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ABSTRACT

This study analyzes Southern Baptist Convention presidential addresses during 1950-1970 to determine their nature and value and to establish the extent to which the presidents utilized their rhetorical opportunities. Specific rhetorical elements examined include speaker aims and strategies, message structure, methods of development, and forms of proof.

A historical sketch traces the Convention's development from the organization of its parent body in 1814, through the controversy which led to its establishment in 1845, to its most recent sessions. The Convention's nature—an organization for the support of missions, evangelism, education, and benevolence, not an ecclesiastical or hierarchical body—has a direct bearing upon the presidential address. The address cannot call for action binding upon the churches; constituency support of the Convention is voluntary. The Convention is composed of messengers from cooperating churches and is an autonomous organization; the churches are independent of the Convention.

The Convention president presides over the annual sessions and may serve as an informal denominational spokesman and a fraternal
messenger to other bodies but has no authority to speak officially for the Convention. This circumstance prevents the address from constituting dogma, encyclical, or an "official Baptist line"; the president wins voluntary support only by persuasion.

The presidents, not the Convention, originated the address; four "unauthorized" addresses were delivered before Convention action officially authorized them in 1923. The address has been delivered annually since 1922 with only five exceptions.

Biographical sketches of the eleven presidents investigated reveal that most were native southerners; ten were pastors. The eldest at time of election was sixty-eight, the youngest forty-four; average age was fifty-five. The longest professional service at time of election was forty-one years, the shortest twenty-five years; average was thirty-three. All except one are still living, and all are published authors.

The typical Convention audience is partisan, predominantly male, southern, and employed in a church-related vocation. About forty-five percent are between thirty-five and forty-nine years old while twenty-two percent are younger. The educational level of Convention audiences is above the national norm. Night session audiences are typically augmented by laymen from the meeting area.
The typical occasion for the presidential address provides a worship-like setting for serious discourse upon issues of vital concern to the Convention; it is not simply an opportunity for empty or bombastic rhetorical ceremonialism or display. The address normally occurs early in Convention programming and is delivered in a calm atmosphere before controversy has had opportunity to develop.

The address is institutional rhetoric and persuasive. Although the speakers frequently aimed at stimulation or motivation, the dominant purpose was to secure conviction. Narration, exposition, and description were used frequently, but argumentation was almost totally absent. Further, the address was issue-centered rather than simply ceremonial; therefore, it played a vital role in Convention life. Several presidents specifically viewed the address as an opportunity to "set the tone" of Convention sessions. All of them utilized it to mold attitudes and opinions.

In addition to individual address aims, the address itself, as an institution, had one major over-all aim: to promote Convention unity and harmony. Some presidents dealt explicitly with this aim as a theme; others included it implicitly in their treatment of specific issues. During 1950-1970 the Convention confronted five prominent issues, local church autonomy, theological controversy, ecumenicity,
racial relationships, and social applications of the gospel, which provide the focus for this critical analysis.

The typical address has rhetorical value in that it is persuasively effective, and it has rhetorical quality in that it is marked by elements traditionally deemed desirable in rational discourse. Its vital persuasive role argues for its continuance as a Convention feature.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The Southern Baptist Convention is the national body of the largest evangelical religious denomination in the United States.\(^1\) Although its numerical stronghold is in the "old South," it has constituents and institutions in all fifty states.\(^2\) The annual presidential address is a rhetorical event related to concerns and issues facing one of the largest regularly assembling religious groups in the world, a group which constitutes a sizeable segment of the national population. Thus, the size and scope of the Southern Baptist Convention justifies an investigation of the annual address of its president.

Further, this address presents rhetorical features which make it worthy of analysis. (1) There is one message each year; this provides a distinct annual rhetorical event. (2) The texts of many of

\(^1\) Southern Baptist Convention Annual, 1970, p. 107. Subsequent references will cite simply "Annual."

\(^2\) Ibid.
these messages are available in reliable form, either in print, on
tape recording, or both. 3 Each address reflects the speech
behavior of one man who has risen to prominence among his colleagues
at least partially upon the basis of his rhetorical ability. 4 As there
has been no suggestion of ghost-writing, the addresses are assumed to
reflect the rhetorical abilities of the speakers involved. (5) The
addresses constitute a body of rhetoric which is "institutional" in
nature; 5 that is, the address itself is an institution, a rhetorical
situation similar to the keynote speech at a political convention or the
president's State of the Union message. Such a rhetorical institution
is worthy of investigation. A number of studies of this nature have
been done, including Paul A. Barefield, "A Rhetorical Analysis of
Keynote Speaking in Republican National Conventions From 1856 to
1964" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Louisiana State University,
1966); E. Neal Clausen, "The Democratic Keynoter: A History"
(unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Southern Illinois University,
1964); Marvin Eugene DeBoer, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Selected

---

3 See Appendix C for information on publication of texts.
4 Biographical data on the presidents reflect this condition. See
bibliography, section C, number 2.
5 The address has existed continuously since 1918. See Appendix
C for specific details.

The basic similarity of each of these studies with the present one is its institutional nature; each investigated some aspect of the rhetoric of an institution in American society. Barefield's study concentrated on one specific recurring rhetorical event, the keynote speech, as does the present study. Claussen's study did essentially the same thing for the Democratic party's speeches that Barefield's did for the Republican. DeBoer's study focused upon the speaking of one officer in the American Legion, not just an annual message; thus his study was larger in scope than the present one. His investigation involved the examination of many more addresses under a greater variety of circumstances than does the present one. Dovre's study focused more upon the institution behind the rhetoric than does the present one. Also, his study bore greater resemblance to the movement study than do the other three named or the present one.

Despite the similarities, the differences in focus, scope, and institution between this study and the others precluded any possibility of the present one being simply a replication of any of them. For
instance, the methodology of the present study grew out of the materials encountered, not out of previous studies of similar nature. The studies cited suggest the validity of rhetorical investigations involving political, social, or religious institutions in American society; the Southern Baptist Convention is one such institution.

Finally, examination of appropriate bibliographic sources and indexes revealed no study of these addresses to date and contact with appropriate Southern Baptist institutions and agencies revealed no such study in progress. The absence of other studies on this subject removes the danger of duplication.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The present study involved the investigation of a three-fold problem area: the nature of the presidential address, its value, and the extent to which the presidents have utilized the rhetorical

---


8 Personal correspondence with the presidents and librarians of the six Southern Baptist seminaries: Golden Gate, Midwestern, New Orleans, Southeastern, Southern, and Southwestern.

9 The Historical Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, and Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee.
opportunity afforded them by the address. By "nature" is meant a classification of the address into some recognized rhetorical category, such as informative, persuasive, entertaining, inspirational; deliberative, forensic, epideictic; secular, sacred; institutional, movement, regional, occasional; or instrumental, consummatory, that is, one which accomplishes objectives beyond the immediate time of delivery as opposed to one which does not. In dealing with rhetorical materials it is desirable to know what manner of materials are involved.

By "value" is meant a concern with the worth of the address, whether there were any indications of personal or social good accruing from its delivery or any intrinsic rhetorical merit. The absence of such value would raise a question concerning the justification of the address in the life of the Southern Baptist Convention; conversely, the presence of such value would suggest the wisdom of its continuation.

By "extent to which the presidents have utilized the rhetorical opportunity afforded them by the address" is meant a concern with speaker responsibility, with whether or not the presidents fulfilled their obligation to the organization which elected them to leadership.

---

10 See "Method of Analysis," p. 12, and detailed treatment of the nature of the address in chapter 5.
The assumption is that leadership in a group organized for serious purposes entails the responsibility to behave in ways calculated to promote the best interests of the group. The concern of this aspect of the investigation, therefore, was with whether the presidents had been aware of the opportunity and responsibility presented by the address, whether they had utilized or neglected the opportunity, and, if they utilized it, the extent to which they did so, that is, whether they met it with determination and seriousness of purpose or simply in a routine, perfunctory, "ceremonial" manner. Simply stated, the concern was to discover whether the presidential address is responsible rational discourse or mere declamatory display.

A number of subsidiary areas of inquiry were involved in illuminating these principal ones: speaker aims and strategies, methods of development, forms of proof, patterns of organization, and the themes developed and their relevance to issues facing the Convention. The classification, interpretation, and evaluation of such materials were expected to provide indicators for the measurement involved in the central problem.

**SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

This study deals primarily with the addresses delivered during 1950-1970. Five basic circumstances suggest this limitation. (1) Of
the forty-two addresses assumed to have been delivered since their official authorization in 1923, one half are included in this period.\(^{11}\)

(2) Of the twenty-one addresses assumed to have been delivered during 1924-1949, only five are known to have appeared in print.\(^{12}\)

Texts of only two have been located. (3) Beginning with 1950, there is a sequential body of texts available for analysis, whereas during 1924-1950, texts were published only in 1937, 1939, 1941, and 1944, leaving gaps in their continuity.\(^{13}\)

(4) For the last seventeen years of the twenty-one year period included in this study, magnetic tape recordings of the actual addresses are available for examination.\(^{14}\)

These recordings permitted analysis of the pitch, rate, volume, and timbre of the speakers' voices and also the audible audience response, elements beyond the reach of the investigator limited to the printed text. Further, comparison of the printed texts with these recordings permitted the determination of textual authenticity. (5) Of the eleven men who delivered the addresses, ten are still alive;\(^{15}\) the widow of

---

\(^{11}\) See Appendix C.

\(^{12}\) Ibid.

\(^{13}\) Ibid.

\(^{14}\) See bibliography, section D.

\(^{15}\) See bibliography, section C, numbers 2, 3; also Annual, 1970, pp. 436-554.
the eleventh cooperated in the study.\footnote{Letters from Mrs. J.W. Storer, November 23, and December 5, 1970.} This circumstance made possible direct communication with most of the speakers. Of the men who served as president prior to 1950, all but two are deceased. Of the two surviving, one is included in the present study because he was president again during 1950-1951; thus only one surviving president is excluded from the study and the indications are that he did not deliver a presidential address.\footnote{Letter from Dr. Louie D. Newton, December 11, 1970.}

**TYPE OF DATA**

Two kinds of data exist about an organization: formal and informal. The formal exists in the organization's official documents: constitution, bylaws, rules of procedure, and policies. The informal exists in the minds of the people who are a part of the organization. The formal is prescriptive, the informal descriptive. The formal provides role specifications; the informal reveals role expectations.\footnote{David Berlo, *The Process of Communication* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), pp. 140-155.} The informal data used in this investigation were supplied by college and seminary professors, pastors, laymen, and the investigator's.
involvement in Southern Baptist churches and denominational organizations.¹⁹

Four types of formal data were utilized in this investigation: material which illuminated the historical setting, including the origin and development of the address as well as circumstances related to each annual occasion; biographical information about the presidents; information concerning the presidents' understanding of the purpose of the address, the issues facing the Convention during their presidency, and the specific aims they had for their individual messages;

¹⁹ The investigator grew up in a Southern Baptist church, holds a degree from Ouachita Baptist University, two degrees from New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, has been music director of seven churches, minister of education of one, and pastor of three in four different states over a period of twenty-four years, including part-time and student service. He has held offices on the district association and state convention levels. As a minister of education and pastor, one of his responsibilities was to teach classes for new church members in which they were instructed in the purpose, organization, activities, and functional procedures of the Convention. In addition to taking formal classes and studying text books, a part of his continuing education involved reading instructional pamphlets and such periodicals as the Baptist state paper, Church Administration magazine, Baptist Program (a periodical for church and denominational employees), and curriculum materials for the educational and missionary organizations. He attended numerous classes, conferences, and workshops on the district association, state convention, and Southern Baptist Convention levels. In addition to his formal education and ministry, he attended the Convention in Kansas City in 1963 and part of the one in New Orleans in 1969. Thus his qualifications rest upon both formal and informal education, personal observation, and participation in the life of the Convention.
and texts of the addresses. 20 The basic sources of historical
information were the Southern Baptist Convention Annual and Baptist
state papers. Although other papers were consulted on occasion, the
basic set of Baptist state papers utilized was The Christian Index
(Georgia), the oldest Baptist state paper still in publication; 21 the
(Tennessee) Baptist and Reflector, published in Nashville where the
Convention’s executive offices are located; the (Texas) Baptist
Standard, which has by far the largest circulation of any Baptist
state paper; 22 and the Arkansas Baptist, the paper of the investi-
gator’s home state.

Biographical information was secured directly from the
presidents still living; each completed a questionnaire which requested
biographical data. 23 Several also sent mimeographed copies of
biographical data sheets which they already had prepared. Biographi-
cal information which the presidents had supplied to the Southern
Baptist Historical Commission was also utilized, as were published
biographical data. The widow of the one deceased president was

20 Details as to the texts and tape recordings will be found in the
following section, in the bibliography, section D, and in Appendix C.

21 Established in 1822.

22 Circulation about 300,000.

23 See Appendix F.
provided a questionnaire, and she supplied the biographical data requested in that instance. Because the biographical concerns of this investigation were only incidental, no extensive biographical investigation was conducted. Much more information was gathered from these sources than was needed for, or included in, this study.

A questionnaire was devised to determine the views of the presidents on the purpose of the annual presidential address, the issues confronting the Convention during their tenure, and their specific rhetorical aims. The purpose of this questionnaire was to permit corroboration of inferences and interpretations based upon investigation of the other materials available. The availability of both types of material added a dimension to the investigation not possible if limited to either alone.

A complete set of printed texts of the addresses was secured by utilizing four sources: the Annual; press release copies filed in Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee; press release copies filed in the office of the Public Relations Secretary of the Southern Baptist Convention Executive Committee who serves as press representative for the Convention; and the (Texas) Baptist

\[24\text{Ibid.}\]

\[25\text{W.C. Fields, 690 James Robertson Parkway, Nashville, Tennessee 37219.}\]
Magnetic tape recordings were secured from Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee. The original recordings of the proceedings of the Convention made by the Convention's Radio and Television Commission were copied for this investigation; they were unedited and included such things as preliminary remarks, audible audience response, and the speakers' verbal inaccuracies.

**METHOD OF ANALYSIS**

Knowledge of the historical context required for detailed analysis of the presidential address was secured by examining the *Annual* for each year during 1845-1970, and Baptist state papers during 1951-1970. The record of proceedings contained in the *Annual* revealed the occasions on which the president addressed the Convention. The *Annual* also contained the Convention's constitution and bylaws; rules of procedure; copies of the annual program; reports of the Convention's boards, agencies, and institutions; and a record of all official Convention actions. Of specific concern were those actions related to the presidential address. Other historical sources, cited in

---

26 *Baptist Standard*, June 7, 1961, pp. 8-9. This was the only year for which no *Annual* copy or press release copy was available.

27 See bibliography, section D, and Appendix C for location of tape recordings and each printed text.
chapter two, were also consulted for information about the origin of
the Convention itself.

The Baptist state papers cited in the previous section contained
information on the controversial issues facing each annual session
and comments upon each session's "spirit," "tone," or "atmosphere."
Enlightening comments upon the behavior of the messengers were
also frequent. 28

The biographical materials were examined to provide a brief
biographical sketch of each president included in the study. No
attempt was made to compile exhaustive information on the presidents
of either a biographical or bibliographical nature. 29

The focal point of this investigation was a three-fold problem
area: the nature of the address, its value, and the extent to which
the speakers utilized their rhetorical opportunities. 30 Enlightenment
upon this problem was sought in speaker intent, message content and
treatment, and audience response. The analysis of message content
and treatment involved the discovery of themes and the classification

28 See chapter 4 for detailed treatment of these concerns.

29 See the biographical sketches in chapter 2 and the picture
in Appendix A.

30 See "Statement of the Problem," p. 4. A detailed treatment
of these considerations will be found in chapter 5; this discussion is
intended to include only enough to clarify the method of analysis.
of treatment in accordance with categories established for rhetorical criticism. A synthesis of classical and contemporary concepts was utilized for this purpose.

The tool developed for this investigation was a form which permitted a descriptive analysis of each address as the tape recording was heard or the text read. In addition to the specific items included on the form, ample space was available for constructing an outline of each address and for making other relevant notations. The organization and content of the form reflect the Aristotelian concept of speaker, speech, and audience and the classical canons of rhetoric, with the exception of memory.

Because responses on the presidents' questionnaires revealed persuasive aims, Aristotle's treatment of persuasive discourse was consulted to determine a classification for these addresses. They involved neither policy propositions nor questions of expediency/inexpediency; therefore they did not fit Aristotle's deliberative category. Neither did they involve questions of justice/injustice; therefore they did not fit his forensic category. Although they did not involve questions of purely praise and blame, the addresses did

---

31 See Appendix G. Not every element was used for each speech, nor were all of the findings incorporated into this report; some seemed irrelevant or inconsequential while others depended too heavily upon subjective impressionistic response for their identification.
contain material designed to "magnify"; therefore they seemed to fit Aristotle's category of epideictic oratory more nearly than either of the other two.  

With the basic nature of their supporting material determined, additional justification for their classification as persuasive rhetoric was sought. Quintilian suggested that narration alone may be persuasive. Although his use of the term "narration" applied primarily to a specific division of an address, not to content or treatment, it was that part of the address in which the facts of the case were set forth. The implication is that "facts" alone, without argumentation, may be persuasive. The addresses under consideration contained extensive bodies of clarification without argumentation.

Glen E. Mills and other contemporary educators teach explanation, or exposition, as a persuasive method.

Kenneth Burke introduced a concept of persuasion which seemed more useful in the examination of these addresses than either


34 Glen E. Mills, Reason in Controversy (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1964), pp. 149-152, and Arthur B. Miller, Modes of Public Speaking (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1971), pp. 105-139.
Aristotle's or Quintilian's: identification. The addresses were examined to determine whether the speakers had identified themselves with positions and values with which the audience could be assumed to identify and which, therefore, would tend to cause the audience to agree with the speakers. The results of this examination are treated extensively in chapter four.

Arthur B. Miller utilized Burke's concept of identification as the foundation of his entire treatment of public speaking which encompasses both of those modes of address normally designated informative and persuasive. Miller demonstrated how the aim of both types of speeches is to secure belief, thus uniting them into one basic type of rhetoric. His treatment provided a useful orientation for analysis of the presidential address.

Further, Miller modified Bryant and Wallace's concept of amplification for application to persuasive, rather than informative, speaking. Bryant and Wallace designated factual information, example, comparison, contrast, causes of effects, and logical definition as kinds


\[36\] Miller, op. cit.
of amplifying materials to be used in informative speeches. \(^{37}\) Miller showed how these may be used in persuasive speeches.

An attempt was made to permit the investigative tools and procedure to fit the materials rather than attempting to fit the materials into a pre-conceived mold. Through the application of categories and concepts of Aristotle, Quintilian, Burke, Bryant and Wallace, Mills, Miller, and others, the presidential addresses were examined to determine their essential nature. The tape recordings were listened to and the texts were read to determine message content and structure which clearly implied persuasive intent on the part of the speakers, corroborating statements of aim on their questionnaires. \(^{38}\)

Evidence of audience reactions in press reports and Convention proceedings provided additional corroboration. \(^{39}\) The Baptist state papers cited in the previous section were consulted to determine reactions to each year's address. These reactions were confined largely to editorial comment about the speaker's delivery, an


\[^{38}\text{See bibliography, section C, number 2.}\]

\[^{39}\text{These are treated extensively in chapter 4.}\]
incidental concern of this investigation; however, on occasion they offered comments upon the significance of the address or upon audience reaction to it.

In examining audience response to help determine the nature and value of the address, Clevenger and Matthews' distinction between process effects (the response of the audience to the speaker's delivery by such things as applause, laughter, "amens," and praise) and product effects (response to the content of the address, usually referred to as effectiveness or rhetorical worth) was followed. 40 Of the four dimensions of value applicable to an investigation of institutional rhetoric, this investigation was concerned only with rhetorical effectiveness and rhetorical quality. 41 The distinction between rhetorical effectiveness and rhetorical quality seems justified on the ground that an address may possess certain desirable intrinsic qualities but be delivered under conditions which


41 Rhetorical critics traditionally assess one or more of the following: rhetorical effectiveness, rhetorical quality, historical worth, or literary merit. See chapter 5 for the analysis of rhetorical effectiveness and rhetorical quality in the Southern Baptist Convention presidential addresses.
seriously limit overt response. Further, in many rhetorical situations reliable measuring devices are not available to the investigator and he would be forced to engage in speculation if he attempted to assess effectiveness. Under such circumstances effectiveness constitutes an inadequate measurement of worth or value. An address may have rhetorical values which transcend its effectiveness with the immediate audience to whom it is delivered. Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" is one example of such a rhetorical event.

In this investigation, an effort was made to go beyond the individual presidential addresses and deal with the address as an institution, as a phenomenon in its own right, as one element in the life of the Southern Baptist Convention. This procedure was an effort to strengthen the unity of the investigation and increase its scope beyond the analysis of twenty-one separate addresses.

In seeking to determine the extent to which the speakers had utilized their rhetorical opportunities it was necessary to determine what those opportunities were. Out of an understanding of the nature of the address it became apparent that the speakers were not merely

---

enlightening the audience with didactic information. Neither were they simply extolling the virtues of the Convention or affiliated churches in an attempt to stimulate the audience emotionally. Continually the Convention was faced with controversial issues which the presidents confronted in their addresses. The Convention faced five such issues of major consequence during the period of this study and the presidents, almost without exception, encountered them squarely in their addresses. It was this encounter which gave the address its viable role in Convention life and which preserved it from a mere ceremonial function. It is in this area that the greatest significance of the address and one of the more meaningful functions of the president were found. To discover these elements, the presidents were queried as to their aims, the addresses were examined to determine what the presidents said, and Convention reactions and press responses were examined in an effort to determine speaker effectiveness.

The printed texts were checked against the tape recordings in order to authenticate the texts and to determine the vocal qualities

---

44 For extensive treatment, see chapter 4.
45 Ibid.
of the speakers and the audible responses of the audience. In authenticating the texts, only one problem was encountered. Comparison of the texts printed in the Southern Baptist Convention Annual during 1950-1953 with those appearing in Baptist state papers revealed no significant discrepancies; however, the summaries and texts which appeared in the papers probably were prepared from the same advance copies of the texts from which the copies appearing in the Annual were made, so it is not possible to guarantee authenticity in these cases. On the other hand, no evidence has been discovered to indicate that either Lee or Grey departed significantly from his prepared text. For the addresses during 1954-1970, the printed texts were checked against the tape recordings of the addresses. With the exception of 1961, it was verified that the printed texts are an essentially accurate reflection of the statements of the speakers. The actual addresses delivered did depart from the prepared texts in many ways typical of those encountered when a speaker prepares a manuscript in advance but instead of reading it verbatim uses it as a guide to keep him close to his original ideas: rephrasing of sentences; substitution of essentially equivalent words; omission of some material and/or addition of other, but not in a manner or to a degree sufficient to alter the speaker's original intent. The 1961 address was the only one in which the printed text varied significantly from the tape
recording. It is not certain whether the text was revised for publication after delivery; it is possible that the discrepancies between tape recording and printed text were merely those resulting from speaker adaptation.

The 1961 address was not printed in the Annual nor was a copy in the files of the public relations secretary of the Convention's Executive Committee who makes the presidential address texts available for publication. To ascertain the circumstances surrounding the absence of a printed text, the persons primarily involved—the speaker, the public relations secretary, and the editor of the first Baptist state paper in which a printed text was eventually located—were written, telephoned, and interviewed in person. The exact circumstances still are not entirely clear. The president initially indicated that he had never written out this address; the implication was that he had spoken extemporaneously. A transcription of the tape recording was made and copies were sent to the president and the public relations secretary for their files. In his letter acknowledging receipt of this transcript, the public relations secretary indicated that he recalled attempting to get an advance manuscript right up until the time of the Convention meeting, but was unable to get one. However, in connection with this circumstance, he mentioned Miami Beach, not Saint Louis, so the event he was recollecting could
have been connected with the 1960 address instead of the 1961. A text of the address was subsequently located in the (Texas) Baptist Standard for June 7, 1961. The other three Baptist state papers consulted as a basic group in preparation of this study did not carry a copy of the text or even a summary of the address. Summaries or abridgments were located in only four of nine other Baptist state papers. When asked about the circumstances of his paper's securing the text it had printed, the Texas editor replied that he had not been editor of that paper in 1961. The implication was that there would be nothing in the files which would reveal the source of the text. When asked about the source of the Texas text in a subsequent interview, President Pollard replied that his memory was quite hazy on the point but that he felt that he wrote it and sent it out before the Convention. The lack of written records and the fallibility of human memory make it impossible to ascertain whether the printed text represents an advance manuscript which was largely ignored during extemporaneous delivery or a revised version of the address prepared after delivery. When first asked for a copy of the text, Pollard replied that he had


never written out the message in full;\textsuperscript{49} after discovery of the Texas text he was uncertain whether it had been written before or after delivery.\textsuperscript{50} The public relations secretary at first could not account for the absence of the text from his files; after receiving a copy of the transcript he recalled "very vividly that he kept promising right up until the time he arrived in Miami Beach to get that speech written down for me. He ended up speaking largely off the cuff . . . ."\textsuperscript{51}

If it was correctly Miami Beach which was recalled, then the address in question was the 1960 address, not the Saint Louis address of 1961.

The Texas editor consulted had been editor of the Georgia Baptist paper, \textit{The Christian Index}, in 1961, one of the papers consulted in preparation for this study. He replied:

My memory is that this is the advance text which was submitted by Dr. Pollard prior to the convention. He did not preach from a manuscript or from notes which is his style, and as frequently happens much of the text was ignored.

My memory is that \textit{The Christian Index} also published this text in the issue of the convention week. This normally is done by several of the papers with an editor's note that this is the text submitted for preaching at the convention.

This editor's memory is also erroneous, because no copy or

\textsuperscript{49} Letter from Ramsey Pollard, October 27, 1970.

\textsuperscript{50} Personal interview, January 13, 1971.

\textsuperscript{51} Letter from W.C. Fields, November 13, 1970.
summary of the text was found in the May, June, or July issues of The Christian Index for 1961.

The available evidence and the conflicting testimony render conclusions tentative; nevertheless, the following seem reasonable. Although he at first did not remember having written out the address, when the Texas text was located Pollard did not disclaim it; therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the Texas text is Pollard's work. An abridgment of this text was found in the Florida Baptist Witness, June 1, 1961. There would hardly have been time for Pollard to edit his address after its delivery and have it published by this date. A few brief quotations following this same text were also located in the Mississippi Baptist Record, June 1, 1961. An abridgment was also found in the South Carolina Baptist Courier, June 22, 1961, and a text in the Oklahoma Baptist Messenger, June 8, 1961. All quotations published followed the same text; none reflected any of Pollard's actual remarks as delivered in deviation from that text. Therefore, all of these quotations seem to reflect dependence upon a single common source probably prepared prior to actual delivery of the address to the Convention but released for publication simultaneously with delivery or immediately thereafter. Since no copy was located in the file of the public relations secretary, it is possible that Pollard released his prepared manuscript directly instead of
through the customary Convention agency. Withholding the manuscript until immediately after delivery would preclude comparison of it with the address on the part of press representatives. Subsequent quotations would likely follow the text of what was distributed, not what was actually said.

The concern over the circumstances surrounding the preparation of this text arises from the nature of the discrepancies between the address as delivered and the text as it appears in print. In several of the other addresses there were departures from the prepared text, but in all of those cases the departures were of the nature which might be expected of any speaker who seeks to maintain eye contact with his audience, adapt to unanticipated circumstances, or who is pressed for time: changes in wording of the same basic thought; the addition of bits of supporting material or the injection of bits of humor or references to the occasion; or the deletion of sentences or even paragraphs of material. Pollard's departures from his text during the 1960 address were of this nature but his departures during the 1961 address were of another nature. The impression is given of one who got caught up in the inspiration of the moment, was fired by the overt response of the crowd, and who exercised somewhat less restraint than he would normally feel appropriate. The address was marked by less formality than the text; the phrasing was neither as
sophisticated nor as polished; several unsupported assertions, pronouncements of personal position, and personal illustrations which appeared in the address did not appear in the printed text; and the address revealed more dogmatism than the text. The basic outline of the text was preserved along with some specific pieces of supporting material, but what was actually said about these various points was radically changed. This is not to suggest that Pollard shifted his position from one side to the other, only that he greatly strengthened the statement of it in actual delivery. A few quotations will illustrate the point. In one passage of his address Pollard dealt with communism; that passage does not appear in the text, but the succeeding passage appears in both the delivered address and in the printed text. Pollard said:

Now a militant church is the answer. We need that the hearts of men shall be changed, and the only way that can be done is by the power of Jesus Christ. Now this is no day for timidity; it is a good time for humility, but it is not a good day for timidity. And I want to impress upon you that we are not on an Easter egg hunt and we're not on a Sunday school picnic and we're not on a garden club party. We're on big business for the Lord Jesus Christ, and it's no time for compromise. I think some of us have been embarrassed because Baptist people sometime in places of leadership have compromised what Baptists believe and what the Word of God teaches. And let's not be guilty of compromise. Some have been so greatly concerned about the Baptist image, what Tom, Dick, and Harry will think and what they will say about Baptists. I think we'd better look into it a little bit carefully and see what God thinks of us and what we're
doing according to the teachings of his Word. And we have to have a militancy, we have to have a conviction, we have to have a church that's on fire, and we have to have courage enough and moral backbone enough to be unpopular if it's necessary. John created a very poor image, and Isaiah created a very poor image, and Jeremiah did, and Simon Peter did, but God used those men because they had conviction. And there isn't anything in the world that's more insipid in the world in which we live than a man or a woman or a nation or a denomination or a church that does not have conviction!  

The printed text read:

A militant New Testament church is the enduring answer. The regenerating power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ is our ultimate hope. That, and that alone, can change hearts of men; and the hearts of men must be changed if civilization is to endure.  

This is no time for timidity in proclaiming the Gospel of redemption. This is no time for compromise for the sake of expediency and creating what some people call "a good image." The day calls for a militant church--a church with conviction. No church worthy of bearing the name of Jesus Christ will make peace terms with evil and oppression. We must have courage enough to be unpopular if our cause is right.  

Pollard said:

Somebody asked the question, "Is the religious issue dead?" Why, certainly it's not dead. You don't know that, you haven't read the papers, and you haven't watched TV and you haven't heard the radio and you haven't read magazines. And today there is a great movement abroad in our land to brainwash everyone who has courage enough to stand up for rights. You'll be referred to as a bigot.

---

52 Tape recording, presidential address, 1961.

You'll be referred to as a man who's hard to get along with, a man who is narrow minded. Well, all truth is narrow, and Southern Baptists have been a narrow-minded people for many, many years. And in spite of those who would lead us out into the great broad-minded areas of life and improve our intellects and make us know how ignorant we are, Southern Baptists are not going to follow that kind of leadership.

Some are proudly proclaiming "The Religious Issue is dead." May I suggest that you read the papers. Listen to the impassioned plea of the Roman Catholic hierarchy demanding federal funds for the support of their church-related schools. Our nation faces danger from without and within. It may be that the gravest of the two is the danger of losing our religious freedom because of a breakdown of the wall of separation of church and state.

Pollard said:

We're putting on great campaigns for our colleges, universities, and seminaries, and I believe in them. My record shows I believe in them. I've gone up and down the length and breadth of the Southern Baptist Convention promoting Christian education, and I'm also saying again this year that Southern Baptists want their seminaries and their schools to be Christian and they want them to be Baptist and we must remember that if the vat be unclean that which comes out will be sour. Keep our schools anchored to the Word of God. Some of our states are putting on great campaigns for Baptist schools, and they ought to; they ought to do it; we ought to do it. Our seminaries need more endowment. Our universities and colleges need more money. All of us know that. And I'm going to tell you one way that you school men can stir a wave of enthusiasm for fund raising, and that is

---

54 Tape recording, presidential address, 1961.

tie your colleges, your universities, and your seminaries onto our Baptist program without any apology. It'll be easier to raise money.

The printed text read:

In many places our schools are seeking to raise millions of dollars for enlargement and endowment. This is good and proper and Baptists must not expect our schools to make brick without straw. One thing which would immeasurably aid in these campaigns for huge funds is a continued confidence that our schools will stay by The Book. Otherwise, Baptists' money, yea, the Lord's money, is wasted.

These passages are typical of the departures from the printed text, if, indeed, the text was prepared in advance. There were other lengthy passages in the address which had no parallel in the text. Those passages typically contained personal references, unsupported assertions, and reflections of dogmatism similar to these cited here.

Whether Pollard prepared the text in advance and departed from it during delivery or delivered the address and then prepared an edited version for publication would have no bearing upon delivery; the effect in Saint Louis would be the same. The essential point of concern is whether Pollard delivered the address first and subsequently attempted to make himself appear more polished, more restrained, more impersonal, less aggressive, and less dogmatic

---

56 Tape recording, presidential address, 1961.

than he actually had been by presenting a variant version of the address for publication. For a speaker to depart from a prepared manuscript in the heat of delivery may be simply a matter of judgment concerning what is appropriate in the light of existing conditions, or at worst a question of restraint or self-control; however, for a speaker to submit for publication a version of an address which does not contain much of what he said and which so alters the remainder as to give a different impression of the speaker from that gained by hearing him speak or by examining a transcript of his actual remarks raises a question of ethics. The inconclusive nature of the documentary evidence and the conflicting nature of the testimony in this case make it impossible to render a conclusive judgment.

Quotations from the addresses normally follow the wording of the printed text unless it differed significantly from the actual words spoken; although the tape recording was the actual source, footnotes cite the printed text. The printed source was examined for comparison and was used for convenience in copying the words and in footnoting. Investigators interested in checking the documentation will find printed sources more readily available and the references easier to locate. Only two sets of tape recordings of the addresses are known to exist; the master set is in Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee, and a set is in the possession of this investigator.
Although the Radio and Television Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention sells copies of their recordings of Convention messages and music each year, no other person or institution possessing a complete set of the presidential address tape recordings can be cited here. Conversely, complete microfilm holdings of the Convention Annual in which appear most of the addresses involved in this study are available in many libraries.

While no footnote references are made to them, press release copies were secured of all addresses which do not appear in the Annual, with the exception of the 1961 address. For that address the tape recording was used and a typed transcription was made. In that single instance, the address was neither published in the Annual, nor did the public relations office have a copy in its file. The only copy located in the file of the president who delivered the address was one which appeared after delivery in one of the Baptist state papers. Thus, to the extent that it was possible to secure it, an "official" copy of every address was examined.

OVERVIEW OF DISSERTATION DEVELOPMENT

Chapter one has been concerned with a justification for the study, a statement of the problem, a survey of the scope of the study,
a report of the type of data involved, and an explanation of the method of analysis which included a treatment of text authentication.

Chapter two provides an over-all perspective of the milieu out of which the presidential address grows; its treatment is largely historical and explanatory. It is intended to be descriptive, not interpretative or evaluative. Although most of the content is specifically documented with references to published sources, some of it is drawn from the knowledge and understanding of the investigator. 58 Further, it gives a description of the typical Convention audience during the period involved in this investigation and the typical occasion upon which the address is delivered. The description of the audience is based upon the investigator's observation of two Convention audiences and informal conversations with teachers and fellow pastors over a period of twenty-four years combined with information provided by the Research and Statistics Department of the Convention's Sunday School Board. 59 The description of the occasion is based upon general reading of

58 See statement of investigator's qualifications in footnote 19 above (p. 9) and in the vita.

59 See vita and Appendix E.
Baptist periodicals over a period of twenty-four years and the Southern Baptist Convention Annual for the period under investigation.

Chapter three presents a description of the speakers' rhetorical method: organization, style, and delivery. This descriptive analysis is based upon the tape recordings and the printed texts of the addresses. In describing the addresses in this chapter, traditional terminology of the speech class room is utilized including the general purposes: inform, persuade, entertain, inspire; specific purpose (the narrow aim growing out of the general purpose); deductive and inductive order; climactic and anti-climactic arrangement; patterns of main heads: topical, enumerative, time, spatial, causal, purpose-means, problem-solution, question-answer; covert and overt audience responses; the parts of the address: title, thesis, introduction, body, conclusion; the speakers' vocal characteristics: pitch, rate, volume, timbre; and their use of language: style.

Chapter four contains a detailed analysis and evaluation of the addresses as they relate to the five major controversial issues confronting the Convention during 1950-1970. Inferences are drawn
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60 See bibliography, section D.

61 See Appendix C.
about speaker intent and effectiveness. Evaluations are offered concerning points of view and positions assumed, as are assessments of worth.

Chapter five contains a statement of the most significant conclusions drawn from the study and a brief assessment of the significance of the investigation itself. An attempt is made to go beyond the detailed analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of chapters three and four to present an assessment of the presidential address in an institutional, rather than individual sense.
Chapter 2

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

This chapter will present a historical perspective of the Southern Baptist Convention\(^1\) and the presidential address, a discussion of the nature of the Convention, and an explanation of the relationship of the president to the Convention. Additionally, the chapter will provide biographical sketches of the eleven presidents included in the study. Finally, it will supply information about the typical Convention audience and the typical occasion as a foundation for the rhetorical analysis in chapter four.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

The convening in May, 1814, in Philadelphia, of the "General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions" marked

the beginning in the United States of organized Baptist life on a national scale. Prior to this time Baptist churches in limited geographical areas had cooperated in district associations and state conventions but there was no nation-wide or general body. When Adoniram and Ann Judson and Luther Rice, Congregational missionaries to Burma, became Baptists, severed their connections with Congregationalists, and sought the support of Baptists in 1813, there was no denominational structure of sufficient scope to support them. Out of these circumstances was born the Baptist General Missionary Convention. Thus, organized Baptist life in the United States had its origin in missionary activity rather than in a movement toward ecclesiastical hierarchy.  

Rice returned to the United States to solicit support for the Judsons and himself. He was instrumental in the formation of the Convention and in securing funds for the support of missions. The Convention was specifically a foreign mission society and was composed of people from churches, associations, state conventions, or independent societies interested in missions. Almost immediately it increased the scope of its interest to include home missions and education. There was a reaction to this enlarged scope and tendency

---

2Annual, 1952, pp. 59-64.
toward centralization, so before 1845 there arose separate societies for foreign missions, home missions, education, and publication.

Centralization and abolition became divisive issues between the North and South, resulting in the organization, on May 8, 1845, in Augusta, Georgia, of the Southern Baptist Convention. The purpose of this Convention was, and is, as follows:

To provide a general organization for Baptists in the United States and its territories for the promotion of Christian missions at home and abroad, and any other objects such as Christian education, benevolent enterprises, and social services which it may deem proper and advisable for the furtherance of the kingdom of God.

The Convention at first met triennially and was popularly known as the Triennial Convention. By 1851 it was meeting biennially. Having missed its meeting in 1865, as a result of the Civil War, it met in 1866 and voted to declare itself a permanent institution. It met again in 1867 in order to get back on its biennial schedule and that same year decided to meet annually. It has met annually since 1866 with the exception of 1943 and 1945 when meetings were canceled due to transportation and housing problems associated with the Second World War. The 1970 meeting was the one hundred thirteenth session in the one hundred twenty-

---

3 Southern Baptist Convention Constitution, article II, Annual, 1970, p. 32.
fifth year of the Convention. Carl Bates, elected in Denver in 1970, is the thirty-sixth man to serve as president. For some purposes, such as the Baptist Jubilee Advance program terminating in 1964, the Convention traces its history back to 1814—more than one hundred twenty-five years—to the organization of the Baptist General Missionary Convention. Although it dates its own existence from 1845, it recognizes its succession from the earlier organization.

Southern Baptists organized in 1845 with a registration of 236 messengers from a total of 4,126 cooperating churches in 9 states with a combined membership of 351,951. There were 9 state conventions. In 1970 there was a registration of 13,692 messengers, cooperating churches totaled 34,335 in all 50 states, and membership stood at 11,489,613. There were 31 state conventions. The Southern Baptist Convention is the largest evangelical Christian denomination in the United States despite the circumstance that it has, on occasion,
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4 Annual, 1845-1970.
5 Annual, 1956-1964.
6 Barnes, op. cit., pp. 306-309.
lost a number of cooperating churches and members by schism but has never gained any through merger.

The smallest number of messengers registered for an annual session was 103 in 1849. The figure first went past one thousand in 1902, first passed ten thousand in 1952, and reached its all-time high at 16,678 in 1969 at New Orleans. The increasing size has produced the argument that the denomination has become too large to continue its meetings on the present system. Some suggest dividing into regions and holding regional meetings. Others suggest selecting a limited number of representatives from each state. Still others propose reducing the number of messengers allowable from each church. None of these suggestions has been able to win popular support.

The size of the Convention, in terms of the number of affiliated churches, constituents, and messengers attending annual sessions, and the geographical area encompassed by its constituent congregations, introduces a diversity—geographically, socially, and educationally—and unwieldiness into its functions which have direct bearing upon the presidential address. Unanimity of viewpoint is an unrealistic
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8 Barnes, loc. cit., and Annual, 1969.

9 The Baptist Program, January, 1970, pp. 5-6, 10-11, 16-19, and this investigator's personal knowledge of Convention history and current affairs. See investigator's qualifications, footnote 19, p. 9.
expectation. Rapid flexibility of philosophical position is unlikely. Consensus based upon rational deliberation is increasingly difficult to secure. Being simultaneously large, diverse, and fiercely independent, Southern Baptists will not allow certain characteristics in the presidential address. The president cannot be an official Convention spokesman; he is granted no such authority. Nor can he issue orders to the Convention. Even if the president were able to persuade the audience to one position, the Convention could not then make that position binding upon the churches. Therefore, not only is the size of the Convention a fact of history, but also it has a bearing upon the nature and function of the presidential address.

NATURE OF THE CONVENTION

The Southern Baptist Convention is composed of messengers elected from local, independent, autonomous churches. The same is true of the Baptist state conventions and the district associations within states. The Convention exercises control over its agencies

---

10 For fuller development, see the next section.

11 For fuller development, see "Relationship of the President to the Convention," pp. 48-52.

12 For fuller development, see the next section.
and institutions, but not over any local church, state convention, or
district association. The Convention constitution specifically
prohibits any attempt at such control.  

The terms "messenger," "agencies," and "Convention" need
further explanation. "Messenger" is used in a specific and technical
sense with reference to the Convention. When Herb Senne attends
the Southern Baptist Convention as a messenger from Mill Creek
Baptist Church, he is neither a delegate nor a representative,
although reporters for the secular press frequently use these terms
in their articles. Senne is not instructed by his church how to vote on
any issue. He does not represent the will of the church on any matter
under consideration. Neither has any authority been delegated to him
to speak for the church or to bind the church to any action. When
Senne votes as a member of the Convention, he votes only for himself
and, in matters ultimately affecting the churches, his vote is binding
only upon himself as an individual, if at all. The Convention is
composed of messengers, not churches. No church "belongs" to the
Southern Baptist Convention; it only cooperates with it.

13 Southern Baptist Convention Constitution, article IV, Annual, 1970, p. 32.

14 Ibid., article III, and bylaw 1, p. 34.
While the Convention does not control any local church, state convention, or district association, it does exercise control over its agencies and institutions. The agencies of the Convention include the Foreign Mission Board, the Home Mission Board, the Sunday School Board, and the Annuity Board; the Education Commission, the Historical Commission, the Stewardship Commission, the Radio and Television Commission, and the Brotherhood Commission. The institutions of the Convention include six theological seminaries.\(^{15}\) The elected members, not the employed personnel, of these boards and commissions and the trustees of the seminaries exercise control over them.\(^{16}\) The Convention has several methods of exercising control. It can leave matters in the hands of the members whom it elects, approve or reject the recommendations presented to it by the agencies and institutions, commend or suggest certain ideas or courses of action to the agencies, or require a specific course of action, such as directing the Sunday School Board to withdraw the first volume of a new Bible commentary series.\(^{17}\)

\(^{15}\) *Annual, 1970, pp. 5-28.*

\(^{16}\) *Southern Baptist Convention Constitution, articles VI, VII, Annual, 1970, pp. 32-33.*

\(^{17}\) *Annual, 1970, pp. 63, 76, 77.*
In actions ultimately affecting the churches, the Convention can only recommend or request. None of its decisions is binding upon any church.\(^{18}\) It is totally dependent upon the voluntary cooperation of the churches in such matters as providing funds to meet its annual budget.\(^{19}\)

The term "Convention" is used, when capitalized, to refer to the Southern Baptist Convention, an organization. It is also used to refer to the annual sessions of that Convention; thus it denotes a meeting, as "At the Southern Baptist Convention in Saint Louis . . . .," or simply "At the Convention in Saint Louis . . . ."

Informally, the Southern Baptist Convention is the churches affiliating and cooperating with one another in the accomplishment of common objectives. In this sense, it is a denomination. Southern Baptists do not refer to their denomination as the "Southern Baptist Church." Technically, the Convention is the messengers from cooperating churches who meet each year to hear reports, approve programs, and adopt policies. In this sense the Convention is simply an annual meeting which exists for only three days during May or June.

\(^{18}\) Southern Baptist Convention Constitution, article IV, Annual, 1970, p. 32.

\(^{19}\) Business and Financial Plan, article V, Annual, 1970, p. 41.
Practically, the Convention is the boards, commissions, institutions, and other agencies which carry out the denomination's missions, education, and publication activities and programs which lead or assist the local churches. Functionally, the Convention is largely the Executive Committee which makes decisions and carries on work between the annual sessions. However, the actions of this Executive Committee, and its Executive Secretary, are subject to the approval of the Convention in annual session.

While other denominational structures might find local churches electing representatives to district associations, the associations electing representatives to the state conventions, and the state conventions electing representatives to the national body, Southern Baptist churches elect messengers directly to each of these three levels of cooperative organization. In this way each of the organizations derives its authority directly from its membership and neither is subordinate to the other. Ultimately, the local church is above them all.

Two editors of Baptist state papers have clearly revealed the nature of the Southern Baptist Convention. According to Jack U. Harwell:

---

20 This explanation is based upon Southern Baptist Convention bylaw 9, Annual, 1970, pp. 36-38, and the investigator's understanding.
There is no such animal as the "Official Baptist Line" on any matter. The priesthood of believers means just what it says. Every Baptist answers to the Lord and his own conscience for his own beliefs and actions.

The approval of a resolution at the SBC ... means merely that those messengers at that meeting by that margin of votes have that particular conviction, and they recommend it to their fellow Southern Baptists all over the nation for what it is worth. It can be followed or ignored according to personal decision and nobody will be cast out of the fellowship whichever position they choose.

And according to John J. Hurt:

The 1965 sessions of the Southern Baptist Convention, good as they were, demonstrated two trends to be watched lest we find ourselves led astray:

1. Timidity of the leadership to talk back when proposals come from the floor.
2. Eagerness to direct agencies without first approaching the agency.

The Southern Baptist Convention is not and never can be a deliberative body. The 15,000 or so in attendance make it as unwieldy as a national political convention. The man who appeals to the emotions has the advantage of the man who appeals to reason.

An incident illustrating Hurt's observation involved a proposed agency name change. Members of Baptist churches generally value their freedom and the autonomy of their churches. Messengers from those

---


churches to the Convention, therefore, are careful to avoid any encroachment upon that freedom and autonomy or any tendency to invest authority in any agency of the Convention beyond that necessary for the performance of its appointed task. It seems to be uppermost in the minds of Convention messengers that the Convention is an agency for cooperation in Christian ministry, not one of ecclesiastical authority.

The nature of the Convention has a direct bearing upon the nature and purpose of the presidential address. Because the Convention is missionary rather than ecclesiastical, the president cannot issue encyclicals or dogma. Because the Convention is composed of messengers from autonomous churches organizationally superior to it, the president cannot lead it to take any action binding upon the churches. Because the Convention was organized for practical cooperative activity rather than as an agency for authoritarian control, the president cannot prevail upon it to police the activities of the churches or the behavior of the members; the Convention cannot sit as an ecclesiastical council. Because the purposes of the Convention are in the areas of missions, evangelism, education, and benevolence, the president cannot lead it to make

---

24 See "Local Church Autonomy" in chapter 4 for fuller treatment of this issue.
binding pronouncements in the province of speculative theology; nor can the president declare an official Baptist position.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE CONVENTION

The first president of the Convention, William Bullein Johnson, was elected largely because he had been a prime mover in the organization of the Convention. He was chosen to preside over the meetings and he was expected to enlist the aid of additional churches in a cooperative missionary enterprise. As the function of the Convention has become more complex with its growth, so has the role of the president.

Informally, the president is a spokesman on behalf of the Convention and the cooperating churches. This is an informal role because nowhere in the official records of the Convention is there any indication that the Convention has officially bestowed such authority upon the president. Most of the presidents are careful to articulate, especially when speaking to "outsiders," and most especially when speaking to representatives of the press, that they speak only for themselves, not for any other Baptist, any church, or the Convention.

25 See Appendix B for a list of the presidents.

Some of the presidents have been careful to emphasize this point repeatedly in their presidential addresses. One Southern Baptist historian stressed the informal or unofficial nature of the president's role as denominational spokesman:

As unofficial spokesman for nearly eleven million Southern Baptists, Paschall realized that many newsmen and others would consider his words to be expressive of the views of his denomination. He thus sought to keep his comments in proper perspective of Baptist life and understanding.

The Convention president is frequently a fraternal messenger to the meetings of other religious bodies, especially other Baptist groups, and he must be on his guard constantly to prevent giving the impression that he is speaking officially for Southern Baptists. Obviously, when asked what Southern Baptists think about certain issues he attempts an answer, but unless the Convention has taken official action the president is fully aware that his reply is only his own concept of what Southern Baptists think.

Technically, the president is the presiding officer over the annual meeting of the Convention. As the Convention's highest elected executive, he is a member of the Convention's "several

---


28 Arkansas Baptist, July 19, 1951, p. 11.
boards and of the Executive Committee" and is empowered to
"appoint the director of music for the Convention." ²⁹

Practically, although the president may advise or counsel
with the boards and other agencies, he wields no official power over
them. Functionally, then, the president presides over the sessions of
the Convention and serves as counselor on the Convention's boards
and Executive Committee. Essentially, the president is a kind of
catalyst who, because of his sagacity, character, and good will, as
well as his doctrinal soundness, is able to engender a spirit of unity
and endeavor among eleven million Americans of diverse backgrounds,
attitudes, desires, and doctrinal persuasions. The annual sessions of
the Convention and the pages of its Annual reveal the lack of
uniformity among Southern Baptists.

The presidents are aware of the limitations of their office. A
question concerning the role of the Convention president brought
these responses:

R.G. Lee: Presiding officer. Counselor on all S.B.C.
Boards as to any and all matters.

C.C. Warren: His major role is to preside, fairly
and impartially. Tho he has no authority to speak for
the denomination, what he says is to some extent
interpreted as Conv. sentiment.

²⁹Southern Baptist Convention Constitution, article V,
paragraph 3, Annual, 1970, p. 32.
Brooks Hays: Presiding--assisting in formulation of policy.

Ramsey Pollard: Presiding officer--Convention Representative--good will ambassador and encourager of the Brethren.

Herschel Hobbs: Presiding officer; inspirational leader.

K. Owen White: Convention Representative.

Wayne Dehoney: A catalyst--a charismatic unifying figure and voice--one who lifts a banner to rally forces--he bridges over the agency and program causes to get popular support.

The fullest answer was given by H. Franklin Paschall who agreed that the president is the presiding officer, a denominational spokesman, and the Convention representative, and added:

Public statements and sermons or addresses probably are most important. Planning the SBC program (annual) and presiding over the Convention are major responsibilities. Answering a mountain of mail personally may be more important than one might think.

It is clear from these representative replies that the presidents do not view themselves as invested with authoritarian powers over the Convention or cooperating churches.

A different kind of comment concerning the role of the Convention president and his address came from Louie D. Newton. Dr. Newton was president during 1946-1948. He is the only surviving ex-president of the Convention not included in the period covered by
this study and the Convention proceedings for 1948 do not reveal any address having been delivered, so Dr. Newton was asked about the matter. He replied:

I have no objection to those brethren who have given presidential addresses, but for my part, I don't think that is what our founding fathers had in mind for the office of president of a Baptist convention. No individual can ever speak for Baptists, unless they specially ask him to do so, and even then, in my opinion, he is walking on egg shells. Take your dictionary and study the word pontificate, and you'll get what I'm talking about.

The attitudes of these men who have served as president of the Convention are probably representative of the mainstream of Southern Baptist attitudes on the matter. It seems to be the genius of the president that he can express the consensus position of Southern Baptists. Whether he is elected because he can do this or attempts to do this because he has been elected is not known.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The remarks which the president may address to the Convention on numerous occasions do not necessarily constitute a "presidential address" in the sense intended within the scope of this study. The president frequently addresses remarks to the Convention just after

30 Letter from Dr. Louie D. Newton, December 11, 1970.
his election and just prior to or following the motion for adjournment. On occasion the retiring president speaks words of farewell. 31 Neither of these messages, nor similar ones, constitutes the presidential address as it was treated in this investigation. The address involved in this investigation was one in which the president came to grips with issues facing the Convention or its cooperating churches. Since 1924 the presidential address has been formally indicated in the program. 32

Informal remarks of appreciation for election, greeting, or farewell were addressed to the Convention by numerous presidents before a formal presidential address was ever made. Further, there were annual sermons before there was a formal presidential address. One of these sermons served as a precursor to the presidential address. The 1849 meeting was one in which several unforeseen circumstances arose. Because of a cholera epidemic the meeting place was changed to Nashville shortly before time for the sessions to convene. Confusion about this change in plans caused many of the brethren not to arrive at the meeting. Among those absent were the men who were to preach the annual sermons. William

31 Annual, 1845-1970.
Bullein Johnson, the president in 1849, had been appointed to preach the Convention Sermon, but he was not present in Nashville. "In the absence of the brethren who had been appointed to preach the Convention Sermon, a committee ... was appointed to nominate a preacher for the occasion."\(^{33}\) J.S. Baker of Georgia preached the Convention Sermon in Nashville, according to the appointment of the Convention. That session of the Convention was presided over by the vice-president, Robert Boyte Crawford Howell, who came close to delivering the first "presidential address." "After a few brief remarks by Dr. Howell, on the present encouraging prospects for the speedy and universal spread of the gospel, the Convention adjourned to meet at Charleston, S.C., on the 23d of May, 1849."\(^{34}\) The Charleston meeting was only three weeks after the Nashville one; the two sessions are considered separate sessions of the same basic meeting. Johnson was present in Charleston, presided over those sessions, and, "On motion, the President, Dr. Johnson, was requested to preach the Foreign Mission Sermon, this evening, at 8 o'clock."\(^{35}\)

In 1849, then, the vice-president, serving as chairman, addressed

\(^{33}\) *Southern Baptist Missionary Journal*, 1849, p. 27.

\(^{34}\) Ibid., p. 29.

\(^{35}\) Ibid., p. 30.
the Convention with a few brief remarks "on the present encouraging prospects for the speedy and universal spread of the gospel," not just words of greeting, gratitude for election, or farewell, and the president delivered the Foreign Mission Sermon to the Convention. Neither of these addresses technically qualifies as "the presidential address," but both are close enough to justify mentioning them as precursors.

During the period under discussion there were three sermons authorized for delivery to the Convention: a sermon on foreign missions, a sermon on home— or domestic— missions, and a doctrinal sermon— sometimes called the Bible Sermon. All were referred to collectively as Convention Sermons. At times any one of them might be referred to as the Convention Sermon. More frequently, however, they were referred to as the Foreign Mission Sermon, the Domestic Mission Sermon, and the Convention Sermon. This ambiguity of nomenclature accounts for Johnson's sermon being referred to in different places as the Convention Sermon and the Foreign Mission Sermon. It was one of the three official Convention Sermons, but it was specifically the Foreign Mission Sermon, not the Bible Sermon. Although it is not possible to determine with certainty from the sources consulted, the implication is that Johnson originally had been appointed to preach

36 Southern Baptist Missionary Journal, 1845-1849.
the Bible Sermon, but because of his absence from Nashville, Baker delivered that message; then when the session convened with Johnson present in Charleston, he was asked to preach the sermon on foreign missions. Whatever the specific circumstances, it is clear that Johnson did deliver one of the official Convention Sermons, and the one he delivered was the Foreign Mission Sermon.

Except for R.B.C. Howell’s Foreign Mission Sermon in 1853, the next indication of a president’s addressing the Convention, other than with greetings or similar remarks, occurs in 1855. Howell, still president at that time, introduced to the Convention two men who had just been appointed for service by the Foreign Mission Board: A.D. Phillips of Georgia, appointed to Central Africa, and R.H. Graves of Maryland, appointed to China. "The President made an address to the Convention commending them to the prayers and sympathies of the members." 37 The record of the session later indicates:

The President made a few touching remarks and brother H.F. Buckner, missionary to the Creek Indians, made a request that prayer might be made for him. He also extended a parting hand to brethren Philips and Graves. Brother DeVotie offered prayer. At the close of which brother J.H. Low made a few pathetic remarks. A hymn was sung and the parting hand extended. It was a melting scene.


38 Ibid., p. 15.
Howell made another speech to the Convention in 1859, but it was one specifically declining the office of president, so it was not a presidential address in the sense involved in this study.

The first address which can be called a presidential address in the sense used in this investigation was authorized by the Convention in 1905 and delivered by E.W. Stephens in Chattanooga, Tennessee, on Friday afternoon, May 12, 1906. The Sunday School Board was requested to print and distribute the address; attempts to locate a copy have proven fruitless.

The next record of a formal presidential address was that of J.B. Gambrell at Hot Springs, Arkansas, on Wednesday morning, May 15, 1918. This address was not officially authorized by the Convention but seems not to have met with significant opposition. There is no reference to its having been printed and no unpublished copy has been located. Gambrell addressed the Convention again the following year in Atlanta, Georgia, and that address was printed in the Convention Annual. It too was delivered without specific authorization.

---

41 Annual, 1919, pp. 17-23.
Edgar Young Mullins addressed the Convention in Jacksonville, Florida, in 1922, without authorization, on the text, "He that putteth his hand to the plow and looketh back is not fit for the kingdom of God."\(^{42}\) Response was favorable enough that the Convention requested its Sunday School Board to publish and distribute the speech. No copy has been located. Mullins also addressed the Convention in 1923 on the subject "Present Dangers and Duties." This address was so well received that the portion of it dealing with science and religion was adopted as the belief of the Southern Baptist Convention and ordered printed in the Annual; the entire message was ordered published and distributed by the Sunday School Board.\(^{43}\) A copy of this address is in the archives of the Southern Baptist Convention and the portion adopted by the Convention as its statement of belief appears in the Annual for 1923.

Convention acceptance of the presidential address was sufficiently adequate for the Convention to take action in 1923 to give it blanket authorization. "It was further voted, after discussion, that the president's address at the Convention should be delivered annually

\(^{42}\) *Annual*, 1922, p. 16.

\(^{43}\) *Annual*, 1923, pp. 19-20.
immediately before organization of the Convention." \(^{44}\) This is not to suggest that there was universal or unanimous approval. As recently as 1952 some opposition to the presidential address has been expressed:

Frankly, we have never liked the idea of what is called the "president's address" which was started back in the days of the first world war, but we liked what Doctor Grey had to say and the way he said it. He made it crystal clear that no one, not even the president, can speak for Baptists, but in speaking for himself it was evident that the throngs present were in perfect accord with what he said. \(^{45}\)

In 1924 E.Y. Mullins delivered the first officially authorized presidential address under the newly approved Convention procedure. This address would rank as the first officially authorized one were it not for the specific authorization of Stephens' 1906 address. No record of the publication of the 1924 address could be located. Although the wording of the authorization for the address was changed in 1925 to allow the president to speak "at his discretion," \(^{46}\) President George White McDaniel did not address the Convention that year.

\(^{44}\) Ibid., p. 72.


\(^{46}\) Annual, 1925, p. 15.
The address seems to have been delivered annually since 1926, except for the two years when the Convention did not meet during the Second World War and during the presidency of Louie D. Newton in 1947 and 1948. The entry in the Annual for 1947 (p. 30) indicates that Newton addressed some remarks to the Convention, but his letter seems to make it clear that he did not deliver a presidential address as such:

First, I did not respond to the suggestion of the committees on order of business in the SBC . . . to give or make presidential addresses, choosing rather to use the time allotted for the addresses in an effort to bring people who would never have appeared before a convention into the picture - particularly the young people, at their first SBC . . . convention.

Second, I have no objection to those brethren who have given presidential addresses, but for my part, I don't think that is what our founding fathers had in mind for the office of president of a Baptist convention. . . .

Newton seems to concur with David M. Gardner in his previously cited attitude toward the presidential address.

The texts of only five presidential addresses are known to have been printed between 1924 and 1949. Two of these have been found. In 1950 R.G. Lee's address was voted as the "expression

---


48 Letter from Dr. Louie D. Newton, December 11, 1970.
of the Convention" and was ordered printed in the Annual. 

Although the addresses were printed in the Annual 1950-1960, 1962-1963, and 1965, not all were voted as official expressions of the Convention.

Each year since 1954 the presidential address has been electronically recorded on magnetic tape by the Radio and Television Commission of the Convention. These tapes are in the archives at the Dargan-Carver Library in Nashville, Tennessee, which is operated jointly by the Historical Commission and the Sunday School Board of the Convention.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF THE PRESIDENTS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

It is not the purpose of this section to present an in-depth or evaluative study of the men who served as president. Instead, the material presented will serve as an introduction to each man as a speaker and as president of the Convention. It is intended to illuminate the first of the three Aristotelian elements, "speaker, speech, and audience." 

49 Annual, 1950, p. 36.

50 See Appendix C for information on publication of all known addresses and bibliography, section D for list of all tape recordings.

51 See Appendix A for a photograph of these presidents.
Robert Greene Lee was born November 11, 1886, in York County, near Fort Mill, South Carolina. Converted at the age of eleven, Lee almost immediately felt the desire to preach. He holds the A.B. degree, magna cum laude, from Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina, where he won the gold medal for best oration. He worked one year toward the master's degree at Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, and earned the Ph.D. degree from Chicago Law School in 1919. He has since been awarded nine honorary degrees.

During his freshman year at Furman, Lee began to preach and was ordained to the ministry on April 3, 1910. When elected to the presidency of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1948, he had forty years of ministerial experience. After pastorates in South Carolina and Louisiana, Lee became pastor of Bellevue Baptist Church, Memphis, Tennessee, on December 11, 1927, where he


53 Information sheet secured directly from Dr. Lee, and biographical data in Porter Wroe Routh, Meet the Presidents (Nashville: Broadman, 1953), pp. 91-93.

54 Ibid.
served thirty-two years, retiring on April 10, 1960, just after the
fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the ministry. He was named
pastor emeritus and continues, at eighty-four, to be active as a writer
and speaker. He has written more than forty books, with at least nine
published since 1960. When interviewed, he had just returned from
speaking at the Texas Baptist Evangelistic Conference and was
preparing to go to Florida to receive a posthumous award in behalf
of his brother. 55

Dr. Lee was president of the Southern Baptist Convention
during 1948-1951. He was in the second year of his presidency
at the time this study begins, and was the last president to serve
three terms. His addresses were marked by the greatest use of
stylistic devices and ornamental language of those in this study.
His style bordered on the grand, yet did not seem to be motivated
by a desire for display.

J.D. Grey

James David Grey was born December 18, 1906, at Princeton,
Kentucky. Converted at the age of twelve, Grey was baptized into
the fellowship of Second Baptist Church, Paducah, Kentucky, and

ordained to the ministry on November 27, 1925. He holds the B.A.
degree from Union University, Jackson, Tennessee, and the Th.M.
degree from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth,
Texas. He has been awarded three honorary degrees.

Except for several student pastorates, Grey has been pastor
of only three churches--two in Texas and his present pastorate.
At sixty-four years of age, he is in his thirty-fourth year as pastor
of First Baptist Church, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Grey, twice president of the Louisiana Baptist Convention,
is currently a member of the Executive Board of the Louisiana
Baptist Convention, the Executive Committee of the Baptist World
Alliance, and its Commission on Evangelism. He holds numerous
positions in New Orleans civic organizations and is in great
demand as a public speaker.

Grey served two terms as president of the Southern Baptist
Convention and was the youngest man to serve in that position at
the time of his first election in 1951. At that time he was in the
twenty-sixth year of his ministry.

---

56 Information sheet and biographical information sheet secured
directly from Dr. Grey. See also James Cole and Robert Lee,
James Wilson Storer was born December 1, 1884, at Burlington, Kansas, and died at Nashville, Tennessee, on April 12, 1970, at eighty-five years of age. He is the only one of the presidents included in this study who is not living. Storer grew up in Nebraska, Washington, and Oregon. He earned the B.S. degree from William Jewell College, Liberty, Missouri, and was later awarded three honorary degrees.

Converted at the age of twenty-one, Storer was ordained to the ministry in 1912 at twenty-seven. He was pastor of six churches in Oklahoma, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Virginia, prior to his twenty-five year pastorate of First Baptist Church, Tulsa, Oklahoma, which began in 1931. He was serving there when elected to the presidency of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1953, at the age of sixty-eight, in the forty-first year of his ministry. He was subsequently Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the Southern Baptist Foundation 1956-1967.

The author of five books, Storer served as president of the Oklahoma Baptist State Convention 1939-1941, as chairman of the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention 1952-1953, and as chairman of the Board of Trustees of Oklahoma Baptist
University 1940-1956. Mrs. Storer, who still resides in Nashville, offered this insight into her husband's interests:

Dr. Storer's knowledge of American History, especially of the war between the states, was remarkable. His collection of presidential autographed letters includes every president of these U.S. personal letters from each since Herbert Hoover, Including JFK!

She gave his library and collections to Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Oklahoma.

C.C. Warren

Casper Carl Warren was born May 28, 1896, in Sampson County, North Carolina, and grew up in Dunn, North Carolina. He earned the L.L.B. and B.A. degrees from Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, North Carolina, and the Th.M. and Th.D. degrees from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky.

He has been awarded two honorary degrees.

Converted at age eleven, Warren was ordained to the ministry in 1922 at the age of twenty-six. His thirty-year pastoral ministry included three churches in Kentucky, Arkansas, and North Carolina.

---

57 Biographical data provided by Dr. Storer on file in the archives of Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee.

58 Letter from Mrs. Storer, December 5, 1970.
It was during his fifteen-year ministry in First Baptist Church, Charlotte, North Carolina, that he served as president of the Southern Baptist Convention 1955-1957, after thirty-four years of ministerial experience. In his presidential address of 1956 he called for the establishment of thirty thousand new churches and missions by 1964. This program was launched and Warren left his pastorate in 1959 to become director of it. Since its completion, Warren has maintained his home in Charlotte.

In addition to his presidency of the Southern Baptist Convention and numerous positions not specified here, Warren served as president of the North Carolina Baptist State Convention, the Southern Baptist Pastors' Conference, the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Alumni Association, the Southern Baptist Convention Executive Committee, and as the first president of the Board of Trustees of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina. He is the author of two books.

Although retired from the pastorate, Warren continues to serve his denomination as a speaker and writer. 59

59 Information sheet and brief life sketch secured directly from Dr. Warren and biographical data furnished by him on file in the archives of Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee.
The only layman included in this study, Brooks Hays was born in London, Arkansas, August 9, 1898. He holds the A.B. degree from the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, the J.D. degree from George Washington University, Washington, D.C., and honorary degrees from numerous institutions.

Hays was converted at the age of eleven and was ordained as deacon in 1923 at the age of twenty-five. He has been an active Christian layman and statesman throughout his adult lifetime.

A member of the law firm, Hays, Priddy, and Hays, at Russellville, Arkansas, Hays was admitted to the Arkansas bar in 1922. He was assistant attorney general for Arkansas 1925-1927 and ran, unsuccessfully, for the governorship in 1928. He practiced law in Little Rock 1928-1933 and was a member of the Democratic National Committee 1932-1939. During 1943-1959 Hays was a member of the United States Congress from the Fifth District in Arkansas. He was unseated in 1958 after attempting to mediate between President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Governor Orval Faubus in the 1957 Little Rock school integration crisis.

Hays was elected second vice-president of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1950, served as chairman of its Christian
Life Commission 1955-1957, and was elected president of the
Convention in 1957 at age fifty-eight. After losing his congressional
seat in 1958, Hays served as a member of the board of directors of
the Tennessee Valley Authority, Under-secretary of State for
Congressional Affairs, and as special assistant to the President of
the United States under John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.
Since 1965 he has been Director of the Ecumenical Institute which
he founded at Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North
Carolina. He is the author of two books.  

Ramsey Pollard

William Ramsey Pollard was born at Cleburne, Texas,
February 15, 1903. Converted and baptized in 1914, he was
ordained to the ministry in 1925 at the age of twenty-two.
Pollard attended Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City,
Tennessee, and Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary,
Fort Worth, Texas, but graduated from neither. Subsequently he
was awarded an honorary degree by Carson-Newman, and the
Distinguished Alumni Award by Southwestern Seminary. He has

60 Information sheet and biographical sketch secured directly
from Dr. Hays and biographical data supplied by Hays and compiled
from Baptist Press reports on file at Dargan-Carver Library,
Nashville, Tennessee.
served as trustee of two educational institutions, on the board of directors of another, and as president of the board of directors of a university.

After three pastorates in Florida and Texas, Pollard was pastor of Broadway Baptist Church, Knoxville, Tennessee, for twenty-one years and succeeded R.G. Lee as pastor of Bellevue Baptist Church, Memphis, one of Southern Baptists' two most prestigious pulpits. At sixty-seven years of age, he is in the tenth year of his ministry at Bellevue.

Pollard has been chairman of the Executive Committee and of the Radio and Television Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, as well as president of the Southern Baptist Pastors' Conference and the Southern Baptist Convention. He was the first president of the Convention to tour the world at the request of the Foreign Mission Board. A tour of the Southern Baptist world mission fields has now become an almost customary feature of the Convention presidency. Pollard served as president during 1959-1961. At fifty-six years of age, he had thirty-four years of experience in the ministry at the time of his first election.

---

61 Information sheet and biographical data secured directly from Dr. Pollard and biographical data supplied by Dr. Pollard on file in the archives of Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee.
Of the presidents studied, Pollard made the greatest use of ad
populum appeal and seemed to engage more than the others in a
reciprocal communicative relationship with the audience. Further,
he extemporized considerably more than the other speakers, espe-
cially in his 1961 address, and his extemporizing generally strength-
ened his statements. He freely professes that he speaks extempo-
raneously with greater freedom than he writes; writing out a message
in advance is a difficult chore for him. He evoked by far the
greatest amount of audible response from the audience of any of the
speakers; during his 1960 address alone there were twenty-two
"amens," twelve bursts of applause, and eleven peals of laughter.
At times he seemed to lose self-control in the excitement of the
total rhetorical experience.

Herschel Hobbs

Herschel Harold Hobbs was born October 24, 1907, in Coosa
County, Alabama, was converted at age eleven, and was ordained to the
ministry in 1929 at age twenty-one. He grew up in Alabama and holds

62 Statement by Ramsey Pollard, personal interview, January 13,
1971, and tape recording of the presidential address, Miami Beach,

63 Presidential addresses, Miami Beach, Florida, May 18, 1960,
and St. Louis, Missouri, May 24, 1961.
the B.A. degree from Howard College, Birmingham, and the Th.M.
and Th.D. degrees from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,
Louisville, Kentucky. Since graduating from seminary in 1938,
Hobbs has been pastor of five churches. He taught at Louisiana
(Baptist) College during 1942-1944 while pastor in Alexandria. His
current pastorate is First Baptist Church, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma,
a post he has held for twenty-four years. He is the author of at
least seven books.

In addition to his two terms as Convention president during
1961-1963, Hobbs has served as trustee of New Orleans Baptist
Theological Seminary and as president of the Baptist General
Convention of Oklahoma, the Southern Baptist Pastors’ Conference,
and the trustees of Oklahoma Baptist University. He was first
elected to the presidency of the Convention after thirty-two years
in the ministry at age fifty-three. He served as preacher on "The
Baptist Hour," a Southern Baptist Convention radio program,
during 1957-1959.64

Hobbs may be characterized as the most scholarly of the
speakers included in this study. The content of his addresses

64 Information sheet secured directly from Dr. Hobbs and
biographical data supplied by Dr. Hobbs on file in the archives
of Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee.
reveals an exceptional power of mind and an encompassing intellectual grasp. His addresses are marked by a greater intellectual depth and strength of treatment than the others involved in this study. Although both are thoroughly grounded on a sound historical foundation, the first is primarily a philosophical and rational discourse.

K. Owen White

Kenneth Owen White was born August 29, 1902, in London, England, and grew up in Canada. Converted at seventeen, White was baptized two years later in Calvary Baptist Church, Los Angeles. He was ordained to the ministry in 1926 at twenty-three years of age. Although he never attended high school, White qualified himself for entry into the University of Louisville, Kentucky, where he earned the B.A. degree. He also earned the Th.B., Th.M., and Ph.D. degrees from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. After graduation from seminary, he was pastor of four churches before going to First Baptist Church, Houston, Texas, in 1953, where he was pastor until 1965.

---

In 1964, at sixty-one years of age, White was elected to the presidency after thirty-eight years in the ministry. His was the only controversial election in the twenty-one year period of this study. It followed the withdrawal from candidacy of the man who had received by far the largest number of votes on the first ballot. Carl E. Bates, with 3,800 votes, lacked only 200 votes polling a clear majority in the field of twelve nominees. (He was elected president of the Convention in Denver, Colorado, in 1970.) White is also the only president included in this study to serve simultaneously as a Baptist state convention president and Southern Baptist Convention president. He declined re-nomination in 1965 because of ill health, thus becoming the only president in this study to serve only one term. He served for several years as coordinator of Southern Baptist work in Los Angeles County, California, and now, at sixty-eight years of age, resides in Tucson, Arizona.

White, the author of two books, has served as vice-president of the Southern Baptist Home Mission Board, a member of the Radio Commission, chairman of the Executive Board of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, and trustee of Baylor University, Waco, Texas. 66

66 Information sheet, biographical sketch, and other relevant data secured directly from Dr. White and biographical data furnished by Dr. White on file in the archives of Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee.
Wayne Dehoney

William Wayne Dehoney was born August 22, 1918, at New Raymer, Colorado. Converted at nine years of age, he was baptized into the fellowship of First Baptist Church, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, and was ordained to the ministry by First Baptist Church, Nashville, Tennessee, in 1940, at the age of twenty-one. 67

Dehoney earned the B.A. degree from Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, and the B.D. degree from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. His college activities included the debate and speech teams; his skill enabled him to win the Founders' Medal in Oratory. His five pastorates since graduation from seminary include a seven-year tenure at Central Park Church in Birmingham, Alabama, and a ten-year ministry in First Baptist Church, Jackson, Tennessee. After his second term as Convention president, he became pastor of Walnut Street Baptist Church, Louisville, Kentucky, in 1967, where he is still pastor, at age

67 The Oklahoma City church later became the pastorate of Convention President Herschel H. Hobbs and the Nashville church later became the pastorate of Convention President H. Franklin Paschall. It had narrowly missed being the pastorate of a previous Convention president. R.B.C. Howell was pastor of the church when he presided over the Nashville segment of the Convention in the dual-session meeting of 1849, but he was vice-president at the time. When he served as president in 1851-1857, he was no longer in the Nashville pastorate, although he returned there after his service as president.
He was first elected to the Convention presidency in 1964, after twenty-five years in the ministry, when he was forty-six years old.

Although Dehoney did not make the most frequent use of humor of any of the presidents studied in this investigation, his use was the most forceful in terms of audience reaction. One of his preliminary remarks before his address of 1965 received the loudest and most sustained peal of laughter encountered in this study. He said:

... Some think we're going to split, but I don't agree on this. I see no evidence at all, but I'll tell you this much in passing, that if we ever do split as a Convention, I'll tell you right now which way I'm gonna go. I'll go whichever way the Relief and Annuity Board goes; that's the way I'm gonna go.

In the 1966 address he related an experience which brought the second most forceful and sustained response encountered in this study. He was being introduced to members of the Karamajong tribe, primitive African herdsmen. His missionary host spoke in Swahili to an interpreter who translated into Karamajong. The Karamajong have no word for "convention" or "church," so the interpreter was unable...

---

68 Information sheet and biographical information secured directly from Mr. Dehoney and biographical data supplied by Mr. Dehoney on file in the archives of Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee.

69 Presidential address, Dallas, Texas, June 1, 1965.
to introduce the president of the Southern Baptist Convention, composed of messengers from thirty thousand churches. Finally the missionary conceived the idea of "chief." "Tell them, 'Big Chief. Eleven million people.'" The interpreter understood and introduced Dehoney as "B'wana macuba. Big Chief! Much cattle; many wives!" 70

Franklin Paschall

Henry Franklin Paschall was born May 12, 1922, at Hazel, Kentucky, and grew up in Puryear, Tennessee. Converted at age fourteen, he was ordained to the ministry in 1941 at age nineteen. He earned the A.B. degree from Union University, Jackson, Tennessee, and the B.D. and Th.D. degrees from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. 71 A recognized scholar, Paschall serves as trustee of Belmont College, Nashville, Tennessee; he has been invited to join the faculty of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and two other seminaries and has been offered the chairmanship of the department of religion at one college and the presidency of another.

70 Presidential address, Detroit, Michigan, May 24, 1966.

71 Information sheet and personal data secured directly from Dr. Paschall and biographical data provided by Dr. Paschall on file in the archives of Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee.
Paschall showed an interest in oratory at an early age and in the fourth grade recited Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. He was also interested in politics and dramatics. He entered a declamation contest during his senior year of high school, winning the local, regional, and state events; laryngitis prevented his participation in the nationals. Debate was at the top of the list of his college interests. During his senior year at Union University he won the Strickland Medal in recognition of excellence in oratory. 72

Possessing a phenomenal memory, Paschall delivered his two presidential addresses from memory with almost word-for-word fidelity to the prepared manuscript. Additionally, each year he preaches a Christmas sermon which is composed entirely of passages of Scripture—including the invitation at the conclusion of the message—which he recites entirely from memory. Members of his church term this worship the most impressive they have ever experienced. 73


73 This information is based upon a personal interview with Dr. Paschall, comparison of the tape recorded message with the printed manuscript, and informal conversations with various members of First Baptist Church, Nashville.
Paschall is in his second pastorate since graduation from seminary. He became pastor of First Baptist Church, Nashville, Tennessee, on January 1, 1956. This investigator was present in the worship services and the reception on January 10, 1971, when his fifteenth anniversary as pastor was celebrated. He and Mrs. Paschall were presented with a console color television set and a gift of five hundred dollars in cash. He is the beloved pastor of an appreciative people.

The election of Paschall to the Convention presidency in 1966, during the twenty-fifth year of his pastoral ministry, marked several firsts. It was the first time a new president was elected from the same state as the incumbent. It was the first time a Nashville pastor had served as president. Less than two weeks past his forty-fourth birthday when elected, Paschall was just a fraction of a year younger than the previously youngest president ever elected, J.D. Grey. Further, three more of the six elected officers of the Convention were from Nashville and members of Paschall's church: Clifton Judson Allen, Recording Secretary; William Frederick Kendall, Registration Secretary; and Porter Wroe Routh, Treasurer, who is also the Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the Executive

---

74 See note about Howell in footnote 67.
Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention. T.T. Crabtree of Oklahoma, who nominated Paschall (placing him in a field of eleven), made no mention of his being from Nashville, or even from Tennessee. Southern Baptists seem to have a resistance to centralized authority. Thus the fact that the offices of the Convention's Executive Committee, the Sunday School Board, the Historical Commission, and the Education Commission are all in Nashville and that many denominational workers in these agencies are members of First Baptist Church could have mitigated against Paschall's election. 75

Paschall has served as trustee of Belmont College, Nashville, Tennessee, president of the Kentucky Baptist Executive Board, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Kentucky Baptist Convention, and a member of the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. He is the author of one book, in addition to numerous articles, tracts, sermons, and other published materials of this type. 76

75 Statement by Lynn E. May, Jr., Research Director, Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, who was present at the session in which Paschall was elected president, in personal interview, January 8, 1971.

76 Paschall's personal data; see footnote 71.
W.A. Criswell

Wallie Amos Criswell, Jr., was born December 19, 1909, at
Eldorado, Oklahoma. Converted at the age of ten, he made a
commitment of his life to the ministry at twelve, began preaching
at seventeen and held student pastorates throughout college and
seminary. He earned the B.A. degree from Baylor University,
Waco, Texas, and the Th.M. and Ph.D. degrees from Southern
Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. After completing
his Ph.D. he served two pastorates before becoming pastor of First
Baptist Church, Dallas, Texas, in 1944, the pastorate he still holds
twenty-six years later. With a membership of about 15,500, this
is the largest church cooperating with the Southern Baptist
Convention.

Criswell has been a recognized leader among Southern Baptists
for more than twenty years. His election, coming as late as it did--
after thirty-two years in the pastorate--is a testimony to the
presidency seeking the man rather than the man seeking the
presidency. The two most prestigious pulpits in the Convention
are First Baptist Church, Dallas, and Bellevue, Memphis. Three of
the most conservative pastors in the Southern Baptist Convention, and
probably three of its most conservative presidents, have been pastors
of these two churches: W.A. Criswell, R.G. Lee, and Ramsey Pollard.
Criswell has served as trustee of Baylor University, a member of the Executive Board of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, and a member of the Annuity Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. He is one of the most widely-sought preachers in the Convention, having preached in almost all of the Baptist state evangelistic conferences and many of the state conventions, in the seminaries and Baptist colleges, at the summer assemblies at Ridgecrest, North Carolina, and Glorieta, New Mexico, and on many special occasions. He is the author of sixteen books.  

Criswell presided over the most stormy sessions of the Convention involved in this study. The sessions at New Orleans in 1969 and Denver in 1970 were marked by great controversy over doctrinal purity, theological accuracy, and the advisability of social encounter. Some observers felt that the Convention was nearer splitting than ever before in its history. Certainly some of the Convention's actions were without precedent, an example of which was the motion directing the Sunday School Board to recall a Bible commentary. Some of the resolutions which failed by narrow

77 Information sheet and biographical data secured directly from Dr. Criswell and biographical data furnished by Dr. Criswell on file in the archives of Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee.
margins were also extreme and without specific precedent, examples of which were a demand that all seminary professors and writers for the Sunday School Board sign an annual doctrinal statement, and a call for the dissolution of the Christian Life Commission because of two objectionable participants on a seminar panel.\textsuperscript{78}

Criswell's addresses may be characterized as the most sermonic of those encountered in this investigation. Both were based upon Scripture texts and used much Scripture as authoritative evidence or illustrative material. There were thirteen references to specific passages of Scripture in the 1969 address and fourteen in the 1970 address, in addition to numerous allusions to events, teachings, or other matters recorded in the Scriptures.

\section*{TYPICAL AUDIENCE}

Although the specific composition of the audience is different each year, its general nature remains fairly constant. It is composed primarily of adults (public schools are usually still in session during the time of the Convention), most of whom are vocational Christian workers or their spouses: pastors, chaplains, ministers of education, ministers of music, youth directors, missionaries, church secretaries, missionaries, church secretaries, ministers of education, ministers of music, youth directors, missionaries, church secretaries, ministers of education, ministers of music, youth directors, missionaries, church secretaries, ministers of education, ministers of music, youth directors, missionaries, church secretaries, ministers of education, ministers of music, youth directors, missionaries, church secretaries, ministers of education, ministers of music, youth directors, missionaries, church secretaries, ministers of education, ministers of music, youth directors, missionaries, church secretaries, ministers of education, ministers of music, youth directors, missionaries, church secretaries, ministers of education, ministers of music, youth directors, missionaries, church secretaries, ministers of education, ministers of music, youth directors, missionaries, church secretaries, ministers of education, ministers of music, youth directors, missionaries, church secretaries, missionaries, church secretaries,

\textsuperscript{78} Baptist Press reports following the meetings of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1969, 1970.
institutional administrators, agency employees, and numerous other specific classifications of denominational personnel. There is a sizeable representation of the laity, the audience for the night sessions especially being enlarged by the attendance of the laity from the host city and surrounding area.

Registration ranged from 6,493 to 16,678 during the period involved in this study. The size of the specific audience varies according to the location of the meeting (smaller on the West Coast, larger in the deep South), the size of the auditorium (sometimes it will seat more than are registered, sometimes fewer), and the location of the address on the Convention program (a night address will attract a larger audience than a morning address in the same auditorium). The registration figure serves as a fairly reliable general indicator of the audience size, but it can be quite misleading on occasion; usually the audience is larger than the number of registered messengers.

79 See Appendix E.

80 Baptist press reports, personal observation, and informal conversations with ministers between 1953 and 1970.

81 Annual, 1950, 1969; see also Appendix D.

The audience normally reflects a relatively high level of education. Most vocational Christian workers have both college and seminary degrees; this represents at least six years of academic preparation, seven in the case of those holding pastoral degrees, and even more in the case of those holding master's and doctor's degrees. Many of the wives hold college degrees and some hold seminary degrees; additional ones have attended college or seminary but do not hold degrees. The educational level of the laity attending sessions of the Convention is not assumed to be significantly different from that of the normal urban population. Many people in the audience are specifically educated in public address and many others, including the laity, have had experience in public speaking. Further, the audience may be assumed to be informed about the programs, procedures, and problems of the Convention. The Baptist state papers make an annual effort to inform the constituency about specific issues which are likely to come before the Convention.

---

83 See Appendix E.

84 Based upon a twenty-four year acquaintance with ministers and their families.

85 Educational organizations of local Baptist churches stress public speaking activities for their members.

It is probably a safe assumption, in the absence of specific empirical data, that messengers who attend the Convention are people of relatively strong spiritual conviction and motivation. Some possibly attend for recreational reasons, but since most are vocational Christian workers they are assumed to be present with a sense of spiritual responsibility. Much emphasis is placed upon prayer and the leadership of the Holy Spirit during Convention sessions. An atmosphere of worship is sought through the use of Scripture reading, hymns, devotional comments, and the continual emphasis upon the spiritual, as opposed to the political or social, nature of the Convention. The audience assembles with seriousness of purpose.

The presidential address normally occurs in a fairly relaxed atmosphere. Occurring early on the agenda—most frequently in the first session which may be on Monday night, Tuesday night, or Wednesday morning, and never later than noon Wednesday in the second session—the address normally follows a period of worship, traditional greetings and responses, and special music. If the annual

Convention sermon and the presidential address both occur in the same session, the address usually precedes the sermon. On a few occasions in recent years the sermon has climaxed the first session on Tuesday night, the presidential address the second on Wednesday morning. Both of these messages are being continually shifted in the Convention program.90 The address usually precedes any business session in which highly controversial matters are likely to appear. Thus, the audience is not usually in a state of emotional unrest arising from controversy; the president is privileged to address a relatively calm audience. The presentation of special music just prior to the address—usually performed by members of the president’s church, if not his own family—places the address in an atmosphere of worship and receptive emotional stimulation.91

The process effects92 of the address noted in audience response vary greatly. Herschel Hobbs's address in Kansas City in 1963 was received with rapt silence. Except for a few chuckles in response to humorous statements during his preliminary remarks, there was neither laughter, "amen," nor applause during the entire fifty-seven-
minute address. Conversely, Ramsey Pollard was greeted by twenty-two "amens," twelve rounds of applause, and eleven peals of laughter in his 1960 address in Miami Beach. His 1961 address in Saint Louis received only slightly less demonstrative response. At times the audience seemed to border on boisterousness. 93

Although it is evident that the president prepares his address with the primary intent of addressing the audience physically present in the auditorium during the Convention session, he is aware that his address will be disseminated to an even larger audience. For at least the last two decades the public relations secretary of the Executive Committee of the Convention has provided texts of the presidential addresses for release to Baptist state papers and other interested periodicals through Baptist Press. These texts are customarily dated for release during the week of the Convention. Most Baptist state papers carry at least an edited version of this text, if not the entire text, during Convention week or the week following. This printed version of the address reaches millions more of the Southern Baptist Convention constituency than ever attend a session of the Convention. Because these texts are also distributed among representatives of the secular press and major news services who are covering the

93 Tape recordings of the relevant addresses.
Convention, the text or an analysis of the presidential address may be conveyed to a still larger audience through the news media of the host city and major cities throughout the nation—especially those in the South. Frequently even national news magazines or radio and television networks give coverage to the Convention, including the presidential address.

TYPICAL OCCASION

Because of its need for a multitude of living accommodations and a large auditorium, the Convention meets each year in a large city. Although the preference is for cities in the South, the Convention has met in recent years in such places as Atlantic City, Detroit, Chicago, Saint Louis, Kansas City, Denver, and San Francisco. Until large auditoriums or convention centers were built in some major southern cities within the past ten years, the Convention found it difficult to locate adequate facilities in a variety of places within the South.

With audiences normally ranging from ten to fifteen thousand, public address (loud speaker) systems were used during each

---


95 Annual, 1950-1970; see also Appendix D.
session included in this study. In some auditoriums there were echoes which made understanding difficult, even with the amplifiers; in others it was easy to hear and understand. Although those inside the convention hall customarily are attentive, listeners seated near exits frequently find it difficult to hear because of the noise created by nearby exhibits and displays which utilize audio-visual materials and by people visiting in adjacent hallways and lobbies.

A general theme is adopted for each year's Convention with related sub-themes chosen for each separate session. It has become usual procedure for the Convention president to relate his address to one of these themes.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented a historical perspective of the Southern Baptist Convention and the presidential address, a discussion of the nature of the Convention, and an explanation of the relationship of the president to the Convention. The Southern Baptist Convention

---


97 Baptist press Convention coverage, 1950-1970; also personal observation.

was organized in 1845 as an organization for the support of missions. It had its roots in the General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions, which was organized in 1814. The Convention, which met triennially until 1851, biennially until 1866, and annually since, except for interruptions caused by wars, held its one hundred thirteenth session in its one hundred twenty-fifth year in 1970. Carl Bates is the thirty-sixth president. From 236 messengers and 4,126 cooperating churches in 9 states at the time of its organization, the Convention has grown into the largest evangelical denomination in the United States with 13,692 messengers, 34,335 cooperating churches, and work in all 50 states in 1970. The record messenger registration was set in New Orleans in 1969 at 16,678.

The Convention is a democratic organization of messengers from cooperating churches. It exists as an agency of gospel ministry, not as one of ecclesiastical authority. It exercises authority over only its own personnel, agencies, and institutions, not over the cooperating churches. The term "Convention" denotes both an organization and the annual meeting of that organization. Sometimes it is also used in the sense of a religious denomination, in which case it refers to the cooperating churches.
The president of the Convention has no official authority except when he is presiding over the business sessions of the Convention. Unofficially and informally he serves as a denominational spokesman but he can speak officially only for himself unless specifically directed by action of the Convention. The president is a member of the Convention’s boards and Executive Committee and he may serve as a fraternal messenger to the meetings of other Baptist bodies, but he has no other official authority or power except that granted by the Convention. The force of his leadership comes from persuasion and his own ethos, not from ecclesiastical authority invested in him by the Convention. He exercises no authority over the Convention’s cooperating churches.

The first official, authorized presidential address was delivered by E.W. Stephens in Chattanooga, Tennessee, in 1906. Presidents delivered formal, but unauthorized, addresses to the Convention in 1918, 1919, 1922, and 1923. In 1923 Convention action officially authorized the presidential address; it has been a regular feature of Convention programming ever since. With the exception of the period included in this study, very few texts of presidential addresses are available.

This chapter also has presented biographical sketches of the eleven presidents included in the study. Although most of them were
born and raised in the South or Southwest, there were exceptions. One was born in London, England, raised in Canada, and lived in California before entering seminary. Another was born in Kansas and grew up in Nebraska, Washington, and Oregon. Another was born in Colorado but grew up in Tennessee. Ten were pastors, the other a layman. J.W. Storer, at 68, was the eldest at the time of his election; H.F. Paschall, at 44, was the youngest. The average age was 55. Storer and R.G. Lee had been the longest in the ministry at the time of their presidencies—41 years; Paschall and Wayne Dehoney had the shortest tenure—25 years. The eleven men had a combined total of 363 years in their professions, for an average of 33, at the time of their election. All are authors, and all except Storer are still living.

In addition to relevant historical and biographical information, this chapter has presented general information about the typical audience and the typical occasion of the presidential address. The typical audience is predominately adult, employed in a church-related vocation, well educated, and southern. The typical occasion is serious, well-organized, worshipful, and relatively calm.
Chapter 3

ANALYSIS OF METHOD

One step in the examination of each presidential address was analysis of the organization. In most cases outlines were provided by the speakers in their printed texts; in other cases outlines had to be constructed. The description of message organization in this chapter is based upon traditional rhetorical concepts.

The examination of style in this chapter was not intended to be exhaustive. It did not involve word counts, paragraph measurement, or other technical measures of "readibility" or "listenability." Nor did it involve classifications such as epanaphora, antistrophe, interlacement, isocolon, homoeoteleuton, hypophora, paralipsis, apopoesis, or catachresis. The examination was designed to elucidate elements meaningful to the general rhetorical scholar; the examples cited are limited to those considered the most typical, relevant, striking, or significant.

The examination of delivery was designed to secure information about only those elements which would provide an impression of the speaker's voice or about those elements specifically relevant to
rhetorical effectiveness. Magnetic tape recordings permitted analysis of the vocal characteristics of all of the speakers except Lee and Grey. ¹ The results will be presented in humanistic, impressionistic, and psychological, rather than statistical terms.

R.G. LEE

Lee's vocal quality customarily combines with his grammar and pronunciation to give the impression of a man of education and refinement. ² His vocal characteristics are generally pleasing and fall into a range of normal acceptability where they call no undue attention to themselves. His inflection pattern has ample variety to maintain audience interest and characteristically combines with changes of volume and rate to create vocal intensity at points of emphasis.

On the whole, Lee's grammar is accurate, his pronunciation correct, and his articulation clear and precise but not pedantic. He utilizes alliteration, metaphor, and other verbal devices, some of which are illustrated by quotations from his 1950 and 1951 addresses:

¹ The description of Lee's and Grey's delivery is based upon other occasions when this investigator heard them speak.

² Because no recording of Lee's presidential addresses was available for analysis, this description is based upon the investigator's recollection of Lee's vocal delivery observed on several occasions between 1948 and 1963, which includes the period, but not the occasions, of this investigation.
... we have put from us alliance with all unionizing councils and bodies—as David thrust aside Saul’s cumbersome armor.

Like David, with a sling of God in his hand, this Convention—with a polity adapted to the genius and elasticity of our New Testament creed—holds in its hands the New Testament, but no military orders.

We are not here to catch sparrows and subdue rabbits.

We would not engage in rolling marbles when there are mountains to be moved, nor be as battleships cruising after beetles. With seas to sail, we must not launch our ships on a millpond.

But, with gratitude to God who has led us safely thus far, with our Southern Baptist heart twenty-five thousand miles in circumference, we ask God’s help to out-think, out-serve, out-love, out-work every false philosophy and ism now bidding for men’s allegiance.

... opening blind alleys of ignorance into endless highways of wisdom.

... is to persuade lions to give over their appetite for meat, or the Philistines to have no scissors for Samson’s locks.

... putting on the ill-fitting armour of any ecclesiastical and ecumenical Saul...

In addition to these stylistic devices, Lee utilized quotations from Chesterton, Jefferson, the Bradford obelisk, and Winston Churchill.

Further, he made direct reference to the following historical events

3 Annual, 1950, p. 60. 4 Ibid.
5 Ibid. 6 Ibid., p. 62.
7 Annual, 1951, p. 61. 8 Ibid.
or persons: Caligula, Gutenberg, World War Two, the Revolutionary War, John Penry and Queen Elizabeth, Savanarola, Socrates, Bunyan, and Livingstone. Lee's use of description and comparison lends vividness to his style, and his historical references provide a measure of impressiveness. Two passages from the 1951 address were especially characteristic of Lee's lofty style:

We, Southern Baptists, convinced that we are commissioned of God to manifest the Incarnate Word from the written Word by the spoken word, seeking to provide Christian specifics for spiritual maladies, meet again at a time when the whole world groans and suffers pain—when grim powers of darkness, dreadfully cunning and deadly in unthwarted malevolence, strive desperately to hold ascendency over mankind. Today, fears spring like gaunt and loveless forms out of relations communal, political, economic, spiritual, educational, national, international. As Southern Baptists, with ears keen of hearing, with tongues that hold God in awe, with hearts that are grateful and humble, with eyes to see the miserable multitudes of earth, with shoulders strong to bear the burdens of many, with feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace, with hands not guilty of niggardly gifts, we meet at a time when the world has a fever hotter than that of Peter's wife's mother, a leprosy fouler than that of Uzziah, a palsy worse than had the man borne of four, an insanity more tragic than Gadara's wild man. The nations, in the grip of planetary nightmares, are noisy as oriental bazaars—-with baying dogs of impatience, howling wolves of rapine, hissing snakes of revenge, puffing adders of atheism, grunting hogs of greed.

---

10 Annual, 1951, p. 61.
We are a Baptist body busy. Busy about our Father's business. We are neither robots nor marionettes, but a people who have breath-by-breath business with God whose resources we never test until we attempt the impossible. We seek to be big people in a big mood for big matters.  

Lee's 1950 address, "Eyes Upon Southern Baptists," was organized around five main heads in enumerative pattern and climactic order: "Our Own Eyes," "Eyes of Satan," "Eyes of Many Christians," "Eyes of Departed Leaders," and "Eyes of God." In the development of the first main head, Lee enumerated various Convention agencies and programs which constituted "our own eyes," some of which were the Sunday School Board, Foreign Mission Board, Home Mission Board, Baptist student work, and denominational papers.  

J.D. GREY

Grey's vocal characteristics customarily combine to lend a note of authority to his delivery. His pitch is moderately deep, but the quality tends to be more strident than mellow. The inflection pattern is normally wide and varied and customarily combines with volume and rate to produce effective intensity at points of emphasis.

Grey's grammar and pronunciation normally are accurate and his articulation clear but not with uniform precision; his language sounds informal and conversational rather than pedantic. His style is colorful, but not ornate. The texts of his 1952 and 1953 addresses revealed a few stylistic devices, but neither so many nor so forceful as Lee's:

Many of our agencies of today that grow as giant oaks were planted as acorns by those illustrious pioneers. The chart and compass they gave still remind us of the purpose for which this Convention was organized, May 8, 1845.

There the words stand like beacon lights—"for eliciting, combining, and directing the energies of the denomination for the propagation of the gospel."

---

14 Because no recordings of Grey's presidential addresses were available for analysis, this description is based upon the investigator's recollection of Grey's vocal delivery observed on several occasions between 1953 and 1960, which includes the period, but not the occasions, of this investigation.

15 *Annual, 1952, p. 59.*

16 *Ibid., p. 60.*
But as the anti-mission spirit brings the chill of death over individuals, churches, and denominations today, so also did it produce sterility and extinction for the churches over a hundred years ago. 17

Regardless of how, when, or by whom the anti-mission spirit manifests itself, it brings ever and always, without exception, extinction and the hand of God writes "ichabod"—"inglorious"—over it. 18

One passage of Grey's 1953 address revealed antithesis:

Those men, fired with a missionary passion, came to Texas not as vacationists, but as vicars of Christ; not to dawdle, but to dare; not to loll lazily in luxury, but to light fires for the Lord; not to practice philosophical gymnastics, but to preach as dying men to dying men. 19

Another passage revealed metaphor:

One would-be suitor has made bold to announce that a chair is being reserved for us. But this young lady in all graciousness would suggest that before she occupies that chair it will have become an antique. She feels that for her, this chair would be virtually an "electric chair." Personally I think the young lady is correct. For the moment she sits down in that chair, she signs her own death warrant and sets the date of her execution. This young lady doesn't object to being friendly with her ambitious suitors, but she has no matrimonial intentions. 20

Grey's untitled 1952 address was not organized around divisions or main heads; it was a continuous historical narrative which was used as a framework for expounding the missionary, as opposed to

---

17 Ibid., p. 61.  
18 Ibid., p. 62.  
19 Annual, 1953, p. 62.  
20 Ibid., p. 66.
ecclesiastical, nature and purpose of the Convention. Its order was chronological rather than climactic or anti-climactic. Grey's use of narrative gave the address an impression of movement.\textsuperscript{21} His untitled 1953 address was built upon a chronological pattern, but at frequent points he enumerated specific contributions of Texas Baptists to Southern Baptist or national life, and he indicated numerous values which Texas Baptists had preserved, such as freedom of worship, the spirit of conquest for Christ, missionary endeavor, cooperative relationships, Christian stewardship, and Christian convictions.\textsuperscript{22}

\textbf{J.W. STORER}

Storer spoke with a note of authority and conviction.\textsuperscript{23} His voice, characterized by good projection, was further amplified by a public address system. His pitch range was baritone, his speaking rate deliberate—about 120 words per minute—with almost regular brief pauses. His vocal quality was resonant and mellow. He spoke with strong vocal emphasis.

\textsuperscript{21}\textit{Annual}, 1952, pp. 59-64.

\textsuperscript{22}\textit{Annual}, 1953, pp. 61-66.

\textsuperscript{23}Tape recording, presidential address, 1954.
Storer's grammar and pronunciation were carefully accurate, his articulation very deliberate and distinct, each syllable being clearly enunciated. He utilized numerous stylistic devices:

The making, meaning, and mission of the Southern Baptist Convention. . . .

Be it remembered that when tyrants suffer from bad dreams, God is at work.

... for the blood that cleanses us also claims us.

Christ died for us in order that he might live in us.

... in a day when the social Vesuvius is in turmoil, when Mars can scarce be restrained from drawing again that sword he has but so recently thrust into its uneasy scabbard.

... for memory too often treasures bits of rags and straw and throws her jewels out of the window . . . .

In the human body there are twelve major and fifty or more minor joints—to say nothing of the vertebral column which is not as rigid as is sometimes supposed. All joints are not alike, which is illustrative of diversity and initiative, that voluntary principle which Baptists so correctly prize. To be sure, there are Baptists who seem dedicated to separatism, who refuse to play on the team, who prefer to return their own punts, call their own signals, do their own blocking, run their own interference,
and set off for a goal line diagonal with the field. They refuse, however, to recover their own fumbles.

Storer also sounded a characteristically "activist" note:

But our mission is more than that; it cannot be less than obedience to our Lord's command to seek out the lost and point to him as the only and complete Saviour from sin, to make of him both Lord and Master. Ours is the day of action—not debate. The voices of wisdom, experience, and hope unite in one chorus, "today!"—the voice of folly murmurs, "tomorrow." God, keep us from becoming revolutionary sons of revolutionary fathers!

Storer's 1954 address, "The Making, Meaning and Mission of the Southern Baptist Convention," was organized around three divisions which were treated in deductive order, the three distinctive words of the title forming the main heads: "Making," "Meaning," "Mission." The second half of the prepared manuscript, eighteen paragraphs, was given to the third main division of the address; but of those eighteen paragraphs, eleven were omitted during delivery, along with substantial segments of two others. The cause of the omission is unknown. This discrepancy between manuscript and actual delivery altered the emphasis of the address. The first main section consumed just over a minute, about what was planned; the second consumed about seven and one-half minutes,

---

30 Ibid.

31 Annual, 1954, p. 64.

32 Ibid., pp. 63-66.
about what was planned; the third consumed only about four and one-half minutes, much less than was planned. Of a four-page manuscript, about one and one-half pages were not delivered, all of it in the third main section. The address itself did not seem to suffer from this omission, but the emphasis upon the "mission" of the Convention was greatly reduced.

Storer's 1955 address, "Southern Baptists and the Voice of God," had two major divisions organized topically: the first enumerated three voices within Southern Baptist ranks; the second dealt with the voice of God. In the second section of the address Storer asserted three verities to which the voice of God demanded witness: witness to an imminent and sovereign God, to redeeming power in Christ, and by lives of sacrificial devotion to Christ. The arrangement of the main heads and subheads was climactic, but the subheads in the second section were not parallel in construction.

C.C. WARREN

Warren spoke for twenty-five minutes, his well-projected, baritone voice, further amplified by a public address system,

---

33 Manuscript (ibid.) compared with tape recording, presidential address, 1954.

sounding a note of conviction and urgency. Speaking at the deliberate rate of 120 words per minute, Warren's voice was resonant and well modulated; at some points there was a touch of raspiness.\(^\text{35}\)

The tape recording revealed frequent departures from the prepared manuscript. Some passages were omitted, some paraphrased, and some inverted in the order of ideas or syntax. For the most part these departures occurred to the detriment of the force, but not the over-all clarity, of the idea as revealed in the printed text.\(^\text{36}\)

Warren's grammar was accurate and his articulation clear; he committed only a few pronunciation errors of relatively minor importance: Babtiss, cogninze, incalcuble, hunderd, peticular, aselerated.\(^\text{37}\) These were not of sufficient import or frequency to hamper his general effectiveness. His word choice was clear and direct, not ornate, although there were such words as cognizance, presage, and eschatological. Unity was lost in sentence structure as word order became confused during some of Warren's departures from his prepared text. The precision of his sentences suffered from his paraphrasing, which injected qualifying words and rearranged

\(^{35}\)Tape recording, presidential address, 1956.

\(^{36}\)Annual, 1956, pp. 70-75.

\(^{37}\)Tape recordings, presidential addresses, 1956-1957.
syntax, but the over-all communication of ideas was not significantly affected. He followed his prepared manuscript much more closely in his 1957 address than he did in his 1956 address, thus eliminating many of these problems of delivery.\textsuperscript{38}

Warren's linguistic style was marked by simile and metaphor:

A decade ago stars of hope appeared on the horizon of our war-ridden world\textsuperscript{39}.

The accomplishments of mankind for a thousand years hang in the balance and civilization, like the time bomb, seems to be ticking away to its final blast.

\ldots a world shaken to its very foundations.\textsuperscript{41}

\ldots the valiant veterans of the cross\textsuperscript{42}.

The one institution that towers over the wrecks of time is the New Testament church.\textsuperscript{43}

The imagery created by these devices produced vividness.

Warren's 1956 address, "This Challenging Hour," was organized in topical pattern with the main heads in climactic order and the sub-

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{38}Manuscripts (\textit{Annual}, 1956, pp. 70-75; \textit{Annual}, 1957, pp. 70-74) compared with tape recordings, presidential addresses, 1956-1957.
\textsuperscript{39}\textit{Annual}, 1956, p. 70. \textsuperscript{40}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{41}\textit{Ibid.}. \textsuperscript{42}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{43}\textit{Annual}, 1957, p. 71.
\end{flushright}
heads in enumerative pattern: "We are Challenged by a Unique Relationship," "We are Challenged by the Tensions which have Occasioned the Distress of Nations," "We are Challenged by the Promise of Victory through a Mighty Offensive." Each succeeding section received fuller treatment than the preceding one.  

Warren's 1957 address, "Now Therefore Perform," was organized around three main heads in topical pattern developed in climactic order, but the main heads were unparallel in structure and unbalanced in development: "The Task before Us," "The Challenge We have Accepted," "The Imperatives for Victory." The first was treated in about five minutes, the second in about four; the third took about eleven. The conclusion was quite brief and consisted largely of an appeal:

Our task is clear. May God help us to grasp the magnitude and importance of what he has called us to do... and as there was a readiness to will, so may there be a performance also out of that which we have.

---

44 Annual, 1956, pp. 70-75.

45 Annual, 1957, pp. 70-74.

46 Tape recording, presidential address, 1957.

47 Annual, 1957, p. 74.
BROOKS HAYS

In 1958 Hays spoke for twenty-two minutes, in 1959 for twenty-eight. His well-projected, baritone voice, amplified by a public address system, was marked by wide inflection and characterized by an almost predictable falling pattern at the end of his sentences. This characteristic, coupled with the sustenance of the vowels and the maintenance of pitch, gave his voice a musical quality. 48

Hays's grammar was accurate; his word choice was plain and direct, not ornate; his articulation was adequately distinct to achieve clarity, although unstressed syllables were slightly glossed over. His pronunciation was essentially correct; only two errors were detected: hunderd, poyant. His address was marked by strong unity, especially within paragraphs. 49 Unlike the others, Hays's addresses were almost devoid of stylistic devices, consisting of narration and explanation.

Hays's untitled 1958 address, built around a simple topical framework with slight chronological overtones, consisted almost exclusively of random reflections. His comments included appreciation, observations on laymen-pastors' relationships, the Thirty Thousand

48 Tape recordings, presidential addresses, 1958-1959.

Movement, easing of tensions, the survey committee, minority groups, the Christian Life Commission, the peace committee, and inspiring experiences. There was no climactic or anti-climactic order.

Hays's untitled 1959 address was organized in topical pattern. The first impression evoked by the recording of the address is that it was arranged in anti-climactic order; Hays first dealt with race, next with the seminary problem, and then world peace, but after discussing another topic he returned to the racial issue and finally closed with a treatment of the Christian's obligation to translate his faith into active involvement in the practical aspects of human existence. Thus, that which at first appeared to be a traditional order turned out to be no order at all.

RAMSEY POLLARD

In his 1960 address, Pollard spoke for thirty-six minutes; in his 1961 address, he spoke for only twenty-seven. His well-projected, deep baritone voice, amplified by a public address system, was quite forceful. He spoke with great vocal intensity, even shouting at points. His speaking rate gave the impression of being faster than it actually

---

50 Annual, 1958, pp. 77-80.
51 Tape recording, presidential address, 1959.
proved to be when the words-per-minute were checked; this condition
seems to have resulted from his fairly lengthy pauses at numerous
points. His basically mellow voice was occasionally strident. 52

Pollard's grammar was accurate, his articulation clear, his
sentence structure terse, and his word choice direct and forceful.
His pronunciation was essentially correct, with only a few minor
exceptions: presperation, squaylor, pugnicious. His 1960 address
was marked by tight unity of ideas and language and by lively
movement from one idea to another without rambling or digression.
Although the tape recording of this address revealed considerable
departure from the prepared manuscript, in Pollard's case these
departures strengthened, rather than weakened, the statement.
Whereas departure from the prepared text tended to make Warren's
presentation weaker, it tended to make Pollard's more forceful. 53
During the 1961 address there was even greater discrepancy between
the address as delivered and the texts located. 54


53 Tape recording, presidential address, 1960.

54 Comparison of texts printed in Baptist Standard, June 7, 1961,
and Baptist Messenger, June 8, 1961, with tape recording, presidential
address, 1961. See the treatment of this issue in discussion of
authentication of texts in chapter 1.
Pollard's principal stylistic devices were accumulation and antithesis:

Stalin is dead, Mussolini is dead, and Hitler is dead, but God still sits on His throne!  

The president . . . has no authority . . . . The Executive Committee has no authority . . . and neither does the Southern Baptist Convention.

But it isn't their money. It belongs to you.

A revival in the South, a revival in New York City, a revival in Miami, Florida . . . .

The unbeliever is going to hell and the believer is going to heaven.

It is a good time for humility but it is not a good day for timidity.

We're not on an Easter egg hunt and we're not on a Sunday school picnic, and we're not on a garden club party. We're on big business for the Lord Jesus Christ.

Pollard's untitled 1960 address was organized with just two main heads: "Internal Life of the Convention," and "An External Look." Although the development of the sub-points was clear,

55 Annual, 1960, p. 79.  56 Ibid., p. 78.
57 Ibid., p. 79.  58 Ibid.
59 Ibid., p. 80.
60 Tape recording, presidential address, 1961.
61 Ibid.  62 Annual, 1960, pp. 78-83.
rearrangement could have made them more orderly and logical and more strikingly climactic, thus strengthening the organization and making the address more forceful. The main heads for his 1961 address, "My Church—a Militant Body," enumerated the requirements for a militant church: "A Victorious Morale," "The Cooperative Program," "A Training Program," "A Spirit of Evangelism."

HERSCHEL H. HOBBS

In 1962 Hobbs spoke for fifty-six minutes, in 1963 for fifty-seven; his addresses were the longest during 1950-1970. His well-projected bass voice, amplified by a public address system, was mellow and resonant. His rate was quite moderate and his pacing steady and deliberate; the word flow was fairly even throughout the addresses at 145 words per minute. Although he spoke with vocal force, he did not shout.

Hobbs's grammar and pronunciation were flawless, his articulation quite distinct—the clarity of the individual syllables being carefully preserved, and his word choice scholarly yet neither ornate nor pedantic. The pattern of his sentence structure was

---

63 Tape recording, presidential address, 1961.

64 Tape recordings, presidential addresses, 1962-1963.
climactic. Although he practiced economy of stylistic devices, those he employed were striking:

Southern Baptists were not willing . . . to wear a blind bridle, so today I do not believe that they are ready to wear a theological straight jacket.

It should ever be remembered that the difference between shock therapy and an electrocution is the skill of the technician and the amount of electricity applied.

... as wise as a serpent, as harmless as a dove, and as courageous as a lion.

Latin America is a whirlpool of political and economic unrest, Asia is a giant arousing itself from sleep, Africa is a seething cauldron; North America and Europe are houses divided against themselves, and frustrated in their efforts to answer the cries of nations in collision.

Let us thrust in the sickle of the gospel and reap.

Except for these passages, Hobbs's addresses were almost entirely explanation; his attempts to clarify complex theological and philosophical concepts suggested such an approach.

Hobbs organized his 1962 address, "Crisis and Conquest," in an almost circular question-answer pattern. He utilized three main

---

65 Ibid.  
67 Ibid., p. 87.  
68 Ibid.  
70 Ibid., p. 95.  
heads, the third one leading back almost to where the introduction started: "Does Christianity have the Answer to the Present Crisis?" "Why is Christianity Impotent in the Crisis?" "Where do Southern Baptists Stand in Relation to the Conflict that has Characterized the Modern Era?" Hobbs could have started over after his conclusion with no evident disruption of thought pattern. The text reveals a carefully wrought, tightly organized dissertation with one idea flowing into the next. 72

Hobbs's 1963 address, "God and History," was organized in topical pattern with the four main heads in narrowing order; from beginning to end the address drew into increasingly sharp focus the critical issues facing the Convention: "Holy History--Five Basic Elements," "What Scientific Historians See in Our Present World," "Man Faces the Choice of being a Blessing or a Curse," "Southern Baptists and History--Only History, or Holy History?" 73 This sharpening of focus could be construed as climactic order, but in delivery the address was not strongly climactic. The impression given was that of a simple topical pattern without emphasis.

72 Annual, 1962, pp. 81-89.

White spoke for thirty-eight minutes, his well-projected, well-modulated, mellow tenor voice amplified by a public address system. He spoke at a steady and deliberate rate of 125 words per minute. His voice was marked by melodic inflection. He read his address with almost word-for-word fidelity to his revised text.  

White's grammar was accurate, his articulation clear and precise. His pronunciation was accurate yet revealed his international background. His accent, probably not "pure" in a technical sense, strikes the ear of the layman as Scandinavian or Scottish rather than English. His accent was an attractive feature of his delivery; it did not interfere with effective communication. His word choice was careful and plain, not overly ornate. He utilized only a few stylistic devices:

---

74 Tape recording, presidential address, 1964. In his preliminary remarks White indicated that he had submitted his text for publication six weeks earlier, but that he had made subsequent changes in it; he released a revision--somewhat less militant than the original--at the Convention. It was this text from which he spoke.

75 Ibid. White was born in London, lived in Canada for a time, then was raised in California.
The Living Word ever shines through the written word. Both are completely dependable.

There is a difference between revelation and speculation.

We do not live in a horse and buggy age. Ours is jet propelled.

If we lose the battle at home and allow the fires of evangelism to flicker and die out, the impenetrable darkness of eternal night shall settle down upon the other peoples of earth.

White relied almost totally upon narration and explanation, in keeping with his subject and purpose.

White's address, "For Liberty and Light," utilized the Convention theme for its title and orientation. It was organized around four main heads in simple topical pattern with no distinct order: "The Theological Atmosphere," "This Present World," "Racial Relationships," "Determining Our Goals." Although the introduction set the stage for chronological development, the pattern was not clearly developed in the body of the address; there were hints, but the pattern was obscured by the topical treatment.

---

76 Ibid.
77 Ibid.
78 Ibid.
79 Ibid.
80 Ibid.
81 Ibid.
WAYNE DEHONEY

In 1965 Dehoney spoke for forty-six minutes, his well-projected baritone voice tending toward tenor at points of stress and revealing an "emotional" quality in the inflection. His voice was also slightly hoarse, probably because of the amount of speaking he had already done; this was the fourth major address he had delivered since his arrival in Dallas. His speaking rate was moderately rapid: 155 words per minute. In 1966 he spoke for fifty-two minutes; the hoarseness and tiredness which had marked his vocal quality the previous year were absent in 1966, leaving the timbre well modulated and mellow.

Dehoney's grammar was accurate and his articulation clear, but not with equal distinctness of all syllables. His word choice was plain, not ornate, and his sentence structure revealed internal rambling and repetition; his sentences were cluttered with qualifying phrases such as "it seems to me," "I tell you, brethren," "as I view this matter." The addresses as delivered were rephrased from the prepared manuscripts, the rephrasings consisting mostly of extemporaneous

---

82 Tape recording, presidential address, 1965.
83 Tape recording, presidential address, 1966.
84 Tape recordings, presidential addresses, 1965-1966.
amplification. The rephrasing did not significantly strengthen the verbal force of the addresses.

Dehoney's only pronunciation error was the intrusion of a schwa resulting in "transuhlate," "athuhletic," and "baptsuhmal." He employed only a few stylistic devices, mostly metaphors or slogans:

Let's not feel that this race issue is an albatross hung around our necks by history.

... not only believe or be damned, but behave or be damned.

Instead of being fishers of men we are becoming keepers of the aquarium and we spend most of our time swiping fish from others' bowls.

Mission money spent in building pioneer churches is like seed corn and it returns to us fifty- and one-hundred-fold.

Adult Thrust

Operation Penetration

We need to strip our preaching of passing theological fads and pseudo-sophisticated encrustments that merely tickle our intellectual fancies.


86 Annual, 1965, p. 95. 87 Ibid.

88 Ibid., pp. 95-96. 89 Ibid., p. 97.

90 Ibid. 91 Ibid. 92 Ibid., p. 98.
They're doing so much with so little, and we're doing so little with so much.

Dehoney organized his 1965 address, "Issues and Imperatives," in enumerative pattern; he dealt with three imperatives if Southern Baptists were to engage in their primary business, evangelism: "Concentrate," "Consecrate," and "Consider." The main heads were subdivided to accomplish movement within the address. Although there was no patterning of main heads, good patterning occurred within them.

Dehoney's 1966 address, "The Living God, At Work In His World," was organized in spatial pattern and consisted largely of the narration of events witnessed and information gathered first-hand on his trip to world mission fields, including Viet Nam, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Thailand, Brazil, Ghana, and Nigeria. This organizational pattern was well suited to the speaker's material. The narrative style of presentation combined with this pattern to produce a stimulating, as well as informative, message.

---

93 Tape recording, presidential address, 1966.
94 Annual, 1965, pp. 95-100.
95 Tape recording, presidential address, 1966.
In his 1967 address, Paschall spoke for forty-one minutes, his well-projected tenor voice, amplified by a public address system, revealing a fairly wide variety in inflection. His vocal quality was somewhat thin, almost tight at points, and his rate quite slow: eighty-five words per minute. His 1968 address was almost precisely the same length as his first one, forty-three minutes, and his vocal characteristics were identical.

Paschall delivered his addresses from memory with only minor deviations from the printed texts, mostly in the substitution of equivalent words; occasionally he recast a phrase or added amplification. His grammar was accurate and his articulation clear and precise with approximately equal precision and distinctness in the enunciation of each syllable. His pronunciation was marred only slightly by the commission of two errors: correckly, pyrmid. Whereas Dehoney had an intrusive schwa, Paschall deleted a schwa.

---

96 Tape recording, presidential address, 1967.
97 Tape recording, presidential address, 1968.
98 Manuscripts (press release copies secured from Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee) compared with tape recordings, presidential addresses, 1967-1968.
Paschall's word choice was neither ornate, flowery, or showy, nor was it pedantic or simple-minded. He utilized numerous stylistic devices such as metaphor, antithesis, alliteration, and accumulation:

One is a Christian not by what he refuses, but by whom he chooses.

We are not churches of words. We are churches of the Word. We are not churches of truths. We are churches of the Truth.

Once there was the stony heart. Now there is the tender heart. Once there was hate. Now there is love. Once there was the life of the flesh. Now there is the life of the Spirit.

It is true that the churches have spot and wrinkle and that sometimes they stumble and stutter.

Government is concerned with symptoms; churches are concerned with disease. Government seeks to change man by changing his environment; churches seek to change man by changing his heart. Government can make man better off, but the churches can make man better. Government administers, but churches minister.

Then there is the bad news of racial strife and hatred, rioting and looting, alcoholism and drug addiction, hunger and poverty, unemployment and injustice, inhumanity and indignity, sin and shame.

100 Tape recording, presidential address, 1967.
101 Ibid.
102 Ibid.
103 Ibid.
104 Ibid.
105 Tape recording, presidential address, 1968.
Furthermore, bad news has invaded churches and denominations. Who can fail to see heartless and opportunistic professionalism, dominating and deadening institutionalism, cold and meaningless formalism, frantic and frustrating activism, hopeless and despairing existentialism.

A mass of information has hit modern man and broken him. He is bemused and bewildered, fragmented and frustrated.

In doing so it tends to damn the past, deify the present, and deny the future.


---

106 Ibid.
107 Ibid.
108 Ibid.
109 Tape recording, presidential address, 1967.
Paschall's 1968 address, "Good News for Today's World," was organized topically with only two main heads: "There is an Avalanche of Bad News Today," and "We have Good News for Today's World." The subheads under each main head were developed in enumerative fashion. Although there was antithesis between the main heads, there was no climactic or anti-climactic order at the level of main heads or subheads. Because of the lack of order or arrangement and Paschall's detailed development of each point, the address did not move well; there was no sense of progression from one point to the next.  

W. A. CRISWELL

Criswell's 1969 address took forty-two minutes, his 1970 address only thirty-eight. He spoke at the deliberate rate of 117 words per minute except for the climactic sections towards the end of his messages when his rate became more rapid. His well-projected tenor voice, amplified by a public address system, manifested an emotional quiver or waver and a tension tending toward a strained quality.  

---

110 Tape recording, presidential address, 1968.
111 Ibid.
The 1970 address revealed some differences from the 1969 address: Criswell's vocal force was greater and shouting occurred frequently; his rate was somewhat slower; whereas there had been frequent departures from the text in 1969, the 1970 address was delivered almost verbatim from the manuscript, thus making the delivery much more compact—the rambling which had marked the previous address was absent from this one, and the sentence structure itself was tighter and more forceful; the entire address was marked by greater unity. The 1970 address, in general, was superior to the 1969 address. Holding closer to his prepared manuscript seems to have solved most of Criswell's delivery problems.

Criswell's grammar was basically accurate and his articulation clear. His pronunciation was generally accurate; only three minor errors were noted: transuhlated, revelancy, revelant. His word choice was plain, tending neither to an ornate nor a scholarly quality. Criswell frequently utilized accumulation and contrast, and occasionally used metaphor:

The Christian religion has two sharp, cutting edges. One edge is faith, the other is works. One is believing; the other is doing. One is evangelism; the other is ministering. The Christian religion is a great communication; it is a great compassion. It is a great conviction;

---

113 Ibid.  
114 Ibid.
it is a great commitment. It is a great doctrine; it is a great deed. It is a great message; it is a great ministry. It is a great speech; it is a great sympathy. It is a sublime word; it is a heavenly work. It is an eloquent propaganda; it is a glorious practice. It is a noble orthodoxy; it is a magnificent orthopraxy.

If you persist in handing out stones when the people ask for bread, they'll quit coming to the bakery, and if you continue to offer serpents for fish and scorpions for eggs, the market is ready to close.

Paul came to Rome to preach the gospel at the center of the civilized world. Rome was a city of slavery, but he did not center his preaching against slavery. Rome was a city of lust, but he did not center his preaching on moral reform. Rome was a center of economic injustice, but he did not center his preaching on the distribution and equality of wealth. Rome was a city of violence, of bloody gladiatorial combat, but he did not center his preaching against the inhumanity of man to man. . .

. . . we shall dissolve like a rope of sand.

We are to be like the mercury in a thermometer--many ups and downs, but always in the thermometer. We are to be like the life in a home--many discussions, many differences, many tears, and many heartaches, but always in the family.

Criswell also utilized both real and invented illustrations to amplify
some of his points. The use of antithesis, accumulation, and metaphor gave his address a forceful quality.

The 1969 address, "Christ in Faith and Works," was a continuous discourse upon the theme without main divisions. Although Criswell touched upon the ministry of Jesus, the teaching of the Scriptures, the pattern of the early church ministry, the pattern of the ministry on the mission field, and the work of the Southern Baptist Convention, these seem to be examples used to amplify his point rather than main heads around which the address was organized.\(^{120}\) Thus the thesis was examined from various points of view in what some homileticians refer to as the diamond treatment; the metaphor rests not upon the shape of the diamond, but upon the practice of holding a stone up to the light and turning it so as to examine its various facets. The structure of the address was loose; it was marked by rambling and repetition at numerous points.\(^{121}\)

Criswell's 1970 address, "The Rock Whence We are Hewn," was organized in topical pattern based upon a chronological or historical concept. He used neither climactic nor anti-climactic order. His main heads included, "We were Born in a great Mission Commitment,"

\(^{120}\) Tape recording, presidential address, 1969.

\(^{121}\) Ibid.
"We were Born . . . in a deep Doctrinal Conviction," and "We were Born . . . in a vast Cooperative Effort." The address contained numerous similarities to Grey's message of 1952 in which he spoke of the Convention as being "born of missionary compassion." Both addresses contained numerous references to the Convention's history.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented a descriptive analysis of rhetorical method. Vocal delivery, verbal style, and message organization were the three areas of focus for this analysis. The speakers were found to fall well within normal limits of pitch, rate, volume, and quality, so that their voices did not call undue attention to themselves. Each speaker exercised sufficient control over his vocal instrument to produce emphasis at desired points in delivery. Vocal quality ranged from mellow to strident, volume from controlled projection to shouting, and inflection from didactic through musical to bombastic.

122 Tape recording, presidential address, 1970; Annual, 1952, p. 60.

123 For a description of elements of the presidential addresses during 1950-1970 not included in this chapter or the succeeding one, see the writer's "A Descriptive Analysis of the Southern Baptist Convention Presidential Addresses, 1950-1970," unpublished manuscript, Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee.
The speakers were generally careful of grammar and pronunciation. Although none was careless of articulation, there was greater variety in this element than in the others; Storer, Warren, and Paschall articulated each syllable with almost identical precision and clarity, while the other presidents practiced a more conversational style.

Most of the presidents practiced a fairly simple and direct verbal style; a few sounded scholarly, but not ornate. Most made use of alliteration, simile, metaphor, antithesis, and accumulation. The addresses as a whole were not marked by contrived or artificial stylistic devices.

Organization of the addresses was unsophisticated; most utilized a simple topical or enumerative pattern. A few were built upon a chronological pattern. Although a few were arranged climactically, most reflected no specific arrangement. Only a few were constructed in deductive order. The remainder were not inductive; they were simply lacking in the clear statement of main heads. Although a few texts contained internal outlines, most did not; in those cases outlines for this analysis were constructed inferentially.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF CONTENT

This chapter will examine the five major controversial issues which the Convention faced during 1950-1970. Although the presidents had specific aims related to these five major issues, a broader aim for the address itself emerged from the investigation. This major aim was affected each year by the specific issues facing the Convention and each president's confrontation of those issues; in this interchange is to be found the significance of the presidential address, and against this backdrop its effectiveness, as well as the effectiveness of the individual addresses, must be measured.

This chapter, then, will seek to analyze and interpret the complex interrelationships among (1) the major aim of the presidential address, (2) the major controversial or divisive issues which the Convention has faced during the past twenty-one years, and (3) the presidents' confrontation of these issues. On the basis of this analysis, an evaluation of the addresses will be made. The concern of this evaluation is dyadic: the effectiveness of individual speakers in achieving specific goals and the effectiveness of the address itself as a force in the life
of the Convention. The assessment of effectiveness is concerned with matters beyond the effects of the communicative process: applause, laughter, "amens," words of praise, and similar expressions. It is concerned with "product" effectiveness, with whether audience response to the content of the message—the ideas, proposals, and appeals—was sufficient to argue for effectiveness of the address. Hence the distinction between "product" effects and "process" effects.  

The consideration of effectiveness recognizes that the presidential address does not occur in a vacuum. The president issues statements to the denominational and secular press; his positions are usually fairly well known even before election and perhaps were instrumental in his election. He is a frequent speaker at denominational meetings on the Convention, state, and associational levels. He may also speak in local meetings or revival crusades. Further, the Convention is preceded by the Southern Baptist Pastors¹ Conference which features numerous sermons and addresses. Additionally, numerous other addresses and sermons are featured on the Convention program, notably the addresses of the executive secretaries of the Foreign and Home Mission Boards and

the annual sermon. These messages frequently deal with many of
the same issues with which the president seeks to cope in his address.
Thus, any measures of effectiveness which ignored these other
influences upon Convention actions would be misleading.

Indicators of address effectiveness were found in three sources:
newspaper reactions, Convention resolutions, and Convention programs
and activities. Although in several instances private correspondence,
both favorable and unfavorable, resulted from the address, because
examination of this correspondence could lead to violation of the
privilege of private communication, no effort was made to secure
or examine it. Thus the analysis of measurable results rests upon
statements of public record.

A change in the procedure for Convention press coverage has
news coverage by Baptist Press increased while coverage by the
editors of the Baptist state papers in attendance decreased. Increasingly the editors' writing was confined to editorial comments and
personal responses—over-all evaluations, statements of personal
position upon the major controversial issues, and similar matters.

Increasingly, then, there has developed a uniformity, an actual
repetition, of material appearing in the various Baptist state papers.
Diversity has disappeared, except for editorial opinion. Thus, for the
most part, comment upon the presidential address began to disappear as it became overshadowed by the controversial issues upon which the Convention debated and acted. In recent years comment upon the presidential address has been confined almost exclusively to a resume of the high points of the message as released in advance of the Convention and a few complimentary words about the speakers' delivery. Whereas the editors once dealt at length with what the president had said and how the Convention reacted, now the full text, or at least an edited version, of the presidential address appears in most Baptist state papers during Convention week or the week following and the editors apparently feel it inappropriate or unnecessary to make comments two weeks later upon an address to which the readers have already been exposed. Current journalistic practice dictates utilizing the advance manuscript instead of the actual address for newspaper coverage. The advance manuscript is released to all Baptist state papers, as well as the secular press, by the press representative of the Convention's Executive Committee. Because of publication deadlines, if the editors waited to hear the actual address and then publish their reactions, in most cases this material would not appear until two or more weeks after the Convention, and editors decline to use "old" news. Further, it is inefficient for individual editors to transcribe and analyze the actual address when an advance
copy has been furnished and most of the presidents maintain such fidelity to their manuscripts that deviations are insignificant. Finally, since the writers for Baptist Press furnish responses to the address to the Baptist state papers, editors increasingly publish these prepared materials instead of writing their own. The total effect of these circumstances has been to decrease the amount of press reaction to the presidential address and to make that which does appear either more nearly uniform or actually repetitious.

Relative to the measurement of results in general, it has been noted that some of the issues facing the Convention were abstract—philosophical, ideological, or speculative. The predominant speaker intent seems to have been to change attitudes. At this point the critic confronts most acutely the speculative nature of rhetorical criticism. It is impossible in most instances conclusively to demonstrate causal relationships. It is difficult enough to determine attitudinal change with any degree of reliability under ideal circumstances; it is virtually impossible when the investigator is removed in time and space from the rhetorical event under analysis. Several presidents indicated their understanding of the purpose of the presidential address as being to set the tone of the Convention;² while the

²See pp. 317-318.
investigator may have an impression about the tone of the Convention, it may be erroneous. Even if it is accurate, he may be unable to point to specific, objective, verifiable evidence which will constitute conclusive proof. Further, some aspects of speaker aim may relate to attitudes or actions among the churches, not in the Convention itself or within its agencies. In these cases results would be impossible to assess without an examination of the churches cooperating with the Convention. Such an examination far surpasses the research capabilities and resources related to this investigation. For these reasons the treatment of the results of presidential confrontation with divisive issues is limited almost completely to newspaper reactions, Convention resolutions, and Convention programs and activities which can be linked fairly conclusively to the content of the presidential address. Even then conclusions are tentative; a president's endorsement of a proposal for the solution of an issue does not necessarily mean that his endorsement affected passage of the proposal—the messengers may have had their minds made up before the president spoke.

Any issue or proposal which is more than routine is potentially divisive; on some occasions, even those which, on the surface, appeared to be routine turned out to be divisive. A case in point was the recommendation of the Convention's Executive Committee in 1964 that the
Convention join with other Baptist bodies for a North American Baptist fellowship within the framework of the Baptist World Alliance.

Proposed as a purely routine matter, controversy arose over it; it was thought by some to be a move toward ecumenicity.³

Some of the issues facing the Convention were essentially concrete—practical or physical; others were abstract—philosophical, ideological, or speculative. Even the practical ones usually had an underlying philosophical basis. Further, while each address dealt with some issue, not all of the issues were controversial. If a given president were to denounce sin, advocate prayer, encourage Bible reading, and stimulate Christian witnessing, he would be confronting issues, but they could hardly be termed controversial. The focus of this chapter, therefore, will be upon those issues which were divisive, and even of those, only the recurring ones or those which were extremely critical in the life of the Convention will be treated in depth. The following are some of the "lesser issues": (1) A proposal to limit presidential tenure to a single one-year term; it was defeated in 1965. (2) Proposals to change the name of the Convention. These arise periodically, generate heated debate, and are voted down; although many people become emotionally aroused, no one withdraws

from Convention affiliation or withholds Cooperative Program funds.

(3) Federal aid for Southern Baptist institutions; this issue usually involves institutions belonging to individual state conventions rather than the Southern Baptist Convention itself, so it seldom comes up for discussion or vote in Convention sessions. Even when it does, opinion is still so strongly in the negative that the issue hardly rates as "divisive." (4) Proposals to seat messengers from Baptist churches in Canada; this issue has existed for many years but has generated controversy to a significant degree on only two or three occasions. Each time it has arisen it has been overshadowed by another of greater importance or divisiveness.

Despite the large number of issues confronting the Convention during the twenty-one year period of this study, only five major divisive issues posed serious threats to the Convention's unity and harmony: (1) local church autonomy, (2) theological controversy, (3) ecumenicity, (4) racial relationships, and (5) social applications of the gospel. Although the latter two are obviously related, the former arose as a separate issue by itself several years before the latter began to be raised by the presidents in their addresses, so it is treated as a separate issue in this investigation.

Analysis of the presidential addresses revealed phenomena for which no generally accepted labels were readily available. An attempt
was made to categorize these phenomena and to identify them with a set of meaningful descriptive labels. On some occasions the speakers confronted controversial issues directly and made statements specifically related to those issues; on others they made general statements about the issues or principles involved in them; on still others they shifted the attention of the audience and the emphases of the Convention to other issues. This kind of behavior has been classified as "tactical method"; the term is intended to indicate the tactic by which the speaker confronted the controversial issues. A similar term, "rhetorical method," was used in chapter three; that term referred to the more nearly mechanical or physical aspects of rhetorical discourse: organization, style, and delivery.

On some occasions the speakers used material which seemed to be intended to convince the audience, to reinforce or alter pre-existent beliefs; on other occasions they used material intended to stimulate their audience, to increase fervor or heighten feelings; on still other occasions they used material intended to obtain an overt, physical response, to elicit some action. This kind of behavior has been classified as "rhetorical approach"; the term is intended to indicate the over-all approach which the speaker made

4 See chapter 5 for discussion of the use of this terminology by Oliver, Brembeck and Howell, and Monroe and Ehninger.
to his audience in his message. "Rhetorical approach" obviously is closely associated with speaker aim; the same set of labels can be used to identify phenomena in both categories. If a speaker's aim is to convince his audience then his material will be designed to convince; he will deliver a "convincing address." If a speaker's aim is to stimulate his audience, to arouse their emotions, then his material will be designed to stimulate; he will deliver a "stimulating address." If his aim is to motivate the audience, to evoke some action, then his material will be designed to motivate; he will deliver a "motivational," or "actuative," address. "Rhetorical approach," then, refers to the message content, whereas "speaker aim" refers to the intention in the mind of the speaker. "Rhetorical approach" is used in this chapter because the essential concern of the chapter is message content, not speaker intent; or at least it is speaker intent as revealed by message content.

Analysis of the presidential addresses focused upon the five major controversial issues which the Convention faced during 1950-1970. The concern of the investigation was centered upon the presidents' confrontation with those issues. The investigation sought to determine three aspects of that confrontation: its degree—how strongly or forthrightly the speaker came to grips with the issue; his tactical method—whether he made direct statements, general state-
ments, or shifted to other issues; and his rhetorical approach—
whether he used convincing, stimulating, or motivational material.

Another phenomenon revealed by the analysis was the nature of
the material which constituted the messages. A set of labels in
addition to those employed in tactical method and rhetorical approach
was needed to describe this phenomenon. In some instances speakers
related historical events; literary critics customarily utilize the
term "narration" for this behavior. In some instances speakers
explained ideas; "exposition" is customarily used to identify this
behavior. Occasionally a speaker declared controversial propositions
which he supported with evidence and logical reasoning; "argumenta-
tion" is the term customarily utilized to identify this behavior. Arthur
B. Miller refers to this phenomenon as "rhetorical mode." 5
Rhetorical mode, then, is treated in this chapter in terms of narration,
exposition, and argumentation.

LOCAL CHURCH AUTONOMY

Convention peace and harmony were threatened in 1949 when
E.P. Alldredge proposed an amendment to article six of the Convention

5 See chapter 5 for fuller discussion and documentation of this
concept.
Constitution which would have placed the Convention in the position of telling local cooperating churches what organizations they could or could not join. While this proposal was intended as a blow against ecumenicity, it raised the issue of the autonomy of the local churches and its provisions clearly would violate Convention policy. The motion was laid on the table in 1949 and Alldredge promised to bring it before the Convention again in 1950.  

Local church autonomy was the major divisive issue before the Convention in 1950 and President Lee dealt positively with it in his address. In this confrontation, Lee chose the tactical method of direct statement. Although he referred neither to Alldredge nor the amendment by name, he wasted no time and minced no words in declaring his position and striking blows against the amendment.

In the second sentence of his address he recognized the reality of the ecumenical issue, but implied that it posed no real threat to the Convention:

> Having great responsibility such as never burdened any people, we meet unembarrassed and unhindered by ecclesiastical harness. Without malice to any, we have

---

6 Annual, 1949, p. 43.

7 The Christian Index, May 18, 1950, p. 3.
put from us alliance with all unionizing councils and bodies—as David thrust aside Saul's cumbersome armor.  

According to the newspaper accounts, Lee's actual statement to the Convention on this point was even stronger than his statement in the prepared manuscript. The paragraph from the manuscript read:

Like David, with a sling of God in his hand, this Convention—with a polity adapted to the genius and elasticity of our New Testament creed—holds in its hands the New Testament, but no military orders.

The newspapers reported:

This Southern Baptist Convention—with no proposal coming before any of our Boards or administrative staffs for any kind of affiliation outside our body, with no one of our Boards or agencies trying to lead Southern Baptists into any unionizing movement, but with a polity adapted to the genius and elasticity of our New Testament creed—holds in its hands the New Testament.

His line of reasoning seems to have been that the threat of ecumenicity was not as great as the threat to the autonomy of the churches posed by Alldredge's suggested protection against ecumenicity; the proposal was more disadvantageous than advantageous. In a

---

8 Annual, 1950, p. 60.

9 Ibid.

statement designed to magnify\(^{11}\) the Convention, Lee declared its essential nature:

A great people we must be. We are not here to catch sparrows and subdue rabbits. Chesterton said: "Jesus was a lion tamer." We miss the purpose for which God brought us to Chicago if we, an advisory Convention of free and independent churches, miss the highway and go down some discreditive dead-end street by going off after non-basical matters--and manifest a spirit that would turn an advisory Convention of free and independent churches into a body of corporate authoritarian control over the churches.\(^{12}\)

In these passages the key words are, "we have put from us alliance with all unionizing councils and bodies," "an advisory Convention of free and independent churches," and "turn an advisory Convention of free and independent churches into a body of corporate authoritarian control over the churches." The Convention was organized for cooperative endeavor in support of missions; it was never intended to issue edicts, encyclicals, or doctrinal pronouncements. Nor were any of its decisions to be binding upon any local church except as that church should freely commit itself. Lee felt that squabbling over ecumenicity was not fulfilling a basic purpose of the Convention.

Still in his introduction, Lee struck another blow at the Alldredge amendment:

\(^{11}\)"Magnify" is used in its Aristotelian sense; see "Method of Analysis" in chapter 1.

\(^{12}\)Annual, 1950, p. 60.
With messengers from the churches standing on equal footing, holding in their hearts consideration for the welfare of one common cause we are here to maintain the century-old and fundamental purpose of the Convention, namely: cooperation in promotional endeavours, missions, and other Kingdom causes and make ourselves weigh all we ought to weigh and measure what we should measure.

In our one hundred and five years of God-blessed history, some of it written in blood, some of it watered with tears, the Convention has done little damaging detouring into the realm of doctrinal statements beyond the acceptance of the fundamentals of the New Testament. Our Southern Baptist Convention—an association of local, self-governing, independent, democratic churches—must recognize the independence and autonomy of the local church in all matters temporal and spiritual. Our churches are independent bodies, voluntarily associated in convention-assembly for fellowship and co-operation—without ecclesiastical authority. The churches, above general bodies, subject in no way to general bodies, voluntarily affiliating with our Convention through their messengers, are always independent and are not in law bound by anything any general body proposes.

This is what makes our six and one-half million Baptists a modern miracle, with 27,000 churches handling their own affairs without authoritative control by any council, convention or outside organization, yet knit together as a compact force—with the New Testament as sole creed and only rule of faith and practice. Thus our unity in major and essential matters is glorious.

Thus, in the introduction to his address, Lee repeatedly attacked a proposal which he felt would endanger the autonomy of the local churches and which was destroying the unity and harmony of the Convention.

\[13\] Ibid.
It has been posited that in the presidential address the speaker comes to grips with live issues and seeks to mold Convention opinion and motivate action. He does the latter by identifying himself with positions, elements, and symbols with which the audience can identify. Thus he appeals to audience motives, beliefs, and values and achieves persuasion through identification. This was Lee's approach in the 1950 address. He identified himself with the following themes with which his audience logically could be expected to identify: the advisory nature of the Convention, the authority of the New Testament, separation of church and state, and the autonomy of the churches. Further, he linked Baptists' business with God's business.

It is somewhat difficult precisely to classify his rhetorical approach; the address may be viewed as convincing, motivating, or some combination of the two. If his specific purpose was to secure commitment to a Baptist doctrinal position and program of work, the address may be classified as convincing.

Regardless of the remainder of the address, Lee intended his introduction to change or strengthen attitudes. He was seeking the defeat of the Alldredge amendment if it should be brought before the Convention again—a motivating aim, because that would call for a

---

14 See p. 16.
negative vote—-but he first had to convince his audience that the Alldredge amendment was undesirable. He sought to accomplish this end by demonstrating the amendment to be contrary to the principles valued by the Convention; he showed it to violate the autonomy of the local churches. Thus it not only violated a revered principle but also it was contrary to stated Convention policy.

In pursuit of his goal, Lee utilized the expository mode. He never explicitly mentioned the Alldredge amendment, nor did he actually declare the arguments or lines of reasoning stated in this analysis. He expounded the basic nature of the Convention and emphasized the autonomy of the churches. He did declare that the autonomy of the churches must not be violated, but he left his audience to infer its own unit of proof. His declaration was a conclusion derived from two unstated premises: those principles which are valuable to the Convention must not be violated; church autonomy is a valuable principle to the Convention; therefore, the autonomy of the churches must not be violated. The audience was left to infer its own conclusion from Lee's statement. Any proposal which would violate the autonomy of the churches should be defeated; the Alldredge amendment would violate the autonomy of the churches; therefore, the Alldredge amendment should be defeated.
While Lee magnified the autonomy of the local churches, he in no way deprecated the Convention; rather, he magnified it also:

Caligula once marched his legions—with beating drums, sounding trumpets, and display of banners—down to the seashore to gather cockle shells. We must not be guilty of like folly. We would not engage in rolling marbles when there are mountains to be removed, nor be as battleships cruising after beetles. With seas to sail, we must not launch our ships on a millpond.

Lee was implying that for the Convention to engage in a squabble over the Federal Council of Churches would have been as small in comparison to its primary responsibilities as is rolling marbles to moving mountains or rowing on millponds to sailing the seas. He continued:

But, with gratitude to God who has led us safely thus far with our Southern Baptist heart twenty-five thousand miles in circumference, we ask God's help to out-think, out-serve, out-love, out-work every false philosophy and ism now bidding for men's allegiance.

He further implied that engaging in unwise policies would be following the direction of Satan. In his second main head he said:

Satan, who brought disorder among the angels and undermined the constitutional order of man's nature, is the God of this world. Maliciously he watches us—hoping to see us make errors of judgment. To him who dismantled the first Adam of his nobility, any discreditive dissonance would be delight. Satan hates our tremendous enterprises,—all born in love, all carried forward with zeal in the blood of those possessed of conscientious and imperious sense of duty. He would empty our lamps
of oil. If, by advocacy of unwise policies, so in antithesis to what our great leaders of the past stood for, Satan can disturb our fellowship, he will be as happy as though he had ruined our good name by making us drunkards and idolaters. "Let us give no place to the devil" (Eph. 4:27).\footnote{Ibid., pp. 62-63.}

In the conclusion of his first main head he further magnified the Convention and reiterated the autonomy of the churches:

With our eyes thus upon ourselves, we see how God has made Southern Baptists prosperous beyond expectation and influential beyond precedent. But, "unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required."

With God's favor upon us authenticated by our progress, we must take no backward step by failure to maintain the absolute autonomy of our churches, which maintenance is the only thing that will keep us from going into some form of ecclesiasticism which is wholly foreign to Baptists—and as much out of place in our Southern Baptist life as a raucous crow in a chorus of nightingales. Moreover, no backward step must we take by a careless indifference to great stretches of the unattained.

And again in the fourth and fifth main heads he confronted the same issue by repeated exposition of the same themes:

Upon us are the eyes of departed leaders: Amid the cloud of witnesses, they look our way to see if we maintain the purpose for which the Convention was organized—to see if we will hand down our blood-bequeathed legacies unreduced in quality and in quantity and show gratitude for our remote past and our glorious present, both as thick inlaid with proofs of God's resources, goodness, guidance, and approval as is the midnight sky with stars.

These departed mighty ones, who dressed in homespun and not in Tyrian purple, opposed the unholy union of Church and State, opposed public funds being given to sectarian
institutions, favored the Lordship of Christ and not the overlordship of any man and transmitted to us some things they believed from the beginning and tested out in the laboratories of their own experience—things which modern scholarship has not improved, things which the popularity of public opinion has not discounted.

Our forefathers tested in the laboratories of their experience the truth that the individual must have freedom to think, to speak, to act for himself, but with no right to be discourteous, to injure anybody else, or to deny freedom to another. Thomas Jefferson said: "Democracy is the greatest amount of freedom to the greatest number of people." Our forefathers, from Johnson to Truett, who believed in and practiced unity of opinion in essentials and diversity of opinion in non-essential and non-basical matters, look our way to see if we are wise enough NOT to lay down a set of rules to determine Baptist conduct as to our Convention relationships. The New Testament—not a book of rules but a book of principles—does not do that.

Our Baptist forefathers, in whose train we can wisely and safely follow, left us a rich heritage in spiritual values. Therefore, as it is carved on the old Bradford obelisk, let it be known of us: "What our fathers with so much difficulty secured, do not basely relinquish."

Moreover, upon us are the eyes of God: Our Christian work is too great for human strength without divine commission. Therefore, we must take knowledge of the storehouse that can not be exhausted. We are stewards of the manifold grace of God—in using as well as in dispensing it—not as saints preserved for future happiness but as sinners redeemed for present service. 17

Thus, by direct, expository statements aimed at strengthening or changing audience attitudes and at securing a negative vote on the Alldredge amendment, Lee confronted the issue of church autonomy which threatened Convention unity and harmony in 1950.

17 Ibid., p. 63.
Newspaper reactions to Lee's 1950 address were fairly consistent in their appraisal of its role:

The address of President R.G. Lee was as usual an outstanding pronouncement and appeal. It was timely and definite. It was a real Baptist pronouncement. The Convention voted that its President's pronouncement be the sentiment of the Convention and that the address be printed in the annual. 18

The speed and vigor with which the president and other early speakers on the program called for unity in spirit and purpose and attacked church unionizing movements led to prompt and unanimous approval of the president's address and the report of the Committee on Common Problems as the official statement of the convention on both these issues. This action obviated any need for bringing up the Alldredge amendment or any similar resolution or proposal.

We would say that at no time in our memory has the convention had as little disposition to have traffic with any kind of movement toward organic church union. Not only the hearty approval of the president's address and this committee's report, but repeated reference to our DISTINCTIVE BAPTIST MESSAGE for the world demonstrated plainly that Southern Baptists fully expect to continue being Baptist, feeling that God has a unique task for us to perform as well as a distinctive message for us to deliver. And for this pronounced conviction we can all be glad. 19

Only Dr. Alldredge can explain his failure to renew his fight, as announced, but it could have been that the presidential address of Dr. Lee sounded the warning.

18 B.L. Bridges, General Secretary, Arkansas Baptist State Convention, Arkansas Baptist, June 15, 1950, p. 16.

Dr. Lee struck hard at any such move three times in his address. There remained little doubt, after hearing it, that he would return to the fight if necessary and the Convention will respond to his leadership.

Now let there be everlasting praise for the presidential address of Dr. Robert G. Lee. He pleaded for Convention unity, for following in the steps of those who through the years had accomplished so much, and definitely did a masterful job in sounding a keynote for the Convention.

Dr. Robert G. Lee, setting the theme for the Southern Baptist Convention's session in his presidential address, took occasion to oppose any effort to "lay down a set of rules to determine Baptist conduct as to our Convention relationships."

The position was pushed forward three times in his address, entitled "Eyes Upon Southern Baptists."

The references were generally interpreted as a slap at the efforts of Dr. E.P. Aldredge at last year's convention to adopt a constitutional amendment preventing any board member or employee from being connected with any church affiliated with the Federal Council.

Dr. Lee led the fight last year which tabled the amendment. Southern Baptists always applaud opposition to the Council but at the same time they do not want to establish a police body.

Dr. R.G. Lee gave his warm-hearted presidential address. By the time he finished unity was cemented, unrest curtailed, and the ground cut plumb out from under any agitators that were present.

The Convention was characterized by a spirit of unity and harmony. There was not a single sharp controversy

---


21 Ibid., p. 6.  

22 Ibid., p. 13.

brought up on the floor. The comment on every hand was, "This has been a surprising Convention, but a very good one."

The re-election of Dr. R.G. Lee as president for the third year was a foregone conclusion and eminently wise. No other name was placed in nomination. The Convention heartily and unanimously elected Dr. Lee by acclamation.

We believe that a main cause of peace and harmony was the wise leadership of President R.G. Lee and many other men who have realized the danger of being divided on non-essentials and thereby missing the great fundamental Baptist principles and policies. Dr. Lee in his presidential address warned against trying to make the Convention an authoritative or ecclesiastical body attempting to discipline the churches.

These published reactions to the president's message and related matters suggest a causal relationship between the presidential address and the general spirit of the Convention as well as the absence of certain specific proposals.

In addition to the absence of controversial action—the Alldredge amendment, tabled the previous year, was not brought back to the floor during 1950—two specific resolutions seem related to the issue of church autonomy and the president's confrontation of it:

Porter W. Bailes, Texas, moved that the president's address be made the expression of the Southern Baptist Convention and that this address be carried in the Annual and become the expression of the Convention toward all

---


25 Ibid., p. 3.
other religious groups as the Convention seeks to bring the kingdom of God among men. Motion was carried.

The Christian Index indicated that the motion was voted unanimously. By this action the Convention clearly gave endorsement to Lee's position and revealed its attitude toward the issues involved in the Alldredge amendment. Further, the Committee on Common Problems with Northern Baptists brought a resolution related to ecumenicity:

We hereby reaffirm our conviction that Southern Baptists cannot enter into organic connection with the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America or any other organizations which would compromise Baptist principles and truths revealed in the inspired Word of God.

By the adoption of this portion of the committee's report, the Convention declared strongly against ecumenicity. It could appear that the committee favored Alldredge's amendment; however, the next paragraph of its resolution declared just as strongly against the undesirable measures Alldredge proposed in order to achieve his goal:

---

26 Annual, 1950, p. 36.


28 Annual, 1950, p. 37. This committee was also known as the Gardner committee—for its chairman, T.C. Gardner; it became involved in another controversy which developed two years later.
If there be a desire to investigate the possibility of changing the Constitution of this Convention to limit the constituency in any way, we recommend that it be done only after lengthy and thorough study by a qualified committee.  

The order and proximity of these events was significant.

(1) Lee delivered the presidential address as the first major event early Wednesday morning. (2) Bailes presented the motion to make the president's address the expression of the Convention. (3) J.M.-Dawson presented the report of the Public Affairs Committee (not related to this controversy); (4) The Gardner committee brought its report with the recommendations indicated above. These combined actions had a forceful impact upon the Convention. The first opportunity to call the Alldredge amendment from the table was a miscellaneous business session late Wednesday afternoon, but the impact of the events on Wednesday morning was sufficient to settle the issue without its being brought to the floor of the Convention again; the amendment was never called up.

Both Stracener and Carpenter cited other speakers as helping to promote unity and harmony. It would be impossible to isolate the effectiveness of Lee's address from these other influences. Yet certain circumstances which may be interpreted as indicators of

---

29 Ibid.

30 Annual, 1950, p. 36.
effectiveness assign some degree of effectiveness to Lee's efforts.

(1) Editorial opinion of the Convention frequently cited the lack of controversy, the presence of harmony and unity, and the prevalence of a constructive spirit despite forebodings of disturbing controversies for months preceding the Convention. Further, specific references were made to Lee's address as contributing to this atmosphere. The spirit of the first two sessions was also cited:

The spirit of those first two sessions carried through the following sessions of the Convention . . . .

The re-election of Dr. R.G. Lee as president of the Convention demonstrated the unanimity of the Convention and was a tribute to the efficiency and fairness of Dr. Lee as the presiding officer. 31

(2) The Convention adopted two measures which argue for effectiveness of the address: (a) Porter Bailes's resolution that the address be adopted as the expression of the Convention and printed in the Annual, and (b) the Gardner committee's recommendations opposing ecumenicity and cautioning against changing the Convention's constitution so as to limit its constituency.

(3) Controversy on the floor of the Convention was avoided. The Alldredge amendment had been tabled in 1949, partly because of Lee's efforts. Although Alldredge had promised to carry the measure

31 B.H. Duncan, editor, Arkansas Baptist, June 1950, p. 3. See also the quotations from Hurt, Bennett, and Carpenter cited in footnotes 20-25 above.
back to the Convention, when the miscellaneous business period arrived after Lee's address, neither Alldredge nor anyone else moved to take the amendment from the table. The Baptist editors gave Lee's address a large portion of the credit for the failure of this controversy to develop.

(4) Lee's unanimous election to a third term, after delivery of the presidential address, suggests that the Convention was not displeased with the stand he took. This suggests effectiveness.

Based upon the foregoing evidence, Lee is judged to have been effective in achieving his objective of defeating the Alldredge amendment, and the address itself is judged as having been effective in promoting Convention unity and harmony.

Local church autonomy arose as an issue before the Convention again in 1952, but only the foreshadowing could be seen at the time of the presidential address. The Gardner committee, officially known as the Committee on Relations with Other Religious Bodies, had been created in 1947 as "a committee of seven . . . to meet with a similar committee from the Northern Baptist Convention to consider our common problems."\(^{32}\) During the intervening years its scope had been enlarged to include relationships with still other religious bodies.

\(^{32}\) Annual, 1947, p. 45.
Some of these relationships involved doctrinal questions, so the committee became concerned with doctrinal matters among Southern Baptist churches, a concern beyond its originally intended purpose.

The committee already had dealt with the matter of ecumenicity (to be discussed subsequently in this chapter) on several occasions, thus involving itself in controversial matters before the Convention. At the 1952 Convention, R.E. Milam proposed an amendment to the committee's report which instructed it to seek information on this question: "How effective is the present teaching program of our denomination on the question of church ordinances in the light of present day conditions?" 33 The questions of church ordinance observation, or doctrinal purity, ecumenicity, and a doctrinal test for fellowship in the Convention were all interrelated and ultimately involved local church autonomy. Thus, although the Gardner committee had not brought any recommendations directly affecting church autonomy, it had dealt with matters ultimately related to that issue. The growing tendency of this committee to assume an authoritative role or to establish a doctrinal test for Convention fellowship caused some to feel that it was far overstepping the scope of its intended purpose.

Although Grey did not refer directly to the Gardner committee, he did refer to the autonomy of the churches:

The nature of our Convention is and has been clearly set forth for 107 years as non-ecclesiastical, non-hierarchical, and non-authoritarian. There appear to be three well-defined constitutional theories concerning the membership of the Southern Baptist Convention--federal, ecclesiastical, and voluntary. But since this Convention is composed of messengers and does not constitute a federation of state conventions, district associations, and local churches, it appears to be the part of wisdom to adhere to the original Baptist constitutional theory of voluntary membership.

Today we need to re-emphasize the principle of democracy and make it crystal clear that this Convention has never usurped authoritarian powers. Pronouncements, ever so timely and praiseworthy, made by a few thousand messengers on political, social, economic, or even doctrinal matters cannot be construed as representing the sentiments of and binding upon the more than seven million Southern Baptists not present when the vote is taken.

Grey's restraint in dealing with this issue may have been a wise tactical maneuver. His address was delivered on Wednesday morning, whereas the Gardner report was not presented until Saturday morning. Had he spoken strongly against specific aspects of the report, the committee could have met and altered its report, thereby placing the president in an embarrassing position. Therefore, Grey's restraint should be viewed as a strength, not a weakness.

---

34 Ibid., p. 60.
If the analysis were based solely upon the passages quoted, Grey's tactical method might be considered direct statement; however, there is no evidence in the printed text to suggest that the passages cited were made to stand out in any unusual way from the rest of the address. Therefore, it seems more fitting to consider his tactical method as general statement. The address was not built around the issue of autonomy; instead, it involved historical narrative and exposition of the original purpose and nature of the Convention. The autonomy of the churches was subsidiary to these larger issues.

The rhetorical mode, then, combined narration and exposition in order to affect attitudes; the address was intended to stimulate or inspire. Grey lauded the revered figures and hallowed events of the Convention's history and the treasured principles involved in its cooperative relationships. Identifying himself with these respected elements was calculated to enhance his persuasive position. The audience was expected to identify with these elements and agree with the implication that the Convention should do nothing to derogate them.

The confrontation was only slightly joined in 1952; the Gardner committee had not yet arrived at its controversial pinnacle and Grey attempted to avert controversy rather than to settle it. The Miami confrontation in 1952 was hardly more than a preview of the 1953 session in which the battle was more openly joined.
Few results of the presidential address itself can be positively identified, but the controversy over the Gardner committee continued to develop during the weeks following the Convention and Grey's statements seem to have crystallized opposition to its attempt to have the Convention impose doctrinal positions upon the churches. Such attempts would have violated church autonomy. The Baptist state papers carried heated discussions of the issues involved in this controversy:

Frankly, we have never liked the idea of what is called the "president's address" which was started back in the days of the first world war, but we liked what Doctor Grey had to say and the way he said it. He made it crystal clear that no one, not even the president, can speak for Baptists, but in speaking for himself it was evident that the throngs present were in perfect accord with what he said.  

Applause expressed both approval and pleasure on the messengers' part in President Grey's historical message with its dynamic appeal.

In addition to actions of the committee, an article written by Gardner and published in Baptist Standard prior to the Convention drew critical response. Edwin S. Gaustad, a teacher in the department


of Biblical literature at Brown University, took exception to Gardner's attempt to have conventions act in a watch-dog role.  

Response to the question of whether the Convention should establish a doctrinal test for fellowship appeared in Arkansas Baptist; the sentiment was generally negative. S.H. Jones, editor of the South Carolina Baptist Courier, felt that the Gardner committee was no longer needed.

John J. Hurt viewed the committee's study of "effectiveness in denominational promotion of the question of church ordinances . . ." as leading to a doctrinal test. Thus, the issues were kept alive after adjournment of the Convention and the stage was set for them to come back before the Convention the following year.

In view of the tentative nature of the controversy at the time of the presidential address, a conclusive assessment of address effectiveness is difficult to make. The newspaper reactions just cited indicate that Grey carried his point, yet there are no absolutely convincing indicators of the effectiveness of the address per se.

---


38 Arkansas Baptist, July 17, 1952, p. 3; July 24, 1952, pp. 8-9; July 31, 1952, p. 3.

39 Ibid.

Two circumstances would point in the direction of effectiveness, but neither is an infallible indicator. Grey was elected to another term as president without a single opposing candidate or vote, and he himself felt a different atmosphere in Houston in 1953 from what he had encountered in Miami in 1952. Obviously, the extent to which the address, as isolated from other factors, influenced these two events is impossible to measure with any convincing degree of accuracy.

The storm which had been gathering for several years finally broke in Houston in 1953. The Gardner committee was prepared to present a report which included the following recommendations:

That the teaching agencies of our Convention continue their effort with renewed vigor to strengthen Baptist conviction with reference to the dangers of interdenominationalism and non-denominationalism.

That the Southern Baptist Convention through its teaching agencies continue to co-operate with the churches affiliated with our Convention in magnifying the scriptural, authoritative, position of local, sovereign, New Testament churches, defined in the constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention as "regular Baptist churches" in administering the church ordinances.

This report was viewed as being another step in the direction of Convention control over the churches in the areas of ecumenicity.

---

41 Personal interview, December 29, 1970.

42 Annual, 1953, p. 51.
and doctrinal purity; further, it ultimately could have led to a doctrinal test for fellowship. Although the recommendations within themselves and in isolation might have been harmless enough, when viewed as part of a trend they were interpreted as danger signals. Thus, the opposition which developed and the controversy which arose were not directed solely toward these two recommendations; rather the object of dissatisfaction was the committee behind them. 43

Although Grey had strong feelings about this committee and its report, he avoided a frontal attack. His address was scheduled for Wednesday morning and the report was scheduled for Friday morning; the considerations he had to face were similar to those of the previous year. For the most part Grey avoided a direct confrontation, and even when he confronted the issues he made no mention of the committee. Throughout the bulk of the address he made general statements about the spirit, purpose, and mission of the Convention. Only in the closing portion of the address did he make direct statements related to the issues involved in this controversy, but when he did make such statements he left no doubt as to his position:

We are grateful as we behold another outcropping of the Southern Baptist spirit. This has to do with the tremendously important matter of conviction. . . .

43 Baptist Standard, May 21, 1953, p. 3.
Certainly no man of studied judgment would suggest that this Convention violate the sovereignty of the churches, set itself up as a hierarchical, ecclesiastical authority handing down encyclicals, edicts, and mandates. However, it must be remembered that we have gone forward "propagating the gospel" as we have because this Convention has held to certain deep doctrinal convictions. Historically and practically, missions is a doctrine. The "hard-shells" split with us over this doctrine. Christian education is another. Stewardship, emphasizing the tithe as the minimum, is another. Again and again this Convention has underscored its conviction on this by endorsing, "Every Baptist a Tither." This is as it should be. And yet, when twenty-six hundred of our churches give nothing to missions and 80 percent of our members do not tithe, no one suggests that they be "read out" of the Convention. We must go on holding convictions on these and other doctrines that have distinguished our people through the years.

Southern Baptists have a job to do for the Lord. They can best do it in their own way and perform their duty as God gives to them to see their duty. We are pressed by two conflicting forces. On one side is the ecumenicalism of "United Protestantism"; on the other is the "anything-ism" of non-denominationalism. We are like a healthy, wealthy, attractive young lady. These ambitious "Lotharios" are "making eyes" at us. But we have not, cannot, and will not even "drop our handkerchief" to invite or encourage their attention. . . .

One would-be suitor has made bold to announce that a chair is being reserved for us. But this young lady in all graciousness would suggest that before she occupies that chair it will have become an antique. She feels that for her, this chair would be virtually an "electric chair." Personally I think the young lady is correct. For the moment she sits down in that chair, she signs her own death warrant and sets the date of her execution. . . .

My brethren, let Southern Baptists face the future in faith, and continue in a united spirit to take up the task of the Lord with strengthened hands. During a crisis in the Texas Convention many years ago, Dr. B.H. Carroll gave this admonition, "Let us bury our differences beneath the cross." We have always been able to do this. We will continue to do it this year and through all the years.
In 1921 the Southern Baptist Convention met in Chattanooga, Tennessee. Dr. J.B. Gambrell, who had relinquished the gavel the year before to Dr. E.Y. Mullins, had just returned from a tour of Europe. He was exhausted in body, but as usual, resilient in spirit. Unable to attend the Convention he sent a message of five short words which this Convention needs to hear and heed. That immortal Baptist statesman, "Uncle Gideon," said, "... Do right and go forward!"

The bulk of Grey's address was a stimulating message aimed at demonstrating the main thrust of missions and evangelism in Convention outreach; this concluding portion, however, was a convincing statement cast in the argumentative mode. Grey was in the unenviable position of feeling it necessary to voice public and "official" opposition to a proposal which had never been presented to the Convention. The Gardner committee was never empowered to develop doctrinal guidelines for Convention fellowship nor to examine the doctrinal beliefs or practices of any cooperating churches. Yet there was a grass-roots feeling that this was precisely the direction the committee was headed. Milam's 1952 proposal that the committee investigate the effectiveness of the denomination's teaching program on church ordinances was interpreted by some to aim at policing the churches in their doctrinal practices. There is a persistent sentiment among some constituents for "reading out" of the Convention.

---
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those whose doctrinal position is not "orthodox." A very complex line of reasoning is involved in this issue and the controversy which Grey encountered. A doctrinal basis exists for fellowship in the Convention; churches who do not meet the doctrinal requirement cannot affiliate with the Convention. Upon these two assumptions is built, in the minds of some, the following argument: Those who do not agree with us on the doctrines should be "read out" of the Convention; X church does not agree with us on the doctrines; X church should be read out of the Convention. It will be noted that this argument involves a question of policy, not of fact. Also, it relates to the issue of doctrinal purity as well as Convention unity. At various times each part of this argument has been given voice in conversation, informal discussion, and articles in Baptist papers; most frequently the major premise has been the portion actually stated. No part of this argument had actually been laid before the Convention as a proposal, yet evidently it was in the minds of many as Grey faced his audience. He chose to counter this line of reasoning by attacking the major premise; this he did by direct contradiction supported by real examples in parallel case. He prepared his ground by declaring in favor of doctrinal conviction, thus espousing a position with which his audience would identify and placing himself on the same side, philosophically, as those he was about to oppose. Then he cited the doctrines
of missions, Christian education, and stewardship, all of which had been endorsed by the Convention, not just the constituent churches. Next he cited statistics indicating that twenty-six hundred churches gave nothing to missions and eighty percent of the church membership did not tithe, yet no one suggested that they be read out of the Convention. By this direct attack upon the major premise he implied an attack upon the conclusion. Not all who do not agree on other doctrines are read out of the Convention; those who do not agree on the church ordinances should not be read out of the Convention. The strength of his argument rested upon the parallel nature of the doctrines of baptism and the Lord's Supper (the church ordinances) with the doctrines of missions, Christian education, and stewardship. Both groups are "practical" doctrines, as opposed to the more "speculative" doctrines of the virgin birth and the inspiration of the Scriptures.

The crux of this entire controversy is in the first assumption cited above, that a doctrinal basis exists for membership in the Convention. Those who say one does exist point to the term "regular Baptist church" in the Convention's constitution and argue that a church cannot be a "regular" Baptist church without holding certain doctrinal views. Others interpret "regular" in a loose sense and claim that it does not extend as far in doctrinal interpretation as their opponents would make it. The total article on membership reads:
The Convention shall consist of messengers who are members of missionary Baptist churches co-operating with the Convention as follows:

1. One messenger for each regular Baptist church which is in friendly co-operation with this Convention and sympathetic with its purposes and work and has during the fiscal year preceding been a bona fide contributor to the Convention's work.

2. One additional messenger from each such church for every 250 members; or for each $250.00 paid to the work of the Convention during the fiscal year preceding the annual meeting.

3. The messengers shall be appointed and certified by the churches to the Convention, but no church may appoint more than ten (10).

Grey seems to have been on firm ground in his line of argument.

If churches who contributed nothing to missions ("the Convention's work")—a direct requirement of the article on membership—were not read out of the Convention, then churches who did not agree with others in their interpretation of certain doctrines—only implied, at best, in the article on membership—should not be read out. There is no record that the Convention itself has ever defined a "regular" Baptist church, nor that it has ever sought to impose any specific doctrinal test for fellowship. The latter condition is precisely what some feared would occur if the Gardner committee were continued.

45 Ibid., p. 22. The constitution is reprinted in each Annual.
Grey thus sought to reduce the distance between the two extreme wings of the Convention--those who held no doctrinal convictions and those who would impose a doctrinal test for fellowship--by arguing for the legitimacy of the middle-ground position: Hold to doctrinal convictions as an ideal, but do not seek to exclude from the fellowship those who do not agree in every detail.

In the next paragraph of this section of the text is found an obvious allusion to the Gardner committee report. Whether the audience was aware of it two days after its delivery when they heard the Gardner report is problematic. Grey said, "On one side is the ecumenicalism of *United Protestantism*; on the other is the "anything-ism" of non-denominationalism." The committee's first resolution warned of the dangers of interdenominationalism and non-denominationalism; Grey had therefore aligned himself with that portion of the report. He had done so, however, without aligning himself with those who would have made of this committee a committee on orthodoxy.

In these two passages Grey declared his position on the two issues involved in the Gardner committee recommendations: ecumenicalism and the observance of the church ordinances. In
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his conclusion he made a direct plea for Convention unity:

My brethren, let Southern Baptists face the future in faith, and continue in a united spirit to take up the task of the Lord with strengthened hands. During a crisis in the Texas Convention many years ago, Dr. B.H. Carroll gave this admonition, "Let us bury our differences beneath the cross." We have always been able to do this. We will continue to do it this year and through all the years.47

The measurable results of this encounter are limited to newspaper reactions:

President J.D. Grey was at his best in presiding over the Convention and the delivery of the president's address.48

Personally we thought that Dr. Grey's . . . address to the Convention was outstanding. He spoke well and spoke the sentiments of the vast majority of our people.49

Vice president C.C. Warren, North Carolina, was in the chair as J.D. Grey delivered his presidential address which struck a hearty response among his hearers, especially when he said Southern Baptists were not going to take the chair reportedly reserved for them in the National Council.50

Several editors of Baptist state papers cited the presidential address

47 Ibid.
48 Arkansas Baptist, May 21, 1953, p. 3.
49 B.L. Bridges, Arkansas Baptist, May 21, 1953, p. 16.
as one of the high points of the Convention, and several of them felt that Baptist unity had been given a boost by this Convention. The general consensus was that Grey delivered a meaningful and instrumental address, yet the specific effectiveness is impossible to disentangle from other influences operative upon the Convention.

There was still controversy which arose when the Gardner committee report was presented to the Convention on Friday. Gardner presented the committee's report and moved the adoption of its recommendations (previously quoted). E.D. Solomon moved, as an amendment, that the committee be continued for another year. Walter Pope Binns moved for an extension of time for discussion. The committee was discussed by Judson G. Jackson and Binns. Time for discussion ran out and A.B. Van Arsdale called for the order of the day. T. Rupert Coleman moved for reconvening at 2:30 p.m. to consider the matter, but his motion lost. Van Arsdale moved for a special order of business at 9:30 p.m. to continue the discussion; his motion carried. When the time for the special order arrived, E.D. Solomon asked for the privilege of withdrawing his motion and it
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was granted with unanimous consent. In this brief review are hidden heated debate and deep controversy which had been developing in the Convention almost since the establishment of this committee in 1947. The extent to which Grey's address affected this debate or the outcome of the controversy is impossible to assess empirically, but two things are known: Grey had declared his position in his address and the Baptist paper editors felt that the majority supported him. Further, Solomon spoke to Grey in the period between the afternoon and evening sessions and asked about withdrawing his motion; Grey felt that would be wise. Had Grey declared strongly in favor of the Gardner committee in his address, it is doubtful if Solomon would have approached him about withdrawing his motion. With the withdrawal of the motion to continue the committee, the controversy melted away. Gardner and R.E. Milam (who had offered the 1952 amendment instructing the committee to investigate the effectiveness of the denominations's teaching on the church ordinances) discussed the two recommendations embodied in the committee's report; they were adopted and the committee was thanked and discharged.
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Duncan shed some light on what was said during these discussions.

After Solomon requested the privilege of withdrawing his motion,

Dr. T.C. Gardner, chairman of the committee, also came to the microphone and stated that the committee had finished its work and should not be continued. The withdrawal of the motion by Dr. Solomon and the statement by Dr. Gardner resolved all the issues of the dispute and a spirit of fraternal Christian brotherhood swept over the audience like magic. The committee's report was adopted by the Convention and Dr. J.D. Grey, president of the Convention turned to the press and chided the reporters on their anticipation of a Baptist fight on the floor of the Convention when the question of the committee's report was to be considered.

Thus it is evident that whatever effect Grey's address had upon the ultimate resolution of this controversy, it was not the sole influence; the presidential address does not occur in a vacuum.

Grey's chiding remarks to the reporters constitute what is generally referred to as the "second presidential address" of 1953. The afternoon papers had been full of dire predictions of a fight and split when the time came for the Gardner committee discussion that night. In the weeks prior to the Convention, some other papers had been predicting a split. These remarks, transcribed from a tape recording of the session, were published in Grey's biography.


The effectiveness of the presidential address—not by itself, but certainly as one among a number of influences—in laying to rest the issue of local church autonomy may be testified to by the circumstance that never since 1953 has this issue risen with any force before the Convention. Several of the presidents have made statements on the issue in their addresses, to be sure, but not in the context of a specific controversy confronting the Convention; it has been done more as a public affirmation of a recognized principle.  

THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY

As previously indicated, the issue of local church autonomy (or the advisory nature of the Convention), theological controversy (or doctrinal purity), and a doctrinal test for fellowship in the Convention are all interrelated. Consider a situation in which a local church receives members who have never been immersed (the only mode of baptism practiced by Southern Baptists, and generally the only mode accepted). Someone proposes that the Convention withdraw fellowship from that church. Someone else observes that this action would constitute a doctrinal test for fellowship and that if the Convention attempts to tell a local church how it
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must observe the ordinances or how it must interpret certain doctrinal teachings then it is violating the autonomy of that church. In this hypothetical example all three of the issues are involved.

Despite this general interrelatedness, there were occasions when one or the other of these issues arose without involving the others in so direct a way. In order to avoid duplication where possible, major attention will be given in this section to those instances in which the question of doctrinal purity, or some form of theological controversy, did not so directly involve either of the other two related issues, although some reference to addresses already cited will be made.

The Alldredge amendment, which Lee opposed in 1950 and which was discussed in the preceding section, involved the autonomy of the local churches, but it also involved ecumenicity and doctrinal purity. It was aimed at preventing persons who belonged to churches affiliated with the Federal Council of Churches from holding official positions in the Convention. In simple terms, Alldredge objected to movements toward church union or ecumenicity. But the ground of that objection was doctrinal. Such union would bring a church into relationship with other churches who held doctrines which it could not conscientiously endorse; thus the question was, at its heart, doctrinal. In dealing with the issue in his message, Lee did not discuss the issue in the full range of its implications; he limited himself to an emphasis upon
the advisory nature of the Convention--the autonomy of the churches.

It is true that he did refer to some of Southern Baptists' central doctrines, but he did not deal with them in depth, nor were they made a central part of his argument.

Although the Alldredge amendment was dead when he delivered his 1951 address, Lee took one parting shot at ecumenicity, this time basing his objection upon doctrinal grounds rather than the autonomy of the churches:

We are a Baptist body berated. Berated sometimes because we are not to be inveigled into ecumenical adventures that propose Christian unity linked with compromise. The vast majority of us believe that Christian unity in any body which does not adhere strictly to divine principles of evangelical truth embodied in the New Testament is impossible. To unite various religious bodies with their contradictory doctrines, on anything less than clear teachings of the Holy Scriptures, is to persuade lions to give over their appetite for meat, or the Philistines to have no scissors for Samson's locks.

Though we are alarmed at dire threats of atheistic Communism and its rabid and rapid political and military domination of great areas of the world, do not just as great dangers lie in compromise, as to the content and emphasis of the Gospel itself?--or in the impaired faith in the essentials of Christianity itself? Can strength come to our evangelical testimony and helpful fuel be added to the revival fires already burning by our joining a super-church organization? Would not the inward decadence that would result from such compromising union be the precursor of dangers as subtle as outside malicious assaults? Seeking no National or World-Council feigned and artificial affiliation, our strength for the present and the future will not be in putting on the ill-fitting armour of any ecclesiastical and ecumenical Saul which denies a number of the supreme affirmations of Christianity. With no claims of self-righteousness, our ears must be dull--
dull for the glory of God and the welfare of the causes we espouse as Southern Baptists—to the so-called "one voice of Protestantism" which, emphasizing social issues more than Gospel proclamation, protests, I fear, no existent evil much more strongly than it protests some of the eternal verities of Christianity.

Lee linked this scathing denunciation of unionism with a denunciation of the controversial spirit which it engendered when, later in the address, he said:

For the dead, the living, the unborn, we are not to be folk of jumble, jangle, jargon, decrepitude, despair—bawling brethren of complaint and brawling Baptists of acrimonious argument and criticism. For our present, we are to be feet for the lame and eyes for the blind—with hand stretched out in spiritual friendship to sinners but with that hand capable of being made into a fist that would strike like the hammer of Thor against evils that would lead our greatest graces to the grave and leave the world no copy.

Lee's reasoning seems to have followed these lines: No Baptist wants to engender evils; evils would result from compromising doctrinal positions; doctrinal positions would have to be compromised in order to unite the denominations; therefore, no Baptist would want to unite the denominations. He implied that one evil already had been engendered, just by raising the issue. Baptists were already involved in argument and criticism.
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As the Alldredge amendment involved doctrinal purity and ecumenicity as subsidiary concerns, so the Gardner committee reports involved ecumenicity and a doctrinal test for fellowship as subsidiary concerns. The two recommendations adopted in 1953 spoke respectively to these two issues. While Grey declared himself to be opposed to ecumenicity and in favor of convictions related to doctrinal purity, he opposed the Convention's assuming a role of policeman for the churches; that would violate their autonomy.

J.W. Storer, who succeeded Grey as president, reacted to previous controversies rather than confronting current controversies in his 1954 address. Since there was no controversial issue openly before the Convention that year, no other interpretation of his remarks seems plausible. Of course, a doctrinal storm which had broken once could break again, and perhaps pouring oil on the waters before they became troubled might have been wise strategy, but there do not seem to have been any storm clouds on the horizon. Rather, Storer seems to have referred to doctrinal matters as a means of identifying with the previous thinking of his audience and with that portion of the audience which might still have been occupied in the same mental territory; he was establishing common ground. Then he moved his audience with him to the ground he wished them to occupy:
What immediately claims our thinking, then, is that we be assured our Convention is still under the dominant direction of the Holy Spirit, from whence, we are persuaded, came its entrance into the world. This is vital, in a day when the social Vesuvius is in turmoil, when Mars can scarce be restrained from drawing again that sword he has but so recently thrust into its uneasy scabbard.

Let us ever exalt the leadership of the Holy Spirit, and be grateful that we have no earthly head, and that we have no man or group of men who have laid out for us an anatomical and comprehensive organization in accordance with which all details must be exactly followed... Let it ever be remembered... that the function of the churches and of this Convention is not legislative, but declarative.

We recognize that there is a great problem in achieving unity in action without centralization of power. How can the Southern Baptist Convention, with its 29,496 churches, its 1,001 associations, its approximately 8,000,000 members, how can there be any semblance of unity where there is no authoritarian voice of command? It can only be done under the Spirit's guidance and in accordance with the law of life found in Ephesians 4:16, "All the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love."

So much for the making and meaning of our Convention, what of its mission?

We hold it to be true that there is continued justification for the existence of our Convention, not for its own sake but for the sake of an unblemished Christianity. For this, Southern Baptists have a responsibility which they may ignore, but which cannot be waived...

But our mission is more than that; it cannot be less than obedience to our Lord's command to seek out the lost and point to him as the only and complete Saviour from sin, to make of him both Lord and Master. Ours is the day of action—not debate. The voices of
wisdom, experience, and hope unite in one chorus,
"today!"—the voice of folly murmurs, "tomorrow."
God, keep us from becoming resolutionary sons of
revolutionary fathers! 61

This was the turning point from doctrine to action; the remainder of
the address sounded this distinct note of activism. Thus Storer
identified himself with a doctrinal position and with principles and
values dear to his audience, then sought to take the audience on with
him to action. His tactical method was that of shifting the emphasis
from one issue to another, from doctrinal debate to activism.

This final thrust seems to have been effective in laying the issue
of doctrinal purity to rest, for it has not been raised in the same way
since. Up to this point concern over doctrinal purity was focused
largely upon the churches; some felt that the churches needed doctrinal
policing. When the issue was next injected into the proceedings of the
Convention, it came as concern not with the practices of local churches
but with the teaching in some Convention institutions. Although the
terms are used essentially interchangeably within this paper, perhaps
"theological controversy" would be a better choice than "doctrinal
purity" for the remainder of this discussion, for the concern was with
speculative theology rather than with practical doctrines such as
baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Theological controversy seldom develops overnight; a little spark is struck somewhere, it is fanned a bit here and there, and finally a full-fledged conflagration sweeps through the Convention.

Such was the case with the controversy which swept the Convention in 1962, bringing one of the most desperate hours in Convention history.

The beginnings of this controversy are to be found some two years previously. Prior to Convention time in 1960, Pollard had received complaints about liberal teaching in Convention seminaries. No formal charges had been made and no documented evidence had been laid before him, so it was impossible to take any official action. However, he felt he had sufficient grounds for bringing the issue out into the open in his message, so he did precisely that. Having declared at the outset that he spoke as an individual, Pollard ultimately declared:

Southern Baptists need a purity of purpose and a purity of doctrine. It does matter what you believe. . . . Some of us have become so tolerant and wishy-washy in our doctrine that we are insipid and impotent. Unless we believe the great fundamental truths and stand by them, God has punishment in store for us.

We hear in this day and time from some of our educators a great deal about academic freedom. Well, I am in favor of academic freedom, but I don’t want a man or a woman in our Baptist colleges, universities, and seminaries who feels that he or she has the right to teach that the Word of God is not true. I do not feel that anyone in any institution supported by Baptist money and whose salary is paid by Baptist money has the right to stand before a class of preachers, or anybody else, and intimate that the miracles in the Word of God are not true. I don’t think that it is being done except possibly in one place and I’m not going
to say where it is because I do not know the facts. I have been told that it does exist. When I know, for sure, I am going to the president of that institution and to the board of trustees. I don't want anybody teaching in our seminaries who says that this idea of God holding back the waters for the children of Israel is just a mirage—that there is no truth in it—they walked across on reeds. In my judgment, that is a lie. I believe that God held the waters back and the children of Israel marched on dry land. If you do not believe the miracles in the Word of God, get out of our seminaries! . . .

We believe in the person of Christ. We believe he is the only begotten Son of God. We believe that we are not saved by his life. We are saved by his death and by the power of the atoning blood and because of repentance in our hearts and faith in Jesus Christ as our personal Saviour. . . .

Let me say this other word and I think the Convention will endorse it. I said I was speaking as an individual. . . . I said to the presidents of our colleges, universities, and seminaries and to the boards of trustees, wherever they are, that if you have a man or a woman who is not teaching the truth, who is criticizing the Word of God and making light of the divine nature of Jesus Christ and of the power of the atoning blood; and if you have somebody on your faculty who is ridiculing the Southern Baptist Convention program and holding it up to scorn, then you are under a mandate from the Southern Baptist Convention to fire that man or woman before night. Your academic freedom stops at a certain point!

It is unnecessary to specify the seminary involved in Pollard's remarks; actually, four of the seminaries, as well as the Sunday School Board, were involved in the controversy before it was
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finally settled in 1963. It should be sufficient to note the following circumstances: (1) Theodore Clark of New Orleans Seminary had published *Saved by His Life* in 1959 and the Baptist state papers had carried letters and articles reflecting criticism. Pollard's assertion, "We believe in the person of Christ. We believe he is the only begotten Son of God. We believe that we are not saved by his life. We are saved by his death...," could hardly be interpreted other than as a slap at Clark. (2) Some complaint was registered against liberal teaching at Southeastern Seminary, but this was largely overshadowed by other developments. (3) Between the 1961 and 1962 Conventions, two seminary professors were subjected to public criticism: Dale Moody at Southern and Ralph Elliott at Midwestern. It was Elliott's book, *The Message of Genesis*, which finally brought the issue to a head at San Francisco in 1962. It is not unlikely that Pollard's reference to God's holding back the waters for the children of Israel was intended as a slap at Elliott. Although his book had not yet been published, he was teaching at Midwestern Seminary. (4) The Sunday School Board had been criticized for its use of the International Sunday School Lesson; the outlines and related materials were copyrighted by the National Council of Churches and the Board's paying copyright fees for the use of the materials was viewed by some as supporting the National Council, to which there was objection in
some circles. The Sunday School Board was later criticized for publishing and selling Elliott's book and it has come under fire since for publishing other "liberal" views. This criticism will be treated further in the examination of Criswell's confrontation with theological controversy.

Although he stopped short of naming persons and institutions, Pollard's tactical method of confronting theological controversy was that of direct statement. It seems noteworthy that Pollard defended the Sunday School Board although he attacked liberal teachers in the schools:

I thank God for the Sunday School Board, and I stand here today to tell you that the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention is all right. I stand here to tell you that the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention has done more to strengthen our churches and more to do our work, the work of the Lord Jesus Christ, than any of us can ever dream. Thank God for the Sunday School Board.  

There can be little doubt that the portion of Pollard's address dealing specifically with theological controversy was intended to be motivational. Although he professed to speak as an individual, not "officially" as the president of the Convention, he clearly sought to marshal Convention support for his position:
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that if you have a man or a woman who is not teaching the truth, who is criticizing the Word of God and making light of the divine nature of Jesus Christ and the power of the atoning blood; and if you have somebody on your faculty who is ridiculing the Southern Baptist Convention program and holding it up to scorn, then you are under a mandate from the Southern Baptist Convention to fire that man or woman before night.

Judging by the chorus of "amens" and the thunder of applause which followed this declaration, there is no question that the Convention enthusiastically endorsed it. Had it been possible to put the matter before the Convention in the form of a motion at that moment, its passage would have been assured.

In this instance Pollard took the popular side of the controversy. It was not necessary for him to argue the disputed points of view; he needed only to declare himself in favor of the conservative position.

Unfortunately, such a confrontation settled nothing. Although the speaker evoked enthusiastic support from his audience, avoidance of any discussion of the controverted theological points left the issue unresolved. Actually, it probably heightened the controversy, as it served to polarize the Convention constituency into "liberal" and "conservative" camps on the basis of emotionally laden labels or speaker ethos instead of on the basis of actual doctrinal conviction born of an understanding of the points at issue.

\[\text{Ibid., p. 80.}\]
Although the tone of this portion of his address was argumen-
tative, the treatment was not. Pollard did not state a thesis and
support it with reasoning or evidence. He simply declared his view
and then played to the audience for response, which he got with
enthusiasm and in abundance.

Some of the results of Pollard's confrontation with theological
controversy are identifiable. The effort to get the Sunday School
Board away from the National Council of Churches in its use of the
International Sunday School Lesson materials was fruitless. There
can be little question that Pollard's strong declaration of confidence
in the Board was at least partially responsible for this outcome.

Harvey T. Whaley, a pastor from Beaumont, Texas, offered a
resolution viewed by some as directed at Pollard's comments:

Be it resolved by this Convention that we respectfully
suggest the inappropriateness and the inadvisability of
expressing in public statements either from this platform
or in the public press vague and generalized doubts and
suspicions concerning the integrity of the dedicated men
and women who serve on the faculties and in the
administrations of our schools and colleges, universities
and seminaries. 

This resolution did not get out of committee; according to committee
chairman J.D. Grey--himself a previous Convention president--it was
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viewed as an infringement upon the rights of anyone to express himself. The resolution verifies the assessment that Pollard's remarks did not meet with unanimous approval; its death probably verifies the inference that the Convention was overwhelmingly in support of Pollard.

The Convention adjourned without taking specific action on any aspect of this controversy. Conditions external to the Convention remained essentially unchanged and moved toward their eventual climax in 1962-1963.

Pollard modified his statement somewhat, but he maintained the same position in 1961 that he had in 1960:

We're putting on great campaigns for our colleges, universities, and seminaries, and I believe in them. My record shows I believe in them. I've gone up and down the length and breadth of the Southern Baptist Convention promoting Christian education, and I'm also saying again this year that Southern Baptists want their seminaries and their schools to be Christian and they want them to be Baptist and we must remember that if the vat be unclean that which comes out will be sour. Keep our schools anchored to the Word of God. Some of our states are putting on great campaigns for Baptist schools, and they ought to; they ought to do it; we ought to do it. Our seminaries need more endowment. Our universities and colleges need more money. All of us know that. And I'm going to tell you one way that you school men can stir a wave of enthusiasm for fund raising, and that is: Tie your colleges, your universities, and your seminaries onto our
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Baptist program without any apology. It'll be easier to raise money.

It is not unreasonable to assume that adverse reaction to his 1960 statement caused him to modulate his declaration in 1961. The Texas text of this address contains a stronger statement on this point than that delivered to the Convention, yet not so strong as the one the preceding year:

... A school is judged by its products; and if any school, anywhere, by any name, fosters modernism, infidelity, unbelief and unrighteousness, let that school and the guilty parties repent of sin!

Again, as in 1960, Pollard did not argue for a position; he simply declared what he felt should be done.

Press response to Pollard's address reflects a situation similar to that of the previous year:

In his two years of forceful, colorful utterances as president of the Southern Baptist Convention, Ramsey Pollard always tried to assume full responsibility by saying, "I speak as an individual."

The audience response to his president's address at St. Louis, however, proved once again that most Southern Baptists like the way he talks. Throughout his typically Pollard message there were smiles and claps of satisfaction from messengers.
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It was clear from the response of the messengers that most of them liked what Dr. Pollard said and the way he said it.\footnote{Gainer E. Bryan, Jr., editor, Maryland Baptist, quoted in Arkansas Baptist, June 1, 1961, p. 13.}

Dr. Ramsey Pollard who finished his second term as president showed himself a master of assemblies and a leader of great effectiveness. He was always firm in presiding but never unfair to any. His address inspired courage in facing the problems besetting us as a people as he summoned Baptists to meet the menace of Communism and the even greater threats to religious liberty from those seeking to advance their religious institutions through tax support.\footnote{Richard N. Owen, editor, Baptist and Reflector, June 1, 1961, p. 5.}

Unquestionably Pollard rallied support for a conservative theological position; whether in doing so he promoted Convention unity is problematic. Convention unity appears to have been sacrificed for doctrinal purity.

Pollard's objections to "liberal" teachers seem to have focused upon three points. He first voiced objection to those who "teach that the Word of God is not true." This general condition would have to be a matter of interpretation, for it is doubtful that a teacher in a Baptist school would actually voice the assertion, "The Word of God is not true." What, then, would constitute such teaching? Pollard became more specific on this point. "I do not feel that anyone ... has the
right to stand before a class of preachers, or anybody else, and
intimate that the miracles in the Word of God are not true." While
becoming more specific, however, Pollard became more vague, for
he said, "intimate that the miracles . . . are not true." His concern
obviously was related to the miracles, but just what would constitute
"intimating" that the miracles are not true? Pollard became more
specific once again. "I don't want anybody teaching . . . that this idea
of God holding back the waters for the children of Israel is just a
mirage--that there is no truth in it--they walked across on reeds."
This, finally, seems to have been the point at issue. There is such
an interpretation of that portion of the Hebrew text. If a Hebrew
scholar were convinced that such a translation of the Hebrew text
were correct, and so taught, the question would still remain as to
whether this specific teaching about this specific passage constituted
an intimation that the miracles in the Word of God are not true, or
constituted teaching that the Word of God itself is not true. Pollard
obviously felt it did, and this seems to have been his line of reasoning.
Others did not put this construction upon the situation, and did not
agree with Pollard.

The second point was related to the first, but the wording in
which Pollard couched his objection suggested a slightly different
line of thinking:
... if you have a man or a woman who is not teaching the truth, who is criticizing the Word of God and making light of the divine nature of Jesus Christ and of the power of the atoning blood; and if you have somebody on your faculty who is ridiculing the Southern Baptist Convention program and holding it up to scorn....

"Not teaching the truth" would be a difficult matter with which to deal objectively. In order to establish that a teacher was not teaching the "truth," it would be necessary to identify all of that which is truth, and then show that the teacher involved was teaching something else. The insurmountable nature of this task is self-evident.

Again, "criticizing the Word of God and making light of the divine nature of Jesus Christ and of the power of the atoning blood" are constructions which would have to be placed upon specific words which might be uttered by a teacher. As interpretations, they involve subjective evaluations. A Diet of Worms would be necessary to establish such conditions.

The third point was "ridiculing the Southern Baptist Convention program and holding it up to scorn." This too would be a question of definition or construction. What specific words uttered by a teacher on a given occasion actually constituted "ridiculing the Southern Baptist Convention program..."?

It is evident that the controversy Pollard was confronting involved questions of definition (interpretation or construction) much more than it did questions of fact. Only his specification of God's
holding back the waters for the children of Israel was a question of fact which could be verified objectively. However, Pollard did not deal with this question; he had said, "I'm not going to say where it is because I do not know the facts." In the absence of the facts, the wisdom of making such generalized charges before the Convention is questionable, at best. Pollard's next statements would seem to reflect the wiser course of action. "I have been told that it does exist. When I know for sure, I am going to the president of that institution and to the board of trustees." Since it is the trustees, not the Convention, who have direct control over each institution, the matter might more properly have been laid before the appropriate trustees before being brought before the Convention. As it was, no recommendation was presented to the Convention for vote. Pollard seems to have been testing the popular sentiment; audience reaction made that sentiment perfectly clear. The theological controversy which existed at that time (as well as that which continues to exist) probably could have been reduced if the parties concerned had separated questions of fact from questions of definition; the Convention has had little success in attempting to set the boundaries of "truth." Indeed, the Convention has largely attempted to avoid any such specification, because it came into existence for the support of missions, not for the specification of theological "truth."
The storm which had been brewing over theological viewpoints finally broke in full force on the 1962 San Francisco Convention. Hobbs was in the first year of his presidency and had prepared his presidential address to deal specifically with the controversy. Without naming Pollard, Elliott, Midwestern Seminary, or anyone else involved, Hobbs came directly to grips with the issue. His confrontation was at once direct and profound. The directness of his treatment was in the substance of his message, however, not in its reference to specific persons or controverted theological points. It dealt with the deeper issue of the academic philosophy upon which theological investigation rested. Hobbs' tactical method, then, was general statement; he dealt with the general principles and philosophies involved, not the specific question of teaching the "truth" in Southern Baptist schools.

Hobbs' rhetorical approach was to present a motivational address. He sought to enable the messengers to face the theological controversy before them with all possible understanding of the nature of Biblical criticism; to that end there was a convincing element. The address combined the narrative and expository modes. Hobbs traced the rise and development of certain schools of theological thought and expounded the philosophical positions involved. He declared:
It is quite evident that present-day Christianity as a whole has not given the answer to the challenge which has been thrown down before our God. But somewhere God has a people which can and must give the answer. God has not left Himself without a witness. I would challenge Southern Baptists to be that witness. To do so we must blow with a certain sound the trumpet of the gospel of Christ. We must raise an ensign about which may rally all who love the Lord Jesus Christ sincerely.

His challenge to Southern Baptists to "be that witness" reveals a degree of motivational intent. He continued:

This does not mean ecumenicity! It means that each entity of the forces of Christ in its own way, and bound together by no bond save an unswerving love for Christ and an unfailing loyalty to His word, shall march forth to confront this world system with Christ's claims until the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

Why is Christianity so impotent in this crisis? To answer this question we must go back almost two hundred years to the rise of modern liberalism as it broke away from the conservative theology of the Reformation. In its extreme form this school of thought applied the rules of an exact but infant science to the basic elements of the Christian religion. Every tenet of its faith was put under the microscope of a humanistic philosophy which made man's intellect the measure of all things. That which did not conform to its preconceived standards was rejected from religious truth. The Bible was emasculated. Biblical supernaturalism was cast aside as the superstition of a credulous age. Even the person and work of Christ were hailed before the bar of pure reason. Some went so far as to deny that Jesus Christ ever lived, making Him the figment of the imagination of a learned Jew named Paul. 73
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It would be impossible to do full justice to Hobbs’s address without quoting the entire text, but it is too extensive. It is sufficient to say that he traced the rise of Scholastic Protestantism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, American liberalism in the nineteenth century, and the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy of the early twentieth century. Then he proceeded to analysis:

How may we analyze this theological struggle? Obviously three elements were involved: physical science, philosophy, and the Christian religion. Now each of these is a legitimate field of inquiry, and is related to man’s total experience.

The remainder of the first half of the address was largely an exposition of the roles and interrelatedness of these three elements in theological investigation. He indicated:

... Physical science deals with demonstrable facts and investigative theories in nature. It is concerned with cause and effect in the continuity of natural truth. Philosophy is concerned with the data produced by physical science and experience. It seeks to relate the whole to a single principle which will explain the universe and its component parts. The Christian religion, on the other hand, is concerned with man’s quest after God and His redemptive will and work. It involves the establishing of a personal communion between an infinite, holy God and a finite, sinful man. In short, science deals with causality, philosophy with rationality, and religion with personality.

Now there need be no conflict between these three areas of man’s experience. They pursue different tasks,
but they seek the same goal, truth. Each has its own basis of authority, method of procedure, criteria for evaluating truth, and means of drawing its conclusions with regard to reality. Each is autonomous within its own realm. . . .

Hobbs was laying the groundwork to come to grips with the basic issue involved in the controversy over "liberal" teaching in the schools:

We have seen that the roots of modern liberalism stem from the invasion of the realm of the Christian religion by physical science and philosophy. And the first attack was upon the Christian religion’s source of authority, the Bible. Now the Bible has nothing to fear from either science or philosophy. But its interpreters should insist upon its authority in the realm of religion. This authority is neither legal nor mechanical. It is spiritual and experiential. The Bible is authoritative in the Christian religion because its message is authenticated as it meets and satisfies the deepest needs of the human soul. In this realm neither science nor philosophy is qualified to speak the final word.

The Bible is not afraid of historical criticism. . . . Neither does the Bible fear the research of science. . . . The Bible need have no fear from comparative religion. . . .

No, the Bible fears neither science nor philosophy except as they seek to impose upon it their autonomy. To deny the supernatural in the Bible is for science and philosophy to say dogmatically what God can or cannot do because it does not submit to their standards of authority. This is neither scientific nor philosophical. For science to discount the miraculous on the basis that it is contrary to natural law is for it to conclude that it knows all of the laws of nature. This denies the very
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basis upon which scientific inquiry proceeds. And physical science in the last twenty-five years has uncovered too many natural laws hitherto unknown to man, for it to declare arbitrarily by what laws God can or cannot work. It would be far more scientific to say that neither science nor philosophy has a criterion by which to judge the supernatural. Such a judgment belongs to the autonomy of religion.  

After dealing with specific examples of theological controversy during the twentieth century, Hobbs sought to deal with Southern Baptists' relationship to theological controversy. He sought to call the Convention:

... to be God's witness in this crisis hour. Someone has said that Southern Baptists are God's last hope in this generation. They have not so proclaimed themselves. But if they are, let them be worthy of the mantle which such a declaration offers to them. If so, as I see it they must first resolve any problems within their own theological position. Four things I would suggest.

The four things Hobbs suggested were that Southern Baptists reaffirm their belief in the priesthood of all believers, that they recognize and practice the principle of unity in diversity, that they place a greater emphasis upon teaching and training their constituency, and that they look to their colleges and seminaries to play a major role in meeting the crisis of their age. Hobbs's position on each of these suggestions does not lend itself to simple summarization; perhaps it can best be
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characterized as moderate. In speaking of the priesthood of all believers, he declared "that every believer has the right and responsibility to read and interpret the Bible as he is led of the Holy Spirit." In developing this point, Hobbs stressed responsibility and the guidance of the Holy Spirit: "He must be certain that he is not led by some other spirit. God is not the author of confusion." In speaking of unity in diversity he asserted "that this principle of unity in diversity imposes upon every Southern Baptist a sacred trust. The emphasis should be placed upon 'unity,' not 'diversity.' Liberty is no excuse for license." In dealing with teaching the constituency, he declared: "Defend the faith they must. But defense is not enough. For in the last analysis each Southern Baptist determines his personal faith for himself." He made it clear that "this emphasis imposes a great responsibility upon each church and pastor." Unity and responsibility received more stress than diversity and privilege.

When Hobbs reached his fourth suggestion, that Southern Baptists look to their colleges and seminaries to play a major role in meeting the crisis of their age, he arrived at the focal point of his message. He continued to seek reconciliation:

... From time to time concern is manifested in this regard. Like any other Southern Baptist or state Baptist institution their schools are not above criticism. ... This concern indicates that Southern Baptists realize the vital role of these educational institutions
in the life of the denomination. They have seen the
departure of many denominations from their historic
faith begin in their colleges and seminaries. They have
a right to be concerned.

But this concern should be expressed in love, not
vindictiveness. To do otherwise only serves to defeat
a well intended purpose as it creates a gulf between the
churches and their schools. Nor should a particular
problem be generalized so as to throw a blanket of
suspicion about the entire educational family.78

Without arguing that Hobbs was necessarily saying so, it may be
suggested that Hobbs's characterization precisely fit the situation
surrounding the seminary controversy: vindictiveness and generalizing
a particular problem so as to throw a blanket of suspicion about the
entire educational family. The widespread demand that Elliott be
fired and his book be banned may be viewed as vindictive; simply
demanding the ouster of "liberal teachers" without specifying charges
constituted generalizing from a particular problem. A heresy-hunting
atmosphere descended upon Convention institutions.

During his presidency Hobbs visited with the faculties of all
six of the seminaries at the invitation of their presidents. Out of his
discussions with them had come four convictions which he enumerated:

First, this generation of seminary professors is
equal in fact or in potential to any in Southern Baptist
history. Second, these men and women are aware of
their responsibility and the trust placed in them by
their denomination. But they hunger for understanding
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and help by the denomination as they discharge this responsibility. Third, they respond favorably to any interest shown in their problems. Without exception they have expressed appreciation that the president of the Convention would take time out of a busy schedule to consider with them their problems. Fourth, these people are worthy of our trust and understanding. The vast majority of them, largely unnoticed by the denomination, are teaching and training their students in a way to gladden the heart of every Southern Baptist. I am not unaware of those areas in which problems have arisen or could arise. But these should be dealt with in particular, not in mass.

The ratio of such problems is no greater now than in past years.

Also on the basis of his meetings with the seminary faculties, Hobbs declared three affirmations: "Southern Baptists have a basic philosophy of theological education"; "Southern Baptists expect the administrations, trustees, and faculties of their seminaries to insure that this underlying philosophy of theological education is brought to a full fruition in the products thereof"; "for Southern Baptists to fulfill their purpose they must retain their theological distinctiveness."

When Hobbs reached that point in his address at which he suggested four things for Southern Baptists to do in order to resolve any problems within their own theological position, he revealed the clearly motivational nature of his intent. He was not seeking to convince his audience of a certain philosophical viewpoint for its own
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sake; that viewpoint was recommended for the sake of the difference
Hobbs expected it to make in Convention deliberations and subsequent
actions. Hobbs wanted to affect the behavior of the constituency.

In accomplishing his objective, Hobbs employed two revered
principles in which his audience could find meaning and with which
they could identify: the priesthood of all believers and unity in
diversity. His development of the first point implied that the priest-
hood of believers must extend to seminary professors as well as
others. Further, he employed the endorsement of an accepted
practice in Convention life: the teaching and training of the
constituency. Teaching and training are strong emphases of the
pulpit as well as local church organizations such as Sunday school,
Training Union, Woman's Missionary Union, and the Brotherhood.
Also, there are agencies on the Convention, state, and associational
levels to help these organizations in teaching and training. The fourth
suggestion, involving the seminaries, was thus linked to three others
which, because of their power to evoke meaning and identification,
should have been persuasive in the minds of the audience. This
procedure should have set up an enthymematic process in the minds
of the audience: "If we do not object to the first three suggestions,
then we should not object to the fourth."
Hobbs had thoroughly laid his foundation for dealing with the theological controversy surrounding the seminaries. The narration and exposition involved in the first half of his address clearly revealed his sagacity; his treatment obviously was not that of the spur of the moment or the top of his head. Further, he already enjoyed a fairly widespread reputation as a scholar. His character was well established; he was already recognized as a man of high integrity. His good will was demonstrated by such statements as these:

For the past year it has been my privilege to write upon request a little column which we have chosen to call "Baptist Beliefs." Some time ago one of our editors received a letter asking if this was "the Baptist belief." The editor wisely replied that it was not. Even though written by the president of the Southern Baptist Convention, it was but one Baptist's effort to state what he believed. And though this statement of the subjects treated probably approximated what is believed about them by most Southern Baptists, it was not intended to be a statement of "The Baptist belief."  

Three affirmations I would make. These are not the affirmations of the Southern Baptist Convention. Nor are they those of its president speaking ex cathedra. They are the affirmations of one Southern Baptist as he views the current theological scene in our denomination.  

In addition to these specific declarations which indicated that Hobbs was not attempting to force his position upon his audience, the tone of the entire address was that of compassion and humility, not pride,
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strife, and belligerence. Hobbs thus established a strong position of ethos with his audience.

That Hobbs viewed his task as that of a mediator is evidenced throughout the address. Repeatedly he voiced agreement with the underlying principle of one faction or the other; but he coupled that agreement with a statement which reflected the viewpoint on the other side of the question, with which he also indicated agreement. Thus, he was standing in the middle between two extremes, fulfilling the role of mediator. The following passages exemplify his technique:

First, Southern Baptists have a basic philosophy of theological education. It is not to teach theology for theology's sake. Rather it is to teach, train, and equip men and women for the purpose of providing a Bible-centered and informed leadership for Southern Baptist churches and institutions. Any program of theological education which proposes to do otherwise is to depart from the purpose of those who established and continue to maintain their seminaries.

This statement seemed to place him on the side of those who wanted to keep the seminaries "pure." Immediately he reflected sympathy for the other side:

This does not mean that they expect their seminaries to ignore current trends in theological thought. Theological thought is never static. Any graduate of Southern Baptist seminaries should be thoroughly at home in this atmosphere. But he should be so grounded in the historical and grammatical elements of the Bible, and so orientated in the current theological scene, as to be able to separate the wheat from the chaff as he shepherds his flock.
Within the succeeding paragraph he reflected this same kind of dual sympathy:

Such a result involves not only the contents of instruction but the method of instruction. Someone has described some of the current methods of teaching as the "shock" method designed to produce thought. This method may be used beneficially in theological education as in psychological therapy. But it should ever be remembered that the difference between shock therapy and an electrocution is the skill of the technician and the amount of electricity applied.

Hobbs's conclusion further reflected his attempt to bring the various factions together toward the center:

The words of Doctor Hoffmann may well be a challenge to Southern Baptists. I would summon this Convention to accept that challenge! This does not mean that it shall forsake theological education. It means that with definiteness of purpose Southern Baptists shall support it with renewed fervor and strength.

Someone is going to shape and guide this new theology. And Southern Baptists are best fitted to do so. They are a "grass roots" people. Their success is due largely to the response given by the "grass roots" to the Gospel as Southern Baptists preach it. If Southern Baptists forsake their conservatively, middle-of-the-road interpretation of the gospel, the "grass roots" will seek elsewhere for spiritual food and guidance. And Southern Baptists as such largely will have lost their reason for being.

In approaching his final appeal, Hobbs indicated that "this is not a call for retreat but for advance"; "Southern Baptists must look to their colleges and seminaries for guidance"; "this is not to say that
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Southern Baptists will forsake their traditional theological position"; then he concluded:

... In short, Southern Baptists must judge their philosophy, and science, according to Christ, and not Christ according to philosophy and science.

Yes, this is an age of crisis. But Southern Baptists are not afraid of crises. They were born in a crisis. Their history reveals that they have passed through seven major crises. And Southern Baptists emerged from each stronger and more resolute than ever before. They have always turned a crisis into a conquest. God grant that they shall do so now!83

Another passage reflected Hobbs's good will and his role of mediation; it further embodied the direct implication that the Convention should not intervene directly in the current crisis.

He was developing the second of his three affirmations, that the seminary administrations, trustees, and faculties should insure the underlying philosophy of theological education:

The original framers of the Constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention wisely provided that the Convention shall not violate the charters of its institutions. This provision places a heavier responsibility upon the elected personnel of these institutions. The problems which invariably will arise should be dealt with by them co-operatively, courageously, patiently, prayerfully, and realistically.

The position of a trustee of a theological seminary is most vital. If ever one should be as wise as a serpent, as harmless as a dove, and as courageous as a lion, he should. He is a steward of eternal verities. He is the
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link between the denomination and its centers of theological training. . . .

One of the most vital functions of his office is to help to preserve within the teaching process the delicate balance between academic freedom and academic responsibility. And in this he must have the full cooperation of the administration and the faculty.

Southern Baptists, on the one hand, should never deny to their seminaries the right of academic freedom. To do so would be to stifle the very genius of theological investigation and interpretation. On the other hand, they should never cease to require academic responsibility. . . . 84

The measurable results of this confrontation are found almost exclusively in newspaper reports and Convention resolutions:

The address of President Herschel H. Hobbs was advanced on the program in hope his appeal for "unity amid diversity" and for turning a "crisis into conquest" would sidestep the theological issue. But this convention, provincial in makeup for meeting on the Pacific Coast and far from any cross-section of Baptists, wanted to shout with any waving of the flag for orthodoxy. It didn't have time or inclination to examine the flag.

President Hobbs was at his best in his presidential message. 85

The pioneer states of the west, plus a goodly number from such states as Texas and Oklahoma, were in the saddle. They were ready to declare for orthodoxy, but without daring to spell it out. They wanted to slap down any accused of being off-center but without waiting to be sure of guilt. 86
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The Southern Baptist Convention received from its president a challenge to turn its theological "crisis into a conquest" as it measured differences against the teachings of Christ.

Herschel H. Hobbs took cognizance of the controversy over The Message of Genesis, by Ralph H. Elliott of Midwestern Seminary, and other seminary battles in his presidential address prepared for the convention's first day of business.

None of the controversies was specified in the address but there could be no doubt of his appeal for "unity in diversity" in the hope theological debate would not spoil the annual sessions. 87

Although not a reaction to Hobbs's address, the following quotation reflects something of the atmosphere in which the address was delivered and indicates that Hobbs was not alone in his position:

Atlanta's Roy O. McClain delivered one of the "bombshells" of the Southern Baptist Pastors' Conference, chiding pastors who were trying to "climb the denominational ladder to glory by condemning intellectuals in the name of defending the word" of God. 88

Surveying the entire Convention, not just the presidential address, one editor reported the two unsuccessful attempts to get Elliott's book banned. Ralph Powell of Kansas City, Missouri (where Midwestern Seminary is located), agreed to withdraw his motion; Ben D. Windham of Portland, Oregon, offered an identical
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motion later and it was defeated "three-to-one." This editor continued in his report:

But there were those present who had come to straighten Southern Baptists out on their orthodoxy, and nothing could stand in their way. They and those who followed in their train were as closed to reasoning, through the early sessions of the convention, as a stampeding herd. There could be no appeal to reason as they demonstrated a strange spirit of haughty distrustfulness.

For one thing, it was a thrilling experience to see the stature of our Convention president as he steered our ship through the stormy waters. We can be thankful that God matched our dark hours with a man of the physical, spiritual, and intellectual stamina of Herschel Hobbs. Dr. Hobbs' Christian statesmanship, reflected in Christ-like patience, humility, fair-mindedness and good judgment, will long be remembered.

In his review of the presidential address, another editor said:

No one can deny this is a time of crisis. It is an age of confusion and anxiety. It is the moment that calls for wise leadership. The address of the president of the Southern Baptist Convention illustrates such.

Dr. Herschel Hobbs gives evidence of mature Christian statesmanship in his message to the Convention at San Francisco. He deals boldly and honestly with our basic problem as Southern Baptists.

Our problem today is one of spiritual crisis. It is theological. It is Christological. Our Convention president calls us to turn the present crisis into a spiritual conquest. His message shows he firmly believes God has the answer for our problems, this answer is in Christ.
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He made a strong plea for Southern Baptists to have confidence in their seminary professors and college teachers. The Convention leader wisely points out also that we must recognize and practice the principle of unity in diversity. The president of the Convention gives wise and timely counsel to Southern Baptists. His message, which we plan to carry in a later issue, should be read carefully by all.  

The following week, this editor summarized Convention action:

Messengers to the 105th session of the Southern Baptist Convention voted overwhelmingly to reaffirm their faith in the entire Bible as the authoritative, authentic, infallible Word of God.

After three hectic days of motions, amendments and mandates covering the whole theological waterfront, messengers closed out in peaceful fellowship the 105th session of the Southern Baptist Convention here with resolutions on communism, Christian morality and observance of the Lord's Day.

The resolution on communism cautioned Baptists against accusing people of being communists without sufficient evidence.

A theological dispute pitting different theological viewpoints among Southern Baptists dominated this national meeting.

Center of this dispute was a book, "The Message of Genesis," by Ralph Elliott, professor of Old Testament at Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Mo.

Many took issue with some of Elliott's interpretations of the first book of the Bible. It was countered that Elliott had a right to his own opinions and to probe for more light on the Scriptures.  92
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Two Convention actions probably can be related in some measure to Hobbs's address: K. Owen White (who succeeded Hobbs as president in 1963) offered a resolution which was divided into two parts upon which the vote was taken separately:

I move that the messengers to this convention by standing vote re-affirm their faith in the entire Bible as the authoritative, authentic, infallible Word of God. 93

This section was unanimously adopted. The second stated:

That we express our abiding and unchanging objection to the dissemination of theological views in any of our seminaries which would undermine such faith in the historical accuracy and doctrinal integrity of the Bible, and that we courteously request the trustees and administrative officers of our institutions and other agencies to take such steps as shall be necessary to remedy at once those situations where such views now threaten our historic position. 94

This second section was passed by a two-to-one vote. 95

The other action which probably reflects at least to a degree upon the presidential address was a recommendation of the Executive Committee to establish a committee to study the Convention's 1925 "Statement of Baptist Faith and Message." This committee was to be
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under the chairmanship of the Convention president and was to include the presidents of the Baptist state conventions related to the Southern Baptist Convention; it was to bring a report to the Convention in Kansas City in 1963. It is possible that the establishment of this committee helped to clear the atmosphere and relieve the pressures in the 1962 Convention.

The specific effectiveness of this address is difficult to assess. There were forces other than the address which were working in the same direction; it is impossible to measure the precise influence of each. Further, it is impossible to declare what actions would have transpired had the address not been delivered. Despite such limitations, however, it seems reasonable to suggest that the address was, to some degree, instrumental in preventing a rupture in Convention fellowship. The Convention refused to have Elliott's book banned. It further refused to intervene directly in demanding his dismissal from Midwestern Seminary. On the other hand, it did affirm its faith in the Bible, and it established a committee to study its previous "Statement of Faith and Message." All of these actions were commensurate with the mediating position taken by Hobbs.
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Hobbs emphasized the policy of leaving specific questions related to the seminaries in the hands of the trustees of those institutions. In 1958 there had been an upheaval in Southern Seminary over thirteen professors who came into conflict with the president over administrative matters. There were some who wanted the Convention to step in and take action. In his 1959 address, President Hays counseled leaving the matter in the hands of the trustees instead of bringing it before the entire Convention; his counsel was followed and the matter was resolved without becoming a divisive issue before the Convention itself. The degree to which Hobbs's similar counsel in 1962 was effective in bringing about similar Convention response may not be precisely measurable, but at least it is evident that the Convention did not violate his counsel. To the extent that the failure of his audience to take measures in opposition to his recommendations is an evidence of speaker success, Hobbs may be declared effective in his 1962 address. Strictly on the grounds of human speculation, Hobbs probably deserves a large portion of the credit for preventing a rift in the Convention and his presidential address likely was a primary force in that direction. It can hardly escape notice that Pollard, without an earned degree, called upon the schools to fire any professor "who is not teaching the truth," whereas Hobbs, the following president, and one of the most intellectual,
counseled the Convention to understand and respect the approach of historical criticism and its role in theological investigation.

When the Convention met in Kansas City in 1963, the issues before it were essentially identical to those of the previous year. Although the Sunday School Board had withdrawn his book from publication, Ralph Elliott was still the center of controversy and the doctrinal issue was still unsettled pending the report from the committee studying the "Statement of Faith and Message." With elected bodies specifically responsible for these two areas of contention, however, the danger of Convention disruption was greatly alleviated.

The situation was still unsettled enough to prompt Hobbs to deal with these two issues, if only briefly, in his address, a combination of narration and exposition titled "God and History." The address dealt largely with events in history but emphasized the interpretation and exposition of the significance of those events. At about the two-thirds mark in his address, Hobbs spoke directly of the controversies facing the Convention:

Now what shall we say about Southern Baptists and history? We are assembled in a historical context. But what of the context of Holy History? Shall we assemble and adjourn only to return to our "cool, sequestered" business-as-usual way? Or will we seize the challenge and opportunity which God extends to us? If so, there are five things which seem to be required of us.
Second, we must resolve our theological problems with Christian patience and love. For the greater part of two years these matters have absorbed a large part of our concern and effort. Last year the Convention assembled in San Francisco made certain affirmations and requests which still are in effect. Since that time responsible, conscientious men have made decisions which to them seemed necessary and wise. From time to time in the future other decisions will be made. Whether one agrees with these decisions or not, the fact remains that Southern Baptists have dealt and will continue to deal with their problems in keeping with their pattern of life extending over a period of one hundred and eighteen years.

From the seminary problem, Hobbs turned his attention to the doctrinal statement:

Since we last met a committee of your own choosing has been prayerfully at work drawing up a proposed statement of our faith and message. This committee's report will be considered at a time designated by your Committee on Order of Business. If the work of this committee accomplishes nothing else, it has demonstrated that brethren of Christian conviction and love can work together. When twenty-four men from one side of this Convention area to the other, and as close as they are to the people in their given areas, can sit down together, and, without a single serious theological difference, agree on a statement of faith; and when

97 Reference was to White's resolution.

98 Reference was to the Midwestern Seminary trustees and perhaps the Sunday School Board.

99 Reference was to the policy of leaving the administration of the agencies and institutions in the hands of the trustees and boards rather than attempting direct Convention control.
the faculties of our six seminaries can study that statement without voicing an objection to its theological concepts, do not tell me that Southern Baptists are not basically united in their theology! It would be tragic therefore, if, in this strategic moment in history, we should spend our time gnawing on old bones or stirring among burnt out ashes.

Tensions exist in the area of theology. Yes. Theology is a living thing. We have never been without tension in our theology. We are not without tension in our theology now, nor should we ever be. When a muscle loses its tension, it loses its effectiveness. Theology is the muscles of our denomination. We should not be using these muscles to bash in one another’s heads. Instead we should be using them to lift toward God a world which writhes in the throes of sin and death. And we must continue to love one another and this lost world as we do so.

Thus, by the tactical method of direct statement, Hobbs came to grips with the controversial issues facing the Convention. As he had done the previous year, Hobbs refrained from naming specific persons or institutions; his audience was well enough informed that specific names were not necessary. Hobbs’s aims and purposes, as well as his methods of achieving them, were complex. He had the immediate practical purpose of setting the stage for the settlement of the theological controversy through adoption of the statement on faith and message—a motivational aim. But a larger aim seems to have been to gain Southern Baptists’ commitment to the task of playing
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100 *Annual, 1963, pp. 91-92.*
their proper role in history; this would still involve a motivational aim. Bringing his audience to the point of commitment, however, would involve an attitudinal response; thus a convincing purpose was evident. In order to achieve these objectives, Hobbs coupled exposition with appeal. He explained the Convention's involvement with controversy, indicated what steps had been taken to alleviate it and what steps were yet to be taken, then appealed for proper attitudes to bring it all to pass:

We must resolve our theological problems with Christian patience and love. . . .

... It would be tragic therefore, if, in this strategic moment in history, we should spend our time gnawing on old bones or stirring among burnt out ashes.

Tensions exist in the area of theology. Yes, ... We should not be using these muscles to bash in one another's heads. Instead we should be using them to lift toward God a world which writhes in the throes of sin and death. And we must continue to love one another and this lost world as we do so.

Although there was sound logic behind the statements, Hobbs's appeal was basically emotional; he was working on attitudes. He evidently hoped that those attitudes ultimately would be made apparent in the actions, or in some cases lack of actions, of Convention messengers.

101 Ibid.
Hobbs's basic proposition in this section was cast as a policy assertion: "We must resolve our theological problems with Christian patience and love." The form was logical, the appeal emotional; Hobbs made no attempt to prove the assertion. The reasonableness of his position was revealed in the conclusion he reached from working with the committee to study the statement of faith and message:

When twenty-four men from one side of this Convention area to the other, and as close as they are to the people in their given areas, can sit down together, and, without a single serious theological difference, agree on a statement of faith; and when the faculties of our six seminaries can study that statement without voicing an objection to its theological concepts, do not tell me that Southern Baptists are not basically united in their theology!

The essence of his point was that actual experience had demonstrated the essential unity of Southern Baptists. The logical implication was that there was nothing for Southern Baptists to fight about, but Hobbs did not convey this message logically; instead he turned to a metaphor which was basically emotional in its appeal:

It would be tragic therefore, if, in this strategic moment in history, we should spend our time gnawing on old bones or stirring among burnt out ashes.

The primitive nature of the imagery in this metaphor is striking. There is the suggestion of a pack of half-wild dogs growling and snarling at one another over old dry bones from which the meat was stripped months previously, and a savage poking dumbly at the ashes
of last week's fire mutely wondering where the heat went, perhaps thinking that by stirring and prodding he can bring it back. The suggestion makes Southern Baptists look rather pathetic. Further, his appeal to love one another and the world while lifting the world toward God was at least as emotional as logical.

Editor Erwin L. McDonald succinctly summarized Convention response to the theological controversy:

Midwestern Seminary, located in the convention city, came in for several attempted attacks or house-cleanings at the hands of those who alleged "liberalism" still rampant there. But the convention refused to do more than adopt a gentle reminder, similar to one directed by the San Francisco convention a year ago, "respectfully requesting" seminary trustees to be alert to correct any instances of liberalism and asking that a progress report be made to the convention next year.

With a self-styled conservative as president, Southern Baptists can expect a continuing emphasis against any liberalism that would undermine the Bible as the revealed and infallible word of God. But President White asserted in his first press conference that he did not feel he had any mandate to campaign against those of different theological views from his own. It is this editor's feeling that the atmosphere has finally been cleared of most of the clouds that have been threatening for months and that calmer and more purposeful
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102 Reference was to K. Owen White, elected president for 1963-1964. The words, "revealed and infallible word of God," echo the words of White's resolution adopted by the Convention in 1962.
days lie ahead. The forecast is fair to partly cloudy with not much change in temperature.\textsuperscript{103}

McDonald shed additional light on the subject in a news article carried elsewhere in the same issue:

\begin{quote}
The Southern Baptist Convention's system of controlling and operating its institutions and agencies through duly elected boards was reconfirmed in actions at Kansas City last week.

Focal point in the latest showdown was Midwestern Seminary, youngest of the convention's six seminaries, located in Kansas City. Some of the messengers who alleged that "liberalism" was still represented in the faculty and teaching on the Kansas City campus sought convention directives to the school.

... the convention outvoted by overwhelming majorities every effort to secure convention censure of the seminary.\textsuperscript{104}

Hobbs's role in contributing to unity and harmony can hardly be questioned, but it must be recognized that his address was only one element in that role:

Being a theologian of distinction he was in a position to speak to theologians and scholars, and being a humble servant of the Lord he had access to the ears of men and women on every level of life.\textsuperscript{105}

Christian patience and love were projected as elements in the solution of the theological problems of Southern Baptists when their president, Herschel H. Hobbs,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{103} \textit{Arkansas Baptist}, May 16, 1963, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., p. 5.
\textsuperscript{105} E.S. James, editor, \textit{Baptist Standard}, May 22, 1963, p. 5.
\end{flushright}
delivered the annual president's message before the 106th session of the convention.

It was a convention that found smooth sailing for the first three sessions but ran into turbulent waters during discussion following the report on Wednesday morning of the Committee on Baptist Faith and Message. Discussion on Midwestern Seminary also provided rough going for parts of two sessions on Wednesday. Then the sea became relatively calm again for the remainder of the meeting.

Perhaps the most unusual thing about the convention was that even with this spirit of animosity in evidence the people yielded to parliamentary procedure and proceeded from session to session with a minimum of dissatisfaction.

Looking back on Kansas City we are more impressed than ever with Southern Baptists' Statement of Faith and Message. If Baptists believe anything they hold to "unity in diversity." President Herschel Hobbs' stress on it met hearty response. It is marvelous we have so few differences.

Hobbs delivered the presidential address, in which he called for unity in diversity and Christian patience and love in resolving theological problems. As chairman he presided over the stormy sessions involving Midwestern Seminary. As chairman of the Committee on Baptist Faith and Message he vacated the chair of the
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106 Don McGregor, associate editor, ibid., p. 8.
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Convention in order to present the report of that committee. Despite the fact that he was seriously ill with a viral infection, was feeling the effects of the medication administered for that infection, was unquestionably under emotional strain, and was physically depleted from days of speaking and presiding, Hobbs did a masterful job of presenting the committee's report, of answering questions relative to it, and of defending it against attack. His performance under these conditions strengthened even more his already favorable ethos with the messengers. 110 These conditions are cited to emphasize the observation that the presidential address does not occur in a vacuum; the effect of the president upon the Convention is not limited to his address. The statement on "Baptist Faith and Message" was adopted without change as presented by the committee. This is not to say that there were not proposed changes, considerable discussion, and heated debate, but Hobbs helped to nullify the effect of all of these influences and bring the Convention to adopt the statement without alteration. Although not a formal Baptist "creed"--the statement serves as information to the churches and as a guideline to the various agencies of the Convention--the presentation of the statement permitted full and

110 This investigator attended the 1963 Convention and was present for all sessions.
open discussion of controverted theological points. Those who had a position they wished expressed had an opportunity to state it. After the voting was done there was not much left to argue over; the democratic procedures had done their work.

The newspaper reports quoted above made reference to the two Convention actions related to theological controversy: one a "gentle reminder, similar to one directed by the San Francisco convention ... 'respectfully requesting' seminary trustees to be alert to correct any instances of liberalism ..." and the other the report from the Committee on Baptist Faith and Message which was adopted without change. The Convention's refusal to by-pass the Midwestern Seminary trustees and its adoption of the statement of faith were in keeping with the position espoused by Hobbs in his address. It is reasonable to conclude that his address was at least one factor in bringing about these two conditions.

By the time the Convention met in 1964, the theological controversy was essentially a non-issue. White had been an outspoken conservative, but he "asserted in his first press conference that he did not feel he had any mandate to campaign against those of different theological views from his own." With the departure of Elliott from Midwestern Seminary before the 1964 Convention, there was nothing of significance for the messengers to scrap about. Perhaps anticipating
that such might not be the case, White prepared a rather lengthy and straightforward message on the theological atmosphere; that was the first main section of his presidential address, "For Liberty and Light,"

This section comprised about one-half of the address, the other half comprising the introduction, three other main heads, and conclusion. If quantity is any measure, White evidently felt the theological issue still of some importance.

White employed the expository mode in constructing a convincing address aimed at gaining a commitment to the present challenge facing Southern Baptists. His primary appeal was to the principle of consistency which he could safely assume was highly valued by his audience. His introduction was built around the reiterated theme, "to the past we are indebted." By the time this phrase had been stated three times in slightly over four minutes, the past to which he referred had been described, and the areas of indebtedness exemplified, the point was well established. This formed the basis of his appeal to consistency in the remainder of the address. The essence of his position on the theological atmosphere was expressed in his closing remarks in that section of his message:

Let us avoid strife, division, bitterness, and prejudice, but let us also hold earnestly to the great distinctives of our Christian faith as revealed in God's Word. Let us keep separate from that which would dilute our convictions, weaken our denominational life, or bring upon us the spiritual lethargy
which has befallen others. We wish our sister denominations well in their efforts to exalt Christ. Recognizing and confessing our own shortcomings, let's pay the price of eternal vigilance in preserving and expanding that which we have under God.

In this section of his address, White's appeal was for courtesy and harmony coupled with conviction. The other sections of the address dealt with "this present world," "race relationships" (to be examined subsequently in this chapter), and "determining our goals." The conclusion was pure appeal (no summary):

Surely, Southern Baptists are come to the kingdom "for such an hour as this." With hearts single to the glory of God, with clearly defined objectives and purposes, with a positive, plain scriptural message, with a deep sense of urgency, with a great, united forward thrust in evangelism which shall envision and encompass the whole world, we must now address ourselves to our responsibility with a seriousness of purpose which will meet the appalling needs and unprecedented circumstances which surround us. The world hastens on in its atheistic, profane, immoral, brainwashed, materialistic way, to certain and perhaps cataclysmic judgment and destruction. In this world stand ten million Southern Baptists, commissioned to bear witness to the redemption which is "in Christ Jesus." May God have mercy upon us if selfishness, lack of dedication, worldliness, or pride upon our part weakens or nullifies our Christian witness. Paraphrasing the well-known words of Sir Winston Churchill, spoken at a time of crisis in material warfare, may we in a time of crisis in spiritual warfare now say, "Let us so conduct ourselves and address ourselves to our duty, that if the world and Southern Baptists shall live a thousand years, men shall say of us, *this was their finest hour.*"112
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Only slight response to White's address was found in the Baptist state papers, and none in Convention actions. In essence, then, there were no measurable results of the address. There is, therefore, no basis for assessing its effectiveness. Except to the extent that some messengers found emotional satisfaction in a conservative spokesman having the last word, the 1964 address was not a meaningful force in the Convention at the point of theological controversy. About the most that can be said for it with regard to the theological controversy is that it was the benediction delivered at the graveside of a dead issue. It should be understood that this is not a pronouncement of negative evaluation upon the entire address but only upon this one issue; White addressed himself to other matters which were still very much alive. One Baptist paper did carry a comment to the effect that White's revised address which he delivered to the Convention contained less of controversy and militancy than the original manuscript circulated for publication. Other than that, the papers were silent on White's address.

Quiet reigned in the realm of theology until 1969, when two events brought the issue back to life before the Convention. A group calling itself "Baptist Students Concerned"—popularly referred to as the

---

113 The Christian Index, May 28, 1964, p. 16.
young Turks--had met during the Convention in Houston in 1968; it
appeared in New Orleans in 1969 and renamed itself the "E.Y. Mullins
Fellowship." Mullins had been president of Southern Baptist
Theological Seminary, was a highly respected scholar, and was
president of the Convention during 1921-1924. It was he who delivered
the last of the "unauthorized" presidential addresses in 1922 and 1923
and the first of the "authorized" addresses in 1924. For half a century
he has been quoted as an authority on Baptist doctrine, and his book,
*The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expression*, has been
considered definitive in Southern Baptist ranks since its appearance
in 1917. The students were identifying themselves with a respected
and revered person, not a rebel. Especially espousing a position
favoring the historical-critical method of biblical scholarship and
otherwise reflecting a somewhat "liberal" tendency, the group had
attracted considerable attention in the press and eventually nominated
a "liberal"--W.C. Smith--for president of the Convention. Nominating
Smith probably was more of a publicity maneuver than a practical
one, for Criswell had served only one term; with his extreme
popularity in the Convention and his avowedly conservative position,
Criswell's re-election was hardly more than a mere formality. Only
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Criswell's and Smith's names were placed in nomination; Criswell was elected 7,482 to 450.\footnote{115}

The other event was a motion offered by Thomas Simmons:

\ldots that the Convention urge the Sunday School Board to have all writers to sign a statement with each manuscript of belief in the infallibility of the entire Bible, that the seminaries secure from professors a like statement annually, and that the Sunday School Board and the seminaries be urged to report to the president of the Convention as to the implementation of this motion, who would in turn report to the Executive Committee in the regular meetings.\footnote{116}

Simmons' motion ultimately lost out to a substitute:

That this Convention call to the attention of its agencies the doctrinal statement framed after careful study and much discussion at its annual session in Kansas City in 1963 and vigorously urge the elected trustees responsible for these agencies to be diligent in seeing that the programs assigned to them by the Convention are carried out in a manner consistent with and not contrary to the Convention's aforesaid statement of faith.\footnote{117}

This substitute was proposed by James L. Sullivan, Executive Secretary of the Sunday School Board. A division was called for and a ballot was

\footnote{115}{Annual, 1969, p. 78.}

\footnote{116}{Ibid., pp. 58-59. Essentially the same motion was offered again in 1970; however, it went even further than Simmons' motion and would have made the statements a condition of employment. This condition constituted a breach of administrative function, so the motion was ruled out of order. Annual, 1970, pp. 64, 66, 82.}

\footnote{117}{Ibid., pp. 70-71.}
taken; the specific vote was subsequently requested and announced as 5,870 to 3,416.

Herschel Hobbs felt these two actions were the most significant during the 1969 Convention; he called attention to the conservative trend in electing Criswell over Smith (a liberal) and adopting Sullivan's conservative amendment to Simmons' ultra-conservative motion. 118

These controversial issues arose during the 1969 Convention after the presidential address; therefore, the address did not deal directly with them. They were instrumental, however, in setting the stage for the 1970 Convention.

The 1970 Convention met in Denver in an atmosphere perhaps the most hostile since 1962 or 1963. Several highly controversial issues were drawing to a head and the more vocal nature of American society which developed during the late 1960's promised an almost certain open clash.

One of the most controversial issues ever placed before the Convention was proposed in 1970. The Sunday School Board had published the first volume of a biblical commentary. Serious objection was voiced against some of its content and eventually it was recalled:

Gwin T. Turner (Calif.) moved that because the new
The Broadman Bible Commentary is out of keeping with
the beliefs of the vast majority of Southern Baptist pastors
and people this Convention request the Sunday School Board
to withdraw Volume 1 from further distribution and that it
be rewritten with due consideration of the conservative
viewpoint.119

This action came after the presidential address, but the issue had
been raised in advance. Although Criswell made no reference to
this controversy or to the commentary, he did include a section on
doctrinal conviction in his address. He did not spell out the specific
doctrines he had in mind, but he did declare, in part:

... We do believe something and that something is
revealed to us from God out of heaven and it is written
in God's Holy Book for all to read, to accept, to preach
and to die for! It is these doctrines that give us strength
and godly courage in a godless world ....

If the God of the Bible is really God, then we cannot
believe Him, accept Him and serve Him each in his own
way. Rather we must believe, accept and serve Him each
in His way. We must not seek to alter our testimony and
our theology to conform to the passing philosophical fancies
and fashions of the day. We must judge the teachings of men
by the teachings of God. It is folly to bend theology to fit man
when the Bible teaches that man must be altered to conform
to the theology of God. A personal faith does not mean that we
personally invent, shape it, or use it as we please. But a
personal faith means that we have personally chosen it,
accepted it, do believe it and, in the case of Baptists, we
hold it in common with millions of others who likewise
believe, accept, and preach it.

Are we to change with the changing times? Only in our
methods, our approaches and our nomenclature. Our great

doctrines and principles never change. God does not change. The Almighty says, "I am the Lord, I change not."...

We must maintain our doctrines and our principles or lose our unity and our message. There will be no more peace to us and no offer of hope to a troubled world if we lose the doctrinal basis for the gospel we preach.

In his concluding remarks in this section, Criswell could have been referring to the commentary controversy:

Our institutions ought to reflect those great doctrinal commitments. Our literature ought to teach it. Our preachers and pastors and denominational leaders ought to preach it. And when we send out missionaries, they ought to declare in other lands the same marvelous, glorious, glad tidings of God's eternal, revealed truth. When we cease to believe in Christ we are no longer Christians. And when we cease to believe in Baptist doctrines we are no longer Baptists. We have become something else.

It could hardly be argued that this statement was of sufficient strength to trigger the recall of the commentary; there was nothing in the address which remotely approached the vehemence of Pollard's 1960 call for the firing of professors.

Criswell's tactical method in this address was to use general, rather than direct, statements. His rhetorical approach reflects the utilization of material calculated to convince his audience. He seems to have been attempting to strengthen commitment rather than to secure specific overt response. The address, "The Rock Whence We
A re Hewn," was an exposition of the significance of Baptist life; as
such, it was organized on a historical framework. The second main
section, from which the preceding quotations were taken, was
introduced with, "We were born, not only in a great missionary
response, but also in a deep, doctrinal conviction." The subsequent
development of this section revealed the application and significance
of that conviction at various points in history. Essentially, then, this
section was a panegyric upon doctrinal conviction. Criswell developed
the concept that the doctrines comprise a unifying force among
Baptists, both in principle and in practice:

It is these doctrines that give us strength and godly
courage in a godless world . . .

... a personal faith means that we have personally
chosen it, accepted it, do believe it and, in the case of
Baptists, we hold it in common with millions of others
who likewise believe, accept, and preach it.

We must maintain our doctrines and our principles
or lose our unity and our message. . . .

The statement was logical enough, but its impact was primarily
emotional. The appeal was to unity and strength, as well as to
consistency, i.e., keeping faith with Baptists of previous centuries.

Utilizing hypothetical examples and logical lines of reasoning, Criswell
built a fairly tight case for doctrinal conviction and denominational
unity. The application, however, seemed to be at the point of local
church membership and ministry; one could have listened to the entire
address without discovering that there was the faintest theological controversy confronting the Convention itself. Because of this condition, Criswell's address is viewed as convincing rather than motivational; he seems to have been trying to cultivate certain attitudes rather than to affect the Convention's vote on specific proposals.

Because of its theoretical, abstract nature, identifying the effects of Criswell's address is difficult. One editor offered:

Whatever else the 125th Anniversary meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention was, last week in Denver, it was one marked by great contrast.

Mountain-top experiences, in our judgment, greatly outshone the depressions. The times of tremendous inspiration and challenge would certainly include the president's address, by W.A. Criswell...

Another editor observed:

Echoing a theme which has made him the center of continuing controversy, the president of the Southern Baptist Convention issued a call for doctrinal loyalty among Southern Baptist churches and denominational agencies.

W.A. Criswell, pastor of Dallas First church, made a strong doctrinal appeal in his presidential address which was scheduled to be delivered in Denver at Monday night's opening session of the SBC.

---

121 Erwin L. McDonald, Arkansas Baptist, June 11, 1970, p. 3.

This article was written before the address was delivered. These two articles were the only reactions to the address itself located in the basic group of papers utilized in this investigation; however, other reactions were helpful in understanding the atmosphere in which the Convention met and the attitudes of observers toward Criswell. Several editorials criticized the hostile spirit apparent in Denver. Erwin McDonald responded specifically to Criswell's behavior:

The marvelous, Christlike demeanor of President Criswell, who, sometimes being reviled by bitter messengers reviled not again, and who leaned over backward to be fair as presiding officer, will long be remembered and appreciated by nearly everybody in attendance.

Still another editor reflected on the general behavior of the messengers:

The 125th session of the Southern Baptist Convention must surely be recorded as unique! In retrospect, the sessions may well be viewed by historians as ones which showed just how much a part of the turbulent times Baptists must be. At times we were on our best behavior; and at times we weren't. In other days, school children would have been sent out of the room for less.

Another editor was very specific in his comments about some debate:
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The vitriolic, hostile, accusative, unforgiving, prideful, arrogant, and often-downright-abusive attitudes and words of many of the preachers who spoke in defense of the Bible—and in attack of all who disagreed with their own views about that Bible—seem to this editor to be totally alien to the teachings and spirit of the central Person in that Bible.

The one Convention action related to the issue of theological controversy—or doctrinal purity—was termed drastic:

The most drastic action ever taken by the convention relating to one of its agencies came with the overwhelming vote to ask the Sunday School Board to recall its Volume 1 of the new Broadman Commentary and have sections rewritten with a view to the conservative viewpoint.

Although the Sunday School Board did ultimately cease publication of Ralph Elliott's book, the two attempts in the 1962 Convention to instruct the Board in the matter were defeated. Further, a motion in 1965 to instruct the Baptist Book Stores not to place the book on sale was referred to the elected members of the Board instead of being handled on the Convention floor. So this editor is correct, at least to that extent, in citing this as the "most drastic action ever taken . . ." It was drastic in view of the Convention's having refused


127 Arkansas Baptist, June 11, 1970, p. 3. The vote on the recall was 5,394 to 2,170. Annual, 1970, pp. 77-78.

to take direct action with reference to Elliott's book or his teaching at Midwestern Seminary. Never before had the Convention intervened directly in a controversy involving one of its agencies or institutions; even the upheaval which occurred at Southern Seminary in 1958 was left in the hands of the trustees. The 1970 recall action was viewed by some observers as a dangerous precedent. One editor suggested that there may have been more to this recall vote than was readily apparent:

The votes on the Christian Life Commission and the Broadman Bible Commentary did not, to us, make this necessarily a "liberal" or "conservative" convention. Rather it almost seemed to be looking for some type of "middle" ground--wherever that may be. We rather suspect that the size of the vote on the commentary indicated a bit more than just the commentary itself at stake. We would hazard the suggestion that some residual resentment over "Quest" in New Orleans, and perhaps some dissatisfaction which has been voiced over the past two or three years with some aspects of the literature being sold by the Board might have been involved.  

It can hardly be argued that Criswell's address was responsible for the subsequent actions of the Convention with reference to the theological issue as it related to the Sunday School Board's commentary. His statement that "our literature ought to teach it" was hardly strong enough to have prompted, or even encouraged, a motion to
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recall and rewrite a commentary. Perhaps there is a case of negative influence involved at this point. Hays counseled non-intervention in 1958; Hobbs implied support for the same position in 1963; had Criswell strongly recommended a course of non-intervention in his address, it is possible that the Convention would have responded to his leadership. The absence of such a recommendation may have been an encouragement to those who felt the time was finally ripe for them to strike in the name of conservatism. There are those who feel that "liberalism" has had unjustified protection in the name of "scholarship" or "academic freedom." \(^{130}\)

Although Criswell's address was dynamic and inspirational, it is impossible to determine any clear-cut effect which it had on the theological controversy in which the Convention was engaged in 1970. The address did contain a strong appeal for unity, and since the promotion of unity was identified as the greater aim of the presidential address itself, it is perhaps there that the significant effectiveness of this message can be found:

... We were born not only in a great missionary responsibility and in a deep, doctrinal conviction, but also in a vast cooperative effort, in an enterprise of common commitment. Luther Rice, the missionary statesman and strategist, by divine wisdom was led to see that what no

one church could do, an association of churches could do and do mightily and effectively. . . . This is still our only possible avenue of facing the needs and the tides of evil of our teeming, troubled world. We must do it together. One of us alone is too weak, too frail and too easily broken. It takes us all in strength and power. . . .

This is our past. This is our present. This is our future. We have no other Lord but Jesus. We have no other book but the Bible. We are moved by no other dedication but serving Christ. We have no other goal but preaching and implementing the gospel. Here we stand, so help us God. We can do no other. And in this commitment we are bound together forever in an unbreakable, unbeatable association and denomination of churches under the leadership of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

With the virtue of unity thus extolled, and the necessity of unity thus demonstrated, the messengers were confronted with the untenable position of being unfaithful to God, to revered spiritual ancestors, and to the demands of their current mission if they allowed their unity to be destroyed. In each major section of the address, unity was magnified. In the introduction, Criswell recounted how Baptists were without unity prior to their cooperation in support of missions:

When Luther Rice was born in 1783, there were about 35,000 of these factionalized, dissenting, contentious Baptists in America. . . .

. . . As we have forsaken our littleness, selfishness, and divisiveness and have assumed the nobler commitment of prayer, intercession, missions and evangelism, we have been blest of God as few other people in the earth.
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Then from the first main section:

If ever we lose that missionary passion and commitment, we shall dissolve like a rope of sand. Our world-wide mission program holds us together like cables of steel. We may differ over many things, but we are one in this: namely, the desire to see men brought to Christ throughout the nations of the globe, "that in all things our Lord might have the pre-eminence."

And finally, the entire third section, climaxing with:

... And in this commitment we are bound together forever in an unbreakable, unbeatable association and denomination of churches under the leadership of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Perhaps, then, Criswell's strong appeal for unity can be identified as the essential thrust of this message, instead of the treatment of a specific issue before the Convention, and at that point its effectiveness may be examined. It is reasonable to conclude that Criswell's direct appeal for unity and his extreme efforts to be fair to all in presiding over the business sessions (previously cited in the newspaper reports) combined to create an atmosphere in which the Convention itself could be preserved despite the lack of harmony with reference to specific issues. The division of the vote upon the motion to recall the commentary—5,394 to 2,170—reflected the lack of unanimity upon that issue. Although seventy-one per cent of a total vote may be considered an overwhelming majority, and although that vote determined what action

\[132\] Ibid.
would be taken with reference to the publication of a commentary, there was nothing in it to change the minds of those who voted against it about the rightness of the action. Doctrinal conviction is not a "voting" issue. Perhaps at this point the wisdom of Criswell's approach is more clearly revealed. He may have felt it futile to attempt to unify the Convention around one doctrinal position, but that he could promote the essential unity of the Convention beyond the scope of any specific divisive issue. Regardless what specific degree of effectiveness may be assigned to Criswell's address, the Convention, contrary to the predictions of some, did not split in 1970.

ECUMENICITY

The third major controversial issue to confront the Convention during 1950-1970 was ecumenicity. This term means different things to different people. To some it means fellowship or informal cooperation across denominational lines; to others it means participation in organizations involving numerous denominations; to still others it means yielding up the autonomy of one's church or denomination in a unionistic organization; and finally, to some it means the complete loss of denominational identity through merger into a super-church or unified denomination. The statements which follow are broad generalizations; exceptions could be cited for any of them.
Baptists generally do not object to fellowship or informal cooperation across denominational lines; they probably would not object to participation in organizations involving numerous denominations, depending upon the purpose of the organization, the nature of its organizational structure, and the effect which such participation might have upon local church autonomy; most Baptists definitely would refuse to sacrifice the autonomy of the local church or the denomination in order to join a unionistic organization, or to merge denominations—there is not even strong sentiment for merging those denominational subgroups with "Baptist" in their names, much less for merging beyond that degree. When Baptists talk

133 Local pastors belong to interdenominational ministerial associations. Local churches affiliate with interdenominational councils of churches. The Convention appropriates funds for the American Bible Society and other non-denominational agencies. Local churches cooperate in interdenominational evangelistic crusades. Churches, associations, and state conventions have cooperated with other church groups and agencies in opposing gambling, alcohol legislation, pornography, and other social issues.

134 Some of the examples cited in the footnote above also would fit into this category, especially those involving interdenominational evangelistic efforts and crusades for Christian morality.

135 The subsequent discussion in this section will support this observation.

136 This observation rests upon "negative evidence," the absence of such proposals either informally in the Baptist press or formally in organized meetings.
to one another, little attempt is made to distinguish among these various applications of "ecumenicity"; hence, the probability of misunderstanding is heightened. The ecumenicity being discussed in this section is most frequently that of the third type: the loss of autonomy through organic union with other denominations. One occasion involved a misunderstanding which caused some to think that the fourth type was being proposed: merger.

Ecumenicity of the third type was involved in the controversies over the Alldredge amendment and the Gardner committee reports which were discussed in the two preceding sections, "Local Church Autonomy" and "Theological Controversy." Both Alldredge and the Gardner committee were attempting to forestall any such ecumenicity, but many saw in their attempts the even greater danger of violating the autonomy of the churches by attempting to prescribe to them what organizations they could or could not join. No attempt will be made to repeat the treatment of those issues given earlier in this chapter; however, it must be recognized that ecumenicity was involved with local church autonomy in Lee's 1950 address and in both of Grey's addresses, and it was involved with theological controversy in Lee's 1951 address. Both Lee and Grey objected to ecumenicity of this type. Since three of these four addresses were examined in the two previous sections, no attempt will be made to re-examine them here.
Although Lee's 1951 address was treated briefly in the preceding section, no detailed analysis was given of it. Therefore, it will be discussed here, but without the quotation of the extensive section, "We are a Baptist body berated," found in the preceding section.

In that portion of his address, Lee linked a scathing denunciation of unionism with a denunciation of the controversial spirit which it engendered. Lee's reasoning was pointed out as linking evils, the compromise of doctrinal positions, and ecumenicity.

The address itself was essentially a panegyric upon Southern Baptists, but this specific section, the first main one of eight following the introduction, was specifically a denunciation of ecumenicity; it extolled the virtue of doctrinal purity by blaming the threats which ecumenicity would pose to that purity. Although there was logic in the implications of Lee's statements, their primary appeal was emotional. He raised questions and presented suggestions, but he never offered a single piece of evidence to prove that ecumenicity would produce the evils he suggested. On one occasion he sounded as if he were going to: "To unite various religious bodies with their contradictory doctrines, on anything less than clear teachings of the Holy Scriptures"; but there he broke off from logic and switched to emotion in metaphor: "... is to persuade lions to give over their appetite for meat, or the Philistines to have no scissors for Samson's locks."
There was logical suggestion behind his questions, but no evidence:

"Can strength come to our evangelical testimony and helpful fuel be added to the revival fires already burning by our joining a super-church organization?" "Would not the inward decadence that would result from such compromising union be the precursor of dangers as subtle as outside malicious assaults?" Lee's implied answers were obvious, but they did not constitute evidence.

Lee's rhetorical approach in this portion of his address was to present material designed to convince. His tactical method involved the utilization of direct statements. He came squarely to grips with the issue of ecumenicity and denounced it as an evil. He suggested, but he never demonstrated, either the nature or the degree of that evil.

Since there was no live ecumenical issue, no actual proposal, before the Convention in 1951, it is impossible to assess the effectiveness of Lee's address. Perhaps it is best simply to say that the total effect of the address probably was to create or strengthen the kind of attitude that would increase resistance to ecumenicity or anything else not strictly Baptist.

The editors of Baptist papers were aware of the ecumenical issue and of Lee's role in opposing it:
Earlier, Dr. Robert G. Lee of Memphis, in his presidential address, also warned against church union and federal movements.\textsuperscript{137}

While there were no real high peaks in the Convention program proper, yet the program as a whole was on a high level. The spirit of the Convention was excellent.

Dr. R.G. Lee was at his best in his presidential address.

The Convention has reaffirmed in each session for the past several years its position on unionism, the ecumenical movement, and other issues brought out in the report by Doctor Gardner.

The report was read in a fighting spirit but there was no one present to fight.

The Presidential address by Dr. Robert G. Lee was a heartsearching, inspiring, challenging message which was again and again applauded and approved with "Amens" from the floor.\textsuperscript{138}

Even those who did not support him originally asked that he take the third term since there was a doctrinal scrap threatened and he could best hold the Convention together. He had said he would not accept a fourth term.\textsuperscript{140}

It seems clear that while no empirical evidence is available to ascertain the degree of effectiveness of Lee's presidential address, popular opinion attributed to him considerable influence in promoting unity in the Convention; his address clearly was one factor in that influence.

\textsuperscript{137} Richard N. Owen, editor, \textit{Baptist and Reflector}, July 12, 1951, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{138} B.H. Duncan, editor, \textit{Arkansas Baptist}, July 12, 1951, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{139} Owen, \textit{op. cit.}, July 5, 1951, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{140} The Christian Index, June 28, 1951, p. 6.
There is no question that his address forcefully declared a position in opposition to ecumenicity.

Lee and Grey were so effective in quashing ecumenicity that when ecumenicity next became an issue before the Convention, the president took the opposite side from the position they took. Perhaps it is exaggeration to say that it "became an issue" before the Convention, for there was no actual proposal before it. However, President Hays felt that Baptists had swung so far in opposition to ecumenicity that they had swung inadvertently into isolationism. Therefore, in his 1958 message he attempted to get his audience to become aware of areas of their involvement with the world beyond their own denominational boundaries.

In pursuit of his goal, Hays avoided direct argumentation; instead, he utilized the tactical method of general statements. He made no direct reference either to isolationism or ecumenicity. Rather, he talked about his own experiences and observations during his first year as Convention president, and he discussed the involvement of the Convention in such concerns as denominational structure and expansion, minority groups, challenges to morality, and world peace. Except for the first ones mentioned, these concerns were intended to lift the vision of Southern Baptists beyond their own boundaries; hopefully, a renewed sense of world involvement would result. Hays's approach
was not to argue that Baptists should be involved in their world, but to
demonstrate that Baptists were already involved, to a degree, in that
world and to extol that involvement as a virtue. Assuming that it is
easier to get people to heighten their fervor in a direction in which
they have already started than it is to get them to turn and move in
that direction initially, Hays made a wise strategic choice in his
approach.

The rhetorical approach utilized by Hays in his 1958 address
involved presenting material designed to stimulate rather than to
convince or motivate. Except for his recommendation of a peace
committee, which comprised a very small portion of his address,
Hays proposed no precise program. Nor did he pursue a hortatory
or didactic line. It seems evident that his address was designed to
stimulate, largely through information.

Focusing upon Hays's peace committee proposal yields different
analytic results from that gained by examining the speech as a whole.
This portion of the address involved a policy assertion growing out of
a problem-solution situation:

The promotion of peace presents a great challenge
to Southern Baptists and we should officially and formally
accept it. Consequently, I recommend that the convention
authorize the appointment of a committee to report within
a year, on what Southern Baptists can do to promote peace and good will in the world.  

This portion of the address, then, recommended a specific course of action relative to a specific problem and was, therefore, motivational in nature. Further, the proposal was centrally related to Hays's specific purpose of turning the Convention away from isolationism. There was little rhetorical depth in Hays's presentation. He did not demonstrate a need for such a committee; he merely asserted it. He did not explain how the committee would work or where it would fit in Convention structure; he simply recommended it. In other words, no "case" was built for the establishment of the committee; Hays did not debate the issue, he only recommended.

Hays drew favorable comments from the press:

Rep. Brooks Hays (D., Ark.), who was re-elected for a second term as Convention president, received praise from most editors for his manner of presiding, his call for world peace efforts, and his Christian statesmanship.

There were two major factors in the behavior of Southern Baptists this year—plus their own determination to look after the business at hand. Credit President Brooks Hays with the principal contribution... There wasn't a single protest to a ruling. One veteran described him as the best presiding

141 Annual, 1958, p. 80.

142 Baptist and Reflector, June 12, 1958, p. 5.
officer since Pat Neff, another politician, and that goes back to 1946. 143

The closing session was given to an emphasis on world peace. President Hays and the president of the Baptist World Alliance were the speakers. 144

The launching by President Hays of a committee for world peace was noted as one of the two actions most likely to be cited as historic. The other was a matter relating to internal Convention structure. 145

The committee was duly appointed 146 and brought its report the following year, after which time its responsibilities were committed to the Christian Life Commission. Through a specific agency-responsibility, therefore, world peace has been a continuing concern of the Convention since 1958.

It is not likely that much would be gained from an extensive discussion of the role of the presidential address in bringing into existence this committee on world peace. It is true that the president recommended the committee during his presidential address; however, the resolution for its creation was presented to the

144 Ibid.
145 Walker Knight, associate editor, Baptist Standard, June 7, 1958, p. 5.
146 Annual, 1958, pp. 24, 69, 73, 75.
resolutions committee by Dale Cowling of Arkansas and reported out of that committee by its chairman. Hays never presented any rhetorical support for the proposal. The extent to which he was instrumental in its adoption was probably limited to the support lent by his ethos; just the fact that President Hays recommended it probably assured its adoption. Certainly the motivation for its adoption is not to be found in the logical or pathetic appeals of the presidential address, for no case was made for it.

Since the address itself can hardly be credited with motivating the Convention to establish the peace committee, what assessment of address effectiveness can be made? The address as a whole probably created or strengthened an attitude in the listeners favorable toward greater involvement in world conditions. The proposal of a peace committee was one practical step in that direction and the Convention approved it without evident opposition. However, it was probably the ethical appeal of the speaker, rather than his rhetoric, which was instrumental in the proposal's acceptance.

Because of widespread controversy among affiliated churches, Hays included some remarks about unity in his 1958 address. Although those remarks were not related to the issue of ecumenicity, since the promotion of Convention unity and harmony has been identified in
previous chapters as the major aim of the presidential address,

Hays's statement seems relevant:

First in importance in the many tasks I have had was to participate in efforts to preserve our unity in a period of tension, to hold together our scattered congregations in this hour of the world's supreme need.

A common faith continues to bind us together. . . .

Although Hays did not launch into an appeal for unity at this point in his address, just the mention of his efforts and of some of the forces which foster disunity would tend to turn the attention of the Convention toward the virtue of unity. The implication was that unity is a virtue worthy of being preserved. It should not have been difficult for the messengers to perform the mental process necessary to lead them along a line of reasoning similar to this: The president has attempted to promote unity; the president is a person whom I admire and respect; therefore, I, too, should promote unity. Viewed in this light, Hays's entire address was an example of low-key suggestion.

Reference has already been made to Pollard's statement in defense of the Sunday School Board against criticism for using the International Sunday School Lesson materials, but the matter will be treated in greater depth here because the issue involved in the criticism was ecumenicity. Those who objected felt that paying

147 Ibid., p. 78.
for the use of these materials constituted support of the National Council of Churches which, in turn, involved the Convention in ecumenicity. Pollard rose to the Board's defense:

I thank God for the Sunday School Board, and I stand here today to tell you that the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention is all right. I stand here to tell you that the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention has done more to strengthen our churches and more to do our work, the work of the Lord Jesus Christ, than any of us can ever dream. Thank God for the Sunday School Board.

In this pronouncement, Pollard was enlisting his own ethos in support of the Board. His statement offered no proof; it did not suggest that he had conducted an investigation; it did not specify the area of accusation or defense; it merely asserted that the Board was "all right" and that it had done more to help the churches and the Lord's work than the listeners dreamed. It seems that for Pollard, saying it made it so.

In this instance Pollard did not utilize direct statements in his confrontation with the ecumenical issue; actually, he did not mention that issue at all. The statement of defense suggests that there had been criticism, but the nature or extent of the criticism was never identified in the address. Thus, Pollard's tactical method involved the

---
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utilization of general statements. His rhetorical approach was to convince through the application of ethical appeal; President Pollard said it so it must be true.

Pollard's effectiveness may be inferred from the reaction of one editor who reported that the Convention expressed confidence in its leaders, especially the Sunday School Board, in killing an effort to get the Sunday School Board away from the National Council of Churches in its use of International Sunday School Lesson materials.\(^{149}\) Precisely what was done or how it was attempted is not revealed by the record of Convention business, but the issue seems to have been settled decisively; it did not arise in subsequent Convention deliberations.

There was no specific ecumenical proposal before the Convention in 1961, but Pollard made a strong statement on the issue in his address:

> I speak as an individual, but I'm not interested in Southern Baptists joining up in any kind of a program that would lead us to drop our convictions and say for the sake of expediency and for the sake of a little bit of sweetheart religion that we'll just soften up and we'll agree to this

---

\(^{149}\) *Baptist and Reflector*, June 2, 1960, p. 4.
and that and the other. If it takes that to join in the great movement of ecumenity, I don't want it.

It is possible, although obviously not certain, that Pollard's attack was prompted by Carlyle Marney. During the Pastors' Conference, Marney appealed for greater ecumenical fervor. Although one of the popular young pastors of a few years previous, Marney's position on ecumenic peace led him into disfavor with many in the Convention. Pollard made his position known, again confining himself to the statement of a personal position without offering evidence as to the advantages of his position or the disadvantages of the one he was opposing.

In this instance, as in the previous one, Pollard's tactical method involved direct statement. His rhetorical approach was aimed at convincing his audience. Although stated as an expression of personal opinion, there can hardly be any question that its intent was to influence audience attitude in that direction by the weight of speaker ethos. It seems readily apparent that Pollard had in mind ecumenicity of the third and fourth types. Whether that is what Marney had in mind when he presented his appeal is open to question.

150 Presidential address, 1961. This statement does not appear in the printed texts circulated for publication in Baptist state papers.
In view of the quite tentative nature of this issue—there was no proposal expected before the Convention—any statement about effectiveness would be hardly more than pure speculation. It is obvious that there is little sentiment for ecumenical movements of the third and fourth types among Southern Baptists.

Ecumenicity actually became a live issue before the Convention again in 1964, but its injection was subsequent to the presidential address:

A few short days ago, as we were facing the annual sessions, many of us were saying that no burning issues were in evidence on the horizon. But what had not been in evidence sprang from a cloud no bigger than a man's hand, as we went into our first full day of deliberations, Wednesday.

It happened during the consideration of the recommendations of the convention's executive committee.... But when the committee recommended what many of us had felt would be a purely routine item—the joining with other Baptist bodies for a North American Baptist fellowship within the framework of the Baptist World Alliance—the fireworks started.

It seems that some messengers felt this would be the first step toward merger of several Baptist groups. There was also the suggestion that the racial question may have been a factor in this issue,

---


ecumenicity. Whatever the motivations, the proposal was deleted from the Executive Committee's report, where it had been in the form of an amendment to bylaw eight: "The standing committees of the Convention shall be . . . (3) Committee on North American Baptist Fellowship . . . ." The basic idea behind the proposal was adopted in revised form at a later session:

... I move the Convention authorize as a temporary committee for one year the Committee on North American Baptist Fellowship, . . . to explore the possibilities of this Fellowship and report to the Convention.

The idea for this fellowship seems to have grown out of the cooperation of seven Baptist bodies in the United States who had joined in the observance of one hundred fifty years of organized Baptist life in 1964.

The Baptist fellowship issue was shaping up as a controversial one in the eyes of some as Convention time drew near in 1965:

The Southern Baptist Convention opened its annual session in Dallas this week with two debates prominent on the agenda and a third in the background.

1. Affiliation with the North American Committee of the Baptist World Alliance. . . .

---
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156 The Christian Index, June 3, 1965, p. 3.
Others did not view it as particularly controversial:

It does not appear probable that there will be any sharp divisions in the Dallas meeting comparable to those in Atlantic City last year or at Louisville six years ago. . . . The report on the Baptist Fellowship Committee has been published in all the state papers, and it has not raised much opposition to date.\footnote{E.S. James, editor, Baptist Standard, May 12, 1965, p. 4.}

When the report of the committee was given, opinion was sufficiently divided over its recommendations that the chair was undecided as to the outcome of the visual vote and called for a ballot; the ballot subsequently revealed a vote of 4,911 to 2,713.\footnote{Annual, 1965, p. 85.} That feelings about ecumenicity were related to the vote was suggested by a motion offered by W. B. Timberlake:

\ldots that the action of the Convention on Thursday afternoon in regard to the North American Baptist Fellowship not be construed as being the first or any step toward organic union.\footnote{Ibid., p. 86.}

This motion was ultimately passed.\footnote{Ibid., p. 92.} These actions of the Convention, then, ultimately bore out the impression that there was opposition to this matter based upon attitudes toward ecumenicity.

How did Dehoney deal with the issue? He referred to it in his intro-
duction as he enumerated issues which had confronted the Convention
in recent years:

A fast-running ecumenical tide has concerned us. The dilemma for Southern Baptists has been that to have unity, we must scrap our convictions; and if we keep our convictions, we cannot have unity! There are those who believe we should all get together in one big church, without denominational distinctives. Now, the Lord has not spoken this word to me! I thought that is what the Reformation was all about—to break up such a monopoly. I do not believe that Southern Baptists are interested in abolishing denominationalism, or abandoning our denominational distinctives. But let us remember that our real enemies are the devil and the forces of materialism, secularism, and atheism—not other Christians and Baptists in other national bodies. Let us continue to seek broader channels of communication and cooperation that will not compromise our conscience, our doctrine or our autonomy.

Thus Dehoney made it clear that he was interested in the first and second types of ecumenicity, but not the third and fourth. But the significant aspect of this statement is that it was in his introduction and was dismissed as a relatively minor issue. It was mentioned along with theological controversy, the racial issue, social and moral decay, and schisms and divisions within the Convention, and then dismissed along with those issues in order to get to the one which Dehoney felt most important:

In my opinion, the single overriding life-or-death issue now facing our Convention is: Are Southern
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Baptists going to get to the main task, the main business, of reaching people for Jesus Christ?  

In this instance, what the speaker did not say may be as significant as what he did say. Dehoney employed a tactical method different from that utilized by most of the other presidents. Instead of trying to settle this issue by direct statements, or even by dealing with it in statements of general principle, he simply referred to it, declared a position both endorsing and rejecting ecumenicity, and then dismissed the issue as comparatively irrelevant. In effect, he shifted the emphasis to other issues.

Probably the essence of both the negative and positive viewpoints was expressed in Dehoney's statement. Those who opposed ecumenicity (of the third and fourth types) feared the loss of autonomy and denominational distinctives; those who favored ecumenicity (of the first and second types) desired broader channels of communication and cooperation with other Christians. Those who opposed probably feared (as evidenced by Timberlake's motion) that one was the first step toward the other.

The report of the Committee on the North American Baptist Fellowship included two statements which seem to have been designed to allay any fears concerning ecumenical intent:

\[^{162}\text{Ibid.}\]
Whereas, Southern Baptists have been an integral part of the Baptist World Alliance since its beginning and have found in it a profitable and useful channel of communication and cooperation with other Baptist bodies that has not hindered or compromised our autonomy or witness as a Convention or as individual churches.

Speaking of the provision of Baptist World Alliance Bylaws:

It shall have no authority over any Baptist church or over any Baptist body or undertake any work for which the member bodies are responsible.

These two statements should have made it clear that the committee was not proposing any move toward organic union or the surrender of the autonomy of any church or of the Convention. It also should have been clear that the committee was not proposing any super-church organization.

What assessment can be made of Dehoney's confrontation? Very little. The confrontation was so nebulous as to defy accurate evaluation. That Dehoney's tactic was concerned more with promoting unity than with confronting issues is hardly to be questioned; there is really nothing controversial about evangelism where the Southern Baptist Convention is concerned. Although it is not universally practiced, it is not debated; it is ignored. The investigator is faced with

163 Ibid., p. 280.
the problem of interpreting the events in the situation. Did Dehoney simply abdicate his responsibility in the face of controversial issues, or did he sincerely believe that everything else should (or would) pale into insignificance in the face of evangelism? Thorough examination of both of Dehoney's addresses suggests that he was sincere. Without questioning his judgment, it is felt that Dehoney was honest in motive. A good case can be made for the argument that the Convention was becoming involved in a digression. Theological controversy had raged through 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963; White had finally sought to lay it to rest with his benediction in 1964. Almost every year since 1954, the racial issue, in one form or another, had been before the Convention, which had passed about all the resolutions it could. Issues exterior to the Convention could hardly be settled by resolutions or position statements on the floor. If the Convention were not simply to waste away into meaningless negative resolutions and recommendations, always declaring itself to be opposed to something, perhaps it needed this very emphasis of getting centrally involved in a program of positive action. If such were the case, Dehoney's tactic was a wise one.

The investigator is still left to ponder the effectiveness of Dehoney's address in settling the ecumenical issue. Did opponents of the measure pick up the cue from the president and simply let the matter pass as an issue of minor importance? Did pre-Convention
publicity help the messengers to understand that only first and second, as opposed to third and fourth, types of ecumenicity were involved? Did the vote of 4,911 to 2,713 reflect the original and unchanged division of opinion of the messengers on the matter, despite publicity and the presidential address? After six years the answer is impossible to determine. Although Dehoney's confrontation with this issue did not have the strength or directness of R.G. Lee's or J.D. Grey's, neither did the North American Baptist Fellowship have the National Council of Churches' potential for controversy.

RACIAL RELATIONSHIPS

When the Convention met in 1954, the Supreme Court's decision on segregation in the public schools was still news. A part of the Convention's Christian Life Commission report was a response to that decision:

In the light of the recent decision handed down by the Supreme Court of our nation declaring segregation of the races to be unconstitutional, and in view of the position of this Convention in adhering to the basic moral principles of our religion as they apply in race relations, we recommend:

1. That we recognize the fact that this Supreme Court decision is in harmony with the constitutional guarantee of equal freedom to all citizens, and with the Christian principles of equal justice and love for all men.

2. That we commend the Supreme Court for deferring the application of the principle both as to time and procedure until the nation shall have had time to work out methods by which transition from the present practice may be effected.
3. That we urge our people and all Christians to conduct themselves in this period of adjustment in the spirit of Christ; that we pray that God may guide us in our thinking and our attitudes to the end that we may help and not hinder the progress of justice and brotherly love; that we may exercise patience and good will in the discussions that must take place, and give a good testimony to the meaning of Christian faith and discipleship.

4. That we express our belief in the public school system of our nation as one of the greatest factors in American history for the maintenance of democracy and our common culture, and we express the hope that in the working out of necessary adjustments, its place in our educational program shall not be impaired.

5. That we urge Christian statesmen and leaders in our churches to use their leadership in positive thought and planning to the end that this crisis in our national history shall not be made the occasion for new and bitter prejudices, but a movement toward a united nation embodying and proclaiming a democracy that will commend freedom to all peoples.

Although efforts were made to delete this section from the report, each was defeated and the report was adopted as presented. This report was the first significant Convention action related to an issue which has kept the Convention in various states of agitation from that time on. Storer made no references to the racial issue in his addresses of 1954 or 1955. Warren was the first to mention it in his presidential address. In 1956, he devoted an entire sub-section to this issue:
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Another problem which poses for us more immediate concern is in the realm of racial understanding.

Two years ago this convention recognized that the Supreme Court decision relative to segregation was in harmony with the constitutional guarantee of equal freedom to all citizens and with the principle of equal justice and love for all men. The far-reaching implication of this decision has become the most disturbing issue in many parts of our Southland. I concur in the feeling that it will be unwise for us to reopen any discussion of it here. It may be well for us to remember, however, that extremists and agitators have, and will perhaps continue to do incalculable harm. Those who follow such a course overlook the fact that economic and social relationships which have been from one to three hundred years in the making, simply cannot be changed overnight.

At this point, the audience broke out in applause. Then Warren continued:

On the other hand, open defiance of the constitutional principle will endanger our foreign mission work throughout thirty-five areas of the earth and play right into the hands of the Communist who will welcome the privilege of ridiculing, not only our democratic form of government, but the type of Christianity which seeks to win the world.

At this point, applause broke out again—whether from the same people, or from others, is not known. Warren pressed toward his climax in this section:

I wonder if it has occurred to you that 94 per cent of the people of this world do not live in the United States. What a comparatively small number are we! What a precarious position we occupy! What a responsibility God has placed upon us! It behooves us, therefore, in this situation where there has been a remarkable lack of humility, to humble ourselves before God and realize afresh that Christian love as exemplified by Christ is the supreme law of all human relations. If we who profess to know and love him,
show the courage, prudence, patience, and understanding called for by the President of the United States, we will find the solution for this question on the local level and demonstrate to the world that men of every race can live together in peace.

It may be inferred that the Convention heeded Warren’s counsel that it would be "unwise for us to reopen any discussion" of the issue. Although the Christian Life Commission report included a statement on the issue, the thrust of it was to encourage Christians to face the issue with Christian conviction and courage; the absence of specific recommendations made the report non-controversial and it seems to have been approved as a matter of routine business without any opposition.

Warren’s tactical method was to use direct statement. Instead of declaring a position and attempting to persuade the audience in his direction, however, he simply counseled non-confrontation. It is true that the position he espoused was a mediating position; he seemed to be trying to get the extremists on one side to slow down and those on the other side to speed up:

... Those who follow such a course overlook the fact that economic and social relationships which have been
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from one to three hundred years in the making, simply
cannot be changed overnight.

Then the case for the other side:

... On the other hand, open defiance of the constitutional
principle will endanger our foreign mission work throughout
thirty-five areas of the earth and play right into the hands of
the Communist who will welcome the privilege of ridiculing,
not only our democratic form of government, but the type of
Christianity which seeks to win the world.

This utilization of contrast seems to have been aimed at influencing
both sides to see the merits of the other's position.

This portion of Warren's address seems to have been
motivational in nature, because he coupled his counsel of non-
involve
tment with the implication that solutions would be found on
the local level and the Convention, therefore, should not intrude:

... It behooves us, therefore, in this situation where
there has been a remarkable lack of humility, to humble
ourselves before God and realize afresh that Christian
love as exemplified by Christ is the supreme law of all
human relations. If we profess to know and love him,
show the courage, prudence, patience, and understanding
called for by the President of the United States, we will
find the solution for this question on the local level and
demonstrate to the world that men of every race can live
together in peace.

The suggestion of finding solutions on the local level was probably
received with approval by the majority of the audience, because
the Convention could only declare its own position and
recommend to the churches. No Convention decision could ever be
binding upon a local church; therefore each church would have to find
its own solution to its own problems regardless what stand the
Convention itself might take.

Although perhaps not the most commendable from the standpoint
of exhibiting moral courage, Warren's comments on the racial issue
probably were well considered from the standpoint of promoting Con­
vention unity. Judging by the record of Convention deliberations, it is
questionable whether a statement by any president could have had
lasting persuasive effect upon the constituency in those turbulent days;
the situation must have appeared almost hopeless. The atmosphere is
little enough improved today, after fifteen years.

In his 1958 address, Hays devoted one main section to a
discussion of the Convention's work with minority groups, specifically
Negroes. He said, in part:

Some of the tragic governmental conflicts involving
race have obscured the fact that there are proven and
accepted ways by which Southern Baptists may express
their Christian concern for the minority's welfare and
progress.

Most of the remainder of this section involved the recounting of some
of Hays' own contacts with minority groups during the year of his
presidency, but then he concluded:

It is not my purpose in this report to dwell upon the
complexities of the problem of race or other social issues.
I realize that we cannot have complete unanimity in these
matters, but it would be tragic for us to assume that we can function as a Christian body without assigning to trusted representatives of the convention the task of pointing out our Christian duty with respect to social evils and current conflicts.  

The 1958 meeting was held in the spring following the Little Rock school integration crisis in the fall of 1957. Not only had the entire country been in a state of unrest during that school year, but also Hays had been personally involved in the Little Rock episode as a mediator between President Eisenhower and Governor Faubus. Hays was clearly attempting to bring the weight of his influence to bear upon this issue. He set the stage for his statement of position by suggesting that he was not attempting to force the constituents to one position: "I realize that we cannot have complete unanimity in these matters..." But then he asserted the Convention's responsibility in the area, indicating that the Convention could not just ignore the problem:

... but it would be tragic for us to assume that we can function as a Christian body without assigning to trusted representatives of the convention the task of pointing out our Christian duty with respect to social evils and current conflicts.

He obviously referred to the Christian Life Commission when he spoke of "assigning to trusted representatives of the convention," because
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study and recommendations concerning the racial issue were in the area of responsibility of that agency. In fact, the Christian Life Commission had prepared a strongly worded call for racial reconciliation as a part of its annual report to the Convention. 169

Significantly, the very next section of Hays's address dealt with that Commission:

The Christian Life Commission has a dual role to fill. It is authorized to speak for Southern Baptists where specific mandates are given, as in the case of legislation affecting advertising of alcoholic beverages and the suppression of obscene literature upon the newsstands of America.

Equally important is its role of familiarizing our people with problems of this nature, supplying counsel and advice on the subject as well as information on the Scripture teaching in specific areas, and to seek a sensitizing of the Christian conscience wherever evil, injustice and oppression exist anywhere in the world. 170

The audience could hardly miss the connection between Hays's stand on race, his stand on the Christian Life Commission's role, and the Commission's report on race. Evidently there were those who felt that the Commission's role should be limited to speaking in behalf of the Convention as directed while others resented being "preached to" by an agency, or having an agency attempt to provide dynamic leader-
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ship in controversial areas. There is no objection to the Commission's speaking out on drinking, gambling, sexual immorality, and even dancing—pet sins denounced by Baptists for centuries—but silence is preferred on racial injustice because there is not universal agreement among Baptists on that question.

Apparently Hays, himself formerly chairman of the Christian Life Commission (1955-1957), was attempting to set the stage for acceptance of the Commission's report. By a tactical method involving direct statements he brought the racial issue to the attention of the Convention, along with the role of the Christian Life Commission in this area. Although he was not attempting to dictate, it seems fairly clear that Hays endorsed a moderate position of positive Christian involvement in the search for solutions to such problems. He made no attempt to coerce, and he did not dwell on the subject at length, but he did lend the weight of his own ethos and his office to a positive approach to the solution of racial problems. His effort was unquestionably strengthened by his own personal involvement with the Little Rock crisis.

Hays's rhetorical approach involved employing material designed to convince. He was not proposing a specific course of action, but he does seem to have been attempting to prepare attitudes which would be receptive to the Christian Life Commission's report.
Although the newspapers made considerable mention of Hays's proposal for a committee on world peace, they were silent on his endorsement of a positive approach to racial problems. Nor were there any resolutions calling for the endorsement of the president's statement by the Convention.

As in some previous instances, an assessment of the effectiveness of Hays's address is highly tenuous. When the Christian Life Commission report was given, an amendment was offered calling for the deletion of the section on racial reconciliation. Although this amendment was defeated, a motion to receive the report as information passed; thus, the Convention placed no endorsement or approval upon the sentiments of the report—it simply recognized that the Commission had reported. Neither of these conditions is deemed to constitute a clear measure of effectiveness of the presidential address. Evidence is insufficient to warrant postulating a causal relationship between the address and subsequent Convention actions.

Hays's 1959 address presents a somewhat different picture. Addressing the Convention at noon in its second session, Hays came immediately to grips with the racial issue; this against the backdrop of his defeat for United States Representative from Arkansas:
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It would be impossible for me to describe what your friendship has meant to me. I ask your indulgence for a brief reference to the recent change of fortune in my professional life, since it came at a critical stage in the denomination's efforts to relieve racial tensions and contribute to the mission of reconciliation. The relevancy of events in Little Rock to our work is acknowledged by all who are familiar with the problem. But I make this fleeting reference primarily to acknowledge my everlasting gratitude for the spirit of helpfulness and the personal anxiety for my family and myself which so many Southern Baptists evidenced in this crisis. In my official activities as your president, I have tried to keep in mind that there is a wide diversity of viewpoints with reference to race relations, but I have steadily insisted that this, the nation's number one problem, has an impact upon our missionary enterprise and must be met with high statesmanship and Christian insight.

In my talks with members of the minority race I have thought of them not as members of another group, but as fellow Christians. A simple incident indicates that the response is satisfying. Following a Baltimore meeting in which I discussed the problem, a Negro member of the congregation said to me, "Tomorrow I will go to a white friend to apologize to him for some things I have said and done, and this decision was produced by what you had to say tonight." And on the majority side it is evident that our members are more determined than ever to find a Christian solution.\footnote{172 Annual, 1959, p. 85.}

After discussing several other issues, Hays returned to the racial issue in a long section climaxing the address:

Having spoken of the missions problem and of the race problem, may I relate the two. As all observers know, the patterns of worship and of Christian activity in the foreign mission fields differ from the familiar ones at home. There is no segregation of our colored converts. The voluntary separatism in our own country is responsible primarily for
our Negro brethren maintaining their own conventions and
generally their own congregations, and is not basically
inconsistent with our Christian professions, but we must
continue to examine with keen sensitivity the aspirations
of our minority people for a status free from all discrim-
ination and injustice. This is a part of the Christian gospel,
and we must demonstrate that we believe it. We cannot
export what we do not have, and if our Christian devotions
here are not adequate, our missionaries cannot transmit
the Christian message to unsaved masses abroad. The
missionaries plead for a better performance in human
relations in America, and while I believe we are making
great progress at home, we must keep the challenge
always before us. 173

Other straightforward statements from this section are: "Perhaps
you are tired of the subject of race conflict, but until perfect justice is
done we must stay with the task"; "There are practical steps to be
taken within the framework of our congregational system, advancing
us toward the day of Christian understanding"; "Discontent of the
minority is the symptom of an illness which affects the nation and
the world. It constitutes the mission field at our doorstep."

Perhaps recognizing that these statements which he hoped would
bring Baptists together in facing a controversial problem might have
the opposite effect, Hays stressed unity before closing his address:

Our distinctiveness is in the commitment to live by the
standards of conduct and service which the New Testament
proclaims. It is a common faith in the efficacy of the
Christian calling that establishes our fellowship and makes
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us one. Our doctrine of the competency of the individual forbids our attempting uniformity of belief, but the scattered Baptist legions are bound together by a determination to submit to God's will and to use our diversified talents in all practical ways.

Thus, employing the tactical method of direct statements, Hays came forthrightly to grips with the racial issue in this address. While he acknowledged the impossibility of achieving absolute unanimity of opinion, and while he made no attempt to coerce, he clearly declared his own position:

\[\ldots\] I have steadily insisted that this \ldots problem \ldots must be met with high statesmanship and Christian insight.

\[\ldots\] but we must continue to examine with keen sensitivity the aspirations of our minority people for a status free from all discrimination and injustice. This is a part of the Christian gospel, and we must demonstrate that we believe it.

These declarations, while compelling no one else to join him there, made it evident where Hays stood.

As his statements of the previous year had done, Hays's rhetorical approach in these portions of the address employed material designed to convince. There was no specific proposal to be presented to the Convention, although the Christian Life Commission report contained a rather strongly worded position statement and appeal:

This Commission believes the time has come for a Christian rapprochement on this question. In any solution we seek the freedom of the individual and the full autonomy of the churches must be recognized and respected. But at the same time, we must remember
that the church is the body of which Christ is the Head. It is to be governed by his laws, motivated by his love, and guided by his mind and Spirit. . . . It is not a law enforcement agency, but it must call for respect of the law and cultivate public opinion which demands the enforcement of the law.

We believe the time has come for the restoration of communication between the white and colored peoples in the South. It is at this point that Christianity faces one of the severest tests of its wisdom, sincerity, and courage. The continuing problem of racial adjustment and understanding must be met realistically, constructively, and patiently. 174

Perhaps picking up his cue from the action of the Convention the previous year, Adiel Moncrief, Jr., chairman of the Commission and the one who presented the report, moved that it be received as information. 175 It seems to have been so received without opposition or controversy.

In the absence of Convention actions, measurable results of Hays's confrontation with the racial issue must be sought elsewhere.

The Baptist state papers were a fruitful source of information:

The frequent and enthusiastic applauding of President Hays throughout this annual address left no doubt about the esteem of Southern Baptists for their leader. But for a provision of the constitution that makes one who has served two terms as president ineligible for re-election
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President Hays would doubtless have been drafted for a third term.\textsuperscript{176}

The Convention was marked by much debate and some controversy. Extension of time was necessary again and again. Nothing was cut and dried. It was a democratic gathering.

No one could have been more patient nor fairer than President Brooks Hays in letting those who sought to be heard have their say.\textsuperscript{177}

Though the President's message was interrupted six times by applause as he spoke on various thorny issues before our denomination, there were some Baptists who had differing views and the matter of race became one of the most controversial points of discussion and debate during the Convention. Especially was this true on Friday morning when a resolution presented by the Convention's Resolutions Committee was amended so as to delete a section referring to the presidential address. . . .\textsuperscript{178}

Despite a very careful attempt to avoid it, the resolutions committee ran headlong into the segregation-integration issue when it recommended "that the section of his presidential address delivered Wednesday morning, May 20, concerning a meeting of representative leaders from the Southern Baptist Convention with leaders of the two National conventions of Negro Baptists be commended to the executive committee of the Southern Baptist Convention for its consideration."

\textsuperscript{176} Erwin L. McDonald, editor, \textit{Arkansas Baptist}, June 4, 1959, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{177} Richard N. Owen, editor, \textit{Baptist and Reflector}, May 28, 1959, p. 4.
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Although they had not avoided mentioning the issue, members of the committee explained that they did not think this concerned integration or segregation.

For the deep-south states the difficult words were "commend" and the mention of Hays' speech. Finally after debate that called for "expediency," accusations of threatening with the dollar sign, and pleas to help the missionaries with a stand on human rights, a compromise amendment was adopted . . .

The editors were clear enough in their praise for Hays's forthright stand on the racial issue, but they were not so clear in their endorsement of the stand itself. In fact, Leon Macon, editor of the Alabama Baptist, was reported as having criticized Hays as "apparently endorsing integration" in his presidential address. 180

The amended resolution mentioned in the report above read:

In the light of continuing existing tensions and pressures, we commend the local, state, and Southwide agencies and workers who are successfully engaging in a ministry of service and understanding with Christians of all races and nationalities and urge the continued prayerful and responsible application of the principles and example of Christ in all our relationships.

We commend the outgoing president, the Hon. Brooks Hays, for his firm convictions, his spirit of fairness to all, and his courageous stand on the great issues of our day.

We recommend that the Executive Committee consider a meeting of representative leaders from the Southern Baptist
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Convention with leaders of the two National Conventions of Negro Baptists to discuss mutual problems.  

The report of this action indicates that it involved "extended discussion." Considerable controversy is suggested. One newspaper article referred to the "hour's debate" involved in passing this resolution.  

These evidences of controversy suggest that Hays was not uniformly effective in persuading his audience to his point of view. That his statement on the racial issue was strongly applauded would lead to the conclusion that there was sufficient support for almost any recommendation in line with the content of that statement; yet when the resolutions committee brought its recommendation, it was felt necessary to modify the statement in order to gain passage. Hays may have helped to form a majority, but he had not achieved unanimity.  

One other action on the Convention floor reflected lack of unanimity, yet the ultimate outcome would suggest support for Hays' position. W.M. Nevins proposed a resolution that the Convention rescind the action of the Convention in 1954 in support of the Supreme Court's...
decision on public school segregation. The proposal was ultimately defeated. The extent to which these newspaper reports and Convention actions constitute measures of address effectiveness is questionable; that there was widespread favorable response to Hays's declaration of his position in that address is not.

The 1960 Convention received as information the Christian Life Commission's report containing a brief but forthright statement on racial relations. There is no evidence that Pollard had either this report or the racial issue in mind when he spoke of grave problems, but his remarks are presented here to enable the reader to make his own judgment:

We have some grave problems. And all of the problems in this world can be solved whenever God's people get right with God. Talk about a needed revival in Africa. Yes, it's needed, but a revival here in America that would shake the very foundations of our churches, our homes and our government would be felt to the ends of the earth. A revival in the South, a revival in New York City, a revival in Miami, Florida, with people turning from their sins and turning toward God in repentance—that's the kind of revival we need. It is hard to get. It is much easier to pass a lot of silly resolutions. It is much easier for us to go around with a pious look on our faces trying to solve the problems of this world. But my business and your business is to preach the gospel of the Son of God and let God's Spirit change the hearts of men. When that comes

---
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about, then other problems will vanish even as the dew vanishes before the sun. Keep that in mind — spiritual preaching, preaching that will get results.

In 1961 Pollard was silent on the racial issue. One newspaper revealed that the issue was not dead:

There was little new, insofar as declarations are concerned, from the annual session last week. Meeting against a background of racial violence in Alabama and Communist domination abroad, the convention consistently refused to be more dogmatic than in other years despite some timid efforts from the floor.

The convention was shown the brink of controversy several times by resolutions on race relations, closer cooperation with other religious groups and the like but each time a wise resolutions committee skirted the trouble.\(^\text{186}\)

That "wise resolutions committee" brought one of the more strongly worded resolutions on the racial issue considered by the Convention up until that time.\(^\text{187}\) If there was controversy over its adoption, the record does not reveal it. The Christian Life Commission brought no specific statement on race that year.

The theological controversy far overshadowed the racial issue in 1962, and there were no resolutions offered. Essentially the same

\(^{185}\) Ibid., p. 79.
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condition prevailed in 1963, except that Hobbs did include a rather lengthy and penetrating statement concerning the necessity of giving "guidance in solving the problems related to underprivileged and minority groups." The essence of his statement was that these problems must be solved on a spiritual and personal basis and that the only permanent and satisfactory solution must be a Christian one. The resolutions committee offered a resolution on Christian responsibility which seems to have been adopted without controversy. While it obviously would apply to racial relations, it was by no means limited to that issue; being of such a general nature it evidently was allowed to pass without debate. The force of the resolution was to place emphasis upon individual responsibility to find Christian solutions to social problems at the local level. This resolution obviously was in keeping with Hobbs's message on the subject, but the impossibility of proving any connection is readily apparent.

The issue of racial relationships was brought back before the Convention as a "live" issue, after these years of smoldering, in 1964. White came to grips with it in the third main section of his address when he said, in part:

---
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Among other problems at home we face the very difficult matter of finding a solution to a growing and urgent challenge in the area of race relationships. Never let it be said that Christians in general or Southern Baptists in particular are indifferent toward any "for whom Christ died." Never let it be said that we are more concerned about maintenance of the status quo than the welfare of human beings. He who says that Southern Baptists have done nothing in this direction is either ignorant of the facts or misinformed. Two of the first institutions to be desegregated in the South were Southern Baptist institutions. We have spoken out on several occasions in clear-cut statements. Several of our churches now have Negro members. Many are seating them in the congregation, many have openly stated the basis upon which they receive members, regardless of race.

... That we have not always moved as decisively and urgently as we should, we confess. But we are on the march!

Since we have no ecclesiastical hierarchy, and ours is not an Episcopal form of church government, the Convention as such has no authority over the local churches and desires none! The Convention assembled in annual session can inform, suggest, and challenge to action, but that is all.  

The statements of the various presidents to date reveal that while they might be considered "progressive" by some, they were by no means flaming radicals on the issue of race.

White's statement is the most clear-cut one since Hays's of 1959, five years previous. Like Hays, White employed the tactical method of direct statement and the rhetorical approach of convincing material. It is not known whether White was attempting to prepare the
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way for adoption of a resolution on race, but one was included in
the report of the Christian Life Commission:

(1) That we commend those Southern Baptist institutions
which have extended their Christian ministries to people of
all races;
(2) That we approve the positive action taken by hundreds
of Southern Baptist churches in affirming an open-door policy
for all people regardless of racial origin;
(3) That we express gratitude for those individual Christians
and churches who are involving themselves redemptively in
community race relations;
(4) That we pledge to support the laws designed to
guarantee the legal rights of Negroes in our democracy
and to go beyond these laws by practicing Christian love
and reconciliation in all human relationships; and
(5) That through legislation and through love, through
work and through witness, through open doors and through
open hearts, through repentance and through renewal,
Southern Baptists give themselves to the decisive defeat
of racism, and that it be done for the glory of God.191

The reaction of the messengers to this statement was revealed in one
news report:

The race relations issue was placed before the Southern
Baptist Convention in one of a series of recommendations by
the Christian Life Commission, an agency.

After summarizing the content of the resolution, the report concluded:

However, the messengers by a close vote chose a
moderate substitute motion prepared by deep South
preachers which declared the final solution to race
problems must come in the local church.192
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In effect, the substitute did little more than reiterate the content of previous resolutions which emphasized seeking Christian solutions on the individual and local levels:

1. We are fully cognizant of the world situation which exists today in the area of human relations with its effect on the Christian witness in the whole world.

2. We also fully recognize the dignity of every human being as God's creation, with his right to have opportunity to achieve full realization of every human capability given him by God.

3. We further recognize the responsibility of Christians and churches to so live and so act as to bring about Christian solutions to these problems.

4. We remind ourselves and the world that Southern Baptists have not been silent in seeking Christian solutions of these problems but have spoken and have through their agencies extended their ministries to people of all races. In doing this, these agencies have acted on the authority of the conventions and bodies controlling them.

5. It is our conviction that the final solution to these problems must come on the local level, with Christians and churches acting under the direction of the Holy Spirit and in the spirit of Jesus Christ. This must be in full recognition of the autonomy of each Baptist church.

6. We would urge every Southern Baptist and church to earnestly pray and work that peaceful Christian solutions may be found in all of the racial relationships facing the world today; and that in their solution the world may see Christ and that God may be glorified.  

The conditions existing in the 1964 Convention create a frustrating situation for the rhetorical investigator. While it is

---

perfectly clear that White presented an unequivocal statement on racial relationships in his address, the newspapers were silent on that aspect of his address, thus leaving the investigator without a record of general public reactions. Further, since either of the resolutions proposed to the Convention could be interpreted as being in harmony with White's position, there is no ground for postulating that his address had any effect on either proposal.

At this point, then, the investigator can illuminate, but he cannot evaluate. Although it may be reasonable to infer that White's statement strengthened pre-existent attitudes, there is no ground for inferring that his statement altered the direction of any contrary attitudes. No president to date has been able to alter significantly the attitudes of Convention constituents on this issue.

In 1965, after passage of the Civil Rights law, the Christian Life Commission proposed another resolution concerning the racial crisis. It was a strongly worded statement calling upon Baptists to acknowledge their shortcomings in this area and to commit themselves to positive action in meeting the crisis. Henry L. Lyon, Jr., moved to amend the report by deleting the last paragraph, one of the strongest in it, and substituting the following:

---

This Convention of Baptists recognizes the authority and competency of every local church affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention in dealing with any question social or otherwise. We further recognize that our main task is to support and promote our programs of world missions and evangelism. We believe that in so expending our efforts we will effect definite solutions for all of our present problems.

This amendment, which was accepted as an addition, not a substitution, had the effect of saying, "Despite all we have said, we leave each local church to do as it pleases in racial relationships; promoting missions and evangelism will solve all of our problems."

What had Dehoney said that might have set the stage for such a maneuver? The introduction to his address largely dismissed the controversial issues before the Convention, among which was race:

The race issue divides us as it divides a nation. But let us not feel that the race problem is an albatross hung around our necks by history. It is a God-given opportunity for Christians to solve the problems that legislation can never solve; not by marches in the street, or pickets at the gate; but by the personal practice of Christian brotherhood in our daily lives. The civil rights legislation has been passed. But we must recognize that legislation can do no more than provide the friendly and orderly environment for moral and spiritual ideals to grow. It still remains the mission of the church and the responsibility of Christians to sow the seeds and nourish the ideals of Christian brotherhood in human relations. And this is our task, today!

---
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In isolation this statement constituted a very clear-cut and straightforward declaration of position on the issue. However, in context the effect of it was essentially nullified. Dehaven dismissed this and the other issues he enumerated in his introduction in asserting the supremacy of the evangelistic issue. Thus, the president's opportunity to set the stage for the favorable reception of the Christian Life Commission's statement was relinquished, and a receptive atmosphere was established for the presentation of Lyon's amendment. In this instance, the president's concern for positive action and unity over-rode his desire to attempt to settle an issue.

One Baptist editor missed his prediction concerning the 1965 Convention sessions:

It does not appear probable that there will be any sharp divisions in the Dallas meeting comparable to those at Atlantic City last year or at Louisville six years ago. The race issue is much in the minds and heavy on the hearts of many Baptists, and a resolution on the subject might be introduced from the floor; but it is not likely to come this year from any agency or institution of the convention...

After the Convention was over another editor compared it with the Atlantic City meeting of 1964:

The consensus of editors and others seemed to be that the Dallas convention, in spite of its fiery moments

---
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of contention, mainly on social issues, will go down as one of the best and most far-reaching in Christian impact that we have had in many years. This is in sharp contrast with the situation just a year ago, when we met in Atlantic City.

This year's convention was at its best in dealing with social issues and world Christian outlook.

The more forthright and positive spirit of the Dallas convention, as compared with recent annual conventions, probably resulted more from greater maturity of Southern Baptists on race relations than from any other one thing. . . .

For many of us, Dallas 1965 will be remembered for its new birth of freedom and hope, in the Spirit, for Southern Baptists in their world conquest for Christ.

That the Convention adopted the statement on racial crisis reflected its strength; that it accepted the amendment reflected something less.

The racial issue did not come before the Convention in 1966. It was not presented as an active issue in 1967, but it seemed to be working "behind the scenes." James Duke offered a motion to discontinue the Christian Life Commission; it was ultimately defeated. Foy Valentine, Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the Commission, was quoted as feeling that the opposition to the Commission was at the point of its stand on racial relations.

---
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1968 the Executive Committee prepared a statement concerning the crisis in the nation, referring specifically to the demonstrations and riots. Although the statement had to survive numerous amendments and procedural maneuvers to quash parts or all of it, it was finally adopted by the Convention and stands as the strongest to date.

Circumstances related to scheduling and consideration of this statement may have been instrumental in its passage. The statement was recommendation number twenty-four in the report of the Convention's Executive Committee. It was originally scheduled for presentation during a business session at 9:15 a.m. Wednesday. The president's address was scheduled for 11:35 a.m. that same day. Thus, the statement was scheduled for consideration before the presidential address. When James L. Pleitz presented the recommendation and moved its adoption, the chairman, Vice-president Landrum P. Leavell, II, ruled that "due to the nature of the recommendation, calling for extended discussion, it should be referred to the Committee on Order of Business to be scheduled for later consideration." It was scheduled for consideration at 4:05 p.m., after the presidential address.

Whether this procedural maneuver was motivated by a desire to enable

---
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the president to speak on the subject before consideration of this statement is not known. Regardless of motivation, the effects would be the same; the president spoke first, thus having an opportunity to influence attitudes related to the statement.  

Paschall indeed gave attention to racial relations in his presidential address. One rather extensive sub-section was devoted to as forthright a statement as has been found among the presidential addresses. Paschall said, in part:

> Many of our critical problems today stem from the age old problem of racial enmity. The tragic events in recent days surely convince us of the frightening proportions of the race problem in our country. . . . Today there is enmity between whites and blacks.

> Man is a social being . . . . His history is marred by envy, strife, and division. . . . The problem of human relations must be seen in all of its enormity and ugliness.

> In the current racial conflict our problem is not primarily legal or economic but spiritual. . . . But economic reforms cannot meet man's greatest need.

> The basic problem is spiritual. There are ghettos of the mind and heart before there are ghettos in our cities. . . .

> A patronizing hand-out will not solve the problem of inner darkness. It demoralizes and degrades man when he is allowed or forced to live on charity. . . .

> The inner darkness of despair, frustration and rebellion can be dispelled by the love of God as demonstrated and proved in the cross of Christ and lived out by Christians. . . .

> The enmity between . . . white and black was slain on the cross. Christ is the only hope for the brotherhood of man, for peace among men.

---

Christians may differ on many subjects but they must agree that the enmity has been abolished in Christ. Christianity and racism are incompatible. \(^{205}\)

Paschall's address will be treated in greater depth in the succeeding section, "Social Applications of the Gospel," because the racial issue became submerged in that larger issue and it was during Paschall's presidency that this wider emphasis first appeared in the presidential addresses. It need only be noted at this point that Paschall employed direct statements to confront the issue in an effort to convince his audience. Although he made no reference to the report which was to be presented later in the day, he did declare a strong position on racial justice. Unless he was instrumental in the move to have the report delayed until after his address, of course, he would have expected action on this report already to have taken place—the proposed order of business would have been established prior to his preparation of the presidential address—thus, the absence of any reference to this report is not considered significant.

Paschall seemed determined to get to the crux of the racial issue, possibly reflecting his background in debate. He stripped away its legal and economic aspects and got to its essential nature: spiritual. He then built his case for racial justice on the central feature of the
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Christian experience, the crucifixion of Christ for all men irrespective of skin color or social condition: "The enmity between . . . white and black was slain on the cross. Christ is the only hope for the brotherhood of man, for peace among men." Paschall thus identified his position with the one experience with which he could reasonably expect his entire audience to identify: redemption through Jesus Christ.

The results of this encounter are impossible to identify and the effectiveness of the address impossible to assess with any degree of reliability. Although the newspapers reported the action on the crisis statement, no mention was made of Paschall's statements on race. Nor does the record of the deliberation on the crisis statement reveal any influence of the presidential remarks. It would be speculation to suggest that Paschall's remarks had any bearing on the outcome of the crisis statement proposal. All that reasonably can be ventured is that the content of Paschall's remarks provided no ammunition for opponents of the crisis statement. If the presidential address had any effect at all, it almost certainly was in the direction of creating favorable attitudes and a receptive atmosphere for the consideration and adoption of the proposal. The proposal was adopted 5,687 to 2,119—72.85 percent to 27.15 percent. 206
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The Convention met in 1969 in New Orleans under the threat that James Forman would appear to present demands in behalf of the National Black Economic Development Council. One newspaper reported the situation:

Unfortunately, underlying the entire convention period was the implied threat that the Black Manifesto would be presented by James Forman. Although Forman never showed up, so far as we know, his pressure tactics were felt in the atmosphere.

"The atmosphere" was not the only place Forman's pressure tactics were felt; specific reference was made in a resolution on Christian social concern:

Be it further resolved, that we reject in total the demands, principles, and methods espoused by the National Black Economic Development Council which has made outrageous claims against religious bodies in our nation, proclaiming our disapproval of the intimidation, threats, and ultimatums propagated by leaders of this movement; . . . .

In view of the atmosphere which was being generated prior to Convention time, what did Criswell have to say in his address? He did not treat race as a separate or distinct issue. Following the direction of Paschall in his address of the previous year, and the theme of the Convention for 1969, Criswell dealt with the dual nature

---
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of Christian experience: faith and works. The only specific reference to race came in a statement which said:

... Our messengers in assembled convocation have spoken out time and again concerning the social and political issues of the day. We have forcefully and emphatically voiced our convictions concerning war and peace, disarmament, human rights and liberties, race, poverty and crime. Were we to do different now it would be to change the course of our own history.

Since this address will be treated more extensively in the succeeding section, no further attention will be given to it here.

Two events related to the racial issue occurred during the 1970 Convention in Denver, neither of them related to the president or the content of his address; they are mentioned here to fill in the total picture on this issue. On Tuesday afternoon a group of students from Metropolitan State College appeared and asked to be heard by the Convention. The chairman suggested to the Convention that as a special courtesy and in recognition of their representing the black community, that ten minutes be allowed for one of them to speak. His suggestion was followed. Response to the subsequent presentation was generally unfavorable.

---
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Except for Paschall's statement in 1968, the presidents stopped dealing with race as a separate issue in 1964; although the Convention has subsequently considered resolutions and recommendations from the Christian Life Commission, from the Executive Committee, and from the floor, the presidents do not seem to have made any clear-cut effort to influence Convention decisions on this issue. What began essentially as an issue involving segregation in 1954 has now assumed the proportions of extremism, militancy, and manifestoes. This issue, because it is one involving not only the Convention as an organization, and not only its agencies, but because it also involves the churches which are affiliated with the Convention and the greater society of which the churches are a part, will not be settled by the Convention. About the most the Convention can do is to attempt to influence attitudes and behavior in the direction of solutions.

With the examination of the individual presidential confrontations with the racial issue completed, what can be said of the cumulative effect? A rather distinct pattern emerges from an examination of these addresses. The presidents usually confronted the issue openly with direct statements aimed at convincing the audience. None of them pursued an argumentative approach and all attempted to be fair and to refrain from pontification. Each lent the weight of his own ethos and the influence of his position in the direction of Christian attitudes,
fairness, and justice. None assumed an extreme posture; all seemed to attempt mediation and moderation. It is questionable whether any given address in isolation changed any listener's opinion from one side to the other, but it is almost certain that the combined effect of these messages, in helping to create an atmosphere, has been to enable Southern Baptists to discuss and confront this very touchy and controversial issue in Christian courtesy and with more logic and less emotion. It is almost certain that the Convention never would have adopted the statements which it has if the presidential leadership had been thrown to one extreme or the other. On balance, then, the presidential address is judged to have been one effective influence in the direction of Convention unity and harmony with reference to the issue of racial relationships.

SOCIAL APPLICATIONS OF THE GOSPEL

As the issue of the autonomy of the churches, or the advisory nature of the Convention, became interrelated with the issue of doctrinal purity, or theological controversy, so the issue of racial relations became interrelated with the issue of social applications of the gospel. Probably it is safe to say that after 1964 or 1965 the racial issue lost its identity as a separate or distinct issue. As social upheaval began to sweep across the nation, the Convention
gradually came to realize that there was more at stake than just public school desegregation or even the desegregation of local churches. A curious situation developed in that the Christian Life Commission could present statements about gambling, alcoholic beverages, sexual immorality, pornography, and other social evils and have those statements strongly endorsed, even unanimously adopted without dissenting debate; however, every statement on the racial issue was met by those proposing to delete, table, or amend in some form or other, if nothing more than to add a statement to the effect that "this Convention of Baptists recognizes the authority and competency of every local church affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention in dealing with any question social or otherwise." 212 It appeared that there were those determined to prevent the Convention from stating any positive, unequivocal position on the issue. This is unusual in view of the fact that no Convention action can ever be binding upon any local church; the only force of such a statement would be to lend the weight of the Convention's moral influence. To observe that such postures of obstruction contributed nothing positive to the solution of racial problems in the South is to suggest the obvious. A popular expression has it that "the most segregated hour in American
national life is eleven o'clock on Sunday morning." A survey of Convention proceedings since 1954 reveals that there were those determined to prevent the Convention from providing any positive leadership in this area. Institutionally, the Convention's record is defensible. Although it has not been militant, at least its seminaries have been desegregated for years—actually they never were officially segregated, but few, if any, blacks sought admission until after 1954. Its agencies maintain a non-discriminatory employment policy. For years it has helped to support American Baptist Theological Seminary, a school originally owned by the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Incorporated. Finally, several of its ministering agencies have programs specifically aimed at the black community, and its institutional services are available without regard to race. Unfortunately, all of these conditions have resulted in little more than touching the racial problem at arm's length. Personal involvement in Southern Baptist life reveals that little progress has been made on the local level, where "every local church has the authority and competency to deal with any question, social or otherwise." Congregations are still closed to non-whites; pastors and other religious workers have been
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intimidated, or even fired, for nothing more than not being opposed to segregation; on balance, the eleven million Southern Baptists have hardly been "progressive," much less "liberal" or even "radical" or "militant" on the racial issue, either inside or outside the churches. In some cases, even to be "moderate" was too liberal. Of course there are striking exceptions to these generalizations, but the generalizations still stand. 214

It is not strange, then, that the Convention found itself in an atmosphere of social crisis by 1967; if it cannot be blamed with helping to precipitate the crisis, neither can it be praised for helping to forestall it. Although a part of Hobbs's 1963 address suggested giving guidance in solving the problems related to underprivileged and minority groups, and White devoted a section of his 1964 address to "this present world," in addition to his section on racial relationships, the presidents before Paschall did not confront problems related to the issue of social applications of the gospel. Although related to old conditions, this became a new problem and a new note in presidential addresses after 1966.

During the introductory remarks to his address, "Mandate to Minister," in 1967, Paschall said, "Baptists do not have to divide on

214 See investigator's qualifications in chapter 1 and vita.
the issue of evangelism versus social action." He also quoted the words of Jesus: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister," and "As the Father hath sent me even so send I you." "From the mountains of inspiration and worship," he said, "we go down into the lowlands to serve." The remainder of the address was an exposition upon the Christian ministry—-not in the professional sense of the vocational church-related employee, but in the sense of the day-to-day ministry of the individual believer—the non-institutional sense.

By the tactical method of direct statement, Paschall squarely confronted social applications of the gospel. However, he recommended no social gospel, simply improving man's living conditions so he will become qualified for heaven. He made it clear that "We must continue to give primary emphasis to man's relationship to God." 215

Although the Christian Life Commission's report included a fairly straightforward section on peace, no specific proposals of a controversial nature were expected before the Convention in 1967. For this reason Paschall's address is probably properly identified as convincing rather than motivating. Because of the myth that has been
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perpetuated in Baptist circles during the twentieth century that if a man becomes a Christian his problems will be solved, many Baptists do not believe that preachers or churches, or even individual Christians for that matter, should concern themselves with social problems. In the 1960 presidential address was found:

    We have some grave problems. And all of the problems in this world can be solved whenever God's people get right with God. 216

Of course, "getting right with God" can be interpreted in such a way that one would have to agree with the statement; but such an interpretation would lead to the conclusion that few people, if any at all, are actually "right with God," in which case the statement becomes essentially meaningless. Facing such a situation in 1967, it was necessary for Paschall to attempt to counteract the popular notion that becoming a Christian is an automatic blanket solution to humanity's ills. His method, then, was to use material to restructure attitudes rather than to attempt to achieve the adoption of a specific program.

    Paschall made much use of the "pastoral imperative." One common feature of the sermon is the frequent use of policy propositions which are supported by explanations or illustrations rather than
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reasons. The method of support is amplification rather than argumentation. The speaker declares, "We must . . ." and proceeds to explain what he means and perhaps seeks to convince by ethical or emotional proof, but does not offer evidence for why "we must" or build a case around the advantages of doing what "we must" or the disadvantages of not doing what "we must." In the most pronounced cases, such a statement amounts to nothing more than an unsupported assertion producing a kind of, "Why?", "Because I said so," situation.

Paschall supported his imperatives, yet he used them freely:

- We must practice an evangelism that is concerned with the whole man.
- We must demonstrate concern for all of the problems of modern man whether they be personal or social.
- We must magnify the local church.
- We must conduct our warfare with spiritual and not carnal weapons.
- We must live positively. Christianity is not negative. One is a Christian not by what he refuses but by whom he chooses.

Paschall concluded with appeal:

- Let us follow in His steps and give thanks for what we have and ask God to bless it. The results now and then will be amazing. The future belongs to Christ and the Kingdom of God will stand forever.

Throughout this section of his address, Paschall built his case around the ministry of Jesus, the pattern of the New Testament
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ministry, and the commitment of the Christian. He utilized those values and principles with which his audience logically could be expected to identify in order to convince them of the reasonableness of his position. Although the section was not built specifically upon this pattern, Paschall utilized the method of residues to some extent. He indicated that evangelism alone, government, political party programs, military conquest, education, nor social welfare is sufficient to meet man's ultimate problems. He pleaded:

Let us preach out, teach out, and live out, the Gospel before all men. Let us proclaim the present reality of the Kingdom of God. Let us lead men in this temporal situation to experience the Eternal. Let us live in two worlds at the same time as we pray, "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven."

Although no program of specific activity was coming before the Convention, the Christian Life Commission's report did contain a strong statement on peace and resolutions were brought from the floor through the resolutions committee on separation of church and state, population explosion, and peace. 218 Although no direct connection between the presidential address and any of these proposals can be established, certainly the atmosphere created by the president's straightforward remarks was not hostile to them.

One of the newspaper reports revealed that Paschall's was not the only voice heard expressing concern for a full Christian ministry:

A debate some had expected messengers to engage in, over whether or not churches should involve themselves in social and political issues, failed to materialize. A call for greater involvement in human affairs was sounded again and again by program participants.

There seemed to be a general feeling that the convention just closed will go down in history as one of real significance, possibly marking some turns for the better. 219

Because summaries or full texts of the presidential addresses are carried in most Baptist state papers during or immediately after the Convention sessions, few editors bother to remark about reactions to the president's statements; the feeling seems to be that the readers have already read the text or summary and by the time reactions can be published the interest in audience reaction has largely disappeared.

This condition presents a special problem for the rhetorical investigator, because it is extremely difficult to assess speaker effectiveness. Process effects are easy enough to determine from the tape recordings; product effects present a greater problem. Therefore, it would be unjustifiable on the basis of available evidence to make a stronger claim for the effectiveness of Paschall's address than has already been made, that it probably promoted an atmosphere conducive to the
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passage of the various proposals. Even then, Paschall was not the only speaker to give counsel of this nature.

While the Convention in recent years has been interested in doctrinal purity and the presidents have sought to promote that element through their addresses, and while they have continued to promote Convention unity, an increasing emphasis on denominational relevance has developed. Thus, the presidential address continues to be used to promote general Convention aims, despite the fact that specific conditions change from year to year. Far from being an exception, Paschall's 1968 address served forcefully to prove the rule. Coinciding with the Convention theme, "Good News for Today's World," this address maintained the essential thrust initiated by its predecessor.

In the first main section of the address, Paschall enumerated certain areas of bad news in today's world: war, crime, racial strife, corruption of the churches. In the succeeding main section he discussed the good news which the Christian has for this world.

Contending that evangelism and ethics go together, Paschall asserted that the good news is unconditional and that it is relevant to the problems of human relations, those of the academic community, and those of nuclear power. In his treatment of human relations, Paschall focused upon race. His tactical method was again direct
statements coupled with the rhetorical approach of convincing address. His development was principally expository. Launching into the heart of his theme in development of the unconditional nature of the good news, Paschall declared:

"The gospel is relevant to the problems of human relations. It says that God loves everyone; that He is concerned about all human beings; that He has a plan for every life; that everybody is somebody--more than an animal, a number, or a name--and that Christ tasted death for every man. The gospel gives dignity and worth to the individual. It can save him from loneliness, fear, frustration and hate."

In the section on race, Paschall discounted the ability of laws, economic reforms, and social welfare to solve man's problems:

"... Good laws make a significant contribution to man's welfare but they cannot solve his basic problem. Economic reforms should be applauded ... but ... cannot meet man's greatest need.

A patronizing hand-out will not solve the problem ... .

So, committed to this good news in Jesus Christ we can meet human needs where we find them and demonstrate convincingly that we genuinely love all men and respect them as persons under God.

With reference to the academic community, Paschall asserted:

"A mass of information has hit modern man and broken him. He is bemused and bewildered, fragmented and frustrated. Knowledge today is without organization or meaning.

Educators have recognized the need for some organizing principles and concepts. We have information..."
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without ideas and ideas are essential for meaning in the intellectual world.

Ours is an anti-intellectual age... Margaret Mead writes of horizontal and vertical learning. She says horizontal learning consists of factual information that goes out of date and pleads for vertical learning which will magnetize the fragments of knowledge and polarize them into meaningful patterns.

The gospel is vertical learning. It is an organizing, integrating, magnetizing center without which life breaks up. The gospel gives meaning to life.

Thus Paschall utilized a problem-solution approach to convince his audience of the reasonableness of his position. He had but to cite the problems—the audience members were well enough aware of them; he did not have to prove them—then offer his solution. It is evident that he was seeking to lay to rest the myth that all of man's problems are solved instantaneously and automatically when he believes the gospel; in fact, a statement to that effect was included in the concluding paragraph of the prepared text, but when Paschall delivered the address he substituted another conclusion.

It was in this session that the Convention adopted by seventy-two percent majority vote a statement on race relations that in effect called for elimination of all racial discrimination; that action was reported in the previous section on "Racial Relationships." Of that action, one editor stated:

It is significant that the action is not in the form of a resolution but now stands as a statement of Convention policy. The fact that the Convention has called on one of
its agencies--the Home Mission Board--to implement the new policy is real evidence that the Convention is taking a decisive, new turn.\footnote{Erwin L. McDonald, \textit{Arkansas Baptist}, June 13, 1968, p. 3.}

Unfortunately, the Baptist papers did not cite any connection between the presidential address and that action of the Convention. Lacking any clear evidence, no stronger claim can be made for this address than was made for the previous one; it, among other forces, probably helped to create an atmosphere of receptivity for the measures which were subsequently adopted. As indicated in the previous section, this statement on the crisis in our nation is the strongest one involving the racial issue or the social applications of the gospel which the Convention has adopted to date. At least the Convention leadership, and the Convention itself in its institutional manifestations, is seeking to make the denomination more relevant to the world of which it is a part. That it is having to do so against such opposition is no credit to its constituency.

The 1969 Convention found the theme and the presidential address again turned in the direction of a dual emphasis stressing social applications of the gospel: "Christ in Faith and Work." Criswell chose as the text of his message, Hebrews 4:12: "For the Word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword
He structured his message around this image; one edge represented faith, the other works.\footnote{222}

Paschall had attempted to alleviate the disunity in the Convention by removing the division over evangelism versus social action; he attempted to remove the "either-or" and engender a "both-and" attitude. Criswell was attempting to do precisely the same thing in his 1969 address. The address was an exposition of this concept. Criswell utilized the tactical method of direct statements. His declarations were both clear and concise:

\begin{quote}
The Christian religion has two sharp, cutting edges. One edge is faith; the other is works. One is believing; the other is doing. One is evangelism; the other is ministering.\ldots

These are the two hemispheres of the Christian religion. Separated, they bleed themselves white. Together, they are a glory before the Lord. Cleave the message from the ministry and the whole becomes dust and ashes before our eyes. Joined with unbreakable links they become the work of God unto salvation and with the power of Christ in the redemption of human life.

Our ministry and message must be to the whole man. Half a religion is not enough. A whole man needs a whole religion. True Christianity involves both the body and the soul, the head and the heart, the inward and the outward life.\ldots

In this life we cannot separate soul and body and even in the life to come the regenerated spirit is to be re-united with the resurrected, glorified body. Both make up the total person.\ldots

The Christian must express himself in two directions: vertical and horizontal, toward God and toward man.\ldots
\end{quote}

\footnote{222}{Presidential address, 1969.}
Faith without works is dead. The Saviour who died for us and by whose atoning grace we are saved is the Saviour who answers prayer in giving us daily bread.

We are to deliver the whole gospel of Christ. We are to preach Jesus born of a virgin, the child of prophecy; Jesus dying for our sins according to the Scriptures; Jesus interceding in heaven for us sinners; Jesus coming again in power and great glory.

But we are also to preach Jesus moved with compassion on the multitudes; Jesus preaching hope to the poor; Jesus healing the sick and cleansing the leper; Jesus feeding the hungry and strengthening the weak. In the message of Christ there is no conflict between the Good Samaritan attitude toward the weary world and the salvation of the soul by the blood of the Crucified One. Both are a part of the gospel.

The Christian faith is more than words, doctrines, sermons. It is also loving dedication in human service, offering hands of help. It is the translation of the word, the speech, the idea into reality that gives the message power and relevancy.

From this panegyric upon faith and works, belief and practice, Criswell proceeded to demonstrate from biblical and Christian history the manifestation of this principle. Because this address was based upon a text of Scripture and consisted of an exposition of the concept embodied in that text, it was essentially a sermon. At the conclusion, Criswell even extended an invitation after which he called upon the executive secretaries of the Foreign and Home Mission Boards to lead in prayers.

Criswell's rhetorical approach was at once stimulating, convincing, and motivating. It was stimulating in its recounting of the life and ministry of Jesus, members of the early church, missionaries,
and revered Convention personalities; it was convincing in that it was aimed at destroying the faith-versus-works dichotomy in the thinking of many Southern Baptists; it was motivating in a broad sense, aimed at ultimately affecting the practice of individual believers on the day-to-day level of life, not in the narrow sense that he was offering a specific proposal which he wished the messengers to adopt. The primary immediate aim probably was to convince.

As was the case with the immediately preceding addresses, the results of this address are unmeasurable. The only reaction to Criswell's message in the papers consulted in the course of this investigation was a resume and commentary based upon the advance copy of the text; nothing was said about the address itself.\footnote{The Christian Index, June 12, 1969, p. 4.} The other source of information as to product effects, Convention resolutions, was equally silent; no resolutions directly related to the president were presented. There were, however, resolutions related to the content of the address: one involved family life and sex education; a second, peace and justice for all men; a third, Christian social concern; a fourth, the first amendment to the United States Constitution; and finally, conscientious objectors.\footnote{Annual, 1969, pp. 65-80, passim.}
Although it is doubtful if the presidential address motivated any of these resolutions, at least it was helpful in creating the receptive atmosphere conducive to their presentation and adoption.

Additionally, the Christian Life Commission brought a statement on extremism which included a list of recommendations. This statement did not fare so well in its venture upon the floor:

Richard Barrett (Miss.) offered a substitute motion to thank the Christian Life Commission for the report and to receive it without adopting the recommendations. 225

... The substitute motion passed.

The Convention met in Denver in 1970 amid great dissatisfaction over some of the Christian Life Commission's activities. Some proposed measures were rather hostile in nature:

Dick Roe (Calif.) moved that the Christian Life Commission be abolished .... 226

Bertha Smith (S.C.) moved that the Convention call for the resignation of the elected staff of the Christian Life Commission. .... 227

Harold Coble (Calif.) moved that the Convention take note of the fact that a great number of our people and our churches have been sincerely offended by the Christian Life Commission's Atlanta conference, and that as a matter of Christian conscience this offense be considered by our Christian Life Commission. ... 228
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Eddie Weber (Kan.) made a motion that we hear from the Christian Life Commission as to their motives in the Atlanta seminar...

Four previous presidents of the Convention prepared a statement supporting the Commission's motives and calling for a forgiving spirit to be manifested in its direction, along with a request for it to be "careful in arranging future programs so that the harmony and cooperative spirit of the Convention not be destroyed." The passage of this statement and the tabling of most of the pending motions related to the Commission brought the issue to at least a temporary settlement.

The dissatisfaction and hostility expressed in the circumstances just mentioned were in the air for months before the Convention met. The seminar to which reference was made had been held about Christmas time in 1969 and objections had been voiced in the press from the time its advance announcement went out. The controversy had raged in the press on through the winter and spring and was fully expected to come before the Convention for formal consideration. With the Convention meeting in a hostile atmosphere involving great controversy over race, theological questions (see previous sections

\[229\text{Ibid., p. 68.}\]
of this chapter), and social issues, what did the president have to say in his address?

The Convention theme was "Living the Christ Life," a theme with obviously social implications. Criswell's address was "The Rock Whence We Are Hewn." At first glance, it would appear that Criswell had abdicated his leadership responsibility; however, closer examination reveals a different situation. Ignoring the individual controversies which the Convention was facing, Criswell confronted the greater issue: Convention unity. His tactical method was to use general statements, so far as specific areas of controversy were concerned. His rhetorical approach was to present material designed to convince. Utilizing the rhetorical modes of narration coupled with exposition, he traced the origin and development of the Convention. He painted a picture of the disharmony out of which the Convention was born:

In the years gone by . . . the Baptists in America were a weak, disunited, divided, argumentative group of small, dissenting churches. Our story was hectic, full of sound and furor, characterized by feudin', fussin', and fightin'. We had fallen prey to that everlasting tendency on the part of God's people to turn aside from the heavenly calling and to bog down in the morass and quagmire of littleness, divisiveness and dissension.
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When Luther Rice was born in 1783, there were about 35,000 of these factionalized, dissenting, contentious Baptists in America. Every fifth Sunday they met in their associational meetings to debate doctrinal subjects posited by one of the elders in their churches. Their time was consumed in arguing and debating over theoretical, theological inexactitudes. When Luther Rice appeared, his presence and his message was nothing short of a celestial phenomenon. Up and down the Atlantic seaboard and across the Alleghenies into Kentucky and Tennessee he went from one debating Baptist group to the other, pleading the cause of world missions, laying upon the heart of the pastors and the churches the mandate and the outreach of the Great Commission. And the brethren listened. Constrained by the Holy Spirit and the burden of a lost world, our forefathers turned aside from their fifth Sunday forensic sessions to face the task of winning the earth to Jesus. Luther Rice organized them into state conventions and finally into a national convention for the support of world evangelism.

From this point in his introduction, Criswell developed his message around the observations that the Southern Baptist Convention was born in a great mission commitment, in a deep doctrinal conviction, and in a vast cooperative effort. His appeal was to consistency with previous commitments on the part of the Convention and to faithfulness with the revered personalities who were the Convention's spiritual ancestors. The effect of his treatment was to focus audience attention upon unifying elements out of its common heritage and in its shared experience. He made a direct thrust for unity in his conclusion:

... We have no other Lord but Jesus. We have no other book but the Bible. We are moved by no other dedication but serving Christ. We have no other goal but preaching and implementing the gospel. Here we stand, so help us God. We can do no other. And in this commitment we are bound
together forever in an unbreakable, unbeatable association
and denomination of churches under the leadership of Jesus
Christ, our Lord,

Bring me my bow of burning gold,
Bring me my arrows of desire,
Bring me my spear, O clouds unfold,
Bring me my chariot of fire.

We shall not cease from battle strife,
Nor shall the sword sleep in our hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem
In this fair and pleasant land.

Bound by a common Lord, a common book, a common dedication, and
a common goal, how could the Convention be other than united? Thus,
transcending the three divisive issues confronting the Convention in
1970, Criswell lent the weight of his personal ethos, the power of his
rhetoric, and the influence of his office to promote unity in the
Convention. Ever since Hobbs first sounded the note of "unity amid
diversity" during his presidency, Convention leadership, including the
president, has made this the watch-word of the Convention. It
appears frequently in Baptist periodicals and it is heard, in fact or
in essence, over and over again in statements from platforms across
the Convention territory. This was the essence of Criswell's plea in
1970.

Again, as in the most recent previous years, Baptist papers
carried comments about the address based upon the advance text and
committed to print before the actual address was delivered. Lacking
either press comments or specific Convention resolutions related to
product effects, no accurate assessment of address effectiveness is possible. It may be inferred that the presidential address was one influence, among others, which helped to create an atmosphere in which resolutions related to peace, drugs and alcohol, public and private education, the environment, law and order, and extremism could be considered and passed and the essential unity of the Convention be preserved. The avoidance of an open rupture in Convention fellowship or membership in recent years, despite dire predictions to the contrary, is itself a testimony to the unifying power of forces operating within the Convention, among which must be listed the presidential address.

Although the speakers have individual aims for their addresses, the address itself has an aim: to promote Convention unity and harmony. Although no historian consulted to date has given any explanation of the origin and rise of the presidential address and although the specific motivations for the early addresses are not explicitly stated in the Annual, the content and response involved in those early addresses suggest that the president originally desired to address the Convention on matters of theological or fiscal import. J.B. Gambrell's 1919 address dealt with dissatisfaction over obstacles encountered in attempts to minister to soldiers during the
First World War. He felt that the religious war work policy of the War Department was unfair to the churches and soldiers who were not Roman Catholic. E.Y. Mullins' 1923 address dealt in part with the evolution controversy; the relevant part was adopted as the belief of the Convention. George White McDaniel's 1927 address dealt with fiscal problems; a committee was appointed to consider the address and bring in a report on the matter of debts, finances, and budget at a later session.

Although President Stephens was asked to address the Convention in 1906 and Presidents Gambrell and Mullins addressed the Convention without being asked in 1918, 1919, 1922, and 1923, the Convention did not officially authorize the presidential address until the 1923 session, so the first one delivered with official blanket sanction was in 1924. Excluding the 1906 address from the statement, then, it is evident that the address originally arose from the
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desire of the presidents to deal with issues facing the Convention, not simply from the Convention's desire to hear the president speak. The precedent for an issue-centered—as opposed to purely ceremonial—address was set early. Succeeding presidents have utilized the address to confront controversial issues and to attempt to mold the opinion of messengers and other constituents in support of certain beliefs, policies, or actions. 237

An information sheet submitted to each of the living presidents in this study included the following question: "What is the general purpose of the president's address, as you view it?" Regardless of what was the intended purpose in 1923, the answers to this question reveal the concepts of the most recent presidents:

R.G. Lee: To set forth objectives and goals, to inspire, to kindle fires of spiritual passion for the lost, to get Southern Baptists to see that if their arms are not 25,000 miles in circumference, they are too small—also to warn against certain evils.

J.D. Grey: Sort of "keynote" of convention—set mood for convention to deal with issues—act as "catalyst."

C.C. Warren: To give tone, direction and challenge to the meeting.

Brooks Hays: To highlight developments in denominational life and in world affairs—and to recommend courses of action.

237 Presidential addresses, 1950-1970; see Appendix C.
Ramsey Pollard: Set the tone of convention.

Herschel Hobbs: To set tone for convention session and/or to deal with pertinent matters.

K. Owen White: To call attention to the most pressing issues and seek to set the stage for action.

Wayne Dehoney: It is a State of the Union address, to say where we are, where shall we go, and come let us march there together.

H. F. Paschall: To help the messengers of the Convention and stimulate the churches to be aware of times and to respond redemptively.

W. A. Criswell: To face without fear the paramount issues facing the convention.

These responses make it clear that the presidents of the last two decades view the address as having more than simply ceremonial functions; it is more than just an opportunity for the president to speak pleasant words or extol the virtues of the Convention.

The most frequent response noted above was to "set the tone" of the Convention. Facing a largely partisan audience, the president attempts to maintain or deepen their pre-existent attitudes. He also attempts to change the attitudes of hostile listeners. These aims are to convince. There is a broad basis for persuasive appeals in the spiritual values, ethical and moral standards, and respect for authoritative evidence—especially the Scriptures—commonly held among Southern Baptists. Although many Convention messengers
may look upon the address as simply a traditional ceremony, it is evident that the presidents are clearly aware of the nature and purpose of the address and have tried to preserve its significant function: promoting Convention unity and harmony.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented an examination of the presidential address relative to the five major divisive issues facing the Convention during 1950-1970: local church autonomy, theological controversy, ecumenicity, racial relationships, and social applications of the gospel. Although reliable measures of specific address effectiveness were not available in many instances, and although an assessment of rhetorical effectiveness is highly speculative at best, the addresses generally were found to be highly principled in motivation, sound in content, structure, and approach, and reasonably effective in influence. The direction, if not the extent, of their intended influence could be determined; it generally was deemed to be both positive and constructive.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the addresses involved in this investigation has involved three functions: the identification of specific events and features, an interpretation of the meaning and significance of these elements, and an evaluation of them. This chapter will present the major conclusions drawn from the study. The analysis of rhetorical method in chapter three and the interpretation and evaluation of the addresses related to the five major controversial issues discussed in chapter four provide supporting evidence for two specific conclusions concerning the nature of the address, two specific conclusions about the value of the address, and a general conclusion concerning the extent to which the presidents have utilized their rhetorical opportunities.

NATURE OF THE ADDRESS

**Persuasive Rhetoric**

The addresses included in this study were delivered before the Southern Baptist Convention, the largest evangelical denomination in
the United States, during 1950-1970, and reflect concerns and issues facing that organization. They were the most recent specimens of a body of rhetoric officially authorized in 1923; although several presidents had addressed the Convention between 1845 and 1923, they had done so without official authorization, with the exception of E.W. Stephens who addressed the Convention by special request in 1906.

The search for one precise, inclusive, acceptable label for the nature of this address proved difficult. Those who desire to place all public address into one of the three Aristotelian categories--forensic, deliberative, or epideictic--would place the presidential address in the latter category, while those who insist on a strict definition of epideictic as a speech of praise or blame would object to its being placed therein. The address is not a ceremonial speech in the narrow sense of the term; the president does not simply extol the virtues of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Those who subscribe to George Campbell's concept that 'all the ends of speaking are reducible to four; every speech being intended to enlighten the understanding, to please the imagination, to move the passions, or to influence the will,' probably would place the presi-

dential address in one of the two latter categories. Campbell's categories reflect the influence and conceptualizations of eighteenth century English faculty psychology which is no longer supported by psychologists; however, the remnants of this concept still exist in the definition of communicative intent.² Reflecting Campbell's influence, Oliver deals with the three forms of persuasive speech as those intended to convince, actuate, and stimulate,³ as do Brembeck and Howell,⁴ and Monroe and Ehninger.⁵

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to impose upon these addresses individually the discrete categories of "convince, stimulate, and actuate." It is doubtful if in any given address the speaker had only one of these ends in view. Nevertheless, although each address contained a mixture of all of these aims, "convince" predominated. The presence of this mixture is understandable if these categories


are recognized as subdivisions of the larger class of oratory, persuasive.

Although the addresses unquestionably were persuasive, some of the classical elements of persuasion were absent from many of them. Despite the fact that a number of the presidents had been debaters while in college and that all of them had been preaching for more than twenty-five years at the time they served as president, argumentation—the statement of a controversial proposition supported by factual or authoritative evidence connected by lines of logical reasoning—was seldom found. Conversely, much use was made of clarification—description, narration, exposition.\(^6\)

If the four traditional categories—informative, persuasive, entertaining, and inspirational—are considered, these addresses could most conveniently be classified as inspirational; however, since an inspirational address is sometimes considered just one particular kind of persuasion, using this classification could result in confusion. Perhaps persuasive is as specific a label as can be applied to these addresses when judged against the criteria of speaker intent, message content and treatment, and audience reaction. Many

of the addresses clearly revealed an intent upon the part of the speaker to persuade the audience. Additionally, several of the speakers indicated such an intent in response to a question on an information sheet provided by this investigator.  

The message content and treatment were not so uniformly or so clearly in the persuasive tradition as was speaker intent. In most of the addresses controversial issues were confronted, positions stated, and support for those positions offered, but that support was more frequently clarification than argumentation. This clarification consisted of narration, description, and exposition, or explanation. Although these elements are often conceived of as belonging to informative discourse, Quintilian treats narration as a means of persuasion, and Glen E. Mills and other contemporary authorities clearly recognize explanation as a persuasive method.

---

7 See pp. 317-318.

8 See specifically Gray and Braden, loc. cit.

Audience reaction was somewhat more difficult to examine than speaker intent and message content and treatment in analyzing these addresses, but some assessment of audience response was possible and it was shown in chapter four that there was direct overt Convention reaction or messenger response to several of the addresses under consideration.

By any approach then—whether considering speaker intent, message content and treatment, or audience response—the addresses are classifiable as persuasive. Yet there are other sets of categories which may be equally appropriate. The presidential address may be viewed as a specimen of "occasional" rhetoric. It occurs regularly, upon a predetermined occasion, within a prescribed setting. Although there are always elements of uncertainty surrounding certain aspects of the annual meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention, at least there is a president who has been elected the previous year and there is a definite time for his address indicated on the order of business which is adopted by the messengers. Within the limitations of human knowledge, it is certain that there will be a presidential address and it is known in advance who will deliver it.
From yet another point of view, the presidential address may be characterized as "institutional" rhetoric. The Southern Baptist Convention may be considered as an institution and all of the oratory occurring during its annual sessions may be viewed as institutional rhetoric, that is, rhetoric growing out of an institutional milieu. In another sense of the term, too, the address may be considered institutional. The presidential address itself, having existed in almost unbroken sequence for nearly fifty years, is an "institution." 

In view of all of these considerations, the Southern Baptist Convention presidential address may be viewed as occasional or institutional rhetoric of a persuasive nature. Each label is applicable, yet none excludes the others. Perhaps "institutional" best designates the occasion while "persuasive" best classifies the nature.

A fuller conceptualization of the Southern Baptist Convention presidential address can be gained from an understanding of the nature of the Southern Baptist Convention, the relationship of the

---


11 See Appendix C.
president to the Convention, and the relationship of the Convention to its cooperating churches. The nature and function of the address grow out of and are determined by these complex interrelationships.

Authority flows from the churches to the Convention, not conversely. The structure of the Convention is cooperative, not authoritative. Its purpose is missionary, not ecclesiastical. Its organization is democratic, not hierarchical. There is no chain of command from the president "down" to the churches. The Convention does not tell the churches what to do; messengers from the churches tell the Convention what to do. To be precise, messengers from the churches constitute the Convention.

Since the actions of the Convention are binding only upon its personnel, agencies, and institutions—not upon the churches—the president of the Convention has no authority over the churches. The only support which the Convention can gain from the churches is that which is elicited voluntarily. The Convention cannot issue edicts, pronouncements, or regulations which are binding upon the

---

12 For a detailed treatment of these elements, see chapter 2.


By the same token, the president of the Convention cannot issue edicts or encyclicals to the churches. He cannot impose authoritative decisions upon them, nor does he have the authority to speak for them. The power of the president over the churches is limited to his ability to carry to them a persuasive appeal which will elicit their voluntary support.

Thus, when the president addresses the Convention, his remarks are never authoritative pronouncements, regulations, edicts, or dogma. He cannot even declare an official "line" for the churches. His message is inspirational and persuasive in nature, designed to promote Convention unity and harmony and to elicit the willing cooperation and loyal support of the Convention constituency. He can direct only by persuasion.

The only time the president can speak with authority to the Convention is in his role as chairman over the business sessions. During these sessions he is invested with the customary authority

---

15 Ibid., article IV.
of a presiding officer, always subject to the will of the assembly within the limits of the constitution and bylaws.

When the president addresses the Convention, he tries to
"feel the pulse" of the constituency on the crucial issues facing the Convention, then enunciate his position in such a way as to lend the prestige of the office and the weight of his own ethos to what he feels is the most constructive and scripturally, theologically, or ethically defensible position. If it is possible, he catches the feeling and sentiment of what he views as the majority position and enunciates it, attempting to rally the support of the uninformed and uncommitted along with that of the informed and committed, in an effort to sway the opposition to his point of view. His kinship with the effective ceremonial speaker is evident at this point. If he should achieve nothing more, when the will of the Convention has been expressed, the president extols the virtue of Southern Baptist democracy and appeals for unified support of the majority decision.19

By the very nature of the election process, the president is likely to be a man who does fairly well reflect the convictions of a majority of the Convention constituency. Thus, although he has no official authority to make pronouncements in the name of the

Convention, he is likely to be able to enunciate his position in such a way that Southern Baptists in general heartily endorse his statement. As David M. Gardner was quoted as saying, in part:

We liked what Doctor Grey had to say and the way he said it. He made it crystal clear that no one, not even the president, can speak for Baptists, but in speaking for himself it was evident that the throngs present were in perfect accord with what he said. In that sense the president becomes a denominational spokesman. He is not officially authorized to speak for Baptists, but his sentiments are likely to be theirs and they like for him to articulate their sentiments for them; they enjoy having their sentiments forcefully enunciated from the platform for all the world to hear.

The president is never an "unknown" or a person propelled into office by a "party." He is a man who has gained the attention of the constituency by speaking in revival meetings, state conventions or conferences, preaching the annual sermon at the Convention or Pastors' Conference, serving as another officer of the Convention or Pastors' Conference, or serving the Convention through some of its other organizations, agencies, or institutions.

---


Although the individual addresses were found to convince, stimulate, or motivate with respect to the five major controversial issues identified in this study, one major discovery of this investigation was that the address, as an institution, has an aim of its own which sometimes surpasses those of the individual speakers. The over-all aim was determined to be the promotion of Convention unity and harmony. Some presidents dealt explicitly with this aim as a theme in their addresses, while others included it only implicitly as they focused their treatment upon more specific controversial issues. In either event, this aim was discernible in all of the addresses involved in this investigation.

Efforts to maintain unity became necessary because unity was viewed as valuable and worthy of maintenance against forces within the Convention or among its constituents which sought to weaken or destroy it. Thus, whatever specific persuasive point any president attempted to make, the address, as an institution, may be viewed as a means of achieving this larger aim. This larger aim constitutes additional evidence that the address is persuasive.

In summary, the addresses were subjected to analysis based upon a synthesis of classical and contemporary concepts, including those of Aristotle, Quintilian, Kenneth Burke, Donald Bryant, Karl Wallace, Glen E. Mills, and Arthur B. Miller. Because of their
relationship to the Southern Baptist Convention and their history, dating back to 1906, they were identified as institutional rhetoric. Their unique nature was found to grow out of the complex interrelationships among (1) the nature of the Convention, (2) the relationship of the president to the Convention, and (3) the relationship of the Convention to its cooperating churches. Although the president may serve informally and unofficially as a denominational spokesman, officially he is only the presiding officer of an organization composed of messengers from autonomous churches. Because the president has no authority to issue official edicts, his denominational leadership is accomplished by persuasion and example. The Convention is an organization which exists for missionary, educational, and evangelistic purposes and, while it exercises control over its own agencies, it sustains only an advisory relationship to the churches affiliated with it.

The addresses included in this study were found to be persuasive in nature. Although all of them contained elements of stimulation and a few of them were basically motivational with reference to specific proposals before the Convention, most of them were essentially convincing in method or aim. As the presidents confronted specific controversial issues, they sought to mold Convention attitudes and opinions. In some cases they sought to
strengthen pre-existing attitudes or beliefs; in others they sought to turn them in new directions. In any event, the presidents always sought the accomplishment of the broader aim of the address itself: promotion of Convention unity and harmony.

**Lofty Rhetoric**

The loftiness of the themes and allusions which filled the presidential addresses gave them an air of spaciousness. As the speakers dealt with spiritual matters and with values of eternal worth and consequence, their language reflected their orientation. The addresses were replete with references to the record of the past—the grand achievements of the Convention in years gone by, the steadfastness of the ministers and churches during years of pioneering, the perseverance of the missionaries in the face of insurmountable obstacles and their faith and dedication in confronting overwhelming opposition. They also sparkled with references to the challenge and promise of the future; they contained a strong altruistic appeal. They emphasized the power of God to perform His work through His people and they stressed the necessity of commitment to the task of cooperative Christian ministry. There were recurring

---

22 See the analysis of style and content in chapters 3 and 4.
calls for the constituency to stay close to the center of its purpose and position and for it to rely upon the power of God instead of the weakness of man. Finally, there were continuous pleas for unity and harmony among Convention messengers, constituency, and cooperating churches; although occasionally only implicit, these pleas were frequently explicit.

AN ASSESSMENT OF VALUE

Rhetorical Effectiveness

The presidential address has value in two areas: rhetorical effectiveness and rhetorical quality. It is valuable to the extent that it contributes to maintenance of the Convention and the accomplishment of its objectives. This is rhetorical effectiveness, or instrumental worth—the achievement of goals outside the address or beyond the mere delivery of the address; this was the major concern of this investigation. Throughout chapter four evidence was cited which supports the conclusion that the address is an effective force in the life of the Convention.

As controversial issues came before the Convention during the twenty-one year period included in this investigation, the presidents lent their personal ethos, their rhetorical powers, and the influence of their office to promote Convention unity and harmony.
In some instances they confronted controversial issues in head-on clash, taking a position on one side of the controversy. In other instances they treated the issues in general terms, sometimes dealing with the larger principles of which the specific issues were a part. In still other instances they shifted the attention of the Convention and the emphasis of their messages to larger issues than those involved in the specific controversy. At times they sought to promote unity by seeking to settle specific issues, while at other times they appealed directly for unity whatever disposition might be made of the specific issues. Whether this major aim was directly involved in the presidential address, or simply stood as a broader aim transcending the narrower ones directly involved, it was always present in relationship to the address.

Lee's and Grey's addresses directly confronted the issues of local church autonomy, ecumenicity, and doctrinal purity and helped to lay them to rest, at least temporarily. Although it was not related to a controversial issue, and thus was not treated in chapter four, Warren's 1956 address called for the establishment of thirty thousand new churches and missions; the Convention launched a full-scale program to reach this goal as a result of his appeal. In 1958, Hays called for the establishment of a committee on world peace; the Convention authorized this committee, then after completion of its pre-
scribed duty, the Convention assigned its general function to the Christian Life Commission, so the same basic work is being continued. Hobbs devoted his 1962 address to an exposition of a complicated concept related to theological investigation so as to prevent a rupture in the Convention over a doctrinal issue. Dehoney altered the direction of the Convention's efforts from squabbling over doctrinal pronouncements to involvement in positive evangelistic activities. Paschall helped the Convention to break out of a narrow construction of the gospel message which ignored the humanity of man and neglected his social conditions and relationships.

Taken together, the cumulative effectiveness of the statements of the presidents through the years has influenced the atmosphere of the Convention itself. Issues are being confronted and resolutions adopted which were foreign to the Convention barely a decade ago. In almost every case, some of the first confrontations with these issues can be found in the presidential addresses; their combined influence through the years has helped to shape the environment of the Convention's deliberations.

The address, as an institution, has exerted a force for positive, constructive Christian leadership. Not only have the addresses been effective as individual rhetorical events, but also the address has been effective as a rhetorical institution. Although reliable empirical
measures of address effectiveness are lacking, and in many cases information required as a foundation for rational inference is absent, in absence of contrary evidence, reasonable human judgment would infer that the presidential address has been one factor, among others, promoting Convention unity and harmony during the period 1950-1970. Its role of positive influence in promotion of unity and harmony is viewed as adequate justification for its continued existence in the life of the Convention. The presidential address is not simply empty ceremony—sounding brass or tinkling cymbal.

Rhetorical Quality

The address is valuable, finally, to the extent that it contains elements of intrinsic worth. This is rhetorical quality. Although it is not likely that any of these addresses will ever find its place alongside Demosthenes's "On the Crown," Jonathan Edwards's "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," Lincoln's "Second Inaugural" or "Gettysburg," Grady's "New South," or even John Kennedy's "Inaugural," several contained impressive rhetorical qualities. The analysis of organization, style, and delivery reported in chapter three and the analysis of invention reported in chapter four revealed that the eleven presidents included in this study—men who were strong in charisma and in the qualities which made them effective
ministers—were also strong in traditional rhetorical skills. They exhibited strength in the use of language. Their word choice was customarily plain and understandable. They achieved vivid imagery through the use of similes, metaphors, and references to familiar events. Their grammar and pronunciation were essentially accurate and their articulation clear and precise. They achieved desirable levels of clarity; although many of the concepts with which they dealt were abstract, their language was adequately specific and concrete--treatment was not obfuscatory.

All of the presidents utilized adequate vocal inflection to prevent monotony and maintain audience interest; all were skilful in achieving vocal emphasis or climax. Further, all spoke well within the limits of pleasing pitch range; they were easy to listen to. Hays probably was the most conversational of the group, Hobbs the most didactic, Pollard the most bombastic, and Criswell the most hortatory.

All of the speakers manifested forceful vocal projection despite the presence of public address systems which would have made audible the slightest whisper. None spoke either so softly as to render hearing difficult or so loudly as to make listening uncomfortable. Their volume was appropriately related to pitch to achieve emphasis.
The speaking rate of all of the presidents was deliberate enough to be understood. Paschall had the slowest rate of the entire group; he spoke slowly enough to permit reflection. Pollard, Criswell, and Dehoney spoke more rapidly than the others, rapidly enough to establish liveliness and a sense of movement and urgency.

The vocal quality, or "timbre," of these speakers was not marked by any pronounced deviation from what might be considered normal. The quality of all generally was pleasing. Warren's voice was occasionally marked by a slight harshness; Dehoney sounded tired in 1955, probably because he had already delivered several major addresses; and Criswell's voice revealed pronounced emotional qualities on several occasions.

The organization of the presidential addresses provided one of the more intriguing aspects of the analysis. Most of the addresses did not reflect strong characteristics of structure. In most there was no clearly climactic or anticlimactic arrangement; there was little evidence of purposeful utilization of either deductive or inductive order. Most of the addresses reflected a simple topical arrangement of the main heads, ignoring the traditional problem-solution or purpose-means patterns of persuasive discourse. This condition in addresses of men of such evident experience and skill was initially perplexing. The addresses were found to be effective, and good organization is
traditionally assumed to be desirable, if not necessary, for effectiveness. The explanation of this peculiar circumstance was found in the relationship between rhetorical purpose and rhetorical method; purpose dictates method. If the aim of the presidential address is to promote unity and to "set the tone" of the Convention, then it was wise of the presidents to avoid argumentation which would promote polarization and contentiousness; the expository and narrative modes, coupled with topical and chronological structure, served to set a non-argumentative example and to create an atmosphere of cooperation instead of contention. Thus that which initially appeared as a weakness was determined to be a strength.

Another strength of the addresses was their reflection of the clarity of the speakers' understanding of the purpose of the address. Although there was great diversity in content and some diversity of structure, the uniformity of overall aim was evident. Many of the addresses seemed to lack a clear-cut relationship between a central specific aim and the major issues confronting the Convention; yet the presidents' awareness of the overall aim of the address dictated their approach to issue confrontation. If the address were to unify the Convention, the approach could not be argumentative; therefore, most of the presidents avoided argumentation. Moreover, most of them did not limit their addresses to treatment of controversial
issues. In most cases the controversial issues were confronted only as one part of the entire address. On only one occasion did a president devote an entire address to a controversial issue; in 1952 Herschel Hobbs dealt with the theological controversy, yet even in this instance he utilized exposition instead of argumentation.

Consideration of the rhetorical quality of speaker invention reveals less uniformly desirable traits. Pollard's behavior seemed based more upon emotion than rationality. He leveled the charge of "liberals" among teachers without having the facts or producing any evidence. This attempt to keep the institutions "pure"—conservative—reflects his own feelings or emotions. A similar assessment could be made of his declaration that "the Sunday School Board is all right." He offered no evidence, only his own declaration. His utilization of _ad populum_ appeals to win favorable audience response is another indication of the same condition. Even his extemporaneous delivery supports this assessment; his mind works better when he is engaged in an emotional encounter with the audience.

Hobbs, the following year, proved to be the polar opposite of this group. His discourse was almost completely intellectual, or rational, as opposed to emotional. He made no effort to excite the enthusiasms of his audience or to stimulate their emotions. Significantly, Pollard took the Convention into conflict; Hobbs brought it out.
Dehoney proposed simplistic solutions to complex problems, suggesting that an evangelistic emphasis in the Convention would remove the controversies and relieve the crises. He did not explain how evangelism was expected to settle theological controversy, solve the racial problem, or lessen the tensions over ecumenicity or the anxiety over economic problems. His proposal seems to have been based upon unwarranted or fallacious assumptions, for there seems to be no evidence that evangelism has ever settled the problems of poverty or racial injustice.

On balance, the qualities related to rhetorical method—organization, style, and delivery—were found to be higher more consistently than those related to invention. Yet the addresses, as a group, manifest numerous desirable qualities in both areas. While none might be labeled great when compared to the world's rhetoric, when taken as a group the strengths far outweigh the weaknesses. The addresses are clearly superior to the traditional discourses encountered in the typical Southern Baptist church on a normal Sunday.

EXTENT TO WHICH THE PRESIDENTS UTILIZED THEIR RHETORICAL OPPORTUNITIES

Although the Convention president is a featured speaker in local churches, in district associational meetings, on state convention
programs, and in summer camps and assemblies, at no other time
during the year does he have the attention of the entire Convention,
and possibly the entire nation, to the extent that he has it during the
annual sessions of the Convention. This occasion provides the
president with a rhetorical opportunity unparalleled in Convention
life. Without exception, the presidents included in this investigation
utilized the rhetorical opportunity afforded them by the address to
come to grips with live issues and to attempt to mold Convention
attitudes and opinions. Although they possessed varying degrees
of rhetorical ability, none of the presidents abused this opportunity
by simply displaying oratorical skills. Their messages were
altruistic, frequently activist, and thoroughly in keeping with the
purpose of the Convention and the greater aim of the address.

Lee, Grey, and Hobbs took the most direct and forceful
approaches to issues confronting the Convention. Lee had led the
fight against the Alldredge amendment in 1949 and his 1950 address
was an aggressive declaration of his position on local church
autonomy. He utilized the address as an opportunity to lend the
full weight of his personal ethos and the prestige of his office
against ecclesiastical or hierarchical activities by the Convention.

When the issues of church autonomy and ecumenicity were before
the Convention in 1952 and 1953, Grey was just as determined to mold
Convention opinion as Lee had been in 1950. He repeatedly asserted that the purpose of the Convention was missionary, not ecclesiastical or hierarchical. Neither the issue nor Grey's position on it could have been missed.

One of the most desperate hours in Convention history fell when the Convention met in San Francisco in 1962. Hobbs was faced with the positive danger that a long-predicted split in the Convention would finally occur. He marshaled his powers in the presentation of the most forceful and intellectually stimulating message encountered in this investigation.

On each of these three occasions the Convention clearly moved in the direction proposed by the president. It would be unreasonable to infer that post-address Convention actions were purely coincidental and that these men had been engaging in mere histrionics. All of the presidents utilized the address for noble purposes; however, these three stand out above the others.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The Southern Baptist Convention presidential addresses have never before been the object of systematic investigation; thus, this study has attempted to elucidate the nature and significance of the address. This investigation provides partial vindication for the
existence of the presidential address. The picture, emerging from this study, of the president as a man who seeks to come to grips rhetorically with contemporary issues of vital concern is worthy of notice by those involved in the life of the Southern Baptist Convention. This study provides enlightenment upon what presidents of the past have done with their rhetorical opportunities; this enlightenment is at least potentially valuable to presidents of the future. The respect which this study should engender for the president as a man of integrity, insight, wisdom, and commitment should provide an element of redemption for its weaknesses. The understanding of Convention history which this investigation makes possible is an asset. If any of these virtues is real, not just imaginary, the investigation was worthy of having been undertaken.
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Former presidents of the Southern Baptist Convention included in this study

Left to right, seated: R.G. Lee (48-51); C.C. Warren (55-57); J.W. Storer (53-55); J.D. Grey (51-53); standing: Ramsey Pollard (59-61); Wayne Dehoney (64-66); Herschel Hobbs (61-63); K. Owen White (63-64); Brooks Hayes (57-59); H.F. Paschall (66-68); inset: W.A. Criswell (68-70). (Photo courtesy Baptist Press and W.A. Criswell.)
## APPENDIX B

### SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION PRESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William B. Johnson</td>
<td>1845-49</td>
<td>M.E. Dodd</td>
<td>1934-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert B.C. Howell</td>
<td>1851-57</td>
<td>John R. Sampey</td>
<td>1936-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Fuller</td>
<td>1859-61</td>
<td>L.R. Scarborough</td>
<td>1939-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick H. Mell</td>
<td>1863-71, 1880-87</td>
<td>W.W. Hamilton</td>
<td>1941-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James P. Boyce</td>
<td>1872-79, 1888</td>
<td>Pat M. Neff</td>
<td>1944-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Haralson</td>
<td>1889-98</td>
<td>Louie D. Newton</td>
<td>1947-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James P. Eagle</td>
<td>1902-04</td>
<td>J.D. Grey</td>
<td>1952-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Levering</td>
<td>1908-10</td>
<td>C.C. Warren</td>
<td>1956-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C. Dargan</td>
<td>1911-13</td>
<td>Brooks Hays</td>
<td>1958-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Lansing Burrows</td>
<td>1914-16</td>
<td>Ramsey Pollard</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B. Gambrell</td>
<td>1917-20</td>
<td>Herschel H. Hobbs</td>
<td>1962-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.Y. Mullins</td>
<td>1921-23</td>
<td>K. Owen White</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. McDaniel</td>
<td>1924-26</td>
<td>Wayne Dehoney</td>
<td>1965-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Truett</td>
<td>1927-29</td>
<td>H. Franklin Paschall</td>
<td>1967-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J. McGlothlin</td>
<td>1930-32</td>
<td>W.A. Criswell</td>
<td>1969-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick F. Brown</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Carl Bates</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

KNOWN PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES
PUBLICATION INFORMATION

1906, Stephens: Printed by the Sunday School Board; no copy located.

1918, Gambrell: No further information.

1919, Gambrell: Printed in the Convention Annual.

1922, Mullins: "He That Putteth His Hand to the Plow." Printed by the Sunday School Board; no copy located.


1924, Mullins: "The Mission of the Southern Baptist Convention." Not known to have been published.

1926, McDaniel: No further information.

1927, McDaniel: Convention took action on recommendations (Annual, p. 57), but no record of publication of the address.

1928-1934: Addresses delivered, but no further information as to titles or publication.

1935, Dodd: "Stewardship of Ideas." No further information.


1937, Sampey: "An Old Man Dreams." Published by the Sunday School Board; no copy located.

1938, Sampey: No further information.
1939, Scarborough: "Vital Essentials Worth Preserving and Perpetuating." Published as a tract by the Sunday School Board; copy on file in Dargan-Carver Library.

1940, Scarborough: "God's Call and Challenge to Southern Baptists." No further information.

1941, Hamilton: "Southern Baptists Facing the Future." Published as a tract by the Sunday School Board; copy on file in Dargan-Carver Library.

1942, Hamilton: "Southern Baptists Plead for Christian Unity." Published by the Sunday School Board; no copy located.

1944, Neff: "Manhood on the March." Digests appear in (Texas) Baptist Digest, June 1, 1944, p. 1, and (Georgia) Christian Index, June 1, 1944, p. 8.

1946, Neff: No further information.

1947, Newton: The Annual suggests that an address was given; Newton implied in correspondence that he did not give one. The evidence is inconclusive.

1949, Lee: No further information.

1950, Lee: "Eyes Upon Southern Baptists." Published in the Annual.


1956, Warren: "This Challenging Hour." Annual.


1961, Pollard: "My Church—a Militant Body." Texts deviating from the address as delivered appeared in (Oklahoma) Baptist Messenger, June 8, and (Texas) Baptist Standard, June 7; abridgments and quotations appeared in other Baptist papers.


1964, White: "For Liberty and Light." Released by Baptist Press; copy in Dargan-Carver Library.


1966, Dehoney: "The Living God, at Work in His World!" Released by Baptist Press; copy in Dargan-Carver Library.

1967, Paschall: "Mandate to Minister." Released by Baptist Press; copy in Dargan-Carver Library.


1970, Criswell: "The Rock Whence We are Hewn." Released by Baptist Press; copy in files.
APPENDIX D

CONVENTION INFORMATION RELATED TO THE ANNUAL ADDRESSES 1950-1970

1950: 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, May 10; Chicago. First main event on program for second session, preceding Convention sermon. Registration: 8,151. Convention theme: "Freedom's Holy Light."

1951: 11:00 a.m., Wednesday, June 20; San Francisco. First main event on program for first session, preceding Convention sermon. Registration: 6,493. Convention theme: "The Whole Gospel for the Whole World."

1952: 10:25 a.m., Wednesday, May 14; Miami. First main event on program for first session, preceding Convention sermon. Registration: 10,960. Convention theme: "Magnifying the Church."

1953: 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 6; Houston. First main event on program for first session, preceding Convention sermon. Registration: 12,976. Convention theme: "That the World May Believe."

1954: 9:35 a.m., Wednesday, June 2; St. Louis. Length: 19 minutes. First main event on program for first session, preceding Convention sermon. Registration: 10,962. Convention theme: "Forward . . . in Christ Jesus."


---

1 Individual speakers and address titles are listed in Appendix C.


1959: 12:00 noon Wednesday, May 19; Louisville. Length: 28 minutes. Climax of second session. The first session, on Tuesday night, was a special celebration held jointly with Southern Seminary which conducted its centennial commencement as a part of the program of the Convention. Registration: 12,326. Convention theme: "Teaching Them to Observe."

1960: 12:00 noon Wednesday, May 18; Miami Beach. Length: 36 minutes. Climax of second session; Convention sermon climaxed first session on preceding evening. Registration: 13,612. Convention theme: "Required of Stewards . . . Found Faithful."


1962: 9:50 a.m. Wednesday, June 6; San Francisco. Length: 56 minutes. Middle of second session; Convention sermon climaxed first session on preceding evening. Registration: 9,396. Convention theme: "Sharing Christ."

1964, the sesquicentennial year, dating from the organization of the parent organization (see note on 1970): 7:30 p.m. Tuesday, May 19; Atlantic City. Length: 38 minutes. Preceding Convention sermon in first session. Registration: 13,136. Convention theme: "For Liberty and Light."

1965: 8:40 p.m. Tuesday, June 1; Dallas. Length: 46 minutes. Climax of first session, almost immediately following the Convention sermon. Registration: 16,053. Convention theme: "Proclamation and Witnessing."


1967: 11:35 a.m. Wednesday, June 1; Miami Beach. Length: 41 minutes. Climax of second session; Convention sermon climaxed first session on preceding evening. Registration: 14,794. Convention theme: "Mandate to Minister."


1970: 8:10 p.m. Monday, June 1; Denver. Length: 38 minutes. Preceding a multi-media presentation celebrating the 125th anniversary of the Convention, dating from its own organization in 1845 (see note on 1964). This was the first time the Convention had met so early in the week and the earliest the address had ever been delivered. Registration: 13,692. Convention theme: "Living the Christ Life."²

² Capitalization of words in Convention theme follows that found in Annual.
APPENDIX E

STATISTICS ON CONVENTION AUDIENCE COMPOSITION

A. Age (nearest birthday):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-29</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-up</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No resp.</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Vocational area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church staff</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife of church staff member</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign or home missionary</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational staff</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Convention agency</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominational agency</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelism</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Secular&quot; or other not named</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Multiple responses cause percentages to add to more than 100.0)

Total participants in items A, B, and C: 6,427. The results of this survey were quite similar to others conducted in recent years; therefore, the results are viewed as representative.
D. Geographical area (only partial information is given here to show that the Convention audience is basically "southern"):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>6.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>5.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>6.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>14.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia—West Virginia</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,795</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.34%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total registration was 13,692.

This information was abstracted from a survey conducted by the Convention's Research and Statistics Department at the Denver meeting in 1970.
APPENDIX F

INFORMATION SHEET

Name:

Date of birth: Place of birth:

Educational attainments (Please list degrees held and institutions which conferred them):

Years of ministerial experience at time of your first election to the Southern Baptist Convention presidency:

Of what church were you pastor at the time of your Convention presidency?

What is the major role of the Convention president: presiding officer, denominational spokesman, Convention representative, or what?

What is the general purpose of the president's address, as you view it?

What paramount issues were facing the Convention during each year of your presidency?
1.  
2.  

What were your specific aims for each address which you delivered?
1.  
2.  

Can you indicate a source from which I might secure additional biographical information (Who's Who, S.B.C. histories, encyclopedias, etc.)?

1 This appendix represents the content, not the spacing, of the original sheet. Wording was adapted for Brooks Hays, a layman.
# APPENDIX G

## ANALYSIS WORKSHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVENTION THEME</td>
<td>REGISTRATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speaker:
- Auditory
  - volume
  - pitch
  - rate
  - quality

Linguistic
- grammar
- pronunciation
- articulation
- sentence structure
- word choice
- stylistic devices
- unity
- clarity
- vividness
- specificity

Internal Qualities
- attitude
- self
- audience
- subject
- occasion
- knowledge
- general
- specific
educational level
emotions
motives
ethos
empathy
age
sex
occupation
experience
sincerity

Utilization of Laws of Attention
size
intensity
change
pattern
familiarity

Speech
General Purpose
Specific Purpose
Organization
introduction
thesis
body
main heads
pattern
order
supporting material
exposition
narration
description
argumentation
evidence
humor
conclusion
Significance
Relevance
Development
clear
orderly
logical
Appeals
  logos
  ethos
  pathos
Scripture references
Strategy

Audience
  Age
  Sex
  Economic status
  Educational level
Knowledge
  general
  specific
Interests
Attitudes
Motives
Emotions
Set-expectancy
Response

Occasion
  Formal
  Informal
  Serious
  Happy
  Sad
  Regular
  Frequent
  Voluntary
  Religious

1 No attempt was made to construct a "perfect" analytical instrument specifically for this investigation. This worksheet was intended only to be suggestive to the investigator and to provide some degree of uniformity. The worksheet was somewhat more useful than blank sheets of paper. During the course of the investigation, many items on the sheet were found to be either inappropriate or irrelevant.
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Robert L. Hartsell was born in Hot Springs, Arkansas, on February 23, 1930. Educated in Lakeside School near Hot Springs, he received his B.A. degree from Ouachita Baptist University, Arkadelphia, Arkansas, in May, 1951. After serving in the United States Air Force, he entered New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary where he earned the B.D. degree in January, 1956, and the M.R.E. degree in January, 1957. After serving churches in Louisiana, Arkansas, and Kansas, he was a member of the library faculty of Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, where he received the M.A. degree in May, 1965. He initiated his doctoral program at Louisiana State University in 1968 while on leave of absence from Southern State College, Magnolia, Arkansas, where he is currently Assistant Professor of Speech.
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