

FRIENDSHIP HOUSE

THE EARLY YEARS

EARLE HOWE

The author, Earle Howe, is Vicar of St Luke's Anglican parish in Manurewa. He has been Chairperson of the Trust Board of Friendship House for twelve years, and has written several historical books. This book was written to mark the 30th Anniversary of the opening of Friendship House in 1976.

Published by Friendship House 2006

Printed by

ISBN 0-473-11017-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	3
FRIENDSHIP HOUSE TIMELINE	5
EARLY BEGINNINGS	6
PRAGMATIC ECUMENISM	11
THE LOCKWOOD HOUSES	15
PLANNING FOR THE PERMANENT CENTRE	19
THE PERMANENT CENTRE IS OPENED	33
THE FIRST DIRECTOR IS APPOINTED	37
THE OPERATING AGREEMENT	40
POSTSCRIPT	44
APPENDIX ONE	45
APPENDIX TWO	467
APPENDIX THREE	49
APPENDIX FOUR	51
FOOTNOTES	59

FOREWORD

Friendship House is the fruit of a movement which changed the face of twentieth century Christianity. The ecumenical movement was seen in denominations with very different histories and traditions learning more about each other and finding ways to work together. Ecumenism was recognised in 1942 by William Temple at his enthronement as Archbishop of Canterbury as the “great new fact of our era”.

Three major streams characterised the ecumenical movement – missionary cooperation - faith and order - (that is what churches believed and how that shaped their organisation, ministry and worship) - life and work. Life and work was initially concerned with the practical application of Christianity in the post-First World War context after Europe’s experience of distressing division and conflict. The initial life and work conference at Stockholm in 1925 declared that “doctrine divides while service unites”.

The pursuit of ecumenical cooperation and Christian unity gained institutional expression in New Zealand in 1941 with the founding of the National Council of Churches (NCC). Its first major activity was the Campaign for Christian Order which was concerned to bring Christian principles to bear on the society which would emerge from the Second World War. Idealism and pragmatic reality were seen in the culminating Conference on Christian Order held in Christchurch in 1945.

The growth of ecumenical understanding was seen globally in the founding of the World Council of Churches in 1948 and nationally in New Zealand through the diverse activities of the NCC. A parallel initiative coming out of the ecumenical movement was the journey some denominations embarked on towards organic church union. The faith and order meeting at Lund in Sweden in 1952 gave expression to a fundamental ecumenical question, whether or not churches should “act together in all matters except those in which deep differences of conviction compel them to act separately”?

Growth in New Zealand society after the Second World War with the baby boomers challenged the churches in new housing areas to find ways of meeting ever expanding demands for halls and churches and stipended ministry. The coming together of leaders with an ecumenical vision that went beyond their own denominations, and the challenge of finding new ways to embody “life and work” in practical mission, ministry, outreach and community service to a new city found their fruitful expression in Friendship House. This was a bold experiment representing a new pattern of churches working together with a shop-front ministry in a place where people gathered to shop and work every day of the week.

Earle Howe’s history tells how dreams were turned into reality, how motivated church leaders together with council officials promoted a new way of working in partnership for the well-being of the community. Fortunately for Manukau City the window of

opportunity was open, and inspired leaders came together at the right time to make Friendship House possible. While it was often easier to work and make decisions as separate churches, the drive and bold plans of those who led the way laid the foundations for Friendship House as a unique outcome of ecumenical initiative.

The ecumenical spirit in New Zealand which gave rise to this venture in faith has weakened, the church union hoped for in the 1960s was not accomplished, and the times have changed. But Friendship House remains a symbol of what can be achieved when denominations are willing to work together with cooperative local leaders for the good of community they are seeking to serve.

Allan Davidson

Allan Davidson has written extensively on the history of Christianity in New Zealand and the Pacific. He is lecturer in church history at St John's College and teaches in the School of Theology at the University of Auckland where he is also Director of Postgraduate Studies.

FRIENDSHIP HOUSE TIMELINE

(This list records some significant events in the life of Friendship House.)

- 4 March 1974:** The Wiri Interchurch Planning and Co-ordinating Committee began work, with representatives from these Churches: Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, Associated Churches of Christ, Baptist, Roman Catholic, and The Salvation Army. There were also representatives from Anglican-Methodist Social Services, the Presbyterian Social Service Association, and the Interchurch Trade and Industry Mission
- 12 December 1976:** The temporary 'Friendship House', with volunteers and part-time staff, was opened in two relocatable Lockwood houses, near where the permanent building was later erected.
- 13 December 1977:** An agreement was signed by the Anglican General Trust Board which committed the Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches to purchase Lot 43, and to build a Centre on the site.
- 13 April 1978:** The land was blessed by *mana whenua* of Pukaki Marae.
- 31 May 1978:** Legal possession was taken of Lot 43.
- 30 November 1978:** A plaque was laid to mark the commencement of work on the new building. Representatives of the seven Churches involved in the planning to date were present.
- 17 June 1979:** The official opening of the permanent 'Friendship House' took place.
- 1 April 1980:** The Reverend Mike Flavell commenced work as interim Director of Friendship House.
- 12 March 1981:** The Reverend Peter Carter was inducted as Director of Friendship House.
- 7 June 1984:** The Friendship House Operating Agreement was signed by the Heads of six Churches: Anglican, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, and The Salvation Army, and Gavin Rennie was inducted as Director.
- 1991:** Glenys (later Zoe) Hampton was appointed as Director.
- 1996:** The 20th Anniversary.
- 1997:** ASB Trusts grants approx. \$250,000 for major renovations of Friendship House.
- 1998:** The Reverend Vicki Sykes was appointed as Director.
- 2001:** The 25th Anniversary.
- 2006:** The 30th Anniversary.

EARLY BEGINNINGS

Friendship House today is a busy place. Located strategically alongside the Westfield shopping centre in the heart of Manukau City, it has a staff of 19 and 12 contractors. It continues to operate as an ecumenical agency, offering a variety of programmes that give support and care to a wide range of clients. Services include a drop-in centre with a cafe', information and advice services, social workers, counselling, educational courses and Living Without Violence programmes for men. In addition, attention is given to social justice issues, and the building also houses several other agencies as tenants. The operations of Friendship House are managed by the Director, who is employed by the governing body, the Friendship House Trust Board. The Board includes representatives of the six participating Churches.

The purpose of this history is to record the details of how Friendship House came into existence in 1976, and to cover its early development until the acceptance and signing of the Operating Agreement in 1984. This account will demonstrate several factors that make Friendship House unique: the ecumenical context of the 1970s which energised women and men to work creatively and co-operatively across denominational lines; the motivation of the Manukau City Council in its desire to see a centre such as Friendship House established in the heart of the city; the vision and hard work of several key persons. The uniqueness of Friendship House is that these factors came together at a particular point in time.

Manukau City came into being in 1965 when the Manukau County amalgamated with the Manurewa Borough. In its early years there was a great deal of pioneering work done with regard to health issues and community development. David Haigh was appointed as Social Services Officer, the first such appointment in New Zealand. There was a strong welfare component with particular concern for families in need. This led, in Otara, to the co-ordination of all social agencies working there. Community development came to the fore, with an emphasis on communities working towards their own aspirations and dreams. A natural development was a network of community facility infrastructure, for example around community houses. In 1972 the Otara Citizens Advice Bureau was formed, one of the first in New Zealand. David Haigh was very much involved in that development.¹

The projected rapid population growth of Manukau City, with a projection of in excess of 416,000 by 1986,² attracted the attention of the Churches. There were two mission concerns for the Churches. Firstly, how could they develop new parishes and provide traditional resources such as church buildings, halls, and houses for the clergy? But there was also a deeper concern – how could they care for people and be part of the building and development of communities?

With regard to the first concern there was the reality that the Churches would find it difficult to fund traditional Church facilities in every suburb. In the ecumenical climate of the period this meant that some Churches took very seriously the alternative of working together. Although formal negotiations for Church Union had broken down by 1974 there was continuing goodwill and energy amongst the Churches for co-operative work. This included Churches that were not part of the Church Union discussions. As well as in Wiri there were examples of this co-operation in many other places, for example in Glenfield on the North Shore, also at Hornby in Christchurch. Enterprises such as the Interchurch Trade and Industry Mission which helped provide chaplaincy in workplaces, were also established in this period. This desire to work together was also fuelled by the second concern for community development. The Reverend Barry Jones, one of the key figures in the planning for, and development of, Friendship House states that ‘The development of Friendship House was premised on the assumption that the Church needed to take seriously the development of the new Manukau City Centre, and have a physical presence within the centre.’ He attributes this mission concern to some significant ‘ground-breaking’ World Council of Churches studies in the 1960s, and quotes from a book written by Hans Reudi Weber, Associate Director of the Ecumenical Institute of the World Council of Churches:

The message of the Bible does not support the common conviction that the Church’s only task is to look after the ‘religious department of life... Christians are called to share Christ’s concern for the whole world, with all its harsh realities. God made it; He loves it; and because He loves it, He set us in it. The world is God’s first love, His first fiancée. Therefore the first covenant which the Bible speaks about is not about the covenant with Abraham and Israel or the Church, but the covenant with Noah and the whole living creation. Also the last promise we have from God is not the promise of a renewed Church, but of a new heaven and a new earth.³

In 1973 Barry Jones began work as the first Superintendent of the Development Division of the Methodist Church, and was based in Auckland. Early in his new work he met Archdeacon Ted Buckle, working in a similar role for the Anglican Diocese of Auckland.⁴

Ted Buckle took me down to Wiri and showed me the rolling farmland just south of Papatoetoe, where Manukau City Council was planning to build a City centre. Ted was passionate about the Church being there at the formation of the new centre. He was equally passionate that it had to be an ‘ecumenical presence’. Not simply because no one denomination could afford to create a presence in the centre on its own, but because a tangible Christian presence in the centre should portray the broadest possible image of church.



Site from Redoubt Road

Ted Buckle had begun working closely with Manukau City Council staff in late 1972. It seems apparent that his vision of a broad ‘image of church’ gained a responsive note from staff who were driven by community development concerns. Ted reported on 16 May 1973 to the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Auckland:

Preliminary discussions have been held...concerning the development of the Wiri Centre....The questions concerning the Manager and the Chief Town Planner are related to whether a major Church Centre, e.g. a ‘Cathedral’ should be planned into the 100 acre development, whether space should also be provided for ‘head offices’ of various departments such as the churches, Social welfare, Maori Mission, etc.

Later in this report, after mentioning that the matter had been reported to the Joint Regional Committee, the coordinating body for ventures undertaken by the five churches negotiating church union, and to various ‘church related agencies’, Ted Buckle indicated,

The situation is that we have been given the opportunity to plan de novo with the Chief Town Planner the heart of a city from scratch. The issue is do we simply wish to perpetuate separate structures of social welfare, administration, and the units given to the nurture and promotion of the spiritual life in the form of the compartmentalised units as we now have them, or can we create together a more intensive yet comprehensive approach to a total city society.⁵

Colin Dale, City Manager until 2006, confirmed Ted Buckle’s estimation of the potential for an ecumenical project in the City centre:

So we had a fit between the new city and a church spiritual and Christian presence. And I suppose in a modest way, whereas cities of years gone by would have a cathedral, it was thought that this would be very appropriate for the new Manukau City...But there was also, as I understand it, at the time in the community area, the view that it would well be a citizens’ advice type of concept, you see. And that sort of gave it legitimacy for the Council to be involved....we were all very excited about this, actually, because it was – well it was almost recognition that we were a city by the church....that was

an alignment that had a lot of meaning to us. Because as a city, everything was new, and it was...really building on the significance of the Christian following and such.

Colin Dale confirmed Ted Buckle's interpretation of the City's enthusiasm for the project:

Oh yes! That's absolutely the case, because concurrently we were promoting very strongly community health, and the concept of the community health centre which was a place for doctors, but was also a place for all the paramedics – the backup physiotherapy services, etc –and also social agencies, Social Welfare, Probation and Salvation Army, Barnados, etc.⁶

The Churches, individually and collectively, were now seriously considering their alternatives in making a response to mission opportunities in the South Auckland region. The Anglican Diocesan Standing Committee, for example, had in 1970 established a 'Church Development Sub-Committee', with Ted Buckle as Convenor. In its report of 2 October 1972 mention was made of discussions with the City Planners and City Manager of the Manukau City Council: 'The question of providing a major Church site within the Civic Centre plan was discussed, and it was agreed that the Convenor should raise the matter with the Parish of Manurewa.'⁷ In 1973, the Standing Committee considered a paper, 'The Shape and Form of Urban Ministry in the Future', which included these comments:

In Wiri, for example, where we can anticipate that 30,000 workers will be housed in offices, and something like 30,000 people will daily shop in the major city complex, the ministry becomes one to the mobile community and to the occupational life of people...it is obvious that when we think of Church Union and the possibility of say a Diocese of South Auckland, we must give considerable thought to the form that the Church expresses in the 'capital' or regional major centre.⁸

On 25 and 26 November 1973 a Wiri Consultation was held at St John's Presbyterian Church, Papatoetoe. This gathering was planned by the Christian Education Departments of the Anglican and Methodist Churches, in consultation with the Reverend Peter Carter, convenor of the Presbyterian Ministry Committee of the South Auckland Presbytery. Sixteen people from the Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian and Roman Catholic Churches were present, and in addition the City Manager (Ron Wood) and the Town Planner (E. Bilson) attended as well. These latter two took the group on a bus tour of the area under discussion. Matters discussed included these questions:

- Should the Church have a presence in the proposed City Centre and what form should it take?
- How does the Church influence the formation of the community?

- How can the Church arrive with the first people?

There was agreement that any development should be carried out on an ecumenical basis, while recognising that 'different churches may have different styles of Ministry and different understandings of mission and this will influence any joint planning that is to be done'. It was felt that there should be a presence in the City Centre, although it was not clear what actual form the Church presence should take. It was decided by the gathering to recommend to the Anglican Development Committee, the Methodist Synod and the Ministry Committee of the South Auckland Presbytery that they appoint three representatives each to a 'Wiri Development Co-ordinating Committee', which should also include a representative of the Auckland Joint Regional Committee. The committee would have power to co-opt other churches and people. The task of this committee would be to help the churches plan and implement a joint strategy in the area, and to relate to local bodies and commercial interest in the area on behalf of the churches involved.⁹ This committee was established as the 'Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee', ('Interchurch Committee')¹⁰ and had its first meeting on 4 March, 1974. Membership was soon extended to include representatives from the Associated Churches of Christ, the Baptist Church, the Roman Catholic Church, The Salvation Army, Anglican Methodist Social Services, Presbyterian Social Services and the Interchurch Trade and Industry Mission.

PRAGMATIC ECUMENISM

Barry Jones has described the development of Friendship House as ‘pragmatic ecumenism’.¹¹ That is certainly borne out in the several archival boxes of correspondence and the minutes of several committees. This period of hard work together across denominational lines is one of the unique aspects of Friendship House.

On 11 February 1974, Ted Buckle wrote to Barry Jones informing him of the Anglican Standing Committee’s decision to commence negotiations with other Churches and with Fletcher-Mainline Ltd, the developers of the Manukau City Centre, for the purchase of Lot 43 as a site for the proposed Church centre. The Diocese was prepared to purchase the property in the event of delays in interchurch approval, so that the land could be secured for an interchurch property. He concluded: ‘Such an investment does not prejudge all the questions of just how the Churches wish to provide a presence in Wiri Centre, though you can rest assured that we are all of one mind that our intentions do not envisage the provision of a Cathedral.’¹²

In July 1974 some members of the Interchurch Committee met with the City Manager, the City’s Property Manager, and a director of Fletcher Mainline. In his notes on the meeting Dick Slater, an Anglican member of the Interchurch Committee, wrote:

Fletcher Mainline have been determined to give the Churches no advantage over commercial developers, and special terms have been sought on the very basis that we are not a commercial organisation but one providing a service. Three main points arose from the discussions:

1. Your representatives emphasised the desirability of having the Citizens Advice Bureau situated in our complex and this was readily agreed to.
2. As it would be some years before we could erect a building, agreement on principle was made that we should have a presence in the shopping centre from the outset -1976. It was envisaged that we could probably be located on the mezzanine floor of the Centre.
3. With the desire of the Manukau City officers to do all they can to assist us, and because of the legal difficulties facing the developers, it has been decided that the Manukau City Council should negotiate with Fletcher Mainline Limited for the purchase and holding of the site for the Churches, and that at an appropriate time transfer be made to us at a price in line with those operating in 1974.¹³

There was no immediate outcome from the negotiations between the City Council and Fletcher Mainline.

During 1974 discussions were setting the parameters for later developments. Consideration was given to the establishment of a Creche in the proposed Shopping Centre. The Churches, through the Interchurch Committee, were verbally offered first option to operate the facility, with Fletcher Mainline underwriting the operating costs, and any surplus going to the body operating the facility. Anglican/Methodist Social Services made several suggestions from the experience of a similar crèche in Birkdale, and commented: ‘the Wiri crèche would have valuable potential in some aspects of community development. It would be a waste to fail to capitalise on this potential.’¹⁴ The Interchurch Committee was pondering other matters as well: links with educational authorities, with the Interchurch Trade and Industry Mission, and ministry to the residential areas.

Ted Buckle questioned whether the Churches should perpetuate traditional patterns of church development in South Auckland, and proposed an alternative course of action, using ‘the natural foci of community’ (schools and shopping centres), and lay leadership along with professional clergy.¹⁵

Barry Jones gave a report to the Interchurch Committee’s meeting in October 1974, based on his observation of ‘new town developments’ in England and the USA.¹⁶ Commenting on the specific learnings appropriate to the New Zealand scene, Barry listed:

- The degree of ecumenical co-operation;
- A declared ecumenical strategy to provide ministry for the developing of a congregation and the building of community;
- The maintenance of a balance between ministry in developing areas and established causes;
- Clear division of responsibilities to ensure a recognition and acceptance of the three primary roles of Christian Ministry: Priestly - Pastoral - Prophetic;
- Denominational overview of developing areas of settlement and evolving patterns of ministry;
- The investment of human resources in developing areas before the provision of physical resources;
- The use of lay helpers to supplement essential ministries;
- Securing Government financial assistance to sustain specific projects;
- Involvement of lay leadership, drawn from the area of concern, to assist in the planning and implementation of specific proposals.

In May 1975 there was further discussion about the proposed Creche in the shopping centre. Anglican/Methodist Social Services considered that the proposed Creche was badly designed, and too small. The Interchurch Committee decided that in the light of this report they could not proceed any further with the Creche proposal.¹⁷ However the Churches’ interest in the Creche proposal was a signal of the hospitality ministry that

was to develop at Friendship House when it opened in 1976. In May 1975 Fletcher Mainline received an enquiry from the Plunket Society for accommodation in the shopping centre. As they could not accommodate such a request they referred the matter to the Interchurch Committee, in case room could be made available in the proposed Church Centre.

Discussions between the Interchurch Committee and the Manukau City Council regarding Lot 43 were continuing. On 14th July 1975 Ted Buckle wrote to the City Manager on behalf of the Interchurch Committee, requesting that the Council consider leasing Lot 43 to the Churches at a non-commercial leasing price:

You will recall that the Churches are seeking to approach the social and religious needs of this new region on a corporate basis. We believe this approach to be essential for the well-being of the community and at present our aim is to provide facilities for a wider ranging number of religious and para-religious services.

Our planning at the present time envisages space for the major social service agencies such as Anglican/Methodist Social Services, P.S.S.A., Roman Catholic and Salvation Army We hope also to provide for counselling services such as Marriage Guidance, Youthline, Lifeline, Inter-Church Counselling, etc....In this respect it is our expectation that we will be providing for Wiri a creative and community-centred service facility which will have as its goal the well-being of the total community rather than denominational or sectarian interests

As none of these agencies are profit making but depend entirely on voluntary support you will appreciate the point that we have continually stressed concerning this particular site being approached differently from the rest of Wiri Centre and the commercial conditions placed upon them....our approach is one of corporate social and humanitarian concern, not one of sectarian denominationalism.¹⁸

The City Manager replied on 29 September 1975, stating that the Council was 'generally in favour of Council repurchasing Lot 43 from Fletcher-Mainline Ltd and leasing it to the Combined Churches.' This arrangement would depend on no commercial activities being carried on in the building and on the Council having rent-free space in the building for Citizens Advice Bureau and social welfare work. However 'the Solicitor's advice is that Council does not have the authority to grant such a lease for non-commercial purposes....it would appear that the arrangement would need specific legislation through an empowering act.'¹⁹

The Interchurch Committee considered this response at its meeting on 8 October 1975. Dissatisfaction with the Council's proposed terms was expressed, and a subcommittee

was asked to meet with the Manukau City Council to seek clarification. Subsequently the Interchurch Committee wrote to the City Manager asking for his comments on an enclosed draft response to the Council. This draft included a suggested option of the Council becoming 'a joint builder therefore participating in the management along with all the other churches and groups participating. Replying on 15 December 1975 Mr Wood commented that the Council would not wish to be involved in such an option.'²⁰

The proposed interchurch development was now attracting the attention of the news media. The *New Zealand Herald*, South Auckland section, printed an article by Allison Oosterman in which she listed the eight churches who were involved in the discussions: Presbyterian, Anglican, Methodist, Catholic, Congregational, Church of Christ, Baptist and Salvation Army. Ted Buckle was reported as saying that other churches were welcome to join in the talks as long as they realised that sectarian interests were not to be promoted. He also said 'In trying to decide what facilities and services should be provided at the centre, we must look at the requirements of the community the churches seek to serve.' Considerations included: the likely huge population, the youth of the population, its multicultural nature, the likely large work force, and the huge industrial area to the west. He concluded: 'It is an entirely new concept for New Zealand and will provide back up facilities for work done by the churches in neighbourhood and district communities'.²¹ A subsequent article in the same newspaper commented that 'The centre will cater for the estimated 6000 people who will be employed in the shopping centre and office park, and for about 30,000 shoppers.'²²

Meanwhile the correspondence regarding Lot 43 continued, with a letter from the Interchurch Committee to the Council on 21 January 1976. This letter included the proposal that the Council sponsor an Empowering Act to enable it to lease the land to the Churches, and also make provision for 'the active participation of the Council social services and for this purpose the Council be entitled to space within the building; the area and conditions of such space being made available to be negotiated'. In his reply Mr Wood, the City Manager, stated that the Council had stipulated that agreement on the space for the Council's social services was fundamental, and should not be left to be negotiated. The Council wished for 'up to 600 square feet of office space'.²³

THE LOCKWOOD HOUSES



The Lockwoods

The establishment of an interchurch centre by the time that the Shopping Centre opened in October 1976 was considered very important, so the Interchurch Committee firmed up plans for temporary accommodation while the Lot 43 issue was being resolved. On 4 February 1976 the Committee resolved to recommend to the participating churches that they jointly purchase a ‘transportable building’, approximately 2000 square feet, costing no more than \$40,000. Such a building would provide for a small quiet place or chapel, a few small office cubicles for use by the various church agencies, a small kitchen, toilet facilities, and a lounge area. It was reported that Fletcher Mainline Ltd were prepared to allow such a building on a site close to Lot 43 free of charge, provided that the Council and the churches had committed themselves to proceed with the lease.²⁴ By April the churches had responded. The Anglican, Catholic, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches had indicated their support for the proposal in principle, and their willingness to contribute financially. The Churches of Christ and the Auckland Baptist Association were not prepared to be financially involved. The Salvation Army advised they could not become legally involved.

The Interchurch Committee was also planning ahead for a permanent centre and decided that they should draw together the expectations that the participating churches had for the facilities to be provided in a permanent centre.²⁵

Because some of the participating Churches had assumed that the proposed centre was to be basically a social service centre, some members of the Interchurch Committee

wrote a statement spelling out the theological rationale behind the centre. The major points of this statement were:

- The Wiri project is an attempt to provide maximum variation and flexibility in the outworking of Christian Ministry
- The Wiri project is a response to a unique opportunity to plan and implement a genuine Ministry to the inner city of Manukau
- The Wiri project is an attempt to bring the concerns and the resources of the Churches to people who work and shop within the City Centre
- The prime objective of the Wiri project is the provision of a base from which the Church can carry on its age-long function of the proclamation and celebration of the Gospel.²⁶

There is no record of any discussion or debate about this statement. This perhaps suggests that others on the Interchurch Committee had no difficulties with it.

As time moved on the focus on the permanent centre began to sharpen. Ken Christiansen, Director of Fletcher-Mainline Ltd, expressed concern about the lack of progress towards concluding negotiations over Lot 43, in a letter to Hesketh & Richmond, solicitors for the Interchurch Committee. He asked that the permanent building be ready for occupation by 30 April 1979, and that legal agreement with the Churches and the Council be completed by 30 November 1976. Howard Anderson, Executive Officer for the Anglican Diocese, was also raising questions about both the cost of the permanent building, and also the operating costs of the Centre once it was opened.²⁷

The Interchurch Committee responded to the matters raised by both Fletcher-Mainline Ltd and Howard Anderson with a significant move. At its meeting on 2 June 1976 the Committee considered two alternative courses: either to continue with the plans to lease Lot 43 and build an Interchurch Centre with no commercial tenants, or purchase Lot 43 outright from Fletcher Mainline and build a commercial investment on it, with ample provision for the planned Interchurch facilities. A sub-committee was asked to investigate the second option further.²⁸ This group reported back a week later to a special meeting of the Interchurch Committee. In the meantime the group met with Ken Christiansen, of Fletcher Mainline. They addressed three concerns in that meeting:

- What would be the cost to the Churches if they purchase outright Lot 43?
- Are there any restrictions on the development of Lot 43?
- Is it possible through outright purchase for the Churches to obtain some relaxation from the conditions laid down by Fletcher Mainline?

Ken Christiansen indicated that Fletcher Mainline would sell Lot 43 at cost to the Churches, for approximately \$5,500, along with development costs to date of \$18,900.

The company's policy was that purchasers should develop their site to the maximum. The company was eager to see some progress with Lot 43 as discussions had taken 2½ years to date. It would be helpful to have a clear procedure from purchase through to completion of the building. When these responses were reported to the Interchurch Committee, the Committee resolved to withdraw from the proposals to lease Lot 43 from the Manukau City Council, and accepted the offer of Fletcher Mainline to undertake preliminary feasibility studies for both minimum and maximum development of Lot 43. Subsequently JASMaD Development (now known as JASMAX) agreed to carry out the feasibility study. The decision not to proceed with leasing was conveyed to the Council by letter on 11 June 1976.²⁹

The JASMaD findings were reported to the Interchurch Committee on 14 July 1976. Their report offered two choices:

- A three storey building at a cost of \$400,000, with one floor leased out.
- A five storey building at a cost of \$716,000, with four floors let.

The Committee considered that the second choice would be dominated by commercial considerations, and that the Churches could have difficulty in funding it, leaving the project viable only if an outside investor could be attracted to it. If this happened the project could then be vulnerable to any investment decisions by that investor. The first choice was seen to be in the best interest of the Churches. Consequently the Committee resolved that a permanent Interchurch Centre of three floors be erected on Lot 43, with the suggested method of financing being:

- The Churches to borrow 60% of the cost: \$240,000
- The Churches contribute proportionate capital grants: \$150,000
- The South Auckland Churches, Community, Industry etc be invited to contribute: \$10,000

The Churches were to be asked to appoint a representative to attend a Consultation on the financing of the project before the Churches determine their responses, which were required to be made by 20 September 1976. The Interchurch Committee also agreed to a contract for a temporary Centre, at a cost of \$40,486 for two Lockwood houses. The General Trust Board of the Anglican Diocese was to be asked to act for and on behalf of the participating Churches. The Committee's decisions regarding both the temporary and permanent Centres, along with the request for the previously agreed contributions for the temporary Centre, were conveyed to the Churches on 20 July 1976.³⁰

On 29 July 1976 the Manukau City Council readily gave permission for a temporary Church Centre to be erected on Lot 41, and the Lockwood houses arrived on site on 16 August 1976.³¹

A consultation to inform members of South Auckland churches about the Wiri Interchurch Centre received a good response, with 50 people attending. Speakers

included representatives from Fletcher-Mainline, the Manukau City Council and the Interchurch Committee. Members of the South Auckland Joint Regional Committee were present.³² The programme included a short address from ‘Our worker Priest’, the Reverend Chris Pryor, who had begun ministry in the Wiri area, working as a ‘community minister’ in the Manurewa Anglican Parish. A member of the Development Council of the Anglican Diocese, he had worked closely with Ted Buckle in the proposals for an ecumenical Church Centre at Wiri. He and his family were living in a house in Kerr’s Road on the Dilworth Farm, just behind St David’s Anglican Church. It was hoped that he would particularly work amongst residents in the new subdivision being developed between Kerr’s Road and the Manukau City Centre, and link people with the proposed Interchurch Centre.³³

With the Lockwood houses on site it was time to plan intentionally for the operation of the Centre. A Management Committee held its initial meeting on 15 September 1976. The summary notes indicate that attention was given to management, communication with the Churches, and use of the centre. The notes list the building exterior and interior, the opening day, staffing, caretaking and publicity as other matters that needed the committee’s attention.³⁴



The construction of the permanent building behind the Lockwoods.

PLANNING FOR THE PERMANENT CENTRE

The Churches were making their responses to the Interchurch Committee's proposals for a finance consultation and funding for the permanent Centre. The Anglican Standing Committee offered to provide half of the building costs and the Presbyterians and Methodists agreed to share the balance. Bishop John Mackey very reluctantly advised that the Catholic Diocese could not provide funding for the Centre, saying 'This pains me, as the ecumenical dimension of the Wiri project appeals to me strongly'. In a later memorandum to clergy and religious of his Diocese the Bishop stated: 'I...would certainly like our Catholic communities to support and use the Centre, because it is a unique ecumenical experiment.'³⁵

The Interchurch Planning Committee wrote to the three contributing Churches expressing appreciation for their positive responses, and their concern that the building of the permanent Centre should commence as soon as possible. The three Churches were asked to appoint representatives to a Project Committee. Members of that Committee would need competence in finance or legal matters, or in the building industry, as well as a commitment to the theological rationale behind the establishment of the Centre. The interim Management Committee had prepared a provisional budget of \$5842 which included payment for a fulltime receptionist. The Committee also began referring to the Centre as 'Friendship House'.³⁶ The Salvation Army and the Auckland Baptist Association advised that they were not able to be financially involved in the project.

JASMaD submitted a draft architectural brief in October 1976, describing it as a 'discussion document which will be extended and modified'. The centre should be 'oriented towards the community – providing resources and training for community leadership, providing skills and guidance but not direction.' Much of the document was a summary of the project's history to date and included findings from a survey of several people 'likely to be involved in the use and management of the permanent centre.' The development was seen as 'non-traditional' with agreement that the building and the staff will need to respond to needs as they are identified. 'The architectural problem will therefore lie very much in finding a balance between the need for flexibility and the need to provide a meaningful form and character to the building.' Respondents 'were not anxious to push a personal view on a building that will have a community function.' Three functions were listed as important: worship and prayer, social service and counselling, education and communication.³⁷

The official opening of Friendship House was on 16 December 1976. Bob Newman convened a committee to plan the event. He wrote to Barry Jones asking him to preside at the occasion: 'The committee wants the occasion to reflect the name of the house, and to be one of friendship with a degree of informality. It is not really possible to write

this into an order of service, and we feel that we can rely on you to lead us in this kind of spirit.³⁸

In December the Interchurch Committee was informed by the interim Management Committee that Friendship House was being used by the Churches for regional meetings and that shoppers were beginning to make a limited 'drop-in' use of the place. Chris Pryor had led a week of forums on the theme 'New Zealand the way you want it?' Contributors included Harry Dansey, 'Race Relations Conciliation'; Merv Wellington MP, 'Politics and the Community'; Doctor Gibb and Doctor Fraser McDonald, 'Community Health; and Professor John Morton, 'The Christian Contribution to the Community.' The Interchurch Committee informed the Management Committee that the employment of a full time 'receptionist-hostess' could not eventuate until the Churches made sufficient finance available for operating costs. Initial enquiries had been made to the Auckland Savings Bank concerning mortgage finance for the permanent Centre and the Churches' solicitor had been asked to complete the legal requirements that would enable the Churches to

enter into an unconditional agreement to purchase Lot 43 from Fletcher-Mainline. The three contributing Churches had all nominated members for the Project Committee that would oversee the construction of the permanent Centre. Members of the Committee were: Howard Anderson, Ransom Smyth and Maurice Tetley Jones (Anglican); Alan McKerras and David Smith (Methodist); Alan Baker and Nield Carter (Presbyterian). Their areas of expertise included finance and administration, legal, accountancy, building construction and contracting.³⁹

By February 1977 the Churches had made the necessary financial commitments to the operating budget of \$8000 so Audrey Dickinson was appointed as 'Co-ordinating Secretary of Friendship House'. The Reverend Jean Brookes, curate at All Saints' Anglican Church in Howick, was working half time at the House, and Warwick McNaughton, staff member with Anglican/ Methodist Social Services, was based there as well.⁴⁰



Jean Brookes

The Project Committee had its first meeting on 17 March 1977. It was convened by Alan McKerras who was a member of the Interchurch Committee as well as the Project Committee. He explained that the Project Committee would be presented with the design of the building once it was approved by the contributing Churches. The contract for the sale of Lot 43 will also have been completed by the Interchurch Committee. There was discussion over the Committee's role, resulting in some confusion. Members had not understood that their work would include fundraising, and expressed concern about their ability to do that, given that several members were not resident in South

Auckland. The Interchurch Committee was asked to clarify the situation, and to advise when the plans for the building would be available, and when it was hoped to have signed the contract for the purchase of Lot 43.⁴¹

At its meeting on 23 March 1977 the Interchurch Committee decided to ask the Management Committee to establish a fundraising committee widely representative of the South Auckland community. The Project Committee was asked to secure \$300,000 mortgage finance immediately, this figure reflecting increasing costs of the building, now estimated at \$450,000. It was hoped that the working drawings for the building would be available by the end of June 1977 and a permit available by 1 September.

Warwick McNaughton's report on behalf of the interim Management Committee noted:

Who comes to Friendship House? ---young mothers with small children; youth late in the evening; the elderly looking for love and care; employees of the Mall looking for peace and quiet; a small number of people have come to worship; employers to discuss their relationships; local Christians – both clergy and laity; New Zealand-wide visitors; people with counselling and special needs such as the deaf; Vestries; parish group, committees, seminars; people concerned with Health, Education, Recreation; the media; representatives of national and Local Bodies, - the daily diary makes fascinating and encouraging reading.



Thursday community night meal

Jean Brookes had become industrial chaplain at the Foodtown store, and it was hoped that this chaplaincy would be the beginning of a close relationship with the whole shopping complex. There were plans to have audio-visual presentations on the 'goodness of life' and also on

some of the issues facing an emerging city. These presentations could be offered on late shopping nights and perhaps at lunchtimes. Jean was also participating in the training of people for the Manukau Technical Community Workers Certificate Course, and had organised a school holiday programme in the shopping centre.⁴²

As the planning for the permanent building gathered momentum there was inevitably some tension around procedures for decision making by the Churches and the desire of

Fletcher-Mainline to see the Lot 43 matters resolved. By May 1977 JASMaD, the architects, had worked out a time-table that would enable construction to begin on 1 November 1977 and be completed by 30 June 1978.⁴³

At the initiative of the Anglican Faculties Committee, there was a combined meeting of the Faculties and Architectural Committees of the three contributing Churches on 2 June 1977, in order to efficiently reach a common mind on the building design. A representative from the architects, JASMaD, was present. The various Church representatives shared their comments.⁴⁴ There is no archival record of the outcomes of the meeting, but the process that the Anglican Diocese subsequently used in order to consider the building design taxed the patience of the Interchurch Committee. The issue was whether or not every detail needed the approval of the denominational bodies. Did the various representatives on the Interchurch Committee and the Projects Committee have authority to act?

Barry Jones wrote to Terry Barton, convenor of the Anglican Diocesan Faculties Committee:

I have been reflecting on the implications of the Faculty (sic) Committee's recommendations that you shared with me yesterday.

Within this ecumenical project each of the participating Churches acknowledges the right the others have to review the various facets of the project in keeping with their denominational procedures....There is however, another significant factor that needs to be borne in mind. The Wiri project is an ecumenical project involving the partnership of three Churches. It follows therefore that if any one partner raises serious objections or questions about any facet of the total project, these concerns should be raised with the others before irrevocable decisions are made....I respect that the Diocese is financially accountable for one half of the cost of the project, but conversely the other half is being financed by the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches. Consequently, any move by the appropriate Anglican Committees to raise questions about the whole scheme profoundly affects the other partner Churches.

He concluded by asking that the Faculty Committee's concerns be made available to the Interchurch Committee, and invited a representative of the Faculty Committee to attend the next meeting of the Interchurch Committee.⁴⁵ In his reply Terry Barton quoted from the minutes of the Faculties Committee: 'The committee are of the opinion that the proposed building will not be entirely suitable for the intended use; they are not enthusiastic about the internal planning and exterior appearance of the building....the ultimate cost will certainly exceed \$500,000...The committee recommend to Standing Committee that the whole concept be reconsidered.' He further stated that 'it would not be proper for discussion to take place with your committee until the report has been

considered by Standing Committee....I am not able to accept your suggestion that a member of the faculties Committee should attend your meeting on 22 June.⁴⁶ Rodney Davies, a representative of the Standing Committee on the Interchurch Committee, wrote to Bishop Gowing saying that the proposal that the whole concept be reconsidered was ‘a grave discourtesy, irresponsible and a tactical error.’ Discourteous, because members of the Interchurch Committee had spent 3½ years bringing the difficult project to fruition; irresponsible, because ‘the Faculties Committee are making their decision on insufficient information and without knowledge of the consequences’; a tactical error ‘because it will seriously affect the building programme.’ He concluded:

You will have sensed that I have an anger at the way this situation has developed. I make no apology for that, as your representative I consider the Wiri Interchurch Centre to be of critical importance to the work of the Church in South Auckland. I have spent a great deal of time and effort, along with others, acting on your behalf, in making this concept happen. It disturbs me greatly that the whole concept could be delayed by people who haven’t enquired as to the facts.⁴⁷

The Standing Committee met on 24 June and adopted the recommendation that the ‘whole concept’ be reconsidered. (In the various contributions to this debate it is not clear whether the ‘whole concept’ meant just the design of the building, or whether it meant the whole project.) Bishop Gowing initiated a meeting of the Interchurch Committee, the Projects Committee, the Faculties Committee, the Presbyterian Architectural Committee and the Methodist Architectural Committee in order ‘to determine the future of this development.’ At the request of Barry Jones the meeting was to be held at the temporary Friendship House, ‘in order that all concerned may have an opportunity of appreciating the project in relation to the site and development at Wiri.’⁴⁸ The meeting took place on 22 July at Friendship House, and from the brief notes taken it appears that there was predominantly a sharing of information, with Anglicans stating that further consideration would be needed by their Standing Committee.⁴⁹ Although the Anglican process may have seemed ponderous to those enthusiastic for the project, Presbyterians also had some concerns, and Eric Laurenson made some submissions on behalf of the Methodist Church.⁵⁰

The developing operation of Friendship House necessitated some clarification of the roles and expectations of the various persons involved in the day to day work of the House. Representatives of the Management Committee met with the Interchurch Committee and talked about ministry at and from Friendship House. Another phone line was needed; ‘Southline’, a new counselling service at the House also needed their own phone arrangements; and other agencies were also making use of rooms from time to time. Jean Brookes’ work at Foodtown amongst 110 staff members was revealing the depth of issues in the surrounding community. The opportunity had been taken to use a vacant shop to mount a programme with two themes: ‘What sort of a city are we creating?’ and ‘Life is good’. Jean Brookes commented that some things emerging at

Friendship House indicated the need for people who had theological skills. Mike Flavell, a Presbyterian representative on the Management Committee, agreed with this, saying that some members of the Management Committee were limited in the time that they could contribute to the House as they had work commitments elsewhere. He stated that there was a need for 'working agents', as distinct from planners or denominational representatives, to pioneer and sustain ministry from Friendship House. Jean presented a paper which addressed the question 'What are the ramifications of a personal ministry exercised from Wiri-Friendship House?' and argued that a Chaplain to the Management Committee should be appointed. This was supported by the Interchurch Committee, with John Patrick, a Presbyterian representative on the Interchurch Committee, stating that the need was now to raise the theological issue of how the Gospel is to be proclaimed in the heart of Manukau City.⁵¹ The committee resolved that a report on the work of Friendship House should be presented to the constituent Church Courts, requesting the endorsement of Jean Brookes as she continued to explore the nature of Ministry from Friendship House.⁵²

The Interchurch Committee set up a meeting of the three participating Churches for 29 July, so that an assessment could be made of the legal and financial implications of the agreement with Fletcher Mainline to purchase and build on Lot 43, before the individual Churches decided irrevocably to be part of the total project.

While the Interchurch Committee and the Projects Committee were busy finalising finance and plans for the new building, the staff at Friendship House were busily investigating and implementing ministry options. Considerable discussion centred on the need for a training programme for youth leaders.⁵³

Audrey Dickinson was settling into her role as Co-ordinator with energy and compassion:

In fact I don't really think I look on Friendship House as a job. It is more an adventure than anything for it has become my way of life...for me, to be able to live in the shadow and nurture of Christianity and Christians has been a wonderful experience. So, in some obscure fashion, perhaps Friendship House has done its work with me...Friendship is really the keynote of the House...It seems to me that I am beginning to put the pieces together. I am beginning to be aware of the issues involved. I am beginning to know the people who are important. I am beginning to get the feel of the massive problems of this expanding area of Wiri and I am just slowly beginning to put my finger on areas of need and ways we can perhaps help.⁵⁴

The Friendship House newsletter of September 1977 reveals that the staff were active in the shopping centre:

The school holidays provide us with an opportunity for meeting thousands of people with no church connections and little knowledge of God. Slides, filmstrips, short films, illustrated stories and displays made up the May experiment. In August we ventured into street theatre – we understand it has not been done by Christians in New Zealand before.

Contact was also made with workers on a nearby building site. The men were offered hospitality in Friendship House while they were on strike. This was a more comfortable alternative for the men to standing in the carpark in the cold and rain.

They became constant visitors during the strike, we made friends with some of them, they appreciated our acceptance of them...and later when they went back to work, gave us a generous donation.

A note from one of the men stated:

This service was greatly appreciated and it brought to some of the men the concept that the churches were able and willing to help the community without any strings attached.⁵⁵

Staff and Management Committee members were busy with communication in the community about Friendship House. Invitations were received to speak at a wide range of community groups: Wiri Rotary, Otara Ministers' Fraternal, South Auckland Joint Regional Committee, a Tuakau ecumenical service, local Methodist women's groups, a Pakuranga interdisciplinary group, the Papakura Social Workers' Association, and the Manukau Quota Club.⁵⁶

Audrey Dickinson also wrote a letter to 'All the women in the Methodist Women's Fellowships.' The Methodist Women's Fellowship had as its 'Special Objective' for 1977-78 the financial support of the Hostess/Co-ordinator at Friendship House. In a brochure supporting that Special Objective, a table was given of 'What Friendship House already provides' This list included: A chaplain, a community worker, a secretary, a teacher for the Hearing Association, a study group, a handicraft/coffee group, a counselling service, a worship centre, a playroom for toddlers, privacy for breastfeeding, hostesses, hot water, coffee and tea, clean toilets, comfortable chairs, peace and quiet, books and magazines, someone to talk to. There was also a table of 'What Friendship House hopes to do':

- To provide a place of friendliness and joy
- To help people in distress
- To search out ways of service
- To gather together people who need people
- To help find outlets for whatever abilities people may have

- To foster well-being in the neighbourhood
- To become a warm, accepting centre from which exciting things can grow⁵⁷

It is clear that Friendship House was a base for ministry and work in the community rather than just a place to come to. A staff document about possible areas of ministry had the following headings: 'Manukau City Council, Shopping Centre, Local residents, Friendship House itself, Industrial Chaplaincy, Nearby Pubs.'⁵⁸

By October 1977 things were settling down with the negotiations over the plans for the permanent building. The Anglican Diocese was willing to execute the agreement with Fletcher Mainline knowing that this would commit the General Trust Board to the whole project. The Projects Committee approved the plans and costing in principle, with the costs stated at \$470,000 plus extra for the land, carpets, furniture and fittings.⁵⁹

On 22 November a letter was sent to the trustees of the Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches outlining the procedures for approval being given by the General Trust Board, as custodian trustee on their behalf, to an unconditional contract to purchase the site and to erect a building by a certain date. The Trust Board would need 'specific written authority' of the three Churches to the mortgage arrangements, the construction contract with Fletcher Mainline, and any increase in the total commitment over \$500,000. This letter also gave details of the Churches' contributions to the project: Anglicans: \$100,000; Methodists \$50,000; Presbyterians \$50,000. \$300,000 would be borrowed on mortgage. The Churches were not expecting any return on their equity contributions and were prepared to service the mortgage, including any principal repayments, together with the rates, insurance, maintenance and other outgoings on the proposed centre.⁶⁰ Subsequently, following receipt of unconditional indemnities from the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, the General Trust Board signed the Agreement with Fletcher Mainline.⁶¹

In early 1978 there was a flurry of correspondence between the City Council and the Project Committee to ensure that the development could start by 31 March 1978. On 13 April there was a special ceremony on Lot 43. The invitation for that event described it in this manner:

Because the concept of an ecumenical church centre involving as many as seven major denominations is a unique venture, the churches are keen to mark the occasion of the commencement of building operations in a significant way.

Representatives of the participating churches will take part in a simple ceremony along with representatives of Manukau City and Fletcher Mainline – the developers of the City Centre.⁶²

The land was blessed by *mana whenua* of Pukaki Marae.⁶³

Attention was also being given to fundraising. A mortgage proposal had been negotiated with the Auckland Savings Bank and a local fundraising committee had also been formed, with office space being made available at Friendship House for a full-time co-ordinator for that committee. An appeal brochure was planned, and Everald Compton of Compton Associates met with the Projects and Fundraising Committees.⁶⁴ Subsequently he made a proposal for a fundraising programme. He commented:

There is no doubt that Friendship House is an exciting new project in the life of the Churches in Auckland, but, because of its new concept, it will not be easy to promote as it will have to overcome resistance to change, suspicion about its aims and objectives, and the sheer difficulty of explaining exactly what it is intended to achieve through the existence of Friendship House.

He proposed that marketing of the project should:

be done in the simplest possible way as the community acceptance of the project to date appears to have been hindered by vagueness and the use of too much religious jargon.

He believed that a target of \$400,000 was appropriate:

as nothing will kill this project quicker in future years than having a heavy interest bill as an intolerable burden, causing a constant need to be begging for funds just to survive.

Such a fundraising project would need 200 visitors and would cost \$26,500 for the firm's professional services, with local costs for printing, promotion, travel, and other office costs.⁶⁵ On 22 May the Project Committee accepted this proposal in principle, but agreed to investigate fundraising alternatives as well.⁶⁶ The investigations took some time.

Meanwhile the Management Committee was beginning to plan for the operation of Friendship House in the permanent building. In a report to the Project Committee they recommended that a small 'initial caring' room be provided on 'Level 1'. This would be a place where immediate care could be given for those who arrived at Friendship House in a distressed state. The Management Committee also listed potential users of 'level 2': Friendship House staff co-ordinator and volunteer hostesses; Ministry staff; Anglican/Methodist Social Services; Southline counsellors; Marriage Guidance counsellors; telephone receptionist. Reservations were expressed about the proposed open plan office accommodation on 'Level 2', especially with regard to privacy, heating and pedestrian flow.⁶⁷

On 27 August the Project Committee agreed to enter into a contract with Compton Associates and to pay a deposit on that contract. However on 14 September representatives of Compton Associates met with the Project Committee and tabled a report which concluded:

The success of the proposed fundraising programme would be dependent on the co-operation, cohesion and dedication which could be injected into the situation without delay. A strong display of united power is essential and there is little to indicate that this would be forthcoming within the time required.

This presents a situation in which the implementation of a fundraising programme would be inadvisable unless a complete change of heart could be brought about immediately.

Consequently Compton Associates withdrew from the contract. The Project Committee accepted this.⁶⁸ There were, however, differing reactions. Barry Jones criticised the lack of flexibility by Compton Associates, and felt that they did not understand the scheme, or have any concept of the regional and ecumenical dimensions of the whole project. But in a memorandum to the Anglican Standing Committee, Howard Anderson supported the Compton Associates analysis:

The problem is that the denominations have in a way 'imposed' this development on the South Auckland community without necessarily having the support of that community, or of the churches within that community. The Project Committee which has been the point of contact with the fundraisers was appointed with an entirely different purpose in mind, namely to watch the interests of the contributing denominations as Friendship House is erected.⁶⁹

After the cessation of negotiations with Compton Associates, the Interchurch Committee began discussions with the Methodist Stewardship Division regarding fundraising.

The community development theme which, as previously mentioned, was part of the founding vision of Friendship House was also an important factor in its early life. Jean Brookes gave particular focus to that. She attended the New Zealand National Community Workers Conference in November 1977 and also participated in a meeting on 25 June 1978 of people from various congregations who had an interest in community work. Reporting to Barry Jones and the Interchurch Planning Committee, Jean noted that these gatherings highlighted for her the need to develop careful understandings of the particular role of churches in community work: 'I believe that this issue of the relationship of church based personnel, facilities and expertise to the needs of society is vital and offer my reflections for your consideration.'⁷⁰ Jean offered an eight

week course, 'Christ and Community', at Friendship House, concluding in August 1978. She commented later:

I think we have discovered a few things. It seemed that few of the group knew how to analyse situations – something churches seem not to have taught their laity – perhaps not many of the clergy either. I felt that we covered a considerable amount of theological and biblical material in various ways as part of the whole process, but this may have been difficult for some participants to recognise – interesting! We certainly discovered some of the personal and neighbourhood needs of South Auckland, and began to see the enormity of the issues surrounding individual people's problems.

At the conclusion of this course Jean presided at the first Eucharist to be held at Friendship House.

In September 1978, commenting on the links between ministry inside and outside Friendship House, Audrey Dickinson wrote:

We know and experience that we are not just another Community Centre, and we feel the attitudes that a Christ-centred response produces in us. Some distressed visitors have recognised this very clearly without us mentioning God at all. Some decision-makers and some fellow Christians may be recognising that we are developing penetration into some of the overall dynamics of South Auckland that gives us a sharpness of insight that may be uncomfortable for all of us. But isn't that one reason we are here?⁷¹

This theological and mission pulse of Friendship House was demonstrated also by a further theological statement, on this occasion from the Management Committee. This statement included the following points:

- Friendship House's theology is incarnational. God is in the world, and God's kingdom is continually coming into being
- Friendship House exists in order to encourage, nurture and at times challenge people in growth towards reconciliation with God, with others and with themselves
- Friendship House believes in personal growth in trust, respect, mature ability to make choices, and in creative co-operative living.
- Friendship House believes in its ecumenical calling.⁷²



Construction under way

Although building work on the permanent Friendship House had commenced early in May 1978, on 30 November a ceremony was held to commemorate the beginning of construction. A plaque was unveiled, and this was subsequently placed in the foyer of the building.



Heads of Churches meet to commemorate construction and a plaque is unveiled.

In late 1978 the Reverend Mike Flavell, Presbyterian representative on the Interim Management Committee, wrote a report on Friendship House for the South Auckland Presbytery. He commented that Friendship House had become involved in the South Auckland community in a number of ways, including:

- As a centre for referrals, especially for counselling services, but also for general enquiries.
- As a drop-in centre, especially for shoppers in the commercial centre.
- As an ecumenical Church centre, initially through the involvement of volunteer hostesses from the surrounding churches but also by being a link between the

churches on several social issues, and a link between secular agencies and the churches. Friendship House had also held a course for Christian community workers.

- As a base for Christian social and community work. Warwick McNaughton, a community worker for Anglican Methodist Social Services, worked from an office at Friendship House. Jean Brookes carried out a busy and varied ministry, including a brief chaplaincy at Foodtown for part of 1977. She had good relationships with Manukau City Council staff and other statutory and voluntary agencies. She was involved in the decision-making concerning the Wiri Health Centre, and had taught classes at the Manukau Technical Institute. Her base at Friendship House was seen as giving credence and support to her community work.

Mike Flavell also commented that Friendship House could develop as a Resource and Research Centre for the churches and the community, and he stated that it was important that Friendship House should be seen as assisting the neighbouring churches, not competing with them.⁷³

On 20 December 1978, the Interchurch Committee considered a report from Jock Hosking, Stewardship Director of the Methodist Education Division.⁷⁴ This report proposed three phases: a feasibility study, promotion and education, fundraising. The Committee resolved to ask the Division to undertake the proposed feasibility study in order to test the acceptability of an appeal, and the probable depth of support.

This meeting of the Interchurch Committee also considered a report from the Joint Planning and Liaison Committee of the Auckland Joint Regional Committee.⁷⁵ This report, covering matters relating to the management of Friendship House and the recognition of the ministry associated with it, was the first step in the development of an Operating Agreement for Friendship House. This Agreement was eventually signed on 7 August 1984.⁷⁶

In commenting on the need for the Churches' recognition of the ministry of Friendship House the writers of this report asked these questions:

- Is the Ministry intended to fulfil a supportive role to others engaged in ministry in South Auckland?
- Is it to be a Ministry to those who work in the Manukau City area?
- Is it to be a Ministry to the 'strong' – the decision makers of the community?
- Is it to be a Ministry to the 'weak' – the underprivileged etc?

In a letter to the participating Churches, the Interchurch Committee expressed its view that a new Management Board should be responsible for:

- financial management and the maintenance of the building
- overseeing the development of Ministry and the pastoral care of staff
- keeping alive the ‘ecumenical vision’ that motivated the Friendship House project
- providing liaison between the participating churches. The Interchurch Planning Committee should then be phased out.

The Churches were asked to comment on the proposals.⁷⁷

Their responses indicated general agreement so in April 1979 the Interchurch Committee wrote to the Churches requesting them to appoint one representative each (preferably a lay person from South Auckland) to serve on an interim Board of Management. The letter advised that the Interchurch Committee had agreed that the Project Committee, the Interim Management Committee, and the Interchurch Committee should continue to function until such time that the new Board of Management was able to accept total responsibility for their functions. The Churches were advised that the official opening of the permanent building would take place on 17 June 1979, and the hope was expressed that the new Board of Management could be in operation by that date.⁷⁸ Meanwhile the Interchurch Committee requested the General Trust Board of the Anglican Church to continue to handle property matters for the next twelve months at least, as this was considered a better alternative to leaving it to the new Board of Management. This arrangement covered the leasing of the third floor, rates, insurance, fire levies, and servicing of the lift.⁷⁹

In order to shape up a final management model the interim Board was to consult with the participating Churches, the South Auckland Joint Regional Committee, the Projects Committee, the interim Management Committee, the Interchurch Committee, and the respective denominational Social Service agencies.

In April 1979, as the completion of the permanent building drew near, the two Lockwood houses that had served so well as a temporary Friendship House were sold to the Milford Baptist Church, for \$36,000.

THE PERMANENT CENTRE IS OPENED

Initial planning for the official opening of the permanent building was adventurous, with the hope of activities extending over a week around the opening. The staff expressed the hope that the activities should promote the function of Friendship House, involve as many members of the South Auckland community as possible, and cover different aspects of community life in order to express the Christian Churches' concern for community life. They considered that the essential elements in the week were positive public relations through the media, the official opening, and the use of religious drama. Other possible activities included: modern communication of the Gospel with puppets, music, etc; a toy exhibition (how to make your own toys); a seminar on loneliness and depression, attention to unemployment issues; displays relating to work and vocation, and exploration into family life.⁸⁰

In March 1979 Jock Hosking, Stewardship Director of the Methodist Education Division, met with some members of the Interchurch Planning Committee. A strategy for the Feasibility Study was agreed on, with a Dinner in late June 1979 being the focal point.⁸¹ The Interchurch Committee invited the Department of Communication of the Presbyterian Church to produce an audio-visual as part of the fundraising effort. When they indicated that they could not help, the Methodist Stewardship Director suggested that Institute Communications be approached. Their proposal, including the production of a colour film, was seen as a complementary fundraising project alongside the Methodist proposals. However it was received by Jock Hosking with considerable concern, being regarded as contradictory to the previous requests to the Methodist Church. Jock Hosking challenged the Interchurch Committee to clarify what it wanted to do.⁸² He attended a meeting of the Interchurch Committee on 28 May, and after negotiation the Committee resolved to ask the Stewardship Section of the Methodist Education Division to engage immediately in the Fundraising Project, without the feasibility study. Jock Hosking replied positively to this request, forwarding a draft agreement for the project, which began in August.⁸³

The official opening of the permanent building took place on Sunday 17 June 1979. The Mayor of Manukau City opened the door of the centre in a ceremony attended by the heads of seven denominations. A group from the Papatoetoe churches presented a short drama, 'It's nothing to do with me.' The service was led by Barry Jones, there were some opening remarks from John Patrick, and the principal speaker was Ted Buckle. Formal greetings were given by Lloyd Elsmore,



Mayor of Manukau City, and also by Roger Douglas, Member of Parliament for Manukau.



Opening Day – outside (previous page) and inside (this page)

The interim Board of Management was now in operation and one of its first tasks was to seek the appointment of a fulltime Director for Friendship House. Initial discussion of the proposed job description included the hope that the Director would be ‘a holy man who believes deeply and humbly’, and the thought that the position should be open ‘to any minister of the supporting churches’ with the stipend according to ‘his’ denomination.⁸⁴ The Board wrote to the participating Churches concerning the desire to appoint a fulltime Director, enclosing the job description, and also information on the financial implications.⁸⁵ The acceptance of Audrey Dickinson as a Methodist candidate for ordination meant some staffing changes were necessary, due to her obligation to attend lectures at St John’s College. Doreen Swinburne was appointed as interim half-time Hostess Co-ordinator, alongside Audrey Dickinson who was also now in a half-time role. (Doreen Swinburne had been helping in a voluntary capacity.)

In addition, the Board of Management accepted Mike Flavell’s offer to work as a half-time interim Director while the appointment of a permanent Director was being finalised, and he was commissioned for the role on 1 April 1980. He was a Presbyterian representative on the Board of Management, and worked as a minister in the neighbouring churches of St John’s and St Philip’s in Papatoetoe. He had come to work

in the area as the result of hearing Ted Buckle speak passionately at Knox College in Dunedin about community development in South Auckland.⁸⁶

The Board of Management established some priorities for the interim Director. These included administration, public relations, promotion, the flow of information to the Board and to the Church courts, the development of Friendship House as a spiritual centre, putting 'some of the dreams of Friendship House into practice, and 'to prepare events in the House to reveal to the Churches what the House is'.⁸⁷

In June 1980 the Board of Management was advised that the Project Committee had completed its work, making the final payment to Fletcher-Mainline for construction of the permanent centre.⁸⁸

The Fundraising Appeal was encountering difficulties. The lack of an adequate feasibility study meant that the Appeal process had begun without a significant number of leaders involved. Jock Hosking reported that the responses for lists of potential donors from South Auckland churches indicated a lack of enthusiasm and support for Friendship House. He stated that only seven out of sixteen Anglican parishes, one out of nine Roman Catholic, eight out of nine Methodist, three out of sixteen Presbyterian, and two out of seven Baptist parishes bothered to reply. As a conclusion it was recommended that the public launching of the Appeal be delayed until March 1981.⁸⁹ Then in September 1980 Jock Hosking advised that he was no longer available to help, but that an Australian person would be available to carry out the obligations of the Joint Stewardship Section of the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches.⁹⁰ This information led the Interchurch Committee to the decision to terminate its arrangements with the Joint Stewardship Section and to pursue its own fundraising arrangements. Factors considered in arriving at this position included:

- The overdraft with the ANZ Bank was \$272,000, not \$350,000 as previously thought
- There were several other major fundraising projects currently underway in the participating Churches
- The feeling that if the loan were substantially reduced then the Churches could cope with the debt-servicing requirements
- There was a strong negative reaction to the suggestion of using an Australian resource person.⁹¹

At a subsequent meeting the Interchurch Committee agreed that the current inertia regarding fundraising could only be addressed when a report on new organisational models for Friendship House had been discussed. This model strengthened the role of the Board of Management, with the provision of committees for Building and Fundraising. These committees were to report to the Board of Management. The meeting agreed that the Interchurch Committee, before disbanding, should ensure that a

competent Fundraising committee was constituted. The Building Committee would assist Howard Anderson in carrying out the role that the General Trust Board had been handling in debt servicing and property matters.⁹²

THE FIRST DIRECTOR IS APPOINTED

The Board of Management considered that by mid 1980 Friendship House was at a critical point in its development, so it called a consultation, on 27 July 1980, of staff, volunteers, users, local parishes, planning and building committees, and the heads of the participating Churches.⁹³ In a report to the Heads of Churches Mike Flavell, the interim Director, also mentioned that over 30 different groups of people were using the premises regularly; about 4-500 people a month visited the Drop-in centre; several Ministers' Fraternal had used the House for meetings; ministers had led the midweek worship service; a Service Club had held a prayer breakfast; Roman Catholics had held occasional Masses; youth groups had held dances; women's groups had held fashion parades.⁹⁴

Mike Flavell's six-month term as interim Director concluded on 30 September 1980, and Alan Lipscombe succeeded him in that role. In commenting on his period as interim Director, Mike stated that what made Friendship House special for him was that it was a tangible expression and presence at the 'top of the cliff', not at the bottom. Because there were no established positions or traditions the people involved were able to exercise a passion to make theology real. This happened in two particular ways: hospitality at the House, and community development from the House. In exercising such theological and mission passion the Friendship House team became a support base for themselves, rather than going back to their own churches. In the development of Friendship House there was never any intention to create a dependent child. Mike regarded the care of the team as the most important aspect of his work. The strengths of the team were in the ability and willingness to appreciate differences and the commitment to seeing things go well.⁹⁵

In 1981 Jean Brookes became Vicar of Mangere East. Her contribution in the early years of Friendship House was remarkable for her passion for and commitment to community development. Working from her base at Friendship House she developed good relationships with City Councillors and Community Development staff, thus building on the City Council's earlier support for Friendship House. She visited countless homes in the Clover Park area, assisting women who were victims of violence, and helping young mothers deal with children's ill health: glue ear, asthma, bronchitis, skin infections. She worked closely with the Medical Health Officer, and also contributed to the development of the Community Health Centre at Manukau.⁹⁶

The Board of Management approved a revised job description for the Director.⁹⁷ The position was advertised widely and attracted twelve applications. The Reverend Peter Carter, a Presbyterian minister in Tauranga, was appointed, and he was inducted as Director on 12 March 1981.

Almost as soon as he began work there was the proposal that the Director's job specification be redefined. A consultation on fundraising and re-financing of Friendship House's debt took place on 24 March. It was agreed that what was needed was a 'key' person to head and direct a work-party elected by the Fund-raising committee, rather than the alternative of farming the project out to a business firm. It was felt that the Director was the most suitable person to undertake this task. Peter Carter supported this, stating that in many ways the ministry of Friendship House was similar to that of a Parish, with the need for a person who would enthuse and actively accept leadership in fundraising and other aspects of the life of Friendship House. He had some experience in the financing and building of St Paul's Presbyterian Church in Manurewa.⁹⁸



Audrey Dickinson's role as Hostess/Co-ordinator ended on 28 May 1981. At her farewell she was presented with a 'Certificate in Experimental Ministry', signed by Mike Flavell as Chairman of the Board of Management, and Peter Carter as Director, in appreciation of her four years contribution. Audrey in 2005 reflected on the trailblazing nature of Friendship House in its early years. For example, mothers were not allowed to breastfeed in public in the shopping mall, so they were made welcome at the House;

Early staff outside the House

there were no footpaths in the new subdivisions between Otara and Redoubt Road, so Friendship House lobbied the City Council for the provision of footpaths; the Thursday evening 'Community Night' began because there was 'a person who was hungry'.⁹⁹

Pat Ross replaced Audrey Dickinson as half-time Hostess/Co-Ordinator, in tandem with Doreen Swinburne. In this way Pat began an involvement with Friendship House that has spanned most of its subsequent history. She trained as a counsellor and worked with Presbyterian Support. That agency was based at Friendship House for a number of years. Pat also became an Associate Counsellor for Friendship House and in more recent years she has served as a Trust Board member. Her story is an example of the manner in which the personal journey of many people has been shared with Friendship House over many years.

In May 1981 Peter Carter reported to the Board of Management that the House now had its own Emergency Housing as well as a Budget Advisory Service.¹⁰⁰

Peter gave considerable energy to the Fundraising effort. As part of this he had to come to grips with the details of all that had taken place over five years. He wrote to the Executive Director of the Anglican Diocese, asking for clarification on several points. Howard Anderson's reply expressed some frustration on Friendship House matters:

I think I must be quite frank, and express some concern at the repeated approaches to me to supply information. I can recall when Mike Flavell became acting Director he came and saw me and I got out all the old files and copied a vast amount of material and sent it to him....Then Alan Lipscombe became acting Director and I went through the same process with him....I invited both Alan Lipscombe and Mike Flavell to the final meeting of the Projects Committee...and they received copies of the audited accounts and the final report of the Projects Committee. When you arrived, Alan Lipscombe brought you up to see me and you spent an hour or two making notes through the whole of the interview....I think there has to be some limitation on the number of times I have to get out old files and minute books and resurrect a lot of data which is now fairly basic and should be on record at Friendship House.¹⁰¹

Howard Anderson, who had carried a significant administrative load during the planning for and construction of Friendship House, added to these comments in August 1981 when he wrote:

I am coming firmly to the view that the sooner the whole operation is transferred out to the Board of Management the better, although there are some real questions as to whether the composition of the Board is such that they can accept this responsibility. Just now the division of function and responsibility means that we are falling between two stools and run the risk of getting into a lot of trouble.¹⁰²

Although Peter Carter and others had worked very hard to get a Fundraising initiative moving there was little progress. The Board of Management was finding it hard to raise money to pay off a debt, and they stated a preference for any appeal to be supporting the ministry of Friendship House. Howard Anderson suggested to Mike Flavell, Barry Jones and Bill Tibbles that a way forward could be for the Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches to accept responsibility for \$230,000 of the outstanding bank loan, and for the Board of Management to find \$30,000 towards the total bank loan of \$260,000, and also to then accept responsibility for every aspect of Friendship House, thus freeing the three Churches of any further obligation.

THE OPERATING AGREEMENT

When Howard Anderson recommended to his Diocesan Finance Advisory Committee that they accept the suggestion for resolving the Friendship House funding dilemma, he commented that ‘the Board of Management should work through to the completion of an agreement governing the constitution, operation and ministry of Friendship House, without delay’, and that ‘steps should be taken to strengthen the Board after the Constitution has been worked out, establishing who appoints and for what terms’ and ‘also to define the nature of the ministry to be carried out from Friendship House’.¹⁰³ The proposal was also considered by the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches. The three Churches all agreed to the proposal. In order to enable the Board of Management to act as if the proposal were already in place, a document was drawn up between the Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches. This document meant, in effect, that for the time being the operations were legally under the umbrella of the Anglican General Trust Board. In correspondence relating to this document Howard Anderson was critical of the fact that the first fulltime Director had been appointed by the Board of Management without the approval of all participating Churches, and he expressed the conviction that this provision should be in any final agreement between the Churches.¹⁰⁴

The Board of Management now directed its fundraising effort towards the support of the ministry at Friendship House. The Chairperson, Beverly McConnell, contributed many hours of work to the Fundraising Campaign, which was launched in June 1982, directed mainly at the industrial and business community of Manukau City.¹⁰⁵ In a document supporting this effort, mention was made of the ‘open door’ at the House and the provision of counselling, a Budget Advisory Service, and assistance for Polynesian immigrants. Other Agencies that were present at the House were the Red Cross Family Support Programme, Lifeline, Anglican-Methodist Social Services, and the Presbyterian Social Services Association. Community groups that made use of the facilities included the Hearing Association, the Stroke Club, the Arthritis and Rheumatism Association, Alcoholics Anonymous, Overeaters Anonymous, and a music therapy group for ‘handicapped children’.¹⁰⁶

In her ‘Chairman’s Report’ for 1982, Beverley McConnell noted that 25 men had visited approximately 150 companies or organisations and by December had raised almost \$30,000 from 50 donors, with a further \$17,000 promised for 1983 and 1984. She noted also that Bishop Godfrey Wilson, Bishop of the Southern Region of the Diocese of Auckland and an Anglican member of the Board of Management, had led the formation of a draft Operating Agreement. During 1982 there had been considerable discussion with the Churches over the proposed text. Beverley noted her personal disappointment at the division amongst Board members over the proposal to provide for the appointment to the Board of one person representing the Agencies based at Friendship House. She felt that ‘we not only lose credibility by this decision, we forfeit the

enrichment and influence that knowledge of their work would give us in directing our own course in interpreting the Gospel today in Manukau City'. There had also been discussion about placing the symbol of the Cross over the entrance to the House: 'Do we know who we are or do we have an identity crisis of our own – or do we really feel this identification would restrict our usefulness in serving the community?' In concluding her report, Beverley quoted from a letter from Mike Flavell, the previous Board chairman:

I realise that my involvement with the House turned out to be the source of some of the best treasures that my life has experienced. Through my involvement God became real, and so did I. The House and the people in it and with it set me on a journey which continues to get better and better.¹⁰⁷

Early in 1983 Beverley McConnell forwarded a revised draft of the Operating Agreement to the Church Courts for their comment. The Churches were asked to respond by 30 April 1983. In her covering letter she stated:

The new draft has sought to follow in a general way the main structure of the 'Standard Agreement for Co-operative Ventures based on joint-use of Buildings'. However it has not done this slavishly; Friendship House is a non-parochial joint venture and its uniqueness calls for some innovation in its Operating Agreement.

She also reported on the division amongst Board members over representation from agencies on the Trust Board, noting that not all Board members were present at the meeting. There was a deadlock with four members voting for the proposal, and four voting against it. Those voting in favour considered that the original vision for the House was to bring together in partnership those who were providing a range of services to the community. Some of the present agencies operating from the House were Church agencies. The other agencies had committed Christians as staff members and a Christian vision of service in what they were trying to do. Those who opposed the proposal either thought that as the agencies concerned were not part of the ministry of Friendship House they should not be represented on the Board, or disagreed about the provision including voting power.¹⁰⁸ Negotiations over the text of the Operating Agreement continued on into 1984. The archival material gives ample evidence of the many diligent hours of patient work that Godfrey Wilson gave in bringing the Operating Agreement to the point where the Churches were all happy with the text. The final text of the Agreement is in Appendix Four. (Over the years since there have been some minor amendments).

In September 1983 Barry Jones led a Consultation on the future ministry of Friendship House. Eighteen people were present, including Board members, staff, and people from the Agencies. The Board presented a working paper identifying some priorities:

- The need to build an integrated team of workers on the first two floors of Friendship House, involving the pooling and co-ordinating of resources and people. This would help develop ministry to the ‘casualties’ in the community, and support initiatives towards the structures in the community that cause the casualties to a greater or lesser degree.
- The need to explore the evangelistic and pastoral ministry to nearby residential areas, including the use of Friendship House as a Sunday centre for worship, fellowship and teaching.
- The need to take more seriously the ministry to the ‘working’ community in and around the City Centre in industry, commerce and local Government.
- The need to develop further as a resource centre for parish ministries, especially for education and ministry training, and for raising awareness of community issues.

There was general agreement that the priorities identified were all important, and the first one was considered especially important. The Board also suggested a revised staffing structure, with a Co-ordinator/Counsellor, and a Chaplain. The Drop-In Centre hostesses also suggested the need for a Co-ordinator with administrative skills. Those present at the consultation felt that a Co-ordinator/Administrator was the key figure, not a Counsellor. A working group was established to bring viable suggestions to a future meeting.¹⁰⁹

In early 1984 Peter Carter returned to parish ministry. Gavin Rennie, who had been working with the Auckland/Methodist Central Mission’s Community & Social Services Division, was appointed part-time Co-ordinator. This arrangement, negotiated by the Board with the Methodist Central Mission, was the result of the September consultation, and the stringent financial situation that Friendship House was in. It was a temporary position from February 9 – May 31 1984, because both the South Auckland Presbytery and The Salvation Army argued that no permanent managerial appointment should be made until the Operating Agreement had been finalised.¹¹⁰ However the position eventually became that of full-time Director.

In February 1984 Peter Carter sought the Board’s approval to conduct a Church service at Friendship House for Pacific Islanders on Sunday afternoons. The Board’s discussion on this matter took place in the context of receiving a request from the Joint Regional Committee to convene a consultation to consider ministry in the residential areas near Friendship House. It was the consensus of the March Board meeting:

That Friendship House should not just be used as a venue for the Sunday worship of a particular denomination. It was also felt that if there were to be Sunday worship, that the ministry should be a part of the overall ministry of the House. There was also the consideration that we should be looking at new

styles of ministry rather than providing alternative venues for what appear to be variations of ordinary parish Sunday worship.¹¹¹



The signing of the Operating Agreement

On 7 June 1984 the Operating Agreement was signed by the Heads of Churches. The event marked not only the completion of the formal establishment of Friendship House; it also marked the continuing quest for the maturity of the vision for the House. The ministry of the House had developed its unique shape, policies had been thrashed out, and many people had made distinctive

contributions. This desire for maturity is perhaps best underlined by the words with which Beverley McConnell concluded her Annual Report in March 1984:

Our ministry to date has been mainly an ambulance type service, and any influence with the decision makers in Central City Administration has come from personal contacts. Whereas this has been of good value, I believe that the 'band-aid and buddies' approach is not in itself sufficient to justify the presence of Friendship House in Manukau City.

If we are to be true to our objectives, and as we respond to the needs around us, we need to raise questions concerning the causes of the problems which people face. I do not see this as thrusting us into any radical political stance incurring polarisation, but more as an honest effort to identify the causes of social injustice, and to work for true reconciliation between all opposing parties.

We must keep rediscovering and affirming the uniqueness of the ministry of Friendship House. We are not neutral. We are Christian.¹¹²

The initial years leading up to the signing of the Operating Agreement, and the years since, bear witness to the continuing ability, and daring, of the people of Friendship House to 'keep rediscovering'. That openness is a large measure of the uniqueness of Friendship House, reflected in this history of ecumenical context, City Council motivation, and the vision and hard work of many women and men.

POSTSCRIPT

And so to the present, thirty years on from the opening of the temporary Lockwood Houses and almost thirty five years on from the first discussions on what kind of presence the churches wanted to have in the new city of Manukau. Manukau is now a mature city; the City Centre has grown up around the House; the mortgage is long gone; and the dream lives on.

In interviews with people and through reading early meeting notes, it is clear how the themes of ministry, mission, hospitality and justice in the context of life in the city, are perennial. Although people have come and gone, and in some cases returned again, the House continues to offer a unique 'Place for People' in the heart for Manukau.

These days the House has a stable financial base with contracts for service with central and local Government, and other income from tenants, clients, churches, and charitable funders. Dedicated Board members and staff work to find ways to meet the new challenges that each year brings in the lives of the people and the community we serve. Friendship House has earned an important and valued place in the life of Manukau. Countless thousands of lives have been touched by the vision and life of the House, and the fabric of the city is stronger for having this unique ministry in our midst.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE

THE PROPOSED INTERCHURCH CENTRE, WIRI OFFICE PARK, MANUKAU CITY

Behind the proposals to establish a modest Interchurch Centre in the Wiri Office Park, there are a number of theological convictions. We wish to affirm these.

We acknowledge that in doing so our comments are exploratory rather than definitive, and as such are open to challenge and change.

1. The Wiri project is an attempt to provide maximum variation and flexibility in the outworking of Christian Ministry.

Often in the past the effectiveness of the Church's Ministry has been inhibited by denominational duplication of resources and a determination to persist with institutional expressions of Ministry which, having initially an authentic relevant form, are now inadequate to meet the diverse needs of modern society.

Behind the planning for the Wiri Interchurch Centre has been a determination to co-ordinate and acknowledge the resources of the participating Churches so that they are available to effectively serve and challenge the people and structures within the City of Manukau.

2. The Wiri project is a response to a unique opportunity to plan and implement a genuine Ministry to the inner city of Manukau.

The building of the Civic, Office and Shopping Centre at Wiri is a reversal of traditional city developments. Normally a city evolves from the hub and suburbs grow around it rather like the growth rings of a tree.

However, in Manukau City the suburban hinterland is already partially complete. Howick, Pakuranga, Otara, Papatoetoe, Mangere, Manurewa and Papakura form the outer rings. The heart of the new city up until the last two years has been farmland. Now the enormous Shopping Centre and the Manukau City Council office block are nearing completion, and the inner city residential developments around the complex, Wiri Park East, Wiri Park West, Wiri Village, Rata Vine and Woodside are planned and in some areas roadworks are nearing completion.

This 'back to front' development has tremendous significance for the Church. Whereas in normal evolution of a city the inner city churches begin and continue basically as Parish Churches, drawing their congregations from the suburbs, the Wiri developments present the church with a unique opportunity to establish a Ministry and a presence 'de nova' in the inner city.

3. The Wiri project is an attempt to bring the concerns and the resources of the Churches to people who work and shop within the City Centre

This emphasis in Ministry must not be seen in isolation from what is being planned for in the new residential areas of South Auckland. The inter-relatedness of the City and suburban expressions of

Ministry is best illustrated by the strategy endorsed by the Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian Church Courts called “The Shape and Form of Urban Ministry in the immediate future”. This strategy calls for the churches to provide resources sufficient to enable the formation and development of both church and community life at the proposed neighbourhood, District and Regional Centres. Consequently, the ministry directed to city workers and shoppers is only one facet of the churches total ministry within Manukau City

4. The prime objective of the Wiri Project is the provision of a base from which the Church can carry on its age-long function of the proclamation and celebration of the Gospel.

We see the proclamation and celebration of the Good News becoming manifest in two important ways:

Firstly, through Christian communication in

- The provision of regular worship and sacramental services, and the hearing of confession during the working week
- The provision of counselling facilities – personal support groups;
- The provision of Christian education resources – particularly related to the social and ethical dimensions of the Christian faith in the context of people’s work;
- The provision of a city forum in which to raise social/religious/ethical/political issues, similar to the Friday Forum of the Methodist Central Mission, Queen Street, Auckland.
- The provision of personnel who can exercise a ‘ministry to the strong’ –the City Planners, Councillors, Government Departments.

Secondly, through Christian Inter-communication as the participating churches, Catholic and Protestant, present both a co-ordinated witness and service from within the City Centre.

RODNEY DAVIES

TED BUCKLE

BARRY JONES

MICHAEL WETTERSTROM

(This statement was undated, but appears to have been written in early 1976)

APPENDIX TWO

THEOLOGY OF FRIENDSHIP HOUSE

Friendship House's theology is incarnational. We believe that God is in the world and that His Kingdom is continually coming into being. We believe Friendship House is part of that Kingdom in South Auckland.

Friendship House exists in order to encourage, nurture, and at times challenge people in growth towards reconciliation with God, with others and with themselves. Friendship House sees itself on a journey; a journey in which many are discovering wholeness and oneness with God –that is, the abundant life.

Friendship House believes in personal growth in trust, respect, mature ability to make choices, and in creative co-operative living. We hope for similar changes in society. We believe that God alone is ultimate, and that while social welfare programmes and community planning decisions can be part of this kingdom they also need to provide opportunities for people to grow in wholeness. Friendship House believes the gospel model of reconciliation can provide such opportunities.

Friendship House believes in its ecumenical calling and sees the experience of its unity resting within the Communion Service.

It is within the above framework that Friendship House interprets all reference to its being a church in the market place; a resource centre; a counselling and drop-in centre; a ministry to the strong; a servant church; and other such references currently popular.

PRINCIPLES FOR INVOLVEMENT:

1. That as a church based venture Friendship House chooses to be involved in particular social issues.
2. That Friendship House works for continuing personal growth, and development towards wholeness of being. That we work to foster people's ability to trust their fellows, their awareness of their interdependence; their ability to share their gifts, and their capacity for caring.
3. That Friendship House be involved in the three strands which encourage community wholeness – patching up (remedial work), preventative work, and community development (i.e. local people using their own resources to meet local needs).
4. That Friendship House affirms that social action and welfare are interwoven in development towards community wholeness.
5. That Friendship House lend support for social action and community development, particularly at local parish-level activity.
6. That Friendship House accepts and identifies with those whose rights are infringed, and whose powers are minimised, whether in the church or community.
7. That Friendship House works for reconciliation between all, particularly working for creative meetings between opposing parties, and the presentation of relevant factual information.
8. That Friendship House works for decentralisation of structures, and consumer participation in decision-making.

SOME CURRENT ATTITUDES AND HOPES:

(which have emerged through involvement)

Health: Health care must be equally available to all, of equal standard, and unrelated to capacity to pay. The emphasis should be on community-based groups, and consumer involvement in decision-making at significant levels.

Education: In school years, education should have a considerable emphasis on personal relationships. Vocational training should primarily be the task of employers and vocational training bodies.

Government: Should be 'with' rather than 'on', 'for' or 'to' the people. Its emphasis should be on quality of life, and assisting people to define and meet their needs from their own resources.

WE HOPE FOR;

- a greater sense of community
- minimal institutionalisation of persons in need of care
- a redistribution of power to those who have lost self-esteem
- a reconciliation of conflicting interests in society

WE HOPE THAT:

- institutions will be smaller and closer to the people
- institutions will support the community or the family when they can no longer cope with the care of a person in need.

WE BELIEVE THAT:

Non-professionals are making significant contributions to the structures of society or the church.

These statements have been prepared by the Interim Management of Friendship House.

Rev Jean Brookes; Mrs Audrey Dickinson; Rev Mike Flavell; Mr Dick Slater; Fr Joe Shepherd.

30 September 1978

APPENDIX THREE

Extracts from the Job Description for the first Director of Friendship House (approved 16 September 1980)

The main tasks of the Director are seen as follows:

1. To oversee ministries at present being exercised in and from Friendship House:
 - the work of the Drop-in centre and associated counselling
 - co-ordinating use of the premises by a variety of church and community groups
 - relating supportively to the staff of social service organisations based in the building
 - organising week-day worship
2. To undertake some counselling on referral from the Drop-in centre's staff.
3. To administer the day to day affairs of the House with special responsibility for building a good team relationship among the Drop-in centre staff and workers, and between them and the other workers based in the House.
4. To explore ways of communicating the Gospel to the thousands of people who work in or visit Manukau City Centre during the week.
5. To get to know the surrounding communities of Manukau City, to understand the basic issues for people in these communities, and to ensure that the resources of Friendship House are available to all those working to build a more truly human community.
6. To develop a working knowledge of the various networks of power in Manukau City, especially in local government, and to develop with others appropriate forms of Christian ministry to the City's decision-makers.
7. To build a good working relationship with neighbouring churches and church agencies in South Auckland, so that Friendship House can develop as a ministry resource centre and be seen as a partner not a rival in ministry.
8. To consult regularly with the Board about all aspects of the House's ministry; to prepare regular reports to the Board and to the courts of sponsoring churches.
9. To be responsible for basic publicity and promotional material for the House.
10. To seek at all times to direct the attention of those who work in and for Friendship House outwards to the community it is there to serve and to prevent their vision from becoming 'House-bound'.

To carry out these tasks the Director will need:

1. A vital personal spirituality and secure faith.

2. Ability to be theologically creative.
3. Ability to relate in a mature way to a variety of people and groups, and skills in developing good teamwork and enabling others' ministries.
4. Strong organisational and administrative skills.
5. Some experience and skills in counselling.
6. An understanding of political processes (in church and secular structures) and ability to relate skilfully to these.
7. A social analysis and critique which is Gospel-centred.
8. A capacity to 'dream dreams and see visions'.

APPENDIX FOUR

THE FRIENDSHIP HOUSE TRUST BOARD

OPERATING AGREEMENT

1. DEFINITIONS

1.1 This Agreement is in respect of the Christian Centre known as Friendship House, located in Manukau City Centre; the Agreement describes its aims, ministry and organisation.

1.2 The specific churches involved in this Agreement, through their respective district courts, are:

Anglican	The Bishop and Standing Committee of the Diocese of Auckland
Baptist	The Auckland Baptist Association
Methodist	The Manukau District Synod
Presbyterian	The Presbytery of South Auckland
Salvation Army	The Northern Divisional Headquarters

In this Agreement they are called “the participating churches”.

1.3 Friendship House is erected on Lot 43, DP 69242 Manukau City. Building and land are in the joint beneficial ownership of the General Trust Board of the Diocese of Auckland, the Presbyterian Church Property Trustees and the Methodist Church of New Zealand, in the proportions described in the Deed of Indemnity appended to this Agreement (Appendix 1). To distinguish them from the other participating churches in certain clauses of this Agreement, the Anglican, Presbyterian and Methodist churches are also called “the owning churches”.

1.4 In this Agreement the term, Friendship House, is a comprehensive one, referring both to the building and to the churches’ ministry carried on in and from the building.

2. PURPOSE

2.1 In obedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Friendship House seeks to be a living presence of Christian worship, witness and concern at the heart of Manukau City.

2.2 Through its workers it aims to respond with Christ’s love to the needs and concern of people.

In Christ’s name and in a spirit of justice and reconciliation it will

- uphold the cause of the poor and powerless
- encourage all who are trying to build a more truly human community
- seek to identify the causes of injustice and work for a more just society.

In the same spirit it will

- develop ministries to the political, business and industrial structures in and around Manukau City Centre
- seek to minister to people in the City who exercise power and make decisions affecting the lives of many.

- 2.3 Through its role as a centre of Christian community it will seek to draw people into Christian faith, fellowship and service.
- 2.4 Through the cooperation of the participating churches in a single ministry it will seek to promote Christian unity, both locally and regionally.
- 2.5 Through its involvement in the City it will seek to keep local churches informed about situations and forces preventing people from achieving their full, God-given potential.

3. **CONSTITUTION OF TRUST BOARD**

- 3.1 The management of Friendship House, and the development and oversight of its ministry, shall be the responsibility of a Trust Board, hereinafter called “the Board”, in accordance with the specific provisions of this Agreement.

3.2 **Membership of the Board**

- (a) Each of the participating churches shall be entitled to appoint to the Board two representatives, at least one of whom should be a lay person. Each of the three owning churches shall be entitled to appoint one additional representative to the Board. All members appointed in accordance with this clause shall have full voting rights.
- (b) Any person appointed by the Board to give over-all direction to the ministry of the House shall, ex officio, be a member of the Board and have full voting rights.
- (c) Friendship House staff members, employed by the Board, shall also be entitled to elect one representative to the Board, but without voting rights.
- (d) Staff members of community development and social service agencies, hereinafter called “the agencies”, who are themselves based in the House, shall be entitled to elect one representative, with full voting rights, to the Board.
- (e) When the Board perceives a specific need for expertise, it shall have the right to co-opt up to 3 additional members, with full voting rights.

3.3 **Appointment of Board Members**

- (a) The district court of each participating church shall appoint its representatives. Before any appointment is made, the Chairperson of the Board or his/her nominee, shall first consult with the Chairperson of the appropriate district

court or his/her nominee about the current needs of the Board. The Board may recommend names to the participating churches for consideration.

- (b) Friendship House staff members employed by the Board shall elect their representative at a special meeting convened for that purpose.
- (c) Staff members of the agencies, who are themselves based at the House, shall elect their representative at a special meeting convened for that purpose.

3.4 Terms of Office of Board Members

- (a) Participating churches shall appoint their representatives for a term of two years. The Board shall arrange retirement on a rotation basis to ensure as far as possible that no two representatives of the same participating church retire at the same time.
- (b) Retiring members shall be eligible for reappointment by their district courts for further terms of two years.
- (c) In the event of a vacancy occurring it shall be the responsibility of the Board to advise the appropriate church court of the need to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the current term.
- (d) The Board members representing the Friendship House staff and the agencies shall be appointed annually. They shall be eligible for re-election.

3.5 Officers

The Board shall elect its own Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson and Treasurer from amongst its own members. The Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson shall not be members of the same participating church.

3.6 Meetings

- (a) Ordinary Meetings of the Board shall be held at such intervals as the Board itself deems necessary, provided that it shall meet not less than six times in any one calendar year.
- (b) A special Meeting of the Board shall be convened upon written request to the Chairperson of no less than one-third of the current membership; a minimum notice of seven days, with the reason for the meeting, shall be given in writing to all members prior to any such meeting.

3.7 Annual General Meeting

- (a) An Annual General Meeting of the Board shall be held between January 1 and March 31.
- (b) All members of the Board shall receive in writing at least fourteen days' notice of the Meeting.

- (c) The Annual General Meeting shall receive an Annual Report and duly audited Accounts for the previous financial year, and it shall elect its officers as defined in Section 3.5 of this Agreement. The Report, Accounts and names of Officers shall be forwarded to the district courts of the participating churches.

3.8 Voting

At all meetings of the Board, except as specified in Section 6.1 below, decisions shall be made by simple majority vote. The Chairperson shall have a casting vote. Any member may require a secret ballot.

3.9 Quorum

At all meetings of the Board the quorum shall be one-third of the current membership.

3.10 Common Seal

The Board shall have a Common Seal to be kept at the registered office of the Board and such Seal shall be affixed to every deed, contract and document to be executed pursuant to a resolution of the Board and in the presence of not less than three members of the Board.

4. FUNCTIONS OF TRUST BOARD

4.1 Accountability

- (a) The Friendship House ministry is the creation of the participating churches. Thus the Trust Board established to direct and develop that ministry is accountable to those participating churches.
- (b) The participating churches shall review the work of Friendship House every five years. The Board shall be responsible for notifying the church courts when each review is due and shall ensure that the review involves all the participating churches.

4.2 Life and Ministry

- (a) The Board shall determine all matters of policy in accordance with this document and give general oversight to the Ministry of the House, as agent of the participating churches; provided that in the case of any major proposed development or policy change the Board shall first seek the concurrence of the district courts of those churches.
- (b) The Board may appoint such sub-committees as it may from time to time deem necessary for the effective management of the House and development of its ministry. These sub-committees shall be responsible to the Board.
- (c) The Board may appoint such staff, paid or voluntary, as it deems necessary to carry on the ministry of the House and may also terminate such appointments,

provided that in the case of any person appointed to give over-all direction to that ministry the Board shall, before making that appointment, ascertain that the person is in good standing with their own church.

- (d) The Board shall have power to determine salaries, conditions and all other matters concerning the employment of staff, provided that in the case of an ordained minister payment shall be not less than the current rate of stipend and allowances pertaining to the person's denomination and the Board shall meet pension contributions.
- (e) The Board shall ensure that Friendship House staff members receive regular personal and spiritual support to carry out their tasks.
- (f) Individual members of the Board shall keep their respective church courts informed on the Friendship House ministry and the work of the Board.
- (g) The Board shall ensure that copies of the minutes of its meetings are sent regularly to the district church courts.

4.3 Property and Finance

- (a) The Board shall be responsible for the provision of all monies required for the operation and ministry of Friendship House, exclusive of any outstanding capital debt on the building, such debt to be the sole responsibility of the bodies named in Section 1.3 of this Agreement.
- (b) The Board shall have power to open bank accounts.
- (c) The Board shall have power to borrow and may borrow up to \$5,000 without security. It may not borrow larger sums without the written consent of the participating churches. If security is required, the Board may, with the concurrence of the other participating churches, request the owning churches to offer the property or part thereof as security.
- (d) The Board shall have power to lease any vacant space in the House, to receive the income from such leasing and to determine the rentals for any accommodation within the House that it may from time to time make available.
- (e) The Board shall be responsible for the adequate insurance, maintenance and general administration of Friendship House.
- (f) The Board shall ensure regular payment of all staff salaries and operating costs.
- (g) The Board shall approve each year a budget for the ensuing year; it shall forward copies of this budget to the district courts of the participating churches for their information.
- (h) After each Annual General Meeting the Board shall send copies of its audited Accounts to the district courts of the participating churches for their information.

5. ADDITION OR WITHDRAWAL

- 5.1 Any church wishing to become a participating church in the terms of this agreement shall be required to make written application to the Board from its district court. If a majority of Board members is in favour of admission the Board shall recommend accordingly to the participating churches. The applicant church shall not be admitted unless a majority of the participating churches has agreed to this, such majority to include the three owning churches.
- 5.2 Any participating church, not being an owning church, wishing to withdraw from this Agreement shall be free to do so upon giving three months' notice in writing to the Board.
- 5.3 It is accepted by signatories to this Agreement that if any of the owning churches wishes to withdraw from this Agreement, and also to withdraw its investment in the Friendship House property, twelve months' written notice to the Board and the other owning churches shall be required and such intended withdrawal must become a matter of negotiation between the three owning churches.

6. **DISSOLUTION**

- 6.1 In the event of it becoming clear to the Trust Board that Friendship House cannot or should not continue, the Board may, by resolution, decide upon the dissolution of the Agreement. Such resolution shall only be deemed to have been passed if it has received the votes of two-thirds or more of the current members of the Board.
- 6.2 Upon a resolution to dissolve being passed by the Board, the following steps shall be taken:
- (a) Within seven days of the passing of the resolution the Board shall communicate the text of the resolution to the district courts of the participating churches.
 - (b) The resolution shall be discussed in each district church court, at an ordinary meeting or a meeting specially convened for the purpose, within four weeks of the resolution having been received.
 - (c) Each district church court shall request its district head for the time being, or his/her nominee, to become a member of a Special Committee with power to act, and the Special Committee of the Heads of Churches thus formed shall meet jointly with Friendship House Trust Board to decide on an appropriate course of action. The Chairperson of the Board, or his/her nominee, shall convene the meeting. This joint meeting shall take place not later than eight weeks after the passage of the Board's resolution to dissolve the Agreement.
 - (d) The Special Committee of Heads of Churches may report back to the district church courts with recommendations other than dissolution; but if, having considered all possible alternatives, the Committee agrees with the Trust Board's resolution to dissolve it shall accept responsibility for winding up the affairs of Friendship House and shall have power to make and declare the dissolution effective.

- (e) In the event of dissolution the capital assets and surplus income of the Board, apart from the Friendship House property, shall be distributed as mutually agreed by the Special Committee of Heads of Churches and the Board.

6.3 “Dissolution” in this document is to be taken to mean the dissolution of the Friendship House ministry, as herein defined and described, and of this Agreement. The Special Committee of Heads of Churches shall have power to recommend to the participating churches other uses for the land and building, whether as a base for activities of the churches or not. Any such recommendation for alternative use shall require the approval of the owning churches before being put to the participating churches for consideration.

6.4 In the event of a decision to dispose of the Friendship House property, the owning churches, in consultation with the Special Committee of Heads of Churches, shall take the necessary actions, and all proceeds from such disposal shall be divided between the Indemnity appended to this Agreement, or in such other proportions as those bodies shall mutually agree upon.

7. AMENDMENTS

No proposed amendment to this Agreement shall become part of the Agreement unless and until it has been agreed to by the Board and by a majority of the participating churches, such majority to include the three owning churches.

8. APPENDICES

Appended to this Agreement are:

Appendix I The Deed of Indemnity of February 1, 1978.

Appendix II A short history of Friendship House’s development.

9. SIGNATORIES

We, the approved agents of the participating churches, do hereby ratify and adopt the above Operating Agreement for the Friendship House Trust Board, and do authorise the Board to incorporate under the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Act 1957, Part Two.

SIGNATORIES: SIGNED THIS 7TH DAY OF JUNE, 1984, IN THE PRESENCE OF EACH OTHER

FOR THE:

THE BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF AUCKLAND
ANGLICAN

FOR THE:

AUCKLAND BAPTIST ASSOCIATION
BAPTIST

FOR THE:

MANUKAU DISTRICT SYNOD
METHODIST

FOR THE:

PRESBYTERY OF SOUTH AUCKLAND
PRESBYTERIAN

FOR THE:

BISHOP OF THE AUCKLAND DIOCESE
ROMAN CATHOLIC

AMENDMENTS TO THE OPERATING AGREEMENT

The intent of the following additions and amendments is to ensure the Board has access to essential legal and financial expertise which may not be available from among members.

Addition:

- 3.2 (e) Any person appointed by the Board to the office of Secretary/Treasurer shall, ex officio, be a member of the Board and have full voting rights.

Amendment:

- 3.5 (a) The Board shall elect its own Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson from among its own members. The Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson shall not be members of the same participating church.

Addition:

- 3.5 (b) In the absence of an appointment under Clause 3.2 (e), the Board may elect a Secretary/Treasurer from among its own members.

FOOTNOTES

-
- ¹ Interview with Colin Dale, City Manager, 14 September 2004, Manukau Research Library Oral History Collection MNP OH 17. Colin has had over 40 years experience as a Manukau City Council staff member. I am grateful to Bruce Ringer, Manager of Research Services for the Manukau City Council, for his assistance with this interview. He has also given invaluable assistance in many other ways.
- ² Barry Jones, 'A Report on the proposed Inter-church building in the Wiri Shopping and Civic Centre, for the Auckland Methodist Synod Property Committee' (undated, but probably early 1976)
- ³ Barry Jones, 'A history of Friendship House', a memo to the author, 20 September 2004. Throughout this paper honorifics will be used only for the first reference to that particular person.
- ⁴ Ted Buckle's position was 'Ecumenical Development Officer', and he convened the Development Subcommittee appointed by Standing Committee. This committee's terms of reference included the provision to work in liaison with the Joint Regional Committee of the Negotiating Churches. In 1980 Ted became Bishop in the Northern Region of the Diocese of Auckland.
- ⁵ Reports of the Ecumenical Development Officer to Standing Committee, 16 May 1973, SCU 19 (5/3) Auckland Diocesan Archives
- ⁶ Interview with Colin Dale, 14 September 2004.
- ⁷ Report of Development Subcommittee, 2 October 1972, SCT 5, Box 1, Auckland Diocesan Archives
- ⁸ Standing Committee of the Diocese of Auckland, 'The Shape and Form of Urban Ministry in the immediate future', 1973
- ⁹ Report on Wiri Consultation 25-26 November 1973.
- ¹⁰ In the various records this Committee was referred to with a variety of differing titles.
- ¹¹ Interview with Barry Jones, 21 September 2004.
- ¹² Archdeacon Ted Buckle to Rev. Barry Jones, 11th February 1974, SCU 19 (5/3), Auckland Diocesan Archives
- ¹³ R A Slater, 'Resume of a meeting at the offices of the Manukau City Council –subject: Purchase of Lot 43 in the Wiri Town centre for the use of the Combined Churches', 22 July 1974
- ¹⁴ undated paper: 'Suggestions of Anglican Methodist Social Services staff concerning creche in Wiri Shopping Centre.'
- ¹⁵ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, September 25th, 1974.
- ¹⁶ Barry Jones, 'Learnings from Overseas as to the Church's role in New Town Developments', October 1974
- ¹⁷ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 28 May, 1975.
- ¹⁸ E G Buckle to the City Manager, 14th July 1975
- ¹⁹ City Manager, Manukau City Council to the Venerable E G Buckle, 29 September 1975.
- ²⁰ The Venerable E G Buckle to the City Manager, Manukau City Council, 27 November 1975; The City Manager to the Venerable E G Buckle, 15 December 1975.
- ²¹ Allison Oosterman, 'Church Centre for Wiri?', *New Zealand Herald*, South Auckland Section, 27 January 1976, p 7.
- ²² 'Churches Move Together', *New Zealand Herald*, South Auckland Section, 2 March, 1976, p 8.
- ²³ The Venerable E G Buckle to the City Manager, 21 January 1976; The City Manager to the Venerable E G Buckle, 12 February 1976.
- ²⁴ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 4 February 1976.
- ²⁵ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 25 February 1976.
- ²⁶ The complete statement is in Appendix One of this history
- ²⁷ Fletcher-Mainline Ltd to Hesketh & Richmond, 5 May 1976; H P Anderson to Barry Jones, 25 May 1976.
- ²⁸ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 2 June 1976.
- ²⁹ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee special meeting, 9 June 1976; Barry Jones to the City Manager, Manukau City Council, 11 June 1976; Barry Jones to Fletcher-Mainline Ltd, 11 June 1976.
- ³⁰ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 14 July 1976; Barry Jones to the Churches, 20 July 1976.

-
- ³¹ City Manager, Manukau City Council to the General Trust Board, Diocese of Auckland, 11 August 1976; Fletcher-Mainline to the City Manager, 12 August 1976; Anglican-Methodist Social Services to Fletcher-Mainline, 17 August 1976.
- ³² Programme details are included in the minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 14 July 1976.
- ³³ Earle Howe, *We Build Forever*, Auckland, 2005, p. 9. Due to delays in the subdivision development there was little progress with this work. Chris Pryor died in 1981. In 1988 the Sisters of Mercy relocated from Otahuhu to Wiri. The women established a strong community profile and now have a Community centre alongside the Wiri School. Margaret Martin also served as a Catholic representative on the Friendship House Trust Board, from 1991-2004.
- ³⁴ Summary of first meeting, Management Committee, Interchurch Centre, 15 September 1976.
- ³⁵ Bishop John Mackey to Barry Jones, 13 September 1976; Deputy Diocesan Secretary to Barry Jones, 29 September 1976.; 'Memorandum from Bishop John Mackey', 27 May 1977
- ³⁶ Barry Jones to H Anderson, W Tibbles, E D Grounds, 1 October 1976.
- ³⁷ JASMaD, 'Wiri Inter-church Committee, Permanent Centre, Manukau City Centre', Architectural Brief, Draft No. 1, October 1976.
- ³⁸ Bob Newman to Barry Jones, 16 November 1976
- ³⁹ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 15 December 1976.
- ⁴⁰ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 23 February 1977.
- ⁴¹ Report of a meeting of the Wiri Project Committee, 17 March 1977.
- ⁴² Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meetings, 23 March and 27 April 1977.
- ⁴³ JASMaD to Fletcher-Mainline, 3 May 1977; B Jones to Fletcher-Mainline, 6 May 1977; Minutes of the Wiri Project Committee, 9 May 1977; B Jones to Diocesan Faculty Committee, 20 May 1977.
- ⁴⁴ Minutes of a combined meeting of the Anglican, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches to assess the sketch plans for the proposed Interchurch Centre, Manukau City Centre, 2 June 1977. Unfortunately the minutes do not include any record of the outcomes of the meeting.
- ⁴⁵ Barry Jones to T M Barton, 17 June 1977
- ⁴⁶ T M Barton to Barry Jones, 22 June 1977
- ⁴⁷ R J P Davies to Bishop Gowing, 22 June 1977. He also wrote a Memorandum to the Interchurch Committee on 1 July 1977
- ⁴⁸ T M Barton to Barry Jones, 11 July 1977.
- ⁴⁹ JASMaD, 'Notes taken at a meeting at Friendship House, 22 July 1977.'
- ⁵⁰ Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee, 'Notice of special meeting', 14 July 1977; E H Laurenson, 'A Methodist Comment on the Proposed Inter-churches Centre: Wiri', 18 July 1977.
- ⁵¹ John Patrick wrote a brief history of Friendship House in 1979.
- ⁵² Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 25 May 1977.
- ⁵³ Notes from a meeting held on 20 July 1977
- ⁵⁴ Untitled paper, 27 September 1977.
- ⁵⁵ Friendship House Newsletter September 1977
- ⁵⁶ Friendship House Newsletter No 2, September 1977.
- ⁵⁷ Audrey Dickinson to 'All the women in the Methodist Women's Fellowship', 13 October 1977; Methodist Women's Fellowship brochure, 'Special Objectives 1977-1978'
- ⁵⁸ An undated and unsigned document that appears to have been written for staff and/or Management Committee purposes.
- ⁵⁹ Minutes of the Wiri Project Committee meeting, 3 October 1977.
- ⁶⁰ Memorandum sent by the three denominations to the trustees of the three contributing churches. This document was attached to the agenda for the Wiri Project Committee meeting on 14 December 1977, and was signed by H Anderson (Anglican), W B Watt (Presbyterian) and B E Jones (Methodist).
- ⁶¹ Minutes of the Wiri Project Committee meeting, 14 December 1977.
- ⁶² Letter of invitation signed by Barry Jones as Convenor of the Interchurch Planning Committee.
- ⁶³ Hine Rauwhero, conversation with Vicki Sykes, January 2006
- ⁶⁴ N. Wallace to H. Anderson, 10 March 1978; Minutes of the Wiri Project Committee meeting, 9 March 1978. Compton Associates was an Australian based firm acting as international consultants in fundraising. During the 1970s the firm had a strong profile in several New Zealand Churches.

-
- ⁶⁵ Everald Compton to the Wiri Project Committee, 3 May 1978
- ⁶⁶ Minutes of the Wiri Project Committee meeting, 22 May 1978
- ⁶⁷ Barry Jones, 'Friendship House Permanent Inter-church Centre Report to the Project Committee', 15 August 1978
- ⁶⁸ Minutes of the Wiri Project Committee meeting, 14 September 1978
- ⁶⁹ Howard Anderson to W B Watt, 18 September 1978; Howard Anderson to Standing Committee, 18 September 1978
- ⁷⁰ Jean Brookes to Barry Jones, 13 July 1978 enclosing the minutes of the 25 June meeting. She had written a similar report on 2 December 1977, after the National Community Workers Conference.
- ⁷¹ Friendship House Newsletter, September 1978
- ⁷² The complete statement is in Appendix Two of this history.
- ⁷³ Mike Flavell, undated paper, 'Friendship House – a report for South Auckland Presbytery'. The paper includes reference to the theological statement in Appendix Two.
- ⁷⁴ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 20 December 1978.
- ⁷⁵ Joint Planning & Liaison Committee, 'Report to the Wiri Interchurch Planning & Co-ordinating Committee', 20 December 1978
- ⁷⁶ At the time of the writing of this history (early 2006), the participating Churches were giving consideration to a proposal from the Friendship House Trust Board that the Operating Agreement be replaced with a Constitution.
- ⁷⁷ Interchurch Committee to the participating Churches (undated)
- ⁷⁸ Interchurch Committee to the Participating Churches, 6 April 1979
- ⁷⁹ Howard Anderson's verbal report to the Board of Management. See the Minutes of the Board of Management meeting, 24 June 1980.
- ⁸⁰ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 6 March 1979.
- ⁸¹ Letter, Jock Hosking to Barry Jones, 19 March 1979.
- ⁸² Barry Jones to Jock Hosking, 8 May 1979; Jock Hosking to Barry Jones (undated)
- ⁸³ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 28 May 1979; letter, Barry Jones to Institute Communications; letter, Jock Hosking to Barry Jones, 27 July 1979.
- ⁸⁴ Minutes of the Board of Management meeting, 30 August 1979,
- ⁸⁵ Minutes of the Board of Management meeting, 2 October 1979.
- ⁸⁶ Minutes of the Board of Management meetings: 21 December 1979, 22 February 1980; interview with Mike Flavell, 7 June 2005.
- ⁸⁷ Minutes of the Board of Management meeting, 1 April 1980.
- ⁸⁸ Minutes of the Board of Management meeting, 24 June, 1980.
- ⁸⁹ Jock Hosking, Report on Fund Raising Appeal, 13 March 1980.
- ⁹⁰ Jock Hosking to Barry Jones, 8 September 1980
- ⁹¹ Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 10 September 1980.
- ⁹² Minutes of the Wiri Interchurch Planning Committee meeting, 18 November 1980.
- ⁹³ Mike Flavell, 'To Friends of the House', 17 July 1980.
- ⁹⁴ Mike Flavell, 'Report of Interim-Director to Heads of Churches', 31 July 1980.
- ⁹⁵ Interview with Mike Flavell, 7 June 2005.
- ⁹⁶ Interview with Jean Brookes, 23 September 2004.
- ⁹⁷ Minutes of the Board of Management meeting, 16 September 1980. Extracts from the Director's job description are included in Appendix Three of this history.
- ⁹⁸ Minutes of a Consultation on Fundraising and Re-financing of debt, 24 March 1981
- ⁹⁹ Interview with Audrey Dickinson, 23 June 2005.
- ¹⁰⁰ Minutes of the Board of Management meeting, 5 May 1981.
- ¹⁰¹ Howard Anderson to Peter Carter, 13 July 1981.
- ¹⁰² Howard Anderson to Barry Jones and Bill Tibbles, 20 August 1981
- ¹⁰³ Howard Anderson to the Chairman and Members of the Finance Advisory Committee, 23 September 1981.
- ¹⁰⁴ Howard Anderson to Peter Carter, 25 June 1982.
- ¹⁰⁵ Minutes of the Board of Management of Friendship House, 1 July 1982.
- ¹⁰⁶ 'What is Friendship House', an undated document on Friendship House letterhead.

¹⁰⁷ Chairman's Report, 1982

¹⁰⁸ Beverley McConnell to the District Church Courts, 21 February 1983.

¹⁰⁹ Report on Friendship House Consultation, 19 September 1983.

¹¹⁰ Chairperson's Annual Report, March 1984, p. 2

¹¹¹ Minutes of the Board meeting, 1 March 1984. It is not clear from the archival material whether the Consultation requested by the Joint Regional Committee ever eventuated, or, if it did, what the outcomes were.

¹¹² Chairperson's Annual Report, March 1984, p. 7