:00

Minutes-FTAM (6 December 1968)

Fountain Trust Advisors Meeting, 12 Buckingham Street, WC2, Friday, 6 December, 1968

Minutes-FTACM (20 November 1970)

Fountain Trust Advisory Council Meeting, Caxton Hall, Westminster, SW1, Friday, 20 November 1970

Minutes-FTACM (12 November 1971)

Fountain Trust Advisory Council Meeting, Caxton Hall, Westminster, SW1, Friday, 12 November 1971.

Minutes-FTACM (2 November 1972)

Fountain Trust Advisory Council Meeting, 19 Draycott Place, London, SW3, 2 November 1972

Minutes-FTACM (5 April 1973)

Fountain Trust Advisory Council Meeting, 19 Draycott Place, London, SW3, 5 April 1973

Minutes-FTACM (8 November 1973)

Fountain Trust Advisory Council Meeting, 19 Draycott Place, London, SW3, 8 November 1973

Minutes-FTACM (9 December 1976)
Fountain Trust Advisory Council Meeting, Evangelical Alliance, 9 December 1976

Minutes-FTCCM (8 June 1977)
Fountain Trust Consultative Council Meeting, 19 Draycott Place, London, SW3,
8 June 1977

Minutes-FTCCM (8 December 1977)
Fountain Trust Consultative Council Meeting, 8 December 1977, 11:00 a.m.-3:30 p.m.

Minutes-FTCCM (10 May 1978)
Fountain Trust Consultative Council Meeting, 10 May 1978, 11:00 a.m.-3:30 p.m.

Minutes-FTCCM (6 June 1979)
Minutes of Fountain Trust Consultative Council Meeting, 6 June 1979

Documents of the International Conferences

1. Guildford

Minutes-Guildford University Conference (12 June 1970)
Guildford University Conference, Minutes of meeting, 12 June 1970.

Notes-Guildford (3 July 1970)
Notes on the meeting of the Guildford Conference Committee, Shalford Vicarage,
Guildford, Friday 3 July 1970

Rough notes-Guildford (14 October 1970)
Rough notes on the meeting of the Guildford Conference Committee, the Upper
Room, St Saviour's Hall, Leas Road, Guildford, Wednesday 14 October 1970, 9:30
a.m.

2. Westminster 1975

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1975 (1 October 1974)
Minutes of the working committee for the Fountain Trust Westminster International
Conference Meeting, 19 Draycott Place, 1 October 1974, 2:00 p.m.

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1975 (31 January 1975)
Minutes of Westminster Conference Working Committee, Westminster Central Hall,
Room C, 31 January 1975, 2:00 p.m.

3. Westminster 1977

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (21 October 1976)
Westminster Conference steering committee, 21 October 1976

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (14 January 1977)
Westminster Conference steering committee, 23 Spencer Road, East Molesey, Surrey,
14 January 1977

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (25 February 1977)

Westminster Conference steering committee, 23 Spencer Road, East Molesey, Surrey,
25 February 1977

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (20 April 1977)

Westminster Conference steering committee, 20 April 1977

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (21 April 1977)

Westminster Conference steering committee, 20 April 1977

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (6 July 1977)

Westminster Conference steering committee, 6 July 1977

INTRODUCTION

When the Spirit renews His Church, the vision for ecumenical unity seems to accompany this work. Irvin records that since the Holiness Movement there has been a belief that Christian division is the consequence of sin. C. P. Jones, the organiser of the Church of Christ (Holiness), strongly criticised denominationalism by saying that it was “slavery”.¹ Being imbued with the thoughts of the Holiness Movement, William Seymour also objected to denominationalism and endeavoured to spread the message of love to restore unity so that Christianity could be effectively expressed.² During the charismatic renewal in the 1950s-70s, the Spirit moved again to renew His church in different parts of the world. A sense of unity was generated through the sharing of the divine experiences in the Spirit which washed away the denominational wall. Renewal thus enabled Christians to see the divided body and take action for change. This ecumenical flow took place and was reinforced among Christians at the grassroots level.

1. Definition and Literature Review of Grassroots Unity³

Grassroots unity is defined as the unity realised at the local level. “Grassroots” implies that something develops deep down in the soil and therefore it is fundamental and basic. It contrasts with the way of pursuing unity which is based on theological and ecclesiological common ground among denominations, such as was developed by the

¹ Dale T. Irvin, “‘Drawing All Together in One Bond of Love’: The Ecumenical Vision of William J. Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival”, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 6 (1995), pp. 35-36.

² Dale T. Irvin, “‘Drawing All Together in One Bond of Love’”, p. 37.

³ Ho Yan Au, “The Charismatic Renewal: A Model of Grassroots Unity”, in Stephen Lakkis, Stefan Höschele and Stefanie Schardien (eds) *Ökumene der Zukunft: Hermeneutische Perspektiven und die Suche nach Identität* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Otto Lembeck, 2008), pp. 191-199.

Faith and Order Movement. Some theologians and ecumenists assert the importance of unity that begins and grows from the grassroots level. Hans Küng and Jürgen Moltmann claim, “This new ecumenical practice at [the] grass-roots level gives us cause for great hope”. It “is not just the point of departure but the aim of *all ecumenical endeavour*. For it is only here that an ecumenical project can be transformed into ecumenical reality”.⁴ Hans W. Gensichen also declares, “‘Ecumenicity at the grass roots’ should never be neglected”.⁵ In the booklet concerning Anglican and Methodist reunion, Hetley Price and Gordon S. Wakefield affirm that “real unity can be achieved only ‘at the grass roots’—not by the enactments of remote assemblies, but by the love of neighbours.”⁶ Some ecumenists stress the importance of grassroots unity in the light of the inadequacy of the mainstream ecumenical movement which has relied heavily on theological dialogues at the official level. For instance, a Roman Catholic scholar, John A. Radano, asserts, “Unity cannot simply be forced upon divided Christians from above.”⁷ An Orthodox scholar voices the need for an alternative ecumenism which “will manifest a new ‘coming together’ through the encounter of men of any and every tradition and confession” instead of ecumenical agreements through dialogue.⁸ Even the founder of the WCC, W. A. Visser ’t Hooft, also acknowledged that the weakness of the ecumenical movement was that it had been isolated from the local churches. He depicted the

⁴ Hans Küng & Jürgen Moltmann, “Editorial: Towards an Ecumenical Confession of Faith”, in Hans, Küng & Jürgen Moltmann (eds) *An Ecumenical Confession of Faith?* (New York: A Crossroad Book, 1979), pp. x-xi.

⁵ Hans W. Gensichen, *The Elements of Ecumenism* (Madras: The Christian Literature Society, 1954), p. 14.

⁶ Hetley Price & Gordon S. Wakefield, *Unity at the Local Level* (Oxford: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1964), p. 1.

⁷ John A. Radano, “Response: Ecumenism in the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Movement”, *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (1980), p. 658.

⁸ Quoted in Michael Harper, *Tip-toeing through the Tulips: Unity and Reconciliation, and ICCOWE’s Future* (25 February 1998), p. 8.

ecumenical scenario as “too much an army with many generals and officers, but with too few soldiers”. He was very much aware of the significance of the mobilisation of local churches for the ecumenical movement.⁹

1.1. Distinctive Features of Grassroots Unity

Compared to unity based on faith and order, the foundation of grassroots unity is people centred, with doctrinal agreements coming second. The contrasts between them are mainly in the area of the experiential/cerebral, and the affective/cognitive and at the local/official level. In grassroots unity, experience plays an important role, while in ecumenical dialogue doctrinal problems are the locus of discussion. The shared experience of local churches may come from worship, ministries, evangelisation or intercommunion. They become the source of the sense of togetherness and solidarity and therefore grassroots unity tends to be affective. Biblically, the sort of unity that Jesus prays for is affective. It is based on the love between the Father and the Son (Jn 17:24) and this love is extended to the believers, “that they may be perfected in unity, so that the world may know that You sent Me, and loved them, even as You have loved Me” (Jn 17:23). Hence, love is the foundation of unity: within the Trinity, among believers and between God and believers. In contrast, ecumenical dialogue is largely cognitive in orientation. This methodology is to explain doctrines of different denominations, investigate the different traditions and negotiate an attempted doctrinal agreement in order to eliminate division. A pursuit of common experience is not perceived as being as ecumenically promising as doctrinal consensus.

⁹ W. A. Visser 't Hooft, “The General Ecumenical Development since 1948”, in Harold E. Fey (ed) *The Ecumenical Advance: A History of the Ecumenical Movement, Vol. 2, 1948-1968* (Geneva: WCC, 1970), p. 26.

Since ecumenical dialogue requires an excessive amount of theological knowledge, it only involves theological and ecclesiological elites who hold the authority of churches or the knowledge of church history and dogmas. Therefore, dialogue is an ecumenical activity conducted at the top level, or the official level, of the well-trained and well-educated in theology. The people involved in the dialogue is only a small proportion of the denominations which they represent, but they define the meaning of unity, decide the methodology and determine whether it can be realised. In contrast, grassroots unity starts from the local level and involves a group of enthusiasts, or even the whole church. Every single member of the church, regardless of his/her educational background, theological knowledge, spiritual experience, gender, age, class or race, can take part in actualising and maintaining the unity as long as they acknowledge the necessity of a united church. Grassroots unity is not only about spreading the ecumenical vision in the congregation, but also about enabling each member to contribute to it. Unity is for, and achieved by everybody belonging to the universal church, not just the ecumenical experts, as Piet Fransen reminds us that “theologians who specialize in ecumenical work and thought easily forget that real unity can only be brought about and established by the ordinary members of the Churches. They in their turn have to be prepared for it.”¹⁰

Fransen expressed this view in the 1970s. However, the WCC just recently officially discussed it at the 9th Assembly in Porto Alegre, Brazil in February 2006. One of the moderators enumerated the problems associated with institutional ecumenism in the last ten years, which have dominated the whole movement. Firstly, it has not adequately

¹⁰ Piet Fransen, “Intercommunion”, in John Kent & Robert Murray (eds) *Church Membership and Intercommunion* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973), p. 32.

raised the awareness of ecumenism among churches but has begun “to generate indifference and even alienation”. Secondly, it was not shared by the whole Christian population but was dominated by a group of ecumenists. Thirdly, it was not only institutional but also became foreign to churches. In the light of these problems, the moderator believes that grassroots ecumenism is the way-out from the dead-end it has researched. It transforms the nature of the movement from being institutional to “people-centred” and stresses that it should connect to life:

Grassroots ecumenism is gaining more attraction in many regions...In fact, ecumenism is not something to be imported from the outside or developed on an institution-centred basis; rather, it must emanate from the very life of people and be owned by the people. It must touch the life of people in all its layers and dimensions. As a consequence of people-centred ecumenism, a life-centred vision of ecumenism is emerging as a feasible paradigm.¹¹

He believes that a movement called “Churches Acting Together” which is taking shape, can lead the ecumenical movement to become more people-centred. However, the grassroots or people-centred ecumenism does not start because of this newly launched movement; rather, it has existed throughout church history as will be illustrated in the two models of grassroots unity which follow.

¹¹ World Council of Churches, *Document No. A01: Report of the Moderator*. ([http://www.wcc-assembly.info/en/theme issues/assembly-documents/2-plenary-presentations/moderators-general-secretarys-reports/report-of-the-moderator.html](http://www.wcc-assembly.info/en/theme%20issues/assembly-documents/2-plenary-presentations/moderators-general-secretarys-reports/report-of-the-moderator.html).) (accessed on 19 September 2006)

1.2. Two Models of Grassroots Unity

1.2.1. Official Ecumenical Experiments in the Local Churches

The first model is the implementation of ecumenical experiments and projects in local churches. This sort of grassroots unity involves both the laity and officials. The officials design ecumenical plans using their theological knowledge and monitor the process of implementation using their administrative training and resources. The purpose is to bring unity among denominations of a particular local area. For example, in 1967, the British Council of Churches and the Conference of British Missionary Societies organised an ecumenical study programme called “The People Next Door” for churches in the whole country.¹² Barry Till regarded it as “the most ambitious scheme undertaken to arouse the interest of the laity in matters ecumenical”.¹³ The Council also published a booklet, *Adventures in Unity: An Introduction of Ecumenical Experiment, Shared Churches and Other United Ventures in the Local Church*¹⁴ to introduce local ecumenical projects such as sharing of church buildings,¹⁵ “interdenominational team of ministries” and local ecumenical experiments in England in 1973-74.¹⁶ The booklet lists forty-six areas in England where these churches were involved in these ecumenical projects.¹⁷ Moreover, education is also a means of grassroots unity. Protestants study in Roman Catholic schools or vice versa, and thus they participate in the liturgical forms which are different

¹² It carried a twofold purpose: to make known the current experiments in the ecumenical movement in local churches and “to test the relevance of the ecumenical insights in the local church situation”. (Barry Till, *The Churches Search for Unity* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd, 1972), p. 463.)

¹³ Barry Till, *The Churches Search for Unity*, p. 467.

¹⁴ David Blatherwick, *Adventures in Unity: An Introduction of Ecumenical Experiment, Shared Churches and Other United Ventures in the Local Church* (London: British Council of Churches, 1974).

¹⁵ The Baptist Union, the Churches of Christ (Disciples), the Church of England, the Methodist Church, Roman Catholic Church and the United Reformed Church registered as users of the Sharing of Church Buildings Act. (David Blatherwick, *Adventures in Unity*, p. 2.)

¹⁶ David Blatherwick, *Adventures in Unity*, p. 1.

¹⁷ David Blatherwick, *Adventures in Unity*, pp. 6-12.

from those they have in their own traditions. Some ecumenical educators raise the awareness among students by organising visits to churches or holding ecumenical discussions.¹⁸ Although these sorts of ecumenical activities at the grassroots level are not always recorded in church reports, they are significant for increasing the sense of unity among local churches. As Michael Horton observes, grassroots unity “is already evident practically everywhere”.¹⁹ When the ecumenical movement has been losing momentum since the 1970s and what is left currently is just a “winter of ecumenism”,²⁰ grassroots unity reminds us that “it is not that the ecumenical movement has disappeared. It is only that we may have been looking for it in the wrong places all this time.”²¹

In fact, the unity in the early church was also a kind of grassroots unity administered by officials. Since the apostles founded many local churches and they governed themselves, inevitably there were differences among them in terms of liturgy, ecclesiological structure and theology. However, through the communication among bishops, Christians of different areas were connected. Norbert Brox finds that by means of correspondence, bishops expressed their opinions, encouragements, exhortations and reported updated news of their churches in order to connect with one another spiritually in the same faith.²² The receiving churches read the letters out in front of the congregation for the sake of maintaining the fellowship. To a large extent, the grassroots unity of the early church was

¹⁸ Bernard L. Marthaler, “Grassroots Ecumenism and Religious Education”, *Ecumenical Trends*, Vol. 16 (April 1987), pp. 66-67.

¹⁹ Michael S. Horton, “Can We Be Confessional & Catholic? Prospects for Christian Unity Today”, *Modern Reformation Magazine “Shall We Still Protest?”*, Vol. 14, No. 5 (September-October 2005). <http://www.modernreformation.org/mh05unity.htm> (accessed on 26 January 2006)

²⁰ G. R. Evans, *Methods in Ecumenical Theology: The Lessons so Far* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 1.

²¹ Robert McAfee Brown, “Ecumenism from the Grassroots”, *Ecumenical Trends*, Vol. 12, No. 6 (1983), p. 88.

²² Norbert Brox, *A History of the Early Church* (London: SCM Press, 1994), p. 70.

sustained by the official communication to the people. However, without ecumenical experience and affection for their brothers and sisters, the official effort for unity would be in vain.

1.2.2. The Holy Spirit-Initiated Unity in the Charismatic Renewal

The second model of grassroots unity is perceived to be the directly inspired work of the Holy Spirit at the local level in the charismatic renewal. The renewal was grassroots *per se* due to its foundation with people who experienced the Spirit personally and collectively. It was both a subjective and objective event and so it was not only a renewal for individuals but also for the whole church. Based on his renewal ministry across the country for ten years, Michael Harper affirmed this grassroots nature in the 1970s by saying, “The Holy Spirit is renewing and reviving our beloved churches at the grass roots”.²³ Tom Smail addressed this nature of the renewal at a conference of the Fountain Trust during the same period. He claimed that the charismatic renewal was not designed by officials and pushed down to the laity; rather the Holy Spirit had “started at the bottom and worked towards the top”. It had been “a matter of ordinary people” at the grassroots level.²⁴

The charismatic renewal did not only have a grassroots nature, but it was also intrinsically an ecumenical stream. Peter Hocken identifies the renewal as “of its nature an ecumenical grace of God”.²⁵ Kilian McDonnell asserts, “It was de facto ecumenical

²³ Letter from Michael Harper to the Most Revd Lord Archbishop of York, Dr. Coggan, 17 May 1974.

²⁴ Tom Smail, *Doing: The Work of the Body* (London: Fountain Trust, n.d.). (Audio Tape)

²⁵ Peter Hocken, “Charismatic Renewal, the Churches and unity”, *One in Christ*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (1979), p. 320.

from the beginning and did not decide to become ecumenical at some later date”.²⁶ Since the charismatic renewal was developed from the grassroots level, it is logical to say that the unity that it nurtured was also from the grassroots. This grassroots unity was particularly significant due to the fact that it brought Protestants and Roman Catholics together. Hence, Kevin Ranaghan regards this unity as “the largest grassroots ecumenical movement that Christianity has known for 450 years”.²⁷ Hocken says, “It is the first time that Catholics and Protestants at grass roots level have truly experienced God’s action together, thereby recognized that their basic unity in Christ is more important than the divisions between them”.²⁸ The WCC also regard the charismatic renewal as “a major ecumenical development of our day” and they identify their responsibility to “discern grass-roots ecumenical development of worldwide significance”.²⁹ Since the charismatic renewal was ecumenical by nature, this grassroots unity was not its by-product, but the primary product. The renewal of worship, community and evangelisation pointed to the purpose of the unity of churches.

The major force of the grassroots unity in the charismatic renewal is attributed to the Holy Spirit instead of church officials and ecumenical theologians. Through bestowing common experiences, the Holy Spirit nurtures affection in people’s hearts which becomes the motivation for accepting one another as Christian. He intervenes directly in the long-term division and produces a sense of love among people despite the doctrinal and

²⁶ Kilian McDonnell, “Church Reactions to the Charismatic Renewal”, p. 3. (Source from the Donald Gee Centre)

²⁷ Quoted in Tom Smail, “Editorial: The More We Are Together...”, *Renewal*, No. 71 (October-November 1977), p. 2.

²⁸ Peter Hocken, “Charismatic Renewal, the Churches and unity”, p. 312.

²⁹ World Council of Churches, “A Statement of Concerns (1975)”, in Kilian McDonnell (ed) *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Vol. III: International Documents, Numbers 1-11, 1973-1980* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980), p. 283.

ecclesiastical disagreements. However, He does not instantaneously erase all the problems; rather, He brings Christians back to the fundamental common denominator of the same faith in Christ who is “the shared centre of our faith and love”.³⁰ This was the reason for the communion of the early church, despite the plurality of practice and understanding of the faith. Charles Farah regards the ecumenical power of the Spirit as having “the force of a hurricane” which “has created an atmosphere of trust and joy among Christians not present since the days of the apostles”.³¹ With the ecumenical development grounded in people, and with experience from which affection is nurtured, the charismatic renewal can be regarded as a grassroots ecumenical movement leading Christians to confess the same Lord Jesus Christ and opening more opportunities for theological dialogue to deal with the doctrinal differences. Although scholars affirm the significance of grassroots unity, we also need theological agreement at the official level. Ecumenists of the grassroots and official level should not mutually discard one another but work together for future unity.

2. Objective of the Thesis

This thesis studies the nature of grassroots unity within the charismatic renewal of the 1970s and its significance for ecumenism. It argues that the unity in this movement made an important contribution to ecumenism by means of the complementarity of institution and charisms, and christology and pneumatology. The historical events of the five international conferences of the Fountain Trust are used as a basis to discuss the

³⁰ Tom Smail, “Editorial: The More We Are Together...”, p. 2.

³¹ Charles Farah, “Towards a Theology of Ecumenicity or Doctrinal Disagreements and Christian Fellowship”, *Theological Renewal*, No. 19 (October 1981), p. 25.

grassroots unity nurtured by the functioning of charisms. The first three chapters will establish the historical scene of the British charismatic renewal and the grassroots unity found within it. Chapter one will discuss the background of the British charismatic renewal and the history of the Fountain Trust. Chapter two will provide historical facts about the international conferences such as speakers, participants, venues, programmes, feedback from delegates and their impacts to the churches in Britain and overseas. Chapter three will focus on the conferences' ecumenical significance. Chapter four provides both historical facts and theological analysis to investigate the grassroots unity at the conferences based on two activities: worship in general and the celebration of the eucharist. Chapter five will search for complementarities of institution and charisms, and christology and pneumatology. Chapter six will discuss the complementarity of ecumenical institutions and the charismatic renewal, the convergence of ecumenical streams and the continuity in modern ecumenical history. It finally suggests that the implication of the charismatic renewal for the ecumenical future lies in its legacy of hope which brings about an eschatological continuity for the ecumenical movement.

3. Methodology

This thesis uses both history and theology, with theological themes emerging from historical sources.

3.1. History

To establish the scene and narrative of the five international conferences in chapters one to four, I collected written and audio materials from the archives of the Donald Gee

Centre at the Mattersey Hall, St. John's College, Nottingham and Michael Harper's personal collection. The written material, including minutes, agendas, booklets, newsletters, and *Renewal* magazines produced by the Fountain Trust, are useful to answer the basic questions of the conferences: Where and When did they take place? Who was involved in the organisation and participation? What was the programme? What were the themes? Why did the Fountain Trust organise these conferences? What were the results and impacts to the churches in the UK and overseas? The letters written by the delegates to the Fountain Trust are particularly useful to obtain information about personal experiences at the conferences and whether these conferences were successful in terms of achieving the purposes and enhancing individuals' understanding and experience of the charismatic renewal. The audio copies of sermons and seminars given at the international conferences are useful resources to know how charismatic leaders in the 1970s interpreted certain issues such as the eucharist, the meaning of the body of Christ, and the purpose of charisms.

Moreover, I also acquired oral historical accounts by interviewing charismatic leaders including Michael Harper, Tom Smail, Tom Walker and David MacInnes. It is done in order to supplement the archival materials with life stories and personal opinions concerning positive and negative ecumenical experiences, the organisation process of the conferences and the background of the charismatic renewal in Britain. It is also used to corroborate the accuracy of the written materials, particularly concerning some controversial issues, such as the closure of the Fountain Trust and the Roman Catholics' withdrawal from participating in the eucharist at the conference.

This thesis aims to discuss the ecumenical nature of the charismatic renewal, it is essential to understand the general history of the ecumenical movement, the World Council of Churches and Vatican II, and the establishment of their theological thinking, in order to understand how the charismatic renewal can fit into the ecumenical history with the concepts of complementarity, convergence and continuity. I consulted reports from the major ecumenical conferences, including the first and the second Faith and Order conferences in Lausanne (1927) and Edinburgh (1937), and reports from the WCC assemblies. In addition, I consulted the documents and commentaries of Vatican II and the reports of the Pentecostal and Roman Catholic dialogues.

3.2.Theology

The theological discussion is primarily focused on the complementarity of institution and charisms, and christology and pneumatology in the church and church unity in chapter five. The reason for setting out arguments on these two complementarities is because ecclesiology and ecumenism have been institutionally and christologically oriented. However, charismatic renewal, with its vivid manifestation of the Holy Spirit, reminds the church of the charismatic and pneumatological elements in the constitution of the church, and hence it is regarded as a major contribution of the renewal. In addition, there are also some minor theological discussions on worship and the eucharist in chapter four, and the ecumenical future in chapter six.

I discuss the complementary of institution and charisms from the perspectives of ecclesiology and pneumatology using two dialogue partners. I use Karl Rahner's

open/closed system and Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens' theories to deal with this subject. These theologians are chosen because in their understandings of the role of the Holy Spirit in the church, they hold a good balance in their views between institution and charisms as they notice the danger of overemphasising either of them in the church and its life. Moreover, they have both raised the awareness of pneumatology at Vatican II, and the Cardinal himself was sympathetic to the charismatic renewal. Hence their theories are helpful to discuss how the charismatic renewal contributed to the complementarity of institution and charisms.

Specifically, for the definitions of institution and charisms, it is important to apply the theories of the traditional churches, especially the Roman Catholic Church, alongside the charismatic understandings. The reason is that it will help to explain the context of the charismatic renewal which brought about a grassroots unity between Protestants and Roman Catholics. For institution, I apply Avery Dulles's definition as it does not just refer institution to a sociological organisation, but it is also constituted by doctrinal, liturgical and legalistic systems. For charisms, I apply Hans Küng's interpretation as he proposes four general features which can be applied to explain both supernatural and natural charisms, that they are everyday phenomena, diversified, universally distributed and still available nowadays.

The Holy Spirit as a Paraclete is used as a basis for pneumatology. I apply the farewell discourse in John 14-16 to explain the role of the Holy Spirit as a revealer, teacher and reminder of truth, and suggest that they can also be found in Paul's understanding of

charisms. Moreover, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the church implies the complementarity of charisms and institution, that the Spirit, the giver of gifts, needs a physical institute to work within and the physical institute needs the Spirit to revitalise it.

For the complementarity of institution and charisms in church unity, I apply the concept of visible unity to the discussion. I argue that because of the tangible manifestation of charisms, the dichotomy of spiritual/institutional unity which refers to invisibility/visibility, should be challenged. The charismatic renewal shows that charisms such as healing, prophecy, tongues, etc. are spiritual but also tangible. Hence the dichotomy should be redefined as spiritual visible unity/institutional visible unity. Conciliar fellowship is suggested as an ideal model to realise the complementarity between institution and charisms, between official and grassroots unity. It allows the co-existence of uniformity and diversity, interaction between council and local churches, and finally the cooperation between humanity and the Spirit.

In order to contextualise the complementarity of christology and pneumatology, I explain two traditional theological concepts: (1) St Irenaeus of Lyons' two hands of the Father, and (2) *perichoresis* in immanent and economic Trinity. Ecclesiologically, the charismatic renewal contributes to this complementarity by bringing about the simultaneous existence of *Spiriti praesens* and *Christus praesens* in the use of charisms, which reflect Jesus' work and words in the present. Ecumenically, I adopt Aloysius Pieris' model to illustrate this complementarity. There are three levels in this model: primordial experience which is pneumatological, collective memory which is

christological and interpretation which is ecclesial. This model itself does not only represent the complementarity of christology and pneumatology, but also shows that both spiritual experience and ecclesial institution are necessary for ecumenism. Hence it can suitably explain how this complementarity can be realised in the charismatic renewal.

Besides the major theological discussion on the two kinds of complementarity, the thesis is also concerned about the theological implications of worship, the eucharist and the ecumenical future in the charismatic renewal. There are also corresponding theological perspectives in those three subjects.

Liturgical studies are used to discuss charismatic worship and the eucharist. Concerning charismatic worship, the first question to answer is how charismatic worship, with the features of the vivid manifestations of charisms and spontaneity, nurtured the grassroots unity, as it is described in the context of the Fountain Trust's conferences (Chapter 4: 1.3.1 and 1.4.1). Charisms characterise diversity, divine presence and declericalisation, thus enabling charismatics to serve one another, experience the presence of God together and the sharing of priesthood at the grassroots level. They blur the boundary between clergy and laity in terms of the ministerial involvement during worship and subsequently a sense of unity grows through mutual ministry at the grassroots level. Spontaneity brings about unity because it nurtures the oneness between spirit and body within oneself, with others and with the divine being.

Based on the experiential character of charismatic worship, the second question is how to interpret the relationship between experience and theology or beliefs in charismatic worship which subsequently leads to grassroots unity. The ancient Latin tag, *lex orandi, lex credendi*, and its original form, *ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*, are used to answer this question as it concisely highlights the intimate relationship between worship and theology. This is because the charismatic renewal began and grew from experience through prayer and worship, rather than theology. It was charismatic experience that gave birth to theological understandings but not the other way around. It was common experience that led to common understandings and hence a sense of unity grew.

Concerning the eucharist, the liturgical terms of epiclesis and anamnesis, are adopted to analyse the theological implications of charisms and the eucharist with a special focus on their spiritual commonalities. These two concepts are useful for this analysis as they both contain pneumatological associations. Anamnesis refers to the Holy Spirit who reminds communion participants of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. Epiclesis is a prayer invoking for the presence of the Holy Spirit in the bread, wine and participants. These two pneumatological meanings: remembrance and presence of the Spirit in the eucharist, also occur in charisms. The thesis also suggests that they both share similar eschatological and ecumenical implications. Eschatologically, they both share the absence-presence paradox as they will cease to exist when the eschaton comes. Hence their presence in the present implies their absence in the future. Ecumenically, they both share another paradox of “one-manyness” since the fragments of the bread and the diversity of charisms both symbolically represent the one body of Christ. By discussing

these four commonalities, I argue that both charisms and eucharist are means of grace and signs of unity.

Concerning the ecumenical future, eschatology is the perspective used to discuss the hope ushered in through the charismatic renewal. Jürgen Moltmann's eschatology illustrated in *Theology of Hope* is regarded as a suitable text with which to interact in order to investigate this subject. This is because his understanding of eschatology is not just about the end time of the world and the parousia, but also about the present day and the foreseeable future. And the hope that he is concerned about does not only look forward to the new heaven and the new earth but also occurs in the world today. This eschatological understanding is more encouraging and optimistic for the ecumenical future. It also resonates with the nature of the charismatic renewal that God's wonderful works do not just take place in the parousia, but also in the present, and therefore Christians can always hope for God's gracious and powerful intervention.

4. Definition of Key Terms

4.1. Charismatic Renewal

The emphasis of the charismatic renewal has varied. In the 1960s-70s, it could be defined by the physical and spiritual, inner and outer manifestations, namely, baptism in the Spirit and gifts from the Holy Spirit. When it continued in the 1980s, its nature was different and Peter Wagner called it the Third Wave. John Wimber and the Vineyard denomination emphasised power in evangelism and healing, which were particularly prominent in this

period. In the 1990s, the Toronto Blessing associated with accounts of animal noises, slaying in the Spirit and other ecstatic activities, was found to be controversial among charismatics. Commenting on these phenomena, Harper said that “it is much harder to see what it is today, the signals are more confusing.”³² Hence, it is important to note that the charismatic renewal that this thesis refers to is the one that took place during the 1960s-70s, and the grassroots unity is discussed in this context.

However, in this period of time, there were two groups of charismatics, those who remained in their denominational churches and those who were called restorationists, or radical charismatics, who rejected the idea of denominational and ecclesiastical structure as they regarded them as incompatible with the new outpouring of the Spirit. They adopted Jesus’ metaphor that new wine should not be poured out into an old wine skin. Hence, for the fulness of the renewal grace, charismatics should leave the denominational churches in order to “restore” the original nature of the church as in the New Testament period, which was not constituted by institution, but was formed as a community; it was not led by clergy, but by apostles. Moreover, they also emphasised the restoration of the post-conversion experience, baptism in the Spirit, and the use of charisms. Andrew Walker labels the restorationists as R1 and R2. This first group tends to be exclusive and authoritarian while the other one is more inclusive and flexible in relation to other churches.³³ Although their action of leaving their own churches and starting new ones was criticised as divisive, they defended their actions by saying what they did could

³² Michael Harper, “From the London Hilton to the Toronto Vineyard”, *Renewal*, No. 236 (January 1996), p. 12

³³ William K. Kay, *Apostolic Networks in Britain: New Ways of Being Church* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2007), p. 20.

fulfill the vision of unity because the denominational barriers were abolished in the community and there was oneness in Christ.³⁴

It is important to state that the charismatic group that this thesis is discussing does not include these radicals, but only those who remained in their denominational churches and the reasons are threefold. First, this thesis aims to argue that the charismatic renewal contributed to the complementarity of institution and charisms by the emphases of the Holy Spirit and charisms. The rationale behind this argument is that institution is still essential for the establishment and functioning of the church as well as the accomplishment of church unity. Institution helps to maintain order, discipline, traditions and doctrinal teachings of the church, and hence it should not be abandoned but should be used appropriately so that it can effectively complement the charismatic and experiential elements of the life of the church. Secondly, the five international conferences show that charismatics could still keep their denominational identities and experienced unity together, and it is ecumenically even more significant especially when Protestants and Roman Catholics could acknowledge one another as Christians. And hence, as far as the thesis is concerned, it is theologically significant. Thirdly, most of the churches still uphold the necessity of institution in the constitution of the church and so it will be more important to deal with the question of how institution complements charisms in the charismatic renewal.

On the other hand, it took time for the term “charismatic renewal” to be finalised and widely adopted. Each stage in developing the term suggests a transformation of people’s

³⁴ William K. Kay, *Apostolic Networks in Britain*, pp. 23, 39.

understandings of the renewal in the 1960s-70s. Historically, charismatic renewal in the Western literature, is regarded as a movement originating in the US in the 1960s. Prominent leaders in the early stages such as Dennis Bennett, an Episcopal rector of St Marks Church, Van Nuys, California³⁵ and Larry Christenson, a Lutheran minister in the US, had made a large impact in many parts of the world, including Britain. Phenomenologically, it was similar to the Pentecostal movement characterised by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the spiritual gifts. Hence, when the renewal started in the US in 1959-1960, adherents adopted some Pentecostal terms such as revival, awakening and outpouring to describe their experience, and there was no need for alternatives, as Hocken records.³⁶ Then the term, “Neo-Pentecostalism” was adopted for which Hocken gives two reasons: first, the realisation that these spiritual experiences were occurring in many parts of the world, and were not localised; second, a feeling of the need to bring the experiences to their churches as a consequence of such a realisation.³⁷ Because of this awareness, Hocken thinks that the word and concept of “renewal” was developed and that it gradually replaced the previous term. Especially in the article, “The New Pentecostalism”, Russel Hitt, the editor of *Eternity*, recorded the refusal by two authors to use the term, “neo-pentecostalism” in an article in *Trinity* and their adoption of the term “charismatic renewal”.³⁸ In the 1970s, the term charismatic renewal/movement was widely used for the sake of making a clear distinction between

³⁵ Nigel Scotland, *Charismatics and the New Millennium: The Impact of Charismatic Christianity from 1960 into the New Millennium* (Guildford: Eagle, 2000), p. 15.

³⁶ Peter Hocken, “The Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement as Revival and Renewal”, *PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1981), p. 37.

³⁷ Peter Hocken, “The Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement as Revival and Renewal”, p. 37.

³⁸ Peter Hocken, “Charismatic Movement”, in Stanley M. Burgess and Eduard M. van der Mass (eds) *International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2002), p. 480;

Peter Hocken, *Streams of Renewal: The Origins and Early Development of the Charismatic Movement in Great Britain* (Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1997), p. 185.

the current movement itself and the Classical Pentecostalism so that mainline churches would find it easier to accept.³⁹

Apart from drawing a distinction between themselves and the Pentecostals by using the term charismatic renewal/movement rather than neo-Pentecostalism, another question arose as to whether the movement was a renewal or revival. In 1969, Harper claimed, “We need to recognize that the charismatic renewal is not in itself revival.”⁴⁰ His *raison d’être* was that the movement of that period was for the church—to renew its ministry, structure, worship and other aspects, while revival, as used in the Pentecostal movement, was viewed as a movement for the world.⁴¹ Hocken suggests that revival means “coming to life” while renewal is a “revitalization” for a life that has existed.⁴² In addition, in terms of continuity, revival tends to be a here-and-now concept because its focus is on the dramatic works of God falling upon human beings. It does not so much consider the past, but more the present and future in terms of eschatological visions. In contrast, renewal attempts to relate the present to the past and emphasises God’s everlasting presence and works within the church.⁴³ He provides three dichotomies to conclude his understanding of the differences between revival and renewal; they are: falling upon/stirring within,

³⁹ Peter Hocken, “A Survey of the Worldwide Charismatic Movement”, in Arnold Bittlinger (ed) *The Church Is Charismatic: The World Council of Churches and the Charismatic Renewal* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1981), p.123.

⁴⁰ Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican - Historical and Contemporary: A Comparison of the Life and Work of Alexander Boddy (1854 1930) and Michael C. Harper” (Unpublished M. Litt thesis of the University of Birmingham, 1976), p. 168.

⁴¹ Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, pp. 167-168.

⁴² Peter Hocken, “The Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement as Revival and Renewal”, pp. 35, 41.

⁴³ Peter Hocken, “The Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement as Revival and Renewal”, pp. 35, 41; “Revival and Renewal”, *The Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*, Vol. XVIII (1998) pp. 50-52.

discontinuity/continuity, radical new beginning/process and development.⁴⁴ Although conceptually, it will be contradictory to put revival and renewal together to investigate either the Pentecostal or charismatic movement, his articles tend to suggest this idea because those two phenomena are historically and theologically inter-related and complementary. The picture is not so clearly seen if only one or other of the concepts is adopted.⁴⁵

Nevertheless, the term, “charismatic renewal”, was used instead of “charismatic revival” by charismatics, and by the middle of the 1970s, this term was more popular than “charismatic movement”. In 1975, Smail explained,

We find ourselves speaking less and less of a movement and more and more of a charismatic renewal. The first suggests something alongside and possibly in competition with the churches, whereas the second makes it much clearer that what we seek is a renewal of the church.⁴⁶

Smail’s semantic distinction between the words “movement” and “renewal” suggests that the phenomenon itself can be viewed in an aggressive (movement) or a contributive way (renewal). The Malines document also prefers the word “renewal” to “movement” which connotes human motivation and force.⁴⁷ Concurring with Smail’s distinction and the preference of the Malines document, I will adopt “charismatic renewal” in the whole thesis to represent the phenomenon. This is also done for the sake of consistency to avoid confusion.

⁴⁴ Peter Hocken, “Revival and Renewal”, p. 54.

⁴⁵ Peter Hocken, “Revival and Renewal”, p. 49.

⁴⁶ Letter from Tom Smail to David Popely, Kent, 10 January 1975.

⁴⁷ Yves M. J. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Volume II: ‘He is Lord and Giver of Life’* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983), p. 163.

4.2. Charisms

Charisms play an essential role in the charismatic renewal as well as in personal lives. Most of the charismatics claim that baptism in the Spirit brings not only a transformation of their spiritual or physical lives, but also the gift of the Spirit for ministry such as healing, prophecy, teaching, etc. and for personal edification such as tongue-speaking mentioned in 1 Corinthians 12. Semantically the renewal was described with the adjective *charismatic* implying the importance of prominent and even “supernatural” spiritual gifts which are frequently used. The Greek word, “charismata”, in its plural form, suggests the multiplicity of spiritual gifts is adopted as the root of the English word, “charismatic”.⁴⁸ Harper said, “What is distinctive about this movement, whatever it may be called, is that many Christians are actualizing the Spirit’s power in their lives, and experiencing in a new way a greater use of charismatic gifts.”⁴⁹ Smail also asserted the features of spiritual gifts and God’s manifestation of His power in the movement. He believed that they should be part of the constitution of the Church and Christians should reacquire them. As he explained in a letter,

When one reads the New Testament one will find...a great deal about the Holy Spirit coming into people’s lives as an experienced reality, on the one hand imparting the love of Christ, but on the other imparting His power and His gifts which are meant for all His disciples. The charismatic movement is simply concerned to remind the Church that such experienced love and power is God’s will and provision for it, into which Christians should be entering.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Nigel Scotland, *Charismatics and the New Millennium*, p. 10.

⁴⁹ Letter from the Director of Fountain Trust to the Editor of the Church of England Newspaper, 1 July 1973.

⁵⁰ Letter from Tom Smail to Miss D. Cameron, 16 July 1975.

Charisms are certainly indispensable in the charismatic renewal. Therefore, Hocken asserts, “Without an openness to the reception of, and practice of the spiritual gifts, it would not be charismatic renewal”.⁵¹

The Roman Catholic Church also talks about charisms but the meaning is broader than the supernatural element that charismatics refer to. As is emphasized at Vatican II, whatever builds up the church is a charism. Hence, charisms can be regarded as ministries, either for the church or the world and they are essential for the growth of the church both spiritually and numerically in terms of members.⁵² The distribution and the effective function of charisms depends chiefly on the action of the Holy Spirit but also on the extent to which people allow the Spirit to work within the church. Therefore, institution becomes an issue. However, in New Testament times, there was not such a sharp contrast between institution and charism as at the present day. Jesus appointed the Twelve to accompany Him throughout His ministry on earth and after His resurrection and Pentecost, and they became founders of churches in various places.⁵³ For Paul, institutionally, the church is not only built up by the apostles, but also by prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers who were anointed by the Spirit. The Holy Spirit also distributed gifts to the faithful, to serve within and without the church. Hence, the early church was simply constituted by a communion of the faithful with the leadership of God’s chosen ones.

⁵¹ Quoted by Nigel Scotland in *Charismatics and the New Millennium*, p. 38.

⁵² Kilian McDonnell, “Communion Ecclesiology and Baptism in The Spirit: Tertullian and the Early Church”, *Theological Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 4(1988), p. 692.

⁵³ Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Vol. II*, p. 39.

5. Contributions of the Thesis

This thesis aims to advance knowledge and insight regarding the charismatic renewal and ecumenism in a twofold way. First, historically, it fills in the gap of British charismatic history by mapping the events of the five international conferences of the Fountain Trust. They are important for understanding the British charismatic renewal in terms of its development (from the coming of age, through its climax and finally to the plateau period), direction (from focusing on charisms, healing and baptism in the Spirit to community and church life to finally social concern and evangelism), popularity (from an attendance of less than 700 at Guildford 1971, to almost 2,000 at Westminster 1975 and finally declining to less than 1,200 at Westminster 1979) and relations with charismatics overseas (Sweden, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, etc). More importantly, they clearly demonstrate the ecumenical nature of the charismatic renewal as they gathered Protestants and Roman Catholics together and a grassroots unity nurtured. They are significant both in ecumenical and charismatic history and hence it is worth recording the events.

Moreover, the thesis provides an alternative interpretation of the ecumenical history. It argues that the charismatic renewal which brought about the grassroots unity should be included in ecumenical history besides the official ecumenical activities. By doing so, we can have a more holistic view of the ecumenical movement that consists of both institutional and charismatic elements, and official and grassroots participation, and the involvement of human effort and the Holy Spirit's power. In addition, we can see the historical continuity of the modern ecumenical movement: from the Edinburgh

conference in 1910, the establishment of the WCC in 1948, the Vatican II in 1962-65 and the charismatic renewal in 1960s-70s, and pursue an eschatological continuity with the legacy of hope given by the charismatic renewal.

Theologically, this thesis provides a new interpretation of the unity in the charismatic renewal. First, it identifies the kind of unity of the charismatic renewal as being a grassroots unity which was nurtured among lay people through common experience and mutual ministry of charisms without doctrinal agreements at the official level. However, this thesis is not intended to give triumphalistic praise to the success of the grassroots unity but to recognise its inadequacy in the pursuit for visible unity. Hence, its second contribution is its search for complementarities of institution and charisms, and christology and pneumatology. These two kinds of complementarities have been discussed by theologians in ecclesiology and ecumenism, but I attempt to deal with this subject in the charismatic context. This is because the charismatic renewal, with the vivid presence of the Holy Spirit and the functioning of charisms, complements the christological and institutional orientation on which church and theology have focused.

Hopefully by providing new historical evidence for the British charismatic renewal and fresh interpretation of the ecumenicity of the charismatic renewal, the historical and theological understanding of both the charismatic renewal and the ecumenism will be widened and theologians of related subjects will be stimulated to conduct further research.

CHAPTER ONE

THE HISTORY OF THE FOUNTAIN TRUST

As the flame of renewal spread in many parts of Britain during the 1950s-60s, some charismatics saw the need to promote the renewal through an organisation. This could gather human and financial resources and build up links among charismatic Christians, churches and organisations so that the renewal could reach out geographically more widely and spiritually more deeply. Based on this vision the Fountain Trust was established in 1964 in Britain and its contribution to the renewal was highly valued. Over the years, it went through a process of building up relationships with churches and self-reflection, until its closure in 1980. During this time, when new directors were appointed, there were changes of emphasis and direction both for the Trust and the renewal. The Trust's closure meant the end of a chapter of the renewal history in Britain. This chapter aims to trace all these aspects. Before doing so, it is important to explore the background of the British charismatic renewal from which the Trust was developed.

1. Background of the Charismatic Renewal in Britain

The British charismatic renewal developed in the 1960s. The church had been undergoing a drastic decline after the Second World War, partly due to the fact that the economy had been flourishing, and a counter-culture which challenged the traditional moral value had been emerging in the society. It was the time when materialism and new social ideas were highly valued, but the Church was failing to

communicate the gospel. The church was desperate for transformation and empowerment.

1.1. The Decline of the Church

1.1.1. Post-War Gloominess

Following two world wars in the first half of the century, the church had experienced a deep gloom and spiritual weariness among both clergy and laity. Many Christian leaders, particularly in the Church of England, had been called to serve as chaplains on the front lines, leaving loyal but elderly members to administer the church and provide spiritual guidance.¹ Those chaplains understood the cruel nature of wars against humanity, but they still had to “bless the guns” or claim that God “is on our side”.² Anglican leaders saw how irrelevant the church was becoming and the exhaustion of its clergy, as Archbishop Garbett wrote in his diary, “May 21, 1940 – Convocation appalling dreary. We discussed exchanges of benefices, cremation, lay readers etc. while the fate of the world is being fought out”.³ When the war ended in 1945, many church-goers were still living under its shadow. Tom Walker recalls that some of his members still felt the guilt of having killed people during the fighting. A Jewish lady could not erase the memory of Auschwitz because of a surgical scar which had replaced a prison number tattoo.⁴ Some Christians had a critical reaction against the church and Christianity. Suffering and death provoked scepticism about the reality of a loving God. Many people gave up their faith and abandoned their church-going habits. As David MacInnes recalls, “The two world wars did an enormous amount of hatchet work on the church so that a lot of nominal Christianity

¹ Tom Walker, *Renew Us by Your Spirit* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1982), p. 15.

² Interview with David MacInnes, 28 June 2006, Oxford.

³ Quoted by Tom Walker, *Renew Us by Your Spirit*, pp. 15-16.

⁴ Tom Walker, *Renew Us by Your Spirit*, p. 16.

was cut away because it had not got any reason for remaining”.⁵ The wars left people with a complex mixture of pain, guilt, sadness and unforgiveness. Questions about suffering, the existence of God and the church were not easy to answer. Spiritual healing and a renewal of power were the only hope for the revitalisation of churches and individual Christians.

1.1.2. Formalism

While the wars brought enormous physical, psychological and spiritual traumas to society, the Church with its formalism and dryness could not comfort the wounded hearts. The old liturgical forms and ecclesiastical structures were not compatible with the rapidly changing society. As Harper states, “Many are dissatisfied with the church structures which may have been adequate for the pre-industrial age”.⁶ Worship was still traditional and dull especially in the Church of England, which was to maintain its role as the Church of the Nation.⁷ Since this approach was not meeting the real spiritual needs, people were disillusioned and just left the church.⁸ The bishop of Huddleston recognised the problem and asserted, “The world will only hear the language of the Church and of the Christian Gospel if it can come with a freshness, a stimulus, a shining sparkle”.⁹ Clearly there was an urgent need for a renewal both of the structures and worship for church growth.

However, some churches believed that theological formalism could be a way to deal with the decline. Walker noticed that preachers avoided conveying a message in a

⁵ Interview with David MacInnes, 28 June 2006, Oxford.

⁶ Michael Harper, *A New Way of Living* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973), p. 45.

⁷ Tom Walker, *Renew Us by Your Spirit*, p. 9.

⁸ Interview with David MacInnes, 28 June 2006, Oxford.

⁹ Quoted by the Bishop of Coventry, “A Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Coventry: The Great and Urgent Need for Spiritual Revival”, *Renewal*, No. 11 (October-November 1967), p. 4.

simple way but with complicated theological concepts. Consequently, although Christianity became less relevant to daily life and difficult to perceive, at least, people respected the theology.¹⁰ This kind of teaching might stimulate their cerebral thinking about belief, but it might not necessarily lead the congregation to their personal God. It was only the coming of the charismatic renewal that began to challenge the ecclesiastical and theological formalism and bring renewed life to the Church and to individuals.

1.1.3. Billy Graham's Preparatory Work

In the gloom caused by the wars and the formalism of the church, Billy Graham's crusade in 1954 lit the hope for the church which paved the way for the charismatic renewal. He preached every night for three months in the Haringay Arena, and thousands of people were converted. Subsequently many young people devoted themselves to ministry. The positive results of Graham's crusade reflected the ineffectiveness of the church in evangelism after the wars because these conversions and devotions were not brought about by churches but an evangelist from the US. At the same time, churches remained unchanged and were unaware of the extent of the current decline. MacInnes commented that in the 1950s, only a few prophetic voices could be heard saying "the country is still living on spiritual capital". There had been great revival in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but at the beginning of the twentieth century there was only liberal theology "which had a tendency to undercut faith" rather than renewing it.¹¹ He believed that Billy Graham did preparatory work for the charismatic renewal by bringing a number of converts to the church when it had been losing its members after the wars. Based on the foundation of the faith, in

¹⁰ Tom Walker, *Renew Us by Your Spirit*, p. 17.

¹¹ Interview with David MacInnes, 28 June 2006, Oxford.

the 1960s, people sought for experiential elements in their belief and the charismatic renewal fulfilled the need.¹²

1.1.4. Drop of Membership

Although Billy Graham's work added some converts in British churches, the general decline continued. The dominating trend was a severe drop in the membership of all denominations in Britain. From 1957, there was a similar decline in the membership of the Church of Scotland which went on until the 1990s.¹³ Easter Day attendance in the Church of England had dropped to a third of what it had been in 1961.¹⁴ Free churches like the Baptists could not avoid the problem either. Baptist minister, Douglas McBain, recalled that when he commenced his ministry in 1957, there were 327,000 Baptists in Britain; however, by 1976, the number had dropped to 181,000.¹⁵ The number of Methodists also decreased from 727,000 in 1930 to 416,000 in 1990.¹⁶ The Roman Catholic Church saw an increase in membership in the post-war period, but by the 1960s it had also started losing its membership for the first time since the eighteenth century.¹⁷ It was only the Black and Pentecostal churches that were not merely immune to this trend, but were actually growing.¹⁸ Most of the historical and mainline churches saw a drastic decrease in their membership since 1960, which went on decade after decade. David L. Edwards concludes that there were a third of church

¹² Ibid.

¹³ G. I. T. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 178.

¹⁴ Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues 1*, Westminster 1977 (London: Fountain Trust, 1977) (Audio Tape);

G. I.T. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth-Century Britain*, p. 178.

¹⁵ Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues 1*, Westminster 1977.

¹⁶ David L. Edwards, *A Concise History of English Christianity: From Roman Britain to the Present Day* (London: Fount, 1998), p. 158.

¹⁷ Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues 1*, Westminster 1977;

G. I.T. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth-Century Britain*, pp. 138, 178.

¹⁸ Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues 1*, Westminster 1977;

G. I. T. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth-Century Britain*, p. 211.

members left between 1960 and 1985.¹⁹ But it was also in the 1960s that the charismatic renewal began. McBain asserted that the renewal was essential for rescuing churches from a far more serious decline.²⁰ Harper declared that the way for the church to solve its “bankruptcy” was the recovery of “pentecostal power”.²¹ British historian G.I.T. Machin claims that the charismatics, including members of house churches, “provided the main signs of renewal of Christians”.²²

1.2. Economic Boom, Spiritual Gloom

The charismatic renewal rose when the spiritual emptiness was deepened by the economic affluence which came after the first and the second world wars. Consumerism and materialism became the dominating ideologies during the 1950s and this continued in the 1960s. These two decades were marked by a “growth in popular prosperity” where “material comfort and physical enjoyment” became a priority in people’s lives. Commodities such as cars, televisions and travel, both locally and abroad, were now affordable.²³ Society was undergoing remarkable economic growth and the Prime Minister of the time was renowned for his declaration that “We’ve never had it so good”.²⁴ The affluence went on into the 1970s and the Canon of Westminster, David L. Edwards commented that

Obviously Britain still belongs to the rich minority of mankind. Indeed, it is probably true to say that the British people were as a whole more prosperous in the mid-1970s than in almost any previous period, even if it was prosperity substantially financed by foreign lenders.²⁵

¹⁹ David L. Edwards, *A Concise History of English Christianity*, p. 148.

²⁰ Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues 1*, Westminster 1977.

²¹ Michael Harper, *A New Way of Living*, p. 49.

²² G. I. T. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth-Century Britain*, p. 213.

²³ G. I. T. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth-Century Britain*, pp. 143-144.

²⁴ Tom Walker, *Renew Us by Your Spirit*, p. 17;

The Bishop of Coventry, “A Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Coventry: The Great and Urgent Need for Spiritual Revival”, p. 4.

²⁵ David L. Edwards, *The State of the Nation: A Christian Approach to Britain’s Economic Crisis*

The fact that “too many had too much in terms of material goods” produced a spiritual vacuum.²⁶ Tangible goods were regarded as more worthy of pursuit than the invisible God. Going shopping and travelling at weekends were more enjoyable than attending services. In that era of materialism, Walker believes that the church unavoidably saw the decline.²⁷ The *Reports to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland* in 1955 comments, “more than ever in such a situation is it necessary for the Church to proclaim the teaching of Christ that “a man’s life consisteth not in the abundance of things which he possesses”.’²⁸ Charismatic renewal developed at a time when people’s minds and spirits were filled up with their material possessions, and when God seemed to be the last consideration of their lives. It reminded people of the forgotten God who was the giver of all things and whose Spirit could satisfy people’s hearts in the way that materials could never do. As Walker points out, “We simply note the fact that the highly spiritual and supernatural emphasis of the renewal movement has been a significant factor in drawing some of today’s rationalistic pagans back to an awareness of God”.²⁹

1.3. The Rise of Counter-Cultures

The charismatic renewal emerged when counter-cultures were growing in 1960’s British society. Young people were pursuing so-called “self-expression” and liberation from traditional values. Hippies outwardly and physically protested against the bondage of conventions with unconventional clothes, hairstyles and behaviour. Rock music and pop art were developed to counter the “high culture” such as fine art

(London: Church Information Office, 1976), p. 18.

²⁶ Tom Walker, *Renew Us by Your Spirit*, p. 17.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Quoted by G. I. T. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth-Century Britain*, p. 144.

²⁹ Tom Walker, *Renew Us by Your Spirit*, p. 17.

and classical music.³⁰ The traditional norms of marriage and sex were challenged. From the early 1960s, the rates of cohabitation, divorce, abortion and illegitimate birth had been increasing.³¹ The emergence of a diversity of contraceptive means encouraged sexual enjoyment without the worry of possible pregnancy.³² In addition, the abuse of drugs for sensual pleasure was growing.³³ The morality which had been tightly sustained by the strong influence of the churches in previous centuries, was now being severely questioned. It led the Bishop of Coventry to say, “Of recent years this moral code has been weakening alarmingly. In some directions one can almost sense what amounts to a moral landslide”.³⁴ In the light of the alarming sign of moral downturn and challenges against conventionalised values, there were pleadings to resist the trend. The charismatic renewal took place when the church was wrestling with the counter-culture and needed wisdom and strength to witness to the gospel in society.

To view the renewal from another perspective, its development in the 1960s was one of the elements of the counter-culture. The subculture offered alternatives to the conventional social norms. The traditional mind-set of the general public was shaken and new ideas, thoughts and experiences were being welcome.³⁵ Charismatic renewal developed in this soil of subversion against standards and conventions which had long been regarded as ultimately correct. There were major changes of emphasis such as the importance of experience rather than just cerebral understanding; of spontaneity

³⁰ D. W. Bebbington, *Evangelism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730's to the 1980's* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), p. 232.

³¹ G. I. T. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth-Century Britain*, p. 213.

³² G. I. T. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth-Century Britain*, p. 213; David L. Edwards, *A Concise History of English Christianity*, p. 147.

³³ D. W. Bebbington, *Evangelism in Modern Britain*, p. 232; Interview with David MacInnes, 28 June 2006, Oxford.

³⁴ The Bishop of Coventry, “A Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Coventry: The Great and Urgent Need for Spiritual Revival”, p. 7.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

rather than formality in worship; of complete surrender to the Holy Spirit rather than human effort. The renewal altered the ecclesiastical formalism on which the church had relied and endowed it with liveliness, freshness, strength and hope. After the spiritual impact of the wars, and the changes in social conventions, it presented an attractive alternative Christianity and a form of church life which gained more and more acceptance among mainline churches and the Roman Catholics. Its success lay in the transformation of the church by the Holy Spirit, but it was the general social trend of welcoming new ideas which helped the renewal to flourish. Thus, the Church of England views that “the rise of the counter-culture and of the charismatic movement were simultaneous” and that this created “a form of Christianised existentialism”.³⁶

2. The Development of the Charismatic Renewal in Britain

When the charismatic movement commenced in Britain in the 1960s, it did not initially make a big splash, nor did it have a significant impact on many churches. In fact, it took a number of years before it was fully recognised, and only began to be accepted as a serious force in the 1970s. Although in 1964 Michael Harper established the Fountain Trust for the promotion of the charismatic renewal in Britain, its growth was “slow”, and “steady but unspectacular”,³⁷ which suggests that it did not catch the eye of most of the church leaders. This situation continued until the 1970s when there was a breakthrough for the whole movement. Martin Robinson reports that charismatic groupings were then set up and conferences took place in some mainline churches. There was the first public Methodist Charismatic Conference attended by

³⁶ D. W. Bebbington, *Evangelism in Modern Britain*, p. 233.

³⁷ Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, p. 185;
Peter Hocken, *Streams of Renewal*, p. 490.

135 people with a report “Charismatic Movement in Methodism ‘Goes Public’” in 1973. The “Group for evangelism and renewal” of the United Reformed Church and the National Service Committee of the Roman Catholics were formed.³⁸ Robinson’s discovery of the growing acceptance of the charismatic renewal echoes Michael Harper’s personal experience in a Church Leaders’ Conference, “Facing the Future”, in Birmingham in September 1972.³⁹ During the ten days of the Conference, he “was able to share with leaders in all the major denominations” and showed the film “Following the Spirit” twice in front of more than one hundred leaders.⁴⁰ He found that they were sympathetic and supportive of the charismatic renewal.⁴¹ There were those such as the Bishop of Warrington whom Harper described as “very friendly and very interested in what is going on”.⁴² He reported to a Fountain Trust Advisory Council Meeting in 1972 that, “There is much greater openness than ever before. All the statements and comments were complimentary, and not negative, towards the charismatic movement”.⁴³ And so he confidently claims “surely we are living in days of great opportunity”.⁴⁴

In contrast to the Classical Pentecostal Movement which was rooted in the working class, charismatic renewal was predominantly a middle-class movement.⁴⁵ Jim Packer talks of the racial and stylistic differences between the two movements. If we trace the history back, one tends to be “black-style” and “holy roller”, while the other one is

³⁸ Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, p. 185.

³⁹ Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 43 (June 1972), London: Fountain Trust.

⁴⁰ Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 44 (October 1972), London: Fountain Trust.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Letter from Michael Harper to William Davies, 29 September 1972.

⁴³ Minutes-FTACM (2 November 1972), p. 1.

⁴⁴ Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 44 (October 1972), London: Fountain Trust.

⁴⁵ Letter from Brian Ellis to Michael Harper, 12 November 1973, p. 3;
Anne Mather, “The Theology of the Charismatic Movement in Britain from 1964 to the Present Day” (Unpublished Ph. D thesis of the University of Wales, Bangor, 1983), p. 48;
Siegfried Grossmann, *Stewards of God’s Grace* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1981), p. 67.

“white” and “restrained”.⁴⁶ Harper admitted that in the 1970s, after ten years of the renewal, it could not permeate into the working class culture.⁴⁷ A person’s social background was often reflected in their qualifications. Most of the Pentecostal preachers had training in Pentecostal Bible colleges while charismatic ministers of the mainline churches had gained university degrees. The educational differences affected the relationship between the two groups.⁴⁸

Another characteristic of the British charismatic renewal is that it was mainly led by Evangelical Anglicans. Hocken reported that at the Stoke Poges conference in June 1964, there were twenty participants and eight of them were Evangelical Anglicans, two Catholic Anglicans and two were middle of the road. There were four independent Christians, one Methodist, two Baptists and one from the Church of Scotland.⁴⁹ Moreover, the four Trustees at the early stage were all Anglicans.⁵⁰ As a Baptist charismatic herself, R. A. Pyle was frequently mistaken for an Anglican and she wondered if the Trust perceived itself as an Anglican renewal movement.⁵¹ Nevertheless, the Trust’s primary purpose was to spread the renewal among churches no matter what the denominational affiliation. It aimed at being both charismatic and ecumenical, as this was the very character of the renewal. The self-understanding of the Trust and its relations with churches are explained as the following.

⁴⁶ J. I. Packer, “Piety on Fire”, *Christianity Today* (May 12 1989), p. 20.

⁴⁷ Letter from Michael Harper to Brian Ellis, 23 November 1973.

⁴⁸ Peter Hocken, *Streams of Renewal*, p. 140.

⁴⁹ Peter Hocken, *Streams of Renewal*, p. 118

⁵⁰ They were Eric Houfe, Bill Grant, Geoffrey Gould and Noel Davson. (Peter Hocken, *Streams of Renewal*, p. 259, note 43.)

⁵¹ Letter from R. A. Pyle to Michael Harper, 5 August 1975, p. 1.

3. A Brief History of the Fountain Trust

3.1. Its Self Understanding in the Charismatic Renewal

Harper established the Fountain Trust because his vision was to “help to fan the flame of the charismatic renewal which was just being kindled” and to “keep it sound and balanced”.⁵² Its self-understanding was continually evaluated and modified so that it could keep up with the unfolding work of the Holy Spirit. Its “prime aim” was for “the renewal of the spiritual life of the Christian Church”, so that its members could “enter into full possession of the important realities of the Holy Spirit”.⁵³ The Trust recognised, within God’s purposes, that its ministry could end one day, and so it did not regard itself as a permanent organisation.⁵⁴ Its self-understanding can be divided into three stages.

3.1.1. Stage 1: Initial Period (1964-1970)

The general goal of the Trust was to spread renewal in churches, “particularly parochial-congregational renewal, within the historic Protestant and Reformed churches”,⁵⁵ but its specific ideas, functions and ministry were still being clarified at this stage as can be seen in the following.

3.1.1.1. The Ecumenical Nature

When the Trust was born (29 September 1964), it was consciously endowed with an ecumenical nature. Harper announced that he felt “called to serve every section of the Church...to bring men of different traditions together” in the power of the Holy

⁵² Fountain Trust, “Michael Hands over the Reins”, *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (28 July 1975), p. 1.

⁵³ Letter from Revd. Ian Davidson, Ipswich, Suffolk, September 1972.

⁵⁴ Minutes-FTAM (6 December 1968), p. 2.

⁵⁵ Peter Hocken, *Streams of Renewal*, p. 122.

Spirit,⁵⁶ to fulfil this vision and to guarantee that renewal could be shared by the whole of the Body of Christ without further division.⁵⁷ Within the first ten years of the Trust, some written documents show that this idea was still sustained. For example, in the minutes of an Advisory Council Meeting in 1970, we read that “the Trust was not an organisation in the sense of having a membership and its work existed to transcend denominational barriers and bring together those whom God had blessed or who were seeking blessing”.⁵⁸ At the international conference in Nottingham (1973), Tom Smail claimed that if anybody asked about joining the Trust, he would say, “There is no such animal!”⁵⁹ In 1974, in a letter answering a question about the Trust, Smail pointed out that one of its features was that it did not have any membership. Instead, it was “to offer a ministry to the Churches and not to build up a support of its own”. For that reason, the Trust did not have branches or a local or national group. It simply had links with churches, groups or individuals who were sympathetic or experienced the renewal inside and outside Britain.⁶⁰

The ecumenical character of the Trust was also apparent in the administrative structure. Besides the four Anglican Trustees under the leadership of Harper,⁶¹ it also formed an Advisory Council in which charismatics from various ecclesiological backgrounds discussed the policies and issues relating to the charismatic renewal. The aim was to reach all the churches in Britain.⁶² Due to its aim of being a service agency

⁵⁶ Quoted from Peter Hocken, *Streams of Renewal*, p. 119.

⁵⁷ Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, p. 154.

⁵⁸ Minutes-FTACM (20 November 1970), p. 2

⁵⁹ Michael Harper, “Editorial: Ten Years Young”, *Renewal*, No. 53 (October-November 1974), pp. 3-4.

⁶⁰ Letter from Tom Smail to John Capon, 1974;

Letter from Revd. Ian Davidson, Ipswich, Suffolk, September 1972.

⁶¹ Peter Hocken, *Streams of Renewal*, p. 119.

Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, p. 226.

⁶² Peter Hocken, “Fountain Trust”, in Stanley Burgess and Eduard M. van der Maas (eds) *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2002), p. 646; *Streams of Renewal*, p. 119;

for renewal, Robinson comments that the Trust succeeded in overcoming “the risk of a separate denomination forming” in the process of spreading the renewal.⁶³

3.1.1.2. From Being a Community to Fellowship

The Trust was envisaged as a “community” working for British churches at this early stage, but this idea proved to be inappropriate and was altered to “fellowship”. From 1964 it struggled to find its precise role in the charismatic renewal. It was in a process of maturing and the way it could develop was not clear. As Harper said in an Advisory Council Meeting, “There had been a phase to see what would happen, particularly since 1964”.⁶⁴ During this misty period, there was an apparent ray of hope in 1967 when Rev. Reg East, an “older” man ministering in a parish in Essex and closely affiliated with the Trust,⁶⁵ proposed a model of community as a “basis of the work of the Fountain Trust”.⁶⁶ His idea was that the work for renewal should be done by a team, and that the team should live together, pray and support each other. The result was a plan to close the office in central London and move to North London or Hertfordshire.⁶⁷ It was agreed that the community should fulfill three goals: 1. Prayer: to make oneself available all the time to pray for any member who was in need and to be a backup for revival. 2. Rehabilitation: to help Christians who had psychological problems which were not too serious. 3. A conference centre: to hold conferences with 30 delegates who were “ministers and full-time Christian workers” particularly to support “those were isolated”. Moreover, the community was also expected to

Letter from Tom Smail to John Capon, 1974.

⁶³ Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, p. 226.

⁶⁴ Minutes-FTACM (1 July 1967), p. 1.

⁶⁵ Letter from Michael Harper to His Honour Judge Ruttie, Wimbledon, 3 November 1970.

In that letter, Harper described Ruttie as “a man with a very wonderful pastoral gift. Since being baptised in the Spirit he has become more and more evangelical”.

⁶⁶ Minutes-FTAM (6 December 1968), p. 1.

⁶⁷ Agenda-FTACM (1 June 1967), p. 1.

Minutes-FTACM (1 July 1967), p. 1.

evangelise and support churches in which the Holy Spirit was doing some renewing work by sending people to “counsel and give guidance”. Staff of the community were supposed not only to work for renewal, but also “to minister to each other”.⁶⁸

Unfortunately, after a year and a half, this idealistic model of community was found unworkable and even harmful to the unity of the Trust. At the Advisory Meeting in December 1968, Michael Harper reported, “The Fountain Trust had been through a difficult and confused time since the last Advisors’ meeting”, particularly because of a sense of disunity that had been felt in attempting to fulfil the vision of a community.⁶⁹ The problem had come to the surface in a residential conference. Harper recorded that “a deep-seated disunity” was found among Trustees and delegates and “a deterioration in the fellowship” existed despite “a time of sharing together in love”. The failed process of attempting to find a house for the community had been particularly disruptive, and resulted in the resignation of a Trustee. It also limited the Trust’s development, as the existing office was too small for the increasing staff and work. The sense of unity was recovered in a fellowship meeting at East’s home and afterwards, the Trustees decided to alter the term from “community” to “fellowship”.⁷⁰

3.1.1.3. Strengthening Local Churches

Besides adopting the principle of being a fellowship, in 1968 the Trust was trying to identify what its ministry to churches should be, and how to respond to the needs of those experiencing the new work of the Spirit. Campbell McAlpine pointed out that

⁶⁸ Agenda-FTACM (1 June 1967), p. 1.

Minutes-FTACM (1 July 1967), p. 1.

⁶⁹ Minutes-FTAM (6 December 1968), p. 1.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

the Trust could be regarded as a service agency “strengthening and helping the local churches” which should themselves be responsible for meeting the local needs, as a “Bible principle”.⁷¹ It was felt that instead of “overnight visits” the Trust would encourage churches more by staying longer in any one place to “preach and adequately teach the word”.⁷²

3.1.1.4. Three aims

After five years of direction seeking, the Trust eventually identified its three aims in 1969, which were stated in *Renewal* as:

1. To encourage all Christians of all Churches to receive the power of the Holy Spirit and to glorify Christ by manifesting in their lives the fruit and the gifts of the same Spirit so that they may enrich their worship, strengthen their witness and deepen their fellowship.
2. To encourage local churches to experience renewal in the Holy Spirit and to recover the full ministry of the Holy Spirit, including that of healing.
3. To encourage Christians to expect and pray for worldwide revival.⁷³

3.1.2 Stage 2: Maturing Period (1971-1974)

3.1.2.1. 1971: “On the Move”

1971 was a significant year for the Trust. It was a time of rapid development of the charismatic renewal, its “coming of age” when the first international conference took place in Guildford. There was an accelerated interest in the renewal and more and more people experienced the Spirit and church leaders became more sympathetic.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Minutes-FTAM (6 December 1968), p. 2.

⁷² Minutes-FTAM (6 December 1968), pp. 2, 4.

⁷³ Letter from Revd. Ian Davidson, September 1972, pp. 1-2.

⁷⁴ Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 41 (February 1972), London: Fountain Trust.

For the Trust, this year marked a “milestone” after “a seven year period of steady if unspectacular growth”.⁷⁵ As a result, the workload grew rapidly, and this was reflected in the huge increase in the sales and expenditures from 1970-71 to 1971-72. Some of the growth was over 100%⁷⁶.

	1970-71	1971-72	Growth (%)⁷⁷
Book sales	£5,838	£15,864	171%
Magazine subscriptions	£2,503	£3,113	24%
Tape sales and hire	£1,530	£3,695	142%
Overheads (incl. salaries)	£9,889	£12,475	26%

Harper predicted that the work would continue to increase in the future and the office was too small for the expanding staff and work. Such growth and the associated difficulties were perceived as an encouragement rather than a burden. He and the Trust were happy to see that it was “on the move”.⁷⁸

3.1.2.2. Theological Preparation

Due to the probable continuation of the rapid development of the charismatic renewal, the Trust realised that one of its urgent tasks was to work out the theological foundations of the movement. Harper stated in 1972 that “it is very likely in the next few years the charismatic renewal will become one of the major theological concerns of the Church throughout the world”.⁷⁹ To enhance the Trust as “an effective

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 43 (June 1972), London: Fountain Trust.

⁷⁷ The figures of sales and expenditure were provided in *Newsletter*, No. 43 (June 1972), but the percentages were my own calculation to show the growth.

⁷⁸ Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 43 (June 1972), London: Fountain Trust.

⁷⁹ Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 41 (February 1972), London: Fountain Trust.

instrument in God's sovereign purpose",⁸⁰ he was convinced that it should be involved in theological study, so as to undergird the renewal, and to clarify the thinking of people about their unprecedented experience in the Spirit. To fulfill this aim, Harper and his wife visited Tom Smail in Northern Ireland hoping that he would assist with the theological development. Smail was appointed as the Trust's General Secretary from September 1972 until September 1975 when he became the Director.⁸¹ Practically the Trust set up a library at the property in East Molesey⁸² and began theological workshops after the Guildford conference in 1971 until 1974. This point will be elaborated in chapter two.

3.1.2.3. Looking Forward to 1974

Despite the encouraging growth and the increasing contribution of the Trust to the charismatic renewal in the early 1970s, Harper commented in 1972 that in the last eight years, "the work was a little fragmentary" and "individuals had been blessed, but we had yet to see whole churches becoming powerful agents of God's Spirit". Therefore 1974 was a year in which the Trust looked forward to seeing the church as a whole being renewed and not just individuals coming into an experience.⁸³ In order to achieve this, it planned to publicise the renewal with printed materials and conferences. The leaders and the Advisory Council were prepared to be involved as much as they could to get the renewal to fan out "throughout Great Britain".⁸⁴ Harper

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 43 (June 1972), London: Fountain Trust.

⁸² In the 1970s, there were not many libraries in the world for the charismatic renewal, apart from the one at the Oral Roberts University and Professor Hollenweger's personal collection in Birmingham. (Minutes-FTACM (2 November 1972), p. 1. Minutes-FTACM (5 April 1973), p. 1.

⁸³ Minutes-FTACM (2 November 1972), p. 2.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

in particular would reserve time for producing printed and audio materials instead of taking on other engagements.⁸⁵

3.1.2.4. New Aims in 1974

After a period of self-reassessment of the Trust⁸⁶ due to the rapid growth of the charismatic renewal and an expectation of another peak of the renewal in 1974, the Trust announced its new aims, “for the renewal of the Church: in Christ, by the Spirit, to the Church, for the World”.⁸⁷

Christ centred (in Christ): it recognises that the fundamental work of the Holy Spirit is to glorify Jesus Christ, who should be the centre and pattern of all renewal.

Charismatic (by the Spirit): it sees the worldwide charismatic movement as one of God’s way of renewal for the whole Church. It regards the recovery of the power and gifts of the Spirit as an essential part of this renewal.

Corporate (to the Church): it sees renewal chiefly in corporate rather than merely personal terms. Its main concern is to see churches of all denominations rather than individuals renewed by the Spirit, while recognising that God brings renewal through individuals.

Compassionate (for the World): it believes that love is the heart of renewal, and that the intention of God is that church renewal should overflow to the world in terms of evangelism and social action.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ Minutes-FTACM (5 April 1973), p. 2.

⁸⁶ The reassessed items were mentioned in an Advisory Council Meeting on 8 November 1973, p. 1:

1. The main points that had arisen were the national and local functions of the Trust and a right balance between the two;
2. improvements in its ministry to minister and leaders;
3. the need to meet a growing demand for teaching materials;
4. ministry of reconciliation with a) classical Pentecostals, b) evangelicals, c) house churches;
5. balance of ministry to those who were beginners in the things of the Spirit and the more mature;
6. dangers of becoming too American, too Pentecostal, too “familiar”;
7. whether a public relations “image” was necessary or not

In *Newsletter*, No. 48 (December 1973), there are also similar items mentioned about the Trust’s reassessment:

1. We want to make our own organisation adequate to our ministry; we want to have the right ministry to serve and support what God is doing in His Church.
2. We want to help those already blessed in the Spirit to know how to continue.
3. We believe that the field of leadership training that we have now entered is going to be of increasing importance, and we are in contact with others of a like mind already working in it.

⁸⁷ Fountain Trust, *For the Renewal of the Church: Fountain Trust—in Christ, by the Spirit, to the Church, for the World* (Esher: Fountain Trust, 1974), p. 1.

⁸⁸ Fountain Trust, *For the Renewal of the Church*, p. 2.

To realise these four aims, the Trust divided its work into four areas with four purposes. 1. Praising—The Trust intended to organise meetings for worship in London and other areas in Britain to share the renewal in the Spirit together. 2. Learning—The Trust provided courses of different lengths for church leaders covering many subjects about the renewal. In addition, conferences also provided a means for learning through “teaching, praise and fellowship”. 3. Listening—producing cassette tapes containing testimonies and ministries was another way to promote the renewal. Records with songs for worship produced by Christian communities were also available. 4. Looking—the Trust also provided printed materials, primarily the bi-monthly magazine, *Renewal*, together with its companion, *Theological Renewal*, which was started by Smail in 1975 and published three times a year, carrying the “deeper implications of what is happening”. In addition, books and films were also used.⁸⁹

Despite the change of aims, the Trust maintained the policy of not recruiting membership and declared during this stage that it “seeks to be nothing in itself, and believes that the results of its work will be seen under God in local parishes and congregations”.⁹⁰

3.1.3. Stage 3: Plateau Period to the End (1975-1980)

After the rapid development since 1971, the Trust and the charismatic renewal entered a plateau period in 1975 where there were not many excitements in terms of the numbers at conferences or miracles occurring. However, there were significant breakthroughs which had not been achieved in the previous two periods. 1975 marked

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

the new age of the Trust. Smail became the director in that year and was concerned about the balance between renewed individuals and renewed local churches. He believed that renewal should be realised in local churches, but it was also important to “bring more people more fully into his blessings” of the Spirit because the second enabled the first to happen. He thought that this vision could not be worked out with some of the methods being used previously, as he claimed, “I am not convinced that altar calls at large meetings are always the right way, I am quite sure that any attempt to pressurise people into stereotyped experiences and manifestation of gifts is the wrong way”.⁹¹

Perhaps due to the change of style and emphasis, the activities of the Trust were not as well-attended as the previous two periods. For instance, compared to the other four, the last international conference in Westminster (1979) had the fewest participants. Harper believed that the increase in renewal organisations and the rise of the House Church Movement caused the general decline in attendance. As he said, “Britain is honeycombed with renewal gatherings for praise, instruction and personal ministry”.⁹² Nevertheless, the Trust had created a new page of the renewal history by its ecumenical cooperation, its ministry in Wales and its social outreach.

3.1.3.1. Ecumenical Breakthrough

Ecumenically, Smail developed a trusting relationship with the Roman Catholics which was built up in the first two periods. The final two Westminster international conferences (1977 and 1979) were organised with the RCNSC during his leadership. He also successfully invited Cardinal Suenens to attend. Moreover, the Trust was

⁹¹ Tom Smail, “Editorial: Simplicity at the Centre”, *Renewal*, No. 66 (December 1976-January 1977), p. 4.

⁹² Michael Harper, “Prospects for a New Decade”, *Renewal*, No. 88 (August-September 1980), p. 14

invited to organise the fourth European Charismatic Leaders' Conference in 1976 in Malines. Its theme was "Koinonia—Fellowship in the Spirit" attended by more than 70 charismatic leaders at the invitation of Cardinal Suenens.⁹³ In addition, among the Anglican evangelicals, the ecumenical breakthrough found expression in the joint statement, *Gospel and Spirit*, in 1977 signed by 16 Anglican ministers and one non-Anglican, Tom Smail.⁹⁴ The detail of the Trust's relationship with evangelicals will be discussed in 3.2.3. Looking back to this period, Smail commented that the ecumenical advance characterised the Trust's work and the charismatic renewal in that period, which was "far more important than tongues and prophecies and all the things that people went on about".⁹⁵

3.1.3.2. Ministries in Wales

During the plateau period of the Trust, there was another breakthrough, and that was in its ministry in Wales. Although charismatic prayer groups, house churches, and mainline churches had shown increasing interest in the renewal in Britain, Ken Walters described Wales as being "virtually untouched" and "slow to respond to the move of the Spirit".⁹⁶ *Renewal* No. 62 (April-May 1976) reads, "In the eleven years of its history the Fountain Trust has ministered in almost every part of Britain—except Wales".⁹⁷ Fortunately, the Trust had the chance to minister here in 1976 when Smail and Colin Greene spoke to a meeting where 300 to 400 people attended at

⁹³ Fountain Trust, "Leaders Meet in Brussels", *Renewal*, No. 62 (April-May 1976), p. 5; "Well Met at Malines", *Renewal*, No. 65 (October-November 1976), p. 4.

⁹⁴ The sixteen Anglican ministers were John Baker, Colin Buchanan, John Collins, Ian Cundy, Michael Harper, Raymond Johnston, Bruce Kaye, Gordon Landreth, Robin Nixon, Jim Packer, Harold Parks, Gavin Reid, John Stott, Raymond Turvey, Tom Walker and David Watson. (Robin Nixon, "Gospel and Spirit", *Renewal*, No. 69 (June-July 1977), p. 18.

⁹⁵ Interview with Tom Smail, 16 February 2006, Croydon.

⁹⁶ Ken Walters, "Wales and the Charismatic Renewal", *Renewal*, No. 64 (August-September 1976), pp. 14-15.

⁹⁷ Fountain Trust, "At Last—to Wales", *Renewal*, No. 62 (April-May 1976), p. 6.

Salem Welsh Presbyterian Church in Aberystwyth.⁹⁸ The message was conveyed in English and Welsh to a variety of participants such as ministers of evangelical churches and Catholic priests.⁹⁹ Amazingly, for most of the participants, that was the first time that they had heard about the renewal and they showed a high expectation and interest.¹⁰⁰ After this pioneering venture, the Trust enlarged its ministry in the area by organising two official conferences in May 1975. The first one was a weekend conference on the 20th-22nd in Llandrindod Wells conducted by Jim Graham and Cecil Cousen. The second one was a ministers' conference held on the following three days at the same place where Smail and Cousen spoke.¹⁰¹ The ministry was still being carried on in 1980. In the summer, the Trust held a holiday conference for families at the University College of Wales in Aberystwyth.¹⁰²

3.1.3.3. Social Outreach

As the charismatic renewal was growing, the Trust and charismatics became more concerned about the social implications and applications of the renewal. Apart from Spirit baptism and gifts, discussion about social outreach became a main topic in the Trust's conferences. In November 1976, with the cooperation of Christian Industrial Enterprises, the Trust organised a conference to investigate the subject of "Christian involvement in industry and society". A diversity of experts were involved so as to discuss the issue from the perspectives of economics, theology, philosophy and

⁹⁸ Fountain Trust, "At Last-to Wales", p. 6;

Ken Walters, "Wales and the Charismatic Renewal", p. 15.

⁹⁹ Fountain Trust, "At Last-to Wales", p. 6.

¹⁰⁰ Ken Walters, "Wales and the Charismatic Renewal", p. 15.

¹⁰¹ Fountain Trust, "1977 Fountain Trust Conference: Welsh Conferences", *Renewal*, No. 67 (February-March 1977), back cover; "Coming Events", *Renewal*, No. 68 (April-May 1977), p. 6.

¹⁰² The speakers were Michael Barling, John Richards, David Pawson, Peter Marshall, Jean Darnall and Tom Smail though he had resigned from the directorship and became the vice-principal of St. John's College. (Fountain Trust, "Fountain Trust Conferences in 1980", *Renewal*, No. 85 (February-March 1980), pp. 10-11.)

business administration.¹⁰³ At the international conference, Westminster 1977 and 1979, social concern was a major topic—ranging from the spectrum of local responsibility in Britain to the global vision in the third world. The Trust in this period aimed at diverting attention from the personal blessings of the Spirit to witnesses and influence in society.

After Smail's resignation from the directorship in 1979, there was neither significant change of direction nor new vision during the short period when Michael Barling held office. Eventually, the Trust's ministry was terminated at the end of 1980 when the Trustees and director felt that the task of promoting the renewal had been fulfilled.

3.2. Its Relationships with Others

As a newly established organisation attempting to promote the charismatic renewal among the developed denominations and churches, the Trust had to build up healthy and trusting relationships with them, and to prevent and clear up any misunderstandings. From 1964, it had tried to do this with the Classical Pentecostals, the main denominations, individual groups, evangelicals, house churches and Roman Catholics, but the process had often been thorny.

3.2.1. Classical Pentecostals: Assemblies of God and Elim Pentecostal Church

As the phenomenon and nature of the charismatic renewal were similar to the Classical Pentecostals, namely the Spirit baptism and the accompaniment of gifts, the Trust wished to develop trusting relationships with them and to cooperate if possible. However, they had not been very successful with the AoG. They had also attempted

¹⁰³ Fountain Trust, "Christians at Work in the World", *Renewal*, No. 67 (February-March 1977), p. 6.

to connect with Elim and other Pentecostal groupings, but not all of them were willing to respond either. Although the report of an Advisory Council Meeting in 1967 mentioned that the misunderstandings between the AoG and the Trust “had now been cleared up” and a good relationship with Elim was maintained due to the shared goal of evangelism,¹⁰⁴ mistrust and tension between the Pentecostal denominations and the Trust continued and became more and more severe. In the editorial of *Renewal* in 1968, Harper expressed his disappointment about the conflict between the “‘old’ and ‘new’ Pentecostals” and advised both of them to learn from each other rather than making any unnecessary comparisons.¹⁰⁵ The 1969 High Leigh Conference in which certain “high” church representatives experienced the Spirit, made some of the Pentecostals very uncomfortable. They were suspicious of ecumenical meetings, and particularly of one in which non-Pentecostals from various denominational backgrounds had “Pentecostal” experiences. For example, it was reported that a nun spoke in tongues. They spoke out against this Conference in an article in the *Christian Guardian* by strongly affirming that they rejected “ecumenism and ritualism” and that they disagreed with Harper’s expression of a “New Pentecostalism”.¹⁰⁶ This event indeed intensified the enmity of the Pentecostals who had never been “fully at one with the Fountain Trust’s position”¹⁰⁷ and the tension continued.

The Guildford Conference in 1971 was another event which deepened the mistrust. Before the Conference started, Billy Richards, who was an outstanding Pentecostal from the AoG in Slough, had stated his opposition to it in an article.¹⁰⁸ During the Conference, there were arguments about doctrine which highlighted the Pentecostals’

¹⁰⁴ Minutes-FTACM (1 July 1967), p. 2.

¹⁰⁵ Quoted in Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, p. 166.

¹⁰⁶ Quoted in Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, p. 165.

¹⁰⁷ Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, pp. 165-166.

¹⁰⁸ Email from Michael Harper, 29 June 2005.

suspicion of the charismatic renewal.¹⁰⁹ Similar to what had happened at the High Leigh conference, the Trust's welcoming attitude and acceptance of the Roman Catholics at the Conference accelerated the distrust.¹¹⁰ The most open display of this was Alfred Missen's walk-out from the Conference due to his discomfort over David du Plessis' warm words about the Roman Catholics. This story will be illustrated in chapter three. In 1972, the conflict crossed the Atlantic in a sceptical booklet by Richards on the charismatic renewal. This received support from the AoG in the US at their annual conference. In response to this issue, the Advisory Council decided that it was essential for Harper to issue a statement.¹¹¹

A meeting between the Trust and the AoG held at the beginning of 1973 was a turning point for the deteriorating relationship. It found that the AoG had held some "very erroneous" ideas that the Trust was planning to set up a denomination itself. It took the AoG by surprise to discover that "the director and general secretary of the Trust were only employees".¹¹² The conversation helped to clear up some of their misunderstandings. It was reported that "there was a much better feeling" as a result.¹¹³ Jack Davies also explained that the Pentecostals felt that there was a lack of cooperation on the part of the Trust. Harper admitted that this "was partly true". Keeping a distance from them had been necessary to avoid rejection by other denominations.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁹ Minutes-FTACM (5 April 1973), p. 2.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Minutes-FTACM (2 November 1972), p. 1.

¹¹² Minutes-FTACM (5 April 1973), p. 3.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

However, the reconciliation achieved could not prevent the resurgence of conflict. In November of the same year, Smail reported that the AoG's attitude towards the Trust had "hardened". They had written "a rather negative statement" showing that they thought of the Trust as "an authoritative body issuing statements on behalf of neo-pentecostalism". And they claimed that the Trust's understanding of gifts should not be a definition of unity, but rather a doctrine. Smail reported that although their statement was not published before the Nottingham Conference, which the AoG had attempted to do, it would be discussed in detail in their Assembly in spring 1974.¹¹⁵ Elim's attitude towards the Trust became negative as they were "more favourably disposed" to the AoG's position.¹¹⁶ Nevertheless, Elim had been less hostile to the Trust and were open to the charismatic renewal. After David du Plessis was reaccepted by the AoG in the US after his excommunication, the Elim church invited him to speak at a meeting.¹¹⁷

Although there was an increasing challenge from the Classical Pentecostal denominations, the Trust remained positive and seized any opportunity for dialogue rather than "letting the door close".¹¹⁸ Although the AoG seemed to oppose the Trust officially, some of the ministers did not take the same view as the majority. The Trust requested some suggestions on how to "bridge the gap between the old and new movements of the Spirit" from Douglas Quay, an executive member of AoG and a minister of the Bedford Pentecostal Church.¹¹⁹ Quay acknowledged the miraculous

¹¹⁵ Minutes-FTACM (8 November 1973), p. 3.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Minutes-FTACM (5 April 1973), p. 3.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Letter from Michael Harper to Douglas Quay, 23 August 1972.

Quay's church was founded by Cecil Polhill of Howbury Hall in 1907. He was active in church broadcasting work as well. He was the Executive Director of IBRA, a Swedish Missionary Radio project which was aimed at "broadcasting the Christian Gospel in multi-language programmes from Portugal; Manila; Seychelles; S. America". He was also a consultant to the Churches Advisory

manifestations in the charismatic renewal as being quite as valid as those in the Pentecostal movement. He also supported the Trust's existence for promoting the renewal, as he said to Harper, "We are rejoicing here in evidence of miraculous power to raise sick and needy from despair and helpless. Michael, we must go forward, for we have the answer to the present-day dilemma".¹²⁰

Quy did not only support the Trust verbally, he took action by accepting the Trust's invitation to speak at the Nottingham Conference (1973). He believed that by speaking he would help the progress of reconciliation because "the older Pentecostals" might see Harper's desire and effort to build up fellowship with them. The fact that a Pentecostal minister like him had been invited as a speaker would increase the chance of removing the hostility and scepticism, and open up communication despite the underlying fears.¹²¹ His confidence was found to be justified by the support of his church members for this speaking engagement. He was able to say, "Many elder brethren are glad to know that at this important occasion, I shall be present with you". He positively believed that "the barriers would be swept away and a door opened for a great 'gale of a wind.'"¹²² Besides Quy, Wesley Gilpin, an AoG minister also accepted the invitation to be a guest at the Nottingham Conference.¹²³

Committee on Local Broadcasting and Broadcaster for AoG on the BBC and ITV. (Letter from Douglas Quy to Michael Harper, 19 December 1972; Curriculum Vitae: Douglas Quy; Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 4.)

¹²⁰ Letter from Douglas Quy to Michael Harper, 11 September 1972.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Letter from Douglas Quy to Michael Harper, 19 December 1972.

¹²³ Minutes-FTACM (2 November 1972), p. 1.

3.2.2. Other Pentecostal Groups

The Trust and FGBMFI had built up a good relationship. In spring 1965, the fellowship sponsored Harper and his wife to go on a trip to the US to meet prominent charismatic leaders such as Dennis Bennett and some Roman Catholic charismatics in Seattle.¹²⁴ In 1967, it was reported that the Trust still had a good relationship with FGBMFI.¹²⁵ In contrast, the Trust had not been able to build any relationship with the Keswick movement since 1964. Harper made it clear that the Trust as an organisation for the renewal was not attempting to compete with the Keswick. As the renewal was spreading quickly, the Trust had to organise plenty of activities to meet the needs. In 1971 alone, it held 15 functions around Britain and hence, it was difficult to avoid clashes. Moreover, Harper felt that the Keswick leaders had been “very obdurate in their opposition to the charismatic movement” and “steadfastly through the years refused to have anything to do with” it. For him, it was “the saddest” thing happening and despite the Trust’s constant attempt to bridge the gap, the gulf was “widening every year”.¹²⁶ Finally, the Trust also intended to relate to the Oneness Pentecostal groups, of which there were around 13 in Britain until 1967. Although the Trust did not agree with their doctrine, it believed that the “false teaching and anti-church emphasis demonstrated the need for fellowship, love and sensitivity”.¹²⁷

3.2.3. Evangelicals

Another Christian group which the Trust found very difficult to build up a relationship with was the evangelicals. Their attitude towards the renewal and the

¹²⁴ Peter Hocken, *Streams of Renewal*, p. 120.

¹²⁵ Minutes-FTACM (1 July 1967), p. 2.

¹²⁶ Letter from Michael Harper to Rev. John Simons, Essex, 20 August 1971, pp. 1-2.

¹²⁷ Minutes-FTACM (1 July 1967), p. 2.

Trust had been hardened from the beginning.¹²⁸ Although the Trust had done plenty of bridge-building, at the beginning of the 1970s they had “simply come up against a blank wall” as the evangelical leaders were not willing to “budge an inch in their policy of neglecting entirely this new work of God”.¹²⁹ Consequently, “misunderstanding and hard feelings” grew. David Watson attributed this attitude to the lack of theological study of the renewal when it had started, maintaining that this had led to division among evangelicals.¹³⁰ Donald Eddison thought it was the “defensive attitude” of evangelicals that caused the difficulty, which he hoped to solve by meetings and discussion.¹³¹ The Trust also realised that there was a “reluctance to talk about it” and gradually the division got deeper.¹³² An example of this can be found in the relationship between Harper and John Stott who were respectively the representative figures of the charismatic and evangelical parties. They held contrasting views about the renewal, and Harper admitted that for ten years from 1965 they had seldom met each other which did not improve the situation.¹³³

After all the discussion and effort, the relationship seemed to get better after 1975. Colin Buchanan thought that this was, on the one hand, because the charismatics had become “slightly tamer than in the past”. For example, they no longer insisted on the necessity of Spirit baptism for being a Spirit-filled person as much as they had at the beginning of the movement. On the other hand, the evangelicals became more accepting of the renewal, particularly the charismatic worship. They had gradually

¹²⁸ Minutes-FTAM (6 December 1968), p. 3.

¹²⁹ Letter from Michael Harper to Rev. John Simons, Essex, 20 August 1971, p. 1.

¹³⁰ “Reality at Westminster”, *The Church of England Newspaper*, No. 4251 (1 August 1975), pp. 3, 16; Fountain Trust, “Conference Aims Explained to Press and Radio”, in *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (29 July 1975), p. 1.

¹³¹ Minutes-FTACM (5 April 1973), p. 1.

¹³² Minutes-FTACM (8 November 1973), p. 2.

¹³³ Michael Harper, “Editorial: A Narrowing of the Divide”, *Renewal*, No. 55(February-March 1975), p. 3.

acknowledged the function of spiritual gifts and looked into the renewal theologically.¹³⁴ The reconciliation was made concrete and documented in two major events. The first one was the Swanwick conference held in November 1975 where Harper witnessed “a significant détente between the parties involved”.¹³⁵ The Anglican theologian, Jim Packer, recognised the contributions of the renewal both in theology and practice, but also addressed its weaknesses. John Stott was present and he did not give such a positive appraisal as Packer. He agreed that he had hesitated to acknowledge the strengths of the renewal, but he wanted to encourage more communication and study of the Bible together.¹³⁶ The second event was the National Evangelical Anglican Congress (NEAC) in Nottingham in April 1977.¹³⁷ Smail was invited by the Anglican evangelicals and was regarded as an important catalyst in easing the tension, as he said that through the meeting, “evangelicals and charismatics are now really listening and speaking to one another in renewed relationship and openness”.¹³⁸ The Joint Statement of the Church of England Evangelical Council and the Fountain Trust, *Gospel and Spirit*, was ready for, and endorsed by the conference.¹³⁹ This statement and Smail’s attendance at the conference were indeed encouragement for the Trust after all the hard work, and were a milestone in the

¹³⁴ Colin Buchanan, *Encountering Charismatic Worship* (Nottingham: Hassall & Lucking Ltd, 1977), p. 21; “Is There a Chairmatic Divide?”, *Renewal* 69 (June-July 1977), p. 21.

¹³⁵ Michael Harper, “Editorial: A Narrowing of the Divide”, p. 2.

¹³⁶ Michael Harper, “Editorial: A Narrowing of the Divide”, p. 3.

¹³⁷ Buchanan recorded that the theme song for the conference was “Jesus is Lord! Creation’s voice proclaims it” which was chosen from a charismatic song book, *Sound of Living Water*, No. 82. It showed the evangelicals’ openness towards charismatic music. (Colin Buchanan, *Encountering Charismatic Worship*, p. 21, footnote 4.)

¹³⁸ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 59 (April 1977), Esher: Fountain Trust.

¹³⁹ The statement claimed, “We have sought to understand each other’s views better and to achieve closer harmony and correspondence through examining them all in the light of bible teaching. We are now issuing this account of our progress, indicating both agreements and disagreements, in the hope that it may help to promote unity where there is discord, and mutual understanding where there has been mistrust”. (Fountain Trust, “Background”, *Gospel and Spirit: A Joint Statement*, published jointly by the Fountain Trust and the Church of England Evangelical Council, April 1977, p. 1.)

marathon of building up a trusting relationship with the evangelicals. It was a significant chapter after going through the previous uncertainty and misery.

3.2.4. House Churches

According to Arthur Wallis, one of the leaders of the house church movement, most of the house churches around the country neither supported the renewal nor disagreed with it, particularly the Anglican charismatic sector.¹⁴⁰ The Trust also recognised the weaknesses and problems of the house churches. First, it doubted the house churches' self-definition as "an anti-denominational and anti-historic church movement".¹⁴¹ They regarded themselves as the true churches as they thought that they had restored the kind of Christian fellowship in the New Testament which the denominational and institutional churches did not have.¹⁴² Therefore, leaders such as Bryn Jones and David Mansell believed that denominational churches could never be renewed.¹⁴³ This was the point about which the Trust was concerned. It was worried about the house churches' conscious isolation from the historic churches, and the danger of repeating the same mistakes that the historic churches had made throughout many centuries. In actual fact this did happen, as the Trust observed.¹⁴⁴ Second, the Trust doubted the possibility of "100% commitment and dedication to Christ" that the house churches taught.¹⁴⁵ The Trust acknowledged that there were plenty of people only giving a "nominal commitment" in the historic churches,¹⁴⁶ but the commitment that the house churches required would pressurise individuals and consequently reduce the

¹⁴⁰ Letter from Arthur Wallis to Michael Harper, n. d.

¹⁴¹ Minutes-FTCCM (8 June 1977), p. 3.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Letter from Tom Smail to John Bedford, Brandhall Baptist Church, Worcester, 5 June 1978.

¹⁴⁴ Minutes-FTCCM (8 June 1977), p. 3.

¹⁴⁵ Letter from Tom Smail to John Bedford, Brandhall Baptist Church, Worcester, 5 June 1978.

¹⁴⁶ Minutes-FTCCM (10 May 1978), p. 3.

number of people in the church.¹⁴⁷ Third, although the house churches grew very fast and were constituted by relatively more young people than the historic churches, the Trust discovered that those young people were cut off from the reality of life and the society. For instance, some of them felt unprepared to deal with the university environment where temptations and pressures were perceived to be everywhere. The Trust thought that this could be due to the protective environment of their communities in the house churches and the lack of theological teaching about the interrelation between the church and society. Consequently, “a kind of spiritual introversion” was developed among individuals.¹⁴⁸

The Trust neither attacked nor corrected these theological and ecclesiological weaknesses of the house churches, but it initiated meetings and discussions to build up relationships with a hope that the house church leaders would modify their theological teachings and the way they saw traditional churches. For example, Bryn Jones was invited to speak at a meeting of the Trust in October 1977¹⁴⁹ and in the following year, Smail visited Jones’s church in Bradford which belonged to the “Bradford Circle”.¹⁵⁰ He was given the “warmest reception and freedom of ministry”. Nevertheless, he insisted on the necessity of “speaking the truth in love”.¹⁵¹ Through these encounters, Smail believed that the Trust’s connection with the house churches

¹⁴⁷ Letter from Tom Smail to John Bedford, Brandhall Baptist Church, Worcester, 5 June 1978.

¹⁴⁸ Minutes-FTCCM (10 May 1978), p. 3.

¹⁴⁹ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 61 (December 1977), Esher: Fountain Trust.

¹⁵⁰ This church was a combination of three churches: Open Brethren church, Clayton Road Fellowship and Wally North’s New Covenant Fellowship and it was formed in October 1975. Members of the church had rented a theatre for worship and other activities, but in 1976, since “the present premises were acquired in the form of the former Anglican diocesan headquarters”, the members scattered in Britain and guided by the leaders in Bradford. So the name “Bradford Circle” was given. (Anne Mather, “The Theology of the Charismatic Movement”, p. 14.)

¹⁵¹ Letter from Tom Smail to John Bedford, Brandhall Baptist Church, Worcester, 5 June 1978.

would be built up and any future discussion could be based on “a context of first-hand knowledge of one another and our work”.¹⁵²

3.2.5. Roman Catholics

The Trust had done a lot of hard work to reconcile and build up relationships with the Christian groups mentioned above. In contrast, the Roman Catholics had always been the Trust’s alliance since the 1960s. Their relationship and cooperation could be divided into two periods, those of Michael Harper and Tom Smail.

3.2.5.1. Michael Harper’s Period (1964-1975)

Harper’s positive attitude towards the Roman Catholic charismatics paved the way for the Trust’s future relationship and cooperation with the Roman Catholics. In 1965, as has been mentioned above, Harper and his wife visited and spoke to the Roman Catholic charismatics in Seattle. This gave them a new insight into God’s renewing work among the Roman Catholics. In September 1969, an American Catholic couple, Bob and Laurin Balkam, who had been baptised in the Spirit in 1968, came to England with their six children (they had two more later). After their arrival, Balkam contacted Harper as the Trust was the only “Pentecostal source” that he had known before his departure. Harper invited him to a Fountain Trust meeting at a Baptist Church in Elephant and Castle, London in December.¹⁵³ In 1970, Balkam was invited to participate in the committee of Guildford conference and he was the only Roman Catholic among the five members. Harper continued to invite the Balkams to “share as fully in Fountain Trust activities” as they liked and to become part of the Trust with

¹⁵² Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 61 (December 1977), Esher: Fountain Trust.

¹⁵³ At the meeting, he firstly met a Roman Catholic, who had been baptised in the Spirit at an AoG meeting in Portsmouth, Esmond Gwatkin from West Meon, Hants. He was the first Roman Catholic charismatic that he had come across in this country. (Email from Bob Balkam, 16 November 2005)

other Roman Catholics. But Balkam had already envisaged developing a charismatic organisation with “visible” and “distinctly Roman Catholic expression” of the renewal so that the renewal could gain the acknowledgement of the Roman Catholic officials.¹⁵⁴ Balkam and other Roman Catholic charismatics organised activities mainly for Roman Catholics such as a “Day of Renewal” on 19 September 1971. The International Ecumenical Charismatic Conference in 1972, and another conference at the University of Surrey in 1973, both had Roman Catholic and Episcopalian speakers from the US. In November 1973, Balkam proposed to some Roman Catholics that they should have a Catholic charismatic organisation, and in the same month, the National Service Committee in England and Wales was founded and chaired by Fr. Mike Targett.¹⁵⁵ This created better connections between prayer groups and local bishops, and arranged charismatic conferences and teaching.¹⁵⁶ It organised its own renewal activities but also maintained a cooperative relationship with the Trust. As they invited each other to participate in their ministries. Balkam was personally grateful for Harper’s “generous assistance and encouragement” during the 1970s, and so after four decades he still regards him as his good friend.¹⁵⁷

The Trust’s activities had not lacked Roman Catholic participation. At the international conferences at Guildford, Nottingham and Westminster 1975, the number of Catholic delegates was higher each time. At a summer school at Sussex University, there were Roman Catholics participating and unity was the main concern. Although participants were discussing the divisive doctrines, they could express their

¹⁵⁴ Email from Bob Balkam, 16 November 2005;

Email from Bob Balkam, 18 November 2005.

¹⁵⁵ Email from Bob Balkam, 16 November 2005.

¹⁵⁶ Anne Mather, “The Theology of the Charismatic Movement”, p. 22.

¹⁵⁷ Email from Bob Balkam, 18 November 2005.

opinion “freely and frankly” and so Smail said, “We shall not easily forget the new sense of closeness that we found with our Roman Catholic brethren there”.¹⁵⁸

In addition, Harper also had personal outreach to the Roman Catholic charismatic renewal. He attended three sessions of the Roman Catholic-Charismatic dialogue,¹⁵⁹ the World Leaders’ Conference in Rome in 1973 and the charismatic conference of the Roman Catholics also in Rome on 16-18 May 1975,¹⁶⁰ where 127 Roman Catholic leaders attended and he was one of the five Protestants. From this conference, he concluded that the renewal was spreading much faster among the Roman Catholics than in other historic churches. There were some “impressively good” leaders in the Roman Catholic circle.¹⁶¹ However, Harper felt that there were still ecumenical obstacles because some Roman Catholics did not recognise any ecumenical relation with non-Catholic churches, for example Edward O’Connor, who resigned from the Roman Catholic Renewal Committee. In addition, doctrinal and hermeneutical problems still hindered ecumenical progress.¹⁶²

3.2.5.2. Tom Smail’s Period (1975-1979)

Smail did not only succeed to the directorship of the Trust, but also continued the ecumenical relationship with the Catholic charismatics that Harper had built up. After the first year of his leadership in 1976, he concluded that the Trust had “made new

¹⁵⁸ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 50 (September 1974), London: Fountain Trust.

¹⁵⁹ The three sessions of dialogues that he participated in were in Zürich (19-24 June 1972), Rome (18-23 June 1973) and Venice (21-26 May 1975). (Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 43 (June 1972), London: Fountain Trust; Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 46 (May 1973), London: Fountain Trust; *Newsletter*, No. 52 (March 1975), London: Fountain Trust)

¹⁶⁰ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 52 (March 1975), London: Fountain Trust.

¹⁶¹ For example, there was a Mexican, Salvador Carillo, who presented his paper on Spirit baptism and was given big applause. (Minutes-FTACM (8 November 1973), p. 1.)

¹⁶² Minutes-FTACM (8 November 1973), p. 1.

and very precious connections with English charismatic Roman Catholics”.¹⁶³ In the summer of 1977, the RCNSC was invited to assist with the organisation of the international conference in Westminster and in the autumn, the Trust held a night school in Westminster Cathedral with Cornerstone, a Roman Catholic educational organisation.¹⁶⁴ At the end of that year, Smail announced that the editorial board of the *Renewal* magazine had involved a Roman Catholic representative so that the Roman Catholics would have a platform to “more fully speak” to their co-workers of the renewal in the country.¹⁶⁵ The cooperation was continued until Smail’s resignation in 1979 when they held the final international conference together in Westminster. For those three years of cooperation, Smail commented, “The sort of Catholic, non-Catholic thing was taken for granted that there were quite close relationships”.¹⁶⁶

Besides the Trust’s relation with the Roman Catholic organisation, Smail also developed some personal relationships with Roman Catholic leaders. Cardinal Suenens, Veronica O’Brien and Bob Balkam regarded him as a “wonderful friend”.¹⁶⁷ He recalled one occasion when the Cardinal and he had spent the whole evening discussing Marian and other controversial doctrines. Although they did not agree with each other, they remained being one in fellowship.¹⁶⁸ Probably due to the friendship with the Cardinal, Smail was able to invite him to attend the two Westminster international conferences in 1977 and 1979. After Westminster 1975, Smail also

¹⁶³ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 57 (August 1976), Esher: Fountain Trust.

¹⁶⁴ The attendance was about 160 people from many denominations which was much higher than seventy that they had expected. (Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 61 (December 1977), Esher: Fountain Trust.)

¹⁶⁵ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 61 (December 1977), Esher: Fountain Trust.

¹⁶⁶ Interview with Tom Smail, 16 November 2006, Croydon.

¹⁶⁷ Letter from Tom Forrest to Tom Smail, 13 February 1979, p. 2;

Email from Bob Balkam, 20 November 2005.

¹⁶⁸ Interview with Tom Smail, 16 November 2006, Croydon.

developed a good friendship with a Jesuit, Paul Lebeau, who was closely associated with the Cardinal and spoke at that conference. On the Pentecost of 1977, they and other Roman Catholics went for a pilgrimage to Jerusalem to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the priesthood of the Cardinal where they enjoyed “ecumenical love”. Smail himself became more devoted to ecumenical work after the journey.¹⁶⁹

3.3. Its Directors

The Trust experienced two transitions of director which involved changes in the direction and emphasis of the renewal ministry.

3.3.1. From Michael Harper to Tom Smail

After eleven years of his ministry in the Trust, in 1975, Harper decided to leave and to minister as a curate at Holy Trinity Church, Hounslow.¹⁷⁰ He gave two reasons for his leaving. First, he believed that transferring the leadership would enable the renewal to reach a new stage. Second, being a minister in a local church would allow him more time to visit churches in and outside Britain and to write.¹⁷¹ He would help with the teaching ministry in Hounslow and the church would also support his travelling and writing ministry relating to the charismatic renewal.¹⁷² He would still maintain connections with the Trust as a consultant editor and contributor to *Renewal*,

¹⁶⁹ Interview with Tom Smail, 16 November 2006, Croydon;
Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 13 June 1977.

¹⁷⁰ Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, p. 205;
An attached letter from Michael Harper, in Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 53 (May 1975), London: Fountain Trust, p. 2.

¹⁷¹ His writing would be based on the church in Hounslow so that it would be more practical than theoretical. He had planned to write a book on Christian joy, the church and ministry and a series of “Glory in the Church”. (Fountain Trust, “From Michael & Jeanne Harper”, *Renewal*, No. 59 (October-November 1975), p. 4; “Michael Hands over the Reins”, p. 1; An attached letter from Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 53 (May 1975), London: Fountain Trust, p. 2.)

¹⁷² “Michael Hands over the Reins”, p. 1;
Letter from Michael Harper to Neville B. Cryer, Word in Action, Bible House, 12 June 1975.

chairman of the Advisory Council and speaker at meetings and conferences. His wife, Jeanne Harper, would give assistance in the musical area.¹⁷³

Harper's contribution to the renewal was highly acknowledged by the Trust and those who benefited from his ministries in Britain and overseas. Smail regarded him as having "been able to present the promise and reality of renewal in the Spirit with such courage and balance to the churches" and he appreciated his acceptance of, and obedience to, God's vision "at risk and cost" in establishing the Trust to promote the renewal in Britain.¹⁷⁴ John Perry praised Harper for being "very wise and often fearless to the work of the Fountain Trust".¹⁷⁵ Considering the public desire to express gratitude, the Trust set up a "Harper Presentation Fund" from May to the end of August 1975 for gifts.¹⁷⁶

When Harper ceased to be the director, Smail was regarded as the most suitable person to succeed the position for four reasons. First, with his personal experience in the Spirit and his profound theological training, it was believed that he could build up theological understandings of the renewal. Experientially, he was baptised by the Spirit under Dennis Bennett's ministry in 1965 when he had been a minister of Thornile Church at Wishaw near Glasgow.¹⁷⁷ Theologically, he was of outstanding ability.¹⁷⁸ Secondly, his Scottish background and connection with Northern Ireland

¹⁷³ An attached letter from Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 53 (May 1975), London: Fountain Trust, p. 2.

¹⁷⁴ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 53 (May 1975), London: Fountain Trust, p. 1.

¹⁷⁵ Letter from John F. Perry to Michael Harper, 20 June 1975.

¹⁷⁶ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 53 (May 1975), London: Fountain Trust, p. 2.

¹⁷⁷ Fountain Trust, *Press Release of Fountain Trust: New Fountain Trust Appointment, 24 April 1972*.

¹⁷⁸ He obtained an MA degree in Philosophy with first class honours at Glasgow University. Then he got a BD in systematic theology with distinction at New College, Edinburgh, where he was awarded a scholarship to study at the University of Basle, Switzerland, under Karl Barth for one year. (Fountain Trust, "Press Release of Fountain Trust: New Fountain Trust Appointment, 24 April 1972"; Letter from Tom Smail to Revd. Douglas A. Smith, 2 May 1974.)

helped in bridging relationships between the Trust and churches of these two areas, which enabled the Trust's ministry to spread out more widely in Britain. He was ordained in the Church of Scotland in 1953 and served in Scottish parishes for fifteen years. In 1968, he was called to minister in a Presbyterian church outside Belfast in Northern Ireland where his ministry was regarded as being of "good and regular standing" in a certificate given by the Presbyterian of North Belfast.¹⁷⁹ Thirdly, his abundant experience of ministering in churches for nearly twenty years would help the Trust with local ministry. Finally, his membership of Presbyterian Church and later on of the United Reformed Church in Walton-on-Thames in 1974 would assist the Trust's work ecumenically.¹⁸⁰ With his academic qualifications, churchly connection, pastoral and spiritual experience, Smail was acknowledged to be the most suitable person to succeed to the directorship. As Harper said, "There is no-one we would rather be at the helm than Tom Smail, and commend him to your prayers and future support".¹⁸¹ Smail's work would focus on the life of renewal in the local churches and training leaders and people who had significant positions in the church.¹⁸² As he said, "We can help to ensure that what the Spirit is doing is not confined to small groups on the fringes of church life, but also has free course at the centre".¹⁸³

¹⁷⁹ Letter from Tom Smail to Revd. Douglas A. Smith, 2 May 1974;

Awarded Certificate to Tom Smail from the Presbyter of North Belfast, Presbyterian Church in Ireland, Belfast, 27 June 1972.

¹⁸⁰ Fountain Trust, "Press Release of Fountain Trust: New Fountain Trust Appointment, 24 April 1972"; Letter from Tom Smail to Revd. Douglas A. Smith, 2 May 1974.

¹⁸¹ An attached letter from Michael Harper, in Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 53 (May 1975), London: Fountain Trust, p. 2.

¹⁸² Fountain Trust, "Michael Hands over the Reins", p. 1.

¹⁸³ Fountain Trust, "Renewal must Result in Grass Roots Reality", *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (1 August 1975), p. 1.

3.3.2. From Tom Smail to Michael Barling

At Christmas in 1978, it was announced that Smail had resigned from the Trust and would accept a lectureship in St John's College, Nottingham starting in September 1979, and that the associate director, Michael Barling, would succeed him.¹⁸⁴ Smail's change of ministry was instigated by the Principal of the College at that time, Colin Buchanan, who encouraged him to consider lecturing in Christian doctrine. After discussing this with the Executive of the Trust, he accepted the offer within a month.¹⁸⁵ He said that this decision was "one of the easiest and most inevitable" ones he had ever made. He described his ministry in the Trust during the seven year¹⁸⁶ as "wandering" in which he experienced "a lot of suffering, considerable disappointment as well as a little disillusionment to mix with the continuing wonder and hope at the reality of what God keeps on doing".¹⁸⁷ He admitted that he had had some "illusions" about the renewal, but throughout those years, they had been swept away, and he felt that it was time for him to go back to reality.¹⁸⁸ He regarded the new task of training people as "a great joy and privilege", particularly at St John's, where the training contains three elements: "evangelical conviction, academic theology and charismatic experience". This was done in an "ecumenical context" though it was mainly for training ministers for the Church of England.¹⁸⁹ Moreover, this job gave him a better opportunity to engage with other ministries at the weekend and during the term break in summer, and particularly to maintain the ecumenical and European connections which had come his way in the previous years. Regarding the Trust's situation, he

¹⁸⁴ Fountain Trust, "Move for Tom Smail", *Renewal*, No. 79 (February-March 1979), p. 5;

Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 64 (March 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 2;

Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 23 April 1979, p. 1

¹⁸⁵ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 64 (March 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 1.

¹⁸⁶ He was the General Secretary in 1972-1975 and Director in 1975-1979.

¹⁸⁷ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 64 (March 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 1.

¹⁸⁸ Minutes-FTCCM (6 June 1979), p. 1.

¹⁸⁹ Fountain Trust, "Move for Tom Smail", p. 5;

Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 64 (March 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 1.

thought that it was difficult for it to fulfill all the needs of local churches with “constant itinerancy”, and it was time to have new directions and insights from a new leader.¹⁹⁰ Smail’s contribution to the renewal was significant in establishing theological reflection on both the renewal and its ecumenical work. The Trust acknowledged his work by saying that he had “given strong and valuable leadership not only to the Fountain Trust but also the renewal in general”. The Trust expressed its thanks to him and his wife in a presentation during the Westminster Conference on 3 August 1979.¹⁹¹ After leaving the Trust, Smail continued to edit the *Theological Renewal* (1975-1983).¹⁹² At the end of 1979, the Trust heard that Smail’s teaching was appreciated by the students in the College, and he had chosen to be ordained Priest in the Church of England in the College Chapel on 5 December 1979.¹⁹³

Michael Barling was appointed to succeed to the directorship of the Trust in September 1979. Although he was not so well-known at that time, the Trust believed that he could meet the needs of the charismatic renewal at that stage since he was a person with “ministry of teaching and renewal, recent parish experience and administrative gifts”.¹⁹⁴ He had been an Anglican vicar and was baptised in the Spirit in 1969 during Harper’s ministry at St. Paul’s, Portman Square where he was a curate.¹⁹⁵ At the international conferences of Westminster 1975, 1977 and 1979, he was a member of the conference committees and proved to be well-qualified to solve

¹⁹⁰ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 64 (March 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 1.

¹⁹¹ Fountain Trust, “Move for Tom Smail”, p. 5.

¹⁹² Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 64 (March 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust, pp. 1-2.

¹⁹³ Michael Barling, *News and Prayer Letter*, No. 66 (December 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 2; Letter from Tom Smail to David MacInnes, 9 August 1979.

¹⁹⁴ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 64 (March 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 2.

¹⁹⁵ Fountain Trust, “Odd Job Man”, *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975 (31 July 1975)*, p. 4.

complicated administrative problems. His directorship finished when the Trust was disbanded at the end of 1980.

3.4. Its End

After sixteen years, although the Trust had been a significant medium for motivating the charismatic renewal in Britain, the Executive Committee and Trustees decided to close it with general consent.¹⁹⁶ It was announced on 1 September 1980 that the Trust would be wound up on 31 December in that year. All the activities would be stopped on that day except the night school which would be continued after that Christmas.¹⁹⁷ *Renewal* and *Theological Renewal* would be continued and would be edited by their founders, Harper and Smail respectively, but they were no longer to be published under the Trust.¹⁹⁸

Michael Barling claimed that its closure was not because of any pressure such as finance, but because of revelation received over several months while praying.¹⁹⁹ The Trustees sensed that God was telling them that He and His work should not be

¹⁹⁶ Michael Barling, "Editorial: Unless a Grain of Wheat Dies...", *Renewal*, No. 89 (October-November 1980), p. 2.

¹⁹⁷ Michael Barling, "Editorial: Unless a Grain of Wheat Dies...", pp. 2-3; Fountain Trust, "News: Work of Fountain Trust to End in December: *Renewal* Magazine Carries on", *Renewal*, No. 89 (October-November 1980), p. 4.

¹⁹⁸ Michael Barling, "Editorial: Unless a Grain of Wheat Dies...", p. 3; "Editorial: Farewell, but Forward", *Renewal*, No. 91 (February-March 1981), p. 2. *Renewal* had been edited by the three Directors of the Fountain Trust: Michael Harper, Tom Smail and Michael Barling. After the closure, *Theological Renewal* would be published by Grove Books and *Renewal* "was saved from the closure of the Fountain Trust" as it was bought by Edward England, who was a close friend of Harper and had a publication career, for £5 with the debts. Harper edited it for three years. *Theological Renewal* was continued until November 1983. Smail explained that it could not be continued due to the lack of theologians writing about the charismatic renewal and the difficulty of keeping correspondence because it was published three times a year. In contrast, *Renewal* was "from success to success" that it reached 16000 circulations at its highest point and it last until 2000. (Interview with Michael Harper, 10 November 2005, Cambridge; Fountain Trust, "News: Work of Fountain Trust to End in December", p. 4; Michael Harper, "30 Year of *Renewal* Magazine: From the London Hilton to the Toronto Vineyard", *Renewal* No. 236 (January 1996), p. 11; Interview with Tom Smail, 16 February 2006, Croydon.)

¹⁹⁹ Michael Barling, "Editorial: Unless a Grain of Wheat Dies...", pp. 2-3.

confined by any human organisation. They took this to mean that it was time to bring the Trust to an end, and that if it continued, it would become a stumbling block in “God’s eyes”.²⁰⁰ The director, Michael Barling believed that disbanding the Trust would enable new life to begin, new work to blossom. He declared, “...it is our conviction that the winding up of the Trust will be a positive contribution towards the renewal of the Church”.²⁰¹ Although the Trustees, and he himself, did not know how closing the Trust would help with God’s new works, they insisted that it was a mission from God and they should implement it with “a joyful obedience”.²⁰²

In reviewing the Trust’s work in the previous sixteen years, Barling suggested that there were two dimensions that the Trust had contributed to the charismatic renewal. Firstly, he believed that it had been given a special privilege by God to motivate the renewal in historic churches through the Holy Spirit. Churches had been renewed and had rediscovered the significance of the Holy Spirit both experientially and theologically.²⁰³ Secondly, Barling suggested that ecumenically, it also made a considerable contribution as it was aware of the divisive potential of the charismatic renewal and had resisted the strong pressure to establish a denomination. It had done this by organising a team of leaders with a variety of ecclesiological backgrounds and had refused to adopt any system of membership.²⁰⁴ In addition, it had also seized every opportunity to achieve reconciliation both with the Evangelicals and

²⁰⁰ Michael Barling, “Editorial: Unless a Grain of Wheat Dies...”, pp. 2-3;
Fountain Trust, “News: Work of Fountain Trust to End in December”, p. 4.

²⁰¹ Michael Barling, “Editorial: Unless a Grain of Wheat Dies...”, p. 3.

²⁰² Michael Barling, “Editorial: Unless a Grain of Wheat Dies...”, p. 3;
Fountain Trust, “News: Work of Fountain Trust to End in December”, p. 4.

²⁰³ Michael Barling “Editorial: Farewell, but Forward”, pp. 2-3.

²⁰⁴ Michael Barling “Editorial: Farewell, but Forward”, p. 3.

Pentecostals by tackling the misunderstandings that had arisen. Their efforts at avoiding further division among churches had been recognised and appreciated.²⁰⁵

The closure of the Trust was a sad day for some because of the spiritual blessings it had brought in the past.²⁰⁶ But others admired the decision because they agreed with the Trustees that its tasks had finished. They also felt that it should not be kept for personal sentimental reasons as a repetition of the past could become a hindrance to the launching of new initiatives.²⁰⁷ That the Trustees could consider the whole matter of closing the Trust, and believe that this would be for the good of renewal in the future, can be explained by their understanding of its role when it was established. One of the members of the Advisory Council, Campbell McAlpine, had long before foreseen its closure as God's purpose. The minutes of the Trust's meeting in 1968 reports that he "felt that there might come a time when the Trust's work would be at an end in God's will, and that the lessons He gives were to help us learn that the scope of any work of His was in His hands".²⁰⁸ The Trustees had kept reviewing their work every eighteen months and one of the questions they continually asked was whether the Trust should be continued. They "were terrified" of being like some Christian organisations which were useless but did not die. After sixteen years, the Trustees and Barling felt that the Trust had fulfilled its task and felt justified in deciding that it should be wound up.²⁰⁹

Although the Trustees claimed that the termination was God's will, and that this was confirmed by the "harmony and complete unanimity by the Trustees and the

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

²⁰⁶ Michael Barling, "Editorial: Unless a Grain of Wheat Dies...", p. 2.

²⁰⁷ Michael Barling, "Editorial: Farewell, but Forward", pp. 3-4.

²⁰⁸ Minutes-FTAM (6 December 1968), p. 2.

²⁰⁹ Interview with Tom Smail, 16 February 2006, Croydon.

Executive,”²¹⁰ two inner pressures on the Trust are worth considering as factors in its closure. The first one was the financial difficulty about which Barling warned. In the Trust’s “News and Prayer Letter” (December 1979), he described the difficult financial situation in detail and said, “I have to report that last year the accounts show a loss of nearly £8,000”.²¹¹ In May 1980, four months before the announcement of the Trust’s closure, Barling warned, “The figures for the following six months, i.e., up to March 80, are even worse!” Regarding this critical financial pressure, he said that the Trust had to be careful with their use of resources and the house at Beauchamp Road had to be sold.²¹² The financial crisis even led them to consider cancelling some activities and was seen to put the whole future of the Trust at risk, although at that stage there seemed to be no thought of closing the Trust altogether. At that point, Barling was sure that “FT should continue in the ministry God has given us” and he urged those who were concerned to think about devoting more resources, both financially and spiritually, for the Trust.²¹³

Secondly, before the closing of the Trust, the leadership team and staff had lost several experienced and gifted persons. In 1979, Bob Gordon ceased to have any connection with the Trust and started work for the Evangelical Alliance in Harrow. Executives and Trustees like Douglas McBain, Brian Soan and Julian Ward also left in the same year.²¹⁴ In the first half of 1980, John Richards decided not to be the Associate Director because of his special calling to the healing ministry which had been confirmed by the prayers of the Executives of the Trust. However, he did retain

²¹⁰ Michael Barling, “Editorial: Unless a Grain of Wheat Dies...”, p. 3.

²¹¹ He reported that in the previous years expenses had grown, with a 64% increase for administration, and a 35% increase for travel. Meanwhile income had not kept pace with the outgoings. (Michael Barling, *News and Prayer Letter*, No. 66 (December 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 2.)

²¹² Michael Barling, *News and Prayer Letter*, No. 66 (December 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 2.)

²¹³ Michael Barling, *News and Prayer Letter*, No. 67 (May 1980), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 2.

²¹⁴ Michael Barling, *News and Prayer Letter*, No. 66 (December 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 2.

a connection with the Trust.²¹⁵ The secretary, Sylvia Lawton, who had served in the Trust for many years left and worked with CMS. Ian Jolly, the editorial assistant of *Renewal* magazine, also decided to leave for a job in a firm of Surveyors.²¹⁶ Although some of the vacancies were able to be filled,²¹⁷ losing such a large number of significant people together with their spiritual insights, guidance, theological knowledge and personal experience in less than eighteen months, was a huge discouragement. It inevitably affected the commitment, zeal and assurance of the continuation of the ministry.

Despite being the founder of the Trust, Harper had not been consulted about its closure. He believed that it was a wrong decision, had nothing to do with God's will and was simply a human lack of vision and confidence. At the end of the 1970s, the Trustees and some charismatics had felt that the renewal had "peaked" and had reached an "apogee" as Colin Buchanan put it.²¹⁸ However, Harper's panorama of the renewal was different. He thought that it was neither "peaked" nor ended in the 1970s, but on the contrary, had undergone an "acceleration". He foresaw that during the 1980s there would be "greater manifestations of the power and presence of Jesus Christ among his people". He expressed this view in an article for *Renewal* in 1980 and still held it in 2005 during my interview with him.²¹⁹ He felt that those leaders of the Trust had failed to get a renewed vision for the needs of the 1980s, but still held

²¹⁵ John Richards resigned the associate directorship of the Trust in May 1980 and worked as a "link man" for the healing ministries in Britain. He was responsible to enhance the communication among people or organisations that were involved in this ministry. (Fountain Trust, "New Link Man for Healing Ministry", *Renewal*, No. 88 (August-September 1980), p. 5; Michael Barling, *News and Prayer Letter*, No. 67 (May 1980), Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 2.)

²¹⁶ Michael Barling, *News and Prayer Letter*, No. 67 (May 1980), p. 2.

²¹⁷ For example, George Hoerder took over the central administration of the Trust, and Mrs Ruby Waterman did the typing as a part-time job. (Michael Barling, *News and Prayer Letter*, No. 67 (May 1980), p. 2.)

²¹⁸ Interview with Michael Harper, 10 November 2005, Cambridge.

²¹⁹ Michael Harper, "Prospects for a New Decade", p. 14; Interview with Michael Harper, 10 November 2005, Cambridge.

on to the original one from the 1960s when the Trust was first established. In contrast, Smail agreed with closing the Trust as he explained that if the task was to introduce the charismatic renewal within the mainline churches, its aim had been achieved, and its job done by the end of 1970s.²²⁰ Although Harper and Smail had different views on the closure of the Trust, they both believed that the appointment of Barling had caused it. Both thought that he was not a right person for the job. For Smail, he did not have the national connections that Harper and he had brought. For Harper, he did not have the “strength”, or the “calling” and was not the “visionary” that the Trust needed after Smail who “had become fed up with it”.²²¹

3.5. The Ecumenical Loss of the Closure of the Fountain Trust

Both Harper and Smail acknowledged that the Trust was an important instrument for linking denominations and so its closure meant an end to the ecumenical developments which had been so successfully and widely cultivated. They both regarded the Trust as an “umbrella” that had grouped and gathered denominations including Roman Catholics together when the renewal was prospering. Especially by the end of the 1970s, the renewal was growing within Anglican, Baptist, Presbyterian and Methodist churches as well as the house churches. Moreover, people had started doing their own thing for renewal within their own denominational groups so there was a kind of “split” taking place.²²² Since the Trust had always resisted the idea of being a denomination and insisted on being neutral as a vehicle to facilitate the charismatic renewal, it could gather representatives of different churches to work together. The Advisory Council became an arena for charismatic leaders of different

²²⁰ Interview with Tom Smail, 16 February 2006, Croydon.

²²¹ Interview with Michael Harper, 10 November 2005, Cambridge.

²²² Interview with Michael Harper, 10 November 2005, Cambridge;
Interview with Tom Smail, 16 February 2006, Croydon.

denominations to discuss issues. Its conferences were a means of gathering laity from a variety of backgrounds to learn and experience the renewal together. Since there was no other organisation with quite the same character as the Trust, this kind of ecumenical consultation and cooperation for the renewal ended when it was disbanded. Individual churches including the historic, Pentecostal and house churches would just concentrate on their own ministries without cooperating with one another. Consequently, they all lost a lot and gained very little. Smail saw that the ecumenical dimension had “got lost...never quite came back again” after the Trust’s closure.²²³ Harper’s criticism was that the Trust closed at a “very strategic moment at the end of the 70s to the 80s”, and that this was a “wrong” and “unnecessary” decision, “a sad story”.²²⁴ He and Andrew Walker believed that it had “left the Renewal without a clear focus” when it approached the 1980s.²²⁵

4. Conclusion

The charismatic renewal in Britain took place within a society undergoing religious, economic, cultural and moral transitions in the post-war period to which the established churches were not able to respond. It was widely spread out and systematically promoted in the country through the Fountain Trust which was founded and developed by the devotees of the renewal. Although the renewal and the Trust did not gain support and acknowledgement from all British churches and they underwent attack and antagonism, plenty of churches were renewed and individuals’ lives were transformed within the sixteen years (1964-1980). The Trust also

²²³ Interview with Tom Smail, 16 February 2006, Croydon.

²²⁴ Interview with Michael Harper, 10 November 2005, Cambridge.

²²⁵ Andrew Walker, *Restoring the Kingdom: The Radical Christianity of the House Church Movement* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1985), p. 51.

successfully encouraged churches to reach out into the realm of ecumenism and search for further possibilities of interdenominational cooperation. It was the symbol of the charismatic renewal and the physical manifestation of the movement of the Spirit. Hence, the closure of the Trust also brought the renewal to an end. There were waves of renewal in the 1980s and 1990s, but the ray spread out by the Fountain Trust was distinct and it only belonged to the 1960s-70s.

The next chapter will demonstrate the historical scene of the Fountain Trust's five international conferences. It will also discuss its impacts on churches in Britain and overseas as well as its reflections on the charismatic renewal.

CHAPTER TWO

THE FIVE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

During the 1970s, the Fountain Trust held five international conferences biennially starting in 1971. They took place at the University of Surrey, Guildford (1971), the University of Nottingham (1973) and Westminster (1975, 1977 and 1979) for five to six days during the summer.¹ Since the Fountain Trust had been established in 1964, it had held many local conferences in various major cities and towns in England and Scotland. However these five conferences were different in character as they were aimed at being both international and ecumenical. There follows a description of these conferences in terms of the aims, participants, venues, programmes and lastly, the feedback and results.

1. Aims

1.1. General Aims

The Trust organised these conferences because it hoped that churches would not just be renewed superficially but right down to their foundations,² through “charismatic worship, ecumenical encounters, international fellowship, and in depth-teaching”.³ Furthermore, the conferences were also intended to be ecumenical which was “indeed

¹ The first three conferences (Guildford, 12-17 July 1971, Nottingham, 9-14 July 1973, Westminster, 28 July-2 August 1975) which were organised by Michael Harper last for six days. The last two conferences in Westminster which were organised by Tom Smail last for five days on 1-5 August 1977 and 30 July-3 August 1979 respectively.

² Rough notes-Guildford (14 October 1970);

Letter from Michael Harper to Michael Pusey, Farnborough Baptist Church, Hants, 29 October 1970, p. 2.

³ Fountain Trust, *Leaflet and Booking Form of the Conference*, n.d.

the very purpose”.⁴ Harper confidently claimed that the conferences would “demonstrate a unity made possible by the experience of the Holy Spirit” despite the disagreements regarding certain areas of doctrine. This ecumenical intention was announced to the public before the Guildford Conference began,

The purpose of the conference is to draw together Christians from every church tradition from Roman Catholic to Pentecostal, and from many countries of the world, to learn more about the power of the Holy Spirit and the way in which our churches can regain it in its fullness.⁵

1.1.1. Two Periods

The aims of these conferences varied according to the visions of the director. During Harper’s directorship which ended in September 1975, the three international conferences in Guildford, Nottingham and Westminster carried two common characteristics: 1. Fellowship and community in the Spirit; and 2. The manifestation of the power and glory of the Spirit. These two features were clearly reflected in the titles. Guildford (1971) was given the title “The Fellowship of the Holy Spirit”⁶ and Nottingham (1973) “Gathered for Power”.⁷ The Trust claimed that “it is through the

⁴ Michael Harper, “Editorial: Christian Unity—The Growing Fact”, *Renewal*, No. 30 (December 1970-January 1971), p. 5;

Letter from Michael Harper to Michael Pusey, Farnborough Baptist Church, Hants, 29 October 1970, p. 2.

⁵ Fountain Trust, *Press Release: International Conference*, n.d.

⁶ The Conference was entitled “The Fellowship of the Holy Spirit” because the Trust wanted to echo the prayer week for Christian unity of Godalming Council of Churches in the autumn of 1971 which was themed with the same title.

Letter from Bob Balkam to Michael Harper, 18 May 1970;

Letter from Michael Harper to Leslie Davison, 9 July, 1970;

Minutes-Guildford University Conference (12 June 1970).

⁷ The theme itself was the title of the book of Graham Pulkingham, the Rector of the Church of Redeemer in Houston. This conference had a “strong Texan flavour” because the Church of Redeemer including its music team—Fisherfolk, and Pulkingham were so much involved in it. Also, a film, *Following the Spirit*, was shown and Harper’s book, *A New Way of Living*, which described the renewal of that church was available for sale during the conference. Harper believed that with the great assistance of that church, delegates would experience the “new and exciting areas” of the Charismatic Renewal “in increasingly creative ways”. (Michael Harper, “Letter of Welcome”, in

gathered community that God's power is most freely and fruitfully manifested".⁸ Harper was personally convinced that "the whole question of the church as a community of people expressing the Body of Christ" was a matter of concern for everybody.⁹ Westminster (1975) was entitled "Glory in the Church" suggesting that "the glory of God should be manifested through His people in the world".¹⁰ This theme was also used for the whole series of celebration activities for the Trust's tenth anniversary from 1974-75.¹¹

After Smail succeeded to the directorship in 1975, the focus of the other two international conferences was altered. He put the emphasis on renewal in the local churches and their responsibility for evangelism and social concern.¹² For example, in his sermon at an evening service in Westminster 1975, entitled "The Recipe of Reality", he emphasised that renewal should be brought about by the work in local churches, and should not only be "singing, hugging and hand raising". He reminded the delegates of the Christ in Calvary and the cross, and taught that charismatics should integrate the gospel and the Spirit, and let renewal be seen by the world. As he

Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power, p. 1.)

⁸ Letter from the Director of the Fountain Trust to Cliff Longley, *The Times*, London, 2 July 1973; Fountain Trust, *Leaflet and Booking Form of the Conference*, n.d.

⁹ Letter from Michael Harper to Larry Christenson, 26 July 1972.

¹⁰ Richard Harbour, "Glory in Westminster", *Renewal*, No. 59 (October-November 1975), p. 4.

¹¹ Fountain Trust, *Press Release*, January 1975.

The first celebrating activity was "Festival of Praise" in St Paul's Cathedral in London on 12 October 1974 followed by a series of "Glory in the Church" weekends which last until Westminster 1975. The weekends were held in various major cities and towns in Britain including Newcastle-on-Tyne (1-4 November 1974), Bristol and Bath (29 November-2 December 1974), Birmingham (7-10 February 1975), Manchester (18-20 March 1975), Liverpool and Manchester (18-21 April 1975), Plymouth (2-5 May 1975). There were some Roman Catholic attendants as Smail recorded, "The fellowship with Roman Catholic brethren was most refreshing". Participants of these weekends were involved in public services in both Friday and Saturday nights. They had lectures and seminars on Saturdays. The last event of the celebration was Westminster 1975 which was specially arranged as the culmination of all the celebration activities. ("Itinerary: Michael Harper and Tom Smail", *Newsletter*, No. 50, September 1974; Itinerary: Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 51, December 1974; "Itinerary: Michael Harper and Tom Smail", *Newsletter*, No. 51, March 1975.)

¹² Fountain Trust, "Renewal Must Result in Grass Roots Reality", p. 1; "Reality at Westminster", p. 16.

said, “The charismatic renewal must never become a movement by itself or for itself. It belongs to the life of the church, to the local church far more than to a large conference”. He took the title “Growing in the Church—An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church” for the fourth conference in 1977, believing that “If the glory is there the growth must follow”.¹³ For him, “growth” meant “growing into the world—how the church can become more fruitfully and decisively involved in areas of social need and concern”.¹⁴ He particularly directed the conference to concentrate on the renewal in local churches, on the basis that

Charismatic renewal stands or falls by what happens in local parishes and congregations. What matters is their ability to be deeply rooted in God’s Grace and Christ’s gospel, so that they may grow into healing fellowship, evangelical outreach and social impact.¹⁵

Therefore, the phrase “Renewal in the Local Church” was added after “An International Conference” in the subtitle. It targeted the local church leaders as the main source of delegates in order “to help them to give renewal and its ministries corporate shape” in their own church.¹⁶ Through prayer and praise, delegates learnt by experience how the local church could be renewed “in their worship, fellowship, evangelism and social concern”.¹⁷ The last international conference, “Joy in the City: An International Conference on Renewal and its Outreach in Society” also had a similar emphasis.¹⁸ Smail wanted to encourage charismatics to concentrate “on the

¹³ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 57 (August 1976), Esher: Fountain Trust.

¹⁴ Minutes-FTCCM (8 June 1977), p. 1.

¹⁵ Fountain Trust, *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, p. 2.

¹⁶ Letter from Tom Smail to Mrs. Agnes Sanford, 23 February 1976;
Letter from Tom Smail to Tom Walker, 23 February 1976;
Letter from Tom Smail to Rev. Howard Belben, 5 March 1976;
Letter from Tom Smail to Michael Harper, 5 March 1976.

¹⁷ Fountain Trust, *Press Release: Growing in the church, April 1977*.

¹⁸ The phrase “Joy in the City” was taken from Acts 8:8, “So there was much rejoicing in that city”. It describes people’s happiness in the city of Samaria after Philip had preached the gospel which was

need for a renewed and revitalised social impact within the life and ministry of the church”¹⁹ because “[t]hese are not alternatives, but that the one is very much the empowerment for the second, and any renewal which forgets this will inevitably become eccentric and inward looking”.²⁰ In addition, Smail insisted that charismatics should not only be concerned about what they personally could gain from the renewal as it could lead to “self-indulgence”.²¹ “Turn the renewal inside out”²² was the slogan of this conference. It reminded delegates of the outreaching purpose of the renewal rather than personal benefits. His major concern when planning who to invite as speakers was to approach those who had experience of local ministry and a vision for renewal in the local church. He found the American style of “star presentations and miracle services”²³ incompatible with this, and said frankly, “I want to avoid both the MacNutt sort of American image, and the theological scholar who is very profound but does not communicate on the popular level”.²⁴

accompanied by signs of healing and exorcism (v.5-8).

¹⁹ Minutes-FTCCM (8 December 1977), p. 1.

²⁰ Letter from Tom Smail to the Bishop of London, 18 July 1979.

²¹ Tom Smail, *Discipline: The Strength of the Body* (London: Fountain Trust, n.d.) (Audio Tape) In a letter, Smail explained, “The central theme as ‘Joy in the City’ where we are trying to turn people’s attention from personal problems and the obsession with healing, which could so easily swamp the renewal movement, into a new obedience to the call of the Spirit towards evangelism and prophetic action in the world”. (Letter from Tom Smail to Michael Green, 23 April 1979.)

²² Letter from Tom Smail to Michael Scanlan, 10 November 1977;
 Letter from Tom Smail to Michael Green, 10 November 1977;
 Letter from Tom Smail to Mrs. Catherine Marshall LeSourd, 10 November 1977;
 Letter from Tom Smail to Mrs. Catherine Marshall LeSourd, 3 March 1978;
 Letter from Tom Smail to William T. B. McAllister, 31 March 1978;
 Letter from Tom Smail to D. K. Gillett, 4 August 1978;
 Letter from Tom Smail to the Archbishop Helder Pessoa Camara, Brazil, 28 August 1978;
 Letter from Tom Smail to Larry Christenson, 15 September 1978;
 Letter from Tom Smail to William J. Brown, 6 February 1979;
 Letter from Tom Smail to the Bishop of London, 6 February 1979;
 Letter from Tom Smail to Tom Forrest, 6 February, 1979;
 Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 23 April 1979, p. 2;
 Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City: An International Conference on Renewal and its Outreach in Society, London 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 1;
 Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 64 (March 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust.

²³ Letter from Tom Smail to Jim Glennon, 4 August 1978.

²⁴ Letter from Tom Smail to Fr. Paul Lebeau, 23 February 1976.

2. Participants and Venues

2.1. Attendance and Nationalities

These five international conferences attracted from several hundred to more than a thousand people from Britain and other countries. For Guildford, there were 650 delegates²⁵ while the number was double that, 1500, at the second one in Nottingham.²⁶ At Westminster 1975, the number climbed up to 1800.²⁷ The Trust's international conferences became more and more popular within those five years. From the time that the conferences were open for registration, the bookings, both from inside and outside Britain, grew steadily and the quota for each conference was filled up very quickly. For example, in December 1970, six months before the Guildford conference took place, Harper had already announced, "The bookings for this conference are going very rapidly".²⁸ In April 1973, he said, "We have had an unprecedented demand for places and we are already nearly full", by which he meant that over 1,000 people had registered. So he then had to close English bookings because the accommodation in the University of Nottingham was "practically full".²⁹ Nevertheless, applications did not stop coming and by the end of May, there were still a "tremendous number of people" on the waiting list.³⁰ The quota for the first

²⁵ This figure includes 460 residents and the rest was day visitors.

Fountain Trust, *Guest list of the Fountain Trust International Conference, University of Surrey, Guildford 12-17 July 1971*;

Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 1.

²⁶ This figure includes 1252 residents and 250-350 day visitors.

Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Guest List*, pp. 1-27;

Letter from Michael Harper to David MacInnes, 11 December 1972;

Letter from Secretary to Rev. Michael Harper to Mr. Dixon, Catering Manager of the University of Nottingham, 28 June 1973.

²⁷ Letter from Truda Smail to Albert de Monleon, Paul LeBeau, W. J. Frøen, Vincent Gisard, etc., 6 June 1975.

²⁸ Letter from Michael Harper to Dr. Thurnace York, 22 December 1970.

²⁹ Letter from Michael Harper dictated and signed in his absence to Rune Brännström, Jesus Centre, Sweden, 10 April 1973;

Letter from Michael Harper dictated and signed in his absence to Lewis Simonfalvi, 10 April 1973;

Letter from Michael Harper to Rev. Hans Jacob Frøen, 10 April 1973.

³⁰ Letter from Michael Harper to Rev. David Bartlett, St. Mark Vicarage, 24 May 1973.

Westminster conference was enlarged to 2,400 due to the “heavy demand for places”³¹ at Nottingham and bookings were “coming in very nicely”.³² Although in 1977 and 1979 Smail did not try to get another numerical breakthrough, and was concerned more about the quality of delegates, the number was still over 1,000.³³ There were 1,715 delegates in 1977 who participated fully, and 200 came to the evening services only.³⁴ In 1979, an attendance of 1,214 was recorded.³⁵ These were mainly British, and the rest were from many parts of the world, although the majority of non-British were from Western Europe and Scandinavia. Within these countries, Sweden was the major supporter.³⁶ There were also quite a number of Americans and Canadians as well as Australians and New Zealanders. At Westminster in 1975, the Temple Trust in Australia brought 50 people to the conference.³⁷ This organisation had kept up communications and maintained a close relationship with the Trust, and it advertised the Conference in its publications and activities. Those who came from Asia and Africa were mainly Singaporeans, Indians, residents in Hong Kong (mainly non-Chinese) and South Africans. At Nottingham, there were some people from the

³¹ Fountain Trust, *Booking Form of Westminster 1975*.

³² Letter from Michael Harper to the Bishop of London, 2 June 1975;
Letter from Truda Smail to Albert de Monleon, Paul LeBeau, W. J. Froen, Vincent Gisard, etc., 6 June 1975.

³³ It was reported that delegates’ maturity was “equally high” compared with the quality of the speakers’ teaching. (Minutes-FTCCM (8 December 1977), p. 1.)

³⁴ Fountain Trust, *Westminster ’77, Growing in the Church, Fountain Trust Conference, 1-5 August 1977, Guest List*;
Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (6 July 1977);
Letter from Tom Smail to speaker, 1977.

³⁵ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust Conference “Joy in the City”, Westminster, 30 July-3 August 1979, Guest List*.

³⁶ For instance, a Swede, Rune Brännström, of the Kriten Ungdom, Jesus Centre asked for 100 places at the Nottingham Conference for a group of young people three months before it began. However, Harper could only offer him 50 and asked him to return the application forms by the end of April to secure the places. These young people had to come by buses instead of by air because the Trust could not offer special price for parties, but it showed their determination for coming to the conference for renewal. (Letter from Michael Harper dictated and signed in his absence to Rune Brännström, 10 April 1973; Fountain Trust, *Press Release from the Fountain Trust*, 2 July 1973, p. 1.)

³⁷ Letter from Ralph Bancroft, Senior Travel Representative, Conference Unit—Incoming Sales Department, American Express, to Truda Smail, 18 March 1975.

Middle East including Israel and Iran, and from South America, Brazil, Argentina and Bermuda.³⁸ Details are shown in the appendix.

That these international conferences which were “a truly kaleidoscopic gathering—with many bright colours”,³⁹ could take place during the period of Harper’s leadership was due to four factors. Firstly, following Guildford, organisations similar to the Fountain Trust had been established in other countries and it had maintained a close relationship with them. Therefore, those organisations advertised the conference and got groups of people together. The Temple Trust in Australia was a good example. Secondly, Harper’s personal contact with charismatics in many countries also helped to increase the variety of countries and number of participants at the conferences. For example, Harper’s visit to India, Australia and Singapore between the end of January and the end of March in 1975 gave him the opportunity to get acquainted with the local charismatic leaders and to open up further cooperation.⁴⁰ He made a second visit to India in November of the same year and was warmly welcomed by the Bishop, Sundar Clarke.⁴¹ When he attempted to invite leaders from the non-Western world to Westminster 1975, with the support of a bursary fund, he contacted the Church of South India and the Bishop of Singapore, Chiu Ban It and asked them to nominate one or two potential leaders.⁴² Chiu himself, apart from speaking at the conference, also

³⁸ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Guest List*.

³⁹ Letter from the Director of Fountain Trust to the Editor of the Church of England Newspaper, 1 July 1973.

⁴⁰ Fountain Trust, “Travelling Man”, *Renewal*, No. 54 (December 1974-January 1975), p. 6. During those two months, he was invited by four bishops of the Church of South India to speak to ministers and theological students in Vijayawada, Hyderabad, Madras, Bangalore and Madurai. Then he was invited to speak at the National Charismatic Conference in the University of Melbourne, 20-25 January 1975 and stayed for one month to visit Canberra, Tasmania, Adelaide and Perth. On the way returning back to Britain, he stayed in Singapore for a week.

⁴¹ Letter from Sundar Clarke, the Bishop in Madras, the Church of South India, to Michael Harper, 15 May 1975, p. 2.

⁴² Letter from Michael Harper to Sundar Clarke, the Bishop in Madras, 21 April 1975;

brought a party of 20 from Singapore and Malaysia to Westminster 1975.⁴³ Thirdly, the provision of simultaneous interpretation in 1975 removed the linguistic obstacle for people whose understanding of English was limited.⁴⁴ Translation into French, German, Danish and Swedish was provided for lectures and seminars.⁴⁵ The Trust also put those delegates who needed interpretation of a particular language together for the evening services.⁴⁶ Although the facilities were expensive, at £700, it was felt to be worthwhile for such a well-represented international conference.⁴⁷ However, at Westminster 1977 and 1979, this facility was not provided as it was thought to be impracticable.⁴⁸

Apart from tackling the linguistic difficulty, the Trust was willing to assist some Christian leaders financially. In 1973, Harper had been prepared to assist a Hungarian Pentecostal, Lewis Simonfalvi, by paying for his conference fee and transportation costs from Budapest to London, and then the return fare from London to Nottingham. Simonfalvi explained that because of the weak Hungarian currency and the barriers to travelling under the communist régime, he needed Harper's assistance both with money and also with an invitation letter to present to the immigration office for a

Letter from Michael Harper to Chiu Ban It, 21 April 1975.

⁴³ Letter from Chiu Ban It to Michael Harper, 30 December 1974.

⁴⁴ Letter from Michael Harper to Hans-Jacob Frøen, 22 November.

⁴⁵ Harper expected that there would be approximately 100 'from each of German, French and Swedish-speaking countries. (Letter from Michael Harper to D. White, Tannoy Rentals Ltd., 18 November 1974.)

Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, p. 3;

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1975 (1 October 1974), p. 2;

Letter from Michael Harper to overseas contacts, 15 October 1974;

Letter from Michael Harper to J. Malm, Sweden, 11 November 1974.

⁴⁶ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, p. 3;

Letter from Michael Harper to Ruth Champness, Schloss Craheim, W. Germany, 12 September 1974.

⁴⁷ Minutes-Westminster Conference 1975 (31 January 1975), p. 3.

⁴⁸ Fountain Trust, *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, p. 3;

Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City: An International Conference on Renewal and its Outreach in Society, London 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 2.

visa.⁴⁹ Unfortunately, Simonfalvi could not come for reasons which he did not explain, and he was “depressed” about it.⁵⁰ The whole incident reflected Harper’s determination and effort to invite as many people in the world as he could, and not to exclude those behind the iron curtain despite the predictable political obstacles to them coming. For Westminster 1975, the Trust set up a bursary fund to overcome the financial difficulties for church leaders from non-Western and Eastern European countries.⁵¹ It was constituted by donations and covered the expenses of transport, accommodation and other necessities.⁵² However, due to the limited amount of money, it was only open to young leaders who could be equipped at the conference for their future ministries.⁵³ The Trust not only offered money and flight tickets, but also arranged visits to some charismatic churches and other European countries when requested after the conference.⁵⁴ Finally, the Trust decided to fund seven charismatic leaders from Asia and Africa.⁵⁵ They were Dr. Louis Tay, a Singaporean Chinese and an Anglican minister chosen by Chiu Ban It⁵⁶ and three Indians, Zao Poonon, a Baptist minister in Bangalore,⁵⁷ G. D. Poornachandrarao, a vicar of St. Andrew’s

⁴⁹ Letter from Lewis Simonfalvi to Michael Harper, 14 February 1973;

Letter from Lewis Simonfalvi to Michael Harper, 19 April 1973;

Letter from Michael Harper to Lewis Simonfalvi to Michael Harper, 1 May 1973.

⁵⁰ Letter from Lewis Simonfalvi to Michael Harper, 5 June 1973.

⁵¹ Fountain Trust, “Bursary Fund”, *Renewal*, No. 54 (December 1974-January 1975), p. 5.

⁵² By the end of January, it had already accumulated £1728, of which there was one donation of £1000. Another source of the Fund was from a couple, Brenda and John Fulcher, in Kenya who donated £100. (Minutes-Westminster Conference 1975 (31 January 1975), p. 1; Letter from Michael Harper to Brenda and John Fulcher, 3 June 1975.)

Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 52 (March 1975), London: Fountain Trust;

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1975 (1 October 1974), p. 5;

Letter from Michael Harper to Chiu Ban It, 21 April 1975;

Letter from Michael Harper, dictation and signed in his absence, to Louis Tay, 16 May 1975.

⁵³ Letter from Michael Harper to Felix Dias-Abeyesinghe, 5 May 1975;

Letter from Michael Harper to Sundar Clarke, the Bishop of Madras, 8 May 1975.

⁵⁴ Letter from Michael Harper, dictated and signed in his absence, to Louis Tay, 3 June 1975.

⁵⁵ Letter from Michael Harper to David Pawson, 15 May 1975.

⁵⁶ Chiu Ban It believed that Tay would be a future leader and the conference would benefit himself as well as his ministry in the diocese. (Letter from Chiu Ban It to Michael Harper, 5 May 1975, pp. 1-2.)

⁵⁷ Poonen’s experience of Spirit baptism and tongues spread very quickly in India. He shared his experience with John Stott in a letter and they ministered together during Stott’s visit in India. His charismatic ministry led more people of his church received the baptism of the Spirit and tongues. However, there were also many people opposed his ministry and the church authorities forbade the

Anglican Church,⁵⁸ and P. A. Sathiasatchy, a layman of Bishop Sundar Clarke's church in the diocese of Madras.⁵⁹ There were three Africans who were funded to attend Westminster 1975: Robert de Maar, a black South African and an Anglican minister of the Church of Reconciliation, Manenberg who was nominated by the Archbishop of Cape Town,⁶⁰ and two leaders of the Trinity Fellowship in Kenya, Julius Adoyo⁶¹ and Elijah Malenje.⁶²

teaching of Spirit baptism. Also, they did not want Harper and Harald Bredesen who had led twelve people experiencing the Spirit baptism in Poonen's congregation to speak any more. As a result, Poonen was prepared to resign. (Letter from Zac Poonen to Michael Harper, 28 April 1975, p. 2; Letter from Michael Harper to David Pawson, 15 May 1975; Letter from Zac Poonen to Michael Harper, 3 June 1975.)

⁵⁸ He was regarded by the Bishop of the Church of South India as a "very fine dedicated young clergyman". At Westminster 1975, he witnessed the works of the Spirit in people's lives from many countries as he said, "The Spirit is indeed moving all over the world". (Letter from Michael Harper to Ananda Rao Smauel, 19 May 1975; Fountain Trust, "What the Week Has Meant to Me?", *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (1 August 1975), p. 2.)

⁵⁹ Clarke described him as a "keen", "very dedicated and committed" member. He had a positive attitude towards the charismatic renewal and the Spirit's power. Clarke expected him to bring the renewal back to the church. (Letter from Sundar Clark to Michael Harper, 15 May 1975.)

⁶⁰ Robert de Maar was very thankful for the Trust's offer as he said, "Word fail to express a deepfelt gratitude". When preparing the trip to England, he came across a "not unusual" problem of passport. Black South Africans were always given a passport one day before they departed. He had had this trouble in the previous year when he wanted to go to the All Africa Conference of Churches in Lusaka, Zambia. Nevertheless, through the persuasion of the Archbishop of Cape Town and the Provincial Executive Officer in Johannesburg to the Minister of Interior, the problem was solved successfully and de Maar was given a passport in the early July. (Letter from the Archbishop of Cape Town to Michael Harper, 7 July 1975; Letter from the Archbishop's secretary to Michael Harper, 8 July 1975; Letter from Robert de Maar to Michael Harper, 12 July 1975; Letter from the Archbishop of Cape Town to Michael Harper, 15 July 1975; Letter from Robert de Maar to Michael Harper, n.d.)

⁶¹ Harper had the idea of inviting Julius Adoyo because when he was traveling in a tube in London, he was told by a passenger that he should invite Adoyo if the Trust was to invite somebody from Africa. When Harper requested Godfrey Dawkins, the General Secretary of the Trinity Fellowship, to nominate two Africans, Dawkins suggested Adoyo. Therefore, Harper thought that it was God's will for Adoyo to come and so he sent the invitation to him. However, Adoyo faced a difficulty from his Bishop as he had already left the diocese once in that year. The Bishop only offered his permission if Adoyo could fulfill two conditions that "he forfeit his allowance for that time" and he would not go to any conference for at least one year. In order to attend the Conference, "this vast and very important gathering in the life of the Church for this days", he accepted those conditions. (Letter from Godfrey Gawkins to Michael Harper, 10 September 1974; Letter from Godfrey Dawkins, Kenya, to Michael Harper, 13 May 1975; Letter from Michael Harper to Julius Adoyo, 3 June 1975; Letter from Julius Adoyo to Michael Harper, 3 July 1975; Letter from Godfrey and Elisabeth Gawkins to Michael Harper, 4 July 1975.)

⁶² Godfrey Dawkins described him as "one of the most consistent Christian characters" whom he knew. (Letter from Godfrey Gawkins, Kenya, to Michael Harper, 13 May 1975.)

2.2. Venues

The first two conferences were residential. Delegates stayed at the student hostels of the Universities of Surrey and of Nottingham. The last three were all in Westminster because symbolically, that area was “the heart of the church and state” where many religious and political buildings are situated such as the Houses of Parliament, Westminster Abbey, Westminster Cathedral, and the Jerusalem Chamber (where the King James authorised version was finalised).⁶³ That those conferences took place in Westminster created an intimate relation between the renewal and society, and implied that the fruits of the renewal should benefit society. The significance of this was particularly obvious in the last two Westminster conferences which stressed the importance of the renewal’s effect on society.⁶⁴ All the activities of those three conferences were scattered around in different buildings of the area: Central Hall, Caxton Hall (Great Hall and York Hall), St. Margaret’s Church, St. John’s Church and Westminster School Hall.⁶⁵ Compared to the first two conferences, these Westminster conferences were “more fluid”⁶⁶ as they took place in a variety of buildings rather than on one university campus.

⁶³ Fountain Trust, *Booking Form*, n.d.;

Richard Harbour, “Glory in Westminster”, p. 4;

Fountain Trust, *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, p. 2.

⁶⁴ Fountain Trust, *Growing in the Church*, p. 2;

Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City: An International Conference on Renewal and its Outreach in Society, London 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 1;

Letter from Tom Smail to David Watson, 10 November 1977.

⁶⁵ The Central Hall consisted of the Great Hall, Lecture Hall, Assembly Hall, Fellowship Room and library. In 1975, the rental cost of the building for the Conference was £2464. (*Memorandum of an Agreement Made on the Thirtieth Day of July 1974, between the Trustees of the Central Hall and Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1 of the One Part, and Rev. Michael Harper on Behalf of Fountain Trust*, p. 1)

Fountain Trust, *Press Release*, January 1975;

Fountain Trust, *Conference Brochure: Welcome to Westminster, Fountain Trust International Conference, 28 July-2 August 1975*, p. 6.

⁶⁶ Minutes-Westminster Conference 1975 (1 October 1974), p. 1.

However, this arrangement had its drawbacks. Some delegates felt that there was a lack of solid fellowship because participants rushed from one place to another by public transport. London itself was a tourist centre with many attractions, which became a distraction for delegates at the charismatic conferences.⁶⁷ Moreover, this venue created an administrative challenge for the Trust since it was not like a university providing a set of lecture rooms, a great hall and residential hostels. Instead it was located in several historical Christian buildings in the heart of Westminster. Also, the number of participants at Westminster 1975 was nearly double that of Nottingham 1973.⁶⁸ Fortunately, Michael Barling, the vicar of St. Andrew's, Sidcup, helped resolve the complexity of the problems it raised. Smail regarded him as the "answer" to all the administrative problems as he was "trained and expert on how to put so many people in so many halls for so many lectures" and, when completed, the plan for doing so was "as clear as day".⁶⁹ His proposed timetable for the morning lectures of Westminster 1975 "was received with admiration" at the conference committee meeting.⁷⁰ Barling started planning Westminster 1975 from September 1974 to make sure that everything ran "like clockwork". He admitted that Westminster 1975 was more challenging than Nottingham because of the venue and he regarded himself as the "conference odd-job man".⁷¹

As these conferences were located in an area of the capital rather than a university campus, the Trust no longer arranged rooms individually but provided several ways in which delegates could be catered for, such as camping, caravanning, university

⁶⁷ Letter from Mr. and Mrs. M. Carney, New Zealand, to Tom Smail, 21 September 1977.

⁶⁸ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 54 (August 1975), London: Fountain Trust.

⁶⁹ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 52 (March 1975), London: Fountain Trust.

⁷⁰ Minutes-Westminster Conference 1975 (31 January 1975), p. 1.

⁷¹ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 52 (March 1975), London: Fountain Trust. Fountain Trust, "Odd Job Man", p. 4.

hostels or hotels. They could also consider staying in homes under the scheme called “Operation Cornelius” which recruited Christians in London who were willing to provide delegates with bed and breakfast.⁷² It helped to “increase fellowship and decrease cost”.⁷³ The Trust first adopted this method in 1975. Harper described it as “a new kind of conference, international in its scope but within the budget of most ordinary people”.⁷⁴ The final two Westminster conferences became completely non-residential. The Trust simply prepared a list of Londoners who were willing to provide bed and breakfast and then left the delegates to make their own arrangements. In 1977, it became a policy for future conferences not to provide accommodation for delegates, because the cost of doing so was “prohibitive”.⁷⁵

3. Programmes

Although the aims of the conferences varied according to the two different directors, the programmes for all the five conferences were similar. From 1975, the Trust invited some bishops to welcome the conference on the first evenings.⁷⁶ In the following four or five days, the conference programme was so packed that delegates

⁷² In 1977, the Trust decided to charge delegate using the service for the cost of food and laundry. (Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 58 (April 1977), Esher: Fountain Trust.)
Fountain Trust, *Booking Form*, n.d.;

Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 51 (December 1974), London: Fountain Trust;
Letter from Truda Smail to G. Davies, 15 November 1974.

⁷³ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 52 (March 1975), London: Fountain Trust.

⁷⁴ Minutes of the Working Committee for the Fountain Trust Westminster International Conference Meeting (1 October 1974), p. 1.

⁷⁵ Minutes-FTACM (9 December 1976), p. 1.

⁷⁶ For example, the Bishop of London, Gerald Ellison, representing the diocese, spoke at Westminster 1977 and 1979 and the Bishop of Southwark, Arthur Mervyn Stockwood, also did so at the 1977 event. (Fountain Trust, *Press Release* (January 1975); Letter from Michael Harper, to A. D. Roake, 9 January 1975; Letter from Michael Harper, dictated and signed in his absence, to the Bishop of London, 2 June 1975; Letter from Michael Harper to the Bishop of London, 15 August 1975; Letter from the Bishop of London to Tom Smail, 9 February 1979; Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 23 April 1979, p. 1; Letter from Tom Smail to the Bishop of London, 18 July 1979; Tom Smail, “Editorial: The More We are Together”, p. 2.)

“had no need to feel at a loose end”.⁷⁷ Each day started from a morning service which was separated into different liturgical forms to cater for delegates of different traditions, though in the main there was a Protestant service and a Roman Catholic Mass.⁷⁸ After the service, delegates would go to lectures which were conducted by a diversity of speakers, each of whom were responsible for a specific topic. The lectures usually lasted for one hour, and were mainly for teaching rather than discussion, as there could be as many as 200-250 people in any one lecture.⁷⁹ But at Westminster 1979, lectures were longer, lasting for one and half hours so that people could raise questions in the last thirty minutes.⁸⁰ In the afternoons, there were seminars held to discuss some precise issues concerning renewal. They were aimed at being “very practical and specific, dealing with particular issues and not broad-based topics”.⁸¹ They usually began with a short introduction given by a speaker and then discussion followed.⁸² Alternatively, delegates could choose to attend whatever workshops were practical and useful for their church ministries. There was a huge variety of choice such as worship leadership,⁸³ dancing,⁸⁴ drama,⁸⁵ banner-design⁸⁶ and art.⁸⁷ The most

⁷⁷ Fountain Trust, *Renewal*, No. 46 (August-September 1973), p. 21.

⁷⁸ Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 1; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham July 1973, Detailed Programme Tuesday-Friday (Saturday to be announced)*, p. 1; *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 8; *Conference Brochure: Welcome to Westminster, Fountain Trust International Conference, 28 July-2 August 1975*, p. 3; “Daily Mass”, *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (29 July 1975), p. 2; *Booking Form*, n.d.; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, p. 2; *Fountain Trust International Conference*, n. d.; *Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 4. There was an afternoon Mass conducted by Cardinal Suenens at Westminster 1977 and 1979. (Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (20 April 1977), p. 1; Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 23 April 1979, p. 1; Letter from Cardinal Suenens to Tom Smail, 9 May 1979, p. 2.)

⁷⁹ Fountain Trust, *Nottingham Conference 1973, “Gathered for Power”, Speakers’ Information*, p. 1; Letter from the Secretary to Michael Harper to Frank Lake, 29 June 1973.

⁸⁰ Letter from Michael Barling to speakers, April 1979; Letter from the Fountain Trust to speaker, June 1979.

⁸¹ Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (14 January 1977), p. 1; Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (25 February 1977), p. 1.

⁸² Fountain Trust, *Nottingham Conference 1973, “Gathered for Power”, Speakers’ Information*, p. 1; Letter from the Secretary to Michael Harper to Frank Lake, 29 June 1973; Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (25 February 1977), p. 1; Letter from Tom Smail to the speakers, n.d.

⁸³ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham July 1973, Detailed*

prominent contributor was the Fisherfolk worship team. They were invited to both conferences of 1973 and 1975 as their members had a variety of skills and strengths.⁸⁸

In the evenings, services which were open to the general public took place in a big cathedral or public hall where most of the registered delegates and some outsiders, joined in the worship. At Guildford these services were held in “the Cathedral of the Holy Spirit”.⁸⁹ Some worshippers reported their extraordinary experience of God’s power. For instance, Dennis Ball, a charismatic leader in England, heard “the most beautiful sound of music and singing” after the worship, when there was no choir or musical instruments being played. A man next to him said, ““So you hear it too!””⁹⁰ A couple experienced God’s power and said, “We were so thrilled to...feel and know the power of God with us—specially in the Cathedral”.⁹¹ David Watson was full of

Programme Tuesday-Friday (Saturday to be announced), pp. 1-2; *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 1; *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, p. 6;

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1975 (31 January 1975), p. 2.

⁸⁴ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham July 1973, Detailed Programme Tuesday-Friday (Saturday to be announced)*, pp. 1-2; *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 1; *Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 5; Richard Harbour, “Glory in Westminster”, p. 6.

⁸⁵ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham July 1973, Detailed Programme Tuesday-Friday (Saturday to be announced)*, pp. 1-2; *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 1.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, p. 6; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, p. 3;

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1975 (31 January 1975), p. 2;

Letter from Lisa Reynolds to Tom Smail, 13 August 1977.

⁸⁸ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham July 1973, Detailed Programme Tuesday-Friday (Saturday to be announced)*, pp. 1-2; *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 1.

⁸⁹ This Cathedral was dedicated to the Holy Spirit. It was relatively young as it had only been built for ten years before the Guildford Conference started. According to David Pawson, since the architect of the Cathedral thought that after twenty years, there would not be any preaching, he “designed it for music and visual effect”. Emile Dallière admired the Cathedral, saying, “And there, above the altar, at the very apex of the choir vaulting, was the rose window with its motif of the dove descending”. (Letter from David Pawson to Michael Harper, 30 April 1970; Emile Dallière, *Guildford International Conference July 1971: A Report by Emile R. Dallière* (1971), pp. 7-8.)

⁹⁰ Fountain Trust, “Guildford 1971: They Heard the Angels”, *Renewal*, No. 94 (August-September 1981), p. 32.

⁹¹ Letter from Mr. and Mrs. Jack Evans, 19 July 1971.

praise, “The Cathedral services were fantastic—it is still hard to believe what happened there”.⁹² Harper personally was so touched by the worship that he said, “for most of those present the cathedral services will surely live longest in the memory”.⁹³

At Nottingham, the worship was located in the Sports Centre of the University⁹⁴ while for the three Westminster conferences, the events were held in the Central Hall. For the first three conferences, Harper invited some Americans to lead the worship. For Guildford, he invited Merv and Merla Watson from Toronto⁹⁵ and for Nottingham and Westminster 1975, the Fisherfolk from Houston and Britain was leading the worship.⁹⁶ By contrast, Smail did not follow the same path but appointed his daughter, Mary Smail, to organise a Fountain Trust music team to lead the worship. The team was praised as “wonderful”⁹⁷ and most of the delegates appreciated the way they led.⁹⁸ The Whitaker thought that Mary Smail’s singing “was a real contribution to the worship”.⁹⁹ J. Pereboom appreciated the singing of the whole team, saying that it was “good, spontaneous and stimulating”, and so people were “with it”.¹⁰⁰ Peggy William admired the way the musicians knew “the right moment to stop or continue”.¹⁰¹ At Westminster 1979, the musicians of St. John’s College, Nottingham where Tom Smail was going to teach, assisted with the team.¹⁰² The service ended with a sermon every night and a communion on the last day. It was conducted in the “Series III” Anglican

⁹² Letter from David Watson to Michael Harper, 20 July 1971, p. 1.

⁹³ Michael Harper, “The Coming-of-Age”, in “Report: Fountain Trust International Conference at Guildford 12-17 July”, *Renewal*, No. 34 (September 1971), pp. 3-4.

⁹⁴ Letter from Michael Harper to John Horner, 18 October 1971.

⁹⁵ Fountain Trust, *Press Release: International Conference 2*.

⁹⁶ Michael Harper, “Letter of Welcome”, in *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 1;

Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Charismatic Conference*, p. 5.

⁹⁷ Letter from John Fowell to Tom Smail, 8 August 1977.

⁹⁸ Letter from Tom Smail to D. M. Adams, 19 August 1977.

⁹⁹ Letter from D. Whitaker to Tom Smail, 21 August 1977, p. 2.

¹⁰⁰ Letter from J. Pereboom to the Fountain Trust, 9 August 1977, pp. 1-2.

¹⁰¹ Letter from Peggy William to the Fountain Trust, 8 August 1977.

¹⁰² Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 2;
Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 64 (March 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust.

form.¹⁰³ This practice was continued when Smail was the director despite his Presbyterian background. He regarded it as “good that the celebrant should be Anglican and have Episcopal status”.¹⁰⁴ These final eucharists triggered a complex variety of feelings within the congregation since the Roman Catholics were not allowed to receive communion even though they had been together with the Protestants throughout the conferences. Detailed of this ecumenical problem will be discussed in chapters three and four.

4. Feedbacks from Delegates

These five international conferences received highly positive appraisal from delegates. The adjectives they used to describe them were full of praise and appreciation. For example, although Simon Tugwell could only participate in part of the conference, he was impressed and benefited greatly saying, “Guildford was most exciting, and a blessing”.¹⁰⁵ Kevin Rangahan said that the conference was “fantastic” and a “tremendous gift from God” which made him praise God for what He had done at Guildford whenever he thought about it.¹⁰⁶ A Swede, Ivar Lungren, claimed that “the

¹⁰³ Letter from Michael Harper to David Barlett, 24 May 1973;

Letter from Tom Smail to Lesslie Newbigin, 23 April 1979.

¹⁰⁴ Letter from Tom Smail to David Pytches, 12 March 1979.

The celebrant at Nottingham was the Bishop of Southwell (John Denis Wakeling), at Westminster 1975 it was the Archbishop of Cape Town (William Burnett), Westminster 1977 the Bishop of Pontefract (Richard Hare), and at Westminster 1979 Michael Whinney. (Letter from Michael Harper to the Bishop of Southwell, 26 July 1972; Letter from the Bishop of Southwell to Michael Harper, 1 January 1973; Letter from Michael Harper, dictated and signed in his absence, to the Dean of Westminster, 3 June 1975; Letter from Michael Harper to the Bishop of Southwell, 28 June 1973; Fountain Trust, *Conference Brochure: Welcome to Westminster, Fountain Trust International Conference, 28 July-2 August 1975*, p. 2; “Michael Hands over the Reins”, p. 1; “Speaker from over the World”, *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (28 July 1975), p. 2; *Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 4; Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 10; Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (20 April 1977), p. 1.

¹⁰⁵ Letter from Simon Tugwell to Michael Harper, September 1971.

¹⁰⁶ Kevin Ranaghan, *The Maturity of the Body of Christ*. (Audio Tape)

conference was wonderful and of great importance for the future”.¹⁰⁷ A South African Pentecostal minister, Dr. F. P. Möller thanked Harper for the “marvellous”, “enjoyable and blessed time” at Guildford and he asserted that “What happened at Guildford is nothing less than a miracle, a doing of God!”¹⁰⁸ After more than thirty years (1971-2005), when Harper recalled what happened at Guildford, he just said, “The Guilford Conference in 1971 was awesome and remarkable”.¹⁰⁹

In the same way, Westminster 1975 was beneficial and full of blessings for most of the delegates.¹¹⁰ They expressed their thanks for the Trust’s effort in organising it and also their feelings about it. It was regarded as “wonderful”,¹¹¹ “super”,¹¹² “splendid”,¹¹³ “profitable”¹¹⁴, “an unforgettable experience”¹¹⁵ and “a tremendous encouragement”.¹¹⁶ Some of them experienced a renewal in their lives and appreciated the way it covered “the breadth and depth of the many areas of life”.¹¹⁷ Some of them had not only gained understanding about renewal, but had also seen how it could be worked out in practice.¹¹⁸ One delegate said that the conference had provided the motivation for praying for renewal in the local church.¹¹⁹

¹⁰⁷ Letter from Ivar Lungren to Michael Harper, 28 July 1971.

¹⁰⁸ Letter from Dr. F. P. Möller to Michael Harper, 29 July 1971.

¹⁰⁹ Michael Harper’s personal note for the author, 22 July 2005;

Interview with Michael and Jeanne Harper, 8 August 2005, Cambridge.

¹¹⁰ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 54 (August 1975), London: Fountain Trust.

¹¹¹ Letter from S. V. Winbalt Lewis to Michael Harper, 2 August 1975;

Letter from Miss J. G. Simpson to Michael Harper, 3 August 1975;

Letter from Bill and Gladys Kutty, 4 August 1975;

Letter from Lorna and Ken, 14 September 1975, p. 2.

¹¹² Letter from Beryl M. Parker to the Fountain Trust, 5 August 1975, pp. 5-6.

¹¹³ Letter from Edwin to Michael and Jeanne Harper, 8 August 1975.

¹¹⁴ Letter from Mrs Pamela Lucas to the Fountain Trust, 29 August 1975.

¹¹⁵ Letter from Ken to Michael Harper, 4 August 1975.

¹¹⁶ Letter from Beryl M. Parker to the Fountain Trust, 5 August 1975, p.1.

¹¹⁷ Letter from Trevor J. Marzetti to Michael Harper, 8 August 1975.

¹¹⁸ Letter from Mary Alison to Tom Smail, 21 August 1975.

¹¹⁹ Letter from S. V. Winbalt Lewis to Michael Harper, 2 August 1975.

The Trust also received plenty of positive feedback for Westminster 1977. Most of the delegates praised the conference as “wonderful”¹²⁰ and “thrilling”.¹²¹ Others commented on the practical side of the conference and regarded it as “helpful”, “challenging”,¹²² “memorable”, “fruitful”,¹²³ and “useful”.¹²⁴ It was also a week full of blessings “in no small measure”.¹²⁵ Tom Walker observed that plenty of the delegates “were touched deeply”.¹²⁶ No wonder that a delegate said, “If that is what a Fountain Trust conference is like, what I want to know is when is the next?”¹²⁷ Moreover, having attended Westminster 1975, one delegate noticed the great improvement in the organisation of Westminster 1977, of which he said that there is “left little if anything to be desired in this respect”.¹²⁸ Other delegates also admired the smooth running of the conference and they were grateful for the hard work of the whole team behind the scenes.¹²⁹

That these five conferences won plenty of praise from British and international delegates suggests that they were significant and valuable in terms of promoting the renewal in Britain and overseas. The messages and experiences of the conferences

¹²⁰ Letter from Mr. D. Whitaker to Rev. and Mrs. Tom Smail, 21 August 1977;

Letter from Collin McCampbell to Tom Smail, 5 August 1977;

Letter from Miss J. Martin-Doyle to Tom Smail, 9 September 1977;

Letter from Mrs Pauline Ruffett to Tom Smail, 9 August 1977.

¹²¹ Letter from Mr and Mrs Mike Carney to Tom Smail, 21 September 1977;

Letter from Mr. Philip Sourbut to Tom Smail, 6 August 1977.

¹²² Letter from Miss J. Martin-Doyle to Tom Smail, 9 September 1977.

¹²³ Letter from Rev. A. K. Pring to Tom Smail, 18 August 1977.

¹²⁴ Letter from Mr. Philip Sourbut to Tom Smail, 6 August 1977.

¹²⁵ Letter from Collin McCampbell to Tom Smail, 5 August 1977;

Letter from Rev. Gordon V. Clark to Tom Smail, 12 August 1977;

Letter from Mr. John Forwell to Tom Smail, 8 August 1977;

Letter from Mr D. M. Adam to Tom Smail, 6 August 1977;

Letter from J. Pereboom to the Fountain Trust, 9 August 1977, p. 2;

Letter from Renale Vetter, West Germany, to the Fountain Trust, 11 August 1977.

¹²⁶ Letter from Tom Walker to Tom Smail, 6 October 1977.

¹²⁷ Letter from Mr. D. Whitaker to Rev. and Mrs. Tom Smail, 21 August 1977.

¹²⁸ Letter from Mr J. Pereboom to Tom Smail, 9 August 1977.

¹²⁹ Letter from Miss J. Martin-Doyle to Tom Smail, 9 September 1977;

Letter from Miss Peggy William to Fountain Trust, 8 August 1977;

Letter from Pamela Mellyard to Tom Smail, 8 August 1977, pp. 2-3.

permeated the lives of individuals and gradually penetrated their local churches. Thus, their impact on the renewal movement is worth investigating.

5. Impacts

5.1. Church Leaders in the United Kingdom

The five international conferences ushered a change in attitude of church leaders towards the charismatic renewal. The influence of Guildford was particularly significant, as Cecil Cousen, one of the Trustees said, “Since Guildford, no Christian can ignore the charismatic renewal” although they disagreed with it. He added, “...the charismatic renewal has infiltrated further into all denominations. Catholics are involved, the Church of Scotland has given us its blessings, and Methodists are showing greater interest.¹³⁰ Indeed, Cousen did not exaggerate what had happened since Guildford. Many leaders of different denominations and Christian organisations had become more open towards the renewal.

5.1.1. Anglicans

The international conferences produced the greatest impact on the Anglican Church because the majority of the Trust’s leaders were Anglicans and they maintained connections with Anglican churches. After Guildford, a number of bishops or ministers expressed their interest in the renewal. For example, in October 1971 the Bishop of Guildford, George Reindorp, arranged a conference with the Trust with the theme of “Pentecostalism” in the Cathedral of Guildford for the Anglican ministers of

¹³⁰ David Coomes, “1500 ‘Gathered for Power’”, *Church of England Newspaper*, No.4144 (Friday, 13 July 1973), p. 1.

the diocese.¹³¹ According to David Pawson, the Bishop spoke about the Spirit Baptism at the Mothers' Union in the diocese, and he perceived the Bishop had been positive in his assessment.¹³² It was very obvious that there was a change in his attitude from before the conference in July 1971. Eric Jennings, a minister of the Bourne Vicarage, Farnham, Surrey, said that the Bishop had been "very prejudiced" against the renewal though he was "willing to learn";¹³³ Jennings had hoped that his misunderstandings would be altered by the book, *Gifts and Graces* which he had sent.¹³⁴ In fact his desire to see the Bishop's attitude towards the renewal transformed was realised exactly one year later when he "responded wonderfully to the fellowship of the Conference and gave...a great welcome".¹³⁵ For the Trust, this change was very encouraging because he could influence the local clergymen. In addition, there had been forty-five local people participating in the conference,¹³⁶ and it was reported that "some of the Guildford churches derived considerable benefit from" it with "very good repercussions" and a "strong impact was made on the diocese of Guildford".¹³⁷ David MacInnes, who was involved in the renewal, was pleased about it and acclaimed, "It is a most astonishing miracle".¹³⁸

For Colin Urquhart, who had been "an unknown Anglican Vicar of an unknown parish" at St. Hugh's, Luton, Guildford was his first experience of the charismatic

¹³¹ Letter from Michael Harper to Rev. Emile Dallièrè, 19 October 1971; Minutes-FTACM (12 November 1971), p. 1;

Letter from Michael Harper to Dennis Bennett, 5 October 1971.

¹³² Letter from David Pawson to Michael Harper, 4 October 1971.

¹³³ Letter from Eric Jennings to Michael Harper, 11 July 1970.

¹³⁴ Letter from Eric Jennings to Michael Harper, 21 July 1970.

Arnold Bittlinger, *Gifts and Graces*, trans. Herbert Klassen (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1967).

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Letter from Michael Harper to John Horner, 18 October 1971;

Letter from Michael Harper to David Watson, 29 July 1971;

Minutes-FTACM (12 November 1971), p. 1.

¹³⁸ Letter from David MacInnes to Michael Harper, 29 October 1971.

renewal and he was still “bathing in the glory” after the conference.¹³⁹ In fact, he had wanted to leave soon after the first meeting, but because he did not want to waste the money that he had paid for the whole conference, he stayed albeit reluctantly. During this time he experienced the power of the Spirit and the love of the fellowship. It confirmed for him that the baptism in the Spirit that most of the people in his church had experienced was God’s will, and he was shown in a prophecy what his future ministry was to be.¹⁴⁰ A year later, his parish church began a new form of church life as a community where Christians learnt to connect and live with one another.¹⁴¹ He witnessed how his church members experienced the Spirit so that

When God was renewing the lives of our people individually within our church, everything was absolutely playing saintly. It was the Vicar’s dream. You know people just falling into blessing, people being healed all over the place. It was lovely!¹⁴²

Apart from these two Anglican ministers, Harper recorded that after 1971 there were seven bishops who were involved in the renewal. In 1972 the Archbishop of Canterbury, Arthur Michael Ramsey, mentioned the renewal appreciatively in sermons and lectures.¹⁴³ For Westminster 1975, the Bishop of Pontefract, Richard Hare, exclaimed in a letter, “How enormously I enjoyed what I saw of the Westminster conference” and he was particularly impressed by Francis MacNutt’s teaching.¹⁴⁴ He became deeply involved in the charismatic renewal and in Westminster 1977 he was invited to celebrate the final communion. Bill Neaty, a

¹³⁹ Fountain Trust, “Guildford 1971: They Heard the Angels”, p. 31;

Colin Urquhart, “My Heart Rejoiced”, in “And Now—Ten People Recall What Guildford ’71 Meant to Them”, *Renewal*, No. 94 (August-September 1981), p. 32;

Letter from Colin Urquhart to Michael Harper, 8 October 1971.

¹⁴⁰ Colin Urquhart, “My Heart Rejoiced”, p. 32.

¹⁴¹ Colin Urquhart, *Renewal in the Local Church Fellowship* (1975). (Audio Tape)

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Michael Harper, “Editorial: From Guildford to Nottingham”, *Renewal*, No. 45 (June-July 1973), p. 2.

¹⁴⁴ Letter from the Bishop of Pontefract to Tom Smail, 10 September, 1975.

rector from the North Yorkshire, commented on Westminster 1975, “It was the most wonderful conference I have attended in nearly thirty two years ministry in the Church of England”.¹⁴⁵ At Westminster 1977, a rector from Bucks, A. K. Pring experienced “a memorable and fruitful time” and he foresaw the “far-reaching benefits” for his future ministry.¹⁴⁶

5.1.2. Roman Catholics

On the Roman Catholic side, there was also active involvement in the charismatic renewal after Guildford. Bob Balkam organised the first “Day of Renewal” at Heythrop College on 19 September 1971 and Bishop Victor Guazzelli was invited to come.¹⁴⁷ On the second “Day of Renewal” in December of the same year, Harper was invited to speak and this enabled the Trust to be more involved in the Roman Catholic Renewal which was progressing at that time.¹⁴⁸ The National Service Committee was born in November 1973, after the Guildford conference. Balkam attributed this development to Guildford 1971, saying, “The family tree of Catholic charismatic renewal in England and Wales certainly has roots in the Surrey hills”.¹⁴⁹ After this, the RCNSC and the Trust frequently cooperated in the renewal, particularly at the Westminster conferences in 1977 and 1979. Although the Trust was closed down in 1980, the Committee still serves the Roman Catholic charismatic renewal today.

¹⁴⁵ Letter from Bill and Gladys Neaty to Tom Smail, 4 September 1975, pp.1-2.

¹⁴⁶ Letter from Rev. A. K. Pring to Tom Smail, 18 August 1977.

¹⁴⁷ Email from Bob Balkam, 16 November 2005.

¹⁴⁸ Letter from Ray Bringham to Michael Harper, n.d.

Letter from Michael Harper to Ray Bringham, 22 November 1971.

¹⁴⁹ Bob Balkam, “Roots in Surrey”, in “And Now—Ten People Recall What Guildford ’71 Meant to Them”, *Renewal*, No. 94 (August-September 1981), p. 33.

5.1.3. Leaders of Mainline Churches

Many leaders of some mainline churches were influenced and edified at the international conferences. Lord George MacLeod of the Church of Scotland was sympathetic to the renewal and he spoke at Nottingham. John Horner, a Methodist minister who had attended the international conferences since Guildford, said he was most edified at Westminster 1975 “from the fellowship, from the speakers and from the Fisherfolk”.¹⁵⁰ A Baptist minister from Worcester, John Bedford, exclaimed, “We’re praising the Lord for all the Good things that happened at the Westminster Conf. [1975]”¹⁵¹ Another Baptist, Gordon Clark, felt being “better equipped” to work for the church after Westminster 1977.¹⁵² With their experiences at the conferences and their support of the renewal, the flame of renewal spread within their local churches and the renewal prospered.

5.1.4. British Council of Churches

One of the leading Christian organisations, the BCC, also showed its support for the renewal after Guildford. In September 1971, Bishop Sansbury of the Executive Committee invited Leslie Davison to talk about his report on the conference to the Executive members, as he had been sent to represent the Council unofficially. He expressed his wish to Davison saying, “The churches will be big enough to contain the Movement and not to expel it”.¹⁵³ In 1974, the General Secretary of the Council expressed his praise and acknowledgement of the value of the movement in *Renewal*, on the occasion of the Trust’s tenth anniversary.¹⁵⁴ The Trust hoped that the Council’s

¹⁵⁰ Letter from John Horner to Tom Smail, 5 August 1975.

¹⁵¹ Letter from John Bedford to Michael Harper, 8 August 1975.

¹⁵² Letter from Rev. Gordon V. Clark to Tom Smail, 12 August 1977.

¹⁵³ Letter from Leslie Davison to Michael Harper, 3 September 1971.

¹⁵⁴ Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, p. 186;
Michael Harper, “Editorial: From Guildford to Nottingham”, p. 3.

understanding of renewal would increase, particularly with the help of Dr. Walter Hollenweger, who had settled in Britain after his appointment at the University of Birmingham in 1971.¹⁵⁵

5.2. International Church Leaders

One of the characteristics of these five conferences was that they were international and their influence reached overseas. Among all of them, Guildford had the greatest charismatic impact. It is not an exaggeration to say that Guildford was like another Azusa Street Revival, in that the wave of renewal was rapidly moving out from its place of origin, and spreading dynamically to many other parts of the world. The renewal not only reached other places but, more importantly, it was to grow there. The following is an examination of the impact of Guildford on the development of renewal in Sweden, Norway, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, in so far as the record of their renewal was sufficiently detailed and available in the archive.

5.2.1. Sweden

After experiencing the renewal at Guildford, Ivar Lundgren, a journalist on a Swedish Pentecostal daily newspaper, *Dagen*, brought the message back to his country and initiated the renewal by holding conferences.¹⁵⁶ He described the conference as “wonderful and of great importance for the future”. He published six major articles about it including reports of interviews that he had conducted during the conference.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ Minutes-FTACM (12 November 1971), p. 1.

¹⁵⁶ Michael Harper’s personal note for the author, 22 July 2005, p. 2.

In Swedish, *Dagen* means “the day”. According to L. Ahonen and J.-E. Johannesson, this newspaper circulates 23,000 copies everyday and it was an important ecumenical medium because it connects Pentecostal and evangelical churches and maintains unity among Pentecostal. (L. Ahonen and J.-E. Johannesson, “Sweden”, in Stanley Burgess and Eduard M. van der Maas (eds) *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2002), p. 256.)

¹⁵⁷ Letter from Livar Lundgren to Michael Harper, 28 July 1971;

Since he was “so enthusiastic about what he saw” at Guildford, he organised conferences with similar settings in order to bring renewal to many local churches in the country.¹⁵⁸ The conferences were also represented ecumenically by the speakers, and organised by committee members from various traditions. He corresponded to Harper saying that there would be at least one Lutheran bishop on the committee for the conference in Stockholm in the following autumn. For that “ground breaking conference”, he invited Harper and some Roman Catholic priests to speak so as to promote the charismatic renewal in Sweden.¹⁵⁹ The ecumenical character of the charismatic renewal also penetrated into the major Swedish Pentecostal church. Lewi Pethrus, the prominent Pentecostal leader in Sweden, invited Harper and a Roman Catholic priest, George de Prasio, to speak in his “Filadelfia” Pentecostal Church in Stockholm in 1971.¹⁶⁰ It was the first time that a Roman Catholic had been invited to speak from the platform of his church.¹⁶¹ Apart from conferences, Lundgren also used written materials to publicise the renewal in Sweden. He considered publishing 12,000 copies of Harper’s book, *None Can Guess*, for a book club in Sweden by a major Christian literature publisher belonging to *Dagen*.¹⁶²

5.2.2. Norway

A similar story also happened in Norway. The flame of renewal was brought back to the country from Guildford by a Lutheran minister, Hans-Jacob Frøen. He and other

Minutes-FTACM (12 November 1971), p. 1.

¹⁵⁸ Fountain Trust, “Guildford 1971: They Heard the Angels”, p. 31.

¹⁵⁹ Michael Harper’s personal note for the author, 22 July 2005, p. 2.

¹⁶⁰ Interview with Michael and Jeanne Harper, 8 August 2005;

Interview with Michael Harper, 11 November 2005, Cambridge.

In Sweden, Pentecostal churches were called “Filadelfia” or “Pingstkyrkan”. Pethrus’ church was the largest Pentecostal Church in Sweden and it has the biggest “religious auditorium in Europe” which can accommodate 4000 people. (Ahonen, L. and Johannesson, J.-E., “Sweden”, pp. 255-6; “Influence of Pethrus and Richards”, *Renewal*, No. 54 (December 1974-January 1975), p. 6.)

¹⁶¹ Michael Harper’s personal note for the author, 22 July 2005, p. 2.

¹⁶² Letter from Ivar Lundgren to Michael Harper, 5 November 1971; Michael Harper, *None Can Guess* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1972).

Lutherans organised a group similar to the Fountain Trust which they called “Agape for the world” and published a magazine, *Deeper Life*, first published before Christmas 1974.¹⁶³ At the beginning of June, Harper and his wife were invited to speak in the country.¹⁶⁴

5.2.3. Australia

The renewal not only spread upward to Northern Europe from Britain, but also downward to the southern hemisphere. Being amazed and inspired by Guildford, Alan Langstaff, a Methodist from Sydney, established the “Temple Trust” with similar functions to the Fountain Trust, to promote the renewal in Australia. He intended to enable the renewal to be “peacefully integrated in the Church”.¹⁶⁵ Langstaff resigned from his Methodist church at the end of 1973¹⁶⁶ and by that time, he had made a lot of links with leaders of the renewal in all the major and capital cities including Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne, Canberra and Brisbane.¹⁶⁷ Because of their support, the Temple Trust could widen its ministry and Langstaff could invite more speakers from abroad. For example, Rodman Williams and Graham Pulkingham came to speak in September and November 1973 respectively.¹⁶⁸ Harper not only accepted an invitation to speak at conferences, but also was willing to cooperate with Langstaff closely as he thought that Langstaff had “a very responsible approach”¹⁶⁹ which gave him the “utmost

¹⁶³ Letter from Michael Harper to Larry Christenson, 19 October 1971;
Letter from Hans-Jacob Frøen to Michael Harper, 6 November 1974;
Interview with Father Michael and Jeanne Harper, 8 August 2005.

¹⁶⁴ Minutes-FTACM (12 November 1971), p. 1;
Letter from Michael Harper to Ivar Lundgren, 12 November 1971.

¹⁶⁵ Letter from Michael Harper, 6 March 1973;
Letter from Michael Harper to J. Abraham, 4 April 1973;
Minutes-FTACM (5 April 1973), p. 4.

¹⁶⁶ Letter from Michael Harper to Rev. and Mrs. Ray Muller, 4 April 1973, p. 1.

¹⁶⁷ Letter from Alan Langstaff to Michael Harper, 25 April 1973, p. 1.

¹⁶⁸ Letter from Alan Langstaff to Michael Harper, 29 June 1973.

¹⁶⁹ Fountain Trust, “Guildford 1971: They Heard the Angels”, p. 31;
Letter from Michael Harper to Rev. Frank Watts, 22 May 1973.

confidence” in him.¹⁷⁰ He was “perfectly happy” to sell the Fountain Trust’s publications including *Renewal* and tapes through the Temple Trust.¹⁷¹ Moreover, the Temple Trust also held conferences to promote the renewal. It organised the first National Charismatic Conference with a Baptist minister called Howard Carter at the University of New South Wales, Sydney. The conference gathered 900 people from Australia, Papua and New Guinea, and 1,500 Anglicans, Roman Catholics, Pentecostals and free churches participated at the final youth rally. It was the first time that Australian charismatics had gathered together. Langstaff and Carter’s efforts to organise this ecumenical and charismatic event were highly acknowledged.¹⁷² In January of both 1974 and 1975, the Temple Trust also organised two other national conferences in Canberra and Melbourne respectively.¹⁷³

5.2.4. New Zealand

In New Zealand, the flame of renewal was rekindled by an ex-Anglican vicar, Ray Muller. He worked at the Fountain Trust for one year in 1971 when the Guildford Conference was being prepared and held. After going back to New Zealand, he established “Christian Advance Ministries” which was also similar to the Fountain Trust. In January 1973, a conference was held at Massey University, Palmerston North, where he had been “a very successful chaplain”. Kevin Ranaghan, Bob Frost and Michael Harper were invited to speak.¹⁷⁴ This had a remarkable influence on the country which had “largely failed to make a noticeable impact on the larger churches”,

¹⁷⁰ Letter from Michael Harper to J. Abraham, 4 April 1973.

¹⁷¹ Letter from Alan Langstaff to Michael Harper, 25 April, 1973, p. 1;

Letter from Michael Harper to Alan Langstaff, 22 May 1973, p. 1.

¹⁷² Fountain Trust, “It’s Time in Australia”, *Renewal*, No. 44 (April-May 1973), pp. 21-22.

¹⁷³ Letter from Alan Langstaff to Michael Harper, 25 April 1973, p. 1;

Letter from Alan Langstaff to Michael Harper, 29 June 1973;

Tom Smail, “Itinerary: Michael Harper”, *Newsletter*, No. 51 (December 1974), London: Fountain Trust.

¹⁷⁴ Letter from Michael Harper, 6 March 1973;

Fountain Trust, “History Repeated in New Zealand”, *Renewal*, No. 44 (April-May 1973), p. 19.

although it had been strong for several years in non-mainline churches.¹⁷⁵ It gathered one thousand delegates, with Anglicans and Catholics in the majority and attracted plenty of ordained and lay leaders to attend.¹⁷⁶ Positive evaluations were given by both Protestants and Catholics. They appreciated the serious theological examination of the renewal and a sense of unity during the eucharist in the mornings and the evening meeting.¹⁷⁷ Similar to Guildford, the conference had “widespread and continuing repercussions” among churches including the Roman Catholic Church and was identified as a “significant turning point” for the renewal in the country.

Together with the Temple Trust and Christian Advance Ministries, the Fountain Trust had developed a partnership with another three charismatic agents in other countries: Charismatic Renewal Services (USA), Fishermen Incorporated and Ecumenical Academy (Schloss Craheim, West Germany). Harper foresaw the great potential of these six to cooperate more frequently and interactively in the future.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁵ Campbell McAlpine and Arthur Wallis were regarded as the pioneers of the charismatic renewal in New Zealand. In 1959, McAlpine preached in Baptist and Brethren churches in the country. Wallis was active in Brethren and evangelical sectors. He organised a conference at Massey University, Palmerston North in 1964 which gathered charismatics and Pentecostals together. The charismatic renewal in the country was mainly launched by individuals rather than an organisation. Muller’s attempt to establish “Christian Advance Ministries” helped to gather resources and finance to spread the renewal more widely in the country. (B. Knowles, “New Zealand”, in Stanley Burgess and Eduard M. van der Maas (eds) *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2002), pp. 189-190.)

¹⁷⁶ Fountain Trust, “History Repeated in New Zealand”, p. 19.

¹⁷⁷ Fountain Trust, “Press Comment on Massey University Conference”, *Renewal*, No. 44 (April-May 1973), pp. 20-21.

Those evaluations were given by an Evangelical Protestant magazine, *Challenge Weekly*, and a Roman Catholic paper, *The Tablet* and were cited in *Renewal*.

¹⁷⁸ Letter from Michael Harper to Rev. and Mrs. Ray Muller, 4 April 1973, p. 2.

5.2.5. South Africa

In South Africa, “very great blessing, new insights, wider vision” were brought from Guildford by its representatives of whom Derek Crumpton was a prominent one.¹⁷⁹ He spent one year preparing for the renewal and established the “Christian Interdenominational Fellowship” in East London.¹⁸⁰ This organisation and its Caring Centre penetrated into the Baptist, Methodist, Afrikaan Reformer and, gradually, the Roman Catholic circles. Many of them turned from being against the renewal to being baptised by the Spirit. The Fellowship organised conferences which attracted an attendance of around one hundred people of various backgrounds. In 1972, almost 70 people participated in the meetings and many of them were baptised by the Spirit and experienced “an increasingly powerful moving of God”. The Fellowship grew “at an astounding rate”.¹⁸¹ Apart from the organisation, Crumpton’s personal ministry was also significant, particularly in teaching. He was invited to speak at a Baptist Family Convention in Pretoria where he seized the leisure time to share the charismatic message with some delegates, and many of them were baptised by the Spirit.¹⁸² He also led some Roman Catholics to “a real experience of salvation by faith in Christ and then into the charismatic experience”. He explained the biblical basis of the Spirit baptism with priests and nuns and some of them attended the meetings of his organisation.¹⁸³ Officially, he was invited to speak in a seminar led by Bill Burnett who was the Bishop of Grahamstown, and by David du Plessis in a Pentecostal Mission’s event and was asked to teach in Baptist churches.¹⁸⁴ Crumpton’s contribution to the renewal in South Africa was noteworthy. Ten years after the

¹⁷⁹ Letter from Jim and Val Kincaid to Michael and Jeanne Harper, 30 July 1971.

¹⁸⁰ Fountain Trust, “Guildford 1971: They Heard the Angels”, p. 30;

Letter from Derek Crumpton to Michael Harper, 2 November 1972, p. 1.

¹⁸¹ Letter from Derek Crumpton to Michael Harper, 2 November 1972, p. 2.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ Letter from Derek Crumpton to Michael Harper, 29 March 1973, p. 1.

Guildford conference, when Harper recorded the history of the event in *Renewal*, he said, “**Derek Crumpton**, who was to go back to South Africa to pioneer renewal and to prepare the way for the breakthrough a year or so later which was to sweep many church leaders into the experience of renewal”.¹⁸⁵

It is possible that there were still many stories of renewal resulting from Guildford in many other countries that Harper and the Trust did not even know about. But from the stories recorded above, it is obvious that the flame of renewal did not just spread around Britain, but moved across national borders so that overseas churches were renewed as well. It is also clear that the methods of spreading the flame in Britain were worth learning, since charismatic leaders of other countries also promoted the renewal through establishing similar organisations, conferences and publications. These organisations gradually developed a network with the Fountain Trust so that they could exchange resources and news of the local renewal development and mutually support one another financially and spiritually.

5.3. Theological Awareness

In all the five international conferences, theology had never been devalued. The schedule of each conference, which was constituted by intensive lectures and seminars on a variety of subjects, suggested that the Trust affirmed the importance of theological knowledge and reciprocal discussions which implicitly countered against the “anti-intellectual elements in renewal movement”.¹⁸⁶ This setting of the conferences conveys a message to the delegates that they should avoid being content with and indulging in the experiential realm of the renewal, but rather find a balance

¹⁸⁵ Fountain Trust, “Guildford 1971: They Heard the Angels”, pp. 30-31.

¹⁸⁶ Michael Harper, “The Coming-of-Age”, pp. 2-3.

between experience and truth. Through learning and discussions, it was assumed that delegates could attain theological knowledge relating to the renewal and their personal experiences so that they could be protected from potential dangers.

The emphasis on theology had occurred since Guildford. Emile Dallière appraised the quality of the theological teaching as being of “an exceptional biblical purity, absolutely sound and authentic.” Speakers were patient to explain and their “lectures were presented with great clarity, dynamic in approach and powerful in conviction”. Some people were baptised by the Spirit during the lectures. Those attending were eager and humble to learn rather than being intent on provoking disputes.¹⁸⁷ J. Rodman Williams, as one of the speakers, was “grateful” and “delighted” to see the growing theological interest among delegates who carefully looked into certain theological issues during the lectures and conversations. For him, this trend of serious theological investigation regarding the renewal was crucial because it prepared for “the vast importance in the future of continuing study and reflection”.¹⁸⁸ Harper said, “The movement expressed at Guildford the desire to study and become deeply acquainted with the biblical foundations of the Christian faith” and thus he pointed out that the conference contained a “didactic character”.¹⁸⁹ This could be regarded as a harbinger paving a theological road for the future development of the British renewal. The renewal was therefore strengthened by continuous theological investigation and a serious attitude towards the truth. The set-up of the theological workshop during the conference provided a good example. For three days, “highly qualified theologians”

¹⁸⁷ Emile Dallière, *Guildford International Conference July 1971*, pp. 4-5.

¹⁸⁸ J. Rodman Williams, “Genuine Concern for Pentecostal Theology”, in “Report: Fountain Trust International Conference at Guildford 12-17 July”, *Renewal*, No. 34 (September 1971), p. 9.

¹⁸⁹ Michael Harper, “The Coming-of-Age”, pp. 2-3.

of different traditions including two Roman Catholic Dominicans and evangelicals¹⁹⁰ investigated theological questions such as the definition of “the baptism in the Spirit”, the relationship between theology and experience, and also charismatic renewal and church structures.¹⁹¹ It proved to be so successful that the members of the group wanted to continue it in the following years.¹⁹² The second meeting took place in January 1972¹⁹³ followed by a residential meeting at Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham on 12-15 December. There was also one at St. John’s College, Nottingham on 1-4 January 1974.¹⁹⁴ Each time during those few years Harper invited more people to join the group on condition that they had “a dedicated interest and concern in the charismatic renewal without...pre-judging any particular theological position”.¹⁹⁵ That the workshop was sustained and grew showed that the theological importance of the renewal was reaffirmed.¹⁹⁶

-
- ¹⁹⁰ The attendants of the workshop were Simon Barrington-Ward, Howard Belben, William R. Davies, James D. G. Dunn, John Orme Mills, David Pawson, John Richards, Simon Tugwell and J. Rodman Williams who was the chairman of the workshop. (*International Conference on the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit. Guildford, England, 1971*; Theological Workshop: Address List.) Michael Harper, “The Coming-of-Age”, p. 3;
An Invitation of the Theological Workshop from Michael Harper, June 1973.
- ¹⁹¹ J. Rodman Williams, “Genuine Concern for Pentecostal Theology”, p. 9;
Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 2;
Letter from Michael Harper to D. MacInnes, 10 November 1971;
Letter from Michael Harper to Simon Tugwell and John Mills, 7 July 1972;
An Invitation of the Theological Workshop from Michael Harper, n. d.
- ¹⁹² In a letter to James Dunn, Harper described that the workshop was a “success” and he was looking forward to more “serious studies” and the fruits borne. (Letter from Michael Harper to James Dunn, 19 July 1971.)
Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 2;
Minutes-FTACM (12 November 1971), p. 2;
J. Rodman Williams, “Genuine Concern for Pentecostal Theology”, p. 9;
An Invitation of the Theological Workshop from Michael Harper, n. d.;
Michael Harper, “The Coming-of-Age”, p. 3.
- ¹⁹³ It was attended by Simon Tugwell, Simon Barrington-Ward, James Dunn and Walter Hollenweger (who replaced Leslie Davison) as the chairperson. (Minutes-FTACM (12 November 1971), p. 2;
An Invitation of the Theological Workshop from Michael Harper, n. d.)
- ¹⁹⁴ An Invitation of the Theological Workshop from Michael Harper, n. d.;
An Invitation of the Theological Workshop from Michael Harper, June 1973.
- ¹⁹⁵ An Invitation of the Theological Workshop from Michael Harper, n. d.
- ¹⁹⁶ However, when the workshop was run until 1975, Smail felt that the meetings had “rather collapsed” and “got lost on the indefiniteness of its agenda”. Nevertheless, he did not devalue the setting of theological investigation and so he consulted James Dunn for remedies to make the discussion more focused. (Letter from Tom Smail to James Dunn, 8 August 1975.)

The trend of theological study was continued at Nottingham where a theological workshop was led by Smail and J. Rodman Williams. Although it could only be a small setting since it was difficult to gather the entire crowd of delegates, Smail strongly advised people to come, saying that it could be worth abandoning their original plans for that morning so as to participate in a profound theological study.¹⁹⁷ As a result of these theological discussions, Emmanuel Sullivan appreciated the leaders of the conference recognising the importance of theology, but they did not overemphasise theology at the expense of experience. For him, theology was a means of rescuing “Pentecostal spirituality from becoming a mindless Christianity inhabited by the devils of fanaticism, elitism, erroneous exegesis, and false prophecy”.¹⁹⁸ In addition, the number of cassettes of the lectures and seminars that were sold suggested the rapid growth of theological interest among delegates. On the fourth day of the conference, 800 cassettes were sold; and within two days, the number amounted to 3,800. The cassette copiers had to keep going all the time to meet the demand.¹⁹⁹

When Smail was the director of the Trust, the emphasis on teaching at conferences became even stronger. For Westminster 1979, Smail stated clearly in his letters to speakers that “serious teaching” was the “main emphasis” of the conference.²⁰⁰ In the first place a new session for Bible Study was added into the programme, and it took place before the lectures, seminars, workshop and services began. It indicated that the Trust affirmed the uniquely unshakable position of the Bible and that all the teaching

¹⁹⁷ Letter from the Secretary to Michael Harper to J. Rodman William, 16 May 1973;
Letter from Tom Smail, Nottingham, July 1973.

¹⁹⁸ Emmanuel Sullivan, “Seeing the Whole Church Renewed”, *Renewal*, No. 46 (August-September 1973), p. 25.

¹⁹⁹ Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 10;
Renewal, No. 46 (August-September 1973), London: Fountain Trust, p. 22.

²⁰⁰ Letter from Tom Smail to Canon Michael Green, 10 November 1977;
Letter from Tom Smail to Mrs. Catherine Marshall LeSourd, 3 March 1978;
Letter from Tom Smail to William J. Brown, 6 February 1979.

should be based on that rather than solely on personal experience. In addition, lectures were lengthened from the usual one hour to one and a half hours, to allow more time to learn, to think and to discuss. All these teaching sessions were arranged in order to achieve the purpose of motivating people to take action in evangelism and social concern, and to transform the world with the renewal. This was stated in a Consultative Council Meeting,

...a renewed church should be able to conform the world to the structures of the gospel. This is an emphasis upon the Word becoming [incarnate] in the people lives and is not a reversion to fundamentalism or conservative evangelism.²⁰¹

To ensure that the teachings on evangelism and social concern were effectively and contextually expressed, the Trust invited speakers who not only had profound theological knowledge but also abundant experience in the area of concern—people such as Lesslie Newbigin and Tom Forrest who had been missionaries in South India and South America for years and were also theorists on missiology.

The conferences reflect the way in which the Fountain Trust saw the role and significance of theology within the renewal. It rejected the idea of being satisfied with a cozy atmosphere in a warm fellowship in the Spirit, and insisted on the profound and careful study of truths. The emphasis on theological exploration grew stronger during Smail's directorship. Perhaps the comment of a so-called "liberal" theologian, Leslie Davison, about the theological work for the renewal, is a suitable conclusion for this section. He said, "If this movement is to enrich the life of the Church it must

²⁰¹ Minutes-FTCCM (8 December 1977), p. 2.

open itself to fullest critical examination and make sure that the Truth within it shines out clearly without distortion. Much sifting has yet to be done”.²⁰²

5.4. Social Concern

Social concern had been regarded as an essential area of the renewal at the international conferences. At Nottingham, three speakers talked about this topic which was believed to be increasingly important.²⁰³ One was Larry Christenson who talked about “A Charismatic Approach to Social Action” dealing with the relationship between charismatic experiences and social action, and how to respond to social needs with spiritual power.²⁰⁴ The other one was Lord George MacLeod, who was a pacifist and had gradually seen the significance of the charismatic renewal. He believed that “a recovery of spiritual vision” through the renewal would provide a solution for the problems created by the industrialised, commercialised and environmentally polluted society, which politicians were incapable of handling. He thought that “the general witness of the Church is simply not faithful enough to bridge the gap”, and so he hoped that the conference would arouse social concern and renew the delegates as “in Christ” with a growing affection for society.²⁰⁵ He encouraged delegates to be “active in politics and social action”²⁰⁶ and more important, to change society with peaceful means instead of violence. He said, “If the world was not to see ‘a violent revolution of necessity’, it must see a ‘non-violent revolution, a revolution

²⁰² Leslie Davison, *Pathway to Power: The Charismatic Movement in Historical Perspective* (London: Fountain Trust, 1971), p. 11.

²⁰³ Letter from Michael Harper to Larry Christenson, 24 May 1973.

²⁰⁴ Letter from Larry Christenson to Michael Harper, 18 May 1973; Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 2; *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2.

²⁰⁵ Fountain Trust, “Four Conference Speakers on What I want for Nottingham—MacLeod, George”, *Renewal*, No. 45 (June-July 1973), p. 5.

²⁰⁶ David Coomes, “1500 ‘Gathered for Power’”, p. 1.

of love, by consent.”²⁰⁷ This made a great impact on the delegates. One such, David Coomes, said, “I left Nottingham believing that I had seen there the seeds of that non violent revolution”.²⁰⁸ Sullivan also commented that he could feel “the growing sense of social responsibility and even political maturity” at the conference, but it still needed to be nurtured and those who were renewed Christians should manifest the holiness that they experienced, in society as well as in the Church.²⁰⁹

Another major figure involved in social concern at both Nottingham and Westminster 1975 was Bill Burnett. He had been the Bishop of Grahamstown in South Africa and was inducted as the Archbishop of Cape Town and Primate of the Church of the Province in 1974. He was baptised by the Spirit when he was praying in his private chapel.²¹⁰ He then spread the message of Spirit baptism in his diocese and his experience “made headlines in most major newspapers”.²¹¹ An increasing number of people became interested and involved in the renewal under his influence.²¹² He also persuaded some Anglican ministers such as Peter Campbell, the rector of Queenstown, to “come out into the open air” when the charismatic renewal was not well accepted.²¹³ Harper described Burnett as having been “already thoroughly committed

²⁰⁷ David Coomes, “Nottingham: A Dynamic Freedom and Joy”, *Renewal*, No. 46 (August-September 1973), p. 19.

²⁰⁸ Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, p. 188.

²⁰⁹ Emmanuel Sullivan, “Seeing the Whole Church Renewed”, p. 25.

²¹⁰ Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 5;

Fax transmission from Michael Harper to John Martin, “Obituary of Archbishop Bill Burnett”, 29 August, 1994, p. 3.

In an obituary of Bill Burnett (1917-1994), Harper described him as “one of the most influential of charismatic leaders”. Burnett depicted the episode of his own Spirit baptism by saying, “When the Holy Spirit came upon me in his power...my knees weakened and I sank down on the floor in adoration...I also found myself praising God in a new language”. (Fax transmission from Michael Harper to John Martin, “Obituary of Archbishop Bill Burnett”, 29 August, 1994, p. 2.)

²¹¹ Letter from Derek Crumpton to Michael Harper, 29 March 1973, p. 1;

Fountain Trust, *Press Release from the Fountain Trust*, p. 1.

²¹² Letter from Derek Crumpton to Michael Harper, 29 March 1973, p. 1.

²¹³ Letter from Derek Crumpton to Michael Harper, 2 November 1972, p. 1.

to the movement”.²¹⁴ Moreover, Burnett had been a prominent opponent of apartheid and now he saw that this was not only a matter of social and political injustice, but also of spiritual warfare.²¹⁵ The renewal made him realise that God was concerned about the oppressed and He also loved the oppressors. This gave the impression to many that he had adopted a compromising position on the political issue.²¹⁶ In a Press Conference, the Archbishop expressed his opinion about racial issues by saying, “The Holy Spirit is renewing people in South Africa but there will have to be vast structural changes in the country if Christian justice between black and white is to come about”.²¹⁷ His personal experience and his talk at Nottingham and Westminster 1975 on social action aroused delegates’ awareness of the issues in the wider society.²¹⁸

At Westminster 1975, delegates were also able to hear teaching and stories about social issues from Cecil Kerr, an Anglican clergyman from Northern Ireland. He was baptised in the Spirit when he was chaplain at Queen’s University in Belfast in 1971. He then began a charismatic prayer group consisting of students from various denominational backgrounds. He was the founder and warden of the “Christian Renewal Centre”, Rostrevor, Northern Ireland, which was aimed at bringing about reconciliation between Protestants and Catholics in Ireland.²¹⁹ At the conference, he talked about social action in a seminar under the title “The World: Reconciliation”. He said that “Ireland’s darkest hour was yet to come” and there would be “many more

²¹⁴ Letter from Michael Harper to Bernard Palmer, 11 May 1973.

²¹⁵ Letter from the Bishop of Grahamstown to Michael Harper, 30 May 1973.

²¹⁶ “Reality at Westminster”, p. 3.

²¹⁷ Fountain Trust, “Conference Aims Explained to Press and Radio”, p. 1.

²¹⁸ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 4;

Letter from Michael Harper to the Archbishop of Cape Town, 13 September 1974;
Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 4, 6; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 29 July-2 August 1975, Speakers’ Subjects; Charismatic Event (July 1975)*.

Letter from the Archbishop of Cape Town to Tom Smail, 30 January 1975.

²¹⁹ Fountain Trust, “Prayer Can Avert Ireland Disaster”, in *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975*, 29 July 1975, p. 4.

killings, shooting and bombings”, and therefore, “don’t expect too much too quickly, after centuries of bitterness”.²²⁰ Nevertheless, he believed that the Holy Spirit was “moving in re-creation, bringing life, joy and peace to a world sadly lacking these qualities”. To face the conflicts in Ireland, people might rely on political solutions but they still needed the inner healing of the Spirit. He believed that if there were more people praying, peace would come one day.²²¹ His talk made a great impression on the hearers. One of the delegates, Barbara Holl, commented, “What depth of understanding there was there, what enlightenment of his heart and mind by the Holy Spirit”.²²²

The teaching on social responsibility at Nottingham brought the renewal to a more mature level. It extended its concern from the internal realm of personal spiritual renewal to the one of social justice and welfare. This concern continued at Westminster 1975. Since there was a rising interest during the conference, the Trust specially arranged “an informal and non-residential weekend consultation” entitled “Spirit and Society” in central London on 13-14 December of that year.²²³ When the renewal went on to the late 1970s, the Trust believed that social action should be facilitated by the ministry of prophecy and prayer, as was stated in a Council meeting minute,

The prophetic ministry and the life of prayer need to combine to make the renewal a much more challenging and powerful force in the land. If one of the

²²⁰ Ibid.

²²¹ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 3-4, 6; *Charismatic Event* (July 1975); “Prayer Can Avert Ireland Disaster”, p. 4; Letter from Cecil Kerr to Michael Harper, 6 July 1975, p. 2; “Reality at Westminster”, p. 3; David Coomes, “Optimism the Key”, *The Church of England Newspaper*, No. 4251 (1 August 1975), p. 1.

²²² Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 4.

²²³ Fountain Trust, “Spirit and Society”, *Renewal*, No. 59 (October-November 1975), p. 9.

ends we are moving towards is a revitalised and reawakened Christian witness in our land then we need to become a prayerfully prophetic people who speak a living true word to the real needs of our society rather than produce endless facile stop-gap measures.²²⁴

The emphasis on social concern continued until Westminster 1979. Smail invited the Colonel of the Salvation Army Men's Social Services in London, William McAllister,²²⁵ to speak about "the local church and social concern". He also arranged for another William from the US to deal with this issue. William Brown, the executive director of the Trinity Christian Community in Orleans, Louisiana, had seen the practical effect of renewal "in the inner city situation and in a difficult racial background" with his church.²²⁶ Smail was sure that Brown's experience and ideas about how the renewal could make an impact on society were "exactly" what the conference needed and that he could inspire those in the congregation who might have a similar situation and concern.²²⁷ Finally, there was a lecture concerning the importance of prayer and prophecy in response to any need in society and the world and how delegates could be equipped by those two ministries.

6. A Reflection of the Five International Conferences

The five international conferences reflected the development of the British charismatic renewal. Their emphases demonstrated the focus of the renewal at each stage, the spiritual circumstances of charismatic churches and how the Trust reacted to them.

²²⁴ Minutes-FTCCM (8 December 1977), p. 2.

²²⁵ Letter from Tom Smail to William McAllister, 31 March 1978.

²²⁶ Letter from William Brown to Tom Smail, 6 March 1979;
Letter from Tom Smail to William Brown, 6 February 1979;
Fountain Trust, *Speakers at Westminster 1979*.

²²⁷ Letter from Tom Smail to William Brown, 6 February 1979.

6.1. Guildford 1971: Coming of Age

Guildford brightened the future of the British charismatic renewal which had previously looked dull and unclear. It was described as “the coming-of age”,²²⁸ “a spiritual breakthrough”,²²⁹ “a milestone”, and “a signpost” of the movement.²³⁰ It had “some widespread repercussions” which sustained and greatly accelerated the progress of the renewal.²³¹ Harper said, “The flames are fanned” and “we have seen things escalate very quickly in England with our international conference at Guildford”, which meant that the Trust was “very much involved in the charismatic movement”.²³² Thus, one of the Trustees, Cecil Cousen, confidently claimed, “Most of all, the charismatic movement was now firmly ‘on the map.’”²³³ Arthur Wallis felt it was a privilege to contribute because it was an event “making history at Guildford”.²³⁴ The reason for these rapid developments was that for the first time, people realised the importance of the charismatic renewal in the church.²³⁵ The gifts and power from the Holy Spirit especially were recognised as the answer to what the church had been searching for in a time of powerlessness and declining attendance. Smail sharply pointed out this problem at a Fountain Trust conference,

Ask the young people, why they don't go to church and you will get one answer: nothing ever happen and it's also boring!...Far more devastating to the reality of Christ work among us, that nothing happens, that there isn't effective

²²⁸ It was the expression used by James Dunn. (Fountain Trust, “Guildford 1971: They Heard the Angels”, p. 30.)

²²⁹ Fountain Trust, *Leaflet and application form of the Nottingham Conference*.

²³⁰ Michael Harper, *Newsletter*, No. 41 (February 1972), London: Fountain Trust, p. 1.

²³¹ Letter from Michael Harper to Brother Andrew, 4 October 1971;

Letter from Michael Harper to Ray Bringham, 22 November 1971.

²³² Letter from Michael Harper to Simon Tugwell, 29 September 1971;

Letter from Michael Harper to Dennis Bennett, 5 October 1971;

Letter from Michael Harper to Bishop Bazley, 29 November 1972.

²³³ Cecil Cousen, “Ten Times More”, in “And Now—Ten People Recall What Guildford '71 Meant to Them”, *Renewal*, No. 94 (August-September 1981), p. 34.

²³⁴ Letter from Arthur Wallis to Michael Harper, 21 July 1971, p. 1.

²³⁵ Martin Robinson, “The Charismatic Anglican”, p. 188

relationship, so that the thing that the Head desires and all that get actually done and could be seen to be done.²³⁶

The church realised that it needed a renewal from the Spirit; the dry bones needed a fresh breath from the Creator so that they could work effectively and fruitfully for the Head of the body. And there in Guildford, ministers and laymen from churches of Britain and overseas witnessed the works of the Spirit which could revitalise the Church. Leslie Davison, in the Report on the Conference for the BCC, said, "...it is very evident that here is a new and powerful movement at work throughout the Christian world which is again demonstrating that the vitality of the New Testament Church can be recaptured".²³⁷

Guildford seemed to soften, moisten and fertilise the sterile soil in Britain in which the Fountain Trust had sowed the seeds of renewal since 1964. People had seen the work of the Holy Spirit with His "truly remarkable" freedom in the conference.²³⁸ Harper believed that the significance of the Spirit in churches' and people's lives would be growing. Meanwhile, the workload of the Trust had increased because as Harper noted, "Certainly many doors have opened since the conference, and opportunities are abounding to witness concerning the power of the Holy Spirit in the Church today".²³⁹ After Guildford, the renewal was able to grow and become mature. This was to be seen at Nottingham two years later.

²³⁶ Tom Smail, *Humanity—The Stuff of the Body* (London: Fountain Trust, n.d.). (Audio Tape)

²³⁷ Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 3.

²³⁸ Letter from Michael Harper to the Lord Rank, 28 July 1971.

²³⁹ Letter from Michael Harper to James Dunn, 29 July 1971.

6.2. Nottingham 1973: A Milestone of Maturity

If Guildford was regarded as the coming of age of the charismatic renewal in Britain, then Nottingham was a crucial step in the maturing of the renewal. Jeanne and Michael Harper commented that Nottingham did not share the same climax as Guildford which denoted “something historic that was happening”.²⁴⁰ However, if the renewal was to grow and not be self-satisfied about what had been achieved at Guildford, then it must reach a higher level of maturity, rather than simply repeating the “coming-of-age”. There was some disagreement about this matter of maturity. The Editor of the *Church of England Newspaper* and Emmanuel Sullivan, the official observer of the BCC at the conference, held opposite views. The Editor was uncertain whether Nottingham had brought the renewal to maturity, although Sullivan testified that it had been evident at the conference.²⁴¹ The Editor’s point was that if the renewal was making a mature impact on churches, the “rediscovery” of the Spirit’s power should result in outreach.²⁴² Sullivan thought that the experience of the Spirit at Nottingham was “richer and deeper” than at Guildford. He also felt that it had become less individualistic and more of a collective and interactive event, and one which was “integrated within their lives, now a fixed pattern of life in Christ”.²⁴³ The Editor had suggested, furthermore, that a mature renewal should result in continuing “the rediscovery of the Church as the charismatically ordered body of Christ”.²⁴⁴ Sullivan affirmed that this rediscovery had occurred at the conference and was being given attention. Finally, the Editor questioned whether the renewal was mature enough to contribute to “the wider life of the Church” and Sullivan responded positively by

²⁴⁰ Interview with Michael and Jeanne Harper, 8 August 2005, Cambridge.

²⁴¹ Emmanuel Sullivan, “Seeing the Whole Church Renewed”, p. 21; “Editorial: Whiter Charismatics?”, *The Church of England Newspaper*, No. 4144 (13 July 1973), p. 7.

²⁴² “Editorial: Whiter Charismatics?”, p. 7.

²⁴³ Emmanuel Sullivan, “Seeing the Whole Church Renewed”, p. 21.

²⁴⁴ “Editorial: Whiter Charismatics?”, p. 7.

saying, “I left Nottingham with fresh hope for the whole church. I left with the conviction that God is doing something wonderfully new among His people. And I said, ‘Praise God!’”²⁴⁵ Nottingham did bring the renewal to another milestone of maturity. A greater ecumenical capacity, a sharper awareness of the need for social concern and a deeper theological investigation at the conference, showed that charismatics and the Trust were not individualistic, nor self-satisfied with the spiritual experience, but were opening themselves to face the challenges of wider ecumenical developments and social and theological adventures.

6.3. Westminster 1975: Renewal on a Plateau

This conference reflected the fact that the renewal had reached a peak between 1973-1975 where everything was stable, there was little change, and it was time to evaluate what had developed so far. The Spirit’s power was no longer such a surprise. More and more members of the laity and clergy in local churches around the country were reported to have been baptised and renewed by the Spirit, or had testified to that. Most of the issues about the renewal such as the theological study of the charismatic experiences and gifts, the question of social concern, the relationship of charismatics with their own churches, etc., had been rethought and dealt with many times. There had been changes to liturgy and worship which people had enjoyed. Physical and psychological healings had borne their fruits. The title, “Glory in the Church”, suggested that after ten years, the Trust and the renewal saw themselves as having reached a mountain top where they would see the glory, so what else could happen? Was there a new topic to think about? Was there a new message to preach? Were there new songs to sing? Were there new divine healers? In fact, all these things had

²⁴⁵ Emmanuel Sullivan, “Seeing the Whole Church Renewed”, p. 25.

happened in what was quite a small circle of people, not the whole Christian community in the country. As Harper warned, “We must not fall into the trap of getting too euphoric about what has happened; the renewal is still very small in England”.²⁴⁶ When Smail was about to succeed to the directorship, he felt that the renewal “should begin to think about itself” in terms of its theology of the gospel, not just be satisfied with enthusiasm.²⁴⁷ One example, according to Colin Buchanan at a conference in Reading in 1976, was that the Trust taught about “how to control and discipline” spiritual gifts rather than seeking for and ministering them. Prophecies had to be discerned carefully rather than be accepted without question.²⁴⁸ In an editorial of the same year, Smail even said, “Two-thirds of the exercise of spiritual gifts is phoney”.²⁴⁹ Smail’s succession was a turning point in the way the Trust focussed on the renewal. He led the Trust, and charismatics generally, to evaluate critically what had happened in their lives and churches, and to look at how they should prepare and adjust for the future.

6.4. Westminster 1977: Retrospection and Ready for the Future

Although this conference was spiritually edifying to delegates and enriched their understanding of renewal, it could not conceal the intrinsic problems of the renewal. Before it took place, delegates were asked to choose which lectures they wished to attend, and nearly 50% of them had chosen “Growing into Wholeness” which dealt with healing. Noting this, Smail said to the speakers in a letter, “I leave you to ponder the implications”. He believed that those who opted for other sections were “really

²⁴⁶ Fountain Trust, “Michael Hands over the Reins”, p. 1.

The claim of the smallness of the renewal was still true in 1976 as it was discussed in the Advisory Council Meeting. (Minutes-FTACM (9 December 1976), p. 3.)

²⁴⁷ Fountain Trust, “Michael Hands over the Reins”, p. 1.

²⁴⁸ Colin Buchanan, *Encountering Charismatic Worship*, p. 21, footnote 2.

²⁴⁹ Tom Smail, “Editorial: Treasure and Trash and the Need to Be Honest”, *Renewal*, No. 65 (October-November 1976), p. 2.

interested in them!”²⁵⁰ His comment indicated that those who applied for that session did so out of curiosity more than real concern about the issue. And after ten years of the renewal, people were still at the a stage of being more interested in miracles than investigating questions relating to the body of Christ—its fellowship, evangelism, understanding of truth and relationship with God.

Moreover, after the conference, when the Trust did an evaluation, Smail and other members had a revelation in their prayer time which was that in the previous two years, the renewal had been coming across the “wilderness” like the experience of the Israelite after escaping from Egypt.²⁵¹ Disappointment grew when the expectations of miracles were unfulfilled. It was recorded that most of the places that had experienced the renewal were “under very testing attack”. All the effort was going to preserving what the church had already received from God or fighting to recover what had been lost, rather than moving forward to another stage.²⁵² Furthermore, in 1976, Smail noticed that there had been charismatics and churches that were not genuinely renewed, but pretended to be. He was also concerned about the growing danger of charismatic gnosticism. He concluded that 1976 “had been a very testing time for all leaders in renewal”.²⁵³ In addition to his view, David Phypers also felt that charismatics had been enjoying themselves in “a cosy diet of warm, loving fellowship with their own ‘in’ group” rather than reaching out of their comfort zone to save the lost with the Spirit’s renewal power.²⁵⁴ As a director observing all this, Smail

²⁵⁰ Letter from Tom Smail to the speakers, n.d.

²⁵¹ Tom Smail, “Editorial: Lights Show Red and Amber”, *Renewal*, No. 72 (December 1977-January 1978), Esher: Fountain Trust, p.2.

²⁵² Tom Smail, “Editorial: Lights Show Red and Amber”, p. 3;
Minutes-FTCCM (8 December 1977), p. 2.

²⁵³ Minutes-FTACM (9 December 1976), p. 1;
Minutes-FTCCM (8 June 1977), p. 3.

²⁵⁴ David Phypers, “Charismatic Renewal: Where are We Now?”, *Renewal*, No. 83 (October-November 1979), p. 30.

interpreted the problems as positive signs indicating the pruning process that the renewal was going through. He believed that because the renewal had been fruitful, it needed to be pruned so that it would bear more fruit.²⁵⁵ The Trust also thought that the renewal was “on the brink of a new stage of development” which required solid faith, profound understanding of the Word, a strong prayer and prophetic ministry, and a re-evaluation of institutional structures which might block the working of the Spirit.²⁵⁶ Motivated by this hope, the Trust courageously continued to lead churches through this painful process in order to reach a more fruitful stage.

6.5. Westminster 1979: A March towards a New Stage

This conference, “Joy in the City”, reflected the Trust’s intention of leading the renewal into a new stage. It wanted to adjust the focus of delegates to see that the way to build their faith was not through “easy triumphalistic panaceas”,²⁵⁷ but through obedience, in order to give up self-indulgence and take up self-discipline, and to stop using the power of renewal to fulfil personal interests and to start following God’s commandments.²⁵⁸ One of the things that charismatics ought to be doing was reaching out to the world through social action and evangelism. That was the emphasis of the conference and the Trust hoped that people would “go out, get on with the job, put into practice back home” what they had learnt at the conference.²⁵⁹ Smail believed that this emphasis resulted in a decrease in the number of participants because it was not pandering to any egotistic concerns such as healing, but about evangelism, focussing on the world and others. He spoke out about this saying,

²⁵⁵ Tom Smail, “Editorial: Growth Business”, *Renewal*, No. 70 (August-September 1977), p. 3.

²⁵⁶ Minutes-FTCCM (8 December 1977), p. 2.

²⁵⁷ Ibid.

²⁵⁸ Tom Smail, *Discipline: The Strength of the Body* (London: Fountain Trust, n. d.) (Audio Tape)

²⁵⁹ Ruth Fowke, “Go out, Get on with the Job”, *Renewal*, No. 83 (October-November 1979), p. 6.

If the conference is about instant healing now you could have booked the Albert Hall every night and it would have been packed. But if you had the conference on “Joy in the City” and getting out into the world, all the people that are just interested in themselves with their problems and their nice experience, they are not there.²⁶⁰

Nevertheless, Smail was not discouraged by the decrease in numbers, but actually was fascinated by the growth of maturity among delegates.²⁶¹ One of the marks of that maturity could be seen in Ruth Fowke’s description, “No emotionalism, solid teaching and appropriate emotion”.²⁶² With the focus on evangelism and social action out of an attitude of obedience, the Trust believed that charismatics could become less self-centred. And that was the point of departure for proceeding to a new stage of the renewal.

7. Conclusion and Evaluation

The Fountain Trust’s five international conferences contained both strengths and weaknesses. First, as far as strengths were concerned, there was a holistic approach in the conferences because the programme included not only spontaneous worship in which people experienced the Holy Spirit, but also practical activities in workshops, and learning through serious theological teaching and discussion. The conferences were not only aimed at renewing local churches and leaders in Britain, but also at spreading the flames overseas. They not only focused, on the inner growth of individuals and churches, but regarded this as preparation for a social impact. Second, the conferences reflected the self-awareness and self-critical attitude of the Trust. They reminded delegates of the potential danger of emotionalism and fanaticism

²⁶⁰ Tom Smail, *Discipline: The Strength of the Body*.

²⁶¹ Ibid.

²⁶² Ruth Fowke, “Go out, Get on with the Job”, p. 6.

which could overshadow the divine purpose of the renewal. Theological teaching was important to safeguard renewal from the indulgence of triumphalism as it equipped delegates to discern anything that was going in the wrong direction. Third, although they reflected the weaknesses and problems of the charismatic renewal during the 1970s, they were simultaneously arenas for correction and equipping people for further stages of the renewal through theological teaching. They helped the renewal to grow continuously with a solid foundation. Fourth, they carried a strong ecumenical feature which abolished denominational barriers through common experiences in the Spirit. This point is going to be elaborated in the next chapter.

However, there were weaknesses in the conferences. They were dominated by Anglicans and Roman Catholics and the free churches were in the minority. This was primarily because most of the staff of the Trust was Anglicans and they had close relationships with the RCNSC. Consequently free churches were not so well informed about the conferences and the renewal. The renewal of the church as a whole was limited in Anglican and Roman Catholic churches. Moreover, the early conferences tended to adopt the American worship style. At Guildford, Harper invited a Canadian couple, Merv and Merla Watson, to lead the worship and at Nottingham and Westminster 1975, the Fisherfolk. It was only when Tom Smail became the director of the Trust that British Christians led their own worship. Overly relying on American worship style weakened the conferences and the renewal in Britain because the style was not entirely suitable for British Christians and they became less creative in composing new songs and developing their own worship style. This might have caused a lack of authenticity in the British charismatic renewal. Furthermore, the influence of the conferences on the charismatic renewal overseas had been decreasing.

It was only the Guildford conference that influenced some Australians, New Zealanders, South Africans and Swedes to take the fire to their own countries. The Trust then assisted them by sending printed and audio materials, and advising them on establishing a charismatic organisation and preparing conferences. Although there were also international delegates at the other four conferences, they did not have the same impact on them to spread the renewal fire through organisations, conferences and theological education in their own countries.

After exploring the general scene of the five international conferences, the next chapter is going to specifically discuss the ecumenicity of these conferences, which shows the grassroots nature of the unity in charismatic renewal.

CHAPTER THREE

THE GRASSROOTS UNITY OF THE FIVE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

The five international conferences demonstrate the grassroots unity brought about by the charismatic renewal. Huge numbers attended, and there was a great diversity of ecclesiological backgrounds both among the speakers and participants. The cooperation between Protestants and Roman Catholics was unprecedented, at least in British church history. The activities, which included worship and the eucharist, nurtured both an intense sense of unity as well as revealing the deep pain derived from the remaining unresolved ecumenical issues. This pioneering ecumenical approach was inevitably rejected by some people who had held a negative view of other traditions; but at the same time there was such a melting pot of ecclesiological diversity that many of the objectors were eventually ecumenically converted. This chapter is aimed at exploring these ecumenical aspects of the five international conferences.

1. Ecumenical Speakers

At Guildford, the Trust had challenged the conventional practice in Roman Catholic and Protestant churches of only having speakers of their own denominations. Instead, the criterion of inviting a person to speak at the conference was their experience and theological reflections upon the renewal regardless of their denomination. Renewal, in this case, was the means of bringing people with different backgrounds together, to serve God and those attending with their expertise. In that way, all the speakers can to

some extent be regarded as ecumenists because they were willing to share a common platform with others from different ecclesiological backgrounds. For these five international conferences, the Trust invited sixty-three prominent theologians and leaders of the charismatic renewal in Britain and from overseas, and from the Roman Catholic Church and mainline Protestant denominations, to speak. Some of them came more than once. Anglicans were in the majority, with twenty altogether, and the second highest number was of Roman Catholics, with twelve. The rest of them were Protestants including Baptists (4), Presbyterians (5), Methodists (4), Lutherans (2), Pentecostal (1), Salvation Army (1). There were some independent and one Orthodox speakers. Each conference had a “galaxy” and “an impressive range of speakers and teachers” numbering about fifteen.¹ Details of the speakers and their subjects are given in the following section.

1.1. Two Key Ecumenists

Among the speakers, there were two prominent ecumenists highlighting the ecumenical nature of the international conferences—David du Plessis and Cardinal Suenens. Du Plessis had felt called to spread the renewal message among mainline Protestant churches and the Roman Catholic Church. In the 1970s, he was the co-chairman of the Roman Catholic-Charismatic dialogue.² The Trust invited him to speak at Guildford and Nottingham where he talked about the Spirit and gifts in an ecumenical context³. He was also responsible for a lecture about “the Pentecostal

¹ Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 64 (March 1979), Esher: Fountain Trust.

² Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 4.

³ He spoke under the titles “An Ecumenical and Economical Pentecost” for a seminar and “Gathered to Unite the People of God” for an evening meeting at Nottingham. (Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, “Fellowship of the Holy Spirit”, 12-17 July 1971, University of Surrey Guildford*, p. 7; Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 1.)

movement and its contribution to the whole church.”⁴ Du Plessis himself symbolised the ecumenical character of the renewal and the Trust’s high regard of the ecumenical significance of the renewal. His attendance and talks at the international conferences certainly raised the ecumenical awareness among those attending.

From the Roman Catholic side, there was also a prominent charismatic ecumenical leader who attended Westminster 1977 and 1979, the Archbishop of Malines-Brussels in Belgium, Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens. During the 1970s, he increasingly acknowledged the importance of the “grassroots charismatic renewal” for two aspects of the church—the institution itself and its spiritual life. He saw some “extraordinary ecumenical implications” of the renewal—not just in the theological symposium, but more importantly, in Christian daily life. From the testimonies he heard about the ecumenical result of the renewal, and he affirmed that it would be “a great impetus for Christian unity.”⁵ He also prayed for his own Spirit baptism, with the help of friends who had had this experience in Belgium.⁶ When Smail invited him to speak at Westminster 1977, he “gladly” accepted, seeing it as supporting and witnessing to the growing unity between the Protestants and Roman Catholics in British charismatic renewal. The joint organisation of the RCNSC and the Trust particularly demonstrated the ecumenical growth between Roman Catholics and Protestants.⁷ At Westminster 1977, he was responsible for a lecture on the Spirit and social action and took part in a

⁴ Letter from Secretary to Michael Harper to David du Plessis, 16 May 1973; Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham July 1973, Detailed Programme Tuesday-Friday (Saturday to be announced)*, p. 2.

⁵ “Looking for the Holy Spirit’s Surprises”, *Renewal*, No. 46 (August-September 1973), pp. 10-11.

⁶ “Looking for the Holy Spirit’s Surprises”, p. 7; Léon-Joseph Suenens, “My Encounters with the Holy Spirit”, *Renewal*, No. 100 (August-September 1982), p. 28.

⁷ Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 14 January 1976; Letter from Cardinal Suenens to Tom Smail, 25 February 1976; Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 7 October 1976.

seminar about ecumenical issues.⁸ On the following evening he gave a sermon on the topic of “the Charismatic Renewal as the work of the Holy Spirit.”⁹ One delegate said that he sensed the Cardinal’s dedication to unity in his speech.¹⁰ At Westminster 1979, he spoke to the whole conference in a Bible study and worship session in the morning. He talked about the biblical insights into the Spirit’s work in renewing society.¹¹ That the Cardinal was delighted to speak at the international conferences with multi-denominational attendance and to share the platform with non-Catholic clergy twice, clearly demonstrated his ecumenical openness. His attendance brought support to the charismatic renewal not just for the Roman Catholics, but also for Protestants. The fact that he spoke to both groups of Christians showed his acknowledgement that the non-Catholics were also members of the body of Christ and that they all experienced the same Spirit. And his emphasis on social concern suggested that both Catholic and non-Catholic charismatics could not avoid the fact that the fruit of renewal must include witnessing in society and ecumenical cooperation. The Cardinal’s attendance also represented the Vatican’s openness to charismatic renewal and readiness for any ecumenical advance following Vatican II.

1.2. Anglican and Episcopal Speakers

There were twenty speakers from the Anglican tradition in Britain and overseas. Three of them had a concern for evangelism. David Watson was invited to speak at

⁸ Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 25 April 1977;
Letter from Cardinal Suenens to Tom Smail, 4 May 1977;
Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens 13 June 1977;
Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust international Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, p. 3; *Suggested Programme for Cardinal Suenens at Westminster Conference*.

⁹ Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 25 April 1977;
Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 13 June 1977;
Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust international Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, p. 2; *Suggest Programme for Cardinal Suenens at Westminster Conference*.

¹⁰ Letter from J. Pereboom to the Fountain Trust, 9 August 1977, p. 2.

¹¹ Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 17 May 1979.

Guildford and Westminster 1975. He was a Curate at St. Cuthbert's Church and became the vicar of St Michael-le-Belfrey in York.¹² At Guildford, he ministered in an evangelistic evening meeting aimed at reaching young people and more than 40 were converted.¹³ At Westminster 1975, he expressed the hope that the conference would bring about a renewal in the local churches, so that non-Christians could experience God through Christian fellowships with lively worship. He stressed the importance of evangelism and also the healing of divisions in the church, particularly among evangelicals, where divisions had been caused by the inadequate theological interpretation in the early stage of renewal.¹⁴ He gave a lecture and seminar on evangelism and how local churches could participate in it. At the first evening service for the opening ceremony, he preached about Jesus' prayer for unity from John 17.¹⁵ David MacInnes' evangelistic concern was also expressed in his talks at Nottingham and Westminster 1979. He was the son of an Anglican Archbishop of Jerusalem, a Precentor of Birmingham Cathedral and Religious Advisor to Associated Television (ATV).¹⁶ Gavin Reid, who spoke at Westminster 1975, was a Secretary for Evangelism in the Church Pastoral Aid Society and the author of *The Gagging of God*,¹⁷ *The Elaborate Funeral*¹⁸ and *A New Happiness*.¹⁹ He described himself as

¹² Fountain Trust, *Booking Form*, n.d.; *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 4-6; *Charismatic Event* (July 1975).

¹³ Letter from Michael Harper, dictated and signed in his absence, to David Watson, 6 April 1971; Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, "Fellowship of the Holy Spirit", 12-17 July 1971, University of Surrey Guildford*, p. 7; Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 1.

¹⁴ "Reality at Westminster", pp. 3, 16; "Conference Aims Explained to Press and Radio", p. 1.

¹⁵ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-2 August 1975, Speakers' subjects*; "Speakers from all over the World", p. 2; Letter from Michael Harper to Gavin Reid, 16 April 1975.

¹⁶ This television company operating in the Midlands.
Curriculum Vitae: David MacInnes;

Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 3; *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham July 1973, Detailed Programme Tuesday-Friday (Saturday to be announced)*, pp. 1-2; Letter from David MacInnes to Michael Harper, 19 April 1973.

¹⁷ Gavin Reid, *The Gagging of God* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1969).

¹⁸ Gavin Reid, *The Elaborate Funeral* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1972).

being indifferent to the charismatic renewal in the 1960s and uneasy about Christians pushing others to be baptised in the Spirit. But following the Nottingham Conference, his attitude changed as he found that the focus of the renewal was not so much on individual satisfaction but on the growth of the church. He had then come to experience renewal in his own life while praying and worshipping, but this had not made him forget the task of preaching the gospel, and the calling for justice in the world.²⁰ After pondering and experiencing the renewal, he neither fully rejected nor fully supported it. He remained neutral, though sympathetic towards it with certain reservations.²¹

There were also three Anglican speakers who specialised in healing and deliverance. John Richards spoke at Westminster 1975, 1977 and 1979. He had been a Curate in different churches and during his service as a secretary to the Bishop of Exeter's Commission on Exorcism, he wrote a popular book, *But Deliver Us from Evil*, which is regarded "as the standard work on the ministry of deliverance."²² He was appointed associate director of the Trust in 1977.²³ At Westminster 1975, he discussed deliverance and exorcism from social, psychiatric and theological angles.²⁴ He suggested that "the problem is not exorcism, but after-care" and the Church should be

¹⁹ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 3, 5; "Speakers from all over the World", p. 3; Letter from Gavin Reid to Michael Harper, 1 July 1975; Gavin Reid, *A New Happiness: Christ's Pattern for Living in Today's World* (Nashville: Abington Press, 1976).

²⁰ Fountain Trust, "Happier about Charismatic Movement", *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (31 July 1975), p. 6.

²¹ Letter from Michael Harper to Herbert F. Stevenson, Editor of *Life of Faith*, 22 August 1975.

²² Fountain Trust, "New Fountain Trust Appointment", *Renewal*, No. 71 (October-November, 1977), p. 6; John Richards, *But Deliver Us from Evil: Demonic Dimension in Pastoral Care* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd., 1974).

²³ Fountain Trust, "New Fountain Trust Appointment", p. 6; Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2.

²⁴ Fountain Trust, "Speakers from all over the World", p. 2; *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 5-6.

a healing community, as Jesus came to the world give life, an abundant life to human beings.²⁵ David Smith was a layman of David Watson's church and he had had "a balanced and successful itinerant ministry" for ten years. He chaired the seminar about exorcism at Westminster 1975.²⁶ Jim Glennon, an Australian Anglican canon, spoke at Westminster 1979 on the same topic. In the invitation letter, Smail expressed his appreciation that Glennon's approach to healing was not the same as the American style of "star presentations and miracle services" since his main concern was about ministry in local churches. In addition, his "firm roots in the Anglican tradition" made him eligible to teach on the subject.²⁷ Glennon totally agreed with Smail's appraisal and said, "I am more concerned to say how this ministry can be exercised by the local church than to have people falling over, etc., etc., at the time."²⁸

Furthermore, some Anglican speakers were specialists in worship and church community. Graham Pulkingham, an Episcopal clergyman from the US, was invited to speak at Nottingham on this topic and he conducted the final eucharist at the conference. He was raised as a Roman Catholic but transferred to the Episcopal Church and became the Rector of the Church of the Redeemer in Texas.²⁹ When Pulkingham had to decline the invitation to speak at Westminster 1975 due to an urgent need for medical treatment in the USA,³⁰ the Trust invited Harold Parks to replace him. He was the vicar of Christ Church in North Finchley and one of the

²⁵ Fountain Trust, *Outline of the Talk of John Richards*, n.d.; Fountain Trust *International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, 3-4; *Joy in the City*, p. 5.

²⁶ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 5-6.

²⁷ Letter from Tom Smail to Jim Glennon, 4 August 1978.

²⁸ Letter from Jim Glennon to Tom Smail, 17 August 1978.

²⁹ Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 4; *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham July 1973, Detailed Programme Tuesday-Friday (Saturday to be announced)*, pp. 1-2.

³⁰ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 4.

Trustees. He spoke about worship at a seminar at the conference.³¹ Colin Urquhart was the vicar of St Hugh's Church, Lewsey, near Luton. He participated in the Guildford Conference and was renewed there. The renewal story of his church in Luton which followed was recorded in his book *When the Spirit Comes*.³² Meanwhile, he had developed a travelling ministry in Britain and overseas.³³ He was invited to speak at Westminster 1975, 1977 and 1979 on worship.³⁴ He suggested that leading worship could be creative rather than solely "singing endless choruses." The task of worship leaders was to lead the congregation to worship "with reality" and with an open heart to the Spirit and others.³⁵ Smail regarded Tom Walker as "an obvious candidate" as a speaker and he spoke at Westminster 1977 with Urquhart on worship.³⁶ He was the vicar at St. John's, Harborne, Birmingham which went through both blessings and difficulties for years as a result of the renewal.³⁷ Walker stated that speaking at the conference was "an enormous privilege" and "a totally refreshing experience."³⁸

Some Anglican speakers spoke about mission and society. William Burnett was invited to speak at Nottingham and Westminster 1975. Besides him there were two other lecturers speaking on mission. Cecil Kerr, as was mentioned in chapter two,

³¹ Fountain Trust, "Last-minute Takeover", *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (31 July 1975), p. 4.

³² Colin Urquhart, *When the Spirit Comes* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1974).

³³ Fountain Trust, *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, p. 4; *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2;

Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 56 (March 1976), Esher: Fountain Trust;

³⁴ Fountain Trust, *Booking Form*, n.d.; *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 4-5; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-2 August 1975, Speakers' Subjects; Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 5.

³⁵ Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (25 February 1977), p. 1.

³⁶ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust international Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, pp. 2-3;

Letter from Tom Smail to Tom Walker, 23 February 1976.

³⁷ Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2; *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, p. 4.

³⁸ Letter from Tom Walker to Tom Smail, 6 October 1977.

spoke about the conflict and possible reconciliation between Protestants and Roman Catholics in Northern Ireland. Lesslie Newbigin spoke at Westminster 1979. He lectured at Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham,³⁹ and although he did not label himself as “charismatic”, he had frequent contact with Pentecostals and charismatics and was concerned about their relation with church life.⁴⁰ His talk was on mission with particular reference to his work in South India.⁴¹ Another lecturer, David Gillet, the director of extension studies at St. John’s College, was also invited to speak on this topic at the same conference.⁴²

Both the Roman Catholic Bishop of Menevia, Langton Fox, and the Anglican Suffragan Bishop of Pontefract, Richard Hare, were concerned about the ecumenical potential of the renewal and they led a seminar at Westminster 1977. Hare also conducted the final communion in the last evening of the conference.⁴³ At Westminster 1979, Michael Green, the rector of St. Aldate, Oxford, was invited to take the daily Bible study in the mornings.⁴⁴ He illustrated the issues of social concern, evangelism, community and unity in renewal by centring on three cities in the biblical period, Jerusalem, Ephesus and Philippi from Acts, Ephesians and Revelation.⁴⁵ Paul Felton, a Scottish Anglican priest in Cumbrae, talked about the relation between

³⁹ Fountain Trust, *Speakers at Westminster 1979*.

⁴⁰ Letter from Lesslie Newbigin to Tom Smail, 25 March 1978.

⁴¹ Letter from Tom Smail to Lesslie Newbigin, 13 March 1978.

⁴² Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 5; *Joy in the City: An International Conference on Renewal and its Outreach in Society, London 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 2; *Speakers at Westminster 1979*;

Letter from Tom Smail to David Gillett, 4 August 1978.

⁴³ Letter from Richard Hare to Tom Smail, 19 May 1977;

Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust international Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, p. 3.

⁴⁴ Letter from Tom Smail to Michael Green, 2 May 1979;

Letter from the secretary to Tom Smail to Michael Green, 8 June 1979;

Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 4; *Speakers at Westminster 1979*.

⁴⁵ Letter from Michael Green to Tom Smail, 16 May 1979;

Letter from Michael Green to Tom Smail, 29 May 1979.

renewal and economic, social and family life⁴⁶ and spoke at Westminster 1977 on the Christian family.⁴⁷ Michael Harper was invited to speak at the same conference after his resignation as the director of the Trust in 1975. He came as a minister of Holy Trinity Church in Hounslow and talked about “Love as the Root and Ground of Growth (Ephesians 3)” as well as leading a seminar on “A New Look at ministry”.⁴⁸ He also gave a “rich treatment of 1 Cor. 12, 13, 14” in the last lecture.⁴⁹ Finally, the Trust invited a Chinese Bishop of Singapore, Chiu Ban It, to lecture on the prophetic role of the church and he led a seminar on evangelism with David Watson and Gavin Reid at Westminster 1975.⁵⁰ Chiu Ban It served on the Anglican Consultative Council, as well as being the chairperson of the Christian Conference of Asia and a member of Central Committee of the WCC and its Commission of World Mission and Evangelism. So he was able to make a comment, “I have been about.”⁵¹ But in 1973, his experience of the Spirit baptism at a WCC conference on evangelism in Bangkok changed his understanding of the scriptures, preaching, worship and ministry drastically. The experience also endowed him with the confidence to begin the healing ministry which he had been called to engage in when he was ordained as Bishop. From that time, it became “a natural part” in his ministry and he sometimes prayed for the sick during services with the vicar of the church.⁵² Many people

⁴⁶ Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (25 February 1977), p. 1;
Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2;
Letter from Tom Smail to Paul Felton, 23 December 1976.

⁴⁷ Fountain Trust, *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, pp. 3-4.

⁴⁸ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, p. 3.

⁴⁹ Letter from Michael Bennett to Tom Smail, 11 August 1977.

⁵⁰ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 4, 6;

Letter from Michael Harper to Chiu Ban It, 5 May 1975;

Letter from Chiu Ban It to Michael Harper, 13 June 1975.

⁵¹ Fountain Trust, “Singapore Bishop’s New Ministry”, *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (28 July 1975), pp. 2-3;

“Bishop Sees Revival in Singapore”, *Renewal*, No. 54 (December 1974-January 1975), p. 4.

⁵² Letter from Peter Young to Michael Harper and David Watson, 28 March 1973;

became Christians and the “luke-warm” Christians were renewed through the healing ministry. Renewal also led him to see that the WCC and the Christian Conference of Asia were doing God’s work on the basis of human knowledge rather than God’s power.⁵³

1.3. Methodist Speakers

The Trust invited four Methodist ministers to speak at the international conferences. For Guildford, despite the controversies, the conference Committee insisted on inviting Leslie Davison who was regarded by some as too liberal to speak. This conflict will be elaborated in the last section of this chapter. Davison conducted four lectures about the Spirit and gifts from the current Protestant perspective.⁵⁴ For Nottingham, the Trust invited William Davies to speak. He was a senior lecturer in Religious Studies specialising in church history and Old Testament at Padgate College of Education, and he experienced the Baptism in the Spirit when he was the President of the College Chapel in 1970. He was a joint editor of the *Dunamis* magazine.⁵⁵ He was given the special topic of “Holiness and Revival” dealing with the

Fountain Trust, *Charismatic Event* (July 1975); “Singapore Bishop’s New Ministry”, p. 3.

⁵³ Fountain Trust, “Bishop Sees Revival in Singapore”, p. 4.

⁵⁴ Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 1;

Letter from Michael Harper to Leslie Davison, 26 April 1971;

Letter from Michael Harper to Leslie Davison, 9 July 1970;

Letter from Leslie Davison to Michael Harper, 13 July 1970.

The contents of the four lectures were written in his book, *Pathway to Power: The Charismatic Movement in Historical Perspective* (London: Fountain Trust, 1971). The first one focused on “the history of the Doctrine of the Spirit up to the formulation of the great Creeds”. He explored the historical facts and tried to relate the history to the contemporary charismatic renewal, particularly the experiential issues. In the second lecture, he concentrated on the history of gifts with an attempt to discover “the development and use of the charismata at different times” in the scriptures. For lecture three, he talked about Wesley’s theology on holiness in the eighteenth century as he believed that it was one of the origins of the Pentecostal Movement and was also related to the charismatic renewal. In the final lecture, he discussed how the holiness and revival movement influenced each other in the nineteenth century and how the charismatic renewal developed from this integration. (Leslie Davison, *Pathway to Power*, pp. 10-11.)

⁵⁵ In the letter of 3 November 1972, Davies mentioned that Charles Clarke’s Newsletter would be combined with *Dunamis*. Clarke was going to be joint editor with Ross Peart and hence Davies would co-edit *Dunamis* with Clarke. (Letter from William R. Davies to Michael Harper, 3 November 1972).

connection of the contemporary charismatic renewal with the 18th century revival and John Wesley's teaching on holiness.⁵⁶ At Westminster 1975, John Horner, the superintendent of the Methodist Mission at Albert Hall in Nottingham was invited to speak.⁵⁷ He had attended Guildford and Nottingham and at this conference, he spoke about Christ and the Spirit.⁵⁸ At Westminster 1977, Smail invited Howard Belben, the Principal of Cliff College in Derbyshire, to speak in order to keep "the Methodist flag flying", as he said.⁵⁹ He talked about discerning God's will in lectures and chaired a seminar together with Jan van der Veken.⁶⁰

1.4. Presbyterian Speakers

From the Presbyterian circle, there were also four speakers involved at the international conferences. J. Rodman Williams, a Professor at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Texas, was invited to speak on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit at Guildford.⁶¹ Two years later he came to Nottingham, and was by then the President of Melodyland Schools (Bible and Theology) in Anaheim, California which

⁵⁶ Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 2; *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2;

Letter from William Davies to Michael Harper, 3 October 1972;

Letter from Michael Harper to William Davies, 16 May 1973.

⁵⁷ Letter from John Horner to Michael Harper, 25 October 1971.

⁵⁸ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 4, 6; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-2 August 1975*;

Letter from John Horner to Michael Harper, 25 June 1975;

Letter from John Horner to Tom Smail, 5 August, 1975;

Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 4.

⁵⁹ Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2; *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 3;

Letter from Tom Walker to Tom Smail, 26 February 1976;

Letter from Tom Smail to Howard Belben, 5 March 1976.

⁶⁰ Letter from Howard Belben to Tom Smail, 25 April 1977;

Letter from Tom Smail to Howard Belben, 9 May 1977;

Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, pp. 3-4.

⁶¹ Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 1;

Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, "Fellowship of the Holy Spirit", 12-17 July 1971, University of Surrey Guildford*, p. 7.

was established in 1973.⁶² He had also taken part in the founding of an Ecumenical Research Centre and the Roman Catholic-Pentecostal/Charismatic dialogue.⁶³ At Nottingham, he lectured on “the charismatic movement in the Protestant churches and its contribution to the whole church” and led a seminar about renewal entitled “The New Reformation”. He also gave a short talk at an evening service under the theme of “Gathered to Unite the People of God” and was involved in a theological workshop during the conference.⁶⁴ As mentioned previously, George MacLeod of the Church of Scotland (Presbyterian) also spoke at Nottingham about social issues. For Westminster 1975, the Trust invited Jim Brown, a minister from Parksburg Presbyterian Church in Pennsylvania, to speak on the baptism in the Spirit and charismatic life and gifts at a seminar. He was known as one of the first Presbyterian ministers to be baptised in the Spirit in the USA.⁶⁵ At Westminster 1977, Andrew Morton, a Scottish Presbyterian who worked in the BCC as a social responsibility secretary,⁶⁶ talked about how Christians might relate to the world and the country.⁶⁷ For Westminster 1979, the Trust invited an Irish Presbyterian, David McKee, to speak on evangelism. He served at the Christian Renewal Centre which Cecil Kerr established for reconciliation between Protestants and Roman Catholics in Ireland.⁶⁸

⁶² In his letter to Harper, Williams mentioned, “We have just launched a School of Theology with 125 in the first class!” (Letter from J. Rodman Williams to Michael Harper, 17 January 1973).

⁶³ Curriculum Vitae: J. Rodman Williams;

Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 5.

⁶⁴ Letter from Secretary to Michael Harper to J. Rodman Williams, 16 May 1973;

Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2.

⁶⁵ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 4, 6; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-2 August 1975*; Letter from Jim Brown to Tom Smail, 10 June 1974.

⁶⁶ Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2; *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, p. 4.

⁶⁷ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, pp. 3-4.

⁶⁸ Letter from David McKee to Michael Barling, 2 April 1979; Fountain Trust, *Speakers at Westminster 1979*.

Smail believed that McKee could give very good lectures on evangelism with his Irish background and that the audience would hear “some good Reformed voice”.⁶⁹

1.5. Baptist Speakers

Four speakers from the Baptist circle were also involved at the international conferences. At Nottingham, the Trust invited David Pawson, a minister from Millead Centre in Guildford, to lecture.⁷⁰ His topic was “Liberty in the Spirit” based on Galatians which was “a bit of biblical ballast”, as he phrased it.⁷¹ This idea came into his mind first of all at Guildford, and he thought that the epistle was “a very needed corrective within the charismatic movement” as it contained the teachings on the gifts and the fruit of the Spirit in relation to salvation, faith and works.⁷² He was also assigned a sermon in an evening service under the theme of “Gathered to hear the Word of God.”⁷³ At Westminster 1975, Jim Graham, a minister from Gold Hill Baptist Church which is near Gerrards Cross, was invited to talk about the fruit of the Spirit and worship.⁷⁴ At Westminster 1977, two Baptist ministers were involved. One was Douglas McBain, a minister from Lewin Road Baptist Church in Streamtham in London, which had experienced “a considerable measure of corporate renewal.”⁷⁵ He

⁶⁹ Letter from Tom Smail to David McKee, 10 March 1978;

Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 5.

⁷⁰ He “definitely” accepted the invitation of speaking at Nottingham two years before the conference actually took place by saying, “I will look forward very much to being at Nottingham”. After one year he seemed to forget about the promise that he had made with Harper, as he said, “I must confess that I had not fully realised that I had definitely promised to be with you, but would appreciate it if you could let me have more details about this and what kind of thing you would like me to do”, and so Harper reminded him of his promise. (Letter from David Pawson to Michael Harper, 4 October 1971; Letter from David Pawson to Michael Harper, 5 September 1972; Letter from Michael Harper to David Pawson, 18 October 1972.)

⁷¹ Letter from David Pawson to Michael Harper, 30 January 1973;

Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2.

⁷² Letter from David Pawson to Michael Harper, 29 July 1971;

Letter from David Pawson to Michael Harper, 30 January 1973.

⁷³ Letter from Secretary to Michael Harper to David Pawson, 16 May 1973.

⁷⁴ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 4, 6; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-2 August 1975*.

⁷⁵ Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2;

was also one of the Trustees. His lecture was “God’s word and fresh vision for Renewal” and he participated in a seminar on the ecumenical issues.⁷⁶ Ken Pagard was a minister from Chula Vista Baptist Church in California. His church experienced a great renewal and it launched a “community-household living within the context of parish life.”⁷⁷ At the conference, his lecture and seminar were focused on his experience and knowledge of this sort of church life.⁷⁸ His approach was both experiential and biblical and so Michael Bennett commented that Pagard’s view on experience was “scripturally verified” and all his lectures were “fully prepared and well documented.” Both McBain and Pagard won praise from the delegates in the last lecture concerning the church’s future.⁷⁹

1.6. Lutheran Speakers

Lutheran speakers only appeared at Nottingham. Arnold Bittlinger was the Director of the Ecumenical Academy in Schloss Craheim and a member of the Vatican-Charismatic dialogue in 1971. He spoke about theological issues concerning the renewal in a lecture and took the subject of “God’s stewards” in a seminar dealing with the relationship between Christian ministry and renewal.⁸⁰ Another Lutheran was Larry Christenson, the pastor from Trinity Lutheran Church in San Pedro in California, and he had a vital part in kindling the flame of renewal in Britain. His

Minutes-FTCCM (8 June 1977), p. 1.

⁷⁶ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust international Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, p. 3.

⁷⁷ Fountain Trust, *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, p. 4; *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2.

⁷⁸ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust international Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, p. 3.

⁷⁹ Letter from Michael Bennett to Tom Smail, 11 August 1977.

⁸⁰ Curriculum Vitae: Arnold Bittlinger; Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 2; *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 3.

lecture was “A Charismatic Approach to Social Action.”⁸¹ Harper thought that this topic would be helpful to the situation in Britain as social action was believed to be increasingly important.⁸²

1.7. Other Denominational Speakers

Although Pentecostals officially expressed their scepticism about the work of the Trust, one of their leaders, Douglas Quay, held a different view. He was “happy to accept” Harper’s invitation to come as a guest and he himself offered to speak at Nottingham.⁸³ At the conference, his four lectures were about the gifts of the Holy Spirit and healing in relation to his special concern about the current healing campaigns such as “Christian Missions of Divine Healings.” He thought that “[r]emarkable healings” possibly contained the elements of extremism and fanaticism.⁸⁴ In addition, with Smail, he gave a speech on “Gathered to receive the Spirit of God” at the first evening meeting, which was about the contribution of the Pentecostal movement to the worldwide churches. Smail talked about the “new” Spirit movement, while Quay talked about the contribution of the “old” drawing out “the relationship between the old and the new.”⁸⁵ Harper and Quay had hoped that through Quay’s participation and address at the conference, the aim of building up a fellowship with the “old Pentecostals” would become foreseeable. Quay was quite positive about

⁸¹ Letter from Larry Christenson to Michael Harper, 18 May 1973; Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 2; *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2.

⁸² Letter from Michael Harper to Larry Christenson, 24 May 1973.

⁸³ When Harper firstly proposed the invitation to Quay of being a guest, he was very cautious. He wrote to Quay first instead of the Headquarters of the AoG to avoid official invitation which would probably caused troubles. Quay accepted to participate in the Conference which did not require any consent of the AoG because it was a “Fellowship of Churches, with no central government or legislative body”. He also suggested to Harper of inviting him to speak in the Conference as it would help improving the relationship between the AoG and the Trust. (Letter from Michael Harper to Douglas Quay, 23 August 1972; letter from Douglas Quay to Michael Harper, 11 September 1972; Letter from Douglas Quay to Michael Harper, 19 December 1972.)

⁸⁴ Letter from Douglas Quay to Michael Harper, 19 December 1972.

⁸⁵ Letter from Secretary to Michael Harper to Douglas Quay, 16 May 1973.

it despite the negative view of some Pentecostals about his participation, and said, “I feel the barriers would be swept away and a door opened for a great ‘gale of a wind.’”⁸⁶ Finally, Colonel William McAllister from the Salvation Army spoke at Westminster 1979 about renewal and social issues.

1.8. Independent Speakers

Apart from speakers coming from various ecclesiological backgrounds, there were some who came without representing any denomination. At Guildford, Ralph Wilkerson, a pastor from the Christian Centre in Melodyland in California, gave lectures on “The baptism of the Spirit and its result” and the unceasingness of miracles.⁸⁷ His colleague, Robert Frost, who was a biologist, spoke about “the charismatic community.” Arthur Wallis, who was regarded as “a respected leader in the house churches, and valued teacher and expositor among all the churches”,⁸⁸ spoke about worship in the Spirit and revival at Guildford,⁸⁹ and prayer warfare at Westminster 1977.⁹⁰ Cecil Cousen was recognised as “a respected and regular speaker at Fountain Trust conferences.”⁹¹ He had been the editor of *A Voice of Faith* for twenty years but the magazine was discarded in 1977⁹² and he developed his own

⁸⁶ Letter from Douglas Quay to Michael Harper, 11 September 1972;

Letter from Douglas Quay to Michael Harper, 19 December 1972.

⁸⁷ Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 1; Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, “Fellowship of the Holy Spirit”, 12-17 July 1971, University of Surrey Guildford*, p. 7;

Letter from Mrs Christine Rennie to Ralph Wilkerson, 26 May 1971.

⁸⁸ Fountain Trust, *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, p. 4; *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2.

⁸⁹ Letter from Arthur Wallis to Mrs Christine Rennie, 8 June 1971; Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, “Fellowship of the Holy Spirit”, 12-17 July 1971, University of Surrey Guildford*, p. 7;

Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 1.

⁹⁰ Letter from Arthur Wallis to Tom Smail, 2 June 1977;

Fountain Trust, *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, pp. 2-3.

⁹¹ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 3; *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2.

⁹² Tom Smail, *Newsletter*, No. 59 (April 1977), Esher: Fountain Trust.

ministry afterwards.⁹³ He spoke about and practised healing at Nottingham,⁹⁴ lectured on the gifts of the Spirit at Westminster 1975⁹⁵ and explained about the wholeness in marriage at Westminster 1977.⁹⁶ Another frequent speaker was Frank Lake. He was the founder and Director of the Clinical Theology Association and had trained Christians for counselling with understanding, skill and “compassion of Christ.”⁹⁷ For him, healing was a crucial but “complex” issue in renewal.⁹⁸ His talk on the subject at the international conferences was conducted from both a theological and psychological perspective. At Nottingham, he taught about how to counsel individuals⁹⁹ and the contribution of the charismatic renewal in dealing with sickness and suffering. He thought that the gift of healing was what the world needed, including physical healing, and the transformation of personal characters which enabled maturity and holiness to grow.¹⁰⁰ At Westminster 1975 and 1977, he continued his teaching on healing and relationships.¹⁰¹ But for Westminster 1979, he was not in the speaker team¹⁰² and the Trust invited another psychiatrist, Ruth Fowke, to deal with the topic of healing from an academic perspective.¹⁰³

⁹³ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, Esher: Fountain Trust, p. 3; *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2.

⁹⁴ Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2.

⁹⁵ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 4, 6.

⁹⁶ Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2.

⁹⁷ Many people had sought for psychological healing from the association, and its staff and office had grown rapidly. Many people were released from their implicit problems at one of its conferences named as “The Charismatic Prayer Group and the Healing of Forgotten Pain”. (Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 3.)

⁹⁸ Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2.

⁹⁹ Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 3.

¹⁰⁰ Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 1; Letter from Frank Lake to Sylvia Lawton, Secretary to Michael Harper, 17 May 1973.

¹⁰¹ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 4-6; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, pp. 3-4.

¹⁰² Letter from Tom Smail to David MacInnes, 31 March 1978.

¹⁰³ Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City: An International Conference on Renewal and its Outreach in Society, London 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 2; *Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 5.

There were some independent speakers who were concerned about or actually involved in social or missionary work. For Nottingham, the Trust successfully invited Loren Cunningham, the founder of Youth With a Mission (YWAM), to speak.¹⁰⁴ He spoke about “Faith and Vision” centred on youth ministry in four lectures and “Gathered to reach the world for God.”¹⁰⁵ At Westminster 1975, Roy Calvocoressi working for Christian social action in Cyprus and British industry,¹⁰⁶ together with Campbell McApline, spoke about social action and God’s work in the world respectively.¹⁰⁷ Since McApline had spoken at the first Fountain Trust conference where 28 people attended in 1964, Harper invited him specially to Westminster 1975 to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the Trust.¹⁰⁸ At Westminster 1977, Simon Barrington-Ward was invited to teach about mission.¹⁰⁹ He was the general secretary of the Church Missionary Society in Birmingham and was described as “an expert on missionary strategy and evangelism.”¹¹⁰ For Westminster 1979, Smail invited William Brown, the executive director of the Trinity Christian Community in Orleans,

¹⁰⁴ It is an interdenominational evangelical ministry recruiting volunteers to serve every corner of the world. It establishes Schools of Evangelism for training workers and leaders and the first one is in Lausanne, Switzerland where the international coordinating centre is located. Until 1973, YWAM had reached 130 countries with tens of thousands volunteers, fifteen schools world-wide and a ship for the purpose of training, medication and transporting volunteers to the South Pacific and Asian area. From 1969, Cunningham had been the International Director of the organisation. Up to 2002, YWAM had sent 50,000 short-term and 11,500 full-time worker, set up more than 240 Discipleship Training School and the University of the Nations awarding degrees, obtained four mercy ships and served more than 220 countries in the world. (E. B. Robinson, “Youth With A Mission”, in Stanley Burgess and Eduard M. van der Maas (eds) *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2002), pp. 1223-1224; Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 2; Curriculum Vitae: Loren Cunningham.)

¹⁰⁵ Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham July 1973, Detailed Programme Tuesday-Friday (Saturday to be announced)*, p. 2.

¹⁰⁶ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 4, 6; “Speakers from all over the World”, p. 2.

¹⁰⁷ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 3, 5; “Speakers from all over the World”, p. 2.

¹⁰⁸ Letter from Michael Harper to Campbell McAlpine, 4 April 1975; Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, p. 5; “Speakers from all over the World”, p. 2.

¹⁰⁹ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, pp. 3-4.

¹¹⁰ Fountain Trust, *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5*, p. 3; *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2.

Louisiana, to talk about the effect of renewal “in the inner city situation and in a difficult racial background” in his church.¹¹¹ Smail was sure that Brown’s experience and ideas about how the renewal could have an impact on society was “exactly” what the conference needed and he could inspire those attending who might be in a similar situation.¹¹² At the same conference, Don Double as an evangelist of the Good News Crusade, which was a member of the Evangelical Alliance, was invited to speak about the Spirit’s involvement in evangelism.¹¹³ Smail thought that he could contribute a lot in the lectures as he had “practical experience in charismatic evangelism.”¹¹⁴ At one of the evening services of the conference, he preached about repentance as he believed that it was the secret of joy, which charismatics had neglected.¹¹⁵

1.9. An Orthodox Speaker

Among all the international conferences, there was only one Orthodox speaker, Fr. Athanasios Emmert. He had been the pastor of the Holy Spirit Orthodox Church, which he had founded himself, and it belonged to a missionary parish in the Antiochian Archdioceses of New York and All North America. In 1972, he was invited by David du Plessis to represent the Orthodox Church in the Vatican-Charismatic dialogue in Zürich. In 1973, he began to serve at the Ecumenical Academy at Schloss Craheim in West Germany.¹¹⁶ Harper was eager and determined

¹¹¹ Letter from William Brown to Tom Smail, 6 March 1979;
Letter from Tom Smail to William Brown, 6 February 1979;
Fountain Trust, *Speakers at Westminster 1979*.

¹¹² Letter from Tom Smail to William Brown, 6 February 1979.

¹¹³ Letter from Don Double to Tom Smail, 1 April 1978;
Letter from Don Double to Michael Barling, 9 May 1979;
Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City: An International Conference on Renewal and its Outreach in Society, London 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 2; *Speakers at Westminster 1979*.

¹¹⁴ Letter from Tom Smail to Don Double, 10 March 1978.

¹¹⁵ Letter from Don Double to Michael Barling, 9 May 1979.

¹¹⁶ Curriculum Vitae: Athanasios Franklin Stuart Emmert, p. 1-2;
Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, pp. 2-3.
He gave up the pastorship in the US and served in Schloss Craheim because J. Rodman Williams

to invite him to speak at Nottingham, as he explained in the invitation letter, “It would be terrible not to have representation from the Orthodox Church and there is no person I would rather have than you.”¹¹⁷ Being encouraged by du Plessis, Emmert accepted the invitation.¹¹⁸ He talked about the charismatic renewal in the Orthodox Church and its contribution to other churches, and also about worship in the Spirit according to the Orthodox tradition.¹¹⁹

1.10. Roman Catholic Speakers

Among the five international conferences, Roman Catholic speakers were the second largest team apart from the Anglicans, with twelve involved. Most of them were famous Catholic theologians or charismatic leaders. Despite the strong opposition from some Protestant leaders, which will be mentioned in the last section of this chapter, Harper insisted on inviting an American Catholic charismatic, Kevin Ranaghan, to speak at Guildford as he was certain that Ranaghan’s approach “would be just the right one for England at the moment.”¹²⁰ From his personal experience, he spoke about how his church in the USA was growing into maturity through the renewal and becoming a “thoroughly Charismatic and thoroughly Catholic” community. He also elaborated on the history of the Catholic charismatic renewal in the USA, with testimonies of transformation that had taken place, both personally and collectively, and gave a talk on “the re-discovery of spiritual gift”.¹²¹

and Ralph Wilkerson who could possibly help in ecumenical works were busy for the theology school in Melodyland. Hence, Bittlinger requested Emmert’s assistance. (Letter from Athanasios Emmert to Michael Harper, 1 November 1972).

¹¹⁷ Letter from Michael Harper to Athanasios Emmert, 18 October 1972;

Letter from Michael Harper to Athanasios Emmert, 22 November 1972.

¹¹⁸ Letter from Athanasios Emmert to Michael Harper, 1 November 1972.

¹¹⁹ Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2;

Letter from the Secretary to Michael Harper to Athanasios Emmert, n.d.

¹²⁰ Letter from Michael Harper to Bob Balkam, 21 July 1970.

¹²¹ Letter from Kevin Ranaghan to Michael Harper, 24 April 1971.

Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 1.

After Guildford, the Trust continued to invite Roman Catholics to speak at other international conferences and when it came to Nottingham Harper said, “We want a strong team of Catholics present.”¹²² He invited Albert de Monléon who was a Dominican priest teaching theology and the charismatic renewal at the Centre d’Études Istine for ecumenical studies in Paris and a leader of the French Charismatic Renewal which was “growing rapidly” and “beautifully”.¹²³ De Monléon also attended the Guildford conference.¹²⁴ Simon Tugwell strongly encouraged Harper to invite de Monléon as he was “a very sound and alive Christian” and “it would be absolutely splendid” if he could accept the invitation.¹²⁵ Harper invited de Monléon three times¹²⁶ and both he and the Trust were “overjoyed” when he accepted.¹²⁷ He talked about “the charismatic movement in the Roman Catholic Church and its contribution to other churches” in one lecture and then a four-session seminar on “Jesus and the Spirit” dealing with the theology of the Son and the Spirit in the Trinity.¹²⁸

At Westminster 1975, there were two Roman Catholic speakers. Francis MacNutt, a Dominican from St Louis, USA, who was a leading figure in the healing ministry in

Letter from Mrs Christine Rennie to Kevin Ranaghan, 26 May 1971.

¹²² Letter from Michael Harper to Albert de Monléon, 27 July 1972.

¹²³ Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 3;

Letter from Albert de Monléon to Michael Harper, 20 September 1972;

Letter from Albert de Monléon to Michael Harper, 28 December 1972, pp. 1-2.

¹²⁴ Fountain Trust, *Catholic Attending the International Conference on the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit, Guildford, England, 1971*.

¹²⁵ Letter from Simon Tugwell to Michael Harper, 1 May 1972.

¹²⁶ In the first invitation, Harper said, “It would give us very great delight if you could manage it and I know that many others will appreciate your ministry there”. But De Monléon hesitated to accept the first invitation since he was not confident in speaking at a big conference and was uncertain about arrangement at Providence College. In the second one, Harper asserted, “I do hope that you can come” because it was very important. In the third one, he said, “We would certainly miss you if you were not able to be there”. (Letter from Michael Harper to Albert de Monléon, 17 May 1972; Letter from Michael Harper to Albert de Monléon, 6 July 1972; Letter from Albert de Monléon to Michael Harper, 15 July 1972; Letter from Michael Harper to Albert de Monléon, 27 July 1972.)

¹²⁷ Letter from Albert de Monléon to Michael Harper, 15 July 1972;

Letter from Michael Harper to Albert de Monléon, 28 September 1972.

¹²⁸ Letter from Albert de Monléon to Michael Harper, 28 December 1972, p. 1;

Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 2.

the Catholic circle.¹²⁹ He taught about and practised healing in lectures, seminars and at an evening service.¹³⁰ One of the features of his teachings and conviction about healing was that “Jesus can do it.”¹³¹ He claimed that healing ministry should be both physical and spiritual. Physical problems could so easily hinder the flow of love for others; inner healing was the way to solve the intrinsic problems of people in the world who were “unhappy and fearful.”¹³² Moreover, he insisted that healing should not be “put on the fringe of the church’s life” since it was a means that Jesus applied to preach his words. Another Catholic speaker was Paul Lebeau. He was a Belgian Jesuit priest teaching at the Institute d’Études Théologiques and “closely associated with Cardinal Suenens.”¹³³ Smail described him as “a theologian of considerable weight as well as being a most attractive Christian brother.”¹³⁴ He was assigned to talk about social action both in a lecture and seminar. He was keen on this topic as he thought that “man’s dignity and divine vocation” had not found its right place in the world.¹³⁵

¹²⁹ He had begun his ministry of physical and spiritual healing in 1967 in the USA, and it had taken him to South America and Africa; in fact he spent “over 75% of his time travelling throughout the world”. (Fountain Trust, “Girl Car Crash Victim Healed in Four Days”, *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (31 July 1975), p. 1.)

¹³⁰ In that service, Richard Harbour recorded that McNutt “wore his white Dominican robes that night ‘to give a little Resurrection life to you Protestants in black.’” (Richard Harbour, “Glory in Westminster”, p. 6.)

Fountain Trust, “Speakers from all over the World”, p. 2; *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 4-6; *Conference Brochure: Welcome to Westminster, Fountain Trust International Conference, 28 July-2 August 1975*, p. 2; Booking Form, n.d.; *Charismatic Event (July 1975)*;

Letter from Francis MacNutt to Michael Harper, 8 July 1974; “Reality at Westminster”, p. 3.

¹³¹ Richard Harbour, “Glory in Westminster”, p. 4.

¹³² David Coomes, “Optimism the Key”, p. 1; “Reality at Westminster”, p. 3;

Richard Harbour, “Glory in Westminster”, p. 6.

¹³³ Letter from Tom Smail to Paul Lebeau, 31 January 1975, Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, p. 5; *Charismatic Event (July 1975)*; “Speakers from all over the World”, p. 3.

¹³⁴ Letter from Tom Smail to Cecil Kerr, 10 February 1975.

¹³⁵ Fountain Trust, *Glory in the Church: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster 1975*, pp. 3, 6; Letter from Paul Lebeau to Tom Smail, 25 January 1975.

At Westminster 1977, besides Cardinal Suenens, the Trust invited four other Catholic representatives, and that created the largest Catholic speaker team among all the five international conferences. Jan van der Veken was a theologian teaching at the Roman Catholic University of Louvain in Belgium and took part with Cardinal Suenens in the composition of the Malines document which provided guidelines for renewal.¹³⁶ Smail requested him to lecture on “The work of God and the work of man in Renewal” to illustrate some of the points in the document, and raise a “basic theological necessity” that renewal involved the power of God and human effort. In other words, it should avoid both “supernaturalism” and “naturalism” which resulted from putting the emphasis solely on God’s power or human effort. More importantly, the lecture was to bring out how renewal theology was related to charisms in practice.¹³⁷ Apart from the lecture, he was also responsible for a seminar concerning gifts, discernment and guidance.¹³⁸ Ian Petit was a Benedict priest and famous in the Irish Renewal.¹³⁹ He had been involved in the previous international conference as chaplain or conductor of Mass, and at Westminster 1975 he spoke as a chairperson of the RCNSC on “The Charismatic Dimension and Catholic Tradition” and also gave a seminar on the “Release of the Spirit.”¹⁴⁰ Through Bob Balkam, Dr. Jack Dominian, a Roman Catholic doctor and psychologist, was invited to speak.¹⁴¹ He was interested in understanding charismatic experiences from a psychological perspective and believed

¹³⁶ Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2.

¹³⁷ Letter from Tom Smail to Jan van der Veken, 23 December 1976.

¹³⁸ Letter from Tom Smail to Jan van der Veken, 23 December 1976;

Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster’ 77, 1-5 August 1977, Lecture and Seminars*, p. 2; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, pp. 3-4.

¹³⁹ Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2; *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, p. 4.

¹⁴⁰ Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, pp. 2-3.

¹⁴¹ Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (25 February 1977), p. 1.
Memo from Bob Balkam, 13 December 1976.

that a bridge could be built between these two areas.¹⁴² He developed his thinking on the relationship between the two in an article in the *Expository Times*¹⁴³ and he illustrated it at the conference under the topic, “The Psychological Health of Charismatics.”¹⁴⁴ Smail believed that this lecture would help charismatic leaders and prayer groups to be aware of the “false supernaturalism” and “false naturalism.”¹⁴⁵ After the conference, his talk was admired as having been “constructive and positive.”¹⁴⁶ Apart from the clinical side, the Trust was concerned about the spiritual aspect of healing and so it invited a Roman Catholic nun to teach and practice it. Briega McKenna, a young Franciscan nun, was becoming famous for her healing ministry in the USA and Ireland, especially in regard to incurable diseases such as cancer.¹⁴⁷ In fact, she was not the first choice for the Trust but was brought in to replace Agnes Sanford who had declined the invitation, due to her advanced age of eighty, although having originally accepted it.¹⁴⁸ McKenna gave a lecture and a seminar on the healing ministry and conducted a healing service at an evening meeting.¹⁴⁹ She was regarded as “the central figure of the conference” and “a real gift

¹⁴² Letter from Jack Dominionian to Tom Smail, 15 August 1977.

¹⁴³ Letter from Tom Smail to Jack Dominionian, 23 December 1976; Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2.

¹⁴⁴ Letter from Tom Smail to Jack Dominionian, 23 December 1976; Letter from Jack Dominionian to Tom Smail, 24 January 1977; Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (21 October 1976), p. 1; Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, p. 3.

¹⁴⁵ Letter from Tom Smail to Jack Dominionian, 23 December 1976.

¹⁴⁶ Letter from Jack Dominionian to Tom Smail, 15 August 1977.

¹⁴⁷ Letter from Tom Smail to Agnes Sanford, 10 June 1977; Letter from Tom Smail to Briega McKenna, 27 May 1977; Fountain Trust, *The Day at Westminster*, p. 2; Minutes-FTCCM (8 June 1977), p. 1.

¹⁴⁸ Letter from Tom Smail to Agnes Sanford, 10 June 1977; Letter from Agnes Sanford to Tom Smail, 2 May 1977; Letter from Tom Smail to Michael Scanlan, 10 November 1977; Minutes-FTCCM (8 June 1977), p. 1.

¹⁴⁹ Letter from Tom Smail to Briega McKenna, 27 May 1977; Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, pp. 2-4.

of God.”¹⁵⁰ Barrington-Ward described her leading of healing ministry as being marked by “her inspired ordinariness and naturalness” and “simple assurance...that God is enough.” People received ministry and were able to “minister to each other.”¹⁵¹ He personally felt that “the reality of the faith, peace and joy” from worship was very obvious in that healing service.¹⁵² Michael Bennett felt “a sense of authority which was helpful” in her spiritual counselling.¹⁵³ An Anglican rector was blessed in her “lovely ministry.”¹⁵⁴ A German delegate enjoyed the gentleness of her ministry in the service.¹⁵⁵ The wife of a Salvation Army captain felt a process of healing of her cervical spondylosis following the service.¹⁵⁶ And a delegate also wrote to the Trust that she experienced a great inner healing.¹⁵⁷ The contribution of the Catholic speakers was highly appreciated. A delegate regarded their talks as “useful and interesting.”¹⁵⁸ An Anglican minister felt that they had given “deeper and better thought” than the Protestants.¹⁵⁹

At Westminster 1979, Cardinal Suenens spoke again and there were three other Roman Catholic speakers. Through the connection with Bob Balkam, the Trust was able to invite another prominent Roman Catholic speaker, Tom Forrest.¹⁶⁰ He was the director of the International Communication Office in Brussels for the Catholic charismatic renewal¹⁶¹ and Smail described him as “much involved in the Catholic

¹⁵⁰ Letter from Tom Smail to Michael Scanlan, 10 November 1977.

¹⁵¹ Simon Barrington-Ward, “Faith Active in Love?”, *Renewal*, No. 71 (October-November 1977), p. 8.

¹⁵² Simon Barrington-Ward, “Faith Active in Love?”, p. 2.

¹⁵³ Letter from Michael Bennett to Tom Smail, 11 August 1977.

¹⁵⁴ Letter from Rev. A. K. Pring to Tom Smail, 18 August 1977.

¹⁵⁵ Letter from Hans-Dieter Gramm to the Fountain Trust, 12 September 1977.

¹⁵⁶ Letter from Mrs Kath Holmes to Tom Smail, 17 August 1977.

¹⁵⁷ Letter from Mrs. Pamela Mellyard to Tom Smail, 8 August 1977, p. 4.

¹⁵⁸ Letter from J. Pereboom to the Fountain Trust, 9 August 1977, p. 2.

¹⁵⁹ Letter from Roger Hardcastle to Tom Smail, 21 August 1977, p. 3.

¹⁶⁰ Letter from Tom Smail to Tom Forrest, 6 February 1979.

¹⁶¹ Letter from Tom Forrest to Tom Smail, 13 February 1979, p. 1;
Fountain Trust, *Speakers at Westminster 1979*.

renewal.” Since the Trust wanted the conference to hear about the renewal in the Third World and Forrest was well-experienced in the South America mission field, it eagerly invited him to speak at the conference.¹⁶² He gave a lecture on “Church and city including reference of the Third World” and also in the first evening service.¹⁶³ The other two Catholic speakers were Paul Lebeau and Ian Petit who had been invited to the previous international conferences. Their lectures were about the local church, social concern and prayer respectively.¹⁶⁴

These five international conferences can be regarded as ecumenically successful because they gathered a group of speakers that was constituted by Protestants and Roman Catholics. Via the common ground of the renewal, they could work together for the conferences regardless of their doctrinal differences and they could speak to an audience that was made up of a diversity of traditions. Perhaps what Jeanne Harper recalled at Guildford could be said to typify the mutual acceptance and ecumenical communion at the conferences, when she commented, “I remember there was an electric stream when the first Catholic speaker got up and said, ‘Dear brothers and sisters’. Something’s really nice.”¹⁶⁵

2. Ecumenical Participants

The five international conferences gathered a huge crowd of lay people and church leaders from a variety of ecclesiological backgrounds to learn and discuss theological questions and to worship the same God, in one Spirit, together.

¹⁶² Letter from Tom Smail to Tom Forrest, 6 February 1979;

Letter from Tom Smail to the Bishop of London, 18 July 1979.

¹⁶³ Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, pp. 4-5.

¹⁶⁴ Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 5.

¹⁶⁵ Interview with Michael and Jeanne Harper, 8 August 2005, Cambridge.

2.1. Laity

The five international conferences carried a strong ecumenical element due to the coming together of Christians from different denominations. Guildford was the first test of such fellowship and it proved to be successful. It was recorded that there were fourteen denominations including four major Christian traditions: Roman Catholics, Orthodox, Protestants and Pentecostals at Guildford.¹⁶⁶ Most of them were charismatics, but some had not had that kind of experience before; so the conferences, bringing together charismatic leaders and laymen as well as theologians, were good opportunities for enquiring and learning about the renewal.¹⁶⁷ This ecumenical character continued in the following four international conferences where delegates from a diversity of Protestant denominations and of Roman Catholics took part. However, for the Trust, the ecumenical nature of the international conferences was defined primarily by the Roman Catholic attendance. Harper endeavoured to help the Roman Catholics who had financial difficulty in coming to Guildford. For example, once he received a letter from Simon Tugwell about his financial difficulty¹⁶⁸ Harper was “very anxious” about the Roman Catholic attendance as he thought that they “should have every opportunity of coming and there should be as good a representation as possible.”¹⁶⁹ He determined to tackle the financial obstacle by offering Tugwell a free place on behalf of the Trust and also one or two more for the Roman Catholics who had similar problems.¹⁷⁰ Furthermore, he consulted his two Catholic partners, Bob Balkam and E. Gwatkin, about the possibility of getting sponsorship from Roman Catholics who acknowledged the Catholic Charismatic Renewal and were willing to subsidise their fellow Catholic members to join the

¹⁶⁶ Fountain Trust, *Press Release: International Conference 2*.

¹⁶⁷ Leslie Davison, *Memorandum to British Council of Churches*, p. 2.

¹⁶⁸ Letter from Simon Tugwell to Michael Harper, 2 January 1971.

¹⁶⁹ Letter from Secretary to Michael Harper to Mr. E. Gwatkin, 6 January 1971.

¹⁷⁰ Letter from Michael Harper to Simon Tugwell, 5 January 1971.

conference, especially “members of the religious orders” for whom the admission fee was “prohibitive.”¹⁷¹ He made this request in early January 1971, six months before the conference, to ensure that those Roman Catholics who had financial problems would be sponsored before the booking was full.¹⁷² Moreover, besides a list of the total attendance, there was also a special list recording the Roman Catholic participants at Guildford and it recorded that 28 of them were from Britain, and the rest came from France (3), Spain (1), Holland (1), Denmark (4) and the US (3).¹⁷³ For the Trust, Guildford was a significant and successful step for the future of ecumenical gatherings because of the Roman Catholic attendance. In the following international conferences, Smail also identified their ecumenicity with Roman Catholic participation. Of Westminster 1977, he said, “...at which at least a third of the participants were Roman Catholics, and which must have been one of the largest and most significant ecumenical events to date in Britain.”¹⁷⁴ Similarly for Westminster 1979, before the Conference actually took place, the Trust believed that it would be significantly ecumenical because there would be a large crowd of Roman Catholics. Smail had confidently anticipated that one fourth to one third of the attendance would be Roman Catholics and the rest Protestants from major denominations.¹⁷⁵ Hence, Smail termed the conference as “widely ecumenical”,¹⁷⁶ “ecumenical oriented”,¹⁷⁷ “fully ecumenical”,¹⁷⁸ “one of the largest lay ecumenical gatherings so far in this

¹⁷¹ Letter from Secretary to Michael Harper to Mr. E. Gwatkin, 6 January 1971.

¹⁷² Letter from Michael Harper to Bob Balkam, 5 January 1971;

Letter from Secretary to Michael Harper to Mr. E. Gwatkin, 6 January 1971.

¹⁷³ Fountain Trust, *Catholics Attending the International Conferences on the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit, Guildford, England, 1971*.

¹⁷⁴ Tom Smail, “Editorial: The More We Are Together...”, p. 2.

¹⁷⁵ Letter from Tom Smail to Catherine Marshall LeSourd, 3 March 1978;

Letter from Tom Smail to Don Double, 10 March 1978;

Letter from Tom Smail to David McKee, 10 March 1978.

¹⁷⁶ Letter from Tom Smail to Catherine Marshall LeSourd, 3 March 1978.

¹⁷⁷ Letter from Tom Smail to William Brown, 6 February, 1979.

¹⁷⁸ Letter from Tom Smail to the Bishop of London, 6 February 1979.

country”,¹⁷⁹ “a very large ecumenical representation”¹⁸⁰ and “very large ecumenical gathering”.¹⁸¹

2.2. Theologians and Church Leaders

These five international conferences carried a strong ecumenical character also because they involved theologians and leaders from different churches, some of them from overseas. At Guildford, Roman Catholic leaders like Albert de Monléon from France and Kilian McDonnell, Director of the Ecumenical Institute in Minnesota attended the conference. Both of them had participated in the Vatican-Charismatic dialogue in Rome in June 1971.¹⁸² Some of the church leaders and theologians were Pentecostals, such as Alfred Missen, General Secretary of the Assemblies of God, though he eventually walked out after the opening ceremony, Dr. Wesley Gilpin of the Elim Bible College and Dr. F. P. Möller, Director of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. A variety of Protestant traditions were represented, including some of the Anglican ministers and lay leaders who experienced the baptism in the Spirit at Guildford.¹⁸³ There was John Neale, the Canon Missioner of the Diocese; Rev. Simon Barrington-Ward, Principal of Crowther Hall; Wallace Haines of the International Christian Leadership; Rev. Howard Belben, Principal of a Methodist College, Cliff College, and Dr. James Dunn, from the Department of Theology at the University of Nottingham, who saw the significance of Pentecostalism for churches.¹⁸⁴ Arnold

¹⁷⁹ Letter from Tom Smail to David Watson, 10 November 1977.

¹⁸⁰ Letter from Tom Smail to David MacInnes, 31 March 1978.

¹⁸¹ Letter from Tom Smail to Larry Christenson, 15 September 1978.

¹⁸² Letter from Michael Harper to the Archbishop of Canterbury. 6 July 1971.

¹⁸³ Letter from Michael Harper to Bob Balkam, 11 May 1970.

¹⁸⁴ Letter from James D.G. Dunn to Michael Harper, 12 December 1970.

Bittlinger, the Director of the Ecumenical Academy of West Germany, also attended at Guildford.¹⁸⁵

At Nottingham, Harper endeavoured to invite leaders of different churches to be represented in the conference. In the Protestant realm, he attempted to approach the three major churches in Britain: the Church of England, the Church of Scotland and the churches in Wales. From the Anglican side, he invited the Bishop of Southwell to welcome the conference in the opening ceremony and to concelebrate with other church leaders the eucharist with Anglican liturgy on the final night. The Bishop accepted the invitation for both tasks.¹⁸⁶ Besides that, Harper also appointed Ray Muller from New Zealand, who was also involved at Guildford, to be an Anglican Chaplain at the conference.¹⁸⁷ Moreover, Harper wished to have representatives from the Church of Scotland, and Smail, who had a connection with the Church, was the most suitable person to give the invitation.¹⁸⁸ Furthermore, Harper also thought that it was important for the churches in Wales to be represented at the conference. He invited Rev. Graham Horwood of Rhondda, Glamorgan whose church had a prayer meeting where ten people had received the Spirit Baptism within a period of several months in 1973. In the parishes of Ystad and Hopkinstown, Pontipridd, there were

¹⁸⁵ Fountain Trust, *Press Release: International Conference 2*.

¹⁸⁶ Minutes-FTACM (5 April 1973), p. 2;

Letter from Michael Harper to the Bishop of Southwell, 26 July 1972;

Letter from the Bishop of Southwell to Michael Harper, 1 January 1973;

Letter from Michael Harper to the Bishop of Southwell, 9 January 1973;

Letter from the Bishop of Southwell to Michael Harper, 16 January 1973.

¹⁸⁷ Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gather for Power*, p. 8.

¹⁸⁸ He approached Dr. H. Walker of the Home Board, Bill Shannon of St. Ninian's and Rev. James G. Matheson of the Stewardship and Budget Department. They all had interest in the charismatic renewal. He did not expect them to represent the Church of Scotland officially at the conference but to bring a personal report on renewal to the Church. However, none of them were able to come. Then he contacted Dr. Rudolph Ehrlich, the Convener of the Panel of Doctrine which was studying Pentecostalism at that time. Ehrlich sent the Trust's invitation to his panel members and the response was positive. (Letter from Tom Smail to Dr. H. Walker, 17 January 1973; Letter from Tom Smail to James G. Matheson, 3 April 1973; Letter from Tom Smail to James G. Matheson, 25 April 1973; Letter from James G. Matheson to Tom Smail, 19 June 1973; Letter from Tom Smail to James G. Matheson, 23 June 1973.)

also similar groups seeking the filling of the Spirit. Therefore, Harper requested Horwood to invite those he knew to the conference saying that he would reserve places for them despite the limited number of vacancies.¹⁸⁹

On the other hand, Harper also actively invited the Roman Catholic leaders who were sympathetic or actually involved in the renewal. He assigned Ian Petit as the Roman Catholic Chaplain for the conference to be responsible for the Mass every morning at 7:00 a.m. Other Catholic leaders like Benedict Heron, Fr. Bernard Brady, the Catholic Chaplain of the University of Nottingham and other priests also helped with it.¹⁹⁰ In addition, Harper asked for a representative of the BCC. The Council officially sent Emmanuel Sullivan, a Roman Catholic Franciscan and the Secretary of the Committee for Unity in Prayer, to attend the conference. Harper regarded him as the most outstanding Roman Catholic observer of the renewal besides Kilian McDonnell.¹⁹¹ Sullivan was “grateful” for the invitation to participate in the conference and he agreed to contribute an article to *Renewal* about his impression of it.¹⁹² Last but not least, some Catholic Charismatic theologians were also invited, such as Tugwell and McDonnell, although neither of them could come.¹⁹³ Interestingly,

¹⁸⁹ Letter from Graham Horwood to Michael Harper, 14 May 1973;

Letter from Michael Harper to Graham Horwood, 22 May 1973.

¹⁹⁰ Letter from Michael Harper to Ian Petit, 28 June 1973.

¹⁹¹ Sullivan wrote a booklet at the beginning of 1973 for the BCC, *Can the Pentecostal Movement Renewal the Churches?* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1972) about the relation between the Pentecostal and ecumenical movement. It had been given a “heartening” response from charismatics. Harper commented that the booklet was “one of the fairest and most constructive pieces of writing on this subject yet to appear” and he thought that Sullivan gave “a slightly qualified ‘yes’” to the question of the title. Harper also raised an interesting point that “the BCC should have to turn to a Catholic to write on such a subject, and an American at that”. It reveals a fact that since the 1970s, there was a lack of British writing about the Renewal. The prominent one was Simon Tugwell’s *Did You Receive the Holy Spirit?* (Michael Harper, “Editorial: From Guildford to Nottingham”, pp. 2-3.)

¹⁹² Letter from the Secretary to John B. Leake, dictated and signed in his absence, to Michael Harper, 30 January 1973;

Letter from Emmanuel Sullivan to Michael Harper, 14 April 1973;

Letter from Michael Harper to Bernard Palmer, 11 May 1973.

¹⁹³ Letter from Simon Tugwell to Michael Harper, 1 May 1972;

Letter from Michael Harper to Kilian McDonnell, 24 April 1973.

Harper wished that the Prince of Wales could witness this international and ecumenical event, and so he sent him invitation. However, because of his commitment as a Naval Officer at that time, the Prince of Wales declined.¹⁹⁴ Having a variety of church leaders at the international conference had become the norm and so there was no lack of church leaders to attend the remaining three. For example, at Westminster 1977, Veronica O'Brien from Malines agreed to come with his secretary. His presence strengthened the ecumenical character of the conference at which a crowd of Roman Catholics were present.¹⁹⁵

2.3. Mutual Acceptance

Although the leaders and laymen came from a variety of ecclesiological backgrounds, there is plenty of evidence of their mutual acceptance at the international conferences. At Guildford, Harper warmly welcomed Tugwell's participation by saying, "We would be delighted for you to be part of our fellowship there and link closely with us."¹⁹⁶ A delegate who came to Guildford with his "real hatred of Romans" was transformed dramatically at the moment where he talked to a man whom he had thought was a Roman Catholic but was in fact an Anglican priest (Eric Sellgren).¹⁹⁷ It was understandable that the differences of theological and doctrinal conviction still existed among them as it was unrealistic to think that historical divisions could be erased in a few days, but delegates at Nottingham were able to be open minded

¹⁹⁴ Letter from Michael Harper to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, 19 January 1972;
Letter from the Squadron Leader, David Checketts, to Michael Harper, 27 January 1972.

¹⁹⁵ Letter from Wilfrid Brieven, Secretary of the Archbishop of Malines-Brussels, to Sylvia Lawton, 13 April 1979;
Letter from Cardinal Suenens to Tom Smail, 9 May 1979, p. 2.

¹⁹⁶ Letter from Michael Harper to Simon Tugwell, 5 January 1971.

¹⁹⁷ Eric Sellgren, "God Spoke to Me", in "And Now—Ten People Recall What Guildford '71 Meant to Them", *Renewal*, No. 94 (August-September 1981), p. 33.

towards different ideas. Coomes described that the delegates at Nottingham in the following way:

[They] were not uptight about every doctrine, tradition and experience, not rooted to every jot and tittle of the law, not so poised on a knife-edge of authority that every criticism seemed destined to destroy faith, future and personal peace. Here were Christians who, when criticised, as they often are (justly or unjustly), don't go on the defensive, don't recoil in horror, don't whip back with angry words, but who are able to laugh at their excesses, analyse the critics, and, if it is just, act upon it.¹⁹⁸

Douglas Quay commented that the grassroots unity manifested at Nottingham 1973 “would have been unthinkable ten years ago” and he praised God for that.¹⁹⁹ For Sullivan, Nottingham gave him a fresh hope for the ecumenical future. He observed that “there was ecumenical witness throughout the conference but [proselytism] never raised its ugly head.”²⁰⁰ He affirmed what Cardinal Suenens said, “not for Vatican III, but Jerusalem II.”²⁰¹ Loren Cunningham witnessed that ecumenical community at Nottingham and he prayed that the Trust would continuously be an “anointed instrument to bring unity within the Body.”²⁰² Delegates of Westminster 1975 also tasted the sweetness of unity. For example, Mrs Pamela Lucas said that she enjoyed the fellowship with many Roman Catholics who had experienced “deeper blessings” in the conference.²⁰³ Barbara regarded herself as a “reserved” lady, but during the conference, she felt “a warmth of fellowship from total strangers—who just happened to be our brothers and sisters in the Lord!”²⁰⁴ Moreover, she noticed that in the eucharist, she was offered the wine by “a non-Conformist, coloured pastor” who was

¹⁹⁸ David Coomes, “Nottingham: A Dynamic Freedom and Joy”, p. 19.

¹⁹⁹ David Coomes, “1500 ‘Gathered for Power’”, p. 1.

²⁰⁰ Emmanuel Sullivan, “Seeing the Whole Church Renewed”, p. 20.

²⁰¹ Emmanuel Sullivan, “Seeing the Whole Church Renewed”, p. 21.

²⁰² Letter from Loren Cunningham to Michael Harper, 3 August 1973.

²⁰³ Letter from Mrs Pamela Lucas, 29 August 1975.

²⁰⁴ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 9.

holding the Cup for her; hence, she said, “This was the true meaning of Ecumenism.”²⁰⁵ The conference also showed Richard Harbour the nature of oneness in Christ. His attitude towards the Roman Catholics was changed and he recalled that he had lunch with two sisters and they all felt sad about the doctrines separating Protestants and Catholics. Such separation was obviously manifested in the final communion. After all these, he said, “Reconciliation is not papering over the cracks.”²⁰⁶ Considering the historical conflict and centuries of isolation, this openness and mutual acceptance between Protestants and the Roman Catholics at the international conferences was something that had been rarely found in church history. These attitudes had been expressed naturally without any artificial packaging in the Spirit.

3. Ecumenical Activities

In these five international conferences, worship played an important role in triggering the sense of unity and actualising the desire of being one in Christ at the grassroots level. Consequently delegates experienced a joy of unity and acquired a sense of the urgency of realising this oneness in the whole Christendom. The concelebration of the eucharist also sacramentally realised the grassroots unity nurtured at the conferences; however, it also reflected the unresolved doctrinal problem as the Roman Catholics were not allowed to participate which eventually brought about a tremendous sadness in the congregation.

²⁰⁵ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 10.

²⁰⁶ Richard Harbour, “Glory in Westminster”, pp. 7-8.

3.1. Worship

The sense of unity was strongly felt in the everyday worship. At Guildford, there was a “Morning Praise” for everybody no matter what their ecclesiological backgrounds;²⁰⁷ and the Roman Catholics also held their Mass each afternoon and welcomed everybody to join. Balkam recalled that they “enjoyed a very warm fellowship.”²⁰⁸ After Nottingham 1973, as the Trust considered the need for different liturgical forms of worship to cater for delegates with a diversity of backgrounds, they officially prepared both Protestant services with Anglican or Reformed traditions and Catholic Mass for the morning service at Nottingham 1973, Westminster 1975 and 1977.²⁰⁹ Delegates could join the services, either according to their own background, or as an opportunity for a new experience. Despite the various traditions, they shared a common character which was charismatic and the services were open to all the attendees.²¹⁰ Westminster 1979 was rather special because there was no separate simultaneous worship section for Protestants and Roman Catholics, but only a daily Mass at 8:30 a.m. followed by a worship and bible study session for the whole conference. This was led by Cardinal Suenens on the first morning and by Michael Green on the remaining three.²¹¹ These arrangements signalled the Trust’s position of welcoming all kinds of traditions and reminded delegates of the importance of respecting differences for the sake of unity in Christ. This was the view expressed by

²⁰⁷ Emile Dallièrè, *Guildford International Conference July 1971*, p. 3.

²⁰⁸ Email from Bob Balkam, 16 November 2005.

²⁰⁹ The Reformed liturgical form was held only at Nottingham. (Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 1; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham July 1973, Detailed Programme Tuesday-Friday (Saturday to be announced)*, p. 1; *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 8.)

²¹⁰ Fountain Trust, *International Conference, Nottingham 9-14 July 1973, Programme*, p. 1; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Nottingham July 1973, Detailed Programme Tuesday-Friday (Saturday to be announced)*, p. 1; *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 8; *Conference Brochure: Welcome to Westminster, Fountain Trust International Conference, 28 July-2 August 1975*, p. 3; “Daily Mass”, *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (29 July 1975), p. 2; *Booking Form*, n.d.; *Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, p. 2.

²¹¹ Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City, London, 30 July-3 August 1979*, p. 4.

Sullivan about Nottingham 1973, which is in fact applicable to the other international conferences. As he said, “The emphasis at Nottingham was on a unity already *possessed* which we have to learn to express visibly in more and more ways without any disloyalty to our conscientious convictions and the disciplines of our various churches”.²¹²

If the morning worship was a lesson in learning to respect one another’s differences, then the evening services were arenas for ecumenical realisation. All the delegates and those of the public who came in, experienced and witnessed the work of the Holy Spirit as they sang and praised together. Subconsciously and gradually, a sense of unity grew among the congregations. Emile Dallière, the brother of the famous leader of the French Charismatic Renewal, Louis Dallière,²¹³ paralleled this sense of unity at Guildford which he experienced on 14 July 1971, France’s national day, with “The Fall of the Bastille”, which marked the beginning of French Revolution.²¹⁴ When the French people were celebrating the liberty they had obtained from the collapse of the monarchy in 1789, those Christians at Guildford were rejoicing in the freedom of unity resulting from the demolition of boundaries by the Spirit. He recalled that in that night, “everyone present was aware that something special was happening” and “the diversity of religions, churches, races or pigments of skin” dissolved when the gift of tongues was performed by most of the congregation. The heavenly language spoken in the Spirit washed away the boundaries between Christians and so he said that “the tower of Babel had been well and truly demolished.”²¹⁵ Furthermore, the preachers of that evening were Kevin Ranaghan and two Roman Catholic priests who were

²¹² Emmanuel Sullivan, “Seeing the Whole Church Renewed”, p. 21.

²¹³ E-mail reply from Michael Harper, Wednesday, 5 October 2005.

²¹⁴ Emile Dallière, *Guildford International Conference July 1971*, p. 8.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

naturally accepted by the congregation which was made up of many Protestants.²¹⁶ Hence he said, “And there is no doubt at all that the unity experienced with such reality on the evening of the 14th July in the Cathedral stands as a great step forward.”²¹⁷ Harper also recalled that everybody “had a tremendous sense of being present at history in the making.”²¹⁸

At the international conferences for the charismatic renewal, worship was a major arena for unity to grow through common experience in the Spirit which brought out the presence and power of God. Charisms such as speaking and singing in tongues, prophecy, healing and intercession functioned as mutual edification and encouragement through the power of the Spirit and the sense of unity was nurtured in the congregation. Delegates’ testimonies and comments on their experience of unity and the ecumenical implications will be illustrated in the next chapter.

3.2. The Eucharist

The eucharist was a direct and significant way to realise the metaphor of the body of Christ, but meanwhile, it also unsympathetically revealed the reality of the divided body despite the harmonious fellowship during the conferences. The sorrow and pain derived from division became sharp when there was a large Catholic participation, especially at Westminster 1975.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

Fountain Trust, “Guildford 1971: They Heard the Angels”, p. 32.

²¹⁷ Emile Dallière, *Guildford International Conference July 1971*, p. 10.

²¹⁸ Letter from Michael Harper to Miss Nina Putman, 6 October 1971.

At Nottingham 1973, the Trust implemented the ecumenical practice of “concelebration” with Anglican liturgy.²¹⁹ The president was the Bishop of Southwell. Harper proposed that he could be responsible for the priestly sections: declaring the Absolution, giving the final blessing and presiding over the “actual sentences of Consecration” while he and other non-Anglican leaders proclaimed the words of consecration at the same time.²²⁰ The Bishop agreed to this suggestion, but said that he would only do it in that exceptional case as followings: “I am ready to accede to your request about others than Anglicans joining in the words of consecration on condition that it is noted that this forms no precedent either within or outside this diocese”.²²¹

He also agreed to use the Anglican rite even though it was held in an “extra-diocesan building” (by which he meant the Sport Centre of the University of Nottingham) which was not “consecrated” which was at the time “technically illegal.”²²² The service, as the “climax” of the whole conference, was regarded as “incredible” and “fantastic”. Delegates obviously felt the filling of the Holy Spirit and were joyfully dancing, singing and hugging one another without “pressure, coyness and embarrassment”.²²³

Concelebration was also practised at the three Westminster international conferences. However, the final communion at Westminster 1975 revealed the reality that the

²¹⁹ It was based on a tradition in the early church where the bishop conducted the eucharist with his presbyters and they said the same words and performed the same actions together. Nowadays it is practised at ecumenical meetings where ministers from various backgrounds consecrate the bread and wine and distribute to the congregation according to the same rite. (Barry Till, *The Churches Search for Unity*, p. 499.)

²²⁰ Letter from Michael Harper to the Bishop of Southwell, 26 July 1972;
Letter from the Bishop of Southwell to Michael Harper, 1 January 1973;
Letter from Michael Harper to the Bishop of Southwell, 28 June 1973.

²²¹ Letter from the Bishop of Southwell to Michael Harper, 3 July 1973.

²²² Ibid.

²²³ Fountain Trust, *Renewal*, No. 46 (August-September 1973), p. 25.

church was still divided as Protestants and Roman Catholics were not yet allowed to celebrate the eucharist together. Due to the canon law of the Roman Catholic Church, Roman Catholic speakers including Francis MacNutt, Paul Lebeau and other Catholic clergy who had been involved at the Conference in the previous few days did not partake in the concelebration. Their withdrawal upset some of the delegates²²⁴ as they could not express the unity that they had experienced through the sacrament “although they had shared the week’s worship...to the full” and “had dropped all the denominational and party labels for four days.”²²⁵ Despite this sharp contrast of unity and disunity that the delegates had experienced so intensely in those five days, Harper recalled that “there were some very moving scenes of deep contrition of the continued divisions in the body of Christ” which “touched the conference deeply.” To empathise with the grief of their “dear Catholic friends”, some delegates from the Baptist, Methodist and other mainline Protestant churches did not partake the eucharist.²²⁶ Barbara Holl, a delegate, said, “I shall remember the tears streaming down the faces of two Roman Catholic nuns who were seated next to me” and hence for her, it was “one of the saddest parts of the entire Conference.”²²⁷ John Richards, one of the speakers, described the eucharist as “a shattering spiritual experience” and expressed his sadness by saying, “the sudden awareness of the only partial participation of the R.C.’s ‘tore’ me, there is no other word for it!”²²⁸ He remembered that he “wept in a way unrelated to normal weeping”.²²⁹

²²⁴ Letter from Mallie Calver to Michael Harper, 8 August 1975, p. 3.

²²⁵ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 10;

Letter from Michael Harper to the Bishop of London, 15 August 1975;

Michael Harper, “Editorial: No Cosy Marinas”, *Renewal*, No. 59 (October-November 1975), p. 3.

²²⁶ Michael Harper, “Editorial: No Cosy Marinas”, p. 3;

Letter from Michael Harper to the Bishop of London, 15 August 1975.

²²⁷ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 10.

²²⁸ Letter from John Richards to Michael Harper, 4 August 1975, p. 1.

²²⁹ John Richards, “Tears, A Gift of the Spirit?”, *Renewal*, No. 86 (April-May 1980), p. 33.

In the face of this reality of division, MacNutt said positively, “We may not yet be able to share the same Eucharist, but we can wash each other’s feet.”²³⁰ Harper warned that we should not deceive ourselves and pretend that the unity was there. Division “*was the real thing.*” We should face the unfavourable reality and “press on in faith towards the full unity of the Body of Christ.”²³¹

Although full communion could not be practised at Westminster 1975, people at the conference still endeavoured to express the unity that they had longed for. For example, the Bishop of London allowed non-Anglican ministers to concelebrate “the Choral Eucharist” with the Archbishop of Cape Town by proclaiming the words of consecration and “holding out their hands over the elements.”²³² Moreover, the chalices used on that night were borrowed from different sources, one of those being a Roman Catholic priest. This particular chalice had been secretly used by the Roman Catholics in the seventeenth century. But in that communion service, it was used openly with other chalices representing “a symbolic gesture of the desire of so many for reconciliation.”²³³ Furthermore, Smail revealed that the Roman Catholic delegates eagerly invited everybody to join their morning Mass every day in the Westminster basement without hesitation. They would be “upset” if the non-Catholics did not go. And their priests distributed communions to the whole congregation every morning despite breaching the canon law.²³⁴

Both the Roman Catholic authority and the Trust had learnt the lesson from the communion at Westminster 1975 and they had looked for ways in which the delegates

²³⁰ Richard Harbour, “Glory in Westminster”, p. 8.

²³¹ Michael Harper, “Editorial: No Cosy Marinas”, p. 3.

²³² Letter from the Bishop of London to Michael Harper, 4 July 1975.

²³³ Letter from Michael Harper to the Bishop of London, 15 August 1975.

²³⁴ Interview with Tom Smail, 16 February 2006, Croydon.

could still follow canon law and could accept the reality of division easily. At Westminster 1977, the Roman Catholic authority allowed everybody to participate in the morning Mass, but not to receive communion. This order brought more pain to the grassroots, as Smail recalled, “The charismatic Catholics were very upset about that and very apologetic that they haven’t been able to do for us what they had done two years before.”²³⁵ Moreover, the Trust also handled the final communion carefully. They determined not to let the Roman Catholics feel that they were being isolated, while helping them to be psychologically prepared to accept the reality of not being able to participate. During the conference, the eucharistic issue not only concerned the organisers, but also the delegates. Some of them raised this question at one of the seminars on ecumenical issues. The Bishop of Pontefract, Richard Hare, who was going to preside at the eucharist on the last evening of Westminster 1977 responded to this question by saying,

Can I say a word about the eucharist on Friday night? Obviously at any eucharist, ...this is an occasion of repentance. I myself am not willing now, since the passing of canon B15 & A, six years ago, to celebrate the eucharist without giving the invitation to everyone that communicate who is baptised and in good common understanding with our tradition.”

Then he said that he was going to give the following invitation at the eucharist.

If you are baptised within a Trinitarian tradition, and if you are a communicant within your own congregation, then it is the Lord’s table and not ours and the Lord says come to my peace and be ready. Come and get it as the Americans say. But there are those for reasons of conscience or obedience, do not feel able to accept this invitation, and if you are among those, then please pray for the unity at which the invitation ends.²³⁶

²³⁵ Ibid.

²³⁶ Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues II*, Westminster 1977 (London: Fountain Trust, 1977). (Audio Tape)

On that evening, he did give this invitation by announcing that the eucharist was an “open table” and that everybody was welcome to participate.²³⁷ Many Roman Catholics felt obliged not to receive communion, but some did join.²³⁸ Those who could communicate experienced blessings by being able to share the bread and wine.²³⁹ But some had not been able to forget the divided table from which the pain derived.²⁴⁰ Although the eucharist was regarded as a “climax” and “heart” of the conference²⁴¹ and Smail praised that the way the Bishop had handled it, saying it was “magnificent,”²⁴² Westminster 1977 still could not avoid the sadness derived from the unrealised sacramental expression of unity, which occurred at Westminster 1975.²⁴³ At Westminster 1979, the sensitivity about Roman Catholic participation still existed, but similar announcement was made that Roman Catholics could decide whether they participated or not according to their conscience.²⁴⁴ The matter of communion was problematic and reflected a contrast between the unity brought about by the charismatic renewal at a grassroots level and the more rigid doctrinal stance of the authorities in the traditional churches. There will be a deeper analysis of this point in chapter four.

²³⁷ Letter from Tom Smail to the Bishop of Croydon, 23 February 1979;

Letter from Tom Smail to Bishop David Pytches, 12 March 1979.

²³⁸ Letter from Tom Smail to Bishop David Pytches, 12 March 1979;

Interview with Tom Smail, 16 February 2006, Croydon.

²³⁹ Letter from Peggy William to Fountain Trust, 8 August 1977;

Fountain Trust, *Renewal*, No. 71 (October-November 1977), p. 9.

²⁴⁰ Letter from Ray J. Simpson to Tom Smail, 8 August 1977.

²⁴¹ Fountain Trust, *Renewal*, No. 71 (October-November 1977), p. 9;

Letter from Hans-Dieter Gramm to the Fountain Trust, 12 September 1977.

²⁴² Letter from Tom Smail to Richard Hare, 12 August 1977.

²⁴³ Tom Smail, “Editorial: The More We Are Together...”, p. 4.

²⁴⁴ Letter from Tom Smail to David Pytches, 12 March 1979;

Letter from Tom Smail to Lesslie Newbigin, 23 April 1979;

Letter from Tom Smail to the Bishop of Croydon, 23 February 1979.

4. Ecumenical Cooperation

The five international conferences demonstrate the ecumenical cooperation that took place between Protestants and Roman Catholics in the charismatic renewal. The conference committee for Guildford consisted of members from three different traditions: Anglican, Methodist and Roman Catholic.²⁴⁵ The result and feedback from the conference presented in chapter two proved the success of this pioneering ecumenical cooperation. When Smail became the director the ecumenical cooperation with the Roman Catholics became more official through the RCNSC, which was established by Balkam after Guildford.²⁴⁶ For Westminster 1977, the Trust invited them to join in with the organising committee, and Balkam and Ian Petit forsook the plan of holding their own conference in the summer of 1977 to help organise the international conference.²⁴⁷ This venture was regarded as a “major ecumenical breakthrough”,²⁴⁸ “the most ecumenical” conference in Britain²⁴⁹ and was “very much

²⁴⁵ They were Harper, Eric Jennings who was an Anglican minister of the Bourne Vicarage of Farnham in Surrey, Leslie Davison who was a Methodist and the General Secretary of the Home Mission Department of the Methodist Church at that time, and Bob Balkam, a lay Roman Catholic. Before this committee was formed, there had been an ecumenical problem. At a meeting for the Guildford Conference on 12 June 1970 attended by Ken and Eleanor Morgan, Bob Balkam and Michael Harper, it was decided to invite Geoffrey Carver and Noel Doubleday to be members of the Committee. Noel Doubleday and his wife were present in a meeting for the Conference on 3 July 1970, but then he wrote a letter to Harper saying that he would not join the committee because he was “rather hesitant” about unity with the Roman Catholics. Although he thought that the Spirit could unite Christians crossing over any barrier, the Roman Catholic doctrines could still be an obstacle of unity because the speech of the Pope in that period gave him an impression that if the “separated brethren” did not accept the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, there would be no opportunity for unity. Therefore, he was not willing to join the committee. (Notes-Guildford (3 July 1970); Letter from Noel Doubleday to Michael Harper, 14 July 1970; Letter from Eric Jennings to Michael Harper, 21 July 1970; Letter from Leslie Davison to Michael Harper, 4 October 1971. Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust International Conference, “Fellowship of the Holy Spirit”, 12-17 July 1971, University of Surrey Guildford*, p. 7.)

²⁴⁶ Letter from Tom Smail to Walter Hollenweger, 5 November 1976;
Letter from Tom Smail to J. Dominian, 23 December 1976;
Letter from Tom Smail to Professor Jan van der Vekan, Belgium, 23 December 1976;
Fountain Trust, *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, p. 1;
Minutes-FTCCM (8 June 1977), p. 1.

²⁴⁷ Letter from Tom Smail to Ralph Martin, 7 October 1976;
Letter from Tom Smail to Cardinal Suenens, 7 October 1976;
Minutes-FTACM (9 December 1976), p. 1.

²⁴⁸ Minutes-FTCCM (8 December 1977), p. 1.

²⁴⁹ Fountain Trust, *Press Release: Growing in the church, April 1977*.

a joint enterprise fully shared by the Protestant and Catholic sections of the renewal in Britain.”²⁵⁰ After two years, the RCNSC was invited to cooperate with the Trust again for Westminster 1979 and the documents of the Trust showed that the Roman Catholics were given a higher profile in the preparation for this conference. For example, on the leaflet and booking form of the conference, the words “arranged by Fountain Trust in association with the Roman Catholic National Service Committee” were clearly printed. This was not the case for Westminster 1977.²⁵¹ In nine out of nineteen letters collected so far, to speakers or to guests and lay people from Smail and Barling, the involvement of the RCNSC was clearly mentioned,²⁵² while in the correspondence for Westminster 1977, it was not stated in most of the letters.²⁵³ Moreover, Smail emphasised the strong ecumenical character of Westminster 1979 by phrasing it as “a very large ecumenical gathering”,²⁵⁴ “a completely ecumenical gathering”²⁵⁵ and “fully ecumenical.”²⁵⁶ These expressions showed that the ecumenical

²⁵⁰ Letter from Tom Smail to Ralph Martin, 7 October 1976.

²⁵¹ Fountain Trust, *Joy in the City: An International Conference on Renewal and its Outreach in Society, London 30 July-3 August 1979*, front page; *Growing in the Church: An International Conference on Renewal in the Local Church, London 1-5 August 1977*, front page.

²⁵² Letter from Tom Smail to Mrs. Catherine Marshall LeSourd, 10 November 1977;
 Letter from Tom Smail to Michael Scanlan, 10 November 1977;
 Letter from Tom Smail to Michael Green, 10 November 1977;
 Letter from Tom Smail to David Watson, 10 November 1977;
 Letter from Tom Smail to the Archbishop Helder Pessoa Camara, Brazil, 28 August 1978;
 Letter from Tom Smail to Tom Forrest, 6 February, 1979;
 Letter from Tom Smail to Larry Christenson, 15 September 1978;
 Letter from Michael Barling to Dennis J. Bennett, 18 October 1978;
 Letter from Michael Barling to Mrs. Norma Hearth, 5 January 1979;
 Letter from Michael Barling to Kent E., 22 January 1979;
 Letter from the Fountain Trust to Maurice, Barnett, Simon Barrington-Ward (Church Missionary Society), Bishop of Kenington, David Bubbers, Wesley Gilpin (Elim Bible College), Kenneth Greet, Clifford Hill (Evangelical Alliance), Don Irving (Church Society), Gordon Landreth (Evangelical Alliance), R. O. Latham, James B. Lawson (St. Andrew’s Garrison Church of Scotland), A. L. Macarthur, Fraser McLuskey (St. Columba’s Church of Scotland), Harry O. Morton (British Council of Churches), Derek Pattinson (CoE General Synod), David S. Russell (General Secretary of Baptist Union), Harry Sutton (Evangelical Alliance), David Taylor (Nationwide Initiative in Evangelism), n.d.

²⁵³ In fact, I am not able to get hold of all the copies of all the invitation letters from the Trust to church leaders, only four of them. In those four letters from Smail to Agnes Sanford, Tom Walker, Arthur Wallis and Jack Dominican, the involvement of the RCNSC was mentioned just in Dominican’s letter.

²⁵⁴ Letter from Tom Smail to Larry Christenson, 15 September 1978.

²⁵⁵ Letter from Tom Smail to Mrs. Catherine Marshall LeSourd 10 November 1977.

cooperation between the Trust and the RCNSC had become more mature and official by the time of Westminster 1979. And on both sides, the ecumenical significance of the charismatic renewal was firmly acknowledged and, therefore, the message of unity was clearly brought out through their successful cooperation.

Besides the major planning for the conferences, the Trust also invited some Roman Catholics to be involved in some minor but important elements. For instance, the banners of all the international conferences were designed by some Catholic nuns. For Guildford, the Trust requested Sister Gertrude, a Benedict nun of the Priory Close in Southgate, to borrow some “beautiful banners which did make so much difference to” the conference.²⁵⁷ For the rest of the four international conferences, the Trust invited Sister Regina who was a Benedictine nun from Cockfosters and “a trained artist”, to design and produce banners which had different slogans.²⁵⁸ Moreover, the Trust assigned both Protestant and Catholic ministers to be chaplains, so that Christians from different ecclesiological backgrounds would be offered helpful advice. For example, Ray Muller and Cecil Marshall were chaplains for Protestants at Nottingham

²⁵⁶ Letter from Tom Smail to Tom Forrest, 6 February 1979.

²⁵⁷ Letter from Michael Harper, dictated and signed in his absence, to Sister Gertrude, 20 July 1971.

²⁵⁸ For Nottingham 1973, the slogans were “Gathered for Power”, “The Water of Life”, “Psalm 103 (104)”, “God’s People on the Way” and “Sing the Lord a New Song”. (David Coomes, “1500 ‘Gathered for Power’”, p. 1; Fountain Trust, *Nottingham University 9-14 July 1973, Gathered for Power*, p. 11.)

For Westminster 1975, The themes of the banners were “The Baptism of Jesus, Matthew 3:16-17”; “The Spirit Moving over the Chaos, Genesis 1:2”, meaning God creates the world in order from chaos; “The Tower of Babel, Genesis 11: 1-9” and “The Day of Pentecost, Acts 5-12”. The “confusion of tongues” after building the Tower represented the disunity of the Church and on the day of Pentecost the apostles were speaking in tongues in the Spirit represented the unity.; “The Life Coal Taken from the Altar, Isaiah 6:6-7, meaning the “the purifying, sanctifying, healing touch of God”. (Letter from Sister Regina to Tom Smail, 4 February 1975)

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1975 (31 January 1975), p. 3;

Minutes-Westminster Conference 1977 (25 February 1977), p. 2;

Fountain Trust, *Fountain Trust international Conference, Westminster, Growing in the Church, 1-5 August 1977*, p. 6.

1973 and Westminster 1975 respectively and Ian Petit was the Catholic chaplain at both conferences.²⁵⁹

5. Ecumenical Conflicts and Conversions

It is undeniable that there was a strong sense of unity that was nurtured by the worship and communion at the international conferences, and this was underlined by the ecumenical audiences and speakers. However, without the determination to be ecumenical, in spite of all the criticism and discouragement regarding the ecumenical cooperation at the first international conference in Guildford, the growth of unity in the other four would not have been progressed so naturally. The main friction occurred because the Trust invited Leslie Davison, who was labelled as a liberal, to be a speaker, and Kevin Ranaghan and Bob Balkam who were Roman Catholics, to participate in the committee. As a Director of the Trust, Harper was the person targeted by some Protestant leaders over these decisions. Recalling this incident, after 25 years he said, “I did not have an easy time”.²⁶⁰

5.1. Ecumenical Conflicts

Before the commencement of the conference, there were three ministers in the Surrey area who were disturbed by the fact of Leslie Davison as a speaker—Michael Pusey, Harold Owen and Fred Pride.²⁶¹ They felt uncomfortable with Davison’s liberal theological preference for two reasons. This first was his book published in 1969,

²⁵⁹ Fountain Trust, *Conference Brochure: Welcome to Westminster, Fountain Trust International Conference, 28 July-2 August 1975*, p. 2.

²⁶⁰ Michael Harper’s personal note for the author, 22 July 2005, p. 1.

²⁶¹ Michael Pusey was a pastor of the Farnborough Baptist Church, Harold Owen, a minister of the Woking Baptist Church and Fred Pride the leader of Abinger Fellowship which held regular conferences in Abinger Hammer. (Michael Harper’s personal note for the author, 22 July 2005, p. 1.)

entitled *Sender and Sent: A Study of Mission*, which was commented as containing some “modernistic views.”²⁶² The second was his speech at a Trust’s Public Relations meeting held on 14 October 1970 which was intended to inform the local ministers of Surrey about the Guildford conference.²⁶³ Pusey could not accept his statement at the meeting that “the Ecumenical, Liturgical & Protest Movements with the Charismatic movement are all ‘of the Holy Spirit.’” He believed that it might have an adverse effect on new believers, and so he thought that Davison should not be a speaker at the conference.²⁶⁴ Owen, who regarded himself as a former Baptist liberal who understood liberal ways of thinking, criticised Davison for rejecting the “substitutionary doctrine of atonement” in his recent publication. He also was “appalled” by Davison’s talk at the meeting which convinced him that he was unacceptable as a conference speaker. Moreover, he worried that if the opponents of Pentecostals and the charismatic renewal knew that the conference had speakers dishonouring the atonement, they would make “mincemeat of us once again.” Therefore, he blamed Harper for creating a difficult situation for people in the renewal circle.²⁶⁵ Pride made a similar criticism about Harper by saying, “I am personally persuaded that you are doing a grave disservice not only to the charismatic movement in this country but to the cause of Christ.” He also mentioned that the advisors of the Bible week of the Abinger Fellowship, which would be held a few weeks before the conference in Abinger Hammer, “were profoundly disturbed” by the fact that a man “whose credentials have

²⁶² Letter from Arthur Wallis to Michael Harper, 13 November 1970;
Letter from Michael Pusey to Michael Harper, 22 December 1970;
Leslie Davison, *Sender and Sent: A Study of Mission* (London: Epworth Press, 1969).

²⁶³ Notes-Guildford (3 July 1970), p. 1.

²⁶⁴ Letter from Michael Pusey to Michael Harper, 16 October 1970, p. 1.

²⁶⁵ Letter from Harold G. Owen to Michael Harper, 29 December 1970, pp. 1-2.

not yet been proved as to their basic and fundamental doctrines” was invited to speak publicly.²⁶⁶

On the other hand, there was also suspicion regarding Roman Catholic involvement in the conference. Owen was sceptical about the Roman Catholics as he thought that they held some “wrong views”. He was even more confused after reading the book, *Catholic Pentecostals*, and found it worrying that its author was allowed to speak on a Fountain Trust’s platform, as he believed that he would not “honour the Blood of Christ...nor the Word of Truth.”²⁶⁷ He also disagreed with the Trust’s sharing the ministry of the conference with a Roman Catholic, by whom he meant Bob Balkam.²⁶⁸

Harper responded carefully and patiently to all these doubts. He defended Davison firmly by pleading those who complained to be fair in their judgment. Harper suggested to Pusey that while generally the ecumenical and liturgical movement were accepted as “of the Holy Spirit”, he was not sure what Davison meant by the “Protest Movement.” Nevertheless, he thought that Davison should not be judged negatively simply because that part of his statement was unclear.²⁶⁹ To reply Owen’s letter, Harper made a careful assessment of pages 117, 128 and 205 of Davison’s book, and corrected Owen’s misunderstanding of Davison’s statement about the substitutionary doctrine of atonement. In these pages, Harper said that he could not see that Davison was rejecting the doctrine but, rather, was commenting on other people’s points of view regarding the doctrine. And he continued to argue that even though Davison did

²⁶⁶ Letter from Fred Pride to Michael Harper, 4 January 1971, pp. 1-2.

²⁶⁷ Letter from Harold G. Owen to Michael Harper, 29 December 1970, p. 2;
Kevin & Dorothy Ranagan, *Catholic Pentecostals* (New York: Paulist Press, 1969).

²⁶⁸ Letter from Harold G. Owen to Michael Harper, 28 August 1970, p. 1;
Letter from Harold G. Owen to Michael Harper, 29 December 1970, p. 2.

²⁶⁹ Letter from Michael Harper to Michael Pusey, 29 October 1970, pp. 1-2.

reject the doctrine, he could still be invited to speak at the conference to talk about something other than the atonement.²⁷⁰ Responding to Pride's letter, Harper affirmed his invitation to Davison as he recognised the Holy Spirit's work not only among the evangelicals but also among liberals, and he believed that they were also being used by the Spirit to make contributions. He reminded Pride that they should avoid the Pentecostals' mistake of consciously or unconsciously regarding themselves as having "the monopoly of the Holy Spirit."²⁷¹

Although he had justified his choices of those two controversial speakers, Harper also raised the issue at the Advisory Council Meeting. He explained his choice of Kevin Ranaghan as a speaker by saying that the Holy Spirit's work was very apparent among the Roman Catholics and he had seen that when he met with some of them in the US. As for Davison, Harper knew him personally and was pleased about his experience in the Spirit.²⁷² The Council agreed to the Trust's invitation to Davison and Ranaghan as speakers for the conference and Harper wrote a private and confidential memorandum to Pusey, Owen and Pride to explain their decision.²⁷³ Pusey's attitude towards Davison was eventually changed completely and he came to regard him as a leader of the renewal,²⁷⁴ however some of them still insisted on their objections after reading the memorandum. Nevertheless, Davison and Ranaghan were still invited by the Trust to speak at the conference.

²⁷⁰ Letter from Michael Harper to Harold G. Owen, 2 January 1971, pp. 1-2.

²⁷¹ Letter from Michael Harper to Fred Pride, 10 January 1971, p. 2.

²⁷² Minutes-FTACM (20 November 1970).

²⁷³ Michael Harper, *Memorandum Sent to David Pawson, Harold Owen, Fred Pride, Michael Pusey*, 18 December 1970.

²⁷⁴ Letter from Michael Pusey to Michael Harper, 22 December 1970, p. 1.

At the conference, there was still criticism about the choice of speaker. David Pawson praised Davison's first two lectures as "brilliant", "stimulating" and the historical research was "superb", but he felt uncomfortable in the last one, primarily because some of Davison's theological statements were made without sufficient support from his own personal experience.²⁷⁵ He discovered after the lecture that some people had also been surprised that Davison's experience in the Spirit was not as deep as they had thought. In addition, he mentioned that some people were perplexed by Davison's stress on his liberal leanings being maintained by the renewal. Hence, Pawson asserted that Davison should seek for a deeper experience in the Spirit so that his theology would be transformed. He regarded Davison as "the odd man out on the team" "trying to identify with the movement without getting too involved."²⁷⁶ However, he did not have difficulty with the Roman Catholics. In fact, he also rejoiced about their experience in the Spirit and their transformed understandings of scriptures, commenting "The exciting thing about the RC's at the conference was that they could hardly have been more fundamentalist in their addresses!"²⁷⁷

5.2. Ecumenical Conversions

Guildford was a conference which not only created ecumenical conflicts, but also brought ecumenical conversions. One of the stories was about Alfred Missen who left the conference after the first day because of David du Plessis' "adoration of the Roman Catholic Church."²⁷⁸ He felt that du Plessis, as a Pentecostal, should realise

²⁷⁵ Letter from David Pawson to Michael Harper, 23 July 1971, p. 1.

²⁷⁶ Letter from David Pawson to Michael Harper, 23 July 1971, p. 1;
Letter from David Pawson to Michael Harper, 29 July 1971, p. 1.

²⁷⁷ Letter from David Pawson to Michael Harper, 29 July 1971, p. 1.

²⁷⁸ Letter from Alfred Missen to Michael Harper, 13 July 1971, p. 1;
Michael Harper personal note for the author, 22 July 2005, p. 1;

Email from Michael Harper, 29 June 2005;

Alfred Missen, "I walked out", in "And Now—Ten People Recall What Guildford '71 Meant to Them", *Renewal*, No. 94 (August-September 1981), p. 34.

that his pioneers had undergone a great deal of suffering for years to safeguard the purity of doctrine. He felt that du Plessis seemed to take little account of the hardship that Pentecostals had experienced at their hands and about this he was “very unhappy.”²⁷⁹ Since he wanted to avoid any impression that his attendance at the conference might be seen as a “compromise” with the Roman Catholics both by himself and the AoG, he decided to walk out the following morning. After he left, he reminded Harper that by coming to the conference he was not giving his assent to what had been said by du Plessis, and he went on, “It would be unfortunate if my attendance were taken to signify approval of some of the things said last night.”²⁸⁰ In addition, he said that he did not want to be present among those who dressed up with “flowing white robes with a long flowing white beard to match” whom he perceived to be Orthodox or those who had “denominational ties.”²⁸¹ However, his view of the Roman Catholics and traditional churches was completely changed within ten years. He saw that God’s work among the non-Pentecostals at Guildford fostered a sense of unity. He regretted walking out saying, “What a tragedy if after it all we walk away from one another and move back again into our denominational enclaves.” He also stated that “It is my prayer that the spirit of Guildford will live on. It is my faith that, despite all our fumbings, the prayer of Jesus in John 17.20-23 will be fulfilled.”²⁸²

Another ecumenical conversion happened to David Watson. As a faithful evangelical, Watson found that it was difficult to speak on the same platform with the Roman Catholics at Guildford. He had been deeply influenced by evangelical belief with its stress on “the inwardness of true religion” which contrasted with “the systematic

²⁷⁹ Letter from Alfred Missen to Michael Harper, 13 July 1971, p. 1.

²⁸⁰ Letter from Alfred Missen to Michael Harper, 13 July 1971, p. 2.

²⁸¹ Alfred Missen, “I walked out”, p. 34.

²⁸² Ibid.

sacramentalism of the Catholics.”²⁸³ He was worried that his major calling as an evangelist—preaching the gospel—would be damaged by sharing the platform with a Roman Catholic priest and his evangelical credentials would be suspected by fellow evangelists in Britain.²⁸⁴ However, his worry proved to be unwarranted at Guildford. He spoke with Ranaghan from the same platform and preached to a congregation which consisted of a certain number of Roman Catholics. During the discussion with the Catholic charismatic leaders, he was surprised to discover how similar their understanding of the gospel was, and how firm their belief in the Bible, as he said,

There was an astonishing agreement as to the truth of the Gospel. But of course, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Truth, and I found to my joy that these Catholic Pentecostals were Christ-centred and Cross-centred, with a great dependence on the authority of the Bible. We had, somewhat to my surprise, the closest fellowship in the Lord, based firmly on his Word as well as on a common experience of his love.²⁸⁵

He also enjoyed the fellowship and worship with the Roman Catholic brethren as they were based on a common experience and truth; but more importantly on love, and he felt that the denominational walls collapsed.²⁸⁶ John Gunstone identified Watson’s ecumenical role during and after the conference as being to bridge the relationship between evangelicals and Roman Catholics where there had been a big gulf despite the Roman Catholic’s ecumenical openness since Vatican II.²⁸⁷ Although Watson experienced this fellowship with the Catholic charismatics at the conference, he could not accept the fact that they were still affiliated with “a basically corrupt church.” But

²⁸³ Hugh Sansom & Teddy Saunders, *David Watson: A Biography* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1992), p. 182.

²⁸⁴ Hugh Sansom & Teddy Saunders, *David Watson*, p. 183;
John Gunstone, “A Strong and Burning Light”, *Renewal*, No. 192 (May 1992), p. 16.

²⁸⁵ Quoted in Hugh Sansom & Teddy Saunders, *David Watson*, p. 183.

²⁸⁶ Hugh Sansom & Teddy Saunders, *David Watson*, p. 183.

²⁸⁷ Hugh Sansom & Teddy Saunders, *David Watson*, p. 182;
John Gunstone, “A Strong and Burning Light”, p. 16.

after hearing God directly challenging his attitude, he confessed his critical feelings towards them and his lack of love. In the following years, he got involved in ministries in Northern Ireland for the reconciliation of Protestants and Roman Catholics.²⁸⁸

The controversies over the invitation to Davison and Ranaghan brought pressure on the charismatic leaders, especially Harper, as is shown in his prayer request to Pride in a letter saying, “I have personally had to endure criticism and persecution from many people—and I know it is impossible to please everyone. But I long to please HIM, not myself”.²⁸⁹ Due to Harper’s insistence on the decision which he and the Advisory Council believed to be right, a new realm of unity was created—not only between Protestants and Roman Catholics, but also between evangelicals and liberals, when everyone opened their hearts to the Spirit as was clearly manifested at the first international conference in Guildford during the British Charismatic Renewal. Davison and Ranaghan’s contributions at the conference were approved by a BCC observer of the conference, Emmanuel Sullivan, as he wrote in a memo for the Council,

Rev. Dr. Davison and Kevin Ranaghan deserve special commendation for their integrated and academic approach. Both seem highly competent to speak on this charismatic phenomenon; both are aware of difficulties associated with the phenomenon.²⁹⁰

²⁸⁸ He was associated with Monsignor Michael Buckley and Mairead Corrigan for this ministry. (Hugh Sansom & Teddy Saunders, *David Watson*, p. 184.)

²⁸⁹ Letter from Michael Harper to Fred Pride, 5 November 1970, p. 1.

²⁹⁰ Emmanuel Sullivan, *Memo: Guildford Conference—July 12-17, 1971* (Written from Franciscan Friars of the Atonement, the Ecumenical Office at 47 Francis Street, SW1).

6. Conclusion and Evaluation

The five international conferences demonstrated the grassroots unity derived from the charismatic renewal which was different from the mainstream ecumenical movement motivated at the official level. This demonstration was primarily due to Harper's vision for an ecumenical charismatic conference at Guildford and his courage in inviting "marginalised" speakers such as Roman Catholics and a liberal. After this pioneering attempt at Guildford, the other four international conferences carried this ecumenical character. There was no more complaint about speakers from diverse denominations sharing the same platform. Mutual recognition among lay people through experiencing the Spirit in worship continued. Sacramental expression of this mutual acknowledgment through concelebration took place though some of the Roman Catholics did not participate in it. For Westminster 1977 and 1979, the Trust even officially cooperated with the RCNSC which reflected a deeper trust between Protestants and Roman Catholics and a more advanced ecumenicity. Undeniably this grassroots unity nurtured by common experience could not tackle all the historical ecumenical problems such as the eucharist, but it created an arena for Christians from different denominations to gain a deeper understanding and to resolve misunderstandings and biases. Hence ecumenical conversions took place during the conferences and further cooperation and communication were made possible. These five international conferences opened up a new page for the ecumenical history and characterised the grassroots ecumenical nature of the charismatic renewal. It is easy to get a sense of unity within a few days of intense experience and learning of the Spirit at conferences, but it is not easy to prolong and create a wider ecumenical impact among local churches. Therefore after the closure of the Fountain Trust, there was no "umbrella" organisation gathering charismatic representatives from various

denominations and so there were not any activities nurturing the grassroots unity. Gradually this grassroots unity brought about by the charismatic renewal disappeared.

Moreover, although there was a galaxy of speakers from many denominations and countries, the subjects of these five conferences were mostly about the basic elements of the truth regarding the charismatic renewal, such as the baptism in the Spirit, healing, exorcism, gifts, community, evangelism, social concern and worship. They had not yet been concerned about how to relate the renewal to the tradition of the church. Such things as liturgy and sacrament, and a balanced christological and pneumatological view of the renewal still needed to be explored. Admittedly the Trust was conscious of the danger of triumphalism, but in the conferences it had not got into serious teaching on relating the renewal to Christian sufferings, discipleship and bearing the cross to follow Christ. Delegates would only be receiving the beginning of truth without being led into maturity and a life of devotion.

The next chapter will specifically analyse how charismatic worship created a sense of unity and why the eucharist was still an ecumenical obstacle despite the unity brought about by the charismatic renewal. Both of these will be done contextually and theologically.

CHAPTER FOUR

AN ANALYSIS OF THE GRASSROOTS UNITY AT THE FIVE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

This chapter will focus on two grassroots activities: worship and the eucharist at the five international conferences. It will contextually demonstrate how the shared experience which was derived from charisms and spontaneity brought about grassroots unity during worship. It will then theologically analyse its ecumenical implications. In the section concerning the eucharist, this chapter will also contextually discuss the associated ecumenical problem through investigating the Roman Catholic Church's dogma on the celebration of the eucharist and its challenges to the Catholic charismatics and grassroots unity. Finally, it will theologically interpret the meaning of the eucharist in the charismatic renewal.

1. A Grassroots Activity (1): Worship

1.1. Worship: Life of the Charismatic Renewal

Worship played a significant role in the charismatic renewal. Colin Buchanan maintains that worship is “the key to the Charismatic Movement” which sustained the life of the renewal.¹ I. R. Stackhouse also acknowledges the importance of worship in the renewal and states ironically, “Without worship it is hard to envisage what charismatics would have left to contribute to the wider body of Christ”.² Obviously

¹ Colin Buchanan, *Encountering Charismatic Worship*, p. 9.

² I. R. Stackhouse, “Revivalism, Faddism and the Practice of the Church: A Theological Trajectory for Charismatic Renewal in the United Kingdom” (Brunel: Unpublished Ph. D thesis of the University of

worship is not the whole of the charismatic renewal, but it is the dominant part of it. Worship is not the only reason for the rapid spread of the renewal from church to church, parish to parish, and country to country; but it is the first reason given, though other reasons follow. Charismatic renewal embraced a form of worship which played a major part in radically changing or gradually shaping the identity as “charismatic”.

1.2. Charismatic Worship: Spring of Grassroots Unity

If worship is indispensable for the charismatic renewal, then the grassroots unity which developed from it is intimately connected to that worship. There is no lack of testimony to this connection from the five international conferences. At Guildford, David du Plessis observed that this unity among delegates was found all the time at every event, from prayer meetings in the morning to the sessions in the evening.³ At Westminster 1975, as a Roman Catholic, Barbara Byrne, said that she experienced “a great joy” in worshipping with Christians from other traditions. Christopher M. Kobba from the Cameroons had a strong sense of “the spirit of love and joy” and affirmed that there was a depth of corporate worship among Protestants and Roman Catholics.⁴ Mrs. Marjorie O’Neil also experienced the corporate worship with almost two thousand Christians which brought a great joy to her.⁵ Referring to the morning Mass in which they participated at the same conference, Mr. and Mrs. James believed that God was able to transform human hearts and to unite His people through the Holy Spirit during worship.⁶ At Westminster 1977, Pamela Mellyard felt that she was being lifted up by the singing of the whole congregation in Christ and was reminded that she

Brunel, 2003), p. 35.

³ David du Plessis, “Unity Breaks down Barriers”, *Renewal*, No. 34 (September 1971), p. 4.

⁴ Fountain Trust, “What the Week Has Meant to Me”, *Westminster Splash: Fountain Trust International Conference, Westminster London, 28 July-1 August 1975* (1 August 1975), p. 2.

⁵ Fountain Trust, “What the Weeks Has Meant to Me”, p. 3.

⁶ Letter from Mr and Mrs James to Michael Harper, 1975, p. 3.

should look upon Jesus for everything at all time and in all situations.⁷ Colonel William McAllister's wife described how the sense of unity grew during the worship, which was a "challenge and blessing and [the] tremendous joy".⁸

Charismatic renewal in the 1970s gave birth to a grassroots unity because of the centrality of worship which was essential for the life of every Christian. Generally worship involved the whole Christian community, the laity as well as the clergy. But charismatic worship was distinctive because of the noticeable acts of the Holy Spirit. The word "noticeable" suggests tangibility, sensibility and visibility, and the word "acts" implies initiative. Charismatics believed that the Holy Spirit took the initiative to fill the people of God and endowed them with spiritual gifts according to His will. He brought the divine proximity to worshippers, so that they could dwell in God and explore His glory and mercy. They were therefore prompted to praise Him with words and physical movement, with rationality and affection, and with the spirit and mind (1 Cor 14:15). God generously gave these experiences to Protestants, Roman Catholics and Christians of any denomination, as long as they confessed the Lord Jesus as the Saviour. They found themselves having similar experiences in the Spirit and realised that, in fact, they were all members of the body of Christ despite doctrinal differences. The Holy Spirit took the initiative to demolish the wall which had separated His people and to bring Christians together in fellowship. Grassroots unity was therefore experienced by laity through the common experiences of the Spirit and the growing affection for one another in charismatic worship. The body of Christ was renewed not only through the new power granted from on high, but through a new love for one another which overrode the prejudices against other Christians inherited from their

⁷ Letter from Mrs. Pamela Mellyard to Tom Smail, 8 August 1977, pp. 3-4.

⁸ Letter from Mrs. Captain (Kath Holmes) to Tom Smail, 17 August 1977.

historical denominations. As a result a new Christian community was born. The five international conferences show how this grassroots unity was nurtured in charismatic worship, particularly through the use of spiritual gifts and free expression in worship. This will be analysed contextually in the following sections.

1.3. Charisms in Charismatic Worship and Grassroots Unity

Charismatics from different traditions were richly edified with charisms when they worshipped God. The worshipping community gradually became one in Christ particularly through speaking and singing in tongues, healing, prophecy and intercession.

1.3.1. Contextual Analysis

1.3.1.1. Speaking and Singing in Tongues: Sounds of Unity

In the worship of the five international conferences, speaking and singing in tongues produced a sense of unity among delegates because it brought about the vivid presence of God. There are testimonies of delegates at Guildford describing the unprecedented unity nurtured by that spiritual speech which was given to Christians of all traditions. For example, Michael Harry recorded that his wife Svetlana, whose native language was similar to Russian, heard a Spanish Catholic priest using a Slavic language to worship. By that his life was transformed and he recognised the ecumenical work of the Spirit through the renewal.⁹ Dallièrè also witnessed the unity when everyone was speaking in tongues to worship regardless of the ecclesiological backgrounds. He contrasted this glossolalic worship of one accord with the “incomprehension and confusion” and consequently division around the Tower of

⁹ Fountain Trust, “And Now—Ten People Recall What Guildford ’71 Meant to Them”, p. 33.

Babel caused by God's withdrawal of the common language. He also drew a parallel between the destruction of the Bastille prison during the French Revolution in 1789 and the fall of the wall separating Christians caused by tongues in the congregation.¹⁰

Unity was also experienced when delegates were enjoying the beauty of singing in tongues. At Guildford, Eric Sellgren was deeply moved by that magnificent moment.¹¹ Alan Shadwick depicted the moment when singing in tongues broke out in the service saying, "Soon, at a point when all the people were standing, a murmur of song began—a kinds of crooning in strange words which rose and after a few minutes gently fell away".¹² Dallière describes the dramatic scenario where delegates praised in tongues under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and were united in Christ.

I do recall that it began rather timidly, then gathered [strength] and finally swelled to become one great spiritual song uniting the whole gathering of eleven to twelve hundred people, filling the nave of the Cathedral with wave after wave of praise, generally very soft and sweet in quality and with a poignant harmony. As the song died away a deep feeling of holiness.¹³

Andrew Morton, as a representative of the BCC at Westminster 1977, sensed the "celestial beauty" of speaking and singing in tongues.¹⁴ Apart from the general evening worship, the daily Masses also brought a sense of unity through singing in tongues. As Anglicans, Mr and Mrs James had only had a few experiences of attending Masses which were conducted in Latin with incense and bells. However, the one at Guildford gave them a new experience of Catholic liturgy and a vivid sense of unity. It was led by a lady who sang modern Christian songs and hymns accompanied

¹⁰ Emile R. Dallière, *Guildford International Conference*, p. 8.

¹¹ Fountain Trust, "And Now—Ten People Recall What Guildford '71 Meant to Them", p. 33.

¹² Alan Shadwick, "Spiritual Renewal at Guildford—& Singing in Tongues", *Church Times* (23 July 1971), p. 16.

¹³ Emile Dallière, *Guildford International Conference*, pp. 6-7.

¹⁴ Andrew Morton, "Depths of Unity", *Renewal*, No. 71 (October-November 1977), p. 10.

by her guitar. But what strongly united the mixed congregation of sixty Roman Catholics and non-Catholics was the moment of singing in tongues. The couple described how it was as if people's hearts were being "lifted up to heaven in gratitude to God that at long last barriers were coming down and we were becoming free to love each other in the same Lord".¹⁵

Their testimonies show that speaking and singing in tongues brought a sense of unity because of the vivid presence of God. The charismatic working group of the Church of England claimed that tongues brought a reassurance of God's presence and "a sense of security" to His people.¹⁶ Heribert Mühlen reckons tongues to be a "physical experience" which the Classical Pentecostals have emphasised and also an "objective sign" representing the presence of the Holy Spirit.¹⁷ However, this presence of the Spirit through tongues can also be understood as both a physical and spiritual, and outer and inner experience. The Spirit fills and works inside the person and prompts the utterances through his/her physical parts. Tongues are always primarily an inner work of the Spirit and secondarily a physical divine manifestation. Paul exhorts the Colossians to worship God "with...spiritual songs, singing with thankfulness in *your hearts* to God" (Col. 3:16). He also says, "If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays" (1 Cor. 14:14). Harvey Cox not only identifies tongues as a "primal speech"¹⁸ suggesting the purpose to be that of manifesting the presence of God, but also as acting as "a language of the heart"¹⁹ by which he meant that the words come from the innermost

¹⁵ Letter from Mr and Mrs James to Michael Harper, 15 August 1971, p. 3.

¹⁶ Church of England, *The Charismatic Movement in the Church of England* (London: CIO Publishing, 1981), p. 32

¹⁷ Heribert Mühlen, "Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church: Dogmatic Aspects of Charismatic Renewal", *One in Christ*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (1976), p. 344.

¹⁸ Harvey Cox, *Fire from Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twentieth-First Century* (New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1995), pp. 81-97 (Chapter 4).

¹⁹ Harvey Cox, *Fire from Heaven*, p. 82.

realm of the person where the Spirit works. Smail also recognises the dual nature of tongues, particularly singing in tongues which involves a “renewed mind” as well as a “renewed heart”. The speech accompanied by a spiritual melody expresses not only the “superficial feelings”, but also “the deep primal emotions at the hidden center of our being in our self-offering to the living God”.²⁰ As speaking and singing in tongues manifest the holistic—physical and spiritual, outer and inner—work of the Spirit, His presence becomes so intimate, “as close as one’s own larynx and vocal chords”.²¹

This sense of the vibrant presence of God brought a new openness to others and hence developed the grassroots unity experienced during the conferences. Donald Gelpi claims that the presence of God can cultivate “charismatic openness to the Spirit”,²² and, I would suggest, in addition, an openness to people, particularly when worshippers realised that the glossolalic speech and songs are generously given by the Spirit to everybody in the congregation regardless of their traditions. The sense of togetherness and acceptance to one another derives from their shared experience of the goodness and intimate presence of God, and instantaneously, the ecclesiological differences became less important. They are bound by the Spirit of unity who endows those He loves with an angelic language which links their hearts together in the body of Christ. Both the working group of the Church of England and Harper perceive that singing in tongues is “a marvellous way of expressing unity” or “unity-in-diversity”.²³ Such unity, rooted at the grassroots level at the conferences, having the support of the

²⁰ Tom Smail, “In Spirit and in Truth: Reflections on Charismatic Worship”, in Tom Smail, Andrew Walker and Nigel Wright (eds) *The Love of Power or The Power of Love: A Careful Assessment of the Problem within the Charismatic and Word-of-Faith Movements* (Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1994), p. 96.

²¹ Harvey Cox, *Fire from Heaven*, p. 95.

²² Donald L. Gelpi, “The Theological Challenge of Charismatic Spirituality, *PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society of Pentecostal Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (Fall 1992), p. 191.

²³ Church of England, *The Charismatic Movement in the Church of England*, p. 36; Michael Harper, *These Wonderful Gifts* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1989), p. 98.

clergy, and based on the spiritual gifts of speaking and singing in tongues, was a contribution of the charismatic renewal to the ecumenical movement which was worth noticing.

1.3.1.2. Healing: Witnessing the Power of God and Human Weaknesses Together

Healing was also a charism that brought a sense of unity to the congregation at the five international conferences. Healing had always been one of the main themes of these conferences, and, therefore, the Trust invited experts who had both intellectual knowledge and the gift to lecture on the topic and to conduct a healing session within a service.²⁴ The healing ministries during the conferences brought vital deliverances for those suffering illnesses and a great sense of wonder for those who were eyewitnesses. They collectively saw the releasing power of God reaching out to His people of whatever denominations, and that led to a gradual acknowledgement of one another as members of the Body of Christ. At Guildford, delegates witnessed a girl's leg which had been shorter, growing an inch in length, and a man was able to speak after the healing of his larynx, and a woman found the arthritis which she had had for a long time had disappeared.²⁵ In one service, Harper led the congregation to pray for healing for a boy aged four years who suffered severely from leukemia.²⁶ Tom Walker who attended Nottingham 1973 witnessed several cases of healing and found people were drawn together because of this.²⁷ At Westminster 1977, the whole congregation was able to minister to one another when Sister Briege led delegates to

²⁴ They invited Cecil Cousen (Nottingham 1973), Frank MacNutt (Westminster 1975), Dr. Frank Lake (Nottingham 1973, Westminster 1975 and Westminster 1977), Sister Briege Mckenna (Westminster 1977), Jim Glennon and Dr. Ruth Fowke (Westminster 1979) to speak about or to minister healing to people.

²⁵ Margaret Granowski, "The Hope of Unity", *Monthly Newsletter of St. John's, Downshire Hill, N. W. 3, No. 246* (August-September 1971).

²⁶ Alan Shadwick, "Spiritual Renewal at Guildford", p. 16.

²⁷ Telephone Interview with Tom Walker, 21 December 2006.

the healing ministry with her “simple assurance” that “God is enough”.²⁸ Andrew Morton noticed the psychological healing in that service which touched on the long lasting wounds deep down in people’s hearts. Personal conflicts with God were revealed and dealt with. There were circumstances where tears poured out.²⁹

That healing brought a sense of growing unity among the laity during the conferences was not only because of the common experience of wonder at what God was doing, but also because of the evidence of human weaknesses and limitations. Moltmann suggests that when the glory of the resurrection and God’s sovereignty which brings “freedom of the messianic era” are magnified in worship, the pain, suffering, failure, and problems of people’s everyday lives are revealed.³⁰ As he says, “The service of worship reveals the heights of life, but also the poverty of the depths of our own lives. These dissonances are part of its harmony”.³¹ He continues, “Where the nearness of God is experienced in the Spirit, there is also awareness of life’s godlessness”.³² He sees the contrast between God’s divine power and human weaknesses during worship. Gordon Lathrop also states that worship reveals “the full truth about ourselves”, which he lists as sorrow, hunger, loneliness, sin and death, but the God of mercy can bring the opposite into our lives.³³ Both Moltmann and Lathrop see the contrast between God’s strength and human weaknesses reflected in worship; however, I would emphasise that this contrast is sharpened particularly when the gift of healing is relieving the sufferers of devastating physical or psychological problems. This is

²⁸ Simon Barrington-Ward, “Faith Active in Love?”, p. 3.

²⁹ Andrew Morton, “Depths of Unity”, p. 5.

³⁰ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit: A Contribution to Messianic Ecclesiology* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1977), p. 261.

³¹ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, p. 262.

³² Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, p. 273.

³³ Gordon Lathrop, “Knowing Something a Little: On the Role of the *Lex Orandi* in the Search for Christian Unity”, in Thomas F. Best and Dagmar Heller (eds) *So We Believe So we Pray: Towards Koinonia in Worship* (Geneva: WCC Publication, 1995), p. 44.

because healing manifests the powerlessness of human wisdom and the limitation of medicine but simultaneously it shows the power of God. In a hopeless situation, God is a source of hope to whom the distressed can turn for a significant qualitative transformation in their lives. It brings alive the meaning of God's consoling words that "my grace is sufficient for you, for power is perfected in weakness" (2 Cor. 12:9).

In a worship assembly, seeking God's healing is not only a matter of concern to those who are sick, it is a burden which is shared by the whole congregation, as was seen in Sister Briege McKenna's ministry when people showed great care in ministering to one another. Therefore, when healing is performed by God's mercy and grace, the joy and wonder are shared by the entire assembly too. As Paul says, "If one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; if one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it" (1 Cor 12:26) because "the members may have the same care for one another" (1 Cor 12:25). The sacrifice of thanksgiving to God in worship is not only presented by the healed, but in fact the whole congregation. Grassroots unity is nurtured through this process of collectively recognising human weaknesses, of having empathy for the suffering brothers and sisters, of earnestly seeking for God's mercy by acknowledging His awesome power and, finally, of offering praise and thanks together. Mühlen rightly sees that healing "is promised *to the Church as a whole*".³⁴ Amongst the congregations engaged in charismatic worship, the gift of healing not only reveals God's remedial hand on the imperfections of human bodies, but also on the flaws and wounds caused by the division in the Body of Christ.

³⁴ Heribert Mühlen, *A Charismatic Theology: Initiation in the Spirit* (London: Burns & Oates, 1978), p. 163.

1.3.1.3. Prophecy: A Collective Edification from the Same God

At the conferences, the gift of prophecy also produced unity at the grassroots level when the whole congregation was addressed by God. Richard Harbour recorded that during the services at Westminster 1975, God spoke to the congregation with tongues followed by interpretation and prophecy such as one entitled “All my cross to go deeper into your lives”.³⁵ This poetic prophecy affirms the unshakeable position of the church which is the gateway of God’s glory, regardless of the accumulation of the faults of the church, and its decline in size and spiritual strength. It was printed in an issue of *Renewal* after the conference.

You stand before great gates my children.
Do not regard how old they are,
or how overgrown.
They have been put there for you and for all my people.
They are not closed for ever, as some believe, never to be used again.
They will open to you are the slightest touch.
Your path lies up to them.
Stretch out in faith and push with the strength which comes from my right
hand.
When they open, you will see my glory.
Your path to the gates may be hard,
sharp with stones and flints;
But you will leap over it with hart’s feet.
The great gates are my church,
the entrance to my kingdom.
Do not look for any other gates than those which are before you.
You stand before my church.
Push, and you will enter in and share my glory.³⁶

Prophecy is the divine-human communication which creates and consolidates the unity of God’s people. At the worship of the five conferences, Protestants and Roman Catholics were addressed by the same God about His concern through the same Spirit.

³⁵ Richard Harbour, “Glory in Westminster”, p. 6.

³⁶ Fountain Trust, “Prophecy given at the Westminster Conference”, *Renewal*, No. 59 (October-November 1975), p. 7.

They received the same encouragement, exhortation and consolation through the divine message. Paul identifies the function of prophecy as being for edification—i.e. building up the church (1 Cor. 14:2, 4) until “we attain to the unity of the faith” (Eph 4:13). That is the mark of true prophecies.

1.3.1.4. Intercession: An Empowered Action of Love in a Koinonia

Intercession also contributed to the unity which was experienced in worship during the five international conferences. There is evidence that the intercession that went on during the conferences brought mutual love and unity to the congregation. At Guildford, Margaret Granowski testified to “a deeper signs of love” when people noticed needs of any sort and offered to pray for one another. Personal ministries, healing and help were given to those who were in need.³⁷ At Nottingham, Tom Walker witnessed that during the prayer section of worship, some people went forward to receive prayer from the clergy while others stayed in their seats and prayed for those who had gone forward. This shows the concern and love for one another that was apparent in the whole community.³⁸ At Westminster 1975, a delegate who had been bound by the power of evil, “finally left really happy” because of a talk by Bill Burnett, and also “very particularly through the loving prayerful ministry of two friends”.³⁹ For her, the intercessory ministry was clearly a touching and personal way to receive the word and work of God. This “prayerful ministry” initiated by the Spirit provided an opportunity for her and the intercessors to talk about something personal which might not have been easy to articulate in front of other people.

³⁷ Margaret Granowski, “The Hope of Unity”.

³⁸ Telephone Interview with Tom Walker (21 December 2006).

³⁹ Letter from Miss Beryl M. Parker to the Fountain Trust, 5 August 1975, pp. 1-2.

Intercession is an action of love, reaching out to those who are in need in the Body of Christ, and thus unity grows out of it at the grassroots level. Prayer is a gift from God and an authority granted by God to those who belong to Him, whether they have been baptised by the Spirit or not. It is a means for communication with the heavenly Father and a sign of a personal relationship with Him. Smail explains its meaning by saying, “The Lord makes us a gift of prayer which gives expression to the fact that we are adopted into sharing his own relationship to God, as sons and daughters to a Father”.⁴⁰ Some people are given a special gift of intercession and have a special calling to pray for something or somebody. They are sensitive to the needs of others and feel compelled by the Spirit to pray according to His guidance. It is true that not everybody has this gift, but there is no doubt that every Christian can pray for others and God will listen. This concern and affection for others is nourished particularly in charismatic worship where the Holy Spirit is believed to move among the whole assembly. Albrecht describes this as “worship as yielding a sensitivity to human need”, even towards strangers. This sensitivity is triggered by a personal encounter with God in worship and the relationship which develops from it.⁴¹ During the worship at the five international conferences, the sense of concern for one another seemed to be stronger than denominational labels, and so in the same Spirit they all prayed to the same Father with petitions for one other. Hence unity grew out of this mutual concern with love in the Spirit motivating His people to minister to one another with prayer.

⁴⁰ Tom Smail, *The Giving Gifts: The Holy Spirit in Person* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1988), p. 205.

⁴¹ Daniel E. Albrecht, *Rites in the Spirit: A Ritual Approach to Pentecostal/Charismatic Spirituality* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), p. 227.

Moreover, the congregation becomes “the house of prayer” (Lk 19:46) dwelt in by the Holy Spirit when Christians intercede for one another. Each individual is a temple for the Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19) and individuals gather together in Christ to build up His Body (1 Cor. 12:27), which is also a “holy temple in the Lord” as Yves Congar puts it.⁴² The living Spirit fills the hearts of those who pray with the love of Christ so that they can have the same love for others. With the foundation of love, the Spirit inspires those who pray with concern for the needs of others, and their intercession is honestly and earnestly presented to God. However, the Holy Spirit does not only work in this way in one person, but draws in everybody from the worshipping congregation, and thus there was the situation of people backing up with prayers those who had gone to the front at Nottingham. As Smail noted, the Holy Spirit “does not only inspire prayer in the heart: he gives a heritage of prayer and praise to the whole Christian community”.⁴³ Intercession enables another sort of experience in the Spirit for both the intercessor and the one who receives prayer. The intercessor becomes the medium of God’s love which is transferred to the person prayed for. The gratitude that bursts out inside the one who receives is not only for God, but also for the intercessor. With the inspiring love of the Holy Spirit and His gift of intercession during charismatic worship, the house of worship becomes the house of prayer inside where grassroots unity grows.

⁴² Yves M. J. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Vol. II*, p. 113.

⁴³ Tom Smail, *The Giving Gifts*, p. 212.

1.3.2. Theological Analysis

1.3.2.1. One Spirit, But Many Gifts: Unity and Diversity in the Charismatic

Context

The worship in the five international conferences reflects the grassroots unity derived from the diversity of gifts. Some of the delegates were gifted with healing, prophecy or intercession and most of them spoke or sang in tongues. There are more gifts enumerated by Paul in 1 Cor 12 and Eph 4, but he emphasises that they are all from “the one and the same Spirit” (1 Cor 12:11), and in Moltmann’s words, “the uniformity of the Spirit’s energies”.⁴⁴ He claims that for Paul, gifts suggest “the energies of the new life”⁴⁵ which comes from the Greek word, *energēmata*.⁴⁶ Thus gifts convey the divine equipment with power enabling each member of the Body to serve God, the Church and the world. This is also how Smail defines gifts,

...for the truth of the matter is that God by his Spirit wants to do things through us. That’s the definition of a charismatic gift. God, the Holy Spirit, doing something that can be seen...that I couldn’t do by myself, doing something through me, that proclaims that Jesus is risen, that’s the definition of a charismatic gift.⁴⁷

The diversity of gifts is designed for the diversity of ministry (1 Cor 12:5); the reason for giving all these gifts to different people rather than allowing them to be owned by a few individuals is to enable a collective involvement in God’s ministry, so that nobody will become proud of themselves. In most of the spheres of human society, diversity tends to easily create chaos and conflict rather than uniformity. The problems that arose in the Corinthian church were not only caused by the misuse of

⁴⁴ Jürgen Moltmann, *Experiences in Theology: Ways and Forms of Christian Theology* (London: SCM Press 2000), p. 329.

⁴⁵ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, p. 295.

⁴⁶ Yves M. J. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Vol. II*, p. 162.

⁴⁷ Tom Smail, *Doing: The Work of the Body* (London: Fountain Trust, n.d.). (Audio Tape)

one gift, but many gifts which complicated the chaotic situation. Thus unity in diversity implies the potential crisis of division in diversity at the grassroots level, but the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of harmony, peace and unity. He generously chooses to distribute a variety of gifts to different members of the church rather than a single one, according to His will “for the common good” (1 Cor 12: 7, 11). Uniformity brings monotony, dullness and allows little freedom and creativity. It is lifeless. Diversity accompanies dynamic, flexibility and multiplication of grace, and it brings life. Although Jesus Christ is the Head of the Body, He does not rule the Church as a dictator, but rather, He ascended on high to “captive the host of captives” and descended to give gifts to His people. (Eph 4: 8-9) So that in one Spirit, from an ecclesiological point of view, the church is developed through ministries with various gifts which are coordinated to serve the world and expand the Kingdom of God. From an ecumenical point of view, through a corporate ministry with a diversity of gifts in one Spirit, unity is cultivated within the Christian community at the grassroots, and it is strengthened by their common experiences in the Spirit and affection for one another. This unity in diversity is clearly shown in the worship at the five international conferences.

1.3.2.2. Charisms, the Presence of God and Grassroots Unity

The above section discusses the fact that tongues manifest the vivid presence of God. In fact, all charisms, by their nature, have this character and so bring about the fellowship at the grassroots. The essential meaning of koinonia is that God is present, as expressed in the promise of Jesus that, “for where two or three have gathered together in My name, I am there in their midst” (Matt 18:20). Koinonia is not the same as a secular social gathering, but is distinguished by being a gathering in Jesus’

name and with His own presence. Therefore, God is the reason for a koinonia. Moreover, He is also a mediator of koinonia by drawing converts to gather together in His name to worship. Although those involved are just strangers at the beginning, they are able to pray and share together because they believe in the same Lord. However, Jesus has ascended to heaven. How can we know that He is present in the fellowship? The answer is partly because Christians believe in Jesus' promise in the scripture, but also because the Lord sends His Holy Spirit among us, and visibly and tangibly manifests Himself with spiritual gifts. Paul says, "But to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good" (1 Cor 12:7). Mühlen notes that when Paul defines tongues and prophecy as signs in 1 Cor 14:22, he uses the word "semeion" meaning "a sign of presence, the appearance, the manifestation of the Spirit of Christ himself (1 Cor 12:7)".⁴⁸ He stresses that the presence of the Spirit is not only reflected in tongues and prophecy but actually in all the spiritual gifts.⁴⁹ He also notes that when healing is performed, Jesus' concern for the sick is manifested and the whole congregation experienced peace, joy, and "liberating freedom". He thus recognises that healing is not only a process of personal physical restoration, but "the expression of the social experience of God".⁵⁰

In the worship of the five international conferences, delegates testified to the presence of the Spirit through spiritual gifts. Charisms used in worship have the effect of bringing human beings close to God, and thus personal sins and collective division are clearly revealed and the desire for repentance and for unity become strong. Charisms show the love of God bringing peace and restoration, in contrast to human selfishness leading to division. In this sense, the ministry of charisms becomes a process of self-

⁴⁸ Heribert Mühlen, "Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church", p. 336.

⁴⁹ Heribert Mühlen, "Charismatic and Sacramental Understanding of the Church", p. 340.

⁵⁰ Heribert Mühlen, *A Charismatic Theology*, p. 163.

rediscovery exposing the lack of love and kindness within one's heart, and showing that it is time to seek for reconciliation with God and others. Because of that, the concept and practice of koinonia is expanded from simply being a coming together of those Christians who share the same doctrines and traditions, to a fellowship with those who have opposite theological emphases, and towards whom they would previously have had negative attitudes. The same Lord that they know about from their own traditions is present with the others and the same Spirit is working among them through His gifts. Jesus still keeps His promise of being with His own people and unity grows out of this koinonia in Jesus' name among the grassroots.

1.3.2.3. Charisms, “De-clericalisation” and Grassroots Unity

Grassroots unity is nurtured by the charismatic renewal because charisms restore the innate priesthood of lay people. Peter identifies the Christian community as “a chosen race, *a royal priesthood*, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession”. (1 Pet 2:9) Verse 5 says that they are also living stones for building up “a spiritual house for *a holy priesthood*, to offer up spiritual sacrifice acceptable to God through Jesus Christ”. In the Old Testament, priests were chosen by God to serve Him and the whole company of Israelites. Among the twelve tribes, He specially chose the Levites, as Number 3:6 says, “Bring the tribe of Levi near and set them before Aaron the priest, that they may serve him”. The Levites were responsible for the duties in the tent on behalf of the whole Israelites, holding services in the tabernacle and taking care of the furnishings of the tent for meetings. (Num 3:7-8) They were also to set up and set out the tabernacle during the exodus. (Num 1:50) Lay people would be killed if they came too close to it. (Num 1:51) Moreover, the whole tribe of Levi not only had the privilege of working for God, but they were also called the possession of God. Num

3:11 says, “I have taken the Levites from among the sons of Israel instead of every firstborn, the first issue of the womb among the sons of Israel. So the Levites shall be Mine”. And God commanded Moses by saying, “You shall take the Levites for Me” (Num 3:41). The scriptures quoted in 1 Peter imply that a person who is spiritually born again to be a Christian is like one of the descendants of Levi who was born to be priest. In other words, this is an innate priesthood. But the New Testament priests do not need to look after the tabernacle and furnishings and offer sacrifices to God by slaughtering animals. They are equipped with charisms to build up the “spiritual house”, the Body of Christ and to serve God and one another. Their sacrifices of worship are given to God “in spirit and truth” (Jn 4:24). To be God’s people is not confined to a particular race, but is available for everybody who has faith in Jesus.

However, in practice, the priesthood of every Christian has been taken over by “priests” within the ecclesiastical structure. The hierarchical structure creates two classes, that of clergy and laity. The purpose of the clergy is to ensure the functioning of the church in terms of its administration, and finance, and the numerical and spiritual growth of members. In this sense, lay people, in Congar’s term, are “clients” of the ordained.⁵¹ As far as worship is concerned, some of the lay people are “assigned” minor tasks to do such as preparing hymn books, arranging flowers and nursing children during services,⁵² but ministers are still the ones running the program. Worship becomes a “spectator sport”, as John Killinger points out.⁵³ The root of the problem still relates to the fact that the priesthood is seen as belonging solely to the ordained, while Peter’s concept of universal priesthood is nowadays not realised.

⁵¹ Yves M. J. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Vol. II*, p. 208.

⁵² Church of England, *The Charismatic Movement in the Church of England*, p. 41.

⁵³ John Killinger, *Leave It to the Spirit: Commitment and Freedom in the New Liturgy* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1971), p. 42.

The charismatic renewal restored the priesthood of laity through charisms which highlighted the significance of grassroots unity. Each member of the Body of Christ is a priest endowed with different gifts for different ministries, because “charisma are used as *ministries*”.⁵⁴ Each of them is able to contribute to the Body in the practical and spiritual realms and maintain the healthy functioning of the Body rather than it being the domain of the clergy only. Congar regards the church as being “de-clericalised” by the restoration of charisms. The Church of England also recognised the significance of “every member ministry” brought by the charismatic renewal.⁵⁵ Even the charismatic renewal itself has never been just the vision of the clergy. As Smail pointed out, “Renewal has been a matter of ordinary people”.⁵⁶ The worship in the five international conferences showed that individuals were edified by the use of speaking and singing in tongues, healing, prophecy and intercession. Their priesthood was restored when the charisms were used and unity was nurtured by ministry that came from the grassroots. This de-clericalisation within the church enables unity to be achieved by every member of the Church through their experience of the Spirit and their growing love and concern for one another. This unity based on the grassroots also characterised the ecumenical aspect of the charismatic renewal.

1.4. Spontaneity in Charismatic Worship and Grassroots Unity

1.4.1. Contextual Analysis

1.4.1.2. Free Expression to God

The second reason for the grassroots unity nurtured in worship at the five international conferences was the spontaneity that occurred. Due to their reliance on

⁵⁴ Yves M. J. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Vol. II*, p. 208.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*;

Church of England, *The Charismatic Movement in the Church of England*, p. 41.

⁵⁶ Tom Smail, *Doing: The Work of the Body*. (Audio Tape)

the Spirit in worship and the simplicity of the worship programme, delegates were able to express their worship freely with their bodies. At Guildford, the Cathedral was filled with delegates every night for worship. There was a free atmosphere where delegates could wholeheartedly express their love and devotion to God.⁵⁷ They raised their arms without hesitation to magnify the God of strength, wonder, love and mercy. In one service, Shadwick saw that the Cathedral became “a forest of arms upraised in praise and openness to the Spirit” when they sang “All hail the power of Jesus’ name”.⁵⁸ In addition, free expression in worship was also featured by the frequent use of dance. They were able to praise God with the movement of the entire body. Shadwick recorded that at one afternoon worship at Guildford, people of all age started dancing as they sang, “The Holy Ghost will set your feet a dancing”. They “were tapping feet and raising arms as if to receive something from the blue sky”.⁵⁹ The worship at Nottingham was regarded as “incredible” and “fantastic” because delegates were filled by the Holy Spirit and the “aisles were filled with dancing, hugging, singing Christians, but naturally and with no pressure, coyness or embarrassment”.⁶⁰ At Westminster 1975, Margi, one of the members of the Fisherfolk worship team, danced every morning during the conference.⁶¹ At Westminster 1977, Roger Hardcastle saw how people enjoyed dancing at the end of the service and commented that dancing was “good & helpful” for worship.⁶² Whether they were delegates or worship leaders, whether they were young or old, with the guidance of the Spirit, the stream of worship ran spontaneously from their hearts to their bodies to

⁵⁷ Michael Harper, “The Coming of Age”, *Renewal*, No. 34 (September 1971), p. 4.

⁵⁸ Alan Shadwick, “Spiritual Renewal at Guildford”, p. 16.

⁵⁹ Alan Shadwick, “Spiritual Renewal at Guildford”, p. 14.

⁶⁰ Emmanuel Sullivan, “Seeing the Whole Church Renewed”, p. 25.

⁶¹ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 6.

⁶² Letter from Roger Hardcastle to the Fountain Trust, 21 August 1977, p. 1

praise God. Their worship was full of joy and passion for God whose presence filled their hearts as well as the whole community.

1.4.1.3. Free Expression to Others

The overflowing stream of worship expressed by the body enabled people to worship with one accord and freely express their love to others of the Body of Christ. The spontaneous worship brought a new openness to people, as Dallière witnessed at Guildford “no one had to feel as a purveyor of strange or dangerous novelties”.⁶³ Margaret Granowski was amazed that at Guildford, Christians who had been segregated from one another by theological controversies for centuries could freely worship together.⁶⁴ At Westminster 1977, Andrew Morton saw that worshippers ceased to be mindful of the social conventions about demonstrative behaviours, and expressed themselves freely towards God and other people—they lifted their arms to God and used them to hug one another.⁶⁵ At Westminster 1975, Barbara Holl who regarded herself as a reserved person found her way of worship transformed and a new openness to people.⁶⁶ She had felt it more and more natural to extend her arms and open her palms to sing and pray. She was also surprised that she was leaping and jumping around St John’s Church after an afternoon worship. She reached a new level of worshipping God to which she could not have broken through by herself.⁶⁷ Moreover, she was able to open herself more to people. She held hands with other delegates and she was able to accept “a charismatic bear-hug” from a Canadian whom she described as “the enormous bearded Viking of a man”, and she felt comfortable

⁶³ Emile R. Dallière, *Guildford International Conference*, p. 5.

⁶⁴ Margaret Granowski, “The Hope of Unity”.

⁶⁵ Andrew Morton, “Depths of Unity”, p. 5.

⁶⁶ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 9.

⁶⁷ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, pp. 5-6.

with it.⁶⁸ Furthermore, she was able to seek reconciliation with others. In the middle of the final service, she approached a person and said, “Forgive me”. They kissed each other and she returned to her seat.⁶⁹ She concluded that the whole transformation was one of God’s “present-day miracles”⁷⁰ and she recognised the ecumenical character of the charismatic renewal. As she said, “What a warmth of fellowship from total strangers—who just happened to be our brothers and sisters in the Lord!”⁷¹

1.4.2. Theological Analysis

The freedom of charismatic worship restores three sorts of unity: the unity of body and soul as a human being, the unity with the triune God and the unity between members of the Body of Christ. The first two kinds of unity are the conditions for the third kind.

1.4.2.1. Unity of Oneself as a Human Being in Charismatic Worship

Free expression in charismatic worship suggests that in the Spirit a person is restored so as to be able to worship God with their whole being. Killinger criticises churches for having dichotomised body and mind. They have given a high value to mind and shown distrust of the body, even demonizing it.⁷² In conventional circles, bodies are supposed to be under strict control during worship and, therefore, dancing, lifting up arms and opening palms are forbidden. Worship has often been an activity of mind only, following a standard liturgical form which is all rationally familiar and predictable.⁷³ Killinger argues that

⁶⁸ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 9.

⁶⁹ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 10.

⁷⁰ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 6.

⁷¹ Barbara Holl, *Glory in the Church*, p. 9.

⁷² John Killinger, *Leave It to the Spirit*, p. 35.

⁷³ J. O’Neil, “Catholic Charismatic Renewal: An Investigation of the Issues” (Canterbury: Unpublished

Intellectualism simply cannot sustain the truth about God. If God cannot be felt in the body, in the entire psychosomatic unity of the person, then he cannot really be said to have an efficacious existence in the life of the person.⁷⁴

This restriction of physical expression during worship was enforced by the way churches were arranged, especially after the Reformation.⁷⁵ Long wooden pews indicated to worshippers that they were to stay where they were throughout the service. Killinger ironically describes this as “a symbol of the gaol-like imprisonment of worshippers”.⁷⁶ Pulpits or altar tend to be built far away from the congregation suggesting the supreme position of the priests within the liturgy rather than a communal worship of God.⁷⁷ The traditional arrangement in church implied a separation of both the mind and body, and also of the clergy and laity.

In contrast to the traditional style of worship, charismatic renewal is a release of physical expression which leads to a harmony of body and soul and this happened at the five international conferences. The body is released from its intellectual cage and freely expresses emotion towards God, according to the soul. Body and soul are united and worshippers can worship God with all their hearts, all their souls and all their strength. Arms are lifted up to express feelings of awe towards God; palms are opened to welcome God Himself and His works; dancing represents the beauty of God’s gentleness or the excitement of His wonder and love. With the guidance of the Spirit, soul and body are coordinated simply for the sake of praising almighty God. Christopher Cocksworth rightly notes that “there is no purely spiritual activity. Every

MA thesis of the University of Kent, 1978), p. 26.

⁷⁴ John Killinger, *Leave It to the Spirit*, p. 38.

⁷⁵ John Killinger, *Leave It to the Spirit*, p. 38;
Michael Harper, “Principles of Congregational Worship”, *One in Christ*, Vol. 13, Nos. 1-2 (1977), p. 37.

⁷⁶ John Killinger, *Leave It to the Spirit*, p. 38.

⁷⁷ J. O’Neil, “Catholic Charismatic Renewal”, p. 33.

action, emotion and affection is a complex interplay between our bodies, minds and spirits”.⁷⁸ For him, the physical expressions of worship make us both “receivers of the Spirit’s work upon us and as transmitters of the worship the Spirit inspires in us”.⁷⁹ Worship in the Spirit proves the inadequacy of the dichotomisation of body and soul because when the Spirit fills the worshippers with awe, excitement, and gratitude towards almighty God, a lip-service of thankfulness is certainly not enough. Charismatic renewal restores the holistic reality of human beings so that they can worship the almighty God with both body and soul. More importantly, this holistic approach to worship also enables worshippers to enhance their vertical communication so as to unite them with God.

1.4.2.2. Vertical Communication: Unity with God

Free expression in worship enables worshippers to be united with God because they present their true self to Him. Physical movements echoing heartfelt gratitude or excitement towards God bring worshippers to a new level of worship. They do not need to disguise their innermost strong feelings towards God by worshipping with words that are in keeping with social conventions, but can wholeheartedly express their true selves in front of God. In other words, they can completely open themselves to God. As James I. Packer comments, “At all events, charismatic worship aims above all to achieve *genuine* openness to God at the deepest level of our personal being” (italics mine).⁸⁰ Worship expressed with one’s true self opens up an intimate encounter with God so that worshippers are united with Him. The vertical communication with God is made effective as the inner works of God begin. Healing

⁷⁸ Christopher Cocksworth, *Holy, Holy, Holy: Worshipping the Trinitarian God* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd, 1997), p. 189.

⁷⁹ Christopher Cocksworth, *Holy, Holy, Holy*, p. 189.

⁸⁰ J. I. Packer, *Keep in Step with the Spirit* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1984), p. 180.

can happen outwardly on the body, and it can also take place inwardly, deep inside a broken heart. Visions are revealed. Tongues, interpretations of tongues, prophecies, words of wisdom and words of knowledge are proclaimed. Where there is a great deal of freedom in worship God is able to work as much as He wills. If the Spirit can work whatever He thinks is enhancing and edifying to the congregation when people are willing to open to Him, then certainly the healing of division in the Body of Christ can also be done, both in individuals' hearts and in the whole assembly. Hence, the unity with God brings unity with others into reality at the grassroots.

1.4.2.3. Horizontal Communication: Unity with Members of the Body of Christ

The unity of body and soul and unity with God of the individual, leads to unity with members of the Body of Christ. The supreme closeness to God brought about by the free expression in worship enables worshippers to experience the divine love of God. This love motivates them to love their neighbours freely in the Spirit. As John says, "We love, because He first loved us" (1 Jn 4:19). However, in the Spirit, sometimes words are not enough for horizontal communication among worshippers. They need to be accompanied by physical gestures such as embracing, kissing and holding hands which can be regarded as concrete signs of love. Physical expressions of love for one another can bring assurance of God's love and a strong sense of security within the Body of Christ. It is a place where support, comfort, and forgiveness in God can be found. The whole community manifests God's presence and love, for as John says, "No one has seen God at any time; if we love one another, God abides in us, and His love is perfected in us". (1 Jn 4:12) Grassroots unity is built upon the stream of love with simple bodily expressions which flows from the spontaneous worship to God in the Spirit, as the love for each other is growing.

1.4.2.4. A New Form of Liturgy

Free expression in charismatic worship creates a unity of liturgical forms for Christians from different traditions which enables the grassroots unity to grow. Gunstone claims that, “The difference between formal and spontaneous worship is not as great as we might imagine” and they even amalgamate “into a lovely unity”.⁸¹ Such liturgical unity brings about the grassroots unity between Christians of various denominations because they have found common ground in worship—following the Holy Spirit. This was obvious at the five international conferences. Although delegates were from various ecclesiological backgrounds and the Trust only adopted the Anglican liturgical form for most of the services, they could still worship the Lord with one accord because what was guiding them to worship was not the liturgical form, but the Holy Spirit. This form, which had been so heavily relied on for worship and building up Christian identity, returned back to its original purpose which was to be a form made for people and not people for the form. Worship no longer consisted merely of lip-service, but of an action involving the body and the spirit, and words and gestures. As Aidan Kavanagh states, “a liturgy exists first of all not to be read or studied but to be done”.⁸²

Moreover, when the worship is free in the Spirit, the form no longer restricts the Spirit but becomes a means for Him to work within His people. It then becomes a common liturgical form and an ecclesial property which charismatics share and utilise together. As Gunstone says,

⁸¹ John Gunstone, *Greater Things Than These: A Personal Account of the Charismatic Movement* (Leighton Buzzard: The Faith Press, 1974), p. 85; *A People for His Praise: Renewal and Congregational Life* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978), p. 93.

⁸² Aidan Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology: The Hale Memorial Lectures of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1981* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1984), p. 96.

...charismatics have very ecumenical tastes in liturgy. When they share in the worship of other denominations, they are less concerned to mark down the differences between that worship and their own; they are more appreciative of the way the Holy Spirit has led that particular tradition to respond to God's Word in its liturgy.⁸³

Therefore, grassroots unity is able to grow freely without the barriers of liturgical form in the charismatic worship. Free bodily expressions and complete surrender to the Holy Spirit respectively are the agreed instruments and attitude to the worship of holy God.

1.5. *Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi* in Charismatic Worship

Lex Orandi, lex credendi is a Latin tag, simplified from a Catholic monk, Prosper of Aquitaine (390-463)'s statement, *ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi* which means "let the law of prayer establish the law of belief".⁸⁴ This suggests that liturgy was a means of grace and a demonstration of Christian faith in front of non-Christians or heretics, particularly in the traditional Good Friday intercession.⁸⁵ Prosper's argument suggests that the function of liturgy is to bring God's redeeming grace to the lost and to proclaim Christian belief to counter Pelagians' teaching especially. Moreover, Geoffrey Wainwright claims that for Prosper, this statement does not just refer to the textual liturgy where written prayers are read out, but liturgy as "a total

⁸³ John Gunstone, *A People for His Praise*, pp. 91-92.

⁸⁴ Geoffrey Wainwright, *Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine and Life—A Systematic Theology* (London: Epworth Press, 1980), p. 224;

Kevin W. Irwin, *Context and Text: Method in Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1994), p. 3.

⁸⁵ On Good Friday, the church prayed, "Grace may be given to unbelievers; that idolaters may be freed from the errors of their impiety; that the Jews may have the veil removed from their hearts and that the light of truth may shine on them; that heretics may recover through acceptance of the catholic faith; that schismatics may receive afresh the spirit of charity; that the lapsed may be granted the remedy of penitence; and finally that the catechumens may be brought to the sacrament of regeneration and have the court of the heavenly mercy opened to them". (Geoffrey Wainwright, *Doxology*, pp. 225-226.)

ritual event”.⁸⁶ Orthodox liturgist Alexander Schmemmann also understands *lex orandi* as a liturgical event where a divine-human encounter takes place rather than being simply a liturgical order.⁸⁷ Hence, *theologia prima* (primary theology) can develop. Kavanagh defines it as the theology born from liturgy through constant adjustment during the event. He claims that there is “collision, chaos, and a certain violence” in each liturgy and participants keep adjusting it so that there will be improvement in the liturgy that follows. The adjustment is made both consciously and unconsciously and it enables liturgy to evolve and grow gradually. Theology is therefore developed through the adjustment.⁸⁸ Kevin Irwin also raises the concepts of adjustment and evolution in liturgy to refer to the fluidity of liturgy. As he says, “...liturgy is an evolving reality whose main contours have been shaped by liturgical tradition, but whose component elements have been and continue to be adapted and adjusted”.⁸⁹ The fluidity and adjustment are conditioned by the understanding of liturgy as an event rather than solely a textual practice. Because of this fluidity, first-hand experience of God in liturgy is allowed to take place and thus the theology growing out of the liturgy is primary and living, influential and transformative to life. Hence *theologia prima* can simply mean the knowledge of God acquired from the divine-human encounter in liturgy.

Liturgists such as Geoffrey Wainwright argue that Prosper’s statement in the tag form can be understood in reverse, and that it is also correct to say that the law of belief establishes the law of prayer, particularly for Protestants who tend to emphasise

⁸⁶ Geoffrey Wainwright, *Doxology*, p. 227.

⁸⁷ Simon Chan, *Liturgical Theology: The Church as Worshipping Community* (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2006), p. 49.

⁸⁸ Aidan Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, p. 74.

⁸⁹ Kevin W. Irwin, *Context and Text*, p. 32.

doctrines over liturgy and set the liturgical rules according to doctrines.⁹⁰ But Kavanagh insists on the irreversibility of the statement and he therefore rejects the tag form. Since linguistically “the law of belief” is predicated with the verb *statuat* which suggests the subordination to and consequence of “the law of prayer”, it is not logical to say that the consequence can become the source. He accepts the explanation that the law of belief can influence the law of prayer, but disagrees that the law of belief “constitutes or founds” the law of prayer; so it is only correct to interpret Prosper’s statement as the law of prayer establishing the law of belief.⁹¹

To apply Prosper’s statement to explain charismatic worship, I suggest that Kavanagh’s interpretation of the statement is more suitable. As Prosper states that liturgy as an event rather than a textual practice proclaims Christian faith to the lost in the world and therefore establishes the law of belief, the eventfulness of charismatic worship can also produce new understandings of Christian belief and *theologia prima*. Charisms such as speaking and singing in tongues, healing, prophecy, intercession, etc. that happened at the international conferences in the British charismatic renewal were actually a direct encounter with the transcendent and given by the transcendent. The free bodily expressions during worship were the result of, and response to, this divine-given encounter, where the physical expressions of praise were no longer bound by the conventional rules in liturgy. Worshippers gained a vivid primary experience of God and therefore a living theology was developed.

In addition, the international conferences demonstrate that this primary experience and theology did not only occur in a particular group of Christians at the service, but

⁹⁰ Geoffrey Wainwright, *Doxology*, pp. 218, 251.

⁹¹ Aidan Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, pp. 91-92.

among Christians from diverse traditions including Protestants and Roman Catholics, and therefore a sense of unity grew. They experienced the same *lex orandi* together in charismatic worship as they surrendered to the Spirit, following which charisms might be given and the body freed to worship. This corporately discovered *lex orandi* overrode the variations of liturgical dogmas and practices across traditions and constituted a set of common *lex credendi*. Ecclesiologically, they realised the church to be the Body of Christ constituted by members not just of their own church, but of many other churches. The church could not function properly and effectively just by the ministerial office, but required also the charisms granted by the Holy Spirit. The vivid presence of Christ reminded the worshippers that He was the head of the church, not the bishop or Pope. Pneumatologically, they also discovered that the Spirit worked according to His will and distributed charisms to every one in the church so that they could serve God and one another. He also filled the lives of individuals for ministering renewal and deliverance. He interceded for each one “with groanings too deep for words” (Rom. 8:26) and helped them to understand more about the triune God. Ecumenically, they realised that the Holy Spirit was capable of removing prejudices and hatred and endowing fraternal love. They discovered that denominational labels representing their identities no longer disguised their intrinsic common identity as the children of God. These three aspects of knowledge were acquired through their experiences in worship. Undoubtedly adjustment took place among those worshippers from various traditions as they consciously or unconsciously laid down certain denominational norms and practices so that they could worship with one accord and gain a new understanding of those things.

Moreover, charismatic worship demonstrates what Kavanagh argues which is that the law of belief can only influence the law of prayer but not constitute or found it. This is simply because there was not an established charismatic theology to give birth to charismatic worship, but rather vice versa. The grassroots unity that was nurtured from the worship was not a result of charismatic theology. The unprecedented experiences in the Spirit during charismatic worship were the source of a new understanding of God and the body of Christ and subsequently of new interpretations of scriptures and new language to explain the phenomena, such as “filled by the Spirit”, “touched by the Spirit” and “resting in the Spirit”. These new linguistic expressions were used by charismatics for communication and they indirectly consolidated the unity that was already built up. This echoes John H. Leith’s emphasis on *lex orandi* that

It comprises essential data for theological reflection; that it provides (together with Scripture) the language and idioms for theological articulation; and that the community of prayer, defined as “worshipping” and “believing,” is a source, principle context, and primary audience for Christian theology.⁹²

The new knowledge of God articulated in the new language derived from charismatic worship has gradually conventionalised and become the law of belief. That *influences* the way worship to continue and then adjustment may take place so that the *theologia prima* may be further developed. Worshipers’ knowledge of God and experience keeps being renewed by the Spirit and by the unity that is growing at the grassroots. Liturgy in charismatic renewal becomes “the work of the people”, in Kenneth W.

⁹² James F. Kay, “The *Lex orandi* in Recent Protestant Theology” in David S. Cunningham, Ralph Del Colle and Lucas Lamadrid (eds) *Ecumenical Theology in Worship, Doctrine, and Life: Essays Presented to Geoffrey Wainwright on His Sixtieth Birthday* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 15.

Stevenson's phrase,⁹³ in that they experience God, articulate the experience with new languages and increasingly become one in Christ through the common experience and language in worship.

1.6. Conclusion

The five international conferences show that the grassroots unity was nurtured in charismatic worship enhanced by the functioning of charisms and by free expression to God and others. Charismatic worship marked by spontaneity and vivid manifestations of charisms enriches the meaning of *lex orandi, lex credendi*. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, Christians from various traditions were able to worship with one accord because of the shared experience and mutual edification of charisms. These commonalities brought about a new understanding of God, the church and unity.

2. A Grassroots Activity (2): The Eucharist

Although worship at the international conferences created both a sense and a reality of Christian unity, paradoxically, they also revealed a painful fact that this unity was not perfect and division still existed around the Lord's Table. As was described in chapter three, the division brought a tremendous sadness to delegates, especially at Westminster 1975. Roman Catholic Church speakers such as Francis McNutt were not concelebrating the eucharist with those of other denominations on the stage. Roman Catholic delegates wept at not being able to share the communion with their Protestant brethren and sisters. The following section will draw out the meaning

⁹³ Kenneth W. Stevenson, "Lex Orandi and Lex Credendi—Strange Bed-Fellows?: Some Reflections on Worship and Doctrine", *Scottish Journal of Theology*, No. 2(1986), p. 241.

behind the failure of sharing the final communion at the international conferences. The analysis will be twofold: (1) the contextual analysis, focusing on the unfulfilled sacramental expression of unity at the international conferences and, (2) a theological analysis, discussing the ecumenical implications that the charismatic renewal and the eucharist both share.

2.1 Contextual Analysis

2.1.1 An Exposure of an Incomplete Unity

The final communion services at the international conferences exposed an incompleteness of the unity that had emerged in the charismatic renewal. It is undeniable that delegates of the international conference experienced a tremendous sense of unity which the mainstream ecumenists had never imagined to be possible. However, under the critical test of the final communion, the unity was proved to be incomplete; it was *per se* emotional and experiential, and it was not the whole answer to the deep-rooted divisions derived from doctrinal disagreements throughout centuries. The unity shown in the charismatic renewal was a temporary event, and not yet a permanent reality. It has not closed the chapter of Christian division in history. Cardinal Suenens saw how the doctrinal problems had been disguised by the sense of unity in the charismatic renewal and warned that, “We must not give way to an euphoric ecumenism which, in the joy of rediscovering Christian brotherhood, would overlook the doctrinal difficulties yet to be resolved”.⁹⁴ The eucharist is one of the toughest ecumenical issues, since denominations insist on their own theological, liturgical and ecclesiastical “truths” about the sacrament. To achieve full communion

⁹⁴ Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens, *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal: Theological and Pastoral Orientations* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1978), p. 45.

came to be far more difficult than charismatics ever imagined, as Smail declared at a conference of the Fountain Trust,

What we thought would be easy has proved to be difficult. What we thought would be fast has turned out to be far more slow. What we thought would happen at the way of some kind of charismatic...that is going to change the whole situation overnight, we've seen to be required much more prayer, much more sacrifice, much more sensitivity, much more patience, much more hard work than we imagined or perhaps even that we've been prepared to give.⁹⁵

Apart from the actual difficulty of achieving unity that the final communion reveals, it also shows that in ecumenism, experience and doctrine, and grassroots level and the official level, are always in confrontation. No matter how real the unity has been that was nurtured by experience at the grassroots level, people at the official level still struggle to achieve doctrinal consensus and believe that it is the gateway to ultimate unity. The authorities of some churches still insist on the truth of certain doctrines and on the importance of others, agreeing with that truthfulness before unity can be achieved. Hence, the unity manifested in the charismatic renewal which was based on experience of the Holy Spirit at the grassroots level is noteworthy, but is not regarded as a basis for ecumenical dialogue. Unity will remain incomplete if the confrontation between experience and doctrine, and between the grassroots and the official level in the ecumenical movement still exists, and if ecumenists find that they cannot deal with the indispensability of both.

2.1.2. The Roman Catholic Dogma

The Roman Catholic Church's persistent refusal to revise the eucharistic doctrine over centuries eventually created the difficulty of achieving any kind of sacramental unity

⁹⁵ Tom Smail, *Humanity: The Stuff of the Body* (London: Fountain Trust). (Audio Tape)

at the international conferences. At the Faith and Order conference in Lund (1952), the Roman Catholic Church rejected the Protestants' proposal of intercommunion as "the medicine of our division" and a stepping stone to full communion.⁹⁶ They insisted that the eucharist could only be celebrated together when unity was achieved. As a Roman Catholic representative of the conference, Yves Congar, clearly affirmed, "There cannot properly be 'inter-communion'. There is or there is not Communion".⁹⁷ He based his statement on the ecclesiastical idea of the Church as both an institution and a communion. As an institution, the Church is established by three elements: faith, sacraments and "apostolic powers instituting a ministry of teaching, worship and government of communities". Hence, the eucharist has its place in the very constitution of the Church as an institution. As a communion, the Church is perceived as a single body composed of members who share the same faith, practice the same sacraments and accept the apostolic authority of ordained priests to minister to the congregation. Therefore, dividing that one body means destroying the church as a communion with the result that there is no point in celebrating the eucharist together.⁹⁸ Since the idea of intercommunion compromises the eucharistic principle of acknowledging the Church as an institution and a communion, the Roman Catholic authority prohibits its members from taking part in any form of communion with their "separated brethren" until the day of perfect unity comes and there will be full communion.

⁹⁶ T. F. Torrance, "Eschatology and the Eucharist", in Donald Baillie and John Marsh (eds) *Intercommunion: The Report of the Theological Commission Appointed by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order Together with a Selection from the Material Presented to the Commission* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1952), p. 304

⁹⁷ Yves M. J. Congar, "Amica Contestatio", in Donald Baillie and John Marsh (eds) *Intercommunion: The Report of the Theological Commission Appointed by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order Together with a Selection from the Material Presented to the Commission* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1952), p. 144.

⁹⁸ Yves M. J. Congar, "Amica Contestatio", pp. 142-144.

In addition, Vatican II officially expressed its rejection of sharing any liturgical ritual with the “separated brethren” for the sake of unity. The Council allows and encourages Roman Catholics to participate in ecumenical gatherings and prayer meetings for unity with non-Catholics as “they are a genuine expression of the ties which still bind Catholics to their separated brethren”.⁹⁹ However, the ties are not allowed to reach as far as the realm of the eucharist to express the sense of unity. The statement says, “Yet worship in common (*communication in sacris*) is not to be considered as a means to be used indiscriminately for the restoration of unity among Christians” but “it should signify the unity of the Church; it should provide a sharing in the means of grace”.¹⁰⁰ Therefore, Christians should wait until the time when “little by little, as the obstacles to perfect ecclesiastical communion are over,” they can celebrate the eucharist together as a sign of the perfect communion.¹⁰¹

Cardinal Suenens, although acknowledging the remarkable ecumenical impact of the renewal which he elaborated in the two Malines documents, publicly affirmed the position of his church regarding communion in one of the seminars at Westminster 1977. His reason for objecting to the intercommunion was in line with Congar who also insisted on the intimate connection of the church and the eucharist, as he explained:

Because eucharist is the reality of the body of Christ and the church is also the body of Christ. It’s one and the same reality in this sense that it is the church making eucharist and it is eucharist making the church. So you cannot divorce because of the depth of the mystery. It’s one and the same mystery in two

⁹⁹ The Vatican Council II, “*Unitatis Redintegratio*”, Walter A. Abbott (ed) *The Documents of Vatican II: With Notes and Comments by Catholics, Protestant, and Orthodox Authorities* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966), 8, p. 352.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ The Vatican Council II, “*Unitatis Redintegratio*”, 4, p. 384.

different aspects. I cannot say take the eucharist and refuse your church because they are one.¹⁰²

In another seminar about ecumenical issues at the same conference, Roman Catholic Bishop Langton Fox also took the same position as Cardinal Suenens, as he asserted, “To receive the communion together is for us the expression of communion fully achieved”. He advised conference delegates to be patient: “We should wait until we have this communion together in faith before we should receive the holy communion together”.¹⁰³ Although the Cardinal and the Bishop were supportive of the charismatic renewal,¹⁰⁴ as leaders of the Church, they had to stand firm on their Church’s position and remind the Catholic charismatics of the doctrines, despite the developed sense of unity and the possible grief at their sacramental withdrawal. The sense of unity that flourished at the grassroots level in the charismatic renewal was found unfulfilled in the sacrament of the eucharist and this demonstrated the sharp discrepancy between the grassroots and official level of ecumenical progress. The unity achieved at the grassroots was still bound by the disunity of the official level. Canon laws still had to be followed, and Protestants and Roman Catholics still had to celebrate the sacrament separately regardless of their desire for a common celebration. The Catholic Truth Society of London understandingly describes the reality that “to abstain from Communion at their Eucharist may be painful, but the pain is part of the tragedy of our divisions”.¹⁰⁵ In the 1980s, the Roman Catholic authority still held the same

¹⁰² Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues II*, Westminster 1977. (London: Fountain Trust, 1977). (Audio Tape)

¹⁰³ Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues I*, Westminster 1977 (London: Fountain Trust, 1977). (Audio Tape)

¹⁰⁴ Langton Fox was named by the bishops at the first Newman Conference as the “Ecclesiastical Assistant to Catholic Charismatic Renewal”. Cardinal Hume affirmed his position by saying, “We Don’t name Ecclesiastical Assistants to anything we don’t approve of.” Fox was active in the RCNSC and frequently attended meetings. The Committee gained a lot of assurance of its work by Fox’s sharing, discussion and prayer. (Email from Bob Balkam, 16 November 2005; Email from Bob Balkam, 18 November 2005.)

¹⁰⁵ *Intercommunion: The Position of the Roman Catholic Church—Statement of the Ecumenical*

position regarding intercommunion. John Paul II stated that it could “send conflicting signals or to mislead people...It would not mitigate the pain of separation if we avoided the cause of this pain, which is the separation itself”. For him, it would be more appropriate for the church to seek for a common faith first and therefore “common celebration” through dialogue.¹⁰⁶

2.1.3. The Identity Crisis of Roman Catholic Charismatics

The final communion services at the international conferences created an identity crisis for Catholic charismatics. The noun “Catholic charismatic” is compounded of two words which convey contradictory ecumenical implications. The adjective “Catholic” represents a church which regards itself as the only true church in the world having inherited the apostolic faith. For this church, unity occurs only when other non-Catholic churches return to it and acknowledge its ecclesiastical, liturgical and sacramental doctrines and its theology. The ecumenical responsibility is laid on the non-Catholic churches to be the ones to approach the Catholic Church for the sake of unity. In other words, this is a one-dimensional approach for unity. The second component of the noun “charismatic” suggests that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is not merely given to “the only true church”, but also to all churches confessing Jesus Christ. Christians mutually recognised one another as members of the Body of Christ because of the common experience in the Spirit and so the approach of unity becomes multiple-dimensional.

Surprisingly these two contradictory elements were brought together in the charismatic renewal and they existed simultaneously in the same person. Roman

Commission for England and Wales (London: Catholic Truth Society, February 1969), p. 15.
¹⁰⁶ Quoted in Philippe Larere, *The Lord's Supper: Toward an Ecumenical Understanding of the Eucharist* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1993), p. 77.

Catholics became charismatic through the experience in the Spirit and obtained a new identity. However this also began a conflict within them because they were presented with a choice between loyalty to the Roman Catholic Church and the realisation of unity for which they longed. As Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen accurately notes, “The Catholic Charismatic Movement is shaped as much (or more) by its commitment to the Catholic Church as it is by its commitment to a type of spiritual experience”.¹⁰⁷ The sadness that arose at the final communion services at the international conferences was one of the results of this double commitment. Catholic charismatics had to choose between breaching the rule of their church which might well create a sense of guilt, and refusing to take the bread and wine with non-Catholics which gave great pain. Although this identity crisis was initially personal to the Roman Catholics, it produced a negative effect on others as the non-Catholic charismatics were frustrated by the dilemma facing the Catholic charismatics. Consequently the grassroots unity which had developed from the common experience and the mutual edification of charism was disrupted by this identity crisis of the Catholic charismatics.

2.1.4. A Challenge to Grassroots Unity

The challenge to the Catholic charismatics in the final communion was also a challenge to their fellow Protestants who had been sharing in the grassroots unity during the international conferences. Some of them felt uncomfortable with the Catholics abstaining from the eucharist in order to be loyal to their church rather than being obedient to Jesus’ command. For example, Miss Susan Pernet, a delegate at Westminster 1975, questioned,

¹⁰⁷ Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2002), p. 94.

Where is the born-again Catholic who will take heed of his Lord's command and receive the elements in company with other members of the body of Christ, and who will obey God rather than the rules of his church?

Is the Catholic still looking at his church's teaching on the Lord's Supper rather than the teaching of Scripture? Dear Catholic brethren, we are burdened by the shackles you bear and long to see you take your stand for Jesus in the light of his word. The blessings will surely follow.¹⁰⁸

Another delegate at the same conference, Miss R. A. Pyle, wrote to Harper to express her "shock" at still being labelled as "separated brethren" who were supposed to return to the Roman Catholic Church despite the "rich time of fellowship". Like Miss Pernet, she believed that the eucharistic teachings in the New Testament should be the only foundation for the sacrament rather than complicating it by adding denominational and historic doctrines and regulations.¹⁰⁹

Not only Protestant lay people believed that the celebration of the eucharist should be based on "the simplest reason" of being united in Christ, but ministers did as well. In the seminar when Cardinal Suenens explained the eucharistic position of his church, Bishop Richard Hare condemned this saying that it was "a lack of faith" not to share communion together at the eucharist until official consent had been given. He said that as long as there is "sufficient unity in faith and to express that unity in the Spirit which has already given" Christians of different traditions should celebrate the eucharist together. He urged for a cessation of all the "divisions in the name of Christ" which led further on to a divided world.¹¹⁰ Douglas McBain, as a Baptist minister, also expressed a similar view, saying that because the Lord's Supper belonged to the

¹⁰⁸ Susan Pernet, "Catholics and Communion", *Renewal*, No. 61 (February-March 1976), p. 9.

¹⁰⁹ Letter from Miss R. A. Pyle to Michael Harper, 5 August 1975, pp. 1-2.

¹¹⁰ Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues II*, Westminster 1977.

Lord, it should be open for all Christians to participate in and to have fellowship with Him.¹¹¹

The grassroots unity which was nurtured mainly by positive emotions of love and mutual acceptance was challenged by the negative emotions of scepticism and judgments based on people's own understandings of the eucharist. This shows that the nature of this grassroots unity was fragile, and that it was easily challenged not only by the doctrines from the official circles outside the conferences, but also from the inner disharmony within the congregation. Nevertheless, it does not mean that the grassroots unity was in vain because it developed a mutual acceptance which is still the basis for dialogue and for further understanding of each other. This kind of fellowship will be prolonged and become mature if churches can deal with controversial and divisive issues with perseverance and patience.

2.1.5 A Neglect of the Eucharist

The five international conferences had an overemphasis on charisms and at the same time neglected the significance of the eucharist. That led to an incomplete understanding of unity in two ways. First, pneumatologically, charisms were seen to be the signs of the presence of the Holy Spirit while sacraments were frequently not perceived to have this significance. However, if the Holy Spirit is the energy of the charismatic renewal of the church, then the eucharist should have been recognised as part of His renewal agenda. That it was not seen to be so could be due to the fact that the charismatic renewal took place mainly in Protestant churches which do not put the same value on the sacramental role of the Holy Spirit, as Lukas Vischer observes to

¹¹¹ Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues I*, Westminster 1977.

be the case during the Reformation, “The doctrine of the Holy Spirit was treated in a new but not more comprehensive way”.¹¹² Owing to the partial perception of the presence of the Spirit in the charismatic renewal, the way to understand the ecumenical work of the Holy Spirit is limited in the experiential spectrum while the sacramental realm remained underdeveloped.

Second, ecclesologically, the focus on charisms also caused a loss of a holistic view of the church. The renewal seemed to create a picture of the church built on “first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, administrations and various kinds of tongues” (1 Cor 12:28) with the power of the Holy Spirit, but it forgot the eucharistic foundation which the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Church have emphasised. One Russian Orthodox priest asserts, “The Church exists in and for the Eucharist”.¹¹³ Du Plessis showed how the Pentecostal and charismatic movement had transformed the church in a miraculous way, but he wondered why these two movements had not “demonstrated a rich and full manifestation of chapters 12, 13 and 14 of the first Epistle to the Corinthians”. He eventually found the reason to be the unsolved problem of the eucharist mentioned in Chapter 11.¹¹⁴ The Lord’s Table is still divided; that means the church, the Body of Christ is still divided and that is the problem that prevents the gifts from functioning to their fullness (chapter 12 and 14), the love coming to perfection (chapter 13) and the renewal to reaching its completeness. C. P. M. Jones also raises a similar point about the interrelatedness of chapters 11 to 14. Paul’s teaching on order in chapter 14 for the exercises of charisms is similar to his instructions for conducting the eucharist

¹¹² Lukas Vischer, “The Epiiclesis: Sign of Unity and Renewal”, *Studia Liturgica*, Vol. 6 (1969), p. 33.

¹¹³ Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia, “Communion and Intercommunion”, in Thomas J. Fisch (ed) *Primary Readings on the Eucharist* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2004), p. 188.

¹¹⁴ David du Plessis, *The Renewal of Christianity Must Be Both Charismatic and Ecumenical* (California: David du Plessis, n. d.), p. 5.

in chapter 11. His preference for prophecy over tongues so that the congregation can say Amen with gratitude to the grace of God (1 Cor 14:16) can also be applied to the eucharist which is *per se* a shared act of thanksgiving. He therefore believes that the eucharist and the charismatic congregation were not separated in the early church.¹¹⁵ Congar acknowledges that the renewal created a “reintegration in unity”, but notices that it could not tackle some ecumenical problems such as the eucharist. He warns that without considering the sacramental, christological and visible elements but only the pneumatological ones, we will only pursue unity under the principle of “immediacy”, and aim to “achieve unity in grace” without “the instituted means of grace”.¹¹⁶ It is undeniable that the charismatic renewal has ecumenical potential which is based on the grassroots experience, but to enable this potential to be used to its fullness, a holistic ecclesiological and ecumenical view is necessary. And that means both pneumatological and christological, spiritual and visible, and charismatic and institutional of the church and church unity should be considered. This point will be fully discussed in chapter five.

2.1.6. The Eucharistic Impossibility Became a Possibility

Although the grassroots unity in the charismatic renewal was found to be incomplete and vulnerable when it came to the challenge of the final communion, and charismatics did not pay much attention to the intimate relation between the eucharist and unity, there is still significance for ecumenism. In practice, intercommunion did happen, although on a small scale, during the international conferences. At Guildford and Westminster 1975, there were occasions where Roman Catholic priests secretly invited Protestants to join the eucharist. Mr. and Mrs. James recorded that in the first

¹¹⁵ C. P. M. Jones, “The Eucharist: The New Testament”, in Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold and Paul Bradshaw (eds) *The Study of Liturgy* (London: SPCK, 1992), p. 193.

¹¹⁶ Yves M. J. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Vol. II*, p. 206.

Mass at Guildford, only Roman Catholics were given the bread and wine, but that was changed in other Masses. They said that,

At the second, the officiating priest was broken down himself to such an extent that he said he could not refrain from offering all his brothers and sisters the Body & Blood of Christ, and on this 3rd day they were freely given & all shared together by receiving.¹¹⁷

A similar incident was repeated at Westminster 1975 when Protestants were warmly invited by the Roman Catholics to join their Mass every morning and to celebrate the eucharist which was consecrated by a Roman Catholic priest. Unfortunately this secretive practice was discovered and the authority forbade the joint celebration with Protestants in the Mass at Westminster 1977. The Catholic charismatics apologised deeply for the prohibition. Nevertheless, the charismatic renewal did create a bonding between Roman Catholics and Protestants which sprang out of affection for one another, which made them want to seize every opportunity to celebrate the eucharist together as a sign of unity, even at the expense of violating the canon law. Although intercommunion is almost an impossibility because the Roman Catholic authorities refuse to allow it, ironically it was the Catholic priests who broke the rules so that it could happen in the charismatic renewal.

To conclude, the final communion in the international conferences revealed a discrepancy in the ecumenical progress between the grassroots level and the official level. It was an incomplete unity because the prohibitions of the Roman Catholic authorities and the identity crisis of the Catholic charismatics challenged the grassroots unity that was developing and the contribution of the charismatic renewal

¹¹⁷ Letter from Mr and Mrs James to Michael Harper, 15 August 1971, p. 3.

towards intercommunion. As has been pointed out, the theological meaning of the eucharist in the charismatic renewal has been neglected, and so the next theological section is an attempt to deal with the relationship between charisms and the eucharist with their ecumenical implications.

2.2 Theological Analysis

The eucharist is a sacrament and a means of grace which is instituted by Christ, so that the church remembers Him; charisms are gracious gifts which are granted by the Holy Spirit to build up the church. From an ecumenical point of view, they are both means and symbol of unity, and particularly in the charismatic renewal where grassroots unity was brought about by the manifestation of charisms. This section is to discuss four characters shared by the eucharist and charisms. They are both anamnestic, epicletic, eschatological and ecumenical.

2.2.1. The Anamnestic Character

Although anamnesis is the purpose of the eucharistic celebration, the manifestation of charisms also carries the same meaning. Anamnesis means remembrance and this is the word Jesus used when he says, “Do this in remembrance of me” (Lk 22:19).¹¹⁸ He asks the believers to remember his sacrifice for humankind through breaking the same bread and drinking the same cup. The request for remembrance of God’s salvation in the eucharist is parallel to the purpose of celebrating the Passover for remembering God’s deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt. The salvific acts in the Old and New Testament are intrinsically a covenant that God has made with mankind and He will never alter or withdraw it. Thus, through anamnesis, the redeemed are once again

¹¹⁸ R. T. Beckwith, “The Jewish Background to Christian Worship”, in Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold and Paul Bradshaw (eds) *The Study of Liturgy* (London: SPCK, 1992), p. 77.

reminded of this covenant and their faith in God is reaffirmed. Particularly in the eucharist, taking the bread and drinking the wine, according to John, represent a relationship with “the Son of Man” who is the bread from heaven given to humankind (Jn 6:27, 53) who abide in Christ and Christ abides in them and they are promised eternal life (Jn 6:54, 56). Hence, the anamnestic purpose of the eucharist is to reaffirm the divine relationship with the Saviour and to reassure Christians about the promise that He has made.

Anamnesis aims at bringing the past events into the present, but it is not nostalgic. Nostalgia drives people to remember the past selectively, particularly the pleasant and enjoyable episodes of the whole incident, and that blinds them from seeing the complete and authentic picture, and prevents them from making fair and balanced evaluations. However, the Holy Spirit, who is the Paraclete and is named as “the remembrance”,¹¹⁹ does not recall our memory of the past according to our own interest, but to His own will in order to build us up. Therefore with the work of the Holy Spirit, the anamnestic function of the eucharist does not only draw the participants back to the dreadful suffering that Jesus bore, but also to the glory of the resurrection that followed, and the joy of thousands of souls being redeemed through this once and for all sacrifice for human kind. Through this holistic remembrance of the past and symbolic act of taking the bread and drinking the wine, participants once again confirm their faith in the Saviour, remain in hope of eternal life, and offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving to God.

¹¹⁹ Laurence H. Stookey, *Eucharist: Christ's Feast with the Church* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993), p. 100.

Charisms which are endowed by the Holy Spirit also contain the anamnestic purpose of the eucharist focusing on Jesus' redemption. Tongues are spiritual utterances praising the works of God and the interpretation of tongues helps to make sense of the praise for human understanding; while healing is believed to be the physical aspect of salvation; and exorcism manifests the authority of Jesus. These gifts of the Holy Spirit represent Jesus' triumph over the evil through the power of the cross and through the resurrection. When "He ascended on high, He led captive a host of captives, and he gave gifts to men...for equipping of the saints for the work of service, to the building up of the body of Christ" (Eph 4:8, 11). Each charism has its own function of edifying individuals as well as the church, but, meanwhile, each of them reminds both the performers and receivers of the gifts of Jesus' salvation. Scott McCormick suggests that anamnesis does not only direct Christians to view salvation as a past event, but as an ongoing process happening in the present, when he speaks of "his re-creating, life-giving gift being repeatedly offered and repeatedly received".¹²⁰ His understanding of the anamnesis of the eucharist rightly fits the intrinsic meaning of charisms which are continuously performed and continuously received to manifest the glory of the salvation.

The collective anamnesis of Jesus through charisms and the eucharist is a collective experience which triggers a collective memory of and affection for the crucified Lord. The charisms and eucharist also confirm the collective identity as Christians and their shared faith. They remind Christians that all the wonderful manifestations of charisms would not have happened if the salvation had not been accomplished by Jesus Christ. The celebration of the eucharist is instituted by Christ for all the redeemed, and

¹²⁰ Quoted in Wesley Scott Bidy, "Re-envisioning the Pentecostal Understanding of the Eucharist: An Ecumenical Proposal", *PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (Fall 2006), p. 235.

charisms is bestowed by the Spirit to all of them. The eucharist symbolises unity with all Christians breaking the same bread and drinking the same wine, while charisms create unity when they are used for building up the body. Hence, the unity growing out of these two activities is the fruit shared by people, and by their very nature both activities are essential to grassroots unity.

2.2.2. The Epicletic Character

The eucharist and charisms share an epicletic character which unites Christians at the grassroots level. Epiclesis is a prayer of invocation to the Holy Spirit to descend upon and to be present in the bread and wine during the eucharist, as well as uniting the communicants.¹²¹ This prayer in the eucharist has been particularly important in eastern liturgy. As Vischer notes, it is “the climax of the whole liturgical action”.¹²² For example, St. John Chrysostom’s prayer reads, “Send down thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon the gifts placed before thee.”¹²³ St Basil’s prayer invokes not just the presence of the Holy Spirit, but also unity, as it has the words, “And to unite us all as many as are partakers in the one bread and cup, one with another, in the communion of the one Holy Spirit.”¹²⁴ Similarly, in Roman Catholic liturgy, the Holy Spirit is first invoked for the transformation of the bread and wine into Jesus’ presence before the consecration. Then afterwards the communicants invoke the “unity in depth”

¹²¹ J. G. Davies, *The Spirit, the Church and the Sacrament* (London: The Faith Press Ltd, 1954), p. 137; Tom Smail, *The Giving Gift*, p. 194; Jennifer Henderson & Anne Primavesi, “The Witness of the Holy Spirit”, *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. 41, No. 3 (1989), p. 430; World Council of Churches Faith and Order, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry: Faith and Order Paper No. 111*, <http://wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/faith/bem3.html>, Commentary E14 (accessed on 27 February 2005).

¹²² Lukas Vischer, “The Epiclesis: Sign of Unity and Renewal”, p. 30.

¹²³ John Zizioulas, “Eucharist and Catholicity”, in Thomas J. Fisch (ed) *Primary Readings on the Eucharist* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2004), p. 224.

¹²⁴ John Zizioulas, “Eucharist and Catholicity”, p. 224, note 70.

which can only be given by the Holy Spirit. And this unity referred to is the visible unity.¹²⁵

The Holy Spirit is believed to be the one who enables the eucharist to be effective¹²⁶ and epiclesis is the means to achieve this purpose. This is because the Holy Spirit links the past with the present, and makes real the Jesus who was crucified and now is alive. He is “the One who makes the historical words of Jesus present and alive”.¹²⁷ Moltmann comments that the eucharist is “the mark of the history of the Spirit”.¹²⁸ The Holy Spirit also enables us to understand the eschatological implication of the eucharist which is that the living Jesus will come back to this world and believers will share the banquet with Him. The epiclesis connects us with Jesus through reminding us of the past, celebrating the eucharist in the present and foreseeing the parousia. It creates a koinonia between each communicant and Christ in the eucharist. As Albert C. Outler claims, “It has been the epikletic action of the Holy Spirit that made of each such occasion a true sign of our koinonia in Christ”.¹²⁹

Moltmann’s eucharistic concept of the Trinity is coherent to the meaning of epiclesis, which suggests that the Holy Spirit is doing ground work among human beings in order to create an upward connection with the Father. His concept of the Trinity

¹²⁵ Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues II*, Westminster 1977. This idea of the epiclesis was explained by Cardinal Suenens during the seminar. However, according to Yves Congar, traditionally, epiclesis was not part of the Roman Catholic liturgy since Gregory the Great. It was added into the eucharistic liturgy with the consent of the bishops during the Vatican II. (Yves M. J. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Volume III: The River of the Water of Life (Rev 22:1) Flows in the East and in the West* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983), pp. 251, 256.)

¹²⁶ Yves M. J. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Vol. III*, p. 250;
Clark H. Pinnock, *Flame of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1996), p. 123.

¹²⁷ World Council of Churches Faith and Order, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E14.

¹²⁸ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, p. 257.

¹²⁹ Albert C. Outler, “Pneumatology as an Ecumenical Frontier”, *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. 41, No. 3 (1989), p. 372.

contrasts the monarchial one which focuses on the descent of love, and the good attributes of the Father that come to human beings through the Son and the Holy Spirit (Father→Son→Holy Spirit). He proposes an ascent of our response to the works and love of God which is inspired by the Holy Spirit. He stirs up human hearts to give thanks, praise and adoration to the Son and the Father (Holy Spirit→Son→Father),¹³⁰ and particularly in the eucharist, through the anamnesis of Christ's sacrifice. This upward connection initiated by the Holy Spirit and expressed in the epiclesis indirectly opens up an ecumenical possibility at the grassroots level.

The request for the presence of the Holy Spirit in the eucharist requires the self-surrender of human beings, which is the beginning of unity. Epiclesis represents an attitude of a complete surrender of self-will without any attempt of manipulating the Lord. It reminds the church that Christ still is and should be the head of the body, and here in His Supper, He is the host. If epiclesis is truly an honest and earnest prayer of the communicants and celebrants of the eucharist, the Spirit of unity will be able to mend the broken Table by open communion for every member of the Body of Christ and gradually unity will come. Wainwright foresees that "common participation in the one eucharist will allow the Lord creatively to bring us closer to the perfect peace and unity that will mark the final kingdom".¹³¹ Vischer suggests that the epiclesis should be used in every church's eucharist because it is a seeking for the Holy Spirit. He believes "that everything which can be said about the work of the Spirit in the church also applies to the union of the separated churches".¹³² It can be "a sign of the

¹³⁰ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation* (London: SCM Press, 1992), pp. 298-300.

¹³¹ Geoffrey Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology* (London: Epworth Press, 1971), p. 143.

¹³² Lukas Vischer, "The Epiclesis: Sign of Unity and Renewal", p. 37.

freedom given by the Spirit”.¹³³ Although the epiclesis has been emphasised in Orthodox eucharistic liturgy, he believes that this plea for the presence of the Holy Spirit should be adopted by all churches and this common epicletic emphasis can be a reference point for unity because of the shared focus on the Holy Spirit that it gives. One of the reasons for this is that churches will then not only look at their own historical continuity but at the continuity of the whole Church of Christ which has been guided by the Holy Spirit.¹³⁴ Hence the epiclesis reduces the individualistic attitude of churches and raises the awareness of the oneness of the church.

The plea for the presence of the Holy Spirit, the attitude of self-surrender and the possible fruit of unity derived from the epiclesis of the eucharist can all be found in the use of charisms. To be able to use the charisms effectively, charismatics request the Spirit to fill them and work through them unceasingly, and that requires a complete obedience and surrender. This is a life-long invocation just as the eucharist is a life-long anamnesis of Christ with the epicletic prayer being used in the process. Charisma and the eucharist both remind the church of the Holy Spirit who is the gift from God, as Visser and Smail assert, and “has the divine willingness to give” life, power and unity to the church.¹³⁵ Hence, charisms are epicletic and the epiclesis is charismatic. As John Gunstone claims, “The *epiclesis* expresses what we (charismatics) believe should be expressed, when the eucharist becomes so much a ‘renewal service’ of the most significant kind.”¹³⁶ They are mutually coherent and more importantly, they both point to a common goal of unity among Christians.

¹³³ Lukas Vischer, “The Epiclesis: Sign of Unity and Renewal”, p. 39.

¹³⁴ Lukas Vischer, “The Epiclesis: Sign of Unity and Renewal”, pp. 34, 37-38.

¹³⁵ Lukas Vischer, “The Epiclesis: Sign of Unity and Renewal”, pp. 34-35;
Tom Smail, *The Giving Gift*, pp. 14-17, 22.

¹³⁶ John Gunstone, “Spirit and Eucharist: Experience and Doctrine”, *Renewal*, No. 64 (August-September 1976), p. 13.

2.2.3. The Eschatological Character

Charisms and the eucharist are both eschatological as they are being used and celebrated until the end time comes. They both point to the eschaton. The remembrance activity with the plea for the presence of the Holy Spirit in the eucharist will cease when Jesus comes back. As Paul says, “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). Therefore, when believers are celebrating the eucharist in the present, with the memory of Jesus’s sacrifice in the past, they are looking forward to the future when Jesus comes back and they drink the new wine with Him in the kingdom of the Father (Matt 26:29). It is a shared anticipation and a hope for the future of all believers. Moltmann even states, “The supper of the hoping church is a ‘foretaste’ of the messianic banquet of *all mankind*” (my italic).¹³⁷ John Zizioulas sees that the epicletic invocation of the Holy Spirit’s presence and work at the eucharist demonstrates the historical Jesus in the present and points to the hope of his actual presence at the end time. He identifies the eucharist as “the eschatologisation of the historical word, the voice of the historical Christ, the voice of the Holy Scripture which comes to us, no longer simply as ‘doctrine’ through history, but as life and *being* through the *eschaton*”.¹³⁸ From the eschatological perspective, the Lord’s table is a place where Christian unity should be realised. It is a means of grace effecting the sweetness of unity among the participants. It is because of this shared hope that Christians maintain their faith and still break bread and drink wine. It is because of this shared hope that the church which is the body of Christ still exists, and it is because of this shared hope that it is meaningful for Christians to prepare themselves as a church for the coming

¹³⁷ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, p. 253.

¹³⁸ John Zizioulas, *Being As Communion*, p. 22.

King. Therefore, the eschatological hope symbolised by the eucharist should always be ecumenical and always be represented by the whole body of Christians.

Similarly the spiritual gifts which are characteristic of the charismatic renewal also carry an eschatological meaning which has further ecumenical implications. According to Paul, all the spiritual gifts will cease to function at the end time of the world. As he says, “If there are gifts of prophecy, they will be done away; if there are tongues, they will cease; if there is knowledge, it will be done away” and “when the perfect comes, the partial will be done away” (1 Cor 13:8, 10). The presence of charisms in the present implies their absence in the future, but before the end time comes, they serve as manifestation of the glory and might of God and as the means of mutual edification among Christians which in turn strengthens the unity. Hence, the charisms which are emphasised in the charismatic renewal, like the eucharist, also suggest a collective anticipation of the arrival of the “perfect” where charisms will cease but the unity developed on earth will last forever for “love never fails” (1 Cor 13:8).

2.2.4. The Ecumenical Character

Both the eucharist and charisms have ecumenical significance. According to Paul, they both carry the “one-many” relationship. For the eucharist, he says, “Since there is one bread, we who are many are one body; for we all partake of the one bread” (1 Cor 10:17). *Didache* provides an analogy of this “one-many” relationship of the eucharist as follows, “As this fragment lay scattered upon the mountains and became

a single [fragment] when it had been gathered. May your church be gathered into your kingdom from the ends of the earth”.¹³⁹

About charisms Paul says, “For just as we have many members in one body and all the members do not have the same function, so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and individually members one of another” (Rom 12:4-5). For functions he refers to charisms outlined in verses 6-8 and there is a similar argument in 1 Cor 12. Paul does not see the contradiction of “one” and “many” as they refer to different entities and the oneness of an entity relies on the “manyness” of another entity to be constituted. In addition, the “manyness” of that entity can be diverse in many aspects but there should be one ultimate commonality. Hence one and many are not mutually exclusive but ought to be mutually dependant. The presence of this “one-many” relationship in both the eucharist and the charisms is significant for Christian unity. Since the body of Christ cannot be constituted just by one person, but many people; not just one culture, but many; not just one race, but many; not just one social background, but many; not just one gender, but both male and female; and finally not just one charism, but many charisms. Although there is “manyness” existing in each member of the body of Christ, there is only one faith shared by all of them. Because of the “manyness”, there is diversity rather than uniformity, and by virtue of the oneness of faith, there is unity. Due to the one faith, they break the one bread and drink the one cup signifying the one Saviour whose flesh was pierced and whose blood was shed for all. Due to the one confession of Christ, they are endowed by the Holy Spirit with many charisms to constitute the one body of Christ. This “one-many” relation of the eucharist and charisms is obvious at the grassroots level. This is

¹³⁹ “Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles”, Aelred Cody (trans), in Clayton N. Jefford (ed.) *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), p. 10.

because the one bread and cup are not just taken by the celebrant on behalf of the whole congregation, but each member of the church is entitled to partake of them. It is also because charisms are granted to each member and they are empowered to be involved in ministries of the church and build up the one body of Christ. Hence, through participating in the eucharist and a ministry when charisms are exercised, each member is creating and demonstrating unity.

2.3. Conclusion

The broken table throughout the centuries exposes the visible division among churches and it also occurred during the charismatic renewal. As Gunstone notes, the charismatic renewal “has not swept away doctrinal differences between Christians on the eucharist”.¹⁴⁰ Because of charisms and common experiences in the Spirit, grassroots unity took place among Christians of diverse traditions during the charismatic renewal; but because of the eucharist, the grassroots unity was found to be incomplete and vulnerable. In fact, both the eucharist and charisms are anamnetic, epicletic, eschatological and ecumenical. Hence these two outward signs of unity and means of grace are indispensable for the church and are crucial for its unity, particularly at the grassroots level. Ecumenists and charismatics should not neglect either of them but pay equal attention to both for the prospective unity of the church.

3. Final Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the grassroots unity nurtured in the charismatic worship at the five international conferences through the functioning of charisms, including

¹⁴⁰ John Gunstone, “Spirit and Eucharist: Experience and Doctrine”, p. 13.

speaking and singing in tongues, healing, prophecy and intercession. It also explained that grassroots unity was developed from the spontaneity during worship which produced an intimacy with God and between people. Moreover, I have attempted to apply the ancient tag *lex orandi, lex credendi* to explain charismatic worship. Its spontaneity and openness to God enable *theologia prima* to occur and the tag can only be interpreted as saying that the law of prayer establishes the law of belief, not the other way around, in charismatic worship.

Worship in the five international conferences demonstrated unity at the grassroots level, but the eucharist exposed its weaknesses and vulnerability when it faced the dogmatic insistence of the Roman Catholic Church that it could only be celebrated together when the unity of the church was achieved. The divided table during the conferences also developed an identity crisis among Catholic charismatics. The incidents showed that doctrinal agreement at the official level was necessary to complement the grassroots unity. Nevertheless, concelebration which took place in the public and intercommunion which was practiced in secret during the five international conferences indicate the fact that grassroots unity, to some extent, enabled the eucharistic impossibility to become a possibility within certain doctrinal boundary.

Theologically, I have attempted to develop a charismatic understanding of the eucharist with the concepts of anamnesis and epiclesis. I have also discussed the shared eschatological and ecumenical implications of the eucharist and charisms. Although the five international conferences show that charisms during worship brought about unity at the grassroots level and the eucharist divided the congregation,

they are *per se* the signs of unity and means of grace. Hence they should not be mutually exclusive but complement each other. The eucharist represents the institutional nature of the church. Worship sustains the life of the church with the functioning of charisms. The eucharist implies the christological element and charisms the pneumatological in ecclesiology. The next chapter is going to depart from the historical context of the five international conferences and theologically investigate the complementarity of institution and charisms, and christology and pneumatology in the church and the church united in the charismatic context.

CHAPTER FIVE

IN SEARCH OF COMPLEMENTARITY

Chapter four has shown the paradoxical situation of the grassroots unity in charismatic renewal. Worship brought about unity among Christians from different traditions but at the same time the eucharist exposed the hidden division caused by the unsolved doctrinal disputes of past centuries. Charismatic worship was spontaneous in its use of charisms while the eucharist was essentially part of the formal church institution.¹ Charisms represent the work of the Spirit and hence are the pneumatological element of the church while the eucharist focuses on Christ's redemption and is to do with the church's basic christological stance. However, the church has been criticised for focusing on the institutional aspect of its life and neglecting the charismatic; ecclesiology has concentrated on christology without so much recognising the importance of pneumatology. It is true that the charismatic renewal reminded the church of the pneumatological element and it nurtured a grassroots unity, but this unity did not last. This indicates that to build up the church and bring about unity, there is a need for both charisms and institution, and for both pneumatology and christology. To attempt to do so with just one or the other is not sufficient. They are complementary. Hence, this chapter is an attempt to search for the complementarity between charisms and institution, and pneumatology and christology for the church (ecclesiology) and the church united (ecumenism) from a charismatic perspective. Each section will contain two sub-sections: the church and church unity.

¹ John Zizioulas, *Being As Communion*, p. 22.

1. Institution and Charisms

In this section, I will explore the theoretical basis of the complementarity between institution and charism. The word “institution” carries two meanings in this thesis. First, it refers to formal organisations which are the churches and ecumenical organisations. Second, in the church, according to Avery Dulles’ definition, it can refer to four structural elements: (1) doctrines in the forms of creeds, catechism, etc.; (2) worship containing sacraments, liturgy and ritual; (3) government such as offices and hierarchy; (4) laws.² Charism as it was defined in the introduction of the thesis means the so-called “supernatural” gifts manifested in the charismatic renewal as well as those beneficial to the spiritual and numerical growth of the church. In this section, I will discuss the complementarity of institution and charisms by using the theories of Karl Rahner and Cardinal Suenens. Then I also will provide an example of the discussion on this subject in the third Roman Catholic-Pentecostal dialogue (1985-1989) because it demonstrates the thoughts on this complementarity from an institutionally-oriented and a charismatically-oriented church. Then I will argue that, ecclesiologically, the charismatic renewal which puts the emphasis on charisms and the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete, restores the charismatic nature of the church and hence creates the complementarity between the two. Ecumenically, this complementarity redefines visible unity, and conciliar fellowship is then considered as a model enabling this complementarity to take place in a united church.

² Avery Dulles, “Earthen Vessels: Institution and Charism in the Church”, in Thomas E. Clarks (ed) *Above Every Name: The Lordship of Christ and Social Systems* (Ramsey: Paulist Press, 1980), p. 159.

1.1. The Church

1.1.1. Institution and Charisms Should Be Complementary

Theoretically, institution and charisms should be complementary for as Congar asserts, “they lead to the same end, which is the building up of the work of Christ”.³ Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians warn that the either-or mentality regarding the existence of institution and charisms in the church will put the church in danger.⁴ Charisms imply freedom, spontaneity, liveliness, creativity and renewal while institution implies order, discipline, jurisdiction and effectiveness. The church needs both elements and should keep them in balance; otherwise, it will either become chaotic, corrupted and alienated from the truth by the overemphasis on charisms or inflexible, restrictive and eventually ossified by the overemphasis on the institution.

1.1.1.1. Karl Rahner: Open/Closed System

Karl Rahner provides a model of the open and closed system of the church which is useful for analysing the complementarity of charism and institution. A closed system he defines as, “A complex of realities of various kinds which, despite their variations, are related to one another and contribute towards a common task, [which] is defined and directed from a point within the system itself”.⁵ In this closed system, the church is constructed as an “absolute monarchy or totalitarian system” where all ministries are administered by the officials or, in the case of the Roman Catholics, by the Pope

³ Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Vol. II*, p. 11.

⁴ Protestant theologians mention about this point such as Clark H. Pinnock, *Flame of Love*, p. 140; G. R. Evans, *The Church and the Churches*, p. 138. Roman Catholic theologians mention about this point such as Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens, *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal*, p. 32; Matthew F. O’Keeffe, “An Investigation into the Charismatic Movement in so far as It Is Related to the Nature of the Roman Catholic Church” (Unpublished M.A. thesis, Manchester: University of Manchester, April 1980), p. 209; Charles Whitehead, “What is the Nature of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal?” <http://www.ccr.org.uk/crnature.htm>. (accessed on 23 September 2005)

⁵ Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations Vol. 12: Confrontation* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1974), pp. 88-89.

who has absolute authority.⁶ In other words, the church relies enormously on human effort and the involvement of transcendent force such as the Holy Spirit, is very limited. In contrast, an open system is featured by, in Rahner's phrase, "the dominion of God", and its functioning is "rather charismatic than institutional in character". Based on this system, he concludes that the charismatic aspect of the church is "inherent in the very nature of the Church as such".⁷ In addition, he recognises that the charismatic movement plays a significant role in keeping the church remaining in an open system, for as he says,

...while the intuitional factor in the Church is a legitimate entity, it nevertheless remains encompassed by the charismatic movement of the Spirit in the Church, the Spirit who again and again ushers the Church as an open system into a future which he himself, and no-one else, has arranged, and in a manner which can never adequately be planned for beforehand, by any man or any institution.⁸

This Spirit-operating open system is not an abstract entity, but it contains a physical structure to enable the ecclesia to grow. Rahner's open system suggests a complementarity between the institution and charisms with an active involvement of the Holy Spirit. The charismatic renewal characterised by the spontaneity of the Holy Spirit brings into view the intrinsic value of charisms, which have been subordinated within the institution, to create an open system.

1.1.1.2. Cardinal Suenens: Institution as the Base of Charisms

For Cardinal Suenens, the complementarity of institution and charisms lies in the fact that they are both the gifts from the Holy Spirit. He perceives institution as a physical

⁶ Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations Vol. 12*, p. 89.

⁷ Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations Vol. 12*, pp. 89, 97.

⁸ Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations Vol. 12*, p. 97.

base for charisms to work in, and gives the analogy of the institution as a tree with roots, trunk, bark and branches, and the charisms as sap. That the sap can support the whole tree with its nutrition and enables flowers and fruits to grow is because it is protected by the tree and absorbed within it rather than exuding away.⁹ Hence, without institution, there is nothing to protect the charisms and within which to enable them to work. The people of God will not benefit from them. In addition, he suggests that institution ensures the continuity of the church in the past, present and future. For the past, the institution serves the purpose of keeping the church being rooted in the tradition, so that it has a solid foundation to receive any renewal in the present. For the present, the institution is important for discerning any danger and avoiding any error. For the future, the institution provides strength for the church to grow and bear fruits.¹⁰

For him, charisms rely on institution, as that is the place in which they function and that is where they nurture the church. It also helps to avoid “over-emotionalism, illuminism, exaggerated supernaturalism” when charisms are used in the church. On the other hand, charisms are like “leaven” boosting the community with “vitality, freedom, thanksgiving and praise, witness and renunciation” and avoiding rigidity and formalism.¹¹ To get the best out of the complementarity of institution and charisms, those in authority in the institution should bridge the charismatic and institutional divide. That is what Suenens saw himself called to, when he was ordained as a bishop.¹² He urges that

⁹ Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens, “The Holy Spirit: Our Hope”, *Worship*, Vol. 49, No. 5 (May 1975), p. 258.

¹⁰ Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens, “The Holy Spirit: Our Hope”, pp. 257-258.

¹¹ Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens, *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal*, p. 32.

¹² Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens, “The Holy Spirit: Our Hope”, pp. 254-255.

We must at all costs avoid giving the impression that the hierarchical structure of the Church is an administrative apparatus with no intimate connection with the charismatic gifts of the Holy Spirit which are diffused throughout the Church.¹³

1.1.1.3. The Discussion in the Third Quinquennium of Roman Catholic-Pentecostal Dialogue (1985-1989)

Theoretically, Rahner and Suenens claim that institution and charism should be complementary, and at the ecumenical dialogue during the 1980s between Roman Catholics and Pentecostals—the institutionally-oriented and the charismatically-oriented church respectively—there was an attempt to search for this complementarity. Pentecostals admitted to their over-emphasis on the Spirit at the personal level, while forgetting the church level.¹⁴ They also recognised their lack of ecclesiological knowledge, both in the congregation and leadership, about the importance of the institution for the functioning of the church and it is recorded that

Pentecostals acknowledge both the reluctance that many of their members have in submitting to ecclesial authority and the difficulty which their charismatic leaders have in working through existing ecclesial institutional channels which could protect them from acting irresponsibly or in an authoritarian manner.¹⁵

¹³ Quoted in Edward O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church* (Indiana: Ave Maria Press, 1971), p. 186.

¹⁴ Jeffrey Gros, Harding Meyer & William G. Rusch (eds), *Growth in Agreement II: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level, 1982-1998* (Geneva: WCC Publication, 2000), no. 76, p. 746.

This dialogue was represented by the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity of the Roman Catholic Church and some Pentecostal leaders who were officially appointed by their churches. This was the first time Pentecostal churches sending representatives to the dialogue including the Apostolic Church of Mexico (1986), the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa (1985-89), the Church of God (Cleveland) (1985-88), the Church of God of Prophecy, USA (1986-88), the Independent Assemblies of God International, USA (1987), the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, USA (1985-89) and the International Communion of Charismatic Church, USA (1986). (Jeffrey Gros, Harding Meyer & William G. Rusch (eds), *Growth in Agreement II*, p. 735.)

¹⁵ Jeffrey Gros, Harding Meyer & William G. Rusch (eds), *Growth in Agreement II*, no. 75, p. 746.

Nevertheless, the end of the report notes that they do not see that institution and church order intrinsically hinder the work of the Spirit, but they regard them “as the will of the Lord for his church” according to the New Testament. They also affirm them as an ecclesial necessity through which the Holy Spirit works for the benefit of the church, and “they recognise that the Spirit operates not only through charismatic individuals but also through the permanent ministries of the church”.¹⁶ This recognition is coherent with the Roman Catholic’s concept of institution. They insist that some elements within the ecclesiastical structure are granted by God and are indispensable, and “that they belong to the very essence of church order”. They see the Spirit working with rather than without the structure, which is the same as that in Suenens’ model.¹⁷

Both Pentecostals and Roman Catholics agree with the necessity of institution as part of the construction of the church, but they also see that the institution needs to be constantly renewed by the Spirit; it needs a fresh breath for its life.¹⁸ Pentecostals who are relatively charismatically-oriented discover the orderliness brought about by institution, while Roman Catholics who are relatively institutionally-oriented recognise the liveliness brought by charisms in the Spirit. The search for complementarity between the charisms and institution of these two churches had the effect of increasing their commonality and taking them a step further towards unity.

¹⁶ Jeffrey Gros, Harding Meyer & William G. Rusch (eds), *Growth in Agreement II*, no. 105, p. 750.

¹⁷ Jeffrey Gros, Harding Meyer & William G. Rusch (eds), *Growth in Agreement II*, no. 83, p. 747; no. 88, p. 748.

¹⁸ Jeffrey Gros, Harding Meyer & William G. Rusch (eds), *Growth in Agreement II*, no. 106, p. 750.

1.1.2. Complementarity of Institution and Charisms in the Charismatic Context

1.1.2.1. Charisms as the Forgotten Component of the Church

The complementarity between institution and charisms seems to be theoretically-proved, but practically the church has been dominated by the institution that it has forgotten charisms as the other basic component. Mühlen argues that this is partly due to the political influence of Constantine when Christianity penetrated into every public and private sector. The result was the pursuit of charisms to empower the church for mission diminished, even at the cost of persecution and martyrdom, and they came to be regarded as part of the “mysticism of the monasteries”. Some charisms such as teaching, healing, prophecy, and caring for the needy have been preserved but most of those that functioned in the early church were lost.¹⁹ Order and discipline were overemphasised as the gifts of the Spirit, particularly in the Western churches, while other gifts were neglected.²⁰

The Roman Catholic Church has stressed the church as an institution. Congar elucidates three major elements of the institution from a christological perspective. First, Jesus gathers the people who have faith in Him. Second, He leads His people into a communion through sacraments such as baptism and the eucharist. Third, through His calling to the disciples, His election of Peter as the rock of the church and His endowment of the Twelve with the apostolic ministry, He forms a structure with “hierarchical powers” for this community.²¹ The church is a ‘*societas perfecta*’ which is comprised of offices governed by bishop, priests and ministers and a Pope as the

¹⁹ Heribert Mühlen, *A Charismatic Theology: Initiation in the Spirit*, p. 147.

²⁰ Heribert Mühlen, *A Charismatic Theology*, p. 121.

²¹ Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1959), p. 25.

ultimate authority of the entire hierarchy.²² For Congar, hierarchy is an essential element of the Roman Catholic Church and its structure, but its hierarchology results in the neglect of lay involvement, and that raises questions about the very nature and being of the church.²³ But he also notices that although Protestant churches stress on community rather than hierarchy, they “are in practice almost as clericalised as the Catholic Church”.²⁴ Another Catholic theologian, Avery Dulles makes the criticism that institutionalism, which overemphasises the institutional substances in an ecclesiastical system, has adversely affected the church for centuries. For him, it is a “deformation” and it subordinates the importance of graces and charisms of the Spirit in the church.²⁵

Nowadays, the term “charism” has been rediscovered, but its definition has been widened to include the institution itself as a charism. Prophecy, tongues, healing, etc. are categorised as non-institutional charisms while leadership and hierarchy are categorised as official charisms.²⁶ As the Vatican II explains about the church, the Holy Spirit “furnishes and directs her with various gifts, both hierarchical and charismatic...”²⁷ Similarly at the third dialogue of the Anglican and Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) in Venice (1976), the two established churches acknowledge episcopacy as a kind of official gift from the Holy Spirit. The ordained ministers follow the apostles in teaching, pastoring the community, and consecrating

²² Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations Vol. 12*, p. 81; *The Spirit in the Church* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1979), p. 35;

Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church: A Critical Assessment of the Church in All Its Aspects* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillian Ltd, 1976), p. 35.

²³ Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, p. 45; *The Word and the Spirit* (London: Chapman, 1986), p. 78.

²⁴ Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, p. 45.

²⁵ Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church*, pp. 35, 44.

²⁶ Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations Vol. 12*, p. 86.

²⁷ Vatican Council II, *Lumen Gentium*, in Walter M. Abbott (ed) *The Documents of Vatican II: With Notes and Comments by Catholic, Protestants, and Orthodox Authorities* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966), 4, p. 17.

the sacraments.²⁸ The problem remains that the institutional aspects take over the non-institutional ones, which rely on the spontaneity of the Spirit. The church tends to be satisfied with the institutional gifts and to believe that the Holy Spirit is working in the church, when in fact, His work is restricted, and He as a person of the Godhead is far from being recognised. Congar records Karl Adam writing about his “trinity” as follows:

The structure of Catholic faith may be summarised in a single sentence: I come to a living faith in the Triune God through Christ in His Church. I experience the action of the living God through Christ realising himself in His Church. So we see the certitude of the Catholic faith rests on the sacred triad: God, Christ, Church.²⁹

Moltmann also traces the omission of the Holy Spirit from the Trinity to the time of Ignatius of Antioch, with His role being replaced by an ecclesiastical approach which can be summarised as: one God, one Christ, one bishop, one church.³⁰ His criticism is that this ecclesiology undermines the Holy Spirit and the charisms with a “monarchical episcopate” and that it is theologically wrong. Consequently, Christians do not realise the crucial nature of the existence of charisms and treat the teachings in the Bible about charisms with a historical lens which is cessationalist.

1.1.2.2. The Advent of the Charismatic Renewal

In such a church which has been institutionally-dominated for centuries, the advent of the charismatic renewal is highly important. The renewal interrupted this pattern within the church and its history and was perceived by the Church of England as “a

²⁸ *ARCIC-I Revisited: An Evaluation and a Revision* (New York: Catholic Press Association, 1985), p. 23.

²⁹ Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Vol. I: The Holy Spirit in the ‘Economy’-Revelation and Experience of the Spirit* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983), p. 159.

³⁰ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, p. 305.

protest against over-rigid ecclesiastical structures”, making the church recognise its flaws through the obvious work of the Holy Spirit.³¹ It reminded the church of that fundamental but forgotten truth which is that the charisms are the source of power if it is to function as it should be as the ecclesial, as distinct from closed, “absolute monarchy or totalitarian system” which was sustained solely by human authority. It pushed the church to become more like an open system for the Holy Spirit so that He could revitalise the trunk (the church) by releasing the sap (charisms) to flow within. It lifted the church out of the sense of security gained by closely attaching to its tradition, and stretched it by the power and love of the Holy Spirit to a stage where it could grow spiritually strong and become a good tree bearing good fruits. The two emphases, charisms and the Holy Spirit, are rediscovered through the charismatic renewal. What follows is designed to explore these two elements in relation to the life of the church and to see how they complement the institutional aspect of the church and restore its vitality.

1.1.2.3. Charisms

Hans Küng points out three characteristics of charisms according to Paul. First, they are “everyday phenomena” which do not only include the gifts which are “exceptional, miraculous or sensational”, but all those related to the service and edification of the church, which, as he puts it, are “less striking”, such as exhortation and acts of mercy (Rom 12:8), service (Rom 12:7), teaching (Rom 12:7; 1 Cor 12:28), etc.³² Similarly, McDonnell identifies charisms as ministries and states that they are closely associated

³¹ Church of England, *We Believe in the Holy Spirit: A Report by the Doctrine Commission of the General Synod of the Church of England* (London: Church House Publishing, 1991), p. 85.

³² Hans Küng, *The Church* (New York: Image Books, 1976), pp. 239-240; *On Being a Christian* (London: SCM Press, 1995), p. 485.

with “the normal operation of the day-to-day life of the Church”.³³ By pointing out the basic nature of charisms as being a normal way of serving the church, both of them “de-mystify” charisms from being something which is beyond daily human life, and also de-romanticises them by removing the exclusively supernatural understanding which otherwise gives the wrong idea about their status in the eyes of the congregation to those who exercise such gifts. Second, charisms are diverse rather than uniform in character, so that they can be applied to the personal needs of the individual and achieve different purposes within the church. Hence, he rejects the idea of charisms being exclusively connected to the institution.³⁴ Third, they are universally distributed by the Holy Spirit within the church in the sense that they are not the privilege of one group of people nor do they belong solely to the authority, but are for the entire people of God.³⁵ Miroslav Volf also raises this point in his discussion on charisms, and he argues that, because of this universality, there is a possibility of “shared responsibility”³⁶ or, in Suenens’ term, “co-responsibility”.³⁷ Every member is responsible for the growth of the church, not just the leaders, as each of them is given charisms by the Holy Spirit to contribute to the whole body.³⁸ Finally, he affirms that charisms are still available for the church now, in the same way as they were for the early church.³⁹ Hence, for Küng, the church is intrinsically charismatic in a way “which *includes but goes far beyond the hierarchical* structure of the Church”.⁴⁰ His view echoes Rahner’s open system marked by its charismatic rather than its institutional nature. With its vivid and universal manifestations of charisms,

³³ Kilian McDonnell, “Communion Ecclesiology and Baptism in the Spirit”, p. 692.

³⁴ Hans Küng, *The Church*, pp. 241-242; *On Being a Christian*, p. 485.

³⁵ Hans Küng, *The Church*, pp. 243-246; *On Being a Christian*, p. 485.

³⁶ Miroslav Volf, “A Protestant Response”, *Concilium*, Vol. 3 (1996), p. 40

³⁷ Fountain Trust, “Looking for the Holy Spirit’s Surprises”, p. 7.

³⁸ Miroslav Volf, “A Protestant Response”, pp. 40-41.

³⁹ Hans Küng, *The Church*, p. 246.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

the charismatic renewal demonstrates the fundamental charismatic nature of the church and provides an example of how this open system functions. The charisms universally enrich the ecclesial life in a diversified way, and if they disappear it “represents a real impoverishment for the communion”.⁴¹ Charisms are the prominent features of the charismatic renewal, however, charisms are actually “the manifestation of the Spirit” (1 Cor 12:7). Therefore, the ultimate purpose of the charismatic renewal is to remind the church of the indispensable role of the Holy Spirit within the ecclesiastical structure who, as a Paraclete, was sent by Jesus after the ascension. In what follows, which is based on John’s understanding of the Paraclete in chapters 14 and 16, I am going to look at His role and functions in the church and to show the relationship between the Paraclete and charisms as understood by Paul.

1.1.2.4. The Holy Spirit as the Paraclete

It is essential to recognise the role of the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete in the church so that there can be a meaningful understanding of the complementarity of institution and charisms. There are plenty of metaphors for the Holy Spirit such as fire (Acts 2:3), wind (Acts 2:2), finger (Matt 12:28; Lk 11:20), cloud (1 Cor 10:1-2), water (John 4:10; 19:34; Rev 22:1-2), breath (Jn 20:22) and dove (Matt 3:16; John 1:32). These are objects depicting His power in different forms, but none of them refer to Him as a subject with a will of His own, and with thoughts, feelings, emotions and actions. In fact, in the farewell discourse, Jesus uses none of these metaphors for the Holy Spirit, but calls him “another Paraclete” from the Father (Jn 14:16) which shows His personality as a distinct hypostasis. McDonnell mentions about Raymond E. Brown’s suggestion that John depicts the Holy Spirit in a “clearly more personal” way than

⁴¹ Kilian McDonnell, “Communion Ecclesiology and Baptism in The Spirit”, p. 693.

other writings in the New Testament⁴² and this is why the term “Paraclete” appears in his gospel to describe the Holy Spirit. Moreover, this term can serve to understand the role of the Holy Spirit in the church better as He Himself is not its object, but a subject who guides, strengthens and encourages His people. Dongsoo Kim emphasises that John does not only refer to the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of Christ, but also as the Spirit of the church.⁴³ Therefore, I choose to discuss the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete who is a counsellor, helper, comforter, advocate, and mediator in the Johannine discourse.⁴⁴

John mentions that the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete abides with and accompanies the church forever (Jn 14:16-17). Jesus assures the disciples that the Holy Spirit has already dwelt with them and will do so forever by saying, “but you know Him because He abides with you and will be in you” (v.17). The indwelling of the Spirit within believers and the church contains three implications which are coherent with God’s indwelling among the Israelites and the tabernacle in the Old Testament. Firstly, it suggests the divine identity of God’s people. The Holy Spirit only dwells in those who believe in, and therefore belong to, Jesus, “Whoever confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, God abides in him, and he in God” (1 Jn 4:15). Similarly, God only dwelt in Israel because it was His chosen nation. After the exodus, God commanded them to build a tabernacle “that I may dwell among them” (Ex 25:8), and He “will meet there with the sons of Israel” and “will be their God” (Ex 29:43, 45). The purpose of God’s indwelling was that the Israelites would remember the exodus which was

⁴² Kilian McDonnell, “A Response to Bernd Jochen Hilberath” in Bradford E. Hinze and D. Lyle Dabney (eds) *Advents of the Spirit: An Introduction to the Current Study of Pneumatology* (Milwaukee Wisconsin: Marquette University Press, 2001), p. 296.

⁴³ Dongsoo Kim, “The Paraclete: The Spirit of the Church”, *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (2002), p. 256, note 5.

⁴⁴ Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit Vol. I*, p. 53.

accomplished by God, so that “they shall know that I am the Lord their God” (Ex 29:46). God acknowledges that the Israelites are His people and affirms that “My soul will not reject you” and “will walk among you” (Lev. 26:11-12). Therefore, the tabernacle is a spiritual symbol of the special relationship established by God with Israel, by which He is their Lord and they are his people. Because of this relationship, God dwells among them to be with them and the tabernacle is a physical place for this meeting. Similarly, the church in the New Testament time and nowadays is also a physical and spiritual symbol representing the special relationship between God and Christians that they belong to God and God is their Lord. The promise of the eternal indwelling of the Paraclete confirms this relationship and divine identity of Christians and the church is the place where they can meet God.

Secondly, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the church entails sanctification and holiness. God proclaims that after the tabernacle was built He would “consecrate the tent of meeting and the altar” (Ex 29:44), which suggests that the building and the altar also belong to Him and become sacred without any profanity. Similarly, the church is and should be holy, and the same should be true for individual Christians, whom Paul identifies as “the temple of the Spirit” where He dwells (1 Cor 3:16-17; 6:19); so he says, “that is what you are” (1 Cor 3:17). This temple needs to depend on the Paraclete to reprove and purify it, to ensure its constant holiness. With the indwelling of the Spirit, Christians and the church are the possessions of God and, therefore, Paul says, they do not own themselves any more (1 Cor 6:19) and are under God’s protection for, “If any man destroys the temple of God, God will destroy him” (1 Cor 3:17).

Thirdly, the church where the Spirit dwells is the place where God's glory can be found. After Moses finalised the architectural work of the tabernacle by erecting the court around the tabernacle and the altar, and hanging up the veil, the cloud covered the tent and it was filled with God's glory (Ex 40:33-35). Correspondingly, the church constituted by Christians who are the temple of God should also reflect God's glory, so Paul urges the Corinthians to glorify God with their bodies (1 Cor 6:20). Since the church is dwelt by the Paraclete forever, which affirms its special identity of being the possession of God with His holiness and glory, He can work within the church by His teaching and empowering with charisms.

Besides abiding in the church, John notes that the Paraclete is a teacher of truth, a revealer of the hidden future and the one who reminds them of Jesus' teachings. These functions are reflected in Paul's understanding of charisms. Jesus says to the disciples that this Paraclete is "the Spirit of truth" (Jn 14:17; 16:13) who "will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said to you" (Jn 14:26) and will also "disclose to you what is to come" (Jn 16:13-14). Paul also identifies the Spirit as a teacher who gives words and thoughts to the preacher (1 Cor 2:13). Since the Paraclete is identical with Jesus who is "full of truth" (Jn 1:14) and He Himself is "the truth" (Jn 14:6), His messages to the church will be in accordance with the truth so that it will "continue in the truth".⁴⁵ Although John does not mention charisms, his understandings of the functions of the Paraclete are coherent with Paul's teachings on charisms. Prophecy, words of wisdom and knowledge, tongues and interpretation of mysteries convey the teaching of the Spirit, revelation of the future and hidden knowledge. He also gives fresh enthusiasm in reading the Bible so that the church is

⁴⁵ Crinisor Stefan, "The Paraclete and Prophecy in the Johannine Community", *PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (Fall 2005), p. 283.

kept renewed and revitalised by Jesus' teachings. Therefore, the church can be built up on the truth that Jesus gave in the past which is brought into present through the endowment of charisms by the Paraclete.

Finally, John implies that this Paraclete is the giver of life to the church which grows through evangelisation with the Spirit. Jesus states that the Holy Spirit is to "testify about Me" (Jn 15:26) and He empowered the disciples to perform signs and wonders, or in Paul's terminology, charisms, so that people "may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you may have life in His name" (Jn 20: 31). After Pentecost when the Spirit gave birth to the church by baptising the disciples and equipping them with charisms, the church grew drastically and "the Lord was adding to their number day by day those who were being saved" (Acts 2:47). There is an intimate link between the existence of the church and the Holy Spirit. As Kim puts it "where there is no Paraclete, there is no Christian community. As the disciples without Jesus are unthinkable, so the church without the Paraclete, for John, is unimaginable".⁴⁶ What defines a church as charismatic is its openness to the Spirit, the Paraclete, who gives life and charisms.⁴⁷ The open system, in Rahner's thinking, is something that is ever growing and active. However, it is not an abstract entity; rather, as Suenens argues, it is something which needs a physical structure. In this structure, the Paraclete should be given the priority to work. As Suenens says, "If God is to be free to act, we need Spirit and life first; then we give it order. Life precedes order".⁴⁸ Because of the indwelling of the Paraclete, the church is not purely a sociological institute; rather it is a spiritual temple where human beings can meet God, receive and be reminded of His teachings. The church as an institute needs the breath

⁴⁶ Dongsoo Kim, "The Paraclete", p. 269.

⁴⁷ Emmanuel Sullivan, *Baptised into Hope* (London: SPCK, 1980), p. 176.

⁴⁸ Fountain Trust, "Looking for the Holy Spirit's Surprises", p. 9.

of the Spirit to revitalise it, and the Spirit needs a physical body within which to work. In this sense, the Paraclete and institution are complementary.

1.1.2.5. The Complementarity Brought about by the Charismatic Renewal

The charismatic renewal brings about what has been lacking and lost in the church throughout history. The lively exercise of charisms and the spontaneous move of the Holy Spirit reappear in many sectors of the church such as liturgy, ministry, sacraments and mission. However, the charismatic renewal did not aim to abolish the institutional church but to complement it with the restoration of charisms and emphasis of the Holy Spirit. As Suenens says, “The charismatic renewal is not against the institution; it is the life of the institution”.⁴⁹ It aimed at breathing into the dry bones that they “may come to life” with new sinews, flesh and skin so that they become “an exceedingly great army” (Ezek 37:5-6, 10). If the breath is the Holy Spirit and the bones are the institution, then Ezekiel’s prophecy suggests the complementarity of institution and the Spirit with His charisms. The breath needs a body to be blown into and the body needs the breath to bring it to life. Similarly, the Holy Spirit needs the institution to work and minister within and the institution needs to the Spirit to prolong its life. The charismatic renewal is a catalyst for this breathing to take place within the physical structure of the church.

In addition, the charismatic renewal aims to balance tradition and experience, the past and the present. E. Haenchen provides a reason why John utilises two distinct verbs, “remind” and “teach” to refer to the function of the Paraclete rather than just one. “Remind” implies an avoidance of stress on the experience in the Spirit in the present

⁴⁹ Fountain Trust, “Looking for the Holy Spirit’s Surprises”, p. 10.

and forgetting past tradition, while the word “teach” means the opposite.⁵⁰ For John, both tradition and experience are indispensable for the life of the church, and so, the institution which consists of tradition and history and the charisms which denote the current experiences in the Spirit should not be mutually exclusive; rather, the church needs the Spirit to remind and teach so as to keep both in balance. The charismatic renewal demonstrates that “the dynamism of the Spirit does not conflict with the incarnate and the historical”⁵¹ but enriches the past by adding new experience of charisms into the church.

If the charismatic renewal restores the complementarity of institution and charisms for the church, it also brings the same emphasis to church unity. The next section will investigate how the charismatic renewal brings about this complementarity to unity especially at the grassroots level.

1.2. Church Unity

1.2.1. The Complementarity of Institution and Charisms for Church Unity

Institution and charisms are indispensable for churches if there is to be a united church. They are both the means and end. Looking at the wonder of the unprecedented ecumenical developments during the charismatic renewal, charismatics tended to jump to the conclusion that the institutional effort is a waste of time, arguing that it involves a massive concentration on pursuing doctrinal agreement rather than focusing on experience, relying on human effort rather than the Holy Spirit. For example, at the seminar on ecumenical issues at Westminster 1977, Richard Hare claimed, “I believe that basis of unity to be not doctrinal agreement but unity in the

⁵⁰ E. Haenchen, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John II* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), p. 128.

⁵¹ Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens, *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal*, p. 33.

Spirit”. He was also sceptical about the “agreed statements” as he thought that they were “achieved by the use of subtle ambiguity” and churches would implement them in their own way.⁵² Rex Davies, as a staff member of the WCC during the 1970s, also suggests that the charismatic renewal was able to cross boundaries due to its emphasis on experiences, gifts and the Holy Spirit while the ecclesiastical structures hinder ecumenical progress.⁵³ However, the ecumenical function of the institution should not be underestimated. It is as vital as the experiential aspect found in grassroots unity. The founder of the WCC, W. A. Visser ’t Hooft insists that it will be “surely impracticable” to abandon the institution and preserve only the experience and gifts of the Spirit, because the united church cannot “manage without rules and agreed arrangements for its common life”.⁵⁴ The statement, “Gospel and the Spirit”, produced by the Fountain Trust and some Anglican evangelicals in the 1970s, affirms that besides experience, doctrine is also an essential element of unity according to the New Testament; without that, there would be ongoing dangers.⁵⁵

In the mainstream ecumenical discussions, the complementarity of institution and charisms in a united church were also a matter of concern. The first Faith and Order World Conference in Lausanne (1927) recognised that episcopal, presbyterian and congregational systems each had their place in the structure of the united church. But the members of the Conference did not forget the significant role of spiritual gifts in the united church which they enumerated as teaching, preaching and spiritual

⁵² Fountain Trust, *Ecumenical Issues II*, Westminster 1977.

⁵³ Rex Davis, *Locusts and Wild Honey: The Charismatic Renewal and the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1978), p. 87.

⁵⁴ W. A. Visser ’t Hooft, *Has the Ecumenical Movement a Future?* (Belfast: Christian Journal Ltd., 1974), p. 34.

⁵⁵ Fountain Trust, *Gospel and Spirit: A Joint Statement*, p. 8.

counsel.⁵⁶ Lukas Vischer comments that this vision at Lausanne of a united church combined “personal, collegial, charismatic and congregational elements”.⁵⁷ The following Faith and Order World Conference in Edinburgh (1937) inherited this vision and reasserted that “Our unity is of heart and spirit” based on the common faith of the church as the body of Christ. This spiritual unity is the foundation of the unity expressed by institution and cooperation.⁵⁸ Ecumenists such as Carl Braaten also share this vision which is that besides the institutional aspects, ecumenism should also take into account the pneumatological realm where the Spirit works across ecclesiastical boundaries to bring unity.⁵⁹ G. Evans sees the danger of losing the balance between institution and charisms in the united church, and says, “Too much order rigidifies and creates oppression. Too much spontaneity can produce chaos”.⁶⁰ The complementarity of institution and charisms for the unity of the church is made visible in the charismatic renewal, and the definition of visible unity, which has been the goal for the mainstream ecumenical movement, is widened by the visible expression of charisms. Before discussing this point, it is necessary to review the understanding of visible unity hitherto in order to compare the new meaning developed from the grassroots unity in the charismatic renewal.

⁵⁶ H. N. Bate (ed), *Faith and Order: Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927* (London: Student Christian Movement, 1927), pp. 469-470.

⁵⁷ Lukas Vischer, “Visible Unity—Realistic Goal or Mirage?”, *One in Christ*, Vol. XVIII, No. 1(1982), p. 28.

⁵⁸ Leonard Hodgson, *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order Held at Edinburgh, August 3-18, 1937* (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1938), p. 259

⁵⁹ Carl E. Braaten, *Mother Church: Ecclesiology and Ecumenism* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1998), pp. 8-9.

⁶⁰ G. R. Evans, *The Church and the Churches*, p. 138.

1.2.2. Institution and Charisms: Visible Unity in Two Understandings

1.2.2.1. A Review of Visible Unity

Visible unity is based on the dichotomy of spiritual/institutional unity. Visible unity relates to something institutional while invisible unity relates to something spiritual. Based on Jn 17:21 “that they may all be one... so that the world may believe”, ecumenists believe that although unity is a spiritual essence, it should be physically expressed by way of shared ecclesial structures, doctrines, and practising of sacraments and mutually recognised ministry so that the world will believe in Christ. The *Toronto Statement* in 1950 affirms the visible and invisible aspects of churches and asserted that both should be considered necessary for unity.⁶¹ This affirmation of visible unity was developed in detail at the New Delhi Assembly (1961) and the statement has become the central idea and definition of visible unity adopted by ecumenists.

We believe that the unity which is both God’s will and his gift to his Church is being made visible as all in each place who are baptised into Jesus Christ and confess him as Lord and Saviour are brought by the Holy Spirit into one fully committed fellowship, holding the one apostolic faith, preaching the one Gospel, breaking the one bread, joining in common prayer, and having a corporate life reaching out in witness and service to all and who at the same time are united with the whole Christian fellowship in all places and all ages in such wise that ministry and members are accepted by all, and that all can act and speak together as occasion require for the tasks to which God calls his people.⁶²

⁶¹ The statement affirms that the WCC “does not ‘imagine a church which one cannot see or touch, which would be only spiritual, in which numerous Christian bodies, though divided in matters of faith, would nevertheless be united through an invisible link.’ It does, however, include churches which believe that the Church is essentially invisible as well we those which hold that visible unity is essential”. (World Council of Churches, “Church & Ecumenical Relations: ‘Toronto Statement’”, Part III, no. 5. <http://www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/ecumenical/ts-e.html>. Accessed on 10 April 2005.)

⁶² W. A. Visser ’t Hooft (ed), *The New Delhi Report: The Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches 1961* (London: SCM Press, 1962), p. 116.

For the Roman Catholic Church there are two symbols of the visible unity. Firstly, they believe that visible unity implies a one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church involved “in the common celebration of the Eucharist” which is “the highest sacramental manifestation”.⁶³ Secondly, Vatican II confirms that the Pope is the symbol of the visible unity of the Church, including the unity of bishops and believers. He is the “perpetual and visible source and foundation” of church unity.⁶⁴ In his encyclical letter promulgated in 1995, John Paul II identified the Bishop of Rome as “the servant of unity” who “must ensure the communion of all the Churches”.⁶⁵ Although these two symbols are not universally accepted by non-Roman Catholic churches and they may well be obstacles to the kind of visible unity which they have envisaged, the Roman Catholic Church has opened up itself for dialogue with other churches since Vatican II and it has “irrevocably” committed to the ecumenical movement with “the ultimate goal” of “full visible unity”.⁶⁶

1.2.2.2. Institution and Charisms are both Entities of Visible Unity in the Charismatic Renewal

Ecumenists dichotomise visible and invisible unity by defining them from both the institutional and spiritual perspectives. However, the grassroots unity demonstrated in the charismatic renewal reveals that the boundary between visible and invisible unity is blurred and any clear-cut definition becomes questionable. Visible is about an object being seen, discovered or perceived and “exposed to view”.⁶⁷ Indeed, the five international conferences contained a degree of institutional visible unity which could

⁶³ John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint: On Commitment to Ecumenism* 1995.05.25, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp (accessed on 7 October 2006), 78, 97.

⁶⁴ Vatican Council II, *Lumen Gentium*, 23, p. 44.

⁶⁵ John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint: On Commitment to Ecumenism*, 94.

⁶⁶ John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint: On Commitment to Ecumenism*, 3, 77.

⁶⁷ *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*. (Electronic Dictionary)

be seen in such things as the concelebration of the eucharist by ministers from both episcopal and non-episcopal churches and the joint participation of Christians from various traditions. This sharing of the eucharist was a huge ecumenical advance as it implied a mutual recognition of ministry and membership of the body of Christ.

Moreover, there was also spiritual unity that was visible during the conferences. The practice of charisms such as healing, exorcism, speaking and singing in tongues, interpretation and prophecy are visually and aurally manifest in the congregation and contribute to unity by reciprocal ministry. The inner love and caring for one another are outwardly demonstrated by the use of gifts with the added physical expression of such things as laying on of hands. This confirms what Christopher Hill notes, “as human beings the spiritual is communicated with and through our physical bodies”.⁶⁸ The spiritual aspect of unity which has been regarded as invisible is given visual expression with the use of charisms. The semantic spectrum of visible unity is no longer limited to the institutional and sacramental realm, as the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church define it, but is expanded to the spiritual in the charismatic renewal. In this sense, the charismatic renewal strengthens the complementarity between institution and charisms by making both of them visible, and hence, there can be institutional visible unity and spiritual visible unity. To sustain this visible unity with the complementarity of institution and charism, conciliar fellowship is a model worth considering.

⁶⁸ Christopher Hill, “Route-Planning the Future Ecumenical Journey”, in Jeremy Morris & Nicholas Sagovsky (eds) *The Unity We Have and the Unity We Seek: Ecumenical Proposal for the Third Millennium* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), p. 205.

1.2.3. Conciliar Fellowship: A Model of Visible Unity and Complementarities

Conciliar fellowship⁶⁹ is a model which can further develop the complementarities of institution and charisms and connect the official and grassroots level of a visible united church in a charismatic context. It was a concept constructed by the Faith and Order Commission during the meetings in Bristol (1967), Leuven (1971) and Salamanca (1973)⁷⁰ refer to the united church “as a conciliar fellowship of the local churches which are themselves truly united”. Each local church shares the catholicity of this united church and in communion with others. Hence, according to the New Delhi statement, sacramentally they celebrate the eucharist together and receive the same baptism. They mutually recognise one another’s members and ministries. The oneness of the church represented in this conciliar fellowship is aimed at fulfilling the shared calling of witnessing the gospel together.⁷¹ The WCC regarded itself as a “transitional opportunity” for the conciliarity of the united church at Uppsala Assembly (1968)⁷² and confirmed the definition made in Salamanca at the Nairobi Assembly (1975).⁷³

⁶⁹ In English, “conciliar” is derived from the word “council” which carries two meanings. It can mean the council of a united church attended by representatives of churches or the informal and preliminary meeting of divided churches. Other languages make distinction between these two concepts, such as French (*concile/conseil*), Spanish (*concilio/consejo*), German (*Konzil/Rat*), Latin (*concilium/consilium*), Greek (*synodos/symboulion*), and Russian (*sobornost/sowjet*). Obviously the meaning that ecumenists refer to is the council of a united church. The process where churches are approaching to this goal is called “pre-conciliar”. (Catholicos Aram I Keshishian, *Conciliar Fellowship: A Common Goal* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1996), pp. 1-2; Lukas Vischer, “The Unity We Seek: Origin and Meaning of the Concept ‘Conciliar Fellowship’”, in Choan Seng Song (ed) *Growing Together into Unity: Texts of the Faith and Order Communion on Conciliar Fellowship* (Christian Literature Society, 1978), p. 190, note 5; “Conciliar Fellowship and Councils: Churches on their Way to a Universal Council”, *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. 41, No. 4 (October 1989), p. 503.)

⁷⁰ Catholicos Aram I Keshishian, *Conciliar Fellowship*, p. 2.

⁷¹ World Council of Churches, “Concepts of Unity and Models of Union, September 1973”, in *What Kind of Unity?* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1974), p. 121.

⁷² Norman Goodall (ed), *The Uppsala 68 Report: Official Report of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches Uppsala July 4-20, 1968* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1968), p. 17.

⁷³ Catholicos Aram I Keshishian, *Conciliar Fellowship*, p. 2.

However, this concept has not been developed or implemented any further by the WCC from the 1980s until now. Nonetheless, some ecumenists still insist on its significance. Lukas Vischer, the harbinger of this concept in 1967, still talked about “churches on their way to a universal council” in an article written in 1989.⁷⁴ An Orthodox Archbishop in Lebanon, Catholicos Aram I Kechishian, claimed in 1996 that conciliar fellowship was “the most challenging and promising model for a common vision of unity”.⁷⁵ In the foreword to Kechishian’s book, Mary Tanner expressed her regret that the ecumenical movement had moved conciliar fellowship from the ecumenical agenda.⁷⁶ I also believe that conciliar fellowship is a preferable model for visible unity, particularly in the charismatic context. Since it contains both the elements of “council” and “fellowship”, it suggests that the united church consists of a central institution which is responsible for the order and doctrines of the church and of the fraternal relationship of member churches at the local level. It is a model that opens up many kinds of complementarity that can be developed, particularly in the charismatic context, as the following three points will indicate.

1.2.3.1. Uniformity-Diversity

Conciliar fellowship in the charismatic context can develop a complementarity between uniformity and diversity in the church. Ecumenists tend to draw a contrast between uniformity and unity and give negative appraisals to the former and positive ones to the latter. However if a united church is so diversified, how can it be recognised as a truly united church? Without a certain degree of uniformity, the united church will have a lack of order. The council of the conciliar fellowship can settle issues of ecclesiological order, structure and doctrines and reach agreements which

⁷⁴ Lukas Vischer, “Conciliar Fellowship and Councils”, pp. 501-514.

⁷⁵ Catholicos Aram I Keshishian, *Conciliar Fellowship*, p. xi.

⁷⁶ Catholicos Aram I Keshishian, *Conciliar Fellowship*, p. iv.

member churches are required to follow. Moreover, facing the social, political and environmental challenges, the council provides an arena for member churches to find common ground for joint action.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, diversity is to be encouraged for maintaining local cultures and the using of charisms. This is because it demonstrates that the work of the Holy Spirit differs from place to place in the variety of gifts and the customs of local churches. And also, it can maintain the unique aspects of the life of a particular local church. Hence, the diverse charismatic elements of the united church can be preserved, but at the same time the church can be disciplined by the agreed doctrine and order, protecting it both from going astray and from recurring division.

1.2.3.2. The Council-Churches at Grassroots Level

This kind of complementarity can be interpreted in two ways. Firstly, it holds together the relationship between truth and experience. The council is responsible for identifying and discerning truths, which will then be tested in the experience of churches at the grassroots level. The churches' reactions and responses to what the council has identified will provide a point of reference for future thinking. This upward and downward relationship between the council and churches can be summarised by Vischer's comment:

The truth of a council becomes evident as the truth when it is tested in the life of the church over a long period of time. A council is deemed to have really spoken for the church and acted for the church when the truth of what it has said is demonstrated in the "reception" of the church.⁷⁸

⁷⁷ Lukas Vischer, "Conciliar Fellowship and Councils", p. 508.

⁷⁸ Lukas Vischer, "Conciliar Fellowship and Councils", p. 509.

The role of the council is vital in discerning whether the charismatic experiences are from the Holy Spirit and whether they are of the truth, and so avoiding confusion. As Lesslie Newbigin rightly notes, conciliar fellowship can serve to provide for “the imperfect discipleship of each local congregation both the correction and the support of the wider fellowship”.⁷⁹

Secondly, conciliar fellowship can bring ecumenical cooperation between church leaders and laity at the grassroots level. The council gathers leaders of local churches to discuss issues, and then they implement them in their local churches with lay people. On the one hand, it avoids the hegemony of ecumenical consensus which is achieved mainly at the official level and then imposed on the grassroots level; and on the other hand, it avoids the over-spontaneous ecumenical impulse which bursts out at the grassroots level and produces a spark of sentimental and experiential unity, but cannot be sustained without the foundation of faith and order. As the charismatic renewal restores the lay involvement in church ministry through charisms, the cooperation between the official and grassroots level will increase. The conciliar agreements on doctrine and order can also strengthen the grassroots unity nurtured by experience and affection.

1.2.3.3. Holy Spirit-Human Beings

Conciliar fellowship will be a sustainable model of the united church only if the Holy Spirit is allowed to work within it according to His will, as is envisioned in Rahner’s open system. This means that the Holy Spirit can act as the Paraclete who abides and accompanies the church, a gathering of Christians with the divine identity of God’s

⁷⁹ Lesslie Newbigin, “What is ‘A Local Church Truly United’?”, in Choan Seng Song (ed) *Growing Together into Unity: Texts of the Faith and Order Commission on Conciliar Fellowship* (Christian Literature Society, 1978), p. 163.

chosen people, and reflects the holiness and glory of God. Moreover, this Paraclete should also be allowed to be the teacher of truth, the revealer of the future and hidden facts, and the one who reminds the church of truth in all circumstances. Most importantly, the Spirit must be allowed to be the constant giver of life so that the church can grow potently in spiritual strength and physical size. As was recorded at Edinburgh in 1937, "...the visible unity of the Body of Christ can issue only from the Living God through the work of the life-giving Spirit".⁸⁰ The charismatic renewal vibrantly displays the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete through charisms which are essential for the vitality of the church. This can be an example for the conciliar fellowship of the united church both in its council and local churches. The council, if it is to be "genuine", should be a "'Spirit-provoked' event", as Vischer quotes from an Orthodox theologian.⁸¹ He also suggests that the council should invoke the Holy Spirit to work through the council in its search for truth.⁸² Hence, although human beings are explicitly present at the council and local churches, they are vessels of the guardian, the Holy Spirit, who is implicitly working through them. This complementariness enables the two kinds of complementarities mentioned above to be maintained and become beneficial to the church and the world. This is because the Holy Spirit Himself embodies this complementarity, being the Spirit of both truth and experience, of discipline and spontaneity.

Conciliar fellowship develops three kinds of complementarity within the united church by combining the institution and charisms. It allows room for charisms to be used at the grassroots level while the council monitor and observe them. It also allows

⁸⁰ Leonard Hodgson, *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order Held at Edinburgh, August 3-18, 1937*, p. 252.

⁸¹ Lukas Vischer, "Conciliar Fellowship and Councils", p. 506.

⁸² Lukas Vischer, "Conciliar Fellowship and Councils", pp. 508-509.

room for the widened definition of visible unity, both spiritual and institutional, to operate within the united church.

1.3. Conclusion

This section explains why institution and charisms should be complementary both in the church and church unity. Although the manifestation of charisms is the main feature, the charismatic renewal does not suggest a replacement of the institution with charisms in churches but promotes the complementarity between the two. It redefines visible unity such that spiritual elements can also become visible when charisms are used and unity is nurtured. To realise this complementarity of institution and charisms visibly in the church united, conciliar fellowship is believed to be the preferable model as it allows other kinds of complementarity to develop. It can also maintain the connection between unity at the grassroots and the official level.

2. Christology and Pneumatology

In the previous section, we have explored the possible complementarity between institution and charism theoretically and practically. They are interpreted as ecclesiological elements represented by christology and pneumatology respectively. As a Roman Catholic theologian, Bradford Hinze points out that “offices founded by Christ and charisms bequeathed by the Spirit” are indispensable for the church.⁸³ Orthodox theologian John Zizioulas also makes this distinction by defining the church “*in-stituted*” by Christ and “*con-stituted*” by the Spirit. The institution is a “fact” or

⁸³ Bradford Hinze, “Releasing the Power of the Spirit in a Trinitarian Ecclesiology”, in Bradford E. Hinze and D. Lyle Dabney (eds) *Advents of the Spirit: An Introduction to the Current Study of Pneumatology* (Milwaukee Wisconsin: Marquette University Press, 2001), p. 368.

“*fait-accomplit*” while constitution is shaped by human participation.⁸⁴ Just as there should be a complementarity between the institution and the charisms for the church and its unity, so also there should be a complementarity between christology and pneumatology which form them both. Particularly because the ecumenism constructed by the WCC and Vatican II has been justified and has sustained itself by christology, while the charismatic renewal which has an ecumenical character is understood in terms of pneumatology, it is necessary to discuss how the two theologies can complement each other ecumenically. In this section, I will firstly review the christologies of the WCC and the Vatican II and, secondly, discuss the complementarity of these two theologies both ecclesiological and ecumenically.

2.1. A Review of WCC’s Christologies

Ecumenists admit that christology dominates the theology of the movement and its practices. Since 1910 a “Christocentric Universalism” has gradually developed. Visser ’t Hooft claims emphatically that “The World Council of Church is either a Christocentric movement or it is nothing at all.” Raiser regards this paradigm as “deliberate”⁸⁵ and José Míguez Bonino sees that the centre of movement is understood christologically.⁸⁶ This was particularly so when the church faced new challenges from society such as Nazism during the second world war, communism and capitalism on either side of the iron curtain after the war, and then also the growing religious syncretism. The Council was determined not only to safeguard its christological emphasis to counteract these ideologies, but also to apply it universally

⁸⁴ John Zizioulas, *Being As Communion*, p. 140.

⁸⁵ W. A. Visser ’t Hooft, “The Calling of the World Council of Churches”, *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (January 1962), p. 224.

⁸⁶ José Míguez Bonino, “The Concern for a Vital and Coherent Theology”, *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (April 1989), p. 166.

to all human beings and to the church.⁸⁷ This Christocentric universalism penetrated every sphere of the movement: from the practical side such as mission represented by the International Missionary Council (IMC) and the social service of churches cooperating with one another represented by the Life and Work Movement (L&W), to the building up of theological frameworks by the Faith and Order Movement (F&O).

2.1.1. International Missionary Council (IMC)

Initially, the concept of Christocentric universalism did not occur in the IMC and it deliberately avoided any discussion of faith and order as it claimed that it was “interdenominational” and that its work did not “involve the idea of organic and ecclesiastical union”. Instead, its members were “entirely dependant on the gift from God of the spirit of fellowship, mutual understanding, and desire to co-operate.”⁸⁸ This policy was brought to an end at the Tambaram meeting in 1938 as delegates realised the necessity of searching for theological common ground. They agreed that global evangelisation should be based on “the common affirmation of the centrality of Christ and a common conception of the nature and task of the Church”.⁸⁹ This declaration paved the way for the IMC to converge with the ecumenical movement and from 1948 to become one of the components of the WCC.

2.1.2. Life and Work (L&W)

This movement was initiated by Archbishop Söderblom in Stockholm in 1925 in response to the aftermath of the First World War. It aimed “to proclaim the lordship

⁸⁷ Konrad Raiser, “Confessing the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour”, *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (April 1985), p. 188.

⁸⁸ Quoted in W. A. Visser 't Hooft, *No Other Name: The Choice between Syncretism and Christian Universalism* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1963), p. 104.

⁸⁹ W. A. Visser 't Hooft, *No Other Name*, p. 105.

of Christ in all realms of life” through practical work in the society.⁹⁰ Similar to the IMC, it also avoided considering any doctrinal problems, and the slogan “doctrine divides, but service unites” was used as a justification for this intention. Nevertheless, Christocentric universalism implicitly dominated the movement. As was stated at a conference, ““The nearer we draw to the Crucified, the nearer we come to one another....In the Crucified and Risen Lord alone lies the world’s hope.””⁹¹ Again, this affirmation enabled the movement to cooperate with the IMC and F&O and subsequently becomes part of the WCC.

2.1.3. Faith and Order (F&O)

This movement played a significant role in constructing christologies for the ecumenical movement in the early stages and the WCC. The movement’s confession of “Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour” built a foundation for the ecumenical movement and subsequently became part of the constitution of the WCC. This clearly demonstrates the christocentric universalism of the ecumenical movement. Despite the one confession, there were five christologies emerging between the 1927 conference at Lausanne and the 1968 Uppsala Assembly. Firstly, christology was discussed in terms of a personal relationship with Christ. At the first and second F&O conferences at Lausanne (1927) and Edinburgh (1937), christology was an “ice-breaking” topic for delegates who did not know each other, coming as they did from churches around the world, and they compared their points of view regarding Jesus.⁹² Apart from touching on such doctrines as Jesus as the second person of the Trinity and the head of the church, they aimed at showing the relationship of Jesus as a

⁹⁰ W. A. Visser ’t Hooft, *No Other Name*, p. 108.

⁹¹ Quoted in W. A. Visser ’t Hooft, *No Other Name*, p. 109.

⁹² Conrad Simonson, *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), pp. vii, 47, 175.

Saviour to their personal lives especially at Lausanne.⁹³ At Edinburgh, this topic was only one of the sections on the general topic of the church which included “the church: our common faith”, “the church: agreements and differences”, “the church and the kingdom of God”, “the function of the church”, “‘Una Santa’ and our divisions”, ministry and sacraments.⁹⁴ In other words, the church was the focus rather than Christ.

Secondly, at Lund (1952), members of the F&O began to look into the ecclesiological traditions which shaped christology.⁹⁵ Through the influence of Karl Barth, the F&O put the stress on the intimate relationship between the church and Christ who is the head of the church and on whom the church relies.⁹⁶ A christological ecclesiology was shaped at Lund, and hence Conrad Simonson regards this conference as highly significant in terms of F&O’s christology as it stretched the discussion from the level of considering Christ purely in terms of personal experience to the wider context of ecclesiology.⁹⁷

Thirdly, a cosmic christology emerged at the New Delhi assembly in 1961. It was proposed by Joseph Sittler⁹⁸ to counteract the “angelic Christology” which filters out the physical elements of human beings and their connection with nature regarding

⁹³The report of Lausanne states, “Through His life and teaching, His call to repentance, His proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom of God and of judgment, His suffering and death, His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and by the mission of the Holy Spirit, He has brought to us forgiveness of sins, and has revealed the fullness of the living God, and His boundless love towards us. By the appeal of that love, shown in its completeness on the Cross, He summons us to the new life of faith, self-sacrifice, and devotion to His service and the service of men. (H. N. Bate (ed.), *Faith and Order*, p. 462.)

⁹⁴ Leonard Hodgson (ed.), *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order Held at Edinburgh, August 3-18 1937*, pp. 231-235, 239-249.

⁹⁵ Conrad Simonson, *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement*, p. vii.

⁹⁶ As the report of Lund states, “Christ lives in his Church and the Church lives in Christ, Christ is never without his Church; the Church is never without Christ.” (Conrad Simonson, *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement*, p. 72.)

⁹⁷ Conrad Simonson, *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement*, p. 76.

⁹⁸ He was a Lutheran professor of the University of Chicago Divinity School.

redemption.⁹⁹ Based on Col 1:15-20, he claimed that redemption is for the whole of nature and human history, which means “all things”.¹⁰⁰ He widened the spectrum of redemption from being only for human beings to the whole creation and cosmos,¹⁰¹ and believed that cosmic christology could lead to “*the possibility for genuine unity*”.¹⁰² However, delegates of the Assembly had doubts about it because the concept was “too broad”. They still adhered to the redemption of humanity without embracing the whole of nature.¹⁰³ Two years after the Assembly, cosmic christology had still not gained much support from ecumenists.¹⁰⁴ For both Barthian theologians, whose approach had been mainly adopted in F&O since 1927, and the Bultmannians, who increasingly gained more attention in the 1960s, cosmic christology was regarded as “poetry or nonsense”.¹⁰⁵

Fourthly, in contrast to the breadth of cosmic theology, existential christology emerged at the Montreal conference (1963). Following on from Bultmann’s existentialist approach, theologians such as Ernst Käsemann claimed at the conference that “Christian doctrine is not to be regarded as a statement about reality *as such*, but about reality *for me now*.”¹⁰⁶ They focused on the here-and-now reality and the individual who is in that reality. The voice of the existentialists balanced F&O’s

⁹⁹ Conrad Simonson, *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement*, pp. 94, 96.

¹⁰⁰ W. A. Visser ’t Hooft (ed.), *The New Delhi Report*, p. 15.

¹⁰¹ At the assembly, he stated, “A doctrine of redemption is meaningful only when it swings within the larger orbit of a doctrine of creation. For God’s creation of earth cannot be redeemed in any intelligible sense of the word apart from a doctrine of the cosmos which is man’s home, his definite place, the theatre of his selfhood under God, in co-operation with his neighbour, and in caring-relationship with nature”. (W. A. Visser ’t Hooft (ed.), *The New Delhi Report*, p. 15.)

¹⁰² Conrad Simonson, *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement*, p. 97.

¹⁰³ W. A. Visser ’t Hooft (ed.), *The New Delhi Report*, p. 16.

¹⁰⁴ At the Montreal conference of the F&O in 1963, delegates agreed that God’s power and grace could be found in “the world of man outside Church and in nonhuman creation”, but they questioned whether they were saved by Jesus and therefore revealed His Lordship. Theologians made the criticism that cosmic christology enlarged the distance between Christ and human actual life. (Conrad Simonson, *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement*, p. 119.)

¹⁰⁵ Conrad Simonson, *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement*, p. 120.

¹⁰⁶ Quoted in Conrad Simonson, *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement*, p. 119.

christology with a concern about “the inner world of decision-making man”, in contrast to the predominantly Barthian emphasis on God’s authority over the world.¹⁰⁷

Finally, a humanity christology approach appeared in F&O’s theology at the Uppsala Assembly in 1968. On the one hand it discussed the humanity of Christ and his salvific work, and on the other hand the creation of a “new human community” through salvation.¹⁰⁸ This approach seems to succeed the Bultmannian existential theology since it places the main focus on humanity and the reality that human beings are facing as a result of sin. It also suggests that Christ’s redemption is a resolution for the hopeless situation of humanity and leads to the emergence of a new human community.

2.1.4. “Jesus Christ as God and Saviour”

A confession of “Jesus Christ as God and Saviour” precisely and concisely characterises the christological approach of the ecumenical movement, and from this simple statement the three separate streams, IMC, L&W and F&O, were drawn together to form the WCC. This phrase was originally used by the Young Men’s Christian Association but adopted by the Episcopal Conference in 1910 and appeared frequently in the F&O documents.¹⁰⁹ This confession was a common denominator that the early ecumenists shared, and a criterion for selecting who should be invited to participate in any meetings.¹¹⁰ Moreover, this phrase also makes clear the nature of

¹⁰⁷ Conrad Simonson, *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement*, p. 120.

¹⁰⁸ The report reads as follows, “This unity of man is grounded for the Christian not only in his creation by the one God in his own image, but in Jesus Christ who “for us men” became man, was crucified and who constitutes the church which is his body as a new community of new creatures”. (Norman Goodall (ed), *Uppsala Speaks: Section Reports of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches Uppsala 1968* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1968), p. 18.)

¹⁰⁹ Conrad Simonson, *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement*, pp. 22-23.

¹¹⁰ For instance, the initiator of the F&O movement, Bishop Brent, and a layman, Robert Gardiner, took this as the basis for choosing delegates. Gardiner explained at a F&O meeting in 1915 that,

