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The Baptist Bible Fellowship (hereafter BBF) is a loosely organized association of independent fundamentalist Baptist pastors and churches in the United States. The BBF came into existence in 1950, when its founders separated from the World Fundamentalist Baptist Missionary Fellowship led by the controversial J. Frank Norris. From its inception the BBF made clear that it existed for the primary purpose of sending missionaries around the world, and its organizational structure developed in response to this understanding.1

By 1960, the leaders of the BBF claimed to speak for “1,100 churches composed of one million Americans.”2 The movement’s exponential growth over its first ten years—it had begun with just 120 churches3—was primarily attributable to the fact that its founders believed strongly in using revival meetings to build churches. In 1950 one of those founders stated, “Nearly every one of the preachers of the Baptist Bible Fellowship is a mass revivalist. All of our churches are the products of mass revivals.”4 Keith Bassham, a magazine editor who has observed the BBF from within for several decades, confirms this interpretation of the movement’s early history: “The presence of so many pastors who were equally in their element in revivalist mode is logical once you consider that the fundamentalist movement of the late 19th and early 20th centuries is theologically and sociologically related more to the frontier revival movements than any of the other religious traditions.”5

Attempting to describe frontier revivalism, Nancy Pearcey asks, “How do you make an effective religious appeal to . . . uncivilized, rough-hewn people? How do you bring religion to Dodge City? . . . You do exactly what the Methodists and Baptists did in the revival movements: You grab people by the throat with an intense emotional experience to persuade them of the power of the supernatural—then you tell them to stop drinking, stop shooting each other, and live straight.”6 She then explains how Charles Finney adapted revival techniques for use in urban settings: “He took the camp meeting style, dressed it in a suit, upgraded to a more urbane language, and pitched his appeal to the professional classes (lawyers and businessmen).”7 Finney died in 1875, but others picked up the mantle of revivalism. By the time that the BBF came into existence 75 years later, the American people had been exposed to D. L. Moody, Sam Jones, Billy Sunday, and a host of less prominent revivalists—and Billy Graham was just getting started in the field of mass evangelism. In short, the BBF inherited a vibrant legacy of revivalism.

As noted above, the BBF’s first decade was one of remarkable growth. By the late 1970s several of the movement’s key founders had passed the scene and the era of rapid expansion had come to an end. Therefore, if one is to understand the role that revivals played in the growth of the BBF, it is imperative to focus on the period between 1950 and 1970. The primary record of the BBF’s history is the Baptist Bible Tribune (hereafter the Tribune), a weekly newspaper that began publication in 1950 and converted to a monthly magazine a few decades later. The Tribune served as a mouthpiece of the BBF, but a record of the views and activities of the movement’s stakeholders.8

In order to focus my research objectively, I have determined to study the practice of revivalism within the BBF as documented in the tenth volume of the Tribune, which began in July 1959 and continued through June 1960. (During this period the BBF was still in its pioneer stage, but was far enough along in its development to demonstrate the movement’s vibrant growth.) More specifically, I will apply Kenneth Burke’s dramatistic pentad9 to the source material so as to portray more clearly the nature, context, personalities, methods, and aims of revivalism as practiced in the early years of the BBF.

Act: The Nature of BBF Revival Meetings

The 48 issues that make up the tenth volume of the Tribune give account of at least 144 recent, current, or upcoming revival meetings.10 Nearly all of these meetings—140, to be precise—were held on American soil—in a total of 28 states and territories. The remaining four took place in three foreign countries where BBF-sponsored missionaries were stationed (Cuba, Formosa, and the Philippines). Nearly two-thirds of the American revival meetings were concentrated in
six states: Texas (30), Missouri (17), Virginia (15), Ohio (11), Kansas (10), and Oklahoma (8). Meetings were reported to have taken place in 110 U.S. cities, with 20 of these being the site of two or more meetings. The site of the largest number of meetings reported (6) was Springfield, Missouri, where the BBF had its headquarters.

Revival meetings reported in 1959 and 1960 had certain features in common. Most consisted of a string of meetings held on consecutive days. Presumably all had preaching as their central activity, with music occupying an important but secondary place. Notwithstanding these similarities, revival meetings also exhibited a range of variation. For example, they differed substantially in length—a matter that I will discuss in the *Agency* section below. They also admitted variations in sponsorship, emphasis, integration with other gatherings, location, and planned culmination.

Nearly all of the 1959-60 revival meetings referred to in the *Tribune* were sponsored by a single local church. However, at least one exception to this rule was noted, as reported in the paper’s March 4, 1960, issue: “A group of churches cooperated in sponsoring a revival in Community Baptist church, Hazelton, Kan., with Paul Lambert as the evangelist. . . . The third week of the meeting was held in the First [Baptist] church of Kiowa.”11 The fact that only one multi-church meeting was mentioned in a twelve-month period is consistent with the ongoing observation that the BBF “advocates local church autonomy and strong pastoral leadership.”12

While BBF churches did not experiment much in regards to sponsorship of revival meetings, they did exercise more latitude in selecting a meeting emphasis. A review of the *Tribune*’s 1959-60 coverage reveals three specialized emphases: missions, youth, and visitation. Denver pastor Carl Boonstra reported having held a mission-centered revival meeting:

We recently had with us Bro. Bob Carlton, Fellowship missionary to Brazil. He left with us one of the greatest missionary challenges our people ever heard. During the three days he spoke for us we had conversions to Christ and additions to the church.

I belive [sic] a Fellowship church will experience a revival, especially in missions, if it will have Bro. Carlton speak for it and show his excellent pictures of the savage tribes of South America.13

At least three churches were said to have organized a youth-focused revival meeting in the period under consideration. One account read as follows: “Bill Sparks and Rodger Phillips conducted a youth revival in Sunnyvale Baptist Temple, Dallas, Tex., Loys Vess, pastor. There were six professions of faith in Christ.”14 Finally, a church in Durant, Oklahoma, was reported to have held “a week’s visitation revival”; this event included a day of “special prayer services” and benefited from the assistance of two guests from Texas.15

Churches occasionally found it desirable to conduct revival meetings in conjunction with other multi-day events. Such events included vacation Bible schools, Bible conferences, and pastors’ fellowship meetings.16 Such variations were likely a matter of expediency: If a capable speaker was coming from a great distance to preach a revival, it was reasonable to assemble different audiences that might benefit from diverse facets of his ministry.

Churches did not always convene their revival meetings in their own buildings. No doubt that was the most usual arrangement, but at least three alternatives were reported during the year under analysis. The tent meeting was the most common variation, being reported at least five times. Meeting in public view certainly drew more attention than doing so behind closed doors, as a report from Cape Girardeau, Missouri, made clear: “There was much opposition. A gang of teenagers tried to break up the services by driving by in their cars, racing the motors, and screaming insults. A petition was signed by many in the community protesting against holding the meeting. Policemen patrolled the tent and maintained order. There were 15 professions.”17 Other alternative locations included an outdoor auditorium18 and a brush arbor.19

A final area of differentiation between revivals pertained to a planned culmination for the meetings. In cases where the revival was to serve the purpose of planting a new congregation, the series of meetings might end with the formal organization of the church: “There were four conversions in a brush-arbor meeting conducted by [evangelist Raymon] Tracy at Neosho,
Mo. Another result of the meeting was the organization of a New Testament church. If the sponsoring church had already been organized but its pastor was inexperienced, a revival meeting might conclude with his ordination ceremony. And when a church was erecting a new building, it sometimes planned a revival meeting leading up to the dedication of the facility.

Clearly, then, organizers of BBF revivals conducted in 1959-60 exhibited the freedom to innovate within the boundaries of a consensual theological and philosophical framework. Nevertheless, all of them saw revivalism as the appropriate response to the state of their world. Their view of the national and world scene included multiple dimensions, to which we now turn our attention.

**Scene: The Context of BBF Revivalism**

The emergence and growth of the BBF in the mid-twentieth century can only be understood in contrast to the advance of modernistic religion in America during the previous five decades. During this time many pastors, churches, and denominations had conceded elements of the historic Christian faith by accommodating evolutionary thought and higher criticism of the Scriptures. The BBF, like the Baptist Bible Union and the World Fundamental Baptist Missionary Fellowship that preceded it, responded vehemently to these compromises and stood firmly committed to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. BBF leaders’ defense of these convictions can be seen most clearly in their response to two ecclesiastical organizations: the Southern Baptist Convention and the National Council of Churches (NCC). The focus of this essay precludes any extended treatment of BBF leaders’ attitudes toward these organizations, but the following vignette will surely shed some light on the subject.

During the 1950s Abingdon-Cokesbury Press issued a twelve-volume biblical commentary entitled *The Interpreter’s Bible*. This massive reference work was based on a new translation of the Bible, the Revised Standard Version, and the two were designed to complement each other. The Revised Standard Version bore the sponsorship of the National Council of Churches. *The Interpreter’s Bible* was the product of the collective work of scholars from several denominations, including some prominent Baptist educators and pastors.

In a full review of the commentary published on April 17, 1953, and in a supplementary article published February 12, 1960, *Tribune* editor Noel Smith alleged that the set consistently denied the infallibility of Scripture and undermined belief in its miracles. He proceeded to indict the NCC for its sponsoring role in the following words: “The National Council, with all the zeal and fanaticism of a Mohammedan Ishmaelite, hopes to make the Revised Standard Version the ‘official’ text, and *The Interpreter’s Bible* the ‘official’ commentary on the text. These two works are the ‘official’ authority for modern Christianity.” Smith then turned his attention to Southern Baptists’ enthusiastic endorsement of the set: “It is an unspeakably shameful thing that the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, the Baptist Sunday School Board, and an increasing number of Southern Baptist preachers are lined up on the side of such a blasphemous commentary as *The Interpreter’s Bible.*”

This brief historical account illustrates one BBF leader’s conviction that a significant proportion of America’s religious leaders had sold out to infidelity, and that militant confrontation was the only suitable response. But liberal theology was not the only enemy that the BBF perceived. Indeed, a political (and ostensibly military) threat—communism—loomed just as large. Given the passage of the Cold War, twenty-first century readers of the *Tribune* may find it difficult to grasp why editor Smith devoted front-page coverage to exposés of the communist agenda. But he and others clearly viewed communism as a vicious threat to the persistence of a free America and to the propagation of the gospel worldwide, as illustrated by the following reaction to Nikita Khrushchev’s trip to the United States: “This official visit of this evil and wicked man is creating for him the international prestige he needs to be regarded as the No. 1 statesman of the world. It is strengthening his tyrannical hold on the slave states composing his Iron Curtain empire. It is creating confusion, frustration and hopelessness in the few countries of the globe that are putting up a brave and honest fight to keep the Red hordes from invading and conquering their lands.”

Opposition to communism was a cause that united both fundamentalists and Roman Catholics. But while BBF leaders may have seen Catholicism as an ally in the war against communism, they were also concerned about its rising influence in American society. John F. Kennedy’s candidacy for the Presidency in 1960
projected this perception of danger into the forefront of fundamentalist consciousness. A June 17, 1960, editorial—unsigned but almost certainly attributable to Noel Smith—concluded as follows: “These Vatican statements, not those of Baptists or Protestants, give us the soundest reasons for refusing to send a Roman Catholic politician to the White House.”

The BBF’s aversion to modernist theology, communist politics, and Roman Catholicism is understandable on ideological grounds. Conservative evangelicals in America today presumably oppose all three movements but would be unlikely to discuss them prominently in denominational news magazines. In my judgment, the BBF took a hard stand on these and other matters because of its revivalist spirit. The movement was founded for the express purpose of sending missionaries around the world, which necessitated the establishment of a strong base of American churches. Modernism, communism, and Catholicism jeopardized the missionary endeavor by undermining the authority of the Bible, threatening to abridge religious freedoms worldwide, and substituting a system of works for the gospel of salvation by grace through faith. Therefore, BBF constituents viewed their denunciation of error as essential to their revivalist aspirations. Their belief in the imminent return of Christ for his church only served to intensify their fervor. This, then, was the scene in which the BBF engaged in revivalism.

**Agents: Players Associated with BBF Revivalism**

As mentioned earlier, the tenth year of the Tribune reported at least 144 revival meetings as news. Since some of these meetings featured two or more preachers, 153 speakers were responsible for leading the 144 revivals. However, many speakers preached in several revival meetings during 1959-60, with the result that 144 meetings engaged 78 unique preachers.

Who were these preachers? Unlike the protagonists of other revival movements, BBF revival speakers were all men, affirming the BBF’s consensus that the New Testament places strict limits on women’s involvement in church leadership and preaching. Fourteen of these men accounted for 81 of the aforementioned 153 speaker appointments (53%)—each taking part in at least three meetings. Eight or nine of the fourteen were full-time itinerant evangelists.

But revival preaching was not solely the province of a few especially privileged men; in fact, 56 of the 78 speakers (72%) were only reported to have preached one revival meeting during the year in question. Of the 87 speaker appointments not known to have been filled by evangelists, 45 (29%) were discharged by pastors; 11 (7%) by missionaries; 3 (2%) each by college administrators and Bible college students; 1 (1%) each by college professors and youth ministers; and 23 (15%) by speakers whose vocational role was not easily identifiable.

As was stated above, music played an important role in BBF revivals. Accordingly, at least eleven of the 144 reported revivals named one or more musicians or musical groups that participated in the meeting. The sponsoring church’s own music director was perhaps most often tasked with coordinating the musical elements of the revival meeting. This sort of arrangement may have been seen as less than newsworthy and was probably underreported. Nevertheless, there is some evidence that this approach was taken in several successful meetings. Sometimes a guest music director was sought out for the meeting. For example, Earl Smith traveled from Springfield, Missouri, to Arlington, Texas, to lead the singing in a summer 1959 revival meeting. And Raymond Miller, a resident of Oakland, California, aided evangelist Don Brown in a campaign held in Salina, Kansas, in the spring of 1960. Given the distance from which these men were summoned, one can only speculate that their contribution to the quality of the meeting was expected to be significant.

In addition to making provisions for direction of congregational music, some churches arranged for special performances by gifted soloists, groups, and choirs. Sometimes this was a simple matter: At a meeting held in Tampa, Florida, in the summer of 1959, the evangelist’s wife was called on to sing. In other cases the preparations were more elaborate, as Ohio pastor Harold Henninger explained: “Three choirs took part; music during the week was furnished by the Temple Aires Quartet, the Templettes Trio, and the various young people’s groups from the church. The Toney Brothers Quartet from Detroit, Mich., were with us for the closing services on Saturday night and all day Sunday.”

Revival preachers and musicians were key players in the drama of BBF revivalism. There were other agents
as well—most notably, the pastors and congregations that sponsored the revival meetings. Their role will become clearer in the following section. And women, though certainly not as prominent as men, were certainly active in BBF revivals. For example, a report of a Kansas revival meeting concluded with the observation that “[Pastor Dean] Cavin and Mrs. Cavin had charge of the music.”38 Several women—including the evangelist’s wife—provided children’s programming during a meeting held in Mishawaka, Indiana, in the spring of 1960.39 And in June 1960 the Tribune announced that Vivian Brewer—wife of Texas pastor Fred V. Brewer—would accompany him to Hawaii for an upcoming revival meeting: “She will be a big help to Bro. Brewer; she will be making chalk drawings at each service, and Mrs. Roby desperately needs the help of a pastor’s wife at this time.”40

One person whose contribution to BBF revivalism should not be overlooked was Tribune editor Noel Smith. In a critique of Billy Graham’s ministry, Smith attested, “I believe in mass revivals. I ought to; I was converted in one.”41 Furthermore, according to Keith Bassham, current editor of the Tribune, Smith had done “some evangelistic work before taking on the editorship of The Fundamentalist for [J. Frank] Norris . . .”42 Smith’s commitment to the revivalist cause is the reason why so much documentation of BBF revivalism appeared in the pages of the Tribune. He certainly had the ability and interest to write on other topics, but the subject of revival was important enough to constitute a recurring theme in his newspaper. In fact, all but three of the 48 issues published in the Tribune’s tenth volume contained at least some reference to a revival.43

Agency: Methods Used in BBF Revivalism

The discussion above has established clearly that sponsoring periodic revival meetings was considered the norm for BBF churches in 1959-60.44 But pastors and churches who desired to plan and carry out such events needed direction, and for that they could turn to the news, views, and other material printed in the Tribune. The newspaper’s role in promoting revivalism within the BBF fits an “explanatory model” that, according to Michael J. McClymond, “views revivals as a process of communications and networking among individuals and communities. A revival ‘happens’ when information and enthusiasm flow between otherwise isolated groups and they develop a sense of participation within a larger movement.”45 The Tribune intentionally sought to facilitate this sort of connectivity between constituents of the BBF. Not only did the paper publish accounts of successful revival efforts around the United States; it also provided a forum for the exchange of recommendations, information, advice, and methods between readers who were interested in sponsoring successful revival meetings.

The Tribune featured recommendations of people and resources. Pastors who had organized revival meetings often recommended their guest preachers to other churches. The following statement is representative of many published in 1959-60: “We thank God for a man such as Bro. [Harold] Bodine, who preaches with such conviction[,] and would heartily recommend him to any church as an evangelist.”46 And in at least one case a guest musician was the object of commendation: “Our meeting was made complete by the wonderful music of Bro. Raymond Miller, whom we heartily recommend to our fellow pastors desiring real spiritual music in their revival meetings.”47

During the course of the year the Tribune also reviewed, announced, or advertised at least ten publications—books, tracts, and hymnals—of interest to revival sponsors. The contents of Blood Redemption Revival Songs received this concise description: “Sixty-three of the old hymns, appropriate for any type of religious meeting, including revivals.”48 And a collection of sermons written by a prominent BBF pastor garnered abundant praise: “Richer sermons in thought that illumine the Gospel of Jesus Christ are not to be found. Ample reader interest and appeal are readily seen in these open, yet humble sermons of evangelistic fervor.”49

The Tribune further enhanced readers’ understanding of revival by publishing informative pieces in a variety of genres—current events, personal narrative, history, and biography. For example, readers were kept abreast of developments in Billy Graham’s crusades,50 acquainted with the revival experience of the newly elected president of the BBF,51 educated about the Irish Revival of 1859,52 and briefed on the outcomes of an evangelist’s first nineteen months of itinerant ministry.53

The Tribune provided a wide range of advice for would-be revival organizers. Pastor and college president G. B. Vick, whose Detroit, Michigan, church
hosted the BBF’s nationwide fellowship meeting in the Fall of 1959, stated his opinion that “no pastor should arrange revival meetings at the time of our great national meetings.”

E. J. Rollings, another Detroit pastor, advised pastors that evangelistic meetings required not merely naturally gifted musicians, but well-trained vocalists and instrumentalists, as many in the audience could distinguish between good and bad music. In a letter to the editor, Wes Auger admonished readers not to participate in cooperative revival services if doing so entailed any alliance with modernism, neo-orthodoxy, or new evangelicalism. And John A. Ross submitted a sermon that called for “a different type of revivals than we are seeing . . . in these days.”

Readers also reflected on theological matters pertaining to revival—most notably, in regards to the tension between divine sovereignty and human responsibility in evangelism and conversion. Most BBF pastors in 1959-60 probably would have shied away from identifying themselves as Calvinists, but there were some exceptions—among them Texas pastor L. T. Grantham. In December 1959 he wrote to the Tribune, “I am a strict Calvinist, but I am also a Missionary, to every lost man, also an evangelist and a revivalist. To me Hyper-Calvinism is the notion that we cannot have another great world-wide revival.”

Several months later Grantham preached a revival meeting in Florida, leading the sponsoring pastor to conclude “that when one preaches the total depravity of man and the absolute sovereignty of God, . . . he is going to be used of God to win men and women to Christ and to strengthen New Testament [sic] churches.” Shortly thereafter Grantham wrote a letter to the editor in which he attributed revival to two coordinated causes: the work of the Holy Spirit and the proclamation of God’s Word. He concluded his letter by stating that “Sovereign Grace [was] not effective until the Gospel had been preached.” One might conclude that most BBF pastors were not concerned about someone labeling himself a Calvinist as long as he affirmed the imperative of revivalist preaching.

This section has shown that the Tribune contributed to the spread of revivalism by publishing relevant recommendations, information, and advice. But the newspaper supplied a vital forum in one additional area: the exchange of methods—practical ideas about how to plan and execute a revival meeting. While the Tribune typically printed only cursory information about a given revival meeting (e.g., sponsoring church, speaker, duration, and summary of outcomes), the records of two particular meetings held in 1959-60 go a long way towards explaining just how the agents involved performed their part in the drama of revival. The first such meeting was sponsored by Canton Baptist Temple (Canton, Ohio)—probably in early November. The meeting lasted eight days and led to 115 conversions. It featured the preaching of Dallas Billington, pastor of Akron Baptist Temple. As explained in the Agents section, musical preparations for the meeting were elaborate. The host pastor, Harold Henniger, explained the church’s strategy:

The church had made great preparation for this revival by placing ads daily in the newspaper, distributing 12,000 pieces of literature, 75 spot announcements on the radio—which gave us a good saturation—eight a day. We utilized 17 small billboards on the main highways of the city, also, we had a daily visitation group with as many as 25 each morning coming out and calling on prospects for the meeting. Prayer groups met nightly before the services . . .

I believe these preparations, plus one of the greatest soul winners in America, and God’s blessings resulted in one of the greatest revivals we have ever had. . . . I believe any church can have an outstanding meeting with the right evangelist anointed of God, if the church will really put themselves into the meeting. The second revival meeting that the Tribune described in detail was organized by Twin City Baptist Temple in Mishawaka, Indiana. It convened March 21 and continued for two weeks. The evangelist, Harvey Springer, hailed from Denver, Colorado. The sponsoring pastor, Victor E. Sears, described the planning and organization as follows:

Elaborate organizational plans and advertising have been arranged. There are thousands of door-knob advertisements, and hundreds of dollars are being spent for newspaper ads, television spot announcements, automobile signs, and a daily broadcast over radio station WJVA, 1580 kc. at 12:05 noon.
The music will be in charge of Herbert Robinson, director of the church’s music, and the church’s 50-voice choir. Choirs from fundamental churches in the area will also be heard.\textsuperscript{65}

Sears went on to explain that the series would include several special services likely to attract crowds, and that ladies would provide special programming for children each night. He concluded by inviting church leaders in the region to attend—presumably for the purpose of encouraging similar revival efforts elsewhere.

These two sketches give some notion of the methods that BBF pioneers believed were appropriate to the conduct of a successful revival meeting. Key elements included selecting an anointed speaker, arranging for high-quality music, planning and executing an advertising campaign, seeking out specific prospects, and praying for God’s blessings. The duration of the two meetings—eight and fourteen days, respectively—was fairly typical. The \textit{Tribune}’s tenth volume listed the duration of fifty-nine revival meetings held in 1959-60. The average was 9.2 days, while the median was 7.0 days.\textsuperscript{66} In at least one case the success of a meeting led a pastor to continue preaching for three days after the guest speaker had departed.\textsuperscript{67}

In summary, the 1959-60 \textit{Tribune} served its original readers by providing a steady diet of practical guidance for those who wished to organize and conduct a revival meeting. Inasmuch as it did so, the newspaper provides a fairly useful historical record of the methods that pastors and churches employed in the quest for a successful revival. Of course, success in revivalism might be defined in various ways, a matter to be addressed in the following section.

\textbf{Purpose: The Aims of BBF Revivalism}

Many of the revival meeting reports that appeared in the \textit{Tribune} during the year under consideration contain a statement like this: “W. E. Dowell, pastor of the High Street Baptist church, Springfield, Mo., and chairman of the faculty of Baptist Bible College, was the evangelist in the greatest revival meeting that Bible Baptist church ever had, according to the pastor of the church, Gene A. Lowry.”\textsuperscript{68} Emotions surely ran high when a pastor’s aspirations for a revival were fulfilled, perhaps leading to a bit of exaggeration about the historic significance of the meeting. But the labeling of a meeting as “successful” suggests that there were certain criteria for determining that a congregation’s effort, joined with that of the revival preacher, had met with God’s blessings.

To some extent the criteria for success were implied in the invitation that the newspaper extended to readers: “Mail \textit{The Tribune} a report of your evangelistic meetings. State the number of professions of faith in Christ, the number of additions to the church by baptism, [and] the number of additions [sic] to the church by letter.”\textsuperscript{69} But reality was somewhat more nuanced than this, as pastors joyfully shared a broad range of revival meeting outcomes with their peers across the country and around the world.

A couple of notices published in the July 3, 1959, issue convey some of the diverse indicators that a revival meeting had been successful:

- \textit{Bob Stockton, Indianapolis, Ind.} Seven days with Bible Baptist church, Knox, Ind., Leonard Jackson, pastor. There were seven professions of faith in Christ, 22 families promising to establish a family altar, four persons making a pledge to tithe, and three additions to the church. . . .

- \textit{Raymon Tracy: Two weeks with Dale Street Baptist Church, Springfield, Mo.}, Earl Scriviner, pastor. Two professions of faith in Christ, two baptisms, four additions to the church, and a young man surrendering for the ministry.\textsuperscript{70}

These notices address both numerical growth (comprising conversions to Christ, baptisms, and membership additions) and spiritual growth (including commitments to disciplines such as tithing or family devotions, or acknowledgment of a call to ministry). These are certainly foundational fruits of revival. A November 13, 1959, report follows the same general pattern: “In addition to the conversions and additions to the church, there was much confession of sin among the church membership.”\textsuperscript{71}

But there are other dimensions, one of which is reflected in a July 3, 1959, notice:

- \textit{Bruce D. Cummons, pastor[,] Massillon Baptist Temple, Massillon, Ohio, was the
evangelist in a meeting in Calvary Baptist church, Baltimore, Md., A. E. Bollman, pastor. . . . 

Calvary church, organized by Bollman four years ago, has an average Sunday school attendance above 90 . . . and is contributing to the support of four missionary families of the Baptist Bible Fellowship.72

In this case, the mention of missionary support in proximity to a revival report suggests some connection between the two, and hints at the purpose underlying BBF revivalism.

Furthermore, an article about a Stockton, California, meeting concludes with this statement: “During the meetings Mr. Lambert got 25 subscriptions to The Tribune.”73 At first glance it may seem surprising that an evangelist would encourage his hearers to secure access to a weekly newspaper. But given the networking function that the Tribune fulfilled vis-à-vis revivalism, as explained in the previous section, it seems that the evangelist was quite astute. Each person who became a regular Tribune reader might imbibe the BBF’s grand vision of building a fellowship of churches capable of sustaining a worldwide evangelistic effort.74

Accomplishing this vision certainly required leading unbelievers to faith in Christ and organizing them into local churches. But the vision entailed more: Believers needed to grow in their capacity for service, take steps to support the BBF’s global missionary enterprise, and perhaps even surrender their lives to full-time ministry. In short, BBF revivalists were seeking to propagate the movement by creating the conditions under which the domestic and foreign ministry forces might be expanded.

The strategy worked, as Texas pastor Jack Bridges attested: “Mr. Tracy’s Spirit-filled, compassionate preaching warmed our hearts and gave all of us a new vision of winning men and women to Christ. One of our members, a man who has been a Christian for 70 years, remarked: ‘I haven’t been in a revival like this since brush-arbor days.’ And one of our Sunday school teachers said: ‘Bro[,] Tracy built a fire under me and I am going after my neighbors.’ And before the revival had closed, this man had won one of his neighbors to Christ.”75

Assessing BBF Revivalism

The aforementioned discussion has demonstrated the centrality of revivalism to the life of the BBF in 1959-60. Members of the BBF’s first generation viewed revival meetings as (one of) the foremost means of building a movement of local Baptist churches. Missionary candidate testimonies published in the Tribune imply that revivals accounted for a significant percentage of overall conversions in BBF churches, and also that revivals played a role in mobilizing disciples to deeper levels of Christian service. They also attest to a negative aspect of revivalism. The testimony of Jesse L. Chaney, missionary to the Navajo Indians, illustrates each of these claims. Chaney was saved in a revival service: “In September, 1952, we were visiting with my w[i]fe’s father and mother in Borger, Tex., and were persuaded by them to attend a revival meeting . . . It was there that I met Jesus and received a full pardon from my sins.”76 A subsequent revival service led him to acknowledge a call to missions: “In September, 1953, in a revival meeting in the Grace [Baptist] church, I surrendered my life to Christ for fulltime service as a missionary to the Navajo Indians.”77 But prior to all of this, a revival led to confusion about his spiritual state: “When I was about 13 years old, I was talked into going forward in a revival meeting. Again, the weightier matters were omitted. All I received was a hand-shaking religion.”78

Taken as a whole, the evidence presented in this essay validates the statement from 1950 quoted in the introduction: “Nearly every one of the preachers of the Baptist Bible Fellowship is a mass revivalist. All of our churches are the products of mass revivals.” The evidence also helps to articulate the BBF’s concept of revival. The Tribune’s tenth volume used the word revival almost exclusively in reference to a planned series of meetings—the kind of event described in the Act section. Only occasionally was a revival portrayed as something more spontaneous—a state of affairs brought about by the sovereign work of the Holy Spirit.79 From the earliest times until the present, constituents of the BBF seem to have believed that God is most apt to do a miraculous work in their midst when they take seriously their responsibility to prepare for that work.80

Most BBF pastors and evangelists would probably agree with William B. Sprague, an American Presbyterian minister who in 1832 defended the stimulation of revival through means consistent with
biblical teaching: “This is a matter in relation to which God is pleased to leave much to human instrumentality. It is possible that his people may co-operate with him in carrying forward a revival by such means that there may be many sound and scriptural conversions, and that his cause may thereby be greatly advanced.”81 In BBF practice, then, a revival meeting is a means of creating the conditions under which God typically carries out its purposes. By contrast, many who affiliate with the BBF would find it hard to accept Iain H. Murray’s conclusion that “no human endeavours can ensure or guarantee results. There is a sovereignty in all God’s actions. He has never promised to bless in proportion to the activity of his people. Revivals are not brought about by the fulfilment of ‘conditions’ any more than the conversion of a single individual is secured by any series of human actions.”82

BBF revivalism, as practiced in 1959-60, was inextricably tied to the planned expansion of the independent Baptist church movement. Some would therefore call into question its legitimacy as a revival. Murray flatly asserted that “a narrow party spirit cannot coexist with a larger giving of the Spirit whose communion extends to the whole body of Christ. Exclusive attention to denominational interests may prevail among Christians in a period of spiritual decline; it never does so in days of enlarged blessing.”83 Sprague, for his part, condemned partisanship without denying its coexistence with revival: “A revival may furnish an opportunity, and suggest an inducement, to different religious sects to bring as many into their particular communion as they can; and they may sometimes do this in the exercise of an unhallowed party spirit . . . . The revival is from above, the proselyting spirit is from beneath.”84 In view of these statements, the fact that the BBF practiced revivalism as a means of building a fairly sectarian movement is somewhat anomalous.

Finally, this essay has shown that the *Tribune* played a crucial role in facilitating BBF revivalism—something that is anything but anomalous. In fact, the media have played a prominent role in spreading revival impulses since at least the 1740s.85 Editor Smith astutely put the power of the press behind the vision of building a fellowship of churches that would minister on a global stage. His efforts were fruitful, effectively furthering the cause of revivalism among fundamental Baptists for a whole generation.

1 “There is no mystery about the progress of this Fellowship. In the first place, this Fellowship at the very outset deliberately determined that the missionary enterprise would be the center of its work. Missions would not be used as bait to get money. Missions would not be used for window dressing. Missions would be basic and central” (“Let’s Thank Our God and Push on,” *Baptist Bible Tribune*, November 20, 1959, 4).
5 Keith Bassham, e-mail message to author, January 31, 2008.
7 Ibid., 266.
8 This notion is expressed in the following statement, which appeared in each issue published in 1959-60: “The churches of the Baptist Bible Fellowship being autonomous bodies[,] The Tribune does not presume to be their official organ. They have no official organ. What The Tribune does is to publish what it believes to be in the interest of the common cause and to accept complete responsibility therefor.”
9 Central to Burke’s rhetorical theory is the idea of a pentad consisting of act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose. In his view, “any complete statement about motives will offer some kind of answers to these five questions” (Kenneth Burke, “A Grammar of Motives,” in *Reading Rhetorical Theory*, ed. Barry Brummett [Fort Worth: Harcourt College, 2000], 762).
10 According to Em Griffin, “When a message stresses one element over the other four, it reveals a speaker’s philosophy or worldview” (A First Look at Communication Theory, 5th ed. [Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2003], 316). It is the goal of this research to elucidate the ministry worldview of BBF constituents in 1959-60 as expressed in their collective references to revival in the *Tribune*.
11 Incidentally, they also make reference to various revival meetings from previous years and provide much additional information about revival as it was understood in the early days of the BBF.
12 In the News of the Week, *Baptist Bible Tribune*, March 4, 1960, 3.
14 In the News of the Week, *Baptist Bible Tribune*, February 19, 1960, 5.
15 Evangelistic Meetings, *Baptist Bible Tribune*, August 7, 1959, 6. The same article reported a similar meeting conducted at High Street Baptist Church in Springfield, Missouri.
16 In the News of the Week, *Baptist Bible Tribune*, May 6,
21 See, for example, Evangelistic Meetings, Baptist Bible Tribune, July 3, 1959, 3, which references the ordination of Lee Friesner.
22 See, for example, “Indianapolis Temple Is Doing Business,” Baptist Bible Tribune, July 31, 1959, 8. Alternatively, a church might schedule a revival meeting shortly after dedicating a new facility (In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, October 16, 1959, 3).
26 Ibid., 5.
27 Noel Smith, “The Bear Wants to Hug You Tight,” Baptist Bible Tribune, October 2, 1959, 4. Other discussions of communism in the tenth volume of the Tribune include “Khrushchev Is Anxious for a Big Funeral,” Baptist Bible Tribune, October 9, 1959, 1, 3; and Walter S. Robertson, “Here Is the Red China They Want Recognized,” Baptist Bible Tribune, November 27, 1959, 7. Smith was not the only BBF founder to denounce communism in writing; in fact, some years later W. E. Dowell authored a pamphlet entitled The Communist Infiltration of the American Church (Springfield, MO: Crusader Press, n.d.).
30 The fourteen most active revivalists named by the Tribune in 1959–60 were Raymon Tracy (14 meetings); Don Brown and J. Townley Davis (11 meetings); J. Paul Lambert (8 meetings); Don Chenoweth (6 meetings); Clarence Green and B. R. Lakin (5 meetings); and Hyman Appleman, Harold Bodine, James M. Bond, Sr., Joe M. Boyd, Fred V. Brewer, Charlie Dodd, and W. E. Dowell (3 meetings). It is likely that these preachers maintained varying levels of association with the BBF; nevertheless, the Tribune reported their revival engagements without distinction.
31 Itinerant evangelists among the fourteen most prominent speakers were Hyman Appleman, Harold Bodine, Don Brown, Don Chenoweth, J. Townley Davis, Charlie Dodd, B. R. Lakin, J. Paul Lambert, and Raymon Tracy. Joe M. Boyd is known to have served as an itinerant evangelist for most of his ministry; however, it is unclear whether he had assumed this role by 1959–60.
32 Additional research could reduce the amount of uncertainty regarding speakers’ vocational roles—probably resulting in an increase of the proportion of speaker appointments attributed to pastors.
33 For example, John Moore led the music at a revival sponsored by his church in Indiana (“Indianapolis Baptist Temple Has 53 Additions,” Baptist Bible Tribune, September 25, 1959, 5), while Bob Johnson was responsible for coordinating the work of choirs and special musicians at Canton Baptist Temple’s Fall 1959 meeting (In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, December 11, 1959, 2).
34 Evangelistic Meetings, Baptist Bible Tribune, August 7, 1959, 6.
36 Evangelistic Meetings, Baptist Bible Tribune, July 24, 1959, 2.
37 In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, December 11, 1959, 2.
38 In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, March 4, 1960, 3.
40 In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, June 3, 1960, 7.
41 Noel Smith, “Billy Graham and His Flea,” Baptist Bible Tribune, July 17, 1959, 8.
42 Keith Bassham, e-mail message to author, January 31, 2008.
43 Issues that made no mention of revival were October 30, 1959; May 27, 1960; and June 10, 1960.
44 Accordingly, a review of a concordance of Bible doctrines included this comment: “Weighing but 2½ ozs., you can take it with you—especially when you are holding revival meetings” (Unsigned review of Topical Concordance of Vital Doctrines, ed. D. M. Miller, Baptist Bible Tribune, December 18, 1959, 5).
46 In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, April 22, 1960, 2–3. For an example of a more extensive personal recommendation, see Wendell Zimmerman’s endorsement of evangelist Raymon Tracy (In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, November 20, 1959, 2).
47 In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, June 17,
1960, 5.

48 Unsigned review of Blood Redemption Revival Songs, Baptist Bible Tribune, October 2, 1959, 7.

49 W. S. Gordon, “Mr. Vick’s Sermons,” review of Soul-Winning Sermons, by George Beau champ Vick, Baptist Bible Tribune, October 9, 1959, 6.

50 “Mr. Graham’s Campaign in Australia,” Baptist Bible Tribune, October 16, 1959, 8.

51 “Baseball Was to Be His Career,” Baptist Bible Tribune, September 18, 1959, 3.


53 In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, February 12, 1960, 3. The evangelist, Don Brown, described his work as follows: “I have now concluded 58 revivals among our Baptist Bible Fellowship churches during the last 19 months. I have preached over 900 times altogether. During this time God has blessed with the salvation of more than 2,000 souls and additions to the local churches where I’ve ministered. One of the larger thrills to me has been the surrender of more than 70 men who have answered God’s call to the Gospel ministry.”

54 George Beau champ Vick, “A Personal Invitation from Dr. Vick,” Baptist Bible Tribune, August 21, 1959, 1. The priorities of conducting revivals and seeking out fellowship with likeminded Christian leaders were not to be pitted against each other, as each was essential.

55 E. J. Rollings, “People Can Spot a Faker,” Baptist Bible Tribune, August 21, 1959, 8.


57 John A. Ross, “Sermon Outline: Ye Have Robbed Me (Malachi 3:8),” Baptist Bible Tribune, October 2, 1959, 7. Ross’s criticism of current patterns of revival grew out of his observation that many “professing Christians . . . never once open their mouths to witness to Christ’s saving and keeping power.”

58 Letters to the Tribune, Baptist Bible Tribune, December 11, 1959, 7.

59 In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, April 15, 1960, 2.

60 Letters to the Tribune, Baptist Bible Tribune, April 22, 1960, 6.

61 Ibid., 7.


63 In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, December 11, 1959, 2-3.

64 Sears, “Harvey Springer,” 3.

65 Ibid.

66 Some meeting durations were listed in weeks rather than days. The calculations reported here are based on the assumption that a week of revival services was equal to six meetings. Since there is no evidence that revivals held in 1959-60 included any days without a meeting, the central tendency figures named here may represent a slight underestimate of reality.

67 In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, March 11, 1960, 2.

68 “60 Conversions at Richmond,” Baptist Bible Tribune, November 13, 1959, 8; emphasis added.

69 Evangelistic Meetings, Baptist Bible Tribune, July 24, 1959, 2.

70 Evangelistic Meetings, Baptist Bible Tribune, July 3, 1959, 3.

71 “J. Townley Davis at Bassett, Va.,” Baptist Bible Tribune, November 13, 1959, 8.

72 Evangelistic Meetings, Baptist Bible Tribune, July 3, 1959, 3; emphasis added.

73 “Paul Lambert Has 55 Conversions at Stockton, Calif.,” Baptist Bible Tribune, December 25, 1959, 2.

74 One pastor wrote appended this statement to his revival report: “Sixty-three families in our church receive The Tribune. It is a blessing to all” (In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, February 19, 1960, 5).

75 Jack Bridges, “Raymon Tracy at Houston,” Baptist Bible Tribune, March 25, 1960, 2.

76 Jesse L. Chaney, “Another Family to the Navajo Indians: His Parents Have Been Married 60 Years,” Baptist Bible Tribune, June 24, 1960, 2.

77 Ibid.

78 Ibid., 3. For another example of a false profession of faith resulting from a revival meeting, see Joan Rohr, “They Are Going to South America: The Missionary Film Was Effective,” Baptist Bible Tribune, January 15, 1960, 2.

79 George A. Morgan, a Tennessee pastor, asserted, “For about 10 weeks the church has been in a state of revival” (In the News of the Week, Baptist Bible Tribune, October 16, 1959, 2). And Illinois pastor James A. Barta stated, “The Illinois-Wisconsin Baptist Bible Fellowship meeting held in our church here last month proved to be a real time of revival” (“R. O. Woodworth Speaks at Ill. Fellowship,” Baptist Bible Tribune, November 6, 1959, 6).

80 Some might go so far as to conclude that God can, or at least will, only work through the diligence of his earthly servants.


83 Ibid., 26.

84 Sprague, Lectures on Revivals of Religion, 43.
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