and in his resurrection he has triumphed over those powers and sent his Spirit to transform us. And we 'jack in' to that reality first and foremost in a flesh and blood community that has been called and gathered around font and altar, where the risen Christ continues to come to us through Word and sacrament. 'Digitalised spirituality' is one matter. 'Digitalised sacramentality' is a contradiction in terms—at least as far as I understand the meaning of the Christian sacraments.

In that community, our personal identities are enriched and mediated to us as we journey with each other in the physicality of discipleship together. Of making and keeping promises to each other to be there: holding the new baby, laying on hands in prayer, passing the peace or passing the casserole dish, waiting all night at the bedside, standing at the gravesite, being the shoulder to lean on or cry on, greeting each other with a holy kiss (or at least bear-hugging each other from time to time.) These things are not incidental to the life of the church; indeed these are the activities that make the strongest impact on people.

As this community of the redeemed, of the liberated, makes its calling sure, it does so in this world, this earth that has been groaning right up to the present time, this world filled with extraordinary beauty and profound suffering. I hope we can say to those around us: 'Jack into this community, this calling, this reality and you'll be truly alive.'

\*Just another 'queer sect' from over the pacific: Anti-Americanism and the Wesleyan-Holiness Churches in Australia\*

Glen O'Brien

\*EE Zachary with koala (Photo: Nazarene archives)\*

'...to a number of people [the Church of the Nazarene]...is just another 'queer' sect from over the pacific [sic]...So far, any mention I have made of [it]...has not been received on the whole with a great deal of pleasure...I am endeavouring to break down the idea that it is not just the starting of another sect but the introduction of a Church here that God can use...for the propagation of...holiness...'

Introduction

When North American Wesleyan-Holiness churches began to arrive in Australia in the years immediately following the Second World War, they faced considerable opposition from Australian Christians who, to some extent, resented American influence on the religious scene. During the war, minority religious groups, such as Jehovah’s

\*Sections of this paper previously appeared in Glen O’Brien, "A Dogged Inch-by-Inch Affair": The Church of the Nazarene in Australia 1945-1958,' The Journal of Religious History vol. 27, no. 2 (June 2003) pp. 215-233, and are used here with permission.

\*Albert Berg to Ted Hollingsworth, 8 January 1945, Kansas City, Nazarene Archives.
Witnesses, with beliefs that disallowed bearing arms in defense of the state, were declared illegal. There were limits to how welcoming Australians in general would be of Americans. PL Beals notes that 'the Sydney people rose up and [refused] their large city hall' to 'Judge' Rutherford, the leader of the Jehovah's Witness organization. This was one American who was a little too much for them. The activity of these groups may have led to suspicion also toward the Wesleyan-Holiness churches who allowed their members to take the stance of conscientious objection on religious grounds, an unpopular stance in the immediate post-war years.

Among fellow evangelicals, the Holiness churches were seen as theologically suspect. A major element within Australian evangelicalism, with its colonial roots in English Calvinism, was decidedly anti-Methodist in its theology. Calvinism's stress on human depravity and inability made the Wesleyan claim to 'Christian perfection' seem a hopeless pipe dream, and more than this, a dangerous heresy. In order for the Wesleyan-holiness churches to gain acceptance they would have to negotiate this difficult and unfriendly territory. In this paper, attention will be given to another basis for opposition to these new groups - the fact that they had their origins in the United States.

I. 'Alexander's Racy Hymns and Americanism'

A longstanding anti-American attitude has existed in Australia throughout its history, right alongside of a positive attitude of fraternity and co-operation. During the nineteenth century many colonial Australians, including Parkes and Deakin, argued that Australia would be the 'United States of the future.' Many looked with envy at America's educational system, its patronage of high culture on the part of the wealthy, and its federal constitution. Mark Twain, when conducting a lecture tour in 1895, had seen little difference between Australians and Americans. Their 'easy, cordial manners' were essentially American, 'English friendliness with the English shyness and self-consciousness left out.' The American Constitution's approach to religion was the subject of much discussion during Australia's constitutional debates, resulting in there being close parallels between the two documents on the relationship between religion and the state. The lengthy campaign to include the 'recognition' clause in the Preamble, described in detail by Richard Ely, demonstrated a knowledge of questions of 'religious liberty' drawn from the American experience. Mainstream Protestants could even, like their American counterparts, sound decidedly theocratic in their conception of government and use language reminiscent of the 'manifest destiny' rhetoric of early American Puritanism. Neville Buch has examined the way in which Australian Baptists in the years following the second word war began increasingly to look to the United States for their inspiration. Pastors frequently travelled to the US to receive exposure to and training in methodologies and approaches successful in that country, but with perhaps dubious benefits down under. The traffic also ran in the other direction, as American pastors visited Australia where they were usually well received as successful pastors with proven know how.

For all of the positive connections between the two countries it is clear that anti-Americanism has also been a part of the Australian consciousness for some time, and the religious world has not been exempt from such sentiment. In nineteenth century Victoria, an Anglican newspaper attacked Wesleyan camp meetings at Queenscliff as 'an undesirable United States import likely to be subversive of home discipline and social order,' and this is probably not atypical.
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9 P. L. Beals, Report to the Board of General Superintendents, 9 January 1939, Kansas City, Nazarene Archives, p. 3.
10 I use the term 'evangelical' rather than 'fundamentalist,' because the latter term has now taken on a very different meaning, with overtones of extremism and social threat. The term 'evangelical' may be defined as 'a conservative Christian stance which looks to the Bible for its authority and actively seeks the conversion of others to the Christian faith.'
9 Southern Cross, 22nd April, 1898 in Ely, p. 39.
Hugh Jackson makes a distinction between the American Methodist evangelist William 'California’ Taylor as a ‘folk evangelist’ whose, largely rural, meetings numbered in the hundreds rather than the thousands, and those later ‘overseas practitioners of the hot gospel’ who, aided by rapid transport and new methods of mass media, increased throughout the 1870s and 90s.13 The pioneers of this new approach were also Americans - Dwight L. Moody and Ira D. Sankey, who took their ‘kindlier’ message of the Gospel of God’s love to Britain in 1873-75. Reports of the success of Moody and Sankey’s British campaign reached Australia and gave rise to concerted prayer meetings for revival in Sydney and Melbourne.14 Many longed for Moody and Sankey to come to Australia and repeat their successes here. They never came, but in 1902 Rueben A. Torrey, the superintendent of Moody’s Chicago Bible Institute, did come, accompanied by Charles Alexander to play the musical role earlier performed by Sankey. J. Wilbur Chapman, one of Moody's converts came in 1909 and again in 1912, also accompanied by Alexander.15 Significant here was the fear on the part of some clergy of the day, such as the Rev. A. Burt, that the converts of such crusades would be converted to 'Alexander's racy hymns and Americanism.'16

Jill Julius Matthews has identified 'an extensive and long term campaign of denunciation of Americanism' in the years following the First World War, on the part of business, civic, social, educational, industrial, and political groups.17 Particularly distasteful to these groups was the cheap American culture conveyed in the cinema, jazz, dancing, advertising, radio, and pulp fiction. In 1922, the movie mogul Will Hays, expressed a confidence that American films correctly depicted American culture and the cultures of other countries, and that this depiction would go far in promoting world peace. According to Matthews, [T]his imperial will to exploit the world, to explain the world to itself, and to be boastful about having done so, seems to have been widely resented among Australians' and expressed both in public humour and in political and economic retaliation, through lobbying for the application of tariffs to American goods.18

The strongest anti-American feeling in the years following the 'Great War' seems to have come from the Church, as both Catholic and Protestant ecclesiastics cried out against those forms of imported popular culture which were seen to be a threat to the purity of the nation's families. The 1936 encyclical of Pope Pius XI warned against 'the damage done to the soul by bad motion pictures'19 and everybody knew that the worst culprit was Hollywood. Protestant 'wowsersm' was equally vehement in its denunciation of the motion picture. Secular critics were little more sparing in their warning against the moral dangers of Americanisation. They turned their venom against Americanisms in speech, against jazz, crooning, sex and crime films, and the overall lowering of community standards through exposure to such things. 'It is America's mission,' warned Beatrice Tildesley, 'to vulgarise the world.'20 It would be the war in the Pacific, however, which would introduce a new and intensified phase to Australian-American relations.

II. Curtin Looks to America

WWII saw a shift to the left in Australian politics with the years of Curtin, Evatt and Chifley a kind of 'Golden Age' in Labor tradition.21 Menzies' preoccupation with British foreign policy led to a loss of support and Labor had been elected in a landslide in 1943. Now, the wartime conditions favored a strong centralised government, an idea at odds with the philosophy of the conservative parties but well suited to a labor government, providing 'a new legitimacy to labor.'22

Curtin made a public declaration of Australia's dependence on the United States to secure its freedom from Japanese aggression in the
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16 Broome, p. 66.
17 Jill Julius Matthews, 'Which America?' in Bell and Bell, Americanization and Australia, p. 15.
18 Ibid, pp. 22-3.
20 Ibid, p. 25.
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Pacific. ‘Australia looks to America free of any pangs as to our traditional ties or kinship with the United Kingdom.’ This speech is often cited as indicating a ‘turning point’ in Australia’s orientation away from Great Britain and toward the United States. This hypothesis maintains that during the war Australia became ‘an imperial satellite of capitalist powers which swapped its British master for American ones.’ No longer was Australia an imperial Antipodes, but the New Frontier down under. There are earlier precedents, however, which to some extent challenge the ‘turning point’ theory. In 1909 Alfred Deakin had proposed a Pacific pact that included America, as did Lyons in 1935 and 1937. Even the Menzies government had established an Australian legation in Washington following a 1939 Cabinet decision. Menzies had pressed Roosevelt in May 1940 to commit the US to greater support of the empire. So Curtin was by no means the first to ‘look to’ the US. After an initial burst of enthusiasm at the onset of the war, relations cooled and Australian leaders began to take a more independent stance, or even to look again toward a revived British empire.

III. ‘The Man with the Turned-Up Hat and the Feller with the Tucked-In Tie’

However the argument over Australia’s supposed ‘turning point’ may be settled, one thing is for certain. A very large number of Americans were about to arrive on Australia’s shores. When Curtin insisted, against Churchill’s wishes, that the 1st Australian Corps be returned from the Middle East to defend the homeland, the returning diggers encountered a ‘friendly’ alien in their own backyard – the American.

25 000 US troops were repotted from the Philippines to Australia. Between 1942 and 1945 an estimated one million American servicemen would pass through Australia, though never more than 200 000 at any one time.

Early Nazarene leader, Doug Pinch, remembered the ensuing chaos.

With startling suddenness American servicemen with their tanks, jeeps, trucks and earth-moving equipment, the like of which had never been imagined to exist, filled the streets of that Queensland city. Everything, for the moment, seemed to be in chaos and confusion. Trains were requisitioned for the transportation of military vehicles. The whole pattern and life-style of a city was changed overnight.

Commander-in-Chief of the Australian Military Forces, Sir Thomas Blamey, had little respect for the American troops and MacArthur reciprocated in regard to the Australian troops. There was so much concern about clashes between American and Australian troops that the Intelligence Branch recommended that Brisbane be fully lit up at night, a relaxing of the standard ‘brown out’ that was designed as a protective cover against Japanese attack. A dispute between an American MP and an Australian soldier escalated within an hour to a riot involving 4000 people. Though this was the largest scale incident, other incidents of conflict took place in places as far apart as Townsville and Melbourne.

Reasons for the hatred of Aussies toward the ‘Yanks’ were many. They had higher pay, better uniforms, were big tippers, and emerged from the American Postal Exchange with such luxuries as ice-cream, chocolate, hams, turkeys, cigarettes, alcohol, and the nylon so prized by the women. Most grievous of all, however, was that they attracted the Australian women.
Rosemary Campbell, in *Heroes and Lovers*, sees the presence of American troops as a threat to 'a national identity based on the rugged masculine world of the bush.' The Americans were refreshingly different from the 'toughened, beer swilling bushmen, diggers and shearers.' They were sensitive, romantic, 'smooth-talking, considerate [and] polite,' and women found this very attractive.\(^{31}\) Syd Harvey remembered, 'The Yanks were very popular with the girls — they used to go around with a bunch of flowers in their hand and we used to think that was bloody stupid.'\(^{32}\)

Dorothy Hewitt was not impressed. 'I scorn the Yanks, pasty faced boys who seem to think an orchid or a box of chocolates can buy them anything...Nobody can buy me...I prefer Australians, who give neither orchids nor chocolates, who are inarticulate but seem to promise love and even silent understanding.'\(^{33}\)

JH Moore in *Over-Sexed, Over-Paid and Over Here*, argues that while Americans were at first warmly received as 'heroes and savours,' most Australians 'were not sad to see them leave.' The series of murders committed by Private Edward Leonski in Melbourne, and the brawls between Australian and American troops in Australian cities no doubt soured the relationship somewhat. Leonski was tried and swiftly hanged for the murder of three women in Melbourne in 1942.\(^{34}\)

George Johnston's wartime book *Pacific Partners* has the rather naive, and perhaps propagandist, view that while '[t]here were brawls and fist fights — 99 per cent of them over women — [they] caused no more serious damage than a few blacked eyes and bleeding noses.'\(^{35}\) The author describes one fist fight which ended, 'apart from the two battered faces,' with 'nothing to indicate that they hadn't always been the best of friends.'\(^{36}\) This in spite of the fact that in February 1943 mounted police dispersed brawls between Australian and Americans in Melbourne, and in January 1944 more than 1000 Americans and Australians rioted in Perth.\(^{37}\) Gunner Edward Webster, formerly of the 2/2nd Anti-Tank Regiment, 7th Division AIF, was killed by US military police officer, Private Norbert J. Grant, on 26 November 1942. Eight Australian servicemen received gunshot wounds and eleven Americans were injured. The Americans involved, including Grant, were fully exonerated but three Australian privates spent up to six months in jail. The 'man with the turned-up hat' and the 'fella with the tucked-in tie' were on unstable terms at best.\(^{38}\)

### IV. The Sanctified Soldier Boys

One factor rarely touched upon in the existing literature is the religion of the American GI. Among the soldiers stationed in Australia were members of the American Holiness churches, the sanctified soldier boys. The arrival of American troops in Brisbane is remembered by Dorothy Hewitt as sending 'a shudder through middle class sensibilities. With visions of young crew cut, gum chewing doughboys scattered 'hi's' [sic] and 'babe's' [sic] throughout the house and 'cutting a rug' in the lounge to that ultimate vulgarity, jazz music, many parents instructed their daughters to have nothing to do with the Americans. There were to be no exemptions, even for officers who looked like Cary Grant and sounded like Clark Gable.\(^{39}\) But there were other young Americans, equally as handsome and dashing, but possessing a different set of values to those portrayed in Hollywood and, in fact, more strongly opposed to secular American pop culture than the mothers of those girls who may have seen them as a threat to their daughters' purity.

Both the Church of the Nazarene and the Wesleyan Methodist Church gained their initial impetus through contact with such American service personnel during the latter stages of the war. Australian Christian leaders with a desire to see Wesleyan-Holiness work commence in Australia provided the earliest leadership after contact with Americans who sparked off the interest. The Wesleyan Methodist Church of America began work in Australia in 1945, when
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RAAF chaplain Kingsley Ridgway, after meeting a Wesleyan Methodist serviceman in the Pacific, offered himself as a 'field representative' for the Australian work. The young soldier gave a clear-cut testimony to 'entire sanctification' and this was just the kind of thing that would have filled Ridgway with memories of his days in the Canadian holiness movement, into which he had married in 1929. Approaching the young serviceman he found that he was a Wesleyan Methodist of the more 'radical' type, represented by Conferences such as Allegheny and Ohio, and by God's Bible School in Cincinnati. This did not faze him however as he knew the radical wing of the holiness movement well, and though aware of its extremes, recognized it as his own spiritual 'homeland.'

Kingsley Ridgway, 1942 (family photograph)

In a similar way, 35 year old Australian Army officer, Albert Berg came into contact with the Church of the Nazarene. Though Melbourne was the first city to see a large-scale arrival of GIs, garrisoning 30 000 by early 1942, by September of the following year, after MacArthur transferred his HQ to Brisbane, 96 000 of the 119 000 American soldiers in Australia were stationed there. Brisbane in 1942 was 'a frightened city invaded by a friendly, though foreign, army.'

Ted Hollingsworth, a Nazarene licensed minister from Little Rock, Arkansas, contracted a tropical disease while serving with the US Army Medical Corps in New Guinea. After a period in the military hospital in Townsville he was moved to Brisbane, where after two months recovering this handsome young zealot was back on his feet and searching around for a place to worship. Through the Gospel Book Depot in downtown Brisbane, he came into contact with the Mount Pleasant Gospel Hall (Plymouth Brethren). Here he met Berg, and others who were attracted by Hollingsworth's testimony to entire sanctification.

Meredith T (Ted) Hollingsworth c. 1946 (photo: Nazarene Archives)

The 'soldier boy', preached on holiness at the Gospel Hall, urging the people there 'not to rest short of...the sure knowledge of a personal Pentecost.' Berg had in fact now met three different
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American servicemen who were members of the Church of the Nazarene, though the identity of the others is unknown. When Hollingsworth returned to America, after being discharged from the Army, he enrolled at Bethany-Peniel College, but did not forget his time in Australia. He prepared a report for presentation to the Board of General Superintendents, who enthusiastically approved the idea of establishing a Nazarene presence in Australia. Meanwhile, independent of these actions, the June 1944 Convention of the Nazarene Young People’s Society (NYP) adopted a resolution to raise $50,000 over a four year period 'for the evangelization of Australia and New Zealand.' Appeals to the American church for funds presented a view of Australia as being either without Christ or at least without any holiness witness. It was viewed as a harvest field that was ripe for a revival of holiness religion. The Michigan Nazarene Young People’s Society urged its constituents to 'Beat Southern California! [in a missions fund raising drive] and give Christ to Australia.'

American Nazarenes seemed unaware of the history of revivalism in Australia and there was a tendency to interpret Australian religious history in extremely bleak terms. Nelson Mink maintained that 'Australia has not had any great revival or evangelical background, such as other British Commonwealth nations have enjoyed.' When General Superintendent, Dr. G. B. Williamson visited Australia at the end of 1951 he claimed in his report that there had been no effective Holiness ministry in Australia in the thirty-five years prior to the establishment of the Church of the Nazarene. This is certainly an overstatement. Holiness teaching was not as widely forgotten or neglected among Methodists as the Holiness people thought it to be. It is understandable that, coming as they did largely from Brethren and Baptist backgrounds, early Australian Nazarenes were encountering holiness as something entirely new. More conservative Methodists, Pentecostals, and those involved in the Keswick Convention movement were all aware of and promoting varieties of holiness' teaching in their own ways. Nonetheless, as McEwan points out, for these early Nazarene pioneers, the absence of Holiness teaching in Australia was at least 'subjectively' true, and the hostility they received from other churches could only confirm their suspicions.

V. 'The Oddities of the Yank Deportment': Differing Religious Origins and Styles

Holiness religion was different in its expression from mainstream Christianity. Many of these differences were perceived as 'American' and thus proved a sticking point for some enquirers as the Wesleyan-Holiness churches sought to find a place in the existing religious scene.

It is a commonplace that Australia's first settlers were not the religious idealists that made up America's first parishes. According to Carey, 'in terms of church-going, deference to clerical authority, and acquaintance with theological principles, the convicts of Botany Bay made a poor showing.' According to Mol, since the nineteenth century, at least, 'Australians were born into a religion rather than changed by it, as happened in particular episodes of American history.' This view of Australian Christianity as lacking the 'charismatic events' which characterized American revivalism, however, has recently been challenged by historians who have researched significant periods of religious revival in places like the Victorian gold fields and the coal mining communities of the Hunter Valley.
Gary Bouma has characterised Australia's religious style as 'military chaplaincy' religion, which has its roots in the colonial experience. According to this view, the military and landowning classes in colonial Australia looked on religion as something done for one by a religious professional. This is significantly different from the evangelical Protestant voluntarism that prevails in the United States, in which one takes personal responsibility for one's religious commitment and activism. Similarly, Mol contends that 'religious affiliation seems for a significant number of Australians to be ascriptive,' that is something one is born with. Contrary to the USA, where in Protestantism the 'voluntarism' of religious affiliation is stressed, to belong does not imply that one supports the religious institution with one's time and talents.

But this older view is open to question. For one thing Anglican evangelicalism of the 'Methodistical' variety characterized much of the religious ethos of early Australia, bringing with it the voluntarist ethic. Indeed, Carey goes so far as to say that evangelicalism was 'the religious success story of the Australian colonies.' Richard Johnson and Samuel Marsden were both evangelicals, and because of the absence of non-conformist sects, at least in the earliest period, the evangelical Anglicans were not threatened by much religious competition. This meant that they were 'keener and more visible in their practice of religion than most other Christians and accordingly they were able to set the colonial religious agenda.'

Australian religious expression has always been notably more muted than in North America. During the debate over whether to insert a clause in the Australian Constitution which would recognize a reliance on 'the blessing of Almighty God,' the Tasmanian Adye Douglas, in opposing such a clause, asserted that '[While] we all rely upon...God in our daily transactions, we do not talk about it.' He informed the delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1898 that the Lord's Prayer was at one time used in the Tasmanian Legislative Council but that 'it had become a matter of such indifference that the custom was given up.' When Alexander Peacock made the point that the Lord's Prayer was used in the Victorian Legislative Council, Alfred Deakin quipped, 'And nearly all the members know it now,' presumably meaning that they had not known it before its introduction. Douglas then gave testimony that he was 'ordinarily as religious as any member of this Convention,' and then added, 'I do not make a parade of it.' It might be argued that Douglas' reticence to display his religious convictions typifies Australian religiosity. If so, this stands in stark contrast to a more demonstrative American religious style.

Nazarenes believed that Australians were more receptive to American ideas and practices than to British ones. But Australian church leaders, as well as the general populace were often suspicious of American denominations. Even Nazarene leaders recognized that there were differences in style between American and Australian Christians and that these had the potential to cause difficulties. The 'oddities of the yank deportment' were something Australians would find hard to understand. Some would-be American visitors had received a courteous 'no' from Berg because of the element of risk involved in their ability to adjust to 'our local psychology.' As much as possible, Australian and American workers should labour side by side so as to learn from each other. As much as possible promotional material is to reflect a peculiarly Australian ethos. It

---

65 Though Deakin may be commenting on the members' illiteracy, rather than their irreligion.
67 P. L. Beal, Report to the Board of General Superintendents, 9 January 1933 (Kansas City: Nazarene Archives), p. 3.
69 Albert Berg to I. F. Younger, 26 September 1962 (Kansas City: Nazarene Archives).
should reflect the Nazarene message 'in a true Australian fashion.' At the same time, Berg sees the Nazarene constituency as 'Nazarene firstly and Australians secondly.'

When EE Zachary arrived from the United States in 1946 to chair the first Nazarene Assembly, the 'peculiarities' of his style of preaching were seen by Pinch as something that the people needed 'the Lord's help to rise above.' The 'altar call,' (kneeling at an altar of prayer in a public meeting) so typical of American revivalism, seemed something of a novelty. When Dr. Weaver Hess, Oregon District Superintendent, preached in Sydney in January 1948, the tears that rolled down his cheeks were perhaps indicative of the approach to preaching among American revivalists, but were not immediately intelligible to the average Australian evangelical, whose expressions were characteristically more reserved. Pinch recalls upon seeing these tears, 'We Australians were unaccustomed to this.'

According to David Bennett, when the altar call first emerged in British Methodism early in the nineteenth century 'it was dubbed the "American custom."' Thus it was perceived as an import, rather than a home bred practice, and was certainly not seen as a strategy used by the English founder of Methodism. As a distinct and intentionally planned system it seems to have had its beginnings in the American camp meeting revivals in the first decade of the nineteenth century. Bennet concludes that 'Methodists seem to have been its only regular users until the 1870s. From then it was promoted to a wider audience by various itinerant evangelists, but there is little evidence of it being widely used in denominations of non-Methodist origins in the nineteenth century.'

What use, or memory, of this practice there may have been among evangelicals of the 1940s is uncertain but the fact that those in early Nazarene meetings encountered it as a novelty seems to suggest that it was not a widespread practice.

American servicemen in Geraldton found themselves without Coca Cola, a drink not known in WA at the time. They did, however, have a supply of the syrup available so they struck a deal with a local soft drink manufacturer to add the carbonated water and begin local production. There may be a metaphor here for religious importation. Certain forms of religious expression may be imported from America on a global scale, and yet they soon begin to be produced locally as well, blending local distinctives with the original 'product' to produce home grown varieties. Yuri Lotman has proposed a five stage model of cultural importation which begins with the assumption that cultural imports are superior to local product, and then moves through various stages of engagement and modification between local and imported cultural expression, culminating in local culture defining itself with little reference to outside cultural influences, ready to transmit meaning on its own terms. Australian evangelicals did not so much find the altar call something 'superior' but they did accept it and incorporate it into their own practices until it was no longer seen as, or even remembered as, an American import.

Neither the Wesleyan Methodist Church of America nor the Church of the Nazarene perceived their Australian work as a mission field. Perhaps because of the similarity that existed between the two cultures, the new work 'down under' came under the jurisdiction of the 'Home' rather than 'Foreign' Missions department. The Rev. JR Swauger, visiting Secretary of Home Missions, was present to chair the first Conference of the 'Wesleyan Methodist Church of America in Australia.' A letter of greeting was read from the General Conference President in America, the Rev. Roy S. Nicholson. Ridgway referred to Swauger's coming as 'a great blessing to the Wesleyan cause in Australia, and we are assured the interests of Australia will be well represented by him in the councils of the home church.' It may seem unusual that the Church in America should be referred to as the 'home church' when nobody at the Conference,
apart from Swauger, could call America 'home.' Ridgway was also able to refer to the American Church as 'the parent church' and the Committee on Resolutions even spoke of the 'Mother Church.'

Yet the obvious American influence does not seem to have been exerted in an overly controlling sense. From the beginning the need to indigenize was encouraged and pursued. The Australian Wesleyan was founded as 'the official organ' of the Church at a Special Session of the 1947 Conference, with Kingsley Ridgway as editor. This was followed by the Wesleyan Witness, later to be discontinued in favour of the American publication the Wesleyan Methodist, which was sent to subscribers only, and initially drew a poor response. The Australian Nazarene served a similar function. Berg stressed the importance of Australian material in a letter to G. B. Williamson, Nazarene General Superintendent. [Articles written [for the pages of The Australian Nazarene] by American or any other Nazarenes are well accepted. But I am working on a greater percentage of articles written by Australian Nazarenes and appreciate your understanding attitude in this connection.

In 1949, after thanking the Wesleyan Methodist Church of America for its generosity toward the Australian Bible College, Kingsley Ridgway asserted the need for a self-supporting work to emerge. 'We cannot expect...that financial help on such a munificent scale will continue. Let it be our earnest endeavour to make our work self-supporting; and that as readily as possible.' The Light and Life radio programme was in use by Wesleyans from 1954. This was 'canned' material from the Free Methodist Church, a sister holiness body in the United States, and so the public voice of the Church was an American one. This quarter-hour programme was broadcast each Sunday morning at 8:30 on 3XY. The Nazarenes also used 'canned' material for their radio broadcasts. 'Of course,' wrote Berg, 'we have to omit references to the U. S. in any material we publish and often are not able to broadcast a 'Showers of Blessing' programme in so far as it directly concerns the American nation and this would sound very strange to Australian people.'

The Rev. Roy S. Nicholson, Wesleyan Methodist Conference President, visited the Australian church in 1953 and conducted a series of meetings in three states. As Nicholson sat in the Botanical gardens, in the shade of Government House, during Christmas week, the mercury rose to 100 degrees, and a strong hot breeze was blowing. Christmas Day and the day following were also very hot. The winter snows of his home in Indiana must have seemed a long way off. In his final report from Australia, he gave his summary conclusions of the situation in Australia.

This continent needs the Wesleyan message of full deliverance from sin...Formal religion is in evidence everywhere, and those with a spiritual hunger seem to suspect the denominational programs, many of which are shot through with theological liberalism and worldliness. That fact has encouraged hundreds of independent groups who hold 'fellowship' meetings apart from all denominational contacts...God has vindicated us and those who feared our intentions (which had been misrepresented to them) have discovered that instead of being heretics out to spread error, we are earnest Christians seeking the lost. Some of them welcome us as 'fellow helpers to the truth,' but, of course, with some others there is no fellowship or co-operation, because our views or essential doctrines and principles are so far apart. In Australia, as in many other lands, it costs one something to separate from an older church group and affiliate with a definitely holiness group. It is doubly costly to unite with one having the ties to American leadership that our Church has. We are gaining favour, however, with those who have become well enough acquainted with us to appreciate our principles, purposes and practices.

According to Stuart Piggott, the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade saw Australia come closest to experiencing a national spiritual awakening than at any other time. One quarter of the entire population of Australia and New Zealand attended a Graham crusade meeting. In many ways, the involvement by the Wesleyan Methodist Church of
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Australia in the Graham Crusade was a watershed moment in the history of that church. The Wesleyans had been the only denominational member of the Fellowship of Evangelical Churches of Australia (FECA), a fundamentalist conglomerate of small independent churches, which followed Carl MacIntyre’s lead in the US in boycotting Billy Graham’s ministry. In refusing to boycott Graham, and breaking ranks with the FECA, the Wesleyan Methodists in a sense, ‘came of age,’ choosing to throw in their lot with mainstream evangelicalism, over against reactionary fundamentalism. Graham had himself broken with the extremist fundamentalist wing back home, shortly before coming to Australia. He received strong mainline church support here as he did in the US.87

The Standing Orders of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of 1958 urged that ‘each pastor and charge enter wholeheartedly and energetically into the visitation programme of the Billy Graham Crusade.’88 Conference President Robert Mattke was able to speak of the Crusade as having a ‘spiritual impact... upon [the] continent’ and urged that Wesleyans ‘do everything humanly possible to follow through with every contact. Let us make the most of this historic opportunity.’89 Kingsley Ridgway represented the Wesleyans on the Executive Committee of the Billy Graham crusade in Victoria. He thanked God for ‘the great door and effectual’ which the campaign had opened for Wesleyans in that state.90 In the wake of the event, Mattke spoke of the Crusade as having brought to Australia ‘a spiritual atmosphere which was probably unique to its history...[bringing] to the masses a certain awareness of God.’91

Piggin sees Australians as displaying an uncritical disposition toward all things American during the 1950s, as America ‘began to replace Britain in the affections of Australians.’92 At the final Crusade, Graham read a greeting from President Eisenhower which was warmly received. Along with this came a diplomatic letter from Richard Nixon. Graham was a well known anti-Communist, considered to be a powerful ally on the American side of the Cold War. All of this resonated well in the anti-communist atmosphere of Australia at the time. Anti-American sentiment waned in Australia, in the post-war period, especially on the part of conservative intellectuals. American culture was far to be preferred to those totalitarianisms which threatened the peace of the ‘free world.’ Left wing intellectuals, on the other hand, saw the day coming when Australia would be just another American province.93 The perception, on the part of the left, of a sudden move toward American cultural influences was unfounded, according to Waterhouse, since
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Americanisation had been a part of the cultural scene in Australia since the mid-nineteenth century.94

As Wesleyan-Holiness churches sought to move from 'outsider' to 'insider' status they have tended to reflect those broader aspects of Americanization that have been integrated into Australian evangelicalism, and to minimize those that have not. When the Graham-style altar call was being used by Anglicans, Baptists, and Presbyterians, in the post Crusade era of the early 1960s, Wesleyan-Holiness use of this device would be far less conspicuous, and would not mark them out as a 'fringe' group. On the other hand, more uniquely 'Holiness' expressions, such as waving of the handkerchief in the air as a sign of being 'blessed,' or shouting 'glory!' were minimized in Holiness churches, partly because such behaviours were identified with Pentecostals, a group from which the Holiness people were keen to distance themselves.

VI. ‘Sheep Stealers’ and ‘Sinless Perfectionists’

In spite of the good will generated by Graham, anti-American sentiment among Australian evangelicals survived at least into the 1970s as is clear from the experience of members of the Church of God (Cleveland) and the Church of God (Anderson) who entered the Australian scene in 1973 and 1960 respectively. Pioneer Church of God (Cleveland) missionaries Bill and Winnie McAlpin were not well received by other Christians who considered them 'sheep stealers.' Even among the Pentecostal churches they were viewed as outsiders.95 The lack of cooperation from other Christians made their work more difficult. Not only was there no denominational connection, and little fellowship with others, they were told in no uncertain terms that they were not welcome in Australia. Viewed as being 'sinless perfectionists,' whose presence was detrimental to the Christian cause, they were urged to 'denounce' their affiliation with the American church.96

The Church of God (Cleveland) seemed neither fish nor fowl. It belonged to the Pentecostal-Holiness family of churches, a group of churches that emerged in the Southern United States, whose Appalachian expression of religion was markedly more frantic than in the North. The precursors of modern-day Pentecostalism, they adopted a 'three-stage' way of salvation, seeing 'speaking in tongues' as a sign of a special 'baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire,' subsequent to both conversion and entire sanctification.97 The churches the McAlpins sought to associate with in Australia, and which kept them at arms length, were Pentecostal groups such as the Assemblies of God. There was no involvement at all with Wesleyan-Holiness groups.98 The Pentecostals would not associate with them because they were considered too Holiness, and the Holiness churches would not associate with them because they were too Pentecostal.99 There was theological opposition to the doctrine of sanctification held by the Church of God on the part of other Pentecostals, who believed them to be not quite orthodox and too rigid in their lifestyle prohibitions.

Harold Mcloud, General Overseer of the Australian work from 1984 to 1995, found that he gained greater acceptance among some Uniting Church and Catholic churches than from the Assemblies of God, which seemed to have held the Church of God at arms length because it was perceived as an American group in competition with it. As a result, Church of God leaders were not invited to participate in any multi-church crusades or organizing committees.100 The fact that the Church of God did not fit neatly into either the Holiness or the Pentecostal camp, meant that one aspect of its self identification would inevitably be muted if it was to find its place among the existing churches in Australia.

The history of the Church of God (Cleveland) in Australia is marked by a striking ethnic diversity. Members of Church of God congregations in other countries would emigrate from their home countries and establish congregations in their new homeland soon after arrival in Australia.101 Like the Church of the Nazarene, the Church of God (Cleveland) attracted significant numbers of
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Aboriginal Australians into its ranks. Tent meetings were regularly held amongst Aboriginal communities in rural New South Wales from 1979 and throughout the 1980s. By 1991 the New Testament Church of God (as it was then known in Australia) had grown from one family to a total of 21 churches and missions and approximately 1300 members. The Church of God website currently includes 35 churches. Here is a church energetically established by American, Aboriginal, White Australian, Fijian, Romanian, Spanish, and Filipino congregations who seemed able, despite their cultural differences, to unite. Perhaps their unity, in spite of the divergence of their cultures arose out of a shared sense of dislocation, as well as a shared religious experience.

Paul Brodwin has traced the manner in which members of the Haitian diaspora in the US gathered into Pentecostal churches, which provided a form of collective defense and moralizing that protected against a loss of social cohesion in the face of the temptations of secularism. Harold McLeod recalled that the immigrant Church of God congregations in Australia held much stricter views than American Church of God adherents on things such as dress codes, use of alcohol and tobacco, and the prohibiting of worldly entertainment. In Brodwin's study, the immigrant Haitians tended to reflect the more conservative features of earlier formative Pentecostalism. Immigrant Church of God communities in Australia would seem to bear out this thesis.

Perhaps the growth of the Church of God (Cleveland) was also enhanced by the fact that the immigrant communities did not necessarily share the anti-American sentiment of many Australians. Winnie McAlpin remembers that her husband Bill's style of pulpit ministry was totally different to the Australian style and that he made no effort to change. According to Mrs. McAlpin, preaching style at that time in Australia was more muted than in America. It was 'more like a Sunday School teacher...teaching rather than preaching...[in

preaching] the American manner was a little more demonstrative, a little more forceful...that was...a little bit frightening to some people coming in seeing this vast difference. Some people really loved it. Some people were scared to death.'

When the McAlpins held evangelistic meetings in Busselton WA soon after their arrival in Australia, some of the members of this conservative rural farming community of about 10,000 people disapproved of the emotionalism of the meetings. When about 20 children were 'moved to tears of repentance' at an altar service some parents withdrew their involvement. Attendances after that were small. Bill was told, 'We've heard about you American preachers. You have some sort of powder that you put on the kids. It affects them and makes them do crazy things. We didn't see you but you must have done that.' The Church of God had the practice of a 'concert of prayer,' during which everybody prayed out loud all at once. Australians didn't appreciate this practice, thinking it was fanaticism. When asked whether there was anti-American sentiment on the part of Australians, the McAlpins answered strongly in the affirmative. Harold McLeod also found it important not to wear his American identity on his sleeve.

Malcolm Hughes remembers the strength of the opposition to the Church of God (Anderson).
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We were often misunderstood, and...viewed as another one of those strange American cults, sects, and at that time there were...a lot of problems...with people being kidnapped and taken into cults, and all of that sort of thing, and there was all the rescuing and deprogramming going on, and so forth, and I think that when you put the sign on the door that said Church of God, primarily a lot of people assumed that we were another one of those strange groups, and it took a lot of one on one communication, a lot of convincing, that we...really had very little to differ from Methodist and Church of Christ people and a lot of other Wesleyan groups, that we have a lot of the same roots.  

VII. American Imperialism or the Production of Modernity?

Were the Wesleyan-Holiness churches examples of a kind of American religious imperialism? Or were they authentically Australian religious communities who looked to the United States as an older sibling able to give them a head start and provide connection to a broader international community?

The question of whether the charge of 'American imperialism' is a valid one lies at the heart of Bell and Bell’s treatment of ‘Americanization.’ Where Philip Adams and Donald Horne raise concerns about Australia being a victim of both British and American imperialism, Bell and Bell contend that Australia’s relationship with America is ‘embedded in more general processes of modernization and globalization.’ Charges of American cultural and political ‘imperialism’ are often simplistic and often overstated. Those things labelled as instances of the ‘Americanization’ of society and culture may in fact be no more than examples of cross-cultural and internationalist modernisation. Modern nations such as Australia, share with the United States, and other nations, in an emerging global culture, some aspects of which might be expressed in ways seen to be ‘American’ but whose American origins are only secondary to their significance as expressions of a global movement.
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the resistance to Wesleyan-Holiness churches was real and would only begin to be broken down as broader evangelicalism itself became Americanized in the wake of Billy Graham-style revivalism.

Piggin sees Anglican evangelicalism’s hegemony as a distinctive feature of Australian evangelicalism. Its suspicion and rejection of ‘the highly individualistic theology of the indwelling Spirit’ is ‘a vital point for understanding the differences in the ambience of American and Australian spiritual life.’ This is significant, for it is just this ‘highly individualistic theology of the indwelling Spirit’ that has been a hallmark of the Wesleyan-Holiness churches. The Anglican evangelical establishment has always been opposed to what it has labelled ‘sinless perfectionism,’ and Piggin sees the retreat into ‘second blessing’ holiness on the part of some Anglicans at Moore College in the 1950s as an unhealthy response to encroaching liberalism, and as a threat to healthy evangelicalism.\[240\]

In an earlier essay, Piggin sets out a number of important questions.

Was Australian evangelicalism shaped primarily and definitively at the time of the origins of Australian settlement? Or have exogenous factors constituted the nature of Australian evangelicalism either by continuing to influence it as it grows or by repeatedly reintroducing varieties of it after other implants have died or grown too sickly to reproduce? What have been the patterns of interaction between evangelicalism and social and cultural forces in Australia, and how do they compare with such interactions in Britain and America?\[251\]

Such a comparative study is not within the scope of this thesis, but it may safely be asserted that ‘exogenous factors’ have indeed shaped Australian evangelicalism and that one of those factors has been American evangelicalism. David Hilliard has traced the reception of religion in post-war suburbia and found that through suburbanization threatened denominational ties and church attendance, ‘the spread of Sunday Schools, outdoor rallies, and American-based evangelism’ helped to counter this drift.\[222\] It is interesting to note that all three of these methods were widely utilized by the Wesleyan-Holiness

churches. In fact, through much of the early history of the Wesleyans and the Nazarenes, Sunday School attendance in the suburbs far outstripped adult church attendance.\[223\]

Lotman’s model of cultural importation presupposes a fairly stable or even passive ‘receiving culture,’ which is acted upon by an outside culture perceived as superior to the local product. Australian evangelicalism was no such static culture. It cannot be understood as something ‘floating above’ or ‘suspended over’ the cultural, political, and social forces that shaped Australia broadly during this, or any historical period. It may be argued that it was ‘Americanised’ in the post-war years only to the extent that everything else in Australia was ‘Americanised.’ The case of the Wesleyan-Holiness churches in Australia differs from Lotman’s model in that the cultural import [American evangelicalism] was not at first considered a superior product. In fact, it was viewed with suspicion. The engagement and modification that took place over time, however, led to a gradual tendency to admire American approaches, especially the well-oiled machinery of American evangelistic techniques, and to adopt them in Australia until the American origins were either forgotten or not seen as important.

Conclusion

It is doubtful that the Wesleyan-Holiness churches themselves have had a significant shaping influence on Australian evangelicalism. They have been too small in number and too marginalized to be granted much leverage. However, they emerged as a new expression of the Holiness impetus that had been present in Australian evangelicalism earlier, primarily through Methodism, and also the Keswick Convention movement, but which had all but died out. As much as they would like to think otherwise, the doctrine and experience of ‘entire sanctification’ as a second work of grace was not introduced to this country by the American Wesleyan-Holiness churches, though it was revived by them. Other evangelicals influenced by earlier forms of ‘Holiness’ teaching were drawn to the new Holiness groups because they recognized an echo of this older, but now almost forgotten tradition. These churches were not

\[239\] See statistical reports in Church of the Nazarene Australia District Assembly Minutes, passim. In 1951 adult Wesleyan membership was 55 and Sunday School attendance was 557! Don Hardgrave, For Such a Time: A History of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Australia (Brisbane: A Pleasant Surprise, 1988), p. 71.
instances of American religious imperialism, but authentic movements of Australian Christians finding in their American cousins willing ‘sponsors’ who could provide legitimacy for their efforts by links with recognized and established denominations. The fact that these ‘sponsoring’ denominations were American, far from being seen as an advantage, was seen by Australian and American church leaders alike, as a liability. These groups continued to be marginalized because of their perceived American origins and control. Only as features of American evangelicalism began to be more widely accepted among Australian evangelicals and seen as authentically Australian and not an American import, did the holiness churches become less ‘queer’ and, as we will see in chapter five, less sect-like.

THE ‘PROBLEM’ OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY

David Sullivan

1. Introduction

Calling the differentiated identities of the Trinity ‘Persons’ raises peculiar sorts of problems, not least because such a term runs the risks of basing the description of the trinitarian identities upon our understanding of human persons. One of the serious difficulties with this approach is that the three trinitarian identities exist as One Being, whilst human persons are separates beings.

So we may ask, how is it that the Holy Spirit exists as a distinct identity within the Trinity, yet exists in one being with the Father and the Son? There is a further specific problem we may raise that is imposed by Scripture. If the spirit is what God is, how can we identify the Holy Spirit specifically as ‘the’ Spirit of God?

The raising of this particular problem is also important in a religious sense. For example, we may ask whether there is anything distinctive about invoking the Holy Spirit as against invoking God. We would expect that the trinity of the Godhead is purposeful and meaningful, and that a monadic or unitarian Godhead is therefore either inconceivable, or at least would have a different purpose and meaning to the trinitarian God. We might put the questions reverently in this way: what difference as against the other members of the Trinity does the Holy Spirit make?

Or we may yet put the matter in another way. In the contemporary world, there is particular attention given to the experience of the Holy Spirit and his work in the world. These experiences are considered to be not only private, nor limited to isolated groups. Christian theology
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(This problem and the one following are posed by Robert Jenson in his Systematic Theology, Vol 1 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 146.)