

INDEPENDENCE OR OWNERSHIP?

A comparison of the struggles and successes of the Bible
College principalships of Howard Carter (1921-1948)
and Donald Gee (1951-1964) with a special focus
on both the risks and benefits of independence and denominational
ownership during these eras.

This dissertation is submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University of
Chester for the degree of Doctor of Ministry by Steven David Jenkins.

April 2019

Abstract

The British Assemblies of God Bible College can trace its roots to the Pentecostal Missionary Union's (PMU) Training Homes which were established in 1909 for men and in 1910 for women. In 1924 the PMU amalgamated into the newly-formed British Assemblies of God (AoG), with a full merger in 1925, and the PMU Training Homes/Bible Schools continued as an independent enterprise under the leadership of Howard Carter, albeit with strong links to British AoG. In 1951, the independent Bible School at Hampstead and in Bristol were given to Assemblies of God and from this time, through to the present, have been denominationally owned and governed. The College's first principal under denominational ownership and governance was Donald Gee. Although this dissertation seeks to reconstruct some of the important contextual narrative of the Bible School(s), from its inception in 1909 through to the end of Donald Gee's principalship in 1964, this research endeavours to be an analysis and comparison of Carter's 27 years as Principal of an independent, yet denominationally-linked college, with the 13-year tenure of Gee's, when it was financially owned and governed by the Assemblies of God. There will be a special focus on the risks and benefits of independence/ownership during the respective eras, examined through criteria such as Finance, Curriculum, Personnel issues and the Student body. In addition to historical research, some contemporary analysis on the risks and benefits of independence/ownership in the 21st century will be elucidated in the Conclusion together with other areas of interest that will be assessed at various points of the dissertation, such as early attitudes to Pentecostal education and whether the focus of training had changed in AoG from overseas to the home field. In light of obvious and perceived risks and benefits, the Conclusion will seek to answer the question of whether denominational independence or denominational ownership was more beneficial for the College in the past and for the current Assemblies of God Bible College at Mattersey. In addition, other observations and lessons for Mattersey Hall will be made. This research seeks to recover the lost voice of this Pentecostal Bible College – to learn lessons from the past in order to help it survive and thrive in the future. This research will be predominantly based on information provided by primary sources.

Declaration

The material being presented for examination is my own work and has not been submitted for an award of this or another HEI. Where research pertaining to the thesis was undertaken collaboratively, the nature and extent of my individual contribution has been made explicit.

Signature:

Submission:

Acknowledgments

I express my heartfelt thanks to all those who have accompanied me on the long journey towards completing this piece of work. Gratitude must be extended to the past and present principals and all the staff and students at Mattersey Hall Bible College – thank you for your interest and encouragement to keep taking my study days. Special thanks to the archivists for giving me unlimited access to the fascinating Donald Gee Centre, housed at Mattersey Hall, Nr. Doncaster.

Most importantly I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr Anne Dyer, for her invaluable guidance at various times throughout this project; and indeed, the assistant supervisor Dr Sue Sainsbury. In addition, Dr Leigh Goodwin has offered helpful advice and motivation along the way. Together they have helped me to produce a piece of work of which I am proud, and I trust will be of use to others.

Finally, I must express genuine appreciation to my family and friends who have supported me throughout. To my wonderful wife, Deborah, and children, Caleb and Aaron, who have released me on many evenings, weekends and holidays to think, research and to write.

Abstract.....	2
Declaration	3
Acknowledgments	4
Chapter 1: Preamble.....	8
1.1 Introduction.....	8
1.2 Methodology.....	9
1.3 Historiography	12
1.4 Literature review	14
1.4.1 European and British Pentecostalism.....	14
1.4.2 Primary sources relating to the PMU.....	16
1.4.3 Academic and other sources relating to the PMU Training Homes and missions training pre-1925	18
1.4.4 Primary sources relating to British AoG and its Bible College	18
1.4.5 Academic and other sources on British AoG and its Bible College	19
1.4.6 Literature Review Conclusion	22
Chapter 2: In the Beginning (1909-1921).....	23
2.1 The formation of the Pentecostal Missionary Union (PMU).....	23
2.2 The foundation and focus of the PMU Training Homes including early attitudes to Pentecostal training.....	26
2.3 The Men’s Training Home	33
2.4 The Women’s Training Home	42
Chapter 3: An Era of Independence: The Principalship of Howard Carter (1921-48).....	45
3.1 Howard Carter.....	45
3.2 The end of the PMU and the beginning of the Assemblies of God	50
3.3 Development and growth of Hampstead and beyond	55

3.4 The War Years and other attempts at training	66
3.5 Struggles and Success - Finance, Curriculum, Personnel & the Student body..	74
Finance	74
Curriculum	76
Personnel.....	79
The Student body	81
Chapter 4: The Interim Period (1948-1951).....	85
4.1 The relinquishing of Hampstead, George Newsholme & the move to Kenley..	85
4.2 The merging of Bristol and Kenley Schools and AoG ownership	88
Chapter 5: An Era of Denominational Ownership: The Principalship of Donald Gee (1951-64)	92
5.1 Donald Gee	92
5.2 Development and growth of Kenley and beyond.....	95
5.3 Struggles and Success - Finance, Curriculum, Personnel & the Student body	110
Finance	110
Curriculum.....	111
Personnel	113
The Student body	115
Chapter 6: An Analysis.....	119
6.1 The effects on Finance during both eras	119
6.2 The effects on the Curriculum during both eras.....	121
6.3 The effects on Personnel during both eras	125
6.4 The effects on the Student body during both eras.....	127
Chapter 7: Conclusion and other observations	131
7.1 Conclusion	131
7.2 Other observations and lessons for the future/further study	139

Bibliography.....	143
Books	143
Journal Articles	146
Theses.....	147
Minutes.....	148
Periodicals/Magazines	148
Letters.....	149
CD-ROMs.....	150
Websites	150
Other.....	150

Chapter 1: Preamble

1.1 Introduction

The Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland (AoG), a fellowship of Pentecostal churches founded in 1924, have had, throughout its history, a strong conviction of its role to facilitate the spread of the gospel throughout the world within a Pentecostal context. Training and equipping men and women through its School(s) for both global and national contexts has therefore been at the forefront from the earliest days.

This dissertation seeks to analyse and compare two relatively successful eras of Bible College training within British AoG during its 95-year existence – namely the principalships of Howard Carter (1921-1948) and Donald Gee (1951-1964). These individuals have been chosen because of their similarities – e.g. both were founding members of British Assemblies of God, both served on its Executive Council for a number of years, both were recognised as able preachers and teachers, both travelled widely, both were authors on Pentecostal issues, both served for over a decade as principals of the Bible College and both experienced their fair share of struggles and successes during their individual tenures. Interestingly, both were born in the same year, 1891. However, these individuals have also been chosen because of one major difference – one served under denominational¹ ownership, where the School was owned and governed by the Assemblies of God via its appointed Board of Governors and its General Council of ministers and one self-owned and governed the School as an autonomous organisation within a denomination, without a Board of Governors, a council or even a Board of Trustees.

This dissertation seeks to document the establishment of the Bible School(s) in British AoG and its predecessor, the Pentecostal Missionary Union (PMU), to plot its growth and influence in narrative form during each of the two eras in question and to use such information to develop the main purpose of the research - namely the risks and

¹ ‘Denomination’, in this context, is defined by the *Oxford Dictionary* as ‘a recognised autonomous branch of the Christian Church.’

benefits of denominational ownership/autonomous independence in both eras through criteria such as Finance, Curriculum, Personnel and the Student body. The Conclusion will seek to answer the question of whether independence or denominational ownership is more beneficial for the effective running of the current Assemblies of God Bible College in Mattersey from a historical comparison and contemporary point of view.

The gauntlet has been well and truly thrown down for the writer by his colleague, John Andrews, in the Conclusion of his 2003 PhD thesis where he states, ‘The journey from Hampstead to Kenley is rich in material, personalities and controversy and needs to be examined.’²

This, in essence, will be the subject of my dissertation.

1.2 Methodology

Nicholas Walliman lists ten key research methodologies in his work, *Your Research Project*.³ From this list, the ‘Historical’ approach is described as ‘the systematic and objective location and synthesis of evidence in order to establish facts and draw conclusions about past events’⁴ and involves ‘Where the events take place, which people are involved, when the events occurred and what kind of human activity was involved.’⁵ The ‘Comparative’ approach, often used with historical research, compares ‘experiences of different eras or societies, either between times in the past or in parallel situations in the present.’⁶ Such an approach of history and comparison provides ‘a natural experiment.’⁷ Chiara Beccalossi would concur when she states that ‘comparative history is a study of similar historical phenomena in different settings’

² J. Andrews, *The Regions Beyond*, PhD thesis (University of Wales, Bangor: Unpublished, 2003), p.317

³ N. Walliman, *Your Research Project: A Step-by-Step Guide* (London: Sage, 2001), p.112

⁴ Walliman, *Your Research*, p.113

⁵ Walliman, *Your Research*, p.114

⁶ Walliman, *Your Research*, p.114

⁷ Walliman, *Your Research*, p.115

which ‘involves two fundamental aims: to disclose both similar and different causal conditions in different geographical or temporal settings.’⁸ Beccalossi continues to elucidate the challenges of the comparative model, namely ‘for a comparison to be useful, there must be some similarities between the two phenomena.’⁹

In order to both fulfil its aims, as stated in the ‘Introduction’ and to provide such similarities for comparison, this research dissertation will be a comparative study of two 20th century Bible College eras within a historical framework. This dissertation will follow a chronological line with an overview of the 1909-1921 era of the School(s) establishment and early growth, together with relevant ‘pointers’ towards the eras under review (Chapter 2), background and analysis of the two eras in question - Howard Carter: Independence 1921-1947 (Chapter 3) and Donald Gee: Ownership 1951-1964 (Chapter 5), with a brief explanation of the important intervening events between both principalships, 1947-1951 (Chapter 4) for continuity purposes. Such a chronological approach has been adopted by a number of Church historians including Bishop J. Moorman¹⁰ and Adrian Hastings.¹¹

Within this chronological framework, the two relatively ‘successful’ eras of training, will be examined and the risks and benefits of independence/ownership respectively will be compared with the necessary discussion of the College-Denominational relationship threaded through (Chapter 6). Various areas of college life during the two eras are used as criteria to analyse such risks and benefits, namely Finance, Curriculum, Personnel and the Student body. In the Conclusion (Chapter 7), such analysis from history, together with contemporary considerations, will seek to determine what is beneficial for the current Assemblies of God Bible College.

At this stage it would be prudent to define the key terms, ‘Independence’ and ‘Ownership’ as understood by Howard Carter and Donald Gee respectively:

⁸ T. Loughran (ed), *A Practical Guide to Studying History* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), p.49

⁹ T. Loughran (ed), *A Practical Guide*, p.49

¹⁰ J.R.H. Moorman, *A History of the Church in England* (London: A. & C. Black, 1953)

¹¹ A. Hastings, *A History of English Christianity 1920-1985* (London: Collins, 1986)

In 1922, 'Independence' for Howard Carter, and as defined throughout this dissertation, was explicitly a venture for which he would be 'personally and financially responsible, without a council'¹² and his School would not be owned by a denomination.¹³ In 1924, when AoG was formed, Carter's School at Hampstead was amongst the first 26 Assemblies to join the Fellowship.¹⁴ The *Constitution*, drawn up in the same year, detailed the structure of the new Fellowship in three tiers: (1) The Local Assembly with its autonomy or independence safeguarded;¹⁵ (2) The District Council which was to exercise a pastoral role in the event of difficulties if invited in; (3) The General Council which was comprised of all ministers, missionaries or evangelists with British and which met annually for discussion and minor decision-making. With such 'assembly' status, Carter's School had immediate and close links with Assemblies of God, together with the benefits that brought which will be examined later in the dissertation, and autonomous status.¹⁶ Such autonomy meant 'there was little in the way of central control'¹⁷ and it could 'conduct its affairs without interference except in exceptional cases'.¹⁸ The School was therefore able to govern itself, have control over its own affairs, own its own buildings, pay its own staff and could act independently of a higher authority as long as it did not teach against the fundamental beliefs of AoG and the leaders did not fail morally. According to the Constitution, should this be the case, the District Council would investigate the matter which could lead to discipline and expulsion for the minister from the

¹² J. Carter, *Howard Carter - Man of the Spirit* (Nottingham: AoG Pub., 1971), p.63

¹³ *PMU Minutes* (10th July 1922)

¹⁴ R. D. Massey, *A Sound and Scriptural Union: The Origins of British Assemblies of God 1920-1925*, PhD thesis (University of Birmingham: Unpublished, 1987), p.339

¹⁵ Massey, *A Sound and Scriptural Union*, p.97.

¹⁶ W.K. Kay, *Pentecostals in Britain* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000), p.29

¹⁷ W.D Foster, *Authority and Authenticity in the Leadership of the British Assemblies of God*, PhD thesis (Kings College, London: Unpublished, 2018), p.71

¹⁸ Massey, *A Sound and Scriptural Union*, p.97

Fellowship. For all other matters, the District Council would need to be invited in by the local assembly to investigate and/or provide pastoral care.¹⁹

‘Ownership’ for Donald Gee during his Principalship from 1951 to 1964, and as defined throughout this dissertation, constituted the fact that the Bible College, now situated at Kenley, was owned by the Assemblies of God and under the jurisdiction of General Council.²⁰ This resulted in the loss of autonomous status which the College had held since 1924 and meant that the buildings belonged to AoG and it could not act independently of a higher authority. A Board of Governors (BoG) was appointed to oversee College affairs and appoint the Principal, who in turn would be expected to appoint a faculty and staff and produce regular progress reports for the Governors who were ultimately answerable to the General Council of Ministers who met annually for the General Conference. At Conference, any recognised minister with status could raise a matter concerning the College from the floor and, in theory, decisions made by the College principal/faculty/BoG could be questioned and overturned at a vote.²¹ As will be seen, such ownership brought expectations with regards to the four criteria examined throughout this dissertation - Finance, Curriculum, Personnel and the Student body.

1.3 Historiography

‘History’ and ‘historiography’ have a similar etymology but have different concepts. The former has been described as ‘the study of past events’ whereas the latter is defined as ‘the study of how historians have interpreted past events’²² or ‘the way history is written’.²³ In many ways history is more straightforward as it generally deals with the ‘what, when and who’ – whereas historiography is more about the ‘why and how’. The writers of such material as Council Minutes and *Redemption Tidings*,

¹⁹ Massey, *A Sound and Scriptural Union*, p.98. The *Constitution* states the three ‘tiers’

²⁰ W.K. Kay, *Inside Story* (Nottingham: Mattersey Hall Pub., 1990), p.232

²¹ Kay, *Inside*, p.232

²² G. Wacker, ‘Bibliography and Historiography of Pentecostalism’ Burgess & McGee, *Dictionary of Pentecostal & Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1988), p.69

²³ W.K. Kay, *Pentecostalism* (London: SCM, 2009), p.15

on which this dissertation has heavily relied, were written for their contemporary generation by key participants within the Movement: how much they were aware of writing history is not known. They are therefore preoccupied with giving the facts and figures of what is happening at the time, in their interpretation, and how it relates to their small corner of the world – they are not concerned with any analysis of ‘why or how’ nor, perhaps, its wider effects. In their historical works, both Donald Gee²⁴ and Alfred Missen²⁵ seek to take it a stage further – they are more than aware that they are writing history and a real attempt to discover the roots of a movement is made. However, analysis, let alone critique, with Gee and Missen is generally lacking and the reasons for such can only be guessed at – e.g. it is difficult to be both a practitioner and researcher and effectively analyse a movement that one is a major part of,²⁶ the Assemblies of God was still relatively young when their accounts were written and in addition, being critical and judging others is often viewed as ‘un-Christian’. Moreover, there is a tendency with such Pentecostal writers to be incredibly defensive of the Pentecostal Movement – its doctrine, its actions and its people – to verge on hagiography and thus portray it as ‘God’s gift’ to the world. In many ways, at the beginning of the 20th century they had to be defensive as custodians of what they viewed as the ‘truth’. The writer of this dissertation, although a member of Assemblies of God, a faculty member of its College for 18 years and in some ways a Pentecostal advocate, will seek to analyse the ‘why and how’ alongside the ‘what, when and who’ and to be constructively critical for a college that continues to face many challenges in the 21st century.

If any attempt is made by the Christian historian to trace a movement’s roots the tendency can be to instinctively assume that its beginnings were purely supernatural and outside the channels of ordinary human beings. For such a historian, a belief in divine providential history is vital – though the secular historian ‘will have none of

²⁴ D. Gee, *Wind and Flame* (Croydon: Heath Press Ltd, 1967)

²⁵ A.F. Missen, *The Sound of a Going* (Nottingham: AoG Pub., 1973)

²⁶ Gee held virtually every office in British Assemblies of God and Missen was at the time he was writing, General Secretary of AoG (GB).

this!²⁷ However, imperfect human channels were also used to achieve the College's purpose through the eras examined and how much was ordered from heaven or orchestrated from earth is probably impossible to determine.

The interpreter of history also needs to be aware of the social, economic, political, theological and technological context of the time – to be aware of both the foreground and the background. This is something that both Gee and Missen failed to do – yet Kay²⁸ does it very effectively. I will seek to include, at times, such important contextual factors.

Finally, the purpose of this piece of work is not to necessarily critique British Pentecostal hagiography, but to examine the success and struggles of those entrusted with training God's people for works of service during two of its finest eras of growth in order to help the College in its present day and as it progresses forward.

1.4 Literature review

1.4.1 European and British Pentecostalism

For the purposes of this dissertation, as neither the PMU nor British Assemblies of God developed in a vacuum, it is important to be aware of the wider context of the origins of British and European Pentecostalism, which is beyond the brief of this dissertation. Cecil Robeck's article *The Development of European Pentecostalism*²⁹ provides an account of how Pentecostalism both established itself and developed in various European nations at the turn of the 20th Century. In addition, Cornelius Van der Laan's article *Proceedings of the Leaders' Meetings (1908-1911) and of the International Pentecostal Council (1912-1914)*³⁰ presents the early attempts by European Pentecostal leaders to develop Pentecostalism prior to the First World War.

²⁷ Kay, *Pentecostalism*, p.22

²⁸ W.K. Kay, *Inside Story* (Nottingham: Mattersey Hall Pub., 1990)

²⁹ C. Robeck, 'The Development of European Pentecostalism', *Pneuma Journal for the Society of Pentecostal Studies* Vol. 10.1 (Spring 1988), pp.1-2

³⁰ C. Van der Laan, 'Proceedings of the Leaders' Meetings (1908-1911) and of the International Pentecostal Council (1912-1914)', *Pneuma*, Vol. 10.1 (1988), pp.36-49

An important figure of that era in both early European and British Pentecostalism, is Thomas Ball Barratt. David Bundy presents the role Barratt played in such works as *Thomas Barratt: From Methodist to Pentecostal*³¹ and *Visions of Apostolic Mission*.³² Other contributors to understanding the development of European Pentecostalism in certain nations include Carl Simpson (Germany),³³ Frank Matre (Norway),³⁴ and Cornelius Van der Laan (The Netherlands).³⁵

When studying British Pentecostalism, an important work that cannot be ignored is Walter Hollenweger's *The Pentecostals*.³⁶ This work is helpful as it sets British Pentecostalism in a world-wide context and allows comparisons with Pentecostal churches in Latin America, North America, Australia, New Zealand, the Continent and Africa. However, on the negative side, according to Kay, Hollenweger's work 'paints on a broad canvas and omits many events within British Assemblies of God'.³⁷

Other than Hollenweger's work, awareness of early British Pentecostalism has been largely based on devotional biographies and autobiographies of personalities at the time, such as Howard Carter, John Carter and Donald Gee. Such works, although insightful, do verge on the hagiographical in the main and whether intentionally or not, find themselves 'defending the denominational bias'.³⁸ According to Ian Randall, in his Foreword to Walsh's *To Meet and Satisfy a Very Hungry People* - 'Although Pentecostalism world-wide is attracting a great deal of scholarly attention, the story of the Pentecostal movement in Britain has not received the coverage it warrants.'³⁹

³¹ D. Bundy, 'Thomas Barratt: From Methodist to Pentecostal', *JEPTA* Vol. 13 (Nov. 1994), pp.19-49

³² D. Bundy, *Visions of Apostolic Ministry: Scandinavian Pentecostal Mission to 1935*, PhD thesis (Uppsala University, 2009)

³³ C. Simpson, 'Jonathan Paul and the German Pentecostal Movement 1907-1914', *JEPTA* Vol. 28.2 (2008), pp. 169-182

³⁴ F. Matre, 'A Synopsis of Norwegian Pentecostal History', *JEPTA* Vol. 9.2 (1990), pp.53-62

³⁵ C. Van der Laan, 'The Theology of Gerrit Polman: Dutch Pentecostal Pioneer', *JEPTA* Vol. 8.1 (1989), pp. 13-33

³⁶ W. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals* (London: SCM, 1972).

³⁷ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.6

³⁸ Van der Laan, *Studying Pentecostalism*, pp.207-208

³⁹ T. Walsh, *To Meet and Satisfy a Very Hungry People – Origins of English Pentecostalism 1907-1925* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2012), Foreword, p.xv

Edith Blumhofer,⁴⁰ Peter Hocken,⁴¹ William Kay,⁴² Timothy Walsh⁴³ and John Usher,⁴⁴ however, do seek to resolve this apparent lack when adopting a more scholarly approach to early British Pentecostalism with Blumhofer and Kay highlighting A.A. Boddy's significant role in its commencement and development whereas both Hocken and Usher examine the PMU and Cecil Polhill's contribution specifically. Walsh's work is interesting as it seeks to argue how British Pentecostalism 'developed distinctively from its global counterparts'⁴⁵ with special attention on four early English Pentecostal centres – Sunderland, Bradford, Bournemouth and Croydon.

1.4.2 Primary sources relating to the PMU

According to Leigh Goodwin, a recent researcher on the PMU:

Potential epistemological problems in researching the PMU relate to accessing sufficient sources, particularly as there are no remaining eyewitnesses to verify events at the turn of the 20th century.⁴⁶

William Kay agrees when he observes that early Pentecostal theology was often 'worked out on the wing' and 'material relating to the early years is difficult to obtain'.⁴⁷ Fortunately, extensive primary sources from the early days still exist and my dissertation will rely heavily on such primary documented sources at various

⁴⁰ E. Blumhofer, 'Alexander Boddy and the Rise of Pentecostalism in Great Britain', *Pneuma Journal for the Society of Pentecostal Studies* Vol. 8.1 (1986), pp.31-40

⁴¹ P. Hocken, 'Cecil H. Polhill: Pentecostal Layman', *Pneuma Journal for the Society of Pentecostal Studies* Vol. 10.2 (1988), pp.116-140

⁴² W. Kay, 'Alexander Boddy and the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Sunderland', *JEPTA* Vol. 5.2 (1985)

⁴³ T. Walsh, *To Meet and Satisfy a Very Hungry People* (Milton Keynes: Authentic, 2012)

⁴⁴ J. Usher, *The Significance of Cecil H. Polhill, 1860-1927*, MA dissertation (Regents Theological College – Unpublished, 2010)

⁴⁵ L. Goodwin, *The Pentecostal Missionary Union and the roots of early British Pentecostalism*, PhD thesis (University of Chester: Unpublished, 2013), p.16

⁴⁶ Goodwin, *The Pentecostal Missionary Union*, p.21

⁴⁷ W.K. Kay, 'Introduction' in W. K. Kay and A.E. Dyer (eds), *Pentecostal & Charismatic Studies* (London: SCM, 2004), p.xix

stages of my research. The PMU Minutes and the personal correspondence of several PMU Board members from 1909 to 1925, which provides insights to the challenges faced by this new missionary organisation,⁴⁸ have proven invaluable. According to Goodwin, such documents ‘demonstrate the policies, values, doctrines and practices of this early Pentecostal missionary training and sending organisation’.⁴⁹ It should be noted that such Minutes were not written primarily for posterity but for their own immediate purposes. In studying such information, which by definition is brief and often bland one has to, at times, read between the lines and seek to reconstruct events, discussions and debates. However, as they had to be approved at subsequent meetings by all present, a certain degree of accuracy can be assumed. It has also been noted the risk of over-reliance on such sources with their ‘one dimensional’ approach.⁵⁰

In addition to the Minutes and correspondence of the PMU (1909-1925), other primary sources will be examined to provide context and background to the founding of the Bible School(s). *Confidence*, subtitled: ‘A Pentecostal Paper for Great Britain’, according to Randall, had ‘enormous influence in the early period of the 20th Century’⁵¹ and was the first British Pentecostal magazine published by PMU pioneer, A.A. Boddy, from April 1908 to early 1926.⁵² It provided Boddy’s edited account of the British and global Pentecostal movement’s expansion, including the work of the Bible School(s), missionary activities and appeal for finance presented through articles, reports, testimonies and adverts. Periodicals of this nature can easily verge on triumphalism – where very little negativity is portrayed and a true ‘warts and all’ picture is generally avoided.

⁴⁸ Such sources are currently housed in the Donald Gee Centre at Mattersey Hall.

⁴⁹ Goodwin, *The Pentecostal Missionary Union*, p.22

⁵⁰ Peter Burke heeds such a warning in *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (Cambridge: Polity, 2001), p.5

⁵¹ Walsh, *To Satisfy and Meet*, p.xv

⁵² There were 141 editions in total.

1.4.3 Academic and other sources relating to the PMU Training Homes and missions training pre-1925

Fortunately, since 1995 serious academic research has started on the significant role played by the Pentecostal Missionary Union, in particular, in the foundation and development of the Pentecostal movement in Britain and British Assemblies of God itself. Peter Kay's dissertation *The Four-Fold Gospel in the Formation, Policy and Practice of the Pentecostal Missionary Union*⁵³ sought to identify 'the fourfold gospel, where Jesus is portrayed as Saviour & Sanctifier, Healer, Baptiser in the Spirit and Soon Coming King as the main entity of the early Pentecostal revival movement and how this fourfold theme is a framework to assess the PMU's formation, policy and praxis.'⁵⁴ As previously noted, John Usher's research highlights the contribution of Cecil Polhill and in particular, the very significant financial contributions made to both the PMU and other Pentecostal projects both nationally and internationally. Goodwin in his recent and exhaustive research has sought to explore the origins, development and challenge of both the Men's Training Home and Women's Training Home from 1909-1925 and their emphasis on training for foreign fields specifically – following the China Inland Mission model of training for its missionary candidates.

1.4.4 Primary sources relating to British AoG and its Bible College

The Donald Gee Archive, currently housed at the National Ministry Centre of British AoG, home of Mattersey Hall Christian College, contains much primary source material on AoG and its Bible College – including student records, private correspondence, *BoG Minutes*, *AoG Executive Council Minutes* and *General Council Minutes*. Such material was relied on heavily to enable the researcher to reconstruct the events, discussions, debates and decisions made at the time relating to training in particular without building on another man's foundation.

⁵³ P. Kay, *The Four-Fold Gospel in the Formation, Policy and Practice of the Pentecostal Missionary Union 1909-1925*, MA dissertation (Cheltenham & Gloucester College, 1995)

⁵⁴ Goodwin, *The Pentecostal Missionary Union*, p.18

In addition, from its beginning in 1924, the Assemblies of God produced a magazine known until 1985 as *Redemption Tidings* or *R.T.*⁵⁵ The many volumes of this periodical provide a wealth of material regarding British AoG and the Bible College – including advertising, student numbers and details, subjects taught, personnel, finance and leadership.⁵⁶ According to Kay, ‘More than any other single source, *Redemption Tidings* helps to recreate early British Pentecostalism.’⁵⁷

1.4.5 Academic and other sources on British AoG and its Bible College

Since 1989, serious and formal academic research has been carried out on British Assemblies of God. William Kay’s PhD,⁵⁸ with a special focus on the wider context of British Pentecostalism and other British Pentecostal denominations, provides a scholarly and well-documented account framing the development of AoG within its social context. Kay presents his work decade by decade rather than grouping subjects together thematically and each major section commences with the relevant economic, political and societal events of the era. With relevance to my own research, Kay comments on the foundation, development, growth and influence of the Bible School itself as each decade is tackled – all presented within the context of that particular decade. However, with Kay’s research, the Bible School is not the main focus. It appears alongside the other departments of British Assemblies of God – for example, Home Missions, Overseas Missions, Youth, Broadcasting, Property Trust etc. David Allen’s PhD research⁵⁹ similarly examines British AoG from 1924-1980. However, less attention is given to the Bible College than Kay with one chapter on Hampstead under Howard Carter (i.e. pre-1948) and a section within Chapter 22 regarding the

⁵⁵ The name was changed to *Redemption* in 1985, to *Joy* in 1992 and *RE* in May 2010. The magazine was disbanded in print form from January 2012 and became available in electronic form from April 2012. As *R.T.* it was published monthly between 1924 to 1933, fortnightly from 1934 to 1956 and weekly from 1956 to 1985.

⁵⁶ At times, for example in June 1971, a College edition of *R.T.* was produced in order to raise the profile of the College amongst AoG and its members. In addition, a monthly column written by the Principal named ‘College Corner’ was produced.

⁵⁷ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.7

⁵⁸ W. K. Kay, *A History of British Assemblies of God*, PhD thesis (University of Nottingham, Nottingham: Published as *Inside Story*, 1989)

⁵⁹ D. Allen, *Signs & Wonders*, PhD thesis (King’s College, London: Unpublished, 1990)

Williamson crisis and era (1970-1973). John Andrews' PhD research⁶⁰ is concerned with missions within British AoG pre-1945. A lengthy chapter is dedicated to training for missions at Hampstead during this time and in his Conclusion, Andrews recognises the need for future research into the College itself, to examine such areas as the relationship between AoG and its College and to ask the question whether the emphasis has shifted to training students for the home field rather than for overseas ministry?⁶¹ The latter is a question I will seek to answer in Section 3.2. Finally, Richard Massey's PhD research⁶² examines the origins of British Assemblies of God between 1920-1925 and provides useful information, for the purpose of this dissertation, on the status of Hampstead Bible School as an autonomous 'assembly'.

In addition to such academic research, there are at least three main historical works, cited previously, on the PMU and British AoG and its training that have been written and will be used in the writing of this dissertation. Donald Gee, who played a vital part in the Pentecostal Movement almost from its beginning and who held virtually every office in British Assemblies of God before his death in 1966, including Principal of the official Bible College for thirteen years, produced *The Pentecostal Movement* in 1941. This work was revised and enlarged in 1967 and renamed *Wind and Flame*⁶³ and although it contains information on other British Pentecostal denominations, namely Elim and Apostolic, it is concerned chiefly with the Assemblies of God.

Although Gee's book is important, as it is the first work of its kind and is meticulously detailed from an eyewitness point of view, it suffers from the fact that it does not take into account the immense changes in society and technology throughout the 20th Century. In addition, Gee rarely gives the source of any information he cites, i.e. there is a complete absence of footnotes and references making it near-on impossible to know what and whom he consulted. Moreover Gee, in typical humble

⁶⁰ J. Andrews, *The Regions Beyond*, PhD thesis (University of Wales, Bangor: Unpublished, 2003)

⁶¹ Andrews, *The Regions*, p.317

⁶² R. D. Massey, *A Sound and Scriptural Union: The Origins of British Assemblies of God 1920-1925*, PhD thesis (University of Birmingham: Unpublished, 1987)

⁶³ D. Gee, *Wind and Flame* (Croydon: Heath Press Ltd, 1967)

fashion, seems to underestimate his own significance to the movement of which he writes.

Alfred Missen, like Gee, held various offices in British Assemblies, notably that of General Secretary from 1963 to 1979. He produced a most readable work in 1973 on the history of British AoG named *The Sound of a Going* and subtitled ‘The Story of Assemblies of God’.⁶⁴ Due to the fact that he, himself, was a student at the Bible School in Hampstead in 1940 under the principalship of Howard Carter, he provides both an eyewitness account of training at this particular time, as well as dedicating a chapter to training in Assemblies of God from 1924 to 1973. However, although providing an almost story-like introduction to British AoG, the book does contain small factual errors.⁶⁵ Moreover, as was the custom at the time, his writing tends to verge on hagiography, with only the positives given on individuals and Assemblies of God itself.

Kay’s 1989 PhD thesis on the Pentecostal movement in Britain was produced in a scaled down publication titled *Inside Story*,⁶⁶ and is an extremely thorough ‘warts and all’ account which seeks to include what Donald Gee fails to do, namely provide the sources of his information and to examine the many social and technological changes which took place at the time.

Other more secondary works include the biographical *Howard Carter – Man of the Spirit*,⁶⁷ *Donald Gee – Pentecostal Statesman*⁶⁸ and the autobiographical *A Full Life – The Autobiography of a Pentecostal Pioneer*⁶⁹ all written by John Carter. Although these works are useful in the fact that they give insightful information about the main subjects of this dissertation, Howard Carter and Donald Gee, in the wider contexts of British Assemblies of God itself and training within AoG at the time, such

⁶⁴ A.F. Missen, *The Sound of a Going* (Nottingham: AoG, 1973)

⁶⁵ For example, he portrays that Polhill specifically made the journey to Los Angeles to study the Azusa Street revival (p. 3). In reality, Polhill took a detour to L.A. when returning from a trip to China. In addition, it suffers from the fact that page numbers given in the index are incorrect.

⁶⁶ W.K. Kay, *Inside Story* (Nottingham: Mattersey Hall Pub., 1990)

⁶⁷ J. Carter, *Howard Carter – Man of the Spirit* (Nottingham: AoG Pub., 1971)

⁶⁸ J. Carter, *Donald Gee – Pentecostal Statesman* (Nottingham: AoG Pub., 1975)

⁶⁹ J. Carter, *A Full Life – The Autobiography of a Pentecostal Pioneer* (Nottingham: AoG Pub., 1979)

publications are by no means a critical analysis and do verge on the hagiographical in the main. In addition to his definitive work on the Pentecostal Movement, some of Donald Gee's other publications, namely the autobiographical *Bonnington Toll*⁷⁰ and the biographical *These Men I Knew*,⁷¹ written candidly on some of those influential in the fledgling Pentecostal Movement at the beginning of the 20th Century, give useful information from an 'insider'.

1.4.6 Literature Review Conclusion

It has become clear during this review that although the wider context of world-wide, European and British Pentecostalism has been researched by others in detail and serious research has taken place regarding the Pentecostal Missionary Union and British Assemblies of God in particular – exclusive research on the role of the Bible School and training in both of these organisations is lacking. Although this subject has been alluded to, researched briefly in a chapter or two and narrated in both academic and non-academic works, primary and secondary source material – still a definitive and dedicated work is yet to be written on Bible College governance, and related issues, within British AoG. Further research is therefore needed that will be of use to those engaged in theological education and ministry formation in a Pentecostal/Charismatic context in Britain and lessons could be learned from the past that will help address the challenges of the future.

⁷⁰ D. Gee, *Bonnington Toll – and After* (Kenley: AoG Bible College, 1960)

⁷¹ D. Gee, *These Men I Knew* (London: Evangel Press, 1980)

Chapter 2: In the Beginning (1909-1921)

2.1 The formation of the Pentecostal Missionary Union (PMU)

On January 9th, 1909 Alexander A. Boddy (1854-1930), the Anglican vicar of All Saints' in Monkwearmouth, Sunderland and fellow Anglican, Cecil Polhill, met in the All Saints' Vicarage and established the Pentecostal Missionary Union.⁷² The PMU was formed as a non-denominational missionary agency council of eight members and Polhill was the President and major policy maker of the PMU for virtually the whole of its existence from 1909 to 1925⁷³ and, according to Peter Kay, 'its policies reflected his missionary priorities and convictions, learnt in the China Inland Mission (CIM) and their implementation was to a considerable extent dependent on his wealth and energy'.⁷⁴

Polhill, one of the famed 'Cambridge Seven' missionaries of the CIM from 1885 to 1902, having been to the Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles, returned to the UK and within two months of his return, was with Boddy at the first Whitsuntide Conference in 1908 at Sunderland, 'the unofficial centre of the emerging Pentecostal Movement'.⁷⁵ These Conferences took place annually from 1908 until the outbreak of World War 1 in 1914 and, according to Gee, 'occupied the supreme place in importance' in the early life of the Pentecostal Movement in the British Isles.⁷⁶

⁷² Peter Hocken calls the PMU 'the first Pentecostal missionary agency' (Burgess & McGee, *Dictionary*, p.706).

⁷³ *PMU Minutes* (14th October 1909 and 9th January 1925)

⁷⁴ P. Kay, *The Four-Fold Gospel*, p.1

In 1900, Polhill inherited a lucrative estate from his uncle – Sir Henry Page-Turner Barron who had died childless. In addition, in 1903 he inherited the Howbury Hall estate on the death of his childless older brother. The income of the Page-Turner estate alone is estimated to have been £16,000 per year, approximately £6.5 million in present-day value (J. Usher, 'The Significance of Cecil H. Polhill for the Development of Early Pentecostalism', *JEPTA*, 2009.2, p. 6). P. Kay lists Polhill's donations to the PMU between October 1909 and February 1926 and although the list is not exhaustive, the total amounts to c. £10,903 (P. Kay, *The Four-Fold*, p. 64).

⁷⁵ P. Kay, *The Four-Fold*, p. 2. By this time the Movement was estimated to number some 500 adherents (Gee, *Wind*, p.41).

⁷⁶ Gee, *Wind*, p.37

The Whitsuntide Conventions⁷⁷ were hosted, instigated, organised, chaired and publicised by Boddy himself and he must be given credit for shaping British Pentecostalism in its infancy. Sermons and discussions from each of the first seven Conventions, published in remarkable detail in the pages of the PMU's periodical, *Confidence*,⁷⁸ show not only how British Pentecostalism developed from its inception in 1908 to 1914, but more importantly it shows the 'developing Pentecostal thinking of its delegates',⁷⁹ some of whom were later instrumental in the founding of the earliest Pentecostal denominations in Great Britain.⁸⁰ Alexander Boddy and Cecil Polhill had much in common both culturally and denominationally and they soon complemented each other as obvious leaders of the fledgling Pentecostal Movement in the British Isles. According to Gee, 'Boddy supplied what Polhill lacked in platform personality and Polhill was willing and able to use his significant wealth to finance the Movement'⁸¹ together with his 'organisational ability, social standing and personal missionary experience'.⁸² Such complementary abilities enabled the smooth running of both the PMU and its training arm.

Despite opposition,⁸³ by 1913 the Whitsuntide Conventions had become well established and *Confidence* had become 'the authoritative voice of British Pentecostal

⁷⁷ The Convention was open to all 'who seek the Baptism of the Holy Ghost with the Sign of Tongues' (*Confidence* (April 1909), p.100).

⁷⁸ Gee, *Wind*, p.41

⁷⁹ W.K. Kay, *Pentecostals in Britain* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000), p.13. In 1913, two of the main subjects were 'Revival and Restoration of Gifts' and the 'Rapture' and in 1914 the themes included 'The Anti-Christ', 'The Present Time in the Light of His Coming' and 'Women's Ministry' (Kay, *Inside*, pp.32, 34, 37).

⁸⁰ Namely, George Jeffreys (Founder of Elim), Howard and John Carter (Pioneers of British AoG) and D.P. Williams (Founder of the Apostolic Church) – (Allen, *There is a River*, p.137).

⁸¹ Gee, *These Men I Knew* (London: Evangel Press, 1980), pp.73-74. In uncharacteristic form, Gee is fairly critical of Polhill's ability in certain areas – e.g. he states 'under Polhill the Whitsuntide Conventions became positively dreary', 'Polhill was ill at ease if speaking in tongues occurred in the London meetings', 'Polhill was a poor chairman of meetings' and Polhill 'only dimly understood the Pentecostal Revival' (Gee, *These Men*, pp. 75-76).

⁸² Usher, 'Significance of Cecil Polhill', p.6

⁸³ Boddy wrote, 'We were spoken against, written against, shut out and banned, but we have continued to this day, and do not intend to go back' (*Confidence* (May 1910), p.104).

leadership,⁸⁴ with an estimated readership of 6,000 per month⁸⁵ and instrumental in propagating Pentecostal doctrine, publicising the work of the Union and its Training Homes and ‘consolidating the Movement during its early and difficult years of opposition and misunderstanding’.⁸⁶ The publication’s own pages clearly displayed the principles and regulations of the PMU, which had been formulated at the preliminary Council meeting in January 1909,⁸⁷ together with its basic beliefs.⁸⁸ The regulations, based upon the model of the CIM,⁸⁹ stated that the PMU was generally known as a ‘faith mission’ as its Directors did not guarantee any fixed amount of support to workers, but sought faithfully to distribute the funds available. Such a ‘faith principle’ continued throughout Howard Carter’s principalship from 1921-1948 and as the PMU was non-denominational in character and missionaries were at liberty to adopt whatever form of church government they personally believed to be most scriptural, such an approach could well have helped influence Carter, to maintain denominational independence during his 27-year tenure. The decision of the PMU Council was to be regarded as final in any appeals from the Field, and the Council managed the affairs of the PMU. New members were chosen and appointed by the existing Council, as was deemed necessary, and the Pentecostal nature of the new Society was affirmed by candidates being required to hand in a written statement as to their soundness in the fundamental truths of the PMU including – the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Trinity, the Fall of Man, the Incarnation, Divinity and the Atonement of Jesus, Justification by Faith, the Return of Christ, the Resurrection of the Dead, Eternal Life and Damnation, the Baptism of the Spirit with scriptural

⁸⁴ Gee, *Wind*, p.42

⁸⁵ Kay, *Inside*, p. 31. Initially, until October 1911, the magazine was free and relied upon voluntary contributions only to cover its monthly expenses – e.g. printing, distribution etc that amounted to c. £30 per month (*Confidence* (August 1908), p. 2). From October 1911, the cost of the magazine was three pence per copy, though voluntary contributions continued to be needed to cover the expenses (*Confidence* (October 1911), pp. 217-218)

⁸⁶ Allen, *There is a River*, p.136

⁸⁷ Namely, the training through the Bible Schools of volunteers sent from Pentecostal Centres around the UK for the foreign field. Such Centres were invited to support the candidates, Schools and missionaries through regular offerings (*Confidence* (January 1909), pp.13-15).

⁸⁸ *Confidence* (July 1913), p.131

⁸⁹ Not surprising in view of the fact the Polhill was also a member of the Council of the China Inland Mission.

signs and healing.⁹⁰ In February 1909 and within a month of the initial Council meeting, the first missionaries were sent out under the auspices of the PMU - a Miss Kathleen Miller of Exeter and Miss Lucy James of Bedford, who both sailed for India on the 24th February 1909.⁹¹ Although Miller and James had not received formal missions or biblical training, it should be noted that Miller, at least, had previous missionary experience in India⁹² and once on the Field, they were sent to work in established mission work alongside proven missionaries for on-the-job training.

2.2 The foundation and focus of the PMU Training Homes⁹³ including early attitudes to Pentecostal training

At the initial meeting of the PMU in January 1909, one of the resolutions adopted by its first Council was the opening of Bible Schools in London and Scotland.⁹⁴ Such Schools were to provide a course of ‘some months’ study⁹⁵ or ‘until it is thought the worker was ripe for service’⁹⁶ and were to be opened as soon as possible for those who were ‘coming forward in an increasing stream who evidently needed some kind of training before they left for foreign fields’.⁹⁷ This was further re-emphasised at the Sunderland International Pentecostal Congress in June 1909 when it was announced that the PMU Council had agreed to a strategy of ‘immediately opening Bible Schools

⁹⁰ *Principles of the PMU* – No. 6: ‘Soundness of Faith’ (*Confidence* (July 1913), p.131).

⁹¹ Gee, *Wind*, p.47 – they were later joined by Miss Boes.

⁹² Gee, *Wind*, p.47

⁹³ The Training Home(s) became known as a Bible School under Howard Carter and a Bible College under Donald Gee. At times throughout the dissertation, these terms may be used interchangeably.

⁹⁴ Resolution 6. Though a Bible School in Scotland was desired and almost came into being (*PMU Minutes*, 18th May 1910) it never materialised.

⁹⁵ *Confidence* (January 1909), p.14

⁹⁶ *Confidence* (November 1909), pp.253-254. There was the thought that a course of study could not only be too short and under prepare a student, but also be too long, and over-ripen a student as it was stated in this article that ‘the course will last just until it is thought the worker is *ripe* for service abroad – and no longer’ (p.254).

⁹⁷ Gee, *Wind*, p. 46. In reality, in these early days, the foreign fields were predominantly China and Tibet (Gee, *Wind*, p.48).

and Training Homes in London and Sunderland⁹⁸ for missionary probationers'.⁹⁹ The training was to be for two years, though many studied for shorter periods of time, and candidates were expected to contribute ten shillings per week to their training.¹⁰⁰ Cecil Polhill was to be 'largely responsible for this training initiative'¹⁰¹ and this proved to be the case both financially and organisationally. What was Polhill's inspiration for starting such a Training Home? We know he was no stranger to formal education having studied briefly at Cambridge. In addition, Polhill had at least 15 years of missionary experience on the field with the CIM and had seen, first hand, the need for adequate preparation for sustainability.

According to Austin such 'practical missional schools in Great Britain, drawing on youthful conservative voluntarism, were powerful forces for world outreach'.¹⁰² Previously, through the encouragement of Hudson Taylor of the CIM, Grattan Guinness established the East London Institute for Home and Foreign Missions in 1873 as the first interdenominational missionary training institute. According to Fielder, 'by 1887, more than 500 young people had gone through the course and were serving all over the world.'¹⁰³ Due to the need for missionaries at the turn of the 20th century, such missionary school courses were relatively short, compared with the several years of training required for ordination within the established church in Britain. According to Sutherland, students needed practical experience and grounding in the Bible, taught in a condensed schedule within close residential communities rather than the overly cerebral, impersonal theological education which college founders considered was typical of universities and mainline seminaries.¹⁰⁴ According to Moncher, it was felt that:

⁹⁸ Although the proposed location had changed from Scotland to Sunderland between January and June 1909, a Training Home in Sunderland did not materialise.

⁹⁹ Gee, *Wind*, p.46. Although the initial focus of the Training Homes were for missionary training, as will be seen in Section 3.2, this focus shifted to predominant training for the 'home field' under Howard Carter.

¹⁰⁰ *PMU Minutes* (2nd December 1910). This was reduced to five shillings per week for foreign students.

¹⁰¹ *Confidence* (June 1909), pp.129-130.

¹⁰² D. Austin, *Our College* (Parramatta: APS, 2013), p.6

¹⁰³ Fielder, *The Story of the Faith Missions*, p.22

¹⁰⁴ W. T. Sutherland, 'John Nelson Darby: Scholarship that Influenced the Bible College Movement', *Christian Higher Education*, 9, 3 (2010), p.278

Higher criticism and other liberalising trends of secular universities did not benefit people who were divinely ‘called’ into the ministry. Instead faculty and staff were considered spiritual mentors first and ministers and teachers second. Bible Colleges were founded to provide practical education, orientated toward church vocations with an underlying philosophy of ‘servanthood’ and a lifelong commitment to Christ and Christian service.¹⁰⁵

The PMU executed such a view of relatively short training courses and an emphasis on the practical when establishing their schools in 1909 and 1910 and this was continued by Howard Carter post-1921. The risk of such an approach was inadequate equipping for ministry in overseas missionary contexts.

Early attitudes to Pentecostal training

Attitudes to training have often varied amongst both denominations¹⁰⁶ and individuals within the Pentecostal Movement¹⁰⁷ and, for the purpose of this dissertation, in British Assemblies of God in particular. For example, Howard Carter viewed training for both the foreign and home fields as ‘important in these days of error’¹⁰⁸ and W.D. Armstrong expressed the folly of inadequate preparation for preaching and ministry and viewed Bible Colleges as having been ‘established for this purpose’.¹⁰⁹ In a 1909 letter to the PMU German pastor, C.O. Voget, urged the newly established Men’s Training Home to develop and expand stating, ‘Since God is calling such fine people into His work and is giving them in the Pentecostal Baptism such wonderful spiritual equipment, it seems to me we ought to do our very best to add the very best training

¹⁰⁵ Gary R. Moncher, *The Bible College and American Moral Culture*, PhD thesis (University of California, Berkeley, Unpublished, 1987), p.291

¹⁰⁶ For example, according to a survey carried out in 1999/2000, the education of Pentecostal ministers in Britain varies among classic Pentecostal denominations – e.g. Elim and the Church of God make formal training for ministry a much more rigorous requirement than do the Apostolic Church and, historically, the AoG (Kay, *Pentecostals*, p.216).

¹⁰⁷ For example, in 1960s, Swiss sociologist Lalive d’Epinay contrasted the remarkably successful Pentecostal pastors in Chile with little or no education and what he called the ‘complete stagnation of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches with their highly educated ministers’ (Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism* (Cambridge: C.U.P., 2004), p.243).

¹⁰⁸ *R.T.* (July 1924), p.11

¹⁰⁹ *R.T.* (7th January 1949), p. 8. Armstrong served as the Honorary Treasurer and member of the BoG at the Bristol Bible College until 1950.

that human learning is able to afford'.¹¹⁰ In contrary terms, anti-education views included AoG pastor Joe Richardson, who advised young men to 'hammer it out on your own anvil, go to the Bible for yourself, look it up, work it out!'¹¹¹ Such a view was prevalent on both sides of the Atlantic amongst early Pentecostals, with anti-intellectualism developing through the four-fold foundation of salvation, baptism in the Spirit, divine healing and the imminent Second Coming of Christ. In each of these distinctive traits of Pentecostalism is a 'lack of concern with the matters of the mind'¹¹² and an anti-intellectualism was further fostered by an early false belief that speaking in tongues negated the need for missionaries to learn foreign languages and due to the fact that early leaders of Pentecostalism - Charles Fox Parham and William J. Seymour - seemed to be fruitful without formal education, which soon attracted criticism from outsiders.¹¹³ In addition, anti-intellectualism arose from a 'misinterpretation by Pentecostals'¹¹⁴ of Mark 13:11¹¹⁵ and secondly, through the Pentecostals' premillennial eschatology and deep commitment to the doctrine of the imminent return of Christ – i.e. the limited time before the Parousia should be used for matters 'more urgent than building or even attending Bible Schools'.¹¹⁶ How, if at all, such an anti-intellectual view affected the pedagogy of the Bible School and caused risks or benefits during the principalship of Howard Carter and Donald Gee will be touched on later in this thesis in Sections 3.5, 5.3 and 6.2. However, as the Pentecostal Movement developed, not all knowledge was seen to be 'of the devil'¹¹⁷ and although early Pentecostals have generally feared any form of education that

¹¹⁰ N. Hudson, 'Uncomfortable thoughts for a lecturer in a residential Bible College at the turn of the century', E.P.T.A. Conference Paper, Brussels, 2002, *JEPTA* 2003, p.46.

¹¹¹ Kay, *Inside Story*, p. 115. One of the elders at Richardson's assembly in Royston, South Yorkshire, strongly advised one of its young people 'not to go to the AoG Bible School' and if they did they would 'lose their ministry'.

¹¹² Kennedy, J.R. 'Anti-Intellectualism' in *Encyclopedia of Pentecostal and Charismatic Christianity* (ed.) Burgess, S. (London: Routledge, 2006), p.36

¹¹³ Kennedy, 'Anti-Intellectualism', p.36

¹¹⁴ *R.T.* (7th January 1949), p.8

¹¹⁵ '...do not worry beforehand about what to say. Just say whatever is given you at the time, for it is not you speaking, but the Holy Spirit' (*New International Version*).

¹¹⁶ Burgess & McGee, *Dictionary*, p.58

¹¹⁷ Kennedy, 'Anti-Intellectualism', p.36

excluded the role of the Holy Spirit, within time, Pentecostal Schools were formed. Although, as will be seen, the PMU Training Homes in London and their successors did not offer a recognised diploma or degree until Mattersey Hall Assemblies of God Bible College at the end of the 20th century, its American counterparts did from an early time. For example, the Southern California Bible College, which was the first institution sponsored by the AoG (US) to offer a four-year degree programme, opened in the late 1930s. Other similar US colleges, opened after World War II, paved the way for the opening of Pentecostal liberal arts colleges, seminaries and universities. Such colleges and universities required academically qualified staff who, themselves, had been trained at respected non-Pentecostal and often secular institutions around the world. The UK Pentecostal Bible Colleges were much later in offering degree courses with both the Assemblies of God and Elim Colleges offering university accredited degrees from the 1990s. Non-Pentecostal Bible Colleges had been offering undergraduate degrees at least thirty years earlier,¹¹⁸ which, perhaps, shows less reluctance to engage with the academic world.

Some within the Pentecostal Movement have not questioned the need for Bible College training itself, but for what and, more importantly, for where a student is trained to serve – i.e. their future field of service. Donald Gee stated that at the beginning of the 20th century, there had been considerable opposition to a proposal for training ministers for the home field, but, rather inconsistently ‘there was never any question in Pentecostal ranks as to the propriety of training for the foreign field’.¹¹⁹ As seen, the PMU Training Homes were established for this very purpose. John Carter states that ‘they were expressly for the training of candidates for missionary work overseas and not for the homeland.’¹²⁰ Initially, young men and women with gifts for ministry and desiring training were encouraged to believe that the only location where they could serve was somewhere in distant lands. For regular ministry at home, a

¹¹⁸ For example, at London Bible College by 1968, ‘over five hundred students had studied for theological degrees’ (I. Randall, *Educating Evangelicalism* [Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000], p.172)

¹¹⁹ Gee, *Wind*, p.60

¹²⁰ J. Carter, *A Full Life* (London: Evangel Press, 1979), p.182

movement that has always embodied such a special testimony to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit has tended to look askance at even the simplest form of scholarly training¹²¹ and the gaining of theological degrees.¹²² A mentality had developed, even initially by Donald Gee himself, of ‘look what I have achieved in the ministry without going to any Bible School.’¹²³ Such an early Pentecostal attitude would almost certainly have caused a risk of inadequate preparation for the ministry in the UK. However, as the British Pentecostal Movement developed, and as the 20th century progressed, the value of Bible Schools in the training of both overseas and then predominantly home workers began to be recognised. Although alternative training initiatives existed in British AoG, such as the practical ‘Challenge Scheme’ launched in 1964 (later known as the ‘Herald Scheme’) linked to AoG Home Missions and which sought to train pioneer workers,¹²⁴ it would be reasonable to suggest that the vast majority of those trained for work within the Fellowship were done so through the Bible College.

As noted, although the first PMU missionaries had gone out without formal training on the 24th February 1909, from mid-1909 onwards, after the establishment of its first Training Home for men and ‘unlike many other Pentecostals at the time,’¹²⁵ the PMU did take its training courses at their Homes very seriously and required their candidates to ‘receive training’.¹²⁶ However, in practice, the urgent need for missionaries and the global task dictated that a PMU candidate undergo shorter periods of training than ordination into the mainstream denominations of the day together with the risks of such ‘quick’ training - a practice that Howard Carter

¹²¹ Acts 4:13 is often quoted to back this up - ‘If Christ had used untutored fishermen to begin his church, he could use unlearned men to complete it’ (Burgess & McGee, *Dictionary*, p.58). However, in time it began to be recognised that Pentecostalism, though born out of intense reliance upon the Holy Spirit, was also a Movement founded on the Bible and so a good knowledge of this was imperative (Kay, *Pentecostals*, p.202).

¹²² A short article appeared in *R.T.* called ‘What to do with a theological degree?’ The conclusion was ‘when you get it, throw it away and forget it.’ What is important is whether the minister is ‘called’ and ‘has the passion to proclaim the gospel’ (*R.T.* (26th September 1947), p.10).

¹²³ *R.T.* (15th February 1957), p. 6. Gee also states in this article that there was some ‘resentment’ at feeling inferior and inadequate to those who had received training.

¹²⁴ This scheme was in operation from the mid-1960s through to the mid-1980s and saw ‘39 men enter the ministry’ (Kay, *Inside*, p.34).

¹²⁵ Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, p.265

¹²⁶ *Letter from Mundell to Meester* (25th February 1915)

continued during his 27-year tenure as Principal. As stated, the training courses at early 20th century mission schools erred heavily on the side of the practical. As Hudson states, for missionary candidates, ‘Theirs was no disembodied spirituality. They were to be prepared for the hard work of mission and that meant that they needed practical skills as well as biblical information.’¹²⁷ E.J. Titterington, the superintendent of the Men’s Training Home from 1915-1916, viewed the purpose of the Homes as primarily to ‘provide for the testing and training of candidates who had been baptised in the Spirit and who desired to offer themselves for work in the foreign mission field’¹²⁸ and in 1913 the then principal of the London Men’s Home, H.E. Wallis, likened his School to a spiritual ‘greenhouse’ and made the bold statement that ‘God never uses an untrained worker if He has His way’, citing biblical examples as the preparation and testing of such characters as Moses, Elijah, John the Baptist and Paul.¹²⁹ It can be said that such training and testing at the PMU Training Homes was generally viewed as beneficial by those who had later ‘gone forth’.¹³⁰ Interestingly, in the years that followed, PMU training was not limited to Britain and British missionaries. In 1917 PMU President, Cecil Polhill, keen to implement a policy that would transfer the task of evangelism and church leadership to local people, developed a two-week block training course taught by missionaries to local leaders. To Polhill, ‘every missionary should be the means in God’s hands of sending out in a very short time numbers of well taught spiritual converts as missionaries to their own countrymen’.¹³¹

¹²⁷ Hudson, *Uncomfortable Thoughts*, p.47

¹²⁸ *Flames of Fire*, No. 26 (April 1915), p.6

¹²⁹ *Confidence* (October 1913), p.202

¹³⁰ *Flames of Fire*, No. 26 (April 1915), p.6

¹³¹ Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, p. 267. Congo pioneer, William Burton, similarly operated on the principle of training African workers, ‘but always under white supervision’ (Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, p.269).

2.3 The Men's Training Home

By July 1909, a Men's Training Home had been opened by the PMU at the private home of Alex Moncur Niblock,¹³² at No. 7, Howley Place, Paddington, West London.¹³³ Here, Niblock was placed in charge of ten students¹³⁴ from Scotland, England, Holland, Denmark and Persia who had offered themselves for missionary service. Similar to the China Inland Mission, the PMU was open to all with no discrimination based on gender or intellect.¹³⁵ For the Union, if candidates could boast of a Pentecostal experience, a fair knowledge of the Bible and its doctrines¹³⁶ and were able to master a new language, then they could potentially serve on the mission field, though students were given no assurance that entrance to the Home would guarantee final acceptance for the foreign field.¹³⁷ The programme initially at the Home included the students rising at 6.00am for prayer, morning 'devotions' and breakfast, followed by classes that included teaching on Bible Study, Doctrine Survey,¹³⁸ Secular Studies and Church History. Later, Elementary New Testament Greek and Homiletics were added to the curriculum and some of the China Inland Mission material was used in the teaching of foreign languages, though the vast

¹³² A. Moncur Niblock received his Spirit-baptism under Boddy at the first Sunderland Conference in 1908 (*Confidence* (January 1909), p.17). He was born in December 1876, the son of a Scottish seaman at Birkenhead and by 1900 was a missionary student. He undertook brief missionary service in India and by 1909 went to Russia holding campaigns in St. Petersburg (K. Malcomson, *Pentecostal Pioneers* (USA: Xulon Press, 2008), pp.156-158).

¹³³ The Men's Training Home was initially known as 'Peniel' (*Confidence* (February 1910), p.33). The side of the road where No. 7 once stood has now been demolished, the opposite side remains intact. Although Assemblies of God later called this 'without doubt the first Pentecostal Bible School in the world' (*R.T.* (30th January 1942), p.4) this is debatable. Charles Fox Parham's Bethel Bible School in Topeka, Kansas, although it was not founded as a Pentecostal School in 1900, certainly developed into one after 1901 (Burgess & McGee, *Dictionary*, p.58). In addition, when a small group of Southern Holiness churches accepted the Pentecostal experience in 1907, they continued to be served by Holmes Theological Seminary in South Carolina (founded in 1898) and the Gospel School in Finley, Ohio, which opened in 1908 (Burgess & McGee, *Dictionary*, pp.59-60). I believe, therefore, it is safe to say that 'Peniel' in Paddington was one of the first schools ***founded as a Pentecostal School***, rather than being ***the*** world's first Pentecostal School.

¹³⁴ Gee, *Wind*, p.61

¹³⁵ Andrews, *Regions Beyond*, p.101

¹³⁶ *Confidence* (January 1909), p.14. It is difficult to determine exactly how a candidate's knowledge of the Bible was determined, though the application form and any interview no doubt would have played a part.

¹³⁷ Andrews, *Regions Beyond*, p.101

¹³⁸ Presumably, the doctrine taught would have included the Pentecostal theology of 'the Baptism in the Holy Ghost with the Scriptural signs' – a belief to be held by all PMU missionary candidates (*Principles of the PMU* – Section 6: 'Soundness of Faith').

majority of a candidate's language training took place on the field in situ. Evidence shows that training at the Men's Training Home under the PMU, although including training on the theory and practice of evangelistic work, did not include specialised missionary subjects such as cross-cultural ministry or 'teaching on non-Christian religions'.¹³⁹ As a comparison, some Dutch Pentecostal missionaries at the time had studied a subject named 'Religions of Heathendom' in a missionary school in the Netherlands.¹⁴⁰ To compensate the home-based classroom learning, when PMU missionaries eventually arrived on the field they were not, initially, placed into pioneer contexts but were placed with experienced field missionaries either from the PMU or from other missionary agencies so they could learn the language and culture. After a time of probation, they were classed as junior missionaries and after a further three years on the field, and after passing all necessary language studies, they would be termed as 'full missionaries'. Any workers who proved unsuitable during these four years of probation and training were retired from the field.¹⁴¹

Afternoons at the Training Home were set-aside for prayer and visitation, evenings were for meetings, leisure and letter writing etc and students were to be in bed by 11.00pm. Every Sunday, students were expected to both attend and take part in local church services to gain experience and in the afternoon they were to 'witness' in Hyde Park.¹⁴² Niblock's ability as a principal was soon recognised by the PMU Council¹⁴³ and Gee calls him 'a man of brilliant gifts and strong individuality, who exercised a powerful influence in the Movement for a short time'.¹⁴⁴ The PMU students at the time regarded him as a 'spiritual father' who was 'of God's choosing'.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁹ P. Kay, *Four-Fold*, p.14

¹⁴⁰ C. Van Der Laan, *Pentecostal Missionary to China: Elize Scharten*, Society for Pentecostal Studies 25th Annual Meeting Conference Paper, Mattersey Hall, 1995, p.1

¹⁴¹ *Principles of the PMU* – No. 5: 'Missionary Candidates'

¹⁴² Article by John Carter on the First Pentecostal Bible College in Britain, undated, p.1 and *Confidence* (Sept. 1909), p. 206.

¹⁴³ *PMU Minutes* (14th October 1909)

¹⁴⁴ Gee, *Wind*, p.62

¹⁴⁵ *Confidence*, Vol. 3 No. 1 (January 1910), p.18

However, in March 1910 and after only eight months in charge of the Men's Home, Niblock was asked to stand down.¹⁴⁶ Polhill stated that the Council were grateful for the work he had done, but there had been 'difficulties' especially in the management of the Home, i.e. the expenses were higher than the Council had approved and Polhill, in an interview with Niblock, stated that he did not feel Niblock had helped the Council 'as much as he might have done' by operating within the necessary budget constraints and through his lack of communication.¹⁴⁷ After Niblock's departure, a Mr Miller from Glasgow was offered the post of Keeper-in-Residence of the Men's Training Home and he agreed on the proviso that the School relocated to Glasgow. Discussion took place amongst the Council members present as to whether the students should attend some classes at the Bible Training Institute (BTI) in Glasgow, supplemented by special classes given by Miller himself.¹⁴⁸ Although an objection was raised by Council member, Pastor Jeffreys, that the BTI was 'not favourable of the Pentecostal Movement', it was agreed to offer Miller a position for a period of one year and that a new Men's Home was to be established in Scotland.¹⁴⁹ However, by July 1910 no suitable residence was found in Glasgow and it was agreed, instead, that Thomas Myerscough of Preston should, as a temporary measure, give lectures to the male students and suitable premises were to be found in Preston for boarders. Such premises were found in two hired rooms over 'Starkie's Wire Shop' on Lancaster Road in the centre of Preston,¹⁵⁰ and in July 1910¹⁵¹ the PMU relocated the Men's Home here under the leadership of Myerscough, assisted in the classroom by Harry Hall. Throughout the five years the School was housed in Preston notable students included W.F.P. Burton and James Salter, future founders of the Congo Evangelistic

¹⁴⁶ Hocken describes the superintendency of the Men's Home during the first ten years as 'a constant problem, as few of Polhill's nominees lived up to expectations and were acceptable to the Pentecostal grassroots' (Burgess & McGee, *Dictionary*, p.706).

¹⁴⁷ *PMU Minutes* (21st March 1910). There is also a reference to Niblock failing to hand in the monthly accounts on time (*PMU Minutes* (21st February 1910))

¹⁴⁸ *PMU Minutes* (18th May 1910)

¹⁴⁹ *PMU Minutes* (18th May 1910)

¹⁵⁰ This building remains a shop to this day.

¹⁵¹ *PMU Minutes* (18th July 1910)

Mission,¹⁵² George Jeffreys,¹⁵³ future founder of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance,¹⁵⁴ E.J. Phillips, future General Secretary of Elim and notable future missionaries such as William Boyd (China), F.D. Johnstone and Edmund Hodgson (Congo)¹⁵⁵ and Frances Jameson (South America). Although Myerscough's ability as a Bible teacher made him well-fitted for the task¹⁵⁶ and the band of students that gathered around him in Preston soon 'made their mark in many spheres of ministry'¹⁵⁷ around the world, Polhill, in February 1913, reported to the Council that he had already made certain preliminary negotiations with a Rev. H.E. Wallis¹⁵⁸ of Cambridge with a view to 'his being associated with the PMU in the training of men'.¹⁵⁹ Polhill was desirous to open another Training Home in London and a future meeting when Wallis could be present was arranged. Myerscough had clashed doctrinally with the Anglican leaders of the PMU over such issues as infant baptism and Gee also links this factor with Polhill seeking to re-establish a School in London.¹⁶⁰ Wallis was interviewed by the PMU Council and stated that he felt a 'leading of the Lord' to help with the training of men in London.¹⁶¹ He also expressed a wish to remain in the Church of England and 'answered all the Council's questions

¹⁵² The C.E.M. was founded by Burton and Salter early in 1920. Both Burton and Salter did not go out under the auspices of the PMU due to a 'conflict' with the leaders of the PMU (ed. Burgess & McGee, *Dictionary*, p. 103).

¹⁵³ A student from November 1912 to January 1913. According to Gee, Jeffreys went on to play 'an outstanding part in establishing the Pentecostal Testimony in Britain' and that 'it can fairly be claimed that he was one of the most outstanding preachers that the British Pentecostal Movement had ever produced' (Gee, *Wind*, p. 290).

¹⁵⁴ In 1940, after a dissension over church government he withdrew from Elim and founded the 'Bible Pattern Church Fellowship' (Kay, *Pentecostals*, p.25).

¹⁵⁵ There is no evidence in the *PMU Minutes* that Hodgson was an official student at Preston, though he was certainly 'involved' (Whittaker, *Pentecostal Pioneers*, p. 173). Hodgson was martyred in the Congo on the 23rd November 1960 (Gee, *Wind*, p.287).

¹⁵⁶ There was a glowing report in the March 1911 edition of *Confidence* stating that there were '25 students in attendance' and 'great blessing rests upon us all'. (pp. 68-69). This report also gives a sample of the syllabus taught, namely the Gospels, Romans, Hebrews, James, the Epistles of Peter, the Epistles of John, Jude, Revelation and subjects such as Healing, Church Government, Spiritual Gifts and Dispensational Truths (p.68).

¹⁵⁷ Gee, *Wind*, p.62. Hocken describes Myerscough superintendency at Preston as 'perhaps the peak-period' of the Men's Home, 'at least until the final years under Howard Carter' (Burgess & McGee, *Dictionary*, p.706).

¹⁵⁸ Wallis had an M.A. from Queen's College, Cambridge. He believed that missionaries should be 'thoroughly trained before going out to foreign fields' (*Confidence* (October 1913), pp.201-202).

¹⁵⁹ *PMU Minutes* (21st February 1913)

¹⁶⁰ Gee, *These Men*, p.68

¹⁶¹ *PMU Minutes* (6th March 1913)

satisfactorily'.¹⁶² Wallis was then asked to leave the room whilst the Council deliberated. The Council could not agree that the Home be transferred from Preston and it was resolved that Wallis be asked if he would be willing to reside in Preston and be associated with Myerscough in training the male students there. Wallis asked for a period of time to consider the proposal and some weeks later, confirmed to the Council that he was unwilling to relocate to Preston, though he would still be willing to 'take up the work if it were in London'.¹⁶³ It was agreed by those present on the Council that as Wallis was able to give the whole of his time to training men and as he had already been offered 'another appointment' within the Church of England, arrangements should be made for Wallis to take charge of another training home for men in, or near, London as soon as suitable premises could be obtained.¹⁶⁴ At the same time it was also put on record the Council's 'warm appreciation of the good work and labour of love so freely given on behalf of the students by Myerscough and trust that this be continued in Preston.'¹⁶⁵ In the Council meeting of the 13th May 1913, Wallis' appointment and the establishment of a new Men's Training Home in London was discussed. Some members of the Council, namely Breeze, Myerscough, Murdoch and Small (which totalled half of the Council at that time) were not present at the April meeting when the resolution was agreed. Now with a full Council, they were unable to arrive at a unanimous conclusion and a further extra-ordinary meeting was held the next day to discuss the proposed new Home under Wallis' leadership. Myerscough was asked to leave the room to enable the other Council members to talk more freely and after consideration, the Council was not prepared to adopt the resolution. Therefore, any Training School started in London would not be the responsibility of the PMU but Polhill's 'personal responsibility'.¹⁶⁶ Between 1913 and 1915 there was, therefore, the anomalous position of two Men's Training Homes

¹⁶² *PMU Minutes* (6th March 1913)

¹⁶³ *PMU Minutes* (15th April 1913)

¹⁶⁴ *PMU Minutes* (15th April 1913)

¹⁶⁵ *PMU Minutes* (15th April 1913)

¹⁶⁶ *PMU Minutes* (14th May 1913)

running concurrently – the official PMU School in Preston and the unofficial School in London funded by Polhill and overseen by a ‘small committee’.¹⁶⁷

Other than the benefit of two schools at opposite ends of the country to service the nation, what was the motive for running two Men’s Training Homes? By all accounts the number of students at Preston had certainly not reached the point where students had to be turned away due to lack of space. Moreover, Myerscough’s ability as a Principal was never questioned by the PMU Council. Perhaps, as Gee had stated, the reason was a ‘doctrinal clash.’¹⁶⁸ Despite the PMU Council blocking a move for an official PMU Home in London, Polhill nevertheless established one with his personal finance. Here we see Polhill’s autocratic style of leadership - he clearly liked his own way and as the one largely responsible for the training aspect of the PMU and with his considerable wealth, few felt able to stand in the way - including the Council itself and the serving principal at the time. Such an autocratic style of working independently of councils and oversight, with the risks that a lack of ‘checks and balances’ can bring, could well have set the culture leading up to, and perhaps influencing, future principal Howard Carter who ran the future School at Hampstead devoid of a council, governors, trustees or a denomination.

Polhill reported in the June 1913 Council meeting that after consideration he had secured a property on King Edward Road, Hackney under the management of Wallis for the purpose of training men for missionary service.¹⁶⁹ This property was on the same road as the PMU’s Women’s Training Home, which had opened in 1910 under the oversight of Mrs Crisp, and Polhill believed that both Homes,¹⁷⁰ being in the same

¹⁶⁷ *Confidence* (July 1914), p.138

¹⁶⁸ Gee, *These Men*, p.68

¹⁶⁹ Hocken observes that this compromise resulted from neither party wanting to admit defeat as well as understanding that a public rift would be disastrous for the PMU (P. Hocken, ‘C. H. Polhill - Pentecostal Layman’, *Pneuma Journal for the Society of Pentecostal Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 1-2, 1988, pp.127-128).

¹⁷⁰ On King Edward Road there has been a major rebuild of flats and new housing and so neither of these Homes still stand.

vicinity, would foster greater co-operation amongst the male and female principals.¹⁷¹

Polhill stated that he would be solely, financially responsible for this new venture.¹⁷²

After the Men's Training Home was established in London on the 4th October 1913 with Polhill presiding, discussion took place at Council level as to where the PMU should send missionary candidates for training - to Preston or London. It was agreed that the candidate themselves should choose and if the candidate was unsure, the Council would decide where the student should train. However, although this was the policy, it would seem that initially there was a certain amount of bias towards the London Training Home by Polhill. For example, in the October 1913 edition of *Confidence* there was a long article written by Wallis, earnestly asking for prayer and finance and stating that there was a School for men and one for women both on King Edward Road, Hackney. No mention is made of the official PMU Men's Home in Preston which had been running relatively successfully since 1910. One month later, in the November 1913 edition there is another long report written by Polhill after a recent visit to the new Men's Home in Hackney. In fairness it states that there is the option of studying in Preston but only at evening classes - the day classes were not mentioned. The emphasis in this article is on the London School, though there seems to be an attempt at rectification a month later when an advertisement in *Confidence* states clearly that the London Home is under the leadership of Polhill and a small committee and not under the auspices of the PMU.

Some eight months later, in August 1914 and less than a year after taking post, Wallis resigned and the students at London were allowed to complete their studies at Preston.¹⁷³ In February 1915 a Mr E.J. Titterington¹⁷⁴ was appointed Honorary Principal of the London Men's Training Home and was invited to join the PMU

¹⁷¹ *PMU Minutes* (25th June 1913)

¹⁷² *PMU Minutes* (25th June 1913)

¹⁷³ Gee, *Wind*, p.62

¹⁷⁴ Titterington was born in Cambridge in 1885 and had an M.A. After being filled with the Spirit he was involved in outreach work in the Spitalfields common lodging houses (*Confidence* (June 1912), p.127).

Council.¹⁷⁵ At this time, despite the relative success of the Preston Training Home, the London Home was officially recognised as the ‘Home for training male students’ and ‘to which all PMU male students should be sent’.¹⁷⁶ Polhill continued to be personally responsible for the maintenance and cost of the London Home and the Council were to make a weekly allowance for each student in attendance. It was clear that Myerscough’s services were no longer required, and a note of thanks was placed on record for his work at the Preston Men’s Training Home.¹⁷⁷ Polhill’s poor treatment of Myerscough and a continuing autocratic culture was evident.

Some three months after closing the Preston Home, Myerscough resigned from the PMU Council¹⁷⁸ and, during the Titteringtons’ extended honeymoon,¹⁷⁹ Smith Wigglesworth¹⁸⁰ had charge of the Home in their absence.¹⁸¹ Polhill asked the PMU Council to take on the financial responsibility of the Men’s Training Home and in September 1915, it was agreed that as from the 1st January 1916, the PMU would be ‘fully and financially responsible for the entire management of the School’.¹⁸² It would be safe to say, therefore, that Polhill was unwilling or unable to continue underwriting the Men’s Home and the reason for this is not stated.

In May 1916, and after only fifteen months as Honorary Principal, Titterington resigned from the Men’s Training School when he was appointed Vice-Consul in Norway.¹⁸³ During Titterington’s brief tenure at the Home, there were six students¹⁸⁴ and lectures included teaching on both Old and New Testaments, Homiletics and one

¹⁷⁵ *PMU Minutes* (22nd February 1915)

¹⁷⁶ *PMU Minutes* (22nd February 1915)

¹⁷⁷ *PMU Minutes* (22nd February 1915)

¹⁷⁸ *PMU Minutes* (28th May 1915)

¹⁷⁹ Titterington married one of Mrs Crisp’s daughters.

¹⁸⁰ Wigglesworth was a member of the PMU Council between 1915-1920 (Gee, *Wind*, pp.24-25, 63).

¹⁸¹ *Letter from Mundell to Swift* (17th July 1915)

¹⁸² *PMU Minutes* (13th September 1915).

¹⁸³ *Confidence* (August 1916) p.137. It would appear that Titterington knew Norwegian and had been previously involved in translation work for T.B. Barratt (*Confidence* (February 1913), pp. 30-31 and (March 1915), p.56).

¹⁸⁴ Article by John Carter on the ‘First Pentecostal Bible College in Britain’, undated, p.3.

lesson per week on New Testament Greek – the female students from the nearby Women’s Home also attended this class.¹⁸⁵

In early 1917, owing to the continuance of World War 1, the expense necessary for the upkeep of the Men’s Training Home and the fact that owing to the Military Service Act where all the male students had been called into service of some kind¹⁸⁶ and who were unable to become ‘conscientious objectors’ due to the PMU being non-denominational - a decision was made by the PMU Council to temporarily close the Men’s Home and notice to vacate was given to the landlord of No. 60, King Edward Road.¹⁸⁷ The Women’s Home continued to stay open throughout the War years.¹⁸⁸

The Men’s Home remained closed for two years before arrangements were made for its re-opening in 1919¹⁸⁹ at No. 12, South Hill Park Gardens, Hampstead Heath. Polhill reported to the Council that Titterington was not available to resume his former position as Superintendent and suggested that Mr and Mrs Joseph Hollis, former missionaries to Bolivia, South America, take the role.¹⁹⁰ Hollis had strong views on mission issues – e.g. he believed that more importance should be placed on the development of the home base for Pentecostal missions than was previously the case. In addition, as well as acknowledging the role of a home council to advise and appoint missionaries, he felt such councils should do more to promote and link missionaries with home churches.¹⁹¹ Such views could well have led to his early exit from the Home. The Hollis’ left the School in January 1921, to return to missionary service in South America, after a personal clash with Polhill. Interestingly, although Polhill had ceased to underwrite the Home some five years previously, it would seem

¹⁸⁵ J. Carter, ‘First Pentecostal’, p.3

¹⁸⁶ *Letter from Mundell to Leigh* (27th May 1916).

¹⁸⁷ *Letter from Mundell to Messrs Stoddart and Sons* (3rd February 1917)

¹⁸⁸ Because the Women’s Home stayed open throughout the War and perhaps because of its relatively stable leadership under Mrs Crisp from 1910-1922, between 1909 and 1924, of the 60 missionaries that were sent out under the PMU, 36 were women and 24 were men (P. Kay, *The Four-Fold Gospel*, p.66).

¹⁸⁹ *PMU Minutes* (9th December 1918). Similarly, the Methodist training college, Cliff College in Derbyshire, was closed for part of the War and re-opened on the 8th October 1919 (N. Dunning, *Samuel Chadwick* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1934), p.188).

¹⁹⁰ *PMU Minutes* (15th January 1919)

¹⁹¹ *Confidence* (Apr-Jun 1919), p.31

that he continued to exercise a somewhat autocratic style of leadership. Such a style arguably continued in Hollis' permanent replacement - Alfred Howard Carter - though the Hampstead School 'entered upon an entirely new phase in its interesting and fruitful history'.¹⁹²

2.4 The Women's Training Home

Some three months after the start of the Men's Home in Paddington, Polhill reported to the PMU Council his plans to start a separate Women's Training Home for the training of female overseas missionaries¹⁹³ and the steps he had already taken to establish it.¹⁹⁴ Mrs Eleanor Crisp, a lady experienced in the Bible training of young women, had consented to take the oversight of such a Home and two of her daughters, who were trained school teachers, would help with various subjects. A suitable four-storey house at 116 King Edward Road, Hackney had been found and was within a ten-minute walk of Crisp's own residence - capable of accommodating twelve female students. Polhill, himself, consented to be responsible for the three-year lease and it was calculated that with the house rent, cost of student maintenance and staff wages¹⁹⁵ '£500 per annum would be needed to run the Home'.¹⁹⁶ The Council agreed to embark on this new venture, though it would seem in reality that the Council were only 'rubber-stamping' a decision already made and set into motion by Polhill. Together with his actions of starting another Men's Training Home in Hackney in 1913, these are examples of Polhill's desire to run things his way and despite the knowledge of the PMU Council. Such an autocratic approach of working independently of councils and oversight, with the risks that unaccountability could bring, could well have influenced future principal Howard Carter who ran Hampstead

¹⁹² Gee, *Wind*, p. 63. Carter's principalship will be examined in Chapter 3.

¹⁹³ This was reflective of society during Victorian and Edwardian times when females were, in the main, taught separately from males (cf. A. N. Wilson, *The Victorians* (London: Arrow Books, 2003), pp. 284-285, 480).

¹⁹⁴ *PMU Minutes* (14th October 1909).

¹⁹⁵ It is not clear how much Crisp and Shepherd were paid initially. In the September 1912 edition of *Confidence*, Crisp states clearly that 'no one receives a salary' (p.212). However, it is clear that Crisp was receiving an 'honorarium' on a quarterly basis certainly from September 1914, if not before. *PMU Minutes* (11th September 1914).

¹⁹⁶ *PMU Minutes*, (14th October 1909)

in a similar vein for 27 years, devoid of a council, governors, trustees or a denomination.

The Women's Home eventually trained and sent out 36 missionaries between 1910 and 1922, as opposed to the Men's Home(s) sending out 24 during the same period,¹⁹⁷ and in 1924 there were 13 men and 20 women training at Hampstead Bible School and in 1926 these numbers rose to 25 men and 24 women.¹⁹⁸ By the time of the official opening of the Women's Home, six female students were in residence,¹⁹⁹ by March 1911 four of these had gone out to the mission field²⁰⁰ and by July 1911 another eight had joined the Home, including students from Scotland, Holland and Denmark.²⁰¹ The chief work of the Home was the 'systematic study of the Scriptures under the light of the Spirit'.²⁰² Time was allocated each day for personal prayer, lessons were given in English, Geography and World Religions²⁰³ and a written test was set at the end of each week. Elocution was being taught by September 1912²⁰⁴ and lessons in singing and 'playing hymns' were offered.²⁰⁵ In addition to study, opportunities were given to help at various women's meetings in the neighbourhood and at 'open-air' services. A 'waiting' or 'tarrying' meeting was held every Monday evening between 7.30pm and 10.00pm for students to receive the Baptism in the Holy Spirit²⁰⁶ indicating that although all PMU students were to adhere to a belief in 'the Baptism in the Holy Spirit with Scriptural signs'²⁰⁷ in practice, it would seem that not all students had received this experience prior to their studies.

¹⁹⁷ Though it needs to be born in mind that the Men's Home closed temporarily between 1917 and 1919 and there was some six principals over a twelve-year period, not doubt producing much instability.

¹⁹⁸ P. Kay, *Four-Fold*, p.66

¹⁹⁹ *PMU Minutes* (21st February 1910).

²⁰⁰ Two in North China and two on their way to India.

²⁰¹ *Confidence*, (March 1911), p.67, *PMU Minutes* (7th June, 19th July 1911)

²⁰² *Confidence*, (March 1911), p.68

²⁰³ Interestingly World Religions was not offered to the male students. Reason unknown.

²⁰⁴ *Confidence* (September 1912), p.212

²⁰⁵ Interestingly such musical lessons were not offered to the male students. Reason unknown.

²⁰⁶ *Confidence* (March 1911), p.68 and *PMU Minutes* (21st March 1910)

²⁰⁷ *Principles of the PMU* - No. 6: 'Soundness of Faith'

It is difficult to assess how well such a curriculum and schedule prepared the female students for ministry abroad in a cross-cultural setting though there is little evidence that the trained missionaries returned prematurely from the field. It would seem likely that although instruction at the Home was given in the Scriptures and World Religions and practical training undertaken in and around Hackney during studies, the main equipping for ministry abroad, involving language study and cross-communication, would have taken place on foreign fields, under the oversight of a senior missionary.²⁰⁸ Students at the Women's Home were expected to live and pay their fees²⁰⁹ by a 'faith principle'²¹⁰ and to 'look to God' for their needs. As will be seen, such a principle was continued by future principal, Howard Carter. The students should not expect any finance from the PMU as any financial gifts and offerings received by the Council were distributed first to missionaries on the field and if anything was left over it was distributed amongst the students.²¹¹

Although the Women's Home was closed in 1922 under the PMU due to a lack of funding, females were given the opportunity to study with the male students at Hampstead and in the ensuing years the number of students of both sexes was encouraging.²¹² After a five-year period as a 'co-educational' school, a separate Bible School for women students was opened in Louth,²¹³ Lincolnshire in 1927 under the leadership of Howard and John Carter.

²⁰⁸ *Principles of the PMU* - No. 5: 'Missionary Candidates'

²⁰⁹ Ten shillings per week for British students and five shillings per week for foreign students (*PMU Minutes* (2nd December 1910)).

²¹⁰ Crisp states in a report in the September 1912 edition of *Confidence* that 'no one receives a salary' (p. 212). However, Crisp certainly received an honorarium for her services (*PMU Minutes* (11th September 1914)). Such a 'faith principle' was continued by Carter at Hampstead post-1921.

²¹¹ *Confidence* (September 1912), p.212

²¹² In 1923 there were 15 men and 6 women students.

In 1924 there were 13 men and 20 women students. In 1925 there were 33 men and 34 women students. In 1926 there were 25 men and 24 women students. In 1927 there were 51 men and 41 women students (*Student Records*). The increase of women students on a par with their male counterparts, was in many ways indicative of the 'greater social freedom' found by women at the beginning of the 20th century, together with political power sought by the suffragettes (Kay, *Inside Story*, p.12).

²¹³ Later it was transferred to Scarborough in 1928 for a brief spell before returning to Louth by 1931. By 1937 the Schools were united once again at Hampstead (Gee, *Wind*, p.152). Although there was five-year period where male and female were trained together, separate training was still desired during the 1920's, a reflection of society at the time.

Chapter 3: An Era of Independence: The Principalship of Howard Carter (1921-48)

3.1 Howard Carter

Alfred Howard Carter was born on the 3rd January 1891 in Aston,²¹⁴ Birmingham. Throughout his life, Carter's father was afflicted with a speech impediment which Howard, himself, inherited²¹⁵ and although he became a 'laughing stock' and not understandable at times in his early years he practised with determination certain exercises to overcome the problem. Something else that Howard inherited from his father was a creative and inventive ability²¹⁶ and the young Howard, after leaving school, enrolled in a local art school where he excelled.²¹⁷ His aim was to qualify as an art teacher until, at the age of twenty, he began to experience disillusionment as he realised that even the finest works of art all fade in the process of time. He shared his feelings with a fellow student who took him to the Catholic Cathedral and then with another student who introduced him to a very different type of service at the Church of Christ denomination near his home in Sparkbrook. At this church both Howard and younger brother, John, were converted and sealed their commitment by baptism in water. They joined this church and attended all the services regularly and later were introduced to the Pentecostal message at a meeting in Smethwick. Here the Carter brothers heard 'tongues' and stories of healing and after attending the 1912 Sunderland Whitsuntide International Convention, they embraced the Pentecostal message. Although they went on to attend the 1913 and 1914 Conventions, and on both occasions were prayed for to receive the Baptism in the Spirit, it was in 1915

²¹⁴ Interestingly, the same area of Birmingham where AoG was established on the 1st February 1924.

²¹⁵ Not a stutter or stammer but a problem articulating words – especially those containing the letter 'r'. Ironically, Howard went on to preach around the world! Later, after his Spirit-baptism in 1915, whenever Carter spoke in tongues all traces of the impediment disappeared. Such an experience convinced him that tongues were truly supernatural and thus proved to be a starting point in his study of the gifts of the Spirit. Interestingly, Elocution was taught under Carter's principalship.

²¹⁶ In later life, Carter 'had all sorts of strange ideas, ranging from making his own toothpaste and shoe polish' (Andrews, *Regions Beyond*, p.190).

²¹⁷ By the end of his first year he had taken more than one 'first' in exams and one First Prize in a model competition. He also gained the highest awards for portraiture and life-drawing in the Royal Society of Artists.

when Howard and John attended a convention in Bedford led by Pastor Robert Anderson Jardine,²¹⁸ that they finally received a tongues-attested Spirit baptism. On returning to Sparkbrook with their new-found experience, the Church of Christ rejected their testimony and cancelled their membership – causing the young brothers to look for fellowship elsewhere. They soon joined a new Pentecostal work in Saltley, Birmingham that had been pioneered in 1913 by a Mr Peters and when Peters decided to emigrate with his family to South America, Howard was asked to take over the leadership of the small church named Crown Mission. Soon the numbers began to build up and a former billiard hall in Duddeston was rented to contain the growing congregation. In 1916, at the age of 25, Howard felt a call to full-time Christian ministry and he resigned his employment as a draughtsman and designer. Although a local Christian businessman offered to pay for him to train for the Anglican ministry, or the ministry of his choice, Howard declined and dedicated all his time to the assembly in Duddeston and pioneer work.²¹⁹

The year 1916 saw a worsening in the World War I situation, causing Parliament to introduce conscription. Both Howard and John were registered as conscientious objectors and at John's hearing of his appeal against military service he was given absolute exemption. Howard's hearing followed soon after and he was granted exemption as a Minister of Religion. However, on discovering that his church at Duddeston was non-denominational, his exemption was overturned, and he was escorted to Wormwood Scrubs in London where he remained for the next nine months. For someone who was 'temperamentally highly strung'²²⁰ yet sensitive and often anxious - for one who appeared impulsive²²¹ yet was meticulously organised²²² -

²¹⁸ Jardine later trained for the Anglican ministry and became the Vicar of St. Paul's, Darlington – soon renouncing Pentecostalism. He became internationally known when he presided over the wedding of the Duke and Duchess of Windsor in 1937.

²¹⁹ It is interesting that Carter, himself, should decline financially supported formal ministerial training and some 5 years later become heavily involved in, and responsible for, formal ministry training at Hampstead Bible School.

²²⁰ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.40

²²¹ An example of later impulsiveness was embarking on a world-tour with only £5 in his pocket. However, his allies would call this 'faith'. Such a trait suited his future principalship of an independent school.

²²² A cursory reading of his personal notebooks and records from the Donald Gee Centre show this. Such attention to detail suited him well as a future principal of Hampstead.

the early weeks of confinement were incredibly difficult. However, it was during his time of imprisonment that Carter further developed his thoughts and produced notes on the gifts of the Spirit found in 1 Corinthians 14.²²³ Such a view and experience of these nine gifts, especially the gift of prophecy, was to become a guiding light in his future life and ministry as Principal of Hampstead Bible School during its era of independence.

After prison and a return to pastoral ministry in the Midlands in late 1919, Carter paid a visit to London that proved to be a turning point in not only his life but the future of the Hampstead Bible School. Carter was invited to the capital by Mr. A.E. Saxby,²²⁴ who believed God was calling Howard to work in London. On the morning of the 25th November, six believers were gathered for prayer for the City and Saxby gave a public message in tongues, which Carter immediately interpreted: ‘Gather My people and build for Me. Gather from the north, south, east and west a great many people... and there shall be heaps of money, heaps upon heaps’.²²⁵ There was an instant fulfilment when later that evening Saxby and Carter were invited out to tea by a Christian businessman who had not been paying his tithes and immediately handed Carter £2400 to recompense.²²⁶ Such a fulfilment would have established a ‘faith principle’ for future finance, upon which Carter would later lead and underwrite as an independent school for 27 years. Taking such events as confirmation, Carter left Birmingham to minister in London and soon answered the call to ‘build and gather’ by purchasing, with the money given, a property on Boone Street, Lee, South-East London known as the ‘People’s Hall’.²²⁷ The work soon flourished and in late 1920,²²⁸ the Secretary of the PMU, solicitor T.H. Mundell, invited the thirty-year old

²²³ These notes developed into a set of lectures at Hampstead Bible School

²²⁴ According to Gee for a short time Saxby exercised a considerable influence on the young Pentecostal Movement at the beginning of the 20th century in Britain and in 1919 organised and chaired the annual Whitsuntide Convention at Kingsway Hall. Later in life Saxby embraced the doctrine of ‘Ultimate Reconciliation’ (Gee, *These Men*, pp.80-82).

²²⁵ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.51

²²⁶ A present-day value of c. £110,000.

²²⁷ This work is still in existence today.

²²⁸ Walsh, *To Meet & Satisfy*, p.80

Howard to take charge of the Bible School at Hampstead. Although extremely reticent,²²⁹ Howard eventually agreed to ‘act temporarily as Superintendent of the Home until at least July 1921’²³⁰ or when a permanent replacement could be found. Carter became Acting Principal of Hampstead on the 14th February 1921 and after five months, the PMU Council expressed their satisfaction with Carter and his work thus asking him to continue permanently.²³¹ His tenure as Principal saw a fulfilment of his own prophecy - he ‘built and gathered’ as students from all four corners of the nation and world were trained for service and sent out.²³²

Some sixteen months after Carter became Principal at Hampstead, the PMU Treasurer’s Report showed a continued deficit and a balance in hand of only £38, against a liability of £525 needed to support the current missionaries on the field. It was proposed that unless the income of the Union increased significantly by July 1922 the Men’s Training Home, similar to the Women’s Home, would close after the 14th August 1922.²³³ Carter was informed by letter of the Council’s plans²³⁴ and immediately read the letter to the student body to invite their prayers and comments. In the days following, convinced that the Pentecostal work in Britain should not be deprived of its only Bible School, Carter wrote to the PMU Council suggesting that the Men’s Training Home be continued by himself as it was, an ‘undenominational

²²⁹ When offered the position, Carter stated that ‘Mundell had made a mistake in asking him and that a married man should be asked so that his wife could serve as the Matron. When asked again, Carter refused the position’ (J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.56).

²³⁰ *PMU Minutes* (8th February 1921)

²³¹ *PMU Minutes* (19th May 1921)

²³² As early as 1933 Carter reports how since 1921, missionaries had gone out to China, Japan, Korea, Ceylon, Africa, Palestine, Russia. In Great Britain ‘over 140 evangelists and pastors are now working in different parts’ (J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.104).

²³³ *PMU Minutes* (26th June 1922). It was predicted that the closing of these Home would save the PMU at least £1000 per annum (*Letter from Mundell to Jameson* (10th April 1923)).

²³⁴ On the morning before receiving the letter, Carter had read Psalm 91 – a psalm of security and protection for those who trust in the Lord.

(sic) Bible Training School'²³⁵ yet without a council and for which he would be 'personally and financially responsible.'²³⁶

Carter's proposal is noteworthy - firstly, would he have insisted that the School be non-denominational had these events taken place after the establishment of Assemblies of God in 1924, the Fellowship of which he was a founder? As will be seen, according to rumour, Carter stated to his successor, George Newsholme, in 1947 that at no point should the Bible School cease to be independent.²³⁷ Both before and after the establishment of the Assemblies of God, Carter's desire for independence had not changed. Secondly, Carter proposed that the new venture should continue without a council or oversight - the risks of which will be elucidated later in the dissertation.

Carter's proposal was agreed by the PMU Council, subject to the consent of the landlord, and he was to take over the tenancy of the premises from the 29th September 1922 – from which date he would be 'entirely responsible for the future outgoings, management and carrying on of the Home'.²³⁸ By October 1922, Carter had signed the agreement and at a time of growing unemployment, economic stagnancy and industrial unrest in Britain,²³⁹ he continued the previous PMU 'faith mission principle' and took personal responsibility for Hampstead, establishing what became 'an important centre of Pentecostal influence throughout the Movement'.²⁴⁰

²³⁵ *PMU Minutes* (10th July 1922). It remained this way throughout Carter's 27 year tenure.

²³⁶ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.63. The previous accounts of 'miraculous' financial provision would no doubt have fuelled his faith to do so. In addition, Carter would have had first-hand experience of Polhill's similar autocratic leadership of the PMU

²³⁷ Kay, *Inside*, p.208

²³⁸ *PMU Minutes* (10th July 1922)

²³⁹ For example, between December 1920 and March 1921, unemployment more than doubled and passed the two million mark. There was a general fall of wages in the early twenties and strikes and threats of strikes marked the start of the decade (Kay, *Inside*, pp.63-64).

²⁴⁰ Gee, *Wind*, p.151

3.2 The end of the PMU and the beginning of the Assemblies of God

After the closing of the Women's Training Home in 1922 and the handing over of the Men's Training Home to Howard Carter in October of the same year, the work of the PMU began to decline rapidly. Because of such changes the PMU no longer had trained missionaries to replace those who had returned on furlough or had left the field for other reasons. Income began to dry up²⁴¹ and missionaries would only go out under the auspices of the PMU 'if they covered their own expenses.'²⁴² Moreover, the outstanding, yet ageing personalities on the PMU gradually 'lost touch with the Pentecostal Movement as a whole'²⁴³ and, according to Gee's later reflections, British Pentecostals felt they lacked true Pentecostal representation.²⁴⁴ In addition, there seemed to be little organisational and structural unity amongst the growing number of Pentecostal Centres around the nation²⁴⁵ and all in all, there was deep regret amongst some members of the PMU Council at the direction it was taking.²⁴⁶

On the 1st February 1924 a preliminary meeting was held in Aston, Birmingham with 15 individuals, including Howard Carter, after a circular invitation was sent by John Nelson Parr and British Assemblies of God was formed. The proposed reasons for such a formation were to '(1) Preserve the testimony to the full gospel, including the baptism of the Spirit and to save the work from false teaching; (2) Strengthen bonds and create a fuller degree of cooperation; (3) Cooperate in evangelistic and missionary work; (4) Present a united witness to outsiders; (5) Save the assemblies

²⁴¹ Only a dozen assemblies were pledging £10 per annum (*PMU Minutes* (27th March 1922)) and income generally amounted to £1700 to £2000 per annum (Missen, *Sound*, p.61). There were few sources of income beyond voluntary donations, box offerings, Convention giving as well as Polhill himself. The economic state of post-War Britain would not have helped though Gee states that due to the PMU's 'impaired Pentecostal character the Pentecostal people were inclined to give it less and less' (Gee, *Wind*, p.125).

²⁴² *Letter from Mundell to Orrell* (12th September 1923)

²⁴³ Missen, *Sound*, p.60. Gee reports that Polhill 'severed his connection with the Pentecostal Movement' (*R.T.* (25th March 1938), p.11). This was probably due to such reasons as: 1) His wariness towards young Pentecostal leaders such as Carter (*Letter from Polhill to Mundell* (5th February 1921)) and 2) Polhill's 'inability to get outside the aristocratic pattern' (Kay, *Pentecostalism*, p.47)

²⁴⁴ Gee, *Wind*, p.125

²⁴⁵ Andrews, *Regions Beyond*, p.107

²⁴⁶ *Letter from Mundell to Jameson* (10th April 1923) and *Letter to Carter* (27th June 1922)

from falling into unscriptural organisations'.²⁴⁷ At this meeting, it was announced that 26 congregations or groups would form the fledging denomination - including Hampstead Bible School.²⁴⁸ At a second meeting in Highbury, London on the 8th and 9th May of the same year, a further 48 Pentecostal assemblies were accepted into fellowship. An official Constitution and Statement of Fundamental Truths was created and Nelson Parr was elected as the first Chairman and Secretary of AoG, in addition to becoming the first Editor of *Redemption Tidings*, the official publication of British AoG, in 1924. It is important to note again, therefore, that due to the fact that Howard Carter's Hampstead Bible School was in Fellowship with AoG it was therefore viewed as an autonomous assembly where 'there was little in the way of central control'.²⁴⁹ The School was able to govern itself, have control over its own affairs, own its own buildings, pay its own staff and could act independently of a higher authority as long as it did not teach against the fundamental beliefs of AoG and the leaders did not fail morally. Though it was to pay a small annual contribution to Assemblies of God (currently 3% of undesignated income) it was not owned by it and this remains the legal position of all AoG churches (though no longer its College) to this day. Carter's School was therefore in the, soon to be seen, beneficial position whereby there were close links with a denomination for advertising, recruitment, placing of graduates and financial support, yet it could make its own decisions as an education establishment without interference from others. In addition, due to Carter's seat on the Executive Council of AoG, he was able to maintain close links between this fledgling denomination or fellowship and his own training school - yet run the College his way.

On the 19th September 1924, the Secretary of the PMU reported a conversation with John Nelson Parr on behalf of the newly-formed Assemblies of God regarding an amalgamation and stated that Parr had asked if it could be arranged for two members

²⁴⁷ Kay, *Pentecostals*, p.28

²⁴⁸ Massey, *A Sound and Scriptural Union*, p.339

²⁴⁹ Foster, *Authority and Authenticity*, p.71

of the PMU Council²⁵⁰ to meet two members of the AoG, Howard Carter and John Nelson Parr, for ‘unofficial talks’.²⁵¹ After a long discussion and obvious divergence of opinion amongst Council members, it was formally agreed that a conversation with Assemblies of God should indeed take place. Later, at this ‘unofficial’ meeting, the following suggestions were made:

A new PMU Council should be created, with an equal number of both AoG and PMU members;

The new Council was to continue its missionary work for two years,²⁵² after which, the entire Council should be appointed by AoG;

All the members of the Council should be willing to subscribe to the twelve Fundamental Truths of AoG.²⁵³

After acceptance of these suggestions by both the PMU Council and the General Presbytery of the AoG in January 1925 the following were appointed to represent the AoG on the new Council – Thomas Myerscough, John Carter, Howard Carter, George Tilling and a member of the Welsh Presbytery. By the end of 1925, the old Council of the PMU resigned²⁵⁴ and in January 1926, it was resolved that the new Council, appointed by AoG, be renamed – The Home Missionary Reference Council.²⁵⁵ The new HMRC of AoG acted for the PMU’s overseas missionaries and took over all the legal interests of the former Union. New, trained missionaries thereafter were to be sent forth directly under the auspices of Assemblies of God.²⁵⁶

²⁵⁰ Polhill preferred that someone other than himself attend on behalf of the PMU (*PMU Minutes* (10th October 1924)).

²⁵¹ *PMU Minutes* (19th September 1924). However, Gee states that it was the PMU Council that approached AoG (Gee, *Wind*, p. 131) and not the other way around.

²⁵² Later amended to 1 year (*PMU Minutes* (9th January 1925)).

²⁵³ *PMU Minutes* (31st October 1924). The PMU resolved that these suggestions be adopted. Polhill, however, knowing he would soon resign from the PMU did not vote (*PMU Minutes* (31st October 1924)).

²⁵⁴ Polhill had resigned in January 1925 – twelve months earlier (*PMU Minutes* (9th January 1925)).

²⁵⁵ *PMU Minutes* (15th January 1926)

²⁵⁶ Gee, *Wind*, p.131

However, after the formation of British Assemblies of God in 1924 attention, arguably unintentionally, began to turn away from overseas mission preparation to the training of home workers. Howard Carter was instrumental in this shift of focus with the introduction of the Bible School Evangelistic Society (BSES) in July 1926 and in all probability not surprising as Carter, himself, had no overseas missionary background at this point – unlike Polhill. The BSES, under Carter, would help in the conducting of evangelistic campaigns in Britain, then acquire a building in the same area for the ‘converts’ and those interested to gather. Students from the Bible School would be sent to lead these pioneer works on completion of their studies, or when Carter felt they were ready for ministry. Carter’s successor, George Newsholme, later stated how the College at Hampstead, albeit independent, existed to train those from and for the Fellowship of AoG for ministry ‘at home and abroad’²⁵⁷ and Donald Gee, himself, also recognised the need for training for the ‘home field’. He stated in 1950 how there were ‘at least 47 Pentecostal assemblies in the UK without a pastor or recognised leader and thus the need for Bible College training was of prime importance.’²⁵⁸ When Gee became Principal, graduates were assisted ‘as far as possible in securing pastorates’ in the UK²⁵⁹ and, in addition, ‘closer liaison’ was sought ‘between the Home Mission Council and the Bible College’ in 1961.²⁶⁰ However, it should be pointed out that although attention unintentionally turned predominantly to the home field, the ‘missionary’ element of the Bible School and Missionary Association was not lost altogether. By 1943, it was estimated that students had ‘found spheres of service in Australia, Brazil, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Congo, China, Denmark, Egypt, Sweden, Switzerland, Palestine, Holland, France, Germany, Japan, Korea, Norway, Transvaal, Argentina and Sierra Leone.’²⁶¹

²⁵⁷ *R.T.* (20th January 1950), p.3.

²⁵⁸ Kay, *Inside*, p.209

²⁵⁹ *BoG Minutes* (12th May 1954)

²⁶⁰ *BoG Minutes* (29th June 1961)

²⁶¹ *R.T.* (30th July 1943), p.6

Although, as has been seen, the first PMU Training Homes had been established to offer basic preparation in biblical doctrine to all their candidates for overseas ministry, under the Assemblies of God from 1924, no compulsory formal training or cultural acclimatisation was arranged for future missionaries. Post 1924, each overseas candidate was expected to hear ‘the call of God and to make their own appropriate preparations for future service’.²⁶² Initially, they were to prove themselves to the Reference Council of AoG in at least five areas:

- i. A personal experience of New Testament salvation;²⁶³
- ii. A definite call to missionary work;
- iii. Their endorsement and acceptance of the Fundamental Truths of AoG;
- iv. Their physical, mental and spiritual fitness for the work;
- v. Their Christian standing, being first endorsed by their local assemblies.²⁶⁴

Although there are some similarities here with past PMU criteria for missionary candidates – e.g. a Pentecostal experience,²⁶⁵ the candidate’s beliefs,²⁶⁶ the candidate’s physical and educational ability²⁶⁷ etc, under the newly formed Assemblies of God, it would appear that the matter of undertaking a course of study at a Bible School was no longer a requirement, as was strongly implied under the principles of the PMU²⁶⁸

²⁶² Kay, *Inside Story*, pp.343-344

²⁶³ Including justification by faith followed by water baptism by full immersion.

²⁶⁴ *AoG Minutes*, January to May 1924, minute 23, p.9

²⁶⁵ *Confidence* (January 1909), p.14, point 9

²⁶⁶ *Confidence* (January 1909), p.14, point 9 & 10

²⁶⁷ *Confidence* (January 1909), p.14, point 10

²⁶⁸ *Confidence* (January 1909), p.14, point 6

3.3 Development and growth of Hampstead and beyond

After only four months in sole charge of the Men's Training Home, Carter wrote to the PMU Council stating that due to the fact that there were currently only two male students at the Home, he was facing financial difficulty.²⁶⁹ The Council, however, advised that public appeals for money were to be discouraged and the matter 'taken to God in prayer'.²⁷⁰ In a sense this was easy for the Council to advise – they were now free of the Training Home and Carter was fully responsible, though they did assist by 'sending any student that desired to be trained'.²⁷¹ Pressure began to mount from the landlady, Miss Squire, who gave notice to Carter for him to end possession of No. 12 by the 25th March 1923²⁷² and although the PMU offered to sell the School furniture to Carter for £125 in December 1922, instead of the valued price of £140.12.6, the Council insisted that the debt be cleared in full by the 25th March 1923.²⁷³ With such financial pressures in mind, Carter decided to make a tour of the Pentecostal assemblies in an attempt to encourage giving and stir up interest in the work of the School - but with little success.²⁷⁴ He also, at this time, sought to relocate his School to more suitable premises and Blackheath College, which was offered to him for £1600, was a possible alternative. During this time, a clear prophecy was given by a Mr R.C. Thomas on the 17th April 1923, in which he said, 'Thou shalt stay where the Lord hath placed thee and shall not depart'.²⁷⁵ On the 4th June 1923, Howard's father visited the Hampstead property and agreed to purchase it from the owner, Miss Squire.²⁷⁶ He then agreed to rent the property back to Howard until finally leaving the

²⁶⁹ *PMU Minutes* (23rd January 1923)

²⁷⁰ *PMU Minutes* (23rd January 1923).

²⁷¹ J Carter, *Howard Carter*, p. 63

²⁷² Although she could not put them out until after June 1923 (*PMU Letter Ledger* (2nd September 1922))

²⁷³ *PMU Letter Ledger* (26th February 1923)

²⁷⁴ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.84. It would seem that after this experience, Carter made it a policy not to solicit funds but to 'trust God' (p.97).

²⁷⁵ Carter kept all prophecies given to him during his life. They are contained in a notebook simply named *Prophecies* and can be found in the Donald Gee Centre at Mattersey Hall.

²⁷⁶ Because No. 12 was in a residential area in Hampstead, Carter was forbidden to advertise the fact that a Bible School was being conducted on the premises. No. 12 was simply called 'Pentecost' – summing up the ethos of the School.

property to him in his will.²⁷⁷ The financial anxiety of being solely responsible for Hampstead, however, soon took its toll and in 1923, Carter suffered a nervous breakdown²⁷⁸ and had to leave the School for some months.

In 1924, despite the pressures and initial set-backs, in the months that followed, Carter pushed ahead and in an open letter to the Assemblies of God advertised his School to the newly-formed Fellowship where he stressed the importance of Bible training, the Pentecostal teachings of the School in line with the Fundamental Truths of AoG which was perhaps to be expected as Carter was also a member of its Executive Council, the facilities at Hampstead and the fees charged.²⁷⁹ In all probability, due to such regular advertising from Carter's links to AoG, student numbers began to rise steadily throughout the 20s²⁸⁰ and attracted several from across the continent.²⁸¹ Initially, the bulk of the lecturing of such subjects as outlines of the books of the Bible, themes such as Redemption, Sanctification, the Work of the Spirit, The Church and Homiletics²⁸² fell upon Howard before he asked his brother, John to join him as a tutor and Assistant Principal in 1923. Howard Carter's own style of lecturing was unconventional. Instead of the usual dogmatic style by which the teacher's thoughts are dictated by notes into the hearer's minds, Carter felt the better method was to draw out the student's own ideas upon a given subject. Consequently, he adopted the conversational style of teaching, often on subjects initiated by the students themselves so that they would be trained to develop their own originality of

²⁷⁷ *Prophecies* Notebook 1923. Interestingly, neither Howard nor his younger brother John mention this fact in their respective accounts of the time. Perhaps they were trying to protect the anonymity of their father's generosity.

²⁷⁸ *The Bible School & Missionary Review* (March-April 1929), p.2. Carter writes of a 'dark cloud lingering for some time'.

²⁷⁹ *R.T.* (July 1924), p.11. Students were expected to contribute £1, or 20 shillings per week for board, with free tuition (*Bible School & Missionary Review* (1930)). This sum remained for the next 10 years or more despite a rise in inflation. The average national weekly wage in 1925 was £5. Carter, therefore, charged a reasonable one fifth of a weekly wage for board and lodging.

²⁸⁰ 19 in 1924, 20 in 1925, 19 in 1926 and 36 in 1927 (Kay, *Inside*, p.122). Perhaps the formation and stability of the new Fellowship of AoG had much to do with the growth of the College at this time.

²⁸¹ For example, in 1929 there were three Swedes, two Germans, one Czech and one Norwegian student.

²⁸² *Missionary & Bible Training School* (July 1923), p.2

thought and interpretation under the tutor's guidance. The downside to such a method was that a set subject or a syllabus may not be followed. Gee comments that an extraordinary feature of the Hampstead School under Carter was that it sought to teach students a method of Scripture study which they could apply to any doctrine or passage of the Bible.²⁸³ Although the School was distinctively Pentecostal - that the Baptism in the Holy Spirit was an experience distinct from and subsequent to salvation, the gifts of the Holy Spirit listed in 1 Corinthians 12 were wholly supernatural and, as stated, the Fundamentals of AoG were taught - Carter believed the students needed an overall grasp of the main doctrines of Christianity and that other mainstream beliefs should be taught.²⁸⁴ It should be noted at this point, that Carter's own teaching was questioned in 1926 by one of the Hampstead lecturers – Inglis R. Monteath.

Monteath, formerly a minister within the Church of England, had been appointed by Carter to teach Doctrinal Studies. However, on the 8th June 1926, he resigned his position and brought a serious accusation against the principal, namely that Carter was a 'Modernist' who had, among other things, denied the reliability of the Scriptures. The charge brought against Carter was based on comments he had made whilst teaching on Romans 9. Carter, it was claimed, had suggested that much of the chapter in question represented the 'mind of Paul rather than the mind of God'.²⁸⁵ Moreover, to Monteath, Carter viewed spiritual gifts, especially tongues and prophecy, as consisting of a mixture of 'both the human and divine'.²⁸⁶ In a letter to the AoG Executive Presbytery Chairman, J.N. Parr, Monteath states:

It is with very real and great regret that I feel it my duty to bring before you...the following matter...I assure you that I bear no ill-will against Mr Carter himself...but against his teaching. I feel very strongly that Pentecost ought to know what teaching had been given and is being given in the School to which it sends prospective pastors and missionaries and which it

²⁸³ Gee, *Wind*, p.151

²⁸⁴ For example, John Carter taught mainstream beliefs about the Trinity and Reformed Protestant beliefs about salvation through Christ's atonement (*R.T.* (February and April 1926)).

²⁸⁵ *Letter from Monteath to Parr* (11th June 1926)

²⁸⁶ Allen, *Signs*, p.143. Carter viewed prophecy as a product of the Spirit 'working upon and through a human mind and personality' therefore all pronouncements should be weighed and judged (Howard Carter, *Questions and Answers on Spiritual Gifts* (London, 1946), p.96).

supports by financial contributions...I happen to know something of this kind of Modernism and its deadly effect and I feel that measures should be taken to protect the students from this false teaching....²⁸⁷

Such a charge, in addition to subconsciously doing no favours for the Pentecostal perception of ‘academics’, became instantly problematic to the new Fellowship. On one hand, the Assemblies of God was created largely out of a desire to prevent the Pentecostal Movement from being discredited by the ‘antics of charlatans and by misuse of spiritual gifts’²⁸⁸ and a belief in the reliability and infallibility of the Scriptures was fundamental to Assemblies of God, as was the practice of spiritual gifts. On the other hand, the Assemblies of God did not own the Hampstead property, it was not its official college and therefore the Fellowship had no power to dismiss Carter.²⁸⁹ In addition, through the BSES the School was undertaking important work in establishing and sustaining new assemblies and training home workers. The matter was investigated by the Executive Presbytery and, it would seem, resolved with the minimum of damage. A letter was circulated to the assembly leaders showing support for the principal, which was not altogether surprising as Carter was a founding member of AoG, a member of the Executive and arguably the only one capable of running Hampstead at that time. They had no power and real incentive to dismiss Carter as Principal as he, himself, owned and was financially responsible for the School and therefore lightening the financial burden on the fledgling denomination. However, as Hampstead had autonomous assembly status, had Carter been found guilty of heresy, his status as a minister with AoG could have been revoked. Should this have been the case, the risk to the College would have been its possible removal as an ‘assembly’ within AoG and the loss of advertising in *Redemption Tidings* and negative publicity that would follow. The risk to AoG itself, in the removal of one of its founding fathers and a fruitful Principal who was clearly carrying out good work

²⁸⁷ Letter from Monteath to Parr (11th June 1926)

²⁸⁸ Allen, Signs, p.144

²⁸⁹ Interestingly, and as will be seen, after the College became officially AoG in 1951, ‘false teaching’ did result in the expulsion of lecturers as with C.L. Parker.

on its behalf, would have been catastrophic to the fledgling denomination in terms of negative publicity and lack of trained ministers for its new and existing churches.

It would seem, therefore, that Assemblies of God did not wish to ‘rock the boat’ and in its letter to ministers pointed out that Monteath had not fulfilled the biblical instructions in regard to an accusation made against a presbyter²⁹⁰ and also that he acted unwisely by ‘broadcasting his complaint.’²⁹¹ A letter was also sent to Monteath pointing out that his complaint was largely based on ‘hearsay’²⁹² and that students could easily have misheard or misinterpreted what Carter had said in the classroom. Soon after, Monteath disappeared from the scene and a year later, at the fourth Annual General Presbytery Conference in 1927, it was resolved to ‘record our deep appreciation of the work of the Bible School and to assure Mr. Carter of the hearty support of the General Council.’²⁹³ Thus, Hampstead was able to continue and encourage various styles of classroom learning. This scenario, together with the perceived risks and benefits will be examined more closely in Sections 3.5, 6.2 and 7.1.

In time, others joined the lecturing staff at Hampstead including C.L. Parker, Elisha Thompson and Harold Horton. Cuthbert Layland Parker was the son of a Church of England vicar and an Oxford graduate. After the First World War he became curate at St. Luke’s, Earls Court where he experienced a conversion experience during the preparations for his evening sermon. After being both baptised by full immersion in water and hearing modern day ‘tongues’ during a trip to Australia, Parker returned and in 1922²⁹⁴ started his own Bible School in a large rectory in Lincolnshire – relocating in 1923 to Oxford. Numbered amongst the first students were Elisha Thompson and a young Pentecostal named Raymond Stone. It was Stone who interested Parker in the Baptism in the Holy Spirit as a subsequent experience to salvation and shortly after joining the staff at Hampstead in 1925 Parker received the Spirit. Although he taught

²⁹⁰ 1 Timothy 5:19

²⁹¹ *Letter from Executive Presbytery to Monteath* (30th July 1926)

²⁹² *Letter to Monteath* (30th July 1926)

²⁹³ *Fourth Annual General Conference Minutes 1927*

²⁹⁴ Missen states it was 1921 (*Sound*, p.81)

at Hampstead, Louth and Kenley on and off for some thirty years, his teaching methods, similar to Carter's, were unorthodox in presentation. He would make provocative statements and ask leading questions in order to get his students to think for themselves and disprove it.²⁹⁵ Moreover, as will be examined later in the dissertation, Parker's beliefs on certain issues were later viewed as 'contrary to the generally accepted interpretation of the AoG Statement of Fundamental Truths' causing a call for his resignation from the lecturing staff in 1955. Although Parker was described as 'highly strung'²⁹⁶ and suffered a 'break down'²⁹⁷ in 1936, Howard Carter, in his Foreword to Parker's book, *The Mystery of God*, described him as 'a choice soul and the possessor of a clear intellect. His penetrating thoughts flashed with lightning speed from an agile brain. Those students who were privileged to sit before him in the lecture room will never forget his dynamic presentation of the truth'.²⁹⁸

Elisha Thompson had left Parker's Bible School in 1924 and made an application to join the Congo Evangelistic Mission. After being refused on account of his poor health²⁹⁹ he returned to work in the mining industry before joining the Hampstead staff on the 8th April 1931, eventually retiring from the resident staff in 1970.³⁰⁰ Throughout his 39 years of service as a resident tutor specialising in the Old Testament, Thompson served as School Secretary for 28 years yet, according to one of his students, 'he was just as happy wearing overalls and clearing out some drain as he was lecturing about some Pharaoh in the sixth or seventh dynasty'.³⁰¹

Another lecturer who joined the Hampstead staff was Harold Horton, an ex-Methodist circuit preacher who was born in Wrexham in 1881. He received healing from a

²⁹⁵ *Interview with Paul Weaver* (9th May 2012)

²⁹⁶ Kay, *Inside*, p.126

²⁹⁷ Missen, *Sound*, p.82

²⁹⁸ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.67

²⁹⁹ According to John Carter, Thompson had a problem with his kidneys (*Howard Carter*, p.68) and, according to Missen, in September 1924 he was given two years to live (*Sound*, p.82). He eventually died in 1975 at the age of 74.

³⁰⁰ After his retirement, Thompson continued as a visiting tutor until 1974.

³⁰¹ Obituary by Dennis Robson in *R.T.* (20th November 1975), p.7

double hernia after being prayed for by Smith Wigglesworth³⁰² in 1925 and soon after, in 1926, resigned his teaching position at the School of Elocution, Duxbury Studio in West London to become tutor of Bible Studies, French and English Composition at the invitation of Howard Carter. In many ways Carter and Horton were kindred spirits – both were artistic, slightly flamboyant, both suffered nervous breakdowns,³⁰³ both married later in life, both were able teachers and writers and at times ‘outspoken’.³⁰⁴ When Carter opened a Bible School for Women in Louth in 1927, Horton was asked to assist the Principal, John Carter, and when the Women’s School was temporarily transferred to Scarborough between 1928-1931 Horton took charge with future Principal, George Newsholme, as a tutor. Horton combined his teaching responsibilities at both Louth and Scarborough with pastoral ministry in the assemblies located in both towns. In August 1933 he became the pastor of the Luton Assembly from where he published the Pentecostal classic, *Gifts of the Spirit*, based on Howard Carter’s own notes on the subject. He died in 1969 at the age of 88.

Under Howard Carter’s leadership the Bible School began to experience much expansion and growth at Hampstead and beyond. The dwindling attendance at the Sion College meetings under Polhill soon saw the venue ‘regularly crowded to the doors’³⁰⁵ and attracting speakers from all over the world. By the beginning of 1926 the students and staff at Hampstead numbered ‘more than forty’³⁰⁶ including Norwegian, Swedish, Polish, Danish, Swiss and American students. With the growth of the work, Carter began to feel the time had come to consider purchasing other properties in the immediate area. It was with this thought of expansion in mind that both Howard and John visited the United States to assess the facilities of other Bible Schools. Upon their return, several properties were viewed and in 1928 a large house on the same road as No. 12 – No. 87 South Hill Park - became available and was

³⁰² In typical fashion, after Wigglesworth prayed for Horton, he was instructed to run up and down the aisle. As he did so the pain left (Whittaker, *Seven Pentecostal Pioneers*, p.131).

³⁰³ Whittaker, *Seven*, p.141

³⁰⁴ Kay, *Inside*, p.12. No doubt such similarities would have fostered camaraderie for Carter during the early years of running an independent school.

³⁰⁵ *Hampstead Bible School Review* (Autumn 1929)

³⁰⁶ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p. 96. In the same year, 214 were enrolled on the Correspondence Course. This number rose to 1700 by 1929 (J. Carter, *Howard Carter*; pp.103-104).

bought by Carter as an annexe for the sum of £1450. It is not known where this money came from. A rough calculation suggests that Carter's School took in about £1000 per year from the £1 per week charged to students for board and lodging. Some of this money undoubtedly was spent on the running costs of the School, though the staff did not receive a salary. It is therefore not unreasonable to suggest that a portion of student income could have been spent on purchasing No. 87.

In addition to providing some formal training, it was imperative to Carter to secure future ministerial openings for the increasing number of students going through his School. John Carter was asked to conduct evangelistic campaigns around the country in order to pioneer new congregations for the Hampstead graduates to pastor, either when their studies were complete or when an opening was available and the student deemed 'suitable' by Carter to fill it. The length of time spent at Hampstead, therefore, varied from a matter of weeks to a number of months and students generally found themselves entering and leaving the School 'incredibly quickly'³⁰⁷ - the risk of which was undertrained graduates for new churches. As stated, such efforts led to the inauguration of the BSES in July 1926. However, as halls were difficult to rent in order to conduct services, Howard conceived the idea of purchasing empty buildings and installing in these properties the 'campaign converts' and other interested people. He would charge a reasonable rent and the money derived from the rentals was earmarked for the purpose of acquiring other buildings. Again, it is not known where the money came from to purchase such halls in the first place though miraculous provision was certainly a possibility. For example, and as stated, in 1929 Carter reported how, after receiving a prophetic word, a Christian businessman gave him a cheque for £2400 which was later spent on a church hall to start an assembly.³⁰⁸ By 1929, the BSES had 67 ministers working in 17 English counties³⁰⁹ and Howard and John were exercising 'almost an apostolic role in regard to many assemblies - particularly those they had founded or whose leader was an ex-Hampstead student'.³¹⁰

³⁰⁷ Andrews, *Regions*, p.197

³⁰⁸ *BSMA Review* (Nov./Dec. 1929)

³⁰⁹ Kay, *Inside*, p.128

³¹⁰ Allen, *Signs*, p.146

However, despite such relative success, in the same year an accusation was made by some ministers within AoG that the Society was engaged in ‘forming an organisation separate and distinct from Assemblies of God and opposed to its principles’.³¹¹ Such tension between some within AoG and the perceived autocratic control of the BSES and its church planting efforts by the Carter brothers, clearly caused a threat in some minds. On one hand, there were benefits of the Society as Hampstead and the BSES were producing ministers and new churches for the fledgling AoG in its important early years. There was a clear fluidity and dynamism in the Carters’ approach and churches were formed quickly and organically - though the rapid training and placing of some individuals did cause a possible risk of inadequate training and preparation for the task ahead. On the other hand, the risk of how Hampstead and the BSES was perceived by some in having a separate agenda to the wider AoG at the time could easily have caused a split and division in the young Fellowship. To remedy the tension, in a statement to AoG, John Carter made it clear that the BSES was not in competition with the Fellowship and should be seen as ‘a wheel within a wheel’. He was keen to assure the Fellowship that the principles of the Society were the same as those of AoG and that all its evangelists and pastors ‘must subscribe to the Fellowship’s Fundamentals’.³¹² Furthermore, at the General Conference in 1937, it was proposed by the BSES that their assemblies be ‘set free to affiliate themselves to Assemblies of God.’³¹³

By 1933, Carter reported that through both the Bible Schools and the BSES ‘over 140 evangelists and pastors were now working in Great Britain’³¹⁴ and although training for the foreign field continued to take place³¹⁵ as stated previously, training for the ‘home field’ became a priority, albeit unintentionally.

³¹¹ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.100

³¹² J. Carter, *Howard Carter*; p. 100. Although John Carter was gracious in his response to the accusation and there was obvious close links with AoG due to the fact that the Carter brothers were founder members, the Fellowship had no power to act as both the Bible School and its BSES were independent enterprises.

³¹³ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.146.

³¹⁴ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.104

³¹⁵ For example, in 1933, Carter reports how since 1920 missionaries had gone out from Hampstead to at least 10 nations of the world (J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.104).

Another important extension of the Hampstead work was the opening of a Bible School for women students at Louth, Lincolnshire. Whilst pioneering in this town in March 1927, John Carter was made aware of a large house – No. 36 Bridge Street – which was also used as the Area Tax Offices³¹⁶ and Howard decided to open Bridge Street as a Bible School for women³¹⁷ with John becoming its first Principal, assisted by Harold Horton. A year later, on the 31st January 1928, a larger house was purchased by Howard Carter for £1300³¹⁸ – Westgate House³¹⁹ which stood on one acre of ground – and the Bible School relocated from Bridge Street. Less than eight months later, by September 1928, the Women’s School was relocated once again to No. 14 Springfield in Scarborough³²⁰ under Harold Horton. By February 1931 it had returned to Westgate House³²¹ and in 1933, when C.L. Parker moved back to Hampstead, Mr and Mrs Donald Gee oversaw the Women’s School.³²² By early 1937, both the Men’s and Women’s Schools were united at Hampstead as a co-educational establishment.³²³

All in all, the place of the Bible School(s) in these early days of the Assemblies of God and the Pentecostal Movement as a whole was important – ministers were trained, and life-long friendships formed, Pentecostal truth was propagated, missionaries were sent out and much needed churches were planted in Britain.

Carter had a definite ability to inspire younger men and many valued the family atmosphere at Hampstead during the 1920’s and 30’s with the opportunity to sit down

³¹⁶ This house still stands today.

³¹⁷ Like the Hampstead School, Bridge Street was named ‘Pentecost’ – emphasising the Pentecostal ethos of the School and its training.

³¹⁸ *Conveyance Document 31.1.28*

³¹⁹ The house still stands and has been restored by the current owner and occupant, Prof. Peter Byrne.

³²⁰ It was felt that Westgate was ‘better suited as a Rest Home than a Bible School’ (*R.T.* (September 1928), p. 18). The building on Springfield no longer exists and flats have been erected in its place.

³²¹ During 1928-31, Westgate House was used as a Pentecostal Rest Home, a Conference Centre (J. Carter, *Howard Carter - Man of the Spirit*, p.102) and for a time, the first and second term male students studied here under C.L. Parker, whilst third term students studied at Hampstead (*R.T.* (March 1930)). Tutors at Louth included R. Taylor, W. Brimble and Miss Furnival (*R.T.* February 1931). Fees for women at Louth were 25/- per week.

³²² *R.T.* (February 1933), p.19

³²³ Gee, *Wind*, p. 152. It would seem from the *Conveyance Document* that Westgate House was sold by Carter to Lincolnshire County Council on the 8th May 1937. The price is not shown.

to meals with the Principal and members of faculty.³²⁴ Although Carter had taken charge of the College at the relatively young age of 31, he had already been imprisoned for his beliefs and had pioneered and pastored in various places in the United Kingdom. He had much to teach the aspiring minister and he sought to instil certain principles to all at No. 12. Such principles included humility, generosity³²⁵ and especially faith. As previously stated, Carter experienced constant financial problems with the majority of income derived from student fees³²⁶ and supplemented by the odd financial gift. However, the young principal also knew continual miraculous financial provision. On one occasion, in 1926, the bank manager had threatened to call in an overdraft unless several hundred pounds were immediately placed into the School account. As was his habit, the Principal made the need known to the student body and together they prayed for help. Within three hours some six hundred pounds had been provided.³²⁷ As Carter lived by faith and ran his Bible Schools by the same virtue,³²⁸ the staff and students were expected to do the same.³²⁹ No home assembly guaranteed a student's support and although no charge was made for tuition, the students were charged for board and lodging.³³⁰

In a real sense, Carter's faith sprang from his personal view and experience of the gift of prophecy, which he believed not only functioned as an inspired utterance in an

³²⁴ *Interview with Alfred Missen by David Allen* (3rd June 1985). Carter clearly appreciated his students and in an article he wrote for the *Review* stated 'They are mine! God has given them to me to prepare these young people for the ministry. I shall never feel grateful enough to the Lord for the privilege of teaching in the School' (J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p. 71).

³²⁵ John Carter gives examples of Howard's humility and generosity in *Howard Carter – Man of the Spirit*, pp. 110-111.

³²⁶ The number of students varied from term to term and thus added a further element of uncertainty.

³²⁷ J. Carter, *Howard Carter - Man of the Spirit*, p.97

³²⁸ Carter's gravestone in Springfield, Missouri carries the inscription: 'Howard Carter – Man of Faith'.

³²⁹ 'Living by faith' can be defined as 'expecting one's provisions to be supplied in answer to prayer' (Kay, *Inside*, p.128). Staff at the School were not paid a salary and were expected to 'trust God'. Finding 'secular' employment to support oneself and a family was frowned upon. Gee, however, states that the Apostle Paul, at times, undertook tent-making and pointed out the Scriptural principle of those who preached the Gospel should live by the Gospel (Kay, *Inside*, p.128).

³³⁰ £1 per week. Students were not charged for tuition as the resident faculty received no salaries. Later, under denominational ownership during Gee's tenure, similarly there were no guarantees from AoG assemblies to support any students they had sent to the College.

assembly of Christian believers (arguably the context of 1 Corinthians 14) but that prophecy could also be given and received personally and privately (cf. Agabus in Acts 21:10ff.) - as one of the roles of the Holy Spirit was to make known to both the Church and individual, the will of God.³³¹ At various times Carter received many personal prophecies and some 73 are recorded in his notebook, *Prophecies*,³³² given concerning his life and ministry between 1919 and 1964. In this notebook Carter gives the year, location and outline of the prophecy and they cover such subjects as the Bible School, his chairmanship of AoG, overseas ministry and financial support. As stated, such a view of the operation of spiritual gifts enabled Carter to be personally and financially responsible for the running of the Bible Schools.

3.4 The War Years and other attempts at training

The Second World War was declared in September 1939 and the first twelve months passed in Britain without much incident³³³ except for precautionary actions including the evacuation of hundreds of thousands of children from the cities to the country, the air-raid alarms, the trenches in public parks, barrage balloons aloft and anti-aircraft weaponry deployed on public buildings which served to remind the nation's people of the imminent threat of Hitler's Luftwaffe. Rationing of food, clothing, petrol and other commodities suddenly also became commonplace. From mid-August onwards the Luftwaffe launched wave after wave of blitz attacks, first on British airfields and aircraft factories and later in ports and major cities such as Coventry, Liverpool, Bristol and London where high-explosive and incendiary bombs were dropped on residential areas.³³⁴ From September 1940 such raids became a nightly occurrence and bombs fell all around the Hampstead Bible School in a wide circle. On one particular Sunday evening, in October, one of the students was leaving the Underground station when she was blown off her feet by the blast of a landmine. She

³³¹ Kay, *Inside*, p.125.

³³² Several examples are also given in *Howard Carter – Man of the Spirit*, pp. 48, 51-52, 79-80 and 85-86.

³³³ The fighting seemed remote and almost academic – the phrase 'phony war' was used to describe the period up to April 1940 (K. Morgan, *The Oxford History of Britain* (Oxford: O.U.P., 2010), p.621).

³³⁴ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.150

managed to pull herself up and struggle to the School at No. 12 South Hill Park Gardens where she met a fellow student. They both had the strange feeling that something ‘awful was about to take place’³³⁵ and they decided to go inside the School building. As soon as they entered through the door a high-explosive 1000lb bomb hit the exact spot where they had been standing.³³⁶ The bomb, coming down at an angle, exploded in the foundations of No. 12, rendering the building uninhabitable.³³⁷

At the time of impact although the teaching staff were out ministering in different parts of London³³⁸ there were several students inside the School, yet ‘only one student was bruised’.³³⁹ In the days following, the local authorities began to demolish No. 12³⁴⁰ and the furniture, which had remained intact, was moved to nearby No. 87 South Hill Park from which the Bible School continued, albeit ‘under severe restrictions’.³⁴¹ Later, another house in the same street was bought³⁴² which housed the classroom and dining room.

As the term progressed, the twelve students³⁴³ in residence at the School were called together and asked what they thought about leaving London. With one exception the student body desired to stay in the Capital to continue their training.³⁴⁴ In the early part of 1941, the number of students fell to six, as some were called to the Forces and others took their stand as conscientious objectors, which they were generally able to do due to the denominational links the School had with AoG,³⁴⁵ and by the end of

³³⁵ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.150

³³⁶ Gee, *Wind*, p.186

³³⁷ The main walls were badly damaged and moved, though all the floors held.

³³⁸ Gee, *Wind*, p.186

³³⁹ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.151

³⁴⁰ A second bomb completed its destruction. A new home was later built in its place and stands to this day.

³⁴¹ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.160. This property was acquired in 1928 for £1450 and served as an annexe.

³⁴² No.77 South Hill Park

³⁴³ Mainly from the British Isles, though also including Swiss, Norwegian and Swedish students (*Student Records 1927-1969*)

³⁴⁴ Gee, *Wind*, pp.186-187.

³⁴⁵ As seen in Section 2.3, this was not the case for male students during WW1 as the PMU was not linked to a denomination. A benefit of both denominational ownership or denominational independence with links.

1941 the student body grew to ten.³⁴⁶ In early 1944 enemy planes dropped three cases of incendiaries, each case containing six hundred bombs, on the area around South Hill Park. At No. 77 two of these fire bombs exploded in the front garden, five in the back garden, one in the entrance and four in the house itself. Although there was much damage and two of the rooms were out of use no one at the School was injured.³⁴⁷ The bombing continued throughout 1944 causing frequent damage to both No. 77 and 87.

Despite the fact that No. 12 had been completely demolished and the existing School buildings were under constant attack, the work of training students continued throughout the War.³⁴⁸ Although between 1939 and 1945 student numbers fluctuated,³⁴⁹ advertising for the recruitment of new students in the official organ of the Assemblies of God, *Redemption Tidings*, continued each month – in addition to advertising in Elim's *Evangel*. Such advertising in the periodicals of other denominations is a clear example of a benefit of being linked to a particular denomination without ownership by it. As the War years progressed, adverts and publicity took on a distinctive war theme³⁵⁰ and it was made clear that although the School had to close for a two-year period during the First World War, every effort was being made to stay open during the Second World War.³⁵¹ This was, indeed, achieved.³⁵² In addition, as an incentive, the pre-War fees of £1 per week would

³⁴⁶ Gee, *Wind*, p.187

³⁴⁷ J. Carter, *Howard Carter - Man of the Spirit*, p.152

³⁴⁸ Notable students during the War years include Colin Whittaker (1943), for many years the editor of *R.T.* and *Redemption* and member of the Executive Council and Clifford Rees (1940) who served on the Home Missions Council and Property Trust.

³⁴⁹ For example, at the end of 1940 there were twelve students, in the early part of 1941 the number dropped to six, at the end of 1941 the number rose to ten and in 1942 the number of students was mostly ten to twelve (*Student Records 1927-1969*). Students were given the option of staying for one to three terms (*R.T.* (12th March 1943), p.8).

³⁵⁰ For example – ‘Although War has been declared the Bible School is still open to equip soldiers for the fight...’ (*R.T.* (22nd September 1939), Cover II) and ‘The Black Out! There is no lack of light at the Bible School’ (*R.T.* (3rd November 1939), Cover II).

³⁵¹ *R.T.* (17th October 1941), p. 4 and *R.T.* (10th March 1944), p.8. At certain times, because numbers dwindled students and friends of the School could stay for periods as short as a week (*R.T.* (25th February 1944), p.2).

³⁵² *R.T.* (26th October 1945), p.5

remain in place³⁵³ and an indication of what the School had produced, in terms of graduates, up to this point was given. For example, two former students ‘had become Principals of Bible Schools abroad’,³⁵⁴ past-students from the Bible School had found ‘spheres of service in 21 nations around the world’³⁵⁵ and ‘over 200 ministers and missionaries were formerly students at Hampstead’.³⁵⁶ On a further positive note it is clear that during the War years, financial donations continued to be sent to Hampstead by individuals and churches³⁵⁷- another example of the benefit of close links with a denomination. In addition, a ‘Bible Extension School’ was started in London in April 1944.³⁵⁸

Although evangelistic campaigns between 1944 and 1947 did not see the kind of results experienced before the War, the Home Missions Council of AoG did succeed in establishing several new assemblies³⁵⁹ and the work of overseas missions continued throughout.³⁶⁰ Post-War Britain had its challenges – some 60,000 civilians had been killed during the conflict and the new Labour Government was faced with the problem of providing housing for the country as War-time bombing had not only depleted the stock of houses, but soldiers had returned home swelling the numbers of people living in the country. In addition, 70% of the nation’s properties were about fifty years old and in need of maintenance and the winter of 1946/47 was the coldest for over a century. Although the War had ended, rationing continued until 1949 and in

³⁵³ For example – *R.T.* (31st October 1941), p.3. Carter thus showed financial wisdom.

³⁵⁴ *R.T.* (19th November 1943), p.6

³⁵⁵ *R.T.* (30th July 1943), p.6

³⁵⁶ *R.T.* (8th May 1942), p.7

³⁵⁷ For example, *R.T.* (27th February 1942), p.7, *R.T.* (10th April 1942), p.5, *R.T.* (24th April 1942), p.5, *R.T.* (19th June 1942), p.10 and *R.T.* (26th March 1943), p.11. It is also interesting that an article in *R.T.* (3rd July 1942) states that if ‘any who have given financially to the work of the School (in the past) and find themselves in financial need (because of the War) they may request their gift to be returned and it will be done so without exception’ (p.7). It is further stated that ‘£1700 has already been refunded’ (p.7).

³⁵⁸ A course of twelve Monday evening lectures was started by Alfred Missen on the 7th April 1944 at 162 King’s Cross Road (*R.T.* (24th March 1944), p.3) under the auspices of Hampstead. A second series was started on the 14th August 1944 (*R.T.* (11th August 1944), p.5). A third series on the 8th January 1945 held in the Kingsway Hall, London and a fourth series on the 9th April 1945.

³⁵⁹ Gee, *Wind*, p.215

³⁶⁰ Kay, *Inside*, pp.188-190

1947 the divorce rate reached 60,000, ten times the pre-War figure.³⁶¹ Materialism began to assert itself in rebellion against the austerity of the first six years after the War. The media – radio, newspapers and television – became much more influential and church attendance began to decline. Of British people, by 1953, 40% never attended church and only 10% were regular attendees.³⁶² Now that the emergency of war was over, with better housing, more money, better working conditions, education and employment prospects, perhaps many felt that church was unnecessary and with the introduction of the 1946 National Health Act, and with the free health services available to all, less dependence on a healing God resulted. In post-War Britain, the 1944 Education Acts sought to establish better education and entertainment became readily available in football stadiums, holiday camps, cinemas and through television.³⁶³ However, as Manwaring states, during this time ‘spiritual capital had run low and traditional Christian morality had steeply declined.’³⁶⁴

The British Assemblies of God sought to respond to the post-War spiritual conditions in at least three ways. Firstly, there was a bold attempt to start new churches; secondly, there was a serious attempt to upgrade the facilities of congregations; and thirdly, there was a ‘gradual attempt to set ministerial training on a firmer footing’³⁶⁵ by training more workers for existing and new AoG assemblies.³⁶⁶ To assist in the latter, similar to the School at Hampstead, at least one other independent Pentecostal Bible School was started that had connections with British Assemblies of God – the Bristol Bible College.

³⁶¹ Much of this information is taken from A. Marwick, *British Society Since 1945* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982).

³⁶² Marwick, *British Society*, p.110

³⁶³ By the 1960s television became available to many households. By the early 1950s even the BBC allowed debate on moral issues – arguably helping pave the way to a ‘permissive society’.

³⁶⁴ R. Manwaring, *From Controversy to Co-existence* (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1985), p. 76. Howard Carter would agree with this assessment. Carter describes post-War Britain as ‘ungodly’ and full of ‘iniquity’ (J. Carter, *Howard*, p.159).

³⁶⁵ Kay, *Inside*, p.198

³⁶⁶ For example, the *AoG Executive Council Minutes* (12th January 1950) item 12 states that by the end of 1949, there were at least 47 assemblies in AoG without a pastor or recognised leader.

In early 1946, the pastor of the Mount of Olives Assembly in Bristol, John Wallace,³⁶⁷ made plans to start a Period Bible School on the church premises on Blackboy Hill,³⁶⁸ near the Durdham Downs, in the autumn. Similar to Hampstead, this new venture was self-governed or independently owned - by Wallace himself - and though both Schools would be given as a gift to AoG in 1951, at this stage there was no talk or intention of a denominational training school for the Fellowship. Hampstead was clearly flourishing as an independent School yet with denominational links and in all probability, Wallace wished for his School to benefit from the same arrangements. Although Hampstead was viewed as an 'assembly' within AoG, with voting powers etc, there is no evidence to indicate that the Bristol School was officially 'in fellowship' too. However, Wallace's own links with AoG as a status minister enabled advertisements to appear in *Redemption Tidings* from its inception - e.g. one stating that the course would start on the 30th September until the 26th October 1946 inclusive and would be 'intensive' in nature.³⁶⁹ Subsequent advertisements listed the proposed lecturers as Robert Barrie (Edinburgh),³⁷⁰ Tom Parfitt (Maidstone), G.T. Shearman (Bristol), James Wallace (Doncaster), A.L. Jenkins (Bristol) and John Wallace himself. The fees for the course were set at 30/- per week including board and lodging³⁷¹ and by the time the course started some twenty-three students had enrolled.³⁷² Wallace was pleased with the proceedings and plans were made for the second Period Bible School in the following February, when both Howard Carter and Donald Gee had been invited to lecture.³⁷³ Being one to champion the cause of Pentecostal training, Carter had written to Wallace to wish him well in this new

³⁶⁷ Wallace had been appointed co-pastor at Bonnington Toll, Edinburgh with Donald Gee in 1930, eventually succeeding Gee as the full-time pastor in 1932. In 1934 Wallace moved to the Mount of Olives in Bristol where he pastored until his premature death in 1959 at the age of fifty-four.

³⁶⁸ A reminder of Bristol's earlier slave trade days. The building was an ex-Methodist church and the assembly was started as a result of a series of Stephen Jeffreys' meetings in Bristol's Colston Hall in 1928 (Gee, *These Men*, p.12).

³⁶⁹ *R.T.* (21st June 1946), p.8

³⁷⁰ Barrie became Principal of the AoG Bible College in Kenley from 1964 until his premature death some eighteen months after taking office (Kay, *Inside*, p.209).

³⁷¹ *R.T.* (16th August 1946), p.8. This was presumably in congregation members' homes as Wallace had yet to buy a building exclusively for running the School.

³⁷² *R.T.* (20th December 1946), p.6

³⁷³ *R.T.* (20th December 1946), p.12

venture and to state that there was ‘no spirit of competition, but one of co-operation’.³⁷⁴ There was no reason why both Hampstead and Bristol Schools could not function separately to train more men and women for AoG ministry and for different purposes as Wallace initially intended his School in Bristol to provide refresher courses for Christian workers.³⁷⁵ Moreover, because the ‘ungodliness and iniquity’ in post-War Britain was seen by Carter as ‘due to the nation’s departure from God’s Word’, in his opinion, ‘more colleges of this sort were needed’.³⁷⁶ At this time, Carter also attacked the majority of the mainstream denominational ministry-training colleges, stating how the pursuit of:

Modernism, higher and textual criticism of the Scriptures are so inculcated into their students that the pulpits are mainly filled with men whose rational views are undermining the faith of their congregation.³⁷⁷

Such an attack on denominational colleges perhaps reflects his own strong feelings against Hampstead ever becoming denominationally-owned.³⁷⁸ He did not wish for his School to go the same way.

In addition to Carter, support for Wallace’s independent school came from the Executive Council of the Assemblies of God³⁷⁹ and in June 1947 another month course was held.³⁸⁰ Visiting lecturers during this time included James Salter, one of the Founders of the Congo Evangelistic Mission and Spencer May.³⁸¹ Lectures were held during the mornings, allowing afternoons free for recreation.³⁸²

³⁷⁴ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, pp.158-159

³⁷⁵ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.158

³⁷⁶ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.159

³⁷⁷ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p. 159

³⁷⁸ Kay, *Inside*, p.208

³⁷⁹ *AoG Executive Minutes* (11th September 1947).

³⁸⁰ *R.T.* (9th May 1947), p. 7

³⁸¹ May had been a student at Hampstead in the 1920’s and served on the mission field in India.

³⁸² *R.T.* (23rd May 1947), p. 12

After the success of a Period Bible School, Carter showed further support by advising Wallace to establish a permanent School in Bristol³⁸³ for both men and women.³⁸⁴ Wallace received a gift of £2000 from ‘two of God’s children’³⁸⁵ and a house was bought less than a mile from the Mount of Olives on the Durdham Downs,³⁸⁶ with plans to hold a three month Open Bible School from the 6th October to the 13th December 1947.³⁸⁷ By January 1948, the three-month course was developed into a two-year curriculum with subjects, both systematic and practical, including Theology, Christology, Homiletics, English, Greek, Book Keeping, First Aid and Brick-laying.³⁸⁸ Students could, however, study for a shorter length of time³⁸⁹ and accommodation was now available at the School.³⁹⁰ Activities such as monthly prayer meetings³⁹¹ and annual ‘Summer Schools’³⁹² were soon introduced and the advertising became more adventurous.³⁹³ Testimonies and reports from students started to appear in *R.T.*³⁹⁴ and by March 1950 a Board of Governors had been appointed,³⁹⁵ fourteen students had entered part or full-time ministry³⁹⁶ and the financial position of the College was improving.³⁹⁷ The daily routine at the College

³⁸³ *R.T.* (1st August 1947), p.5

³⁸⁴ *R.T.* (8th July 1949), p.11

³⁸⁵ *R.T.* (1st August 1947), p.5.

³⁸⁶ Today, No. 27 Durdham Park is a private school.

³⁸⁷ *R.T.* (1st August 1947), p.12

³⁸⁸ *R.T.* (21st November 1947), p.12. A small library was also in place by this time (Hughes, *My Story*, p. 83) as well as a prayer room for students that was available for ‘one-hour slots’ (p.85).

³⁸⁹ *R.T.* (30th January 1948), p.12. One student studied at Bristol for ‘a fortnight’ (*R.T.* (23rd April 1948), p.8.

³⁹⁰ *R.T.* (29th August 1947), p.12

³⁹¹ *R.T.* (23rd April 1948), p.8

³⁹² *R.T.* (23rd April 1948), p.8

³⁹³ *R.T.* (17th December 1948), p. 12. A photograph of the new building at Durdham Park and its staff also appeared on the front page of *R.T.* on at least two occasions (12th September 1947 and 3rd March 1950).

³⁹⁴ *R.T.* (8th July 1949), p.11

³⁹⁵ *R.T.* (3rd March 1950), p.8

³⁹⁶ *R.T.* (3rd March 1950), p.8., including some from overseas (p.8).

³⁹⁷ See Treasurer’s Report (*R.T.* (3rd March 1950), p.8). Financial gifts of £18, 48s had also been received during the first two months of 1950 (*R.T.* (3rd March 1950), p.9) and £15, 23s between the months of March-May of the same year (*R.T.* (23rd June 1950), p.12).

included rising at 7.00am, morning lectures, private study in the afternoon and evenings for ministry and meetings.³⁹⁸ Students would also be required to preach at the local assembly on Blackboy Hill and be examined by a panel, including faculty members and other invited ministers.³⁹⁹ The emphasis of the College was thoroughly ‘Pentecostal’⁴⁰⁰ and the College would do all it could to provide opportunities for ministry once a student had finished their course.⁴⁰¹

Although the Bristol Bible College never became large nor did its ministry extend over a long period, according to Gee ‘it was sufficient to train and put an indelible stamp for good upon some young men and women’.⁴⁰² Notable students at Bristol include Selwyn Hughes,⁴⁰³ the founder of Crusade for World Revival and Cyril Cross⁴⁰⁴ who both proceeded to start training institutions themselves in the 1960’s, some twenty years after graduation.⁴⁰⁵

3.5 Struggles and Success - Finance, Curriculum, Personnel & the Student body

Finance

As stated, in October 1922 Howard Carter took sole, financial charge of the Hampstead Bible School from the PMU and in the months and years that followed, Carter’s views on finance became clear. In early 1923, Carter wrote to the PMU stating how student numbers were incredibly low and he was facing ‘financial

³⁹⁸ This was relayed to me by Mrs Hazell Sumner who was a student at the College between January and December 1948 (*Telephone interview* on 19th August 2011).

³⁹⁹ Hughes, *My Story*, p.104

⁴⁰⁰ *R.T.* (2nd February 1951), p.12 – presumably, as Wallace was on the Executive Council of AoG, doctrinal teaching was based on the AoG Fundamental Truths.

⁴⁰¹ *Interview with Sumner* (19th August 2011)

⁴⁰² *R.T.* – Tribute to John Wallace by Donald Gee, p.28

⁴⁰³ Hughes was a student between September 1948 and July 1950 (Hughes, *My Story*, pp.73, 90). Part of the ministry of C.W.R. is discipleship and counselling training. Hughes was disappointed that the subject of Counselling was not taught at the Bristol College (Hughes, *My Story*, p. 81).

⁴⁰⁴ Cyril Cross was a student at Bristol in 1948 and together with his wife, Barbara, both AoG (GB) missionaries, began the Nairobi Pentecostal Bible College in rented premises in 1966. The College exists to this day.

⁴⁰⁵ Although for Hughes and Cross it was a case of the ‘trained becoming the trainer’ this was not always the case and few left Hampstead, Bristol and Kenley as students to join a Bible College faculty.

difficulty.⁴⁰⁶ Although discouraged by the PMU from making public appeals for funds, Carter decided to make a tour of several Pentecostal assemblies in existence at the time to encourage giving to the School – however, with little success. From this moment onwards, Carter made it a policy to not solicit funds directly from churches or individuals, but to ‘trust God’.⁴⁰⁷ He also sought to save expense by relocating to cheaper premises in Blackheath College, which was offered to Carter for a discounted price. After receiving a prophetic word in April 1927, he decided to stay at Hampstead and later that year, Howard’s father bought the property, both renting it back to his son and finally leaving it to him after his death.

The role of prophecy, and other spiritual gifts, was clearly important to Carter, functioning privately as well as publicly in order to guide an individual in decision-making and in order to gain faith to believe for substantial sums of money, as seen. However, to Carter, living by faith should be the expectation of ‘every Christian’⁴⁰⁸ and such a view was extended not only to the students of Hampstead, in order to trust for their board and lodge fees, but also the faculty and staff at the School(s), who were not paid salaries.⁴⁰⁹

In addition to ‘miraculous provision’, Carter also took a pragmatic approach to fund raising and this is seen in such areas as charging students £1 per week for their board and lodging (bringing in an estimated £1000 per year)⁴¹⁰ and also advertising the activities of the School(s) to the newly formed fellowship of Assemblies of God⁴¹¹ though, it would seem, with no direct appeal for finance. Such advertising clearly shows the beneficial, close and co-operative relationship between School and Fellowship and contributed to growth and therefore income, as student numbers rose

⁴⁰⁶ *PMU Minutes* (23rd January 1923)

⁴⁰⁷ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.96

⁴⁰⁸ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.121

⁴⁰⁹ By 1927, there were 5 members of staff at both Louth and Hampstead Schools.

⁴¹⁰ Carter gave a 10/- per week meal allowance to each member of staff. He charged students twice this amount therefore giving the impression that students were charged double what it cost the School.

⁴¹¹ *R. T.* (December 1930), p.15

steadily throughout the 1920's and 1930's.⁴¹² Moreover, although linked with AoG but not owned by them, according to Monteath some assemblies were giving to the work of the School - a benefit of denominational links without, necessarily, denominational ownership.⁴¹³

However, despite both human and divine efforts of fund raising, bearing the sole financial responsibility of running Hampstead did take its toll on the young principal at times. As noted previously, in 1923 Carter suffered a nervous breakdown caused by 'financial anxiety'⁴¹⁴ and needed to leave the School for a period of time. Moreover, the long-term sustainability of such a venture where dependence on student fees and on a sole individual without denominational ownership and a Board of Governors added to the risk.

Curriculum

When Howard Carter took over as Principal of the PMU Bible School in 1921, up to that point, the curriculum included classes on Bible Study, Doctrine,⁴¹⁵ Secular Studies,⁴¹⁶ Church History, New Testament Greek, Homiletics and Evangelism. Some material from the China Inland Mission was also taught. Under Carter, an attempt at holistic personal and ministry formation was made alongside the classroom studies, afternoons were set aside for private study, practical ministry and evenings for leisure, meetings and open-air ministry. Every Sunday students were expected to both attend and take part in local church services to gain experience. After Carter took sole ownership of the School in October 1922, other subjects were added to the curriculum including English Grammar, Elocution⁴¹⁷ and Practical Pastoral Work and the layout

⁴¹² See section on 'The Student body' pp.77ff

⁴¹³ *Letter from Monteath to Parr* (11th June 1926)

⁴¹⁴ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.125

⁴¹⁵ Presumably, the doctrine taught would have included Pentecostal theology (*Principles of the PMU* – Section 6: 'Soundness of Faith')

⁴¹⁶ For example, Foreign Languages, Geography etc

⁴¹⁷ As noted, Carter himself had a speech impediment

of the day, evening and weekend stayed roughly the same.⁴¹⁸ Study of the books of the Bible took placed thematically (e.g. Redemption, Sanctification, Work of the Spirit, the Church etc) and biographically, by the main characters contained. Christian Doctrine was distinctively Pentecostal and after Hampstead Bible School was admitted into the Fellowship of the Assemblies of God in 1924 as an autonomous ‘assembly’ such doctrine included, though was not limited to, the AoG Fundamental Truths⁴¹⁹ showing a close and co-operative relationship between the School and fledgling Fellowship. However, Carter was not a dogmatist and believed it beneficial that his students receive both inspiration and, fairly contrary to the anti-intellectual view of Pentecostals of the day, a broader theological education. Therefore both denominational and mainstream beliefs were taught at Hampstead, including wider theories of the Trinity and the Atonement. However, despite an attempt at critical analysis in some areas, Carter loathed ‘modernism, higher and textual criticism of the Scriptures’ that undermined faith and generally prevalent in mainstream denominationally-owned training schools.⁴²⁰ Whether Carter was correct or not in this view, in all probability this could account for his independent running of Hampstead for over 25 years and his insistence that it stay ‘undenominational (sic)’⁴²¹ in the future.

As seen, Carter’s teaching methods were unorthodox and his beliefs on various portions of Scripture⁴²² and practices⁴²³ were challenged. As noted, instead of a dogmatic style by which the teacher’s thoughts are dictated by notes in the hearer’s minds, Carter felt the better method, and of more benefit to his students, was to draw out the students’ ideas upon a given subject. Consequently, he adopted the conversational style of teaching, often on subjects initiated by the students themselves

⁴¹⁸ *The Bible School and Missionary Association Review* (March 1934), p.2

⁴¹⁹ *R.T.* (July 1924), p.11

⁴²⁰ J Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.159

⁴²¹ *PMU Minutes* (10th July 1922)

⁴²² For example, Romans 9, to Carter was more ‘the mind of Paul than the mind of God’ (*Letter from Monteath to Parr* (11th June 1926))

⁴²³ For example, prophecy as a product of the Spirit working through the human mind and personality.

so that they would be trained to develop their own originality of thought and interpretation under the tutor's guidance. Gee later comments that an extraordinary feature of the Hampstead School under Carter was that it sought to teach students a method of study which they could apply to any doctrine or passage of the Bible.⁴²⁴ However, such a pedagogical approach often resulted in the risk that a subject or theme would not be covered adequately.

An observation worthy of note is the absence of any missions or geographical material taught under Carter, as compared to the School under the PMU.⁴²⁵ As time progressed practical courses on Pastoral Work, Assembly Ministry and Local Church Life and Government were added to the curriculum.⁴²⁶ This is perhaps reflective of Carter's own enthusiasm for pioneer activity in the UK and non-missionary background, though in stark contrast to the founders of the PMU Bible Schools in 1909 and 1910 and their sole emphasis on overseas ministry. A probable risk of an independent school driven by a sole individual. In addition, as seen, because training under Carter varied in length depending on the availability of suitable, imminent ministry positions, the risk of inadequate training for some was a real possibility.⁴²⁷ Such a missional, or 'Jerusalem'⁴²⁸ approach to theological training was reflective of Pentecostals at the time with the urgency and priority of actual ministry more than the training for it.⁴²⁹

⁴²⁴ Gee, *Wind*, p.151

⁴²⁵ Although, interestingly, 'Missionary Principles' was taught to the female students at Louth (*BSMA Review* (Oct-Dec 1934), p. 17 and modern languages such as German and French was available to male and female students in the early 1940's.

⁴²⁶ *BSMA Review* (Oct-Dec 1934), p.19

⁴²⁷ Mark Noll examines the historic tendency of evangelicals to focus their resources on more short-term practical concerns, but often to the neglect of investing deeply for the long haul into institutions oriented towards deeply-rooted moral and theological study (M. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994)

⁴²⁸ V-M Kärkkäinen, 'Epistemology, Ethos and Environment': In Search of a Theology of Pentecostal Theological Education', *The Pentecostal Educator* 1:1 (2014), p.24-25

⁴²⁹ See 'Early attitudes to Pentecostal training' pp.25ff

Personnel

As noted, after Carter took sole charge for Hampstead in 1922, he set about building a faculty and staff around him. Due to the independent nature of the School, Carter was in the relatively beneficial position of selecting those whom he personally wanted and those with whom he had an affinity. These included his brother, John, in 1923, C.L. Parker in 1925, Harold Horton in 1926 and Elisha Thompson in 1931. Regarding negative personnel issues during the Carter era, two are worthy of note. Firstly, there was the Inglis Monteath incident in 1926. As stated earlier in the dissertation, Monteath wrote to the then Executive Council Chairman of AoG, John Nelson Parr, to accuse the Principal of 'false teaching' with regards to his open views in the classroom on such subjects as Romans 9 and the content of prophecy and tongues etc. The Assemblies of God Executive were clearly in a quandary – on one hand, a belief in the reliability and infallibility of the Scriptures, together with the practice of spiritual gifts, was clearly important to the fledgling Pentecostal Fellowship of churches, yet the denomination, itself, did not own the Hampstead property, nor was Hampstead Bible School the official College of Assemblies of God, though in fellowship with it, so any action the Executive could take was somewhat limited. As stated, the Executive Presbytery did undertake an investigation into Monteath's accusations toward Carter but found him 'not guilty'. In essence, should the Principal have been found guilty of 'heresy', he could not have lost his job at the College as it was not owned by AoG. The only repercussions would have been removing Hampstead from the Fellowship and severing its links with British Assemblies of God. As Carter was on the Executive this would have placed the fledgling denomination in a tenuous position. Moreover, Carter was clearly doing a sterling job with an increase in student numbers and the School's involvement in establishing and providing ministers to assemblies around the nation. In addition, Carter, himself, sat on the same Executive Council and was financially responsible for the School, so not causing a financial burden to the young Fellowship. Clearly, AoG, in its infancy, needed Carter's School - to train and supply ministers and the School needed the AoG - for advertising purposes and the supply of students. The Executive decided to support the Principal and did so in both an open letter to the assemblies in fellowship

with AoG at the time and at the General Conference the year after. There was also open criticism on both the basis of Monteath's accusation and the procedure he followed. It would be safe to say that had Monteath not already resigned before bringing the accusation, he would have been dismissed by Carter - who was not averse to 'getting rid' of staff.⁴³⁰

Interestingly, when another accusation of 'false teaching' was levelled towards a member of the Kenley faculty almost thirty years later, the lecturer was dismissed. This will be examined later.

Secondly, with regards to Personnel issues, there appeared to be a clash between John Carter's wife, Roxanna, and Howard. A note appears from a BSMA Council Meeting⁴³¹ on the 18th December 1930 stating that:

Owing to difficulties that have arisen in connection with Mrs John Carter and the work in general, she was invited to attend this Meeting and explain what she had against the members of the Society. In consequence of her refusal to attend, it was regretfully decided, for the general welfare of the work, to ask her to have her meals in future in her own home with her husband.⁴³²

Howard Carter's wording here is interesting – there is the gracious word of 'inviting' yet when Mrs Carter does not attend the meeting, the stronger word of 'refusal' is recorded. It is probable that Mrs Carter found communal living at Hampstead difficult, especially as a newly-wed. This may well be the reason that, together with her husband John, they moved to the Women's Bible School in Louth shortly after. It is also worth noting that, according to Kay, Howard Carter dismissed a Mr Thomas from the Bible School staff.⁴³³

To sum up Carter's approach to Personnel issues, it would seem clear that an autocratic style of leadership had developed soon after Carter took charge of

⁴³⁰ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.130

⁴³¹ Members of the Council included Howard Carter (Overseer) and John Carter and C.L. Parker.

⁴³² *BSMA Council Meeting Notes* (18th December 1930)

⁴³³ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.130. Nothing more is known about this incident and Kay does not cite a reference in his book.

Hampstead. There seems little doubt that he liked to function with the minimum of interference from others, not to be in fear of being over-ruled by a denomination and to have his hands free to both ‘hire and fire’ whenever he saw fit,⁴³⁴ regardless of whether they were family members or not,⁴³⁵ and to stay in post even when he, himself, was challenged over the content of his teaching. A clear risk to independence from a denomination. In fairness to Carter, although there were spasmodic clashes with those both within and outside the Bible School⁴³⁶ he was also known to be a leader who would apologise to those he had grieved and when he was wrong, humbly own up to it.⁴³⁷

The Student body

As noted, throughout Howard Carter’s term of office, the length of time a student studied at Hampstead varied considerably from weeks,⁴³⁸ to months,⁴³⁹ to years.⁴⁴⁰ Such a variation of length of study was dependent, in the main, on Carter finding suitable opportunities for students in new church plants or existing churches around the UK. This can be seen as a benefit of denominational links without necessarily denominational ownership to both graduates and AoG. However, the urgency of placing graduates in positions of ministry too quickly and after inadequate training was a risk of such an approach.

⁴³⁴ This is also shown in the fact that he would send young men from his Bible School wherever and whenever he saw fit (Kay, *Inside*, p.130)

⁴³⁵ It should be borne in mind that Carter’s almost gung-ho approach to ‘hiring and firing’ would not survive the more robust employment laws of modern times.

⁴³⁶ For example, John Nelson Parr, George Jeffreys (Kay, *Inside*, pp.72, 76, 140) and, as seen, Fred Squire.

⁴³⁷ An account is given of his apology to John Nelson Parr in Kay, *Inside*, p.140.

⁴³⁸ For example, D.E. James from Wales studied for 2 weeks in May 1927, as did W.J. Wennerbergen from Sweden in June 1927 (*Student Records 1922-1969*)

⁴³⁹ For example, J. Reid from Scotland studied for 3 months from September 1925 and A.J. Hamper from England studied for 5 months from February 1925 (*Student Records 1922-1969*)

⁴⁴⁰ For example, N.A. Charter from England studied for 1 year and 3 months from April 1927 (*Student Records 1922-1969*)

Between 1922 and 1948, some 707 students, or an average of 26 per year, were trained under Howard Carter from at least 25 nations and 5 continents of the world.⁴⁴¹ At least 262, or 37%, of the total number were female.⁴⁴²

Student application forms from the Howard Carter era are no longer available. Therefore, it is very difficult to decipher from which denominations or church backgrounds the students originated. During the 1926/27⁴⁴³ Academic Year, there were 21 British students in residence (14 women and 7 men) and 12 students from overseas.⁴⁴⁴ Due to the fact that the Pentecostal Movement was well established in Scandinavia and parts of Central and Eastern Europe by the mid to late 1920s, it is not unreasonable to imagine these overseas students being sent by the Pentecostal denominations in their respective countries. With regards to the British students, by 1927 the number of local assemblies affiliated to Assemblies of God had almost doubled from 74 in 1924 to 139 in 1927.⁴⁴⁵ Again, it is not unreasonable to believe that many of the British students at Hampstead in 1927 were sent from such Assemblies and ‘where the Pentecostal movement was strongest, that is to say, from the Midlands, Wales and the North.’⁴⁴⁶ In addition, Carter made it his aim to travel and visit any such assembly that would have him, stating at the Annual Conference in 1928 that his desire was to ‘visit every Assembly’ as soon as possible.⁴⁴⁷ Such visits would have aided student recruitment and shows the close and co-operative relationship between School and Fellowship.

⁴⁴¹ Including 535 British, 39 Swedish, 39 Swiss, 25 Norwegian, 16 Danish and 9 Bulgarian (*Student Records 1922-1969*)

⁴⁴² *Student Records 1922-1969*

⁴⁴³ These dates have been chosen as they show the state of affairs some 5 years after Carter took over as Principal.

⁴⁴⁴ Including 1 Swiss, 1 Danish, 1 Norwegian, 2 Polish and 7 Swedes (*Student Records 1922-1969*)

⁴⁴⁵ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.85

⁴⁴⁶ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.122

⁴⁴⁷ *R. T.* (December 1930), p.15

With regards to the 1933/34⁴⁴⁸ Academic Year, records show growth in the student body with 31 British students and 8 from overseas⁴⁴⁹ totalling 39 and made up of 33 male and 6 female. It is clear that as the number of assemblies affiliated with Assemblies of God increased – e.g. 74 assemblies in 1924, 139 in 1927, 200 in 1929⁴⁵⁰ – so the number of students at the Bible School increased – e.g. 33 in 1927, 39 in 1934. It is reasonable to think there is a direct correlation between the two. Certainly, by the 1930s, and throughout the 1940s the College was advertising regularly in *Redemption Tidings* with captions such as ‘Your Bible School is ready to receive you!’⁴⁵¹ Further evidence of the close and co-operative relationship between the AoG and Carter’s School.

With regards to future ministry of the graduates, although no definite and clear statistics exist (as opposed to clear figures given by future principal Donald Gee in his quarterly *Principal’s Report* to the BoG during his tenure) the following can be ascertained - Firstly, that a number of overseas students had returned to their homes and churches after their Hampstead training⁴⁵² and a number of British students entered missions work in foreign fields. This is derived from Howard Carter’s own pen in both a 1934 article called ‘Bible Students in Other Lands’⁴⁵³ and a 1933 article he wrote called ‘Fourteen Years Ago’. In this account Carter talks of his principalship and how ‘students have been gathered from the north, south, east and west of these favoured isles and missionaries have gone out to China, Japan, Korea, Ceylon, Africa, Egypt, Palestine, Russia and other parts of the world.’⁴⁵⁴ Secondly, with regards to the

⁴⁴⁸ These dates have been chosen as they show the state of affairs at the half way point of Carter’s tenure.

⁴⁴⁹ Including 1 Spanish, 1 Chinese, 1 Swede, 2 Swiss and 2 American (*Student Records 1922-1969*)

⁴⁵⁰ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.85

⁴⁵¹ *R.T.* (5th April 1940), p.2

⁴⁵² As noted, over Carter’s tenure, some 172 overseas students were trained. One such notable student was Arthur Bergholz who studied at Hampstead in 1925 and who returned to Poland, later to become the Chairman of Polish Assemblies of God (Gee, *Wind and Flame*, p.241)

⁴⁵³ Carter lists the whereabouts of some 80 graduates and their ministry in at least 16 nations and 4 continents (*Bible School Review* (March 1934), p.12).

⁴⁵⁴ Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.104

home field, despite early tensions between the work of BSES and how it was perceived through some within AoG, it did 'secure openings in UK pioneer work for the increasing number of young men and women who had been trained at Hampstead,⁴⁵⁵ and between 1926 and 1933 'over 140 evangelists and pastors' were working in various parts of Great Britain⁴⁵⁶ in Pentecostal ministry. Despite the obvious benefits of the work of Hampstead/BSES to AoG in its important early years, the generally rapid training and placing of Hampstead students did cause the risk of inadequate training and preparation for the ministries and contexts the graduates may be facing in the future.

Notable students during the 1930's include David Powell, Principal at Mattersey Hall from 1974 to 1977 and a student under Carter in 1932, and Alfred Missen, General Secretary of AoG from 1963 to 1979 and a student in 1937.

⁴⁵⁵ Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.99

⁴⁵⁶ Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.104. This number of 140 would account for roughly one half of those who had so far been trained at Hampstead.

Chapter 4: The Interim Period (1948-1951)

4.1 The relinquishing of Hampstead, George Newsholme & the move to Kenley

By 1948, Howard Carter was travelling abroad continually and in July of that year decided to take the step of handing the whole work of the Bible School to his friend, George Newsholme⁴⁵⁷ with, according to rumour,⁴⁵⁸ the express wish that at no stage should the work lose its independence. Why? Firstly, as seen, Carter had verbally attacked the denominationally-owned mainstream training colleges in the UK due to their ‘modernism and high textual criticism of Scripture’⁴⁵⁹ and he would not wish for his School to possibly go the same way. Secondly, for Carter, the benefit of not being associated with any organisation allowed for the position of being ‘entirely dependent on God’.⁴⁶⁰ Thirdly, between 1922 and 1948 he had been personally and financially responsible for the School and had led it relatively successfully without a BoG or panel of reference (although he allowed AoG representatives to inspect the premises and comment on the doctrinal position of the curriculum⁴⁶¹). It was clear to AoG through its periodical that the School was independent of denominational ownership, though linked⁴⁶² (although from March 1938 the School was mistakenly called the ‘Assemblies of God Bible School at Hampstead’ in *Redemption Tidings*⁴⁶³) and that Carter was in charge.⁴⁶⁴

⁴⁵⁷ J. Carter, *Howard Carter - Man of the Spirit*, p.158

⁴⁵⁸ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.208

⁴⁵⁹ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.159

⁴⁶⁰ Andrews, *Regions*, p.201

⁴⁶¹ There were two representatives and they were in place by 1939 (*AoG Executive Minutes* (27th September 1939)). The representatives resigned at the 1945 General Conference as they believed they ‘served no further purpose’ (*AoG Conference Minutes* (December 1945)). The exact reason for appointing these representatives is unknown. Perhaps Carter desired some transparency and accountability with the Fellowship his college had links with.

⁴⁶² Kay, *Pentecostals*, p.30.

⁴⁶³ *R.T.* (25th March 1938), p.12

⁴⁶⁴ The College at Hampstead was often referred to as ‘Howard Carter’s Bible School’ (*HMRC Minutes* (27th January 1928)).

In 1948, after relinquishing his position at the School, Carter continued his international travels, periodically visiting the UK to attend the General Conference, and on October the 14th, 1955 married Mrs Ruth Steelberg, widow of Wesley Steelberg, a former General Superintendent of American Assemblies of God. After marriage, the Carters continued to travel and pastored in New Zealand before returning to Kenley Bible College in 1966 where Howard served as Resident Tutor under his brother's principalship. In 1969, the Carters returned to live in Springfield, Missouri where Howard died on the 22nd January 1971.⁴⁶⁵

George Newsholme, Carter's successor, was born in Brierfield, Lancashire in 1896 and when his schooling had finished at the age of thirteen, he went to work as a weaver in a cotton mill. In 1916 he was called up to serve in the forces and was soon promoted to the rank of sergeant, serving as a physical training instructor. Whilst in France he was converted through the reading of a Christian tract and after returning home he joined the Pentecostal assembly in Burnley.⁴⁶⁶

Some three weeks after being appointed as the principal at Hampstead, Newsholme was asked to pastor the assembly in Scarborough, which he did on the weekends or in his own time.⁴⁶⁷ During his three-year tenure as principal some sixty-eight students went through the School,⁴⁶⁸ from at least nine different nations,⁴⁶⁹ and lecturers included Elisha Thompson, L.F.W. Woodford, C.L. Parker, R.J. Hayes, W.H.T. Richards, Miss Kelly and Mrs Parker. Other staff included Mrs Thomas as Matron,

⁴⁶⁵ *The Pentecostal Evangel – Tribute to Howard Carter* (Springfield Mo: A/G, March 1971)

⁴⁶⁶ Misson, *The Sound*, pp.80-81.

⁴⁶⁷ After leaving Scarborough, Newsholme became the pastor at Doncaster, which he undertook whilst the principal at Hampstead. Misson remembered him with affection as his pastor at Doncaster when 'his ministry was at its best' (Misson, *The Sound*, p.81). Kay states that Newsholme pastored a 'thriving assembly' at Doncaster (Kay, *Inside*, p.209) though was overworked, treated harshly and underpaid (Kay, *Inside*, p.118). It is worth noting that as well as his duties as Principal and weekend pastoring, the distance between Hampstead and Scarborough was some 250 miles and Hampstead to Doncaster, some 170 miles. It is likely that this journey was made by train(s), adding to an already full week and weekend.

⁴⁶⁸ *Student Records 1927-1969*. Notable students from the Newsholme era include Charles Bowler, who spent time in Kenya and who served on several AoG committees in the UK. This is compared to 163 students that went through the School between 1951-1956 under Gee. However, it should be borne in mind that the College under Newsholme was slightly smaller and had healthy competition from the Bristol Bible College.

⁴⁶⁹ *Student Records 1927-1969*

Mr Snook as Subscriptions Secretary and Miss Jennings as the Correspondence Course Secretary.⁴⁷⁰ At this stage the course was one year in length,⁴⁷¹ all the doctrinal teaching in the School was ‘based on the AoG Statement of Faith’⁴⁷² (similar to the syllabus previously under Carter) and subjects included Romans, Christ’s Coming, Foundational Truths, Pastoral Theology, Church History, Healing and Spiritual Gifts.⁴⁷³ There was a strong practical element to the course, with students ministering in local assemblies on the weekends, ‘open air’ events, engaging in ‘door-to-door’ evangelism and hospital visitation.⁴⁷⁴ Hampstead’s aim was to ‘produce preachers’.⁴⁷⁵

In 1949 Newsholme had decided to look for new premises for the Bible School and in early 1950 announced to the Fellowship of which the School was part, that ‘after viewing over forty houses with a view to purchase and suffering many bitter disappointments, a suitable building has been purchased on the outskirts of London, in Kenley, Surrey’.⁴⁷⁶ No. 4 Kenley Lane was an ex-hotel standing in about one-acre of well-kept grounds in an area in Surrey known locally as ‘miniature Switzerland’.⁴⁷⁷ The house itself was spacious with central heating, hot and cold running water and train and bus links to London were within walking distance. The move from Hampstead was to take place on the 3rd February 1950.⁴⁷⁸

Newsholme had bought the Kenley property for £10,000⁴⁷⁹ and various pleas for finance went out to the ministers of the Fellowship stating that ‘both houses at

⁴⁷⁰ Annual Conference of the Assemblies of God Evangelistic Society Programme (Hampstead, 12th – 16th September 1949) and Kay, *Inside Story*, pp.231-232

⁴⁷¹ By 1952, under Gee, the diploma course became 2 years in length (Kay, *Inside*, p.231).

⁴⁷² R.T. (8th December 1950), p.12.

⁴⁷³ R.T. (19th January 1951), p.4

⁴⁷⁴ R.T. (19th January 1951), p.4

⁴⁷⁵ R.T. (19th January 1951), p.4

⁴⁷⁶ R.T. (20th January 1950), p.3. The buildings at Kenley were eventually sold in 1976 and 1977 for c. £50,000 in total (Allen, *Signs*, p.294). The Bible College moved to Mattersey, North Nottinghamshire where it remains to this day (Kay, *Inside*, p.335).

⁴⁷⁷ R.T. (20th January 1950), p.3

⁴⁷⁸ W.H.T. Richards, *Leaders’ Letters - No. 520* (J. Carter, *Howard*, p.160).

⁴⁷⁹ *AoG Conference Minutes* (May 1952)

Hampstead, when sold, will not come anywhere near this figure'.⁴⁸⁰ Because Newsholme had bought the property in his own name, on his death his heirs would inherit it⁴⁸¹ and he was also personally liable for any income tax on the home. It is not clear how much the Hampstead houses eventually sold for though certainly by May 1952 Newsholme was still left with a £2500 bank mortgage.⁴⁸² This debt was almost cleared when an appeal amongst assemblies raised £2438 in total⁴⁸³ by July 1952.

4.2 The merging of Bristol and Kenley Schools and AoG ownership

On the 15th February 1951, the Executive Council, acting upon a suggestion from John Wallace, invited Newsholme to attend a meeting to discuss the possibility of merging the Bible Schools at Kenley and Bristol.⁴⁸⁴ The tentative proposal was that one of the two school buildings be sold and that after all charges and outstanding claims have been met, the balance, if any, was to be given to the other School towards meeting the overdraft on that property.⁴⁸⁵ This building was then to be offered to Assemblies of God as an officially AoG-owned Bible School⁴⁸⁶ contrary to Howard Carter's wishes⁴⁸⁷ and operating under the jurisdiction of the General Council which included all recognised ministers. In practice, any minister could raise a matter concerning the now denominationally-owned School from the floor of the General Conference, decisions could be made on behalf of the College and, potentially, pre-made decisions overruled. The School would cease to be seen as an autonomous 'assembly' and the General Council of ministers was to elect Governors who would appoint the Principal who, in turn, would establish a faculty, appointed by the BoG.

⁴⁸⁰ W.H.T. Richards, *Leaders' Letters - No. 520* (J, Carter, Howard, p.160).

⁴⁸¹ *AoG Conference Minutes* (May 1952)

⁴⁸² *AoG Conference Minutes* (May 1952). It would seem plausible that Hampstead sold for around the £7500 mark.

⁴⁸³ *AoG Conference Minutes* (May 1953)

⁴⁸⁴ *AoG Executive Minutes* (15th February 1951)

⁴⁸⁵ In practice this didn't eventually happen. When the Bristol premises were sold virtually all of the profit was used to pay its outstanding overdraft of £4000 (*AoG Executive Minutes* (15th June 1951))

⁴⁸⁶ Kay, *Pentecostals*, p.30.

⁴⁸⁷ Kay, *Inside*, p.208

The Executive Council expressed itself as being generally in agreement with the suggestion and the following item was to be included in the Provisional Agenda at the next General Conference:

The attitude of the Conference is sought towards a suggestion made by the two Principals that, if possible, the two Bible Schools should be merged, and that there be one official Bible School under a BoG elected by the General Council.⁴⁸⁸

At the next Executive Council meeting the General Secretary, John Carter, was asked to obtain further information regarding the legalities, running costs, geographic location, number of students for the past three years and accommodation offered at both the Hampstead/Kenley⁴⁸⁹ and Bristol Schools, and report back to the Council.⁴⁹⁰ The proposition of the merger was agreed in principle at the May 1951 General Conference and that:

The Executive Council, together with George Newsholme,⁴⁹¹ act as a committee to implement, if practicable, the proposition that the two Bible schools be merged and that there be one official Bible School. That if and when the arrangements are carried through, this new Committee shall act as a BoG until the next General Council in 1952.⁴⁹²

Over the ensuing months, all seven members of the Executive Council⁴⁹³ were to examine both properties⁴⁹⁴ and in June 1951, the Kenley premises were preferred over

⁴⁸⁸ *AoG Executive Minutes* (15th February 1951)

⁴⁸⁹ Even though the College had relocated to Kenley, Surrey a year previously the School was still known as Hampstead at this time.

⁴⁹⁰ *AoG Executive Minutes* (8th March 1951)

⁴⁹¹ John Wallace was already on the Executive Council.

⁴⁹² *AoG Conference Minutes* (May 1951)

⁴⁹³ Namely F.D. Barnes, D. Gee, A.L. Jenkins, J. Wallace, F. Watson, J. Carter and J. Salter.

⁴⁹⁴ *AoG Executive Minutes* (31st May 1951)

Bristol.⁴⁹⁵ Over the next month, a Board of Governors was appointed to whom the Principal would report on a quarterly basis.⁴⁹⁶ Donald Gee, now at the age of sixty, was offered the position of Principal ‘unanimously’,⁴⁹⁷ Mrs Wright from the Bristol Bible College accepted the invitation to become the new Matron,⁴⁹⁸ Elisha Thompson accepted the position as School Secretary and Tutor and L.F.W. Woodford and C.L. Parker⁴⁹⁹ were asked to continue as Visiting Tutors.⁵⁰⁰ The question of a regular honorarium was raised and it was stated that Thompson objected to receiving one. Gee, himself, desired only to take £3 per week until the School was in a ‘paying position’⁵⁰¹ though it would seem that Gee never did receive a salary from the College throughout his time as Principal.⁵⁰²

Shortly after the new academic year commenced, on the 18th September 1951, the premises known as 4 Kenley Lane, Kenley, became the Bible School of the Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland⁵⁰³ and an official opening ceremony took place in its grounds.⁵⁰⁴ Ex-Principals Wallace and Newsholme were thanked for the generous gift of their schools to the Fellowship and goodwill messages were sent

⁴⁹⁵ *AoG Executive Minutes* (15th June 1951). The main reasons for choosing Kenley over Bristol include the fact that Kenley’s premises were worth more - £10,000 as opposed to £5000 for Bristol and the overdraft on Bristol stood at £4000 compared to £3100 for Kenley. The members were informed that ‘next to nothing could be expected from the sale of the Bristol property in regarding to liquidating the overdraft on the Kenley property’ (*AoG Executive Minutes* (15th June 1951)).

⁴⁹⁶ This included the present Executive Council members and George Newsholme (*AoG Conference Minutes* (May 1952)).

⁴⁹⁷ *AoG Executive Minutes* (15th June 1951). Ross states that the committee that invited Gee to be the next Principal expected him to decline the offer due to his age and ‘to their surprise he accepted’ (Ross, Donald Gee: *In Search of a Church*, D.Th. thesis (Knox College, Toronto: Unpublished, 1974), p. 65).

⁴⁹⁸ Wright accepted the offer ‘with a real sense of delight’ (*Executive Minutes* (12th July 1951)). Mrs Thompson, the Matron at Hampstead, had been feeling the strain of the previous eleven years and was ‘looking forward to returning to private life’ (*AoG Executive Minutes* (12th July 1951)).

⁴⁹⁹ Questions were initially raised as to Parker’s suitability (*AoG Executive Minutes* (12th July 1951))

⁵⁰⁰ *AoG Executive Minutes* (12th July 1951).

⁵⁰¹ *AoG Executive Minutes* (12th July 1951)

⁵⁰² Kay, *Inside*, p.308

⁵⁰³ This is the official date, although an advert in *R.T.* on the 6th November 1942 calls Hampstead ‘the Assemblies of God Bible School’ p.3.

⁵⁰⁴ *R.T.* (12th October 1951), pp.6-7

from around the world.⁵⁰⁵ After comments from the new Principal and members of faculty, the BoG laid hands upon, and prayed for, the entire College staff. A closing hymn was sung to reaffirm the purpose of the School's training.

The new School year under Gee's leadership saw seventeen students in attendance⁵⁰⁶ with each student required to pay fees of £2 per week.⁵⁰⁷ Student numbers rose to twenty-eight in January 1952 and then to thirty-one by the third term.⁵⁰⁸

When examining the merger some questions perhaps need to be asked. Why did Wallace suggest sinking his new college into a venture with Newsholme and not when Carter was in charge three years previously? Perhaps he found that running a Bible College was not what he expected, perhaps he had low student numbers or perhaps he sacrificed his own concerns for the greater good. In many ways a single training institution was beneficial in AoG 'to provide a graduate trained under one curriculum and under the philosophy and leadership of one administration'.⁵⁰⁹ Why did Newsholme leave a relatively flourishing school at the relatively young age of fifty-five after only three years as Principal? Perhaps the personal financial pressure⁵¹⁰ together with the constant and hectic schedule of leading a college, pastoring a thriving assembly and weekly travel of over 200 miles round trip was taking its toll. We may never know the answers to these questions, but one thing was sure, under the new leadership of Donald Gee, the now denominationally-owned College soon entered a new era of growth and development – though the pressures continued.

⁵⁰⁵ Including the Principal of the Apostolic Bible School in Wales, the Principal of the IBTI, the Principal of the Elim Bible College and the Salters from C.E.M. (*R.T.* (12th October 1951), p.6).

⁵⁰⁶ 11 men and 6 women (*AoG Executive Minutes* (14th November 1951))

⁵⁰⁷ *AoG Executive Minutes* (15th June 1951). It was calculated that to run the School at this time, a weekly income of £25 was needed (*AoG Executive Minutes* (15th June 1951)). Fees for foreign students were raised to £3 per week from November 1955 (*BoG Minutes* (9th November 1955)) and by 1963 they rose to £3 10s for all students (*Kenley Bible College Brochure*, 1963)

⁵⁰⁸ *AoG Conference Minutes* (May 1952)

⁵⁰⁹ Ross, Donald Gee, p.64

⁵¹⁰ As a comparison, after taking the full financial responsibility for Hampstead Bible School Carter certainly had his times of 'depression' and 'great difficulty' (J. Carter, *Howard*, pp. 64 and 97).

Chapter 5: An Era of Denominational Ownership: The Principalship of Donald Gee (1951-64)

5.1 Donald Gee

Donald Gee⁵¹¹ was born on the 10th May 1891 in North London, the only child of a widowed mother.⁵¹² Both mother and son attended the Finsbury Park Congregational Church in North London and it was here, in 1905, that Gee was converted under the preaching of Seth Joshua.⁵¹³ His mother later transferred her church affiliation to a Baptist church, and although her decision to be baptised by full immersion made him ‘furious’⁵¹⁴ Gee soon followed suit, though retaining his membership as a Congregationalist at Finsbury Park, where he was the assistant organist. His mother began attending late night ‘Pentecostal’ prayer meetings at the Missionary Rest Home of Mrs Cantel⁵¹⁵ and after three months of attendance it was here that Gee received his Spirit-baptism, with the evidence of tongues,⁵¹⁶ at a meeting in March 1913.⁵¹⁷ A year later he married his fiancée, Ruth, and after the couple had moved in with Gee’s mother, he entered the family sign-writing business, working from home, and devoting his spare time to the local Pentecostal meetings at the Rest Home. A Pentecostal assembly was soon established in Haringey that became the Gee’s spiritual home and base.

⁵¹¹ The life and work of Gee is probably better documented than any other of the Pentecostal pioneers due to the fact that from the early days of his ministry he was a diligent writer and included much autobiography in his works.

⁵¹² His father died at the age of thirty due to tuberculosis when Donald was nine years of age (Malcomson, *Pentecostal*, p. 333). Such experiences could account for Gee’s tendency towards solitude (Kay, *Inside*, p. 49). His son, David, stated that his father was ‘somewhat of a stranger’ and standoffish (J. Carter, *Donald Gee – Pentecostal Statesman* (London: Evangel Press, 1975) pp. 30-31).

⁵¹³ Joshua was one of the leading figures in the Welsh Revival of 1904 -1905 (J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.8).

⁵¹⁴ J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.11

⁵¹⁵ No. 73 Highbury New Park, Islington, London. PMU President Cecil Polhill was also a regular guest at these meetings.

⁵¹⁶ Gee was emphatic upon the initial evidence. He stated in an address on Whit-Monday 1926: ‘I do not believe in any baptism in the Holy Spirit except a Scriptural baptism that has with it the Scriptural evidence of speaking with tongues’ (J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.15).

⁵¹⁷ Gee describes this experience as being ‘in a condition of spiritual ecstasy and taken up wholly with the Lord’. He later stated that from this moment ‘my whole Christian experience was revolutionised’ (Whittaker, *Seven*, p.84).

When conscription to the Great War was introduced in 1916, Gee chose conscientious objection on the grounds that ‘as followers of Christ, its members could not participate in war and bloodshed’.⁵¹⁸ Gee was exempt from military service on the understanding that he take up work of ‘national importance’ within fourteen days.⁵¹⁹ Gee soon found work on the farm of a family member in Buckinghamshire, later transferring to a nearby farm after the death of the uncle six months later. Gee found the work onerous and exhausting often working sixteen hours each day. Although his wife and child later joined him, being a ‘Conchie’ meant social ostracism and being the object of venomous insults and threats from the locals whose family members were facing danger on the Western Front. Although the whole affair caused ‘mental suffering’⁵²⁰ to Gee, after the armistice in 1918 he returned to London viewing this time as a period ‘when God put iron into his character’⁵²¹ and imperative to fulfil the roles he would later assume.

On his return to the capital, Gee sought to resume his old trade as a sign-writer but with the growing conviction that ‘God would open a door into the ministry’.⁵²² However, because the Pentecostal Movement during the immediate post-World War 1 period possessed very few assemblies and only a small proportion of these were able to support a married pastor with two children, there were no suitable ministry opportunities and Gee scraped a living as a ‘ticket-writer’ and from occasional preaching gifts. The Gees went through two years of extreme financial hardship⁵²³ until an invitation to become the pastor of an assembly in Edinburgh arrived in May 1920.⁵²⁴ Gee decided to leave his family in London until he knew ‘how the matter

⁵¹⁸ J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.18

⁵¹⁹ J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.18. It is interesting to note that although they were both born in the same year (1891), Howard Carter was imprisoned for pacifism, yet Gee was not.

⁵²⁰ D. Gee, *Pentecostal Pilgrimage*, (unpublished), p.6

⁵²¹ Kay, *Inside*, p.50

⁵²² J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.22

⁵²³ They called this a ‘hard and mysterious period’ (J Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.22). Unfortunately, as will be seen, such a ‘hand to mouth’ existence was to continue during his tenure as Principal of Kenley Bible College.

⁵²⁴ Bridge Street, Leith. The invitation was sent via telegram from A.E. Saxby.

would fall⁵²⁵ and on arriving at the mission hall in Leith, he found ‘an unattractive low-roofed, double-fronted shop in the poorest part of the town’ with ‘a congregation numbering thirteen on the first Sunday morning’.⁵²⁶ As the new pastor, Gee worked meticulously every morning between nine and twelve and in the afternoons, he visited his congregation.

The work at Leith began to prosper⁵²⁷ though Gee, personally, and the assembly as a whole were not without its problems.⁵²⁸ Gee eventually stayed at Leith for twelve years during which time he became a founding member of British Assemblies of God in 1924,⁵²⁹ was elected to the Executive Council in 1925, became a member of the Home Missionary Review Council (later the Overseas Missions Council) in 1926, undertook a six-month teaching tour of Australia in 1928⁵³⁰ and became a joint-editor of *R.T.* in 1932. Later years saw him Chairman of the Redemption Hymnal Committee, Vice-Chairman of the Executive Council of AoG from 1934-44 and Chairman from 1948.⁵³¹ However, Gee’s involvement with Pentecostalism went beyond the Assemblies of God in Britain. He became editor of *Pentecost*,⁵³² a ‘review of worldwide Pentecostal missions and revival news’⁵³³ in 1947 until his death in 1966 and was elected onto the Presidium of the World Conference of Pentecostal Churches in 1949.⁵³⁴ Hollenweger calls Gee a ‘Pentecostal ecumenist’⁵³⁵ and through

⁵²⁵ J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.23

⁵²⁶ Kay, *Inside*, p.50

⁵²⁷ Gee reported in *R.T.* in 1926 that about thirty new members had been added to the assembly in the first three months of that year alone (March 1926).

⁵²⁸ At one point, Gee returned to London for a number of weeks to ‘restore a sense of calmness and equilibrium’ (Kay, *Inside*, p.51).

⁵²⁹ J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.29

⁵³⁰ Missen, *Sound*, p.38

⁵³¹ Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*, p.208. Not only did Gee edit *Pentecost*, but he also ‘accepted personal responsibility for its publication and financial liabilities’ (Missen, *Sound*, p.39).

⁵³² Gee was given this role at the World Conference of Pentecostal Churches in Zurich in 1947.

⁵³³ Missen, *Sound*, p.39

⁵³⁴ Gee, *Wind*, p 240

⁵³⁵ Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*, p.208

his writings, his co-operation with the World Council of Churches,⁵³⁶ friendship with such people as David DuPlessis⁵³⁷ and Benedict Heron⁵³⁸ he sought not only to promote Pentecostal distinctives in non-Pentecostal denominations world-wide but ‘never gave up hope of winning the Pentecostals over to an ecumenical outlook’⁵³⁹ – arguably, such a view may well have contributed to his departure from the role of Principal in 1964. At the conclusion of his history of Pentecostalism in Britain, Gee noted that, ‘the unity of the Spirit is vastly more important than a union of denominations’, and addressing the issue of ecumenicalism wrote:

The new outbreak of glossolalia among the older denominations was something truly ecumenical and provided a Pentecostal meeting-place among Christians ranging from Baptists to Roman Catholics, fraught with rich possibilities of a transcendent unity of One Spirit.⁵⁴⁰

However, it is Gee’s role as the new Principal of Kenley Bible College with which we are concerned and to which I shall now return.

5.2 Development and growth of Kenley and beyond

The choice of Gee as Principal of Kenley was soon seen to be clearly inspired. His world-wide reputation as a Bible teacher,⁵⁴¹ his stable influence after the uncertainties of World War 2, the initial support from British AoG as a whole,⁵⁴² together with the attractiveness of the new College site, was a recipe for success. Almost immediately

⁵³⁶ Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*, p.210

⁵³⁷ DuPlessis was ‘one of the prime movers behind the spread of Pentecostalism across the older denominations’ (Kay, *Pentecostals*, p.173). His roving ministry took him to the 1954 World Council Assembly, the third session of Vatican II (1963-65) and he attended all six assemblies of the World Council of Churches from 1954 to 1983.

⁵³⁸ ‘Most Pentecostals in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s had very little time for Roman Catholics’ (Kay, *Pentecostals*, p. 333). However, when Principal at Kenley, Gee enjoyed a friendly correspondence with Benedict Heron, a Roman Catholic priest, both face-to-face and by letter.

⁵³⁹ Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*, p.213

⁵⁴⁰ Gee, *Wind*, p.309

⁵⁴¹ Especially in European countries such as Holland and France which had a Pentecostal movement but no Bible College of their own (Kay, *Inside*, p.305)

⁵⁴² J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.78

Gee's annual reports to the General Conference showed an improvement in both Kenley's financial position and student intake. By 1953 the £3500 debt on the Kenley property had been paid and Gee called the improvement in the financial situation at the College 'amazing'.⁵⁴³ By 1952 Gee had introduced a two-year diploma course⁵⁴⁴ with thirty-one students,⁵⁴⁵ by 1953 the College was filled to capacity with thirty-six students,⁵⁴⁶ with at least three hundred attending the Bible School Day,⁵⁴⁷ though at the beginning of the 1954 academic year, the number of students had dropped slightly to twenty-nine.⁵⁴⁸ Initially, Gee wisely kept the same small faculty as his predecessor including C.L. Parker, who taught Gifts of the Spirit and Healing, Elisha Thompson, who taught Isaiah, Church History and Modern Heresies and L.F.W. Woodford, who taught Christology, Hermeneutics and Missionary Practice. Miss Kelly taught weekly classes in English Grammar and future lecturers and subjects included Alfred Webb (Evangelism), John Carter (Doctrines of AoG, Prison Epistles and Romans), Aaron Linford (Homiletics), Swinborne Smith (Youth Work) and Douglas Gray (Music).⁵⁴⁹ After some twenty-four years of world travel Gee directed his energies and abilities to the College⁵⁵⁰ where he made his home.⁵⁵¹ The usual student schedule was in many

⁵⁴³ *AoG Conference Minutes* (May 1953)

⁵⁴⁴ The standard of diploma was dependent not only on a student's studies but also on their 'attitude, discipline, personal progress and spirituality' (*BoG Minutes* (11th May 1955)). The diploma was graded by either a gold seal (75% or more) or a red seal for 74% and under (*BoG Minutes* (July 1957)).

⁵⁴⁵ *AoG Conference Minutes* (May 1952). There were only 18 students at the College when Gee took charge in 1951 (J Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.79).

⁵⁴⁶ *AoG Conference Minutes* (May 1953). Two further applicants decided to study elsewhere because of their desire to learn Greek (*BoG Minutes* (12th November 1953)) and one student was asked to leave owing to his 'prolonged fasting' which caused 'anxiety to the staff' (*BoG Minutes* (12th November 1953)). In addition, direction was asked about an application from a 'coloured brother from Jamaica' (*BoG Minutes* (15th September 1953)).

⁵⁴⁷ On the 13th June 1953 (*BoG Minutes* (1st July 1953)).

⁵⁴⁸ This number included twenty-two students from Britain, one from Eire, one from Germany, one from Switzerland, two from Sweden, one Slavic student and one from Israel. Eighteen were male and eleven were female (*R.T.* (8th October 1954), p.10).

⁵⁴⁹ *R.T.* (23rd October 1959), pp.5-9

⁵⁵⁰ A proposal was brought before the General Conference in 1955 that the term "College" be substituted for 'School' (*BoG Minutes* (11th November 1954)). Although this motion was passed, School Secretary, Thompson, felt he could not 'conscientiously use the designation "College" in his official correspondence' (*BoG Minutes* (11th May 1955)). This may well have been due to its academic connotations.

⁵⁵¹ Gee, himself, stated that 'The garnered experience of a lifetime, and of world-travel, could now be laid at the feet of young men and women preparing themselves for the work of the ministry' (*Bonnington Toll – and After* (Kenley: AoG Bible College, 1960), p.56).

ways similar to that under Carter and included personal devotions⁵⁵² morning lectures, duties, private study and weekend and evening ministry in local churches.⁵⁵³ Friday evenings in the College were open to the public and on such occasions the meetings were conducted entirely by the students, e.g. preaching, reading, testimonies and musical items. The first Friday in each month was set apart as a Day of Prayer⁵⁵⁴ and students were expected to take part in vacation evangelistic tours.⁵⁵⁵ Upon completion of their studies, students were given assistance by the College ‘as far as possible in securing pastorates’⁵⁵⁶ and although by this time in the College’s history the emphasis had shifted from foreign fields, Gee was quick to point out that ‘close links are maintained with the Overseas Missions Council’ and that ‘3 former students are serving as missionaries in the Belgian Congo and 1 in Rhodesia’.⁵⁵⁷

Gee’s own daily schedule included his mornings devoted to lectures, the afternoons filled with administration and correspondence, student counselling and preparation for further lectures.⁵⁵⁸ Gee also insisted on ‘half-an-hour quiet’ across the campus after the mid-day meal when no work, domestic or otherwise should be done.⁵⁵⁹ Gee’s daily schedule proved to be tight and only his personal discipline made it possible. However, despite his natural shyness⁵⁶⁰ the students generally found him to be a man for whom they could entertain affection as well as awe.⁵⁶¹

⁵⁵² A personal Bible reading guide was written by College staff and provided for every student covering the Bible in two years. Notes were to be taken by the student on the chapters read together with a ‘sermon outline for a Gospel message, a message for believers and a devotional thought’. These were to be discussed in small groups with the tutors (*Principal’s Annual Report to Conference 1954*).

⁵⁵³ *R.T.* (8th October 1954), p.10

⁵⁵⁴ J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, pp.82-83

⁵⁵⁵ For example – ‘The Kenley Trekkers’ (*R.T.* (20th May 1960), p.15)

⁵⁵⁶ *BoG Minutes* (12th May 1954)

⁵⁵⁷ *Principal’s Annual Report to Conference 1954*

⁵⁵⁸ Gee lectured in various subjects in various years – during 1954-55, for example, he lectured on the Gospel of John, Attributes of God, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology (*R.T.* (8th October 1954), p.10).

⁵⁵⁹ J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.79

⁵⁶⁰ Missen describes Gee as ‘complex’ and ‘by nature somewhat remote and aloof’. Both himself and the faculty would eat on a separate table to the students. With the passing of the years and his rubbing shoulders with Bible College students in his last years this had a mellowing effect’ (Missen, *Sound*, p.40).

⁵⁶¹ Kay, *Inside*, p. 208. See J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.82 for other student tributes.

Although the 1950's saw sustained growth regarding student numbers,⁵⁶² the College was not without its problems concerning both personnel and finance. On the 5th December 1956 a 'critical situation'⁵⁶³ arose in the College regarding the student body and the Matron, Mrs Wright, who had 'reproved a young lady on a matter of decorum in dress'.⁵⁶⁴ The entire student body demanded an apology 'under threat of leaving en bloc' and at the Principal's request, John Carter was asked to chair a meeting with the students, who vented complaints about the Matron concerning not only the incident in question but also of 'unsatisfactory supper arrangements, of personal habits and manner'.⁵⁶⁵ After much discussion, Carter asked the students to vote by ballot as to whether the Matron should 'stay or leave'. The result was a unanimous 'leave' and this expression was conveyed later to the Matron, who later tendered her resignation and explained her actions. Mrs Wright stated how the frequent absence of Gee and the illness of Elisha Thompson had thrown too much responsibility upon her, under pressure of which she had several clashes with the students. She complained that the Principal had indiscreetly mentioned her name to students who she had reported for misbehaviour, causing them to resent her. She claimed that she had been insulted by students twice, considered the students not amenable to discipline and thought the 'voting' by the students unreasonable, lowering the prestige of the College and an indignity to herself as Matron.⁵⁶⁶ Thompson informed the Governors that 'tension had been building for years' and that Wright's 'domineering attitude had made co-operation and smooth working difficult from the first'.⁵⁶⁷ Wright's resignation was accepted by the Board and a gift of £10 was made for her services, in addition to her removal fees.

⁵⁶² For example, in the years 1951-1956 at least 163 students had passed through the College (*AoG Conference Minutes* (10th May 1956)), in 1958 there were 31 students in residence (24 male and 7 female, including Dutch, German and Swiss students) (*R.T* (21st February 1958), p.17) and by 1960 there were 'nearly 40 students from 9 different countries' (*R.T.* (15th July 1960), p.16).

⁵⁶³ *BoG Minutes* (9th January 1957)

⁵⁶⁴ *BoG Minutes* (9th January 1957)

⁵⁶⁵ *BoG Minutes* (9th January 1957)

⁵⁶⁶ *BoG Minutes* (9th January 1957)

⁵⁶⁷ *BoG Minutes* (9th January 1957)

In addition to this personality clash, an ‘enquiry into certain doctrines taught at the College’ was ordered in 1954 regarding C.L. Parker.⁵⁶⁸ Although Parker had previously left Hampstead and the AoG in 1936 to return to his Anglican roots,⁵⁶⁹ by early 1947 he had written to Gee indicating his intention to leave the Church of England and start his own Bible School.⁵⁷⁰ After a personal conversation with Gee, Parker postponed these plans and in 1949⁵⁷¹ re-joined the faculty at Hampstead and the Assemblies of God.⁵⁷² According to Missen, Parker’s teaching method was based on making ‘provocative statements and asking leading questions in order to encourage the students to think for themselves.’⁵⁷³ Under the previous independent regime of Carter, Parker’s teaching style would not have been unusual. As previously stated, Carter himself had employed a new process of teaching when he became Principal in 1921, encouraging a ‘conversational style of lecturing so that students would be trained to develop their own originality of thinking’ as opposed to the teacher’s thoughts being ‘inculcated into the hearers’ minds’.⁵⁷⁴ It would appear that once the College lost its independence and became the official College of the AoG in 1951, the expectation was now to ‘prescriptively promote a narrower denominational dogma’⁵⁷⁵ and to ‘ensure that the doctrinal position of future Pentecostal ministers was in accord with the fundamental truths espoused by the denomination’.⁵⁷⁶ What was acceptable at Hampstead was not acceptable at Kenley and ‘Parker’s provocative style caused

⁵⁶⁸ *BoG Minutes* (7th July 1954)

⁵⁶⁹ There seems to be a variety of opinion as to why Parker left. Kay attributes the move to ‘financial pressures’ (Kay, *Inside*, p.126) whereas Missen states that the move was as a result of a ‘breakdown in health’ coupled with an invitation from his father to become his curate at Clerkenwell (Missen, *Sound*, p.82). Reginald Ashby, a colleague of Parker’s, states that he left AoG as he had become ‘disillusioned’ with a Movement that ‘had not impacted the nation as he had expected’ (L. Goodwin, *The Life and Doctrine of C.L. Parker*, pp.33-34).

⁵⁷⁰ There was talk at one stage of Parker succeeding Newsholme at Kenley (Goodwin, C.L. Parker, p.38).

⁵⁷¹ Incorrectly, Missen states that Parker rejoined the faculty in 1945 (Missen, *Sound*, p. 82). As noted, Parker was still with the Church of England in 1947.

⁵⁷² It would seem that John Carter ‘regretted’ this appointment (*Letter from Donald Gee to John Carter* (27th November 1951)).

⁵⁷³ Missen, *Sound*, p.82.

⁵⁷⁴ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.60

⁵⁷⁵ Goodwin, C.L. Parker, p.40

⁵⁷⁶ Kay, *Pentecostals*, p.202. As noted, John Carter lectured at this time on ‘Fundamental Doctrines of AoG’.

him to be misunderstood'.⁵⁷⁷ However, it was not Parker's teaching style that caused the greatest controversy but aspects of his doctrine. Parker had personally written, published and financed a book in 1952 entitled *Foundation Truths* which he had tried to promote at various times in British AoG. In his book, Parker dismissed the view that the Great White Throne judgement in Revelation 20:11-15 will inevitably be one of condemnation on the grounds that it must address 'those who have been born during the Millennium'. In discussing the principles behind this judgement, Parker stated that God will take into account 'not only what one did, but what one would have done under happier circumstances' and here he refers to Matthew 11:21-24 where Christ states that the condemnation of Korazin and Bethsaida will be greater than that issued to Tyre and Sidon because these cities would have repented if they had seen the miracles and signs performed in Galilee. Kay states that Parker's view 'was not universalistic, nor does it obviate the preaching of the Gospel at this present time. It simply suggests that God will not condemn people on the basis of their ignorance of the cross of Christ, instead omniscience reckons saving faith to exist where it would have existed in other circumstances.'⁵⁷⁸

However, at the 1954 General Conference, the BoG were instructed by the General Council of ministers to 'investigate certain complaints concerning doctrines taught at the Bible School'⁵⁷⁹ and Parker was asked to attend an 'Emergency Meeting of the BoG'⁵⁸⁰ on the 15th July 1954.⁵⁸¹ At this meeting, before Parker was asked to enter the room, the question was raised as to whether Parker's doctrines 'contravene the Fundamental Truths of Assemblies of God' and whether 'action should be taken against him'.⁵⁸² The Governors affirmed that a member of the faculty of the official Bible School should 'teach in the School only those views of the Fundamentals which

⁵⁷⁷ R.T. (5th May 1967), p.4

⁵⁷⁸ Kay, *Inside*, p.232

⁵⁷⁹ *AoG Conference Minutes 1954*

⁵⁸⁰ Gee later asked why the whole Board needed to deal with this matter and not 'two or three delegates' (*Letter from Gee to BoG* (4th October 1954)). It was believed that 'such an important matter could not be delegated to two or three members' (*BoG Minutes* (10th November 1954))

⁵⁸¹ *BoG Minutes* (7th July 1954)

⁵⁸² *BoG Minutes* (15th July 1954)

are generally accepted in the Fellowship⁵⁸³ and after sixteen questions⁵⁸⁴, drafted by John Carter, were scrutinised as to their suitability in the conducting of the inquiry, Parker was interviewed. He was asked to state whether or not he taught the views in question in the School⁵⁸⁵ and was required to answer all sixteen questions on the spot. In many ways the proceedings resembled a court hearing with a stenographer present to record Parker's replies,⁵⁸⁶ though with no discussion and defence allowed.⁵⁸⁷ Moreover, after Parker provided his answers he was asked to leave the room while the Board deliberated his fate. It was unanimously decided that Parker 'must not be permitted to teach in the School' as firstly, Questions 1-6, 8-10 and 13-16 were regarded as 'too speculative and controversial' and secondly, it was evident that the doctrines held by Parker 'constituted a system of theology contrary to the commonly accepted interpretation of the Fundamentals of AoG.'⁵⁸⁸ It was agreed that if Parker was prepared to refrain from teaching these views in the School, the Governors hoped that it 'may be possible for the Principal to appoint him some other subjects to teach.'⁵⁸⁹ Parker agreed on a temporary basis not to teach certain contentious doctrines until the matter was resolved and Gee allowed him to teach certain subjects.⁵⁹⁰ Gee clearly found himself in a difficult situation – caught between his own personal views of Parker's doctrine, which he did not personally consider

⁵⁸³ It is interesting to note that when Gee was asked his view on 'Healing in the Atonement' at a Governors' Meeting in January 1955, Gee expressed the opinion that he, as Principal, 'should not be questioned regarding his beliefs' (*BoG Minutes* (12th January 1955)) and he was 'grieved that the Governors did not appear to accept his loyalty to the Fundamentals' (*BoG Minutes* (9th March 1955)). Elisha Thompson's views on 'eternal punishment' were also questioned (*BoG Minutes* (12th January 1955)). This could be due to the fact that Thompson had sat under Parker's teaching at his Bible School in 1924. After an interview, Thompson was 'assured of the Governors' fullest confidence' though he was warned 'not to teach in the College the views of C.L. Parker' (*BoG Minutes* (11th May 1955)).

⁵⁸⁴ These questions cannot be traced – though they may be similar to some questions posed to Elisha Thompson regarding the sinful nature of man, whether Christ had a sinful nature in his humanity, a second chance after death and the eternal torment of the unbeliever (*BoG Minutes* (10th November 1954)).

⁵⁸⁵ These views are not specified in the *BoG Minutes*

⁵⁸⁶ *BoG Minutes* (15th July 1954)

⁵⁸⁷ Parker later complained that 'the Governors gave him no opportunity to defend his position at the Enquiry' (*BoG Minutes* (9th March 1955)).

⁵⁸⁸ *BoG Minutes* (15th July 1954)

⁵⁸⁹ *BoG Minutes* (15th July 1954).

⁵⁹⁰ 'Spiritual Gifts and Divine Healing' (*BoG Minutes* (10th November 1954)).

‘erroneous’⁵⁹¹ and his role as Principal of the AoG Bible College. Gee was clearly unhappy that Kenley was put under this kind of scrutiny as he felt it was unhelpful to the reputation of the College and that it might lead to the loss of other staff members, especially Elisha Thompson and his wife.⁵⁹²

At the 1955 General Conference, the decision to call for the resignation of C.L. Parker was endorsed and within a month of the Conference, Gee had requested Parker’s resignation from Kenley,⁵⁹³ which Parker tendered ‘graciously’.⁵⁹⁴ As a temporary replacement, Mr. H. Burton-Haynes, was invited to lecture ‘one morning each week throughout the term’.⁵⁹⁵

However, by September 1955,⁵⁹⁶ Parker decided to fight back and had asked for the services of the twelve-man Court of Appeal⁵⁹⁷ to petition a review of his resignation and to re-open the matter with the General Council of AoG. Parker argued that the Governors had overstretched their authority as they had been authorised to investigate ‘complaints’ and not ‘doctrines’ and their mandate was to ‘investigate’ rather than ‘take action.’⁵⁹⁸ In November 1955 the Court held a plenary session that was generally favourable towards Parker and which found, in their view, that the Governors had ‘broadened the issues beyond what had been asked of them’.⁵⁹⁹ What is also noteworthy is the fact that John Carter, as General Secretary of AoG, was asked to represent the Executive Council at the plenary session in order to oversee the constitutional aspects of the case. This could be perceived as a tactical move on behalf of the Executive. Although the Court of Appeal was to include ‘twelve independent

⁵⁹¹ *BoG Minutes* (9th November 1955)

⁵⁹² Goodwin, C.L. Parker, p.42

⁵⁹³ *BoG Minutes* (11th May 1955).

⁵⁹⁴ Missen, *Sound*, p.82

⁵⁹⁵ *BoG Minutes* (11th May 1955)

⁵⁹⁶ By this time, Parker had personally written and published a new book, *Original Sin and Eternal Punishment* (*BoG Minutes* (9th March 1955)).

⁵⁹⁷ *BoG Minutes* (7th September 1955)

⁵⁹⁸ Kay, *Inside*, p.233

⁵⁹⁹ Goodwin, C.L. Parker, pp.43-44

representatives who would fairly review issues relating to status and discipline'⁶⁰⁰ John Carter had a clear conflict of interest as he was also the member of the BoG who had brought their findings to the General Conference in 1955 and had devised the questions posed to Parker at his hearing. It would seem that the Executive wanted a presence at the Court of Appeal session as they were clearly unhappy at the Court considering the appeal of Parker on the grounds that only the General Conference could consent to this matter being re-opened.⁶⁰¹

In January 1956 John Carter reported to the Executive Council that the Court of Appeal had not allowed him to attend its plenary session in November and that he had taken the opportunity to protest against the Court's own legality to hear Parker's appeal.⁶⁰² At the plenary session, it was agreed by the Court that the matter should be discussed again at the next General Conference in 1956⁶⁰³ and as a counter-attack the Executive Council, which incidentally included four of the five members of the BoG, planned to propose, at the same Conference, that 'the Court of Appeal's terms of reference be more clearly defined'.⁶⁰⁴ At the 1956 General Conference, the Court presented its findings regarding Parker and asked the General Council, which consisted of all status-holding ministers, to reconsider his position at the College. However, the eventual conclusion of the Conference was that 'the Court of Appeal erred in judgment in hearing the appeal of C.L. Parker and therefore rejected the section of their report dealing with this matter'.⁶⁰⁵ Although Parker made a last-ditched effort to appeal to the 230 members present at the General Council who, in reality, pulled the strings of power as their wishes could overturn the decisions of the Executive Council and the BoG, he was unsuccessful and in 1956 his dismissal from Kenley was final.⁶⁰⁶

⁶⁰⁰ Goodwin, C.L. Parker, p.44

⁶⁰¹ *AoG Executive Council Minutes* 162, 13

⁶⁰² *AoG Executive Council Minutes* 164, 7

⁶⁰³ Kay, *Inside*, p.233

⁶⁰⁴ Kay, *Inside*, p.234

⁶⁰⁵ Kay, *Inside*, p.234

⁶⁰⁶ Ironically, in 1963 Parker was elected to the BoG. Parker explained his removal from the faculty and his election to the Governing Body as 'a joke of the Almighty' (Missen, *Sound*, p. 82). He died in 1967.

In addition to personnel pressures, Gee's thirteen years as Principal saw other pressures. Although by 1962 the student growth at Kenley resulted in a decision to build an annexe in order to extend the College facilities,⁶⁰⁷ it must be said that this was all the more remarkable when considering the lack of finance. For example, in 1956 only one half of the four-hundred and eighty-six assemblies had sent a financial gift to the College⁶⁰⁸ and certainly by 1960, only fifty assemblies out of a Fellowship of over five-hundred⁶⁰⁹ had sent even the smallest gift towards the running expenses at Kenley,⁶¹⁰ despite periodic financial pleas to the assemblies⁶¹¹ and encouragement to all ministers in AoG 'to see their own School' in operation.⁶¹² On the subject of finance, throughout his thirteen years at Kenley, though given board and lodging, Gee, together with the School Secretary,⁶¹³ took no salary⁶¹⁴ and such income came predominantly through preaching engagements and royalties from his books⁶¹⁵ no doubt increasing the pressure to fill his weekends with ministry in order to provide for himself, thus adding physical strain to a man already in his sixties. Through his level-headed exposition of Scripture, as well as his first-hand knowledge of Pentecostalism around the globe, students at the College gained a Pentecostal world-view. It was Gee who encouraged Kenley students to take part in the United Bible College

⁶⁰⁷ Made possible by a legacy and gift in 1959. The annexe consisted of a one-storey residence with four rooms, toilets and a bath. A second storey was added in 1962 to accommodate additional students and a resident tutor. (J Carter, *Donald Gee*, p. 79) and *AoG Executive Minutes* (6th September 1962)

⁶⁰⁸ *AoG Conference Minutes* (10th May 1956)

⁶⁰⁹ 511 to be exact (Kay, *Inside*, p.271)

⁶¹⁰ Kay, *Inside*, p. 305. Other examples of financial difficulties at Kenley see J. Carter, *Donald Gee – Pentecostal Statesman*, p.81.

⁶¹¹ For example – *R.T.* (8th October 1954), p. 10, *R.T.* (23rd October 1959), p.5. It was also suggested that an offering for the Bible College be taken up each year in all the Assemblies during the last week in October and that an evening be given over to the work of the Bible College at the General Conference (*BoG Minutes* (6th July 1955)). There is no evidence this eventually happened.

⁶¹² *R.T.* (8th October 1954), p. 10. Various 'Bible School Open Days' were arranged throughout the year for this purpose. Moreover, Gee wrote articles on the need of the Bible College and to encourage students to be sent from the assemblies and not be dissuaded from training (*R.T.* (23rd October 1959), pp.3-4).

⁶¹³ Although the Governors did review Thompson's honorarium at times – e.g. *BoG Minutes* (7th July 1954)

⁶¹⁴ Though it would seem Gee took some expenses – e.g. *BoG Minutes* (12th March 1958).

⁶¹⁵ After his death these royalties went towards supporting needy Bible students (Kay, *Inside*, p.309), a practice that continues to this day and amounts to c. £200 per annum. In addition, throughout his time as Principal, ministry gifts that Gee personally received were often given towards the work of the College (*BoG Minutes* (12th November 1953)).

demonstrations in London in the early sixties⁶¹⁶ thus giving his students the opportunity to see across into the other Pentecostal denominations in Britain.⁶¹⁷ Gee's own position on the place of Bible Colleges in Britain was not favourable in his early years of ministry and in many ways, mirrored the anti-intellectualism prevalent in Pentecostal circles at the time. In an article entitled 'Bible Schools are Unnecessary' Gee states how this was once his personal view owing to the fact that he, himself, had achieved much without attending such a School and resenting the fact that other ministers, who had attended Bible School, 'thought themselves superior' to those who had not.⁶¹⁸ However, by 1957, Gee stated how 'this period has passed, conditions have changed and people today will not be satisfied with an incompetent ministry.'⁶¹⁹ Certainly after six years as Principal Gee believed that the Bible School could set the young 'on a path of high usefulness in the kingdom of God' and that it was 'little short of a crime to dissuade and hinder them because of vague prejudices against Schools'.⁶²⁰ Although he was quick to add that the official Bible School at Kenley was not the only way to ministry, Gee believed strongly that those who have the opportunity to attend such a School should attend.

During Gee's Kenley years, 'he was doing his most serious thinking'⁶²¹ and he was challenged to express in both spoken word and print his observations of British Assemblies of God at that time. For example, the number of assemblies was bothersome to Gee. The end of the Second World War had restored a semblance of normality in the British Church, but in some ways the Church seemed incapable of coping with her audience. The Assemblies of God, in particular, did not display the effectiveness that Gee thought necessary and its performance was even more disheartening when compared with the success of associates in South America and the

⁶¹⁶ *R.T.* (15th April 1960 and 31st March 1961)

⁶¹⁷ There were 120 students present at this demonstration representing the four Pentecostal Colleges in Britain at that time – the AoG College in Kenley, the Elim College in Clapham, the IBTI in Burgess Hill and the Apostolic Church College in Penygroes. (J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.90). In addition, there were regular College 'get-togethers' with Elim Bible College (e.g. *R.T.* (17th December 1954), p.7).

⁶¹⁸ *R.T.* (15th February 1957), p. 6

⁶¹⁹ *R.T.* (15th February 1957), p. 6

⁶²⁰ *R.T.* (15th February 1957), p. 6

⁶²¹ Ross, Donald Gee, p.69

United States. For example, at the 1951 General Conference the number of new assemblies added throughout the past year was reported as twenty-three. Instead of the usual vote of thanks being registered, as a member of the Executive Council, Gee expressed to the ministers his opinion that ‘when all was said and done, an increase of twenty-three was something less than noteworthy’.⁶²² He wondered if it was realistic to expect that the current figure of four hundred and thirty-four assemblies might be doubled in the forthcoming year. This caused a Conference-wide debate and resulted in Gee expressing his views in a future edition of *Redemption Tidings*⁶²³ where he questioned, amongst other things, the Movement’s lack of ‘Pentecostal Power’.⁶²⁴ His now-famous ‘Another Springtime’ Chairman’s Address given at the 1960 General Conference, called for church ‘multiplication not edification’, a ‘wider vision’ to face the social and political issues of the day, to restore ‘waiting meetings’ and to understand the fact that ‘the Pentecostal Revival is now touching those outside the official Pentecostal Movement’.⁶²⁵ His later writings included a challenge on the British Assemblies’ understanding of divine healing,⁶²⁶ tongues⁶²⁷ and their commitment to the Lordship of the Spirit over ‘committee-meetings and efficient institutionalism’.⁶²⁸

Gee finally left the College, his final post within British AoG, in 1964 amidst some controversy. In 1962 the General Council minutes reported that ‘the Conference unanimously confirmed the re-appointment of Gee as Principal of the Bible College’ and as this appointment was for a two-year term it was due to expire in 1964 when Gee was 73 years of age. In 1963 the BoG, ensuring that there was a smooth transition between Gee and his successor, proposed that Robert Barrie work alongside Gee as his Vice Principal until Gee’s term of office was complete. After this, Barrie

⁶²² Ross, Donald Gee, p.70

⁶²³ ‘Can it be doubled?’ *R.T.* (22nd June 1951), pp.3-4

⁶²⁴ Such comments attracted criticism by some ministers (*R.T.* (October 1951), p.3). Gee replied that ‘to disparage the challenger is not to dispose of the challenge’ (p.3).

⁶²⁵ The address was given in print form in *R.T.* (1st July 1960) pp.3-5.

⁶²⁶ Gee, *Trophimus I Left Sick* (London: Elim Pub., 1952) p.19

⁶²⁷ Gee, Tongues and Truth, *Pentecost*, No. 25, 1953

⁶²⁸ Gee, Pentecost and the World, *Pentecost*, No. 54, 1960

was to take over as Principal. However, a short time before the 1963 General Conference, Gee asked if he could retire at the end of 1963, a good six months before his official leaving date.⁶²⁹ At the General Conference in May 1963, the Governors' proposition was not carried, and Gee was expected to see through the full two years of his term of office. This shock decision resulted in three resignations from the BoG – namely Barrie himself, Eric Dando and A. E. Mellors, who felt their advice had been rejected and because of the 'present administration of the College'.⁶³⁰ What is meant by this latter reason is mysterious. By all accounts the numbers of students being trained, the standard of teaching and development of the campus were all of a 'good standard'.⁶³¹ A letter from Gee to the BoG's Secretary, Keith Munday, some months later implied there was a 'lack of confidence' in Gee's administration⁶³² at Kenley and Barrie's early appointment was probably seen as the answer. It has been suggested that some in the 1963 General Conference were keen to 'get control of the College and to lever Gee out' because of his age.⁶³³ The resignation of three quarters of the BoG⁶³⁴ caused three new Governors to be elected.

In early 1964, new faculty member, Ernest Crew,⁶³⁵ enquired about the nomination for the principalship after Gee's retirement in the forthcoming summer. The BoG replied that they had invited Gee to stay in the position for another year, until 1965, an invitation Gee had accepted.⁶³⁶ Crew, however, in a letter to the Board, questioned

⁶²⁹ Gee was keen to retire early so that he could concentrate on chairing the World Pentecostal Conference due to be held in Helsinki in the summer of 1964. Presumably Gee assumed that Barrie would become Principal on the 1st January 1964 and not in the summer of 1964 – resulting in them having two terms of hand over instead of three (J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.93).

⁶³⁰ *AoG Conference Minutes* (May 1963)

⁶³¹ Allen, *Signs and Wonders*, p.219

⁶³² *Letter to Munday* (4th September 1963)

⁶³³ Kay, *Inside*, p. 306. There was a general feeling that Gee should have resigned from his role at Kenley when he had reached 70 years of age.

⁶³⁴ W. Swinburne Smith, a supporter of Gee, did not resign.

⁶³⁵ When Crew joined the College faculty and, together with his wife, had taken up residence at Kenley, Elisha Thompson felt that 'his position as Senior Resident Tutor was being undermined by Crew' (Allen, *Signs and Wonders* p. 221). The governors had to confirm that Thompson was to be 'in charge in Gee's absence' (Allen, *Signs and Wonders*, p. 221).

⁶³⁶ Kay, *Inside*, p. 307. Gee accepted this extension as his workload had decreased due to the appointment of Crew at the College.

Gee's health and ability to remain as Principal.⁶³⁷ Gee sought to defend his physical and mental state⁶³⁸ though later agreed, after a medical examination,⁶³⁹ that the Governors 'will be wise to begin to consider a successor, but without treating the matter as urgent'.⁶⁴⁰ The Governors took Gee's advice and proposed Elisha Thompson as the next Principal at the 1964 General Conference.⁶⁴¹ Thompson, however, failed to attain the two-thirds majority he needed,⁶⁴² though by all accounts he did not seem worried by this.⁶⁴³ After Thompson's rejection, Robert Barrie's name was put forward⁶⁴⁴ and he was voted into office as the next Principal at Kenley. A proposal by the BoG to appoint Gee as Principal Emeritus alongside Barrie was unsuccessful, and plans were to be made by the Executive Council to consult with Gee about where he should live after vacating the College premises.⁶⁴⁵ It was clear that Gee was 'troubled' about his future abode⁶⁴⁶ and thus made his own arrangements.⁶⁴⁷ On his departure in the summer of 1964 Gee went to stay temporarily at the International Bible Training Institute in West Sussex with John and Doreen Wildrienne. A taxi arrived at the door

⁶³⁷ *Letter to the Board* (27th January 1964). Crew questioned Gee's physical fitness and claimed that together with his other responsibilities – e.g. Editor of *Pentecost*, Gee was becoming 'weary'. Moreover, Crew made his thoughts clear at the Representatives' Conference in the same month (*BoG Minutes* (7th February 1964)).

⁶³⁸ In a *Letter to the Board* on the 4th February 1964, he stated that his 'health was good'.

⁶³⁹ The results stated that his arteries were hardening and his blood pressure was slowly rising. Gee was to 'now slow up and not undertake work that might cause him undue strain' (*Letter to AoG General Secretary* (14th March 1964))

⁶⁴⁰ *Letter to Munday* (20th February 1964)

⁶⁴¹ *Letter to AoG General Secretary* (27th February 1964)

⁶⁴² It is not clear the reasons for this. It would seem that there was suspicion, at least from the Midlands District Council, that Thompson believed doctrines similar to C.L. Parker's about 'salvation after death' (*Letter to BoG from Midlands D.C.* (30th March 1964))

⁶⁴³ In a *Letter to the Governors* in March 1964 Thompson stated that his 'nomination as principal is not what I could have wished for. Still it could well be for the best for the time being'.

⁶⁴⁴ *BoG Minutes* (13th May 1964)

⁶⁴⁵ Barrie was a married man who thus needed more spacious accommodation than Gee had previously been allocated. The Conference in 1964 was asked to raise money for the purchase of a house for Barrie. It was clear that there was no room for Gee.

⁶⁴⁶ J. Carter, *Donald*, p.95

⁶⁴⁷ John Carter states that Gee had made these arrangements in July 1964, at least a month before leaving the College c. the 20th August 1964 (J. Carter, *Donald*, p. 93). Gee stated he had made his own arrangements as he had 'heard nothing from the Executive Council about the matter' (*BoG Minutes* (3rd July 1964)). The Executive later refuted such negligence (*BoG Minutes* (30th October 1964)).

at Kenley and, without a formal farewell and with little proper recognition⁶⁴⁸ of his thirteen years of free service to the College, Gee left.⁶⁴⁹

To the surprise of many, Gee remarried in October 1964⁶⁵⁰ and for the remaining years of his life, he lived in Sussex where he continued to edit the widely-circulated *Pentecost* magazine⁶⁵¹ and wrote a series of articles about Pentecostalism's pioneers.⁶⁵² He died in July 1966 of a cardiac arrest in London on his way home from the funeral of an old friend, where he had taken part in the tributes. Gee's funeral was held in the Metropolitan Tabernacle, London where over five-hundred mourners gathered. Representatives from British Assemblies of God, Elim and the Evangelical Alliance paid tribute. John Carter, who had known Gee the longest, concluded his message with fitting words:

A gifted writer has laid down his pen. An eminent Bible expositor will teach no more. A distinguished Editor has vacated his chair. A renowned author has concluded his last volume. A veteran leader has left our ranks. A great warrior has fought his last battle. Our friend Donald has fallen asleep. Divine awakening will bring about a joyous reunion.⁶⁵³

⁶⁴⁸ Although a notice appeared in the 12th June 1964 edition of *R.T.* stating the Fellowship's appreciation of Gee's 'labour of love' (p. 19) and a gift of £250 was made by the Executive Council (*BoG' Minutes* (30th October 1964)).

⁶⁴⁹ To add insult to injury, after Gee had retired a recommendation at the 1965 General Conference to increase his pension from £3 to £6 per week (the same incidentally as John Carter and L.F.W. Woodford) was not carried and instead Gee was given a scroll which had been produced by one of the students. In addition when the suggestion of a lump-sum payment on his retirement had been made by the Executive Council, the Kent and Midlands District Councils wrote in to complain about how the money was to be spent (*AoG Executive Minutes* (8th January 1964)). Moreover, when after Gee's death it was suggested that a pension be paid to his widow, this was not agreed to (Kay, *Inside*, p.309). Member of the BoG, W. Swinburne Smith, stated that Gee was 'shamefully treated' (Allen, *Signs*, p.223). Barrie and his wife was to be paid £11 per week plus their board and lodging (*BoG' Minutes* (3rd July 1964)).

⁶⁵⁰ Born in 1901, Jean L. Hutchison (nee Combe) was a member of Bonnington Toll. Widowed in 1938, she married Gee on the 3rd October 1964 (*R.T.* (23rd October 1964), p.19).

⁶⁵¹ The outbreak of charismatic gifts among the more established and mainstream non-Pentecostal denominations both nationally and internationally helped refocus Gee's attention. Gee was happy to offer 'any encouragement that was requested' to such church groups (Ross, *Donald*, p.83).

⁶⁵² These articles appeared in *R.T.* between 1964 and 1965 and were published collectively in the book *These Men I Knew*.

⁶⁵³ Missen, *Sound*, p.40

5.3 Struggles and Success - Finance, Curriculum, Personnel & the Student body

Finance

Although denominationally owned, during Donald Gee's time in office, the finances of the College were an obvious cause of concern to the Principal – this is displayed in the fact that in all of his quarterly reports to the BoG, by far the largest section was on 'Finance' and due to terms and words he used such as 'regret'⁶⁵⁴ and 'there is a need.'⁶⁵⁵ It would also be safe to say that throughout the Gee era, the finances of Kenley were erratic. As stated, in 1951 it was calculated that £25 per week was needed to run the newly-owned School and with each student required to pay £2 per week, income was topping £60 per week through this means alone. By 1953, the £3500 debt on the Kenley property had been paid and student numbers began to increase steadily throughout the 1950's. However, Gee knew full well that 'no Bible School can expect to meet all of its running expenses purely by student fees alone' and if Kenley was to remain open and functional, it would need a 'steady flow of gifts from the assemblies' within the Fellowship by which it was owned.⁶⁵⁶ By 1962, the growth of the student body resulted in an annexe needing to be built – made possible by a legacy and gift – and a student minibus was needed for student ministry. However, despite periodic pleas to the Fellowship⁶⁵⁷ and a suggestion that an annual offering be made to the College from all assemblies in October of each year, giving was extremely patchy. For example, as noted, in 1956 only one half of the 486 assemblies at the time sent in a financial gift and by 1960, only 50 assemblies out of over 500 had sent a gift. Due to the autonomy of the local assembly, although pleas for finance could be made, giving could not be demanded. To attempt to increase financial giving, various Open Days were organised to allow as many ministers within AoG to see, for themselves, the work of the School. Such a lack of systematic and generous giving by at least a large proportion of the Assemblies resulted in the College accounts moving between the 'red' and the 'black'. For example, in July

⁶⁵⁴ *Principal's Report to the BoG* (July 1963)

⁶⁵⁵ *Principal's Report* (March 1964)

⁶⁵⁶ *R.T.* (8th October 1954), p.10

⁶⁵⁷ For example, *R.T.* (8th October 1954) and (23rd October 1959) etc

1963, Gee states his ‘regret that for the first time he has to report that the accounts are in the ‘red’ due to a payment to the builder for extension work.’⁶⁵⁸ In September 1963, Gee reports to the Governors his ‘gratefulness’ to Barclays Bank for an overdraft facility that will ‘tide them over’ for the time-being.⁶⁵⁹ In November 1963, Gee states how the ‘Executive Council have asked for regular financial updates [from the College to discuss] at their meetings’ and how Gee, himself was ‘pleased to produce these.’⁶⁶⁰ Although the end of 1963 saw the College bank account as ‘very low’⁶⁶¹ by January 1964 this had picked up due to a number of students paying the next term’s fees in advance and an announcement made by the General Secretary in the Fellowship magazine, *R.T.*⁶⁶² Although by March 1964, the College accounts were back in the ‘black’⁶⁶³ Gee expressed to the Governors the need for ‘our Assemblies to understand their responsibility to their College as many have only a vague idea about an annual offering.’⁶⁶⁴ As noted, such a ‘hand-to-mouth’ existence also resulted in Gee, together with the School Secretary, taking no salary – this was the case for Gee’s entire tenure. Thus, the financial benefit of the College’s ownership by AoG was not apparent.

Curriculum

During Donald Gee’s tenure, contrary to the continuing view of anti-intellectualism’ amongst Pentecostals in the UK⁶⁶⁵, a definite attempt was made to raise the academic standard by changing its name from Kenley Bible School to Kenley Bible College in 1952, by developing the programme to a two-year diploma and by grading the award

⁶⁵⁸ *Principal’s Report* (July 1963)

⁶⁵⁹ *Principal’s Report* (September 1963)

⁶⁶⁰ *Principal’s Report* (November 1963)

⁶⁶¹ *Principal’s Report* (January 1964)

⁶⁶² *Principal’s Report* (March 1964)

⁶⁶³ £356 (*Principal’s Report* (March 1964))

⁶⁶⁴ *Principal’s Report* (March 1964)

⁶⁶⁵ For example, although US A/G colleges had been offering degrees since the 1930s, the UK AoG was still some 40 years away from offering this.

by either a gold seal (for 75% and over) or a red seal (for 74% and under). Such grading took into account not only a student's studies but also their attitude, discipline and spirituality.⁶⁶⁶ In addition, although when taking office in 1951 Gee kept the same faculty and subjects as his predecessor – e.g. Gifts of the Spirit, Healing, Isaiah, Church History, Modern Heresies, Christology, Homiletics, Hermeneutics, English and Missionary Policy & Practice – other subjects were soon introduced to the curriculum. These include Evangelism, Prison Epistles, Romans, Youth & Children's Work, Music, Pastoral Theology and Fundamental Doctrines of Assemblies of God. The latter is no surprise - ownership by a denomination does bring certain expectations, including the doctrine that it teaches. As seen, it was expected that only AoG doctrine be taught, as opposed to the curriculum under Carter when other Christian doctrine was taught alongside the AoG fundamentals. The clear risk with pedagogy under Gee was a verging on indoctrination, a narrow conformity and a lack of critical approach. As Kärkkäinen later reflects, 'the Pentecostal way of discerning God's will is geared towards non-mediated, direct encounters with God and in such an environment, critical thinking, analysis and argumentation often sit uncomfortably'.⁶⁶⁷ However, despite such expectations, Gee was not afraid to 'thoroughly review' the curriculum from time to time and to make changes.⁶⁶⁸ In addition, under Gee, a holistic approach to both personal and ministry formation was adopted as, in addition to morning lectures, the daily timetable included personal devotions, corporate meal times, work duties, private study, quiet time across the campus, together with weekend and evening ministry in local churches and corporate days of prayer.

With regards to teaching methods during the Gee era, according to Goodwin, the expectation was to 'promote a narrower denominational dogma'⁶⁶⁹ and to 'inculcate the thoughts of the teacher into the mind of the hearer'.⁶⁷⁰ As has been seen, the unconventional approach practised by C.L. Parker - where students were encouraged

⁶⁶⁶ *BoG Minutes* (11th May 1955). Such areas are difficult to quantify.

⁶⁶⁷ Kärkkäinen, 'Epistemology, Ethos and Environment', p.27

⁶⁶⁸ *Principal's Report* (July 1963)

⁶⁶⁹ Goodwin, C.L. Parker, p.40

⁶⁷⁰ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.60

to think for themselves after provocative statements made - was questioned along with the more serious issue of content, by those outside of the College in the General Council of Assemblies of God. Both Parker's classroom style and content resulted in his dismissal. Such a promotion of dictatorial denominational dogma, as opposed to wider views of Christian teaching being taught in 'safe space', could be viewed as a risk of denominational ownership.

Personnel

As stated, when Donald Gee took the principalship of Kenley in 1951, he wisely kept the same small faculty as his predecessor, George Newsholme. This would certainly have helped both Gee and the student body during a time of change under denominational ownership. During his tenure, Gee encountered at least two personnel challenges – regarding Mrs Wright and C.L. Parker.

Mrs Wright was the Matron at Kenley and in December 1956 a dispute arose regarding her methods and manner. There are three points of interest here – firstly, the reluctance of Gee to be directly involved, indicating that he disliked confrontation; secondly, the student involvement in decision-making and the democratic process followed to dismiss a member of staff; interestingly, student opinion was not involved in the dismissing of C.L. Parker; and thirdly, the personality clash was dealt with internally and without the need for General Council, BoG or Assemblies of God involvement.

The second personnel challenge for Gee was clearly more serious. C.L. Parker's teaching style and aspects of his doctrine was questioned – not by the student body it would seem, but by those outside of the College. With regards to Parker's teaching style, he was accused of making provocative statements – though in order to encourage students to think for themselves. As noted, such a style was not dissimilar to Howard Carter's own teaching methods in the classroom. However, it was the content of Parker's teaching that brought the greatest accusation. After an investigation and a Hearing in July 1954, it was made clear by the BoG that 'a member of the faculty of the official Bible School should teach in the School only

those views of the Fundamentals of Assemblies of God – that which is generally accepted by the Fellowship.⁶⁷¹ It was held that some of Parker’s beliefs and teaching was contrary to commonly accepted interpretation of the Fundamentals and it was decided by the BoG to allow Parker to teach other subjects at Kenley and to keep his job. However, when the Governors reported back to the General Council at the 1955 General Conference, a decision was made and endorsed by the General Council and, despite an appeal by Parker, he was asked to resign. He left the teaching staff shortly afterwards, though, ironically, joined the BoG of Kenley some years later.

As stated previously, Gee was uncomfortable at the judgement made as he, personally, did not consider Parker was teaching serious error – certainly not enough to result in his dismissal. In addition, Gee felt that such action was unhelpful to the reputation and stability of the College as it may have led to the loss of other faculty and staff. Such action shows the, at times, tenuous relationship between College and denomination. The Bible School at Kenley was not only an institution which functioned within Assemblies of God, but now operated under the jurisdiction of the General Council, which included all recognised ministers.⁶⁷² Such ministers were freely able to speak from the floor, or at the microphone, at the annual General Conference during the morning business sessions and strong opinions would certainly sway the decisions made by the various departments of the Fellowship which were answerable to the General Council. The ‘power’ was not ultimately in the hands of the Principal nor BoG but with the collective ministers of Assemblies of God - the General Council. As stated, C.L. Parker had been on the teaching faculty during the Howard Carter era almost thirty years previously and it would not be unreasonable to suggest that his views and teaching methods would not have changed drastically over this time. However, what was acceptable under independence was not acceptable under denominational ownership. With regards to the latter, it would seem that Gee could only make certain decisions with regards to personnel issues and the College’s own BoG were in a precarious position of being open to over-rule by the General Council of ministers at a future General Conference and by those who were, perhaps,

⁶⁷¹ *BoG Minutes* (15th July 1954)

⁶⁷² 332 in 1955 (Kay, *Inside Story*, p.271)

largely unaware of the details and facts of the particular incident: - a clear risk of denominational ownership.⁶⁷³

The Student body

Between 1951 to 1964, some 398 students, or an average of 28 per year, were trained under Donald Gee from at least 21 nations and 4 continents of the world.⁶⁷⁴ At least 122, or 30%, of the total number were female.⁶⁷⁵

Analysis from a sample of student applications in 1955/56 and 1957/58⁶⁷⁶ indicate that in the 1955/56 Academic Year, some 56% of the applicants were from British Assemblies of God, with the remaining 44% derived from either overseas or other British denominations including Bible Pattern Pentecostal,⁶⁷⁷ Methodist and Church of the Nazarene. In the 1957/58 Academic Year, the number of applicants from British Assemblies of God had risen considerably to 85% and with the remaining 15% derived from overseas or other British denominations including Elim Pentecostal.⁶⁷⁸

Student application forms during the Donald Gee era also show the following:

- 1) There is a presumption that applicants would be from an Assemblies of God background.⁶⁷⁹ However, attendance of an AoG Church was not necessarily a condition of acceptance.

⁶⁷³ Other examples of General Council over-rule have been seen in Gee's request for early retirement, Elisha Thompson's non-acceptance as Principal and no increase in Gee's pension.

⁶⁷⁴ Including 278 British, 17 Swedish, 17 Swiss, 14 Finnish, 12 German and 8 Dutch. Other countries represented include Israel, South Africa, Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) and the Caribbean (*Student Records 1922-1969*). Undoubtedly, Donald Gee's worldwide travel and ministry, together with his presence on various worldwide boards would account for this.

⁶⁷⁵ *Student Records 1922-1969*

⁶⁷⁶ These dates have been chosen due to availability of student records and they show the state of affairs both 5 years after Gee took over and at the halfway point of his tenure.

⁶⁷⁷ A denomination founded in 1939 by Elim founder, George Jeffreys.

⁶⁷⁸ *Student Files 1955/56, 1957/58*

⁶⁷⁹ The application form asked, 'To what Assembly do you belong?' Such a question could give the impression to an applicant and potential student that only AoG candidates need apply. A clear risk of denominational ownership.

- 2) Two references from an applicant's church background were taken seriously. Un-favourable references would result in an 'unsuccessful' application.⁶⁸⁰
- 3) No interview was required
- 4) Gee was willing to recommend alternative Bible Colleges to non-accepted students – e.g. IBTI, Elim Bible College etc.⁶⁸¹
- 5) The question of whether an applicant has been 'Baptised in the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:4)' or was 'earnestly seeking' such, appeared to be a priority.⁶⁸²
- 6) There were various reasons for Kenley not accepting certain applicants – for example, lack of education,⁶⁸³ little prospect of future ministry,⁶⁸⁴ references not favourable⁶⁸⁵ 'vagueness' of application form⁶⁸⁶ and no room/beds available at the College.⁶⁸⁷

With regards to future ministry of the graduates during the Donald Gee era, analysis from the 1955/56 College Year shows 25 students in residence at the beginning of the year, 3 students left after the first month⁶⁸⁸ and 8 graduated at the end of the College Year. From the graduating class, 4 returned overseas,⁶⁸⁹ 3 entered AoG ministry in the

⁶⁸⁰ *Letter to Mr J. Tyson* (18th July 1955)

⁶⁸¹ *Letter to Miss B. Keymer* (19th November 1955). It would be safe to say that Gee championed the cause of training and recognised other, non-AoG efforts.

⁶⁸² These appear near the top of the form.

⁶⁸³ *Letter to Mr C. Terry* (21st January 1960)

⁶⁸⁴ *Letter to Miss M. Sabey* (5th October 1960)

⁶⁸⁵ *Letter to Mr J. Tyson* (18th July 1955)

⁶⁸⁶ *Letter to Mr L. Morecraft* (5th July 1961)

⁶⁸⁷ *Letter to Keymer* (19th November 1955). This was especially an issue in the late 1950's and early 1960's. on these occasions were given to male applicants, i.e. those who would have more prospects of future full-time ministry – see *Letter to Miss C. Firth* (7th July 1960)

⁶⁸⁸ *BoG Minutes* (9th November 1955)

⁶⁸⁹ P. Roman (Europe), Paul Mink (German), A. Barker (South Africa) and J. Mathez (Switzerland)

UK,⁶⁹⁰ 1 student became a missionary with the Congo Evangelistic Mission⁶⁹¹ and 14 students continued their studies at Kenley.⁶⁹²

Analysis from the 1957/58 College Year shows clear growth with 31 students in residence at the beginning of the year, and almost at capacity, with 9 of these students graduating during the College Year. From the graduate class, 1 returned overseas,⁶⁹³ 5 entered AoG ministry in the UK,⁶⁹⁴ 1 became an independent missionary in Kenya,⁶⁹⁵ 1 student went to work at the Elim Eventide Home,⁶⁹⁶ the future ministry of 1 is unknown⁶⁹⁷ and 22 continued their studies at Kenley.⁶⁹⁸ Clearly, the future ministry of Kenley graduates was important to Gee – this was evident in May 1954, when it was stated that assistance was given to students by the College ‘as far as possible in securing pastorates’ and to send ‘overseas’⁶⁹⁹ and also in July 1963, when Gee expressed concern that ‘leavers lacked direction after graduation.’⁷⁰⁰ Gee offers some advice to remedy this especially as Assemblies of God was not centralised for appointments as with other denominations.

It is impossible to track down the ministerial lives of all who attended Kenley under Donald Gee but, according to Kay, there were ‘enough good ministers in Assemblies of God during the 1980’s’⁷⁰¹ who had studied under Gee to demonstrate that the College had done a good job in producing ministers during his time.

⁶⁹⁰ T. Hanford, A. Wieland and Miss Raine (who married an AoG minister R. Chambers)

⁶⁹¹ W. Dalby

⁶⁹² *BoG Minutes* (11th July 1956)

⁶⁹³ Mr Franz (Germany)

⁶⁹⁴ Mr K. Robinson, Mr E. Squires, Mr Jarvis, Mr Nance and Mr B. Barrett

⁶⁹⁵ Mr M. Merson

⁶⁹⁶ Miss D. Barrett

⁶⁹⁷ Mr Coopey

⁶⁹⁸ *BoG Minutes* (12th March 1958 and 9th July 1958)

⁶⁹⁹ *BoG Minutes* (12th May 1954) and *Principal's Annual Report to Conference 1954*

⁷⁰⁰ *Principal's Report to the BoG* (July 1963)

⁷⁰¹ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.274

Both recruitment from, and supply of trained ministers to, Assemblies of God churches does show the generally co-operative and close relationship between College and denomination and a benefit of such governance. What is also clear during Gee's tenure, compared to Carter's principalship under independence, a student's course was much longer (at least a year) and a greater element of foundation-building and subject coverage was guaranteed.

Chapter 6: An Analysis

In this chapter I will be seeking to elucidate in what ways both independence and denominational ownership affected the areas of Finance, Curriculum, Personnel and the Student body and any causes of risks or benefits to both the Assemblies of God and its College at the time.

6.1 The effects on Finance during both eras

It is a clear fact that despite a close relationship between the College and Assemblies of God during both eras of independence and ownership, the financial support of training within the denomination has always been a bone of contention with both Carter and Gee making the raising of funds and balancing of the books a priority during their respective time in office. As examined, between the start of the first PMU Training Home in 1909 until becoming AoG owned in 1951, the brunt of the financial responsibility was carried by two individuals – Cecil Polhill between 1909-1922 and Howard Carter between 1922-1948 – and it is probable that the former’s autocratic approach could have influenced the latter. As seen, during Carter’s tenure, finance was raised through both ‘divine provision’ and through a pragmatic approach, though some small financial gifts were given by individuals and assemblies within the fledgling denomination.⁷⁰² With regards to ‘divine provision, large sums of money were provided through individuals and with regards to pragmatism, finance was raised through the charging of fees for board and lodging. In addition, costs were saved through the non-payment of salaries and via the fact that Carter’s father had bought the Hampstead property in 1927 and rented it to his son at a reasonable rate. However, despite such provision, bearing sole financial responsibility for Hampstead did take its toll on Carter’s physical and mental wellbeing. A clear risk of independence without a Board of Trustees. Moreover, the long-term sustainability of running an independent Bible School where sole financial responsibility rested on lone shoulders, together with an over-reliance on student fees, added to the risk.

⁷⁰² As indicated in *Letter from Monteath to Parr* (11th June 1926).

However, post-1951, the financial responsibility of the Bible School should have rested on broader shoulders. As noted, although there were times when the Fellowship as a whole, several assemblies or even individuals rose to the occasion and supported their College in times of need or expansion,⁷⁰³ it would be safe to say that regular giving to the Bible School had been poor and patchy with only one half of the 486 assemblies sending a financial gift to Kenley in 1956 and only 50 assemblies sending a gift in 1960. Moreover, due to the autonomy of each local church, there was no policy in place under denominational ownership for individual assemblies to guarantee financial support for students they themselves had sent to Kenley. This was similar to independence at Hampstead under Carter. Under Gee, although much has been expected from the School – e.g. almost the sole producer of pastors for the Movement and adhering to denominational doctrine etc – in reality little has been given to the School. Despite pleas made to the contrary from Gee, an attitude seemed to exist that the Bible School should meet all its expenses from student fees – an attitude which certainly laid untold pressure on the principal, faculties and governors and almost certainly hindered the growth and expansion of the College through Gee’s tenure.⁷⁰⁴ Moreover, an over-reliance on student numbers to balance the books is extremely risky and can cause an acceptance of some students to make ends meet, instead of students well-matched to ministry within Assemblies of God or elsewhere. This in turn, would have a knock-on effect to the denomination itself when seeking suitable graduates to fill positions. In addition, such an ungenerous attitude to finance from Assemblies of God was also reflected in the poor personal treatment of Donald Gee himself. Very similar to the Carter era, finance during the 1950’s and early 60’s was mainly raised through student fees, though Gee himself knew that if Kenley was to remain open and functional, it would need a ‘steady flow of gifts from the assemblies’

⁷⁰³ For example, in May 1952 when the Kenley mortgage was needing to be paid off and £2438 was raised by the Fellowship.

⁷⁰⁴ As noted, a much-needed annexe was only built in 1962 due to a legacy, a mini-bus was needed for the student body with no record of one being bought, the finances were periodically in the ‘red’ and an overdraft facility needing to be arranged.

within the Fellowship of Assemblies of God.⁷⁰⁵ As seen, there were, indeed, gifts made by assemblies, but these were irregular - certainly not the 'steady flow' desired.

Historically, it would appear in respect to finance, that denominational ownership was of no more benefit than independence. Perhaps the only benefit was that Donald Gee, himself, was not personally responsible though, no doubt, the lack of finance at times, the constant appeals to the denomination and his own personal lack of salary would have caused a personal strain – similar to Carter.

6.2 The effects on the Curriculum during both eras

Although both Carter and Gee lacked Bible College training themselves and any further and higher education they pursued was limited⁷⁰⁶ both principals did seek to raise the academic standard of the College during their tenures.⁷⁰⁷ This was despite the prevailing anti-intellectualism still prevalent in Pentecostalism in the UK during the 21st century.⁷⁰⁸ However, under Carter, with an urgency for church planting in the 1920s to 1940s, the length of study for most students was only a matter of weeks or months at best. Inadequate training of ministers was therefore a risk to AoG and its churches. Gee, however, under the AoG increased the length of training to two-years and shows a benefit of denominational ownership with expectations of a more thorough training for its ministers in order to benefit its assemblies.

Throughout both eras, the Bible School had largely offered short courses based almost entirely upon the study of the text of Scripture together with more vocational modules

⁷⁰⁵ R.T. (8th October 1954), p.10

⁷⁰⁶ As noted, Carter undertook a year or two of Art College after leaving school and never did achieve an early goal of training to be a teacher. Gee took a trade route after school and trained in the family business of sign writing.

⁷⁰⁷ For example, as stated, Carter believed that his students needed to be taught other mainstream Christian doctrines in addition to Pentecostal theology. Gee increased the official length of the course to a two-year diploma, which was graded.

⁷⁰⁸ See Section 2.2

such as Pastoral Work, Youth Ministry and Evangelism thus recognising the need to prepare students for a 'hands-on' UK-based ministry.

It is clear that the curriculum in both eras sought a holistic approach to both personal and ministry formation and in some ways was reflective of the Principal and/or faculty biases and strengths rather than seriously considering whether the subjects taught actually equipped the student for their future ministry context. This is a point put forward by Neil Hudson who states how:

A college curriculum needs to be built primarily around real needs and with both the student and their future ministry context in mind. When a curriculum is being discussed, designed and developed, local church leaders, overseas mission bases etc should be consulted and considered a vital part of the course development process.⁷⁰⁹

As an example of this, when beginning his tenure, Donald Gee kept 'Missionary Practice' in the teaching programme, which was perhaps reflective of Gee's world travels and the fact that he had sat on the board of the Overseas Missions Council since 1926. By 1934, Howard Carter had introduced a module entitled 'Local Church Life & Government' to no doubt equip those involved in pioneer work through Carter's BSES. In addition, both Gee and Carter introduced Pastoral Theology/ Practical Pastoral Work to the curriculum reflected, in all probability, by their own individual gifts and desire to see the growth and expansion of the Church in Britain. Practical outworking was clearly important to both men with regular opportunity given to students to put into practice what was being learnt in the classroom. However, such placements were usually local or national at best and thus a UK context was presented instead of a global view. Both Gee and Carter emphasised Pentecostal theology and practice in their respective curricula – reflected, no doubt, by their own experiences and beliefs. In addition, many of the subjects taught in both eras were similar, as was the content and schedule of an average week and weekend. However, it is clear that during the Carter era of independence there appears a greater freedom on behalf of the lecturer to move away from any denominational line and expand the students' learning. This is seen in the example of the dismissal of C.L.

⁷⁰⁹ Hudson, 'Uncomfortable Thoughts', p.49

Parker due to both style of lecturing and especially lecture content during Gee's tenure.

Carter and his staff were certainly willing to teach the Fundamental Truths of AoG at Hampstead however, there was the additional benefit to the student of these Truths being taught alongside other theological views and opinions to provide wider exposure and training for its students and future ministers. Thus, although anti-intellectualism was still the prevailing Pentecostal view of the time, Carter was unafraid to push out the 'theological boat' in the School's pedagogy. Moreover, as seen, Carter had been vocal in his concerns of mainstream, denominationally-owned training colleges and their tendency for 'modernism and high-textual criticism of Scripture'.⁷¹⁰ However, with regards to Curriculum, it would seem that Gee was more reticent, preferring to stay within an indoctrination of AoG fundamental truths only. As seen, when Carter's teaching content was queried and investigated alongside his unorthodox lecturing style, not only did the Principal remain in post but was publicly commended for his work at the School before the General Council of ministers. However, when Parker was accused by the General Council and the BoG of teaching 'error' at Kenley and not meeting the expectation of 'prescriptively promoting a narrower denominational dogma'⁷¹¹ put together with his own unorthodox approach to lecturing, Parker was dismissed. This was despite the Principal's own personal support of Parker,⁷¹² the fact that Parker agreed not to teach anything that was not strictly in line with the Fundamental Truths in future and after the Court of Appeal of Assemblies of God asked the General Council to reconsider Parker's position at the College. It would seem that the General Council of AoG themselves 'pulled the strings of power' as their wishes could overturn the decisions of the Executive, the BoG and the Court of Appeal.

Thus, the C.L Parker controversy highlights a risk to a faculty of a College under AoG ownership. It would be highly unlikely that under the independent regime of Carter, wider theology and doctrines held and taught by a member of the College faculty

⁷¹⁰ J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.159

⁷¹¹ Goodwin, C.L. Parker, p.40

⁷¹² *BoG Minutes* (9th November 1955)

would have been questioned outside of the College itself. Even if such pedagogy was questioned by a member of the General Council of AoG little could have been done as Carter was personally responsible for the running of the College which, though linked with AoG as one of its ‘churches’, was not officially owned by AoG. The worst that could have been done in the event of ‘heresy’ would have been the severing of Hampstead from British Assemblies of God. Because Carter was, at the time of the personal accusations, a member of the Executive Council, this would have placed the Council in a tenuous position. This highlights an obvious risk of a College with denominational links, yet not owned or governed by a denomination – the lack of accountability. When the College became the property of AoG in 1951, it ceased to be viewed an autonomous ‘assembly’ within AoG - a BoG was appointed, annual reports needed to be made to the General Conference when the General Council of ministers would meet, questions at the microphone by any minister with status could be asked and decisions, potentially, made or overruled. The Principal was now appointed by vote and therefore, at times, caught between a rock and a hard place with fulfilling what was expected of them by the denomination and what they personally would choose.⁷¹³ Such situations, no doubt, causing strain between the Principal and Assemblies of God. In addition, every minister and member of the General Council were now entitled to their opinion and with many of them arguably uneducated and untrained themselves, almost overnight the doctrines taught in class, teaching methods used, practices adopted and materials produced by the Principal and lecturers were now under scrutiny and could be challenged. The College and its representatives were required to ‘toe the party line,’ erring and at times falling on the side of indoctrination rather than the general theological education of students. Note, for example, the subject on doctrine taught by John Carter in Kenley under Gee – ‘The Fundamental Doctrines of AoG’ Moreover, as in the Carter/Monteath controversy, Parker’s removal did little for the Pentecostal perception of academics.

⁷¹³ For example and as noted, Gee did not personally believe Parker was teaching error.

In addition to the ‘explicit’ curriculum there is also the ‘hidden curriculum.’⁷¹⁴ Throughout its existence the Bible College under both Carter and Gee has sought to be Pentecostal not only in name but also in nature with Pentecostal doctrine being a key component in the curriculum since 1909. In addition, an outworking of such beliefs outside of the classroom, in the form of ‘waiting’ or ‘tarrying’ meetings for the students to receive the Spirit-baptism and the exercise of spiritual gifts in corporate worship, as well as the house name of both Hampstead and Bridge Street, Louth - ‘Pentecost’, has both indirectly and subconsciously reinforced and promoted the College’s Pentecostal distinctiveness and helped to produce Pentecostal practitioners in its day. Hudson, writing in 2003, would agree:

Pentecostal Bible Colleges need to be places of Pentecostal formation. Primarily, students do not need to know about the limits and problems of tongues and prophecy in Corinth in 50 A.D.; they need to be able to speak in tongues and prophesy in Manchester in 2003 A.D.⁷¹⁵

6.3 The effects on Personnel during both eras

With regards to personnel issues, it is clear that both Carter and Gee exercised different leadership styles. These may well have developed due to the contexts both principals found themselves in, for example, with the absence of a BoG and non-denominational ownership, it seems clear that a more autocratic style of leadership had developed soon after Carter took charge of Hampstead in 1922. As seen, prior to this, strong personalities such as Polhill, with finances at his disposal, ran the School(s) in a similar style and in all probability, Carter ran the School in a similar fashion out of necessity. There seems little doubt that Carter liked to function with the minimum of interference from others and to have his hands free to make decisions on individuals’ futures as he saw fit,⁷¹⁶ irrespective of whether they were family members or not, and to stay in post even when he, himself, was accused of ‘heresy’

⁷¹⁴ As far as can be gathered, this is a term first coined by J.H. Westerhoff III in *Will our Children Have Faith?* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1976)

⁷¹⁵ Hudson, *Uncomfortable Thoughts*, p. 56

⁷¹⁶ This is seen in the fact that he would send young men from his Bible School wherever and whenever he saw fit (Kay, *Inside*, p.130) and with the instance of a Mr Thomas who was dismissed.

regarding his classroom teaching. In fairness to Carter, when incidents with individuals occurred, he did provide a forum for staff to speak in their own defence and although there were periodic clashes with those both inside and outside of the Bible School, for example, John Nelson Parr and George Jeffreys, Carter took the initiative to apologise to those he had grieved and when he was wrong, humbly own up to it.⁷¹⁷ In contrast, under denominational ownership, a more democratic approach to leadership existed. In all probability this was the result of both Gee's more phlegmatic disposition and because there were various levels of authority to whom the principal was now answerable – including a BoG and ultimately the General Council of ministers within Assemblies of God. Some personnel issues were dealt with internally within the College and democratically – for example, the incident regarding Mrs Wright the Matron at Kenley. More serious personnel issues, for example, regarding C.L. Parker's doctrinal beliefs, were initially dealt with internally by the College's own BoG. However, although the Governors had decided to allow Parker to continue teaching at the College, albeit lecturing on alternative subjects and Parker agreeing to only teach what was strictly within the Fundamental Truths of AoG, the General Council of ministers over-ruled at the following annual General Conference and Parker was asked to resign. This was despite Gee's own, personal view that Parker was not teaching serious error in the classroom – certainly not serious enough to result in his dismissal – and that such drastic action could affect both the reputation and stability of the College.

Such action as this shows that the Bible School at Kenley was not only an institution which functioned within Assemblies of God, but operated under the jurisdiction of the General Council, which included all recognised ministers within the Fellowship. Such ministers were freely able to speak from the floor or at the microphone, at the annual General Conference during the morning business sessions and strong opinions could be heard and would potentially sway the internal decisions made by the various departments of the denomination (e.g. Overseas Missions, Home Missions, the Fellowship magazine, Bible College etc) which were answerable to the General Council. The ultimate 'power' therefore was not in the hands of the department

⁷¹⁷ Kay, *Inside*, pp.72,76,140

leaders and committees - in this case, the BoG nor Principal and his faculty - but with the collective ministers of Assemblies of God, the General Council.

It would appear, therefore, with regards to personnel issues relating to the Bible School, with independence these were dealt with internally and by those close to, and familiar with, the situation in question. With ownership, although some minor issues were dealt with internally and which stayed internal, other more serious issues, although initially dealt with internally by the Principal and BoG, were liable to being over-ruled externally by the General Council of status ministers at some future point and arguably by individuals who were largely ignorant of the facts, the individuals in question and what was intrinsically involved in the running of a theological institution. Such an undermining is a clear risk of denominational ownership.

6.4 The effects on the Student body during both eras

With regards to the student body, both Carter and Gee experienced growth during their time in office. Carter averaged 26 students per year from 25 nations and 5 continents of the world and Gee averaged 28 students per year from at least 21 nations and 4 continents. In addition, during Gee's principalship, the number of female students dropped to 30% of the student body, compared to 38% during the Carter era. During the Gee era of AoG ownership, a higher proportion of students came from AoG churches (rising to 85% in 1957/58) than during the Carter years of independence, though it should be remembered that the denomination had a smaller number of assemblies in the 1920's and 1930's than during the Gee era. That said, when the School was independent, there is a direct correlation between the growth in the Assemblies of God after 1924 and a rise in the student body. Under Donald Gee, the admissions process was fairly stringent – e.g. references from sending churches were important, Pentecostal distinctives such as an experience of a Spirit-baptism subsequent to conversation (or the desiring of such) was a priority. In addition, a student's age and future ministry prospects were factors in whether a candidate was accepted or not. Under both Carter and Gee students from non-AoG churches were

considered for acceptance, advertising in *Redemption Tidings* and in assemblies around the nation fully utilised and the future ministry of women in the UK not encouraged.

It would appear, therefore, that denominational ownership did not make a vast difference to the recruitment of students. As seen, both eras saw consistent and sustained growth in student numbers from both the UK and overseas. Although independent, Carter's College had strong links to a denomination yet was, arguably, not seen to be limited to that particular denomination. During the era of denominational ownership, the number of students from AoG churches peaked at 85% which could arguably give the impression that the College during this time existed for its own denomination only and therefore be a risk in terms of recruitment.

Regarding the placing of graduates at the end of their studies, for both Carter and Gee, under independence and ownership, the Bible School was clearly a means to an end and not an end in itself and the placing of graduates into AoG churches was imperative.⁷¹⁸ Certainly, during the birth of the Fellowship of Assemblies of God in 1924 and the early years of the Carter era, the rapid establishment of many UK-based churches⁷¹⁹ often necessitated new leaders of these assemblies and therefore the length of training fluctuated. A study of the Scriptures with lessons on how to preach was the order of the days and the training under Carter was specific and clearly task orientated. The course during independence was relatively short with many students staying for a matter of weeks or months – until opportunities to pastor assemblies became available. As seen, it was Howard Carter's view that training was of little benefit if students had no ministry context to go to after graduation and he would personally place students who were either completing their training or, it was felt, had enough training. It would seem that Carter made this choice. Such students were placed into, predominantly, new church plants around the UK and Carter would often assist them in providing a building at a reasonable rent. The clear risk of such a

⁷¹⁸ For Carter, through the BSES and for Gee see Kay, *Inside*, p.209

⁷¹⁹ For example, in 1924, the number of AoG assemblies numbered 74, by 1927 this rose to 139 and by 1929 there were 200 assemblies (Kay, *Inside*, p.85)

procedure is that students were relatively inadequately trained for the positions they were to take. Between 1926 and 1933 some 140 graduates were serving in pioneer ministry in the UK,⁷²⁰ which accounted for circa 50% of the students trained. The other 50% would be made up of those that entered the mission field, those who returned to their countries of origin and those that returned to home churches in the UK to serve in some capacity. The close links and cooperative spirit between Assemblies of God and Carter's College, which was classed as one of its 'assemblies,' provided steady opportunities for graduates to enter AoG and 'ordained' ministry – though the downside of this was the lack of options for those completing their training i.e. AoG pastoral ministry in the UK or overseas work for the British students and returning home for the foreign student.

Under denominational ownership the length of course was increased to two years, as opposed to months or even weeks under Carter to provide more adequate training for future fields. Like Carter, the future ministry of Kenley graduates was clearly important to Gee.⁷²¹ On average, about 50-55% of graduates entered British Assemblies of God ministry, the remaining 45-50% either serving overseas, returning to their countries of origin, entering non-AoG ministry or returning to their home churches to serve in some capacity. Again, a downside during the Gee era appears to be a lack of options for graduating students.

It would appear, therefore, that denominational ownership did not make a vast amount of difference in the area of future ministry for graduates compared to independence. Under both eras, a similar percentage of students (c. 50%) entered AoG ministry on completion of their studies with the remaining number either serving overseas, returning to their countries of origin or returning to their UK home churches to serve in some capacity. It is also clear that during both the era of independence and denominational ownership, at least 50% of Bible School graduates were remaining in the UK and not entering foreign fields, as was the case during the days under the PMU.

⁷²⁰ Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.104

⁷²¹ For example see *BoG Minutes* (12th May 1954) and the *Principal's Annual Report to Conference 1954*

To conclude, such analysis also shows the relationship between both principals and the College they served during each respective era. For Carter, despite the early tension of the perceived purpose of his Bible School Evangelistic Society, there was generally a supportive, close and co-operative two-way relationship - e.g. he was allowed to advertise extensively in the official organ of the AoG which caused student numbers to rise and some funding to be received, Carter ensured the fundamental truths of AoG was taught to the students (though not exclusively so), Carter's School provided ministers and church planters for the fledgling Movement through the BSES, Carter received public support from AoG after Monteath's accusation. For Gee, although there was initial support from British AoG⁷²² and in the main, a co-operative relationship existed - e.g. advertising in *Redemption Tidings* did cause student numbers to grow, graduates were assisted into AoG churches on completion of their studies etc - there were certainly expectations from the denomination that now owned the College which, at times, caused a tenuous atmosphere to exist. For example, the over-ruling of the C.L. Parker decision by the General Council of ministers despite Gee's own personal views, the expectation that only AoG doctrine be taught, the lack of systematic giving from AoG churches etc. Arguably, the challenges and criticism to the General Council of ministers by Gee, on the lack of Pentecostal power in the Movement, the low number of churches being planted and periodic pleas for finance at the College, brought about the successful attempt to 'lever him out'⁷²³ by ministers in 1964. The lack of generosity towards the ageing principal both at this time, and subsequently, bears this out.

⁷²² J. Carter, *Donald Gee*, p.78

⁷²³ Kay, *Inside Story*, p.306

Chapter 7: Conclusion and other observations

7.1 Conclusion

To conclude, Howard Carter took control of the Hampstead Bible School in 1922 and led it with no council oversight, no BoG nor Panel of Reference and as a venture that was not financially owned by a denomination. This did not change with the establishment of the Assemblies of God in 1924, a denomination of which Carter was, himself, a founding member and it was rumoured that Carter wished for his School to remain independent of AoG ownership when handing it to his successor.⁷²⁴ Though the School had autonomous status as an ‘assembly’ within AoG from 1924, it soon became known as ‘Howard Carter’s Bible School’⁷²⁵ and although Carter would periodically allow AoG representatives⁷²⁶ to inspect the premises and make comments on the curriculum, he continued to lead the School independently throughout his tenure until 1948, which would suggest he was generally comfortable with a lack of interference from a denomination. This, no doubt, would have suited his choleric, yet melancholy, character – e.g. periodic impulsiveness (setting off on a world tour with only £5 in his pocket⁷²⁷), his meticulousness (a cursory glance at his notebooks and records would show this) and his occasional obsessive behaviour (for example he would only buy lace-up boots from a certain shoe chain). In addition, being unhindered by councils of men would have suited his strong faith, based on personally hearing from God and knowing what to do in certain situations and at certain times. It is difficult to determine AoG’s relationship towards Carter. They were certainly keen for him to remain on their Executive Council for a number of years and, as seen, publicly supported him after the Monteath accusation. There appeared to be a good-working relationship between both parties throughout Carter’s

⁷²⁴ Kay, *Inside*, p.208

⁷²⁵ E.g. *HMRC Minutes* (27th January 1928)

⁷²⁶ As stated previously, the reason for these representatives is unclear – perhaps Carter wished the running of his college to be transparent to a denomination it was linked to, though not owned by.

⁷²⁷ Though his allies may see this as an example of his faith.

principalship, AoG churches were being established through the BSES, the student body at the School was increasing in number, ministers for new and existing assemblies were being produced. Denominational independence, yet with links seemed to work and neither Carter nor the AoG sought to change this. Why? Such independence appeared to have its benefits. For AoG, as stated, graduates were produced for the fledgling Fellowship. For Carter, not being legally nor financially owned by any organisation nor answerable to any council or board, allowed him the position of being ‘entirely dependent on God.’⁷²⁸ This may sound reasonable in theory, though in practice, distinguishing between what Carter wanted and what God wanted would be an impossibility and incredibly risky. As Gee found out during his own tenure, he had other ‘higher forces’ to contend with and a denominational College comes under the scrutiny of an Executive Council, a BoG and ultimately the General Council of ministers at conference time that was numbered in the hundreds. The Principal’s Report was submitted to Conference on an annual basis and to the Governors on a quarterly basis. Expectations of the teaching of certain denomination doctrine only, the production of graduates to fill denominational churches, the balancing of the books and a general toeing of the denominational line was required – even if the principal and College BoG had other opinions. The C.L. Parker incident is a clear example.

However, although Carter’s tenure was clearly fruitful, a lack of denominational ownership and/or higher governance did take its toll on his health and mental well-being as has been previously stated. The pressure of bearing sole responsibility for an organisation both financially and operationally was incredible with large amounts of money needing to be found at various times – perhaps this was the reason that both John Wallace, with his flourishing Bristol Bible College, and George Newsholme, at the relatively young age of fifty-five and after only three years in charge and during a time of relative growth, handed over their colleges to AoG. In moments of extreme pressure or in the event of insolvency, Gee could walk away as he would not be personally and financially liable for a denominationally-owned organisation. Carter, on the other hand, could not walk away and often other people’s livelihoods were at

⁷²⁸ Andrews, Regions, p.201

stake.⁷²⁹ In addition, with independence and especially with no council, trustees, governors nor a Board of Reference, a lack of obvious and transparent accountability was extremely risky with the man at the ‘top’ often doing what he felt to be right ‘before God’. However, in fairness to Carter he did allow AoG representatives between 1939 and 1945 to inspect the College and make comments and thus foster some transparency. Interestingly, in spite of this, it would seem that Carter served for some twenty-seven years relatively unscathed and much credit for this should be given to the trusted and gifted team that he built around – ‘some of the most outstanding people in Assemblies of God’⁷³⁰ at the time who were willing to work alongside and under a leader who often did as he saw fit and often with ‘little or no consultation with his staff.’⁷³¹ It is clear that Carter was not an easy person to work with and liked his own way, displayed in the examples of his clashes with such pioneers as Elim Founder, George Jeffreys⁷³² and AoG Founder, John Nelson Parr.⁷³³

Therefore, Independence or Ownership? As seen, denominational ownership affected the College in the area of finance only in as much as it prevented an individual, or individuals, from the risk of being personally financially liable and responsible for its operation and continuance. Although ownership by AoG should have resulted in consistent income from its assemblies and the denomination itself, the opposite was often the reality with the autonomy of each assembly within the Fellowship distancing itself from ‘its’ College, thus causing it to mainly rely upon student fees for its income – the downside of which was requiring a certain number of students, even ‘unsuitable’ ones, to make the venture work. Such financial pressure can develop a philosophy of ‘accepting as many students as possible to make the College viable for those who

⁷²⁹ As stated, during Carter’s early years at Hampstead, there were missionaries on the field who needed financial support. In June 1922 the amount needed was £525 or the equivalent of £20,000 today.

⁷³⁰ Kay, *Inside*, p.133

⁷³¹ This was portrayed to me by Richard Davis on the 19th July 2012. Davis personally knew Carter’s loyal colleague, Elisha Thompson, when they were together at Kenley in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s.

⁷³² Kay, *Inside*, pp.72,76

⁷³³ Kay, *Inside*, p. 140. It would also be true to say that Carter’s relationship with Donald Gee was ‘not always warm’ (Kay, *Inside*, p.133)

should be at College.’⁷³⁴ The balancing of the books was therefore a constant priority for both Carter and Gee. Historically, denominational ownership did not result in an additional income stream.

Regarding curriculum and personnel issues, it is clear that denominational ownership resulted in an expectation of certain subjects that should be taught in line with denominational beliefs. Although independence gave Carter and his faculty a certain amount of latitude and ‘safe-space’ in the classroom, with regards to pedagogy, with the obvious benefit to the student of a wider theological education, denominational ownership expected a dogmatic and indoctrination approach to teaching and a certain amount of ‘toeing the party line.’ Denominational ownership, although in-line with the general, early British Pentecostal view of anti-intellectualism, would have denied the students a wider theological education and the ability to think issues through for themselves. Moreover, it seemed to remove some faculty from their ministries and careers when they taught outside of the AoG ‘box’. In addition, under denominational ownership any decisions made internally by the College Principal and College Governors could potentially be over-ruled by the General Council of Assemblies of God ministers at a future General Conference and, arguably, by those who were distant from the case in point. No doubt, this added untold stress to the principal and his faculty at Conference time.

Regarding the recruitment of students and their placing after the completion of studies, denominational ownership seemed to have no benefit over independence. As seen, whether the College was owned and governed by Assemblies of God or simply linked with it, both eras knew:

- i) Steady growth in student numbers;
- ii) A consistent supply of College graduates to Assemblies of God in both pioneer work and taking charge of existing assemblies;
- iii) The training and equipping of students for the mission field or a return to the country of origin.

⁷³⁴ Principal, John Carter (1966-1970) gave this advice to Principal, David Petts (1977-2004) who passed this information to me in 2003.

However, as seen, students under Carter were placed in church planting contexts sometimes a matter of weeks into their training with the risk of inadequate training for such contexts being a real danger. The training course under denominational ownership was increased to two-years to remedy this.

A further possible risk for student recruitment of denominational ownership is the perception that a training college exists for its own constituency and not for the wider Church, though this is impossible to quantify. In addition, as seen, there is the possibility of advertising and publicity amongst the assemblies within the Fellowship, of which it was linked, in order to attract students and therefore produce income yet without the need for denominational ownership. As seen, the Bristol Bible College is an example of this. A clear downside of independence under Carter, and thus a benefit of ownership, was an individual solely bearing the financial burden of an institution with the mental and physical strain that can bring. On the flip side, a contemporary benefit of denominational ownership in a 21st century post-modern environment is that any appeal to the religious standards and moral position of a denomination would certainly help should some form of legal action be taken against its college for upholding a moral position on a certain issue.

In addition to such lessons from the past, the challenges facing Mattersey Hall Bible College in the 21st century do provide a useful voice in answering the question of independence or ownership. Since 1994, Mattersey Hall has entered the academic world where its awards are validated by a British university.⁷³⁵ With such validation, there are clear benefits to students - e.g. nationally and internationally recognised qualifications, guaranteed funding from the Student Loan Company, the expectation of a wide theological education etc. Such university validation also brings clear benefit to the college - e.g. reputable courses, guaranteed tuition sent straight to the College from the SLC etc. However, validation brings new challenges to the College with a myriad of compliance issues (QAA, Student Finance, Border Agency etc) and the risk of tensions arising between denominational expectations (e.g. the

⁷³⁵ Currently, the University of Chester and previously the Universities of Wales, Bangor, Glyndwr and Sheffield.

denomination's own Statement of Faith) and the expectations of the university (e.g. a wider theological education). For lecturers teaching a university-validated course, spiritual gifting is now not enough - they need to gain academic qualifications in order to teach, knowledge of the university system and academic bodies is imperative and a broad education for students, as opposed to denominational dogma is now required. In addition, it has become clear that universities do expect a certain amount of operational and financial independence from a denomination/other body within the College they work with to show that finance from student fees are, indeed, spent on that which the student will directly benefit from. Furthermore, an independent college which is not owned by a denomination will stand a better chance of obtaining external charitable funding for its activities, resources and premises from Christian charities and benefactors.⁷³⁶ Finally, the risk to both the College and denomination of recognised qualifications is for some students who attend the College to only receive a degree and not to necessarily follow a vocation or 'calling' within the denomination.

Independence or Ownership?

Based on my findings from both the past and the present and considering the blatant and possible risks and benefits of both independence and denominational ownership, there are two possible scenarios that could aid the viability of Mattersey Hall Bible College in the present and future:

1) Independence from Assemblies of God both financially and legally, but with strong links to AoG, even in the form of becoming one of its 'Assemblies' as in the Carter era in order to still benefit from advertising amongst AoG churches for recruitment purposes and with the opportunity to place suitable graduates in the churches it has links with. Such a level of independence would also seek to provide Mattersey Hall with the necessary freedom and autonomy to:

⁷³⁶ In 2009, an unsuccessful attempt was made by the then principal at Mattersey Hall to become independent from Assemblies of God as a Company Limited by Guarantee for the main reason of obtaining Christian funding.

- a) Define and maintain its own unique mission;
- b) Admit and keep only those students well-matched to this mission;
- c) Determine the curriculum, both stated and hidden, in order to provide a broader training beyond denomination dogma;
- d) Not limit itself nor, perhaps more importantly, be perceived to be limited to the training of individuals from AoG assemblies only;
- e) Make its own decisions relating to the well-being of the College without the fear of over-ruling from AoG directors and the General Council of AoG ministers;
- f) Continue to receive financial assistance from individuals and assemblies within AoG because of its close links and;
- g) Advertise amongst other denominations and church streams.

However, such a scenario would require a Board of Trustees/Directors/Governors for transparency and accountability which, ideally, should not be comprised of clergy in the main, but a board comprising of a broad range of appropriate skills including financial, educational, I.T., legal, human resources, marketing, fundraising etc. Such a Board would:

- a) Ensure the College is carrying out its purpose and mission;
- b) Ensure the College is complying with Health & Safety legislation, a validating university's requirements etc;
- c) Act in the College's best interest;
- d) Manage the College's resources responsibly;
- e) Ensure the College remains accountable to its Trustees.

Such governance would ensure that no one individual carries the sole financial and legal responsibility for the College, with the risks of personal pressure and limited skill set that this brings. The ultimate responsibility will now rest on wider shoulders with a broader range of skills executed by the College oversight and seek to provide

greater long-term sustainability for the College. In addition, such an independent institution could potentially benefit from private financial grant funding, something that a denominational College is not always able to avail itself of due to its ownership by a particular Church group or denomination and the expectations that such a group should be funding its own training initiatives. Moreover, independence, yet denominational links could well result in some financial funding from the AoG, as was seen on occasions in the cases of both Hampstead and the Bristol Bible College.⁷³⁷

2) Continued ownership and governance by Assemblies of God but with conditions. In addition to obvious, ready-made advertising and recruitment purposes, together with the placing of graduates in AoG assemblies, there is a certain amount of College *raison d'être* and specific focus that can be brought with ownership by a particular denomination together with both financial input and underwriting and the overall legal responsibility resting with the denomination itself and not an individual(s). However, in my opinion, such ownership by AoG would need to allow for:

a) A proactive approach to finance – i.e. Consistent financial income from AoG which is in addition to the regular income from student fees. Such a demand on each assembly would prove difficult in the current climate with the autonomy of each local assembly. However, this could be overcome by a proportion of the annual contributions sent from each assembly to AoG HQ (currently 3% of undesignated giving) being designated for the running of the College;

b) A BoG appointed by AoG which is not clergy-weighted but whose members contribute a broad skill-mix including financial, legal, marketing, fundraising and HR expertise;

c) The wholehearted support from AoG itself towards the Principal, Faculty and College BoG. This would involve, amongst other things, a non-automatic overruling

⁷³⁷ A present day example of an independently-owned, yet denomination-linked, UK-based Pentecostal Bible school is the International Bible Training Institute located in Burgess Hill, West Sussex. Word count limit does not allow an examination of this as a case study.

of decisions made by the College by either the AoG General Council of ministers and/or the directors of AoG. A recent example being the dismissal of a Mattersey Hall principal in 2016 by the directors of AoG despite the strong objections by College senior staff, faculty and students;

d) An understanding that the Bible College in the 21st century faces issues never encountered by the early to mid-20th century principal and faculty, including compliance with such official bodies as The Health and Safety Executive, The Border Agency, its validating university (if applicable), the Quality Assurance Agency, the Office for Students (previously known as HEFCE), the Student Loans Company etc. Such compliance, if it is to be carried out efficiently, is time-consuming and specialised and needs to be carried out by those within Mattersey Hall who know the systems and without unnecessary and uniformed interference by the denomination that owns it.⁷³⁸

7.2 Other observations and lessons for the future/further study

Examining both the PMU Training Homes and the College under both independence and AoG ownership, the Bible School has at various times emphasised and fostered:

i) An attempt at spiritual formation⁷³⁹

Throughout both eras examined, there was clear emphasis upon spiritual formation – to develop the whole person to serve Christ effectively both in ministry and in their day-to-day Christian journey. In addition to daily lectures other activities such as personal devotions, social and sporting events were encouraged amongst the student body and certainly from 1952, the final grade of the new two-year diploma was dependent not only on a student's studies but also on their 'attitude, discipline,

⁷³⁸ A present-day example of a denomination-owned, UK-based Pentecostal Bible school is Regents Theological College located in Malvern, Worcestershire. Word count limit does not allow an examination of this as a case study.

⁷³⁹ Gerald May defines 'spiritual formation' as a general term referring to all attempts, instruction and disciplines intended towards the deepening of faith and furtherance of spiritual growth' (*Care of Mind, Care of Spirit* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1992), p.6).

personal progress and spirituality.⁷⁴⁰ As noted, certainly during the Howard Carter era faculty were expected to sit and interact with students at mealtimes and outside of the classroom, though this aspect was lost during the Donald Gee era.

Hudson agrees with the need for spiritual formation:

Colleges need to be places of formation. Students need to know how to mediate between difficult relationships, not just being able to analyse the difficulties between Luther and Zwingli. Space and expectation needs to be built into the timetables for this to happen. This integration of spiritual gifts and theoretical knowledge might be the greatest gift we can give them.⁷⁴¹

Kärkkäinen states:

The study of theology that fails to positively shape a person's identity, faith and character has simply failed its calling. An alternative is not to drop altogether the pursuit of theological education, but rather to work hard for the revising and rectifying of training.⁷⁴²

ii) An emphasis on the practical

Educator Lois LeBar states that a student's 'growth is determined not by what he hears, but by what he does about what he hears.'⁷⁴³ From its instigation in Paddington in 1909, the Bible School(s) has sought to expose students to ministry contexts during their studies - including local church involvement on Sunday, Sion College meetings on Friday evenings, door-to-door evangelism, hospital visitation and the 'Kenley Trekkers' in the 1950's and 1960's. Such practical exposure continues at the College to this day.

⁷⁴⁰ *BoG Minutes* (11th May 1955)

⁷⁴¹ Hudson, 'Uncomfortable Thoughts', p.56

⁷⁴² Kärkkäinen, 'Epistemology, Ethos and Environment', p.30

⁷⁴³ L. LeBar, *Education that is Christian* (Wheaton: Victor, 1989), p.166

Finally, if this conclusion is to function, in part, as a ‘prologue to progress’ then other issues need to be addressed and are worthy of future study. Firstly, it has become clear that although the first PMU Training Homes were established for the sole purpose of training of men and women for foreign fields, Howard Carter’s Bible School at Hampstead and its Evangelistic Society formed in 1926, perhaps unintentionally turned its attention closer to home. In the years that followed, churches were planted and ministers trained on and for British soil⁷⁴⁴ and although training for overseas mission was never off the agenda,⁷⁴⁵ with the demise of the PMU 1925, with its strong policies on training, and with the advent of Assemblies of God a year earlier which made no demands for the compulsory training of overseas candidates,⁷⁴⁶ many missionaries have left for foreign shores underprepared and generally unequipped. To this day, although under review, no clear formal training requirements are made for missionary candidates within British AoG whereas both formal, i.e. by DVD, conference attendance etc, and practical training are a requirement for ministerial candidates who wish to serve in Great Britain. This is an area that needs readdressing.

Secondly, the appointments of both Carter and Gee are noteworthy. Within both the PMU and Assemblies of God there was a tendency, at times, to appoint a principal based on incomplete or inadequate criteria. Although the traits of a striking personality, success in both local and global church ministry, an effective preaching ability and clear allegiance to a denomination arguably play a part, such factors seemed to be the only, or main, abilities looked for by the councils who appointed them. Although both Carter and Gee sought to raise the academic standard of the College during their principalships neither principal was Bible School-trained and any

⁷⁴⁴ For example, by 1929, the BSES had 67 ministers working in 17 English counties (Kay, *Inside*, p. 128) and by 1933 over 140 evangelists and pastors had now passed through the Bible School and the BSES and were serving in Britain (J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p.104).

⁷⁴⁵ For example, in 1933, Carter reports how since 1920 missionaries had gone forth from Hampstead to at least 10 nations of the world (J. Carter, *Howard Carter*, p. 104). George Newsholme stated in 1950 how the College at Hampstead existed to train those from the Fellowship of AoG for ministry ‘at home and abroad’ (*R.T.* (20th January 1950), p.3).

⁷⁴⁶ Candidates for overseas work had to prove themselves in five areas – an N.T. experience of salvation, a definite call, acceptance of the Fundamental Truths, physical and mental health and endorsement from a local assembly (*AoG Minutes* (January to May 1924), minute 23, p.9).

formal higher education he did have was limited. Although such a lack did not prevent either from training large numbers of people for ministry during their individual tenures, such abilities as curriculum development, knowledge of the Higher Education system and the gaining of personal graduate and post-graduate qualifications are no longer a luxury but a necessity, for any principal and faculty member in the 21st Century, where the qualifications offered are often validated by British universities.

Bibliography

Books

- Allen, D., *There is a River* (Milton Keynes: Authentic, 2004)
- Anderson, A., *An Introduction to Pentecostalism* (Cambridge: C.U.P., 2004)
- Anderson, A., *Spreading Fires* (London: S.C.M. Press, 2007)
- Anderson, A.(ed), *Studying Global Pentecostalism* (Oakland: Uni. of CA Press, 2010)
- Atkinson, G., *In the Beginning was the Word: A History of Preston Pentecostal Church 1908-2008* (Preston: Self-pub, 2009)
- Austin, D., *Our College: A History of the National College of Australian Assemblies of God* (Parramatta: APS, 2013)
- Barratt, T.B., *When the Fire Fell* (Oslo: Alfons, Hansen & Sonner, 1927)
- Bloch-Hoell, N., *The Pentecostal Movement* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1964)
- Blumhofer, E., *The Assemblies of God Vol. 1* (Springfield, MO: GPH, 1989)
- Bundy, D., *Visions of Apostolic Mission* (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2009)
- Burgess, S. & McGee, G.(eds), *Dictionary of Pentecostal & Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1988)
- Burgess, S.(ed), *Encyclopedia of Pentecostal & Charismatic Christianity* (London: Routledge, 2006)
- Carter, H., *Questions and Answers on Spiritual Gifts* (London: AoG Pub.,1946)
- Carter, J., *A Full Life* (Nottingham: AoG Pub., 1979)
- Carter, J., *Donald Gee – Pentecostal Statesman* (Nottingham: AoG Pub., 1975)
- Carter, J., *Howard Carter – Man of the Spirit* (Nottingham: AoG Pub., 1971)
- Cassell's Classified Quotations* (London: Cassell & Co. Ltd, 1935)
- Chapman, D., *Searching the Source of the River* (London: PUSH, 2007)
- Counsell, W., *Fire Beneath the Clock* (Nottingham: New Life Pub., 2003)

- Dunning, N., *Samuel Chadwick* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1934)
- Evans, R., *The Victorian Age* (London: Edward Arnold Pub., 1968)
- Fielder, K., *The Story of the Faith Missions* (Oxford: Regnum, 1994)
- Gee, D., *Bonnington Toll – and After* (Kenley: AoG Bible College, 1960)
- Gee, D., *These Men I Knew* (London: Evangel Press, 1980)
- Gee, D., *Trophimus I Left Sick* (London: Elim Pub., 1952)
- Gee, D., *Wind and Flame* (Croydon: Heath Press Ltd, 1967)
- Goff, J. *Fields White Unto Harvest: Charles Fox Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1988)
- Hastings, A., *A History of English Christianity 1920-1985* (London: Collins, 1986)
- Hollenweger, W., *The Pentecostals* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1972)
- Hughes, S., *My Story* (Kingston-upon-Thames: C.W.R., 2007)
- Kay, W.K., *Inside Story* (Mattersey: Mattersey Hall Pub., 1990)
- Kay, W.K., *Pentecostalism* (London: S.C.M. Press, 2009)
- Kay, W.K., *Pentecostals in Britain* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000)
- Kay, W.K. & Dyer, A., *Pentecostal & Charismatic Studies: A Reader* (London: SCM, 2004)
- Kelsey, D.H., *To Understand God Truly: What's Theological About a Theological School* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1992)
- Kelsey, D.H., *Between Athens and Berlin: The Theological Debate* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993)
- LeBar, L., *Education that is Christian* (Wheaton: Victor, 1989)
- Loughran, T., *A Practical Guide to Studying History* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017)
- Malcomson, K., *Pentecostal Pioneers* (U.S.A.: Xulon Press, 2008)
- Manwaring, R., *From Controversy to Co-existence* (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1985)
- Marwick, A., *British Society Since 1945* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982)

- Matthews, C., *The Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: O.U.P., 2003)
- May, G., *Care of Mind, Care of Spirit: A Psychiatrist Explores Spiritual Devotion* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1992)
- Missen, A.F., *The Sound of a Going* (Nottingham: AoG, 1973)
- Moorman, J.R.H., *A History of the Church in England* (London: A. & C. Black, 1953)
- Morgan, K., *The Oxford History of Britain* (Oxford: O.U.P., 2010)
- Noll, M., *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids, MI; Eerdmans, 1994)
- Polhill, C. H., *A China Missionary's Witness* (Luton: Howbury Hall, 1908)
- Pollock, J., *The Cambridge Seven* (London: I.V.P., 1966)
- Randall, I., *Educating Evangelicalism* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000)
- Robeck, C., *The Azusa Street Mission and Revival: The Birth of the Global Pentecostal Movement* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006)
- Rubenstein, W., *Britain's Century – 1815-1905* (London: Arnold, 1998)
- Vaizelle, J., *Boddy's Memoir*, unpublished and undated typewritten document from the Donald Gee Centre, Mattersey Hall, Mattersey, Nr. Doncaster
- Wacker, G., *Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Boston: Harvard, 2001)
- Walliman, N., *Your Research Project: A Step-by-Step Guide* (London: Sage, 2001)
- Walsh, T.B., *To Meet & Satisfy a Very Hungry People* (Milton Keynes: Authentic, 2012)
- Westerhoff III, J.H., *Will our Children have Faith* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1976)
- Whittaker, C., *Seven Pentecostal Pioneers* (Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering, 1986)
- Williams, C., *Tongues of the Spirit* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1981)
- Wilson, A.N., *The Victorians* (London: Arrow Books, 2003)

Journal Articles

- Anderson, A., 'All Points of the Compass' - <http://enrichmentjournal.ag.org/200602>
- Blumhofer, E., 'Alexander Boddy and the Rise of Pentecostalism in Great Britain', *Pneuma Journal for the Society of Pentecostal Studies*, Vol. 8.1 (1986), pp. 31-40
- Bundy, D., 'Thomas Barratt: From Methodist to Pentecostal', *Journal for the European Pentecostal Theological Association* Vol. 13 (Nov. 1994), pp. 19-49
- Hittenberger, J., 'Toward a Pentecostal Philosophy of Education', *Pneuma Journal for the Society of Pentecostal Studies*, Vol. 23/No. 2 (Fall, 2001), pp. 217-244
- Hocken, P., 'Cecil H. Polhill – Pentecostal Layman', *Pneuma Journal for the Society of Pentecostal Studies* Vol. 10/No. 2 (Fall, 1988), pp. 116-140
- Hudson, N., 'Uncomfortable thoughts for a lecturer in a residential Bible College at the turn of the century', *JEPTA* Vol. 23 (2003), pp. 45-57
- Kärkkäinen, V-M., "Epistemology, Ethos and Environment": In Search of a Theology of Pentecostal Theological Education', *The Pentecostal Educator* 1:1 (2014), pp 22-36
- Kay, W.K., 'Alexander Boddy and the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Sunderland,' *JEPTA*, Vol. 5.2 (1986), pp. 44-56
- Matre, F., 'A Synopsis of Norwegian Pentecostal History', *JEPTA* Vol. 9.2 (1990), pp. 53-62
- Robeck, C., 'The Development of European Pentecostalism', *Pneuma Journal for the Society of Pentecostal Studies* Vol. 10.1 (Spring 1988), pp. 1-2
- Simpson, C., 'Jonathan Paul and the German Pentecostal Movement 1907-1914', *JEPTA* Vol. 28.2 (2008), pp. 169-182
- Sutherland, W.T., 'John Nelson Darby: Scholarship that Influenced the Bible College Movement', *Christian Higher Education*, 9.2 (2010), pp. 166-180
- Usher, J., 'The Significance of Cecil H. Polhill for the Development of Early Pentecostalism', *JEPTA* Vol. 29 (2009), pp. 37-60

Van der Laan, C., 'Proceedings of the Leaders' Meetings (1908-1911) and of the International Pentecostal Council (1912-1914)', *Pneuma Journal for the Society of Pentecostal Studies* Vol. 10.1, (1988), pp. 36-49

Van der Laan, C., 'The Theology of Gerrit Polman: Dutch Pentecostal Pioneer', *JEPTA* Vol. 8.1 (1989), pp. 13-33

Warrington, K., 'Would Jesus Have Sent His Disciples to Bible College?', *JEPTA* Vol. 23 (2003), pp. 30-44

Wenk, M., 'Do We Need a Distinct European Pentecostal/Charismatic Approach to Theological Education?', *JEPTA* Vol. 23 (2003), pp. 58-71

Theses

Allen, D., Signs and Wonders, Unpublished PhD thesis, King's College London, 1990

Andrews, J., The Regions Beyond, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wales Bangor, 2003

Bundy, D., Visions of Apostolic Ministry: Scandinavian Pentecostal Mission to 1935, Unpublished PhD thesis, Uppsala University, 2009

Foster, W.D., Authority and Authenticity in the Leadership of the British Assemblies of God, Unpublished PhD thesis, King's College London, 2018

Goodwin, L., The Life and Doctrine of C.L. Parker, Unpublished M.Th. thesis, University of Bangor, 2009

Goodwin, L., The PMU and the Roots of Early Pentecostalism, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Chester, 2013

Kay, P. K., The Four-Fold Gospel in the Formation, Policy and Practice of the PMU, Unpublished M.A. thesis, Gloucester College of H.E., 1995

Letson, H., Keeper of the Flame: Story of John Nelson Parr, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wales Bangor, 2005

Massey, R.D., *A Sound and Scriptural Union: The Origins of British Assemblies of God 1920-1925*, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 1987

Moncher, G.R., *The Bible College and American Moral Culture*, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of California Berkeley, 1987

Nelson, D., *The Story of William J. Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival*, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 1981

Ross D., *Donald Gee: In Search of a Church*, D.Th. thesis, Knox College Toronto, 1974)

Minutes

Assemblies of God Board Minutes January to May 1924

AoG Executive Council Minutes 1939-1964

AoG Bible College BoG Minutes 1951-1964

China Inland Mission (CIM) London Council Minutes 1906-1907

AoG General Conference Minutes 1927-1964

Home Missions Reference Council Minutes 1928

Pentecostal Missionary Union (PMU) Minutes 1909-1925

Periodicals/Magazines

Confidence published by A.A. Boddy 1909-1925 [passim]

Redemption Tidings published by AoG 1924-1985 [passim]

The Bible School Magazine 1954-1960 [passim]

The Bible School & Missionary Review by Howard Carter 1923 and 1929 [passim]

Letters

Burton to PMU Council (16th October 1913)

AoG Executive Presbytery to Assembly Leaders (30th July 1926)

AoG Executive Presbytery to Monteath (30th July 1926)

Elim Bible College to Barrie (30th January 1932)

Gee to Board of Governors (4th October 1954)

Gee to BoG (27th January 1964)

Gee to Holbrook (3rd March 1960)

Gee to John Carter (27th November 1951)

Gee to Keymer (19th November 1955)

Gee to Morecraft (5th July 1961)

Gee to Munday (20th February 1964)

Gee to Sabey (5th October 1960)

Gee to Terry (21st January 1960)

Gee to Tyson (18th July 1955)

Gee to Wareham (18th October 1956)

Monteath to Parr (11th June 1926)

Mundell to Carter (27th June 1922)

Mundell to Crisp (28th March 1922)

Mundell to Glassby (23rd January 1924)

Mundell to Jameson (10th April 1923)

Mundell to Leigh (27th May 1916)

Mundell to Meester (25th February 1915)

Mundell to Messrs Stoddart and Sons (3rd February 1917)

Mundell to Moser (2nd March 1922)

Mundell to Orrell (12th September 1923)

Mundell to Polhill (16th December 1920)

Mundell to Trevitt (24th February 1922)

Mundell to Swift (17th July 1915)

Polhill to Mundell (5th February 1921)

Wigglesworth to Mundell (21st September 1924)

CD-ROMs

Confidence, 1909-1925 (A.A. Boddy, ed)

Redemption Tidings, 1924-1939 (AoG)

Flames of Fire, Oct. 1911-Dec. 1917

Websites

Assemblies of God, Great Britain, <http://www.aog.org.uk>

Other

Bible School Student Records (1927-1973), Donald Gee Centre, Mattersey Hall,
Mattersey, Nr. Doncaster

Conveyance Document – Westgate House, 31st January 1928 and 8th May 1937

Carter, H., *Prophecies Notebook* (1919-1964) housed at the Donald Gee Centre,
Mattersey Hall, Mattersey, Nr. Doncaster

Carter, J., *The First Pentecostal Bible College in Britain*, undated paper