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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

There in the pages of an old history of the Ohio legislature which my great grandmother used for a scrap album, there amidst recipes for canning and preserving, amidst the obituaries and wedding notices of friends and family were clippings of the famous female evangelist Aimee Semple McPherson. As with so many people of the era, Aimee Semple McPherson had captivated the imagination of these simple Ohio farmers who were leaders in the local Methodist church and the community of Indian Camp. They wondered about this Pentecostal evangelist who had stirred thousands in her earlier Ohio crusades but now had become embroiled in controversy in her southern California church.

These clippings in an old scrapbook, together with an autobiography of Aimee Semple McPherson belonging to my great grandfather, acquired from the estate of a maiden great aunt, sparked an interest in a female evangelist who died forty-five years before. The interest was stirred again in the wake of controversies about televangelists which brought the stories of Aimee Semple McPherson into current news accounts. (Newsweek, [April 6, 1987]: 23)
Armed now with new interpretive skills, I thought it time to explore the life of Aimee Semple McPherson.

PENTECOSTALISM

Pentecostalism is that part of revivalistic Christianity which seems to have had its genesis in America about the turn of the twentieth century. Although by no means a universal evaluation and a current topic for debate among Pentecostal historians, usually the beginning is attributed to the ministry of William J. Seymour, a black holiness evangelist, who propagated the phenomenon of "speaking in tongues" at the Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles in 1906 (Robeck, 1986:1-4).

Almost immediately, participants spread the news not only to far flung areas of the United States, but also to other countries in Europe, Africa, South and Central America (Frodsham, 1968). Revival had come and God was repeating the work begun on the day of Pentecost, as recorded in Acts, Chapter Two. While there had been records of others down through the ages experiencing similar manifestations to those being recorded in the mission's paper, The Apostolic Faith, the Pentecostalists believed that this time the manifestations were a re-appearing of God's sovereign act recorded in Acts, Chapter Two.

The Pentecostal Christians of this century believe that they have returned basically to the New Testament patterns of doctrine, religious experience, and practice. They consider that the
doctrines and religious experiences of the apostles are constant standards that should not change, and that although the Church's methods, organization and general approach to the world may vary somewhat according to local cultures, the principles of apostolic practice should characterize the Church of every age (Womack, 1968:15).

The scandal facing the mainstream Christian Church was not only the emotionalism and questionable behavior, but also the fact that historical support for the doctrines outside the text of the Bible has been euphemistically dubbed the "history-of-heresies" approach because the occurrences of "speaking in tongues" and other Pentecostal phenomena had been cited only among groups considered to be heretical (Nichols, 1966:18-24; Dayton, 1985:1-4; Spring 1986).

Yet, although the behaviors of the Pentecostals had dubious historical backing, their doctrines were popular and fostered by prior and current revivalistic groups—particularly the Southern Holiness and Methodist groups (Synan, 1971), Christian and Missionary Alliance missions, churches and camp meetings (Anderson, 1979), and the revival efforts of D. L. Moody (Dayton, 1987). The doctrines congealed into four areas (sometimes five, particularly in the Holiness groups) consisting in a doctrine of personal salvation in Jesus Christ; a doctrine of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit which was sometimes split into a work of Entire Sanctification and then of Baptism with the evidence of tongues; a doctrine of divine healing usually construed as
being part of the Atoning work of Christ; and finally a millenial doctrine about the pre-millenial return of Jesus Christ (Dayton, 1987; 1985:21-26; Faupel, 1972; 1988).

All of the doctrines had immediate prior support in the ministries of the city missions; or the revivalists and a large share of the revivalistic churches which were spawned from the Second Great Awakening, a revivalistic era which began just prior to the Civil War and ended in the era of reconstruction (Weisberger, 1966 also McLoughlin, 1978). They were crystallized in a book by A. B. Simpson in 1898 on the ministry of Jesus Christ (however, Simpson did not expect the gift of tongues in the work of the Holy Spirit). More famous was the expression given by Aimee Semple McPherson, who in 1921 in a revival campaign, packaged it in the term "the Foursquare Gospel," which to her meant (1) Jesus Christ the Savior, (2) Jesus Christ the Healer, (3) Jesus Christ the Baptizer, and (4) Jesus Christ the Coming King (McPherson, 1946 & 1969). While her doctrine was the epitome of Pentecostal belief, she, herself, was a unique individualist.

CHARISMATIC PERSONALITY

Aimee Semple McPherson began ministry subordinate to the system. In her efforts with her husband, Robert Semple, under the auspices of the Hebden mission in Toronto, Canada, she labored in any task that was assigned her. (Miller,
1986; McPherson, 1919). Later, in her second start, not only was she more independent of her (second) husband, but also of others. Although a member of the Assemblies of God clergy from 1919 to 1921, she could not be contained in the company of peers. "Aimee Semple McPherson was a dynamic and dramatic individualist," said Carl Brumback, historian of the Assemblies of God Church, "and it is doubtful that she could ever have been a permanent member of any organization except her own" (Brumback, 1961:130).

Aimee Semple McPherson was just one of "those types of persons." She was too big to be constrained by others. She had to be on her own. She had to be in control. It was recognized in school, in the community, and at home. (McPherson, 1919:22-34). She was charismatic.

Ann Ruth Willner might well class her as a "Spellbinder" (Willner, 1984). The Charismatic leader as the Spellbinder is Willner's way to change the emphasis on the development of such leadership from the sudden, mystical model that Weber had developed with reference to the Biblical Prophets (Weber, 1963). Willner's thesis is that leaders are made charismatic by the response of the multitudes that follow them. The process is neither a mystical occurrence nor a programmed creation. In examining the leadership of Sukarno, Castro, and other political leaders, Willner suggested that the interaction between the leader and his audience was the dynamic of charismatic leadership
What Willner has isolated with the tools of sociology might as well be approached through communication models. As old as the ethos of Aristotle and as new as the rhetoric of social intervention, rhetorical and communication theory has considered the relationship of the speaker and the audience and the effect it produces. Among recent approaches is that of William R. Brown, who argues that the picture of the world held by a multitude is maintained or changed by the information conflicting with it being either masked or featured (1982, 1978). The "power" utilized by the communicator is created more by the communicative process than is the process the creature of power itself ("Power" 1986). Power is fostered in the needs of the leader and of the audience as they and these processes work concomitantly to create a new and different picture of reality, (1978, 1987) including the interdependent relationships that are the focus of power (for further information on Brown's methodology cf. Chapter II).

JUSTIFICATION FOR STUDY

It has been more than 80 years since the birth of the Pentecostal Movement (Anderson, 1979:62-78). As one Pentecostal minister put it, "We used to be the tar paper shack across the tracks, but now we're the big beautiful complex on the growing side of the community. We have arrived" (A
Pentecostal Evangelist to Kankakee, Illinois Interfaith Fellowship, c. 1972). The process for moving from the "tar paper shack" to the beautiful edifice is detailed by H. Richard Niebuhr in *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (1929). According to Niebuhr's theory, a religious group goes through three distinct stages of development--"Sect," "Church," and "Denomination." It is evident that Pentecostalism has arrived at the last stage of formalization. During this stage, a group can tolerate self-evaluation and an objective stance to the investigation. This is evident in the function of The Society for Pentecostal Studies.

The Society for Pentecostal Studies began in the mid-seventies primarily for fellowship for those of Pentecostal background who were engaged in graduate studies. However, by the Fifteenth annual meeting, members were engaged both in historical-critical evaluation of the Pentecostal Movement and of themselves (Gaitherburg, Md. Nov. 14-16, 1985).

Past research about Pentecostalism has focused on one of its most peculiar features, glossolalia or "speaking in tongues." Psychologists, (Cutten, 1927), linguists, (Samarin, 1971), and theologians (MacDonald, 1964)--often considering "tongues speaking" as the most salient feature of the movement--have generally been unfavorably critical because the practitioners lacked understanding of the "true nature of the phenomena" (Wilson, 1981).
Current research, however, has turned from the flamboyant issue of glossolalia to more general matters, including detailed historical analysis of the development of the movement as a whole (Anderson, 1979) or of particular groups within the movement, such as Open Bible Standard Churches by Robert Mitchell (1982), or the Assemblies of God by William Menzies (1971), or of particular theological roots such as the history by Vinson Synan (1971). Currently, there is more interest in the dynamics creating an adherence of nearly 59,000,000 around the world by the year 1985 (Barrett, 1982).

This is the time to do research on the Pentecostal Movement because its communicants are more attuned to being studied than at any time in the past. Current concern about their own development has facilitated access to materials which tell the story of the development of the movement (Pneuma Vol. 8 No. 2 [Fall 1986]:77-183). Yet, in the rush to carry on research, a gap has been left in approaching the development through the method of rhetorical criticism. The few examples that do exist are examinations of sermons utilizing a traditional neo-Aristotelian methodology. The development of rhetorical methodology in the last twenty to twenty-five years has been ignored. The newer theories have not been tapped to explain the development of this particular movement (cf. review of Literature below).

It is appropriate in studying the Pentecostal Movement
that the focus fall on Aimee Semple McPherson and the Four-square Gospel denomination which she founded. Her involvement began in 1908 in independent missions in Ingersoll, Stockton, and Toronto, Ontario; Chicago, Illinois, and Findlay, Ohio (Miller, 1986; Faupel, 1980, McPherson, 1919). She was a Pentecostal missionary to Hong Kong in 1910 (Miller, 1986; McPherson, 1919) and a traveling tent evangelist from 1915 through 1919, when she began to hold her meetings in large auditoriums. She was a key evangelist for the largest group of Pentecostals, The Assemblies of God, from 1919-1922, when she began to form her own separate organization (Robeck, 1988a:569f; Brumback, 1977). She had been part of it all yet was unique because of the power of her personality. Her life provides a historical pattern for the demonstration of the developmental process of institutionalizing of a charismatic leader.

The organization she founded was one of the last classical Pentecostal denominations founded in the United States. One other follows and it was primarily a split of her own work. (Mitchell, 1982; Smith, 1933). Students of the movement will realize that since 1960, new developments have been designated Neo-Pentecostal or Charismatic to note the distinctions between the socio-economic and cultural differences between the two movements (Quebedeaux, 1976 & 1983).
The doctrine preached by Aimee Semple McPherson was the epitomization of Pentecostal doctrine. Donald Dayton, of Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, has identified in his book, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, the fourfold doctrine, which she described as "The Foursquare Gospel," was the root theology for all of Pentecostalism (1987). Therefore, studying her organizational and communicative development is studying a representative of classical Pentecostalism.

It is important, then, to study Aimee Semple McPherson because of her influence. She was noted as influencing a powerful change in the status and acceptability of Pentecostalism nationwide. Vinson Synon believes her campaigns brought such a level of acceptability for struggling Pentecostals that arson, beatings, and other forms of violence perpetrated against them ceased (1971: 190-191). Too, she was noted as a classic representative of religion in Southern California. In 1953, Armine MacKenzie called her "The Los Angeles Paradox" and in 1961, in the *Californian*, C. D. Champlin states, "For 25 years, the name of Evangelist Aimee Semple McPherson was synonymous with southern California" (p.16). Even the auto club in *Westways*, in a tour of Los Angeles says, "A Day in the City, Echoes of Aimee" (April, 1970). McPherson was also noted as typical of her era in American history. Her story was chosen by Isabel Leighton, editor of *The Aspirin Age, 1919-1941* to represent a major
religious development of that period. In addition, Douglas Dacre, in an article for Maclean's Magazine, called her the "High Priestess of the Jazz Age" (1951). Her significance to the church, to the area of the country, and to the day in which she lived, further justifies the importance of investigating her life and particularly the institutionalization of her charismatic personality. It is a study of McPherson and her relationship to her movement, not a study of the Foursquare movement itself.

LIMITATIONS

This is a rhetorical study. As will be seen in the review of literature, there have been several approaches to the study of Aimee Semple McPherson. Studies have been homiletical, rhetorical, theological, and historical. This study is a rhetorical study of history; that is, it is using the rhetorical theory of social intervention to analyze this historical case. Since this is not a study in theology, it will not discuss questions of divine involvement in the formation of the charismatic leader. This is not to deny that this leader did not display the classical expectations of followers taken from the models of the Biblical Prophets or practitioners in the Early Church, but it is to say that I am limiting my examination to those elements in the communication process that indicate the development of institutionalization in this charismatic leader.
Given the controversial nature of the life of Aimee Semple McPherson, one might expect that there be a claim regarding the truth of the claims made by McPherson and her detractors. But this study is neither an apologetic nor a diatribe. Instead, the study attends to the audience acceptance of a claim that makes the difference in the rhetorical situation. It is what the supporters and detractors did with the information that is important and that McPherson had to act based upon that rhetorical situation rather than "did she or didn't she?"

Garrison Keillor, of Lake Wobegon Days, in a recent interview commented on Aimee Semple McPherson as the last great woman evangelist who has been condemned on the basis of "one little incident." He feels someone should rescue her reputation (Radix 17 [Spg. 1986]: 11). This study is not intended to "rescue" but should help in evaluating her successes as well as her failures in a more objective fashion. It is hoped that it can help identify stages of leadership development that can be utilized to study not only McPherson but other perceived charismatic leaders in religion, business, or politics.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The ministry of Aimee Semple McPherson spanned the prominent portion of the history of classic Pentecostalism. Her involvement began two years after the Azusa Street
Revival, the opening watershed in 1906, and it ended in 1944, sixteen years before the modern burgeoning of the Neo-Pentecostal or Charismatic Movement (Quebedeaux, 1976; 1983). She, along with only a few others, set forth a model and theology for Pentecostal evangelists and more particularly for women in ministry (Bundy, 1986: 184). Because, however, of the relative newness of Pentecostal studies, a search for materials on Aimee Semple McPherson was a challenge.

SEARCH FOR LITERATURE

The search for literature began with three specific bibliographies on American Pentecostalism. David Faupel, under joint auspices of the B. L. Fisher Library of Asbury Theological Seminary, and of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, produced a short bibliographic essay. The essay follows a three-fold division following Everett L. Moore, who divided the movement into those denominations with a Keswick view of sanctification, those denominations with a Holiness view of "entire sanctification," and those denominations that hold a "Jesus Only" view of the God-head (Faupel, 1972:12). Faupel discussed the literature in terms of these theological distinctions, including practical expression such as missions, homiletics, and apologetics. He concludes his short work with a series of appendices listing the denominations, their publishing houses, periodi-
cals, and location of Pentecostal collections (Faupel, 1972: 44-54).


The third bibliography is *Charismatic Religion in Modern Research*, by Watson E. Mills (1985). This bibliography provided sociological and historical interpretive articles on the Pentecostal/Charismatic view of the world. It did not provide particular works on Aimee Semple McPherson.

As material began to become available, the bibliography for each source was compared to the list of sources acquired from the specialized bibliographies mentioned above. New material was noted and inter-library loans were requested; the materials were checked first-hand following the lead of the previous writings.

In addition to published bibliographies on the subject
of Pentecostalism and related subjects, I consulted several indices. Matlon's Index to Journals in Communication Studies Through 1985 yielded only one article on McPherson, Harry Ebeling's "Aimee S. McPherson: Evangelist of the City" from the 1957 Western Journal of Speech Communication, which was acquired for the study. The Catalog of dissertations yielded no additional dissertations to those described by Jones (1983) as of 1986. The Union catalog of Pre-1956 imprints was consulted. One additional title was found of McPherson's published works that seems pertinent to the subject, What's The Matter With The Churches, The Preacher, The Pew, The Seminary, The Old-time Religion?

In addition to the above procedures, the following libraries were contacted for bibliographic materials. The Library of CBN University in Virginia Beach, Virginia, while concerned about the subject, had little to offer. The only unique piece was an account of the disappearance coupled with a personal testimony. Oral Roberts University supplied several bibliographies of material on Pentecostalism which confirmed materials mentioned in the published bibliographies already mentioned. L.I.F.E. Bible College provided collections of McPherson's publications, The Bridal Call, and The Bridal Call Foursquare. There were deteriorating copies of the Crusader, McPherson's newspaper, but because of its condition they were unusable. Anna Swartz, L.I.F.E.
Bible College Librarian, was very cooperative in making the Bridal Call available. There are four boxes of duplicate materials available at the Billy Graham Evangelistic Center in Wheaton, Illinois, including sermon manuscripts, stenographically recorded, as well as the same periodicals already obtained from L.I.F.E. Special permission of International Church of Foursquare Gospel administrators is required for their use. A catalog of materials from the Billy Graham Center revealed copies of postcards, pictures, tambourine—material connected with her function as an evangelist.

In a series of personal interviews at International Church of the Foursquare Gospel Headquarters, L.I.F.E Bible College, I learned the following information. Dorothy Jean Furlong, since retired, taught the history of the Foursquare Movement and Pentecostalism at L.I.F.E. Bible College. She could not confirm the presence of any correspondence except a mimeo copy of the preamble to the Articles of Incorporation, which was a class handout, which others had verbally referred to as a "letter." It states that McPherson had no intentions of starting a denomination. Furlong could not verify the presence of any diaries. Charles Duarte, Chair of the Heritage Committee of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, and to whom requests for use of Billy Graham Center materials must go, said that the intention was to house all material that academics could utilize at the
Billy Graham Center. While they would prove useful to the subject of this dissertation, the corporate records are closed to all says Duarte, "because of confidentiality of people dealt with in those closed sessions" (Interview, May 25, 1988). In addition, Dr. Harold Helms, Pastor of Angelus Temple, took me on a tour of the facility and discussed past and present programs of the church (Interview, May 25, 1988).

Another source of information was the annual meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies. Desmond Cartwright, historian for the Elim Pentecostal Church (Great Britain), informed me that he possessed bibliographic materials on McPherson's campaigns in Great Britain during 1926 and 1928. While the materials do not bear directly on this dissertation, I include the information here for other researchers (Cartwright, Personal Conversation, [Nov. 15, 1985]).

In research for the recently published Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements (1988), Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., editor for the Society's journal, Pneuma, came upon three letters regarding the Ordination of Aimee Semple McPherson with the Assembly of God denomination and her surrendering those credentials shortly before the opening of Angelus Temple. Copies of these letters were made available for this study. In addition, J. Ray Tyson, at the 1988 conference, admitted to possessing a letter that had been
sent to his grandmother regarding campaigns in the Dayton, Ohio area. A copy of this letter was graciously made available for this study. I was unable to obtain other correspondence.

In summary, the primary materials utilized for this research include copies of Aimee Semple McPherson's books, This is That, both the 1919 and 1923 editions; In the Service of the King, 1927; Give Me My Own God, 1936; and The Story of My Life published posthumously in 1973. In addition, several doctrinal works which were produced from transcripts of her preaching including The Second Coming of Christ, 1921; Divine Healing, 1928; What's the Matter with the Churches..., 1928; Lost and Restored, 1928; Declaration of Faith, c.1928; a series of outlines used in her classes at L.I.F.E. Bible college and the Correspondence School, Foursquare Types and Shadows and The Foursquare Gospel produced from her material posthumously in 1946.

Of primary importance was McPherson's periodical, The Bridal Call, later called the Bridal Call Foursquare which provided news information, schedule information, and transcriptions of her sermons. It also provided comments and editorials by other important figures in the operation of Angelus Temple and the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. I was able to obtain access to all known existing copies from September, 1917, through 1934. I also was able to obtain some information from her newspaper, The
Crusader, begun in 1927. This material is deteriorating rapidly and unless measures are taken to duplicate this material, it will be lost.

To obtain knowledge of public opinion and alternative evaluations, I utilized The New York Times from 1926 through 1944. I also had access to several Ohio newspapers regarding McPherson's campaigns in Ohio from the Ohio Historical Society in Columbus.

Secondary sources important to this study include works by Robert V. P. Steele, who wrote under the pseudonymn of Lately Thomas (1959, 1970) and Nancy Mavity, (1931). Negative critics included Shuler, (nd); Goben, (1932); and Bogard, (1934). A number of magazine articles from the period were also utilized. Important apologetic material was provided by Raymond Cox's work as historian, editor, and defender of Aimee Semple McPherson and the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel (1983; McPherson, 1968; 1973).

EVALUATION OF PRIOR RESEARCH

A search for dissertations and theses revealed that there had been four theses and three dissertations regarding Aimee Semple McPherson. One of the latter, a study from 1956, was not considered in this study for while mentioning McPherson in his title, "A Study of the revival method in America, 1920-1955," Lawrence Lacour treated McPherson peri-
pherally and focused primarily on Billy Sunday and Billy Graham. It was, therefore, excluded from consideration in this study. Taken in chronological sequence, the others will be evaluated.

The first work was a Masters Thesis written in 1949. William F. Fahrner wrote about "The Persuasive Techniques of Aimee Semple McPherson," for the Department of Speech at the University of Redlands, California. This is a classical rhetorical study of setting, invention, ethos, pathos, logos, structure or organization, and style and delivery of sermons. The sermons studied were selected from Bridal Call magazine and were preached in 1925 and early 1926. This period was McPherson's height of popularity just prior to her disappearance and the subsequent controversy. Fahrner's analysis supports McPherson's popularity and influence, but he specifically avoids discussing the controversy surrounding McPherson, which I feel contributed to her motivation for finally incorporating and solidifying her organization around herself. I had access to a more complete selection of Bridal Calls than did Fahrner. A conscientious effort had not yet been made to preserve, catalog, or make the material available to researchers. Since my study does not focus on McPherson's preaching, I found my study was not duplicating the efforts of Mr. Fahrner.

The second study is also a masters thesis. In 1952, William D. Blomgren wrote a historical study of "Aimee
Semple McPherson and the Foursquare Gospel, 1921-1944," for Stanford University Department of History. This essay offers a timeline of McPherson's life between her Oakland vision of the "Foursquare Gospel" and her death in 1944. The study offers a critical but not hostile report of the evangelist and her organization shortly after her death and thus, gives historical analysis of the charismatic leader and her audience that joined her in her organization. Blomgren, however, does not concern himself with communicative climate, process, or the dynamic that influenced the formation of the movement. McPherson's public address nor public evaluation play an important consideration in this study. My research focuses on these public communications, and the historical applications. Our research does not duplicate each other's.

The third study is a Ph.D. dissertation. In 1960, Kenneth Howard Shanks wrote "An Historical and Critical Study of the Preaching Career of Aimee Semple McPherson" for the University of Southern California Speech Department. His approach was historical-critical and rhetorical. He examines the audience, delivery, content, structure, and language of selected sermons by Aimee Semple McPherson utilizing films, recordings, and transcribed sermons. This study is useful in describing McPherson's preaching style from a rhetorical point of view. Shanks acknowledges the
persuasive nature of McPherson's speaking ability and her ability to draw an audience in a community which demanded entertainment and variety. Shanks also provides an appendix with a chronology of the life of Aimee Semple McPherson as provided by her daughter, Mrs. Roberta Salter, from Mrs. McPherson's birth to 1923 (178ff). Shanks, like Fahrner, has an entirely different focus from this study. Shanks deals with the preaching of McPherson as significant because an organization was founded. This study intends, on the other hand, to show that the organization is a result of McPherson's communicative process as revealed in both the audience's and her evaluations as gleaned from reports from the published accounts. Rather than appearing to duplicate Shank's study, this research utilizes the rhetorical approach of the Social Intervention Model (see Chapter II).

The fourth study is a Ph.D. Dissertation. In 1976, Joel W. Tibbetts wrote about "Women who were called: A Study of the Contributions to American Christianity of Ann Lee, Jemima Wilkinson, Mary Baker Eddy, and Aimee Semple McPherson," for the Vanderbilt University Department of Religion. This dissertation explored the theological implications of female ministers in terms of leadership, the image of God, and family life. It is primarily a theological reflection on the place of women in the ministry. It is useful because of its philosophic dependence upon sociology of religion theories regarding charismatic leader-
ship. It does consider the effects of McPherson's controversies upon her followers, but does not deal with the communication system nor with the development of her leadership. Its focus, conclusions, and methodology all differ from this study. Tibbetts offers a theological analysis of women as ministers, whereas this study utilizes rhetorical analysis. This current study also had access to materials unavailable to Tibbetts, namely McPherson's periodicals.

The fifth study is a masters thesis. In 1979, Mary H. Kendzora wrote on "The Homiletics of Aimee Semple McPherson," for Asbury Theological Seminary in the area of homiletics. It contrasts an Aristotelian rhetorical study with the more recent narrative preaching, which is the current trend in homiletics. It finds that McPherson's sermonic approach was a prime example of this current trend in preaching. It supports her leadership abilities and skills as a communicator. It considers both information pro and con but does not focus on the controversies alone. Its bibliography suggests some sources unnamed by others. Because of the difference in approach, Kendzora sees in a positive light McPherson's style which Shanks viewed as naive and lacking structure. It confirms how a difference in approach can shed different light on evidence. Kendzora did not have access to The Bridal Call.

The sixth study is a masters thesis written in 1981.
John Lathan Hood considered "The New Old-Time Religion: Aimee Semple McPherson and the Original Electric Church," for the Department of Communications and Wheaton College Graduate School. His focus falls on McPherson's innovative use of the media, particularly radio, in the 'Twenties' and 'Thirties.' It was reported that she was the first woman to preach over the airwaves and claimed to be the first church to own a radio station, but the honor actually went to a Pennsylvania congregation. This does not diminish her innovative use of the media. Hood's study clearly shows that she was insightful and forward-thinking in affecting crowds, utilizing what was at hand to persuade, motivate, and move as a united force. This study is useful in supporting Aimee Semple McPherson's creativity and leadership but its focus and methodology are entirely different from the scope of this study. It does not demonstrate her use of media in maintaining power in the Los Angeles community at large or to defend herself in the face of public question. It does show McPherson's creativity and technical forethought to move her organization and accomplish her stated goals, despite setbacks caused by the Great Depression and the loss of her planned movie project.

The last study, although not about Aimee Semple McPherson, does bear mentioning because of its focus on charismatic leadership. In 1972, Eugene C. Elser wrote, "Charismatic Communication: A Critical Analysis of the
Rhetorical Behaviors of George Fox, Founder of the Society of Friends," for the Department of Communication at the Ohio State University. It is helpful to this study because of its evaluation of Weber's concepts, and its similarity in its concerns about the routinization of the charismatic leader. However, its model follows Weber heavily and focuses on comparison between the Biblical prophets and George Fox. My study attempts to show a development of a charismatic leader by a series of attention-switches, with varying needs and power shares rather than the "suddenness" of the appearance of the leader as suggested in Weber's approach. Not only is the subject of the study different, but the methodology and focus of research are also different so that my study moves beyond Elser's in a rhetorical explanation of charismatic leadership.

In addition to theses and dissertations, two communication journal articles were discovered. The first was written by Harry Ebeling in 1957 and published in the *Western Journal of Speech Communication*. Ebeling took a sample of McPherson's sermons from her Bridal Call magazine and did a content analysis. He found that 57% of her sermon content was narrative, which suggests that she was successful with the crowds because she spoke in picture words with which they could identify. Ebeling's focus was the structural content of McPherson's sermons. My research focuses on the
use or the understanding of public discourse relating to McPherson and her ideology, relationship to the audience, and perception of need with its resolution.

The second article is the most recent study of Aimee Semple McPherson. Janice Schuetz wrote "Storytelling and Preaching: A Case Study of Aimee Semple McPherson," in the Religious Communication Today journal in 1986. She, like Ebeling and Kendzora, was concerned with McPherson's narrative preaching style and did not concern herself with McPherson's charismatic leadership or organization.

This literature review reveals that no previous study approaches or concerns itself with that planned for this current research. No great dependence was given to these examples of prior research, rather there does appear to be a gap in the research regarding the movement of McPherson from the evangelist to being the head of a religious organization. The rhetorical and communication studies utilize older methods of rhetorical criticism while this research utilizes the Social Intervention Model of William R. Brown. In addition, the previous studies did not have access to the periodical base of McPherson's writings and organizational statements found in The Bridal Call and its subsequent evolutions.

REVIEW OF PRIMARY LITERATURE

First in significance of the primary literature on
Aimee Semple McPherson is a series of autobiographical books beginning with *This is That* which was first published in 1919 with revisions in 1921 and 1923. The 1923 edition is utilized by her denomination for historical reference and the 1919 edition has recently been reprinted as part of the *Higher Christian Life Series*. The 1919 edition includes material which was transcribed from her earlier religious campaigns but was removed in preference to a history of the erection of Angelus Temple which was dedicated in 1923. Both volumes include material previously printed in her magazine, *Bridal Call*, testimonials from crusades, and newspaper accounts reprinted en toto. *This is That* is especially useful in realizing McPherson's evaluation of her call and her role perceptions in her early ministry, including her perceptions as a "servant of God," as an evangelist throughout the country, and in the building of Angelus Temple. Comparison with the *Bridal Call* shows that the material in the 1919 edition is older and that it has been edited little from these same stories printed in the *Bridal Call*, which also indicates that these stories were utilized in her sermons and as tracts.

Shortly after her disappearance, return, and subsequent controversy, McPherson presented her position justifying the disappearance as a kidnapping in the book, *In The Service of The King*, 1927. The earlier chapters of the book reiterate the story of her life through the opening of Angelus Temple.
This book has recently been reprinted (1988) by the Heritage Committee of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. This volume is useful in demonstrating the changes in McPherson's self-perceptions, especially as she is concerned with formalizing her power by incorporating her denomination and controlling the nature of the developing church as "Gospel Lighthouses."

After conflict in marriage, family, and denomination, McPherson took an around-the-world trip. She recorded her observations, including comments on the threat of war in her book, *Give Me My Own God*, (1936). This book was also printed in Britain under the title, *I View The World* (1937). Because of her visit to China, the book contains reflections on her relationship with Robert Semple contained nowhere else. This book reflects her attitude and self image which predominates until her death. It marks the end of McPherson's high-publicity days. She is in the role of authority and leadership.

In addition to autobiographical material, McPherson wrote a number of booklets, teaching materials, and doctrinal works, much of which originated from her pulpit work. Included are her favorite themes which arose out of her Foursquare ideology, her credal statement, and her efforts to demonstrate the importance of her Pentecostal theology in the period between the World Wars in which she ministered.
These materials give concrete expression to her doctrine and her teaching and the ideology which she set forth. These works include, Lost and Restored, The Declaration of Faith, Foursquare Types and Shadows, and specific books and booklets on particular doctrines. Further, the two books entitled, The Foursquare Gospel edited by Stiffler (1946) and Cox (1969), reflect McPherson's lessons at L.I.F.E. Bible College and her sermons on the subject, respectively. Since ideology is important to the Social Intervention Model of rhetorical criticism these works were also important in establishing McPherson ideology. Christ in The Second Coming of Christ: Is He Coming? How is He Coming? When is He Coming? For Whom is He Coming? (1921), Behold! Thy King Cometh (c1925); Divine Healing in Divine Healing Sermons (1921) and Healing in His Wings (c1925); The "baptism with the Holy Spirit" in The Holy Spirit (1931) which was reprinted in 1969 by the denomination as Fire From On High and in Perfection, can a Christian be perfect?, also written sometime in the thirties.

McPherson published two periodicals in her lifetime, both of which merged into the Foursquare Magazine after her death. The first was the Bridal Call, later called the Bridal Call Foursquare. This magazine was begun during her tent campaigns up and down the Eastern seaboard. Much of the earliest material has been lost (Vol.1 No.1 – 3 [June, July, August, 1917]; Vol.1 No.5-7 [Oct., Nov., Dec., 1918];
Vol. 3 No. 1 - 3 [June, July, Aug., 1919]; and Vol. 3 No. 6 [Nov. 1919]). However, Mrs. McPherson participated in a digest magazine call *Word and Work*, which also published *Pisgah* edited by Dr. F. E. Yoakum, *Words of Life* and *Our Gospel Letter*—all representing what was then called the Apostolic Faith. A more complete series is available from January, 1920, on. A second periodical, a newspaper called the *Crusader*, began in 1926 during the controversy over her disappearance so McPherson could be sure her side would be heard. (Vol. 1 No. 1 [Nov. 25, 1926]: 1, 8). Most of the random issues which remain have deteriorated badly and were in too bad a condition to be utilized in this study. I consulted with the Librarian at L.I.F.E. about getting the newspapers preserved on microfilm, but I am afraid this original source may be lost.

The *Bridal Call* was the primary source of material for this study outside of McPherson's autobiographical works. The early additions, this periodical include much of McPherson's testament. As her roles change, it reflects not only McPherson's image of herself and her ministry, but it also contains significant reflections by her followers. These are, of course, positive reflections but they do tell about the systems beliefs, not only about the organization but regarding McPherson herself. Because of the nature of Pentecostal historiography, periodicals like the *Bridal Call*
are valued sources of information about the development of the groups and the individuals. Much of what is known about various individuals in the Pentecostal Movement comes from the movement's periodicals. As noted above, the other studies about McPherson have not had access to these periodicals on the level available to this study.

SIGNIFICANT SECONDARY LITERATURE

In contrast to McPherson's autobiographical statements, her detractors published critical statements about McPherson, her beliefs, and her practices. This was especially true after her disappearance in 1926. Reverend Robert P. Schuler published a series of sermons preached in 1924 against McPherson preserved in McPhersonism: A Study of Healing Cults (1924). Schuler was in direct competition with McPherson; he too had a radio station, magazine, pulpit, and influence in the community. He contributed to bringing the controversy about the disappearance to public scrutiny because he did not believe McPherson.

McPherson was not without detractors within her own organizational structure. One of the original Board members of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel felt compelled to publish Aimee: The Gospel Gold Digger (1932). In the short booklet, John Goben argues against the organizational structure she has adopted and against operating practices in Angelus Temple, as well as the methods for
conducting services. The material argued in this booklet contributed to the split of the Foursquare Church that same year (Mitchell, 1982).

The first biography about McPherson, *Sister Aimee*—written by Nancy Barr Mavity in 1931—was a more favorable presentation of the events of the disappearance and the grand jury investigation. Mavity had access not only to the four volumes of grand jury transcripts, but also to the 1400-page impeachment trial of Judge Carlos Hardy, who had figured prominently in the McPherson hearings. Mavity also gained access to numerous lawyers involved in the case both for defense and prosecution, as well as key witnesses. Hers is another rhetorical voice in evaluating the conflicts of Aimee Semple McPherson.

Two important biographical works produced since McPherson's death are by Robert V. P. Steele, under the pseudonymn of Lately Thomas. Steele's books, *The Vanishing Evangelist* (1959), and *Storming Heaven* (1970), are about the court battles of Aimee Semple McPherson, particularly the disappearance and subsequent family squabbles which were taken to court between Aimee and her mother, Aimee and her daughter, and Aimee and her associate pastor (1970). These books, particularly *The Vanishing Evangelist*, are challenged by Raymond L. Cox in *The Verdict is In* (1983) in which he argues for the kidnapping story, citing in addition to materials published in the papers and court records, infor-
mation which had been gathered for defense had the case gone to trial. The two taken together identify the rhetorical court of public opinion as the real problem with which McPherson had to deal.

In addition to the aforementioned books, there are significant articles from the popular press, cultural review, and news magazines, as well as chapters from historical works analyzing McPherson, her times, and her influence upon the Twenties and Thirties. Articles are available from both prior to and subsequent to her death in 1944 (See bibliography).

Most significant to the process of institutionalization of Aimee Semple McPherson are the works by Goben (1932) and by Robert V. P. Steele (1959, 1970). Goben was a preacher, and his title reflects a dramatic response to the debate between McPherson and himself over the issue of church government. The work is documented more than might be expected from the title and knowledge of the models of church organization help to cut through the anger and emotionalism which was present (on both sides). Steele demonstrates knowledge of the same sources available to Mavity. The shortcoming is that it is not a dispassionate review nor are the primary sources cited. Steele, however, does offer an accurate picture of how McPherson was viewed by people outside of her own organization. The negative nature of
these sources helps to offset the positive--non-critical sources from McPherson's magazine. Since this is a study of public communication and expectation, the authors' approach is an asset, not a hindrance.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this dissertation is to describe the sequence of transition of the charismatic to organizational leader and more particularly to identify the nature of development of charismatic leadership by applying the Social Intervention Model as it is mediated through concerns regarding Ideology, Need, and Power (cf. Methodology Chapter II below). I am proposing that the application of this rhetorical model to the historical case study reveals the following sequence of role changes in the institutionalization of the charismatic leader.

THE SERVANT

The Role of the Servant is marked by a high sense of calling. It is demonstrated by a ready compliance with others' wishes, self-effacing, and marked idealism. The individual enacting this role makes rhetorical statements about servanthood, helpfulness, and willingness to live by the expectations held by people for the servant-leader. Fame and recognition are anomalous to this rhetorical stance. The ideology expressed by the leader and the audi-
ence necessitates change, or attention-switch, to accommodate the fame (see Chapter II). This servant is viewed with limited power and readily fulfills the wishes of those people the leader is attempting to serve. Personal needs are sublimated in favor of the needs of the cause or the group and need meeting is perceived in the broadest fashion. It is as much out of the audience's need as it is the individual's that the leader must succeed to the next role in charismatic leader institutionalization. A servant stance leaves opportunity for enhancing the otherwise anomalous growing fame the budding charismatic leader experiences.

Needs of belonging and fulfillment of "potential" may be enhanced during this phase to prepare the way for phase two.

THE CAMPAIGNER

The rhetorical role of the Campaigner is marked by itineracy, the persuasion of crowds, as well as an adjustment in the ideology from an idealistic approach to a more pragmatic approach to the leader-audience relationship. In this role, there is a growing sense of awareness by the leader of his or her power both to sway multitudes and influence public opinion. What once had been deferred to others now seems more appropriately personal. The phenomenal growth in the number of followers seems to justify adjustment in conceptions of self, of the followers, and of the structures necessary for system stability. Power from com-
munication is seen in the acquired influence over others and a need is rhetorically created to show accountability to the system and to structure what has been developed. While the leader may verbalize a role similar to the servant role, the practices of the leader and the development of lieutenants speaks rhetorically of a stronger power base for the leader within the system. The individual becomes recognized as an authority and is invited with greater regularity to preach to an ever widening base of support. The cause which the leader espouses may or may not be uppermost in the audiences' mind. The number of audience members willing to meet a perceived need to guarantee influence and importance grows and the desire for need satisfaction moves the system into the third rhetorical role for the leader--that of builder. There is a move to phase three.

THE BUILDER

The rhetorical role of the Builder reflects the development of the leader-audience system that requires the establishment of a more stable base of operations. This is generated in the group ideology, perception of need, and in the power relationships within the system. The ideology of the system requires that the cause of the leader and followers demands a structure, that is, in some fashion the cause becomes secondary to a structure which is perceived by the group as enabling the fulfillment of the cause. The
ed may be suggested by either the leader or the followers, the leader takes initiative based upon the developed relationships in calling for support of structures reflecting the audience perception of the leader's specialness, function, and purpose in the system relationship which is developed. Rhetorical messages will focus on need and fulfillment, as well as the ideology of the uniqueness the leader and the cause he or she espouses. The product the builder role is an organization and buildings as tangible expression of the ideology of the system (cf chapter II). But along with the process of building an organization, there is the instituting of the leader.

E LEGEND

In the role of the Legend as the charismatic leader is given charge of the organization surrounding him or her, the developing ideology about the leader is instituted into a "legend." I use the term "legend" because the beliefs of the audience about the leader are based upon the rhetorical statements of the leader, the practices of the leader, the relationship between leader and audience, as well as unproven beliefs about the leader on the part of the audience. The legend may become visible only when the leader tries to move too far from the perception of the audience or does or says something perceived as "out of character" for the leader. The system becomes disturbed and suffers until
the leader readjusts to the now strong beliefs about the nature of the leader. This institutionalization is the product of a process that parallels but is not the same as routinization of group practice. This institutionalization is the product of the social intervention of a rhetorical role which has developed apart from the person of the leader, and to which the leader must subscribe to maintain leadership.

It is my contention that these roles are explicable by Brown's model of social intervention. This model helps to identify the moves from one role perception to another by examining the communication exchanges. These communication exchanges point to changes in the need structure, the power shares, and the interpretive formula for the system created around the perceived charismatic leader. It points out that the leader demonstrates the changes both in words and deeds as he or she attempts to justify the situation to both friend and foe alike.

QUESTIONS

This dissertation is one of several in the Department of Communications at Ohio State University to utilize the rhetorical theory of William R. Brown. It is an effort to address the rhetorical process of institutionalization of a charismatic personality. To do so, this study addresses the following questions.
QUESTION ONE

How does the institutionalization of a charismatic leader from a personal evangelist to a leader of a religious organization take place? In particular, I am exploring the change in self-perception of leadership roles, as well as the audience perception of the nature of the leader and her charisma change across time.

QUESTION TWO

What epistemological claims can be made about the process in light of the Social Intervention Model? Specifically, what claims about the rhetorical process are illuminated in the institutionalization of an individual?

QUESTION THREE

What descriptors and predictions can be made about a perceived charismatic leader as a result of this rhetorical analysis?

SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have introduced the study of the institutionalization of a charismatic leader in the person of Aimee Semple McPherson. I have discussed her place in the Pentecostal Movement and justified the timeliness of this study. I have reviewed the literature about Aimee Semple McPherson and stated the sources I have relied upon for this study. I have set forth some expectations about the nature of a charismatic leader from a rhetorical per-
spective and specifically stated my research questions. I now move to explain the methodology of the Social Intervention Model of rhetorical research already alluded to in this chapter.
CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

Most of us have had an experience of trying to return to a past place or time. We have tried to recapture a beautiful memory of childhood, of family, or personally significant event. Such an attempt uniquely emphasizes the truism "our past, whether glorious or not, exists only in our memories." Once we have experienced such an attempt it is not hard to begin to realize that what is true of the individual is also true of the whole of humanity. Any event, any history, is in the memories of the participants.

Some object, arguing that the past can be reconstructed with precision-like accuracy. They scour the first hand accounts, news reports, and documentary evidence; they suggest they have "it," the past. But even on short term, the construct is of memories--more or less accurate memories, but memories nonetheless.

Understanding that we are dealing with memories helps us to recognize that when we deal with first-hand accounts, we are working with perceptions colored by viewpoints about the world. At that point, it is clearer that we are speak-
ing of rhetorical presentations of the past world.

Thus, the rhetorical examination of history, while not trying to do away with other historiographic methodologies, attempts to present the material from a different perspective in order to reveal something of the past. Using rhetoric to reconstruct the past by examining the explanations, assertions, interpretations, and evaluations of both the participants and the critics, it offers a history of past communication, treating the pattern of communication as dynamics for change.

HISTORY AND RHETORIC

History and rhetoric are interrelated. Since Aristotle, they have been blended in their development, application, and usefulness. As separate disciplines they are looking for the multiple causes of a given event, tracing them to their roots. In the intellectual milieu, they are part of the researcher's tools, one for the other, to perform tasks of selection, analysis, and reporting on the chosen object of consideration. Yet history and rhetoric are distanced.

First, there is the historian's view. The historian views history as the systematic, disciplined reconstruction of the story of past events. This is accomplished through the selection of evidence and its analysis from a stated perspective, in light of current research by other disci-
plines pertinent to the subject at hand. It is the pains-taking reconstruction of a story based upon research into the events and evidence, thereby becoming the summary of our knowledge about the past (Davidson & Lytle, 1982).

Second, there is the rhetorician's view. History is to the rhetorician both a source for art and a repository of the best and representative of a given period. By reconstruction of a period's rhetoric, it identifies evidence for the discipline of history. Developmentally rhetoric provided history with substance, with method, and with evidence (Gronbeck, 1975:311). In addition, history is a mode of rhetoric's own work to provide evidence of the ideas and culture of a given period. Baskerville argued that the rhetoric of a period reveals both its milieu and dynamics for that milieu.

But the study of oratory is more than a study of influence. The orator is at once engine and mirror; not only can he provide the impetus toward what he feels should be, he can also reflect (often unconsciously) what is. Since his success at persuasion depends in part upon an accurate assessment of existing states of mind, he gives expression directly or indirectly to ideas and attitudes prevalent at the time (1979:3).

History and rhetoric share a commonality in method. They both seek, first of all, to reconstruct the past. They seek in disciplined method the sources of the past in order to yield a picture of the speaker, the audience, the standards and the culture of the time, including the dynamics of
the situation (Oliver, 1965). Secondly, they perform critical studies which consistently apply stated standards to the particulars of the evidence to draw conclusions which are neither patronizing nor defamatory but state the situation as objectively as possible (Hochmuth-Nichols, 1963). Thirdly, they perform comparative and contrasting studies which look not only at one individual but at his/her peers and contemporaries. This allows for an understanding the impact of the individual in greater detail (Wrage, 1947). Fourthly, they work to produce a statement of the standards of their art and science for the particular time. This allows an eighteenth-century speaker both to be judged by the standards of that age, as well as to be compared to contemporary standards (Parrish, 1954). They are, finally, both concerned with truth and accuracy. This type of research reveals that things are not always as they appear and speakers and audiences have differing responses to the same concepts. The researcher must discover what is the real concern in each encounter (Hochmuth, 1965).

Unlike some other areas of historical research, however, rhetorical history is often based not on private papers, official documents, and unpublished accounts. Rather, rhetorical history, like the name might suggest, utilizes the public presentations of the situation under scrutiny. The public pronouncements, acts, and displays of the words and deeds provides information on both the inter-
personal and intrapersonal levels. Evaluating this public communication utilizes information on human nature and rhetorical and communication theory. Rhetorical theory can be utilized as a means to treat an historical situation as a case and explicate both the rhetorical and historical situation (Bitzer, 1968).

Rhetorical analysis of history is a critical approach that requires knowledge of personality characteristics, a general understanding of sequence of events, as well as a knowledge of the attitudes of the general populace of the time and place in question. There needs to be an ability to identify the particular beliefs and myths of the time and place and individuals involved and the ability to translate that thought into the scholarly perspectives for consumption today. This requires a diagnostic and interpretive approach.

One distinction between the approach of history and that of rhetoric concerns situations reported by one witness. Throughout this study there are events described only as reported by Aimee Semple McPherson. Although confirming information may not be at hand the rhetorical approach allows for utilization of those reports as evidence of that individual's understanding of an event, private perceptions about the event, or a personal portrayal of what happened. Citations utilizing McPherson's reports from her books and
magazines are to be seen as her testimony about the event. They are what she believed to be the case, just as it would be true of any credible witness. The absence of confirming evidence does not damage the study because it is purposefully looking at what were the rhetorical presentations about and by McPherson. Where confirming reports have been given outside Mrs. McPherson's writings I have given them. The distinction that this study confirms the rhetorical event is part of what makes this a rhetorical not a historical study.

HISTORY AND THEORY

Davidson and Lytle in After the Fact inform the reader that "History is not 'What happened in the past;' rather, it is the act of selecting, analyzing, and writing about the past" (1982:xvii). They describe, through the use of case studies, the principles of "selecting evidence," "perspectives of evidence," "microscopic approach," "documentary analysis," "grand theory," "pictorial evidence," "psychohistory," and "oral history." They present these approaches as part of the arsenal of the historian to utilize as need arises to explain the event in question.

Of particular concern in this study is the use of a particular theory to explain a particular historical event. They argue that a knowledgeable use of a theory can be useful in looking at a particular topic because it helps
the researcher to ask certain questions that would not otherwise be asked. They also caution that it causes certain questions to remain unasked; that is why they call for a purposed use of a theory rather than an unstated assumption. Theory, they say, "tends to single out particular areas of investigation as worthy of testing, and to dismiss other areas of inquiry as either irrelevant or uninteresting" (Davidson & Lytle, 1982:85).

It is their contention that use of a particular theory can actually sharpen the researcher's vision by limiting it and aiding in the powers of selection by targeting specific issues and data (Davidson & Lytle, 1982:89). The requirement becomes a stated description of the theory in use to explain the event.

In this sense, application of a theory and its explicit statement are useful because even when unstated, our explanations arise from our personal lenses of our sense of the world, as Lichtman and French suggest; "be it myth, creed or experience of life" (Lichtman & French, 1978: 119). It is futile to take an extremely objective view of research; rather, they suggest, "Given the vast number of possible explanatory models available, scholars simply cannot suspend judgment until they have completed a rigorous evaluation of every possibility for every event examined. They must instead restrict their vision to a manageable number of hypotheses" (Lichtman & French, 1978: 105).
The rhetorical theory chosen for this historical case study is the "Social Intervention Theory" of Brown. It is a specific choice to use this theory. It is expected that it can produce new results by providing a means of viewing the old facts about Aimee Semple McPherson in a new light. This theory and method of Brown is expected to provide a vantage point to direct this researcher's attention to significant areas of inquiry, for in the words of Albert Einstein, "It is the theory which describes what we can observe" (quoted in Davidson & Lytle, 1982: 110).

This might be construed as a peculiar way to do history; but if the saying, "If you don't know history, you are bound to repeat it," has any validity, then history needs explaining not just reciting. Brown's model of social intervention is intended to explain the process of change in the individual, the system, or the movement especially from the perspectives of ideology, need, and power.

RHETORIC OF SOCIAL INTERVENTION

The model "Rhetoric of Social Intervention" has been developing for more than ten years. In a series of articles (1978, 1982, 1986, 1987), as well as through his course in Rhetoric of Social Intervention, Brown has developed his model of rhetorical investigation, explanation, and intervention. While it has been utilized by Brown and students,
Anderson (1983); Lopez (1985); Corley (1983); Snyder (1987); Opt (1987); Stoner (1987); and Pondozi (1988), as an investigative tool for rhetorical study, it is visualized also as a strategy to implement intervention into future situations. Brown visualizes further development and utilization of the model.

This model is a communication model. Communication is seen as both the revealer and motivator of a systematic process running along the whole spectrum of human interaction. The rhetoric that welds the ideology also motivates change and flows in and out of personal need and out of shared power utilized by the individual, group, and movement. In addition it can be examined by the investigator to reveal the motivations, the process, and the results of the communication exchange. The model argues a wholeness and dynamic that yields a holographic structure of reality (Brown, 1987).

The hologram is the operational metaphor for Brown's model of social intervention. He best describes the sense of a holographic model in an article on argumentation which Brown treats as an unrelated to the Social Intervention Model. He explains there that the hologram is a holistic way of emphasizing "not the knowledge that comes from seeing the parts in a whole, but rather that which arises from seeing the whole in each part" (1987: 89). So, in discussing ideological attention shift of principal players one is also
dealing with the everpresent intrapersonal need and interpersonal power. Likewise, when discussing the interpersonal power shares among the participants, the investigator must know that intrapersonal need and the worldview will be present as the "whole" in the "part" of power. In addition, intrapersonal need can be the "part" containing the "whole" of the shares of power and the ideological inputs (Brown, Lecture 617, O.S.U. Spg. 1986; "Need," 1986).

ATTENTION SWITCHING

The attention switch is the dynamic function of the Rhetoric of Social Intervention. It refers both to a focus and an attitude toward information. The former is illustrated by Franklin's account of the philosopher's friend who could be judged by attention as focused on the philosopher's good leg or his withered one. Franklin's remedy was to advise unhappy people to "leave off looking at the ugly leg;" the advice promoted an attention switch by changing focus (Brown, 1982:17). It is also an attitude as expressed in the evaluation of a half glass of water as being either "half-full" or "half-empty." The mental movement from one evaluation to the other is the attention switch. The explanation, however, need not be so metaphorical (Brown, 1982:17).

The Necker Cube is an effective and accurate description of the gestalt switch which Brown is describing in his
rhetorical model. The line drawing of a three dimensional box changes perspectives in depth, making the differing sides appear closer or more prominent. The individual can see only one perspective at a time; yet, by staring a short time the mind will switch and be able to see the other perspective (Brown, 1982:18). The Necker Cube reveals three things about the gestalt switch that takes place: (1) there must be at least two interpretive patterns or "templates" always potentially available in evaluating a situation; (2) each of these "templates" must be capable of presenting a coherent explanation of the situation; and (3) movement from one "reconstituting of the situation" to another must take place to have a switch (Brown, 1982:18).

As Franklin's philosopher illustrates metaphorically and the Necker Cube visually, the change—the attention switch from one explanatory template to another—is also illustrated in the rhetoric of a given situation. The words uttered or printed in public reveal the opinions, and the interpretive patterns used to describe the social reality. Brown has noted that conflicting views of any given subject reflect differing ideological interpretive schemes called "templates." Each "template" represents the influence of personal and group history, socio-economic positon, and conception of the world. It is like the descriptive difference between the black citizen, the indifferent white, and
the racial supremacist. Each has a different view of "reality" based upon input factors into their life which effects how each interprets "civil rights," for instance. The "template" is not a fixed entity. It can change (Brown, 1978).

The focus of Brown's method involves explicating the motivating force behind the major changes he calls "attention shifts." It may be a discontinuous change of ideology such as a conversion (Brown, 1978), a more gradual development based on the psychological dynamics of need (Brown, 1987), or a give-and-take exchange of interpersonal conflict (Brown, 1986). The shift can be evidenced in at least four areas according to Brown. These are: (1) in one's concept of epistemology, (2) among various modes of axiology and ontology, (3) in the metaphorical use of language and (4) a strict-to-loose construction of the worldview (Brown, 1982:22). Although the analysis may be about any of these areas, the strategies for the movement both before and after a switch boil down to only two: "anomaly masking" or "anomaly featuring" (Brown, 1982).

An anomaly is any variant feature in the individual or group's worldview that is non-fitting with the operational template. Each worldview creates certain expectations; an anomaly is any component that violates the expectations of the worldview, a contradiction in the power structure, or a need or method of need meeting which was previously uncon-
ceivable. The anomaly is defeated by discounting and made salient by featuring. People tend to follow those who are able to make anomalies fit the system (Brown, 1982: 23).

Anomaly featuring is one of two basic strategies utilized to move the operational "template" from one concept of reality to another. The intervenor focuses on either real or conceivable anomalies to the system targeted for change. The social intervention of anomaly featuring will have the effect of showing that the desired conceptualization is preferable to the existing understanding of reality (Brown, 1982: 23). The process of intervention progresses as anomalies and conceivable anomalies are added and enhanced, forcing restructuration of the system. Conceptualization of the anomalies is disadvantageous to the system, while downplaying benefits gives dynamic to felt need for change in the system (Brown, 1982: 24).

Anomaly masking is the second overall strategy used to achieve attention-switch in a conception of reality, self evaluation, or interpersonal relationship. Differences between the current concept of the system and any disconfirming interpretation are discounted, masked, or ridiculed in an effort to keep the conflicting interpretation from necessitating a change in the current system. Differences may be called "no-differences," or discounted by some other rhetorical tactic. The strategy of anomaly masking is to
guide or present attention-switch in ideology, need, and power of the system in question. The differences are masked by showing one to be the other—a switching of frames of reference (Brown, 1982:25-26).

These two strategies of anomaly masking and anomaly featuring are used to promote a gestalt switch in the ideology, in needs, and in the power shares between individuals and groups. Both strategies can make use of the normal rhetorical maneuvers already at use in the arsenal of exchange (Brown, 1982:26).

IDEOLOGY

In the Rhetoric of Social Intervention, the "Attention-Switch" is the dynamic of this rhetorical model. While Brown explains it in each article, it is most fully expounded in the 1982 article. The movement that he describes in the switch occurs in three focal points—"Ideology" (1978), the "Intrapersonal need" (1987), and the "Interpersonal power relationships" (1986). These three areas identify the primary change points in any given gestalt switch, primarily because in Brown's holographic vision of the model all three areas have changes in their relationships affected because of their interrelationship (1987).

The first area Brown identified as a change point in the rhetoric of social intervention is that of ideology
By "Ideology," Brown means "any symbolic construction of the world in whose superordinate 'name' human beings can comprehensively order their experience and subsume their specific activities" (Brown, 1978: 124). The ideological process interprets experience, reifies interpersonal roles and relationships and creates a communication system that modifies according to the status of the ideology (Brown, 1978: 124).

Ideology is that abstracting process in which human beings try to make sense of their perceptions. It is the personal expression of practical epistemology (cf. Pappas & Swain, 1978: 279ff & 289ff; Brown, 1978: 125). In the process of symbolizing, not only are entities described in the word "but [persons] also impute complex interrelationships among them" (Brown, 1978: 125). Brown describes the process as a continuous building of a model of reality by which to explain general experience.

...through the recursiveness of relational categorizing, the result can be superordinate symbolic construction of "reality" with "order," "coherence," and "system," altogether giving the participant in the ideology the sense of power accruing from any comprehensive explanation of experience" (Brown, 1978:126).

The individual has then in mind "one, real, knowable world" (Brown, 1978:127, emphasis his); whether we are speaking of the scientist, historian, or lay person, all have the propensity for categorizing all of experience. It is this categorizing that makes human beings eager and able
to learn, just as it was in the case of Helen Keller in her
discovery of categories (1954:36).

We are all in a sense "blind" until we can categorize
and compare those categories with the categories of others.
That is only the first step the individual takes toward
relatedness, repeatability, and further discovery. Brown
explains, following Langer, Kuhn, and Burke that humans cope
with the world by symbolizing it, translating experience
into reality and non-reality.

...once the human individual populates experience with abstractions, it makes them collectively "familiar" by positing recognizable, i.e.,
repeatable, relationships among them--arbitrating via sensory, formal and meta-abstracting "not only what sort of entities the universe does contain but also by implication those that it does not" (Brown, 1978:127).

The individual, in the process of abstracting, describing
and interpreting experience, creates a complex hermeneutical
relationship identifiable as a worldview, an ideology (Brown

The worldview not only creates a world for the individual, it is operative in the formation of inter-relationships, roles, systems of believers, motives and status. Brown says, "every ideology posits a great chain of being culminating in some highest reach of aspiration" (Brown 1978:130).

The "great chain of being" is a process of change and
development that progresses over time and requires interactive roles which are part of the communicative system of ideology making. Brown summarizes the development of a communicative system in the development of a worldview.

The questions of how to account for persistence or demise of a given worldview, as well as, how to conceptualize the overall process of intra and inter-personal ideologizing, lead me to consider a worldview as a communicative system (Brown 1978:132).

In the evolution of this communication system, the worldview must fluctuate to compensate for need and power changes in the inner person and in the interpersonal relationships created by the ideology (Brown, 1978: 133-134). The changes hinge on anomalies which are important to the attention-switching, as noted above. Thus Brown concludes, "communication and creation of ideologies proceed together" (Brown, 1978:139).

Ideology gives one focal point to examine the Rhetoric of Social Intervention; as Brown concludes, "As much as one might regret or welcome the passing of a particular ideology, the process of ideologizing will continue" (Brown, 1978:139). It is one of the ever-present dynamics to observe the communicative process in our social structure. The next we observe is "Need."

NEED

The second focal point of the social intervention model is "Need." When need is used as an entry point of examina-
tion, power and ideology are both present as need is present when the examination comes through one of the other entry points. Need is holographically one with Power and Ideology. Needs come in two varieties (1) "biosocial givens" of our humanity, and (2) "needs as the symbolic creation arising out of our communication" (Brown, 1986: 3).

Need as a "biosocial given" are those type of needs already delineated in the social sciences, such as psychology and sociology. These needs arising out of humanity's growth and survival needs are usually presented in developmental sequence. These are usually "individual stressing needs" because they focus on the need of the individual rather than the group. Maslow's hierarchy of needs is one example. "Collectivity-stressing needs" are those which focus on the needs of the social structure, such as needs for social participation, political power, creative work, and economic security as identified by Berger (Brown, 1986: 3).

Whether "individuality-stressing" or "collectivity-stressing," these biosocial needs are considered "given" because they are an integral part of what we are as human beings. Rhetorical intervention for these type of needs usually entails an appeal made from or to these biosocial givens (Brown, 1986: 4). Intervention comes in the process of acknowledgement of innate needs. It is communication from need.
On the other hand, there are needs which are derived from the communication process. These needs are considered "needs as symbolic creations." In the process of communication needs are "attributed" and arise in the "very act of communicating." Rhetorical intervention comes in attributing the need to the individual or group. It is "communication making need" (Brown, 1986:4).

In order to accomplish the communication of needs, whether "givens" or "creations," requires that there be agreement on the "name" for the need between the intervenor and the audience. When there is agreement on what the need "is" the need is made "salient." When the communicators agree on what need they are discussing, they can plan on the requisite action to meet the identified need. Communicating the how and what of meeting the need is "need advocacy." The form of advocacy arises out of the nature of the need and so may be expressed in "the catatonic's rigid silence to the charismatic's mass movement" (Brown, 1986: 11). The process of identification of need, advocating for need meeting, and the final identification that the need has been met is a "need spiral" since as a cycle it never fully occupies the same time and space or exact nature as before (Brown, 1986: 11).

Brown identifies three tactics for addressing need-related rhetorical situations. The three tactics which the
The intervenor can employ are: (1) affirm or deny the need, (2) prompt need advocacy or the means of advocacy and at the same time discourage need promulgation, and (3) facilitate or impede attention by needers to potential need-meeters (Brown, 1986: 21). These three tactics relate to the realm of existence, the ethical and moral choices for meeting needs, and the world-view that is created, supported, or modified (Brown, 1986: 21).

POWER

The third area of concern in Brown's model of Social Intervention is the concept of "Power" (Brown, 1986). Power here is not viewed as the raw force that is expressed as causal overpowering, coercion, or otherwise pressuring to accomplish some goal (Brown, 1986: 181). Power is relative to a system. No individual (or a group functioning as one) acts or stands alone. Power in Brown's model is a gestalt term that is more akin to responsibility and to relationship than simply to causality. Individuals have "power" in relation to each other. They "share" the power within an operative social-communication system. It is similar to that expressed by Urban and Walton in their discussion of The Power of God, "a plurality of free moral agents necessarily entails a sharing of power within certain limits that are not very well defined" (1978: 8). That "sharing of power," according to Brown, is expressed through communica-
Power has been traditionally defined in terms of causality (Taylor, 1967: II, 58), but, rhetoric as power is not the Divine creative power of the Hebrew dabar of Genesis chapter one (Brown, Driver & Briggs, 1974: 180ff). Rhetorical power is a means of social intervention, an agent of change not control (Brown, 1986:181). While power itself may be a means of communication, what concerns Brown is not just communication through power, the "code of behavior for making action," but the logically prior concern of generating power through the communication process (Brown, 1986: 181, 182).

Power is achieved through a process, in a communication system, by means of various rhetorical strategies which enhance the image, the position, and the status of power (Brown, 1986: 182, 197). This process occurs particularly in the interpretive relationship between the holder and the subject of the power. When the subject perceives the power holder to have power, the power resides but the failure of the subject to accept that interpretive relationship can cause the shift of power shares between the holder and the subject. This was illustrated in the 1926 disappearance of Aimee Semple McPherson. In light of published events, the "interpretive relationship" of the public to McPherson drastically changed. McPherson suddenly was no longer a "power" of consideration to the press, the politicians, and
to the people outside of her assembly. Brown summarizes, "I find that persons make power real by ascribing it interdepen-
dently to one another and by conceiving its types as conse-
quents to participants' collective ethos" (1986:186).

The reaction of the press and the people surprised McPherson because she failed to take note of the "cultural code of behavior which depends upon hierarchical interdepen-
dency" (Brown, 1986:187). McPherson failed to realize that by subscribing to the code of "Public Figure" that she subsumed a worldview and an ideology that was at its base (Brown, 1986:187). She was attempting to communicate through power of the position she felt she had "earned" by declaring her innocence, but this act brought with it "an economy of power distribution" which constituted rules that "without being causal," says Brown, is "binding on behav-
ior." The power relationship came with a code that (1) regulates expectations for the roles of power sharers, and (2) controls the ideology upon which future choosing is based (1986:190). In the mind of the public, McPherson had violated the rules (cf. Chapter IV).

Roles are defined for the "Power" dynamic in the con-
junction of relationships and the code. Relationships, according to Brown, are complementary, interdependent, or hierarchical. They are built in the interaction process as a result of the controlling influence of the code. The
Power code is made up from the expectations, rules, "taken for granted interpretations," cultural codes, and conventional rules in the milieu of interpersonal interactions (Brown, 1986).

Roles represent the "kind" of power or the strength of the power share. The usual role prescribed for the person with power is established when the individual uses power as a means to communicate. They utilize the code of behavior that makes for action or policy decisions without deliberating in the classic sense. Such officiating does not deal with what is logically prior, "creating power through communication." This second approach encompasses the rhetorical moves or invention topoi for power creation (Brown, 1986:181). Recognizing this element of power allows for broader recognition of roles in power interdependency.

The roles are controlled in the interaction of the complementary relationships between the individual perceived as having power and the public. It is the interaction process between them that leads to stability and alteration of society (Brown, 1986: 184). The opinion of the public is one form of moral code arbitration that arises from the "taken-for-granted" interpretations of the culture. The conventional rules control the roles of the leader and the audience (Brown, 1986:187).

The intervenor from "Power" can regulate cooperation or competition through the tactics of integrity, exchange, or
threat (Boulding, 1978:190; Brown, 1986:194). Integrity is based on the shared meaning which is dependent upon the roles of the parties involved. Action is taken based on who the person is, i.e., "I will do something or I will ask you to do something because of what I am and because of what you are" (Boulding, 1978:190; Brown, 1986:194). Exchange and threat involve reciprocity and coercion.

THE POINT OF ENTRY

The Rhetoric of Social Intervention is a systems theory approach to (primarily historical) human interactions, as well as methods and focal points of system adaptation and change. As pointed out above, the change takes place concomitantly in the holographic model of ideology (attention), intrapersonal need, and interpersonal power shares. Each of these focal points operates as an entry point into the study of the social intervention. When exploring the rhetorical situation through power, need and attention are always present. Likewise, in examining need, power and attention are viewed as side effects and in turn when looking at attention, the features of power and need are also considered. This is due to the holographic nature of the "whole" being present in the "part" (Brown, 1987:91).

In the subsequent chapters, I have in turn entered the study of Aimee Semple McPherson's institutionalization through the portals of ideology, power, and need. I have
also viewed the side effects of the alternative entry points and attempted in the final chapter to look at the whole to give a perspective on institutionalization made visible by the Social Intervention Model. The study of the institutionalization proceeds along the roles assigned or projected by McPherson over the period of the institutionalization process. First, I will consider McPherson's early ministry as "The Handmaiden of the Lord" and the role of the servant.
CHAPTER III
"THE HANDMAIDEN OF THE LORD"

By 1908, the phenomenon of Pentecostalism spurred by the 1906 meetings at Azusa Street in Los Angeles had spread not only across the country but around the globe (The Apostolic Faith Vol. 1 No. 1 through Vol. 2 No. 12 [Sept. 1906 -- May 1908]; Frodsham, 1946). One of the cities in the experiential link was Toronto, Ontario, Canada. There at the city mission begun by James and Ellen Hebden, the pente­costal experience and doctrine took root and soon spread to outlying areas in Ontario (Miller, 1986: 5), including the small community of Ingersoll (Robeck, 1988: 776-777; Miller, 1986: 15). It was at the Ingersoll, Ontario, meetings that young Aimee Kennedy changed her allegiance from skeptical evolutionism to a missionary Pentecostal adherent (McPherson, 1919: 27-57).

DEVELOPMENT OF THE EVANGELIST

Aimee Kennedy was the daughter of Minnie and James Kennedy. Although James was forty years her senior, Minnie, according to Aimee's accounts, had the stronger influence in the home. James was the staid and gentle Methodist. Minnie
was the energetic Salvation Army soldier who took her week-old daughter to the Army meeings (McPherson, 1919: 11-19). Aimee reports that at age five she, because of her mother's instruction, could recite many Bible stories from memory (McPherson, 1919: 21). Aimee seemed to be the answer to her mother's prayers for a daughter who would be a female preacher (McPherson, 1919: 14).

During the adolescent transition (Erickson, 1962, 1968), Aimee reported her disaffection with religion and belief in God and turned her energies to propagating Ingersoll and Darwin both in and outside of the classroom (McPherson, 1919: 30-34). This momentary attention switch to theological agnosticism and enthusiastic enjoyment of cultural pleasures such as novels, films, and dances could not withstand the experiential counter evidence perceived by Aimee regarding the local Pentecostal mission workers (McPherson, 1919: 36-44).

Convincing her father to take her to the meetings ostensibly out of curiosity, Aimee had a real purpose of mockery and planned disruption as a means of anomaly masking toward this "new religion" (McPherson, 1919: 37-38). She had not expected the minister to be so persuasive nor the testimonies of the adherents to show so convincingly that God was active in their lives. The presentation featured the anomalies--non-fitting features, between her agnosticism
and their faith (Brown, 1982: 23-24). The people did indeed believe that God was real and active in their lives, and they behaved in a way consistent with someone convinced by personal experience of the divine (Dayton, 1987). As such, their ideology structured a need for the divine, and Aimee was forced by this intervention into a night of contemplative prayer and conversion to this budding form of Christianity (McPherson, 1919: 39-43).

If Aimee thought her reconversion would satisfy her mother, she was mistaken; for the course Aimee had taken was still divergent from her mother's view of Christianity (McPherson, 1919: 45-47). This can be explained in several ways. First, in Minnie's view of the world, Christianity did not have behavior that appeared ecstatic, hallucinatory, or convulsive; rather, there was order, military-like devotion with focus on salvation of souls and social benefit rather than upon spiritual emotionalism. Her Christian world-view was formed in the Salvation Army (Chesham, 1965: 80-94). Secondly, Aimee had participated in direct contradiction of her mother's wishes and had in this manner reflected teenage rebellion against parental power, both in her choice of churches, and in her former agnostic position. Aimee was still a rebellious child. Thirdly, as yet no experience had forced Minnie to judge Aimee's behavior as unexplainable according to her seasoned view of the world i.e. Aimee introduced no anomalies (Brown, 1982:21). Yet,
not only Aimee's but also Minnie's world-view was open to change to account for the conversion experience (Brown, 1978; 1982).

In Aimee's new world-view, the stories communicated to her by her mother about Aimee's birth and dedication to ministry could be combined with the new vitality of religion, allowing her conversion to "make sense" of the pieces of her world. Her amorous interests in the tall, handsome preacher who had introduced her to the truths she had decided to live by became a focal point of her divine purpose (McPherson, 1919:59-65). Aimee could fulfill the dream of her mother for her to be a preacher, move from the youthful stance of agnosticism, and accomplish her personal goals by dropping out of school and marrying Robert Semple and going off to minister with him. It appeared to her that life was complete, but as life changes so do attention, power, and need. In distant China, a major loss would trigger yet another attention switch in purpose (McPherson, 1919:59-65; Miller, 1988:18).

The couple began ministry by serving a couple of Pentecostal missions in nearby towns in Ontario while Robert earned his income from factory work and Aimee kept house. Soon they departed for Chicago to work with William H. Durham at the North Avenue Mission in 1909 (Riss, 1988:255). Under Durham's tutelage, the Semples adopted methods
and theology reflecting the "Finished Work" Theology, also identified as Keswick Pentecostalism (Riss, 1988: 306-309; Faupel, 1972: 12, 20f). This meant, among other things, that they believed that the grace of God was readily available to believers, based upon the atoning work of Jesus Christ upon the Cross which was ongoingly applied by the Holy Spirit throughout the life of the believer. (Riss, 1988:306-309; Bundy, 1988:518-519, see p. 99 below). While assisting Durham, the Semples campaigned with him in Findlay, Ohio, at Thomas L. Leonard's mission and school and in several Ontario communities (Culbertson, 1988:5; Miller, 1986:15; Riss, 1988: 255-256; McPherson, 1919: 67-75; Owen, 1989:19 n32).

Returning to Toronto where Robert was to be a major speaker at a convention at Hebden Mission, the Semples were commissioned as faith missionaries to Hong Kong, China (Miller, 1986: 18). The couple traveled east in order to visit Robert Semple's parents in Ireland. When they arrived in London, Aimee found that she had been scheduled to speak to a large auditorium and there reportedly delivered her first sermon. Utilizing her speaking abilities from high school elocution and childhood knowledge of Scriptures, she preached the substance of what was later to be called "Lost and Restored" (McPherson, 1919:79; Bridal Call Vol. 1 No. 11 [April, 1919]: 1-12; McPherson, 1976). While Aimee had not been the "preacher," she had exercised her power role in
terms of verbal "testimonies" and the Pentecostal gifts of "speaking in tongues" and "interpretations" which were power shares open to any member of the congregation and often the only power share available to a woman (Wilson & Clow, 1981; Note Testimonies, McPherson, 1919: 253ff; see p.86f below).

In Hong Kong, the Semples joined the mission operated by A. G. Garr, who later became a prominent figure in Pentecostalism in the Southeastern United States, as an evangelist and pastor (McGee, 1988: 328-329; Bays, 1987: 43-59). In a matter of months, both were sick and hospitalized with Malaria. Aimee attributed Robert's severer case to her feeding him raw vegetables in salad (McPherson, 1936: 56-57). Robert died, leaving the young widow to give birth to their daughter, Roberta Star Semple, a few weeks later (McPherson, 1919: 83-89; McPherson, 1927: 119-130).

After receiving money from friends in the United States, Aimee sailed for San Francisco, feeling guilt and depression but finding hope in her young daughter and the requests of the passengers that she preach to them. The offering and gifts affected her ideology and caused her to believe that God would always supply her financial needs (McPherson, 1919: 89-90). Receiving a blanket for her daughter and a small offering, Aimee traveled to Chicago to her friends from the North Avenue Mission and then on to New York, where her mother was currently working with the Salva-
tion Army (McPherson, 1927:132-139). At twenty, having been married and widowed, and a mother without the prospects of her dreams, Aimee found her world collapsing into depression, hopelessness, and aloneness. She wrote,

Oh! how I longed for someone who would understand or put their arms about me and help me at this critical moment of my life, and this was just the time that the Lord permitted those I loved best to seem to draw aside the arms that had been before so strong and dependable, causing a little curtain of reserve to drop between us, leaving me on the outside with my baby (McPherson, 1919: 95).

Aimee's vision of reality (see p.89f below) and her vision of fulfilling her dreams of love, marriage and ministry were dashed upon the rocks of reality. She had set out with high hopes and expectations that her life's work and meaning had been settled. This interpretation had been confirmed by her mother's stories of her childhood, in the selection, praise, and encouragement from the Pentecostal Brothers and Sisters, as well as in her own memories of her call and the way things had been happening up to this point in her life. The "Call of God" had been confirmed, and the Semples had been commissioned to the mission field. They were going to be able to fulfill one of the highest dreams of the new revivalistic movement—-to carry their message to people in foreign lands. She had left North America with the ideals of her fellow believers, the romantic dreams of a young wife, and the hope for a fulfilling life. Now she had returned in despair because the realities had changed her
life. Here she decided on the vision of security offered by the general culture—marry and let your husband take care of you (McPherson, 1919: 93-97; 1927: 138-139).

The Pentecostals' rhetorical vision of the "successful witness," and a belief in "miraculous intervention" in contrast with real life crises that Aimee faced prior to her twentieth year, prompted a need to succeed, compelling Aimee to take greater risks later as a female evangelist which magnified both her triumphs and her failures. Repeatedly, she recalled these early days in pamphlets, books, and sermons. The visions of "calling" and "successful witness," and "miraculous intervention" to which Aimee subscribed in these early days became the basis for her search for success in ministry, in marriage, and during recurring sessions with doubt and depression when the successes seemed to elude her. Such behaviors are not only consistent with the developmental psychoanalytic theories of Erickson, (1962:212-213) but also with Bormann's conceptualization of the effects of rhetorical vision on the individual (1972:400) and Brown's description of the dynamic of need in the social intervention model (1986:35).

Again and again, one sees evidence of marked depression and doubt, coupled with Aimee's development as an institution -- after her return from China (McPherson, 1973: 68-72), after her marriage to Harold McPherson (McPherson, 1919: 92-103), and prior to and after her marriage to David
Hutton, involving a trip to the Caribbean, and later a trip to the Middle East and Europe (New York Times Nov. 4, 10, 17, 1930; Mar. 16, 17, 20, 23; July 14, 15, 17; Aug. 29; Dec. 31, 1932).

All of the reported bouts with depression had elements of: (1) concern about her interpersonal relationships, particularly marriage; (2) conflict between her expectations and the expectations of the multitudes of people who were her followers, and (3) the difference between theological visions of what should be and reality (cf p.89f below). These elements combined in her struggle to fulfill her personal ideological interpretation of the world, maintain and expand her power shares to control her future, and satisfy her needs. This affected her belief about marriage, her adopted role enactments and her measure of success in her religious organization. Mrs. McPherson fulfilled her role as minister and evangelist as she and her audience construed it and as it was enacted over time.

At twenty, Aimee's romantic optimism changed to desperate despair. Her husband was dead; she no longer was a missionary; she was feeling quite alone; and friends and family seemed insufficient to get her out of her "slough of despond." In the early 1900's, her solution then, seemed to be the typical solution of the period's culture--marriage. The problem Aimee faced in the marriage to McPherson was
that it was inconsistent with her high ideals of love and fulfillment and with her visions for her life. Aimee married for security—to have a home and protection from the elements for her daughter and herself. Her reports about her feelings and provisos about the "Call of God" show that she had little, if any, expectation for happiness and success in the marriage, as she felt she had had with Robert Semple (McPherson, 1919: 93-106). Aimee had introduced her proviso because her ideology held that the "Call of God" held higher priority than financial and physical security. Because of her reservations that would feature anomalies between her new marriage and her ideology, Aimee set the stage for a later switch that would deeply change her role of wife and mother.

Complaints lodged later by Harold McPherson and his family at the divorce proceedings suggest that the union was ill advised (Steele, 1970: 36-37). Of course, women in early Twentieth Century United States had few options and it is difficult to criticize based on assumptions that are common decades later. The marriage to Harold McPherson was not the haven Aimee had sought and it did not successfully deal with her needs primarily because of her concepts of "how-the-world-should-be" in terms of her ideal concept of marriage and ministry. The interdependency roles for the new marriage were not what she expected or desired. The Social Intervention Model holds that when changes in rela-
tionships occur, there will be corresponding changes in both need and ideology (Brown, 1982:18; 1978:128f). Aimee had attempted to fulfill a need but had not really changed her ideal life purpose as a minister; nor could she fulfill her power or relational expectations in the role of a housewife rather than in the role of a minister. Her preexisting, childhood concepts and desires were too well ingrained in her for this form of need advocacy to work. To escape from the dilemma Aimee, would have to focus on new needs, change the ways of meeting her needs, or choose old topoi for the meeting of her needs. Her choice was to advocate her needs by turning back.

After the birth of her son, Rolf, Mrs. McPherson began having severe physical problems coupled with depression. Near death after appendicitis (McPherson, 1919: 100) and a hysterectomy, (which was not reported until the Hutton controversies New York Times June 25, 1933 & July 18, 1933) Mrs. McPherson felt compelled to return to ministry. To Mrs. McPherson this meant leaving her marriage and starting over. Late one night, she took her children and her bags and returned to the Canadian farm (McPherson, 1919: 103-106). While her mother watched her two children, Mrs. McPherson began to attend nearby revival services and camp meetings working her way from the bottom by helping with clean up, setting up chairs, cooking meals, and any other
odd jobs that came her way (McPherson, 1919: 107-112). Gradually, she took part in the services, playing the piano, testifying to her return from her "backslidden state," and helping others "pray through." These various roles of repentance, devotion, and commitment were requisite for anyone wanting to return to the movement.

Mrs. McPherson began to be invited to be the campaign speaker, speaking at Berlin (Kitchener) and London, Ontario, and utilizing her own $65 tent in services at Mount Forest. She was on her way as a campaigner because others saw in her the qualities identified as a dedicated servant of the Lord (McPherson, 1919: 113f). Because of the nature of relationships of the small missions, with workers traveling between them, it was not long before Mrs. McPherson's reputation had spread to the United States, and she received an invitation to hold services in the North East. She campaigned in Providence, R.I., where apparently a truce was drawn with Harold, and he began to assist in the services. She graduated to a second and larger tent at Cape Cod, Massachusetts (McPherson, 1919: 117-119; Word and Work [Sept. 1917]).

The earliest mention of healing (see p. 103 below) in Mrs. McPherson's campaigns was at Corona, New York, during services conducted at the Swedish Methodist Church. She confirmed the healing two years later at a service she held prior to her trip to Los Angeles (McPherson, 1927: 174-175). She conducted three weeks of services at Long Branch, New
York, at which she reported twenty-six "baptized in the Holy Spirit," and several healings, including a preacher who had come to the services on crutches. The service included typically Pentecostal verbal messages in "tongues and interpretations" and a reported vision of Jesus (Word and Work, [Sept. 8, 1917]: 493). From Long Branch, Mrs. McPherson went to Hyde Park in Boston, where she reported a child with a paralyzed leg two inches shorter than the other being healed (Word and Work, [Sept. 8, 1917]: 494). Boston was followed by ten days at Huntington, Long Island, with more reported healings, including a crippled girl in leg braces, twenty-six "Baptized in the Spirit," dancing and singing in "tongues" (Word and Work, [Sept. 8, 1917]: 494).

At Montwait, Massachusetts, one of the Methodist ministers, his wife, and daughter were "Baptized in the Spirit." McPherson's influence over other ministers seemed assured; by August, 1917, in Washburn, Maine, Mrs. McPherson reported over one hundred "Baptized in the Spirit," including several ministers experiencing the "Pentecostal Blessing." Here, too, was the first mention of her use of religious drama to present her messages. "The Ten Virgins" utilized children from the community to act out her sermon as she preached (Word and Work, [Sept. 8, 1917]: 494-495).

The arrival of winter sent Mrs. McPherson and her campaign south to Florida, holding meetings in Jacksonville,
Durant, (Tampa area) and on to Miami. By the time McPherson reached Miami, she had acquired a new car, a new tent, 40' by 80', and a caravan of followers and helpers (Bridal Call [Jan. 1918]: 6-14). Mrs. McPherson was enjoying a positive response and feeling that she was indeed fulfilling her Pentecostal vision of the "Handmaiden of the Lord," as well as her childhood dreams of being a preacher. Although in her mind services were open to all, local prejudices did not allow blacks at the local meetings. Her response was to move her campaign to a black area in Key West and hold "colored camp meetings" for a month in Key West and another for a month, just north of Miami in Palm Beach. She retained no statistics, "leaving that to God," and reported only subjectively perceived results (Bridal Call Vol. 1 No. 10 [Mar. 1918]: 16).

Mrs. McPherson was fulfilling her power role as the "Handmaiden of the Lord (cf. p. 96f below)." Dutifully humble in this role, McPherson reported to her readers her sense of weakness and dependency: "I feel my weakness and utter dependence upon God as never before, as I look out over this sea of hungry faces, crowds still increasing, hundreds unable to obtain seats, pray Saints, Pray!" (Bridal Call Vol. 1 No. 10 [Mar. 1918]: 15). However, she had been neglectful, she felt, in revealing to her readers the hardships of her ministry. She described what it meant to her to fulfill the power role of servant as the "Handmaiden of
the Lord," while at the same time informing her Pentecostal supporters that she was indeed dutifully fulfilling the expectations that the movement had for its ministers. Graphically, she wrote to them through her magazine.

It has meant self sacrifice and in our weekly reports for Word and Work we endeavor to picture the sunny side to encourage the many who live far from meetings, but fail perhaps to show the other side where sometimes in driving rains we find our sleeping tents ankle deep in water, our bedding wet, struggling to cook on smoky oil stoves and yet keep singing and smiling and fight the good fight of faith. Pray for us that we may be ever faithful, even unto death if necessary, for greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his brethren. We are not looking for death, however, but for Jesus to come quickly (Bridal Call Vol.1 No.11 [Apr. 1918]: 15).

The last phrase of this quotation regarding the coming of Jesus is key to understanding the motivating vision behind Mrs. McPherson's concept of herself as the Lord's "Handmaiden." No sacrifice was considered too great, no hardship too difficult to bear in light of the shortness of time before the coming of the Lord, the resulting Judgment and establishment of the Millennium. The language of this quotation shows how seriously Mrs. McPherson took her calling, as well as the length she was willing to go to be able to preach to and convert others; she was that much convinced that these were indeed end times, especially given the national experience in the Great War. The concepts of premillennialists had taken hold and those "laboring in the field" knew that sacrifice was in order (Dayton, 1987:143-
Indeed, Mrs. McPherson was feeling the sacrifice. Harold had gone ahead as advance man to schedule some much-needed services (and hence offerings). Although the campaign among the blacks was greatly appreciated, there were inadequate offerings to keep the campaign going. It was also evident from the growing crowds that a larger tent was needed. This expansion required that the McPhersons appeal for donations to the readership of the *Bridal Call* and *Word and Work* (the latter a reader's-digest type magazine which republished on an every-other-month plan *Bridal Call* as well as several other Pentecostal magazines); the larger tent would be needed at a nationwide camp meeting to be held in Philadelphia July 21 through September 3, 1918. Since the McPhersons were to be one of the major features of the camp meeting, expansion was justified. However, contributions came in slowly; several came nevertheless, from states in which McPherson had yet to hold meetings. Her audience was building (*Bridal Call* Vol.1 No.11 [Apr. 1918]: 17).

In addition to her monthly magazine, *Bridal Call*, and her growing tent ministry, which had expanded by early 1918 to a $2500 tent that seated one thousand, Mrs. McPherson utilized the tools at hand. Traveling from place to place necessitated a car, but this was not simply a means of transportation. It, too, became a billboard for the Gospel
message. Painted in gold lettering her "Gospel Car" carried such statements as, "Where will you spend eternity?" (Bridal Call Vol.2 No.1 [June, 1918]: cover, 13). In addition, she and her entourage passed out Gospel tracts in each city through which they traveled between engagements (Bridal Call Vol.2 No.1 [June 1918]: 13).

Mrs. McPherson was controlled by her vision to convert the lost and used every means at her disposal to accomplish her perceived task. While holding meetings at St. Petersburg, Florida, during a parade, she bedecked her "Gospel Car" with flowers and a model of her tent and simply drove into the parade as one of the floats (McPherson, 1919: 136). Like many mission workers, the end justified the means; they did not give close scrutiny to "petty man-made rules." The religious heritage taught them that the all-important presentation guided all activity. In all probability, it never entered McPherson's mind that there were expectations and fees for those entering the parade. Simply put, there had been an opportunity, a gap in the parade, and she drove on. She reported the tent was filled that night (McPherson, 1919: 136-137; McPherson, 1927: 192-196). Once Mrs. McPherson had a core crowd, her tents were rarely empty.

Although there may have been initial reticence to attend a Pentecostal Tent Meeting on the part of the citizenry, when Mrs. McPherson once had an initial audience she was quite gifted in resetting the moral code of public
opinion. As in St. Petersburg, the crowds liked her audacity and ingenuity in making religion interesting. McPherson was able to associate her campaign with the attendee's value for the "Camp Meeting" in this period of national stress because of the war. Likewise, special themes, especially in later campaigns the theme of Divine Healing, would draw many (The Evening Repository, Canton, Ohio [October 6, 1921]: 1). Word of mouth of her public presentations, her persuasiveness, and public belief that her message was helpful, all assisted McPherson in creating power through the communication process (Brown, 1986:181). McPherson's willingness to be creative in her religious expression and not stick to traditional and expected revivalists themes, such as "Hell Fire," were key to the interaction process between she and her audience which led to an alteration of and restabilization of codes regarding tent revivalists (Brown, 1986:184). In the past, the audience would have expected the featuring of human sinfulness and eternal damnation. However, Mrs. McPherson instead focused on promise, grace, and the positive aspects of Christianity.

Mrs. McPherson rarely mentioned world or national events other than as analogies to proclaim the message of the "Second Coming of Jesus Christ." Her sermons and pamphlets from the period suggest this interpretation of current events, as illustrative of a greater Divine purpose,
including "Modern Warfare," "Over the Top," "Liberty Bonds
Over There," and "The Red Cross." Her Pentecostal form of
dispensationalism pictured revival experiences as prepara-
tion and empowerment for telling about the coming of Jesus
Christ. In her depiction, the Christians empowered by the
Holy Spirit were the "Bride of Christ" and were preparing
the church and the world for the Lord's return. Mrs.
McPherson's characteristic presentation featured such a role
for her audience. In her sermon/pamphlet "Lost and Re-
stored," McPherson set forth her expectations that the
church would experience greater and greater revival until
the coming of the Lord. However, the Pentecostals usually
did not have the funds to sponsor the evangelistic crusades
that appeared to be necessary. Many projected campaigns
never came to fruition. (McPherson, 1976; Bridal Call Vol.1

Leaving the Florida campaigns in Jacksonville, Durant,
Miami, Key West, Palm Beach, Orlando, St. Petersburg, and
Tampa, McPherson headed to the Nationwide Camp Meeting in
Philadelphia. En route she held meetings at the Pulaski,
West Virginia, Pentecostal Holiness Church where there was
difficulty regarding the "Sanctification Controversy" (Riss,
113). Mrs. McPherson held to Durham's "Finished Work"
teachings regarding sanctification which she had learned
while assisting at Chicago with her husband, Robert Semple
(Riss, 1988: 255-256, see p. 100f below). The controversy necessitated changing locations of the services, but it did not affect her popularity at the National Camp Meeting (Bridal Call Vol.2 No.1 [June, 1918]:15; McPherson, 1919: 172-173; McPherson, 1923:133-139).

After a campaign in Roanoke, Virginia, the McPhersons went to Philadelphia for the Nationwide Camp Meeting, forty days of religious meetings in the tenor of the 19th Century Camp Meetings in which the Pentecostals gathered from across the nation to confirm their faith, experience "outpourings" from God, and to evangelize others in their beliefs (cf.Bruce, 1974: 61-95). The audience was touched by the devotion demonstrated by Aimee McPherson. One conventionaire described her "personal work" with the penitent and seeking souls at the altar in the after service.

This tableau finished as the first early signs of dawn was breaking; and the great prayer of consecration which followed from the heart of Sister McPherson, seemed not only to take in her own soul but the souls of the whole camp. It was a time in which the hearts around her melted with that sweet sadness that only a contrite heart knows (quoted in Bridal Call Vol.2 No.4 [Sept. 1918]: 16).

McPherson was now a nationally known revivalist. The meeting at Philadelphia became a turning point, both personally and professionally. The Pentecostal community believed that she, indeed, demonstrated the ideals they held for a Pentecostal evangelist. Following Philadelphia, she began a
series of meetings through the Northeast, Long Hill, Connecticut; Montrait Camp Grounds in Framington, Massachusetts, and Worcester, Massachusetts. But instead of continuing North, she turned West to Hartford, Connecticut, and Vandras Mission in New York. She spent October in the New York area preparing to travel West. The meeting at Apostolic Faith Church in Rochelle was her last meeting before leaving for California (Bridal Call Vol.2 No.4 [Sept. 1918]: back-cover; Vol.2 No.5 [Oct. 1918]:16) Harold, however, refused to go on. He wanted to drop out of the evangelistic campaign, but Aimee had had the taste of success. She knew she could do more. There was a conflict between Harold's concept of the role of a wife of a quiet businessman and the crowd-stirring public speaker, which Aimee had become (McPherson, 1919: 199). Mrs. McPherson transposed her family crisis into an ideological statement about Harold's refusal to go on as the price she must pay for her devotion to Christ and the ministry (McPherson, Personal Testimony, nd).

Her marriage dissolving, Mrs. McPherson, her mother, Minnie Kennedy, along with "Sister" Bingham, nurse for the children, as well as her two children, began the long transcontinental trip by automobile in October, 1918 (Bridal Call, Vol.2 No.8 [Jan. 1919]: 12). She had published her proposed itinerary in the Bridal Call to encourage meetings in the towns along the way, hoping to raise money for her
journey. She did not count on the banning of public gatherings imposed by the outbreak of the flu (Bridal Call Vol.2 No.8 [Jan. 1919]: 13-14). The 1918 flu was devastating, reportedly killing up to twenty million people by 1920 (Urdang, 1981: 295). McPherson and her daughter were stricken with the disease during her meetings at New Rochelle, New York, prior to leaving for California. In part, her daughter's illness contributed to her desire for a permanent home for her children, further prompting the move (McPherson, 1919: 205; Bridal Call Vol.2 No.5 [Oct. 1918]: 16). The ban on meetings only made the harrowing auto trip that much more an accomplishment for the three women and two children. Mrs. McPherson had her tent shipped to California in April 1919 for use in her Los Angeles and San Francisco campaigns (Bridal Call Vol.1 No. 12 [May 1918]:15; Vol.2 No.11 [April, 1919]:16; McPherson, 1923: 165-167).

By the time McPherson reached Kansas in early November, the local bans had been lifted and she was able to begin meetings—Olathe, and Iola, Kansas; Oologah, Oklahoma, and finally Tulsa (Bridal Call Vol.2 No.7 [Dec. 1918]: 6-7). In accounts reminiscent of pioneer settlers on the Oregon Trail or of the Children of Israel in the Wilderness, McPherson described how the "Gospel Auto" took them across country (Bridal Call Vol.2 No. 8 [Jan. 1919]: 12). The images of the pioneer spirit and rugged individualism and
new beginnings are all bound up in McPherson's account of her journey. They matched the cultural expectations for the strong, capable leader she was becoming. In acting out her need too be strong as a single parent, Mrs. McPherson confirmed the ideology of her call to be a national evangelist; her need advocacy set the stage for greater triumphs (McPherson, 1919: 209-229; cf. also, Robertson, 1980: 147-157).

Mrs. McPherson entered Southern California as the "Lone Evangelist"; having crossed the great American plains she had come alone to preach the Pentecostal doctrine of the Second Coming of Jesus which necessitated the preparation of "the Bride," the Church, through the "Baptism of the Holy Spirit." Mrs. McPherson was enacting her needs for a safe, secure place for her children, and at the same time demonstrating her capabilities as a strong individualist. Here her acceptance of national ideologies of the rugged individualist, and the westward movement colored her more theological beliefs about her purpose as an evangelist.

Mrs. McPherson rode into town, alone, a woman, and a newly recognized national evangelist. Meetings were quickly arranged to be held in Victoria Hall, Los Angeles. It was, as Mrs. McPherson called it, "a real revival." In describing her meetings she said:

A real revival spirit fills the people. It sprang, as all other revivals have, from the sure deep roots of much travelling prayer and interces-
ession before the Lord, and it came suddenly as God's answers usually do. As the saints were praying her, and asking of the Lord great things, the Lord was answering (McPherson, 1919: 231).

Of course, it was this dedicated "Handmaiden of the Lord" who was the answer to the prayers of the people of Los Angeles. The meetings moved between Victoria Hall and Bethel Temple during December, 1918, and January, 1919, with the crowds and volunteers multiplying. The building phase began here as her followers, one by one, donated land, materials, landscaping, labor and even a pet canary to provide the lone evangelist's family a permanent home (McPherson, 1919: 231-241). Once again, because of the acceptance by the people and an establishment of a relationship, McPherson renewed her beliefs in the provision of the Lord that she held after her first husband's death in China. When she did the Lord's work, the people would be blessed and the Lord, through them, would provide all her needs. This concept is important to her later building of Angelus Temple.

McPherson, the lone evangelist, who entered the Southern California culture, had also traversed several "attention switches" predicated on her defined needs and search for interdependence and power with others. In explicating these, the Pentecostal and McPherson's theological worldview must be explained.
WORLD-VIEW OF THE EVANGELIST

WHAT IT MEANT TO BE PENTECOSTAL

Particularly during her early period of ministry (1908-1918) Aimee Semple McPherson considered herself a "Handmaiden of the Lord," specifically fulfilling the Biblical prophecy of Acts 2:17-18, the Pentecostal ethos of presenting the full gospel in order to prepare the world for the coming of Jesus Christ and the integrity between Pentecostals and their preachers (Word and Work Vol.39 No.31 [Sept. 8, 1917]:492). This Pentecostal world-view is clearly expressed by McPherson in her magazine from the earliest publication.

The Bridal Call is a Pentecostal Paper published monthly. Believing as we do that Jesus Christ the Son of God is soon to come back to this earth for His waiting people, we feel led to send this Bridal Call far and wide to extend to all mankind the invitation to the marriage of the Lamb. We endeavor to set forth in simple words that all can understand, the plain message of Salvation, the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, Divine Healing and the Soon coming of Jesus (Bridal Call Vol.1 No.3 [Jan. 1918]: inside cover).

This statement of purpose gave the reader some important statements regarding the Pentecostal ideology of Aimee Semple McPherson.

Prior to the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles, almost every revivalistic activity in the United States was credited as being "Pentecostal," i.e., relating to the action of the Holy Spirit enlivening the church. However, the coupling of "Speaking in Tongues" with experiencing of
the Holy Spirit made revivalists, and others, quickly restrict the use of "Pentecostal" to those sects practicing glossolalia (Grause, 1976:107).

Historically, Pentecostalism was a logical step in the development of the concept of reformation and restoration in the church which had begun in the 16th Century Protestant Reformation in Europe (Bainton, 1956). The Reformation was credited by the protesting Christians with returning to the Church such concepts as "Salvation by Faith" and "Salvation by Grace." These concepts had been considered lost by Martin Luther and others in the liturgy and traditions of the Catholic Church. With colonization and expansion in the New World, religious leaders such as Jonathan Edwards felt a lack and failure to live in the fullness suggested by the Reformation theology of redemption which had been developed between the 14th and 17th centuries (Chadwick, 1972). The need for spiritual renewal perceived by American religious leaders such as Frelinghuysen, Tennent, and Edwards, was satisfied in a series of "Awakenings" which emphasized a return to New Testament values, beliefs and practices, variously and developmentally conceived in each of the revival outbreaks (McLoughlin, 1978: xiii; Noll, 1983:101-102).

By the beginning of the 20th century many Christians experienced a perceived need for spiritual power. One such group was the Pentecostals, who took the concept of restor-
ation one step further, establishing a code of need fulfillment to verify that a believer had indeed an experience and faith as described in the New Testament. Incorporating these verifying evidences into the group practice, the Pentecostals felt that they could prove compliance with New Testament Church normalcy, not only in the experience of "speaking in tongues" but also through miracles of healing, evidence of "spiritual gifts" (I Corinthians 12:7-10) and in an expressive brand of worship liturgy in church services (MacDonald, 1976:58-75).

Aimee Semple McPherson makes this restoration theme salient in her sermon "Lost and Restored" (Bridal Call Vol.1 No.11 [April 1918]:1-14). This sermon and pamphlet became the metaphor for spiritual neglect and sets forth the expected code of behavior for the "Baptized" believer. With the theology in place, an expected role was created for the Christian. If one were to be the best Christian possible, then one would need to seek and receive the experience of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit and the sign of speaking in tongues in order to fulfill the role of restored, empowered Christian.

There were two major ways of communicating the need to others: "testifying," whereby lay people recounted their spiritual journey advocating the need for the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, and "preaching," by which set-apart representatives interpreted the Bible as a means of featuring the need.
and role enactment expected of believers in accord with the Pentecostal vision of the restored church. Through these same methods McPherson not only identified the need from the Pentecostal Theology but also told her people both how they could meet this need and how they would know the need had been met in the Pentecostal form of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit with accompanying glossolalia.

POWER SHARES IN PENTECOSTAL GROUPS

As Brown's holographic model suggests, the presence of ideology also suggests the presence and functioning of need and power (Brown, "Need" 1986: 1f). At least six power roles were defined in the Pentecostal worldview: (1) those outside of the Church, considered "the Lost"; (2) those inside the church but considered incomplete because they were either "cold and indifferent" or "new born Christians;" (3) those inside the Church and "Spirit Baptized" including the next three categories; (4) "the faithful;" (5) "the called [to preach];" and finally, (6) "the powerful speakers." Obtaining these roles became a goal for Pentecostal preaching. It was used to communicate the need to move through this continuum in spiritual development.

The Saved and The Baptized

The first two categories comprised those targeted for communicating the two-fold conversion experience of "Salva-
tion" and "Baptism of the Holy Spirit." The lost, those completely outside of the "invisible" church, were those who had not experienced "Salvation," which may have been because they had never had opportunity to hear the message or "up and till now" had refused to accept the message. The lost were the major altruistic reason for the "Baptism of the Holy Spirit." The second experience was to qualify by sanctity and enable by empowering the individual to be a "witness" (Grindstaff, 1973). Thus, those who were in the church, but who had not had the second experience were targeted by the Pentecostal need-advocates for restored vitality and purpose to the Christian life and power and sanctity, to be enabled to live up to the model of the normative New Testament Church (Gause, 1976).

The Faithful

The Spirit Baptized comprised the last four groups of the Pentecostal power shares. Anyone who had experienced "speaking in tongues" and attending the group was considered to have been "Baptized in the Spirit" and one who was experiencing status among the redeemed. There were gradations of relationship to the group with which the "Baptized" had to deal. They could be among "the Faithful," those "dear Saints" who graced the services with their presence every time the doors were opened, ever ready to help with the singing, praying with others, and contributing their means
to the ongoing functioning of the group. These faithful formed the backbone of both the localized Pentecostal Missions and Churches, and the traveling revival campaigns. They often traveled great distances to be a part of some "new work" or experience healings and blessings. The "Baptized" demonstrated their adherence to the doctrines of Pentecostal power and holiness by enacting the roles of faithfulness. By these behaviors, they hoped to prove their allegiance to the Pentecostal doctrines and more especially to their Lord.

The Called

Among the faithful were those who held the relationship to the group as the "called to preach." These individuals, both male and female, described their calling to the congregants in terms of the compelling experience of the Holy Spirit and the salience of Biblical commands. Hollenweger describes the communication intervention expressed by these individuals in his landmark study, The Pentecostals.

In the Pentecostal movement the call to be a pastor must be an experience which in the eyes of the person who is called and of his future followers allows a break with previous loyalties, and indeed demands and gives positive interpretation to such a break. It can be brought about by visions, dreams, voices, prophecies on the part of another person, the reading of the Bible, or doubts about the established church. The final step is usually brought about by a combination of various factors (1988:482).

Early, these were trained by a loose apprenticeship; later a
system of Bible Schools developed in the pattern of the other Holiness and Revivalistic movements. Bible schools were formed to formalize scriptural instruction, standardize practice, and enhance reduplication of the movement (Jones, 1983; Wilson, 1988:8-11,19).

The Called and Gifted

Further set apart among the preachers were the most select "powerful speakers" who were perceived because of their special speaking abilities to be extraordinarily endowed by God. They were highly capable speakers, emotionally stirring, interesting to listen to, and excelling in description of scriptural stories in terms of the Pentecostal restorationalist worldview. Ideally these powerful preachers used extemporaneous methods with only the Bible for quotation and not "paper speeches." They were not at a loss for words because they "dialogued" with the audience. They represented a belief that they were lifted up from among the people. They were not the product of dead seminaries and higher criticism but of imparted ability from the Holy Spirit. Among these most capable speakers, some were further set apart because of the perception of extra "giftedness" in this Pentecostal economy. Aimee Semple McPherson fell into this latter category because of both her healing ministry and her preaching (Harrell, 1975; Simson, 1977; Kendzora, 1979; and Schuetz, 1986). It was to maintain this
level of performance that McPherson strove to fulfill her servant role as the "Handmaiden of the Lord."

During her early period, McPherson adhered closely to the code of the Pentecostals as she traveled from tent meeting to tent meeting. But after 1921, she purposely sought out acceptance by the old-line protestant ministers and adhered to a prior existing code dictating the conduct of a "revivalist" which had been part of the repertoire of belief but not necessarily practiced in these churches which had been born out of the earlier awakenings (Bruce, 1976). So much did McPherson vary from what was perceived as Pentecostal practice that she was accused by fellow Pentecostal Ministers to her credentialling board, The Assemblies of God, as not being Pentecostal (Bridal Call Vol.6 No.5 [Oct. 1922]: 10). She, subsequently, denied interdependency with the Assemblies of God by turning in her credentials because of the criticism she received from other Assembly of God ministers about the organization structure of Angelus Temple being held in her name (McPherson -Bell Letters, 1922).

McPherson's change in strategy in Pentecostal evangelism can be seen in the contrast between two quotations taken from her Bridal Call magazine, one from the period in which she was clearly operated in a strategy expected of a Pentecostal, and the second from a period in which she specifically changed her strategy to featuring her "interdenominationalism" and striving to win the favor of the denom-
inational ministers to her cause. First, in an article entitled "What about those Manifestations?" she writes that come what may, she would have Pentecostal manifestations.

Many flourishing assemblies, once filled and swayed by the power of God, have quenched the Spirit, criticized and checked manifestations until today they have no manifestations to quench or to bring reproach upon them.... Thank God we have not come to the pass where we have to try to be popular or pleasing to the world. Even if we are a gazingstock or a spectacle, let God and His Spirit have the right of way, whatever the cost may be (Vol.2 No.8, [Jan. 1919]:5).

Secondly, she writes in response to the question raised by an Assembly of God minister, "Is Mrs. McPherson Pentecostal?" In this later worldview of Pentecostalism, she features sobriety and piety as the primary features of the spirit-filled life.

To be Pentecostal in Spirit, however, is to be something far different than many suppose. To be Spirit filled is the grandest, proudest, tribute of sobriety and piety one can possess. The Holy Spirit is not marked by wildness, hysteria, screaming, or unseemly manifestation; but by deep, holy, sober, godly, reverent, prayerful exaltation of the gentle Christ of Galilee, and earnest passion for souls, a biblical and scriptural Holy Ghost boldness and wisdom that will be the means of leading men and women to the Cross in which we glory (Vol.6 No.5 [Oct. 1922]:7).

In these two passages, McPherson shifts the salience of the need for the Baptism of the Holy Spirit from manifesting evidences to a practice of life which switches to a new code of behavior for the Spirit-filled individual. The relational communication turns from an exhibition to the church
while reacting to the Spirit to a new power relationship for the spirit-filled with the unconverted outside of the church. This change was a change in interdependency between the Pentecostals in the interest of establishing complementary relations with the mainline Churches, the arbitrator being the opinion of the establishment (McPherson, 1923:173-179; Brown, 1986).

THE FULL GOSPEL

Long before McPherson's description of the Pentecostal doctrine as "The Foursquare Gospel," (see Chapter IV) she taught the "Full-Gospel" as defined by the preaching and literature of the Pentecostal movement. The four-fold message of Salvation, Baptism of the Holy Spirit, Divine Healing and the Second Coming of Jesus formed the full Gospel. Although carried over from the Holiness and Revivalistic movements before it, the Pentecostals' interpretation was a unique world-view (Bridal Call vol.1 No.8 [Jan. 1918] inside cover; Dayton, 1987).

Salvation

These primary doctrines are presented in such a fashion to affirm particular needs, as well as set forth a means to satisfy the needs. The doctrine of salvation presented a relational need to the audience whereby the auditor needs to experience forgiveness in order to be related to God and
practice the Pentecostal beliefs and behaviors to relate to each other in the church. Failure meant the threat of judgment. In general, the doctrines of personal salvation and Christian living followed those outlined from the periods of awakening in the United States and the teachings of the revivalistic and Holiness movements. Pentecostals added little but accepted as its own what had been taught by others for years.

**Baptism in the Holy Spirit**

The doctrine of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit was conceived as a "second work of grace" whereby the believer was expected to fulfill the need spiral of the redemptive work of Christ. This "need spiral" was presented in two distinct formats depending on the theological antecedents of the particular group of Pentecostals. First, those Pentecostals arising directly out of the Holiness movement already held a belief in "Entire Sanctification" as a "second work of grace." Therefore, their logic concluded that the Baptism of the Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues would be a third work of grace. This position is represented in the beliefs and practices of the Church of God, Cleveland Tennessee, among others (Faupel, 1972:13-20).

The second position was popularized by William Durham, Robert and Aimee Semple's [McPherson] mentor in pastoral work from the North Avenue Mission in Chicago, Illinois.
Durham's position was called the "Finished Work" (Riss, 1988:255-256). This position arose from Keswick and Christian and Missionary Alliance's interpretation of Salvation and Sanctification which taught all grace was made available to believers because of Christ's "finished work" on the cross and was appropriated over the entire period of being a Christian rather than as a sudden crisis moment, as taught by the Wesleyan concept of Entire Sanctification or Christian Perfection (Bundy, 1988:518-519; Riss, 1988:255-256).

This second position is represented by the Assemblies of God and Aimee Semple McPherson's Foursquare Gospel Church (Faupel, 1972:20-25).

Although the Pentecostal understanding arose out of the same Biblical texts and a similar need for spirituality as the Holiness and Revivalistic movements before it, this new generation of Christians had adjusted the construction of the need. Now for the collective church to be a "New Testament" Church, the Pentecostal need advocates argued, each individual must experience "glossolalia" believing it to be like that received by believers from the First Century Church (Womack, 1968; MacDonald, 1964). Power was shared (Brown, 1986: 181) based on the concept of "faithfulness" so that a person exhibiting the requisite behavior, teaching, and helping others to experience "Spirit Baptism" and "glossolalia" were viewed with greater deference.

There was interdependency (Brown, 1986:187) between
Aimee Semple McPherson and the audience to reify her advocacy for meeting the need to be "Baptized in the Spirit," by the uninitiated believer. She utilized tactics of "I will ask you to something" -- "raise your hand--come forward--pray--receive the Spirit--speak in tongues" because you are the weak, frail, and distant Christian in need of this experience to enable you to be successful in living the Christian life. This approach of "Integrity" (Boulding, 1978; Brown, 1986:194) was typical in advocating the need for and inducing adherence to the Pentecostal code of behavior, interdependency and fulfillment of perceived need. The Pentecostal ideology was utilized to create the need for Spirit Baptism, and, once achieved, became the basis for sharing the power in the assembly.
Divine Healing

The third primary doctrine of the Pentecostal worldview was Divine Healing. Aimee experienced miraculous healing of a broken foot in 1909 while under Durham's tutelage and prayed for the few requesting prayer for healing in her early meetings. "Divine Healing" however, was not a featured topic in McPherson's early campaigns (McPherson, 1919:67-75; Owen, 1989:19). Not until after her San Diego Campaign and healing service at Balboa Park where thousands came for prayer to be healed did Divine Healing become a featured, if controversial item in her services (McPherson, 1923:312f; The Evening Repository, Canton, Ohio [Oct.6-21, 1921 daily]; Simson, 1977:85, 87, 170, 175).

The world-view of the Pentecostal expected that if a person had sufficient faith, the person could be expected to be cured when prayed for by "laying on of hands" and "anointing with oil." While skeptical of Aimee Semple McPherson's efforts, newspapers were still quick to publish names, addresses, and type of healing experienced by individuals in the community who had attended her services (Dayton Journal [May 14,1920]:3; The Evening Repository, Canton, Ohio [Oct.6-21, 1921, daily]). Many of the newspaper reports were reprinted wholesale by McPherson in her written accounts of the campaigns in her 1923 version of This is That (1923:196-198, 361-364, 398-399, 405-409, etc.). Ministers and reporters skeptical of the healings
were often won over to McPherson after investigating "healings" that had taken place months or years prior to their investigation (Bridal Call Vol.6 No. 10 [Mar. 1923]:12-16). The expectation of the Pentecostal was for the miraculous intervention of God in one's day-to-day life as normal for the current believer as it had been for those described in the Book of Acts (Hollenweger, 1988:431).

McPherson utilized the tactic of "exchange" (Boulding, 1978; Brown, 1986:194) in presenting the healing message. The individual, in exchange for "faith," coming forward and seeking prayer, would be healed of whatever malady one possessed. Thus, she exercised power through her communication while advocating for development of the expectation of the individual to act upon his or her belief. The seeker felt dependent upon McPherson as being the focal point of the power of God to heal. While there are stories of hysterical healings which did not endure (Simson, 1977:170) or stories of outright trickery (Simson, 1977:175), there are stories which cannot be easily dismissed as hysteria or trickery. Although the position might be debated theologically, Mrs. McPherson presented and people received healing, consistent with the vision of the Pentecostal movement.

The Second Coming of Jesus

The fourth element of Pentecostal vision was the "Second Coming of Jesus." This was made especially cogent
to the audience during the period of Mrs. McPherson's campaigns because of World War I, and the national economic problems which people faced. These personal experiences gave salience to the whole need system for the restoration of the Church and society through the Baptism of the Holy Spirit and the Coming of Jesus Christ and made the ideology preached the more believable.

The theme of the second coming was part of the restorationalist views of the Pentecostals. Some such as Anderson (1979) and Faupel (1989) would argue that this theme is the key theme for the entire rhetorical vision of the Pentecostals. By stressing the second coming, Mrs. McPherson was consistent with the general Pentecostal sentiment, especially in her early years where her metaphor for describing the church was "the Bride of Christ." Her presentation argued that people now had the opportunity to change so that they might be part of the Church--The Bride of Christ as it is described metaphorically in the Biblical Book of Revelation (Bridal Call Masthead; Rev. 19:7-9).

While on the one hand Aimee Semple McPherson emphasized the role of the Bride of Christ, she also enacted the role of the "Handmaiden of the Lord." This servant role was a direct carry over from Biblical texts that described the service function of the Church in the end times (Acts 2:17-18; Mark 13:32-37; Matt. 25:14-30; Luke 19:12-27). This was also an effective way to be self-effacing while laying
claim to her position as "a powerful preacher." (cf. p.94f above). In the servant role prescribed for the Pentecostal minister, it was necessary to show willingness to preach at anytime and any place, to live by "free-will offerings," to voice no complaints, and to give due emphasis to the doctrines of Salvation, Baptism of the Spirit, Divine Healing, and the Second Coming. These taken-for-granted functions formed a code so that if the preacher was to be found credible by the group, he or she must strictly adhere to the performance of ministerial duties. Implied was a threat (Boulding, 1978; Brown, 1986:194) of being no longer acceptable to the group, and thereby losing the distinct purpose to which the preacher felt "called." For Aimee Semple McPherson this sense of calling was reflected in her needs of belonging, identity, security, and purpose to which we now turn.

NEED AND THE EVANGELIST

THE NEED TO BELONG

McPherson was a capable and popular student in high school, where she was faced with the anomalous features in secular education in relation to her religious up-bringing in the home. She was confronted by two normative roles, "the-truly-modern-woman" versus "the-active-believing-participant-in-religion-woman." McPherson masked her religious
conflict by comparing her behavior to other religious persons doing activities that she had previously evaluated as being evil, such as dancing. She wondered how it could be wrong if it was the young Presbyterian minister who had been the first to ask her to dance at her first attendance at a community activity (McPherson, 1919: 29). This also afforded an opportunity to justify her adolescent rebellion against parental Gods (Erickson, 1962:49ff). But minor shifts and masking could not hold back the stress caused her world-view by the teachings of Ingersoll, Paine, Voltaire and Darwin. She probably accepted these ideas, in part, out of her given need to belong. Her behavior suggests that she wanted to be that "truly-modern-woman," participating in all the local society offerings with the hope of becoming a great actress one day. All of this was the image she pictured of herself in fulfilling not only the need to belong, but also needs of identity and purpose (McPherson, 1919: 27-29).

However, McPherson's life came into contrast with that of the folks who attended the local Pentecostal Mission, which reconstituted and defined her basic need for identity. McPherson's individuality-centered needs did not fit into the atmosphere of the collectivity-centered needs of the Pentecostal Mission. Here the still older teachings of her childhood took on new meaning because these people acted as if the teaching was real to them. The ideological base she
had constructed around her need to belong in her school settings no longer had the meaning they once had. Because of the holographic nature of need, power relationships, and ideology, this anomalous situation helped create an atmosphere in which she was ready to convert (Brown, "Need," 1986:18-9). These new "Pentecostal" expressions of what she had come to despise in her parents' religion now found new power in defining her need advocacy, as well as her role in order to belong. McPherson was challenged to exchange (Boulding, 1978; Brown, 1986: 194) her old codes, her old need-meeting responses, her old interdependency for a new code expressed in the Pentecostal rhetorical vision for a new manner of meeting her need. McPherson was challenged to belong through "faithfulness," (as explained above p.94f) and to accept a new interdependency with Pentecostal believers (Brown, 1986:184-185).

Eventually, she reconverted to this variety of Christianity from her evolutionism and skepticism and demonstrated that fact by energetic faithfulness. This practice of faithfulness, as a maneuver, affirmed the reality of her need to belong and facilitated an attention switch evidenced by her regular attendance at meetings. Despite school schedule, inclement weather, and parental injunction, her mother and father could not yet conceive that this switch was helpful because of their personal ideology and need as
parents to protect. Aimee also demonstrated the change in loyalties by discontinuing dancing, reading of novels, and playing "ragtime" music and by ceasing participation in dramatic presentations (even those written, directed and starred in by Aimee). She would find her new sense of identity and purpose not as an actor in the usual sense of the word but as a "minister" (McPherson, 1927: 79-81). Later, she would revitalize her dramatic sense and incorporate it into her presentations at Angelus Temple. Mrs. McPherson did not convert half-way. She intended to prove that she belonged. Her behavior was the enactment of her rhetorical statement that she now adhered to the new group's code of conduct and relational communication (Brown, 1986:185).

THE NEED FOR IDENTITY

In addition to McPherson's need for group identity in belonging, she also had an individual need for identity. This is demonstrated in the contrast between two more normative roles, or templates--those of "housewife" and "handmaiden of the Lord." Filled with the normal human urges and desires, she had a desire to marry and yet be useful to her Lord. The first normative role of "housewife" could be fulfilled in her old code of conduct, but with her conversion, the second role had to go with the first because she was presenting herself to the group as a leader. For her to
enjoy a complementary relationship with the congregation, as well as her internal need to fulfill her "calling," McPherson needed to be able to combine the two roles into the role of "minister's wife." Mrs. McPherson found, because of the need advocacy arising from her mother's instruction, as well as out of the ideology of Pentecostalism, she could combine her roles in her union with Robert Semple (McPherson, 1927: 93-130). Any discomfort she may have felt arising from her mother's expectations that she be a preacher could be easily masked by this template of "preacher's wife." This was a common enough strategy for women who felt a call to ministry, even to this present day (Barfoot & Shepherd, 1980; Scanzoni & Setta, 1986).

Functioning as a minister's wife, Aimee, like many other women, could justify her parental expectations and her own visions of her call without much disturbance. Scanzoni and Setta illustrate the conflict in such a reification of non-pulpit place for women with a quotation from the Guide to Holiness. "'[The Christian woman] contents herself with shining, like the moon, with borrowed splendor, as the mother, sister, or wife of the great so-and so,' wrote columnist Mrs. J. Fowler Willing. Such a woman has 'left her talent in its napkin while she is obeying the world's dictum by helping to make the most of his'" (1986:224). As might be predicted, these concepts conflicted after Semple's death when she married the grocer, Harold McPherson. Mrs.
McPherson could not perceive how she could be "the handmaiden of the Lord," and at the same time the wife of a grocer and mother to two small children. In this relationship, she could not assist him to greatness in the ministry, since in her mind he had none.

Being the wife of a grocer, instead of a minister, became highly anomalous in relation to her perception of what she "ought to be doing." No longer could she mask her perception of calling behind the calling of her husband, Robert Semple. Now she had to deal with her individual-centered need; what she "ought to be doing" was preaching. McPherson became plagued with depression and illness, hiding away in her home and failing to perform her functions as a wife and mother. Harold would question, "Why can't you be like other women?" She would retort with her pre-nuptial escape clause about a possible future call to preach (McPherson, 1919: 93-98). Aimee McPherson had demonstrated her acceptance of the role defined for her as "preacher's wife" by "helpfulness," actively participating in her duties in the home, playing piano in services and helping around the altar. In her second marriage, Mrs. McPherson demonstrated her rejection of the role of "just-wife-and-mother" by becoming disfunctional in the home, in the grocery, as well as in her body (McPherson, 1919:93ff). While not intentional, the disfunction nevertheless did demonstrate
the depths of her personal struggle to resolve both her concept of Christian duty and role need. Her need was not the bio-social given of security but the constituted need to be a minister. Mrs. McPherson's needs-meeting response was to leave late one night to return to be a preacher (McPherson, 1919: 104-115).

THE NEED FOR SECURITY

Security wants seem to play a recurring part in Mrs. McPherson's actions. Although security is usually considered a biosocial given, Mrs. McPherson felt secure only in the constituted need of felt security expressed in her ministerial role. This is especially true of her marriage to Harold McPherson. The second marriage is in direct contrast to her reported perceptions of her security needs. Although in an insecure financial situation with Robert Semple, she had not interpreted the situation in such a negative fashion.

During these months I was taught my first lessons in the faith life, taking neither price nor script for our journey. We went into all the world to preach the Gospel firmly believing that we should take no thought for what we should eat, or what we should drink, or what we should put on, for the Lord knew that we had need of these things. Splendid months of discipline and heart preparation they were for the work that was to come (McPherson, 1928: 17).

Contrast this feeling of security Aimee felt in the midst of Robert Semple's material insecurity with the emotional insecurity Aimee expressed in the secure financial
situation provided by Harold McPherson. She had physical means but was losing out with God and conflicting with her vision of her person, her place, and her concept of the world.

It was just at the time of my greatest perplexity, when I had begun to lose out spiritually and wander away from the Lord, and was longing to make a home for the baby, that I married again (McPherson, 1919: 95).

The security need was utilized to define rhetorically what her actions ought to be. An example of her security need-featuring was her decision to migrate to California in late 1918. While conducting services at Rochelle, New York, Roberta fell ill and nearly died. McPherson lamented her decision to be so rootless and was feeling guilty for her decision. She needed a proper home for her children. She recorded it for her audience thus:

Staying in the furnished rooms without heat or home comforts I yearned for a little house where I could care for her properly, and I remembered how before becoming unconscious she had said: "Oh, Mamma, I do wish we had a little home where I could go to school." I had said: "Darling, would you want Mamma to leave work and try to get a little home together?" She said: "Oh, no, Mamma, I don't want you to leave the work; I will try to teach myself." Dear Little Lamb (McPherson, 1919: 205-206).

McPherson's strategy to meet her security need during this period of her life was to affirm that God had become her source of security by providing funds after Robert Semple's death while she was still in China (McPherson,
1919:88). McPherson also felt God to be her security by providing money, blankets and a thermos after reaching San Francisco (1919:90) and again in the provision a new home in Southern California, "The House God Built" (1919: 239-241). These and other forms of assistance were perceived as direct interventions of God in her daily life. At this time, this was sufficient affirmation for herself and her followers that "God supplied;" however, later during her many court battles, it became another matter (Thomas, 1970: 325ff).

THE NEED FOR PURPOSE

A fourth need that motivated McPherson's shifts in vision and presentation was the constituted need of "purpose." McPherson was rather constant in reiterating her testimony of "infidelity, conversion, baptism in the Holy Spirit, healing, calling, and life in the Spirit" (Bridal Call Vol.4 No. 10 [Mar. 1921]: 2). Whether in sermon, pamphlet, or book, McPherson justified to her audience the rightness of her following the "Call of God" to be a preacher in a period when women ministers were not well received. American religious culture would deny her purpose of being a preacher of the gospel and disallow power of the leadership role as a minister and evangelist. In contrast to the cultural template of the normative role of homemaker, wife, and mother, Aimee adopted the template originating in her mother's image of a woman minister, after the pattern of
the Salvation Army. This role image was expanded by the example of Holiness and Pentecostal women, who had begun missions where no other Christian church was willing to operate (Cartwright, 1985). The template of the "woman minister" was maintained through consistent demonstration of devotion and acts of "miraculous intervention," which gave her power and credibility in the eyes of her audiences. As stated above (p.94f), the church expected faithfulness, calling, and "powerful preaching." Mrs. McPherson's testimony of giving up hearth and home, suffering privations in the open air, traveling like a nomad, putting up, maintaining, and taking down her own tents confirmed to her audiences that she had the right and the authority to preach. The testimony of those aided and those assisting made her out to be a model of Pentecostal devotion, function, and aspiration. In a similar fashion, her family also testified to her meeting the model of devotion. In a tribute to her mother, Roberta recalled those days of the tent campaigns.

I caught sight of mother crouched in the driving rain, her hair streaming, driving in the loosened stakes with the heavy sledge, but the storm loosened them faster than she could re-drive them. Faster and faster she worked, but to no avail. One small woman was no match for such a storm.

Realizing this at last, she instantly changed her tactics. She rushed inside and standing in the center of the aisle, she grasped the corners of the rough lumber benches on each side of her and with a mighty effort pushed them over, each falling bench pushed over the one behind, domino fashion. Then loosening the pulley rope that held the canvas aloft, she ran clear and watched the
tent descend. Crumpled and limp the once proud tent lay close to the ground safe from the storm. (Bridal Call Vol.16 No.2 [May 1933]: 6).

McPherson was not going to let man nor element stand between her and her accepted purpose of preaching and proclaiming the Coming of the Lord. She took seriously, and expected others to take seriously her call, her personal dedication, and her tireless efforts to fulfill the vision she had taken as the "Handmaiden of the Lord" (see above 89, 99, 101-104).

SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have outlined the historical development of the individual Aimee Semple McPherson. It has addressed her world-view as a Pentecostal Evangelist as it was defined by her doctrine and practice. This chapter has also focused on those needs which make more salient her interpretation of the role of a minister as the "Handmaiden of the Lord." Thus individual-centered needs, even more than group-centered needs, controlled the events that shaped her life, and she revealed and constructed these needs through her rhetorical words and actions, especially at crucial junctions of change. This chapter has described these change points, opinions, and rationales in terms of the Social Intervention Model.

In the next chapter, we shall look at Aimee Semple McPherson's expanding base of operations which, in turn,
enlarged the expectations of her audience. The ensuing institutional structuring was a result of a dynamic between McPherson and her audience, resulting in the birth of a unique Christian denomination rising out of Aimee Semple McPherson's revival activities.
NOTES

1. There was a strong evangelistic and missionary emphasis in the Pentecostal movement. Many felt that the gift of speaking in tongues was for the distinct purpose of preaching overseas without having to learn the language. However, they learned quickly, otherwise. Cf Bays, 1988; The Aposotolic Faith; L.G. McClung, "Missiology" Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements. 1988: 607-609.

2. Other Pentecostal periodicals included: Pisgah edited by Dr. F.E. Yoakum; Words of Life; and Our Gospel Letter.

3. In 1917 there were 4.8 million motor vehicles registered in the U.S.--435,000 were trucks. The average price of a car was $750. (Urdang, 1981:293).

4. This was also true of her work in auditoriums. In Canton in 1921 there was one 3" by 5" ad in the Evening Repository the day before services were to begin. By the third day the auditorium was filled by the newspaper reports and word of mouth. It was not until San Francisco area the next year, July 1922 that there was pre-planning on any scale and this was due to Dr. W.K. Towner (McPherson, 1923:478).

5. It is not that McPherson never preached about Hell or judgment but rather that she felt that people would be won over more readily with a positive message.

6. Her sermons can be found in the Bridal Call and its heirs. Many of her later manuscripts are available at the Archives of the Billy Graham Center in Wheaton, Illinois. Access to the archives requires permission of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel.

7. "Outpouring" is a term from Biblical metaphor for the Baptism of the Holy Spirit or "move of the Spirit."

8. The image that McPherson presented was a heroic stereotype, best described by Henry Kissinger in an interview while Secretary of State. Americans he surmised, want the lone hero/heroine, which he describes as the cowboys. "Americans like the cowboy who leads the wagon train by riding ahead alone on his horse, the cowboy who rides all alone into town...with his horse and nothing else. Maybe even without a pistol....this cowboy doesn't have to be courageous. All he needs is to be alone, to show others that he
rides into the town and does everything by him­self....(quoted by Robertson, 1980:6).

9. "And in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; yea, and on my menservants and my maidservants (handmaidens, King James Version), in those days I will pour out my Spirit; and they shall prophesy." Acts 2:17-18 R.S.V.

10. An example is the "Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene" of 1906 which changed its name to Church of the Nazarene because of the association of "Pentecostal" with the practice of glossolalia.

11. There are numerous studies on glossolalia or speaking in tongues. Research can begin with Watson E. Mills, Speaking in Tongues: A Classified Bibliography. Franklin Springs, GA: Society for Pentecostal Studies, 1974; or "Glossolalia Research Pathfinder" Virginia Beach, VA: C.B.N. University Library, November, 1987; in addition to the Faupel and Jones Bibliographies.

12. "To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good. To one is given through the Spirit the utterance of wisdom, and to another the utterance of knowledge according to the same Spirit, to another faith by the same Spirit, to another gifts of healing by the one Spirit, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another the ability to distinguish between spirits, to another various kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues." 1 Cor.12:7-10 R.S.V.

13. One of the major problems addressed in the Protestant Churches since the 1960's with the "Charismatic Movement" is a spiritual eliteism assumed by those having had these experiences described. cf. Kilian McDonnell Presence Power Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal 3 Vols. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Order of St. Benedict, Inc. 1980. It is a compilation of denominational statements and reactions to the movement.

14. This is not to say that views of salvation were uniform but that in general, they followed the developmental trends described as Fundamentalist and Evangelical. Initially, Pentecostals were unwanted allies but were able to mainstream with Evangelicals since 1947 with joining the National Association of Evangelicals.
15. Entire Sanctification is viewed as a second crisis experience in the life of the believer, whereby they are freed from the power of sin. Its emphasis through the Holiness Churches has been in subjects of purity. cf. H. Orton Wiley Christian Theology Vol.2 Kansas City, MO.: Beacon Hill Press, 1969 pages 440 and following.

16. "Second Work of Grace" is second because it is subsequent to the experience of salvation through New Birth. It is a work of grace in that it was taught to be the work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the individual rather than as a result of effort by the individual. The phrase is language from the Holiness Movement. The concept was carried over into Pentecostalism but the language was dropped off. Wiley, 1969: Vol.2 p. 445f.


18. Many early Pentecostals traced the movement by tracing references or alusions that might be interpreted as Glossolalia through Church History. It has been referred to, somewhat sourcastically as "history of heresies" approach because most of the groups or individuals cited as evidence of the "Pentecostal" experience through the centuries were considered to be heretics by the general Church.

19. These became sacraments for the Pentecostal Church, although not on the par of Water Baptism and Communion. Generally the person being prayed for had olive oil placed on the forehead and the palm of the hand of the person praying was laid on the individual's head or place of injury or illness during the rite of healing. For McPherson cf Divine Healing nd.; for analysis cf. David Edwin Harrell, Jr. All Things are Possible: The Healing and Charismatic Revivals in Modern America. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1975; and Eve Simson, The Faith Healer New York: Pyramid Books, 1977.
20. "Let us rejoice and exult and give him the glory, for the marriage of the Lamb has come, and his Bride had made herself ready; it was granted her to be clothed with fine linen, bright and pure--for the fine linen is the righteous deeds of the saints. And the angel said to me, "Write this: Blessed are those who are invited to the marriage supper of the Lamb." Rev. 19:7-9 R.S.V.

21. These references are representative of the eschatological passages reflecting servanthood of Christians in anticipation of the return of Christ.
CHAPTER IV
"THE FEMALE BILLY SUNDAY"

INTRODUCTION

Angelus Temple was ablaze with flowers. An expectant crowd filled the auditorium anticipating Aimee Semple McPherson's sermon telling the story of her life. With music, the scent of flowers, and an escort of children carrying garlands of flowers, Aimee Semple McPherson entered the auditorium dressed in sunbonnet and calico dress carrying a milkpail to depict her origins as a Canadian farm girl. The occasion was her thirty-fifth birthday on October 9, 1925 (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.9 No.6 [Nov. 1 1925]:20]. She was at the height of her popularity. As the service progressed, each usher, in turn, came down the isle with a basket of flowers and well wishes from the congregation. Aimee Semple McPherson retold the story of her life so familiar to them, but still one in which they vicariously rejoiced. Like McPherson, the majority of the audience had come from the farm and remembered the small town and the uncomplicated, free and irreverent times of childhood (Waterfield, 1986: 152). They were her congregation and she was their pastor and each was for the other.
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Each had a role and a place in Angelus Temple and the Four-square Gospel movement.

"There are men, who by their sympathetic attractions," said Emerson, "carry nations with them and lead the activity of the human race" ("Essay on Power," 1860). McPherson had become such a person. Through her success at religious campaigning, building a modern domed temple, and utilizing entertaining and effective methods, Aimee Semple McPherson became a modern legend, her popularity not only marking her success in affecting the people but also marking an increasingly mythical expectation by that audience. The audience became the "magic mirror" (Brown, 1979:49) telling McPherson not only who she was, but what she could do or be. This feedback guided her performance in the presentation of her gospel so that a Los Angeles Record reporter's description of her as spellbinding was reiterated in McPherson's Bridal Call Magazine.

To those assembled all biblical history becomes a living, present reality. When the Evangelist, in a voice full and resonant and undulating,...

It is easy to see how Mrs. McPherson grips deeply into the spiritual lives of her followers. She brings them in her own personality a religion of health, of joy (quoted in Bridal Call Vol.6 No.10 [Mar. 1923]: 16).

This chapter will discuss the initiating process of institutionalization through McPherson's campaigns, her Foursquare Gospel and her method. It will also discuss the
conventionalization of the institution in Angelus Temple despite the disconfirming experience of McPherson's disappearance in 1926. It will conclude with a discussion of prescribed roles, and their relations, the standard of performance in the conventionalization of McPherson's ministry. First we turn to the initiating process.

INITIATING THE INSTITUTION

DEVELOPMENT OF ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

As soon as she was able, after her transcontinental trip of 1918, McPherson began to hold meetings in Los Angeles at the 3500-seat Victoria Hall and at Bethel Temple on Spring Street (McPherson, 1919:231-235). Eastern followers still wanted her services, as evidenced by a request from Mrs. Emma Peffers of Dayton, Ohio, a Bridal Call reader, who requested that McPherson return to Ohio to hold a campaign (McPherson-Peffers, Letter 2/22/1919). McPherson was not inclined to return to the East so soon and had planned a series of meetings at Glad Tidings Temple in San Francisco (Wilson, 1988:10).

Both Bethel and Glad Tidings were member congregations of the General Council of the Assemblies of God and at this time, (1919-1922) McPherson carried credentials with the Assemblies of God (McPherson-Bell Letters, 1922). Glad Tidings seated 2500 and cost $100,000. Shortly after McPherson's visit, Glad Tidings Temple began an adjacent
Bible Institute (Wilson, 1988:10). It is interesting to note the similarities to McPherson's vision to build her "Echo Park Revival Tabernacle" which seated 5300, cost $250,000, and a year later had a school attached. It suggests not so much that McPherson was emulating Robert J. Craig, the pastor, as that it was considered the normal mode of operation for a large Pentecostal Church.

The meetings at Glad Tidings were important to her career as an evangelist. It would become a mecca for a number of important ministers and evangelists in the Pentecostal movement. Her services were successful and resulted in church expansion, leading to further meetings in Oakland and San Jose that same year (McPherson, 1919:243-247). These meetings in the Bay area and surrounding territory netted McPherson some loyal supporters in Dr. W.K. Towner and Dr. Charles Price (Riss, 1988:726-727).

In 1919, McPherson listed her four types of ministry as Camp Meetings, Evangelistic Campaigns, Gospel Auto Work, and Free Tract Distribution (McPherson-Peffers, Letterhead, 2/22/1919). In addition to her Evangelistic Campaigns in San Francisco, Tulsa, Chicago, and Holdrege, Nebraska, McPherson held three Camp Meetings in the Blue Ridge Mountains, New York, and Los Angeles (McPherson, 1923:165-172). When she traveled by auto to places such as San Francisco, she distributed tracts as she had in 1917 and 1918 on the East coast. She was back in full swing.
On at least two occasions in 1919, the Assemblies of God had banded together at State Conventions or special meetings to sponsor McPherson's meetings at Holdrege, Nebraska, when she spoke to the State Convention. In attendance had been John W. Welch, Chairman of the General Council of Assemblies of God, as well as representatives from the State councils of Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado (Bridal Call Vol.3 No.5 [Oct.1919]:20; Menzies, 1971). At Akron, Ohio, in the Armory, notable Pentecostals from surrounding states gathered to the services. Even though all of these men and women were notable in the Pentecostal movement, and Mrs. McPherson considered the meetings in Akron a success, they had not been reported in the Akron papers (Bridal Call Vol.3 No.8 [Dec. 1919]:23; Akron Beacon Journal [Nov. 1, 1919- Dec. 31, 1919]; Akron Times [Nov. 1, 1919 - Dec. 31, 1919]; The meeting was held Nov. 5-17, 1919).

Nevertheless, by the close of 1919, McPherson had become important to the closed community of Pentecostals who would come from great distances to attend her meetings. But she had not caught the public eye. Reporters had not yet been assigned to report the happenings at her revivals. This would change.

In 1919, her meetings were primarily sponsored by Pentecostal Missions and Churches belonging to the General Council of Assemblies of God. In February of 1920, however,
there was a marked change in strategy for McPherson when she began, as she put it, to "Fish for Whales" (McPherson, 1923: 174f). McPherson was holding an "independent and undenominational meeting" (1923:174) at the Lyric Theater in Baltimore, Maryland. She was struck with the fact that "ministers, Doctors of Divinity, Jewish Rabbis, Medical doctors, and the best people of the city" were coming to hear her preach. During one service, someone from the local Pentecostal establishment began acting in "fleshly manifestations." McPherson would have none of this. Her control and moderation seemed to impress the mainline protestants who immediately began to schedule her for services (McPherson, 1923: 174-176). In 1920, McPherson held three campaigns in Canada, two Camp Meetings in West Virginia and Illinois, four campaigns in Methodist and Brethren Churches, and a one-day campaign at Dayton, Ohio, sponsored by the Ohio Council of Assemblies (McPherson, 1923:179-247; The Dayton Journal [May 14, 1920]:3).

McPherson described the change in receptiveness as doors of opportunity. She wrote to her Bridal Call Family about her opportunities.

My Mind ran swiftly back over the past few eventful months of loving labor; and I realized as never before the vastness and reality of the open door which Christ has set before us, since the march of the tempest, and the lull of the war. Surely never were doors open wider, or hearts more easily persuaded then now. Surely never did revival fires burn brighter, or power of God fall greater, or open wider than during the past few
Doors -- Doors -- Doors -- open doors on every hand -- ever opening wider. (Vol. 3 No. 11 [April 1920]: 12).

The doors of opportunity opened wide during 1921 during mass campaigns at San Diego, San Jose, St. Louis, Denver, a repeat performance at San Jose and finally at Canton, Ohio (McPherson, 1923: 248-382; Bridal Call Vol. 4 No. 10 [March 1921] -- Vol. 5 No. 6 [Nov. 1921]). The public eye turned upon McPherson at the San Diego crusade because of the uniqueness of her ministry. She held her crusade at the Sports Arena, apparently a first, initiating the meeting by going to the Arena the night before and going into the Boxing ring between bouts and inviting everyone there to the meeting and to bring the "biggest sinner in town" with them. The crowd loved her audacity and came to see this unusual preacher who would enter their world to invite them to services. Apparently her style filled their entertainment needs enough that they listened to her, even though they had avoided the church before (Bridal Call Vol. 4 No. 10 [March 1921]; McPherson, 1923: 248-304).

Secondly, San Diego aroused the interest of the public eye because of the unique and graphic healing service that took place in Balboa Park. Many people had relocated to the area for health reasons. Medical doctors had suggested that since they could do no further for these patients that the climate could be beneficial. This large audience of sick
and infirm persons embraced the Pentecostal Rhetorical Vision of Divine Healing. The arena could not hold them. City officials quickly decided to let McPherson use the Park and the band stand as a stage. So many thousands were there that the Navy Chaplain, M. A. Spotts, arranged to have the Marines control traffic. The crowds were so large that she could not get close to the band stand with her auto. Testimonies of miraculous healings filled the pages of the Bridal Call months later, and skeptics even used these testimonies as test of the truthfulness of McPherson's ministry. It was this campaign that marked her ministry as a "faith healer." (McPherson, 1923: 312; "As In the Days of Old," by an M.E. Minister; "Chaplain of U.S. Navy Writes About Revival," by Lt. M.A. Spotts; "Testimonials," Bridal Call Vol.4 No. 11 [April, 1921]; "Earthquakes at San Diego," by W. C. Pierce, "Testimonials," Vol.4 No. 12 [May, 1921]; "Do the Healings Last?" Vol.5 No.1 [June 1921]).

Thirdly, McPherson caught the public eye because of the official response and aid in conducting her campaign. It was one thing for small Mid-Western towns to rally around her evangelistic efforts, but for officials of a major city to recognize her ministry as worthy of being given the use of public space, and for the U. S. Government--in the person of military personnel in San Diego--to aid her efforts made it obvious that Aimee Semple McPherson was someone to note. Although not reported in the New York Times from the Asso-
ciated Press, the same broad city-wide support and official response were repeated in San Jose, St. Louis, and—especially—Denver (McPherson, 1923:304-372; "Mayor Daily Praise Lord for Work Done," "Wife of Mayor Healed--Other Testimonies," by Francis Wayne of Denver Post; "Juvenile Judge Writes of Meeting," by Judge Lindsey Bridal Call Vol.5 No. 3 [August 1921]).

In her role of evangelist, Aimee Semple McPherson kept a demanding schedule during a campaign. Her first meeting began between 7:30 and 8:00 a.m. often followed by a second in the forenoon to teach and pray for seekers of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit. She had an afternoon meeting beginning at 2:30 and the evening meeting at 7:30. She ate only at lunch and supper, if she had time. It is important to note that while these meetings had fixed beginnings they had no definite set time for closure. Hence, they often ran within thirty minutes of the next and stopped only because the next meeting was to begin. McPherson's schedule proved to herself and her constituency her dedication to the task and that she was enacting the expected role of the evangelist. The people were impressed by the level of her dedication (Bridal Call Vol.5 No.5 [Oct. 1921]:7-11).

Testimonials abounded regarding her abilities, dedication, and success. Reverend R. H. Moon, of the Christian Missionary Alliance Church in Oakland, praised her "Biblical
As a pastor who sat on the platform and listened to almost every one of the messages, I am glad to say that nothing but a Scriptural, sane old-fashioned gospel was preached. There was not even a tinge of fanaticism or wild fire present in any of the meetings. The crowds were exceedingly large, reverent and orderly (quoted in McPherson, 1923:492).

McPherson was measured against the models of revivalism and found to be a prime example of the expected role. Reverend William E. Schlieman, Ph.D., Professor of English Literature at Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma, called her "more effective than Moody" (quoted in Bridal Call Vol.6 No.1 [June 1922]:18). This was echoed in other cities and by various levels of people. Francis Alice Emmons, reporting the Alton, Illinois, revival called McPherson, "...God's chosen vessel for this day" (quoted in Bridal Call Vol.4 No.3 [Aug. 1920]:16). Reverend Dr. Everett C. Johnson, a Presbyterian Minister from Seattle, Washington, described her preaching as the greatest of the time.

I only had to hear Mrs. McPherson preach a few times and to note the result of her ministrations—a year ago—in order to determine for myself that she is undoubtedly the greatest preacher-evangelist in the world of today—and I so stated at that time. (quoted in Bridal Call Vol.6 No.2 [July 1922]:17)

The people loved her. She filled a niche in their lives; she brought faith and hope back to a people still affected by the Great War through which they had just passed. They were exuberant in their response. At the
Denver crusade the people planned a dramatic farewell. As she stepped to the pulpit on the closing night, a shower of rose petals fell from the heights of the municipal building all around her. When the shower ended, the stage and pulpit area was ankle deep in rose petals (Bridal Call Vol.6 No.2 [July 1922]:17). Her Campaigns had brought her into the forefront of these people's lives. They expected her to take the role of a "female Billy Sunday" and more. In the opinion of the people formulating the boundaries of the role, as well as its responsibilities, McPherson epitomized the role of evangelist. Charles A. Shreve, Pastor of McKendree M.E. Church in Washington D.C. said of her,

> When people write and ask me what I think of the work of Mrs. Aimee Semple McPherson, I tell them that I am perfectly sure that she is a handmaiden of the Lord, set to call the people to Jesus, and I believe she is the greatest asset that has come to the people of God in the way of a worker for a hundred years (quoted in Bridal Call Vol.6 No.7 [Dec.1922]:15).

During McPherson's evangelistic period of city-wide campaigns the organizational structure was permeable. There were no fixed structures, although there were semi-fixed operational roles in each crusade. The organizer and supporter roles were variously filled by various religious, civic, and business leaders. These people shared their community power roles with McPherson and by shared radiance offered to McPherson acceptance and credibility, so needful in this period of limited name recognition for her. The
locus of power shares during this period rested with the audience. They retained the "ethos" power of choice to attend to or to avoid the campaigns. The denominational ministers operated as power brokers between McPherson and the audience during the ascendancy of her influence and recognizability as an evangelist. McPherson gained more power shares in relationship to the people as each crusade progressed.

As a side effect to the power dynamic, McPherson's need for audience affirmation increased while her need for brokerage by other's power shares decreased. McPherson's name became recognizable and an ideological expectation was held by the population attending her crusades that she could bring salvation, revival, and healing to a community because she was in touch with God.

PRESCRIPTION OF ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

Aimee Semple McPherson had been given the role of a prophet. She was perceived as speaking forth the Word of God with a message needed for the day. The process of prescribing roles had developed in McPherson's case as generally described by McLoughlin as (1) identification as spokesperson for God; (2) development of disciples and followers; (3) prescription of theology both in doctrine and practice, and finally (4), establishment of social norms for behavior by the group (McLoughlin, 1978:16). What
McLoughlin described by historical analysis, Ernest Bormann described in communication as the process of Rhetorical Visioning, whereby a recollection of the past or a dream of the future is "chained out" to develop a common culture, whereby the group can test the values and attitudes of members, legitimize the world-view and elicit emotions and commitment to the cause (Bormann, 1972:397-398). This is illustrated at McPherson's Oakland, California, campaign in 1922. McPherson took the role of prophet that had been attributed to her during her sermon on Ezekiel's vision (Eze. 1) where she declared her trade term for the "Full Gospel"—"The Four Square Gospel." She set forth the rhetorical vision as she described her interpretation (see below) and the audience became spontaneously and exultingly involved in her ideological picture. Her description of the event marks it as a key attention switch for her ideology.

Instantly, the Spirit bore witness. Waves, billows, oceans of praise rocked the audience. Borne aloft upon the rushing winds of a Holy Ghost revival, the melody evoked that day has been carried around the world. The term, Foursquare Gospel, which the Lord gave to me that day as vividly and fittingly distinguishing the message which he had given me to preach, has become a household word throughout the earth. (McPherson, 1946:23).

The "Four Square Gospel" became the code name describing not only the Full Gospel of Pentecostalism, but McPherson's particular variety of the ideology. It became the brand name of her ideology set forth at Angelus Temple in Los Angeles and its branch churches (McPherson, 1923:482-
The ministers' conference held concomitantly with the large tent meeting in Oakland began slowly, with seventy-five ministers meeting at Trinity Episcopal Church. When the effects of the crusade grew, so did the response of the ministers. The subject of the conference was the "Four-Square Gospel Association." The purpose was to band together ministers and lay people of various Evangelical Churches in fellowship and co-operation in evangelistic efforts to preach the Pentecostal "Full Gospel." One thousand ministers are reported to have signed the covenant committing themselves and their churches in declaring this theme (Bridal Call Vol.6 No.4 [Sept. 1922]:9).

The Ministers' conference was held during the mornings of July 25, 26 and 27, 1922, Tuesday through Thursday. Dr. William Keeney Towner reported on the nature of this inter-denominational evangelistic effort.

Out of the Conference grew a new banding together of the laity and clergy in America who hold and practice the four-square-gospel. The new fellowship is to be known as "The Four-Square Gospel Association." Already many hundreds of pastors, evangelists, teachers and prominent members of the recognized evangelical churches have enrolled and many thousands in all the churches stand ready to enroll as fast as the new project is presented to them by returning delegates and visitors (quoted in Bridal Call Vol.6 No.4 [Sept. 1922]:17)

Towner's description indicates that he and the others understood this as a revivalistic movement. The term which
McPherson later utilized in a denominational and doctrinal way was a synonym for the usual Pentecostal expression of their ideology, the "Full Gospel." It may well be that the willingness of the evangelical churches to sign this covenant was a way for them to utilize Pentecostal theology and/or practices without becoming fully associated with the Pentecostal denominations. McPherson had put forth the terminology not as a denomination but as a description of a commitment to preach the various aspects of the gospel, as was being taught by the Pentecostal movement, in the sense of the modern day revival of religion. It must be remembered that two basic assumptions of Pentecostals and, therefore, of McPherson, had guided the ideology. First, the New Testament was the model of Christian life and practice and as such was repeatable by each generation of people and secondly, oral tradition took precedence over extensive creeds or theological tomes (MacDonald, 1976:59).

Donald Dayton (1987) has argued ably that the four-fold presentation characterized by McPherson as the "Foursquare Gospel" was the basic presentation of Pentecostal theology. This was true also of McPherson, who before her "Foursquare Gospel Revelation" taught these specific doctrines. It was clearly so stated in the description of her Bridal Call Magazine where it reads:

Our endeavor is to set forth, in simple words, the plain message of Salvation, the Baptism

McPherson's presentation in her sermon "The Vision of Ezekiel" prior to the minister's meeting was a new rhetorical packaging of the basic Pentecostal message in terms of the first chapter of the Book of Ezekiel. During McPherson's sermon she describes a heuristic event as she understands Ezekiel's vision in a Pentecostal way by a sudden flash of insight. Bormann describes such an event as a conversion.

At some point, the testimony often portrays this as a sharp and sudden awareness, the individual will click into the new rhetorical vision. Suddenly, the person sees the world in a new way. The old fantasies are now seen clearly in their despicable light. Indeed, the new fantasies will often evoke hatred for the old ways of thinking, believing, and acting. The person, suddenly seeing through the lenses of the new rhetorical vision, usually feels joy, excitement, and peace. The doubts have been resolved; the struggle is at an end (Bormann, 1985:14).

In light of Bormann's comment on conversion evoking "hatred" of the prior position, it is interesting to note that shortly before the Oakland event McPherson repudiated her Assemblies of God credentials saying, among other things, that she "never really used them." (McPherson-Bell Letters, [Jan.-Mar., 1922]). McPherson's ideological change was having side effects in her power relationships not only with her audiences but with other officials of Pentecostalism (Kendrick, 1961:154). In addition, McPherson no
longer had a need for outside brokerage among Pentecostals (Menzies, 1971:170; McPherson-Bell Letters, [Jan.-Mar. 1922]). As Brown predicts in his model, changes in ideology will have corresponding changes in the areas of power relationships and in intrapersonal needs. He likens the effect on the social system to "what the dropped stone is to the surface of quiet water" (Brown, 1982:21).

In the first published sermon on the topic, McPherson describes her typological presentation of the Ezekiel passage. Typology was usually a Christian interpretation of Old Testament images and events. Although usually reserved for images identified by the New Testament, in this case McPherson, consistent with her Pentecostal theology, reinterpreted Ezekiel's vision into an interventional theology for the Pentecostal position on the four cardinal doctrines. It was an important event in the development of her ideology.

These four faces we likened unto the four phases of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

In the face of the Man we beheld that of the Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief, dying upon the tree.
In the face of the Lion we beheld that of the mighty Baptiser with the Holy Ghost and with fire.
The face of the Ox typified the Great Burden-bearer, who Himself took our infirmities and carried our sicknesses, who in His boundless love and divine provision had met our every need.
In the face of the Eagle we saw reflected soul-enrapturing visions of the Coming King, whose pinions soon would cleave the shining heavens, whose silvery voice would set the milky way to echoing as He came to catch His waiting bride away.

A perfect Gospel! A complete Gospel for body, for soul, for spirit, and for eternity. A
gospel that faces squarely in every direction—
(Bridal Call Vol. 8 No. 3 [Aug. 1924]:18).

McPherson presented this teaching as "the lost chord was found again!" As the years progressed and her institution developed, McPherson emphasized this definition of the Gospel and not only characterized her doctrine but called her denomination by the term "Foursquare." The spelling of the term itself was even refined from "Four-Square" to "Foursquare," the first emphasizing the four-foldness of the doctrine and the later used in the corporate name.
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Front cover: The Declaration of Faith. Compiled by Aimee Semple McPherson as printed about 1928
To justify the term, she turned to the King James Version which translated terms for "square" as "foursquare" using a typological approach to explain how the passage clearly referred to her presentation of the "Foursquare Gospel." If there is an incompleteness in the article on Pentecostal Hermeneutics in the Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements (1988), it is in failing to explain this free-association, allegorical type of interpretation of the Bible that was often used by Pentecostals (Arrington, 1988:376ff). McPherson also used a numerological approach in almost any use of "four" in the Bible or place "four" could be inferred, such as, four pieces of Christ's robe at the cross torn and divided among the soldiers as booty, four beams of light from a beacon, in the four compass directions ("Four Garments" Bridal Call Vol.12 No.4 [Sept. 1928]:5-6; "The Lighthouse Foursquare" Vol.8 No.11 [Apr. 1925]:5-7). In her teaching, all the great preachers of the Scripture preached the "Foursquare Gospel" --Ezekiel, Isaiah, David, John, Peter, Paul and Jesus ("Great Exponents of the Foursquare Gospel" Sermon Notes, Reprinted for Founder's Day, Oct. 4, 1970).

McPherson's doctrine was presented as a return to basics and not as an issue of inactivity, as might be suggested by Aristotle's use of "four-square," "It is a metaphor, indeed to say that a good man is 'four-square,' since both the good man and the square are perfect; but the meta-
phor suggests no activity" (Rhetoric 3.11). The "Four-Square Gospel Association" was presented as a teaching of perfection and goodness and it came during the period when liberals and fundamentalists were wrestling for control in the major denominations. The people attracted by McPherson's revivalism were from the mainline churches who valued Biblical language, a dynamic spirituality, and a fear of the new cultural accommodations of their peers (McLoughlin, 1967:56; cf Quebedeaux 1983:39f; "Is McPherson Pentecostal?" Bridal Call, Vol.6 No. 5 [Oct.,1922]:7,9-11).

McPherson was successful in drawing in these Protestants because of her use of traditional language, her restraint of the traditional Pentecostal excesses, her appeal to broad non-partisan support, and her making the people feel that they were a part of a grand program of renewal in the Church. In Brown's language this is "Ideology feeding into Power and Need" (1986, cf pp.145-146 below).

The ministers and people signing the Four Square association covenant accepted the "Foursquare Gospel" as the epitome of the renewal movement. They were greatly appreciative of her presentation of the doctrine of salvation. "I have heard many Evangelists preach the gospel, but I have never heard the claims of salvation presented so clearly before as Mrs. McPherson presents it. Her message is as clear as a bell" (an unidentified Methodist Episcopal
Minister quoted in Bridal Call Vol.4 No.11 [Apr. 1921]:18).

The ministers were appreciative of her methods in presenting the healing message in a Biblical and moderate way.

Mrs. McPherson works along Apostolic lines. She first anoints the foreheads of the sick with oil and then she prays over them. Then, in the name of Christ, she tells them to 'rise up and walk.' She herself has the most implicit faith in the power of Christ to alleviate and banish pain and suffering, and accordingly, she confidently looks for a renewal of health and strength in the bodies of those upon whom she has poured the anointing oil and over whom she has made the 'prayer of faith.' Sometimes, however, the results are a surprise even to her (from Montreal Standard reprinted Bridal Call Vol.4 No. 8 [Jan. 1921]:15).

The ministers appreciated the moderation in her approach, in contrast to general Pentecostal practice of the day, as indicated in a Baptist minister's evaluation of her presentation of the doctrine of the Second Coming of Christ.

The doctrine of the second coming of Christ is presented, at the Temple, in practical and scriptural form. It is thoroughly distinguished from the speculative aspects and Chiliastic extravagances indulged in by many pre-millenial teachers are entirely absent (quoted in Bridal Call Vol.7 No.6 [Nov. 1923]:19, emphasis author's).

The ministers visioned her as one "who stands upon the Bible as the inspired book and preaches a 'Four Square Gospel,' ...Here is preached a full Gospel. Here is old time power." (quoted in Bridal Call Vol.7 No. 6 [Nov. 1923]:21).

One of McPherson's long-time supporters from the Methodist Church confirmed what he and others, who stuck with her in her difficulties, saw as the issue. It was the teaching
that they had accepted, not an individual alone.

The Foursquare Gospel is a kind of gospel that takes you to a Foursquare City. The Scripture speaks of the City in Heaven and says the City over yonder lieth Foursquare. We expect to have people in all four corners of that City. We need to have a good gospel that will fulfill all the needs of the people. What we mean by the Foursquare Gospel Scripturally is that Jesus does for people multitudes of things, but He represents Himself in four special ways to people, which ways we put a pin down upon, as it were, when we speak of it as the Foursquare Gospel (Dr. Charles A Shreve, "The Pillar of Fire: The Light of the Foursquare Gospel," Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 14 No. 14 [July 1931]: 10).

Not all Methodist Ministers were so accepting of McPherson's teachings. In fact, her arch rival in Los Angeles was R. P. (Bob) Shuler, Pastor of Trinity Methodist Church. One year after the opening of Angelus Temple, he preached and published a series of scathing sermons — McPhersonism: A Study of Healing Cults and Modern Day Tongues Movements (1924). It was Shuler who rose up and demanded a trial because he disbelieved her story of her disappearance in May, 1926 (Steele, 1959:98). It was Shuler's contention that McPherson had built the group on her own boasting, personality, and cultish emotionalism and worship by many who attended her Temple.

No student has carefully followed her without finding himself convinced that through her whole program she so weaves the ego and so exalts herself as to convince her followers of the very thing she thus modestly denies in her spoken messages. Whatever the lips of Mrs. McPherson may say, the fact remains that thousands of people sit in Angelus Temple and worship Aimee McPherson,
even as we are supposed to worship Jesus Christ. (Shuler, 1924:11).

But Shuler was wrong. What he was seeing was not so much McPherson building a movement on her own personality but a movement being built around the role of her person by the many thousands who attended to her preaching. If the people were, indeed, being trapped by being mesmerized by McPherson as Shuler supposed, then it was also true, in terms of the Social Intervention model, that she was trapped in a role by the multitude of people following her. Their sheer number had a powerful influence on what she perceived her ministry to be. McPherson's "Legendary self" was being developed. In fulfilling expectations of the "new" (cf. below) ideology she was being placed in a role of leadership that was leading to a separate and distinct grouping. Their combined "needs," "relationships," and "world-views" were adjusting to the changes dictated by the absorption of the new doctrine.

In a scientific study that verifies the Social Intervention Model as it applies to Religious development L. B. Brown found that religious ideology constitutes relationships and perceptions of what needs to be done to fulfill the need to organize one's world.

Religious belief constitutes a predominantly cognitive activity, acquired and sustained by social influences, and expressed in a number of ways, including religious practices. Religious beliefs are categories by which people can explain, interpret, and cope with the natural world,
while religious practices give tangible expression to these beliefs. Religious beliefs are acquired and maintained within a social context which supports and molds them (L.B. Brown, 1966:270).

Social Intervention moves beyond mere association and notes that given a change in ideology there is a corresponding change in the holographic whole of the system, including both the areas of defining and filling (1) intrapersonal needs and (2) interpersonal power relations. Brown describes the corollary changes in the system in his 1982 article. "[T]he attention-switch, dynamically considered, amounts to a grand strategy for the rhetoric of social intervention as its corollaries lead to changes in the way human beings name and thus make 'real' their relationships with one another" (Brown, 1982:26).

McPherson's ideology presented as the Foursquare Gospel was repackaging of the traditional Pentecostal teachings in the form of a new rhetorical vision. In the dynamic public setting of the Oakland crusade, the audience immediately responded positively to McPherson's presentation and began to "chain out" the vision presented. The "new" ideology did not prescribe roles in and of itself; rather, roles and relationships were prescribed as based upon the acceptance or rejection of the ideology of a clearer presentation of Pentecostal teaching, better fulfilling needs for unity, clarity, and increasing adherents' ability to enlist others. In other words, as side effects, ideology set not only need
and its fulfillment but also the nature of roles and relationships (Brown, "Need," 1986:2).

The ideology became a place for ministers and lay people to "name" their allegiance and by signing and enacting the ideology of "The Four Square Gospel" they were committing themselves to a new grouping, "The Four Square Gospel Association." Despite its informal nature, it had a consequence to the signatories and acceptance of a new code of conduct. Specifically, the covenant enjoined the signers to believe, support, and propagate this specific gospel interpretation. Tacitly it also prescribed a code of support for Aimee Semple McPherson, as originator and founder, and her expansionistic efforts, demonstrated by broad-based financing the building of a Temple in Los Angeles. Although not specifically stated, acceptance of the new ideology, in accord with the Social Intervention Model, the "believer" felt compelled to support McPherson's efforts and to contribute to the building of a locus of power for this new ideological presentation of the gospel especially as she made appeals to purchase seats, representative sacks of cement, or other signs of having committed to this new ideology (Bridal Call Vol.5 No.8 [Jan. 1922]:18).

DEVELOPING REINFORCEMENTS AND SANCTIONS

Time magazine quoted an elderly gentleman regarding Mrs. McPherson's preaching, whose remark sums up the enter-
aining and personal appeal that she gained through her revivalistic methods. "I've heard 'em all. She's the only one of the lot can touch Henry Ward Beecher" (Time [Feb. 28, 1927]). Aimee Semple McPherson felt called to preach and she viewed every opportunity positively. When the keel of the Titanic was being laid, it became a pulpit for Aimee Semple McPherson, as did the largest locomotive in the United States (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 9 No. 10 [March 1926]: 23). Every place was an opportunity to preach. Nor did she go in for dull methods. She sought to "entice sinners" rather than beat them up over their wrongs. She figured that they already knew that they were sinners.

Audiences enjoyed her preaching. The entertaining and uplifting nature of the services rewarded them for their effort to attend, in spite of the crowds, lack of seats, and the time it took to get to a service. In the first three years of operation of Angelus Temple, despite multiple daily services, there were overflow crowds (Bridal Call Foursquare, Vol. 6 No. 8 [Jan. 1923]; Vol. 7 No. 1 [June 1923]). This was also true in her campaigns; she regularly attracted audiences who overflowed tents, churches, and auditoriums that seated thousands. In part, her preaching success was credited to her ability to speak directly to the people. William J. McWhirter, reporting on her first crusade in England, discussed her preaching. "Why, she does not preach at all in the ordinary sense of the word, she talks right to
the hearts of the people and commands attention from the most indifferent and apathetic" (quoted in: Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.9 No. 12 [May 1926]:9). The London Daily Express agreed with the evaluation of McPherson's preaching ability. Its reporter described her as a speaker easy to comprehend.

This fervid woman evangelist has mastered the art of riveting and holding the attention. The eye visualizes everything she says. Abstract argument never; concrete illustration all the time. (quoted in: Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.9 No.12 [May 1926]:13).

The second method utilized by McPherson that reinforced or sanctioned the developing institution was "physical healing." McPherson included in her ideological message that Jesus was the Healer. She presented her gospel of healing as one proof that God was indeed active today. In her sermon, "Is Jesus Christ the Great I Am? Or is He The Great I Was?" (McPherson, Divine Healing Sermons, nd: 11-22) McPherson set forth the argument that miraculous healing was made available to the believer today. This was contested by Baptist minister, Ben M. Bogard, in a debate with McPherson at Little Rock, Arkansas, during May, 1934. His theological argument held that miracles were not for today but for Bible times only (Bogard, 1934). This was contrary to a basic Pentecostal tenet that the New Testament Church was the model or "type" of the Church and the abilities and events they experienced were available to the believer today.
The ideological tenet that set the stage for the McPherson's healing events was acceptance by the audience of the concept that they could be healed.

One of the major reasons that Pentecostals argued that healing was for today was that many taught healing as part of the atonement of Christ. They read the prophecy of Isaiah Chapter 53 "and by his stripes we are healed" as direct justification for the healing message. McPherson even put her thoughts to music in her song "Why are They Whipping My Jesus" (c.1935, McPherson, 1947: 267).

Why are they whipping my Jesus?  
Why does the lash descend?  
Why must His quivering shoulders,  
Christ to the swift lash lend?  
Is not the Cross-tree of Calvary,  
Sufficient to pardon my guilt?  
Why are they whipping my Jesus?  
Tell me, my friend, if thou wilt.

Here are they whipping my Jesus,  
Here find of life a wealth.  
Calvary purchased redemption;  
The whipping post bought health.  
Have you not read in the prophets,  
That by His stripes all may be healed,  
Health for thy body was purchased,  
Then to His will ever yield.

For this they're whipping my Jesus,  
As lashes rise and fall.  
Here He is purchasing healing,  
Without the judgment hall.  
Jesus Himself bare thine anguish,  
Yea, Jesus Himself bare thy pain,  
Cast now thy burden upon Him.  
Health thro' His stripes now regain.

By Sermon and by song McPherson challenged people to accept the message of healing. She featured this exper-
ience, which for most was anomalous, through testimonials in her magazine, public testimonies during the services, displays of abandoned crutches, braces, and canes, at times specifically naming names and addresses of people with significant healings. While featuring those healed, she also masked those situations where there was misinformation about healing. Bogard makes much of McPherson's unwillingness to debate. This was not because she did not believe that healings were taking place and knew herself to be a charlatan, as he supposed, but more than likely because of her inexperience at debating on the level that he wanted. An examination of the debate shows that, as far as the technical abilities were concerned, she was outclassed. According to Bogart she lost the debate (Bogard: 1934). Both Bogard and McPherson used people present to illustrate the non-healing or the healing question, but the cases were not well verified or measured for consistency.

It is not uncommon for those believing in "Divine Healing" to avoid advertising their "failures." After all, failures do not build faith and help people to believe. Hollenweger experienced this conflict when he was translator for a "faith healer" preaching in Germany in the post war period (Hollenweger, 1988:356). On the other hand, however, Doctors or service deliverers of any kind rarely advertise their failures, either. The battle is a rhetorical battle
between the advocates and detractors of the healing process. It was engaged in regularly by McPherson (McPherson, *Divine Healing*, nd; *Bogard-McPherson Debate*, 1934; Shuler, 1924).

In Dayton, Ohio, the newspaper declared that there were "No Miraculous Cures At Healing Services Held by Evangelist" as a headline but listed people by name and address and condition who claimed healing (*Dayton Journal* [May 14, 1920]:3). At the same time, McPherson used the Dayton meeting as a prime example of the "healing power of God" (*McPherson, Divine Healing Sermons*, nd:64-71). Again, she was challenged in Canton, Ohio, by a minister and doctor claiming she healed by hypnotism. A psychologist and hypnotist, Professor D. H. Deamude, who happened to be in town, silenced this criticism from McPherson's viewpoint, by explaining, based on his expertise, that hypnotism had nothing to do with the McPherson campaign (*Bridal Call* Vol.5 No.6 [Nov. 1921]:16).

By featuring the healings and masking the disconfirming information, McPherson helped people to find solutions to their need in this Pentecostal ideology. The people came to her, as a matter of faith, to yield to her prayers with the expectation that, in coming to her their expectations, would be fulfilled by Jesus through the evangelist, Aimee Semple McPherson. It was her teaching that failure to believe, failure to continue in Christian behavior and faith, or failure to utilize the healing for evangelistic purposes
might cause the person to "lose their healing." It was a
significant sanction; she had testimonies of those who had
failed in these areas and subsequently lost their healing
(McPherson, Divine Healing Sermons, nd:75ff).

As the popularity of McPherson grew, proximity and
association with her became an important reinforcement for
the people following her. The popularity of McPherson, and
the resulting interdependency, went through at least three
different stages which highly influenced the presence and
the use of sanctions in the developing power system.

The first stage of development takes place in the
period 1919 to 1923 during her city-wide campaigns. The
interdependency is largely undifferentiated, that is, the
relationships were not fixed but were fluid and defined by
the momentary pragmatic needs of a McPherson campaign. In
figure 2 McPherson and her mother are, more or less, equal
organizers in the campaign structure. Those with the next
largest share of power in this interdependency are the local
organizers, such as William Towner in the Bay area and
Charles Price, at Lodi. Organizers changed from location to
location and had momentary importance which occasionally
carried over to other campaigns should they travel to be
present, as often the case for Charles Shrieve of Washing­
ton, D.C. or Frank C. Thompson, who became closely asso­
ciated with McPherson's Bible College. Being further dis­
tant and sharing less organizational power were local supporting ministers, campaign attendees, and the general community population. Although the press was introduced into the story during the San Francisco Meeting at Glad Tidings Tabernacle (March, 1919), they were not a part of the power-shares. The Press's involvement was not foreseen and was a total surprise to McPherson.
Figure 2 McPherson Power Shares 1919-1922
For newspaper reporters or editors to attend or interest themselves in writing up Pentecostal meetings favorably, without money, was an idea so improbable and unprecedented that we had hardly [sic] given it a thought,...

The telephones rang; reporters and city editors called up, sometimes two or three in one afternoon. Coming into the hall one afternoon we found two reporters sitting on the steps who refused to move until they had an interview (Bridal Call, Vol. 2 No. 12 [May, 1919]:12-13.

McPherson was eager to please her hosts and supporters. She was pushed along by the tide of popularity that was growing and her reason for declining invitations was built upon the opportunity for a greater and more influential audience, rather than any sense of personal comfort (McPherson-Peffers, Feb. 22, 1919). During this phase of McPherson's institutionalization, her charismatic ethos was in neo-natal development. As she was about to separate herself from the Assemblies of God, her power share had grown sufficiently to leave the need of this third party brokerage behind. Brumback recognized this developed power when he described McPherson's influence in the development of many Assembly of God churches, as well as her choice to separate from formal connection to them, a choice almost inevitable for anyone operating with charisma.

...it was her great campaigns which placed innumerable "Council" churches on the map.... Everywhere Mrs. McPherson preached, mammoth crowds were attracted and the attention of churches and ministers was drawn to the Pentecostal message. Aimee Semple McPherson was a dynamic and dramatic individualist, and it is doubtful that she could ever have been a permanent member of any organization except her own (Brumback, 1977:129f).
After the founding of Angelus temple the development of the temple organization and the power relationships began to be more and more hierarchical and defined (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.6 No.8 [Jan. 1923]). Partnership with her Mother was a foregone conclusion early in the process but after 1926 the relationship became more and more strained as McPherson was elevated in her ethos and charismatic power. After several stormy encounters, including law suits and reported physical aggression, the relationship between mother and daughter came to silence and quiet hostility (Steele, 1970).

In figure 3 the adjacent power sharers were a "royal court" of secretaries, close advisors, lawyers and some reporters, all who variously agreed with or attempted to guide McPherson. McPherson utilized ultimate sanctions as, "unofficial excommunication," by banishment, firing and various signs of her disfavor. This is suggested not only by direct statements, such as, "I demand loyalty in the institution, and I will fire anyone who is not loyal to me!" (quoted by Steele, 1970: 300), but also by noting the sudden comings and goings evidenced in the staff at Angelus Temple in the pages of the Bridal Call. There is usually no direct statement about the workers fate given the concept of "quietly withdraw[ing]" (Declaration of Faith nd: 30), which McPherson developed. This is not currently verifiable
through the corporate records due to the organization's policy on confidentiality (Duarte, Interview, May, 1988).

In general, as figure 3 suggests, attendees of the Temple, ministers of branch churches, and Bible college students have the next greatest share of power in the relationship; members of the press and local government often appear close to "court life" as if dignitaries from foreign kingdoms who came with gifts for the ruling queen. The supporting kingdom included the membership of the Temple, of the various branch churches and missions, "the Bridal Call Family," and members of "the Cathedral of the Air" which was developed, complete with membership certificate, to support her radio ministry (Bridal Call Vol.9 No.10 [Mar. 1926]:27).

As McPherson's media awareness developed from passing out tracts and handbills from her "Gospel Car" to use of radio, dramatic sermons, and an expectation that the press would assist her in presenting her message to the multitudes, she viewed the general population not as undifferentiated unknowns but as potential followers. When taken to a newspaper office in San Francisco for an interview, she was shown the extent of the coverage her sermons received as pins on a map where people read that paper. She asked them to kneel down and "ask God to bless these messages as they go forth."
Figure 3 McPherson Power Shares 1923-1927
We called in that afternoon and after they were through with their questions, and we had told them our desire to see souls saved and the work of God extended, they led us out to a great map which covered the wall, and pointing to the hundreds of thumb-tracks [sic] which dotted a territory reaching not only from the Atlantic to the Pacific, through every state in the Union, but through Canada and Mexico, said: "Here is your audience, four million, six hundred and seventy-five thousand people strong." (Bridal Call Vol.2 No. 12 [May, 1919]:13).

Outside the "kingdom" were various powers and detractors which were presented rhetorically as being a part of a great "Satanic" conspiracy to overthrow McPherson, the representative of Christ and the Church, and destroy the ministry that had developed at the Temple (Figure 4; Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.4 [Sept. 1926]:4; Vol.10 No.5 [Oct.1926]:15-17,32; Vol.10 No.6 [Nov. 1926]:21,33; Vol.10 No.6 [Nov. 1926]:22; Vol.10 No.9 [Feb. 1927]:9-10, 31).

Figure 5 illustrates the change in status of family and the ascendancy of "friends in court" in the Temple structure. This inclusion of "outsiders" was part of the complaint of John Goben, former assistant Pastor at the Temple and member of the founding Board of the denomination, which caused him to break relationship with McPherson and the Temple (Goben, 1932). It was these advisors who apparently influenced McPherson to enter certain risky and controversial projects such as a cemetery, retirement-vacation development, among others (Goben, 1932: 22-39).
Figure 4  McPherson's Conspiracy Model 1927
While the figures 2, 3, and 5 formulate the power shares in the form of concentric circles, this does not account for the fluctuating of influence whereby an outer circle collapses in over inner circles and enjoys heightened attention from the founder and hence an escalation of power share in the system as a whole. Over time, representatives from the various circles of relatedness become significantly important to McPherson, as illustrated by lawyers and reporters who had worked for the prosecution during her trial but who became significant advisors afterwards as the best means "to control and deal with the press" (Steele, 1970: 60-61).

At the basis of the institutional structure is an assumption that as visionary and founder of the Foursquare Gospel, McPherson had certain "divine rights" within the movement. She was quoted by Steele as having said, "I ruled like a queen in my kingdom." (Steele, 1970: inside cover). The side effect of the ideological creation became a developed power structure of interrelationships which became more and more conventionalized as time passed.
Figure 5 McPHERSON POWER SHARES 1927-1928
CONVENTIONALIZATION OF THE INSTITUTION

In his book, *Dissent in American Religion*, Edwin Scott Gaustad argues that "...new wine must not be poured into old wineskins. New experiences made new saints, and new saints needed a new church" (1973:13). That describes the situation in which McPherson increasingly found herself. Her converts agreed with her that there needed to be a permanent revival center where she could minister. Her supporters from farm and city sponsored the $250,000 to build what was first called the "Echo Park Revival Tabernacle" in its inception as an idea but became known as "Angelus Temple" at its completion (*Bridal Call* Vol.4 No. 8 [Jan. 1921]:20).

McPherson presented the need to the Bridal Call family in an appeal for funds. In part McPherson related the need to the large influx of people into Southern California.

Thousands of tourists are here from every State of the Union, many coming to reside; (statistics declare that two thousands are arriving daily). Their other needs have been provided for by the city,—homes, amusements, theatres, automobile highways, and parks, but alas, few adequately large buildings where they might hear the Word of God in its blessed Pentecostal fullness (*Bridal Call* Vol.4 No.8 [Jan. 1921]:20).

Progressing stage by stage in raising funds, McPherson was able to open Angelus Temple on January 1, 1923, one year after beginning her building project.

Prior to the opening of the Temple, McPherson had been gradually organizing her followers in a series of support groups. She identified her subscribers to her magazine "the
Bridal Call Family." She had worked to become highly organized, for in 1919 she had requested a subscriber to help identify those people in a given area as subscribers (McPherson-Peffers Letter, 2/22/1919). In 1921 McPherson organized The Echo Park Evangelistic Association, Incorporated. She claimed two thousand members supporting her "Full Gospel Evangelism." Her board of trustees included Claude Stutzman, a businessman from the San Jose First Baptist Church (Bridal Call Vol.5 No.7 [Dec. 1921]:22). The next year she launched "The Four Square Gospel Association" based on the signatures of a thousand ministers and lay people (see pages 133-136 above).

McPherson presented the Temple as the practical application of these associations. The purpose was both revivistic and practical.

The purpose is not only to conduct full Gospel revival services in Los Angeles to which hungry children of the Lord will come from every State in the Union, but also to be the practical means of training evangelists for home and foreign fields (Bridal Call Vol. 5 No. 10 [Mar. 1922]:19).

It was presented as being international and interdenominational. In the process, the point of this new organization was to forward the evangelistic efforts of Aimee Semple McPherson and "the hastening of a preparation for the coming of the Lord." (Bridal Call Vol.5 No.10 [Mar. 1922]:19).

Membership in the association and the Temple project was the donation of twenty-five dollars per chair. Chair
holders included such representatives as the Asbury Methodist Episcopal Church, Rochester, New York, The Canton Daily News, and the San Francisco Area Klu Klux Klan which donated four chairs (McPherson, 1923: 441, 376, 484) and the gypsies bought two hundred chairs (Steele, 1959:73). Others donated money toward memorial windows, the school, and the radio station giving promise to enhance further the presentation of the Gospel. Mrs. McPherson's broad support can be related to her non-condemning attitude toward outcast groups, the positive economic impact her crusades had on local businesses, and the fact that her narrative-style sermon facilitated the hearers in arriving at their own particular understandings of her words.

The Temple was opened with what became an annual event—a two week convention. With the help of Dr. William Keeney Towner of the First Baptist Church of San Jose, California, Dr. George A. Bale of Temple Baptist Church of Oakland, California, Dr. Charles S. Price, of the First Congregational Church of Lodi and Dr. Charles A Shrieve of McKendree Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C., McPherson hoped to establish the interdenominational nature of the revival center. She wrote about the breadth of inclusiveness in its opening convention.

The interdenominational spirit of this Evangelistic Association will be truly exemplified at the opening—as in after days, people of all evangelical orthodox churches working as one and for
one God and Saviour of us all.

Their efforts will not be toward the building up of any one particular denomination but the bringing of the greatest blessing to all, and the working on an equal footing the one with the other (Bridal Call Vol.6 No.6 [Nov.1922]:27).

McPherson was presenting the rhetorical base for her institution as being interdenominational. It was acceptable in the minds of these denominational representatives to participate. McPherson was an independent evangelist with no denominational ties; she preached a doctrine to which they had subscribed months prior to the opening of the temple--the doctrine was the basis of operation. McPherson clearly stated the ideological base for the temple.

The term "Four-Square Gospel" was given the writer in a remarkable way, and will become the foundation of our work for God. Angelus Temple will be called "The church of the four-square Gospel" and our teachings in general will fall under this heading, Jesus Saviour, Baptizer, Healing and Coming King (Bridal Call Vol.6 No.6 [Nov.1922]: 29).

McPherson wished to establish the Temple as fulfilling an interdenominational role in the Full Gospel Movement. Her experiences with organizations had not been good. They had criticised her and her performance. This distrust was a carry over from the foundations of the Pentecostal Movement (cf Apostolic Faith 1906-1908). McPherson considered "organization, ceremonies and form, red-tape, regulations and rules..." to be similar to how Saul's armor appeared to young man David-- debilitating, restricting, and in the end useless (Bridal Call Vol.8 No.1 [June 1924]:28). McPherson
postulated a perfect revivalistic situation as interdenomina-
nationalism.

INTERDENOMINATIONALISM—that is the Word, the key to
the whole wonderful outpouring. Meeting here, in this
mighty Temple, one is made to forget that one is a
Baptist and one's neighbor, a Methodist, while yonder
is a Presbyterian and over there a Lutheran. Denomi-
national barriers seem to be forgotten, all fences are
down and meeting with tear-brimmed eyes at the cross
of Calvary, hands instinctively reach out for other
hands, clasp and clasp tightly in the love of a common
cause, the praises of a common Lord (Bridal Call Vol.6
No. 12 [May 1923]: 11).

The place of Angelus Temple was seen as unique. In
less than three years between January, 1923, and October,
1925, nearly five million people attended the Temple (Bridal
Call Foursquare Vol.9 No.5 [Oct. 1925]:17). Many attending
were those arriving from the farm and the midwest; many
others were immigrants and displaced people (Bridal Call
Among the displaced were the religiously displaced. Funda-
mentalists withdrew from Liberal associations and joined
sects such as McPhersons's, critical of the turn of their
ministers, churches, and seminaries (McLoughlin, 1967:56).
McPherson offered these people a God to believe in, a God
who would be active in their lives, and a God not ashamed of
demonstrative religion. McPherson saw the multitudes as
needing her, her temple, and her gospel.

With the great need of the world before our eyes and
upon our hearts, Angelus Temple came into being. It has
filled a ministry never before
known in the world. Its influence has reached out beyond our fondest imaginings (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.1 [June 1926]:3).

ESTABLISHMENT OF CUSTOM AND EXPECTATION IN THE TEMPLE

Services at Angelus Temple began with a two-week convention, and the pattern of the convention set the pattern for services for several years. Services included a daily sunrise prayer service, often with parallel prayer services for special groups such as the Tuesday Minister’s Prayer meeting. In addition, two people met in the prayer tower night and day twenty-four hours a day for prayer. There were special programs for children—Sunday School on Sunday, a Children’s Rally on Saturday and Children’s Church on Sunday morning, Friday afternoon was a meeting for Seniors and Friday night for the young people. Some meetings were designated for evangelism, others for “deeper teaching,” and still others for divine healing. Preaching services were held at 2:30 and 7:30 p.m. each day, usually presided over and preached at by Aimee Semple McPherson herself. Additional street meetings were held on flat bed trucks so that they could be relocated. Missions were established in downtown and ethnic areas also. McPherson established a perpetual schedule of events much like that she had sustained for two to three weeks at a time in her traveling campaigns (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.6 No.9 [Feb. 1923]:11-19).

Surprising as the schedule McPherson kept is the fact
that the majority of these services, especially the preaching services, were crowded, requiring that people wait in long lines, that the rail service schedule extra trains, and that the police assign extra officers to control the crowds and the traffic. Descriptions of McPherson's services and the effects upon the crowds and the community reads much like the descriptions of other awakenings in American history.

Since the Temple could not hold all the people, it was not long before "branches" started up. By 1925, there were twenty-eight branches, including Pasadena, Alhambra, Burbank, Fullerton, Graham, Hanfor, Lankershim, Lorrita, Salinas, Santa Monica, Sawtelle, Southgate, Torrance, Venice, Ventura, Willowbrook, Monrovia, Inglewood, Redlands, San Bernandino, San Pedro, Santa Ana, Whittier, and Hamet, California; Hurlock, Maryland; New Philadelphia, Ohio; New Baltimore, Michigan; and Prince Rupert, Canada. These were all considered branches of the Temple, two years before there was a "denomination" (Bridal Call Vol.9 No.5 [Oct. 1925]:35).

The expectation of private epiphanies experienced by the congregants during the services of the Temple became the bedrock on which the structure of the new grouping would be built. McPherson had inspired them, had fostered their faith, and had given them the experience of God that they had been seeking. Now she had to accept a structure to
facilitate their desires. They had broken with old ways to create a new. Edwin Scott Gaustad describes it, "For the pietist generally broke from the old church only in order to build a new one, one truer to his own rich experiences and to those insights granted in the divine encounter" (1973:10-11).

The Temple and McPherson's practices became the custom and expectation of the people. When Wynonah B. Johnson visited the Temple in 1923 to write an article for *Saturday Night* magazine, she found hundreds dressed in standard white nurse's uniforms with blue capes. She questioned Minnie Kennedy about them. Minnie responded in the negative; the dresses were not uniforms. In Minnie's description the nurses' dresses were a practical solution to a common problem of dress.

Uniforms? No, it is a costume evolved by Aimee, when she was searching for something to wear to service one evening, and had to have a suitable dress which would be neat, simple, suitable for afternoon and evening. She purchased this, which was all three, and liked it so much that she has kept on wearing the style. We have never asked the choir to wear the dress, nor the hundreds of workers you see with it on, but they find it has solved the problem for them too, since, unfortunately much of our modern dress is unfit for choir work (quoted by Johnson, 1923:5).

The uniforms may not have been expected, initially, but McPherson recognized the usefulness and distinctiveness of the dress. After she organized her denomination, women were expected to wear similar uniforms well into the late 60's,
over twenty years after McPherson's death (Handbook for operating Foursquare Churches, 1965). During the late twenties and early thirties, the uniform, and the fact that many of the women dressed to emulate McPherson, was one of her defenses during the many trial appearances (Steele, 1959, 1970). Uniforms became expected in service situations, especially by students of L.I.F.E. Bible College.

The events at Angelus Temple quickly convinced McPherson that God was at work through her and the temple she had built. She set forth the Temple ministry as the epitome of divine intervention to evoke the interest of more recruits to fulfill her vision.

Angelus Temple, the spiritual hub of the universe, where the wheel constantly turns, carrying in streams of sick, sinful, discouraged, distressed, careless, hungry, desperate men and women; bearing them out again with bright, happy faces--saved, healed, Spirit-filled and inspired with an intelligent knowledge of the Word of God and the plan of redemption--their viewpoint changed from downward to upward, from inward to outward Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.9 No.2 [July 1925]:30).

McPherson interpreted the Temple as a spiritual hub because she saw being fulfilled in the services what Pentecostal people had envisioned and had sought since 1906. In describing the influx of people, McPherson interpreted them as finding what had been missing in their previous affiliations.
Who can blame them for seeking an oasis in a desert land? Why a dry church when there are churches with ever open doors where the Holy Spirit is blessing—where the latter rains are falling? Rain drenched churches mean spirit filled people. When the Spirit fills the people, the people fill the churches ("It's Raining" Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.17 No.6 [Nov. 1933]:14).

The Temple was contrasted with small Holiness and Pentecostal Missions, Fundamentalist Churches and rich liberal congregations. McPherson held that in contrast to the small missions, there was joy and excitement at the Temple with more discussion about Heaven and less about Hell. The Temple was bright, open, and cheery in architecture in contrast to the dark large churches. The members dressed in simple conformity with unity of service rather than furs and finery trying to impress one another. The Temple was not about raising money for projects but having the people go directly and do the work she felt important and necessary (McPherson, "Foursquare" Sunset [Feb. 1927]:15-16).

The Temple seemed to take on a life of its own, but that life demanded the animating spirit of Aimee Semple McPherson. McPherson became trapped in her own creation. She did not complain but boasted of her involvement. In 1925, she wrote to her magazine audience about her busy schedule.

We are busy every moment. The Evangelist has not had a vacation in over two years and sees no way to leave, as revival is too mighty. God is giving her wonderful strength and though working every day and preaching sometimes three and four
times a day, she seems stronger than when it all began. Pray for continued strength to draw these mighty nets to land (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.8 No. 10 [Mar. 1925]:21).

McPherson's "magic mirror" (Brown, 1979:48) of her audience was telling her of her success and expecting the behaviors of the successful evangelist. The more she engaged in pageantry, the more the audience called for. A Baptist minister drawn into the movement described the pageantry of her entry to the pulpit.

And who comes along the rampart, down the steps to the rostrum? Receiving loving tribute from countless eyes? White robed in servant's livery; whose servant she? Whence the glory and beauty of that face?... Then a message, with what ease and confidence spoken! Where heard you such a voice, so clear, so musical, loving and trained servant to every noble thought and emotion (Rev. G.A. Bale, "A Word Picture of Angelus Temple," Bridal Call Vol.8 No.1 [June 1924]:17).

The people wanted Aimee Semple McPherson. If they could not have her, they wanted someone trained to present the message just like her. She received letters from people who had attended her campaigns offering transportation, expenses, and lodging if only she would send some of her people (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.9 No.10 [Mar. 1926]:24). So desirous were the people far from Los Angeles for McPherson-trained evangelists that there arose imitations who created expenses, took large offerings from areas, and based the solicitation on their association with Aimee Semple McPherson. This necessitated a system of credential-
ling of evangelists of the Echo Park Evangelistic Association. If there was any doubt, people were instructed to call or wire the Temple for confirmation. The demand for McPherson and the style of evangelism she presented necessitated further steps in institutionalizing the structure of the association (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 9 No. 4 [Sept. 1925]:14).

Through the school, McPherson expected to duplicate herself. Students were sent out with tents and to missions to spread the ideology of McPherson and the Foursquare Gospel (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 9 No. 9 [Feb. 1926]:4). This was also true of her radio station, KFSG, atop the Temple by which she preached to Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Canada, Cuba, South America, and islands and ships at sea (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 8 No. 10 [Mar. 1925]:20; cf. Hood, 1981:66f). In addition, lay members of the Temple were her personal representatives in street meetings, at food and clothing commissaries, over the telephone, in the prayer tower, among the ushers, cleaning squads and others who dedicated themselves to the service of the Lord and Aimee Semple McPherson at and through the Temple (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 8 No. 10 [Mar. 1925]:20-21; "Know the Truth" pamphlet quoted by Blomgren, 1952:46f).

McPherson became the model to copy for those adhering to the Four-Square Gospel, attending the Temple, and matriculating at the Training School. It was soon common to find
women out preaching dressed in the white gown, blue cape and hair pinned on top of their heads in the fashion of Aimee Semple McPherson. She was the founder, pastor, "Little Sister," teacher, and as an evangelist, possessed the power of God so that her actions were described after the pattern of Biblical characters. During her disappearance, she was described in ways which likened her to Elijah, Jonah, and even Jesus Christ (Steele, 1959:9-20). At the opening of Angelus Temple, McPherson published descriptions of the various functions and activities at the Temple. Both the January and February, 1923, issues go into great detail about each department and its individual responsibilities. This description and practice set the stage for expectations by attendees whether from near or far. This detailed description of the religious life at the Temple served two purposes. It gave news but it also made appreciable the expectations of the Bridal Call readers regarding the ritual and practice at Angelus Temple (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 6 No. 8 [Jan. 1923] and Vol.6 No.9 [Feb. 1923]).

This continuous actualization of expectation continued into the third year. In late 1925, one could still read about "nine hundred and forty-one days of continuous revival" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 9 No 3 [Aug. 1925]:20). The adherents "knew" that the events were "revival" because the events were consistent with not only historical Pente-
costal experience (Apostolic Faith 1906-1908) but also his-
toric revivalism (Bruce, 1974). The fulfilling of expecta-
tion contributed to the drawing power to crowds looking for
religious fulfillment.

In describing the "ritual" of Angelus Temple, it must
be remembered that Pentecostals decried ritual as being
formalistic and detrimental to the Church (McPherson, What's
The Matter With The Churches, the Preacher, the Pew, the
Seminary, the Old-Time Religion. 1928). It was Pentecostal
ideology that they were free of ritual but ritual, neverthe-
less, was evident in the regular practices and role expecta-
tions. These functions were characteristically renamed to
mask the anomalous nature to their Pentecostal ideology.
The relabeling was sufficient to confirm not only the basic
Pentecostal ideology but also the power relationship of
Aimee Semple McPherson as the epitome of the expectations.
McPherson further colored the basic rituals with pageantry
and drama, costume and color, music and flowers as trade-
marks of Temple ritual.

McPherson set forth her vision for the Temple in gran-
diose rhetoric such as "hub of the universe" (Bridal Call
Vol.9 No.2 [July 1925]:30), which infuriated her competi-
tion. Robert Shuler, with anger and sarcasm, said, "She is,
according to her followers and according to her own boast-
ings, a little further advanced than any other of Christ's
messengers 'in these last days.'" (Shuler, 1925:10). Even
associates were critical of her propensity to exaggerating in her story-telling method of preaching. John Goben, former assistant pastor of the Temple, complained of her practice.

And this exaggeration is deliberately premeditated. She teaches the students in the Bible School that this is the proper way to win souls for Christ. To her it is good psychology. It is built up. Ballyhoo, that keeps the crowds coming (Goben, 1932:14).

Part of the conflict over "exaggerations" was the sense that the critics did not accept McPherson's world-view and had conflicting rhetorical visions. Shuler became a catalyst for the formation of the Evangelical Methodist Church split from the Methodist Episcopal Church. This was a group which focused its rhetorical vision in the Holiness Movement rather than the Pentecostal Movement, rival interpreters of the ministry of the Holy Spirit in modern Christianity (Jones, 1974:304-305; Clark, 1949:66). Shuler had a rather parallel establishment to the Temple at his Trinity Methodist Church, including a radio station. McPherson attributed his frequent attacks to jealousy (Steele, 1959:174).

One bit of oral history circulating at one of the denominational Bible Colleges during the late 60's told how, in a sermon about Jesus meeting the Disciples at the Sea of Galilee after the resurrection, McPherson in her narrative style referred to Jesus feeding the Disciples fish and toast (John 21:9). The King James version uses the word "bread,"
so Shuler attacked McPherson for her perverting the Word. McPherson responded knowingly, "Poor man doesn't even know that when you put bread on fire you get toast." (Nettie Lopp, classroom discussion, c. 1964-1965). The verbal battle between Shuler and McPherson was vociferous and long lasting.

In the development of the Temple institution, the people elevated McPherson to a level of high allegiance. As a side effect of this power relationship, the practical ideology was modified. Although never specified in creed form outside of references to "loyalty," the rules and roles in this "structure" were known by the congregation, ministers, and students. The show of solidarity proved stronger than the questioning and accusing of the outside community.

BREACH OF CONFORMITY IN THE DISAPPEARANCE

It would seem that there would be little to add to the discussion of the controversy regarding Aimee Semple McPherson's disappearance. Detractors such as Robert V. P. Steele under the pseudonym "Lately Thomas" (1959) and Charles H. Mcgee, who wrote the ribald Antics of Aimee (1926), declare they are convinced of the sexual improprieties of the Hollywood-star styled evangelist. Defenders like Raymond Cox, on the other hand, declare The Verdict is In, (1983) not only as to her innocence but also the license prosecutors took with the evidence in the case. It is, however, this story
which has spawned several operas, a television movie by Hallmark on "The Disappearance of Aimee," as well as ideas for interpreting the 1960 film version of Sinclair Lewis' novel *Elmer Gantry* (1927).

Denominational officials of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel are nervous and skeptical of the motives of researchers about Aimee Semple McPherson, especially when it comes to the issue of the disappearance, (Duarte, Interview, May 25, 1988). So Robert Bahr admits his biography of McPherson *Least of All Saints*, (1978) is "speculative" because he was denied access to material from the archives for his book. Rolf McPherson generally refuses interviews to discuss his mother because of the tendency of those interviewing to disregard totally the story as she told it in favor of telling it like any other Hollywood sex scandal (Duarte, Interview, May 25, 1988).

When this research began, it was surmised that probably little more could be said to explain the disappearance until more time has passed and the organization allows researchers access to corporate records that could confirm or deny the newspaper accounts, which were filled with rumors. Raymond Cox even criticizes researchers who rely upon the newspaper accounts instead of his and the organization's accounts, forgetting that others could perceive these secondary accounts as biased and skewed (1983:1-5). But the approach of
looking at public discourse (cf. Chapter II) brought a different perspective to this research.

As one reads the accounts of the disappearance, it is easily recognizable that rumor ruled the day and the scandal was an effective means of selling newspapers. Even when one goes to a national newspaper like the *New York Times*, stories begin (although reduced and with the worst offenses of rumor deleted) with the disappearance of McPherson on May 18, 1926. What happened to McPherson is that the accusation became a lively public issue because she had had such a dramatic effect in many great cities across the country with her campaigns. The rhetorical situation, whether Aimee Semple McPherson was guilty or innocent, was that she was forced to defend herself as if the accusations were serious and "probably true." In other words, she was forced to deny the allegations with all the force she could muster if she were to save the evangelistic influence over people, churches, and cities that she had had before.

The disappearance took place between May 18 and June 23, 1926. The five weeks from a Tuesday afternoon to an early Wednesday morning set the stage for months of speculation, rumor, and divergent viewpoints to be discussed, argued, stretched, denied, or affirmed. The bottom line was that the majority presenting a public written opinion felt that for whatever reason, Aimee Semple McPherson had run off with Kenneth Ormiston (*New York Times* [July 16,
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Even the most positive expression, *Sister Aimee* by Nancy Barr Mavity, postulates that given McPherson's schedule, physical and emotional strain, and loneliness of leadership, she was a prime candidate for such an event (1931). Others of the period were not necessarily so kind as Mavity (Mcgee, 1926).

Kenneth Ormiston was of little help in clarifying the mystery. He was an elusive prey for investigators because of his desire to avoid contact with his wife or her attorneys. She was seeking a divorce which she received for desertion (*New York Times* [February 15, 1927]:27). In a series of articles produced exclusively for the *Los Angeles Examiner* in January, 1927, he identified "Miss X," the woman who accompanied him to Carmel by the Sea to have been a nurse from Seattle (Steele, 1959:319). Ormiston dropped from press reports and established himself as a respected radio engineer in the Los Angeles area. He died in 1937 at the age of forty-one of complications from an appendectomy (Steele, 1959:325).

McPherson offered the newspapers everything they needed to sell papers--crime, mystery, intrigue, sex, drama, and religion. McPherson received publicity and exposure of which any star would be envious. Those who seemed to lose the most were the lawyers involved. The Prosecutor ended up serving time because of improprieties which were uncovered
when rumors about this trial were being investigated (New York Times, [April 9, 1929]:16; [April 10, 1929]:34; [April 11, 1929]:2). Judge Carlos Hardy, who aided McPherson, while impeached without conviction, was not re-elected because of his involvement in the McPherson case (New York Times, [April 27, 1929]:1). This is not to say that McPherson did not suffer (New York Times, [Sept. 19, 1926]:28). She lost so much of the positive press and public opinion that even her public works in the Depression and during World War II did not compensate ("Aimee's Four-square Behind the War," Newsweek, 22 [July 19, 1943]:64).

Most of the literature since that date about Aimee Semple McPherson focuses on the disappearance.

In direct confrontation with the presentation of the newspapers and the work of the prosecuting attorneys, McPherson used her pulpit, her radio station, her magazine, and began a newspaper for the distinct purpose to get her version of the story into the public eye and challenge the accusation that she had committed perjury, obstructed justice, and conspired to debase public morals (Foursquare Crusader Vol.1 No.1 [Nov. 1926]:1,8; New York Times [Oct. 1, 1926]:25; [Oct. 4, 1926]:25; [Nov. 4, 1926]:29).

In January, 1926, McPherson took a much-deserved vacation. Her congregation sponsored a trip to Europe and the Holy Land. She was absent from the Temple from January 11 to April 25, 1926 (Steele, 1959:329). After her return, as
far as the Temple people were concerned, everything was back to normal.

But in just three weeks, their world seemed turned upside down. Aimee Semple McPherson had gone to the beach to prepare her sermon for the next Sunday night. Emma Schaffer, one of the secretaries, accompanied McPherson. Leaving McPherson to run an errand, Schaffer returned and found that she had disappeared. With Schaffer having last seen McPherson going out to swim, Minnie Kennedy and the Temple staff concluded that Aimee Semple McPherson had drowned (New York Times [May 20, 1926]:4; [May 21, 1926]:14). A Dr. Gustave Haas, who had treated McPherson, postulated that she could have suffered a mental lapse from overwork and was wandering about dazed (New York Times [May 24, 1926]:3). An energetic search of the beach, pier, water and offshore began on, under, and above the water; thousands gathered to watch or participate in the search. Efforts ceased on June 3 when Minnie Kennedy and Rolf McPherson, Aimee Semple McPherson's mother and son, tossed tribute flowers into the waves (New York Times [June 5, 1926]:14). At the same time kidnapping was also suspected by some and sightings of McPherson supposedly occurred as far north as Edmonton, Alberta, Vancouver, B.C., as well as up and down the coastal area and in the Southwest inland area (New York Times [June 4, 1926]:6; [June 6, 1926]:9). As Admiral Bird
was welcomed to New York City, McPherson staggered out of the Mexican desert into the border town of Agua Prieta (New York Times [June 24, 1926]:1). In her triumphant return, which was described as more elaborate than that welcoming President Wilson, Prince Albert of Belgium, or President Taft, Temple followers and Los Angeles rejoiced that their leader was back (New York Times [June 27, 1926]:12). While she had been gone they had wept, wailed, and postulated her likeness to Elijah, Jonah, and Jesus in her bodily disappearance and possibility of return. Among them were those who ascribed sainthood to her and expected a miraculous conclusion to the matter (Steele, 1959:11). With her return, the Temple set forth to celebrate.

The Celebration began with her entry into the depot. Thousands of enthusiastic followers crowded together to sing, cheer, and march carrying her in a royal chair and continued the next day at Sunday services when 7500 squeezed into the Temple to bid her welcome back to her pulpit. McPherson spoke to their need, addressing the subject of her five weeks absence in the sermon "Conquering Hosts." McPherson dramatically recounted how she had been kidnapped, held captive in a Mexican shack, and finally had escaped by cutting her bonds on the jagged edge of a tin can, fleeing to Agua Prieta (New York Times [June 28, 1926]:2; Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 10 No.1 [June, 1926]:18f; Vol.10 No.3 [August, 1926]:9f).
After some futile efforts by McPherson and authorities to find the shack in Mexico, McPherson appeared before the Grand Jury. The Grand Jury found insufficient evidence to indict the alleged kidnappers and the issue seemed to be at an end. However, McPherson's nemesis, Robert Shuler, pastor of Trinity Methodist, wanted to know all that the Grand Jury had considered. Through letters, newspapers, and his own radio broadcasts, Shuler stirred the pot. The Judge and Grand Jury felt the issue had taken too much time and attention of the community. They wanted it off their hands (Steele, 1959:153-155).

New revelations from the community of Carmel-by-the-Sea suggested that rather than being kidnapped, McPherson had had a rendezvous with Kenneth Ormiston, the Temple's former Radio operator (Steele, 1959:159ff; New York Times, [July 16, 1926]:4). The new evidence was brought back to the Grand Jury on August 3 and a Preliminary Hearing occurred on the charge of "corruption of public morals, obstruction of justice, and conspiracy to manufacture evidence" (Steele, 1959:332; New York Times [Oct. 1, 1926]:25; [Nov. 4, 1926]:29).

McPherson resisted the attack by going directly to the radio and the homes of potentially millions with her accusation of persecution. In sermons such as "Satan's Convention," McPherson cried out that even the ministers were
tools of the Devil to work persecution upon her. She called for a "showdown."

It is a showdown, not before officials and officialdom, not before judge and grand juries, but before the great American public. If the chivalry of American manhood, the wonderful sympathy of American womanhood will sanction the suffering, the mental and physical anguish which I have withstood, then I am content; but I have held my peace long enough! Now I will reveal a sequence of sinister events, a chain of evidence that will make the motive of the whole damnable conspiracy apparent to every man, woman, and child in the civilized world. Then, perhaps, if no effort still be made to find my abductors, no further efforts will be made to find me where I never was...(quoted by Steele, 1959:172-173).

Ryan and Cline (the investigators), she charged, were "Catholics persecuting a Protestant Minister" (Steele, 1959:174). Shuler also was a target because of his attacks upon McPherson.

Must I permit pastors who preach hate against my church? Am I, a woman, to be deprived of the chivalrous protection with which Americans have always guarded every woman's name? Blunderers that they are! They do not see that they are trying to drag down into the abyss not only Aimee Semple McPherson but Christianity throughout the earth! The Devil's Convention is at its height! (quoted by Steele, 1959:174).

In metaphor upon metaphor, McPherson reached out to attack the demonic origins of the "plot" and "conspiracy" against her (Figure 4. In "Satan's Master Stroke" she set forth to her people the rationale that masked the anomalies of the last months. She described it in dialogue between the Devil and his minions.
O Lucifer, the worst news of all that I bring to you is, there is a church in Southern California that is almost as dangerous as all other churches put together....It has done irreparable injury to the cause of Satan, and brought defeat to the hosts of hell in countless ways....This thing is threatening the kingdom of Satan! It must be stopped! Something must be done to curb this revival!...What shall we do? Something must be done to stop this woman!...

Lucifer laughs loud and long. No longer are there signs of distress upon his face. 'A little woman? You had me frightened for a minute. We'll fix her.'

And so they drew closer together, talking earnestly in subdued whispers. The flames which burst out occasionally from the mouths of the fissures, light the scene and reveal the cunning, and satanic leers upon the faces of the Powers of Darkness....'Let us touch her name! Let us prick the bubble of her reputation and the thing is done. There are many who would rejoice to see her taken down from her pulpit and her power for good destroyed.' (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 10 No.4 [Sept. 1926]:24,25).

In her sermons and articles, McPherson set before her people a vision of reality that fit their Pentecostal and Fundamentalistic backgrounds. Titles of articles included "Kidnapped! or Forty Days In The Wilderness" described as "An authentic report, published for our Bridal Call readers whom we know long to hear the truth." (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 10 No. 3 [August, 1926]:9f); in "Coat of Many Colors," "God was with Joseph" says McPherson, "the same God is with us" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 10 No.3 [August, 1926]:14f). She described treachery in "Thirty Pieces of Silver" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.4 [Sept.1926]:11f); "Christ, Our Spiritual Gibraltar" was preached as the source of strength to endure the situations
of life (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 10 No.4 [Sept. 1926]:4). Both McPherson and her mother called upon the people to remain strongly behind them. "Watch and Pray," wrote McPherson; "Stand! Don't Waver!" wrote her mother (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.5 [Oct.1926]:14,15).

Taking a stand above it all, she wrote of the attitude that she and the Temple people should have towards their "persecutors" — "Father, Forgive Them" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 10 No.6 [Nov.1926]:21).

With the publicity from the newspapers and her demonstrated ability to put on a good show, McPherson's temple filled to overflowing. Her rhetorical battle for her people to see her as the representative of Christ and to see the Church as being persecuted meant that both Christ and the Church were being attacked by the spiritual forces of Satan and the conspiring forces of evil men. With her ideological intervention, McPherson created roles and relationships for her fellowship keeping her crowd but losing much in public opinion. Although the case was thrown out as unprosecutable, McPherson lost much in the realm of public opinion (Ryder, 1926:81; cf. New York Times [Feb. 16, 1927]:18; [Feb. 17, 1927]:23), which she conscientiously worked to win back on her vindication tour (New York Times [Feb. 19, 1927]:7; [Feb. 20, 1927]:12; [Feb. 21, 1927]:8; [Feb. 22, 1927]:40).
More than ever before the disappearance created a situation in which the collectivity-stressing identity (Brown, 1982:21) took place. McPherson had been raised to personify the Temple; for the Foursquare folk now it became "us against them." The "us" was McPherson, the Temple people, Christ, the Saints and the Church universal. "They" were the Devil, modernist preachers, crime lords, prosecutors, and newspapers (Figure 4). The identity changes taking place in McPherson and her people changed the hierarchical structure so that from this point "loyalty" became a big issue to McPherson and her organization. In Declaration of Faith compiled by McPherson and printed just after incorporation as "The International Church of the Foursquare Gospel" December 28, 1927, she discusses membership.

An applicant for membership...must declare his loyalty to, and willingness to assist in the support of the association, both with his substance, as well as his undivided effort. Each such applicant shall express his recognition of the fact that "a house divided against itself cannot stand," and his adherence to the policy of this association, that there shall be no disloyalty, insubordination, whispering, criticizing, or backbiting of this association, or its leaders, and that if at any time any member feels that he is no longer loyal or in unqualified sympathy or one-accord with this association, he shall ask for a letter of dismissal, and quietly withdraw from membership, (McPherson, Declaration, nd:30).

This statement is no longer included in the Declaration of Faith (1988). The statement, however, was still included in printings of the Declaration of Faith from the 60's and the 70's, suggesting members and ministers accept the offi-
cial positions of the church without question or criticism (This we Believe, nd:30).

Immediately upon her return, McPherson preached an illustrated sermon that dramatized the event of the kidnapping ("Conquering Hosts"). This type of presentation was hardly objective and unbiased in the sense that we expect in news today but then, too, the newspaper articles were also sensational in the sense of our modern National Observer or Star. It must be remembered that McPherson was accustomed to presenting truth in such a format. It was no different in her mind to present this life event and its spiritual implications in such a manner than it was to present Biblical truth. When challenging her people "Do you believe me?" They readily affirmed with up raised hands and arms, "Yes we do!" (New York Times [June 27, 1926]:12 & [June 28, 1926]:2; see also "Kidnapped," Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.3 [Aug. 1926]:9f). But the opposition was viewing the situation from an entirely different perspective. Its members did not live and communicate in her world and to them the story sounded like a "story" made up for publicity. The prosecutor, Keyes, challenged her in court with the concept of publicity stunt. "Well, one of the reasons that you might have for pulling a stunt like this is for the purpose of getting worldwide advertising or publicity for the sake of helping you in your work" (quoted by Steele, 1959:133).
Mother Kennedy "admitted" to the newspaper reporters following her testimony at the initial Grand Jury investigation that McPherson made a "mistake," but not the one speculated about.

The only mistake Sister made in this whole terrible affair was to talk at all, to make any explanation of her disappearance, though her story was every word true. If she had declined to explain her absence, little would have been thought of it. But because she did tell her story, because she told exactly what happened, she has made herself the target of enemies and unbelievers (quoted by Steele, 1959: 149).

Silence was really not possible given the all-out effort there had been to find McPherson or to raise a Memorial fund. Robert V.P. Steele's evaluation graphically displays the attitude that McPherson found herself up against from those not of her flock. He editorializes, "The grand jury, politely but scathingly, had declined to swallow the evangelist's yarn. If tacit condemnation could do it, Aimee stood stripped of veracity--discredited" (1959:153).

Over the course of the Summer and Fall of 1926 McPherson began to present reality in the form of a "conspiracy" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.5 [Oct.1926]:15-17,32; Vol.10 No.6 [Nov. 1926]:21-23,33; Vol. 10 No.9 [Feb. 1927]:9-10,31). While on the stand McPherson argued to the Grand Jury that she was a "Mother and Pastor" not a "Paramour, ill, or publicity seeker."
Had I gone away willingly, I would not have come back. I would rather never have been born than to have caused this blow to God's word and His work! I had rather that I had never been born or seen the light of day than that the name of Jesus Christ, Whom I love, should be crucified and people would say, 'There is Sister; she had been preaching, and if her story is wrong--' That is the sad part to me, not only that my children should go through life and have people say, 'See what her mother did,' but the blow to my work is the greatest thing (quoted by Steele, 1959:132).

The rhetorical strategy employed, according to Brown's Social Intervention Model, is that of "anomaly-masking" (1982:22). In the world-view of the prosecutor and much of the public, there were many anomalies in McPherson's story expressed in the form of questions, rumors, and inconsistencies. McPherson attempted to answer these objections but her method went from one metaphor to another. In Bormann's model of Rhetorical Vision, she raised her explanation to a level "immune to corroboration" by raising the level of conflict to that of God versus Satan and outside of common experience (McPherson, "March of Martyrs," "Conquering Hosts," "The Biggest Liar in Town"); and by the use of universal terms to describe the situation (cf.Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.9 [Feb. 1927]:9). These formal moves were accepted by her congregation of followers but only created more incongruence for the onlookers and fuel for those outrightly against her, such as Robert Shuler.

This situation created a "revised social perception" (Brown, 1982:19) which was predicated upon the new stereo-
type that was being presented in the press. In the opinion of these gatekeepers, McPherson had lied; she was the mystery lady traveling the Southwest with Kenneth Ormiston during the five weeks of her absence. True to Brown's prediction, there was a polarization between "us" and "them." The "collectivity-stressing identity" made McPherson identified with the Temple, the Temple with the Church Universal, the Church with the Saints, and finally with Christ. Therefore, any persecution of McPherson was obviously a direct persecution of Jesus Christ. That is what McPherson preached and that is what her people accepted. In contrast, the prosecutors were identified as being "anti-protestant," being tools of Crime Lords and the underworld, and collaborating with modernist and jealous ministers who were all tools of the Devil ("March of the Martyrs;" "Devils' Convention").

In summarizing the situation, McPherson wrote to her magazine readers, "We are, at the present time, the victims of a gigantic and fiendish plot" ("A Summary" Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 10 No. 6 [Nov. 1926]:23). A few months later when the case had been dismissed, McPherson wrote an introduction to a published review of the case by Judge Jacob F. Denny, Ex-Judge of the 58th Judicial Circuit of Indiana, who was at the time practicing law in Southern California in which he describes the "Collapse of the Conspiracy." McPherson wrote:
Today God's smile is shining down upon the Church of the Foursquare Gospel with no clouds of persecution to hide its rays. Today the world is rejoicing that the horrible nightmare of injustice is over and that God has again bared His mighty hand in defense of His people. Today the dark clouds of innuendo and groundless rumor have rolled back into the black recesses from which they came and the world's millions are rejoicing that once more the sweet pure air of justice is circulating throughout the universe.

However, for almost eight months so much has been said and written regarding this persecution of the Church of the Foursquare Gospel and its leader, Aimee Semple McPherson, that even the intelligent reader has found it almost impossible to form a logical opinion of all the evidence, false and true, and to sift down the volumes and volumes of untruth.

Judge Jacob F. Denny, Ex-Judge of the 58th Judicial Circuit of Indiana, now a member of the California Bar, and a man who is not affiliated with any church but who has had a wealth of experience that has mellowed his heart and deepened his insight into human character and the workings of truth and falsehood, when asked [by McPherson] for his judicial opinion in the matter, after having read and weighed carefully every bit of evidence for and against, has written the following article (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 10 No. 9 [Feb. 1926]:9).

What appears significant in light of the institutional process is that in December, 1927, the "interdenominational" movement, as an outgrowth of this controversy, became an incorporated denomination, The Foursquare Gospel Lighthouses, Inc. and in December, 1928, The International Church of the Foursquare Gospel (Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, 1988:3; Goben, 1932;).
Figure 6 "SOUL-SAVING STATIONS AROUND THE WORLD"

FOURSQUARE GOSPEL LIGHTHOUSES, INC.

The response to Aimee Semple McPherson's disappearance by the press and the political organization of the city and county were anomalous with her prior experience. Prior to this event relationships seemed amiable and she received good press. She received all that she wished, namely that they, at least in her mind, believed and trusted her much as did her congregation McPherson selectively noted and reprinted the positive reports of her campaigns (cf Bridal Call Vol. 4 No. 4 [Sept. 1920]: re: Alton, Ill.; Vol.4 No. 7 [Dec. 1920]: re: Philadelphia; Vol.5 No.3 [Aug. 1921]: re: Denver; Vol.5 No. 5 [Oct. 1921]: re: San Francisco; Vol.9 No.4 [Sept. 1925]: re Rochester, N.Y.). Note however that the only press quotation she records in the Bridal Call, after the incident was from Canada regarding a visit to her home, Vol. 13 No.3 [Aug. 1929]:20). She had not foreseen any conflict for she had perceived the press as being "on her side."

McPherson was blind to the fact that she and the city and press were operating in different conceptual fields. When she presented her case, McPherson was surprised that her arguments had no effect in calming the tide of controversy outside of her church. In her religious world-view of camp meetings and Pentecostalism, the lists of successful conversions and continuance of ministry, despite her absence, were sufficient to prove that God was blessing and that she was not the sinner the press and prosecutors
claimed. But to the newspapers, hardened by their experience with human kind, it had only the ring of a cover-up or fabricated story with no real basis in fact. The conflict ensued because they were at the confrontation of two different worlds (cf. Brown, 1978).

The two ideological worlds clashed in their making sense of the disappearance event. On the one hand, those outside the Temple congregation constructed templates of the situation such as: "wanton infidelity," "sensationalistic publicity stunt," or "a criminal act of diverting public resources to support a concocted story." On the other hand, McPherson's faithful saw the event as a "planned program of vengeance for anti-criminal activities," "an effort to discredit the servant of God," "a means to stop the influence of a crusader for right," and "an act of public persecution of the righteous." Both sets of templates are believable when one accepts their given set of assumptions about human nature, church people, and Aimee Semple McPherson in particular. Neither set of templates proves the other wrong, and the argument ends in a stalemate rather than checkmate because each ideological group cannot get the other to accept the anomaly—masking of their position.

In impact or effect it does not seem to matter whether the kidnapping or sex scandal happened one way or the other—each side would have to live with the results as they
stood. No kidnappers were caught, nor was a conspiracy between McPherson and others confirmed. Aimee Semple McPherson was not put out of ministry; rather her congregation grew, apparently because of the publicity. McPherson boasted of the increase in attendance at the Temple and the loyalty of her followers.

When the smoke clouds of the first great onslaught had passed by, it was found that the Temple membership had exactly doubled, that the Sunday School attendance had increased from two thousand to four thousand, and that the tempest had but succeeded in fanning out the few flakes of chaff that had floated in with the wheat. The entire church membership was bound together with the most wonderful fellowship and love it has ever been the privilege of present day Christianity to witness ("Foursquare Fortitude," Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 12 No.4 [Sept. 1928]:13).

While McPherson congratulated her congregation on its behavior during her ordeal, she was working to establish the permanence of her organization and its expansion as a denomination. To her congregation she reiterated the victory.

Not one soldier in that great Christian army faltered, not a department of the work was neglected, not a service was missed, not an organization disbanded. They believed their Captain gave but the order of their Great Commander Jesus Christ rang out clear. Go on! Go on and on! (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.7 [Dec. 1926]:28).

Yet, when McPherson began to travel on her vindication tour, first in halls for paid admission and later on a free-will offering basis, she did not find the crowds she had left four years earlier (Bahr, 1979:296; cf. above). In
addition, radio station, WRNY, cancelled her broadcast in New York for fear of bad publicity she had received (New York Times [Feb. 16, 1927]:18). McPherson discovered through her experiences that, indeed, her support had been damaged by the bad press. In consolidating her forces and postulating a new denominational movement, then, she would be able to maintain a power relationship that had been built up by expectations of people who had attended her Temple and had read her magazine.

The situation created a new need and a new way to maintain the power relationship she had achieved. A further step in institutionalization seemed the best recourse. The attention-switch brought about by public reaction to her trial could no longer be masked. In accord with the Social Intervention Model, when McPherson changed in the areas of need and power it necessitated a corresponding change in her ideology. She could no longer maintain her concept of interdenominationalism. She had to move to a more specific form of organization and institutionalization.

McPherson's reaction to the disappearance event and the public outcry suggests that economics and social class are not the only variables useful in describing the emergence of a new denomination. H. Richard Niebuhr (1929), in examining how social, economic, and political aspects of American democracy influenced the emergence of denominations, set forth a paradigm for the social formation of denominations.
The Social Intervention Model, as a communication strategy, suggests that the anomalous communication event in which McPherson found herself needed a rhetorical response which facilitated the stability of McPherson's power relationship with her congregation and branch churches by becoming a denomination. The satisfying of her needs for security, belongingness and importance, as well as the further institutionalization of McPherson's ideology were also enhanced. The Social Intervention Model offers another way to describe the structural changes present in the new denomination based upon communication rather than on economics and social class.

SUMMARY

This chapter has discussed the process of initiating an institution through development of roles and relationships as demonstrated in McPherson's campaign period. It also discussed how those roles and relationships were prescribed by McPherson's particular ideology of the Foursquare Gospel. These were reinforced by McPherson's methodologies of preaching and practice of healing by laying on of hands and prayer.

The Chapter continued to discuss how the institution of McPherson's message and method became conventionalized in the customs and expectations of the crowds attending her Angelus Temple. There developed typical expectations for
her presence, performance, and presentation which could not be broken by even disconfirming information about her disappearance. McPherson was able to mask the anomalies for her congregants but could not effect the same kind of acceptance in the general public. It is argued that this created a security need that forced an ideological change in McPherson so that she further formalized her organization into a denomination and set out to expand its influence.

In the next chapter we will look at how the institutionalization process moves beyond the routinization of structure. Ideology is enacted into need and role relationships through McPherson's efforts to establish her ideology and expand her organization.
NOTES

1. "Milkpail to Pulpit" is available on audio cassette from Foursquare publications. The date this sermon was recorded is not included. It has been edited for radio re-broadcast.

2. Attending were Arch P. Collins of the Colorado Council, W. T. Millsaps, C. A. Beechum and S. H. Patterson of the Kansas Council of the Assemblies of God.

3. Ministers attending McPherson's Akron crusade included: F. O. Price, of Chicago; Harry Long, of Zion City, Illinois; George C. Brahman, of Chicago; T. K. Leonard, of Findley, Ohio; J. B. Gordon, of Elyria, A. B. Cox of Dayton; S. H. Lines, of Woodhull, N. Y.; B. White of Elkland, Pa.; M. S. Schrock of Tennessee, A.A. Deline of Grafts, W. V.; R. E. Erdman, of Buffalo, N. Y. In addition missionaries I. G. Shakly and H. M. Wright, of Sierra Leone, Africa; David Barth, of China; and Mr. and Mrs. M. I. Jacobs of India were in attendance.

4. "Fleshly Manifestations" refers to practicing Pentecostal-Charismatic gifts motivated out of the "flesh" the nature of mankind separated from God. Therefore, it is not considered by Pentecostals a legitimate operation of Spiritual gifts discussed in I Corinthians 12.

5. "Female Billy Sunday" was a newspaper description which McPherson did not appreciate because she disliked the term "female" and considered her ministry uniquely different from her peer Billy Sunday (Bridal Call Vol.2 No.12 [May, 1919]:12f).

6. Four-Square was spelled as two hyphenated words meaning "full gospel." In 1927 when McPherson incorporated her denomination the spelling was changed to Foursquare meaning her particular expression of Pentecostal Doctrine as a separate movement.

7. The "Four Square Gospel Association Covenant" was not printed in the Bridal Call. There is no reference for such a document in other literature and bibliographic sources. It apparently reflected her early doctrinal statements and writings in her magazine. These were consistent with other Pentecostals and with A. B. Simpson's "Four Fold Ministry of Christ (Dayton, 1987).
8. "As for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man, and the face of a lion, on the right side: and they four had the face of an ox on the left side; they four also had the face of an eagle. Thus were their faces:" Ezekiel 1:10-11a (K.J.V.)


10. However in 1888 A. B. Simpson was preaching and teaching about the Four Fold Gospel: Christ our Saviour, Sanctifier, Healer, and Coming Lord. See masthead *The Christian Alliance* Vol.1 No.5 (May 1888). A book *The Four Fold Gospel* was published 1925. It is still in print by Christian Missionary Alliance Church.


16. One such was *Aimee* by William Goyen and Worth Gardner performed by the Trinity Square Repertory Co. Dec. 26, 1973 to Jan. 4, 1974, New York City. Another was *Aimee!* by Patrick Young and Bob Ashley in 1981 (Horizon vol.24 No.7-8 [1981]:18), and *Sister Aimee* an Opera (Belsan J. Martinez, *Opera* Vol.35 No.8 [1984]:867).

17. "Disappearance of Aimee" was first Broadcast in the early 1970's over television. It is available on videotape. Aimee's own plans to make a film about her life was stopped by the crash of 1929. Lack of income caused her to stop plans for the film in which she was to star.

18. Although Sinclair Lewis took pains to disassociate the character of Sharon Falconer from McPherson. Richard Brooks' film version utilized McPherson's "Milkpail to Pulpit" costume of bonnet, calico dress and milkpail in the introductory scene for Sharon Falconer in the 1960 film starring Burt Lancaster and Jean Simmons.

19. In a recent television interview the editor of *People* magazine admitted that the current controversy over Jim and Tammy Bakker was responsible for selling a lot of copies of the magazine.

20. While there is not a date printed in the booklets cover photographs generally identify the period of time in which they were printed.
CHAPTER V

"EVERYBODY'S SISTER"

INTRODUCTION

Aimee Semple McPherson, "everybody's Sister," in the decade 1927 to 1937 dealt with issues of love and loyalty in her religious organization. Sentiment about her and her practices ran high and often to opposite extremes. One follower extolled her virtues in "A Birthday Tribute."

Always the same, be the skies gray or blue,
In sunshine or shadow, still smiling and true;
Much like the Master who walked among men,
Ever the weak and the poor to defend;
Everyone's Sister and everyone's friend.

Skillful and sweet, with a face like a flower,
Eyes fixed on Jesus, imbued with His power,
Marching on Home with a step firm and sure.
Proud for her Lord any trial to endure,
Leading an army of women and men;
Everyone's Sister, and everyone's friend.

Matchless evangelist, honored of God,
Countless the steps which her glad feet have trod, to
P-reach to the millions the true living God.
Hundreds of thousands have knelt at Christ's feet,
Each a soul-winner, with arms full of wheat.
Reverence and love and honor we owe our
Sister McPherson wherever we go.
Of mighty few persons could these words be penned:
"Nobody's enemy; everyone's friend." (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.5 [Oct. 1931]:4).

Many of her followers would have defined love towards McPherson as the Shepherd Silvanus from Shakespeare's "As
You Like It" defined love.

[Love] is to be all made of fantasy,
All made of passion and all made of wishes,
All adoration, duty, and observance,
All humbleness, all patience and impatience,
All purity, all trial, all observance; (Act V, Sc. II, 100-104).

The decade in question had begun with a lost leader having returned to the city as a welcomed "prince or potentate." (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 10 No. 1 [June 1926]: 3). McPherson's followers loved her. Through the ensuing "tribulation" resulting from press reports, investigations, and trials, the congregation stood firm. Angelus Temple was to them "The Fountainhead of the World's Greatest Revival Movement" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 10 No. 8 [Jan. 1927]: 18). The children sang together in affirmation of the congregation's love and loyalty, "We are McPherson's boys and girls, We are McPherson's boys and girls. The Bible is our textbook and we love it best of all, We are McPherson's boys and girls" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 10 No. 8 [Jan. 1927]: 22).

In the midst of trial, her establishment had been tested. The Temple had associated with it an established pattern of behavior and expectation enforced by peer expectation, as well as by direct enactment of authority from McPherson herself. The people had accepted an institutionalized standard. One Temple member expressed a world-view of uniformity among all of the branches of the Temple. Divergence of thought, practice, or behavior was not in the
rhetorical vision of the budding denomination.

No Temple member can go to a branch and feel a stranger, for all sing and pray and testify alike. The same joy radiates, the same loyalty abounds. All are one in the Spirit, all love the same Saviour. The standard of Foursquare preaching, salvation, healing, the Holy Spirit and Second Coming, keep all to whom it is preached on safe Scriptural ground. There is no chance for fanaticism and no room for the creeping death of coldness. As long as this Gospel is preached to the branches they remain miniature Angelus Temples, one in hope and doctrine; one in charity. (Alwyn Greenwalt, "One Heart--One Soul," Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.9 [Feb. 1927]:16-17).

The rhetorical vision not only espoused uniformity among existing branches, but it also foresaw a great in-rush of other congregations into the Association. Followers expected many more ministers and churches to apply for membership. McPherson and her board stood ready to welcome them into the fold (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.10 [April 1927]:21). In telling of McPherson's "Vindication Tour" in 1927 and a report to the convention at Angelus Temple in January, 1928, church officials voiced expectations of global impact.

In addition to the many branches definitely incorporated, there are still many other churches applying for affiliation and recognition. The work is extending on and on and on. The goal is the encircling of the world with this glorious Foursquare Gospel, and the establishment of Foursquare Lighthouses, not only in America and Canada, but throughout the whole world. Many churches have already applied and are urgently appealing that Sister McPherson should go and receive them into fellowship.

In response to these requests, Sister McPherson, who has not always been able to go
herself, has sent capable workers from the Temple, who have had great success in winning souls to Christ and establishing Lighthouses throughout the country (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.1 [Jan. 1928]:19).

McPherson stepped up the pace of her involvement in and development of her organization. It was reported in her Bridal Call magazine, "This is the impulse that characterizes the movements of Angelus Temple and Sister McPherson—revival campaigns in one place; work organized in other places; churches received into fellowship somewhere else; and through it all Angelus Temple with its progressive evangelistic program and multitudinous duties" (Vol.12 No.1 [June 1928]:10).

McPherson meant news. Reporters were regularly assigned the "Temple beat." The New York Times reported in 1930 that McPherson "has averaged a first page story in the Los Angeles newspapers three times a week for five years" (November 30, 1930:6). McPherson was "top-hole" news for most of the decade 1927-1937; daily events of her life were eagerly followed. She had top tabloid billing. The New York Times reported that stories on just one day intimated wild and contradictory stories.

...she had been spirited away in a coffin; was being held a prisoner in her own home; had signaled from a barred window a mysterious limousine driven by a Japanese chauffeur and had received a code reply.

...the pastor was to be married; she was dying; she had reduced too fast to meet the requirements of a movie contract; she was only resting; she was preparing to resume her platform
McPherson's Temple was news; the controversies that embroiled her were news. In reviewing McPherson's life, Plagenz noted that although her congregation was devoted to her and she was called "everybody's Sister," "Nevertheless, rebellion was always lurking just under the surface among the Temple hierarchy who were constantly coming and leaving in a steady stream" (Biography News Vol. 1 [Sept. 1974]: 1054).

There were a number of leaders who came and went in the Temple and in the organization, some quietly and others with great grievance. But ideology and movements do not develop without challenges to their status quo (Brown, 1978). McPherson's challengers did her a service in the institutionalizing process by further defining expectations and setting the boundaries of legend about the leader of the Foursquare movement. It is those challenges I now examine.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND EXPECTATION

THE CHALLENGE OF LIFESTYLE

Aimee Semple McPherson and the organization of Angelus Temple survived the threat arising from her disappearance and sudden return. The Temple was going strong and attendance had multiplied. One person at the center of the celebration and responsible for the music program at Angelus Temple was Gladwyn Nichols. Nichols and his wife had been
in attendance at Glad Tidings Tabernacle (San Francisco) in 1919 when McPherson had begun her campaign to establish a permanent place of ministry (Steele 1970:36). He had later become an assistant pastor and musical director at Angelus Temple.

Music at the Temple was not typical Pentecostal fare. When the crowds arrived early, in order to obtain seating, they were entertained by the band playing popular, patriotic, and religious tunes (Bissell, 1928:126; Goben, 1932:5-6). Usually Pentecostals had utilized strictly the old revivalistic hymns and songs from the previous revivalistic periods (Larson, 1987:16-17). Indeed, this is illustrated in McPherson's early hymnals (1947). The emphasis was on doctrinal issues, praise, and conformity to the Pentecostal interpretation of revivalistic themes (Hustad, 1987:7-10). Usually organization and formality were shunned. Duncan, in describing Pentecostal hymnology, noted the contrast to other churches.

Formality was anathema and was to be avoided at all costs. Informality, participation, spontaneity and emotional display were highly valued and indeed, encouraged. The public display of uninhibited religious emotion was striking in contrast to the sophisticated liturgy of the established churches (Duncan, 1987:11).

Later, while maintaining belief in less formality, more participation by all, and openness to spontaneity, McPherson's services moderated emotional display. The purpose
presented by McPherson and Nichols was that people be saved. The function of the Temple Choir and the Temple Symphonic Band was to facilitate this purpose and to give congregants with musical gifts an opportunity to utilize them in the service of the Lord. Nichols was proud of his accomplishment with the Music Department. It was not typically Pentecostal and he desired that it be world renowned. He reported at the 1927 Convention that the music department was "the medium in God's hands" to interpret the greatest sacred music.

The Angelus Temple Choir rehearses night after night some of the most difficult and yet the most beautiful sacred masterpieces by Bock [sic], Beethoven and Gounod, not only with technical proficiency, but with a wonderful spiritual insight and fervor which is so little known even in the sacred musical field of the day.

The same is true of the band which is being recognized everywhere as almost more of a symphony orchestra than a band, having lost all semblance and sign of a brassic quality known to many military bands.

Angelus Temple is known as the greatest revival center, and our ideal is that even so the Angelus Temple musical organizations will be known the world over in the coming years as being all that is synonymous—the greatest in sacred music (Nichols, "The Ministry of Music" Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.8 [Jan. 1927]:24).

McPherson wanted the best. Like a great stage or screen director, she commanded loyalty and expected the service to proceed according to her specific directions. Bissell reports that she was in total command of the speaking situation, controlling the crowds not only with lively and interesting fare but by force of rule. He reportd
McPherson began her message by establishing control over the movement of the congregation.

We have a rule in the Temple that no one shall leave during the sermon, under any circumstance. I become utterly helpless if there is any motion before me. No one must stir. The ushers will enforce this, please (quoted by Bissell, 1928: 127).

The congregation gave allegiance to this spiritual general who gave the audience what it wanted by making its old beliefs exciting and by making those beliefs fit society in general. Critics, such as Worthington, noted that without her audience, McPherson would be nothing and because she arose from their midst, she could both meet their expectations and give them the mystery that made religion exciting (Worthington, 1929:550). The New York Times reported that the controversy surrounding McPherson "vastly stimulated" the loyalty of her congregants (January 2, 1927:II,4).

McPherson apparently came to relish controversy. In 1929 when the British press was negative about her entering the country and conducting services, she remarked, "Well, Thank the Lord, for all this advertising to help us get the Old Time Story out to the world" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.8 [Jan. 1929]:19). On her "Vindication Tour" in 1927, McPherson began changes that reflected her awareness of the general culture but that to some of her followers raised the question of "worldliness."

"Worldliness" refers to the Christian ideology that the
believer had not separated enough from the surrounding culture. Traditionally, in the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements, it had meant simplicity in dress, often a ban on jewelry, long sleeves and skirts on dresses, as well as long hair for women. It also precluded behaviors involving diversions from novels, movies, theatres, card playing, dancing, and use of tobacco and alcohol. These McPherson had herself rejected in her youth, as a convert.

I began enumerating the many things which I would have to give up in order to become a Christian—there was dancing. I was willing to part with that,--the novels, the theatre, my worldly instrumental music. I asked myself about each of them and found that I did not count them dear as compared with the joy of salvation and knowing my sins forgiven (McPherson, 1919:41).

Over the years, however, and particularly after the 1926 turmoil, her attitude moderated. No longer was McPherson "culturally rejecting," as were many Pentecostals but rather "cultural affirming" (Niebuhr, 1951). This change was reflected in McPherson's dress, her hair style, and the freedom she felt to carry her message into brothels and speakeasies. Although she did not participate in activities in the clubs and saloons, her presence there made some uneasy about the direction of her behavior. Gladwyn Nichols was one of these.

Because situations at the Temple had demanded McPherson's attention while she was on her "Vindication Tour," Gladwyn Nichols was commissioned by McPherson's mother to go
meet McPherson and convince her to return. The people wanted her back. He was present in New York when McPherson took a tour of local nightclubs, including Texas Guinan's Three Hundred Club early one morning. Guinan convinced McPherson to take the center of the dance floor and preach to the staff and guests. After the sermon, Guinan called out, "This is a woman I admire. She has the courage of her convictions. Give this little woman a good hand." The guests obliged and Guinan promised that she and those she could induce to do so would attend McPherson's meetings at Glad Tidings Tabernacle in New York (New York Times [Feb.19, 1927]:7). McPherson repeated the experience in Chicago and expressed her evaluation.

I saw Chicago's night life—its fearful vistas of broken hearts, wasted bodies, and lost souls. I saw the temptations that young girls face: the gorgeous settings, bright lights, liltting music and the beautiful women and their lovely clothes. I believe that to preach intelligently one must see how the city lives.

I seemed to see, as in a dream, behind the tarnished thrillseekers our white clad Bible School girls and smiling faces doing the work of God. How weary the others looked in contrast; how different their faces were. In those of the white clad figures beamed the smile of the builders of eternity, not the frozen professional smile that hides an aching heart (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.11 No.2 [July 1927]:25).

But Nichols had not accepted McPherson's version. He returned to Los Angeles without her. Immediately, he began to speak of his objections with the band and the choir (Steele, 1970:66-67). Rumblings were reaching troublesome
proportions; McPherson was forced to leave early a tent crusade in Alton, Illinois, because of the controversy. McPherson discovered, "a small group with secret ambitions had started to foment disloyalty." McPherson requested Nichols' resignation for "disloyalty to the Four-Square Gospel and to me" (Mavity, 1931:327). Nichols claimed that the request for the resignation arose out of his failure to have the band and choir stand and applaud McPherson's entrance down the ramp to the pulpit. Mavity identified this as an commission of Lèse majesté (Mavity, 1931:327).

Gladwyn Nichols, the band, the choir, and three hundred members of the Temple left to form the "Church of Philadelphia," the church of brotherly love. He reported that their actions had been calculated to induce McPherson to return to a "more respectable" form of dress and decorum.

Our action was taken in the hope that we could persuade Sister McPherson to walk in the spirit of the Lord and not devote her life to a thing of steel and concrete. We were dissatisfied with the condition of affairs spiritually in the Temple (quoted by Mavity, 1931:328).

The specified infractions of "worldliness" involved not only McPherson's dress, her hair, and her visits to nightclubs but also scandal surrounding her secret expenditure and hoarding of money (Steele, 1970:75; Mavity, 1931:328). The Nichols protest did not last; at least twenty-five percent had returned to the Temple by May 17, 1927 (Mavity, 1931:328). For those who remained with Nichols, the protest
was a matter of conscience and Biblical principle. In an open letter to McPherson published in the *Los Angeles Times*, Nichols specified five reasons for the departure.

1. McPherson was not in "good report with those without," as specified in I Timothy 3:7,4 because of the recent trial.

2. In the administration of finances at the Temple, the members had no voice.

3. McPherson "transgressed the rules of the church" on not entering a theatre or other worldly place of amusement.

4. In her changes in dress from cotton to silk, in bobbing her hair, and in seeking publicity, McPherson had contradicted her own statements about long hair being a necessity as "a covering" so she could preach. And:

5. When Gladwyn Nichols warned McPherson about her behavior, he was "met with a sneering rebuff." (Los Angeles Times [July 24, 1927], quoted by Mavity, 1931: 333-335).

McPherson trumped the challenge by a power-through-communication move of threatening to resign as pastor of Angelus Temple, leaving a vacuum and collapsing the power structure. The Board, representing the congregation, was expected to approve carte blanche McPherson's past, present, and future conduct, or she would resign. She demanded a ballot on three issues.

1. Did I do right in obtaining dismissal of my case?

2. Did I do right in making this tour and taking Ralph Jordan as manager?

3. Will it be right to go on tour again and take him along? (quoted by Steele, 1970:74).
There were only two dissenters. One had written, "I don't know." the other had said, "Yes, if others go along" (quoted by Steele, 1970:74). McPherson was not finished with establishing her authority and testing loyalty. She went to the Bible College and put it to the four hundred students and inquired, should she resign. The response—"Never! Never! We are with you foursquare!" (quoted by Steele, 1970:76). McPherson thus re-established her power, confirmed her version of Pentecostal ideology, and fulfilled her needs for self-affirmation and control of the movement.

Prior to 1926, McPherson had been controlled by her mother. She reportedly received only twenty-five dollars a week spending money. Her needs for fulfillment and for achievement meant that she needed control over her sense of person. In addition to the maternalism, she lived with in the parsonage, McPherson was facing an increasingly grandiose role definition from her congregation in her institutionalization as the epitome of the Temple and the Four-square Gospel. Changes in her needs contributed to modifications in her ideology from traditional Pentecostal evaluations of dress and deportment as well as in the demand for greater power shares in the relationships around her.

Since 1920, McPherson had taken a stance regarding Pentecostal practices different from the practice of other ministers (cf. p. 126-127). This raised the question of her
allegiance to the tenets of the Pentecostal rhetorical vision ("Is Aimee Semple McPherson Pentecostal?" Bridal Call Vol.6 No.5 [Oct. 1922]:7,9-13). It also raised the question of her motives for her actions (McPherson-Bell letters, Jan.-Mar. 1922). McPherson, however, was operating out of a modified Pentecostal world-view. In the later 1920s she had further diverged from the traditional stance of being "against culture" to one of utilizing culture as a message carrier. This was a major ideological change. Bach, in They Have Found a Faith, suggests that McPherson had found a formula that reached the public with a message packaged to be acceptable to the American mind.

[McPherson] capitalized on what had already taken hold of the American mind. She kept her finger on the public pulse. She took the popular trappings of the secular world and draped them around the cross (Bach,1946:60).

Most of her constituency saw no conflict in her methods of cultural affirmation. They agreed that one could do certain things for "right reasons." Her people reaffirmed their allegiance to McPherson and her methods and found it easy to adjust their ideology in order to accept the methods they observed her utilize so successfully. One pastor from Seattle lauded her shortly after the Nichols defection.

But in the final scene of the drama God has raised up and appointed a woman as the outstanding leader of the Spirit filled messengers who are to prepare the hearts of the people for the coming of the Bridegroom and King.5

That woman is Aimee Semple McPherson (A.L. Knudsen, Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.2 [Feb.
Important to the understanding of the change in McPherson's ideology is the recognition that while McPherson discarded some of the trappings of the early Holiness and Pentecostal revivals, she retained certain essential prohibitions for living the Christian lifestyle. In her creed, The Declaration of Faith, however, behavioral expectations were stated in a positive fashion. It was not a list of prohibitions of how not to live but affirmations of how to live the Christian life. She described the daily Christian life.

We believe that having been cleansed by the precious blood of Jesus Christ and having received the witness of the Holy Spirit at conversion, it is the will of God that we be sanctified daily and become partakers of His holiness; growing constantly stronger in faith, power, prayer, love and service, first as babies desiring the sincere milk of the Word; then as dear children walking humbly, seeking diligently the hidden life, where self decreases and Christ increases; then as strong men having on the whole armour of God marching forth to new conquests in His name beneath His blood-stained banner, ever living a patient, sober, unselfish, godly life that will be a true reflection of the Christ within (Declaration of Faith, nd:14 cf also "The Spirit Filled Life":18; and "Moderation," :20).

Not only did McPherson's search for fulfillment and achievement change the ideology but as side effect also changed the power structure. The writers and editors of the Bridal Call were quick to justify and mask any anomalies that might be published in the secular press. They justified the modifications in McPherson's behavior and theology.
by appealing to the loneliness of her position as leader. This re-established and confirmed power relationship and masked any "enigmas" to the membership.

[McPherson's] life is the typically lonely one of a leader. Surrounded by thousands who love her and would willingly make any sacrifice to spare her any suffering or any worry, yet she had had to go through alone as God has led.

Perhaps it is the price of leadership. Perhaps it is that if there were more capable of understanding the heart of a leader, there would be more leaders in the world; for the great leaders of the world have ever been enigmas to those above whom they have towered head and shoulders (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.14 No.5 [Oct. 1930]:20).

The charges of "worldliness" had little effect on the masses of people attending the Temple. To the loyal it was only another confirmation of the persecution of their godly leader. Rather than detracting from her power and authority, the challenge only confirmed it. The next year the elders, workers, and members in a birthday tribute joined together in proclaiming their allegiance to their leader. They confirmed her role as pastor and leader of the Temple and church.

We have seen her stand humbly and quietly, yet firmly, for the cause of Christ in the midst of the most terrific fires of persecution; and have seen her come out, like the Hebrew children of old, without the "smell of burning" upon the garments of her consecrated life.

We have stood shoulder to shoulder with her, and have thrilled to realize that, indeed, this is the work of God, or else it would not draw the fire of persecution, nor would it stand untouched in the midst of them, were it not founded upon the Solid Rock (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.5
McPherson counted Nichols an enemy; yet, his challenge only strengthened her association with the audience at the Temple. The challenge gave her an opportunity to rename "worldliness" as an evangelistic means to reach those outside of the Church and normal evangelistic channels. It gave her opportunity to teach her people methods of meeting her needs for feelings of security, self-worth, and taught them that to maintain communication with her that they had to accept the wisdom of her acts, although they appeared to challenge some of the old patterns of the revivalistic movement.

In identifying her needs for security—control over her finances, for self-worth—ability to choose more modern and flattering attire and hair style, and fulfillment—reaching into areas previously unexplored evangelistically, McPherson also effected her power relationships and her ideology. In relation to power, McPherson established her place at the pinnacle of the hierarchical relationship, the "rightness" of her actions, and her indispensable nature to the operation of the Temple, the School, and the Foursquare movement. In relationship to ideology, McPherson established and routinized her future methods of evangelism and conduct, and identified those who could function in her absence as those "loyal" to her and the Foursquare Gospel as she had further specified its nature to the culture at large.
Karl Barth taught that in preaching the Gospel, a sense of mission, not an attitude of special privilege should control the minister. The minister should be a servant (Barth: 1963:50). John Goben came to question whether Aimee Semple McPherson was behaving like a servant or whether she had baser motives for her operation of Angelus Temple. It had not always been so; he had once been an enthusiastic supporter and emissary.

John Goben had joined the Temple staff in 1927. He had been drafted by McPherson while on her "Vindication Tour" at Des Moines, Iowa. Goben had already been a leader in the Pentecostal movement. He had been saved at a Pentecostal revival in his hometown of Lucas, Iowa in 1908, and in 1910 had attended Opperman Bible School in Joplin, Missouri (Mitchell, 1982:116).

Goben quickly came to the forefront of organizational development in the Pentecostal movement. In 1913, he was among a list of three hundred and fifty-two persons ordained by the Church of God in Christ (Brumback, 1977:4-5). When these later seceded to form the Council of the Assemblies of God, he was among the officers. Goben was the first chairman of the Council for Iowa and North Missouri, a position he held for seven years from 1914 to 1921 (Mitchell, 1982:117). During the next five years, Goben tra-
veled as an independent evangelist; it was during this period that his path first crossed that of Aimee Semple McPherson (Mitchell, 1982:124).

In 1926, while McPherson disappeared, Goben was starting a church in Des Moines, Iowa, "The Des Moines Gospel Tabernacle." While Goben had been among those whites accepted by the black organization, Church of God in Christ, and also among the first leaders of the Assemblies of God, he had structured his Tabernacle as independent. But when McPherson came to Des Moines in 1927 on her "Vindication Tour," he sponsored the meeting. Because of his enthusiasm and the response of his church, McPherson extended an invitation to him to begin the new "Foursquare Gospel Lighthouse Movement" (Mitchell, 1982:125-126).

Goben entered into the project enthusiastically. He efficiently induced many independent churches to join the movement. The movement was officially launched at the Fifth Convention at Angelus Temple in January, 1928, and Goben addressed the ministers and lay people gathered as the new Field Superintendent for the Foursquare Gospel Lighthouses (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.1 [Jan. 1928]:22).

The "Lighthouse Movement" carried the nautical theme throughout (Figure 6). Not only did the churches affix the name Lighthouse (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.13 No.3 [Aug. 1929]:33), but some built a lighthouse type tower as part of the structure of the church or a sign of that shape (Mit-
chell, 1982: photo following 192). There was even consideration of tearing down Angelus Temple Parsonage and building a fourteen story lighthouse shaped tower and apartment building adjacent to the Temple and Bible College (Steele, 1970:91). The nautical theme was also carried over in uniforms and titles. The "Salvation Navy" was complete with Navy style uniforms, "Gospel Cars" made from boats and set on Ford chassis (Steele, 1970:photo, 94). McPherson was to be the Admiral patterned after the Salvation Army from which she had come (Steele, 1970:91-94). The uniforms and ranks were short lived, because the U. S. Navy complained that the uniforms were too much like official naval uniforms; further, staff of the Temple could not agree on ranks (Steele, 1970:92-93).

Despite the fact that the uniforms and ranks were short lived, and the fourteen-story lighthouse was never built, Goben was successful in building the organization. In only seven months, Goben reported his successes.

In the past seven months our records show that 148 churches have become officially affiliated with the Lighthouse Movement. Some of this number were branch churches of Angelus Temple previous to the inauguration of the Lighthouse Movement; others new churches which have affiliated with us (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.5 [Oct. 1928]:28).

Churches affiliated with Lighthouse Movement and were found in the states or provinces of Arkansas, California, Colorado, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Idaho, Florida,
Georgia, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Texas, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, Ontario, British Columbia and Saskatoon (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.5 [Oct. 1928]:28). There were also 9 missionaries in six other countries and the rhetorical vision promised to carry the Foursquare Gospel around the world (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.5 [Oct. 1928]:28).

Goben was proud of the organization he was overseeing. He liked the plan that allowed the churches to retain their property and yet be affiliated with this new movement. He was scrupulous about appearances. He described the functioning to the readers of the Bridal Call.

The Foursquare Gospel Lighthouse Movement at headquarters is represented by seven directors, who are elected by delegates from the churches at the Annual Convention. This Board of Directors convenes monthly to interview and approve missionaries who are going into foreign fields, approve all bills and authorize payment of same. All funds of the Foursquare Gospel World-wide Mission Fund are handled through and banked by my office. All checks are written in my office and countersigned by myself. Our books are open for inspection by anyone who is interested in what we are doing for the Lord (Vol.12 No.5 [Oct. 1928]:28).

Further, the expectation was that George Jefferies, of England, would lead one hundred churches to join the movement and that ninety churches in Australia and ninety-four "Mexican" churches in southern Texas were ready to join. The local pastors were becoming enthusiastic as the rhetorical vision chained out (Willard H. Pope, "The Foursquare
Expectations were high and so also was the sense of unity. The Temple was likened to a beehive in organization, cooperation, and unity of purpose. The harmonious effort demonstrated "loyalty to a single cause and the supply of spiritual accomplishment piled like well stored honey, tier upon tier" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No. 8 [Jan. 1929]:5). The future looked promising. The Sixth Convention demonstrated the success of the Lighthouse Movement.

Although much business was transacted during this convention, the by-laws were revised, the cords lengthened, the stakes set further out in order to give room for the sudden and rapid growth of the church, the said business did not interfere with the spirit of the gathering. Not a ripple marred the services--perfect love and fellowship attended by a downpouring of the Spirit of God characterized the whole Convention (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No. 9 [Feb. 1929]:12).

The movement was two hundred churches stronger, largely through the efforts of John Goben as Field Superintendent (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.10 [Mar. 1929]:17). He worked tirelessly to build the movement. During the summer, John Goben was among the group that spent fifteen days with McPherson at a campaign in Masonic Auditorium at Detroit. Homer Rodeheaver was the song evangelist and G. F. Fink the host pastor. Out of the meetings, fifteen new Lighthouses were started (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.13 No.3 [Aug. 1929]:4-8).

But the harmony expressed at the January convention did
not last the year. Questions related to the Detroit campaign arose in Goben's mind when there was a deficit of nine hundred dollars left for the church to pay, as well as unpaid personal expenses from McPherson's hotel stay for beauty shop and pitchers of orange juice. The churches deemed this luxurious expenditure (*New York Times* [Oct. 12, 1929]:40). Goben reported a discrepancy between the amount of the "love offering" offered for McPherson's services and the amount she told the crowd she had received (Steele, 1970:139). Goben had mounting suspicions about McPherson's financial practices.

At the root of Goben's complaint were two differing models of church organization. McPherson's model had been likened to a business, usually negatively as did Goben. Rev. R. J. Hall of Swansen England considered McPherson, "a typical booster who has turned religion into a business" (*New York Times* [Oct. 3, 1928]:32). It is true, she utilized business structures in her organization when as she spoke of "subsidiary branches" and of the churches in the Foursquare Gospel Lighthouse "chain" (*Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.6* [Nov. 1928]:31). Indeed, the business-like structure of the denomination's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws (1988) still reflect a business model rather than "Discipline" or "Manual" or "Confessions" of other older church organizations.
Bach evaluated this model in a positive fashion. "Little did the public realize how hard this beautiful woman worked. She personally organized and managed her congregation as if it were a business enterprise," (1946:67). The entrance into this arena of business was through McPherson's evangelistic enterprise, and the progressive growth created layers of corporations to cope with that development. She began with "Bridal Call Publishing," then moved to "Echo Park Evangelistic Association." Held in conjunction by McPherson, this second corporation was parent to "Angelus Temple," and music publishing. She then began the "Four-square Gospel Lighthouse, Inc." and finally reorganized it into the "International Church of Foursquare Gospel," in which she was the chief officer. The complaint of critics about her wealth and nature of the church stemmed from these layered corporations, of which she was the primary owner and officer. During the developmental period, the people began to expect the "evangelistic association" to act like a church. The Temple then began to function to meet needs other than evangelistic. In the minds of the people, they were joining the church, however, records show that the Temple was legally held in McPherson's name. McPherson claimed that the property would always be used for religious purposes.

There have been erected these beautiful buildings and these three great corporations have been set in order. A religious organization has
been formed which has served, assisted and minis-
tered unto thousands. My time, my strength, my
personal love offerings and my very life have all
been poured into the work. For myself I have
asked no personal remuneration; and, at the close
of these twenty years, have received none except-
ing the love of thousands who have been helped.

People say that thousands of dollars have
come into my hands. It has--and it is all repre-
sented in Angelus Temple, the Bible School and
their appurtenances which are valued at one and
one-half million dollars, and which stand in the
name of the Echo Park Evangelistic Association to
be used for religious purposes forever (McPherson,
"Preamble to the Articles of Incorporation of the
Church of the Foursquare Gospel," [July 31,
1928]:4).

On the other hand, John Goben understood "church" in
terms of his experience. He held to local church autonomy
and self-determination. His financial concepts were con-
trolled by a different theology of church operation. He
considered his way to be "Bible Order," in accordance with I
Corinthians 14:40 "everything is to be done decently and in
order" (Brumback, 1977:9-11). Goben did not consider the
events at Detroit nor the discrepancies in the books at the
Temple to reflect that kind of church government. When he
discovered secret accounts in the names of "Ruth and Eliza-
beth Johnson" through which Temple funds had passed by the
thousands, he questioned the integrity of McPherson and of
Ralph Jordon, who had access to the funds (Goben, 1932:22-
23).

The final break came when Jordon came to Goben insist-
ing that the government of the Foursquare Gospel Lighthouses
was wrong and that "Mrs. McPherson should have power to
appoint all her boards and ministers, and that all properties of the organization be deeded to her" (Goben, 1932:33). The switch from local autonomy to central control, in which the churches no longer owned their own property, had a right to choose their own minister and govern local affairs was intolerable. Goben had led nearly five hundred churches into the Lighthouse Movement and felt that this change was a blow to his personal character and the promises he had made to the associating churches (Goben, 1932:32-33). Mitchell (1982) also discusses the importance of the question of church government and ownership was to the Churches that left to form Open Bible (See pages 237ff below).

Goben left the movement and a number of churches defected with him, apparently to be independent again. The fifteen churches in Michigan had departed over the Detroit incident. Others named as defecting included, El Monte, Hollywood, Pomona, Lomita, Santa Ana, Pasadena, Whittier, Hyde Park, Bell, Corona, Stockton, Oakland, Long Beach and Huntington Hills in California and Bremerton, Washington (Mavity, 1931:335-336; Steele, 1970:145).

Goben's accusations led to a grand jury investigation. But when auditors attempted to confirm the issues, they found the books in such a state that the cost in time and effort to investigate any wrongdoing could not be justified. McPherson was vindicated by default (Steele, 1970:147-152).
However, the Internal Revenue Service found that she had not included as income amounts which the I.R.S. claimed raised her stated income of $18,668 to $107,395. The money had been raised as a defense fund and had gone to lawyers. The New York Times confirmed that the I.R.S. found evidence that McPherson was using the Johnson account. It reported the results in June 1931. The amount added to McPherson's 1928 income included a payment of $38,871 on a life insurance policy for her by the Echo Park Evangelist Association, $12,000 in cashier's checks drawn from a Los Angeles bank account maintained by "Elizabeth Johnson," and profits from real estate transactions (New York Times [June 25, 1931]:19).

Clearly, there was a clash between McPherson's accounting policy and Goben's open-book policy. McPherson had long held that any money that was donated was donated to her and that she had the right to do with it as she would ("My Journey Log," Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.10 No.2 [July 1926]:11). In McPherson's need to pay for her legal fees and need to feel free to enjoy some of the benefits of life, she felt the use of the money justified. To McPherson her use of money was her private life, not open for public scrutiny.

By the Seventh Convention, Goben was gone and as the ministers and lay people from around the country gathered, McPherson interpreted her situation as their situation and
offered them spiritual rejuvenation while at the same time, increasing their admiration for her spiritual aptitude. McPherson described her actions at the convention to the Bridal Call Foursquare readers.

When the time came for me to preach, I stood up and opened my Bible, but as I stood there before my pulpit the Master seemed to whisper in my soul: "Ask those people out there before you if there are hungry and discouraged ministers and evangelists and delegates in the Convention who, like vessels, have emptied themselves out again and again during the past year. Ask them if they would like to come forward and kneel at the altar and be filled anew."

....Thirsty! Hungry! These blessed children of the King! Day after day they had poured out the message, until they were parched, empty, sorely in need of the Living Waters from the Eternal Fountain.

"Lay your hands on them and pray," was again whispered by that dear inner Voice within my soul (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.13 No.8 [Jan. 1930]:21).

Goben claimed that while he had been Field Superintendent, about five hundred new branch churches had joined the association (Goben, 1932:32). The convention report, however, reported only 216 churches in the United States and Canada--fifty-five additional from the previous convention (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.14 no.8 [Jan. 1931]:30). It is unclear exactly how many churches withdrew but counting the churches that Goben had anticipated would join the association most of these churches simply did not follow through and join because of the changes regarding government of property (See page 224 above). At any rate, the defection
was absorbed and McPherson defended. Charles A. Shreve, who had been associated with McPherson's ministry since 1920, wrote a tribute emphasizing God's hand upon McPherson as measured by the results; people converted, baptized in the Spirit, people healed, and churches developed (Shreve, "God's Handmaiden in the Harvest Field," Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.3 [Aug. 1931]:16-17).

McPherson's need for loyalty was reaffirmed. Loyalty was maintained as a prime response to her and her organizational creation. In order to be a part of her organization, one must be loyal to McPherson. This focus on organizational loyalty necessitated adjustment of the movement's ideology. Under the banner of "Stability, Solidity, and Sincerity" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.13 No. 9 [Feb. 1930]:20), the Seventh Convention saw the change of the Foursquare Lighthouse Movement to The International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. It specified qualifications for ministers to have had attended McPherson's school, that evangelists had to be registered and accredited, that missions would be centrally funded, that the Board would appoint pastors annually, and that the movement would publish its own literature, including Sunday School literature. In addition, there was a provision which might be called "the Goben provision" dealing with reinstatement of ministers.

Resolved, that any minister or worker withdrawing or being dismissed from the Foursquare Gospel ministry for disloyalty, who desires to be
reinstated, shall surrender his ordination certificate to the Board of Trustees of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel and shall make restitution by public and written confession, and upon the recommendation of said Board of Trustees shall be licensed for a period of one year before being reinstated. After this period he may be re-ordained (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.13 No.9 [Feb. 1930]:21).

To complete the ideological changes and to set the stage for power share maintainence, McPherson even wrote a chorus.

Stability, when hot the battles waging;
Solidity, when billows 'round are raging;
Sincerity, in all I do or say;
Foursquare Gospel, this I pledge to thee today!
Amen! (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.13 No.9 [Feb. 1930]:21).

Power was confirmed in the imagery of McPherson at the "Helm of the Good Ship Foursquare." In an article of that title, there were five justifications that "bespeak the presence of the Lord God in the midst at Angelus Temple--and Sister is at the helm" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.7 [Dec. 1931]:21).

The five summarized justifications of McPherson included, (1) the Foursquare leader continued to carry on the work of the Lord, despite all the fury of the enemy; (2) All activity in the various departments show "the work and the blessing of this great institution of God's own planning;" (3) Every Sunday over five thousand people gather to worship at each of the main services; (4) The Spirit-inspired messages from "the burning heart of Sister;"
and (5) The miraculous healing of the hopelessly sick and afflicted. All proved the "Godliness" of Aimee Semple McPherson to her constituency (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.7 [Dec. 1931]:21).

Goben challenged McPherson and questioned the structure of the church. The choice that McPherson and her denomination made was the opposite of what he advised and would cause further problems to which I will turn in the next section. While McPherson's choice may be disputed considering that the two parties were defining the nature of the church differently, the conflict did make a choice necessary and did further shape the ideology and power structure of the developing institution.
THE CHALLENGE OF PRINCIPLE

Bormann argues in the presentation of his method of rhetorical investigation, that "Individuals in rhetorical transactions create subjective worlds of common expectations and meanings" (Bormann, 1972:400). The commonly presented image by McPherson and her church was the Foursquare Gospel as the epitome of God's movement on earth. Wildman wrote in "How To Be a Foursquare Member," "I do not know a church in the world that is nearer to God's pattern and program than the Foursquare" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.6 [Nov. 1931]:9).

By the Eighth Annual Convention, McPherson had divided her church into twelve different districts. The districts included: Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, overseen by Harold Jefferies; Wyoming, South Dakota, and Montana, overseen by D. W. McCullough; Iowa and Minnesota, overseen by John R. Richey; Canada, overseen by Mrs. Anna D. Britton; Michigan, overseen by R. J. Turner; North Dakota, overseen by Howard D. Ray; Wisconsin and Illinois, overseen by Sidney Correll; Northern California, overseen by William E. Opie; Texas and Oklahoma, overseen by A. C. Wegner; Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York, overseen by Bert W. Bruffet; Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri, overseen by Frank A Cummings; and Colorado, overseen by Herman D. Mitzner (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.14 No.9 [Feb. 1931]:18-21, 32-33).

The theme for the Eighth Convention was "Forge Forward,
Foursquare." The district supervisors charged the convention with the duty and need for the church to remain true to its vision. Bert Bruffett challenged the convention to continuing the Foursquare Gospel.

In times past, as we have watched other movements, and read the history of their founders, we find that in many cases the workers who followed lost the original vision, and departed from the message. It seems to me that this is one of the things that we as workers for God today must guard against (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.14 No.9 [Feb. 1931]:17).

The sentiment of the conventionaires seemed unanimous. Sidney Correll echoed Bruffett, "We stand Foursquare now and forever, loyal to the Gospel we preach, and to Aimee Semple McPherson, our leader, who has made all this possible because she had been true to her God" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.14 No.9 [Feb. 1931]:21).

John Richey's statement was, in the final analysis, the most prophetic.

The new year--1931--lies ahead now. We do not know what it holds for us; it is as yet unexplored; but I do feel that as we enter its portals we can have the assurance of Jesus Christ through the mighty power of the holy Spirit (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.14 No.9 [Feb. 1931]:16).

1931 marked changes in McPherson's personal life which effected organizational changes in her movement. McPherson's children and mother were married within a few short weeks (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.14 No.11 [Apr. 1931]:14; Vol.14 No.12 [May 1931]:18-19; Vol.15 No.3 [Aug. 1931]:11).
McPherson was left alone in her parsonage. Life seemed reduced to a public figure walking between buildings and the contrast of crowds in excess of five thousand and a house with no one, save herself present. There was a need to satisfy the feeling of loneliness that had become her lot.

On September 13, 1931, McPherson married David L. Hutton at 6:00 a.m. after a quick flight to Yuma, Arizona (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.5 [Oct. 1931]:16; New York Times [Sept. 14, 1931]:1). McPherson explained to her readers.

> While in the midst of the great meetings and my constant work on that beautiful sacred opera, "The Iron Furnace," which the Lord gave to me over a year ago, he set a love into my heart. It was a different love—a love for one and in one about whom God spoke to me as being the person to help me as a companion in this stupendous Gospel work. For the past sixteen years I had been traveling alone. I had been very engrossed in my work, but I was lonely (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.5 [Oct. 1931]:2)

It must be remembered that divorce and remarriage was, and remains, a sensitive issue among conservative Christians, including Pentecostals. From the beginning of the movement, it was generally taught that divorce and remarriage was a breach of "plain Bible doctrine" ("Bible Teaching on Marriage and Divorce," The Apostolic Faith Vol.1 No.5 [Jan. 1907]:3). In examining the doctrinal works of Pentecostalism, one finds this subject among the ongoing important concerns explored by Pentecostal writers and theologians (Jones, 1983). It was a rhetorical situation of
non-acceptance by her people that McPherson entered when she married David Hutton.

If the elders and leaders of the Temple had any doubts about this marriage, they did not express it. Doubt and anxiety would be expected from the Temple and denominational leadership because a minister's divorce and remarriage was generally unacceptable in the Pentecostal world-view. McPherson herself held divorce to be a very serious matter and that it should be avoided if at all possible (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.11 No.1 [June 1927]:6). But in spite of their prior beliefs, the elders affirmed the choice.


We elders approve Sister's choice. It has been a great responsibility to care for Sister and we are glad now that it is shared by so fine a young man as Mr. Hutton. We are sure he will be a real helpmate for our own dear Sister (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.5 [Oct. 1931]:17).

Dr. B. F. Gruden, assistant pastor and Chairman of the Missionary Cabinet, told a ministerial group the value of the marriage to the movement.

I believe Sister McPherson's wedding is the greatest thing that has ever happened in the Foursquare Movement. We believe that she has a wonderful gentleman and that he is going to be a great help to her in God's work (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.5 [Oct. 1931]:29).

Dr. Charles A Shreve, former pastor of a Methodist church in Washington D. C., who had become one of McPher-
son's assistant pastors, felt that McPherson's marriage to Hutton would aid her in fulfilling "God's plan" to set the Bible to music. He saw a great opportunity for Hutton to aid McPherson in spreading the Gospel message (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.5 [Oct. 1931]:17).

Harriet Jordon, Dean of L.I.F.E. Bible College, who had performed the Hutton-McPherson ceremony also expressed hope in the union.

I am glad Sister has taken this step. It is the most wonderful flight for the Foursquare Gospel. We are going out to a greater launching a greater extension than ever before, because Sister has a strong helper. It is going to mean much to the Foursquare Gospel (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.5 [Oct. 1931]:28).

Almost immediately the couple were at work. The wedding was set early so McPherson would not have to miss a service. In October, the couple went to Boston to hold a revival. While there, McPherson said that her marriage was based on "friendship, love and evangelical work" (New York Times [Oct. 9, 1931]:25). Matters seemed to be going as planned. The McPherson-Hutton team was praised by the church for its success.

Brother Hutton is faithfully co-operating with the singing and musical programs and together their messages in song and sermon, with their impressive illustrations are winning hundreds of souls into the Kingdom of God (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.6 [Nov. 1931]:6).

The joy was brief. Two days after the marriage, Hutton was sued for breach of promise by Myrtle H. St. Pierre.
McPherson put it off as just headlines (New York Times [Sept. 16, 1931]:25). It was June of the next year before the issue came to trial and July before there was a ruling. Miss St. Pierre was awarded five thousand dollars (New York Times [July 10, 1932]:9). Upon hearing the news at her home in Elsinore, Mrs. McPherson-Hutton fainted, struck the base of her skull and was in a state of physical collapse because of the ruling. The denomination leaders were reportedly upset and felt that Hutton should withdraw from any official capacity at the Temple. Hutton took it as a challenge and defied those he called "discontented persons" (New York Times [July 11, 1932]:2).

McPherson's stress was multiplied because a number of ministers and churches across the country had been in contact with Harriett Jordon, Vice-President of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. The ministers affirmed their loyalty to the message of the Foursquare Gospel but expressed concern about the marriage of their leader because of McPherson's previous divorce from Harold McPherson. The publicity about Hutton only intensified the issues. For a number of churches, the issues were not resolved and they, therefore, chose to secede (Mitchell, 1982:146-147).

John R. Richey, district officer for Iowa and Minnesota Foursquare Churches, released a statement to the press disclosing the separation on August 31, 1932.
Thirty-two ministers, representing the Iowa and Minnesota division, have voted to withdraw from the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel and all affiliations with Mrs Aimee Semple McPherson Hutton, the Rev. John R. Richey, divisional officer, announced Wednesday.

"Certain widespread publicity" and policies of the international church's leadership were given by the Rev. Mr. Richey as reasons for the withdrawal....

The Rev. Mr. Richey, in behalf of the ministers, expressed appreciation of Mrs. Hutton's past ministry and influence upon their individual lives (Des Moines Tribune [Aug. 31, 1932]:1 quoted by Mitchell, 1982:147).

The new group was organized as "The Open Bible Evangelistic Association" later to become the Open Bible Standard Churches (Warner, 1988a:651-653). The separation was conducted in the churches by a vote of the congregations. The organizers decided to continue to support Foursquare missionaries until January 1933 to avoid hardship for them (Mitchell, 1982:147). Harriett Jordan attempted to persuade Richey and the others to return, but McPherson planned no fight to reunite the churches (Mitchell, 1982:148). Perhaps she recognized the motivation of conscience behind this withdrawal.

The issues of conflict outlined by the ministers were inconsistency in McPherson, the unfavorable publicity that surrounded her, and the move to centralize property to the denomination from the local churches (Bruland, 1945:8-9).

The issues did not vanish with the separation of the Iowa and Minnesota. The stress mounted. McPherson took a sea voyage and was carried onto the ship. Christian Century
reported "for several months past [McPherson] has divided her time between the courts and her sickbed, appearing in her pulpit on rare occasions only" (Feb. 15, 1933:232). Internal organizational and apparent defections continued while Hutton attempted to manage the Temple but was being resisted by the other leaders, who resented the outsider's involvement (Steele, 1970:255).

Representing McPherson in her absence was William Black, who had been named as general supervisor of the denomination. The denomination in 1933 consisted of two-hundred and fifty-eight churches, sixteen mission stations, and thirty-five missionaries in Africa, India, China, Japan and Philippines (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.16 No.12 [May 1933]:18; Vol.17 No.1 [June 1933]:6,10). It also had ethnic missions and churches among the Spanish, Armenians, Chinese, Germans, Blacks and American Indians (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.14 No.9 [Feb. 1931]:20; Vol.16 No.12 [May 1933]:5). As second to the founder, Black called for loyalty and dedication to the organization and to McPherson.

The organization of the Foursquare Gospel has been the result of Sister McPherson Hutton keeping His commandments. The work has developed bit by bit, fulfilling the commands of the Lord to meet the need of lost humanity.

But remember this! Aimee Semple McPherson has stood by her people. She has sought no sheltered place. She has marched at the head of the column, baring her heart (and it is a tender heart) to the darts of the enemy. She has ever sought to protect her people with her very life.
She has spread her arms to shelter the young converts from the force of the attack.

Don't think for a moment that the Devil aims his shots alone at Sister. It is the Foursquare Gospel Movement he seeks to crush. The sticks and the stones of the world strike Sister first, only because she marches at the front like a general, leading the hosts to battle (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.17 No.1 [June 1933]:11,19).

While her followers were defending McPherson's honor, she was traveling in Europe recuperating from nervous exhaustion. In June, she sent a cable to Hutton about the birth of a son. Later, she reported that the cable had been a hoax, designed to discover sources of leaks in her private communications (New York Times [June 25, 1933]:15). Hutton asked his wife to return and to explain the cable. The New York Times reported some supposed that McPherson was attempting to gain residence in France to divorce Hutton (New York Times [June 24, 1933]:3). Communications between the couple broke down. It appears that because of the treatment by Temple followers, who only wanted a helper and consort for McPherson—not another official at the Temple—and because of McPherson's hoax-cable, the couple stopped communicating. Hutton reportedly took personal offense accusing Aimee of subjecting him to ridicule and so filed suit for divorce. He had mused, "I wonder if I married just Aimee or the whole Temple?" (quoted New York Times [July 17, 1933]:2; [July 18, 1933]:19).

On July 24, McPherson returned to Los Angeles. A small crowd of five hundred greeted her at the train station.
"We're behind you, sister!" they shouted (New York Times [July 25, 1933]:6). She was saddened by the absence of Hutton and sobbingly, she thanked her supporters, "Our hearts are a little heavy. But I want you to know that your support and faith in me means everything" (quoted New York Times [Aug. 2, 1933]:8). In light of the interpersonal dynamics and the obvious stress of a high visibility relationship as it was reported in the newspapers, it would appear that this marriage had been doomed from the beginning. McPherson could not separate her private self from her public self, nor could she yield power to her husband. In Aimee's ideology Hutton was taking the role traditionally taken by the woman, while Aimee retained a dominant role. In addition, the Temple was the fruit of her labor. There was a symbiotic relationship that would not allow her to separate from it, especially at this period in its development. Now that conflict moved from private to the legal domain McPherson, in a defensive move, filed a counter-suit in December, 1933 (New York Times [Dec. 21, 1933]:22). Hutton's petition was heard in March, 1934; her complaint was not (New York Times [Mar. 2, 1934]:22).

McPherson's personal defense, however, was carried to the people. She again referred to herself as Aimee Semple McPherson in October, 1933 (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.17 No.5 [Oct. 1933]). In light of the Open Bible defection and
the publicity about her marital woes, McPherson was determined to win back her public. She went on another whirlwind vindication tour, concentrating on the area of the defec-
tion. Its content was the "old time Gospel" but its purpose was to vindicate her and to prove to her followers that she was the "same old Aimee" that they knew and loved. She had not defected in faith or practice in the midst of her personal turmoils. In October, she was in Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Minneapolis, Minnesota; New York, Philadelphia, and Boston. In November she traveled to Sioux City, Iowa; Tulsa, Oklahoma; Hot Springs, Arkansas; Shreveport, Louisiana; Houston, San Antonio, and Waco, Texas; to Ardmore, Oklahoma; back to Fort Worth and Dallas, Texas; Wichita, Kansas; and New Baltimore, Michigan. She ended in December with an eleven-
day crusade in Des Moines, Iowa, with side trips to dedicate new Foursquare churches in Oseola, Albia, and Fairfield, Iowa (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.17 No.6 [Nov. 1933]:15; No.7 [Dec. 1933]:8).

McPherson enjoined her audiences to focus on the vision that she presented and to follow Christ, despite her hardships.

How different my lone stand here in Boston now, to that of two years ago! But, I must not think of that. No time for tears here! There's work to be done for Christ. Life is short. This is no hour to repine. We must keep eyes fixed upon the Lord Who understands and Who is able to keep through every fiery trial (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.17 No.6 [Nov. 1933]:16).
Mrs F. J. Lindquist, wife of a leading Pentecostal minister of Minneapolis, reported on McPherson's successful impression upon the people.

This little woman came to Minneapolis with very little backing, and without any organization of churches and ministers and was able to fill the huge building seating over 11,000 night after night. This is something that has never been done in Minneapolis before by any evangelist. No doubt, the Lord was with her....

The multitudes that had been filled with prejudice against Sister McPherson by adverse newspaper reports, forgot their prejudice, and became fine friends of the evangelist and her message, as they listened (quoted in Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.17 No.6 [Nov. 1933]:15).

In the heart of the area that defected, McPherson felt she had won the victory. She felt vindicated because of the crowds reasoning that God had to be with her to produce such results. Aimee's followers believed that Hutton had demonstrated his "evil intentions" by making a side-show of his relationship with their evangelist in his short lived vaudeville show. The marriage was an unfortunate "mistake" and they would continue to follow her, for her works continued to prove the "power of the Lord" was still upon her. Her charisma was verified by her followers as they reaffirmed her ministry. She was further institutionalized as the attending crowds accepted her "as the same Mrs. McPherson" they knew before. Her legend was being confirmed.

McPherson felt isolated by the institutionalization process which was depersonalizing her and making her a legend against which she herself had to compete. McPherson
had been prompted to satisfy a need for companionship, as anyone might through marriage. Like her daughter, son, and mother, she wed that same year. The Temple was, however, reluctant to share McPherson with anyone. Even with the help of the leaders and elders in setting forth an ideological basis for her action, McPherson could not convince her followers of the "rightness" of her marriage because it did not fit their image of the institutionalized legend which she had become. She could not compete with her own legendary figure.

McPherson's vindication tour was a damage-control tactic which identified that she was, indeed, the same "Sister" her campaign attendees and branch church members had come to know and love. Identifying and persuading her national audience that she had not changed from her previously stated goals declared in her magazine, her meetings, and her conventions at the Temple and was, in fact, as the legendary "Everybody's Sister," she was able to further organizational development. Losses for the denomination were minimal because it had nearly the same number of churches after the defection as it had before (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.17 No.8 [Jan. 1934]).

The defectors rejected the attempted justification to the changes in the ideology not only in reference to McPherson's personal life but in terms of the move to solidify the
power structure to make it impossible for a church to defect. A pastor might resign, a congregation might abandon the building, but the property as a base of operations would remain under the new organizational plan.

The defection of the Iowa and Minnesota churches did not stop the spiral of change. Criticism by the ministers and churches had theological merit but only momentary effect on those pastors and churches who remained with the denomination. In a year, McPherson was again divorced. There was no place in the power structure for a husband to the leader; even if the ideology were temporarily adjusted, it could not be maintained, for he would have had no official place. A husband might be acceptable as a "helper," Temple leaders had argued, but in practice, Harriett Jordon and others had precluded him from power by denying him access to records and by refusing to acknowledge his authority in Temple business. Perhaps McPherson, herself, questioned the relationship and resenting the attempted intrusions into her profession by Hutton, just because he was her husband. In today's parlance, Hutton's assumption of right to power was chauvanistic. McPherson would have to satisfy her relational and sexual needs in another way.

The change in the power relationships further affected the denomination's ideology. As enacted by Aimee McPherson it was to be forbidden until 1988 for a divorced minister to retain credentials and remarry, for any reason (Articles of

The ideological taboo at this point was too strong for McPherson to break because of the type of remarriage scenario. Aimee could not keep it a private matter, as she had attempted to do concerning questions of finances; nor could she redefine the practice as use of present culture in order to persuade the masses because the anomaly was too large to accommodate. McPherson did find, however, that by reaffirming the older ideology and admitting failure, she could persuade the offended to listen and respond to her message again. It was a costly lesson but one which clarified the boundaries of her relationships and ability to affect the ideology of her church.

THE PURPOSE OF THE CHURCH

Social action was not limited to "Social Gospel" advocates (Sharpe, 1983:540-541). Just as Smith showed in Revivalism and Social Reform (1957) and Dayton in Discovering an Evangelical Heritage (1976), conservative theology aided rather than hindered social activism both in the revivalistic and Holiness traditions. No less can be said of the Pentecostal Movement (Robeck, 1987:103-107). Among the Pentecostals active in social concerns was Aimee Semple McPherson.

In the organization of Angelus Temple, McPherson struc-
tured a way "to do a definite, practical work for the poor and needy," first as the Angelus Temple "City Sisters" and later as a function of the Commissary which grew out of a portion of the City Sisters work (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.8 [Jan. 1929]:7). By 1929, there were nineteen different departments and committees operating under the administration of the City Sisters: Hospitality, The Auto Club, Lonely, New Converts, Commissary, Probation Girls, Charity, Nursery, Home Relief, The World Wide Prayer Band, County Farm, Bereavement, Children's Clothing, Comforts, Ladies Lounge, Kindergarten, County Hospital, McPherson Circulating Library, and Prison Probation Work (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.8 [Jan. 1929]:7, 26).

The Commissary began in August of 1927, and in five months, had given food to 1,398 families (9,786 people) and clothes to 1,341 families (5,361 people), (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.3 [Mar. 1928]:16). By Spring of 1928, the Church had a trained nurse and a social service worker to make regular visits to the homes of the needy in order to expedite the requests for aid (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.3 [Mar. 1928]:15-16). Figures for the Depression were not published in the Bridal Call but did reflect an expansion of the figures included here (see p.254 below).

The Temple became known as a place to receive aid and bypass red tape. While one case is not proof it was
reported as not unusual for the police or other civic employees to send or bring the needy directly to the Temple. It was reported by the Bridal Call that an officer brought a mother and seven children to the Temple where they received food and clothing. A box of food was sent to their home, and a job search was begun to find a means of support for the woman and her children (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.13 No.3 [Aug. 1929]:26). It was the work of the City Sisters and the Commissary that brought Anthony Quinn, the now noted actor, into contact with Aimee Semple McPherson, for whom he had only praise because of the help he had received (Quinn, 1974:145-154).

Quinn described the openness and practicality that McPherson's social action took.

This was all during the height of the Depression, when hunger and poverty permeated America. Many Mexicans were terrified of appealing for county help because most of them were in the country illegally. When in distress, they were comforted by the fact that they could call one of Aimee's branches at any time of the night. There, they would never be asked any of the embarrassing questions posed by the authorities. The fact that they were hungry or in need of warm clothing was enough. No one even asked if they belonged to Aimee's church or not (Quinn, 1974:152).

The Depression created a great need for a strong administration of this social action. Administration for the Temple's social action was accomplished by hiring Rheba Crawford Splivalo, who was the State Welfare Director 13 appointed by Governor James Rolph Jr. However, the legis-
lature was upset because he had appointed a woman to such a high position; in the midst of the Depression, it adjourned without appropriating funds for the welfare administration. They thought that if she were not paid, Crawford might resign (Hall, 1964:203). They did not count on Crawford joining forces with Aimee Semple McPherson.

Crawford came to McPherson with what seemed ideal credentials. Their history was remarkably similar: Both were raised in the Salvation Army, began to preach, dropped out and married, felt a call back into ministry ending in divorce from their husbands, evangelized, and located in a large church in California (in Crawford's case First Congregational Church in San Francisco) (Hall, 1964:197-202).

Crawford had been dubbed "Angel of Broadway" by Walter Winchell when she worked in New York on the steps of Gaiety Theater on 46th Street from 1921 to 1923. She was aided in her work by the local Catholic priest, police, criminal leaders and, of course, Walter Winchell. Her ministry to the destitute, prostitutes, discharged soldiers, and castoffs from society, defined her sense of the "Social Gospel" (Chesham, 1965:179). Crawford saw the "Social Gospel" as "the teaching that Christ died to purchase salvation for all mankind, and to establish forever the dignity of the individual" (Hall, 1964:199).

Originally, Crawford had met McPherson in Florida during McPherson's 1917 and 1918 campaigns. Crawford had
seen this lone woman struggling to put up a tent by herself. On impulse, she had stopped her car and walked over and dumped the contents of her purse into the lap of McPherson (neither recognized the fact until their pact in 1931) (Steele, 1970:17, 275; Hall, 1964:20). Crawford not only operated the State Welfare office out of the Temple, but she also filled in as associate Pastor in the absence of McPherson.

In December, 1931, McPherson opened "Angelus Temple Free Dining Hall." The Yellow Cab Company had donated a 120 x 200 foot building for the use. It had previously rented for six hundred dollars per month. In addition, the White Sewing Machine Company donated twenty sewing machines to McPherson to be used in preparing clothing for distribution to the needy (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.9 [Feb. 1932]:16-17). The kitchen fed five thousand people a day.

There was also a free medical and dental clinic. McPherson set up a School of Practical Nursing and trained five hundred nurses to care for children and elderly suffering from malnutrition (Steele, 1970:220).

Rheba Crawford was an able coordinator and an able preacher. She coordinated all these efforts and those conducted by the county and city welfare offices so that there was no duplication of services between the Temple and other agencies. As illness and travel took McPherson from the
pulpit, Crawford was called upon to fill in. While McPherson traveled to Europe and the Holy Land, Crawford was one of four ministers appointed to fill in for the seven months. These four speakers were Rheba Crawford, Dr. Charles H. Babcock, Dr. B.F. Gurden and Rev. J.W. Arthur of Temple staff (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.17 No.1 [June 1933]:19; Vol.17 No.4 [Sept. 1933]:7).

One of Crawford's sermons from this period told of the admiration that she had for McPherson and the work she had accomplished. But she warned the people that they had to bear more of the burden; the life of the leader was not easy.

Great people are lonely people....

They are ever seeking friendship and communion, and are always having difficulty in finding people who speak their language; because their language is the language of bigness and of greatness and of far-seeing. They are bound ever to behold their visions in silence, with their dreams locked within their own breasts; because if they should tell them, people would laugh ("What I Think of Aimee McPherson Hutton," Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.17 No.1 [June 1933]:5).

The admiration was reciprocal. Upon her return, McPherson announced, "I am so glad that God has sent Rheba Crawford to assist and to stand in this pulpit during my absence. I pray that her ministry may be blessed of God" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.17 No.4 [Sept. 1933]:7).

McPherson had planned her second vindication tour to regroup support after the Open Bible defection and the difficulties of her pending divorce from Hutton. Crawford would stand in
again. The plan was for Crawford to preach at the Temple, giving McPherson two-thirds of the year to be on the campaign trail (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.17 No.6 [Nov. 1933]:16).

The arrangement must have been of mutual benefit, for in December 1934, McPherson resigned as "active pastor" of Angelus Temple. Under the arrangement, Crawford would be the active pastor and McPherson would retain the nominal title of pastor and remain the leader of the Temple's 15,000 members (New York Times [Dec. 15, 1934]:10). In the previous two years, Crawford had preached more than had McPherson at the Temple, for McPherson had been ill and on long trips for her health or on evangelistic tours. Besides the pastoral arrangement, McPherson announced intentions to journey to the Orient and to Africa.

The tour took McPherson around the world. She chronicled her journey in a book with a revealing title, Give Me My Own God (1936). In the book, McPherson evaluated the moral and spiritual development of the countries she visited as inadequate because it arose out of belief in "inadequate gods" resulting not only in spiritual but social and economic problems. McPherson returned, having gathered costumes and props from each country for her illustrated sermons. Upon her return, McPherson proposed a "back to religion" movement in which the denominational fences would be
removed and the new Christian faith would demonstrate charity, the work ethic, and sweeping evangelism (New York Times [June 14, 1935]:19). But McPherson would fail to see such unity even in her own small denomination.

One of McPherson's plans to establish a forward movement was a campaign to place more women in high positions of her church. McPherson argued against sex discrimination in the church.

Any woman who can manage a well-organized home has executive ability. It is only within the church that a definite prejudice against women exists. I intend to wage a fight to break this down (New York Times [Jan. 12, 1936]:IV,2)

McPherson found that women were no more compliant then men when it came to her absolute command of the Temple. Friction was building between McPherson and Crawford. Although offered a two-year extension to her four-year contract, Crawford had demurred in March of 1936 and by July, the friction was publicly evident. Crawford's social gospel and direct ways led her to become actively involved with Los Angeles politics. She wanted direct action in solving the problems she perceived. Crawford did not accept the "two step" plan of win them to Christ and then win them to humane treatment. In her economy one worked on both problems simultaneously. Some of the public figures verbally attacked appealed directly to McPherson, who quickly defended the Temple and her image in the community by announcing that Crawford was not speaking for the Temple,
that no "political speeches" were aired over the church's radio station, KFSG, and that the Temple was definitely not functioning as a political entity (New York Times [July 5, 1936]:10).

The division not only involved Crawford but also McPherson's daughter, Roberta Semple. Roberta Semple contended that Giles Knight, new business manager, was attempting "to create a dictatorship in Angelus Temple" (New York Times [Sept. 25, 1936]:25). A slander suit was filed by Semple against Andrews, McPherson's lawyer, because of derogatory statements made by him. Semple won a two thousand dollar settlement against the lawyer, but no one doubted that the battle had more to do with a family and religious split than with the lawyer's behavior. Judge Kincaid warned the parties, "a continuation of such warfare as this will result in the eventual collapse of Angelus Temple" (quoted in New York Times [April 24, 1937]:36).

Concomitantly with the suit by Roberta Semple, McPherson was faced with a suit by Vivian Denton, a church publicity agent whom McPherson had fired allegedly for disloyalty to herself and for loyalty to Crawford (New York Times [Aug. 22, 1936]:28). At the same time, McPherson was also faced with a suit by Rheba Crawford for slander and defamation of character for public statements made in terminating Crawford from the Temple before the end of her con-

Crawford sued for one million, eighty thousand dollars. The female leadership seemed to line up against McPherson. In Crawford's corner were Minnie Kennedy, Roberta Semple, and one of McPherson's most loyal supporters, Harriet Jordan, Vice President and Bible College Dean. The issue boiled down to loyalty to McPherson and a differing perspective on the purpose of the Church. Crawford's political pursuit was only the extension of the kind of programs McPherson had once initiated (cf. "Challenge of Lifestyle" p. 210ff above) by taking the church not only into the streets and places of pleasure, but also into the process of society--politics. The program arose out of Crawford's and McPherson's Salvation Army heritage. Once again the controversy meant a split.

Crawford began her own "Interdenominational Church" inaugurating the New Year by preaching a sermon, "I Turn My Back" to a congregation of over three hundred (New York Times [Jan. 4, 1937]:30). It was little competition for the Fourteenth Annual Convention at Angelus Temple at which two thousand ministers and three thousand lay delegates listened to McPherson (New York Times [Jan. 4, 1937]:30). The rhetorical vision of the Foursquare Gospel was again rehearsed by Aimee Semple McPherson; "it was the work of God."

Supernaturally planned, executed, maintained?--Account for it any other way. Angelus Temple (and what is said of it, may be said with
equal truth of all its "children") was conceived in the heart of a consecrated, gifted woman. It epitomizes the faith and dramatizes the vision of a great soul, moved with compassion over the sin and suffering of a lost world.

No business enterprise of this nature could function as does this church. It comprises some fifty-seven departments, many of which are charitable in nature and represent an astonishing "out-go." A far-flung missionary enterprise with about 115 mission stations, a commissary feeding and clothing thousands a month, a radio station, supported entirely by donations and never off the air for lack of donors, a huge ministerial program of five services a day, rallies, conventions, fellowship meetings, revival campaigns and occasions of note,—all supported ENTIRELY BY FAITH. (The Foursquare Crusader [Jan. 6, 1937]:2).

Perhaps McPherson feared disloyalty as a result of the battles with Rheba Crawford and Roberta Semple. Note that in the Fourteenth Convention, a slate of speakers from the Temple officers, denominational officers, and divisional supervisors preached from outlines prepared for them by McPherson (Foursquare Crusader [Jan. 6, 1937]:1,2,6). The results of battles showed in the number of district officials falling from twelve in 1928 to seven in 1937, although mission stations had grown to one hundred and fifteen and there were three hundred and fifty-six churches (Foursquare Crusader [Jan. 6, 1937:1). The theme of the convention was "Pentecostal Unity."

McPherson was not the only one seeking peace and unity. A delegation of ministers from the Los Angeles area visited both Rheba Crawford and Aimee McPherson, requesting that for the sake of the community and the cause of religion, they
should settle their differences. Civic leaders and business leaders also pressed for settlement. A financial settlement was secretly agreed upon "with prejudice," meaning that the law suit could not be revived. The amount of settlement was undisclosed (Steele, 1970:329f).

McPherson had been faced with needs of personal illness and a need for personal fulfillment to travel old paths and to re-establish the influence of her message and her person to the churches across the country. McPherson had felt that she had found a perfect substitute for her in her pulpit. The arrangement went well during the height of the Depression, but as the immediate social need began to change, so also did the work of Rheba Crawford. Crawford's actions were taking the Temple into areas in which McPherson did not wish to work. It was not in her ideology to lobby politically for one candidate or another. McPherson's motivation for social action had been human need and she sought to meet that human need in order to present the Gospel. Although she was not so blatant as to demand that people listen to a sermon before they were fed, McPherson did expect people to accept her Lord and hopefully join her congregation.

The Crawford challenge helped McPherson further clarify the purpose of the Church. It clarified the ideology and how far it would go in social action. The controversy also brought about a reduction on publicity by avoiding free
access to press interviews thereby changing the power structure of the Temple in relation to the press and politics in the city (Steele, 1970:331).

As a side effect to McPherson's need for security and the institutionalization of her person, a struggle for power ensued involving helpers and family. Justices warned that continually appealing to the court to settle family and religious matters would destroy the Temple; so, as an outcome, there was a blackout of news by McPherson. After 1937, only rarely did she appear in the newspapers at birthday anniversaries (New York Times [Oct. 10, 1938]:10), during World War II (New York Times [Sept. 14, 1942]:15; Newsweek [July 19, 1943]:64), and finally at her death in 1944.

THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION PROCESS

McPherson began and ended the decade of 1927 to 1937 with damaged charisma. She engaged in a communication strategy designed to maintain her charisma in her organization. Sociology identifies three stages of development of charisma: magical, prophetic, and priestly. These are connected in a routinization process in which the magical is suppressed over time by prophetic formalizing the ideal and by satisfaction of the need by adherents for magic through legitimizing and focusing satisfaction, in accord with the "priestly organization" (Miyahara, 1983:370). As Miyahara
explains, "Routinized Charisma is radically different from genuine charisma. First, it is no longer revolutionary. On the contrary, routinized charisma legitimates the existing institutional order and the continual operation of an organized enterprise, be it religious or political" (Miyahara, 1983:372). McPherson not only acted out the stages suggested by Miyahara to satisfy audience needs through the "magic" of charisma, establish an interpretive rationale through her prophetic presentation of the Foursquare Gospel, and routinize practice in priestly fashion in her Foursquare churches, but because McPherson, as the founder, was still alive, there was a rhetorical situation enabling return to the magical period in the eyes of her followers.

The dramatic cycles of events in McPherson's life during this decade can easily distract from the process of development of the institutionalized McPherson and the Foursquare Gospel Church. The structuring of McPherson's ministry, as well as the structuring of the denomination are both features of routinization of the charisma within the organization and of image building around McPherson's personal charisma. The events described in this chapter set forth rhetorical situations which functioned to revitalize McPherson's charisma while institutionalizing her image. This is evidenced by the way McPherson set forth her expectations as needs, as well as how she expected her subordinates and
congregants to meet those needs. To accomplish this change both the people and McPherson had to share understanding about the need identified in the ideological process (Brown, "Need," 1986:10).

In the four identified conflicts McPherson's needs were denied by a key figure in the organization but ultimately affirmed by the majority of the church, especially as McPherson is presented as fulfilling their popular image of her—her "legend." Shreve, who had worked with her since 1920, was one example of the affirming process by rhetorically turning back the clock and reporting that McPherson, as both a servant and campaigner was "God's Handmaiden in the Harvest Field" (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.3 [Aug. 1931]:16-17). McPherson's "legendary self" was utilized to support the concept that McPherson remained the same. Thus as McPherson enacted the role of her "legendary self," utilized the catch phrases and slogans from the ideological presentation of the Foursquare Gospel, and engaged in featuring or masking of various needs, as dictated by the situation, she confirmed her charisma in the midst of institutionalization process. McPherson found herself presenting her need state in direct competition with her "legendary self." Her "legendary self" was the institutionalized, idealized image of McPherson which was the embodiment of the rhetorical vision of the people Foursquare.
INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND THE LEGENDARY LEADER

The process of institutionalization is more than the routinization of group behavior within the structured organization. That this is clearly part of the construct is not denied (Weber, 1963; Miyahara, 1983; O'Dea, 1983; Poloma, 1989). However, the stages of routinization focus on group behavior organized in reaction to the charismatic leader and key lieutenants' interpretations. The ideology was operationalized in organizational structures, in order to make charisma stable, manageable, and progressive (Miyahara, 1983; cf also Elser, 1972). The process of institutionalization is also the distribution of power and the formalization of a functional rhetorical vision.

Institutionalization is also the apportionment of charismatic power to lieutenants and other subordinates. This is especially evident as the organization grows beyond the ability of the charismatic leader to monitor physically. When the leader is absent, power must be divided to others. It becomes part of "the cultural code [which is] dependent on hierarchical interdependency" (Brown, 1986:187ff). Prior to 1926, power was divided between McPherson and her mother in a partnership (cf Chapter III). As the organization developed, those who demonstrated an ample measure of devotion were rewarded with places of responsibility and a share of the power. The disappearance created major revisions in the power structure, as well as the move to formalize the
organization into a "religious corporation" (Chapter IV).

In Chapter Five, we have seen a series of people who had been apportioned power, and who used it to disagree with McPherson and attempt to divide McPherson from the image the people had of her. It should be noted that power was divided so that financial, church operations, and preaching were only united in McPherson. Because of the events described in this chapter, McPherson designated her successor to be her son, as lifetime president because from her experiences, especially during this decade, convinced Aimee McPherson that he was the only one to carry on her vision. Rolf McPherson had little of the charisma of his mother but was an able businessman who led the denomination from near-financial ruin to a church of 201,198 in the United States and 1,015,086 over seas, as well as 18,986 churches around the world (I.C.F.G. Yearbook, 1989:7). Rolf McPherson further ritualized the vision of taking the "Foursquare Gospel" around the world in "the spirit" of his mother Aimee McPherson by structuring the program and directing the affairs of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel for the past 44 years (The Gavel is Passed Videotape, 1988).

From a Social Intervention Model perspective, institutionalization is the process whereby the charismatic leader changes communication roles and intervenes to build a rhetorical vision that takes on a reality beyond the leader
or the structure which she had built. McPherson, over the period of her ministry, enacted various roles which developed along side the organizational structure of the Four-square Gospel Church. In the period of time in which McPherson was developing herself as a message source, she took the roles of servant and campaigner, roughly between 1915 and 1921 (Chapter III). During this period, she focused her communication towards satisfying individuals' needs through spiritual intervention with the Pentecostal messages of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ, divine healing for the body, and eternal salvation for the soul. McPherson's popularity increased, granting her greater power share, gaining more adherents to her ideology, and satisfying the collectively centered needs of the Pentecostals as the "Bride of Christ."

From 1921 to 1926, McPherson presented a new vision of the Pentecostal message as "the Foursquare Gospel." This new ideological expression, she reasoned, necessitated a new association and a new Temple. McPherson took the role of the charismatic builder who systematized both the ideological world-view and the Temple. She managed, directed, and presided over the multiple revival services, special outreaches and functions as the evangelist-of-the-hour. In the process, she not only was fulfilling her concept of the evangelist but building an expectation of how "the true evangelist" would behave, spend her time, and relate to the
multitudes. McPherson stretched herself to the limits of physical endurance and created an unachievable expectation in the "Legendary McPherson" with which she could not compete over the long run. As McPherson's followers compared their image of the ever active, energetic, helpful, enlightening and entertaining speaker to the person of McPherson their belief set the pattern for McPherson's behavior. The energy that could be infused into an image was far more than she had within herself. The image that McPherson had presented to the people became their model for judging her later behavior.

Through her communication—both behavior and rhetoric, McPherson created an alter-ego which began to be "chained out" as a rhetorical vision taking on a life of its own. Through the communication process, McPherson was institutionalized by her followers into the "Legendary McPherson" through the cyclical process of social intervention. In attempting any change McPherson was in direct competition with the ghost of her past—a ghost enhanced and strengthened by the beliefs of thousands of her followers. For McPherson to present alterations in her need state, methods of need satisfaction, or communicate changes in the system required the understanding of her followers which, in turn, depended on their ideology of McPherson herself (Brown, 1987:10). Understanding her needs as described in this
chapter required that the people share definitions with McPherson. But, in evaluating McPherson's needs her followers had more "Legendary McPherson" in mind than the physical person who was in their midst. This lack of salience created conflict and necessitated maintaining the charisma by re-identifying McPherson with her "institutionalized legendary self."

INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND COMMUNICATING THROUGH POWER

Looking at the side effects of power in the encounters described in this chapter one sees that McPherson is communicating her "potentate self." As Brown advises in describing the nature of the power element of Social Intervention Model, there is a distinct difference between gaining power through communication and communicating through power. Brown tells us, in the case of Robert Moses, a New York politician, "If there had been a simple flaw in Moses' tactics and maneuvers for rhetorical intervention, it was that he increasingly mistook the power to intervene for the power to control. He had perhaps forgotten that the efficiency of communication through power must be premised on power through communication" (Brown, 1986:197). This feature can be labeled the "potentate syndrome," that is, that a charismatic leader, unaware of his or her "legendary self" as separate from the self, attempts to communicate out of their own perceived power, not realizing that the power is
not in the self but in the rhetorical-vision about the person which has been institutionalized over time by the followers. Only as the leader intervenes to adjust the world-view, and achieves an attention switch so that the "legendary self" is seen to include "such-and-such behavior," will the charismatic leader be able to step outside the bounds of the life envisioned for the "legendary self."

McPherson argued to her followers successfully that practices objected to by Nichols, Goben, and Crawford were consistent with the "Legendary McPherson," as new methods of evangelism, rewards for labor, the proper structure and practice of a church founded by this charismatic leader. However, McPherson could not, even with the aid of her highest and most trusted lieutenants, convince her constituency to accept her third marriage because it conflicted with the rhetorical vision of the institutionalized legendary McPherson, as well as a core belief of the general ideology which she represented. McPherson had to engage in a vindication tour to demonstrate that she was, indeed, the same ministering McPherson as before her personal problems.

The conflicts and challenges of McPherson's power, as well as her statement of needs and need advocacy, set the scene for the faithful to define the institutionalized charismatic leader. For even in the challenging process, the model of comparison was the "Legendary McPherson." The clearer the image of the charismatic leader, the easier to
function in her absence, making it subsequently easier to function in the "spirit of Aimee Semple McPherson," both at the Temple and at the hundreds of Foursquare churches and mission stations around the globe. The sharper the image of the institutionalized legend the more enduring the presence even in the ultimate absence of the grave. "Everybody's Sister" could then be the model of the Foursquare movement for generations to come.

**SUMMARY**

I have discussed in this chapter the image of Aimee Semple McPherson as "Everybody's Sister" whose needs were presented to the church but challenged as worldliness in her lifestyle, as a lust for money and power in her structuring the church, as sinful in her marriage after divorce, and unprogressive in her view of the purpose of the church. In each of these challenges, the definition of the "Legendary McPherson" was made clearer and formalized by this process of institutionalization. I have defined institutionalization not only as routinization of behavior in the organization, the distribution of power of the leader, but also as the process of structuring a rhetorical vision of the charismatic leader, which I have called the "legendary self."
NOTES

1. Among the cities included in the "Vindication Tour" were Denver, Colorado Springs, Wichita, Topeka, Kansas City, Shenandoah, Omaha, Des Moines, New York and Alton, Ill.


3. There was a compulsory nursery provided and a special seating section in back for mothers who received numbers so they could be quickly and quietly called if needed.

4. Regarding qualifications for an elder I Timothy 3:7 says: "moreover he must be well thought of by outsiders, or he may fall into reproach and the snare of the devil."

5. "Spirit filled" refers to the rhetorical vision of the Pentecostal movement that they have been "in filled by the Holy Spirit of God" and therefore, living out the model of New Testament Christianity through operation of "spiritual gifts" as identified in First Corinthians 12:1-7 and by practice in the Book of Acts.


7. The men were white: the Church of God in Christ, the oldest Pentecostal denomination, was black. The acceptance of ordination was in keeping with the openness between the races in early Pentecostalism. The separation was seen as a move for racial segregation to gain more general acceptance by the populace cf. Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements and A Guide to the Study of the Pentecostal Movement.

9. Foursquare missionaries in 1928 were: Mrs. E. B. Lawler, Beatrice Lawler, and Roland Lawler, in China; Vincent DeFonte, Philippines; Albert Yellen, Czechoslovakia; Mr. & Mrs. Arthur F. Edwards and family, Panama; Mrs. Gussie Booth, Japan; Martha Mary Leising, Hawaii; Samuel Kashmanian, Armenian Mission; and Mr. & Mrs. Merrill Sigler, African Congo; *Bridal Call Foursquare* Vol.12 No.5 (May, 1928):17.


11. The statistics for the commissary for the first year of operation, August 1, 1927 to July 1, 1928, was: 3463 families clothed; 24160 pieces of clothing given out; 3823 families fed; 84 layettes; 452 pieces of furniture; 850 comforters; 173 pairs of blankets; 150 mattresses; 30013 cans of food; 139 bags vegetables; 572 pounds dried fruit; 12885 pounds potatoes; 2417 pounds beans; 2631 pounds flour; 4146 pounds sugar; 6276 loaves bread; 129 dozen rolls; 345 cakes; 324 dozen eggs; 1713 pounds butter; 14 pounds cured meat; 12 chickens; 513 pounds nuts; 301 cakes soap; 966 jars fruit; 837 pound rice; 1731 pounds coffee; 795 pounds onions; 70 pounds crackers; 57 pounds tea; 1010 pounds cereals; 100 pounds spaghetti; 397 pounds macaroni; 131 pounds lard compound; 100 pounds peanut butter; 1500 pounds fresh beef; 28 pounds raisins; 48 quarts fresh milk; 100 pounds pancake flour; 50 dozen lemons; 8 crates lettuce; 1000 bunches celery; 18 boxes apples; 4 boxes oranges; 20 lugs carrots; 160 heads cabbage; 12 lugs turnips; 6 lugs asparagus; and 2 crates cauliflower. *Bridal Call Foursquare* Vol.12 No.3 (Aug. 1929):29.

12. Even the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, Richard Halverson, testified to a convention of Foursquare ministers and lay delegates that he had his family and been helped by the commissary ministry of Angelus Temple and Aimee Semple McPherson. Convention of International Church of Foursquare Gospel in the 1970's.

13. Rheba Crawford was born on Feb. 14, 1898, Milwaukee, Wisconsin dying on January 7, 1966 in Los Angeles, California. She was the daughter of Colonel Andrew Crawford of the Salvation Army.
14. Damon Runyan used Rheba Crawford as the basis for his story "The Idyll of Miss Sarah Brown" published in a series as *Guys and Dolls* and later as a play and movie.

15. Ten of Crawford's sermons are reprinted in *Bridal Call Foursquare* from April, 1933 through June, 1934.


17. Roberta had been divorced from Smythe and had returned to live at the parsonage and help at the Temple.

18. At the Boston crusade McPherson had the auditorium aisle covered with sawdust to create a camp-meeting atmosphere for the audience.
CHAPTER VI

THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF A CHARISMATIC LEADER

INTRODUCTION

Aimee Semple McPherson was, in the words of David Harrell Jr., "by far the most visible Pentecostal leader during the 1920s and 1930s" (1987:16). So well known was she that when Elmer T. Clark wrote his classic study The Small Sects In America, he noted that the familiarity of McPherson's name and doctrine made "unnecessary a detailed discussion of the sect" (1949:115). McPherson's media presence made her first name sufficient. People knew of whom one was speaking when they spoke of "Sister Aimee."

In the Bridal Call Foursquare, McPherson responded to the question, "To what do you attribute the remarkable growth of the Foursquare Gospel movement?" She responded that her organization had been established for "poise, balance, equilibrium and stability" in the presentation of the Christian message.

To what do you attribute the remarkable growth of the Foursquare Gospel movement? To the fact that the world everywhere is hungry for a Christ of present day power, Jesus the great I AM rather than Jesus the great I WAS. That is, Jesus the Christ, who still breaks the captives chains,
heals the sick, bears the burdens of his people and is a living reality rather than the historic Christ of yesteryear (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.15 No.9 [Feb. 1932]:29).

McPherson considered her Foursquare Gospel movement the epitome of the Pentecostal movement. She considered it to be an amalgamation of the best of other earlier Christian movements. In her sermon, "Death in the Pot," McPherson described Foursquaredom as a melting pot of assorted positive teachings of various Christian groups blended by the work of the Holy Spirit. "Perhaps there is not another movement on earth made up of such varied assortment of teachings, creeds, and organizations," she boasted, "yet all melt and blend into one when put into the water of the Word, and boiled over the fire of the Holy Spirit (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.2 [Feb. 1928]:30).

McPherson attributed the roots of her belief both in justification by faith and the present work of the Holy Spirit, to the Methodists; the importance of the Bible and water baptism by immersion, to the Baptists. She also attributed to the Salvation Army her practice of preaching in unusual places (in "enemy territory"), as well as her use of both men and women as ministers. The emphasis on "Heart-Purity" and Coming of the Lord was linked to the Holiness movement; the study of prophecy, to the Adventists; a church shaken and controlled by the Spirit's power, to the Quakers; and a sense of reverence, obedience, and deep appreciation
for spirituality to the Roman Catholics who joined her movement. She also felt indebted to Presbyterians, Huguenots, and Episcopalians ("Death In The Pot," Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.2 [Feb. 1928]:31).

But the broad sweep of ingathering also brought in conflicting teachings, behaviors, and attitudes. She named these conflicts "False Teaching," "Error," "Doctrinal Issues," "Lover of Power and Recognition," "Self-Righteousness," "Formality," "Pre-conceived Ideas and Teachings," "Fear of Manifestations, Flesh and Fanaticism," "Lack of Brotherly Love," "False Reports," "Harsh Criticism," and "Tale Bearing" ("Death In The Pot" Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.2 [Feb. 1928]:32). McPherson's argument was that despite the conflict in Pentecostalism, the helpful outweighed the harmful. In her ideology the earnest seeker of truth and spirituality could depend upon the Word of God to control error and to meet the needs of individuals attending her church.

Indeed, McPherson's movement had its share of problems. However, the controversies surrounding McPherson in the 1920s and 1930s did not keep her movement from having a significant impact among Pentecostals and Evangelicals during the subsequent decades. Between her death in 1944 and 1988, during the tenure of her son and appointed successor, Rolf McPherson, the Foursquare church participated and held leadership roles in such groups as The National Asso-

Rolf McPherson has recently retired to Emeritus status and John R. Holland has become the third President and first non-family member to lead the organization (*The Gavel is Passed* Videotape, 1989; "Meet The Hollands," *Foursquare World Advance* Vol.24 No.3 [March-April 1988]:8-10; Robeck, 1988:572). While it was not the intention of this study to detail the development of the organization beyond 1937, it is noted here because the organization uses these successes as indicators that the organization was not built on Aimee Semple McPherson alone but also upon a dependence on the Word of God and its vision of Jesus Christ. They note that the organization has outlived Aimee Semple McPherson, growing and developing in the process (Duarte, Interview, May, 1988; Rolf McPherson letter to ministers, Nov. 19, 1976; Helms, Interview, May, 1988).
The research undertaken in this dissertation was intended to give an overall picture of the institutionalizing process in McPherson's own time, as revealed through the Social Intervention Model of rhetorical analysis. A good way to begin the review of that research is to recount an event that seems to characterize the ministry of Aimee Semple McPherson. I feel justified in selecting this event, for it was frequently referred to by instructors at the Foursquare Bible College at Mount Vernon, Ohio, to inspire students in their pursuit of ministry. The story is of McPherson's first independent meeting held in Mount Forest, Ontario, in 1915 (McPherson, 1919:253). McPherson, herself, saw in this story the birth of the uniqueness of her methodology and place as a woman evangelist.

Right at the outset, there was borne in upon me the realization that the methods so often used to impart religion were too archaic, too sedate and too lifeless ever to capture the interests of the throngs. And it was the hungry throngs that Jesus wanted, not the sedate, the lifeless few. So I developed methods which have brought hundreds of thousands to meetings who otherwise would never have come, and when we went on we left them singing, their hearts filled, not with me, but with God (McPherson, 1927:152).

McPherson's independent ministry began in Mount Forest, Ontario. "Sister" E. Sharp, who was working in a mission in the town had visited an evangelistic campaign at London, Ontario, where McPherson had been participating. Sharpe felt that McPherson was the person to bring revival to her little mission, so she extended an invitation (McPherson
When McPherson arrived, she was dismayed at the small audience that had gathered. She concluded the audience had been "preached up" and determined to get others to the meeting despite the fact that Mrs. Sharp had failed to advertise the event (McPherson, 1927:146-147). McPherson took a chair from the small storefront auditorium, walked about a block away, set the chair at the curb, and stood upon it. Lifting her hands in prayer and closing her eyes, she began to pray—silently. People began to gather wondering about this woman in an apparent trance with face and hands lifted up to heaven, silently standing on that chair by the roadside. After several minutes, a crowd had gathered, McPherson jumped down off the chair, cried "follow me," and grabbing the chair ran down the street into the auditorium with the crowd following. Although it became unnecessary, she advised the usher to lock the door and not to let anyone out. McPherson launched into her sermon, no one tried to leave, and she stated, "from that day to this I've always preached to crowds" (McPherson, 1919:113-115; 1927:151).

Mrs. Sharp's account notes that the meeting outgrew the hall, moved to a tent and created a stir, including Mrs. McPherson and Mrs. Sharpe being hauled into court for disturbing the peace, by dividing the community pro and con to the evangelistic efforts of these Pentecostals (printed in
McPherson, 1919:253ff). In this first evangelistic effort by McPherson was the development of organization, dependent on McPherson's power and motivation, recognition by others of her uniqueness and charisma, as well as a certain awe about the happenings at Victory Mission. This story illustrates the three forms of institutionalization that this study has discussed (1) institutionalization as establishing structure, (2) institutionalization as building of power relationships, and (3) institutionalization as the attributing mystical qualities to the revivalist, as the Legendary Leaders.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION AS IDEOLOGY

THE SYSTEM

Aimee Semple McPherson began her evangelistic ministry as an independent. Neither the ordination she had received with her husband, Robert Semple, by William Durham in 1909, nor the commissioning by Hebden Mission as a missionary seems to have had consequence to her at that time (Robeck, 1988:569; Miller, 1986:18; Cartwright, 1985). But, as McPherson demonstrated her commitment by dishwashing, piano playing, and praying with others, she gained more prominence as a representative of the Pentecostal movement (McPherson "Milkpail to Pulpit" Audiocassette, nd; 1919:107-115). The method of McPherson's recruitment to Mount Forest was typical of the kind of movement expected in the early system.
As McPherson began to demonstrate success, speak of her own calling, and publish her own periodical, the Bridal Call, she moved not only to acceptability, but also desirability in the eyes of large churches, communities, and revival situations. McPherson was credentialed by the Assemblies of God, 1919-1922, the Methodist Episcopal Church, as an exhorter in 1920, and the First Baptist Church in San Jose, California, in 1922 prior to her establishing the Four Square Gospel Association, and her own location at Angelus Temple. These credentialings did not interfere with her independence. They had the weight of honorary degrees. By them, these groups recognized McPherson's gifts and abilities but demanded little in structural responsibility. The Baptist ordination was later disputed (Robeck, 1988:569).
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Figure 7 illustrates the development of the structure of the institutionalizing process from being an independent Christian worker through the religious corporation, The International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. Communication interventions modified the structure of the system so that the audience no longer viewed McPherson as an individual among many, but as the unique God-called "Handmaiden of the Lord." The structural changes of the organization were necessitated by the ideological switches about McPherson, her abilities, and her ministry, as well as perceptions of her need and the means and methods of power sharing. As the ideology and structure changed, McPherson could justify her needs for larger tents (1915 at Mount Forest through 1918 at Philadelphia, Nationwide Campmeeting), to larger auditoriums (as at Canton, Ohio), and finally to appeal for a "place of her own" to teach and preach—a Gospel Tabernacle which was to be called Angelus Temple. The structural changes fed back upon the reputation of Aimee Semple McPherson and facilitated the attention switch about her place and importance as a Pentecostal evangelist.

METHODS OF INTERVENTION

McPherson's basic strategy in demonstrating the importance of her ministry and thereby justifying changes from one structural form to another was that of anomaly featuring. That is, McPherson featured the failures of mainline
churches, in particular, to reduplicate the church of the New Testament. This was done through sermons which also became magazine articles, tracts, and parts of her books. Examples include messages such as, "Lost and Restored" (1919:380f; Bridal Call Vol.1 No.11 [April 1918]:1-12; booklet of same name, nd); "Shepherds 'False and True'" (1919:448f); "Saul of Tarsus and Present Day Sauls" (1919:457f); "Death in the Pot" (1919:596; as the "Revival Pot" Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.12 No.2 [Feb. 1928]:8-9,30-33), and What's The Matter With The Churches, The Preachers, The Pew, The Seminary, The Old-Time Religion, 1928). In these sermonic interventions McPherson argued from her ideology of restoration that the general church of her day failed to operate like the church in the New Testament. Featuring this ideal state for the church created an anomaly for church attendees, so that they would have to question, why the church was in such a state and why was it not like the New Testament Church? McPherson was ready with an answer. The church was in such a state because it failed to believe and practice the "Foursquare Gospel."

In the presentation of the "Foursquare Gospel" was the implicit message that failure to adhere to this rhetorical presentation of the Christian Gospel would demonstrate failure to achieve the best the Gospel has to offer. McPherson's strategy was developed from the revivalist--
Holiness--Pentecostal heritage from which she had come. The many issues of *Lost and Restored* over the years has demonstrated McPherson's vision of the inadequacy of other systems and the fulfillment that her version of the Gospel offered (Centennial Edition, 1989).

The primary strategy utilized by McPherson was that of anomaly featuring. Through her story-telling method of preaching (Schuetz, 1986; Kendzora, 1979) McPherson continued featuring the inadequacies of the Non-Pentecostal, Non-Foursquare way until inadequacy caused a collapse in the people's ideology and they "converted" to her way of thinking. These descriptions of prior and then current religious structures paved the way for McPherson's denominational structure to develop. Conditions of the times for mainline Christianity aided the fulfillment of McPherson's argument (Handy, 1960). So also did the particular condition of loss of power and prestige by mainline churches in Southern California lend to the ascendancy of McPherson's Angelus Temple because it was perceived as being an aid to the people (Singleton, 1979: Quinn, 1974; cf. Figure 8 below).

The task of attributing failure to mainline Churches was made all the easier for McPherson because of on-going secularization in the mainline church during the social crises of the post World War I migration from farm to city, the Great Depression, and the perceived social disorganization of the 1920s and 1930s (Robbins, 1988). Aimee Semple
McPherson, at the same time, could further attribute failures of the mainline churches to the presence of sin, the absence of the ministry of the Holy Spirit, and devaluation of the Bible as the Word of God. Her strategy was to point to the evidences of life and joy in her services, the ingathering of multitudes to the Temple, as well as demonstrating the vitality of the Bible through her illustrated sermons, dramas, and sacred operas (Bells of Bethlehem Videotape, Foursquare Publications, nd). Clearly, by the yardstick McPherson offered, her system demonstrated a restored Christianity.

CHANGES

In the course of gradually formalized social intervention by McPherson there were ideological changes. During these interventions the source and validity of knowledge about McPherson's ministry moved from the general to specific. When McPherson first began to minister (1909 & 1915) there was a broader acceptance of the gifts and abilities of all members of the group. In that situation she was merely one among many "ministers." There was more equity among members, whether lay or pastoral, and the Pentecostal hierarchy was still developing. A message in "tongues and interpretation" or "prophecy" given by any member of the audience was viewed as being just as important, if not more so, than the sermon delivered by the "official" minister.
For instance, an entire section of "tongues and interpretations," "prophecies," and "spiritual songs" given by McPherson is included in the 1919 version of *This is That*. This section was expunged from the later editions, in part, to demonstrate that these verbalizations were not to be given revelation status like the Bible (McDonald, 1964; Christenson, 1968, Fee, 1987). However, some of these have been reprinted in *Has God Said? A Record of Prophetic Promptings To Our Generation* (1980). In the Foreword, Jack W. Hayford argues that while these vocal gifts are to be heeded by the congregation, they are not to be elevated to the status of the Bible.

It should be understood that these guidelines of the Holy Spirit are subsidiary to the basic truth and principles, commandments and guidelines of the Holy Scriptures. These promptings and assisting words are understood to be local points of instruction as to how this "family" is to be run as a small portion of the larger "family of God." As a family is governed by its own principles, but still is in submission to the laws of the land, so do we understand these "words" as the Father's direct help in the managing of our Foursquare family, but that all these directives are subject to the Eternal Word of the Bible (Stanton, 1980:2).

While the booklet contains prophetic messages from others in the Foursquare movement, it primarily contains those offered by Aimee Semple McPherson, herself. It demonstrates what can be seen in the historical development of the movement. As McPherson gained status as a charismatic
religious leader, she was viewed as an increasingly important source of knowledge. A key turning point in that development seems to be the Oakland, California meeting, at which she delineated her Foursquare Gospel. From that point, in particular, the structure to validate her as a source of knowledge about God and religion became more and more solidified. The Temple, the college, and the organization became a means to propagate her words, her music, her methods, and her theology so that the branch churches could be "little temples."

In terms of ideological values, McPherson capitalized on a change in attitude about the worth of organization in the Pentecostal movement. While still eschewing "formality," followers began to value organization in the movement. This was not without some difficulties. In the transitions from The Four Square Gospel Association, to Foursquare Gospel Lighthouses, Inc. and, finally, to the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, there were defectors. Some left quietly, others with animosity—such as Nichols, Goben, and Crawford. McPherson set forth her decisions as being efficient, a means of redoubling her own efforts, and a means of controlling false "McPhersonites," which some communities had experienced (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 9 No. 4 [Sept. 1925]:14). These changes further institutionalized the ideology of membership, power sharing and means of need advocacy within the group.
The followers of McPherson both accepted and contributed to a denominational structure that held the essence of Pentecostalism to be in the form of a four-fold teaching about Jesus Christ. Foursquare was seen as the epitome of Pentecostalism; the pinnacle of Foursquaredom was Angelus Temple. The life of Angelus Temple was Aimee Semple McPherson. The charges brought against her after her disappearance gave McPherson opportunity to argue that to persecute her was to persecute the Temple, to persecute the Temple was to persecute the Church, and that equated with persecution of Christ (cf. Chapter IV). In addition, the opening of the Temple gave opportunity to demonstrate that the structure that had been created was, indeed, fulfilling the ministry of Christ through the Church. The detailed description of the services, programs, and opportunities for others to minister in the structure was an effective intervention regarding the revival of religion taking place under the guidance of the charismatic, Aimee Semple McPherson (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.6 No.8 [Jan. 1923]; Vol.7 No.1 [June 1923]).

SUMMARY

The institutionalization of a charismatic leader is accomplished through ideological interventions over time. The charismatic leader sets forth a world-view expressed in ideological form. This becomes the key element of the
rhetorical vision of the group. Aimee Semple McPherson set forth a series of ideological attention switches which guided the change from one level of organizational structure to another. Figure 8 illustrates the attention switch model with McPherson's preaching as the intervention. As the practice of Angelus Temple fulfilled McPherson's image of a New Testament Church, there was less need to preach her restorational theology. McPherson's sermons became more dramatic and narrative than before (Kendzora, 1976 & Schuettz, 1986).
Figure 8 INSTITUTIONALIZATION AS IDEOLOGY
Early in her career McPherson preached a series of ideologies including "The Bride of Christ," "Lost and Restored," "The Foursquare Gospel," as well as an ideology of need for an interdenominational evangelistic tabernacle, a training center, and expansionism of the system. McPherson's later narrative preaching interpreted the Scriptures to encourage reading them as practically applicable for the day. This meant practicing the Christian life in the pattern of New Testament Christians and expecting and experiencing salvation, healing, and the "move of the Spirit." The more McPherson's ideologies were accepted by the people the less she would have to intervene by preaching on restorative themes. When the congregation accepted the ideology and practiced it in the Temple and "experienced" the results of the ideology in their own lives the less need for the intervention of preaching. However, after an extended period of limited intervention on those themes the people in the congregation would inevitably hold belief less intensely. Eventually practice would fall off, necessitating a renewed emphasis--more preaching, to avoid a vicious circle and collapse of the system.

Ideological focus on the Foursquare Gospel created a need for organizational structuring because the ideology gained adherents. Adherents needed structures to maintain their adopted ideology and the system they had joined. Campaigns, associations and other forms McPherson's organi-
zation took over time were formalized to feature McPherson's world-view. When people accepted McPherson's world-view they gave it institutionalization as they adopted a structural organizational as her followers.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION AS POWER

THE SYSTEM

Considering a source for charisma is like considering the nature of learning--is it the product more of nurture or nature? More succinctly, is charisma more a gift within the individual or a gift of the people? While the source for the energy of charism is debated, it is generally accepted that "charisma does not supply its own authority; rather it is vested with authority by the action of others" (Keyes, 1982:8; cf also Willner, 1984).

The Social Intervention Model recognizes that power is not simply the product of the "action of others" but is also the product of a system relationship, in which power is shared by both the followers and leaders (Brown, 1986). Sharing, however, does not mean equity in the amount and kind of influence that people in the system share. Generally speaking the kind of sway available to the leader is that which is developed from the leader's communication (Brown, 1986). Only in those cases where the leader has military might or police force, such as the individuals
discussed by Willner (1984) is there power which can be utilized coercively. Coercive power is available when the responsibility and ability to choose life and death is under control of one person for others in the system. In our American system, the potentiality for coercive power has been limited by our ideology of freedom. Examples, such as Jim Jones and Jonestown, do, however, exist (Hall, 1989). McPherson had influence based primarily upon her ability to communicate. Conflict was evident between her and her lieutenants when she attempted to make "efficient" decisions arising out of a relationship of power. Brown's analysis of power requires a balance between "deciding power" and "persuasive power." Decision can be presented in benign ways, such as by way of "love gifts," "wish fulfillment," where the leader's needs are anticipated and acted upon without verbal expression of command. This was true in McPherson's case. Like all charismatic leaders she gained power by communication but maintained relationship by utilizing both "power through communication," and "communication through power" (Brown, 1986:197).

Initially, power was centralized in Aimee Semple McPherson. In her crusades and campaigns, much of the advertising, promotion, and organizational efforts did not take place until she arrived on the scene. It was not until Towner organized the San Jose, California, crusade that anyone made any attempt at preparing beforehand for McPher-
son's crusade (McPherson, 1923:304-311). Choicemaking was centered in McPherson because she was perceived as the "instrument" for bringing the revival. This is shown in the attitude of the crowds which they expressed to the Dayton newspapers regarding McPherson's one-day campaign in May, 1921. She was perceived as the means of bringing revival long sought by people in the community (McPherson-Peffers, 1919). In addition, there was no real "team" which organized, maintained, and followed up on McPherson's crusades. This lack of organizational relationship changed, however, when the Temple was opened in 1923. McPherson's periodical is detailed in the description of the organization of Temple activities. While it is clear that McPherson was always present in the early days, she began to yield other tasks to helpers (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.6 No. 8 [Jan. 1923]; Vol.7 No. 1 [June 1923]). McPherson yielded more and more duties to others, carefully dividing them so that no one person could make too influential choices in her organization. In Chapter Five, some of those given more authority challenged McPherson's leadership, but they had become "choicemakers" in her organization because they had been hand-picked by McPherson. There was no prescribed method of sharing McPherson's power and even those who once worked against her might be recruited to further the effectiveness of the Temple minis-
try, as in the case of the lawyers and reporters who joined her team after the trial, which had resulted from her disappearance (cf. Chapter IV). McPherson's popularity, not only in Southern California but also across the country, made her disciples desirable for ministers. Communities reportedly were requesting her trainees to begin churches. There were even imposters who sought to capitalize on McPherson's popularity; McPherson had to warn her readers (*Bridal Call Foursquare* Vol.9 No.4 [Sept. 1925]:14).

The net result of the division of responsibilities for decisions was a gradual development of a denomination, church by church, with pastors, both male and female, trained in McPherson's college and Temple in her doctrine, method, and style. However, in the early days many more women were pastors than is currently the case (*Ohio Christian News* Vol.62 No.7 [Oct. 1989]:3; *Christianity Today* Vol.17 No.13 [Mar. 30, 1973]:694-695; Synan, 1987:54; Jacquet, 1989:261-266). It was not simply the leadership of Rolf McPherson that brought the denomination into acceptability and growth since Aimee McPherson's death but rather all of the pastors who had experienced her meetings and trained at her college, and who carried the vision of the Foursquare Movement forward ("Membership Figures," *Christian Century* Vol.106 No.25 [Aug.30-Sept.6, 1989]:776).
METHODS OF INTERVENTION

How did McPherson's attitude about herself as leader change across time? How did she intervene to increase her power to accomplish her goals? In Chapter Three, McPherson was seen as having perceived herself as the "Handmaiden of the Lord." As her role changed, (see below Institutionalization and Legend Building), McPherson utilized a strategy of anomaly featuring. She allowed no alternative definition of her ministry or of herself to go unchallenged, showing how the opinions were false, Satanic in origin, or inconsistent with her person or work. This does not mean she challenged the individuals directly, for she considered this to be fighting and unacceptable (McPherson, 1927:88). However, she was quick to define her position in sermon, article, and book, as her several writings demonstrate.

McPherson's maneuver for inviting attributions of power utilized the Pentecostal world-view of the call and of demonstrated signs. The healings at San Diego (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 4 No. 10 [March, 1921]), her vision at Oakland (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 8 No. 3 [Aug., 1924]:18-20), and her services at the Temple (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol. 13 No. 6 [Nov., 1929]:6) were utilized as signs of her call, her charisma, and her place as a special instrument of God in that particular time and place.

McPherson's tactics to maintain her power, especially
in the aftermath of the disappearance, and the subsequent defections from her organization, were varied—depending upon the specific situation. In the case of the threat of loss of power following the disappearance, McPherson denied the allegations. Friend and foe alike recognized that McPherson did not alter her story. It remained the same firm denial of wrong (Steele, 1959; Cox, 1983; McPherson, 1927). She presented her case in her famous sermonic style that blended story telling and dramatic staging, which yielded an audience-involving presentation of her interpretation. Although there were government officials and newspapers against her, she had access to her own auditorium to address the faithful, to her own radio to reach all the surrounding area, and to her own publications to present her case to distant followers. In the final analysis, it was McPherson's public appearances that convinced many marginal followers that her interpretation of the events was accurate. Her vindication tours were important to the justification and maintenance of her place in the power structure of her church because she was able to convince the marginal followers that she was essentially the same as they had remembered her and that the accusations were false anomalies.

In the decade following her disappearance, McPherson's power was severely challenged by rising leaders in her church and her Temple. As they sought to gain more power,
they did so by appealing to the imaged McPherson of the past. McPherson was successful in convincing her followers that, indeed, she was the same McPherson, that her desires and her interpretations were justified. In these cases, McPherson also used threat to move challenging persons out of the power structure. Enacted in the guiding document, is an implied threat to those who might criticize Aimee Semple McPherson. In the additional unnumbered paragraph, at the end of the document, *The Declaration of Faith*, people are required to be quiet, not to criticize, and to leave quietly if they did not agree with McPherson (*Declaration of Faith* nd:29-30).

CHANGES

Power creates an increased importance for the quality of loyalty, particularly loyalty to the charismatic leader. As time progressed and McPherson gained more and more of a following, her uniqueness was extolled, and her importance to the followers had to be justified. McPherson came to the position that loyalty meant loyalty to her and her ideas. In countering the image of the newspapers about her disappearance, McPherson conceived of the reports as a conspiracy and persecution that had its roots in Hell, and the activity of the Devil. She presented the persecution of Aimee Semple McPherson and Angelus Temple as persecution of the Church Universal (Chapter IV). In the challenges brought against
her by some of the movement's leaders, McPherson was specifically concerned with the issues of loyalty to herself. She had been sensitized by the attacks from the newspapers whom she had considered allies in the presentation of the Gospel. She recalled, "New York press representatives attended the meetings; also National Syndicates flashed the news of this, (to them) wonderful revival to every state in the Union, making the bold assertion that we were 'driving the devil from New York,'" and similar encounters (McPherson, 1923:171).

Changes in power associations not only affected the source of knowledge that McPherson was the spokesperson for God (with the highest level of importance being loyalty to McPherson), but it also affected, for those in her movement, the nature of being for the Church. McPherson became the model for Christianity and Pentecostalism.

The adherents to the movement, even without McPherson asking, began to emulate her. The women dressed in uniforms like McPherson's and did their hair after the manner of her hairstyle. The method of worship utilized by both male and female ministers was that utilized by McPherson at Angelus Temple. McPherson emphasized the methods of her Temple as being the prime example of the model of Christian worship, worship in "the middle of the road."

This then is the condition at the left and at the right. But down the center of the road,
between the two, marches the Foursquare army, an ever increasing number, with banners gleaming, "Holiness unto the Lord." Not touched by the formalism at the left, nor swept aside by the fanaticism at the right, still taking the fundamental teaching of the old church and the fire of the new. They have made a happy combination of both, which is seeping multitudes into Glory (Bridal Call Foursquare Vol.13 No.6 [Nov., 1929]:6).

Power was divided and the system grew and multiplied as McPherson became the inspiration, source, and model of the movement. As adherents multiplied, McPherson's perception of her power increased, which moved her in her self concept from that of the servant to that of a sovereign in control of all that she surveyed.

SUMMARY

Power of the charismatic leader develops within the system. This power is institutionalized as it is "shared" among the adherents to the system. The charismatic leader begins to gain power as a following is attracted to the leader; this is ethos. The more ethos the leader has been credited with, the more the leader's "influence" grows over the existing and new adherents. The larger number of people being influenced by the leader creates a managerial problem, which necessitates that the leader divide "responsibility" among key adherents. The sharing of responsibility requires a higher level of trust and loyalty between the leader and these key lieutenants. The more intense the "relationship,"
the less necessity for attraction as the system cycles through power switches (cf. Figure 9).

Institutionalization is achieved through the sharing of power relationships as the system grows from the attraction of the charismatic leader. The leader is no longer able to do all that he or she was once able to do. The day-to-day management and lesser decisions have to be delegated to others in the system. The stronger the relationship and development of power among the managers means less attraction to the leader. Less attraction threatens influence, the structure of responsibility, and relationship requiring an intervention to switch from "Less to More" (Figure 9). That is, when there is "less" attraction to the leader, the leader has "less" influence, reducing the amount of responsibility that must be shared with the leader. With "less" responsibility to share, there is "less" interdependency among the lieutenants. In order to insure the continuation of the system the attraction to the Charismatic leader must be increased--the "less" to "more" switch.
Figure 9 INSTITUTIONALIZATION AS POWER
INSTITUTIONALIZATION AS LEGEND BUILDING

THE SYSTEM
One of the questions considered in this dissertation was about perceptions of McPherson by her followers across time. The continuum of perceptions is a continuum of roles. These roles include: (1) servant; (2) campaigner; (3) builder; and (4) potentate. The roles, as defined by the communication exchange between leader and followers, established a conception of McPherson which she either had to live by or else show how any apparent behavioral anomaly "really fit" the conception of what I have called "The Legendary McPherson."

The Servant. The role of servant was enacted and promoted from the beginning of McPherson's return to ministry in 1915. "Sister" Sharp discovered her as she continued to fulfill servant roles in various meetings in the small towns of Ontario. Mount Forest was the beginning of a theme that McPherson utilized in her coastal campaigns from New England to Florida and back in 1917 to late 1919. McPherson described herself in the Bridal Call as the "Handmaiden of the Lord" (Chapter III). This image was salient with the perceived need of the audiences in the communities she campaigned in, traveling from place to place pitching her tent and preaching her message of preparation for the "Coming of the Lord."
The Campaigner. After McPherson relocated to Southern California, she gradually was seen as a "Campaigner," that is, she was one to be called upon to bring special revival services to entire communities, whether held in Church buildings, as in Rochester, New York, and Washington, D.C., or in a large tent as in San Jose or Fresno, or in arenas, coliseums, or large halls as in San Diego, Denver, or Canton, Ohio. As McPherson was able to build her crowds into the thousands, she had a vision of a tabernacle in which she could preach and teach. The concept of the Echo Park Evangelistic Tabernacle was born. People supported her efforts to build the Temple, which was conceived and promoted as an interdenominational evangelistic outreach of which they could be a part.

The Builder. The development of the concept about McPherson as an evangelist, healer, and revivalist blossomed further when the Temple was opened in January, 1923. For over three years the auditorium was filled to overflowing many times each week. McPherson was perceived as being "mightily used by God." McPherson, herself, viewed the system pragmatically. Her task was to preach and spread the Gospel and even unusual means seemed appropriate—announcing a campaign between bouts of a boxing match, dropping leaflets from an open cockpit airplane, or elaborate dramatizations of her sermons. During this period McPherson did not attempt to control her image as much as to flow with it.
Both the newspaper sensational response to her disappearance, as well as followers' approving responses to her other activities seemed surprising to her. McPherson believed the same proofs which she offered to the people. If indeed, she was the charismatic leader, how could her requests run awry?

The Potentate. As McPherson's power increased perceptively, and people responded to her wishes and in other ways allowed her to enact communication through power, she enacted the role of a "Potentate." But, the result of the change in the McPherson image over time was the creation of an alter ego, the "Legendary McPherson." The people had clearly in mind who McPherson was "to be" and exactly how she "should act" and also the limits of her power. McPherson and the people seem unaware of the presence of this image of McPherson that both filled up the audience's expectation and limited the expansion of McPherson's personal freedoms. McPherson wanted to act out power as a "potentate" but had to enact the role of "Legendary McPherson" to participate in the system. To do otherwise, meant collapse of the system. This image of McPherson became the controlling ideology that looped back upon itself keeping the system from collapsing from the vicious circle of McPherson's inability to keep pace with her "Legendary self."
METHOD OF INTERVENTION

The development of Aimee Semple McPherson was not that of a well-laid plan. McPherson's program was developmental and pragmatic. The controlling aspect of the development of McPherson was her sense of calling and her belief that her primary purpose was to preach the Gospel. This program developed through opportunities which presented themselves. These came at important junctures in her own life. McPherson's near death influenced her call, and the illness of and lack of stability for her children influenced her decision to relocate in California (McPherson, 1919: 93-106; 205-207). The results of her trial influenced McPherson into organizing her following into a denomination (Chapter IV). McPherson's strategy throughout was both anomaly featuring and anomaly masking, based upon her prior conception of her "mission" in life.

McPherson's anomaly featuring is notable in her ministry to blacks in south Florida when that was unpopular, but most especially in Baltimore, where she specifically controls "Pentecostal manifestations" in order to "Fish for Whales" i.e., to win over religious leaders to her evangelism and her message (McPherson, 1923: 173-175). McPherson also featured her uniqueness and the uniqueness of her message at Oakland in 1922, when she declared "the Four Square Gospel" and organized "The Four Square Gospel Association" around this unique statement of the Christian Gos-
pel (Chapter III). In these cases, McPherson was featuring her differences from the expectations about "Pentecostals." Featuring these differences even made some of the Pentecostal constituency question the validity of her Pentecostalism. In addition to the overtly stated differences in property management, which contributed to McPherson's withdrawal from the Assemblies, actions such as limiting of women ministers in Ohio (Culbertson, 1988:3), and criticism about her "Pentecostalness" ("Is Mrs. McPherson Pentecostal?" Bridal Call Vol.6 No.5 [Oct. 1922]:7,9-13), led to her separating herself from the General Council.

At the same time McPherson was featuring her uniqueness as a Pentecostal, she was masking any deviation which might be construed as non-Christian. Activities such as going into nightclubs and moving to accept current dress codes were redefined so that followers could adjust their prior beliefs about these items and activities and see them as a means of evangelism and outreach to those not of the church. Such maneuvers were effective because McPherson was able to demonstrate to her audience the evidences of the cures in the abandoned crutches, the numbers of people coming to the altar in reports, and the numbers of people attending Angelus Temple and crusades. The extra efforts of city and transportation services and reporting in the news helped people to see that McPherson was being effective.
Effectiveness was viewed as a sign of God's working through Aimee Semple McPherson. Signs helped create the legend of McPherson and they also helped to verify McPherson in her evangelistic activities.

Serious threats to McPherson's image, such as the trial after her disappearance and the challenges by various Temple leaders such as Nichols, Goben, and Crawford (Chapter V) were met with the tactic of denial of the attitudes, positions, or activities attributed to her. In addition, McPherson labeled such activity as disloyalty and attributed to those who questioned her similar accusations of evil, moral failure, and destroying the work of God. Generally, McPherson's maneuver worked, with the exception of the public response to her third marriage and divorce. These behaviors could not be redefined to her followers. The expectations of the people forced McPherson to align her behavior with what the people expected of "Sister Aimee," the evangelist and Christian leader.

If the development of Aimee Semple McPherson was not that of a well-laid plan, neither was it inevitable, nor is it that the Social Intervention Model is fatalistic. While the narrative and explanation about Aimee Semple McPherson in this study might seem to suggest determinism, this is a feature of "point of view." In looking at the developmental process from McPherson's aspect, we see the elements of her choosing in the attention switches and changes in interde-
pendency and interpersonal needs. When we look at these changes from the systemic view, the changes in McPherson's life are "variations on a theme." That is, others go through similar life events and progress along similar paths. The Social Intervention Model is not setting a deterministic course for the charismatic leader, as much as it is describing the general process which humans seem to follow in their social progress and individual development. The social scientist's knowledge of what an individual may do does not take choice away from the individual any more, to paraphrase Augustine, than does a parent's ability to predict a choice to be made by a child; that is, the ability to predict does not cause the event of the choice. Aimee Semple McPherson chose her course, but there is a similarity of pattern between her choice and those of other charismatic leaders, as described from the perspective of this model.

CHANGES

The ideological changes about the charismatic leader involve not only the sense of call for the religious leader, but the sense that the teachings and beliefs of the group are localized in the legendary leader. Foursquare doctrine was validated in Aimee Semple McPherson. The teachings were not essentially new to Pentecostalism or even to the prior Holiness revival, but they had a new vitality as a source of truth and knowledge because the expression came from the
lips of Aimee Semple McPherson. As time progressed, the doctrines were viewed as uniquely tied to McPherson and finally to the organization formed from the blending of ideology about McPherson and the ideology of her teaching. McPherson, as charismatic leader, evolved in the belief of the people to the place that she was the perfect match to the world-view of Restorational Pentecostalism that she taught as the Foursquare Gospel.

In addition to changes in the concept of McPherson as the source of knowledge and evaluation of the movement, is that the movement's essence was McPherson and her "Legendary Self." What was achieved in the belief of the people was something of a platonic model of the charismatic leader. That is, the particular "Aimee Semple McPherson" was to be understood in terms of the idealized legend that her followers built around her. This is not to say that these beliefs had no foundation, but that McPherson as the charismatic leader could not operate outside of her image as it had been institutionalized through both her behavior and the people's belief in the "Legendary McPherson." The charismatic leader is institutionalized through a communication process that intervenes and builds an image that both critics and supporters utilize to measure the person of the leader. In addition, once the image has reached sufficient development, the leader cannot act outside of the role that
has been created and accepted without dismantling the charismatic power. There is a sense, then, that the image has a life of its own separate from the person and that the charismatic leader is not finally institutionalized, simply because he or she develops a structure to work in or distributes his or her power to make the system operate. Rather institutionalization is complete when the individual must live by the image that has been created, and that individual must do so or else be removed from the system.

When the organization loses the leader, the legend about the leader enables the institution to move on "in the spirit of" the charismatic leader. Secondary leaders might ask, "How would Aimee do it?" or "What would Aimee do in this situation, if she were alive?" It is in the legend that is born during the life of the charismatic leader that the institution lives and adjusts. As the institution lives, there is a reminder of the founder and often periodic returns to glory in, emulate, or attempt to follow the pattern that had been established by the leader. In the case of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, there has been a renewed interest in Aimee Semple McPherson, as marked by republishing of some of her books in "Heritage Editions" along with video tapes and audio cassettes. This is the beginning of a healthful and necessary process by which the movement may examine its current vision and goals in light of those seen by their founder and her early fol-
It is important that the movement examine its past and its founder just as other groups in the past have done. In the process of rediscovering the founder, followers can re-evaluate the successes and failures of McPherson. They can not only note their view of how God worked through this woman, but also recognize her as a human being of her time and place. In the knowledge of its past, the Church can face its developmental challenges about the maintaining or loss of charisma within the institution founded by Aimee Semple McPherson.

QUESTION

In response to the first research question: "How does the institutionalization of a charismatic leader from a personal evangelist to a leader of a religious organization take place?" I refer back to the preceding sections, Institutionalization as Ideology, Institutionalization as Power, and Institutionalization and Legend Building above. Institutionalization occurs in the ideological cycling into an organizational structure. It continues to occur through the division of power and multiplication of assistants to accomplish tasks previously reserved for the leader. In addition to the structure and division of power the institutionalization of the charismatic leader takes place in the role definition of the leader by the people. This role define-
tion yields a "Legendary Self" for the leader. The Legend is therefore, the image of the key figure in the movement constructed out of ideology, practice and audience response. It informs expectations about the person for whom the legend is formed. That is, it dictates acceptable behavior and attitudes, and sets boundaries for the leader. The legend is defined and utilized to control the leader by both friends and critics. By this process, the charismatic leader is institutionalized.

MODELING THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION PROCESS

THE MODEL

As figures 8 and 9 suggest there is an ongoing cycle to the process described by the Social Intervention Model. In figure 10, this cycling has been extended into a series of cycles pictured as a helix. In this model of the institutionalization process, the consecutive loops represent attention switches in the life of the charismatic leader. The four key events illustrated from the McPherson case are marked. As there is continuity between the cycles, there are similarities between one cycle and another. These similarities are indicated by the parallel "X's" on each loop. The differences between one cycle and another are indicated by the width of the space between each loop. The narrower the loop, the smaller amount of change between the cycles pictured. The arrow running the center of the helix indi-
cates the trend of the direction of change. It is conceivable that this could be a wandering arrow should there be poor role definition within the system. The arrow further represents the perceptions of both the leader and the people reflecting the rhetorical statements by and about the leader's life and work.

**QUESTION**

In response to question two of this dissertation: "What epistemological claims can be made about the institutionalization process in light of the Social Intervention Model?" I say that there is a predictable series of roles and changes through which a charismatic leader will traverse in the process of institutionalization. This development may or may not be well defined, but they will demonstrate both features of similarity and differences between these roles. The transition process through the roles can be identified by use of Social Intervention Model.
X: Similarities
\{: Differences
\$\$\$: Gestalt Switches
\arrow\: Trend of Development

Figure 10 HELICAL MODEL OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION
SOCIAL INTERVENTION AND THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION PROCESS

The life and ministry of Aimee Semple McPherson, seen through the Social Intervention Model, prompt some speculations about the process of institutionalization. In response to the third question addressed by this dissertation, "What descriptors and predictions can be made about a perceived charismatic leader as a result of this rhetorical analysis?" I respond in the following four sections: which describe the holistic nature of the Social Intervention Model as it continues to function in the created institution.

NEEDS AND RELATIONSHIPS ENGENDER IDEOLOGY

The Social Intervention Model is holographic. That is, the parts interface and influence each other in such a way that to have a part, one has the whole. Based upon this case, ideological formation grows from felt and fulfilled needs through the personal testimony of the budding charismatic leader. This communication is accepted by the group as fulfilling the rhetorical vision so that they grant acceptance (ethos) to the leader, belief to the ideological expression and structure to a relationship in light of the reciprocal commitment of the leader. In this case the ideology of the Foursquare Gospel was formulated as McPherson preached, demonstrated, and explained her mission and
described the particulars of her message. Her charismatic leadership was verified in sign by the "miracles" and by the vast number of people that began to follow her.

IDEOLOGY AND NEEDS EXPLAIN POWER

Power as interpersonal relationships is systematized when public presentations of the public's needs, as defined by the leader, are accepted as part of the rhetorical vision of the group. These presentations both define personal expectations and give a pattern for persuading others to join the group. The relationships are further systematized in the prescribed feeling of oughtness in both the stated and unstated expectations about belief and behavior. As in this case, the rhetorical situation demanded that a structure develop to control and guide both the ideology and need fulfillment of both McPherson and her followers. The structure was further necessitated by the fact that McPherson could no longer "do it all" because of the vastness of the audience.

Further, power as interpersonal relationships is divided as the ideology is formalized into organizational structures and operational procedures characterized by signs and symbols meeting the need for group unity. The presence of uniforms and other marks of conformity to the group were a means to demonstrate the group's unity; the level of importance of structural activity in the group was a means
of multiplying the effect of the charismatic leader.

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS AND IDEOLOGY EXPLICATE NEEDS

Needs are often presented for immediate action, but implementation is controlled by the restrictions of the power system in which the need exists. A need is also controlled through exigency, the special circumstances and situations that come into consideration because of the ideological field in which the need exists. When a need is identified, it is modified through a process of interpersonal conflicts of varying degrees. The conflict may be enhanced if someone such as the charismatic leader attempts to obtain or utilize power which by extent or nature the leader does not possess. Thus if the leader attempts to utilize power as a means of communication but has only power built on communication, the results will be enigmatic to the leader, the system, or the situation.

It is one function of the system to limit the nature of perceived needs of powershares. This limitation is accomplished by stabilizing through more clearly specified rules and expectations, as well as by modifying the ideology regarding charisma, leadership, and group identity. In this case, Aimee Semple McPherson perceived that her needs of loneliness and for loyalty could be fulfilled by the people allowing and rejoicing in her marriage to David Hutton. However, the system precluded such a solution for several
reasons. There was conflict regarding a place for Hutton within the system. He felt he had certain inherent rights as the spouse of the leader; however, the hierarchy did not wish him meddling in the situation without earning a place. Under these conditions he could not have been fully accepted into the system.

In another fashion, McPherson's action broke system taboos that reached back into prior systems. The justifications and praises offered as interventions by Temple leaders within the system could not suffice in this situation. McPherson's perceived need would have to be met in another fashion. She was going to have to find fulfillment in the structure that had been built around her and her "Legend."

IDEOLOGY, POWER, AND NEEDS CONTINUE TO CYCLE IN THE INSTITUTION

The process of institutionalization is the process of the holographic interfacing of ideology, power, and needs. These three interact together to formulate, systematize and moderate the exigency of rhetorical situations. Once this institutionalization process has begun, it can continue even after the death of the charismatic leader.

If the charismatic leader dies he or she is often enshrined while mythbuilding is utilized to ensure the continuity of the institution. Often this involves focusing on the uniqueness of the individual qua the rhetorical vision
of the organization being emphasized. It also involves sanitization of the leader's personal history to exemplify better the ideals of the ideology. This gives the institution a means to continue to develop its power system and definition of needs of the group as it redevelops its social presentation of the group's rhetorical vision. The vision and the "Legendary Leader" are kept alive in an ideal depiction to enable the group to pursue its vision. This is accomplished by subordinating the "Legend" about the leader to the vision which in part the leader helped to create.

In the case under study, this was accomplished by telling stories about McPherson's vision, and the building of Angelus Temple, in maintaining publication of This is That in the 1923 edition. The generation that arose in the organization in the 1960's knew nothing of the controversies, challenges, or alternative accounts of McPherson. The presentation of The Disappearance of Aimee in the mid 1970's was a challenge not only to the corporate memory of McPherson; it was also a challenge to a large body of adherents who had not had any idea of the existence of the controversy. Realizing that ignoring the past was not a sufficient strategy, Raymond Cox has been busy restating the organizational image of Aimee Semple McPherson by editing an ideological presentation in The Foursquare Gospel (1969), McPherson's life in The Story of My Life (1973), and responding to the controversy of the disappearance in The
Verdict is In (1983).

In addition, the organization has reiterated its place in Pentecostalism by publishing a systematic theology, *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology* (Duffield & Van Cleave 1983). One of the organizational leaders has been involved in the interface of Pentecostalism and Charismatics and is significant in reshaping the vision of Pentecostals, Charismatics, and other Evangelicals in regard to the subject of worship through sermon, song, and book, *Worship His Majesty* (Hayford, 1981 & 1987).

**CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS RESEARCH**

In examining Aimee Semple McPherson and the beginnings of her organization, The International Church of the Four-square Gospel, through the lens of the Social Intervention Model of Rhetorical investigation, at least three areas show significant outcome.

First, this research has given insight into the possible motives for the formation of McPherson's denomination. In the rhetorical situation of forceful separation from the public and supportive media, McPherson felt a necessity to structure her security around her. It was a means to maintain control of her successes and avoid losing what she had worked so hard to achieve. Her work had become her life and a threat to one was a threat to the other. This was not
only a sociological dynamic but also a rhetorical position of defense and a means to demonstrate that she was still an effective minister and leader.

Second, this research gives insight into the power of the congregation to control the development of the charisma of the leader. In this case, this was specifically exercised in the rejection of specific aspects of McPherson's life which believers found incompatible with the image they held of their leader. As a means of retaining rhetorical control, McPherson had to adjust her life to the expectations of the role she had chosen, which also had been defined for her by her followers.

Third, this research identifies features of institutionalization via rhetoric. It is not only a structural organization or division of power, but also the systematization of the image of the charismatic leader. The process of defining and presenting the image in roles leads to a picture of reality, which limits the functions of the leader as much as does an abstracted structure or division of power. Because of the numerous sociological studies, institutionalization is often read in terms of "routinization"--the pattern fixing of ritual and relationship that intends to maintain the charisma of the leader in his or her absence. Through the lens of the Social Intervention Model, institutionalization describes the image building that occurs before and during the identification of a charismatic leader
through the process of audience ethos, as well as the image building of a controlling legend about the leader. Legend development is a combination of events in real time, the ethos of followers and the persona, or public presentation of the leader herself. Institutionalization via rhetoric shows development before Weber's "sudden" appearance of a leader and the routinization engaged in by the social structure built around the leader.

Fourth, this study highlights the feature that certain events do not need to be brought to the state of "fact" to be useful to the researcher. The disappearance, for instance, does not have to be proven as "she did or she didn't" in order to see the effect of interpretation of the event upon McPherson, her followers, or on others. The researcher can still see how image building works on institutionalization (cf. pp. 180, 181, 197, 199). While it is not necessary to know the true nature of McPherson's disappearance to discuss the rhetorical situation, it is important historically and does reflect upon McPherson's internal psychological processes. It would be extremely helpful to know the processes and outcomes of actions that were taken behind closed doors. It is important for an accurate historical presentation to have access to the corporate records. The absence of personal papers also hinders understanding some of the private thought processes of Aimee
Semple McPherson. If, indeed, they exist, they were unavai-

Sufficient time will have to pass for the particulars about the primary characters can be revealed without breach of confidentiality. It is important to understand the de-
tails of the development of the Foursquare movement, because the models McPherson used to structure her organization reflect the twentieth century. She also sought to give women a place in ministry, which is a current concern in many religious groups. But some of these questions remain unanswered because of inaccessibility of primary documents and records.

Finally, this study contributes to understanding and applying the Social Intervention Model of rhetorical research. As such, this study illustrates the invention nature of the model; it illustrates rhetoric as a way of knowing. It is important to note, however, that while the approach of Social Intervention Model illustrates rhetoric as a way of knowing, it does not preclude its use as an approach to rhetoric as valuing.

If one views institutionalization as organizational structure and the eventual demise of charisma, Aimee Semple McPherson could be conceived as having failed her charisma by the very fact of institutionalization. Social Intervention Model explains how this is not failure in two ways. First, Social Intervention Model uses a perspective
approach. That is, at one time it looks at the rhetorical events from the perspective of one participant and at other times from the viewpoint of a different participant. It may also take a "God's eye-view"--a perspective that views the entire interaction. This is a feature of its holistic nature.

Second, the process of progressive attention shift with changes in ideology, interdependency, and intrapersonal need allows an individual or group to modify beliefs and practices so that they do not seem anomalous to the system. Pentecostals, as did Aimee Semple McPherson, generally held a belief against organization. It was part of the Rhetorical Vision to laud their freedom from structure, liturgy, and ritual which they identified with the older mainline denominations. But Aimee Semple McPherson successfully renamed the organizational structure as part of the expansion of the Rhetorical Vision of the Foursquare Gospel, while her people saw it as a means of preserving Aimee Semple McPherson's charisma in the Legend.

FUTURE RESEARCH

In regard to Aimee Semple McPherson, there are areas of her ministry which studies could illuminate. One would be a focus on McPherson's relation to ministers and denominations during her interdenominational campaign period. Did they see her efforts as another period of awakening on the Ameri-
can scene? A closer scrutiny of the Angelus Temple commis-
sary during the Depression could specifically address some
of the social influences of McPherson's ministry in the
Southern California community.

Although there have been some studies of McPherson's
sermons as models of narrative style and compilations of
edited sermons for apologetic reasons, there is currently no
volume which sets her sermons in their historical setting
and rhetorical situation. This would seem to be of value
both to scholars and to her organization.

There has been a dissertation which addresses some of
the theological questions of women in ministry (Tibbetts,
1976), but no specific study as to the possible model McPher-
son might offer women in the pastoral ministry. This would
seem an appropriate study for those interested in pastoral
theology.

In addition, a closer examination of the Interna-
tional Church of the Foursquare Gospel and its leaders seems
important to better understand the roles new leaders take in
the organization, in light of the charismatic leader's
memory. In particular, Jack Hayford, although not currently
a denominational organizational leader, has been in the past
and continues to have charismatic effect on many ministers
of the organization. Is his development a complementary
charismatic leadership or a replacement within the system?
There are currently several other cases which might be studied to verify the processes intimated in this study. Currently, the religious-media charismatic leaders offer subjects in Jim Bakker, Oral Roberts, and Pat Robertson, all of whom have built religious organizations who have had to respond to controversy, and are nationally notable. These would make good subjects to replicate this research. The uniqueness of Jim Jones' power over his people make his movement another possible figure for doctoral study. In addition, this study might be generalized to study figures as the epitome of movements involving institutionalization of charismatic figures ranging from industrial entrepreneurs to entertainment figures such as Walt Disney and their individual influences on their individual systems and organizations.

CONCLUSION

McPherson remembered from her beginnings as an evangelist at Mount Forest, Ontario, that once she had a crowd, she was able to keep their attention, and gain their acceptance and allegiance to her message. What McPherson was unaware of was that in the act of standing upon the chair, she began to create an image that would control her activities and choices in the future. The presentation of McPherson's public self gained control over her private self. McPherson's rhetoric was the reality of her life for as a
charismatic public person, her accepted role became defined by her public, and she could not separate from the role without losing the public she desperately wanted.

McPherson once commented that she had given up the stage to become a Christian and a minister. In the final analysis, this was an inaccurate assessment. She indeed was an actress on the stage before the public. Her purpose was not to entertain but to win them to the vision she had about Christ, the World, and the Future. She achieved what she wanted and paid the price for the fame that came her way. Not all agreed with her methods, but they recognized the vitality and importance that Aimee Semple McPherson had for her age.
1. II Kings 4:38-41 was the text regarding the prophet Elisha at Gilgal. Compare the sermon in *Bridal Call* where the reference is to the Foursquare movement with the 1919 version in *This is That* pages 596-614 where the movement is defined as the Pentecostal movement.

2. The Church started by McPherson in Mount Forest reportedly still exists. It did not join her organization (Austin, Aimee Semple McPherson, 1980:20).

3. In the arrangement for crusades, local ministers were the organizing force. McPherson was the only constant in all of the crusades. There were occasions, however that ministers traveled to and assisted in local crusades. Charles S. Price, for instance, came to Canton, Ohio, to help.
APPENDIX:

CHRONOLOGY OF AIMEE SEMPLE MCPHERSON

Oct. 09, 1890  Born, Ingersoll, Ontario, Canada
Winter 1908  Conversion
Aug. 12, 1908  Marriage to Robert Semple
Jan. 02, 1909  Ordained by William H. Durham
Jan. 1910  Commissioned as Missionaries to Hong Kong by Hebden Mission, Toronto, Ontario
Spring 1910  First Sermon, basis for "Lost and Restored," London, England
June 1910  Arrive as Missionaries Hong Kong, China
Sept. 17, 1910  Roberta Semple is born.
Oct. 24, 1911  Marriage to Harold McPherson
Mar. 23, 1913  Rolf McPherson is born.
1915  Return to Ministry
1916  Evangelistic Crusades up and down East Coast of U.S.
June 1917  Begin publication of The Bridal Call
Oct.-Nov. 1918  Transcontinental trip by Automobile to Los Angeles, California
Jan. 1919  City Campaigns begin
1919  Ordained by Assemblies of God
Feb. 1919  Publication of This is That
Dec. 1920  Licensed an Exhorter in Methodist Episcopal Church
1921  Publication of collections of sermons, Divine Healing Sermons; Second Coming of Christ
Aug. 1921  Divorced by Harold McPherson
Jan. 05, 1922  Returned credentials to Assemblies of God
Mar. 27, 1922  Ordained by First Baptist Church of San Jose, California
July 1922  Oakland, California Campaign
"Vision" of Foursquare Gospel
"Four Square Gospel Association"
1922  Australian Campaign
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 01, 1923</td>
<td>Opening of Angelus Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 1923</td>
<td>Publication of 3rd Edition This is That</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1924</td>
<td>Opening of Radio Station KFSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 11, 1926</td>
<td>Ends Marathon of Services at Temple for a vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Campaign in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18, 1926</td>
<td>Disappears from Venice Beach, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 23, 1926</td>
<td>Reappears at Auga Pieta, Mexico/Douglas, Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-Dec. 1926</td>
<td>Grand Jury investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 10, 1927</td>
<td>Acquited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.-Mar. 1927</td>
<td>Vindication Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1927</td>
<td>Nichols Defection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 28, 1927</td>
<td>Foursquare Gospel Lighthouses, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1929</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1930</td>
<td>Reorganization, International Church of the Foursquare Gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 13, 1931</td>
<td>Marriage to David Hutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1931</td>
<td>Free Dining Hall Opens as Angelus Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1932</td>
<td>Open Bible Evangelistic Association split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1933</td>
<td>Hutton separation, ends in divorce the next year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1933</td>
<td>2nd Vindication Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1933</td>
<td>Appoints Rheba Crawford &quot;Active&quot; Pastor of Angelus Temple, to facilitate travel and evangelistic campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>World Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Publication of Give Me My Own God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.-Dec. 1936</td>
<td>Law suits by Denton, Semple, Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1937</td>
<td>Rheba Crawford opens rival, &quot;Interdenominational Church.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1944</td>
<td>Oakland, California Crusade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 26, 1944</td>
<td>Last Sermon: &quot;The Story of My Life&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 27, 1944</td>
<td>Death, Oakland, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 09, 1944</td>
<td>Funeral, Burial at Forest Lawn, Glendale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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