

Forty Years On: An Evangelical Divide Revisited

Andrew Grills

It is now forty years since the events of October, 1966 when Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones and John Stott took very different ecclesiological positions on the issue of separation. This essay does not assess in detail the theological validity of their respective positions, but the practical impact the two men had on the ecclesiological debate. It argues that both men had grand visions for the future of evangelicalism in Britain, yet both men adopted partially flawed means to pursue those visions. Lloyd-Jones adopted an increasingly negative approach after 1966 and was largely responsible for opening a rift between British evangelicals that has yet to be fully bridged. Stott's positive approach to the issue had the greater impact and was the driving force behind the evangelical watershed that occurred at Keele in 1967. Yet he too adopted methods after 1967 that were partially flawed and, despite their apparent success, did not come without cost for Anglican evangelicals.

Two men tower above the landscape of twentieth century British evangelicalism—Martyn Lloyd-Jones and John Stott. By 1960 they were pulpit giants in an age when great preaching appeared to be in decline. They combined incisive exposition of the Scriptures with compelling application that moved the hearts and minds of their hearers. Both were leaders of their respective church groupings, both had begun to command an international audience. A warm personal relationship existed between the two and for many years they stood united at the nexus of an informal inter-denominational evangelical communion that was cherished by Free Church and Anglican evangelicals alike.

This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the breaking of that unity in the watershed events of 18th October, 1966. The dividing issues were separation, secession and schism. The underlying issue was ecclesiological. What was 'the church'? How should it be defined? When was separation necessary? Neither man was content with the *status quo*. For Lloyd-Jones, the time was ripe for greater cross-denominational evangelical unity, separation from the historic

denominations, and even the formation of a new evangelical denomination. For Stott, separation was not a feasible option as Anglican evangelicals were presented with a golden opportunity to increase their influence within the Church of England. Both men made powerful contributions to the debate, but their divergent positions proved irreconcilable and eventually created a division within British evangelicalism that lingers to this day. How have their respective contributions to this ecclesiological debate been assessed?

History has judged the contribution of Lloyd-Jones more harshly. J. I. Packer, the noted scholar and a long-time friend and gospel partner of Lloyd-Jones, described his contribution to parts of the debate as ‘viciously flawed’.¹ Another friend, Alec Moyter, has said that his contribution to the debate in 1966 ‘did nothing for the church at large’ and left ‘a lasting legacy of division and suspicion’.² Others have described his contribution as ‘an irrelevancy from which the evangelical world is still recovering’.³ These negative opinions are supported to a greater or lesser degree by scholars like McGrath, Bebbington, Steer and even the grandson of Lloyd-Jones, Christopher Catherwood. The consensus is of a great man ‘enmeshed in bad arguments’⁴ who ‘retained wide respect as a spiritual guide but was no longer seen as an evangelical statesman ...he became increasingly a voice in the wilderness, as the move to regain the high ground in the denominations gathered momentum’.⁵

John Stott’s contribution on the other hand, has enjoyed almost universal scholarly approbation. The impression created in the works of the historians mentioned above is of a statesmanlike and biblically sound approach to the debate which immeasurably strengthened Anglican evangelicalism by releasing it ‘from the ghetto’,⁶ and guiding it into the sunny uplands of the Keele congress and beyond. There are a few dissenters, but the general consensus is clear.⁷

Forty years may still be too soon to make an authoritative judgement, but it is an appropriate time to re-examine the issues underlying the rift that opened within British Evangelicalism in 1966 and to reassess the enduring impact of its chief protagonists on the course of British evangelicalism. I will argue that the historical consensus is not entirely accurate. There can be no doubt that both Lloyd-Jones and Stott stand as truly great evangelical leaders, men with gospel hearts and a compelling vision for the future of evangelicalism. Yet, while it is not my purpose to rehash the theological validity of their respective

positions, it is my contention that both men adopted means that were in part flawed. Lloyd-Jones adopted an increasingly negative approach towards evangelical unity after 1966 that was largely responsible for opening the enduring rift between British evangelicals. Stott's positive ecclesiology had the greater long term impact and was the driving force behind the evangelical watershed that occurred at Keele in 1967. Yet the events since Keele suggest that Stott's positive vision has not been without cost for British evangelicalism.

Martyn Lloyd-Jones

From the earliest days of his ministry Lloyd-Jones considered ecclesiology an issue of vital importance: 'If your doctrine of the church is wrong eventually you will go wrong everywhere.'⁸ Lloyd-Jones conceived of the church in the traditional evangelical manner as 'a spiritual fellowship of the truly converted, a group that transcended particular ecclesiastical affiliations'.⁹ All that mattered was that a man or woman had experienced the new birth and was in a living relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ. For Lloyd-Jones a member of a church was not necessarily a Christian, but all Christians were members of the church.¹⁰ Moreover, for Lloyd-Jones all true Christians were evangelical Christians, because the evangelical faith and the New Testament faith were synonymous.¹¹ This understanding of the church is clearly reflected in the statement which he authored for the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students (IFES) as early as 1952. The statement read—

The Church of Christ consists of all those....in vital relationship with our Lord Jesus Christ as a result of the 'new birth'. The New Testament itself recognises only two aspects of the Church: (i) the whole company of believers in heaven and on earth; and (ii) the local manifestation which is the gathering in fellowship of all who are in Christ....¹²

But such a view of the church carried with it a logical dilemma that Lloyd-Jones recognised from the first. If the Church is indeed the communion of true believers and its local manifestation was 'the gathering in fellowship of all who are in Christ', what then of those whose denominations were led by men who were clearly not evangelicals and therefore were not in Christ? From at least the early 1950s, Lloyd-Jones' solution was unequivocal: they were compromised and evangelicals should leave and fellowship with other true gospel-believing Christians.¹³ To remain within a compromised denomination, and particularly a compromised state church denomination,¹⁴ was logically untenable.

Also logically untenable was any move towards ecumenism, either within or across the denominations, on any other basis than a unified belief in the gospel (evangelical) message. The form of ecumenism, which was on the rise in several denominations in Britain, was nothing less than a ‘menace to the true meaning of the gospel’.¹⁵ Closely interlinked with this position was Lloyd-Jones’ belief in the doctrine of the remnant and his concept of schism. For Lloyd-Jones ‘nothing is so opposed to the Biblical teaching as the idea that numbers and powerful organisation alone count’—ecumenism simply would not equate with spiritual strength.¹⁶ In fact such an idea was ‘the very opposite of the great Biblical doctrine of “the remnant”...’. Only when the remnant (comprised of the truly converted) came out of the compromised denominations could the British church expect revival for, as he argued, ‘there is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few’. (1 Sam. 14:6).¹⁷ For Lloyd-Jones this obligation to come out was not schism, indeed separation from nominal Christians and those in serious doctrinal error had never been schism: there was no question that the reformation was justified. Rather, ‘the only people who could be guilty of the sin of schism were those who in reality belonged to the body of Christ....and yet remained separate from one another in different denominations. They (and they alone) could be guilty of that sin (schism)’.¹⁸

These were strong opinions on ecclesiological separation, but for many years Lloyd-Jones was content to hold them and yet work positively towards closer practical union between evangelicals. He believed that evangelical Anglicanism was a misnomer, but he was nevertheless happy to work together with Anglicans in IFES, The Evangelical Alliance (EA), the Tyndale Fellowship, the Puritan Conference and the Westminster Fraternal for ministers. By 1966, however, Lloyd-Jones had come to believe that the ecumenical situation was such that strong action was required by evangelicals.¹⁹ His beliefs did not change, but from 1966 his ‘method of putting them into practice and their relative importance in relation to other issues’ did.²⁰

October, 1966

On October 18th, 1966, Lloyd-Jones took the opportunity of an EA meeting to propel the issue of separation to centre stage. The topic of the meeting, at which most of the prominent evangelical leaders and many clergy and laymen were present, was evangelical unity. Lloyd-Jones had been asked to give the

keynote address after John Stott, who was the meeting's chairman, had taken ten minutes to explain his ecclesiological decision to remain within the Church of England. In what rapidly developed into an impassioned advocacy of the case for separation from mixed denominations, Lloyd-Jones argued—

The Church surely, is not a paper definition. It does not consist in Articles or a confession of faith. It consists of living people. Sometimes we are told that the Church is a place in which a man can fish, but surely the church does not consist of unconverted people. It consists of saints.²¹

But Lloyd-Jones went further. Clearly responding to John Stott's position on remaining within the Anglican Church he went on to 'make an appeal'—

What reasons have we for not coming together?...Some say we would miss evangelistic opportunities if we left the denominations, but I say 'where is the Holy Spirit?' Surely, he will honour the truth if we hold together. Evangelicals spend their time criticising their own leaders, but these men are still your leaders....you cannot disassociate yourselves from the church to which you belong. That is a contradictory position, and one that the man in the street must find very hard to understand.²²

The language was impassioned and the point of the appeal was unmistakable: evangelicals in mixed denominations should 'come out'.²³ But exactly what specific action Lloyd-Jones was advocating continues to be hotly disputed. Many believe that the call was for evangelicals to leave the mixed denominations and join together in the creation of a new evangelical denomination. Others, appealing to Lloyd-Jones' previous writings, have argued that he only urged evangelicals to come out of the denominations into a tighter unity between evangelical churches.²⁴

Whatever Lloyd-Jones may have intended, the effect of his 'appeal' was an immediate polarisation within the British evangelical world. At the conclusion of Lloyd-Jones's address, John Stott stood and made a dissenting statement.²⁵ The religious press took up the issue and Lloyd-Jones' proposal was described as 'hare brained' by some, divisive by others and by still others as 'visionary'.²⁶ Although it polarised evangelical opinion, up to this point Lloyd-Jones contribution to the ecclesiological debate should not be considered as negative. He had a right to express an opinion that he supported from Scripture and was asked to do this very thing by the conveners of the EA meeting.²⁷ Nor is controversy in itself a bad thing

if it is based on solid biblical doctrine and conducted in love. Lloyd-Jones' negative contribution at this point lay in a lack of specificity on his practical solution to the issue he raised: he incisively identified a problem, but the details of his solution were nebulous. As such his contribution had the practical effect of further clouding an already emotive debate.²⁸

But it is clear that October, 1966 was a watershed for Lloyd-Jones. From this point on his ecclesiological position took on increasing importance as a 'gospel issue'. As such his contribution to the debate became primarily a negative one and resulted in almost the exact opposite of the increased unity he had set out to achieve. A month after his EA address he ended the Westminster Fellowship with the words, 'I am closing the fellowship today. The Anglicans are not with us.'²⁹ The move caused astonishment and sorrow among the many ministers from a variety of denominations that had benefited from the grouping. It was re-formed some time later, but it was no longer open to Anglicans.³⁰ Three years later the same ecclesiological issue led to the serious weakening of the Puritan Conference. This conference had done much, under the joint leadership of Lloyd-Jones and the Anglican, J. I. Packer, to deepen evangelical life by exposing its members to the doctrines and lives of the Puritans. In 1970 Packer was told by Lloyd-Jones that his continued involvement in the Anglican Church meant that his presence within the conference was no longer required.³¹

This negative shift by Lloyd-Jones was most prominent in his rhetoric. In November, 1967 he stated at a prominent service that Anglicans who remained in mixed denominations were 'guilty by association' and were, in fact, guilty of a 'denial of the evangelical, the only true faith'.³² Further, he asserted that 'the idea that Evangelicals can infiltrate an established church...and reform it, and turn it into an evangelical body, is midsummer madness'.³³ Later he went even further to speak of those evangelicals who 'have not bowed the knee to Baal' or become 'mixed up with infidels and sceptics and deniers of the truth'.³⁴ Irrespective of whether Lloyd-Jones' position was right or wrong, the strong language he used to advocate it, served to undermine the very cross-denominational evangelical unity he so greatly desired.

Many evangelicals did heed his clarion call for separation. The British Evangelical Council was immeasurably strengthened by his support and by 1981 had more than 2000 affiliated congregations.³⁵ But many more

evangelicals did not heed the call, particularly among evangelical Anglicans. To them Lloyd-Jones had ‘marooned himself ecclesiastically’³⁶ and his influence among them never recovered. More than that, for some it actually served to strengthen their commitment to the Church of England. As R. T. France has stated ‘Lloyd-Jones’ appeal....made us more clearly aware that our denominational context was more than just a flag of convenience, we became more conscious of being evangelical Anglicans, not Anglican evangelicals’.³⁷

There can be no doubt that Lloyd-Jones’ vision of greater evangelical unity centred on the gospel of Jesus Christ was a great and positive one. But after 1966 his means of achieving that vision were negative and counter-productive. In the words of Packer, he placed ‘a matter of opinion within the definition of an “uncompromising gospel basis” and that was a serious if not sectarian development’.³⁸ Lloyd-Jones was an influential evangelical leader and the manner in which he contributed to the debate opened up a broad division within English evangelicalism and ‘bitter dispute....where there had hitherto been friendly disagreement’.³⁹ It may well be that Lloyd-Jones’ vision for ‘unity’ was both positive and biblical, but by making an essentially ecclesiological issue the touchstone of orthodoxy he was, ironically, primarily responsible for creating a rift within British evangelicalism that has yet to be completely bridged.⁴⁰

John Stott

Balanced against Lloyd-Jones’ position on separation was John Stott. In one sense their positions had much in common. Like Lloyd-Jones, Stott (at least initially) held to a traditional evangelical ecclesiology in the sense that the Church was primarily an invisible community that was seen to ‘transcend all institutions and to lie precisely in that invisible, yet very real, spiritual fellowship across denominational boundaries’.⁴¹ This was reflected in his statements that he was first and foremost a Christian following Jesus Christ, then an Evangelical Christian, and only then an Anglican. He therefore preferred the term ‘Anglican Evangelical’ with Evangelical as the noun and Anglican as the adjective, rather than Evangelical Anglican which suggested the converse.⁴² Moreover, like Lloyd-Jones, Stott would maintain throughout his ministry that the ‘the evangelical faith is nothing other than the historic Christian faith’.⁴³ This ecclesiastical agreement underlay much of the cooperation between the two leaders prior to 1966 and such was its strength that Lloyd-Jones even asked Stott if he would take over Lloyd-Jones’ own church (The Westminster Chapel) on his retirement.

Yet the conclusion that Stott drew from this ecclesiology was radically different from that of Lloyd-Jones. Stott had seriously considered the issue of secession in the 1950s, but by the 1960s had firmly decided that his place was within the Church of England.⁴⁴ Stott expressed this contrary opinion on the night of Lloyd-Jones' address to the EA by stressing that formularies of the Anglican Church were both biblical and evangelical and that evangelicals were therefore Anglican loyalists, and it was non-evangelicals who were the deviationists and who should consider secession.⁴⁵ Stott later elaborated on this position—

....some evangelicals like myself, believe it is the will of God to remain in a Church that is sometimes called a 'mixed denomination'. At least until it becomes apostate and ceases to be a church, we believe it is our duty to remain in it and bear witness to the truth as we have been given to understand it.⁴⁶

Stott never ruled out the possibility of separation.⁴⁷ Asked in 1978 what he would do if his loyalty to the Christian faith clashed with his loyalty to the Church he stated unequivocally, 'One would secede from the Church of England' but he went on to add—

But I don't see that happening....I would only contemplate seceding if the official doctrine of the Church of England denied the Gospel as I have been given to understand it in any fundamental particular. Then, and not till then, would be the time to secede.⁴⁸

In essence Stott believed that the Church of England was an excellent church in theory if not in practice, and he saw it as his task to work towards making theory conform with practice. In his earlier ministry, most of his work outside his parish had been inter-denominational, through the InterVarsity fellowship (later renamed the Universities and Colleges Christian Fellowship), but his Anglican churchmanship revealed itself when challenged.

It was this belief that lay behind Stott's unusual intervention after Lloyd-Jones' message on 18th October, 1966. Stott was concerned that many young evangelical Anglican clergy had been persuaded by Lloyd-Jones' exhortation.⁴⁹ In a spontaneous attempt to dissuade these young men he stood and argued that 'history is against Dr. Jones' in that previous attempts at evangelical unity had failed and that 'Scripture is against him' in that 'the remnant was within the Church and not outside it'.⁵⁰ This was an improper use of the chair and John

Stott admitted as much in a later apology to Lloyd-Jones.⁵¹ Stott's glib statement that Scripture was against Lloyd-Jones—without any elaboration—must have infuriated Lloyd-Jones and, had he not held his temper in check, could well have initiated an ugly continuance of the debate in a dangerously supercharged atmosphere. Indeed Lloyd-Jones stated that he 'scarcely restrained himself from answering'.⁵² While evangelical Anglicans seem to have quickly forgotten this incident, this snub to Lloyd-Jones has proved to be a lingering hurt among non-Anglican evangelicals. Stott's action that night placed additional and unnecessary stress upon an already divisive issue and should be seen, in form if not in substance, as a primarily negative contribution to the debate. Yet Stott's contribution to the debate of October, 1966 was insignificant compared with his role in the watershed that occurred at Keele the following year.

Keele 67

The first National Evangelical Anglican Congress (NEAC) was held at Keele University in April, 1967. Jointly chaired by Stott and Sir Norman Anderson, and with Dr. J. I. Packer doing much of the planning, it was comprised of over 1000 evangelical Anglican laymen and clergy. It is almost universally recognised as marking the 'end of a numerically significant separatist party within Anglican evangelicalism'.⁵³ No longer would evangelicals stand uncomfortably on brink of the Church of England. 'We are,' the report stated, 'increasingly anxious to play our part in the Church of England....it is reform we desire not separation.'⁵⁴ Moreover, it expressed a more positive attitude to ecumenism—'We desire to enter this ecumenical dialogue fully. We are no longer content to stand apart from those with whom we disagree.'⁵⁵ As proof positive of this the Archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey, who had been no friend of the evangelicals, was invited to open the congress.⁵⁶ While it is simplistic to see Keele as an Anglican response to the call for separation, it was undoubtedly an antithetical approach to that of Lloyd-Jones.⁵⁷ Rather than focusing on evangelical cross-denominational unity, and despite the lip service in Point 93 of the printed statement, evangelicals were encouraged to place loyalty to the Church of England above that of fellow evangelicals.⁵⁸ This was a radical change in the approach to this ecclesiological debate for which John Stott, as the joint chairmen and driving force behind Keele, was primarily responsible.

There is little doubt that Stott's contribution to the separation debate at Keele was both profound and enduring. It was Stott's vision and not Lloyd-Jones' that

carried the day. It ushered in a new acceptance of evangelicals as legitimate players in Anglican Church politics and did much to improve their media image. Nevertheless, it should also be recognised that Stott's contribution to these developments was by no means universally positive for Anglican Evangelicals.

Stott sought to increase the impact of the evangelicals within the Church of England. Yet the Church of England contained a powerful high church element and, if this group was to be won over, evangelicals would be required to accept some traditionally high church emphases.⁵⁹ To embrace membership in a national Church demands, at least in part, an acceptance of the dominant ecclesiology of that body. This began with the acceptance of Ramsey on the platform,⁶⁰ but more important still was the substantive concession to the Anglo-Catholics in Point 76 of the Keele statement where the participants committed themselves to work towards weekly communion as the central corporate service of the church.⁶¹ These may have been relatively minor concessions, but the process, once started, rapidly gathered momentum. At the second NEAC in Nottingham in 1977, again under the leadership of Stott, the congress statement could confidently assert that 'the Church is, and must be, defined sacramentally by baptism....we could do worse, therefore, than use it as our working definition of the Church'.⁶² While Stott maintained his understanding of the Church as an invisible body, in practice his position of leadership in both Keele and Nottingham lent support to a decidedly unevangelical concept of the church as the community of those baptised.⁶³

This, however, was not the only questionable element of Stott's ecumenical contribution. The admission at Keele that all within the Anglican church should be considered 'Christians' and all could learn from each other in the ecumenical debate, appear on the surface wise and tolerant.⁶⁴ In reality they come dangerously close to undermining the very foundation of the evangelical gospel. No longer would evangelicals and their gospel message constitute the true Anglican Church, they were now part of a broader collective all of whom have access to the gospel light. John Stott led strongly in this direction as his 1988 Essentials dialogue with a noted liberal Anglican, David Edwards, makes clear. In the dialogue Edwards denies many of the essentials of the Christian faith including the fall of man, the need for atonement by a divine redeemer and the physical resurrection of Christ. Yet Stott could say he was 'impressed by David Edwards' sincere Christian profession' and that those like him who

deny the virgin birth and the bodily resurrection of Christ do not ‘forfeit the right to be called Christians’.⁶⁵ Whether this is seen as a positive or negative development depends on one’s standpoint. What is surely not in question is that it was a major departure from historic evangelical thought.⁶⁶ Given this new tolerance, it is perhaps little wonder that while evangelical numbers have grown within the Church of England the theology of those who hold to that definition has broadened well beyond the borders of historic evangelicalism.⁶⁷

While the new direction Stott established at Keele has resulted in more bishops from the evangelical stable and even an evangelical primate in George Carey, this has not proved altogether positive for the evangelical cause. The very nature of operating in such an eclectic ecclesiastical environment has resulted in some of these men drifting progressively away from their evangelical moorings.⁶⁸ Indeed, many consider that rather than decrease the pressure on evangelicals within the church, this pressure has continued to increase since Keele. As one lecturer at Wycliffe Hall remarked—‘We are supposed to have more evangelical bishops in the House of Bishops than ever before, and yet the Episcopal attack on evangelicalism continues unabated.’⁶⁹ Stott’s vision may have prevailed, bringing with it many positive aspects, but it came at the cost of diluting historic British evangelicalism. As Gerald Bray put it—

What Dr. Lloyd-Jones saw clearly—more clearly, one feels than either Dr. Packer or John Stott did—was that Anglican Evangelicals were in danger of losing their cutting edge if they got too involved in the structures of the Church of England.⁷⁰

Conclusion

Martyn Lloyd-Jones and John Stott were probably the two greatest leaders of twentieth century British evangelicalism, but their views on ecclesiology were vastly different. For Lloyd-Jones the ‘mixed denominations’ were inherently compromised. The only feasible solution was for the remnant to leave them and unite with other evangelicals in a pure cross-denominational body that could hope to be used by God as the means of revival. To stay was to quench the Holy Spirit, confuse the gospel message of the church and risk inevitable doctrinal contamination. For John Stott, the call to stay within the Church of England was just as compelling. It was the task of the remnant to stay and, by God’s grace, to be part of a great and glorious gospel reformation that would return the Church of England to its biblical roots in the 39 Articles. It is to the

grievous loss of British evangelicalism that both men chose partly flawed means to implement their vision. Lloyd-Jones retreated behind an excessively narrow evangelical barricade that further splintered the evangelical unity he so dearly desired; Stott boldly led Anglican evangelicalism into the broad stream of the Church of England where, despite many gains, its clarity and distinctiveness are in serious danger of being diffused into the greater flow. Both were great evangelical leaders, both made great contributions to the ecclesiological debate. It was Stott's view that triumphed, but forty years of hindsight may give cause to conservative evangelicals to rue the price that his vision demanded.

ANDREW GRILLS is a Captain in the Australian Regular Army. He is currently an Anglican ordinand at Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia where he is completing his study prior to serving as a chaplain in the Australian Army.

ENDNOTES

1. J. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones (1899-1981) and Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002), p. 131.
2. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 97.
3. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 97.
4. J. I. Packer quoted in Murray, I. H., *Evangelicalism Divided: A record of Crucial Change in the years 1950-2000* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2000), p. 95.
5. A. McGrath quoted in Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided*, p. 126-27.
6. Buchanan, C., quoted in D. W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: a History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (Unwin Hyman: London, 1989), p. 250.
7. Murray, Barclay and the editors of the 'Foundations' magazine continue to harbour serious doubts.
8. E. Davies, "18th October 1966: Its context, message and significance," *Foundations*, No. 37 (Autumn 1996): 7.
9. K. J. Vanhoozer, "Evangelicalism and the Church: The company of the gospel," in C. Bartholomew, R. Parry and A. West, *The Futures of Evangelicalism: issues and prospects* (IVP: Leicester, 2003), p. 46.
10. His ecclesiology can be equated with what Vanhoozer more generally has described as 'the distinction between the invisible church of the truly converted and the church as a visible institution, whose members include both believers and nominal Christians' Vanhoozer, 'Evangelicalism and Church', p. 47.
11. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 89.

12. C. Catherwood, *Five Evangelical Leaders* (Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1984,) p. 77. Lloyd-Jones himself had been a Congregationalist, and Westminster Chapel had been a Congregationalist church, but he became convinced that Congregationalists should discard their suspicion of confessions of faith, and he affiliated Westminster Chapel to the Fellowship of Independent Evangelical Churches, which is united by an Evangelical confession of faith.
13. It must be noted that Lloyd-Jones never argued for a 'pure church' in the sense that at any given time all in a local fellowship would be truly converted. His concern was with a situation where unconverted people gained positions of leadership within an established denomination and evangelicals become a minority.
14. For Lloyd-Jones the 'whole notion of a state church is a complete contradiction of the basic statement of the New Testament about the nature of the Church'. Lloyd-Jones quoted in Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 90.
15. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 83. Lloyd-Jones stated in 1962: 'Fellowship exists only among those who believe, as the result of the operation of the Holy Spirit, these essential truths concerning man's lost estate—that we are all by nature children of wrath—and the action of God in Christ Jesus for our salvation and restoration....How ridiculous it is to suggest that there can be fellowship and unity between those who believe they are saved and have access into God's presence solely because in His great love he made his own Son "to be sin for us" and "spared him not but delivered him up for us" and those who believe that the death of Christ was a great tragedy, but that God forgives us even that, and that ultimately we save ourselves by obedience, good works and our practice of religion.' M. Lloyd-Jones, *The Basis of Christian Unity* (http://www.mlj.org.uk/emw_mag/October1966.htm) 1962, p. 6. Cited 22 September, 2004.
16. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 91.
17. M. Lloyd- Jones, "The Basis of Christian Unity," p. 7.
18. M. Lloyd-Jones, "Relations within Evangelicalism," (http://www.mlj.org.uk/emw_mag/October1966.htm.) 1962, p. 4. Cited 22 September, 2004.
19. While the ecumenical movement has come to very little in the decades since the 1960s, at that time Lloyd-Jones' belief that the British ecumenical movement was gathering irresistible momentum was widely held by Catholics and Protestants alike.
20. Catherwood, *Five Evangelical Leaders*, p. 77.
21. Lloyd-Jones, quoted in "October 1966" http://www.mlj.org.uk/emw_mag/October1966.htm 1996, p. 1. Cited 22 Sept., 2004.
22. M. Lloyd-Jones, quoted in "October 1966," p. 2.
23. Lloyd-Jones argued that the principle of the remnant meant that even with small

- numbers ‘if we stand for God’s truth we can be sure that God will honour and bless us’. Lloyd-Jones, M. quoted in ‘October 1966’ (http://www.mlj.org.uk/emw_mag/October1966.htm), 1996, p. 2. Cited 22 September, 2004.
24. The evidence is mixed but, as Brencher has shown, it seems likely that Lloyd-Jones aim was for a ‘deliberate and intentional’ move towards a new and formal evangelical alignment. It must be stated, however, that Lloyd-Jones was never under the allusion that a new evangelical alignment would remain doctrinally pure forever. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 99.
 25. Dudley-Smith, T., *John Stott: A Global Ministry* (Leicester: IVP, 2001), p. 68.
 26. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, p. 267.
 27. Lloyd-Jones may have exceeded his brief in the strength in which he put forward his view, but this could hardly have been unanticipated by the EA. His views, the passion with which he held them and the potential effects of his persuasive eloquence on his hearers were widely known.
 28. That this in fact occurred is proven by the continuing debate about what it was that Lloyd-Jones actually advocated. Indeed, the magazine, *Foundations*, could still devote an entire issue to this question in 1996, thirty years after the EA conference.
 29. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 106.
 30. There can be little doubt, as Carson and Brencher have pointed out, that Lloyd-Jones’ Welsh nationality contributed to what one commentator has called his ‘almost pathological loathing’ of the C. of E. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, 168.
 31. This position was not explicitly stated by Lloyd-Jones, but Packer and several others were left in no doubt that his participation in the Anglican ecumenical movement was the reason for the dismissal.
 32. Lloyd-Jones quoted in Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 127.
 33. E. Davies, “1966: The historical background,” *Foundations*, No. 37, (Autumn 1996): 2.
 34. Lloyd-Jones quoted in Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, 134.
 35. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, p. 267.
 36. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 230.
 37. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 131.
 38. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 108.
 39. McGrath quoted in Dudley-Smith, *John Stott*, p. 69.
 40. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 129.
 41. G. Vandervelde, “The challenge of evangelical ecclesiology,” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 27 (2003): 6.
 42. R. Steer, *Guarding the Holy Fire: The Evangelicalism of John R. W. Stott, J. I.*

- Packer and Alister McGrath* (Baker: Grand Rapids, 1999), p. 10.
43. Dudley-Smith, *John Stott*, p. 15.
 44. Stott has candidly remarked that ‘one of the topics discussed in the eclectic society in the 1950s was whether we should stay in the Church of England and on what grounds’. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 102.
 45. This was the substance of his preliminary address at the EA in October 1966. Dudley-Smith, *John Stott*, p. 66.
 46. Dudley-Smith, *John Stott*, p. 70.
 47. It must be noted, however, that Stott has progressively softened the condition on which secession would be required. In 1993 he remarked that if Bishop Spong’s moral agenda were to become the official doctrine he could not stay, but seven years later he stated that even then he ‘would be minded, not without pain, to stay on and continue the debate for some time’. Dudley-Smith, *John Stott*, p. 433.
 48. Dudley-Smith, *John Stott*, p. 71.
 49. Stott later said, ‘from the platform I could see younger men with flushed faces, sitting on the edge of their seat, hanging on every word, and probably ready to go home and write their letter of resignation that very night’. Dudley-Smith, *John Stott*, p. 67.
 50. Dudley-Smith, *John Stott*, p. 68.
 51. Dudley-Smith, *John Stott*, p. 68. Stott did not, however, apologise for what he said.
 52. Dudley-Smith, *John Stott*, p. 68.
 53. E. Davies, “Then and Now: 1966-1996,” (*Foundations*, No. 37, (Autumn 1996): 4.
 54. P. Crowe, (ed.), *Keele 1967: the National Evangelical Anglican Congress Statement* (Falcon: London, 1967), p. 36.
 55. Crowe, *Keele 1967*, p. 37.
 56. Ramsey had previously described evangelicals as ‘heretics’ among other things. Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided*, p. 41.
 57. Planning for Keele had been well underway before October, 1966.
 58. Point 93 stated, ‘We value our present fellowship and co-operation with our fellow evangelicals in other churches, to whom we are specifically bound by a common understanding of the faith, and we desire a strengthening of these relations.’ Crowe, *Keele, 1967*, p. 39. This was viewed as nothing more than token by many Free-Church evangelicals who correctly interpreted Keele as, in practice, a move away from cross-denominational evangelical unity.
 59. Barclay, O., *Evangelicalism in Britain 1935-1995: a personal sketch* (IVP: Leicester, 1997), p. 84.
 60. Lloyd Jones was ‘amazed’ that such a man could be ‘called onto an evangelical

platform....I still personally have to be satisfied that the man is really a Christian in the New Testament sense of the word'. Brencher, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones*, p. 167.

61. Crowe, *Keele 1967*, p. 35.
62. Second National Evangelical Anglican Congress Statement, Nottingham, 1977. Quoted in Barclay, *Evangelicalism in Britain*, p. 101.
63. Barclay has put it well when he states, 'The Anglican enthusiasts for the Keele and Nottingham emphases continued to argue that they were recovering a biblical doctrine of the Church. What they in fact were recovering was a renewed emphasis on the Church of England as the national Church and of the local church as including at least all baptised people.' Barclay, *Evangelicalism in Britain*, p. 102.
64. The Keele statement read: 'we recognize that in dialogue we may have to learn truths held by others to which we have hitherto been blind, as well as to impart to others truths held by us and overlooked by them....we do not suppose that evangelicals have a monopoly on the Spirit's ministry in this regard'. Importantly, however, the document did stress that not all views are 'equally valid'. Crowe, *Keele 1967*, p. 37.
65. D. L. Edwards, J. Stott, *Essentials: a liberal-evangelical dialogue* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1988), p. 228.
66. It is difficult to reconcile Stott's approach with that of George Whitefield who could state: 'The generality of our clergy are fallen from our articles, and do not speak agreeably to them, or to the form of sound words delivered in the Scriptures; woe be unto such blind leaders of the blind! How can they escape the damnation of hell?' Quoted in Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided*, p. 161.
67. Packer, one of the architects of Keele, would later write in 1978: 'Is Anglican comprehensiveness a matter of not insisting on more than the gospel as a basis of fellowship, or not insisting on the gospel at all? No outsider could be blamed for concluding that it is the second, for that is what you see when you look at the Church today.' Packer quoted in Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided*, p. 115.
68. Gerald Bray for instance states that 'to be an Evangelical bishop, you must be 'open': others need not apply'. (Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided*, p. 128.) Open evangelicalism is widely accepted within the Church of England, but those who adhere to the former evangelical truths are now outside the pale and are said to be the benighted representatives of the 'last rites of the male, Western, Enlightenment and privileged sub-culture of evangelicalism'. P. Barron, "The case against REFORM," in C. Yeats, *Has Keele Failed? Reform in the Church of England* (Hodder & Stoughton: London, 1995), p. 65.
69. Thompson, 1997, quoted in Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided*, p. 128.
70. G. L. Bray, quoted in Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided*, p. 134.